

1 ~ PRESUPPOSITIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The Jesus Enigma

At the beginning of the twentieth century Albert Schweitzer observed that portrayals of Jesus by people in the century prior to his own mirrored in some way or another the lives and settings of those who had depicted it. In the last paragraph of his famed book *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Schweitzer¹ spoke of Jesus as the “one unknown” to those, “wise or simple,” who had obeyed his command to follow him but to whom he would “reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in his fellowship,” and, then, as an unspeakable puzzle (in Schweitzer’s words, “unaussprechliches Geheimnis”), “they shall learn in their own experience who he is.”

By carefully analyzing the Bible historically in the light of the knowledge available to him at that time, Schweitzer emphasized the strange difference between the first-century Mediterranean and twentieth-century European worldviews and mind-sets. Those images of Jesus by Bible readers who do not have an educated historic consciousness and, therefore, do not take the dissimilarity regarding these worldviews and mind-sets seriously, are merely pictures featuring their own worlds. It requires only a cursory view of the paintings of artists like El Greco (painter, born circa 1541 in Crete, worked in Italy and Spain, and died circa 1614) and Rembrandt (a Dutch painter and etcher, born in 1606 and died 1669), to underscore Schweitzer’s observation.

Well-founded research is also available in the field of the psychology of religion² that demonstrates a clear relationship between images people have of God and images of parental figures. Building upon this research, another study shows that the Christian believer (either exegetically trained or not) tends to “shape a *self-concept* that corresponds...to some extent and in some sense to his or her image of Jesus.”³ From these studies the psychology of religion draws the plausible hypothesis that those “deep questions” about what human beings value, “underlie all ‘readings of Jesus’.”⁴ The discord among scholars about the nature of either the historical Jesus or the risen Christ is “in part a function of disagreements about...values.”

Nobody’s portrayal of someone’s life or of some event is an intact, objective reconstruction. This dictum also applies to the constructs of scholars with a well-trained historic consciousness, like Schweitzer himself.⁵ It is Schweitzer himself, as we have seen, who notes that the follower of Jesus shall learn in her or his own experience who Jesus *is*. Schweitzer’s truism, therefore, certainly applies to the portrayals by the first witnesses of Jesus’ life which are found in the known and, for many, unknown Christian writings of the earliest centuries of the common era. This includes all of the precursors to Schweitzer, and both his concurrent and subsequent companions who have interpreted these “paper” characters in the Bible and constructed their images of Jesus from reconstructed artifacts. It is no weakness to admit to it. However, there are certain constraints because not “anything goes.” An image of Jesus can be either an alienation or an affirmation of the model, even if the portrayal is only a shadowy etching. Reflecting on the boundaries of interpretation and how far one is allowed to spread one’s wings requires one to seriously consider one’s presuppositions. Answers should be given to

questions such as: What is at stake when one says that the study of the life of Jesus is important? How much can we know about him? Are our earliest Christian writings, including those in the New Testament and other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature, in continuation or discontinuation of the Jesus of history? Why do scholars distinguish between a pre-Easter Jesus and a post-Easter Jesus? What does it mean to refer to the first as the “historical Jesus” and to the latter as the “kerygmatic Christ”? Did Jesus regard himself to be Christ, or for that matter, Son of God? Why is it necessary to reflect once more on the continued importance of Jesus and on the interrelationship between the quest for the historical Jesus and the origins of the church? It could therefore be of help to take the request of Sean Freyne,⁶ to heart:

Yet I am convinced that the present “third wave” quest for the historical Jesus is no more free of presuppositions than any of the other quests that went before it. Nor could it be otherwise, no matter how refined our methodologies. If we are all prepared to say at the outset what is at stake for us in our search for Jesus—ideologically, academically, personally—then there is some possibility that we can reach an approximation to the truth of things, at least for now. Even that would be adequate.

Leif E. Vaage,⁷ in a contribution entitled “The Scholar as *Engagé*,” adheres to this position. According to him, the fact that there are as many faces of Jesus as there are Jesus researchers is not a matter of different modes of knowing or various angles of seeing different dimensions of one and the same object:

What captivates, rather, is the social fact of situated discourses and their specific subjects. The oft-touted “subjectivity” of historical-Jesus research is

simply a function of the fact that, unlike certain other forms of New Testament scholarship, the link here is still patent between who the particular scholar is, including the social grouping(s) to which she or he belongs, and the preferred form(s) into which the Jesus data have been made to fit. Thus, the more honest and precise we can be about exactly what makes “the historical Jesus” worth discussing and what we hope to gain from our “Jesus,” the better the chance there is that our conversation about the historical Jesus will produce not just scholarly smoke but intellectual fire and human warmth.

Research Outline

The “situated discourse” of this study is not only a matter of ideological and academic concern, but most definitely one of personal engagement. Identifying a research gap with regard to existing Jesus research in chapter two will therefore consist of explaining two phases. One pertains to the growing realization among scholars that, if one denies at the doorstep the quest for the historical Jesus, doubt concerning God comes in through the window. The second facet aims at showing that, to some extent, a new frame of reference is established among scholars today within which historical Jesus research is being done. It is as if we have put on a different thinking cap. In chapter three I shall argue that the starting point of the quest for the historical Jesus could be moved beyond Jesus’ relationship to John the Baptist. Thus far, Jesus’ baptism has been seen by historical-critical exegetes as the point of departure for the quest. However, one can move backward from the Jordan to the cradle, in spite of all the legendary elements that cloud the nativity stories. Yet, in taking such a step, one should be aware of historiographical pitfalls when one studies the process of the “historization” of myth.

In chapter four, entitled “the Joseph trajectory,” I demonstrate that Joseph, the father of Jesus, should probably be seen as a legendary figure. Such an argument will lead me to conclude that Jesus should be seen as someone who grew up fatherless. In antiquity, especially in first-century Galilee, fatherlessness meant trouble. Against the background of the marriage arrangements within the patriarchal mind-set of Israelites in the Second Temple period, the “fatherless” Jesus would have been without social identity. He would have been debarred from being called a child of Abraham, that is, a child of God. Access to the court of the Israelites in the temple, where mediators could facilitate forgiveness for sin, would have been denied to him. He would have been debarred from the privilege of being given a daughter in marriage. With the help of cross-cultural anthropology and cultural psychology, I shall explain in chapter five in social-scientific terms an ideal-typical situation of someone who bore the stigma of being fatherless but who trusted God as Father. In chapter six I shall demonstrate that the “myth of the absent father” was very well known in antiquity, whether in Sepphoris, Galilee or in Pompeii, Italy, where it can be seen in mosaic or mural paintings. The story of an abandoned child who matures into an adult anti-patriarchal in temper, and who comes to the rescue of women and children, is almost recycled language. I shall argue that the Hansel and Gretel motif of abandoned children who subsequently become adopted by God, underlies the story of Jesus, son of Mary. The same motif is replicated in the story of Jesus’ blessing of “street children.”

In chapter seven I shall retell Ovid’s story of Perseus who was conceived virginally. My intention is to show why the second-century philosopher Celsus thought that the Christians unjustifiably mirrored this Greek hero, child of Zeus, in their depiction

of Jesus. Other examples within Greek-Roman literature are the myths surrounding Herakles, a Greek hero who also had a divine conception. In explaining his adoption as child of Zeus (which means deification), the Greek writer Diodorus Siculus tells the story of an empty tomb and an ascension to heaven. The same theme is to be found in the Lukan story of Jesus. The Roman writer Seneca also tells the story of Hercules' divine conception and his adoption as child of Zeus. In the New Testament Paul (Seneca's contemporary) is particularly known for the notion "adoption to become God's child" and for his use of the metaphor "Son of God" which he attributed to Jesus. This demonstrates that Jesus was revered as "child of God" by his followers. Here the focus is no longer on the *Jesus of history* but rather on the *Jesus of faith*. In chapter seven this notion will be explained as a parallel to Paul's contemporary, Seneca's portrayal of Herakles and the references by Diodorus Siculus and in the *Carmen Priapea* to the notion of "adoption" and miraculous conceptions of god-like human figures. Like Paul, John also attests to the idea that the believer, in some sense, shares Jesus' sonship. In John's gospel Jesus' "fatherlessness" is contextualized within a defamatory campaign that focuses on alleged illegitimacy. This offense is disputed by an argument that Jesus actually came from the heavenly region into the fullness of human condition and that Joseph is his biological father. Nonetheless, the Judean opponents of Johannine Christianity opposed this claim by showing that the children of Joseph are believed to be the ancestors of the Samaritans and that "true" Israelites do not mix with the Samaritans.

Chapter eight focuses on the origins of the church and the developing of a dogmatics of a "Christology from above." Towards the end of the book, the subversiveness of Jesus' cause is underlined. This is an important facet in answering the

question concerning the continued importance of the historical Jesus. Therefore, in the last chapter I shall demonstrate why the quest for the historical Jesus could be called *engaged hermeneutics*. One of the most urgent social problems of our time is that millions of children are growing up fatherless—this is not only a concern in the Third World but also elsewhere, as can be seen in the title of David Blankenhorn’s book *Fatherless America: Confronting our Most Urgent Social Problem* (1995). On the dust jacket of this book, Don Browning, Professor of Ethics and the Social Sciences at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, writes: “*Fatherless America* is the strongest possible refutation to a thesis widely held in our society—that fathers are not really important. David Blankenhorn exposes the multiple ways our culture has convinced itself of this falsehood and shows how to reconstitute fatherhood for the future.”

This study is about the historical Jesus who filled the emptiness, caused by his fatherlessness, with his trust in God as his Father. Among the earliest faith assertions of Christians, which gave them authentic existence, was their belief in Jesus as child of God. Searching for Jesus, child of God, could also restore authenticity in the lives of many people today.

The Dialectic between the Jesus of History and the Jesus of Faith

To call *Jesus* the *Christ*, on the basis of the New Testament, is not altogether obvious. It is a matter of a Messiah who did not want to be a Messiah!⁸ In the New

Testament we do not have any statement by Jesus that he is the Christ, except in a very qualified and indirect sense in Mark 14:61. Historical-critical analysis illustrates the many layers with regard to the traditions about the origins of Christianity. Accordingly, an understanding that there is a difference between the *Jesus of history* and the *Jesus of faith* developed among critical scholars. The word “faith” belongs to the realm of the church, the believing community of Christians. For now, it is sufficient to postulate that faith is experienced, lived, confessed, and proclaimed in the church.

In biblical times, the name “Jesus” was fairly common.⁹ Influenced by Greek idiom, this name occurred frequently among Israelites around the beginning of the common era. In Mediterranean countries many people are called by the name “Jesus.” Apart from the Jesus “who is called the Christ” and Joshua, the “son of Nun,” mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, the first-century Galilean historian Josephus mentions at least twelve others called “Jesus.” They played a part in the history of Israel during the period of Greco-Roman geopolitical domination. The vast majority of these persons belonged to priestly and governing families.¹⁰ However, when people today hear the word “Jesus,” or use it themselves, they probably have in mind *the* Jesus to whom Christians pray, as if they are praying to God. For many people today there is no difference between the names “Jesus” and “Christ.” In other words, when Christians use the name “Jesus” or “Christ” they are referring to God. This equation already appears at the end of the second century of the common era, as used by Clement, the church father of Alexandria in North Africa.¹¹ Similarly, the second-century Syrian church father of Antioch, Ignatius, refers to Christ as God as though such a statement were quite self-evident.¹² However, such a relatedness is not to be found among Jesus’ own sayings. Ignatius¹³ often used the

expression: “(Jesus Christ) our Lord.” In most instances, the New Testament itself, however, has reservations about calling Christ “God.”¹⁴

All of these events indicate that, to the Christian believing community, Jesus is *more than* merely a historical figure. Jesus is, in a sense, elevated above history when he is seen as someone special. Since the second half of the first century and for two thousand years, Jesus has been proclaimed and confessed by Christians in the church *as* the Messiah of Israel, *as* Lord of the world, *as* the Child of God, *as* God—essentially equal to the Father (since the fourth century) and to the Spirit (since the eighth century, and formulated in a specific way in the Western church since the beginning of the eleventh century). This Jesus is the *Jesus of faith* in contradistinction to, yet irrevocably bound with, the *Jesus of history*.

Different expressions are used to refer respectively to the one or the other. The *Jesus of history* has often been called the *historical Jesus* while, on the other hand, the *Jesus of faith* is known as the *kerygmatic Christ*.¹⁵ The word “kerygmatic” is derived from the Greek word that means “proclaimed.” The distinction *pre-Easter Jesus* and *post-Easter Jesus*, respectively, is also used for this purpose. Considering the reasons for the use of these various terms may help us to get some grip on a very profound matter. It can help us to understand what the quest for the historical Jesus involves. It also illuminates why, even in secular society, the question as to the continued importance of Jesus is still being asked. If Jesus was seen as merely a historical figure, the significance of his life would be no different from that of people like Aristotle, Plato or Alexander the Great. Nobody who knows anything about world history would deny the value of the historical investigation of these figures. Jesus, like others from the ancient or more recent

past, may be added to such a “who’s who in world history” list. From a historical perspective, Jesus is important because he was influential in the course of world history.

For instance, in a note on the stoning of James, the brother of Jesus, the first-century historian Josephus¹⁶ found it worth mentioning that James is “the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ.” Here, in this report intended to be the product of historiography, we are not dealing with a honorific, as is the case with the same words (“Jesus, who is called ‘Christ’”) in the Gospel of Matthew (1:16, see also Mt 27:17, 22). This is also the case with the Roman historian Tacitus,¹⁷ (circa 110 C.E.), and with other “non-Christians”¹⁸ who, subsequent to Josephus, made pejorative remarks about “Christ” or “Christians.”

Clearly, the reasons for the importance of Jesus to people outside the Christian believing community are different from the reasons of those who began believing in him and like him. In the concluding chapter of this study, I shall indicate briefly why the quest for the historical Jesus, seen from the vantage point of both the church and the broader community, should be undertaken. For now, it is sufficient to emphasize that the question of the importance of Jesus is *today* irrevocably bound to the fact that the *historical Jesus* is also taken to be dialectically linked to the *kerygmatic Christ*.

The terms “kerygma” and “dialectical thinking” are theological jargon. After orthodoxy and liberalism, dialectical thinking represents a third option of doing theology. In doing theology and interpreting the Bible, liberal theologians do not consider themselves bound by any ecclesiastical constraints such as canon or creeds. In orthodoxy these will function as filters for doing theology, as though dogmas generate justifying and saving faith. Dialectic theology offers a third option. With regard to critical and

historical exegesis of the Bible it is like a loose horse running in a field without fences. But when it comes to applying the results of critical thinking, the church and its dogmatic codes are neither seen as having patent rights for correct interpretation, nor considered to be irrelevant.

Sometimes the term “kerygma” is used to refer to the *proclaiming* Jesus and the *proclaimed* Christ. The terms “proclaiming” and “proclaimed” here constitute a dialectical conceptual pair. This means that they are two different grammatical constructs and therefore have semantically different connotations. However, they function as a unit. Their interrelatedness contributes toward establishing meaning. *Proclaiming* refers to Jesus himself acting and speaking. *Proclaimed* refers to the interpreted Jesus whose words and deeds are retold by others. This constitutes the *Jesus-kerygma*—Jesus manifests as a becoming event through the retelling of his cause. It is a matter of *telling* and *showing*.

In the *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus*¹⁹ these terms are used somewhat differently by the Jesus Seminar. For the Jesus Seminar, “showing” comes first and it refers to “enactment,” while “telling” is the same as “recounting.” Here, in this study, the expression “telling” is used to refer to a probable act of the historical Jesus while “showing” refers to an act of faith by believers of later faith communities “retelling” Jesus. *Telling* refers to both authentic sayings and deeds, because sayings and deeds go hand in hand, even if one or the other is not reported. *Showing* is that “enactment” or “recounting” which could be based on either something authentic or unauthentic. Irrespective of the historicity of the case, the faith assertion expressed by the enactment or retelling is so overwhelming that authenticity is

overshadowed and difficult to discern. *Telling* is thus not without *showing* and vice versa. Yet telling and showing must never be confused, although in principle they should be distinguished from each other, regardless of the fact that they are dialectically intertwined.

The concepts “historic-kerygmatic” and “proclaimer-proclaimed” first appeared in the title of a book written in 1896 by the dogmatician of Jena in the old Prussian Empire, Martin Kähler²⁰ (1835-1912). There he distinguished between the “historical Jesus,” “real Christ” (“der historische Jesus,” “der wirkliche Christus”) and the “geschichtliche,” “biblical,” in other words, “proclaimed Christ” (“der biblische Christus,” “der gepredigte Christus”). These concepts not only disclose a distinction in German between the “historisch-geschichtlich” and “wirklich-biblich”/“gepredigt,” but also between the names “Jesus” and “Christ.” This distinction is related to the dialectic “pre-Easter Jesus”-“post-Easter Jesus.”

Why do scholars draw these distinctions? The answer lies in the fact that historical-critical exegesis of the New Testament brought forth the historic insight that Jesus did not regard himself *as* the Christ, *as* the Child of Humanity, *as* the Child of God, *as* God.²¹ Nor was he recognized as, for instance, the Child of God by the people around him. The New Testament, not Jesus himself, the church fathers, as well as the drafters of the fourth-century creeds, proclaimed and confessed him in these terms.²² It is, furthermore, not the case that all these names (Christ, Child of Humanity, Lord, Child of God, God) were used immediately by *all* followers of Jesus. An investigation into the development of the origins of Christianity and the handing down of traditions relating to Jesus, brings to light trajectories that indicate the succession of different historic phases

in the development of the use of these terms. The results from the past two hundred or three hundred years of New Testament scholarship illustrates:

- the complicated transitions from oral to written traditions;
- the influence on oral and written traditions of, first, the eastern Mediterranean and, later, the Greco-Roman cultural contexts;
- source interdependence, for instance, the fact that Matthew and Luke used, among others, Mark as a framework and source of information, but that each of them, nevertheless, freely diverged from it in constructing a specific, unique message;
- the consequences of the fact that documents originated at different dates—for instance, that Paul wrote his letters before the final editing of the Gospel of Mark and that although John was written after Matthew and Luke, it was to a significant degree an independent enterprise.

Drawing an accurate picture of Jesus from these complicated particulars is certainly no easy task. The question regarding the historical Jesus is prodigiously complicated. Who is the “real Jesus?” We must remember that we do not have immediate access to what Jesus thought of himself and of God. However, for the Christian believer he is *the* manifestation of God, although he, as in the case of Socrates, did not himself put to pen either the message of his words and deeds or the interpretation of his birth and death. It would have been very strange for a carpenter who made yokes and doorframes (someone like Jesus, who was probably part of the peasant farming

community of first-century Galilee) to read or write! This is said in spite of the tendentious report in Luke 4:16 that Jesus, in a synagogue, read from Isaiah 61 and applied it to himself. This passage is typical of the evangelist's post-Easter conviction that Jesus was the Messiah of Israel and a fulfillment of Jubilee. The different aspects of the influential nature of Jesus' life were handed down mainly after his death by those who met God on the basis of the traditions concerning Jesus. Jesus is therefore "God's becoming event"²³ for Christian believers.

At first, the handing down of traditions occurred orally. The first written record to be found today in the New Testament only appeared twenty-five years after Jesus' death, and was written by someone who had never met him personally: Paul (according to Acts 9:11 [cf. Acts 11:25] from the town Tarsus in the region of Cilicia in Asia Minor, today's Turkey). The Gospel according to Mark, which was written circa 70 C.E., only came afterwards. Mark served as a source for the authors of the Gospel of Luke (written circa 85 C.E.) and of the Gospel of Matthew (written circa 85-95 C.E.). The Gospel of John originated independently of the three synoptic gospels, Mark, Luke and Matthew, towards the end of the first century. During the second century, (Gnostic) writings with a so-called "hidden" way of talking about Jesus, although very diverse in nature, content, and "God-talk," became prolific. Though outnumbering the writings commonly used by the Roman-based church, these "hidden scriptures" were not regarded as being in accordance "to the rule of faith" by the dominating church. However, today a number of influential historians and exegetes argue that some of these documents contain authentic sayings of Jesus or, at least, present trajectories of Jesus traditions that lie beneath behind

the New Testament gospel material. A large number of these (Gnostic) writings are part of the Nag Hammadi Library.

The way in which the documents of the New Testament were produced and reproduced should also be taken into account. Before the improvement of book printing by Johann Gutenberg (circa 1450 C.E.), books were written, copied, and translated by hand.²⁴ These manuscripts only appeared in book form around 300 C.E. The original manuscripts (the first foundational texts) of the New Testament are no longer extant. The earliest surviving small fragments of manuscripts date from the period after 125 C.E. and the larger fragments from circa 200 C.E. The earliest surviving complete manuscript of a New Testament book dates from circa 300 C.E. No two manuscripts of a specific New Testament book dating from before circa 1454 C.E. agree in all respects. Numerous “mistakes” crept in during the process of copying and translating the manuscripts. A *historical-comparative* investigation is required in order to determine a reliable New Testament text. *Text-historical* research should not be limited to those manuscripts that form part of the New Testament. All relevant evidence should be taken into account. Under the auspices of the United Bible Societies, a team of historians engaging in research into the origins of the New Testament, exercised certain choices by way of voting. Their results were arranged in four categories of greater or lesser probability and published. The final product is the New Testament that is still read today.

The *historical-comparative* methodology, with the same *modus operandi* of committee work and voting used in the above-mentioned compilation of a text of the New Testament, was being used by the Jesus Seminar²⁵ in the United States in its investigation into the historical Jesus. A certain amount of gentle mockery of the Jesus

Seminar was “the custom among scholars not directly involved.”²⁶ It was also said that “in most instances the Jesus Seminar is not voting on anything half so tangible” as the editors of the Greek New Testament who were “weighing the evidence of actual manuscripts.” However, such a remark is debatable. Is there really a difference between the United Bible Societies’ detection of plausible historicity and the uncovering of authenticity by the Jesus Seminar? In its search for historicity, the United Bible Society searched for the origins of both the *copied* (referred to as “actual” by Thomas Wright) manuscripts dated from the end of the third century C.E. onwards, and the early *translations of the copied* manuscripts dated much later. With regard to historical Jesus research, the quest for the authentic sayings and deeds of Jesus investigates the plausible layers behind the (referred to as “tangible” by Thomas Wright) Greek texts. These so-called “tangible” texts were the product of a similar process, namely the detection of the origins of the available manuscripts. The New Testament as a collection of edited manuscripts is, therefore, not an objective data base for research. Historically, how could the one enterprise claim more credibility than the other?

Within the Jesus Seminar, historical decisions are being guided in particular by the criterion known as “multiple independent attestation.” This means that multiple independent written evidence has greater historical probability than either singular evidence or a plurality of interdependent literary evidence. In other words, evidence in independent documents such as Paul and Mark should be historically more seriously considered than evidence in Matthew and Luke, which was taken over from Mark. Evidence independently reported in Matthew and John is also probably more historical than that of a single witness in Luke, for example. However, this does not mean that a

single witness should be regarded as unauthentic. Yet, an argument for authenticity in such a case lacks historical proof. The Jesus Seminar further takes into account that writers often amended material to suit their intentions and narrative structures. Such material and statements which clearly exhibit the literary preference of a particular writer and the characteristics of a post-Easter ecclesiastical life situation (*Sitz im Leben*) often serve as directives toward those Jesus traditions that cannot historically be traced back to the oral period of 30-50 C.E. Such editorial material can hardly be deemed authentic sayings or deeds of the historical Jesus.

However, the issue is much more complicated than meets the eye. Take as an example the well-known Jesus saying reported in the Gospel of Matthew (16:20) that the “church” is built upon “Peter.” From a historical-critical perspective, virtually no New Testament scholar would regard this saying as words of the historical Jesus. Yet, *telling* and *showing* are so closely intertwined in this saying that it is almost impossible to differentiate between Jesus’ telling and Matthew’s showing. However, the reference to Peter’s primacy among the core group of Jesus’ followers is historically very well attested in independent documents. This element in the particular saying could therefore, in all probability, be regarded as historical. However, historical-critical research indicates that the reference to an assembled faith community (analogous, for example, to an assembled religio-political community in either the context of Israel or the Greco-Roman world) as “church” (in Greek: ἐκκλησία/a) is not from the life situation of the historical Jesus or the pre-Easter disciples, but rather from the post-Easter faith community.²⁷

Concerning the “search for Jesus” (*Rückfrage nach Jesus*), the German New Testament scholar Ferdinand Hahn prefers to focus on “individual features” (*Einzelheiten*) rather than on complete sayings: “It is a matter of establishing an concise description of the interrelatedness between post-Easter and pre-Easter elements in the individual pieces of Jesus traditions.”²⁸ This kind of historical research, applied to a search for Jesus, assumes that the followers of Jesus attributed or applied general “wisdom” derived from their experience of life and the world to him. It is similar to what writers did with regard to legendary sages such as Solomon, Socrates, and Krishna. Thus, for example, Matthew represented Jesus in a way that conformed with the Greek translation of the Old Testament (the Septuagint). In doing so, he made use of apocalyptic-messianic themes derived from a shared late first-century Hellenistic-Israelite context. In this regard, I have certain First-Testament pseudepigrapha²⁹ (originally written in Greek or Aramaic, although today some of these documents are only found in translations) in mind. In these writings, Israel’s messiah was depicted among other images as the coming Son of Man, a figure who would inaugurate God’s perfect kingdom when the despondent believers (seeing this human-like figure come from above) will be justified and rescued.

In his representation of Jesus, Luke, in turn, used propaganda motifs that appeared in Greco-Roman stories about deities and in the emperor cult. It was presented in this way in spite of the fact that many of the traditions in the sources of this gospel originated in Israel and Roman Palestine. The Gnostic literature, on the other hand, located Jesus firmly within a heavenly realm entering into the earthly context only apparently human.³⁰ All these examples are related to what may be called the “Christianizing” (in German:

Christianisierung) of Jesus. A more inclusive way of referring to this process would be to call it a technique of exalting Jesus by using honorific titles (in German: *Würdeprädikationen*). Clear traces of such exaltation are already present in the New Testament and trajectories can be followed deep into the second century and even afterwards.

Suffice it to say that certain statements by Jesus clearly exhibit convictions characteristic of Christians after Easter. This is related to the phenomenon that the Christian community designed certain apologetic statements, which they attributed to Jesus, in order to oppose defamatory campaigns by opponents. This information assists us in constructing a particular image of the historical Jesus that can be clearly distinguished from the images of Jesus found in the canonical and non-canonical gospels. In this investigation, historical decisions are not made depending on what modern people, within the context of the Western tradition, deem rationally possible or acceptable.

Because of the natural sciences of the period before Albert Einstein many unwittingly became “positivists.” Even in the twentieth century it still remains the predominant mind-set. Positivism was prevalent in the philosophy of science during the nineteenth century.³¹ It is indicative of the grip that the natural sciences had on the spirit of the day. According to positivism, *knowing* can only result from *empirical* observation. “True knowledge” is, therefore, the product of so-called objective, controllable, experienced exactness. In other words, positivism boils down to the conviction that the concepts *knowledge* and *truth* are synonyms and the upshots of both experience and reason.

However, at the time when the Bible was written (also when the classical ecclesiastical creeds were established) empiricism was not the prevalent theory of knowing or truth. Contrary to biblical thought, to distinguish between a “super-natural” occurrence (for example when the “spirit of God” reportedly comes upon someone cf. Jdg 14:6; 1 Sm 10:1; Mt 1:18, 20; Lk 1:35; Mk 1:9-11) and a “natural” happening is a modern-day fabrication. Such a distinction is not valid in first-century Mediterranean culture.³² In the cultural context of first-century people in the area of the Mediterranean Sea, the primary distinction in this regard was between “creator” and “creation.” The latter included not only the so-called “natural” things concerning humanity and its constituents, but also the so-called “spiritual” things concerning the world of God, angels, miracles, diviners, and magic, expressed by rituals and spells.³³ These “spiritual” experiences led to a condition that may be called an *altered state of consciousness*.³⁴ The particular nature of this condition is influenced by cultural associations and personality types. Without this insight from cultural psychology, rationally oriented people in the Western world today would be inclined toward an anachronistic understanding of the context of Jesus and of its peculiar consciousness which involved, among others, faith healing and resurrection experiences.

Knowing the dynamics of an altered state of consciousness is particularly relevant for understanding the apocalyptic mind-set of Jesus and his contemporaries. Apocalypticism involves the view that God’s new age will come imminently and that it will be introduced by catastrophes of cosmic dimensions.³⁵ Scholars believe that Jesus (or at least John the Baptist, if not Jesus himself) expected God to let the heavenly kingdom become an earthly reality soon.³⁶ Therefore, the writers of the New Testament

announced this expectation in varying degrees. It has become clear to me that one needs to be very concise concerning the meaning of both the terms *apocalypticism* and *eschatology* when writing on the historical Jesus. These terms pertain to particular concepts of time.

Cross-cultural anthropology helps us to discern between modern Western and ancient Mediterranean concepts. I have come to realize that so-called “eschatologies” are constructs that do not take into account the difference between the pre-modern Mediterranean and the modern Western notions of time. Of course, Jesus and the writers of the Bible made use of time schemes in order to put their understanding of God’s relationship to people into words. It goes without saying that *their* concept of time played a role in establishing *their* constructs. The mythological worldview of the first century Mediterranean world was oriented toward the *present*, while our “Swiss” time in the modern Western world is oriented toward the *future*.³⁷ However, this does not mean that *future* or *present* does not exist in the concept of time of the respective cultural spheres.

The issue with regard to time is important in Jesus studies. An aspect of the debate is whether or not Jesus was an eschatological figure. “Apocalypticism” is often viewed in connection with “eschatology,” the doctrine that concerns the end of time. The Greek adjective *eschatos* (εσχάτος), however, has two possible meanings in the New Testament: to be “last” or to be “least important.” From the meaning “to be last,” theologians developed a comprehensive thought structure with regard to time³⁸. Social-scientific studies by especially Bruce Malina and John Pilch³⁹ investigated the phenomenon *apocalypticism* and the concepts “time” and “apocalyptic eschatology” from

a cultural-anthropological perspective. These social-scientific studies consciously attempt to take seriously the distance between the ancient and the modern and the consequent cultural differences. The studies demonstrate that it is a hermeneutical fallacy to interpret their concept of time (pertaining to a pre-industrial, advanced agrarian Mediterranean world) from a contemporary Western perspective (which is oriented towards the future).

As far as the Mediterranean concept of time is concerned, one may distinguish between *experienced time* and *imagined time*. That which is imagined relates to that which one experiences. Within such a culture, forefathers, for example, are regarded as “living dead.” The world beyond experience, for example the world beyond death, forms an elongation relative to what is experienced in the worldly life. What is sometimes called “apocalyptic eschatology” by scholars,⁴⁰ refers to experiences of “imaginary time” and this is related to an altered state of consciousness manifested in ecstatic experiences by means of visions or heavenly auditions that create a trancelike condition. The people of Jesus’ time regarded these phenomena as “natural.”

At present, the quest for the historical Jesus is of a multidisciplinary nature. Biblical archaeology, sociology, cultural anthropology, psycho-biography, cultural psychology, medical anthropology and socio-linguistics are some of the disciplines that provide a basis for the investigation of the historical Jesus. Upon closer inspection, all of this information points to the fact that people in today’s Western world will never be able to determine exactly what Jesus would have said or done. Our attempts to fathom the core of his message can only be through the literary witness of believers who proclaimed him *as* Messiah, *as* Child of Humanity, *as* Lord, *as* Child of God, and *as* God.

Since Emperor Constantine (fourth century C.E.) an image of Jesus known as classical ontological Christology was developed with the help of complicated Greco-philosophical metaphysics and Roman legal terminology. Terms such as “persona” and “substantia” were taken from the renowned Roman legal system. According to this system, the law provides for an individual to share some substance with someone else while retaining his or her own possessions. From this simple legal regulation, the sophisticated and ingenious monotheistic dogma of the One Triune God was developed: God Three-In-One. Sharing the same substance of being, three persons feature different aspects within the divine economics of salvation: *begetting and providing* (God the Father), *conciliating* (God the Son), *managing* (God the Holy Ghost).

Focusing on the second category, God the Son, the mode of the dogmatic discussion is to speculate about the two natures of the Son—his divine and human natures. At this point it becomes metaphysical, ontological Christology. Since Plato (circa 427–347 B.C.E.), metaphysics has been about the distinction and relationship between “natural” and “supernatural”: human-like and God-like. We already indicated that “Christian thinkers up to the nine century really did not develop theologically significant usages of the super-natural.”⁴¹ Christology emerged as an enterprise of theologians who have reflected and systematized their thoughts about Jesus. They presumed that these thoughts are supported by witnesses in the New Testament, while most of it actually originated in later Christian thinking.

When thinking theologically, ontology has to do with the philosophical view that the “true” essence of someone or something exists only in its relationship to the ultimate unseen “idea” which lies beyond what can be empirically known or observed. The word

“ontic” has to do with the aspect of *relating* and not with someone’s behavior or way of functioning. The particular question of metaphysical ontology as it pertains to Jesus is primarily focused on what concerns God, not humankind. It is therefore also known as the “Christology from above.” It is concerned with the *similarity of being* in the *personae* of the Trinity in their threefold respective interrelationships. However, in the past, New Testament scholars⁴² referred to the Christologies of the authors of the New Testament as “functional.” From this perspective, the focus is on Jesus’ *behavior* inferred from his words and deeds that directed his followers. Subsequently, the writers of the New Testament ascribed honorific titles to him.

Today, apart from the distinction between an ontological (*from above*) and a functional (*from below*) perspective on Jesus, a perspective *from the side* also has been introduced.⁴³ Critical New Testament scholars are convinced that an ontological perspective on Jesus is not to be found in the New Testament, not even in Johannine literature. In John 1:1 we read that the *Logos* (Word/Jesus) was with God and was God. Here, however, we do not have a typical ontological metaphysical scheme, but rather a “functional” way of speaking about understanding Jesus’ behavior. The term *Logos* originated in so-called Greco-Semitic wisdom speculation and has clear traits of gnosticism. In the Johannine literature, however, gnosticism is “converted” into something less docetic. This is a form of theology which says that God’s becoming event in Jesus can be explained by using the honorific title *Logos*: from the heavenly realm, God entered into the earthly context. As stated earlier, the functional perspective emphasizes those words and deeds of the pre-Easter Jesus that, in the post-Easter period, gave rise to the “majesty titles” ascribed to Jesus by the earliest Christians. However, the

perspective “from the side” does not endeavor to unravel the interweave of pre-Easter and post-Easter Jesus traditions. In this investigation, the issue is how Jesus would have been experienced by his contemporaries rather than how his later followers interpreted his words and deeds. The interpretation from a post-Easter faith perspective was filtered through experiences of resurrection appearances.

Earlier, the unraveling of—and continuity/discontinuity between—the historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ was carried out with the assistance of a number of criteria.⁴⁴ The investigation went through different phases.⁴⁵ The work of the Jesus Seminar focuses on the *historical* investigation of Jesus and the *historical* development of the trajectories of tradition in early Christianity. This project is not aimed at questions concerning the theological relevance of the *historical* investigation of Jesus. A number of individual researchers who form part of the Jesus Seminar do, however, in their own research, investigate theological issues. The results of the historical investigation of the Jesus Seminar move towards a minimum consensus. Jesus is seen as a person from the peasant farming community of Herodian Galilee with an “apolitical” criticism of the temple and a non-apocalyptic, inclusive, and anti-hierarchical vision of the kingdom of God. These investigations indicate that Jesus communicated his vision, in particular, by means of short proverbial expressions, his dealings with social outcasts, and exorcisms. His words and deeds are therefore seen as interacting with one another.

The *historical* investigation practiced in this study is multidisciplinary in nature. From a literary point of view, relevant documents are read against the background of their chronological periods and respective contexts. A multiplicity of congruent, independent evidence from a particular tradition carries relatively greater historical

weight.⁴⁶ The influence of Easter on the handing down of Jesus traditions is taken into account. This is necessary to distinguish historically between the pre-Easter and the post-Easter Jesus. Pre-Easter traditions are interpreted within ideal-typical situations in terms of a first-century, eastern-Mediterranean society. The contention of this study is that Jesus grew up as a fatherless son.

This point of departure is supported by a historical-critical deciphering of a post-Easter trajectory with regard to a legendary Joseph figure. Initially Joseph is found in the wisdom literature of the First Testament (Gen 37-50). Here he is depicted as the abandoned sibling who became an Israelite sage in Egypt. Having been called from Egypt, he was the Moses prototype who rescued Israel in need. I will show that Joseph's offspring, believed to be the forefathers of the Samaritans, were marginalized by the Judeans as illegitimate children of Israel. Nevertheless, in the New Testament Joseph became (by God's intervention) the savior of Mary and her child. This tradition was conveyed in both intertestamental documents and the New Testament. It developed in a distinctive way in "post-apostolic" literature, Roman Catholicism, and Protestant dogmatics. In the New Testament, we find this tradition behind and beyond Matthew, Luke, and John. In Matthew, there is the scene of a holy marriage and, as in Luke, the story of the adoption of Jesus by Joseph. According to John, Joseph is Jesus' biological father. Historically seen, the figure of Joseph as Jesus' father does not occur in the early sources behind Matthew and Luke. Joseph also does not play a role in the Pauline literature and the New Testament documents that built upon Paul. In chapter four of the book, I shall come back to this Joseph trajectory. At this point, it is sufficient to postulate that the presence of such a trajectory historically satisfies the so-called criterion of multiple, independent attestation of the fact that Jesus probably grew up fatherless. Jesus' fatherlessness is probably a historical fact that should be taken into account

when one considers his social identity, his a-patriarchal ethos, his behavior towards women and children, and especially his trust in God as his father.

Literary, historical and social contexts are therefore considered in an integrative way. In this project fatherlessness is *not* a topic about which one *fantasizes* as was done from a “psychopathological” perspective by those “liberal theologians” (“*freisinnigen Theologen*”) with whom Albert Schweitzer⁴⁷ was at loggerheads. In this study we shall try to avoid this “psychological fallacy.”

Methodological Concerns

Because we do not have Jesus’ words as recorded by him, but only as transmitted by witnesses, two other fallacies may be created. The first fallacy is that it would be impossible to determine the historical core of the mind-set of Jesus of Nazareth. (Here the term “mind-set” is not used positivistically as though the researcher could enter into the head of someone else and read his or her mind empirically.) The second fallacy is that it may be deemed undesirable to undertake a historical Jesus investigation because the real Jesus is the Jesus to be found on the surface of the Bible and not behind the text. In orthodox theological circles, this is the Jesus of whom the ecclesiastical creeds bear witness. The title of Martin Kähler’s book (1896), referred to earlier, already indicates his opinion that only the Christ *proclaimed* (“*gepredigt*”) in the Bible (New Testament) really matters. This view is still prevalent among scholars who often ridicule the work of the Jesus Seminar.⁴⁸

The work of Rudolf Bultmann (the most influential New Testament scholar of the twentieth century) has often been wrongfully used to validate the view that a quest for the historical Jesus is “impossible.” Bultmann was prompted by Albert Schweitzer’s finding that exegetes who draft biographies of Jesus often project their own ideologies onto their images of Jesus. Such ideologies include the exegetes’ own ideas regarding ethical-religious perfection, goodness, sinlessness, and holiness. These are projected onto the inner being of the person Jesus.⁴⁹ Bultmann called this “psychological fallacy.” One cannot describe another person’s mind.

Earlier Kähler⁵⁰ had already pointed out that a biography of Jesus would be impossible since sources did not mention Jesus’ psychological disposition. Therefore, Albert Schweitzer reacted against theories about supposed mental disorders in the mind of Jesus. In his doctoral thesis, *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*, which served as the completion of his medical examinations, Schweitzer responded to the work of four “psychopathologists.” They claimed to build upon Schweitzer’s view that Jesus’ activities were those of a “wild” apocalyptic prophet.⁵¹ Using the so-called psychopathological method (“the investigation of the mental aberrations of significant personalities in relation to their works”)⁵² these men depicted Jesus as someone who was suffering from hallucinations and paranoia⁵³. Schweitzer’s reaction to these “psychopathologists” was similar to his reaction to the “liberal theologians” from the previous century. According to Schweitzer, they constructed a “liberalized, modernized, unreal, never existing Jesus...to harmonize with [their] own ideals of life and conduct.”⁵⁴ With regard to these psychopathologists, Schweitzer stated: “[They] busy themselves with the psychopathology of Jesus without becoming familiar with the study of the

historical life of Jesus. They are completely uncritical not only in the choice but also in the use of sources.... We know nothing about the physical appearance of Jesus or about the state of his health.”⁵⁵

In his well-known Jesus book, Bultmann⁵⁶ agrees that, “psychologically speaking” (*psychologisch verständlich*), we know virtually nothing of the “life” and “personality” of Jesus. Bultmann’s student, Ernst Käsemann⁵⁷ also agrees with this. But, according to Walter Schmithals⁵⁸ (another Bultmann student), in the *Nachwort* to Bultmann’s Jesus book, a gross misunderstanding (“ein groteskes Mißverständnis”) could arise here. It is misleading to believe that Bultmann (or Schweitzer, for that matter) considered it impossible to carry out a historical investigation of Jesus. Bultmann⁵⁹ also says that we know enough of Jesus’ message to be able to draw a coherent picture of him. The problem is not that we know too little of the historical Jesus. The question is whether this knowledge is at all relevant for faith. This issue nearly caused the debate between Bultmann and his students (in particular Ernst Käsemann and Joachim Jeremias) to become personal. Fortunately, both Käsemann and Bultmann⁶⁰ declared that the matter at hand was more important than persons.

One of the assumptions of this study is that historical Jesus research can be done. The question then would be whether it is necessary. Can one be a Christian without it? Marcus Borg⁶¹ points out that there have always been Christians who believed in Jesus *as* Christ, *as* Child of God and *as* God without ever having engaged in the quest for the historical Jesus. Kähler⁶² called it the “childlike faith” of millions throughout history. According to Luke Timothy Johnson⁶³ (a critic of the Jesus Seminar), the post-New Testament’s “developed, dogmatic Christ of church doctrine (true God and true man)” is

not the Jesus “limned in the pages of the New Testament.” The latter Jesus is “instantly graspable” by uncritical Christians, who let their lives be shaped by it and not by historiography. The problem, however, is that Luke Timothy Johnson sees the writings of Paul (and of 1 Peter and Hebrews) “converging” with the canonical gospels, but overlooks the New Testament’s diversity. The “converging” picture, then, is the “instantly graspable” image of Jesus!

The issue here is: in whom or in what do we place our ultimate trust? The members of the Jesus Seminar are often accused of being positivists who place their trust in “historical” facts. The opposing opinion presents itself as trusting only in what the New Testament says. However, trusting in the New Testament as an “objective entity” also exhibits positivism. It is claimed that “truth” is to be found in the “kerygma” (in the New Testament). How, then, does “truth” manifest in the witness regarding the “kerygmatic Christ?”

In a specific response to Luke Timothy Johnson, John Dominic Crossan⁶⁴ pointed out that the narrative form (as in the four canonical gospels) is not the only gospel format. There are also gospels in the format of a collection of proverbs of Jesus (“sayings or aphorisms gospel”) which undoubtedly came into being before the narrative type. The Sayings Gospel Q (hidden in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke), and the Gospel of Thomas (recovered in Greek fragments and in a Coptic translation found under the sand at, respectively, Oxyrhynchus and Nag Hammadi in Egypt) are examples of the aphorism format. Unlike the narrative gospels and the letters of Paul, the “sayings or aphorisms” gospels do not attach any redemptive meaning to the death of Jesus.

What, then, is “true” with regard to the “kerygmatic Christ” found on the surface of the New Testament, in contradistinction with the “historical Jesus” who is rediscovered by means of historiography? After all, these two types of gospel format with their different messages of God’s salvation cannot both lay claim to credibility! Even if one were to work only with the canonically accepted gospels, the problem would not be solved, since the interpretations of the death of Jesus by Mark and John differ radically, as Crossan⁶⁵ notes:

For Mark, the passion of Jesus starts and ends in agony and desolation. For John, the passion of Jesus starts and ends in control and command. But, I repeat, as gospel, both are equally but divergently true. Both speak, equally but divergently, to different times and places, situations and communities. Mark’s Jesus speaks to a persecuted community and shows them how to die. John’s Jesus speaks to a defeated community and shows them how to live.

Luke Timothy Johnson misses *the* important point. The issue is not that historical Jesus researchers want to ground their faith in historiography rather than in the normative nature of the Scriptures! One cannot formulate it better than Crossan:⁶⁶ “[O]ur faith is not in history, but in the meaning of history; not within a museum, but within a church.”

The present-day dialectic systematic theologian Eberhard Jüngel⁶⁷ says it in different words: “[F]aith in Jesus as the Christ cannot be *grounded* in the historical Jesus, it must nevertheless have a *support* in him.” Jüngel⁶⁸ is quite correct when he states that God cannot be known *historically*, but only on the basis of God’s *revelatory* acts in respect of which the *faith* of the one who receives the revelation corresponds. God is revealed by God’s own undertaking through the medium of historical events. By this, I

mean that, for Christian believers, God is manifested in the human Jesus of Nazareth. Another renowned systematic theologian from the Netherlands, Schillebeeckx⁶⁹ says: “Without Jesus’ historical human career the whole of Christology becomes an ideological superstructure.” If so, all of our reflections on Jesus’ relevance for us, as witnessed in documents written by biblical writers or afterwards, would be ideas flying without identifiable roots in human existence. Such ideologies unjustifiably separate the so-called “supernatural” from “natural” entities without realizing that the authors of the Bible did not have such a dichotomy in their mind-set.

Although God’s becoming event in Jesus of Nazareth occurred historically, and is therefore in principle open to historical investigation, the act of faith that confesses that Jesus is the Christ, the Lord, the Child of God, God-Self, is not grounded in historiography as such: “No one can say that ‘Jesus is the Lord’ but by the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor 12:3). But “(i)f God has made *this* human being—and not just any human being—to be the Christ, as faith confesses, the faith must be interested to know what can be known about this person: but not in order to *ground* faith in Jesus Christ historically, but rather to guard it from docetic self-misunderstanding.”⁷⁰

The word “docetism” is derived from a Greek word (*doke/w*) that denotes “apparentness.” In other words, it yields to the other side of what is called “empiricism.” Yet docetism presents a viewpoint that is not really less positivistic in nature than empiricism. Over against the viewpoint that someone’s or something’s credibility depends on its empirically observed or tested value in this earthly world; a docetic viewpoint would emphasize that someone’s or something’s value could manifest to the senses or mind as “real” or “true” on the basis of evidence that does not need to be

empirically seen or touched. Exegetes of the Johannine literature have therefore explained the references in both prologues of the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1:14) and the First Letter of John (1 Jn 1:1) to the seeing and touching of the *Logos* which became *Flesh* as a polemic against Gnostic docetism.⁷¹

At the end of the first century C.E., writings that advocated a world-escaping gnosticism originated. Among the documents of the Nag Hammadi library, discovered in 1945 in the desert close to Luxor in Upper Egypt, a fair number of such texts were found.⁷² In general, these documents view the empirical world negatively. The world is seen as inherently evil, domesticated by evil powers, or as an imperfect creation because of its transitoriness.⁷³ When the Nag Hammadi writings refer to Jesus “who became flesh” their intention is, for the most part, that “Jesus who is a spiritual being hides his spiritual ‘flesh’ under shapes, likenesses or a human body.”⁷⁴ However, writers such as Paul and John, instead emphasized that God’s becoming event in Jesus Christ is trustworthy because it comes to believers by means of the apostolic kerygma. According to this kerygma, Jesus was equal to people in terms of human history and the human condition. In all probability the apostolic kerygma originated in the Jerusalem church before the city was ruined by the Romans in 70 C.E.. In chapter four (where the Joseph trajectory) and in chapter eight (where the historicity of “the Twelve” will be discussed) I shall focus more critically on the role of the so-called “pillars” of the Jerusalem church.

Bultmann’s⁷⁵ well-known observation, that it is the *that* (“Daß”) of Jesus which is important for faith and not the *what* (“Was”), deals with precisely this type of dialectic between “spirit” and “flesh.” According to this stance, stories in the gospels about Jesus’ work and life, his birth and death (in other words the “whatness” of his life) are assertions

of faith in which the Jesus-kerygma is expressed. The Jesus-kerygma is the “thatness” of God’s becoming event in Jesus, the “ground of Christian faith.” However, it is on this point that students of Bultmann, such as Käsemann (and Jeremias), misunderstood their mentor. Bultmann⁷⁶ was not of the opinion that a “historical and material” antithesis⁷⁷ exists between Jesus and the kerygma of the early church. Bultmann⁷⁸ spoke of a distinction between “historical continuity” and “material relation.” It seems that he meant that a continuity clearly exists between Jesus and Christ (the two names “Jesus” and “Christ,” after all, refer to the same historical person) but that there is no historical continuity between the *kerygma* which takes the death of Christ Jesus as a redemptive event, and the *historical Jesus* himself who did not call on people to believe in him, but to depend, like him, on the presence of God. However, there is a material relation between the message of Jesus and the ecclesiastical kerygma: both announce that life in the kingdom of God is qualitatively and radically different from the meaning that people find in cultural arrangements⁷⁹—life in the kingdom of God is *life according to the Spirit* and not a *life according to the flesh*. Paul, therefore, did not need to ground his kerygma in Jesus, the Jew, because then he would have grounded faith in the Christ who, as a human, came from the cultural context of the Israelites (Rm 9:5).⁸⁰

Yet, it would be a misrepresentation of Paul to say “that Jesus in his flesh may well have been Jewish, but that as the resurrected Christ he certainly is not.”⁸¹ Indeed, to Paul, Jesus would be bound to particularism, that is, to a peculiar cultural arrangement, had the significance of Israel’s messiah been solely of an ethnic nature. Such a messiah would be, according to Romans 9:5, “Christ according to flesh.” But this is *not* the material essence of the traditions of Jesus that had been handed down to Paul. On the

contrary, there is a material relation between Jesus of Nazareth and the Christ Jesus proclaimed by Paul. In other words, the *Jesus of history* is not irrelevant.

Faith assertions, according to Paul, do not need stories about miracles, pronouncements of controversies with Pharisees or parables about God's patronage. These stories, however, are vehicles of the faith assertions found in the gospel material. In other words, the authors of the gospels regarded them as functional. Furthermore, Paul did not deem it necessary to use the Jesus-kerygma as source in order to reconstruct a historical Jesus *before* he could believe. However, Paul could only base the life "in Christ" (as he, from an existential perspective formulated the Jesus-kerygma compactly), because he in some way or another had knowledge of the handed-down Jesus tradition. According to this tradition, Jesus was subversive towards the culture of his time. Thus, according to Jesus, living in God's kingdom means that neither mediators, nor specific cultural arrangements, are needed to give someone direct and immediate access to God's love. God's becoming event in Jesus has universal relevance—no one is excluded, as Paul's notion of "justification by faith" puts it. The concept of "immediacy" is a functional metaphoric way of explaining the *cause of Jesus*.

But, with regard to the Jesus-kerygma, let me put it very concisely (maybe in slight disagreement with both Bultmann and his students): the Jesus-kerygma is merely another faith assertion that cannot claim to be the sole credible reflection of the *cause of Jesus*, that is, *God's becoming event in Jesus of Nazareth*. The observation by Joachim Jeremias⁸² that Bultmann runs the risk of replacing the message of Jesus with the preaching of Paul (and John), is therefore not entirely inappropriate. Such an admittance, however, does not eliminate the fact that Bultmann indeed emphasized the existence of a

material link between the message of Jesus and the Pauline kerygma. In Robert Funk's⁸³ version of Jesus' understanding of the kingdom of God, none other than Paul's statements are echoed in particular:

God's domain was for Jesus something already present. It was also something to be celebrated because it embraces everyone—Jew, gentile, slave, free, male, female. In God's domain, circumcision, keeping kosher, and sabbath observance are extraneous. The kingdom represents an unbroken relationship to God: temple and priests are obsolete.

The gospels presented this message in a version different from that of Paul, while John presented it in a version different from that of Mark, and the Gnostic writings in the Nag Hammadi library differently again. A harmonized composition of the Christ events, as recorded in the New Testament, is not “normative,” as Luke Timothy Johnson would have it; nor is a necessarily relativistic choice of one version above another. It is the mode of the dialectic between pre-Easter and post-Easter that is normative. Crossan says:⁸⁴ “It is because of that normative process that each Christian generation is called both to consider the historical Jesus and simultaneously to reinterpret that figure as Christ or Lord. Each side of the dialectic must be done over and over again....What is permanent is the dialectic.”

Seen in this way, the imposed injunction to repeat this same dialectic mode amounts to our always being oriented again by the evidence in the New Testament and other intra-canonical and extra-canonical literature. Where else do we learn of God's revelation in and through Jesus of Nazareth? To the writers of the New Testament he was: Jesus *as* Christ, Jesus *as* Child of Humanity, Jesus *as* Child of God, Jesus *as* Lord.

To the authors of extra-canonical literature, like the Nag Hammadi documents, Jesus was, among other things, the “Fullness of God.” And for me: Jesus *as* God, but then not necessarily in the classical ontological sense of the word alone.

In other words, when Funk⁸⁵ deliberately chooses to turn his back on Paul and, for that matter, decisively also on Bultmann as a dialectic theologian, one can have respect for his taking Jesus’ subversiveness seriously. However, to go along, towards the new millennium, with Jesus, but without the New Testament or the church as the believing community of Christians, would not be an act of faith that necessarily rests on or is implied by his cause. Yet it does not mean that the New Testament should be put, as Willi Marxsen⁸⁶ formulates it, “in the place of Jesus as *the* revelation.” William Thompson,⁸⁷ building upon the insights of philosopher-theologians Paul Ricoeur and David Tracy, says:

Christianity is not a religion of a book, but of a person, Jesus [as] the Risen One. But the Jesus event has left us “traces” of itself in the New Testament, and it is chiefly to this “text” that we must turn for “normative codification” of the Jesus event. That we go to Jesus *through the biblical text* is finally rooted in our tradition-bound character. Like all other things human, Christianity is an historically-mediated religion.

END NOTES

1. Schweitzer, A [1906] 1913, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p 642: “Als ein Unbekannter und Namenloser kommt er zu uns, wie er am Gestade des Zees an jene Männer, die nicht wußten wer er war, herantrat. Er sagt dasselbe Wort: Du aber folge mir nach! und stellt uns vor die Aufgaben, die er unserer Zeit lösen muß. Er gebietet. Und denjenigen, welche ihm gehorchen, Weisen und Unweisen, wird er sich offenbaren in dem, was sie in seiner Gemeinschaft an Frieden, Wirken, Kämpfen und Leiden erleben dürfen, und als ein unaussprechliches Geheimnis werden sie erfahren, wer er ist....”
2. E.g., Vergote, A. & Tamayo, A. 1981, *The Parental Figure and the Representation of God*; Vergote, A., Tamayo, A., Pasquali, L., Bonami, M., Pattyn, M.-R., & Custers, A. 1969, “Concept of God and Parental Images,” pp. 79-87. Recently, Francis, L.J. & Astley, J. 1997, “The Quest for the Psychological Jesus: Influences of Personality on Images of Jesus,” pp. 248f., summarize these authors’ findings. According to the 1969 study the parental image of God rather than the maternal image is for both males and females in the North America society samples more preeminent. This tendency was even stronger in males than in females. Also within Asian communities in North America God is for boys and girls more like a father than a mother. According to another study, the correspondence between God and father, or between God and the masculine image, was basic in women whereas in men, the relation between God and mother, or between God and the feminine image predominated (cf. Francis & Astley, p. 249). They also show that among French-speaking Belgians both males and females emphasize the parental image of God corresponding to their own gender. A more recent study among Canadian students draw attention to the “strong relation between the concept of God and the mother image for both male and female subjects.”
3. See Francis, L.J. & Astley, J. 1997, “The Quest for the Psychological Jesus,” pp. 247-259. By means of the so-called “Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire,” through which personalities are profiled, they quizzed 473 secondary school students between the ages of twelve and fifteen in the United Kingdom, 317 students studying religion at A level and 398 adult churchgoers. The data exhibit significant correlations between the respondents’ personality and their images of Jesus.
4. Francis & Astley 1997, p. 248.
5. See Schmidt, Darryl D. 1997, “Albert Schweitzer’s Profile of Jesus,” unpublished paper, Westar Institute’s Jesus Seminar, Fall Meeting 1997, Santa Rosa, CA.

6. Freyne, S. 1997, "Galilean Questions to Crossan's Mediterranean Jesus," p. 91.
7. Vaage, L.E. 1997, "Recent Concerns: The Scholar as *Engagé*," p. 181-182.
8. These words came from a New Testament scholar from the Netherlands, Cees den Heyer 1996, *Opnieuw: Wie is Jezus? Balans van 150 Jaar Onderzoek naar Jezus*, pp. 78-80: "Een Messias wat geen Messias wilde zijn."
9. During my visits to Mediterranean countries, I heard many people called by the name "Jesus." According to its Semitic origins, the name means "God is salvation." In Luke's gospel, Jesus is also called "Savior." In the First Testament, this epithet refers to men who delivered God's people from their enemies (see Bock, D.L. 1987, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, p. 78).
10. See Whiston, W. 1978, *Josephus Complete Works*, p. 767. These Jesuses were Jesus, son of Phabet, who was robbed of the high priesthood (Ant 6.5.3); Jesus, son of Ananus (BJ 6.5.3); Jesus, also called Jason (Ant 12.5.1); Jesus, son of Sapphias, governor of Tiberias (Vit 12.27; BJ 2.20.4); Jesus, brother of Onias, who was robbed of the high priesthood by Antiochus Epiphanes (Ant 15.3.1); Jesus, son of Gamaliel, who was proclaimed high priest (Ant 20.9.4); Jesus, the oldest priest after Ananus (BJ 4.4.3); Jesus, son of Damneus, who was proclaimed high priest (Ant 20.9.1); Jesus, son of Gamala (Vit 38.41); Jesus, son of Saphat, who was the leader of a band of robbers (Vit 22; BJ 3.9.7); Jesus, son of a priest, Thebuthus (BJ 6.8.3); Jesus, son of Josedek (Ant 11.3.10).
11. Clement of Alexandria (Protr 1:1): "We should think of Jesus Christ as we think of God."
12. See Ign Trall 7:1; Ign Smy 1:1; 10:1.
13. Ign Eph (prologue; 15:3; 18:2); Ign Rm (2x in prologue; 3:3); Ign Pol (8:3). What was important to Ignatius was precisely to indicate that there is nothing self-evident in viewing God as being present in the shape of the human Jesus Christ. However, his concern is not with the idea that God, at all, appeared in the shape of a human. To people like the Greeks and the Romans, such an idea was far too general for this to have been the case. What concerns Ignatius is the mystery that God appeared in the specific shape of the *suffering* Jesus Christ. Therefore there is, to him, a paradox which is expressed in the terms "incarnated God" (Ign Eph 7:2), "God's blood" (Ign Eph 1:1), the "suffering of my God" (Ign Rm 6:3) or the "bread of God, that is the flesh of Jesus Christ" (Ign Rm 7:3).
14. See also among others Bultmann, R. 1952, "Das christologische Bekenntnis des Ökumenischen Rates," p. 248; Bultmann, R. 1968a, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 131 note 1; Richardson, N. 1979, *Was Jesus Divine?*; Harris, M.J. 1992, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of "Theos" in Reference to Jesus*. Apart from Jn 1:1, where the

15. See Theissen, G. [1999] 1999, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*, p. 22.
16. Josephus, Ant 20.9.1 – cf. Whiston 1978, p. 423.
17. Tacitus, An 15.44.
18. Cf. Whiston 1978, pp. 639-647. For information about references to Jesus Christ in ancient sources by non-Christians, which may be of historical value, are those by Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny, Celsius, Lucianus of Samosata, Thallus and Mara, son of Serapion (see Evans, C.A. 1996, *Life of Jesus Research: An Annotated Bibliography*, pp. 291-298.
19. Funk, R.W. (and the Jesus Seminar) 1998, *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus*, pp.27-28.
20. Kähler, M. 1969, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*, neu herausgegeben von E. Wolf.
21. Cf. Tatum, W.B. [1982] 1999, *In Quest of Jesus*, p. 157.
22. See Grillmeier, A. 1965, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*.
23. Cf. Scubert M. Ogden 1996, *Doing Theology Today*, pp. 248-252; building upon the insights of Willi Marxsen 1978, *Christologie – praktisch*.
24. Cf. Funk, R.W. 1991, *The Gospel of Mark: Red Letter Edition*, with M.H. Smith, p. 18.
25. For an explanation of the program and aims of the Jesus Seminar, see *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*, edited by R.W. Funk & R.W. Hoover 1997, pp 34-37.
26. Wright, N.T. 1996, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 30. In fairness to Thomas Wright, one cannot but admire the fine scholarly way of articulating his disagreement with the Jesus Seminar, while also giving credit in some extent to aspects of the work of the Jesus Seminar's and some of its preeminent members like Robert W. Funk, John Dominic Crossan and Marcus Borg.
27. See Schrage, W. 1963, "'Ekklesia' und 'Synagoge': Zum Ursprung des urchristlichen Kirchenbegriffs;" Trilling, W. 1978, "Implizite Ekklesiologie: Ein Vorschlag zum Thema 'Jesus und die Kirche'," pp. 57-72.

28. Hahn, F. 1974, "Methodologische Überlegungen zur Rückfrage nach Jesus," pp. 28-29: "Es ist die Relation zwischen nachösterlichen und vorösterlichen Elemente in den einzelnen Überlieferungstücken zu prüfen und Exakt zu bestimmen."
29. See, e.g., 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, The Lives of the Prophets and Pseudo-Philo. In these documents intertextual parallels occur, resembling each other with regard to messianic eschatological symbolism. 2 Baruch is important, for it shares with Matthew an intention to cope with the "eschatological meaning" of the Temple after the catastrophe of 70 C.E. and with the emergence of formative Judaism. In both the Gospel of Mathew and in 2 Baruch the history of Israel is interpreted by means of apocalyptic imagery in the light of the destruction of the Temple. However, it is difficult, almost impossible, to prove dependency on the part of the Gospel of Matthew. It rather a common dependency on apocalyptic imagery. Cf. Van Aarde, A.G. 1998, "Matthew 27:45-53 and the Turning of the Tide in Israel's History," pp. 16-26.
30. See Franzmann, M. 1996, *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings*; Koester, H. 1990, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*, pp. 124-128..
31. Cf. Snyman, J.J. & Du Plessis, P.G.W. (eds.), *Wetenskapsbeelde in die Geesteswetenskappe*.
32. Cf. Pilch, J.J. 1996, "Altered States of Consciousness: A 'Kitbashed' Model," p. 134. Pilch, elaborating on his previous published research, discusses in the above-mentioned article a "social-scientific" a model for the exegesis of specific texts, such as the records on the appearances of the risen Christ. He makes use primarily of Bourguignon, E. 1979, *Psychological Anthropology: An Introduction to Human Nature and Cultural Differences*, Saler, B. 1977, "Supernatural as a Western Category," pp. 31-53; and Evans, D. 1987, "Academic Scepticism, Spiritual Reality, and Transfiguration," pp. 175-186.
33. Pilch, J.J. 1996, "Altered States of Consciousness," p. 134.
34. Pilch, J.J. 1995, "Insights and Models from Medical Anthropology for Understanding the Healing Activity of the Historical Jesus," pp. 314-337; Davies, S.L. 1995, *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity*. However, Pilch, 1997a, pp. 71-72, in a "Review Article" on Davies' book, blames the author that he did not interpret the Mediterranean personality types and their contextual embeddedness cross-culturally adequately. Davies' use of cultural psychology, is also according to Pilch, anachronistic and ethnocentric from a Western "monocultural" perspective. Ethnocentrism amounts to the accusation that different ethnic cultural codes are unjustifiably composited.

35. Present-day studies on apocalyptic eschatology reveals a “sectarian mentality” (see, among other publications, Collins, J.J. 1984, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*): in a crisis, a minority group becomes marginalised, tending to be aware of only two sides of a matter (dualism): the right and the wrong, the divine and the satanic, a world here and now and a world beyond. As is well known, the worldview of the apocalyptic is marked on the one hand by pessimism and determinism, and on the other by hope: the present dispensation is a miserable dispensation, while the transcendent dispensation beyond this one is joyful. Such pessimism and determinism are relativized by the conviction that the course of history may be changed, for the sake of the self and others, by means of the prayers and martyrdom of the “righteous.” The crisis in the cultural world of Israel and the church, which gives rise to this, revolves around the pressure which heathen powers placed on the cult and the being of the church. The crisis is magnified because the presumed relation between deed and retribution is not realised. The godless are not punished and the righteous are not visibly the victors. Seen from Bruce Malina’s study (“Christ and Time: Swiss or Mediterranean?,” 1996, pp. 179-214), “experienced time” is as a result of this embarrassment projected into an “imaginary time” in which God exercises control.
36. See Allison, D.C. 1998, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet*.
37. See Malina, B.J. [1989] 1996, “Christ and Time: Swiss or Mediterranean?,” pp. 179-214.
38. This applies with respect to New Testament scholars, to schemes like that of F.C. Baur’s historiography of early Christianity (*Urchristentum*) which is based on G.W.F. Hegel’s idealistic conception of time, Albert Schweitzer’s “consequent eschatology,” Charles Dodd’s “realised eschatology,” Oscar Cullmann’s “salvation history” (*Heilsgeschichte*), and even E. P. Sanders’ “restoration eschatology.” These time schemes are constructs from modern European era and are anachronistic with regard to their use of the Scriptures. This does not mean that aspects of these theological constructed eschatologies have been to a greater or lesser extent existentially meaningful to people of the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. Experience confirms that this was indeed the case, but it does not make a particular construct, viewed exegetically, more or less legitimate.
39. See, especially, Malina, B.J. 1996, “Christ and Time: Swiss or Mediterranean?,” pp. 179-214; and Pilch, J.J. 1993, “Visions in Revelation and Altered Consciousness: A Perspective from Cultural Anthropology” pp. 231-244.
40. See, e.g., Sim, D.C. 1996, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*.

41. Pilch, J.J. 1996, "Altered States of Consciousness," p. 134. Referring to Saler, B. 1977, "Supernatural as a Western Category," p. 46, Pilch notes that "theologically significant usages of the supernatural" were only then introduced into the theology of Western Christendom when the works of Pseudo-Dionysios were translated into Latin in the ninth century C.E..
42. See, e.g., Balz, H.R. 1967, *Methodische Probleme der neutestamentliche Christologie*.
43. Cf. Malina, B.J. & Neyrey, J.H. 1988, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*, pp. x-xi.
44. Hahn, F. 1974, "Methodologische Überlegungen," pp. 11-77; Mussner, F. 1974, "Methodologie der Frage nach dem historischen Jesus," pp. 118-147; Calvert, D.G.A. 1971, "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus," pp. 209-218; Du Toit, A.B. 1985, "Die Historiese Jesus en die Verkondigde Christus," pp. 267-293.
45. Cf. Tatum, W.B. [1982] 1999, *In Quest of Jesus*, pp. 91-109; Scott, B.B. 1994, "From Reimarus to Crossan: Stages in a Quest," pp. 53-280; Telford, W.R. 1994, "Major Trends and Interpretive Issues in the Study of Jesus" pp. 33-74; Breytenbach, C. 1995, "Jesusforschung: 1990-1995. Neuere Gesamtdarstellungen in deutscher Sprache," pp. 226-249; Borg, M.J. 1988, "A Renaissance in Jesus Studies," pp. 280-292; Borg, M.J. 1994a, "Portraits of Jesus in Contemporary North American Scholarship (with Addendum)," pp. 18-43.
46. Cf. especially Crossan, J.D. 1991, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*, pp. 427-450.
47. Cf. Schweitzer, A. 1913, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, Band 2, p. 367.
48. See, among others, Luke Timothy Johnson. I am referring to two of his publications and not to his opinions, much more scholarly articulated, as expressed in an Internet debate between Marcus Borg, John Dominic Crossan and himself during 1996. Cf. Johnson, L.J. 1995, "The Search For (the Wrong) Jesus," pp. 20-44; Johnson, L.J. 1996, *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels*. See, however, Robert J. Miller (1999), *The Jesus Seminar and its Critics*.
49. Cf. Joy, C.R. 1948, "Introduction: Schweitzer's Conception of Jesus," p. 23; Kähler, M. 1969, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*, p. 28 note 1a.

50. Kähler 1969, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus*, p. 14: “Der sogenannte historische Jesus ist für die Wissenschaft nach dem Maßstabe moderner Biographie ein unlösbares Problem; denn die vorhandenen Quellen reichen nicht aus....”
51. Cf. Schweitzer, A. 1948, *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus: Exposition and Criticism*, pp. 46-53.
52. Schweitzer, A. 1948, *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*, p. 33.
53. Cf. also Schweitzer, A. 1913, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, pp. 362-367.
54. Joy, C.R. 1948, “Introduction: Schweitzer’s Conception of Jesus,” p. 19.
55. Schweitzer, A. 1948, *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*, pp. 44-45, 47.
56. Bultmann, R. [1926] 1988, *Jesus* (Neuausgabe), pp. 8-10.
57. Käsemann, E. [1954] 1960, “Das Problem des historischen Jesus,” pp. 212-213: “Bei einem Leben Jesu kann man schlechterdings nicht auf äußere und innere Entwicklung verzichten. Von der letzten wissen wir jedoch gar nichts, von der ersten fast gar nichts außer dem Wege, der von Galiläa nach Jerusalem, von der Predigt des nahen Gottes in den Haß des offiziellen Judentums und die Hinrichtung durch die Römer führte.”
58. Schmithals, W. 1988, “Nachwort,” p. 149.
59. Bultmann, R. 1988, *Jesus*, p. 13. Cf. also Painter, J. 1987, *Theology as Hermeneutics: Rudolf Bultmann’s Interpretation of the History of Jesus*, p. 102. To my knowledge, the most concentrated summary of Bultmann’s reconstruction of the historical Jesus is to be found in his *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus* ([1960] 1965a, p. 11): “Mit einiger Vorsicht also wird man über das Wirken Jesu Folgendes sagen können. Charakteristisch für ihn sind Exorzismen, der Bruch des Sabbatgebotes, die Verletzung von Reinheitsvorschriften, die Polemik gegen die jüdische Gesetzlichkeit, die Gemeinschaft mit deklassierten Personen wie Zöllnern und Dirnen, die Zuneigung zu Frauen und Kindern; auch ist zu erkennen, daß Jesus nicht wie Johannes der Täufer ein Asket war, sondern gerne aß und ein Glas Wein trank. Vielleicht darf man noch hinzufügen, daß er zur Nachfolge aufrief und eine kleine Schar von Anhängern – Männern und Frauen – um sich sammelte.”
60. Käsemann, E. [1964] 1969, “Blind Alleys in the ‘Jesus of History’ Controversy,” p. 36; Bultmann, R. 1965b, “Antwort an Ernst Käsemann,” p. 190. Bultmann notes: “Denn ich bin mit Käsemann ganz darin einig, daß die Sache wichtiger ist als die Personen, und daß der Zusammenhalt einer Gemeinschaft, wie sie zwischen Käsemann und mir bestand und besteht, Spannungen ertragen muß, unter denen das persönliche Verhältnis nicht zu leiden

61. Borg, M.J. 1994b, “Does the Historical Jesus Matter?,” p. 184.
62. Kähler, M. 1969, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus*, p. 44: “Der wirkliche, d. h. der wirksame Christus, der durch die Geschichte der Völker schreitet, mit dem die Millionen Verkehr gehalten haben in kindlichem Glauben, mit dem die grossen Glaubenszeugen ringend, nehmend, siegend und weitergebend Verkehr gehalten haben – der wirkliche Christus ist der gepredigte Christus.”
63. Johnson, L.J. 1995, “The Search For (the Wrong) Jesus,” pp. 20-44.
64. Crossan, J.D. 1996a, “Why Christians Must Search For the Historical Jesus,” p. 42-43.
65. Crossan, J.D. 1996a, pp. 44.
66. Crossan, J.D. 1996a, p. 45.
67. Jüngel, E. 1995, “The Dogmatic Significance of the Question of the Historical Jesus,” p. 88.
68. Jüngel, E. 1995, p. 83.
69. Schillebeeckx, E. 1987, *Jesus in our Western Culture: Mysticism, Ethics and Politics*, p. 13.
70. Jüngel, E. 1995, p. 97.
71. Cf., e.g., Robinson, J.M. 1981, “Sethians and Johannine Thought: The Trimorphic Protennoia and the Prologue of the Gospel of John,” p. 663.
72. See, especially, Franzmann, Majella 1996, *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings*.
73. Franzmann, M. 1996, p. 57.
74. Franzmann, M. 1996, p. 72.
75. Bultmann, R. 1965a, *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*, p. 9.
76. Bultmann, R. 1965b, “Antwort an Ernst Käsemann,” p. 191.
77. Käsemann, E. 1969, “Blind Alleys in the ‘Jesus of History’ Controversy,” p. 36.
78. Bultmann, R. 1965a, *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*, p. 9; 1965b, “Antwort an Ernst Käsemann,” p. 191. Bultmann uses the phrase: “Unterschied zwischen *historischer Kontinuität* und *sachlichem Verhältnis*” (my emphasis).
79. Bultmann, R. 1969, “The Significance of the Historical Jesus for the Theology of Paul,” pp. 223-235.

80. The (English) (Holy) Bible, the *New International Version of the New Testament*, 1984, p. 645, translates the Greek phrase in Rm 9:5, “from whom the Christ, according to (the) flesh, comes,” as “Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ.”
81. As Robert T. Osborn 1990, “The Christian Blasphemy: A Non-Jewish Jesus,” p. 221, rightly sees.
82. J. Jeremias, in Käsemann, E. 1969, “Blind Alleys in the ‘Jesus of History’ Controversy,” p. 24. Earlier I said that this remark by Jeremias “is... entirely inappropriate” (cf. Van Aarde, Andries G., 1997b, “The Continued Importance of Jesus,” p. 784. However, by second thought, I have changed my mind.
83. Funk, R.W. 1996, *Honest to Jesus: Jesus For a New Millennium*, p. 41.
84. Crossan, J.D. 1996a, “Why Christians Must Search For the Historical Jesus,” p. 45.
85. Funk, R.W. 1996, *Honest to Jesus*, p. 304: “We can no longer rest our faith on the faith of Peter or the faith of Paul. I do not want my faith to be a secondhand faith. I am therefore fundamentally dissatisfied with versions of the faith that trace their origins only so far as the first believers; true faith, fundamental faith, must be related in some way directly to Jesus of Nazareth” (Funk’s emphasis).
86. Marxsen, W. 1968, *Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to Its Problems*, p. 284.
87. Thompson, W.M. 1985, *The Jesus Debate: A Survey and Synthesis*, p. 115.