

# Searching for the Historical Jesus: Does History Repeat Itself?

*F. David Farnell*

---

A wise old saying has warned, “Those who do not learn from the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them.” Does history repeat itself? Pondering this question is important for current evangelical Gospel discussions, especially in reference to modern Gospel research. In terms of searching for “the historical Jesus,” history has indeed repeated itself through the First and Second Quest and is threatening to do so again in the contemporary Third Quest. Below it is argued that based on the lessons of the first two quests, evangelicals should be leery of involvement in the Third Quest lest history repeat itself yet again.<sup>1</sup>

## The Consistent Testimony of the Orthodox Church for 1700 Years

From the nascent beginnings of the church until the A.D. 17<sup>th</sup> century, orthodox Christians held that the four canonical Gospels, Matthew, Luke, Mark and John were historical, biographical, albeit selective (cf. John 20:30-31) eyewitness accounts of Jesus’ life written by the men whose names were attached to them from the beginning.<sup>2</sup> These Gospels are virtually the only source for our knowledge of the acts and teachings of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> The Gospels were considered by the Church as the product of Spirit-energized minds (John 14:26; 16:13; 1 John 4:4) to give the true presentation of Jesus’ life and work for the thirty-plus years that He lived on the earth. The consistent, as well as persistent, testimony expressed in early church history was that the Apostle Matthew, also known as Levi, wrote the book of Matthew

as the first account of Jesus' life; the physician, Luke, companion of the Apostle Paul, wrote the Gospel based on careful interviews of those who interacted with Jesus (Luke 1:1-4); Mark, the interpreter for Peter, wrote his Gospel based on the preaching of Peter; while the Apostle John, an especially intimate disciple of Jesus—"the disciple whom Jesus loved"—wrote the last canonical Gospel that bears his name. Since these men had either accompanied Jesus' ministry from its inception (Matthew, John) or been in direct contact with those who had (Mark, Luke), the accounts were considered absolutely trustworthy witnesses to Jesus' life and ministry as it actually occurred in history.

Most likely, the reason why four independent gospels would attest to His life is found in the Old Testament Mosaic legal concept of establishing matters on the basis of eyewitness testimony: "on the evidence of two or three witnesses a matter shall be confirmed" (Deut. 19:15b cp. 17:6-7). God, who knows that we depend on the testimony of those who themselves saw and heard Jesus, made sure that the message necessary for salvation was transmitted to us not singly but through multiple eyewitnesses to affirm the matter. The independent witnesses confirm one another in a complementary fashion.<sup>4</sup> The Old Testament penalty for false testimony regarding anyone who would lead God's people astray in prophecy or toward false gods was death. The early church maintained that gospels are supplementary and complementary, not contradictory, to one another. Importantly, from the early church until the 17<sup>th</sup> century no differences between these Gospel accounts and how Jesus actually was in history was conceptualized.<sup>5</sup> The Jesus of the Gospels was the Jesus of history down to His uniqueness as well as His supernatural character as God-man. The rise of modern *philosophical* ideologies inherent in historical criticism generates such distinctions.

## The Rise of Modernism Creates a Chasm Between the Jesus of the Bible and the "Christ of Faith"

One cannot overstate that the rise of modern *philosophical* ideologies inherent in historical criticism generates any such

distinctions between the Jesus as he is presented in the canonical Gospels and any conceptualizations of how he is alleged to have been actually in history. Hostile philosophical underpinnings of a virulent *anti-supernaturalism* create these hypothetical distinctions.

*The “Historical Jesus” Research is Searching for a Definition of the Term*

The term “historical Jesus” cannot truly be defined with any degree of satisfaction or consensus among those who advocate such research. These researchers search for a concept of Jesus that cannot be defined. The irony of this state of affairs in its definition has resulted from the fact that no consensus has occurred as to what the “historical Jesus” is or was. Donald Hagner incisively comments,

It deserves to be emphasized that in both the nineteenth-century writing on Jesus and that of today, what seems to be wanting is not so much *a truer* view of Jesus as an *alternative* view. The traditional view of Jesus, the view held by the early church, is old-fashioned, uninteresting, and thought to be unconvincing. What the world craves is a debunking of the traditional Jesus, a Jesus rescued from the dogma of the church for twenty-first century human beings. What will sell books and bring fame or notoriety and new explanations of Jesus—explanations acceptable to the proclivities and sensitivities of the modern world.<sup>6</sup>

After two hundred-plus years of questing for whatever the “historical Jesus” might be, involving possibly three perceived “quests” (whether three exist is debated as will be discussed), no general agreement exists among biblical scholars who pursue this discipline as to what the term means. William Hamilton, reflecting somewhat of a Bultmannian or Tillichian mode that assumes *a priori* negative historiography involved in historical criticism, rejects the whole process as “beyond belief,” concluding that “Jesus is inaccessible by historical means” and preferring instead a “Quest for the Post-Historical Jesus.” Jesus in history can never be defined or known. Thus, not only is the Gospel portrait rejected but no certainty can exist or be known about Jesus

even in an alleged post-Easter circumstance.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps the crescendo of this type of thought is found with Jewish theologian Jacob Neusner, who argues that the questing for the historical Jesus is “disingenuous” and “irrelevant,” since modern standards of historiography “cannot comprise supernatural events,” and “religious writings such as the Gospels cannot, and should not, attempt to meet [such standards].”<sup>8</sup> Since the heart of the Gospels entails the supposition that God entered human history with Jesus, anything supernatural is *a priori* ruled out from being investigated historically.

### **Whatever the “Historical Jesus” is, it must *not* be the Christ of the Gospels**

In 1959, James M. Robinson, a leader of what is now known as the “second quest” period, did, however, stress what the term could *not* mean:

The term “historical Jesus” is not simply identical with “Jesus” or “Jesus of Nazareth,” as if the adjective “historical” were a meaningless addition. Rather the adjective is used in a technical sense, and makes a specific contribution to the total meaning of the expression. “Historical” is used in the sense of “things in the past which have been established by objective scholarship.” Consequently the expression “historical Jesus” comes to mean: “What can be known of Jesus of Nazareth by means of scientific methods of the historian.” Thus we have to do with a technical expression which must be recognized as such, and not automatically identified with the simple term “Jesus.”<sup>9</sup>

Robinson continues regarding the first alleged quest that “[t]his was in fact the assumption of the nineteenth century quest of the historical Jesus. For this quest was initiated by the enlightenment in its effort to escape the limitations of dogma . . . unrestricted by the doctrinal presentations of him in the Bible, creed and Church.”<sup>10</sup> Since no perceived agreement or consensus exists as to who or what the “historical Jesus” is or even if such a definition can even be determined, the consequence appears to be that it is to be defined negatively

since a general agreement exists among questers that whatever the “historical Jesus” is or was, He is not, indeed cannot be, equated fully with the Jesus who is presented in the Gospels. Since historiography, i.e., hypotheses of what can take place in a time-space continuum in reference to historical critical ideology, cannot encompass the supernatural—indeed, rules it out from the very beginning—whatever the “historical Jesus” is, He cannot be equated with the Jesus as He is presented in the Gospels.<sup>11</sup>

### **The Existential Jesus or What Does the “Historical Jesus” Mean to You?**

As a result, the term “historical Jesus” is best perhaps termed the “existential Jesus,” for, as will be seen, a close examination of the questing reveals that the “historical Jesus” is whatever the quester *a priori* determines Jesus to be or wants him as somehow significantly in distinction from the biblical documents. This subjectivity is highlighted in reviewing terms used today in the “third search” to define the “historical Jesus”: an eschatological prophet, a Galilean holy man, an occult magician, an innovative rabbi, a trance-inducing psychotherapist, a Jewish sage, a political revolutionary, an Essene conspirator, an itinerant exorcist, an historicized myth, a protoliberation theologian, a peasant artisan, a Torah-observant Pharisee, a Cynic-like philosopher, a self-conscious eschatological agent, and the list would go on and on.<sup>12</sup> No one embraces all of these images, but they are presented by their advocates as the most reasonable reconstruction of “the historical Jesus.” After an *a priori* decision has been made on a preconceived concept of Jesus, criteria of authenticity, stemming from tradition criticism, can be applied to the Gospels, and that concept of Jesus affirmed. Since the criteria are subjective and conflicting, other criteria can be invented and applied to ensure the outcome desired. The critical weakness, as well as subjectivity, of these criteria lies in the fact that the same criteria can be applied or countered with different criteria to ensure whatever view has already been assumed.<sup>13</sup> The current situation of widely conflicting views on whom the “historical Jesus” was has prompted Jesus Seminar participant John Dominic Crossan to comment that “*Historical Jesus research* today is becoming something of a scholarly bad joke” and “an academic embarrassment”

as well as giving the “impression of acute scholarly subjectivity in historical research.” He goes on to note, however, something he deems positive: “the number of competent and even eminent scholars producing pictures of Jesus at wide variance with one another.”<sup>14</sup> As a consequence, he deems necessary a re-examination of methodologies involved in the search.<sup>15</sup>

## Philosophical Basis of Questing: The “Historical Jesus” is a True Historical-Critical Myth Centering in the Philosophical Basis of Errancy<sup>16</sup>

The “questing” or searching for the historical Jesus may be defined as *a philosophically-motivated historical-critical* construct that the Jesus as presented in the Gospels is not the same or not to be identified fully with the Jesus who actually lived in history. Underlying the questing is the assumption that “scientific” research showed that the Jesus of history was different from the Christ of Scripture, the creeds, orthodox theology and Christian piety.<sup>17</sup> To some degree or another, such an activity has as its underlying operating assumption that the gospels cannot be taken as wholly trustworthy in their presentation of Jesus’ life since belief or faith has mediated their presentation. In other words, faith and history are perceived as in opposition in reference to proper or legitimate historical methods due to its standard pronouncement of a closed-continuum of cause and effect. This idea of historiography means that the phrase “historical Jesus” is oxymoronic. If Jesus is to be understood historically, according to the standards of accepted historiography replete in the ideology of historical criticism, then He cannot be the Jesus presented in the Gospels. If one accepts the Jesus in the Gospels, then such a Jesus is not historical. One must default to a departure from the New Testament presentation of Jesus out of perceived necessity so that the “historical Jesus” *must be* something other than exactly the Jesus of the Gospels.<sup>18</sup>

One cannot overstate that *presuppositional philosophical underpinnings* of historical criticism have driven a qualitative, as well as quantitative, wedge between how Jesus is presented in the Gospels and current hypothesizing as to how Jesus actually was alleged to be

in history in *all* quests for the “historical Jesus.” This philosophical, presuppositional basis for the “historical Jesus” or the “Jesus of history” results in a Jesus removed from the supernatural as well as much of the uniqueness of Jesus as He is presented in the Gospels. The separation is, admittedly, somewhat one of degree depending upon the philosophical underpinnings accepted by the individual “searcher,” but usually, it is a very sharp separation, especially in terms of any violation of a closed-continuum of cause and effect. As a result, biblical scholars who follow this mode of thought are forced *a priori* to “search” for the historical Jesus to find how He actually was in reality.

Importantly, the idea of a “historical Jesus” distinct from the Gospel presentations as well as practice of “questing” or “searching” for this presumed historical Jesus is an axiomatic consequence foundational to the tenets of historical criticism. The more one is consistent with the application of historical-critical ideology, the further the concept of a “historical Jesus” is removed from the Gospel presentation of Him. To put it bluntly, the “historical Jesus” is a *chimera* of historical criticism that has at its basis philosophical motivations. For evangelicals who hold to an orthodox view of inspiration and inerrancy as maintained in church history, the great irony is that the true “myth” of historical criticism is its idea of the “historical Jesus.” That is, this historical-critical “Jesus,” whatever the viewpoint or conclusion of the plethora of researchers in the quest, never existed except in the minds of historical critics. The only Jesus that existed was that Jesus as He is accurately, and historically, portrayed in the Gospels. This conclusion is quite the opposite of historical-critical ideological assertions.

### *Baruch Spinoza Stimulated the Questing*

Questing is usually traced to the Enlightenment as its stimulating force, for it was during this period that a strong “prejudice against prejudice” was developed, whereby scholars rejected previous opinions of the ancients as tenuous. Orchard and Riley observe, “The Enlightenment not only witnessed the rise of critical history . . . it also signaled the triumph in the eighteenth century and subsequent European culture of rationalist ideals and antipathies, and the consequent divorce of Reason both from the tradition of faith and from tradition in principle, that is, from all tradition. The result was an

era of wholesale ‘prejudice against prejudice’ . . . the emasculation of tradition.”<sup>19</sup> Whatever the ancient, early church said about the Gospels in terms of their authorship or integrity was rejected in favor of more current approaches of the time.

While very few ideas stem from an absolute beginning or a single root cause, the nascent beginnings of the historical-critical ideology of all these searches can be largely traced, not only to the Enlightenment, but to the profound, albeit belated, influence of the Jewish apostate Benedict Spinoza (1632-1677).<sup>20</sup> Spinoza, to a large degree, may truly be regarded as the progenitor or father of modern historical-criticism of the Bible. Spinoza himself was a rationalist and pantheist, who for overriding personal reasons, disdained the plain meaning of the biblical text because of the implications as well as affect that it had upon him as a person as well as society as a whole.<sup>21</sup>

To have sympathy with Spinoza’s situation that inspired his philosophical approach, one must remember that he grew up in a world where he observed the use and abuse of Scripture as applied by both government and institutionalized religion. Both before and during the time that he lived, Jews in many places had been forced to deny Judaism or die a martyr’s death; gentile kings had justified their dubious actions by use of Scripture in policy and war; personal freedoms and actions that were considered contrary to Scripture were forbidden in many places impacted by Christianity.<sup>22</sup> In other words, Spinoza’s views arose at a time of a “war of worldviews” that competed with Scripture and what role in society Scripture should play, if any. For Spinoza, his intent was that Scripture should have no role or influence in the modern world. His magnum opus, *Theologico-Political Treatise*,<sup>23</sup> was a landmark as “both the first theoretical defense of the idea of liberal democracy and the first extended treatise on biblical criticism to employ recognizably modern methods of analysis.”<sup>24</sup>

Spinoza’s method had a simplistic genius behind it. He set in motion the modern nature of biblical criticism “*as a weapon to destroy or at least discredit the traditional metaphysics of Christianity and Judaism.*”<sup>25</sup> Its purpose was to remove all influence of the Bible not only in the religious sphere, but also in the economic as well as political areas of society. Commenting on the antecedent developments of historical critical ideology, David Dungan relates,

Spinoza and his followers multiplied questions about the physical history of the text to the point that the traditional theological task could never get off the ground. That, however, was precisely the intended effect of the first step: to create an endless “nominalist barrage” if you will, an infinitely extendable list of questions directed at the physical history of the text, to the point where the clergy and the political officials allied with them *could never bring to bear their own theological interpretations* of the Bible. In other words, Spinoza switched the focus from the *referent* of the biblical text (e.g., God’s activity, Jesus Christ) to *the history of the text*. In doing so, he effectively eviscerated the Bible of all traditional theological meaning and moral teaching.<sup>26</sup>

Dungan goes on to comment, “In short, the net effect of what historical critics have accomplished during the past three hundred years—apart from accumulating an enormous heap of data about the physical history of the text—has been to eviscerate the Bible’s core religious beliefs and moral values, preventing the Bible from questioning the political and economic beliefs of the new bourgeois class [that arose in the modern historical-critical era].”<sup>27</sup> Simply put, biblical criticism from this point on would spend its time on issues regarding the accuracy and relevancy of the text (questions behind the text) that would leave very little room for exegesis or authority of the actual text itself.

Spinoza’s “weapon” succeeded, perhaps not in his lifetime but soon afterwards, even more than Spinoza may have imagined or hoped. One need only examine modern Gospel commentaries—liberal, conservative, and evangelical—to see Spinoza’s handy-work realized: to see how much effort is today expended in historical-criticism’s ideologies of source, form/tradition, redaction criticism, etc. studies of the Gospels (and other OT and NT books) and to see how much discussion space is utilized on such issues where the text of the Gospels is largely mixed, intermingled or even deflected. As Norman Geisler comments, “virtually all the central emphases in modern liberalism . . . are found in Spinoza.”<sup>28</sup> The German philosopher, Heinrich Heine,

remarked well: "All of our contemporary philosophers, perhaps often without knowing it, see through the lenses ground by Baruch Spinoza."<sup>29</sup>

Spinoza's mantle was taken up by the English deists who, "together with Spinoza on the Continent, may be regarded as the forerunners of biblical criticism" and "the initiators of the quest for the historical Jesus" who attempted "to desupernaturalize and secularize religion in general and Jesus in particular."<sup>30</sup> Although English deists disappeared by 1750, their ideas took root everywhere. The most pervasive thought was that the miraculous cannot be accepted as a factor of history. According to deism, reason precludes the supernatural so that miracles and prophecy must be rejected. This idea, in turn, eventually led to the concept of searching for the real Jesus of history since the historical Jesus, according to this type of thinking, could not have been the supernatural person performing miracles as depicted in the New Testament.<sup>31</sup> This helped create deist Lessing's "ugly ditch" of a large, unknowable gap between the Jesus as He was in history and the Christ of faith (miracles of Jesus and especially His resurrection): "That, then, is the ugly ditch which I cannot get across, however often and however earnestly I have tried to make the leap."<sup>32</sup> To this day, all searching for the historical Jesus has not surmounted this abyss, for its negative historiography, i.e., that the historical Jesus must be someone other than the Jesus of the Gospels, has not been overcome.

### *A Historical Sweep of Stimuli*

Due to space limitations, a sweeping selective summation of events afterwards can only be given. Spinoza's 17<sup>th</sup> century ingenious deflection away from the Scriptures as credible sources due to rationalism's virulent anti-supernaturalism (in this case with reference to the historiography of the Gospels) to issues behind the text and deist Lessing's (who personally promoted Reimarus' thinking) philosophically imposed gap between the Jesus of the Gospels and any certainty of who Jesus was in history became crystallized and popularized in subsequent philosophical movements to the present time.<sup>33</sup> The philosophy of the Enlightenment in the 18<sup>th</sup> century popularized a prejudice against prejudice so that any testimony of the early church regarding the Gospels could be dismissed. Importantly,

everyone, both liberal and conservative, who engages in being dismissive of early church statements regarding the canonical Gospels, has been influenced by Enlightenment thinking in Western culture. Although Spinoza's view found little following in his day, in the Age of Enlightenment he attracted many followers. Gerhard Hasel notes that the rationalists had quite an influence on historical criticism:

René Descartes made reason the sole criterion of truth and elevated doubt to range unchecked through the whole fabric of customary convictions. Shortly later Benedict de Spinoza published his famous *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (1670) in which he dealt with the question of the relation of theology to philosophy. He argued that both needed to be carefully separated and suggested that reason is men's guide to truth. All of these influences were powerful catalysts toward the formation of the full-fledged historical-critical method.<sup>34</sup>

The philosophy of Romanticism following later in the 18<sup>th</sup> century sought a naturalistic mechanistic explanation of all history in terms of development and change so that any concept of inspiration was removed.<sup>35</sup> The 19<sup>th</sup> century philosophy of evolution sought that mechanistic development in terms of simple to complex that became a large impetus around popular Synoptic source hypotheses, while the existentialist philosophy of Kierkegaard (1813-1855) opened up the door to the idea that even if a belief in the historical credibility of Scripture could no longer be maintained, an irrational leap into subjective believe was still allowable. Jesus could now be defined as to the personal predilections of the interpreter.<sup>36</sup> Nothing could be known of him with any objective certainty.

In the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century the New Testament Enlightenment scholar David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874)<sup>37</sup> who popularized the "mythical" view of Scripture, would characterize Reimarus (and Lessing's promotion of it) as one of Christianity's "most courageous and worthy representatives" of biblical criticism in the eighteenth century.<sup>38</sup> The views of Strauss were close to that of Reimarus. In 1862, Strauss published a tribute to Reimarus who maintained a rationalistic interpretation of Jesus' life.<sup>39</sup> In 1835-36, Strauss wrote *Das Leben*

*Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet* (“The Life of Jesus Critically Examined”) that set forth the concept of “myth” in the Gospel accounts. Strauss removed any element of the supernatural from history, especially biblical history. He saw a closed-continuum of cause and effect that admitted no divine intervention. To Strauss, whenever the biblical data presents the supernatural or abnormal, the mythopoeic faculty has been at work. Although Strauss allowed a minimal historical framework for the life of Jesus, he considered the vast majority of material in the Gospels to be myth.<sup>40</sup> Neill and Wright remark regarding his work that “if Strauss’s interpretation of the Gospels came to be accepted, Christianity as it has been understood through the centuries would come to an end in a generation.”<sup>41</sup>

Around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Wilhelm Wrede, in *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (“The Messianic Secret”—1901) would undertake a similar tactic in rejecting the historicity of Mark and asserting that Mark’s gospel represents creative, dogmatic ideas which the evangelist imposed on the tradition, i.e., Jesus never claimed to be Messiah during his lifetime; the church superimposed this post-Resurrection idea upon the lips of Jesus.<sup>42</sup> Any perceived historical elements or markers were merely a vehicle to conveying the theology of the evangelist. Norman Perrin remarks that “Wilhelm Wrede (1859-1906) . . . sounded the death knell” regarding the historicity of Mark “by demonstrating that a major aspect of the Marcan narratives was precisely the ‘mythic’ and, in so doing, opened the door for the entry of redaction criticism upon the scene.”<sup>43</sup> History was no longer a consideration or a factor in gospel composition, for according to form criticism the Gospels were an expression of the theology of the church, not Jesus, and in redaction criticism the theology of the unknown evangelist was expressed rather than Jesus, so that any expression of Jesus’ actual teaching was rendered highly dubious.

Around the same time as Wrede, Ernst Troeltsch—whose essay “Historical and Dogmatic Method in Theology” (1898) delineated the principles of historical criticism—believed that the unifying factor in the thinking of the Enlightenment was the rejection of the supernatural and that deism was its religious philosophy.<sup>44</sup> Troeltsch’s three principles of historical criticism evidence the antisupernatural bias: (1) *The principle of criticism or methodological doubt*: In the realm of

history there are only judgments of probability. Nothing can be known for certain—doubt everything. One must subject religious tradition (especially the miraculous) to rigorous criticism. (2) *The principle of analogy*: Present experience is the key to probability in the past. Thus, since miracles or the supernatural do not occur today, such events did not occur in the past. (3) *The principle of correlation or mutual interdependence*: A closed continuum of cause and effect exists, i.e., no miracles or salvation history is possible.<sup>45</sup> Troeltsch argued, “It was not until the Enlightenment that an essentially historical [i.e., historical-critical] outlook emerged.”<sup>46</sup> Krentz concurs, arguing that “Historical method is the child of the Enlightenment.”<sup>47</sup>

### *All Questing for the “Historical Jesus” Originate in Common Philosophical Roots*

As the above overview indicates, quests for the historical Jesus, however many and varied, share the same roots as the ground cause for their existence, whether acknowledged by liberals or evangelicals alike. These roots are the developmental heritage of historical criticism.<sup>48</sup> Such a heritage has been clearly set forth in such works as Edgar Krentz’s *The Historical Critical Method* that gives an honest assessment of the discipline. Hostile, alien philosophies and world-views have succeeded in separating Jesus from the documents that gave primary witness to His life and teaching (Col. 2:8; 2 Cor. 12:5). By the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Bible-believing people had been marginalized through the overwhelming predominance of such thinking and withdrew to contend for an orthodox presentation of “the faith which was once for all handed down to the saints” through the Gospels and Epistles (Jude 3).

An intellectually honest assessment in light of the historical developments of historical-critical ideology is that a pronounced anti-supernatural—indeed anti-Christian—sentiment is at the historical, presuppositional core of historical-criticism and its concomitant and variegated searching for the “historical Jesus” as traditionally developed, expressed and refined from Spinoza forward. It stands in stark antithesis to the Apostle Peter’s statement, “For we did not follow cleverly devised tales when we made known to you the power and

coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of His Majesty” (2 Peter 1:16—*NASB*).

## The Lessons of History— Doomed to Repeat Themselves?

This is the pressing question that current evangelicals must now face with urgency and honesty as the twenty-first century starts. Are evangelical scholars being wooed by modern quests for the “historical Jesus,” which have been shown historically to produce results at odds with the traditional view of Jesus affirmed by the early church? To address this question, a brief overview of the three quests may be helpful.

### *The First or Old Quest (1778-1906)*

The first quest for the historical Jesus ended in failure. At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the battle between liberals and fundamentalists had reached somewhat of a crescendo.<sup>49</sup> In 1906, Albert Schweitzer, in his now famous *The Search for the Historical Jesus*, declared that the “critical study of the life of Jesus” or what has now become known as the original quest for the “historical” Jesus or “the first quest” had failed to find Jesus.<sup>50</sup> Fifteen years before, Martin Kähler had called “the entire Life-of-Jesus movement” during this time as “a blind alley” as well as “[t]he impossibility of [writing] a biography of Jesus.”<sup>51</sup> With the substantial historicity of the Gospels rejected, two hundred years of liberal questing had failed to find Jesus anywhere. One thing that the Quest did overwhelmingly agree upon was that the Jesus of the Gospels was not the Jesus that actually lived in history. This was due to the virulent anti-supernatural bent of historical criticism employed. Notably, however, conservative evangelical scholars of the time—such as Charles Spurgeon, R. A. Torrey, and those who founded the many evangelical colleges and universities across the U.S.—adamantly rejected this first quest. The history of the so-called modernist-fundamentalist controversy that ensued is often told and thus need not detain us here.

### *The No Quest Period (1906-1953)*

After the first quest failed to find whatever is meant by “the historical Jesus,” a period known as the “No Quest Period” (1906-1953) ensued. This term “No Quest” is largely a misnomer, however, since Jesus research continued—it never stopped. Even the radical historical critic Bultmann wrote *Jesus and the Word*.<sup>52</sup> In his various works, Bultmann accepted only around forty sayings as genuinely attributable to Jesus. He also considers only the bare facts of the life and death (not the resurrection) of Jesus to be authentic. Some other German form critics, such as Dibelius, were slightly less radical than Bultmann regarding historical judgments. Dibelius asserted at times, “That the words of Jesus were preserved, that they were put together to form ‘speeches’ with a single theme, and . . . that the sayings and parables were edited in the interest of exhortation, shows the Church’s concern for shaping the life according to the commands of the Master.”<sup>53</sup>

### *The New or Second Quest (1953-1988)*

The New or Second Search for the historical Jesus began in 1953. As with the first quest, the second quest was German led. Reacting to the negative assessment of his mentor Bultmann, this new effort was sparked by Ernst Käsemann in his “The Problem of the Historical Jesus,” which was a lecture given at the reunion of former Marburg students on October 20, 1953.<sup>54</sup> Käsemann argued that “there are still pieces of the Synoptic tradition which the historian has to acknowledge as authentic if he wishes to remain an historian at all.”<sup>55</sup> German form and redaction critics applied themselves to the task. Nonetheless, if the proverbial door was “open” to knowledge of Jesus by this second quest, it was barely ajar. Marcus Borg notes, “its methods and results remained largely the same” as in the putative “no quest period.”<sup>56</sup> This second quest was increasingly characterized as at a “dead-end.”<sup>57</sup>

### *The Most Recent Quest: The Third Quest (1988-)*

In 1988, a third quest began. This time the British have been instrumental in sparking and leading the most recent endeavor. The beginnings of what is now being termed the “Third Quest” is not easily marked by a particular year but seems to have been gradually

implemented through the 1970s and into the 1980s. Some choose 1985 with the publication of E. P. Sanders' *Jesus and Judaism*, which continued a similar line of thinking of placing Jesus within Judaism as Sanders' approach had done with Paul in his *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977).<sup>58</sup> Others mark the beginning at 1988 with Neill's and Wright's *History of Interpretation* who coined the phrase, "the Third Search" in his 1982. The reviews on the current endeavor of a possible "third" quest for the "historical Jesus" are quite mixed. In spite of current hopes among some scholarship who promote it as to its viability, terming it "A Renaissance in Jesus Studies,"<sup>59</sup> strong pronouncements of its demise have already come out. Still others see both "loss and gain."<sup>60</sup>

## Growing Evangelical Participation in the Third Quest

What marks out the third quest from the other two is perhaps the rapidly growing evangelical participation in it. With the perceived shift toward more openness to the historicity in the Gospels—a shift in the burden of proof—as well as a perceived openness to the miraculous among some third questers, some evangelicals now desire to participate. One evangelical scholar writes, "this third quest for the historical Jesus . . . provides the greatest possible hope for a more sympathetic reading of the gospels as historical sources and is likely to provide a reasonable answer as to why the church began, and why it believed what it did and acted how it did."<sup>61</sup> Another writes about the third search that "the miracle stories are now treated seriously and are widely accepted by Jesus scholars as deriving from Jesus' ministry" and "myth has ceased to be an item of importance. . . . the miracle tradition is no longer the stumbling block that it once was."<sup>62</sup> Still another evangelical has declared that his work on the Gospels "belongs to the third quest" even though he admits that the third quest is not "fundamentally conservative."<sup>63</sup> He sees the "strength" of the third quest in the following terms: "the strength of the so-called third quest, whether or not it is really a third quest, is its starting point in the very milieu in which Jesus lived and spoke. . . . So there is value in seeing

what can be shown historically to be likely in understanding Jesus and his relationship to his Second Temple Jewish context, as long as one keeps in mind that the Jesus of Scripture is a Jesus remembered.”<sup>64</sup> Indeed, in a very recent book on the third quest, this evangelical writes:

Can the lion and the lamb lay down together? For many people, the idea of an evangelical engaging in a historical Jesus discussion is oxymoronic. For many critics, the evangelical view of Scripture is said to skew evangelicals’ discussion of Jesus issues. . . . So can there be evangelical approaches to the historical Jesus?

I believe the answer is yes. To get there, however, one must appreciate the nature of what historical Jesus work seeks to achieve as well as the limitations under which such a historically oriented study operates when it seeks to cross thousands of years to do its work.<sup>65</sup>

While such sentiments may be understandable, in light of the history of the failed quests for the “historical Jesus,” several responses should be noted to this current evangelical enthusiasm regarding the third quest. Firstly, in the recent book, *The Historical Jesus: Five Views* (2009), the evangelical participant is rightly criticized by Dunn with erroneously trying to equate the term “historical Jesus” with the biblical Jesus of the Gospels: “The question of what we mean by *historical* is also raised by . . . [his] somewhat casual use of the term ‘the historical Jesus.’” Dunn goes on to criticize this evangelical rightly in his incorrect use of this term in that

properly speaking, “the historical Jesus” denotes Jesus as discerned by historical study. Those engaged in the quest of the historical Jesus, those at least who have sought to clarify what the phrase “the historical Jesus” denotes, have usually made the point that the term properly denotes the life and mission of Jesus as they have been “reconstructed” by means of historical research—“historical” in that sense.

He then criticizes this evangelical for his improper defining of the term “as a reference to the historical actuality of the first-century Jesus of Nazareth.”<sup>66</sup> For Dunn, this evangelical’s concept of Jesus came too close to the biblical presentation of Jesus for it to be a permissible view of the “historical Jesus” in the third quest, especially in any certainty of the resurrection.<sup>67</sup> In other words, the view in the third quest that will *not* be accepted in searching is one that comes closest or wholly approximates that of the portrayal of Jesus in the Gospels. While this evangelical commendably sought to convince third questers that the Jesus of the Bible can be proven through the ideologies of third questing, such an attempt is flatly rejected as coming too close to the biblical portrait of Jesus. While third questers such as Dunn may allow for some measure of historicity in the gospels, they do not appear to tolerate evangelicals superimposing their evangelical presuppositions upon the text. For Dunn, at best, only “probabilities” are possible “rather than certainties.”<sup>68</sup> Ironically, under the third search, the closer evangelicals attempt to equate the “historical Jesus” with the biblical Jesus, the more the third questers outright reject their suppositions and cry fowl for imposing evangelical views on the concept.

Secondly, a close corollary is that the concept of the “historical Jesus” in these quests is rooted in philosophical concepts that stand opposed to the full integrity of the Gospels, as discussed above. In other words, *no “historical Jesus” ever existed except in the minds of those who pursued one of the quests, for the conception of “the historical Jesus” is that of Jesus divorced from the biblical portrayal in important ways, especially in terms of Jesus’ distinctiveness as well as supernatural content relayed of him in the Gospels.* Hence, the term “historical Jesus” is ironic in that it really is a fiction of historical criticism without any connection to how Jesus really was. For those who would take the Bible as *a priori* an inspired work, as hopefully evangelicals would, the Jesus in the Gospels is how He actually was. No separation exists.

Thirdly, evangelical participation in the third search is a direct consequence of the growing evangelical acceptance of historical-critical ideologies of source, form/tradition, and redaction. These are philosophically-motivated hermeneutical constructs that, regardless of whatever search, philosophically construct a separation from Jesus

in the Bible from some concept of Jesus in history. The more one adopts these premises as well as their philosophical underpinnings, the more one is forced to search for the historical Jesus. If, however, the integrity of the Gospels are maintained as they are, as the early church so strongly and unanimously espoused from its nascent beginnings, then they are eyewitness accounts of the actual life and activities of Jesus written by the men whose names the Gospels were connected with in church history. The anonymity of the canonical Gospels is a potently powerful witness to the apostolic origin of these documents, for only the certainty of their having come from apostolic origins can reasonably explain their unanimous acceptance. If evangelicals are operating from this supposition instead of adopting historical-critical approaches, any need for searching for the historical Jesus is null and void.

Finally, perhaps some evangelicals suppose that they can turn this quest into an apologetic, evidential value for the trustworthiness of the gospel by participating in this dialogue with third questers. Perhaps they sincerely want to affirm the gospel in joining third questers. While this attempt may have an appearance of wisdom, it too is dubious. The moment one begins questing for the “historical Jesus” an immediate pale of doubt is placed on the Gospels from which these documents can never recover. These ideologies were never intended to affirm the Gospels but to deny the substance of them. Each time evangelicals participate in questing, Spinoza’s intent of deflecting away from Scripture to an endless barrage of questioning and doubting succeeds quite well. Spinoza’s shadow casts a long pale in evangelical participation.

## Conclusion

The present writer finds that the Jesus Seminar has issued a warning that is *very pertinent* to the activity involved in searching for the historical Jesus: “Beware of finding a Jesus that is entirely congenial to you.”<sup>69</sup> All three searches, as well as the non-search period, are guilty of violating this apothegm, including the Jesus Seminar, for all three seek a Jesus that is in some way or another separated from the biblical

portrait of Jesus. The only portrait that conveys how Jesus truly was is that which was given by the eyewitnesses and followers of Jesus in the Gospel accounts. The only portrait that can produce belief and salvation is that found in the Gospels written by those who had direct, eyewitness contact with Jesus. As John, direct eyewitness to Jesus' life and ministry, wrote in his portrayal: "these have been written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in His name" (John 20:31). The irony of these searches is that they are the ones who truly have produced a fictional account of Jesus since they have departed from the Gospel testimony that alone is sufficient in truly understanding Jesus as He actually was in history. The moment one departs from this fundamental understanding, the search for a truly fictional "historical" Jesus has begun.

## Notes

1. A much more expanded treatment of this subject will be forthcoming in the 2012 Edition of *The Master's Seminary Journal*.
2. These views of the early church regarding the four gospels as coming from the eyewitness Apostles whose names were attached to them are ancient and persistent. For example, Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* 3.39.1-6, 14-16; 5.11.1-4; 5.20.4-8; 6.14.5-7; Clement *Hypotyposesis* 6; Irenaeus *Against Heresies* 5.33.3-4; Clement *Stromateis* 1.1.1.11. For greater delineation of these references, see F. David Farnell, "The Synoptic Gospels in the Ancient Church: The Testimony to the Priority of Matthew's Gospel," *MSJ* 10/1 (Spring 1999) 53-86.
3. In a disputed passage, Josephus has a brief reference to Jesus' ministry, see Josephus *Antiquities* 18.:3.3 § 63-64; Acts 20:35 has a record of a saying of Jesus quoted by Paul ("it is more blessed to give than to receive").
4. For an excellent discussion of this point, see "The Purpose of the Four Gospels," in Eta Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 195-203.
5. See F. David Farnell, "The Case for the Independence View of Gospel Origins," in *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels*. Ed. Robert L. Thomas (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002) 235-241.
6. Donald A. Hagner, "An Analysis of Recent 'Historical Jesus' Studies," in *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World*. Eds. Dan Cohn-Sherbok and John M. Court (Sheffield: T & T Clark, 2001), 82.
7. William Hamilton, *A Quest for the Post-Historical Jesus* (New York: Continuum, 1994) 8-9, 19. See also Dieter Georgi, "The Interest in Life of

- Jesus Theology as a Paradigm for the Social History of Biblical Criticism,” *Harvard Theological Review* 85/1 (1992) 51-83.
8. Jacob Neusner, “Who Needs, ‘The Historical Jesus’? An Essay-Review,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994) 113-126. For how Jewish theologians have used historical-critical ideologies to find a Jesus compatible to them, see Donald A. Hagner, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1997).
  9. James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: SCM, 1959) 26-27.
  10. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 27-28.
  11. For further discussion of the operating agenda of historical criticism, see F. David Farnell, “The Philosophical and Theological Bent of Historical Criticism,” in *The Jesus Crisis*. Ed. Robert Thomas (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998) 85-131; Edgar Krentz, *The Historical-Critical Method*. Ed. Gene M. Tucker (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975); Ernest Troeltsch, “Historical and Dogmatic Method in Theology” (1898), in *Religion in History*. Essays translated by James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense with an introduction by James Luther Adams (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 11-32.
  12. For these various portraits of what or whom the “historical Jesus” has been in the search since its beginnings to the present day, consult Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Translated by W. Montgomery from the first German edition, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (1906). Introduction by James M. Robinson (New York: MacMillan, 1968); Walter P. Weaver, *The Historical Jesus in the Twentieth Century 1900-1950* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1999); John K. Riches, *A Century of New Testament Study* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International, 1993); Eds. James K. Beilby and Paul Rhodes Eddy, *The Historical Jesus: Five Views* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2009).
  13. For discussion of these criteria of authenticity as conflicting, see F. David Farnell, “Form Criticism and Tradition Criticism,” in *The Jesus Crisis*, 199-207. As will be shown in this article, the “Third” quest has developed additional criteria of authenticity.
  14. John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus, The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991) xxvii-xxviii.
  15. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus, The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*, xviii.
  16. For an expanded treatment of the philosophical background of historical criticism see F. David Farnell, “The Philosophical and Theological Bent of Historical Criticism,” in *The Jesus Crisis*, 37-84.
  17. See Colin Brown, “Historical Jesus, Quest of.” *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Eds. Joel B. Green Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove, IVP, 1992) 326.
  18. Hagner, “An Analysis of Recent ‘Historical Jesus’ Studies,” 83.

19. Bernard Orchard and Harold Riley, *The Order of the Synoptics, Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer, 1987), 111.
20. See Travis L. Frampton, *Spinoza and the Rise of Historical Criticism of the Bible* (New York and London: T & T Clark, 2006), 199-234.
21. For an excellent overview of Spinoza's ideology, as well as other factors that gave rise to historical criticism, especially in terms of the synoptic "problem," see David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem* (New York: Doubleday, 1999) 171-176; 198-260; see also Norman L. Geisler, "Philosophical Presuppositions of Biblical Errancy," in *Inerrancy*, ed. Norman L. Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 316-320; F. David Farnell, "Philosophical and Theological Bent of Historical Criticism," in *The Jesus Crisis*, 89-92.
22. For an excellent review of Spinoza's life, consult Matthew Stewart, *The Courtier and the Heretic Leibniz, Spinoza, and the Fate of God in the Modern World* (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Co., 2006).
23. For more information on Spinoza's work, see Benedict De Spinoza, *A Theologico-Political Treatise and A Political Treatise*, in *The Chief Works of Benedict De Spinoza*. Translated from the Latin with an Introduction by R. H. M. Elwes (New York: Dover, 1951); *The Collected Works of Spinoza*. 2 vols. Edited and Translated by Edwin Curley (Princeton: Princeton University, 1985).
24. Roy A. Harrisville and Walter Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture, Theology and the Historical Critical Method from Spinoza to Käsemann* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 39.
25. Dungan, 199, italics in original.
26. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*, 172.
27. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*, 174 cf. 171. Dungan goes so far as to say that "modern biblical hermeneutics [i.e. historical criticism] was an essential part of the main attack on the traditional institutions of Throne and Altar."
28. Norman L. Geisler, "Inductivism, Materialism, and Rationalism: Bacon, Hobbes, and Spinoza," Norman L. Geisler Ed. *Biblical Errancy: An Analysis of Its Philosophical Roots* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1981) 19.
29. For the tremendous influence of Spinoza on subsequent philosophers in Germany, see Heinrich Heine, *On the History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany and Other Writings*. Ed. Terry Pinkard (Cambridge: University Press, 2007) xx, 50-54, 59, 99, 108, 110 (quote from p. 187).
30. Colin Brown, *Miracles and the Critical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 47; idem. *Christianity and Western Thought* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 199) 203; idem. *Jesus in European Protestant Thought 1778-1860* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1985) 29, 50.
31. Brown, *Christianity and Western Thought*, 212.

32. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Lessing's Theological Writings*. Selection in translation with an Introductory Essay by Henry Chadwick (Stanford: Stanford University, 1957) 55.
33. For more detailed information, see Colin Brown, *Christianity and Western Thought*, 173-330; Farnell, "The Theological and Philosophical Bent of Historical Criticism," in *The Jesus Crisis*, 92-117.
34. Gerhard Hasel, *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 26. Baird notes that Spinoza's views in *Tractatus* and elsewhere "made significant contributions to biblical study." See William Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, vol. 1: From Deism to Tübingen (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1992), 6. See also Sylvain Zac, *Spinoza et l'interprétation de l'écriture* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1965); Leo Strauss, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion*. Translated by E. M. Sinclair (New York: Schocken, 1965).
35. For the impact of Romanticism on views of gospel inspiration, see Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*, 308-326; F. David Farnell, "How Views of Inspiration Have Impacted Synoptic Problem Discussions," *MSJ* 13/1 (Spring 2002) 33-64.
36. Due to space limitations, the author has been selective. For a detailed elaboration of this summation, see F. David Farnell, "The Philosophical and Theological Basis of Historical Criticism," 106-117; Eta Linnemann, *The Historical Critical Method: Methodology or Ideology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), 83-159; Norman Geisler, "Philosophical Presuppositions of Biblical Errancy," in *Inerrancy*. Ed. Norman L. Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 307-334.
37. Strauss himself espoused the philosophy of Hegel. For further information on Hegel's influence upon Strauss and others, consult such works as Cornelio Fabro, *God in Exile*. Translated and Edited by Arthur Gibson (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1968); Bruno Bauer, *The Trumpet of the Last Judgement Against Hegel the Atheist and Antichrist*. Translated by Lawrence Stepelevich (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1989).
38. See David Friedrich Strauss, "Hermann Samuel Reimarus and His Apology," in Hermann Samuel Reimarus, *Reimarus: Fragments*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Translated by Ralph S. Fraser (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 44.
39. See Strauss, "Hermann Samuel Reimarus and His Apology," in *Reimarus: Fragments*, 44-57.
40. For further information, see David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Edited by Peter C. Hodgson (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 52-92.
41. See Stephen Neill and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986*. Second Edition (Oxford: Oxford University, 1988), 14.
42. For a critical analysis of Wrede's assertions, see William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J. C. Greig (Cambridge and London: James Clarke & Co., 1971); James D. G. Dunn, "The Messianic Secret in Mark," in *The*

- Messianic Secret*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 116-131.
43. Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 7.
  44. Ernst Troeltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1927), vol. 3, 131.
  45. For further information on these points, see Ernst Troeltsch, "Historical and Dogmatic Method in Theology (1898)," in Ernst Troeltsch, *Religion in History*. Essays translated by James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense with an introduction by James Luther Adams (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 13-15.
  46. Troeltsch, "Historical and Dogmatic Method in Theology," 24.
  47. Krentz, *The Historical-Critical Method*, 55.
  48. Krentz, *The Historical-Critical Method*, 55-72.
  49. See George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture, The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1980).
  50. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus. A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by W. Montgomery from the first German Edition, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 1906. Introduction by James M. Robinson (New York: Macmillan, 1968), p. 2, 398-403.
  51. Martin Kähler, *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ* *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ*. Forward by Paul J. Tillich. Translated, edited, and with an Introduction by Carl E. Braaten (Philadelphia: Fortress 1964), 46.
  52. *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntress Lantero (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958 [1934; German Edition 1926]).
  53. Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 289.
  54. See Ernst Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," in *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Translated by W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982 [1964 SCM]), 15-47. This was first published *ZTK* 51 (1954) 125-153.
  55. Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," 46.
  56. Marcus Borg, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, 5.
  57. James I. H. MacDonald, "New Quest—Dead End? So What about the Historical Jesus?," *Studia Biblica* 1978: II Papers on the Gospels. Ed. E. A. Livingstone. Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield University 1980), 152.
  58. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977).
  59. Marcus Borg, "A Renaissance in Jesus Studies," *Theology Today* XLV/3 (October 1988) 280-292.
  60. J. P. Meier, "The Present State of the 'Third Quest' for the Historical Jesus: Loss and Gain," *Biblica* LXXX (1999) 459-487.
  61. Michael Bird, "Shouldn't Evangelicals Participate in the 'Third Quest for the Historical Jesus'?" *Themelios* 29/2 (1994): 8.

- 
62. Craig Evans, "Life of Jesus-Research and the Eclipse of Mythology," *Theological Studies* 54/1 (March 1993): 19, 36.
  63. Darrell L. Bock, *Studying the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005) 148, 152.
  64. Darrell L. Bock, "The Historical Jesus, An Evangelical View," in *The Historical Jesus: Five Views*, 25-251.
  65. *Ibid.*, 249-281.
  66. Dunn, "Response to Darrell Bock," *The Historical Jesus: Five Views*, 298-299.
  67. *Ibid.*
  68. *Ibid.*, 299.
  69. Funk, Hoover and The Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels*, 5.