

As much as I think that “Christ-kerygma” as well as “Jesus-kerygma” can be reasonably said to have its origin in the Christ-event, and thus to be formally and not merely substantially apostolic and canonical, I still think there are good reasons for saying such things as the following:

[T]he canon of the church, and hence also the primary authority for theology, must now be located in what form critics generally speak of as the earliest layer of the synoptic tradition, or what Marxsen in particular refers to as ‘the Jesus-kerygma,’ as distinct both from ‘the Christ-kerygma’ and from ‘the mixed form of the Jesus-kerygma and the Christ-kerygma’ that we find expressed in the writings of the New Testament (*OT*: 64).

[T]he true apostolic and, therefore, canonical witness [refers to ] the earliest layer of witness now accessible to us through historical-critical study of the [s]ynoptic [g]ospels, which, following one of the most careful students of this whole matter, Willi Marxsen, I call the Jesus-kerygma (*F&F*: 45 f.).

Here, if anywhere, in these earliest Jesus-traditions [*sc.* these very oldest traditions that any quest of the historical Jesus must perforce reconstruct], or, as Willi Marxsen prefers to say, in this earliest ‘Jesus-kerygma,’ we have what for us today must function as the real Christian canon or norm of appropriateness (*PC*: 113 f.).

17 September 2005