

Many of them say this, Is there a continuity between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith? Is there or is there not a continuity? Perrin said before his death, I used to be disgusted with Bultmann's statement that the Christ of history is not a part of NT theology, it is merely a pre-requisite for the NT° theology, but I now believe it is the truth about the matter.

Several of them have said, If Jesus really thought he was the Son of Man he would hardly be saying it, so they all agree that some of these statements just are not genuine. Well, where did these statements come from? Most of these people began to believe say 100 years ago a new theory was presented along the lines of the higher criticism. You look at the three synoptic gospels, and you find some instances told in two, some in three. So they must have taken it from another source. They began to teach what they called source criticism. They said originally there was Mark and originally there was a book called Q which contains the discourse material that is found in Mark and LUke. Rather Matthew and Luke.

They said these two and some other traditions were joined together, and this is the source criticism. They took these various writings and combined them and made the three synoptic gospels. That was widely taught as established fact. It is taught today as established fact in nearly all seminaries that are over 100 years old.

first

But since the/World War they advanced a new kind of criticism called form criticism. Form criticism says that before these documents came together, in the history of these documents there were various traditions and these traditions can be compared. Some of them went to the extreme of saying that anything in them that sounds like any Greek teaching comes from Hellenic sources. And anything that sounds like any Jewish teaching comes from Jewish sources. So that is where these all started from. They didn't start from Christ at all, they started from these sources!

Then since the second World War under Bultmann and other's leadership there is another kind of criticism and that is called redaction criticism. By that they mean how Gospel writers Mat, Mc, and Lk, changed what they had been given, how they altered it to fit their own theories. So when they get through there is really nothing you can believe in the Gospels. In fact an article just came out in one of the Journals this week on "The Tradition that Never Was." In which he said that the whole idea there was any traditions included in the apostles [writings] about Christ is--there is nothing to it.

Well, of course we believe that the Bible is true, it is God's Word. We believe that when the Lord Jesus said in Jn. 14:26, "The Counsellor, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of all things I have said to you." We believe this means that the Holy Spirit reminded them of what he had said, and what they wrote was what Jesus actually said. Well I should not say exactly what he said. There are very few rods in there are what he said because he talked in Aramaic. ~~Theyssssssss~~ Maybe he talked in Greek, but we don't know but he certainly mostly talked in Aramaic and the Gospels were [written] in Greek so they had to translate it, but we believe the Holy Spirit led in that translation. And when we have two Gospels that ~~xxx~~ tell pretty much the same thing, but the words are a little different, well you get any two Americans to translate a German word today and your words are going to be different.