

1-1-2002

## A Response from the Editor

Paul Anderson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Anderson, Paul (2002) "A Response from the Editor," *Quaker Religious Thought*. Vol. 98 , Article 4.  
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt/vol98/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quaker Religious Thought by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolfe@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolfe@georgefox.edu).

## A RESPONSE FROM THE EDITOR

Dear Herbert Standing,

Thank you for your thoughtful response to my recent analysis of recent quests for the historical Jesus. In response to your concerns I have asked two leading New Testament scholars, Marcus Borg and Mark Allen Powell, to respond to your comments about my essay and the Jesus Seminar itself, taking the discussion further toward the implications of recent Jesus studies. In addition, I had received an essay from Gary Kinkel, the theologian from Simpson College referred to in your letter, and I asked him to re-craft his essay as a theological response to recent Jesus studies as treated in my essay. I am delighted that all three of these scholars have agreed to respond to the Jesus essay in *QRT* #94, and I have written a response to all of these essays at the end, hoping to tie some things together.

Before hearing from our responders, however, two matters I would like to correct regarding my essay are as follows. First, N. T. Wright pointed out to me that Dominic Crossan does not see himself as a member of the “third quest” for the historical Jesus. He would see himself as part of the “renewed quest,” described by Funk as an extension of the “new quest.” That being the case, I would probably locate the Jesus Seminar within the new quest for the historical Jesus in its continuity with other naturalistic and history-of-religions approaches to the venture. A second item is minor, but in order to avert possible miss-citations, the subtitle of my book on John’s Christology is: *Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (not *Its Unity and Diversity...*). Beware of pesky spell-checkers! Now for the responses to the Jesus essay.

Paul Anderson