

Having reread Marxsen as well as my essay on him and my essay involving criticism of Mackey, I am clearer than I was before that both theologians are really developing essentially one and the same type of christology—a christology that, to my mind, is an unrevised revisionary christology.

Whatever their differences, they both locate the historical ground of christology in Jesus' own faith and his living of that faith toward others who, through him, come to share it and then in turn live it toward yet others. Thus Marxsen argues that "God's way leads to people *by way of* people who themselves *live* the Jesus-business" (JC: 131 f.). But isn't this only a verbally different way of saying what Mackey says—that "this kind of faith . . . can only spread by contagion. Only carriers can give it to others" (*Jesus, the Man and the Myth*: 169; cf. 196)?

True, Marxsen is sharply critical of the idea of Jesus' sinlessness. On the other hand, he can so talk about Jesus' "completely" giving himself to the "business" of bringing others to his faith that it'll do until talking about sinlessness comes along.

Perhaps the biggest difference is that Marxsen's holding out for such a christology is contradictory of his own most basic principles—as I show in the final point of my criticism—whereas Mackey's position, lacking in such principles, seems more consistent.

28 February 2007