

MARCUS J. BORG  
N. T. WRIGHT

THE MEANING  
OF JESUS

TWO VISIONS



HarperCollins e-books

# CONTENTS

---

Introduction	v
<b>PART I. HOW DO WE KNOW ABOUT JESUS?</b>	
1. Seeing Jesus: Sources, Lenses, and Method <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	3
2. Knowing Jesus: Faith and History <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	15
<b>PART II. WHAT DID JESUS DO AND TEACH?</b>	
3. The Mission and Message of Jesus <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	31
4. Jesus Before and After Easter: Jewish Mystic and Christian Messiah <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	53
<b>PART III. THE DEATH OF JESUS</b>	
5. Why Was Jesus Killed? <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	79
6. The Crux of Faith <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	93
<b>PART IV. “GOD RAISED JESUS FROM THE DEAD”</b>	
7. The Transforming Reality of the Bodily Resurrection <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	111

IV Contents

8. The Truth of Easter <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	129
<b>PART V. WAS JESUS GOD?</b>	
9. Jesus and God <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	145
10. The Divinity of Jesus <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	157
<b>PART VI. THE BIRTH OF JESUS</b>	
11. Born of a Virgin? <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	171
12. The Meaning of the Birth Stories <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	179
<b>PART VII. “HE WILL COME AGAIN IN GLORY”</b>	
13. The Second Coming Then and Now <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	189
14. The Future of Jesus <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	197
<b>PART VIII. JESUS AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE</b>	
15. The Truth of the Gospel and Christian Living <i>by N. T. Wright</i>	207
16. A Vision of the Christian Life <i>by Marcus Borg</i>	229
Notes	251
Index	281
About the Authors	
Cover	
Copyright	
About the Publisher	

## 8 INTRODUCTION

---

THIS BOOK HAS grown out of a friendship. We first met in 1984, after Tom Wright had read Marcus Borg's book *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*. As Tom has described elsewhere, he found this book exciting and illuminating, and he sought out Marcus to congratulate him as well as to explore some "matters arising" and to ask why the book had ended as it did rather than in certain other possible ways.

Since our friendship thus grew out of the fascinated study of Jesus within his historical context, it is appropriate that it should give birth, some fourteen years later, to a book in which we put down some markers indicating where the conversation has led. During this period, we both have published several books and articles, many of them about Jesus. It is impossible in a work of the present size to rehearse all the arguments and to set out all the documentation, which are the normal requirements of scholarship. The main lines of most of what we here summarize have been set out and argued for in these other works, though at various points we both go beyond what we have said elsewhere, not least as a result of our own continuing dialogue.

Our personal stories are both interestingly similar and interestingly different. Marcus Borg grew up in a traditional and conventional Midwest Lutheran church, Tom Wright in a traditional and conventional Anglican one in the north of England. Marcus found increasing difficulties with his tradition in his teens and twenties, though he never lost his fascination with its central figure, and through that he has come

back into a lively and active Christian faith. Tom, at the equivalent period of his life, found the tradition coming alive in fresh ways through some fairly un-Anglican styles of spirituality, though he never lost his instinctive rootings in the liturgical life of the church, and he has faced the predictable challenges that arise through the study of history and philosophy. Both of us went to Oxford University, and both, though at different times, ended up studying under the late Professor George B. Caird; our indebtedness to him has been recorded elsewhere. Marcus, however, continued to pursue the study of Jesus, whereas Tom at that stage focused almost entirely on Paul, coming to the historical study of Jesus in the late 1970s.

We are both committed to the vigorous practice of the Christian faith and the rigorous study of its historical origins and to the belief, which we find constantly reinforced, that these two activities are not, as is often supposed, ultimately hostile to each other. Rather, we find them mutually informative and supportive. To put this another way: we both acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as Lord, and we regard the no-holds-barred study of his actual history as a vital part of what we mean by that. For precisely this reason, we deliberately began the work for this specific project in shared eucharistic worship, when Marcus visited Tom in Lichfield (England) in September 1997. The plan for the book took shape within the framework of participating together in morning and evening prayer in Lichfield Cathedral during the following five days. We believe that this setting, so far from prejudicing the “objectivity” of our work, was and is the most appropriate context for it. There is, after all, no such thing as objectivity in scholarship. Anyone who supposes that by setting scholarship within a modern secular university, or some other carefully sanitized, nonreligious setting, they thereby guard such work against the influence of presuppositions that can seriously skew the results should, we suggest, think again.

This is not to say, of course, that we find ourselves in substantial agreement on the majority of issues. If that were so, there would hardly be a book to write. Indeed, within the bounds of friendship and shared Christian faith and practice, we have both frequently been puzzled, and even disturbed, by some of what the other has said. Working on this book has at least enabled us to understand each other a lot better, to explain to each other (and perhaps to our readers) things that we each

had thought were clear but that apparently weren't, and to remove impressions that had been unwittingly given. Inevitably, this has left the remaining disagreements posed more sharply. We have not flagged them all the way through the book, since to do so would become complex and tedious. The reader will quickly see where they are to be found. What results is, as it were, a single-frame photograph taken from a long sequence, freezing one moment in our conversation in the hope that others will find it interesting and helpful.

We envisage at least three categories of interested readers.

First, we hope that those who would not call themselves Christians will find the conversation interesting and refreshing. We both believe strongly that what we say about Jesus and the Christian life belongs, not in a private world, inaccessible and incomprehensible except "from faith to faith," but in the public world of historical and cross-cultural study, in the contemporary world as well as the church.

Second, we hope to shift logjammed debates into more fruitful possibilities. Much current writing about Jesus falls into rather sterile either-or distinctions (such as the classic fundamentalist versus modernist debates); we venture to suggest other ways in which the issues might be lined up. We hope thereby to advance an ecumenical dialogue that is often ignored. Liberal Lutherans, for instance (to use a broad-brush term for the moment), have more in common with liberal Anglicans or Presbyterians than with the more conservative members of their own denominations. Our dialogue might provide stimulus for such groups to begin to talk to each other afresh. While hard-line fundamentalists and radicals will both perhaps gnash their teeth, we hope that this book will serve as a bridge between many other groups of Christians.

On this point, it might appear at one level that Tom is a traditionalist in his views and Marcus a revisionist. There is a grain of truth in this, but we regard these labels, and similar ones, as quite misleading. Tom has come, through wrestling with the history and culture of first-century Judaism, to a picture of Jesus that is seriously at odds with traditional Christian views on some matters (for example, Jesus' supposed predictions of his second coming), while supporting the tradition in other matters, though from quite new angles. Marcus has come, through wrestling with cross-cultural issues of how to describe appropriately a

figure like Jesus, to a picture that is firmly supportive of the tradition on some matters (for example, Jesus' healings, his spirituality, and his founding of a movement), while questioning it on many others, though by no means always in what has become the standard, dare one say traditional, revisionist fashion. Tom feels able, as a historian, to attribute more of the gospel material to Jesus than Marcus does, though the meaning Tom suggests for the material is by no means always what the traditionalist would expect. Marcus, in suggesting that less of it goes back to Jesus himself, nevertheless insists upon its importance, its truthfulness in senses other than historical, and its validity within a contemporary Christian vocation to follow Jesus.

Third, we hope to open up more specifically the perennially important question of how different visions of Jesus relate to different visions of the Christian life. Many who are deeply concerned with issues of justice, spirituality, pastoral care, and other matters within the churches do not always relate these issues to the question of Jesus. We propose some ways in which this might be done.

Neither of us is content to let things rest with a cheap and easy suggestion that, since we are both practicing Christians, our two positions are equally valid—whatever that might mean. It might be that both our positions are equivalent and fairly adequate expressions, from different points of view, of the same underlying reality. Neither of us quite thinks that. It might be that we are both wrong, and that some quite different position is truer. Neither of us thinks that, either. It might be that one of us is closer to the truth in some areas, and the other in others; and that by our dialogue we may see more clearly things that the other has grasped more accurately. We are both prepared for that eventuality.

Where we do agree, however, is on the following point. Debate about Jesus has recently been acrimonious, with a good deal of name-calling and angry polemic in both public and private discourse. We hope in this book to demonstrate that this is not the only way of doing things. Of course, it is comparatively easy for us: our positions, though very different in many ways, are not at opposite poles in the current debate, and we share, as we have said, both friendship and overlapping personal histories. But we hope, and indeed pray, that in this book we will be able to model a way of conducting public Christian disagreement over serious and central issues that will inspire others to try the

same sort of thing. If, in the process, we help both Christians and non-Christians, and those uncertain which of these two brackets they belong in, to grapple with points of view they might otherwise have dismissed without serious thought, we shall be delighted. If, in addition, both of us grow, through this process, in our understanding of the subject matter, and enable others to do so as well, we shall have succeeded in our deepest underlying aim.

Our process, for those who may be interested, has been as follows. We had already read each other's work, as it had appeared, over many years, and had had many conversations, public and private, about broad outlines and numerous details. When we met in September 1997 we discussed some of the most central topics and managed to eliminate some initial puzzles and misunderstandings as well as to pose new questions to each other. We then agreed on the outline of the chapters for the book—the topics for each chapter and the order in which we would take turns in addressing them. We then each drafted what we wanted to say on the topic in question, without further reference to the other, though of course with many memories of the issues the other had raised. We then read each other's chapters, commented on them, and redrafted our own in dialogue. We could, of course, have doubled the size of the book by taking matters further at each point, but we have felt that the reader would not easily follow to-and-fro discussion of detailed points. Though we have not, of course, reached agreement, we are satisfied that we have eliminated misunderstandings, that is, that neither of us has misrepresented the other. We offer the result to the reader as the celebration of shared friendship, faith, and scholarship.

M. J. B.

N. T. W.



## SEEING JESUS: SOURCES, LENSES, AND METHOD

*Marcus Borg*

---

HOW DO WE KNOW about Jesus? What are our sources, what are they like, and how do we use them?<sup>1</sup> For most of the Christian centuries, the answers to these questions seemed obvious. Our sources? The New Testament as a whole, and the four gospels in particular. What are they like? The gospels were seen as historical narratives, reporting what Jesus said and did, based on eyewitness testimony. How do we use them? By collecting together what they say about Jesus and combining them into a whole. Importantly, it did not require faith to see the gospels in this way; there was as yet no reason to think otherwise.

This way of seeing the gospels led to a common Christian image of who Jesus was and why he mattered. Who was he? The only Son of God, born of the virgin Mary. His purpose? To die for the sins of the world. His message? About many things, but most centrally about the importance of believing in him, for what was at stake was eternal life.

But over the last two hundred years among historical scholars, both within and outside of the church, this common image of Jesus has dissolved. Its central elements are seen no longer as going back to the historical Jesus, but as the product of the early Christian movement in the decades after his death. Jesus as a historical figure was not very much like the most common image of him.

As I write these words, I am sitting on the shore of the Sea of Galilee. I am here with a group of thirty Christians assisting my wife, Marianne, an Episcopal priest who leads educational-spiritual

pilgrimages to Israel. My role is to provide historical background and commentary. As I do so, I often feel like the designated debunker. Again and again I find myself saying about holy sites associated with Jesus, “Well, it probably didn’t happen here,” or, “Well, it probably didn’t happen at all.” Of course, I have more to say than that, but it is a frequent refrain.

For example, today as we drove past Cana, I told the group that the story of Jesus changing water into wine at the wedding at Cana is most probably not a historical report but a symbolic narrative. At the site marking the Sermon on the Mount, I said that it was unlikely that Jesus ever delivered the Sermon on the Mount as a connected whole, even though many of the individual sayings probably go back to him. In Nazareth, I said Jesus probably was born *here*, and *not* in Bethlehem.

I sometimes feel like a debunker in my writing as well. A significant portion of what I have to say is, “This story is probably not historically factual,” or, “Jesus probably didn’t say that.” And yet, for reasons I will explain later, I also find the nonhistorical material to be very important and meaningful. I am not among the relatively few scholars who think that *only* that which is historically factual matters.

## THE NATURE OF THE GOSPELS

---

But for now I want to explain why the issue comes up so often, whether on pilgrimage to the Holy Land or in my work as a Jesus scholar. The issue arises because of the nature of the Christian gospels, our primary sources for knowing about Jesus. Two statements about the nature of the gospels are crucial for grasping the historical task: (1) They are a developing tradition. (2) They are a mixture of history remembered and history metaphorized. Both statements are foundational to the historical study of Jesus and Christian origins, and both need explaining.

### *The Gospels as a Developing Tradition*

The four gospels of the New Testament are the product of a developing tradition. During the decades between the death of Jesus around the year 30 and the writing of the gospels in the last third of the first cen-

tury (roughly between 70 and 100), the traditions about Jesus developed. More than one factor was responsible. There was a need to adapt the traditions about Jesus to new settings and issues as early Christian communities moved through time and into the broader Mediterranean world. Moreover, the traditions about Jesus grew because the experience of the risen living Christ within the community shaped perceptions of Jesus' ultimate identity and significance.

As developing traditions, the gospels contain two kinds of material: some goes back to Jesus, and some is the product of early Christian communities. To use an archaeological analogy, the gospels contain earlier and later layers. To use a vocal analogy, the gospels contain more than one voice: the voice of Jesus, and the voices of the community. The quest for the historical Jesus involves the attempt to separate out these layers or voices.

### *History Remembered and History Metaphorized*

The gospels combine history remembered with history metaphorized. By the former, I mean simply that some of the things reported in the gospels really happened. Jesus really did do and really did say some of the deeds and teachings reported about him.

By history metaphorized, I mean the use of metaphorical language and metaphorical narratives to express the meaning of the story of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> I define *metaphor* broadly to include both symbol and story. Thus the category includes individual metaphors, such as Jesus is the light of the world, and metaphorical narratives, where the story as a whole functions metaphorically. Metaphorical language is intrinsically nonliteral; its central meaning is “to see as”—to see something as something else. To say Jesus is the light of the world is not to say that he is literally a light, but means *to see him as* the light of the world. Thus, even though metaphorical language is not literally true, it can be powerfully true in a nonliteral sense.<sup>3</sup>

As I use the phrase, history metaphorized includes a wide variety of gospel material. Sometimes a story combines both history remembered and history metaphorized. For example, Jesus really was crucified. But the stories of his death, as I shall argue in chapter 5, are to a large extent history metaphorized: the meanings of his death are expressed in

metaphorical language and narrative. A second example of history metaphorized based on history remembered: Jesus probably did restore sight to some literally blind people. But the way the stories are told in the gospels gives them a metaphorical meaning as well.<sup>4</sup>

The category of history metaphorized also includes stories of events that most likely did not happen. I see the story of Jesus changing water into wine at the wedding in Cana in its entirety as history metaphorized; I do not think a historical event lies behind it. As the opening scene of the public ministry of Jesus in John's gospel, the author uses it (and perhaps created it) to invite us to see the story of Jesus as a whole as the story of a wedding banquet at which the wine never runs out and at which the best is saved for last.

So also with the stories of Jesus feeding the multitude in the wilderness with a few loaves and fishes. They are, almost certainly, not historical reports but metaphorical narratives using imagery from Israel's story of the Exodus. The association invites us to see Jesus as one like unto Moses, to see what happened in him as like a new exodus, and (as the gospel of John puts it) to see Jesus himself as the bread of life, the true manna sent from God to feed us in the midst of our journey from bondage to life in the presence of God.

In short, the gospels do not simply report the history of Jesus, they metaphorize it.<sup>5</sup> For me as a Christian, both matter. For me as a historian, the realization that the gospels are a developing tradition containing both history remembered and history metaphorized points to the historical task. It also leads to the distinction that has been foundational to the modern discipline of Jesus scholarship.

## A CRUCIAL DISTINCTION

---

The name *Jesus* has two referents. On the one hand, *Jesus* refers to a human figure of the past: Jesus of Nazareth, a Galilean Jew of the first century. On the other hand, in Christian theology, devotion, and worship, the name *Jesus* also refers to a divine figure of the present: the risen living Christ who is one with God.

These two referents have been variously named in the history of Jesus scholarship. The first is commonly spoken of as "Jesus of

Nazareth” or “the Jesus of history” or “the historical Jesus.” The second is “the Christ of faith” or “the biblical Christ” or “the canonical Jesus.” My own preferred terminology is “the pre-Easter Jesus” and “post-Easter Jesus.”

By the pre-Easter Jesus, I mean of course Jesus during his historical lifetime: a Galilean Jewish peasant of the first century, a flesh-and-blood figure of the past. This Jesus is dead and gone—a claim that does not deny Easter but simply recognizes that the “protoplasmic” Jesus isn’t around anymore.

By the post-Easter Jesus, I mean *what Jesus became after his death*. More fully, I mean the Jesus of Christian tradition and experience. Both nouns, *tradition* and *experience*, are equally important. The former includes the Jesus of the developing Christian tradition in its pre-canonical, canonical, and ultimately creedal stages. The latter is the Jesus whom his followers (in the first century and in the centuries since) continued to experience after his death as a living, spiritual, and ultimately divine reality. As the Jesus of Christian experience, the post-Easter Jesus is an experiential reality, not simply an article of belief.

Both the pre-Easter and post-Easter Jesus are the subject of this book. How they are related to each other will be treated in later chapters. For now, I want to emphasize the importance of making the distinction between the two. When we don’t, we risk losing both.

Such was my experience. I didn’t know the distinction when I was growing up in the church, and so I combined everything I heard about Jesus into a single image: stories from the gospels, texts from the rest of the New Testament, doctrinal statements from the creeds, affirmations from Christian hymns and preaching. My uncritical synthesis generated what might be called “the composite Jesus.”

I thus thought of Jesus as a figure of history as more divine than human. That’s because I took it for granted that he was all of the things that the New Testament and the creeds say about him: Son of God, Word of God, Wisdom of God, messiah; very God of very God, begotten before all worlds, of one substance with God, the second person of the Trinity. And I took it for granted that he knew all of these things about himself.

Moreover, I thought of him as having the mind and power of God. It was because he had a divine mind that he knew things and could

speak with authority. Because he had divine power, he could do spectacular deeds such as multiplying loaves and walking on water.

But note what had happened: I lost the historical Jesus as a credible human being. A person who knows himself to be the divinely begotten Son of God (and even the second person of the Trinity) and who has divine knowledge and power is not a real human being. Because he is more than human, he is not fully human. As the South African scholar Albert Nolan has remarked, we consistently underrate Jesus as a figure of history.<sup>6</sup> When we emphasize his divinity at the expense of his humanity, we lose track of the utterly remarkable human being he was.

Less obvious but equally important, I also lost the living risen Christ as a figure of the present. Because I had uncritically identified the divine Jesus with the human Jesus, Jesus as a divine figure became a figure of the past. He was here for a while, but not anymore. For thirty years, more or less, Jesus a divine being walked the earth. Then, after he had been raised from the dead, he ascended into heaven, where he is now at the right hand of God. He will come again someday—but in the meantime, he is not here. Jesus had become for me a divine figure of the past, not a figure of the present.

Thus failing to distinguish between the pre-Easter and post-Easter Jesus risks losing both. When we do make the distinction, we get both.

## MY LENSES FOR SEEING JESUS

---

How we see Jesus is to a large extent the product of the lenses through which we see him. So I turn to describing the lenses—the intellectual factors—that most affect how I see Jesus and Christian origins. Four are most important.

The first lens is the foundational claim of the modern study of Jesus, and this has already been described. Namely, the gospels are the product of a developing tradition, and they contain both history remembered and history metaphorized.

The second lens is the study of ancient Judaism. Like most scholars, I emphasize Jesus' rootedness in his own tradition. Jesus must be understood as a Jewish figure teaching and acting within Judaism, or we will misunderstand what he was about.

The third lens is the interdisciplinary study of Jesus and Christian origins, especially the social world of Jesus. A recent development with great illuminating power, it is one of the central features of the current renaissance in Jesus research. John Dominic Crossan most fully embodies this approach, and I have learned much from him.<sup>7</sup>

My fourth lens is the cross-cultural study of religion. To the interdisciplinary approach of Crossan and others, I add studies of religious experience (its varieties and effects) and types of religious figures known cross-culturally. I emphasize especially ecstatic religious experience and the nonordinary states of consciousness associated with it. Indeed, to the extent that my own sketch of Jesus is distinctive within the discipline, it is because of the weight that I give to ecstatic religious experience and its effects.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF WORLDVIEW

---

One more crucial factor affects how we see Jesus: our worldview. It could be understood as a fifth lens, but is better understood as a “macro-lens” affecting all of our seeing. A worldview is one’s most basic image of “what is”—of what is real and what is possible.<sup>8</sup>

Individuals have worldviews. We all live our lives on the basis of what we think is real and possible. Cultures also have worldviews; indeed, one of the primary elements of a culture is its worldview.<sup>9</sup> Thus there are a multitude of worldviews.

Nevertheless, and broadly speaking, worldviews fall into two main categories: religious and secular. For a secular worldview, there is only “this”—and by “this” I mean the visible world of our ordinary experience. For a religious worldview, there is “this” and “more than this.” The “more than this” has been variously named, imaged, and conceptualized; I will simply call it “the sacred.” A religious worldview sees reality as grounded in the sacred. For a secular worldview, there is no sacred ground.

Modernity is dominated by a secular worldview. This image of reality began to emerge in the Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with the birth of modern science. Sometimes called the Newtonian worldview or simply the modern worldview, it sees

what is real as the world of matter and energy, space and time; and it sees the universe as a closed system of cause and effect, operating in accord with natural laws. This vision of reality took the Western world by storm, to a large extent because of the impressive accomplishments of the science and technology that it generated. By this century, it had become the worldview of mass culture in the West, and most of us were socialized into it.

Like all worldviews, it functions in our minds almost unconsciously, affecting what we think possible and what we pay attention to.<sup>10</sup> It is especially corrosive of religion. It reduces reality to the space-time world of matter and energy, thereby making the notion of God problematic and doubtful. It reduces truth to factuality, either scientifically verifiable or historically reliable facts.<sup>11</sup> It raises serious doubts about anything that cannot be accommodated within its framework, including common religious phenomena such as prayer, visions, mystical experiences, extraordinary events, and unusual healings.

This worldview has very much affected the modern study of Jesus and the Bible. Not all scholars operate within it, but it has been the majority mind-set of the modern academy. When we try to see Jesus within this framework, it radically reduces what we will take seriously. There is much that we will miss, including the centrality of God for Jesus. We focus instead on what makes sense within our way of seeing.

So it was for me. There was a prolonged period in my life when the modern worldview functioned in my mind as the final arbiter of what can be taken seriously. The process was gradual. Raised as a Christian in the middle of this century, I grew up with both a religious and a secular worldview. By early adolescence, the secular worldview had begun to cause problems for my religious worldview. By my late teens and twenties, the problems had become acute. Indeed, the modern worldview had essentially crowded out the religious worldview.

But I now see things differently. In my thirties, I became aware of how uncritically, unconsciously, and completely I had accepted the modern worldview. I saw that most cultures throughout human history have seen things differently.<sup>12</sup> I realized that there are well-authenticated experiences that radically transcend what the modern worldview can accommodate. I became aware that the modern worldview is itself a relative cultural construction, the product of a particular



era in human intellectual history. Though it is still dominant in Western culture, I am confident that the time is soon coming when it will seem as archaic and quaint as the Ptolemaic worldview.<sup>13</sup>

The change in my worldview has made it possible for me once again to take God seriously. I am convinced that the sacred is real. I see reality as far more mysterious than the modern worldview (or any worldview) affirms. I do not know the limits of what is possible with any precision. To be sure, I am reasonably confident that some things never happen, but I am convinced that the modern worldview draws those limits far too narrowly. All of this has strongly affected my work as a historian of Jesus and Christian origins. I can take much more of the tradition seriously.

## METHOD: EARLY LAYERS PLUS CONTEXT

---

Constructing an image of Jesus—which is what the quest for the historical Jesus is about—involves two crucial steps. The first step is discerning what is likely to go back to Jesus. The second step is setting this material in the historical context of the Jewish homeland in the first century.

### *Step One: Discerning What Is Early*

The quest involves discerning the early layers of the developing traditions about Jesus. What is early? What is later? I accept these common scholarly conclusions about our sources of material about Jesus:

- Paul is our earliest New Testament author. All of his genuine letters were written before any of the gospels; his earliest ones are from around the year 50, and they predate Mark by about twenty years. Yet Paul says relatively little about the historical Jesus, so he is not a major source.
- Q is the earliest written layer in the gospels, put into writing most likely in the fifties. A hypothetical document reconstructed by scholars from material found in Matthew and Luke but not in Mark, it is about two hundred verses long. An early collection of

teaching attributed to Jesus, it contains very little narrative material. It was used by both Matthew and Luke when they wrote their gospels.<sup>14</sup>

- Mark is the earliest of our existing gospels, written near 70 C.E. It provides the narrative framework for the other two synoptic gospels, Matthew and Luke.
- Matthew and Luke each had a copy of Mark when they wrote their gospels later in the century. They also had a copy of Q, and they knew or created other traditions now found in them.
- John's gospel is very different from the synoptic gospels and is not a primary source for the historical Jesus. It is, however, a powerful witness to what Jesus had become in the early Christian community in which John was written, about which I will say more later in this book.
- The gospel of Thomas, discovered about fifty years ago in Egypt, is (like Q) a collection of sayings (114 in all). In present form, Thomas probably dates to the first half of the second century. I am inclined to see Thomas as independent of the synoptics and containing some early traditions not found elsewhere. But it is not a major source in my work.

Thus I see Mark and Q as the two primary documents behind the synoptic gospels. This widely accepted position is commonly known as “the two-source theory” or “the two-document hypothesis.”<sup>15</sup>

Given the above view of our sources, how does one discern what is early? First, the most objective test is multiple attestation in two or more independent sources, at least one of which is early. In practice, it most commonly means “double attestation,” for we have relatively few traditions with three or more attestations. The logic is straightforward: if a tradition appears in an early source *and* in another independent source, then not only is it early, but also it is unlikely to have been made up.

Second, when a core of material has been established through multiple attestation, texts that have only single attestation can be accepted if they are coherent with this core. Coherence might be argued on the basis of common subject matter. It might also be argued on the basis of

common form. For example, many of the parables that have only single attestation are accepted as going back to Jesus because they reflect a perception and voice already established by multiple attestation.

A third factor involves a complication. Namely, one can discern demonstrable tendencies of the developing tradition. This functions both negatively and positively. When a saying or story reflects such a tendency, one must be suspicious of it. Alternatively, one that counters a demonstrable tendency of the developing tradition may well be historical, a survivor from an earlier stage.

### *Step Two: Historical Context*

Historical context is crucial, for words spoken and deeds done take on meaning only in context. They mean little, or remain ambiguous, apart from context. The same gesture can have very different meanings in different cultures, and the same saying can mean very different things in different contexts.

For reconstructing the meaning of things said and done by the historical Jesus, the crucial context is not the literary context of the gospels, but a cultural context, a social world. The context in which early Jesus material is to be set is the social world of the Jewish homeland in the first third of the first century.

There are several resources for knowing about the world of Jesus. Some of what we know comes from literary sources: early Christian literature, mostly canonical but also noncanonical; Jewish literature, both ancient and contemporary with Jesus; and (to a lesser extent) non-Jewish sources. Some comes from archaeological investigation. And some comes from the interdisciplinary study of his world. There are things we can know about his world that our ancient sources do not explicitly say. For example, none of our sources says that the world of Jesus was the world of a preindustrial agrarian society, yet we can be quite sure that it was. Knowing the economic and political dynamics typical of such societies can help us understand what the world of Jesus was like. Indeed, knowing those characteristics enables us to recognize data in our sources that point to such a world.

This is not the place to try to describe the world of Jesus in a comprehensive way. I content myself with noting that the Jewish social

world in the time of Jesus was undergoing significant social change and sharp tensions. The Jewish homeland fell under Roman imperial control in 63 B.C.E., about sixty years before Jesus was born. The combination of Roman rule and Hellenistic cultural influences meant that traditional ways and identities were in question. Ethnic identities were in tension with more cosmopolitan visions of human life. The commercialization of agriculture led to the dislocation of peasants from land that they had owned. It was a restive time. Jewish revolts against Rome broke out around the time of Jesus' birth. Forty years after his death, the calamitous war of Jewish rebellion climaxed in the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, changing Jesus' native religious tradition forever. Jesus thus lived in a watershed century. In this setting, he did what he did. And everything we can know about his world is relevant to the study of the historical Jesus.

Because much of this chapter has focused on how to go beneath the surface level of the gospels in order to discern the historical Jesus, I want to emphasize as I conclude that both the historical Jesus and the canonical gospels matter to me as a Christian.<sup>16</sup> The pre-Easter Jesus, as we can discern him through historical research, is a remarkable and compelling figure, and our glimpses of him can help provide content for what it means to take him seriously. The canonical Jesus discloses what Jesus had become in the experience of early Christian communities near the end of the first century. Independently of their historical factuality, the stories of the canonical Jesus can function in our lives as powerfully true metaphorical narratives, shaping Christian vision and identity. It is not an either-or choice; both the pre-Easter and post-Easter Jesus matter.

What we see is to a large extent the product of how we see. Thus our understanding of the sources, as well as the lenses through which we see both them and the world of Jesus, will decisively affect what we see in the figure behind the gospels. What all of this means will, I trust, become clear in the rest of this book.

## KNOWING JESUS: FAITH AND HISTORY

*N. T. Wright*

---

WE KNOW ABOUT Jesus in two ways: history and faith. People regularly try to eliminate one on the basis of the other, dismissing combinations as compromise. This separation belongs to the Western world of the last three centuries. It goes with the split of religion and politics, with the dismissal of “God” into a remote deist heaven (leaving humans to organize the world as they pleased), and with the definition of *religion* as “that which humans do with their solitude.” These and similar phenomena of the so-called Enlightenment have created a climate in which history has been used as a weapon against faith, and faith as an escape from history.

Like Marcus, I grew up with this split implicit in my worldview. One used a different tone of voice for God, and even for Jesus (“Our Lord”). Fascinated as I was by ancient history, when I first studied the New Testament, the closest I got to integrating the two worlds was when Paul appealed to Nero. The early Christians lived, one assumed, primarily in a world of faith, hammering out issues such as justification and Christology. Their theology hardly impinged even on their thinking about their own corporate life, let alone on world politics, except as a distant implication.<sup>1</sup>

But around the time that I began to study Jesus in his historical context (the late 1970s), I also began to study Judaism. Not the idealized Judaism I had thought of before, in which people carried in their heads a set of abstract ideas and expectations, but the rough-and-tumble Judaism of the Maccabees and Herod, of the wars of 66–70 and 132–135,

of Qumran and Masada. It was a world in which Philo of Alexandria could write learned works of philosophy and exegesis and then act as an ambassador at the imperial court on behalf of his beleaguered community. It was the world of the learned and devious Josephus, the general, aristocrat, and historian who spoke of Israel's God going over to the Romans—and then did so himself. It was the world of the Dead Sea Scrolls. I began to read them, and the pseudepigrapha, too, (a motley and disparate collection of Jewish writings from the last few centuries B.C.E. and the first few C.E.) not simply as collections of dreams and visions, encoding abstract theological ideas that could then be lined up either as precursors of Christian beliefs or as evidence of that which Christian theology opposed, but as Jewish tracts that used the language of symbol and myth to stake out positions in a very this-worldly political history. At every point in this reading I found material that illuminated Jesus and the texts that spoke of him. At no point did I detect the familiar split of history and faith.

It took some years, and various crises exegetical and personal, to show me that this integrated world of history and faith was more true to the rest of human life, including my own, than I had dared to suppose. Study of ancient integrations led me to conjecture, then to celebrate, analogous contemporary integrations. Led me, in other words, first to name and then to rebel against the tyrannical thought-forms in whose split-level world I had grown up. Led me, at length, out into fresh epistemological air, and the new, risky choices of a single world with multiple interlocking dimensions.

I regard this move as the most liberating moment in my intellectual development. I react against attempts to pull me back into the old split-level world—attempts made, of course, from both levels—with the vigor of one who does not want to be imprisoned again in the attic (faith divorced from history) or the dungeon (history divorced from faith). This reaction will be understood, perhaps, by those who have experienced other liberations, for instance from heavy-handed traditional Protestantism or Catholicism; though from where I sit it often looks as though those who trumpet loudest about such liberations have sometimes merely exchanged the attic for the dungeon.

All historians have theological presuppositions. Atheism and agnosticism count as well as faith; refusing to declare one's own interests, or

assuming an unargued modernist or secularist stance a priori, is either naive, or mischievous, or a naked power play. We all see the world through the colored spectacles of our own personal histories, backgrounds, assumptions, and so on. History is precisely a matter of looking, *through one's own spectacles*, at evidence about the past, trying to reconstruct the probable course of events and the motivations of the characters involved, and defending such reconstructions against rival ones, not on the grounds of their coherence with one's own presuppositions, but on the scientific grounds of getting in the data, doing so with appropriate simplicity, and shedding light on other areas of research.<sup>2</sup> Part of the process is becoming aware that one's spectacles are almost certainly distorting the picture, and becoming ready to let puzzles within the evidence or the reconstruction, or the alternative theories of one's colleagues, alert one to such distortion and enable one to clean or replace the offending lens. Those who are unaware that they are wearing spectacles are merely less likely than their colleagues to know when they need cleaning. My own major book on Jesus<sup>3</sup> grew to the length it did precisely because I was determined to allow this process of dialogue to occur at every stage of the research and to be visible at every stage of the argument.

My view, that we come to know Jesus by both history and faith, is itself a product of a lifelong attempt to do just this, which I believe to have been sufficiently successful (though constantly in need of improvement) to encourage me to press on. When, during this attempt, I have found from time to time that the Jesus I knew by faith seemed less and less like the Jesus I was discovering by history, I have found that by living with the problem, turning it this way and that in the complex and often hidden world of personal and communal consciousness and reflection, faith has been able to discover not just that the new, and initially surprising, historical evidence was capable of being accommodated, but also that it could actually be turned to advantage. Alternatively, there were times when faith stood its ground and, by looking at the challenge from all angles, was able to show that the historical evidence was as well if not better interpreted within a different framework.

Part of the challenge of history comes from allowing suspicion a proper role. Suspicion, that is, of the texts themselves, of one's colleagues'

readings, and particularly of one's own. However, a caution is necessary. The guild of New Testament studies has become so used to operating with a hermeneutic of suspicion that we find ourselves trapped in our own subtleties. If two ancient writers agree about something, that proves one got it from the other. If they seem to disagree, that proves that one or both are wrong. If they say an event fulfilled biblical prophecy, they made it up to look like that. If an event or saying fits a writer's theological scheme, that writer invented it. If there are two accounts of similar events, they are a "doublet" (there was only one event); but if a single account has anything odd about it, there must have been two events, which are now conflated. And so on. Anything to show how clever we are, how subtle, to have smoked out the reality behind the text. But, as any author who has watched her or his books being reviewed will know, such reconstructions again and again miss the point, often wildly. If we cannot get it right when we share a culture, a period, and a language, it is highly likely that many of our subtle reconstructions of ancient texts and histories are our own unhistorical fantasies, unrecognized only because the writers are long since dead and cannot answer back. Suspicion is all very well; there is also such a thing as a hermeneutic of paranoia. Somebody says something; they must have a motive; therefore they must have made it up. Just because we are rightly determined to avoid a hermeneutic of credulity, that does not mean there is no such thing as appropriate trust, or even readiness to suspend disbelief for a while, and see where it gets us.

I propose, then, a no-holds-barred history on the one hand and a no-holds-barred faith on the other. This, I believe, is to live in the uncomfortable real world, where such things do not shout challenges at each other from behind locked doors but meet, merge, fuse, question each other, uncouple again, swirl round each other, undergird and undermine each other, examine each other's foundations and set about demolishing or reconstructing them, appearing at one moment inseparable and at the next in an embarrassingly public family squabble. This is, after all, inevitable if we reflect on what doing history actually involves, and on what faith—the Christian faith, at least—is all about.

One important feature of bringing together the worlds of history and faith, and recognizing that other people (notably first-century Jews) did so, too, is that we should make ourselves conscious of the way



in which we, and they, use language to do both at the same time. George Caird, with whom Marcus and I both did our graduate work, argued in a famous book that when people come face-to-face with ultimate and personal reality, this event “can be adequately viewed only through the lenses of myth and eschatology.”<sup>4</sup> These are both, Caird argues, varieties of metaphors. But, as he also argues, to say that a particular set of language is “mythological” or “eschatological” is by no means to say that it does not intend to refer to actual people, actual events, actual history. What it does, rather, is to invest that history, those people, with a significance that a bald and unadorned narrative would lack. To allow bare history, or a “truth” that was entirely divorced from history, the last word would be to cave in and admit that the Enlightenment’s split world had won after all. The attic or the dungeon.

How then do we proceed with the tasks? What do history and faith look like when pursuing these goals?

First, history. I take it as basic that the historian of any period covets, dreams about, lusts after *evidence*. Every coin, every half-erased inscription, every fragment of papyrus is precious. Who cares whether the evidence comes from a “heretical” sect? If it is evidence, we want it. If this is true for any historian, it is even more so for the ancient historian, who often has to piece together random fragments and make bold hypotheses about whole decades for which little or no evidence has survived. When it comes to knowing about Jesus, we have a good deal of evidence at one level and precious little at another. We have a fair amount of material produced by Jesus’ avowed followers, and very little produced by anyone else. Any fresh clues, from whatever source, are to be welcomed, studied, sifted, and used to their full potential.

The historian of Jesus, using all available material and coveting more, will try to answer questions such as: What can be known about Jesus? Where does he belong within the world of his day (the world of Greco-Roman antiquity and of first-century Judaism in particular)? What were his aims, and to what extent did he accomplish them? What caused him to meet an early death? And, not least, why did a movement claiming allegiance to him spring up shortly after his death, taking a shape that was both like and significantly unlike other movements of the time? These are questions that *any* historian, not just Christians, must ask. All will want to use the same data to answer them.

The question then is: do the available data offer us, as they stand, a coherent picture which makes sense historically? If not, how do we evaluate them? Which pieces of data take us closer to Jesus, and which ones lead us away from him?

The available sources do not offer a coherent picture. The Jesus of the canonical material is in certain respects quite different from the Jesus of at least some of the noncanonical documents (for example, the Nag Hammadi codices). The Jesus of both of these is scarcely recognizable in the veiled picture of Jesus in the later rabbinic material. Add to this the picture of Jesus in Tacitus, Josephus, and elsewhere. How do we decide? What do we make of the evidence?

Almost all scholars still believe that the earlier the material, the more likely it is to bring us into contact with historical bedrock. This assumption is by no means always justified, but let us remain with it for the moment. It at once opens up the long-standing problem about the sources that, whatever one's prejudices, are bound to play a large role at some point: the synoptic gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke).

It has long been assumed among New Testament scholars that in order to work back from our sources to find Jesus himself we must first solve the problem of the literary relationship between these gospels. This is notoriously complex. (The question of the relationship between them and John, and between all four canonical gospels and Thomas, is more complex still.) If they used sources (including one another), can we reconstruct them?

Further stages of investigation are frequently undertaken. Prior to the writing of the gospels and their sources, the material probably circulated in oral forms, which can be studied in terms of their likely settings. When the gospel writers used their sources, they can be presumed to have selected, adapted, and arranged the material. A three-stage development can then be postulated: (1) the shaping of preliterate oral traditions; (2) the collecting of oral traditions into literary sources; (3) the collecting and editing of these literary sources into polished gospels. In case this were not already sufficiently complex, it is frequently supposed that we can and should also investigate further hypothetical stages of the history of Jesus traditions in between these three.

If all this worked, and if most scholars agreed about it, it would be fine. But it doesn't, and they don't, and it isn't. Despite frequent claims,

a century of research has failed to reach anything like consensus on a single one of the stages in question, let alone on the hypothetical developments in between. Thus:

1. There are dozens of different proposals about how to analyze the forms of the early tradition and about what elements of the life of the early church they may reflect. None commands widespread agreement.
2. There are at least two widely held, variously developed, and mutually incompatible theories about the literary sources of the synoptic gospels: (a) The majority still hold that Mark was written first and that behind the passages in which Matthew and Luke overlap with each other but not with Mark was a source that scholars call Q. A vocal minority within this majority claims to distinguish different stages in the development of Q; many others, though believing firmly in Q, offer radically different explanations of its origin or, alternatively (like Marcus), regard all such further theories as at best unprovable. (b) A minority, however, hold that Matthew was written first and was used by both Mark and Luke (so that Q never existed). Further, several who agree with the majority on Marcan priority agree with the minority that the overlap between non-Markan passages in Matthew and Luke is better explained by Luke's use of Matthew than by a common source.
3. Mutually incompatible theories abound as to where, when, and why the synoptic gospels came to final form. Since there is no agreement about sources, there is no agreement as to how and why the different evangelists used them. If, for instance, we believe that Matthew used Mark, we can discuss Matthew's theology on the basis of his editing of Mark. If we don't believe Matthew used Mark, we can't.
4. In the nature of the case, if there is no agreement about how the tradition developed in these major stages, there is no chance of agreement on possible levels or layers in between.

One reason for the continuing impasse on these questions is that they are often addressed, and solutions to them proposed, with more

than half an eye on the probable outcome for the supposedly second-order questions concerning Jesus. The Q theory came to birth as part of a conservative response to radical nineteenth-century skepticism; it provided, so it was said, a reliable and early source for Jesus' sayings. Now, however, some who promote it do so in the hope that, by isolating a hypothetical "early Q," they may offer a radically alternative vision of Jesus and early Christianity to that which appears in the synoptic tradition as a whole. Similarly, Marcan priority has sometimes been used as a way of affirming that the early church preserved a memory of Jesus' career, at least in outline; Matthean priority is now sometimes presented as a way of ensuring the authenticity of sayings (parables, for instance) which might otherwise be suspect as occurring only in one source, and that a late one. And so on, and so on.

All such questions, however, are to be seen in their wider context, which is a part of the large question: why did Christianity begin, and why did it take the shape it did? This includes questions about Jesus and John the Baptist; it includes questions about Paul, John, and the gospel of Thomas; it includes, particularly, questions about the nature of the synoptic material and the way in which it reached its present form. And the way to solve all such questions, whether to do with Jesus or to do with the sources, is once more the scientific method of hypothesis and verification.

There still seems to be considerable confusion as to how this method, which I have consciously tried to use through all my historical work, actually functions. The researcher, after a period of total and sometimes confusing immersion in the data, emerges with a hypothesis, a big picture of how everything fits together. The hypothesis is proposed, spelled out as fully as possible. In the process, it is tested against three criteria: Does it make sense of the data as they stand? Does it have an appropriate level of simplicity, or even elegance? Does it shed light on areas of research other than the one it was designed to cover? History diverges from the so-called hard sciences, not in the use of this method and in the asking of these questions, but in that there are no agreed-on criteria for what counts as "making sense" of the data or, for that matter, what counts as the appropriate level of simplicity. Real life, which history purports to describe, is often bitty and messy, with loose ends and inconsistencies.

This method is quite different from that frequently proposed within some circles of Jesus study. It is proposed that the way to study Jesus is to break the material down into its component parts and to evaluate these on the basis of certain rules. Only when we have done this will we be allowed to put together the jigsaw puzzle of what we have discovered and see what sort of a coherent picture it might produce. This apparently scientific proposal hides two unproved assumptions: (a) the belief that isolated fragments of Jesus material circulated, and developed, in the early church divorced from narrative frameworks; (b) a quite well worked out theory about Jesus and the early church which actually dictates the rules proposed for assessing material.

If we are to be thorough and disciplined about the total historical task, however, it is important that we recognize that *all* the pieces of the puzzle, including every question about Jesus and every question about the sources, belong together within the overall hypothesis. We are not in a position to solve one part of the puzzle first and then use it as a fixed point from which to tackle the rest. In particular, we are not (despite repeated assertions) in a position to solve the question of synoptic sources first and then use this to reconstruct Jesus. As I have argued elsewhere, we actually know more securely that Jesus of Nazareth was a Jewish prophet announcing the kingdom of God than we know almost anything about the history of traditions that led up to the production of the gospels as we have them.<sup>5</sup> And we can fill in this picture of Jesus step-by-step, as I have tried to show in my writings, in such a way as to draw in more and more of the evidence within a growing hypothesis about both Jesus himself and Christian origins, *including the writing of the gospels*. The coherence and simplicity of the resulting picture, the sense that is made of the data, and the light that is shed on many other areas enable us to state with confidence that this, or something like it, is indeed how it was. Whether or not my own reconstruction is accepted in detail, this is the method that we must use, as historians, in coming to know about Jesus.

What is more, we cannot settle in advance the question of how much, if any, of the gospel material belongs to a period later than that of Jesus himself. We cannot, that is, *assume*, ahead of the reconstruction, that quite a lot of the gospel material was invented by the early church and then argue implicitly from that assumption that anyone

who comes up with a historical proposal about Jesus which gets in most of the data cannot be considered a serious historian. This is precisely the sort of move, a kind of hedge around the critical Torah, made by paradigms under threat to protect themselves from the possibility of an imminent shift. Of course the early church used and shaped the gospel stories for their own ends. But of course we do not know, ahead of time, whether they invented any stories wholesale and, if so, which bits are which. Only if we presuppose a view of Jesus—if, in other words, we secretly decide the question before we start—could we know that. This, of course, is often done, particularly by those still wedded to an older liberal picture of “Jesus the teacher” who (unlike several leaders of first-century Jewish movements) would be shocked to think of himself as, for instance, messiah. I do not know in advance, more specifically, that a considerable gulf exists between Jesus as he was (the “pre-Easter Jesus,” in Marcus’s language) and Jesus as the church came to know him and speak of him (the “post-Easter Jesus”). We might eventually wish to reach some such conclusion; we cannot build it into our historical method.

So much for history. What then can we say about faith in itself, a no-holds-barred Christian faith of which I have already spoken? What is it, and what sort of knowledge of Jesus can it provide? It has been inherent in Christianity from the beginning that the believer “knows Christ”;<sup>6</sup> Jesus, as the good shepherd, knows his own sheep, and his own know him.<sup>7</sup> This is regularly described in terms borrowed from ordinary interpersonal relationships: believers are aware of Jesus’ presence, his love, his guidance, his consolation, his rebuke, and even perhaps his laughter. They are aware of being in touch with a personality that is recognizable, distinct, frequently puzzling and unpredictable, always loving and lovable, powerful and empowering, loyal and calling forth loyalty. This awareness is regularly generated and sustained through certain activities, notably worship, prayer, the sacraments, suffering, the reading of scripture, Christian fellowship, reflection on the world as created and redeemed in and through Jesus Christ, and perhaps particularly the service of those in desperate need, those in whom Christians believe they meet Jesus in a special way.

At the same time, as with any relationship, there can be problems, misunderstandings, and difficulties. Almost all Christians report

experiencing from time to time a sense of distance or even the apparent withdrawal of Jesus' presence. Christian teachers and spiritual directors have long recognized that this may happen through one of, or a combination of, various factors, including depression, tiredness, rebellion, sin, misinformation, wrong expectations, and many others. Equally, they may happen for none of those reasons, and there may be times when all one can do is to wait in the darkness. But after the waiting, again and again, comes fresh "knowledge"; granted the way the English language works, one cannot call it anything else. It is not just "belief." It is natural to say "I believe it's raining" when indoors with the curtains shut, but it would be odd to say it, except in irony, standing on a hillside in a downpour. For many Christians much of the time, knowing Jesus is more like the latter: being drenched in his love and the challenge of his call, not merely imagining we hear him like raindrops on a distant windowpane. (For many, of course, the latter is the norm; hinting, promising, inviting.)

But what does it mean to "know" someone? Humans being what they are, this is a great mystery. It is, clearly, different from knowing *about* them. When we "know" a person (as opposed to, say, knowing the height of the Eiffel Tower), we imply some kind of relationship, some mutual understanding. We are used to each other; we can anticipate how the other will react; we accurately assess their wishes, hopes, and fears. We could perhaps have arrived at the basic facts by careful detached study, but when we say we "know" someone, we assume that this knowledge is the result of face-to-face encounter.

When someone claims to "know" Jesus of Nazareth in this sense, they are making a claim about other things as well: the existence of a nonspatiotemporal world; the existence of Jesus within that world; the possibility of presently alive human beings having access to that world, and of this being actually true in their case. They are claiming, more particularly, to know one person in particular, a distinctive and recognizable person, within that world, and that this person is identified as Jesus. This knowledge is what many people, myself included, are referring to when we say that we know Jesus "by faith."

And, in that knowledge, we come also to know *about* Jesus: in the context of the personal relationship, we discover more about who Jesus is, what he is like, what gladdens him and grieves him, what he longs

for and laughs at, what he offers, and what he challenges people to do. And, at the heart of it all, less easy to express but deeply important, one is confronted with a love rooted in historical action and passion, a love that has accomplished for us something that we desperately needed and could not have done for ourselves.

In saying all this, I open myself, of course, to the full hermeneutical fury of the modernist, who says I have renounced objectivity, and the postmodernist, who says it's all wish fulfillment. Equally important, I open myself to the comment that plenty of people have used the word *Jesus* to denote figures so different from one another that the possibility of self-delusion is strong. All this I acknowledge. Yet at precisely this point history comes to the help of faith. The Jesus I know in prayer, in the sacraments, in the faces of those in need, is the Jesus I meet in the historical evidence—including the New Testament, of course, but the New Testament read not so much as the church has told me to read it but as I read it with my historical consciousness fully operative. The Jesus whose love seems to go deeper and reach more of me than the deepest human loves I know (and I have been blessed with much human love) converges remarkably with the Jesus whom I have tried to describe historically in chapter 12 of *Jesus and the Victory of God* and, more briefly, in chapter 6 of the present book—the Jesus, that is, who found himself possessed of a very first-century Jewish vocation, to go to the place where the world was in pain and to take that pain upon himself. The more I find out *about* Jesus historically, the more I find that my faith-knowledge of him is supported and filled out. These knowings are indivisible. I see why some people find themselves driven to distinguish the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, but I do not think the early Christians made such a distinction, and I do not find the need to do so myself. This Jesus of whom I speak still comes to meet us, sometimes bidden, sometimes not, sometimes despite the locked doors of an enclosed epistemology, always recognizable by the mark of the nails. And he thereby raises most of the questions that the rest of this book will examine.

History, then, prevents faith becoming fantasy. Faith prevents history becoming mere antiquarianism. Historical research, being always provisional, cannot ultimately veto faith, though it can pose hard questions that faith, in order to retain its integrity precisely as *Christian*



faith, must struggle to answer, and may well grow strong through answering. Faith, being subject to the vagaries of personality and culture, cannot veto the historical enterprise (it can't simply say "I don't like the Jesus you write about, so you must be wrong"), but it can put hard questions to history, not least on the large topic of the origins of Christianity, and history may be all the better for trying to answer them.

All of this means, I realize, that the question this chapter sought to address—that of *how* we know about Jesus—interacts in all sorts of ways with the rest of the book, which deals with *what* we know about Jesus. We cannot find a neutral place on which to stand, a theory of knowledge, or a theory of knowledge-about-Jesus, which can be established independently of its object. History and faith (taking *faith* in its broadest sense, as whatever worldview-commitment or metaphysical assumption one may make) need each other at every step, and never more so than here. This inclines me to suppose that the category of knowledge itself is actually a branch of another category—that, as in some parts of the Hebrew scriptures, "knowing" is part of "loving" rather than the other way around. But since this is a book about Jesus, not about epistemology, this topic must be left for another day.