

SOME PERSONAL REFLECTIONS ON THE JESUS SEMINAR

WILLIAM RICHARD STEGNER

"Of making many books there is no end...." This saying from Ecclesiastes could also describe the publications of the Jesus Seminar. Now, Robert Funk, founder of the Seminar, adds his book to the list. The title, *Honest To Jesus: Jesus For a New Millennium*, well describes the goal of the Seminar. Since Dr. Funk is the chief inspiration and founder of the Seminar, this book offers an opportunity to do some critical thinking about the work of the Seminar. Accordingly, this article will begin with a brief review of Funk's book and then reflect upon the work and claims of the Seminar.

In some ways this is the most informative book published by these new questers. For the uninitiated it introduces the kind of information shared by most New Testament scholars. In addition to introducing the "tools" of the trade, Funk helps the reader understand the work and approach of the Seminar. He sketches his picture of the Jesus behind the Gospels and sets forth in starkest terms the program of the Seminar—the destruction of orthodox Christianity along with its Christ, its creeds, and its faith.

The book opens with a remarkably candid account of the author's personal pilgrimage through life. From a teenage evangelist studying at a Tennessee Bible college, Funk traces his "professional migrations" through thirty-five years in the classroom to his founding of the Westar Institute and its project, the Jesus Seminar. His goal is seeking "the historical truth at all costs" (p. 8).

Dr. Funk writes well. In a beautiful passage he describes the significance of Jesus for today: "In his authentic parables and aphorisms, Jesus provides a glimpse into another reality, one that lies beyond the present conceptual horizons. His words and deeds open onto that reality. His vision, in my view, is worth exploring" (pp. 18-19). Indeed, when he turns to the parables, Funk is at his best both in terms of expres-

William Richard Stegner is the Senior Scholar in New Testament at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary in Evanston, Illinois.

THE ASBURY THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

FALL 1997 • VOL. 52 • NO. 2

sive language and insight. He has written about the parables throughout his career and here he displays his mastery for scholar and layperson alike.

However, the more one reads his book, as well as other books published by members of the Seminar, the more one recalls the first quest of the historical Jesus. At the end of the last century, liberal German Protestant theologians initiated the first quest with slogans like the following: Away with the Christ of dogma! Away with the supernatural Jesus of miracles and last judgments! Back to the simple Jesus of history, our great human teacher, whose sublime ethics lead to the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. While the modern questers want nothing of Jesus, "a moralist" (p. 163), the slogans, except for the so-called sexist terms, could be interchanged.

How does one evaluate this new quest and its claims? Let us begin by saying that mainstream New Testament scholarship has not "bought into" the findings of the Jesus Seminar. Secondly, we will show that the social models employed specifically by Robert Funk and John Dominic Crossan¹ are highly controversial.

THE MAINSTREAM REMAINS UNCONVINCED

Despite all the publicity and media hype, the Jesus Seminar does not represent the mainstream of contemporary critical scholarship. By contemporary scholarship I mean those New Testament scholars who use the methodologies of source, form, redaction, and rhetorical criticism and still continue to believe that the Gospels contain substantially accurate information about Jesus. In contrast, the Jesus Seminar is a decided minority of New Testament scholars. The following discussion will illustrate the kind of historical judgments which separate Robert Funk and Dominic Crossan from two representatives of mainstream scholarship.

In order to follow the discussion, some *fine distinctions* between history and theology must be kept in mind. For example, an historical statement follows: Jesus was crucified by Pontius Pilate in the first half of the first century A.D. That statement is subject to verification by the "tools" of analysis employed by historians. Note the difference from the theological statement which follows: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself..." (II Corinthians 5:19a). The theological statement is not subject to verification by an historian. Only if historians could somehow prove that Jesus was not crucified or otherwise put to death by Pilate would the theological truth of that statement be called into question. While some individuals may not believe Paul's statement, it is not subject to verification by historical methodology.

In order to clarify the matter even further let us apply the above insight to a sentence quoted from Dr. Funk's book. We quoted this sentence from page 18: "In his authentic parables and aphorisms, Jesus provides a glimpse into *another reality*..." (emphasis mine). Here Funk makes a theological statement because "another reality" is not something subject to historical verification. On the other hand, Funk rejects the above statement by Paul in II Corinthians *as that statement has been interpreted by Orthodox Christianity*. Here, I mean specifically the doctrine of the sacrificial atoning death and the doctrine of the incarnation. Certainly, there is a great theological gulf between many mainstream New Testament scholars and Dr. Funk. Nevertheless, the primary disagreements between mainstream scholars and the Jesus Seminar do not so much focus on theological questions (at least, publicly) as

on the historical questions. Vigorous debates focus on the more radical *historical* judgments and reconstructions of Funk and his followers.

Of course, a vigorous debate indicates that some mainstream scholars have joined the quest for the historical Jesus along with members of the Jesus Seminar. Accordingly, both sides claim to be historians as they research what can be known about the human Jesus who lived in Palestine. For example, note how E.P. Sanders describes his methodology:

The aim of this book is to lay out, as clearly as possible, what we can know, using the standard methods of historical research, and to distinguish this from inferences, labeling them clearly as such.²

Although both sides claim to use "the standard methods of historical research," they frequently arrive at strikingly different results. And these different results spark vigorous debates. One such debate concerns the passion narrative—the story leading up to the crucifixion and burial. Let us listen to the debate between Robert Funk and Raymond Brown, one of the leading mainstream scholars in the United States.

In his massive commentary on the passion narratives found in each of the four Gospels, Raymond Brown carefully sets forth his primary and secondary goals. His primary goal is to interpret for the modern reader the *meaning* that each Evangelist seeks to convey in his version of the passion narrative (hereafter, PN). This primary goal presupposes that the Evangelists were writing a "narrative" and not a history book, such as E.P. Sanders defines history above. Further, the Evangelists were working on two levels. While telling the story of Jesus' death, each Evangelist was also addressing that story to a particular audience and its contemporary situation. Consequently, each PN contains different emphases. For example, Matthew was addressing the PN to his own Jewish-Christian community that was being hard-pressed by its Jewish neighbors. Thereby, Matthew adapted the Markan PN for his audience and their particular situation-in-life.

A secondary goal is attempting to get behind individual units of the PN to establish pre-Gospel traditions. Since Mark wrote the first PN, by "pre-Gospel tradition" Brown means a story that Mark learned and later incorporated into his account or PN. One such "pre-Gospel tradition" tells of the Galilean women who witnessed the crucifixion and the empty tomb (Mark 15:40 and 16:1). While Brown is reluctant to identify such pre-Gospel traditions with history, he does claim that history is found in the PN.

In a later paper, published after his commentary, Brown reflects on his research and distinguishes four stages in the development of the PN. Accordingly, the first stage was the memory of what happened from Gethsemane to the burial (history). In the second stage the early church associated Old Testament passages with this history. In the third stage the term "Jews" was increasingly used to describe the non-Roman opposition to Jesus. Then, in stage four, some of the later passages, found especially in Matthew and John, were added.

In this same paper Brown identifies himself squarely with the mainstream by rejecting two other approaches. The first approach reads the passion narratives "as literal history." However, Brown seems to be much more concerned with the opposite approach.

The other view I judge unacceptable discredits the Gospel passion narratives as almost totally the product of Christian imagination, with little or no foundation in

fact. Under the mantle of scholarly objectivity, advocates assert firmly but without proof that the early Christians knew little about how Jesus died and simply invented their narratives on the basis of Old Testament imagery.³

Of course, Brown is referring to the kind of scholarship practiced by members of the Jesus Seminar.

Robert Funk and the Jesus Seminar sketch an entirely different picture from that of Raymond Brown. Their picture begins with "the bare facts" and some views entirely different from the PN. The bare facts are remarkably brief: "However, the bare facts that Jesus was executed in Jerusalem on the authority of Pontius Pilate have stood up under close and repeated examination."⁴ From that point on the views of the Seminar diametrically oppose the PN. Instead of burial in a well-known tomb, "the Fellows of the Jesus Seminar concede that Jesus may possibly have been buried in a common grave, but they doubt that his grave site was ever known."⁵ While Galilean women may have witnessed the crucifixion, Funk doubts that their observations had anything to do with the creation of the PN. "We do not know how their memories came to inform the creation of a passion narrative many decades later, if indeed that narrative reflects any eyewitness observations at all."⁶ Funk supports these views, not by citing any "facts," but by casting doubt upon the account in the PN. The story of the women witnesses at the empty tomb "was undoubtedly a literary creation of Mark." (Note that Brown calls it a "pre-Gospel tradition.") He also states that the traditional location of Jesus' tomb was not identified until the reign of Constantine in the early fourth century A.D. However, that fact has no bearing on the significant issue: did any followers of Jesus know where he was buried?

If, as Funk maintains, there were no memories of eyewitnesses behind the PN, how, then, did it come into being? Funk follows a recent proposal put forth by a modern scholar. According to this proposal several stories found in the Old Testament and in intertestamental literature exhibit a "common plot" featuring the following elements:

"...the hero...does something to provoke a *reaction*, a *conspiracy* develops...; an *accusation* is brought forward; there is a *trial*...a *sentence*; the...accused is *condemned*...*vindication* comes at the end."⁷

Mark, or someone prior to him, knew this "common plot" and, fitting Jesus into the role of hero, produced the PN. Funk recognizes that this proposal says nothing about the vital question of history in the PN. One might also ask whether the "common plot" was an ancient reality or a product of modern scholarly guesswork? Nevertheless, Funk concludes his discussion with this statement: "The simplest, most reliable solution remains the view that Mark *created* (emphasis mine) the first version of the story and every other version is based on Mark, directly or indirectly."⁸

According to Funk's view, Mark was exceptionally inventive in creating the PN. For example, Mark records that Joseph of Arimathea, a member of the council, approached Pilate, received his permission, and buried Jesus in a tomb "hewn out of the rock" (14:46). Note Funk's judgment: "Joseph of Arimathea is probably a Markan creation."⁹ If Jesus were thrown into an unknown, common grave (as the Jesus Seminar holds), the rock hewn tomb must also be a creation! And the pivotal role of the women must be Mark's doing. The Galilean women witness the crucifixion (15:40), see the tomb in which Jesus

was buried (15:47), and first visit the empty tomb on Easter morning (16:1). By means of these women three of the most important scenes in the Gospel are tied together! However, since the empty tomb is a myth, Mark invented the women witnesses. Since Jesus was buried in a common, unknown grave, again, Mark invented the women who knew its location!

How does the crucial role created for these women "play" against the cultural background of the time? Or, the issue may be stated differently: what kind of author would create such a pivotal role for women in such a culture? Women could not function as witnesses in Jewish courts. In a passage like a court brief Paul argues for the certainty of the Resurrection by citing only living, *male* witnesses! (1 Corinthians 15:5-11). In Graeco-Roman society, particularly in Roman circles, male witnesses carried far more weight than female witnesses. (Traditionally, Mark's Gospel was written in Rome.) Is it not strange that Mark could invent a male, Joseph of Arimathea, to bury Jesus, but could not invent males to tie together the crucifixion, the location of the grave, and the empty tomb?

Indeed, Funk has succeeded in portraying an extra-ordinarily inept creator for the PN. In terms of the patriarchal societies of the time, this inept creator shoots himself in the foot. Or, in leading from weakness, is Mark telling "the historical truth"? In any case, Funk's account of the writing of the PN, in addition to being highly speculative, does not play well against the cultural background of the time. Is it surprising that the mainstream remains unconvinced on this and other points?

Let us turn now to another debate concerning the historical Jesus. Was Jesus an illiterate Galilean artisan, or did he receive the kind of education available for some Jewish boys of the time? In order to answer that question some background information must be introduced.

In his biography of Jesus, Crossan portrays Jesus as an illiterate artisan from a low-class stratum of society. In order to draw such a conclusion an author must know something about ancient society and how it functioned. Therefore, biblical scholars frequently turn to social scientists or other experts on the early Roman Empire. Crossan has turned to Gerhard Lenski who has written about the social stratification of the time in an agrarian society. Lenski theorizes that only one percent of the population were rulers or members of the governing class. These in turn were served by a retainer class made up of scribes, administrators, and soldiers. In addition there were merchants and priests. The vast bulk of the people were peasants who worked the land. Beneath the peasants in order were artisans, landless agricultural workers, and slaves. Modern Americans must not posit a large and prosperous middle-class between the extremes of wealth and poverty in some ancient societies.

Note how Crossan arrives at his conclusion that Jesus was an artisan. Taking his cue from the Greek word for "carpenter," Crossan assigns him to the category of artisan. Of course, the words "carpenter" and "son of the carpenter" occur in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. According to Lenski's stratification, artisans are just below peasants, the great majority of the population, and just above the desperately poor landless agricultural workers and slaves.

However, other scholars, especially some American archaeologists, disagree with Lenski's model. Since Lenski wrote in 1966, several significant archaeological "digs" have

been conducted in Galilee both in villages and in Sepphoris, the capital. Some American archaeologists who worked in these digs have maintained that the *extremes* of wealth and poverty, such as were found in Italy and other provinces of the Empire, were not typical of the Jewish state.

Again, Crossan seems to arrive at the conclusion that Jesus was illiterate from Lenski's model. Having located Jesus in the lowly artisan class, Crossan makes this surprising statement about the extent of illiteracy in "the Jewish state" of the time: "Furthermore, since 95 and 97 percent of the Jewish state was illiterate at the time of Jesus, it must be presumed that Jesus also was illiterate..."¹⁰

Again, others disagree. They argue that the level of literacy among Jewish males was higher than among other ethnic groups because of the centrality of Torah in the life of the people. This is the approach that John P. Meier pursues in trying to prove that Jesus was literate. However, before we turn to Meier's mainstream approach, a small group of Jewish scholars should be heard.

A small group of Jewish scholars have argued that Jesus was a learned man on the basis of the same word for carpenter or craftsman. For example, Geza Vermes, instead of beginning with the Greek word for carpenter that is found in the Gospels, examined the *Aramaic* word that lies behind the Greek. The Aramaic word (*naggār*) can be used metaphorically. The metaphoric usage is found in both the Jerusalem Talmud (dated about 400 A.D.) and in the Babylonian Talmud (dated about 500 A.D.). There the word "stands for a 'scholar' or 'learned man.'"¹¹ While the Talmuds were written several hundred years after the Gospels, the term is found in proverbial sayings, which, in those days, could survive over centuries. If the term "carpenter" were used metaphorically by those ancient bystanders, Jesus was learned!

Note that in this debate Crossan focuses on the Gentile world for his social model and places Jesus within that model by the use of a Greek word. In contrast, Jewish scholars emphasize the Jewish background of Jesus. Further, much recent mainline scholarship has been rediscovering and emphasizing the Jewishness of Jesus. Similarly, John P. Meier also examines Jesus' Jewish roots in assessing the question of literacy.

While Crossan argues on the basis of a social model, Meier pursues "an indirect argument from converging lines of probability... that Jesus was in fact literate."¹² The first line of probability is generally acknowledged: Judaism prized literacy more than other peoples due to the centrality of Torah in its life. Secondly, the criterion of multiple attestation comes into play. All sources in the Gospels—Mark, Q, the special sources behind Matthew and Luke, and John—show that Jesus engaged in dialogues and disputes with Scribes and Pharisees concerning legal, theological, and scriptural questions. Scribes and Pharisees were the leading religious thinkers of the day. Thirdly, apart from his father, the synagogue in Nazareth would be the source of his education. Would that synagogue have supported a school? Indeed, archaeology points to "a thoroughly Jewish settlement" at Nazareth with 1,600 to 2,000 inhabitants!¹³ The literary evidence suggests it was devout.

The archaeological and literary evidence together is impressive, and, if post-biblical definitions of carpenter/woodworker (*naggār*) are accurate, Joseph may have been much more prosperous than Lenski's stratification would allow.

While certainty in answering the question of literacy is not possible, again it is apparent

why mainstream scholarship remains unconvinced by arguments like Crossan's. Crossan argues on the basis of a social model drawn up in the sixties to describe the Roman Empire as a whole. Mainstream scholarship tends to approach Jesus through the Judaism of the time and relies heavily upon recent archaeological data.

NEW SOCIAL ROLES FOR JESUS

In addition to the vigorous debates between the Jesus Seminar and mainstream scholars, Funk and Crossan have been assigning new social roles to Jesus. If one rejects the biblical roles associated with orthodox Christianity as "theological accretions," one must create new roles to describe what the historical Jesus was really about. What social role enabled Jesus to provide "a glimpse into another reality..." (page 18).

Dr. Funk uses the word "sage" and the expression "itinerant sage" over and over again in his book. He even defines what he means by sage: "... Jesus may well have been a wisdom teacher—a sage."¹⁴ Perhaps the favorite role that Funk and the Seminar have reserved for Jesus is sage.

However, what do *they* mean by sage? Of course, the Old Testament speaks of wisdom teachers and Jesus did teach words of practical wisdom as did the sages of old. However, by sage, Funk and others in the Seminar identify Jesus with a particular kind of Hellenistic philosopher called a Cynic.

Now we know that many things Jesus said had parallels in the lore taught by Cynic philosophers he may have heard as a youngster in *Hellenized* Galilee. A whole new paradigm for understanding Jesus suddenly presents itself. (emphasis mine)

The Cynics were teachers of popular philosophy. They did not focus on how to succeed or "get ahead" in life so much as how to live well. They emphasized moderation and restraint. They may be compared with the existentialists of a generation ago who taught authentic existence based on conscious decisions. Their advice was mostly this-worldly and in many points their teaching was similar to that of the Stoics. Finally, Cynics were not a homogeneous group.

Further, the Jesus Seminar is not the first to make comparisons between Jesus and the Cynics. Such comparisons were made in the ancient world. Perhaps the most famous person to identify Jesus with a Cynic philosopher was Friedrich Nietzsche. However, the cogent question is not how many people have drawn this comparison, but how valid is it?

Is it a valid comparison and is there any basis for Funk's statement that perhaps Jesus listened to Cynic philosophers as a youth? While a detailed study comparing the *teachings* of Jesus with those of the Cynics has not yet been made, Hans Dieter Betz has written the most complete study of the methodological problems involved in this popular comparison. He writes:

The presumed presence of Cynics in the Galilean society in which Jesus lived is mostly fanciful conjecture. The evidence for Cynicism is limited to Gadara and Tyre, Hellenistic cities outside of Galilee... It is, therefore, wrong to make up for our lack of evidence by projecting a sophisticated urban culture replete with Cynics into every part of Galilee.¹⁵

On methodological grounds it is incorrect to speak of a homogeneous "Hellenized Galilee." Recent excavations show Galilee in Jesus' time to have been much more diverse than Funk supposed. Some towns and villages were "thoroughly Jewish." Sepphoris, the capital, and Tiberias contained a mixed population and were much more open to Hellenistic influences. Still, there is no ancient literary reference to Cynic activity there. Further, the Gospels may speak by their silence. They do not record that Jesus ever taught or preached in Sepphoris or Tiberias. Rather, he spent most of his ministry in predominantly Jewish areas.

Similarly, on methodological grounds, one should not speak of a homogeneous kind of Cynic philosopher. There were at least two kinds of Cynics and the boundary lines between Cynics and Stoics were fluid. So, once again, mainstream scholars are not persuaded that Jesus was influenced by Cynic philosophers! Nevertheless, if Jesus were *only* a wandering *teacher of wisdom* (as Funk pictures him), there is a rough analogy. Still, for someone whose goal is seeking "the historical truth at all costs" (p. 8), there is remarkably little "historical truth" to commend this new social role.

Like Funk, Crossan would also clothe Jesus in the *pallium* of a Cynic philosopher. However, there are even fewer analogies between the picture of Jesus that Crossan draws and any homogeneous Cynic philosopher. Even Crossan points out significant differences:

But he is rural, they are urban; he is organizing a communal movement, they are following an individual philosophy....¹⁶

The analogy is stretched to the breaking point as Crossan pictures Jesus as the kind of social "revolutionary" who would be totally at home in the late twentieth-century world of political correctness. Jesus organizes counter-cultural communities that are "the symbol and embodiment of radical egalitarianism, of an absolute equality of people that denies...any discrimination...and negates...any hierarchy..."¹⁷ This, of course, includes gender.

How does he derive this picture from the Gospels? For example, did not Jesus choose twelve and do they not represent some kind of hierarchical structure? Well, no: the Evangelist is reading back a later group into the ministry of the historical Jesus! Other stories also seem to lose their literal meaning and support Crossan's thesis. For example, the healing of the leper in Mark 1:40-44 isn't really talking about physical healing, but social healing and accepting a social outcast into the new community. And, as for Jesus' command to the leper to show himself to the priest so that the priest may declare him clean—that did not happen either. Such an egalitarian community would never defer to such a representative of hierarchy and patriarchy! Indeed, Crossan seems to have gone beyond historical criticism into skepticism.

How does one evaluate this new quest? First, we have seen that contemporary mainstream biblical scholarship does not accept the more radical conclusions of the Jesus Seminar.

Secondly, the phrase "the historical truth" becomes quite wobbly in actual practice. Note what historical research is not, and what historical research is trying to do in the case of Jesus. It is not a scientific experiment or a sociological survey of live participants. It is seeking to delineate the historical Jesus and *must* use the Gospels as well as other ancient literature. Note the decisions the Jesus Seminar has made in using the Gospels and in

approaching other ancient literature. In using the Gospels they have removed the so-called theological accretions and reduced the database of authentic Jesuanic sayings and parables drastically. In approaching other ancient literature they look beyond Judaism to the contemporary Hellenistic world. They certainly reject the hierarchical Jewish society of the time and the end-of-the-age speculation of the Apostle Paul and John the Baptist: this is what Jesus-as-sage really indicates.

Given all of the above, they must create a "model" to explain how a first-century Eastern Mediterranean culture functioned and how Jesus functioned within that culture. With a small database of authentic sayings, controversial models, and the biases of the interpreters, "the historical truth" turns out to be composed of a large dose of clever guesswork. In construing Jesus on the model of a Cynic philosopher, this guesswork becomes almost wish-fulfillment.

A final observation is relevant. Critics of the first quest said that the nineteenth-century liberal German theologians looked into the "well" of criticism and beheld their own face. Thus, the historical Jesus turned out to be very much like a liberal, nineteenth-century German gentleman! Is it strange that the Jesus served up by this latest search turns out to be like modern, disaffected academic types? In one case Jesus is surprisingly like a wandering wisdom teacher and in the other a politically correct social revolutionary. Like disaffected, modern academic types, this poor Jesus can only provide "a glimpse into another reality." Amidst the boring flatlands of postmodernist times such a Jesus is not much help.

NOTES

1. John Dominic Crossan, *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: Harper, 1994) and Robert Funk, *Honest to Jesus: Jesus For a New Millennium* (San Francisco: Harper, 1996).
2. E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Jesus* (New York: Penguin Books, 1993), 5. Even St. Paul seems to point to this dimension of the Son "who was descended from David according to the flesh..." (Romans 1:3—emphasis mine).
3. Raymond Brown, "Narratives of Jesus' Passion and Anti-Judaism," *Explorations* (Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996), 6. Brown outlines his four stages on pages 6-8. See also Raymond Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*, in *The Anchor Bible Reference Library* (New York: Doubleday, 1994).
4. Funk, *Honest to Jesus*, 220.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.* The following quotation is found on page 221.
7. *Ibid.*, 240. Funk is following George Nickelsburg, "Passion Narratives," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 5, 172-77.
8. Funk, *Honest to Jesus*, 240.
9. *Ibid.*, 234.
10. Crossan, *Jesus*, 25. See also Gerhard Lenski, *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 189-296.
11. Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 21. Vermes follows David Flusser, *Jesus* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1968), 20.
12. John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, *The Anchor Bible Reference Library* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 277-78.
13. Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 277. See esp. notes 135-37. See also Meyers & Strange, *Archaeology, the Rabbis, and Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), 56-57. Meier is following the archaeologi-

cal and literary research of Meyers and Strange.

14. Funk, *Honest to Jesus*, 70. See Index p. 341 for references to sage. The quotation below, identifying Jesus with the Cynics, is also found on p. 70.

15. Hans Dieter Betz, "Jesus and the Cynics: Survey and Analysis of a Hypothesis," *JR* 74 (1994), 471. See also 453-75.

16. Crossan, *Jesus*, 122.

17. Crossan, *Jesus*, 71.