LIBRARY OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

t&tclark

THE QUEST FOR THE HISTORICAL JESUS AFTER THE DEMISE OF AUTHENTICITY

Toward a Critical Realist Philosophy of History in Jesus Studies

JONATHAN BERNIER

BLOOMSBURY

LIBRARY OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

540

Formerly the Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement series

THE QUEST FOR THE HISTORICAL JESUS AFTER THE DEMISE OF AUTHENTICITY

Toward a Critical Realist Philosophy of History in Jesus Studies

By
Jonathan Bernier

t&tclark
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

T&T CLARK
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA

BLOOMSBURY, T&T CLARK and the T&T Clark logo are
trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2016
Paperback edition first published 2018

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-5676-6286-6
PB: 978-0-5676-8170-6
ePDF: 978-0-5676-6287-3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Bernier, Jonathan, author.
Title: The quest for the historical Jesus after the demise of authenticity: toward a critical realist philosophy of history in Jesus studies / by Jonathan Bernier.
Description: New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016. | Series: Library of New Testament studies; volume 540 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifi ers: LCCN 2016032051 (print) | LCCN 2016033021 (ebook) | ISBN 9780567662866 (hardback) | ISBN 9780567662873 (epdf)
Subjects: LCSH: Jesus Christ–Historicity.
Classifi cation: LCC BT303.2 .B383 2016 (print) | LCC BT303.2 (ebook) | DDC 232.9/08–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016032051

Series: Library of New Testament Studies, volume 540

Typeset by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India

To find out more about our authors and books visit
www.bloomsbury.com and sign up for our newsletters.

Dedicated to Anders Runesson

Contents

Acknowledgments

This study is concerned with reassessing the possible contributions that the work of Ben F. Meyer and his teacher, the philosopher and theologian Bernard Lonergan, might yet offer for historical Jesus studies. I am not a philosopher or a theologian, and thus learning about Bernard Lonergan has been a steep learning curve. This curve has been greatly aided by interactions with the faculty and studies at Regis College at the University of Toronto, where Lonergan had taught from 1947 to 1953 and again from 1965 to 1975, and which today houses the Lonergan archives at its Lonergan Research Institute. Brian Bajzek, John D. Dadosky, Eric Mabry, Gilles M. Mongeau, Justin Schwartz, and Jeremy Wilkins deserve special mention. Wilkins's gracious invitation to present to the Lonergan Research Institute Graduate Seminar in March of 2015 an early form of what became the introduction to this volume was a highpoint in this interaction. I benefited greatly also from getting to know Michael Vertin, emeritus professor in the Department of Philosophy at University of Toronto, who not only works on Lonergan's thought but was also a personal friend of the man himself. The insight offered by all these scholars is greatly appreciated.

As always, there is a laundry list of other persons to whom gratitude should be expressed, and please forgive in advance if my list is incomplete; that would be the consequence of an imperfect memory, not inadequate gratitude. Thank you to my *Doktorvater*, Anders Runesson, for the years that he invested in equipping me with the skills necessary to be a working New Testament scholar; to my former teachers Eileen Schuller and Stephen Westerholm, both of whom worked alongside Ben Meyer and gave me a better sense of the man himself; to my former classmates, John Bolton and Jordan Ryan, for the many hours spent discussing this project; thank you to Chris Keith, for first approaching me with the idea of writing this volume for T&T Clark's Library of New Testament Studies, and for helping shepherd it through its various stages; to Alan Kirk, for his belief in the value of this work; to Bill Heroman and Anthony Lawson, for their moral support and willingness to read drafts and spot typos; to my parents, Alan and Anne Bernier, for their various forms of support over the years; to Debra and Jamie Lediet and Sascha Kokott, for a lifetime of friendship; to my colleagues and students at St. Francis Xavier University, for being just such wonderful people to work with; and finally to the library staff at St FX's Angus MacDonald Library, whose work was invaluable in allowing me to secure the resources needed to complete this project.

All of you are amazing, each in your own way, and I only hope that this project will live up to your expectations.

Antigonish, Nova Scotia
June 15, 2016

Introduction

"After two hundred years of historical-Jesus research, the bulk of which by common consent has proved a failure, it would seem reasonable to ask the writer of yet another book on the topic not to make the old mistakes."[1] Historical Jesus research seems today to be at least as much at an impasse as it was when Ben F. Meyer wrote these words almost forty years ago. The criteria of authenticity, which were considered then to be the state of the art (but whose collective utility was already being called into question by Meyer, among others),[2] are now widely recognized as bankrupt historiographical instruments in need of serious revision if not outright repudiation.[3] As is perhaps inevitable in such situations, we are greeted on the

1. Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (repr. ed. with new introduction; Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2002), 13.

2. Cf. R. S. Barbour, *Traditio-Historical Criticism of the Gospels* (Studies in Creative Criticism 4; London: SPCK, 1972), 1–27; Morna Hooker, "Christology and Methodology," *New Testament Studies* 17/4 (1971): 480–87; Morna Hooker, "On Using the Wrong Tool," *Theology* 75 (1972): 570–81; Meyer, *Aims*, 85–87; Ben F. Meyer, "Some Consequences of Birger Gerhardsson's Account of the Origins of the Gospel Tradition," in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. Henry Wansbrough; Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 424–40, esp. pp. 425–29.

3. For the criteria approach's obituary, cf. the various contributions to Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne, eds., *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity* (London: T&T Clark, 2012). For intimations of its eventual doom, cf. Dale Allison, Jr., "How to Marginalize the Traditional Criteria of Authenticity," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter; 4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1:3–30; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Christianity in the Making 1; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 81–85, 330–36; Tom Holmén, "Authenticity Criteria," in *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus* (ed. Craig A. Evans; New York: Routledge, 2010), 43–54; Chris Keith, *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Literacy and the Teacher from Galilee* (Library of Historical Jesus Studies 8/Library of New Testament Studies 413; London: T&T Clark, 2011), 27–50; Chris Keith, "Memory and Authenticity: Jesus Tradition and What Really Happened," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunder der älteren Kirche* 102 (2011): 155–77; Anthony Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 87–91; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* (5 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1991–), 1:167–95, esp. pp. 167–68, 183–84; Rafael Rodríguez, "Authenticating Criteria: The Use and Misuse of a Critical Method," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 7 (2009): 152–67; Rafael Rodríguez, *Structuring Early Christian*

one hand by historiographical reactionaries who want to shore up the old ways of doing things[4] and on the other by historiographical nihilists who tell us that if the old ways no longer work, then there can, in fact, be no way.[5]

Meanwhile, in the midst of all this, the most startling phenomenon is evident, namely genuine advance in the field of Jesus studies.[6] In principle, this advance was conceptually complete in Meyer's work, but it has taken some time for the field to fully register this breakthrough. The advance consists of overcoming the "rupture hypothesis," that is, the hypothesis that an unbridgeable gulf exists between Judaism and Jesus on the one hand and Jesus and Christianity on the other.[7] While what has been described as the Third Quest has been focused upon overcoming the conceptual rupture between Judaism and Jesus, the effort to overcome the conceptual rupture between Jesus and Christianity has remained on the margins of historical Jesus studies for some time.

Dunn's magisterial *Jesus Remembered* represented a landmark contribution to overcoming this conceptual rupture between Jesus and Christianity. In this work, Dunn articulated in a clear and timely fashion two insights. These insights can perhaps best be articulated through reference to Marxsen's three settings for the Jesus tradition: the setting in Jesus' ministry, the setting in the early church, and the setting in the gospels; or, alternatively, the dominical,[8] the ecclesiastical,

Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text (Library of New Testament Studies 407; London: T&T Clark, 2010); Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002); Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, *Jesus and the Historians* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 161–82.

4. Cf. Paul Foster, "Memory, Orality, and the Fourth Gospel: Three Dead-Ends in Historical Jesus Studies," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 10 (2012): 191–227, esp. p. 227.

5. Cf. the declaration of a "New No Quest" by Zeba Crook, "Memory Distortion and the Historical Jesus" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Baltimore, MD, November 25, 2013), a presentation that largely recapitulated the argument advanced previously in Zeba Crook, "Collective Memory Distortion and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 11/3 (2013): 53–76.

6. In addition to the negative argument in Keith and Le Donne, *Demise of Authenticity*, significant examples of this advance include Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*; Keith, *Jesus' Literacy*; Le Donne, *Historiographical Jesus*; Rodríguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory*; Jens Schröter, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the Christian Canon* (trans. Wayne Coppins; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013).

7. Cf. Meyer, *Aims*, 223–41. Cf. also the discussion in Ben F. Meyer, *The Early Christians: Their World Mission and Self-Discovery* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1986), 14–22, esp. pp. 14–15. Cf. also the comparable argument from Meyer's McMaster colleague, E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985), 18–22.

8. There might be those who will object to the use of the term 'dominical,' stating that it inescapably affirms Jesus's lordship. To such a hypothetical objection, I would respond

and the evangelical.[9] The first insight advanced by Dunn is that all the dominical material found in the New Testament and other emergent Christian sources, regardless of their historical relationship to the Jesus of Nazareth, has been shaped by the emergent Christians, and thus is always already ecclesiastical material[10]; the second insight, that emergent Christian identity, thought, and practice were effected in large part by Jesus and his operations, such that the ecclesiastical material took its distinctive shape precisely because of an antecedent dominical situation.[11] The evangelical material is ecclesiastical, and the ecclesiastical is neither independent of nor discontinuous from dominical activity; the three categories—dominical, ecclesiastical, and evangelical—are mutually entailed in a markedly dynamic fashion. These insights, combined with the Third Quest's insight into the relationship between Jesus and Second Temple Judaism, have effectively consigned the rupture hypothesis to the dustbin of historiography, such that any future historical Jesus studies that suppose the said hypothesis will appear simply antiquated. The continuity between Jesus and Christianity, I would suggest, is at the heart of the Fourth Quest for the historical Jesus, the advent of which we might associate most fully with the publication of *Jesus Remembered*.

These insights have methodological consequences. Precisely because the gospels represent always already Christian mediation of Jesus of Nazareth, the question "Which material is unmediated by the church?" is from the off a *question mal*

by saying only that by my usage I make no such affirmation. Rather, I use the word only because it is less cumbersome to repeatedly write 'dominical setting' than it is to repeatedly write 'the setting of Jesus's life.'

9. Cf. Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (trans. James Boyce, Donald Juel, William Poehlmann, and Roy A. Harrisville; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1969), 23–24.

10. This insight is not original to Dunn, of course; William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J. C. G. Greig; Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971) represents a classic articulation thereof. Cf. also the discussions in Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (trans. W. Montgomery; New York: MacMillan, 1968), 330–97; Christopher Tuckett, ed., *The Messianic Secret* (Issues in Religion and Theology 1; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983). Note also that Marxsen's idea of three settings for the Jesus tradition represents a development from the work of Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (trans. S. H. Hooke; 2nd rev. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1972), 23, who identified two settings: the dominical and the ecclesiastical. Marxsen's distinction between ecclesiastical and evangelical settings was thus, in effect, always a distinction between non-evangelical ecclesiastical and evangelical ecclesiastical settings.

11. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 125–34. Contemporaneous with *Jesus Remembered*, Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 53–54, argued similarly that "the only reasonable factor that accounts for the central place of the figure of *Jesus* in early Christianity is the impact of Jesus' ministry and its consequences, especially for his followers." Cf. pp. 53–64 for his more extended treatment of this theme.

posée. Yet, it was after unmediated dominical facts that the criteria of authenticity tilted, precisely on the supposition that ancient ecclesiastical mediation was a barrier to contemporary historical knowing. As John P. Meier, who has delivered what is probably the single-best articulation of the criteria approach, phrases the question: "How do we distinguish what comes from Jesus . . . from what was created by the oral tradition of the early Church . . . and what was produced by the editorial work (redaction) of the evangelists?"[12] That is to say: How does one distinguish which material in the now-extant tradition came from which of Marxsen's three settings? The criteria set out to distinguish unmediated dominical data from mediated ecclesiastical or evangelical data, the unmediated to be deemed "authentic," and the mediated "inauthentic."[13] More nuanced treatments might qualify unmediated dominical data as *relatively* unmediated dominical data, but such difference is procedurally a difference that makes no difference: the object of investigation remains material that can be ascribed to Jesus rather than to the early church. Dunn's advance, following Meyer, is to recognize that the texts written by the Christians during their first decades, not least of all the canonical gospels, constitute not a barrier to but, rather, a conduit for, a genuine historical apprehension of Jesus of Nazareth.

With any significant advance, there must come a time of consolidation that, on the one hand, shores up the breakthrough lest either the reactionaries or the nihilists manage to shut down the discussion while, on the other hand, providing the groundwork for subsequent advances. This is the situation in which historical Jesus studies currently finds itself. Some of the old mistakes have been corrected and, consequently, some of the old failures are being reversed, and if we make good on these promising developments, then we might conceivably correct more mistakes, reverse more failures. This study aims to contribute to this work of consolidation, by undertaking the specific exercise of more precisely defining the task of historical Jesus studies, using the conceptual resources made available by the critical realism that Ben Meyer pioneered within New Testament studies and which Dunn explicitly appropriates as the basis of his own epistemology.[14] That is to say, insofar as the genuine advance in historical Jesus studies that we have been privileged to witness in our time was already from the beginning grounded within

12. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:167.

13. For a recent and succinct overview of the development of the notion of "authenticity," cf. Anthony Le Donne, "The Rise of the Quest for an Authentic Jesus: An Introduction to the Crumbling Foundations of Jesus Research," in Keith and Le Donne, *Demise of Authenticity*, 3–21. Although Marxsen is typically remembered as a founding father of redaction criticism, Chris Keith, "The Indebtedness of the Criteria Approach to Form Criticism and Recent Attempts to Rehabilitate the Search for an Authentic Jesus," in Keith and Le Donne, *Demise of Authenticity*, 25–48, quite rightly situates the criteria of authenticity in relation to form criticism, insofar as their development (as well as that of redaction criticism) was predicated upon an essentially form-critical understanding of early Christian development.

14. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 110–11.

a broadly critical-realist perspective, it seems well and good to more carefully think about historical Jesus studies in an intentionally critical-realist fashion.

"Critical realism" is a pernicious term, however. As noted, in New Testament studies it has been most fully developed by the aforementioned Ben Meyer,[15] who explicitly identified his critical realism with that of Bernard Lonergan, under whom he studied at the Gregorian University in Rome,[16] and more recently popularized by N. T. Wright.[17] Yet, the term is associated in the broader human sciences not only with Lonergan's thought but also with more than one set of entirely unrelated traditions within the philosophy of science.[18] Robert B. Stewart is mistaken, however, when he argues that the critical realism advocated by Wright "is a term borrowed from philosophy of science and carried over into theology and biblical studies."[19] Wright's, and also Dunn's, critical realism is that of Meyer,[20] and

15. Cf. Meyer, *Aims*; Ben F. Meyer, *Christus Faber: The Master-Builder and the House of God* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1992); Ben F. Meyer, *Critical Realism and the New Testament* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1989); Meyer, *Early Christians*; Ben F. Meyer, *Reality and Illusion in New Testament Scholarship: A Primer in Critical Realist Hermeneutics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994).

16. The central presentations of which are to be found in Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran; 5th ed.; Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 3; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972). Note that when I cite *Insight* throughout this study, my pagination will conform to that found in the now-standard 1992 edition, which differs from those published previously and, unfortunately for our purposes, from those used by Meyer. Meyer's debt to Lonergan is perhaps most clearly articulated in *Reality and Illusion*, viii, when he states that his "philosophical stance is entirely that of Lonergan. He is often cited; intended originality vis-à-vis his work is negligible. . . . No attempt is made to improve on the master." Cf. also Meyer, *Critical Realism*, 1–16, 147–56.

17. N. T. Wright, introduction to Meyer, *Aims*, 9a–9l; N. T. Wright, *New Testament and the People of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 1; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992), 32–37.

18. Cf. the succinct overview of the "Varieties of Critical Realism" provided by Donald L. Denton, *Historiography and Hermeneutics in Jesus Studies: An Examination of the Work of John Dominic Crossan and Ben F. Meyer* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 210–25.

19. Robert B. Stewart, *The Quest of the Hermeneutical Jesus: The Impact of Hermeneutics on the Jesus Research of John Dominic Crossan and N.T. Wright* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2008), 77. Robert L. Webb, "The Historical Enterprise and Historical Jesus Research," in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus* (ed. Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 9–94, pp. 28–29, n. 55, evinces a similar confusion as he tries to assimilate these variants into a single phenomenon known as "critical realism." There is, in fact, no such single phenomenon.

20. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 110–11; N. T. Wright, introduction to Meyer, *Aims*, 9a–9l; Wright, *New Testament and the People of God*, 32.

Meyer's that of Lonergan, and contra Stewart,[21] this comes out of disputes within the Thomistic tradition in which Lonergan was trained and operated.[22] No matter how adequate or otherwise might be Wright's appropriation of Meyer's, and thus Lonergan's critical realism,[23] it remains the case that it was this critical realism and only this critical realism that he set out to appropriate.

As such, I can and will leave these other critical realisms entirely to one side, not because they are neither worthy of discussion nor could potentially help elucidate matters of dispute in historical Jesus studies—quite the opposite might well be the case—but simply because my particular interest in this study is to develop the critical realism already current to a certain extent in New Testament scholarship. That critical realism is the one pioneered by, and associated with, Bernard Lonergan.

Philosophy and Method

This study moves beyond recurrent concerns with method to that which stands prior to method. There is a supposition, current among historical Jesus scholars, that method is our salvation: if our mousetraps failed to catch the mouse, then surely we require a better mouse trap. There seems a certain indubitable logic to this position: our historiographies are the result of our historical methods, and thus if our historiographies are inadequate, then so might be our historical methods. Thus does Meyer ask: "Is it possible that progress in the development of historical techniques . . . might resolve the dilemmas of historical-Jesus research?"[24] Perhaps to the surprise of many a reader, Meyer answers this question with a negative, but a negative that must be understood properly not as the nonsensical denial that better historical methods can and do yield better history but, rather, as the affirmation that our inadequate historical methods are, in fact, the consequence of antecedent philosophical inadequacies.[25] Meyer would not deny that we can and do come to methodological impasse and that such impasse requires a

21. Cf. Stewart, *Hermeneutical Jesus*, 112–13, n. 4.

22. Cf. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas* (ed. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe; Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 2; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997 [1967]), which collects four articles written c. 1946–49; Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas* (ed. Daniel Monsour, Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe; Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 1; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000 [1971]), which collects two articles written c. 1941–42. That this work on Aquinas precedes Lonergan's work in *Insight* and *Method* by up to fifteen years attests to the extent to which his work is grounded in the Thomistic tradition.

23. Cf. the discussion in Denton, *Hermeneutics and Historiography*, 218–20.

24. Meyer, *Aims*, 13.

25. Ibid., 14.

methodological solution. He would simply observe that methodological impasse is typically a symptom of a deeper malaise and that the quest for methodological solutions will be incomplete, inadequate, and not improbably unsuccessful until we engage with the deeper concerns. This drives us toward that upon which our historical methods are predicated, namely our philosophies of history.

In thinking through these matters, let us turn to the words of R. G. Collingwood, whose thought in the philosophy of history was to greatly influence both Lonergan and Meyer and, in fact, become foundational to modern historiography[26]:

> Philosophy is reflective. The philosophizing mind never simply thinks about an object, it always, while thinking about any object, thinks also about its own thought about that object. Philosophy may thus be called thought of the second degree, thought about thought. For example, to discover the distance of the earth to the sun is a task for thought of the first degree, in this case for astronomy; to discover what it is exactly that we are doing when we discover the distance of the earth from the sun is a task for thought of the second degree, in this instance for logic or the philosophy of science.[27]

Mutatis mutandis, to discover the historical Jesus is a task for historical investigation, or thought of the first degree, while to discover what we are doing when we discover the historical Jesus is a task for the philosophy of history, or thought of the second degree. Historical method is how we actually go about the work of historical investigation, which is to say that it is the practice of thought in the first degree; philosophy of history, or thought of the second degree, is how we go about determining the best practice in such investigative work, precisely by defining the nature of history and our practice of doing history.

Collingwood is useful in helping us understand the etiology of methodological impasse. We move toward this understanding by following forward the same line of thought that led us to identify method as a problem in the first place. Yes, we can affirm that our historiographies are the result of our historical methods, such that if our historiographies are inadequate, then so might well be our historical methods; but, in turn, our historical methods are the result of our philosophies of history, such that if our historical methods are inadequate then so might well be our philosophies of history. Meyer, in fact, moves even beyond the level of the philosophy of history to the cultural matrix from which contemporary philosophies of history emerge, arguing that our recurrent struggles in historical Jesus studies are the result of a "basic and baffling dilemma, not a technical but

26. Lonergan, *Method*, 203–08; Meyer, *Aims*, 81–92; Meyer, *Critical Realism*, 157–72. For a recent overview of Collingwood, specifically concerned with historical Jesus studies, cf. Jordan Ryan, "Jesus at the Crossroads of Inference and Imagination," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 13 (2015): 66–89.

27. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (rev. ed.; ed. Jan van der Dussen; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 1.

a cultural dilemma,"[28] namely that "the heritage of Christian belief affirms as indispensable what the heritage of modern culture excludes as impossible."[29] One cannot easily disagree with Meyer on this point, regardless of what position one might adopt vis-à-vis this cultural dilemma; yet, in this study I am not interested in following him quite so far down the rabbit hole.[30] Rather, I am interested in the question, intermediate between method and culture, of philosophy: intermediate because, much as Lonergan suggests that "theology mediates between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of a religion in that matrix,"[31] I would suggest that philosophy mediates between a cultural matrix and the role and of knowledge generation within that matrix.

Still, it is probably worthwhile to spend some time on the broader intellectual context in which we currently find ourselves. I will spurn the venerable "history of scholarship" genre that tends to preface works in biblical studies, not least of all in the studies related to the historical Jesus; one interested in such a narrative can easily consult any of a large number of extant introductions to more advanced texts.[32] Instead, I want to take a bird's-eye view of the last two centuries of intellectual development in the Western tradition. The nineteenth century was marked by what will probably in the long-run be recognized as one of the greatest intellectual achievements in human history: the development of development.[33]

28. Meyer, *Aims*, 14.

29. Ibid., 15.

30. Lonergan wrote significantly on the matter of culture throughout his works: Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Collection* (ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran; 2nd ed.; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993 [1967]), 232–45; Lonergan, *Insight*, 553–72; Lonergan, *Method*, 27–99, 235–66; Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J. F. Lonergan* (ed. William F. J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrell; London: Longman, Darton, and Todd, 1974), 1–9; Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan* (ed. Frederick E. Crowe; New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 55–109, 239–50. Lonerganian thought on culture has moved on since then, cf. Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 473–558; Neil Ormerod, *Re-Visioning the Church: An Experiment in Systematic-Historical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 31–98.

31. Lonergan, *Method*, xi.

32. For purposes of the present discussion cf. esp. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 11–97.

33. "Development" here is understood not in terms of the now thoroughly discredited twentieth-century neo- and postcolonial ideology that sought to conform the entire world to western European life-ways. Rather, what is meant is the idea that any adequate apprehension of any given reality requires one to understand the omnipresent processes of often (but not always) incremental change that produced the said reality. Lonergan's single best and, for our purposes, most relevant account of development is to be found in Bernard Lonergan, *The Triune God: Doctrines* (ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour; trans. Michael G. Shields; Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 11; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 29–255, which represents his most sustained concrete exercise in