

I am struck by Sanders' observation that the authors of the gospels "intended people to turn to [Jesus], to admire him, and to believe that he was sent from God and that following him would lead to eternal life" (*The Historical Figure of Jesus*: 7 f.). Is it far-fetched to see in this threefold distinction between (1) turning to Jesus; (2) admiring him; and (3) believing/following him something like the orthodox analysis of the *fides qua creditur* as involving the three distinguishable moments of (1) *notitia*; (2) *assensus*; and (3) *fiducia*?

True, Sanders speaks of "believing *that*," while "*fiducia*," on the orthodox understanding, being rather personal trust/loyalty, is a matter of "believing *in*." But, surely, it is also possible, if not in fact likely, that Sanders simply fails to express himself as carefully as he could and should have.

Anyhow, it seems clear that there are indeed important differences between (1) adverting to Jesus, or taking note of what he has to say; (2) admiring him, in the sense of judging what he has to say to be true, or credible, and therefore worthy of belief; and (3) entrusting oneself to him and loyally following him himself as being of decisive significance for one's own existence.

Spring 1996