

BASIS FOR THE HISTORICAL JESUS

LEWIS A. FOSTER, Ph.D.

"To see Jesus" expresses in an ancient phrase the yearning of man in every age, the focal point of Biblical study, and a current subject heading the list of New Testament problems. The purpose of this study is to review briefly the modern attempts to interpret the life of Jesus and to consider the basis upon which one can come to know Jesus as He actually was and is.

The very term "historical Jesus" awakens different concepts in different minds.

(1) "Historical" is commonly used in the sense of "things in the past which have been established by objective scholarship." Consequently the expression 'historical Jesus' came to mean: "what can be known of Jesus of Nazareth by means of the scientific methods of the historian."¹ Therefore this can be a technical expression which should not be automatically identified with the simple term "Jesus". Since, however, the conclusions of each historian depends greatly upon his starting points, interests, and selection of material, it would seem more descriptive to call the results of this approach the "historian's Jesus" rather than the "historical Jesus".

(2) The Germans have two words for history and Martin Kähler as early as 1892 defined *historisch* as the bare facts of the past about Jesus of Nazareth and *geschichtlich* as the things of permanent significance about the Biblical Christ as the apostles had proclaimed Him.² Thus the single English term historical could cover both these fields, but the usage "historical Jesus" points to the significance of the German *historisch*. (3) The trail of studies in the life of Jesus has led to an acute feeling of difference between history and dogma, that which actually happened and that which is theologically held. The present usage of the term "historical Jesus" is often given in contrast to the "Kerygmatic Christ".³ The significance of this comparison is the common insistence that the Jesus who really lived and is described in the Gospel narrative must be distinguished from the glorified Christ who is proclaimed in the early church. This differentiation is related to the German contrast between *historisch* and *geschichtlich*. (4) To the philosopher the "historical Jesus" stops short of the ultimate reality, the metaphysical Jesus. We are separated from the *ding und sich* by the records of the life of Jesus and variant interpretations of his words and deeds; but the ultimate truth lies somewhere beyond.⁴ (5) Regardless of the present shift from acceptance of objectivity in the realm of history, the term "historical Jesus" can be used in its popular connotation, describing Jesus as He actually lived; and this figure need not be incongruent with the Christ resurrected and ascended, proclaimed by the early church and confronted in the lives of men and women today. It is in this last usage that the study at hand is undertaken. When one finds the basis for knowing Jesus as he really lived, he also finds the basis of testing the innumerable modern portraits of Jesus' life and gains assurance in his own understanding of the Son of God.

Literature on the subject of Jesus, His life and teaching, is prolific. Professor Cadbury of Harvard once remarked while passing through the stacks of the Divinity School library that one tenth of all the books there (a library of about 500,000 at the time) pertained to the life of Jesus. Albert Schweitzer wrote the book which pointed up the modern attempts to reconstruct Jesus' life. The German original was entitled *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (1906), but the later English translation bore the more suggestive title *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (1936). Schweitzer dramatically permitted a century of scholars to lead forth their pictures of Jesus; but one becomes painfully aware that Schweitzer each step of the way is adding strokes of his own so that by the conclusion of his book he can point

to thorough-going eschatology as the predominant color in the portrait of Jesus. In 1940 Chester McCown published *The Search for the Real Jesus*. His historical survey is more convincing as to the salient points of the successive schools of thought and their relationship to one another. Since McCown's book, however, the quest for the historical Jesus was abandoned in the circle of scholars holding the limelight; but now it has been taken up again with a new motive for study and a new direction in its search. James M. Robinson in his *New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1959) describes the direction of the renewed search. Of the innumerable periodical articles on the subject, probably Joachim Jeremias', "The Present Position in the Controversy Concerning the Problem of the Historical Jesus"⁶ is considered to be most significant. It can be brought up to date by Edward Lohse's article in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.⁷

Upon the publication of pamphlets originating from Hermann Samuel Reimarus, the modern rending of Christ's scriptural portrait began. Reimarus did not bring these works into print himself, but Lessing, one decade after the author's death printed the seventh of these fragments.⁸ This was the year 1778 and marks the beginning of man's posing the problem of the historical Jesus in a way that had not been done before. Reimarus contended that Jesus had failed to achieve his "aim" to be a political Messiah, as reflected in His cry from the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" In contrast he pictures the "aim" of the disciples as something different. According to Reimarus the disciples contrived to steal the corpse of Jesus and invent the message of the resurrection. They achieved their purpose of creating the figure of Christ; but the Jesus of history and the Christ as a product of the church were quite different.⁹

In 1835 Strauss carried the destructive process a step further. He applied his theory of myth, borrowing from Heyne who said "all primitive history as well as philosophy comes from myths".¹⁰ Strauss proceeded to distinguish three kinds:

historical myths, that is narratives of real events colored by the intrusion of the supernatural; philosophical myths, that is stories which clothe an idea in the garb of history; and poetical myths, those which combine the historical and the philosophical and embellish the idea or fact with a veil of fancy.¹¹

In the Gospels Strauss distinguished pure myth (a social product of the community representing various current ideas supposedly shaped by a skillful interpreter who had no conscious thought of deception in the construction of the myth; the historical myth to which religious imagination has been added; a legendary elements including mistakes and misconceptions arising from oral transmission; and editorial additions. In 1909 Arthur Drews pursued Strauss's mythical criticism to its bitter end and denied that Jesus ever lived at all.¹²

Another emphasis of Strauss was the Hegelian dialectic of history and philosophy of religion. This course of interpretation was followed by Ferdinand Christian Baur and the consequent "new Tübingen school". In Judaistic "Petrine" Christianity Baur discovered the thesis, in Paulinism its antithesis and in Catholicism its synthesis. These "tendencies" allowed only Galatians, I and II Corinthians and Romans to come from the pen of Paul for the others did not fit the pattern of this interpretation.

Finally the third path of Strauss's work emphasized the use of literary and historical criticism to which other historical documents were then being subjected. This procedure resulted in the liberal school of thought which dominated the theological scene for some years to come. Although the first two paths begun by Strauss, i.e., myth and Hegel, have ended in dead-end attempts, this third avenue

is still conveying people away from an acceptance of the Jesus of the Scriptures. Some of the terminology and principles of the first two are still employed in current positions, but it is the third which lives on in the liberal school and its successors.

Oskar Holtzmann and Adolf Harnack represent the "liberal" accounts of Jesus at the beginning of the twentieth century, but the "consistent eschatology" of Loisy and Schweitzer eventually destroyed the liberal image of Jesus. It also shattered the basis of the "social gospel" that emphasized Jesus as a prophet of spiritual religion and social reform. Schweitzer maintained that Jesus expected the coming reign of God to revolutionize society in a miraculous way, but He died on the cross because He was mistaken about God's bringing the kingdom at that time. So Schweitzer agrees with Reimarus that Jesus failed in his goal. Schweitzer criticizes the "modern historical" method with its tendency to read between the lines of the Gospels and to find complex motives and developments not given in the sources, and then claims to extract the historical kernel while discarding everything that does not fit its particular reconstruction of the happenings.¹³ A further development in this era was the religio-historical approach. Via the history of religions and a study of parallels and relationships Rudolf Otto attempted to interpret Christianity on a level with all other religions and explain its teachings by similarities in other religious thought.¹⁴

In this period Shirley Jackson Case published his biography of Jesus¹⁵ in which he discusses different ways of testing the historical accuracy of the gospel records. He dismisses the canonicity or even the early date of the books as of little assurance. The documentary theories of authorship and *formgeschichte* fail to divide the true from the false. The test for historical accuracy, Case maintains, is found in the gospel records' relation to their social setting. If the material fits the social environment as Case reconstructs it, then it is true, otherwise it must be rejected as pure invention on the part of the early church. Henry J. Cadbury wrote a fairly favorable review of the book in which he describes what Case has done; these remarks can be applied to the whole class of typical modern studies of Jesus:

He has, in fact, a most persuasive way of calling the gospel statements pure fiction without jarring in the least. The early Christians simply "relieved Jesus of any stigma attaching to the assumption that the insignificant village of Nazareth had been his birthplace" (p. 173) by inventing a birth in Bethlehem. "The prerogatives of the risen Christ had been generously conferred by the evangelist upon the earthly Jesus" (p. 353) Of course such sentences mean simply that what the gospels tell us is not so. But Professor Case gives reason for his opinions which the careful reader must consider, while the careless reader will scarcely see how negative the treatment of the record is.¹⁶

There have been so many negative treatments of the Scriptural record in recent years and so much careless reading that the world stands utterly confused with the images of those who are called Jesus but are not the historical Jesus. They are mere puppets whose lives have been drained by the sceptics and whose only movements have been added by the interests and choices of the authors:

Joachim Jeremias writes:

The outcome of it all is that every epoch, every theology, every author finds in the personality of Jesus the reflection of his own ideal. What has gone wrong? It is that, unconsciously, dogma has been replaced by psychology and fantasy. For all these lives of Jesus have one thing in common, their delinea-

tion of the personality of Jesus has been achieved by means of these two factors, psychology and fantasy.¹⁷

Professor Cadbury pronounced solemn condemnation upon his own liberal colleagues as he published his life of Jesus entitled *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*:

Many of the old portraits are not faithful to the original. But the new lives confuse reality with modernness and substitute a more modern and hence less conspicuous bias for the traditional unrealities These books often grow out of unsatisfied modern need rather than out of painstaking effort to recover from a distant and foreign scene an actual and unidealized fact.¹⁸

Cadbury continues by quoting with approval the picture of Jesus given by Schweitzer. "The historical Jesus will be to our time a stranger and an enigma." He has been loosed from the "stony rocks of ecclesiastical doctrine;" but now that He has come to life He returns to the first century from whence He came.¹⁹

Thus the liberal scholars agree in picturing Jesus as a man of the first century limited by the world view and social setting of the time and place He lived.

In a less well-known writing Cadbury sought to call attention to a reverse tendency, "The Peril of Archaizing Ourselves".²⁰ If Jesus was confined to the first century, then there is the peril that people will attempt to return to first century times in order to restore their contact with Jesus. Cadbury adopted the language of David to explain what he means: "He will not return to me, but I shall go to Him."²¹ This warning is not so much needed as attention given to a third peril: "The Peril of Archaizing Jesus." The Liberals have not freed the real Jesus but have only reconstructed a figure called the historical Jesus and chained Him to the confines of Judea in the first century. What purported to be historical, however, was only a result of their own pattern of thought, the basis for this archaized Jesus was in their own insight and not in the real Jesus.

After the delusions of two world wars and a depression, liberalism had exhausted its supply of optimistic self-propulsion. One has pictured it as a ship which no longer made headway on the high seas. Both crew and passengers were ready to desert the leaking derelict. But just before it sank, another ship passed close enough to pick up the desperate voyagers. The new ship came in the form of a philosophy, existentialism.

The roots of existentialism in its theological relations began with Kierkegaard, the Danish theologian of the middle nineteenth century. The philosophy of existentialism defies simple definition because of its variety of tenets and proliferation of conclusions. As associated with the present study, suffice it to say that "it is a realist reaction against the shallow optimism and easy rationalism of the nineteenth century liberals."²² In this thought existence is prior to essence. "To exist is to value personal authenticity more highly than scientific exactitude."²³ In this highly subjective reasoning all of reality is in historical experience, but the emphasis is on experience as the most important element of history. Thus the written Word of God is secondary to the Living Word, supposedly speaking to an individual in the moments of decision. The existentialist separates the Jesus of history from the Christ of the church and dismisses the former as irrelevant to our own predicament; but emphasizes the present encounter with the cross and the Christ. The resurrection is reinterpreted to involve not a new body and a new heaven and earth but rather a present adjustment to this world in a regenerate life here and now.²⁴ Whereas liberalism had twisted history to serve its purpose, existentialism seeks to abandon it altogether.

Two main streams of theological thought have emerged from the existential sources. The first is Neo-orthodoxy which dates its beginning from the issuance of Karl Barth's exposition on Romans in 1919. In this theology of crisis there is a strong emphasis upon Jesus Christ and the cross, symbol of both despair in the doom of this world and hope in the election in Christ to life. Because Christ is emphasized, one might expect to find a major place for the historical Jesus in the study of the Barthians. Not so, however, because the record of Jesus' life is downgraded as a human book with errors, untrustworthy though meaningful in determining how God spoke to his people in an earlier day. The Bible is a word about the Word, but becomes God's Word only when an individual is overwhelmed by its power as God speaks to his heart. As in existentialism in general, the historical Jesus has little place, because it is the personal confrontation with Christ in the crisis experience which is important to Neo-orthodoxy, not a figure who lived in the first century.

The second main theological stream from existential philosophy is the school of thought following Rudolph Bultmann, for many years professor at Marburg. He too attacks the Scriptural record maintaining that they must be demythologized before they are fit for modern use. This *Entmythologisierung* includes the rejection of such beliefs as the pre-existence of Christ, incarnation, crucifixion, atonement, resurrection, Christ's ascension, enthronement, return, resurrection and judgment of the dead, and the presence of the risen Christ. "They are finished (enledigt) and if Christianity depends for its existence upon them, then Christianity itself is finished."²⁵ This type of cry has been heard through the years but the patterns of man's thoughts and objections have changed, but the Word of God has continued to challenge each coming generation.

What Bultmann leaves for use today is once again the cross and the gospel of justification by grace through faith. As for Jesus, He is reduced to the figure of an ordinary man, one it is impossible to know because of the mythological wraps that have enveloped him in the Gospel narratives. Bultmann's interest has not been in the historical Jesus but in the presentation of the kerygmatic Christ in the epistles and the Acts. In thus splitting his Jesus and Christ and his subsequent judgment upon them, Bultmann becomes guilty of both the early heresies concerning the Person and Work of the Lord. "On the one side He was represented as a mere man (Ebionism): on the other side He was represented as a mere phantom (Docetism)."²⁶ In existentialism the historical Jesus is presented as mere man and the kerygmatic Christ becomes something of divine but has no earthly existence in Jesus, resembling a type of phantom without an historical existence. Bultmann's Jesus is Ebionite and his Christ is Docetic.

When Barth came upon the scene in Europe there was rejoicing among many who appreciate a more Biblical understanding, a more conservative view of God and man, of sin and redemption. Unfortunately numerous ones who have become enamored with Neo-orthodoxy have emphasized that Barth and his followers are traveling in the right direction; but they fail to note they are on the wrong road. The Scriptures are not acceptable to them as the Word of God. Some amazement has been registered that Germany could so quickly shift from Barth to Bultmann. ". . . Germany is just as nearly 'Bultmannian' today as it was 'Barthian' a generation ago, 'Ritschlian' half a century or more ago, and 'Hegelian' still earlier; and Bultmann's works and ideas have become Germany's dominant theological export throughout the world."²⁷ This is more easily understood when one sees that they are all traveling on the same road, and when it came to a choice either to back-track from Barth to the cross roads where the infallibility of the Scriptures in-

licated another road, or whether to go ahead of Barth turning to the left toward Bultmann, the trend of the majority has been to turn more radical to Bultmann.

For thirty years a period of moratorium settled upon the dominant theologians as far as the quest for the historical Jesus was concerned. Bultmann relegated his discussion of Jesus to Judaism, not Christianity,²⁸ and in his *Theology of the New Testament*²⁹ he maintains that the preaching of Jesus belongs to the presuppositions of New Testament theology, but is not a part of that theology itself. Only in the Christ proclaimed in the kerygma is the response of faith awakened, according to Bultmann.

Jesus Christ confronts men nowhere other than in the kerygma, as he had so confronted Paul and brought him to decision . . . The kerygma does not mediate historical knowledge (of Jesus) . . . and one may not seek to get beyond the kerygma and use it to reconstruct the historical Jesus . . . That would be the Christ according to the flesh of the past. Not the historical Jesus, but Jesus Christ, is the Lord.³⁰

Strangely enough criticism of this position and a new quest for the historical Jesus have come from some of Bultmann's leading pupils themselves. Ernst Käsemann addressed a meeting of "old Marburgers" in 1953 on "The Problem of the Historical Jesus."³¹ He maintained that "the early church identified the risen Lord with the earthly, historical Jesus, and was not prepared to substitute a mythical figure or an heavenly being for Jesus of Nazareth."³² This was soon followed by another Bultmannian, Ernst Fuchs, who wrote that Jesus' conduct was the real context of his preaching and both demand our study.³³ In 1956 Günther Bornkamm produced the first book on the historical Jesus in many years to come from the Bultmannian school.³⁴ He insists that one must look for kerygma in the history and for history in the kerygma. He admits the need of inductive historical scholarship; but his existential position necessitates his maintaining that these conclusions can never be certain, but only relative, and faith can never be dependent on the relativity of historical judgments.³⁵ Still it is the existential encounter with the person of Jesus Christ which holds top place in faith; but on the other hand this faith-encounter cannot decide the question of history. "This means that in the selfhood of the participating historical enquirer there is an unceasing tension between the certainty of existential knowledge and the uncertainty and inconclusiveness of historical knowledge."³⁶ One becomes increasingly suspicious of the strong subjectivism in the existentialist when an examination is made of their work in the field of hermeneutics. Their interest in undertaking literary critical investigation of the Gospel framework is not to establish its historical probability or biographical record of Jesus, but to explicate and elucidate the theological or Christological aims and intentions of the Evangelists, with the explicit assumption that it is the Evangelist's understanding of the kerygma which has determined the process by which his Gospel has been formed.³⁷ An example of this procedure can be drawn from Hans Conzelmann's study of Luke's theology where an attempt is made not to assess Luke as an historian but to estimate how much theology he was writing in and how much meaning he understood of what he wrote.

So Conzelmann shows that the geographical elements in Luke's Gospel are not primarily topographical, as places figuring in a biography, but kerygmatic or religious in significance—for example, "The mountain" in Luke 6:12 and 9:28-36 is the place of heavenly manifestation, where "the people" cannot come; "the plain" (Luke 6:17) is the place of meeting with the people; "the lake" is the abyss on the edge of solitude (Luke 8:22-39).³⁸

Such exegesis deserves only the word of Jeremias, "fantasy". Warning from T. W. Manson is also pertinent:

The danger is that what is entitled "Life of Christ" or the like should turn out to be in fact a psychological novel about a large number of anonymous members of the primitive church. And, what is worse, that this brand of fiction should enjoy a greater credit than the Synoptic Gospels themselves. Anyone who doubts this only to consult the voluminous life of Jesus written by the late Professor Guignebert. Present M. Guignebert with a couple of verses of Mark or Q and his mind at once becomes a prey to doubts and misgivings of all kinds; present him with a couple of pages of M. Loisy's imaginative reconstructions of what "must have happened" in the early Church—what *must have happened* commonly designates that for which there is no evidence except the writer's inclinations to believe it—and he will swallow the lot at one gulp.³⁹

When a textual scholar approaches his task in New Testament studies, his goal is to determine the original words of the author. When an exegete addresses himself to fulfill his duty in New Testament studies, he attempts to convey the meaning of the original author. But in the modern quest for the historical Jesus, all the schools considered thus far have this in common, they seek to present a Jesus different from the Gospel accounts. They do not use the historical accounts as the basis for their Jesus, but they adapt their materials to fit their preconceived framework dictated by the current world-view and interests of the hour. This is their basis. They strain as oarsmen rowing boats that are tied to the dock. Tied to a dock of their own making: naturalistic development, historical relativity, epistemological uncertainty. The only difference among them is that some have more rope than others, but they are still tied to the dock. A certain degree of the supernatural has even come into vogue with the new tendency. But it is noteworthy that resistance is still maintained against any Biblical miracles. Just as Lloyd Douglas in *The Robe* attributes special powers to the robe of Jesus, an unscriptural tale, yet naturalistic explanations are narrated for all Biblical miracles such as turning the water into wine or the feeding of the five thousand. Even so the miracle of Christ's confrontation with individuals today is emphasized in existential theology but the place of Jesus' special power to walk on the waters of Galilee is discounted. It seems that one of the unwritten laws of modernity is that one cannot turn back to believe what a former age accepted, regardless of whether it is true or false.

The ready reception granted by historians to the slightest strand of evidence for most figures in antiquity is in deep contrast to the modern resistance against the far more trustworthy material of the New Testament writings judged by purely historical criteria. For instance, our sources for the life of Alexander the Great can be traced back to five writers "whose histories constitute the only continuous accounts that we possess—Arrian, Plutarch, Diodorus, Curtius and Justin, three Greeks and two Romans, who lived 300 to 500 years after Alexander."⁴⁰ There were earlier sources for Alexander's life available to these historians of antiquity, but they are no longer extant. Imagine, however, writing a life of Jesus if our earliest sources were the church historians such as Eusebius and Jerome who lived as long after Christ as Alexander's extant biographers lived after him. Instead one can approach the study of Jesus through sources that come from the very generation when Jesus lived.

The Gospel narratives were written with a purpose of inspiring faith within us: ". . . these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John 20:31). Because the

Gospel writers have a motive in recording the life of Jesus, or to be more exact the Gospel of Jesus, does not mean they will allow this motive to lead them into writing that which is untrue in order to gain their end. This would have been contrary to the honesty proclaimed in the Gospel they are presenting. That they were sincere but simply mistaken in the testimony they gave is likewise discounted by investigation. The Gospel narratives contain an objective report, strikingly free of personal opinion, exaggerated claims, expanded descriptions, or expressions of sentimentality. They bear the mark of verisimilitude, true to the setting in which Jesus lived His life and spoke His words. The Gospel writers are harmonious in the reports they give. There is a balance of similarity and difference in their accounts which cannot be explained any other way than that they are independent reports of what actually happened. The guidance of the Spirit is claimed for Scripture and both the life which has been unfolded and the manner in which it is given corroborate the claim that it was written under the power of the Spirit of God.

When a person chooses as his sole basis for the knowledge of the historical Jesus the truth and infallibility of the Scriptures, he is immediately accused of being naive and anti-critical. It may be, however, that he has investigated different bases and determined that this is to be preferred above all others. T. W. Manson could not be accused of fundamentalist prejudice, but he wrote: "I submit that what is long overdue is a return to the study of the Gospels as *historical documents* concerning Jesus of Nazareth, rather than as psychological case-material concerning the early Christians."⁴¹

The Bible believing Christian will examine not only the direction he is going, but the road he is traveling. History is no longer considered as simple as Ranke described it, letting "the facts speak for themselves." Nor is it as loose as the existentialist pictures it:

"The past keeps changing with the present and every age has to rewrite its history. In every age a different Christ dies on the Cross and is resurrected to a different end." Herbert Muller concludes "History has no meaning in the sense of a clear pattern or determinate plot, but it is simply not meaningless or pointless. It has no certain meaning because man is free to give it various possible meanings."⁴²

If one travels this road of relativism, he cannot see the Jesus as He is presented in the Scriptures and as He was preached in the early church. But if one travels the road of both faith and objective acceptance of the record of the Scriptures and gains an understanding of its truths, then this Jesus, the same yesterday, today, yea and forever, can be known in the heart of experience today as well. Some cameras have a view-finder which shows two images until it is brought in proper focus, then the images coincide. Even so the historical Jesus will coincide with the kerygmatic Christ when they are in proper focus, and Jesus will advance to meet us upon our response to Him. To see Jesus as He actually was necessitates a committal of life to Him as Lord and Savior as He actually is.

Cincinnati Bible Seminary
Cincinnati, Ohio

FOOTNOTES

1. See James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1959), pp. 26, 27.
2. See Joachim Jeremias, "The Present Position in the Controversy Concerning the Problem of the Historical Jesus," *The Expository Times* 69(1958), p. 334.
3. See Bo Reicke, "Incarnation and Exaltation: The Historic Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ," *Interpretation* 16(April, 1962), pp. 156-168.
Paul Althaus, *Das sogenannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus* (1958).
Donald T. Rowlingson, "Jesus in History and in Faith," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 29(1961), pp. 35-38.
4. See Carl Michalson, "The Issue: Ultimate Meaning in History," *Religion in Life* 28(1959), pp. 376-384. Also Mack B. Stokes, "Theology and the Anti-Metaphysical Spirit," *Religion in Life* 28(1959), pp. 413-425.
5. William Lillie, "'The Jesus of History' in 1961," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 15(1962), pp. 151-163. Cf. Sidney Mead, "On the Meaning of History," *The Christian Century* 78(46, Nov. 15, 1961), pp. 1361-64.
6. *The Expository Times* 69(1958) 333-339.
7. "Die Frag nach dem historischen Jesus in des gegenwertigen neutestamentlichen Forschung," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 87(Marz, 1962), 161-174.
8. *Concerning the Aim of Jesus and His Disciples. Another Fragment by the Anonymous Author from Wolfenbuttel* (1778), See Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 333.
9. Cf. *Ibid.* p. 334.
10. C. C. McCown, *The Search for the Real Jesus* (1940), p. 59.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
12. *Christ Myth* (1911). Cf. "The time is past when scientific scepticism could doubt whether Jesus had ever lived at all." J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 335.
13. This, however, is precisely what Schweitzer does continually. See J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 334.
14. Rudolf Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (transl. 1938).
15. *Jesus: A New Biography* (1927).
16. Henry J. Cadbury, "The Historic Jesus," *Journal of Religion* 8 (1928), pp. 131f.
17. J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 334.
18. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (1937), pp. 15, 16.
19. A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1910), p. 397.
20. *Interpretation* 3(1949), pp. 331-337.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 331.
22. John H. Stoll, "Contemporary Theology and the Bible," *Grace Journal* 3(1962), p. 28.
23. Carl Michalson, *Christianity and the Existentialists* (1956), p. 17.
24. J. Stoll, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
25. *The Review of Religion* (Nov. 1955), pp. 5-24.
26. B. F. Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John* (1892), p. XXXIV.
27. J. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
28. *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der Antiken Religionen* (1949).
29. (1954)
30. *Glauben und Verstehen*, I (1933), p. 202. See William Farmer, Norman Perrin, "The Kerygmatic Theology," *Religion in Life* 29(1959), p. 87.
31. "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," *Z.Th.K.* 51(1954), pp. 125-153.
32. *Ibid.* p. 134. See also Farmer, Perrin, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
33. "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus" *Z.Th.K.* 53(1956), pp. 210-223.
34. *Jesus of Nazareth*.
35. Hugh Anderson, "Existential Hermeneutics," *Interpretation* 16(1962), p. 154.
36. *Ibid.* p. 153.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 153f.
39. T. W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (1962), p. 7.
40. C. A. Robinson, *Alexander the Great* (1947), p. 13.
41. T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
42. C. Gregg Singer, "The Meaning and Goal of History," *Christianity Today* 4(March 28, 1960).