

[Translated with the assistance of DeepL, Google Translate and ChatGPT by Neil Godfrey, August 2023. This translation has not been completely proof-read so should be considered a Draft. Comparison with the original text at [archive.org](https://archive.org/details/dieevangelischeq0000weis/) - <https://archive.org/details/dieevangelischeq0000weis/> - should be made before finally establishing the original meaning of Weisse's work.]

The
Gospel History
Critically and Philosophically Edited
By
Ch. Hermann Weisse.

Volume One.

Enervis fidel confessio est, in Christum
sine teste et argumento non eredere.

Faith is a weak confession, to believe in Christ
without a witness and argument.
Faust. Manich.

Leipzig.

Printed and Published by Breitkopf and Härtel.

1838.

Preface.

The idea of a present treatment of Gospel history is older than the appearance of Strauss's well-known work; but I dare not assert with confidence that without this work it would ever have been carried out. My tendency, as one will find, is not a negative-critical one, but an essentially positive one, the production of the historical image of Christ from the unclear shell with which, according to the conviction which I share with the majority of the educated of our age, it was surrounded early on by tradition, and later by ecclesiastically established dogma. I believe that I am aware of a certain calling to collaborate in this important enterprise, all the more so because, as a non-theologian, I am exempt from the special obligations to the ecclesiastical creed; which almost always, even without his knowledge, and in most cases the more conscientious he is, the more they tend to inhibit the servant of the Church, or the one who wants to become one, in his free, unbiased research, or if he nevertheless emancipates himself from them, they make a hostile, negative direction in him against the power which he is well aware does not relinquish its claims on him. Such negating work is an unpleasant, uninviting business for me; indeed, I feel as good as incapable of such work, insofar as it is not directly aimed at putting a new positive in the place of the critically removed. Nevertheless, a treatment of the Gospel history before Strauss that met the requirements of scientific criticism and a philosophy that was truly self-understanding would hardly have been able to avoid containing so many negative-critical elements that the positive tendency would hardly have been able to be expressed. For this reason, the appearance of that work was welcomed by me from the outset as a pleasing, not at all sacrilegious but, on the contrary, demanding one for true Christian knowledge and insight, which for me lies once and for all not in the past but in the future, and it was only now that I gained the courage to seriously think about the execution of the plan, with which an inner need for spirituality had long since driven me to occupy myself.

However much the positive common view of the historical-religious subject, which is the basis of my enterprise, has gradually and for some time already been forming in me, I must nevertheless confess that I have only succeeded in giving the scientific handle, through which I dare to hope, a whole, consistent with itself and formed from one whole, during the work itself, I must nevertheless confess that I only found the scientific means by which I succeeded, as I dare to hope, in giving a whole that is consistent with itself and formed from one whole, during the work itself, which after this discovery I found it

necessary to begin again from the beginning and to completely remelt. This handbook consists of the analysis of the origin and mutual relationship of the synoptic Gospels, which is presented in the first book of my work and will be found in all subsequent books.

v

I hope that this hypothesis, by virtue of its clarity and simplicity, by virtue of its inner probability and its agreement with the external testimonies about the Gospel books, will commend itself sufficiently to be worthy of attentive examination by qualified scholars; but of this examination itself, if it should be granted, I have no doubt that it will end by elevating what at first only announces itself as a hypothesis to evidence. It was only the irresistible evidence with which it impressed itself on me, while I continued to use the sources myself, that moved me to accept it and surrender to it. When I first became aware of the punctum saliens from which this hypothesis developed - the originality and priority of the Gospel of Marcuse over the others - I found myself surprised, even frightened; I distrusted my discovery for a long time and almost violently resisted it, since it did not seem to me to fit in at all with my already festgestellten basic assumption about the content of these documents, which, as one will easily see, had also developed for me at first from the tradition hypothesis that was almost universally accepted among the theologians of that time. The review of Holuck's value on the credibility of Protestant history, which appeared in print in February and March 1837, but only considerably later in the second issue of I. H. Fichte's "Zeitschrift für Philosophie und speculative Theologie" (Journal of Philosophy and Speculative Theology), still bears witness to how distant I was at the beginning of my work from the critical aperçu that now provides the guiding thread for it; although one could perhaps already discover in it the trace that must have led me to it. On closer examination, however, I not only found myself more and more confirmed in the truth of the hypothesis, but it also became clear to me how I am by no means compelled by it to abandon my other convictions, but rather only gain the right scientific justification for it. That through it my gaze was drawn down a little more than it had been before from the amusing field of the formation of legends to the "firmer" ground of history: this, after repeated consideration of the context in which the whole now presented itself to me, I could not regard as a disadvantage.

vi

In this work I have tried to be as concise as possible, I have only now and then briefly indicated my relationship to the views of others, to the exegetical and other literature of our time concerning the subject matter, but otherwise I have refrained from all explicit polemics, which I could regard as having been done away with by Strauss in relation to

most of the views that have been possible up to now, and in general, as much as I could without leaving a gap in the context, I have avoided doing anything again about Gethane that was done by others. My main attention had to be directed towards clearly presenting the inner, spiritual context of my own view of the subject matter; more extensive literary remeasurements would have been more disruptive than helpful, and all the more unnecessary, since those who wish to continue to make a scientific and learned study of the whole of Protestant history can in any case not be spared the study of the writings to which I would have had to refer. However, I believed that I would have to distract the reader's attention as little as possible and divert him from the main point; for this reason, especially in those parts where I had to deal less with preliminary studies than directly with the subject matter, even when I had to consider opposing opinions, I usually avoided dealing with the opponents more explicitly and in greater detail.

vii

I refrain from speaking here about the relationship of this work to my other, especially philosophical works and endeavours, since I intend to give a more detailed account of the way in which I grasp the significance of the personality of Christ and of evangelical destiny from a general or philosophical standpoint in the eighth or last volume of the whole. In part, but by no means exclusively, I wish the announcement of a philosophical treatment of Protestant history given on the title to be related to this final treatise. That an aphoristic reconstruction of history cannot be thought of in any way, however mildly, I believe to have been adequately provided for in the work itself. The words that precede the book as a motto are not intended to suggest such a thing, but only to contrast it with that way of thinking which treats the proof of the truth of the historical foundation of Christianity as a legal testimony and document, whereas this foundation is to be treated in exactly the same way, and neither more nor less, as any historical fact in the true literal sense, the concept of which is not to be confused with the concept of a legal fact (cf. p. 1). 4 f.), has to be authenticated and really authenticated by itself, by its inner truth and its connection with other facts, even with the presupposed manifoldness of the witness and documentary evidence. No less will I be credited with having kept myself free from scholastic terminology and philosophical pseudo-antiquism of all kinds. However, if Strauß already wanted to owe the ability for his work mainly to his philosophical studies, I believe I can say the same in an even more positive sense about mine. I am as far away, perhaps even further away, from wanting to substitute philosophical speculation for religion or historical revelation than many of those who are most eager to discredit philosophy in the religious sphere; but how, without the organ of philosophy, the Christian faith can gain the form in which it again becomes a truth for our age, I confess to being unable to form any conception of this? a way of thinking in

which I am glad to have some of the most worthy and meritorious theologians of our time as like-minded people.

viii

The second volume, which concludes the work, will follow the present first within a few months.

ix

Table of contents.

Book 1.

The Sources of Gospel History. p. 1.

The Tradition Hypothesis in its various forms p. 3 ff.

Its origin on the occasion of Wolst's hypothesis on Homer p. 10.

Its Relationship to the Hypothesis of the Primitive Gospel p. 12,

Lessing's views on ecclesiastical tradition p. 16.

Examination of the hypothesis of tradition from the point of view of its relation to the apostolic writings p. 19,

on the writings of the apostolic fathers p. 26. Fathers p. 26.

Testimonies on the Origin of the Written Gospels. p. 28.

Papias on Mark and Matthew p. 29.

Schleiermacher's and Wachmann's views on it p. 34.

Whether the canonical Mark Gospel is the genuine one? p. 41.

The λογία of Matthew and the canonical Matthew Gospel. p. 47.

Testimony of the Church concerning the Synopt. Gospels. p. 49.

Internal Criticism of the Synopt. Gospels. p. 53.

Relationship of Mark to Matthew p. 54 and Luke p. 56.

Further reasons for the authenticity of Mark p. 57.

The beginning of this Gospel. Other traces of Peter's narratives on which the Gospel of Mark is based p. 60.

Other characteristics p. 63.

Character of the Presentation of Mark p. 64,

in relation to the representation of Matthew and Luke p. 67.

Composition and arrangement of the Gospel of Mark. p. 68.

The relationship of Matthew and Luke mediated by Mark as their common source p. 72.

Mark 9, 33 ff. as an example of this mediation p. 74.

Mark 1, 21 - 28 Luke 4, 31 - 37 as an example of the relationship of these two Gospels p. 79.

Doublets of sayings of Christ in Matth. p. 82.

The Hebrew λογία as the second common source of Matth, and Luke p. 83.

Scriptural Character of Luke p. 86.

Chronological Relationship of the Gospels of Luke and Matthew p. 91.

Relationship of the Synopt. Relation of the Synoptic Gospels to the Scriptural Truth in General p. 94.

The Gospel of John p. 96.

External testimonies to the same. Conclusion of the Editors of the Gospel p. 99.

Composition of this Gospel from various parts p. 103.

The Speeches of Gospel of John p. 106.

Their Relation to the Synoptic p. 107.

The Johannine Image of Christ p. 115.

Revision of this Gospel by the disciples of John p. 116.

Factual Relation to the Synoptics p. 118.

Relationship of the Narrative to the Speeches p. 123.

Character of the narrative parts p. 125.

Joh. 5, 1 ff. as an example p. 128.

Other proofs of the similarity of the parts of this Gospel p. 132.

Conclusion of the treatise on the sources p. 137.

x

Book 2.

The Legends of the Childhood of the Lord. S. 139.

Connection with the foregoing p. 141.

Legend or Myth as the Source of the First Chapters of Matthew and Luke p. 143.

Unhistorical character of these passages p. 144.

The "mythical view" according to Strauss, p. 149.

Relation of the form of mythical narratives to their contents, explained by analogies of other mythical literature p. 151.

The childhood saga as a historical motif p. 153.

Character of the Sporadic Legendary Myth p. 154.

Relation of the infancy myths to the providential myths of the Old Testament or the Messianic prophecies p. 156.

Ideal character of the myths p. 160.

World-Historical Context p. 161.

Meaning and Interpretation of the Myths p. 163.

Chronological relationship p. 165.

Canonical and Apocryphal Myths, etc. First point of departure of the gospel myths. Myths in the Legend of the Descent of the Messiah from David p. 167.

The mythical genealogies of the "Gospels" explained by mythological analogies p. 170.

Significance of these genealogies in their present context p. 172.

Second point of departure in the legend of the conception by the Holy Spirit p. 174. Spirit p. 174.

Origin of this legend p. 175.

Relationship to Paganism and Judaism p. 176.

Significance of the Conception p. 180.

Mythical figure of Mary p. 182.

Further mythical execution; double mythical circle of Luke and Matth. p. 183.

Legendary circle of Luke; mythical figure of John p. 187.

John as Elijah p. 188.

Zacharias and Elisabeth p. 190.

Meaning of the legends of the late birth of mythically distinguished personages p. 191.

Significance of the command of naming p. 193.

Zachariah's unbelief punished p. 195. Proclamation of Mana p. 196.

Apocryphal sagas from the Protevangelium p. 198.

Visit of Mary to Elizabeth p. 200.

Circumcision of John p. 202.

Birth of Jesus p.203.

Census of Quirinius p. 204.

The Angels and the Shepherds p.207.

Presentation in the Temple p. 208.

Symeon and Hannah p 210.

Jesus as a boy in the temple among the teachers p. 212.

Legendary circle of Matthew younger than that of Luke p. 214.

Joseph's Dream p. 216.

The Magi from the East p. 218.

Star of the Magi p. 221.

Presentation of the Gifts p. 223.

Mythical Gestalts of Herod p. 224.

Pre-lighting of the Star to Bethlehem ibid. Flight to Egypt p. 225.

Infanticide at Bethlehem p. 228.

Resettlement in Nazareth p. 229.

Conclusion p. 230.

Book 3.

Overview of the Gospel History up to the Death of Jesus p. 233.

Uncertainty of the Birth of Jesus p. 235.

Data of Luke p. 236.

Chronological Relationship to the Reign of Herod p.237.

Parents and Descent p. 239.

Siblings p. 240.

Galilee as the Fatherland of Jesus p. 242.

Means of Education p. 243.

Study of the Old Testament p. 245.

Youth Stories p. 247.

Trade p. 248.

Whether Married? p. 249.

John the Baptist p. 250.

Message of Josephus p. 251.

Chronological Relationship between John and Jesus p. 252.

Introduction of Baptism p. 254.

Character and other activities of John p. 257.

His School p. 259.

The Annunciation of the Messiah p. 260.

General Criticism of the Gospel. News on this p. 262.

True Significance of the Relationship between Jesus and John p. 265.

Historical Traces of this True Relationship p. 266.

Recognition of Jesus by John after completion of the latter's career, p. 269.

Baptism of Jesus by John p. 273.

Motive of the same p. 274.

Time of the same p. 276

Epoch-making significance of baptism for the spiritual consciousness of Jesus p. 277.

The moral struggle for development after baptism p. 279.

The beginning of Jesus' public career; his age p. 284.

Irenaeus' information about the age of Jesus p. 286.

Place of worship at Capernaum p. 288.

Total duration of the public career p. 289.

Lack of chronolog. Provisions in the Gospels. p. 290.

Result p. 292.

Venue of the Public Career p. 293.

Criticism of John's News of the Festive Journeys to Jerusalem p. 294.

Contradiction of the Synoptics p. 295.

Connection of the views of the setting with the general approach to the public life of Jesus p. 298.

Jesus' Relationship to the Obligatory Festivals p. 303.

The Travelogues of the Fourth Ev. in Detail p. 309.

Travels within Galilee p. 313.

First Proclamation of the Gospel p. 315.

Plan of Jesus p. 317.

Jesus as "Son of Man"; meaning of this expression and criticism of the various views of it p. 319.

Concept of the Kingdom of God or Heaven p. 326.

Jesus' consciousness of His Messiahship and the expression of this dignity p. 328.

Erroneous views of the Fourth Ev. on this subject p. 331.

Final Conclusion on Jesus' Self-Consciousness at the Time of His Appearance p. 332.

Jesus' Miraculous Gift p. 334.

Naturalness or comprehensible lawfulness of the same p. 335.

Relationship to Spiritual and Moral Endowment p. 336.

Continuity of Jesus' miracles in their capacity as miracles of salvation p.339.

Requirement of Faith p. 343.

Corporeality of the Miraculous Gift p. 345.

Leadership and Forgiveness of Sins p. 346.

Relation of the miraculous gift to the animal kingdom p. 349.

The Demoniacs p. 352.

Jesus' Procedure in Casting Out Demons p. 354.

Acquaintance of the demoniacs with His Messiahship p. 356.

Healing of other diseases p. 360.

Promptness and certainty p. 362.

Communication of the Miraculous Gift to His Disciples p. 364.

Unhistorical miracle narratives; miracles p. 369.

Jesus' Awareness of the Miraculous Gift p. 373.

Priority of the Teaching Activity of Jesus over the Miraculous Activity p. 375.

Outward Form of the Teaching Activity p. 376.

Relationship to the Mosaic Law p. 377.

Exotic form of teaching; parables p. 380.

Esoteric form of teaching; relation of both to each other p. 384.

Disciples of Jesus p. 386.

Contrast of the discipleship of Jesus with other discipleship p. 387.

The Twelve Apostles p. 389.

Their Calling p. 390.

Closeness of the Number of Twelve p. 394.

Judas Iscariot p. 395. Peter p. 395.

The Zebedaeides p. 399.

The three familiar disciples p. 400.

The Remaining Apostles p. 401.

Relationship of the Apostles to the Master p. 402.

Sending them forth p. 404.

Whether the apostles had already baptised during Jesus' life? John's message about this p. 406.

Other contradictory notes p. 408.

Untruthfulness of this message on general grounds p. 410.

Jesus' relation to the people p. 413.

Composition of the Hearing Crowd p. 415.

Opponents p. 417.

Relationship to Herod Antipas p. 419,

Jesus' death agenda p. 421.

Justification of the Gospel News about it p. 422.

Relationship to the Messianic Prophecies p. 424.

Journey to Jerusalem; its Motive p. 427.

Whether to the Passover? p. 428.

Duration of time , of a stay there p. 429.

Choice of time for the journey p. 430.

Way of the Journey p. 432.

Moment of entry p. 434.

Contrast of the Synoptics and John concerning this p. 435.

Bethany p. 436.

Purification of the Temple p. 437.

Hostility of the Priests and Scribes p. 438.

Attacks of Jesus against the Jewish Hierarchy p. 440.

Attacks of the Opponents p. 442.

Passover meal p. 445.

Imprisonment p. 448.

On the Motive of Judas' Treachery p. 449.

Interrogation at the High Priest p.452.

Interrogation of Pilate p. 455.

The silence of Jesus before Caiaphas and Pilate p. 459.

Crucifixion; criticism of the news about the same p. 462.

xii

Book 4.

Gospel Narratives and Speeches according to Mark p. 467.

Introduction p. 469.

Baptism of John p. 471.

Calling of the First Disciples p. 475.

The Possessed Man in the Synagogue at Capernaum p 476.

Peter's Mother-in-Law p 477.

The Leper p 478.

The Paralytic at Capernaum p. 479.

The banquet of the publicans p. 480.

The Fasting of the Pharisees and John Young p. 481.

Non-observance of the Sabbath p. 484.

Dispatch of the Pharisees p. 485.

Jesus and His Relatives p. 486.

Parable of the Sower, with Other Sayings and Parables p. 487.

Jesus in a Ship in a Storm p. 494.

The Gadarene Possessor p. 495.

Flow of Blood and Daughter of Jairus p. 499.

Jesus in his father city Nazareth p. 504.

Feeding miracle p. 505.

Second feeding miracle p. 509.

The Talk of the Leaven of the Pharisees as the Key to those Miraculous Tales p. 510.

Jesus Walking on the Lake p. 519.

Conversation with the Pharisees about the use of ablution p. 522.

The Cananaean Woman p. 525.

The Deaf Mute and the Covenant p. 528.

Jesus recognised as Messiah by Peter p. 529.

Various Sayings on the Occasion of this Conversation p. 531.

The Declaration p. 534.

Conversation on the Appearance of Elijah p. 544.

The possessed boy p. 549.

Dispute of rank of the disciples p. 553.

Other Sayings p 555.

Conversation on Divorce p. 562.

Jesus and the Children p. 564.

The Rich Man Who Wants to Enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Jesus and His Disciples p. 566.

Jesus on the Journey to Jerusalem p. 567.

The Sons of the Zebedaus p. 568.

The Blind Man at Jericho p. 570.

Jesus entering Jerusalem on the colt p. 572.

Purification of the Temple p. 574.

Cursing the fig tree p. 575.

Question of Jesus to His Opponents about the Baptism of John p. 578.

Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard p. 579.

The rejected stone p. 580.

The Image of the Emperor p. 581.

Captious question of the Sadducans ibid. The Most Important Commandment p. 584.

The Messiah Whether a Son of David? p. 586.

The hypocrisy of the scribes p. 587.

The mite of the widow ibid. Prophecies of the Future p. 588.

The Parousia of the Son of Man p 593.

The Anointing Woman at Bethany p. 598.

The Passover p. 600.

Prophecy of the Betrayal S. 601.

Institution of the Lord's Supper p. 605.

The Denial of Peter p. 608.

Jesus at the Mount of Olives p. 610.

Jesus to the Arresters p. 613.

First book.

On the sources of Gospel history.

"The apostles, scattered, gradually died out in the second half of the first century, the preaching of the gospel spread throughout the Roman Empire and became more and more of a certain type. Hence many a saying which is identical with passages in our present Gospels, and which we find quoted in the earliest church writers without any indication of a source, is doubtless drawn from oral tradition; but soon this tradition was recorded in various writings, to which one, perhaps also an apostle, supplied the basic lines, writings which at first had no fixed form, and therefore had to undergo many transformations, as the example of the Gospel of the Hebrews and the quotations of Justin show.----- In Justin and Celsus the derivation of the Gospel writings from the apostles in general; only in the end did the striving for certainty lead to the attribution of individual apostles and disciples of the apostles to the authors of these writings, whereby local circumstances, which apostle had been particularly active in a region or was of particular renown, or also legends that this or that person had written a similar writing, may have contributed." *)

*) Strauß *Leben Jesu* vol. 1, p. 73. second ed.

In the preceding words, the conclusion is concisely and succinctly compressed, which the critical research on the sources of gospel history, proceeding in a specific direction and guided by a specific idea, must inevitably produce if it is carried out with consistency and clarity. When this idea first dawned, when this direction first broke through, one was far from foreseeing this result; even further was one from foreseeing the immeasurable conclusions to be drawn concerning the content, the historical character of the Gospel history itself, from that principle. Even that writing, which has particularly contributed to the general acceptance of the hypothesis that our Gospels, especially the three synoptic ones, are drawn from a tradition that has already taken on a fixed form, through scholarly and shrewd substantiation, even the well-known work by Gieseler presents this hypothesis as being quite compatible with the usual assumption about the authors of the Gospels, and even attempts to support this assumption by it. *)

*) Gieseler's *Historical-critical attempt on the origin and earliest fate of the written Gospels*. (p. 120ff.)

Now, however, the majority of those who subscribe to the stated hypothesis - and they make up the overwhelming majority of the theologians who are involved or influential in the literature of our time - have at least retreated with regard to the first two canonical Gospels. First, regarding the author of the first, the alleged apostle and eyewitness Matthew, there has arisen, either expressly based on the tradition hypothesis or at least showing it in the background, a considerable number of critics **) over the course of these last years who dispute his eyewitness status and assign to his work an origin from second or third hand.

**) Not only the writings and treatises expressly dedicated to this subject by Dav. Schulz (in the first edition of his "Doctrine of the Lord's Supper"), Sichert, Schneckenburger, Kleiner, Schott, etc., are meant here, but also the occasional remarks of others in exegetical writings or treatises on the introduction to the N.T., such as Schleiermacher, de Wette, Credner, and others. Even Tholuck (Credibility of the Evangelical History, p.140) has found himself compelled to grant indisputable right to the "doubtful grounds, which at least appear to us" in this case. More recently, Neander also expresses himself more definitely in the same sense (Life of Jesus, p. 8.), just as Lücke had earlier (Commentary on the Gospel of John, Vol. 2, p. 461).

Regarding the second, Mark, outside the circle of that hypothesis*), the opinion had already formed that he could not have worked independently of the other two synoptic evangelists, but must have compiled his own from their mutual works.

*) Mainly through Griesbach's well-known treatise on this subject. The same view is the basis of the commentaries by Fritzsche and de Wette.

This opinion has also been largely adopted by the supporters of the tradition hypothesis **), although the latter was originally conceived precisely with the intention of making it, as well as all similar hypotheses of one evangelist's dependence on the others, superfluous.

**) Also by Strauss, op. cit. p. 69, who finds it already elevated to evidence by Griesbach.

But while in this way the negative direction arising from that principle with regard to the first two Gospels of our canon increasingly gained ground, the positive, dogmatic view retained a foothold in the last two Gospels, with respect to which the traditional opinion about their authors has remained largely unshaken so far. The third Gospel indeed still lay within the scope of the tradition hypothesis, which thought to find in it, and its

relationship to the first Gospel, precisely its most conspicuous support. But here the possibility of reconciling this hypothesis with the authorship of the Apostle's disciple Luke did not seem so remote. The undeniable identity of the author of this Gospel with the author of the Acts of the Apostles, who presents himself as an eyewitness of part of the events narrated in the latter, while he also reports another part in the supposedly legendary manner of the Gospel narratives, cast a strong weight here in favor of the received opinion, while this striking combination of heterogeneous elements in the latter work could serve as evidence of how even for a writer so close in time to those events, they were clothed in the garb of legend. But in particular, it was the fourth Gospel, which the supporters of the tradition hypothesis themselves used to fend off the all too conceivable consequences of this hypothesis. This one had from the outset not been included in the explanation, which the hypothesis gave about the origin of the other Gospels. They continued to regard it as the work of the Lord's beloved disciple, and had no scruples about elevating it as a result of this dignity to a canon for the rejection of all other Gospels. For the form in which it exists, for the selection of the events narrated in it, which had always given room for doubt, they believed they had found a new reason for explanation, in that they specifically considered it, not indeed, as they had formerly assumed, to supplement and correct the three other Gospels themselves, but rather the underlying tradition. A forceful and well-conducted attack, which had been undertaken at the same time we are speaking of here against the authenticity of this Gospel *), passed tracelessly before the eyes of the prevailing theology; it was thought that after the repulsion of this attack, this authenticity, and with it the historical character of the Gospel history, was not in contrast to the tradition hypothesis, but in agreement with it, only all the more firmly grounded.

*) Bretschneider, *Probabilia de evang. et epist. Johannis origine et índole*.

— In the face of this shaping of the prevailing critical views on the Gospel history and its sources, the famous work by Strauss has now emerged, which has its undeniably great and far-reaching significance solely in the fact that it takes the assumption underlying these views — and this is precisely the one we have designated by the name of the tradition hypothesis — at its word, and, rejecting all half-heartedness in carrying it out or timidity in its application, takes it seriously in the pure and full sense of the word. The thought from which that hypothesis emerged: that between the Gospel history and its depiction in the written Gospels, there must lie a shaping principle in the middle through which the history was first cast into the form in which our Gospels have adopted it: this thought has only gained its proper consistency and poise in Strauss by being developed into the concept of a Gospel legend or mythology, and has taken exclusive possession of the entire realm of the Gospel narratives.

We owe it expressly to this energetic implementation of the principle, which had crept, unconsciously to most who felt its effects, into theological research, that now a more comprehensive and thorough appreciation of the principle itself, a sharper examination of its applicability to the present material, has become possible. As long as that principle, so to speak, hid from itself, as long as it lurked in the dark and only timidly sought to intrude alongside the principle of a historical immediacy of the transmitted reports: as long as one did not know where to grasp it, there remained the danger that, if rejected or refuted at one point, it would, sooner or later, push itself forward all the more irresistibly at another. Now, after it has revealed itself so openly and completely back to its deepest root and up to its furthest consequences, the prospect of completely suppressing an idea of this power and scope, or banishing it forever from the realm in which it has proven itself strong enough to take possession in this way, may indeed have receded. The necessity to make significant concessions to it, to bring significant sacrifices, has been demonstrated more decisively and incontrovertibly than ever before in the eyes of all unbiased researchers. On the other hand, it may now be more successful than before to relegate it to its true limits, and to gain a proper awareness of the extent and conditions of its applicability to the field of Gospel history. This itself, the criticism and appreciation of the tradition hypothesis and the "mythical view" directly connected with it, can henceforth only take place in the broader context of a positive investigation into the true nature of the Gospel history sources, just as this in turn can only occur in the context of a historical-philosophical exploration of the history itself, which is to be drawn from them. The more, indeed, on the standpoint to which the matter has been recently placed through that perfect implementation of the tradition hypothesis, it appears not just as it was at the beginning, or seemed to be, a necessary makeshift to explain certain phenomena in the nature of the sources of history, but rather as the result of a complete critique of the historical content of these sources, the more surely it can only be overcome or relegated to its proper bounds by a repeated critique of equally comprehensive tendency. But the task of such a critique, if it is to be undertaken with a full consciousness of the challenges posed by previous research, must itself start from the point indicated by its predecessor, the critique conducted from the "mythical standpoint." This point is precisely the one designated by the words we quoted earlier from Strauss's work. As much as we must recognize the content of these words as the most logical and complete conception of the tradition hypothesis to which any of its proponents have yet committed, and as much as they also appear, considering their relation to the work of their author, more as the result of this work and its purely negative results than as the principle from which those results would be developed or through whose application they would be found (it can be considered significant in this regard that they are not found in the first, but only in the second edition

of that work) - they still contain within themselves an unproven or insufficiently proven assumption, one that invites itself to be the subject of further discussion. It has already been criticized by several reviewers of Strauss's book how hastily it glosses over the important preliminary questions regarding the origin and nature of the source writings. Certainly, Strauss does this not by oversight or negligence but with awareness and clearly expressed deliberateness. He explicitly states *), that for him, all such investigation coincides with the investigation of the nature of the content of the sources, as, with the lack of sufficient external notes on the origin of those writings, only the critique of their content can yield a valid result about those questions.

*) In the first issue of the "Polemical Writings in Defense of L. J."

But it has also been noted, and rightly so, that it is precisely at this point, which he most avoids discussing, the question of the external, historical justification of his view of the source writings, that he must be held, since, if it should prove here that his assumptions are false, or that the emptiness he also seems inclined to leave here can be filled with positive evidence of the opposite kind, it would simultaneously be proven that the negative results of his "inner critique" cannot be the final word.

9

While the connection in which the "mythical view" of the evangelical history presented by Strauss stands with the views that recent scientific research has opened up on so many sides about the significance of myth and legend for religion and poetry, for history and national life, while this connection has already been made the subject of public attention, which is so highly directed to Strauss's work, a different but closely related analogy has mostly gone unnoticed, but perhaps it can serve no less to shed light on the path that research has now taken in this field. Regarding the content of the evangelical history, the "mythical view" is the same as the tradition hypothesis concerning the sources of this history, as already indicated. The mythical view necessarily presupposes this hypothesis and could not have arisen without it, while conversely, the tradition hypothesis, if consistently pursued, leads to the mythical view.

10

Now, it is certainly not to be seen as a coincidental circumstance if we notice that the first presentation, as well as the subsequent spread of this hypothesis, falls exactly at the time when, in the field of ancient studies and philology, a closely related view caused the most significant and consequential movement. We mean the famous Wolfian view regarding the origin of the Homeric poems. It is this, without a doubt, to

which we must attribute the tendency that for a time spread over the entire scientific literature, to regard all such literary monuments whose origin has something enigmatic, as to whether they should be considered the work of a particular, notably known author or rather as the gradual, unconscious product of an oral tradition that developed step by step and was only eventually also recorded in writing. *)

*) The first writings through which the tradition hypothesis was not so much presented as it was merely first suggested (Eckermann theological contributions, Vol. 5, p. 2, and Herder's Rule of Agreement of our Gospels) appeared in the years 1796 and 1797. Wolf's Prolegomena, however, had been published in 1795.

It's not as if everyone who posited or found agreeable similar hypotheses in other fields, particularly in the Old and New Testaments, explicitly had Wolf's investigations in mind or found justification for their own endeavors in them. Such explicit consideration can only be proven in rare cases, but more emphasis should be placed on the impulse that spread from that beginning across the learned world, which many followed unconsciously or without recalling where it first came to them. Therefore, it is natural to draw a prediction from the fate that Wolf's hypothesis has experienced in the field of classical studies for the fate that the tradition hypothesis can expect in the field of biblical criticism. There, recent research is making it ever clearer that there can hardly be any talk of the immediate validity of that hypothesis in its initial form. The basic premise on which it was built, the alleged inconceivability of the use of writing in that time for the composition of larger works, is, particularly since the investigations by Nitzsch and Kreuser, considered as good as refuted. The character of true poetic art, however, a meticulous crafting of form that those poems consistently show, forms such a marked contrast to the formlessness of poetry that springs directly from the mouth of the people that from the side of aesthetic consideration no less than scholarly antiquarianism, the necessity emerges to abandon that view. On the other hand, in its indirect effects, the upswing that literary and ancient research has taken through that hypothesis and in it will continue to have a beneficial impact for a long time. Regarding the immediate subject of it, at least this result has been tested and has been almost unanimously recognized by its opponents: that the poems, in the form we possess them, cannot be thought of as immediately stemming from one author. Even more comprehensive and profound, however, are the ideas and perceptions that have been made through them concerning folk poetry and myth creation in antiquity, as well as in entirely different regions of ancient people's lives in general. Here Wolf's work has truly marked an epoch, and the profound insights that our age has over previous ones in regard to these subjects, and so many related ones, are largely dated from it. Perhaps among these effects, the influence that, as just noted, the impulse emanating from

those investigations also exerts on biblical research, is not to be regarded as one of the least, even if, as we indeed believe, that the immediate application of the Wolfian hypothesis to the origin of the written Gospels will prove to be as untenable as the hypothesis itself.

12

We believe that we can refer to any such view of the evangelical documents as an immediate transfer of the Wolfian hypothesis, which not only negatively designates the possible disproportion in which these documents may stand to real history but also positively undertakes to attribute the peculiar shape and nature of them, either in their form or content, not just in a few details, but in the whole and large, to an oral tradition lying between real history and the documents. With the first adherents of the tradition hypothesis, it was mainly the form and external shape, initially that of the three synoptic Gospels, which they sought to explain in this way. The phenomenon that prompted such an attempt at explanation was the mutual relationship and agreement that these Gospels show precisely in those points where such a relationship is rarely found among independent writings. In this respect, this hypothesis took the place of another, by which one had immediately before attempted to explain the same phenomenon, the hypothesis of a written original gospel, which underlies our canonical Gospels and has largely passed into them verbatim. Indeed, in its earliest form, the tradition hypothesis was really nothing more than the hypothesis of the original gospel itself, supported and modified by the newly acquired concept of such a tradition, in which oral speech takes the place that one was used to seeing fulfilled only by the written. So externally was this concept initially transferred to evangelical source research; it did not arise from facts that would have been found within itself, but rather was deceived by an externally given occasion against what was drawn from such facts, but no longer tenable. One must also admit that the Wolfian hypothesis, in the rugged and paradoxical form in which its author had presented and asserted it with great expenditure of acumen and learning, was indeed suitable for, and indeed invited, being carried into other fields in such an external way, being applied to other subjects. There, through that scholarly giant's work, the results of which one had to accept simply because one could not refute them with equal learning, the extraordinary feat was accomplished of proving that one of the recognized great works of human art was, in fact, not a work of art, but a consciously and intentionally created natural product: how could one not have been tempted, wherever a difficulty in explaining literary phenomena appeared, which one had vainly sought to resolve through the usual way of treatment, to resort to that means, the application of which now seemed so easy everywhere after such preparatory work? — So in the case at hand. The reason for the peculiar relationship between the gospel writings, which according to all transmitted accounts were created completely

independently of one another, had been the task that the most ingenious researchers in this field had tried in vain to solve by exerting all their efforts. The most plausible explanation that had been found so far, the assumption of a lost original written document from which those writings were jointly drawn, lacked any historical basis, as there was no slightest historical trace to prove the existence of such a document. And if such a trace had been found, it would only have explained the similarity of the gospels to one another, but not their divergence; this would have seemed even more puzzling than before. What could be more convenient in such a situation than a category of such a kind, already found and established in another field, that promised to grant all the advantages of that doubtful presupposition without being equally vulnerable to the same objections? An oral tradition is not such a visible, externally palpable thing as a written document; therefore, the demand for explicit historical proof seemed easier to reject or circumvent regarding the former than the latter. This assumption also brought with it the possibility, even the necessity, of a multitude of incongruities and deviations in the written record of what was orally transmitted, which in the other assumption had appeared only as a new, unresolved problem. Admittedly, there was still the circumstance that opposed such an immediate and historically unmotivated application of that category of oral tradition, that here, unlike in the Homeric question, it was not about a poem; that is, a work where the choice and placement of words, the definite shape of the thought progression and the ordering of matters, in short, all those externalities of form in which the phenomenon to be explained lay here as well, had a significance that allowed the explicit fixing of the word and letter to be explained without or before this recording. However, this objection was forestalled by substituting doctrine for poetry, and it was also known to present as probable that at a time when it was not yet supported by written essays, through frequent repetition, combined with the endeavor for literal accuracy and perfectly faithful reproduction of what was received, the doctrine could be fixed in a standing pattern that was reproduced by each individual narrator almost like a memorized poem; for which as examples the faith confessions, prayer formulas, etc., that were passed on to later times, were not neglected to be cited.

14

The more recent supporters of the tradition hypothesis, in their broad development and application, have less in view the aspect according to which it is supposed to serve to explain the external form of the written Gospels, than rather the other aspect related to content, which they try to present as a mythical, legendary one with its help. Indeed, the assumption that the relationship between the synoptic Gospels should be explained by it remains in the background; as we saw from the quoted words of Strauss's work, in which there is talk of a "definite type" to which the evangelical proclamation must conform. However, it must be surprising how precisely the most ardent of those

supporters find the hypothesis insufficient to explain precisely the most striking and peculiar phenomena concerning the form of the Gospels, for whose explanation it was first invoked. If one comes, as we noted above, to the conclusion that despite the tradition hypothesis, one repeatedly comes back to regarding the author of our second canonical Gospel as an epitomator, who explicitly compiled his writing only from the first and third Gospels, then the use of the hypothesis for this formal aspect is reduced to the harmony between the two last-mentioned Gospels. Nevertheless, almost nothing has been done in recent times to further explain the agreement and divergence of these two in this way, after Schleiermacher's attempt to first dismantle the Gospel of Luke into its simple components, which could be regarded as the direct or nearest direct product of tradition, has been recognized by most or all as not at all successful.

*) About the writings of Luke. A critical attempt. Reprinted in the second volume of the first section of Schleiermacher's complete works.

Only a small treatise by Lachmann **) pursues, prompted by Schleiermacher's aforementioned investigation and other related and more comprehensive ones by the same researcher, some of which have not yet been made public, that direction.

**) *De ordine narrationum in evangeliiis synopticis*. In the theological studies and critiques. 1836. Issue 3.

This treatise, however, as we will show later, opens up, even without intending to, the prospect of an entirely different understanding of the relationship of the Gospels, one that, we hope, will put an end to the entire tradition hypothesis. — For our part, in the current section of our undertaking, which is devoted to the consideration of the sources according to their origin and formal nature, we initially have to consider only this more external aspect of the hypothesis and will seek to refute it from this perspective. To highlight the other side, and to examine the "mythical view" that emerges from the hypothesis or rather from it for this content, also based on the nature of the content of the evangelical story, remains reserved for the later books of this work.

Whenever there was talk of a historical justification of the tradition hypothesis in the stricter sense, the only fact that was found, upon which it could be based, was simply this: the undoubtedly more important and elaborated role that was assigned to oral instruction over the written in the earliest Christianity. It is of interest to observe how, in this respect too, that hypothesis could lean on something already laid down in contemporary research and could take its concepts from there in all essentials. Through

Lessing, the same researcher who, alongside Semler, had first brought the hypothesis of the written original gospel to the forefront in the field of evangelical source research in German theology *), had, in contrast to previous Protestant orthodoxy, pointed to the importance **), which, alongside the New Testament writings, at a time when these writings had not yet fully gained unconditional canonical authority, as later, and were not yet in everyone's hands or accessible to everyone, was constantly asserted in the Church by tradition, oral transmission.

*) New Hypothesis on the Evangelists as mere human history writers. In the 6th volume of Lessing's complete writings (Berlin 1825).

**) In *Anti-Götze* and some smaller essays related to it.

Lessing had by no means done this in the sense that he intended to derive those writings themselves from this transmission, or to make the Passion story and the sayings of Jesus, in short, what makes up the content of the written Gospels, the subject of this transmission. His intention was rather to show how the content of Christianity should not be confused with the content of the written documents, how it existed independently of the latter and could not be endangered by doubts that might arise not only from the form of the documents but from the content itself. This observation was meant to help emancipate Christianity from the bondage under the historical proof of its divinity, according to the spiritless form in which the current dogmatics used to provide such proof. He wanted to achieve this by securing for Christianity a content that was not of the nature of external historical events but of purely spiritual nature, thus also exempt from the requirement of historical justification or proof from facts. Only later, after evangelical source research had returned from the standpoint to which Lessing had directed it and had taken the previously described turn, did they attempt to use the insights gained by Lessing to explain the origin of the evangelical documents as well. And here, indeed, it is not possible to overlook how such a transfer was close enough in the context opened by Lessing himself and could be presented as very agreeable. If in a later time, when not only the documents of the Holy Canon had already gained validity and authority, but writing in general had taken up a broad ground in the Church, if even then the actual core of Christianity, its confession of faith, on the correct understanding of which they believed salvation and blessedness rested, was not written down but handed down in oral instruction, pronounced in oral speech by the confessors: how much more likely must it appear that in the apostolic age, among those earliest, largely illiterate disciples, who were almost always little practiced in it, a uniform oral transmission, rather than a written relation of historical facts, could be formed on the historical foundation on which their faith was built?

However seemingly plausible this conclusion may be, it becomes clear how precisely in this transfer a significance that Lessing assigned to tradition with sharp insight and thorough scholarship is lost. It is presupposed that the apostolic teaching was either wholly or largely composed of historical narration, of relating facts from the life of the Lord, or of deeds He performed. If this were really the case, we would have to assume that this teaching underwent a significant alteration when the historical narration was included in the written Gospels and recognized as authentic documents for the knowledge of the evangelical events. For we do not find that from that time on, these documents were handed over to all members of the community and made the basis of oral instruction; even less do we find that an oral tradition, explicitly preserving their content, namely the evangelical history, was maintained and propagated alongside these documents. On the contrary, as Lessing has excellently demonstrated, we find that the documents of the New Testament were indeed regarded as sacred and preserved by the presbyters of individual congregations and studied by scholars, but the instruction of the catechumens was not based on them, but on that symbol of faith, that "regula fidei," which had originated independently of the written documents, and where it was an explicit, clearly expressed principle that it should not be imprinted on parchment but on the spirit and heart of the faithful. That tradition, therefore, of which Lessing spoke, was not a makeshift, a surrogate for the written record; it was the direct organ of ecclesiastical life itself, one that writing could not, nor should, replace. Regarding that tradition, however, from which the written Gospels are supposed to have emerged, one must admit that it could only be considered a very inconvenient means to replace writing, which, if ever, must be in place here, where faithful and accurate preservation of facts is concerned.

— But what is undoubtedly the most troubling aspect of that hypothesis is the question that arises here: how it came about that the historically recounting lecture of the evangelical events and speeches, if it constituted such an essential part of teaching and preaching in the apostolic community, receded so much into the background after its content was recorded in writings that were accepted by the Church into the canon of holy books. Surely one would not want to think that these writings made it appear superfluous, having previously admitted that the acquaintance of the majority of the congregation members with these books was very limited and remained very limited down to the Reformation, partly even by the express will of ecclesiastical power. The example of the Israelites and the use they made of their holy history books in their

schools, in contrast to other ancient peoples who lacked such history books, and also the example of the Christians themselves, and especially those Christian denominations in which the Bible became a popular book by freely allowing its use and by translating it into the vernacular, shows how, instead of distancing the multitude of confessors from the historical through written recording, a relationship between this multitude and the historical is rather first established. In the first centuries of Christianity, however, precisely the opposite would have had to happen if that hypothesis of a typical proclamation of the evangelical content of faith before the composition of the written Gospels were correct. This circumstance, strange in itself, becomes even more strange when one considers how little need there seems to be for an explicit, didactic communication of events belonging to the contemporary or recent past, and how such a need tends rather to present itself with increasing temporal distance.

20

After all this, the judgment should be sufficiently prepared for us to dare to assert now that the assumption of a typical teaching discourse in the Christian Church of the first centuries, which would have had the gospel history as its content, entirely lacks a sufficient historical foundation. Let us be allowed to express our objection to this assumption with the words of a keen researcher who, even before it had taken as widespread a place in the scholarly world as it has now, had opposed it on just an occasional occasion. Leonhard Hug, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, — a work whose general tendency takes a similar position to the hypothesis of the proto-Gospel as our present work does to the tradition hypothesis, — speaks on the interpretation that some had given to the introductory words of Luke, as if they were speaking of such attempts at historical narration that are modeled after the oral contracts of the eyewitnesses.

*) First edition. Vol. 2, p. 102.

He says the following words about this interpretation: "It proceeds from the assumption that the Apostles, before there was anything written about the life and work of the Lord, presented his history in the assemblies according to their circumstances and sequence so that history books could arise from it. However, this was not the teaching method of the Apostles. To the extent that the instruction was merely historical, it only referred to the main moments of the story: the suffering, death of the Lord, and the pillar of the entire doctrine, his resurrection. Acts 5:30, 31. 13:28 — 39. 17:3. 10:38—42. 1 Cor. 1 — 9. 20—29 *). The detailed treatment of these events was done by demonstrating the prophetic scriptures from which it was shown that this course of fate was foreordained for the Messiah. Compare the above citations and Acts 17:3. 11 (καθ' ἡμέραν

ανακρινοντες τας γραφας, ει εχει ταυτα ουτως). 8:35. 18:28. 26:22. 23. 28:23. 24. With that, the dogmatic statements about his world dominion, which he took over as the Messiah after his entry into glory, a world judgment, and retribution in another existence were connected, as can be seen from several of the previously cited passages. If the Apostles ever elaborated on specific parts of the story, it was with the outstanding liturgical arrangements of the Christian school, such as the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. 11:23 ff., or even baptism. Teaching detailed history was far too remote from the purpose of their mission and of Christianity in general; in Palestine, in particular, the preparation of the people relieved them of these elaborations. There, the actions and workings of Jesus were considered so well-known that in preaching and teaching in the country itself, they relied simply on the common knowledge of the living age regarding his history, as Peter did in Acts 2:22 and later 10:37 ff. even at a conversion of the Gentiles in Caesarea, and Paul before King Agrippa in Acts 27, 26 ff. Since they could assume the history to be generally known, the method formed itself to secure the main moments, in order to immediately build the doctrine upon them."

*) It could have been added in Acts 1:22, where the actual expression used to describe the mission of the Apostles is "witnesses of the resurrection" (μαρτυρες της αναστασεως).

21

This simple and plain explanation, which must announce itself to anyone who has read the documents of the apostolic age with some attention as the true one at first glance, can be further supported by the following consideration. If a main aspect of the gospel proclamation was the detailed report of the events from the life of Jesus, His miracles, His speeches, and conversations, how does this correspond to the content and character of all writings of the apostolic age that have come down to us, apart from the four Gospels? Wouldn't one expect that the habit of such detailed narrations would have left a trace in these writings, that the reference to what was so frequently orally presented by them would be at least as familiar to these writers as the reference to the written Gospel word to their successors? But we find the opposite in both the New Testament writings and those immediately following them. In the most extensive and significant of these writings, those of the Apostle Paul, there is not the slightest sign of an approach to that teaching type, which by a historical proclamation of this kind, which could have become a fixed tradition type, would have to have become second nature to the Apostles. How often, even with Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, in letters to congregations to whom these reminiscences must have been greatly unintelligible, are the references to Old Testament events and sayings; and how rarely do we encounter references to sayings of the Lord, or to events of the Gospel history, with the exception

of the institution of the Lord's Supper, the death on the cross, and the resurrection! And those few allusions, how concealed and incidental they are, how completely devoid of the solemn tone that the appeal to a higher authority usually brings with it, and which we do not miss at all with the Apostle in his Old Testament quotations, and how little they correspond exactly in the chosen words and the motivating context with the Gospel passages; indeed, how doubtful it remains in some of them whether they are really to be taken as such allusions*)!

*) This latter might be the case, for example, with 1 Cor. 15:32, where the allusion to Luke 12:19 narrated is very doubtful because both passages seem to be based on an Old Testament saying (Sir. 11:19). As evidence of the character of Paul's Gospel allusions described by us, consider Gal. 5:9 and 14, compared with Matt. 13:33 and Mark 12:31 and parallel. Most explicit (besides the passage about the Lord's Supper in the first letter to the Corinthians) is the reference to 1 Thess. 4:15 ff., 5:1 ff., to the eschatological proclamations of the Lord, where Paul explicitly states, speaking *εν λογω κυριου*, and assuming familiarity with those sayings. But the doctrine of the Parousia, as is known, forms an article of the apostolic creed; since this article is essentially based on those sayings of the Lord, it is not surprising if here they were more expressly preserved and handed down than elsewhere.

How often does it happen with Paul that we find thoughts expressed, even elaborated at length, where certainly no one who was accustomed to place value on such attestations would have let the opportunity for a citation pass, where even for us, if we are somewhat versed in the Gospel, nothing seems closer at hand than the reference to a saying of the Lord or an event from His life story, without such a reference actually taking place *)?

*) For example, how close at hand it was in the letter to the Romans and Galatians, where the Apostle speaks of the meaning and obligation of the Mosaic law, to relate partly to Jesus' explicit sayings in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, and partly to Jesus' disregard for the Sabbath, purification customs, etc. Had Paul been able to presuppose those sayings and actions as known to his congregations or as subjects to be communicated to them, it would indeed have been impossible for him to ignore them in the relevant places in those letters; his first and most essential endeavor must have been to reconcile his own doctrine, as presented there, with those occurrences and to base it upon them. Nevertheless, the deepest silence about them, so that it almost seems as if they had not even come to the Apostle's own knowledge, at least in their closer detail. - Who, furthermore, would not expect a reference to Matt. 5:32, Mark 10:2 ff., and

parallels, in the frequent places where Paul speaks of the marriage bond and marital duties, especially in 1 Cor. 7:10, where Paul does indeed contrast the commandment that has come from the Lord with what he, but not the Lord, commands, but without any reminiscence of the words used by Christ? In the passage in the first letter to the Corinthians, where the superiority of the unmarried life is discussed, to Matt. 19:12? And so in countless cases. Also, in passages like 1 Cor. 4:8-12, 6:7, in which some have wanted to find a reminiscence of the Sermon on the Mount, as well as Rom. 16:19, 1 Cor. 14:20 to Matt. 10:16, I rather find it striking that such a reminiscence, which was so close at hand, did not actually occur. - It is also highly striking how the Apostle, who is so often engaged (as is also the author of the letter to the Hebrews) in finding expressions for the nature and dignity of Christ, never (even in 1 Cor. 15:47 and elsewhere, where it was so close at hand) makes use of the expression υιος του ανθρωπου, used by Jesus himself.

— In contrast to all this, we have (in the first and second chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians) the apostle's most explicit declaration about his lack of concern for the external facts of the events of which he was not an eyewitness, but other apostles. Only three years after his conversion did he come to Jerusalem to speak to Peter, but he did not stay there longer than fifteen days without seeing any of the apostles, except Peter and James, the brother of the Lord. Fourteen years after his conversion (if not after his first stay in Jerusalem) passed before he repeated his visit, following an explicit reminder from God, this time with the intention of consulting again with the disciples there and convincing himself of the correctness of his version of the Gospel which he preached. That this "Gospel" cannot mean what our written Gospels contain is sufficiently evident from the context just described, from what Paul further adds concerning his dispute with the other apostles about what should be imposed on the Gentile Christians, and from the general usage of language in apostolic times, which understands by "Gospel" only the proclamation of salvation in Christ in general, not another historical narrative. Above all, it is remarkable how Paul does not complain about his distance from the intercourse with the Lord's immediate disciples, does not apologise for it, but rather praises it explicitly as a confirmation of his apostolic profession. He did not receive the Gospel from men, but through the direct revelation of Jesus Christ *).

*) ουδε γαρ εγω παρα ανθρωπου αυτο ουτε εδεδαχυν, αλλα δι αποκαλυψεως 'Ιησου Χριστου. Gal. 1, 12.

From the womb of his mother, God had chosen him for this purpose; but after he had expressly called him to it, he, Paul, did not think he had to follow the flesh and blood and go to Jerusalem to join the earlier apostles, but wandered into solitude in Arabia **).

**) ου προσανεθεμην σαρκι και αιματι ουδε ανηλθον εις ιεροσολυμα προς τους προ εμου αποστολους αλλ απηλθον εις Αραβιαν. v. 17.

All of this, and the note about his first stay in Jerusalem, where he saw no other apostles besides Peter and James, he asserts with a solemn oath; so that we see even more clearly how his apostolic authority must have rested not merely in his own opinion but also in the view of the congregation on his independence from the other apostles, on the personal immediacy of the revelation from which he drew his teaching. How does this agree with the assumption that detailed historical narration was an essential task of the apostolic calling? Is one to assume that Paul was made acquainted with the particular facts of that history, with the individual sayings of the Lord, through direct inspiration? That the congregation assumed knowledge obtained in this way in him, or expected it of him for the validation of his calling? But what is true of the Pauline letters is essentially true of all other apostolic and immediately post-apostolic writings. In the letters of Peter and James, as one can expect, some closer familiarity with the language and even individual sayings of the Lord does shine through, but the habit of a teaching type determined by the narration of such sayings is found in them as little as elsewhere. John, in his letters, indeed speaks not only in the same thoughts but almost in the same words and phrases as Christ in his Gospel (not in the others), but we will see further how much more likely it is that the speech of the Johannine Christ reflects the subjective thought and expression of the disciple, rather than the reverse, that the latter is modeled on the former. Finally, the letter to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse are just as devoid of explicit quotations as the writings already mentioned, and, especially the latter, possibly even further removed from any echo of a traditional Gospel historical narrative.

26

— Some writings not included in the New Testament canon can also be cited for the same purpose. Such is the case with the so-called Letter of Barnabas, which, however improbable its authorship by the apostolic companion may be, certainly belongs to the time when the flowering of the evangelical tradition type must fall. In it, the scarcity of evangelical recollections is all the more striking as this letter is brimming with Old Testament scholarship, which in it, as somewhat in the Letter to the Hebrews, assumes such a form that it seems to aim to be fixed as a teaching type far more than any evangelical narrative.

However, we must not conceal that some citations in Barnabas, particularly those in Mark 12:36 and parallels (cap. 12, p. 41 ed. Cleric.), seem to attest to a more specific familiarity with individual details of the evangelical story than we find at least in the Pauline writings.

[Retraction published in second volume:

p. 26. The concession given here in the footnote, of a more detailed acquaintance with events of the evangelical history evident in the letter of Barnabas, I must retract upon a second examination of the passage mentioned there. This passage (Barnab. 12) does not refer to Mark 12:36 at all, but contains, just as Acts 2:34 does, a citation from Psalm 110:1, independent of that statement by Jesus.]

Similarly, the roughly contemporaneous First Letter of Clement to the Corinthians. Here too, alongside a lot of Old Testament references, only a couple of evangelical citations are found. These, compared to the corresponding passages in our Gospels, testify to a fairly vague and general memory, not pointing at all to a strict type of tradition *).

*) Cap. 13, p. 153 and similar 46, p. 173. The first of these quotations appears in similarly vague generality also in the letter of Polycarp.

The other works attributed to the ancient Roman bishop are not relevant here, as they are in no way older than the second century and the use of written Gospels. It is only in the letters of Ignatius that the Gospel citations become somewhat more frequent. However, since the Antiochene bishop already knows the Pauline epistles, the question arises whether there is sufficient reason to deny him familiarity with written Gospels **).

**) Here the authenticity of the shorter recension is assumed. In the larger, probably interpolated recension of those letters, the use of written Gospels, and explicitly our canonical ones, is evident.

But as we proceed further into the second century, on the threshold of which the latter stands, we find, along with the more frequent appeals to Gospel sayings and events, the definite and undeniable use of written Gospels ***).

***) Among the writings to which this applies, as already hinted, are also the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. In these, we do indeed find the Gospel citations introduced only with words commonly regarded as an appeal to tradition, such as "Christ says," or "the Lord," "the Prophet," "the Unerring says," etc. But here, the reason for this manner of citation lies clearly in the form of

these writings, which, as is well known, have Peter speaking throughout, who obviously cannot quote the written Gospels. — I would not have found it necessary to state this explicitly, as it is so clear, had not some supporters of the tradition hypothesis appeared to take advantage of this circumstance for their favorite view. For example, Crevner (Introduction to N.T. pp. 190, 198f, and earlier in "Contributions") lists several passages that are supposed to testify to a complete or purer tradition used by the Clementines, in contrast to the tradition laid down in the canonical Gospels. Gieseler and Strauss also do not explicitly exclude these books from those upon which they base their hyperbole. — As for the matter itself, it seems to me that the Clementines stand in precisely the same relation to the Gospel writings as does Justin Martyr. The use of written Gospels, and even explicitly our canonical ones (I indeed find these also in Justin's memoirs), is unmistakable; but it is a free use, a citation mostly from memory, here and there perhaps (compare, for example, Hom. II, 50; III, 50; XVIII, 20) mixed with apocryphal reminiscences.

It is precisely here that the rapidly emerging habit of referring to these noteworthy features contrasts with the lack of it among earlier writers. This habit most clearly demonstrates that the absence of such references can have no other basis than the fact that only with its written recording was the detail of the evangelical story made available for use in actual teaching discourse.

28

In exactly the same way, the explicit testimonies that have been preserved for us about the creation of the written Gospels speak entirely in favor of an origin of a different kind than from a tradition that had already become a fixed type. However, we do not want to insist here on the silence of these testimonies about such a tradition type. This objection might perhaps be dispelled by recalling similar cases where phenomena of spiritual life, created unconsciously by a necessity's instinct, fade away just as unnoticed and only survive in their products, without an express memory of their existence being preserved. Such a situation tends to occur everywhere in relation to that creative mental activity through which legends and myths are generated. Those who consider the evangelical story to be a myth, or entirely of mythical nature, therefore act entirely consistently when they derive it from an unconscious poetry of this kind, which, after the expiration of the era in which it flourished, left no other trace of its existence than the legends themselves that were generated from it. Assuming such creative activity, it would not be strange in itself if specific names were given to us as the authors of the written Gospels, names that ascend beyond the time when the legend was recorded in writing and fall into the time of the emerging legend itself. Indeed, it is the way of the legend to express its own

doing in this manner as the doing of specific figures embraced within its own sphere; as we find, for example, in Greek mythology, the names of Olen, Musaeus, Orpheus, and other poets and singers to whom the authorship of poems was attributed, which are nothing but later written fixations of the old legendary poetry. — But what forbids us once and for all to place the notes about the authors of the written Gospels in a row with those mythical statements, are the particular circumstances with which we find them accompanied. These circumstances, in fact, provide a positive insight into the real creation of those writings, bearing an entirely historical character, and decisively replacing that vague and nebulous supposition with real history.

29

We begin the examination of these testimonies with the oldest and most substantial among them, namely the well-known testimony of Bishop Papias of Hierapolis *), who published five books on "Explanations of the Sayings of the Lord" (λογίων κυριακών ἐξηγήσεις) in the first half of the second century.

*) Euseb. II, E. III, 39.

From the mouth of Presbyter John, an immediate disciple of Christ, with whom Papias had personally associated, he first reports concerning one whose name is, of course, also mentioned among the authors of our canonical Gospels, saying: "Mark, the interpreter of Peter, has recorded, as far as he remembered, exactly but not in order, what Christ either spoke or did. For he himself had neither heard the Lord nor accompanied Him but later followed Peter, who taught as the needs of the moment required and not as one intending to compose a systematic collection of the Lord's speeches. Therefore, nothing could be charged against Mark if he recorded some things from memory. His only aim was to omit nothing he had heard and to add nothing untrue." This, as stated, Papias tells from the mouth of Presbyter John about Mark. Furthermore, he says, without specifying the source, perhaps from the same source, about Matthew: "he has composed the sayings of the Lord in the Hebrew language, and everyone has translated or explained them as well as he could." — That this testimony is in every respect trustworthy, should never have been doubted. Indeed, Eusebius, who knew his work, portrays Papias as a man of somewhat weak intellect; but this judgment refers only to his understanding of the teachings handed down from the Apostles, which he was inclined to take more literally than reasonably, leading to some objectionable chiliastic views "and other fabulous things." However, such external notes as those given here do not imply how that criticism should apply. There is no occasion for misunderstanding, no conceivable motive for falsification, which in any case could hardly occur with a witness so close in time. The testimonies themselves are in perfect

agreement with a long series of subsequent ones, which, for the most part, independently identify Mark as a pupil of Peter, and from whose narrations his Gospel was compiled, and have Matthew write a Hebrew Gospel. — So now, we ask, how do these reports relate to the tradition hypothesis? Notice how, for the Gospel whose origin Papias describes in greatest detail, undoubtedly not without reason, a source is named which explicitly states that it was not intended to lead to a written compilation of events or speeches. It was the casual, occasional narrations of a single disciple, not a canon of narratives uniformly spread among the various disciples, from which the first written Gospel emerged — (that the Gospel of Mark was this, according to Papias, we will show immediately afterward). This deficient quality of his source, and the resulting gaps and disorderliness of the Gospel itself, were indeed criticized by other disciples, those who had heard the Lord themselves and not drawn solely from second-hand sources like Mark, as we can see from Papias' words. But is this criticism itself indicative of or pointing to a completely enclosed circle of traditionally finalized historical narration? Clearly not; rather, we see how Presbyter John explicitly finds an excuse for Mark in the nature of his source, which surely implies that he did not know of any such tradition type for the evangelist to have used to supplement his work. He himself, the Presbyter, also provided only occasional supplements and corrections in response to Papias' questions, which Papias later incorporated into his work. Had he, or those others whose accounts Papias also used, either indirectly or directly, made a business of their knowledge of the Gospel history from tradition in the way the tradition hypothesis assumes, the latter would have been spared the trouble of individually inquiring of all those he could reach, just as Eusebius reports that he did, to gather material for his work; no less would Mark have been spared the effort of laboriously piecing together an evangelical report from the isolated, disjointed narrations of a single Apostle. Finally, those who, either before the composition of Mark's Gospel, or because they did not know it, or because it did not suffice them, wanted a different collection of Gospel stories or speeches, would have been spared the trouble of translating Matthew's collection of sayings from Hebrew with inadequate language skills or incorporating facts known to them from elsewhere into it with inadequate subject knowledge.

32

So we see that this oldest testimony, from whichever angle we consider it, contains not only no negative circumstance that would lead to the conclusion of the existence of a Gospel tradition in that recently invented sense — although it would itself fall directly into the time of the flourishing of this tradition, as at least this hypothesis has been formulated lately — but also indicates a mode of origin for the first Gospels that is in itself entirely plausible and credible, and outright excludes the presence of such a tradition. This will become even clearer as we now attempt to derive a definite result

about the actual origin of the individual written Gospels from this testimony, in conjunction with a few others that align with it. — However one may interpret Papias's statements about Matthew's Gospel writing, in relation to Mark it clearly emerges that he has this companion of Peter compose his Gospel entirely independent of any other evangelical narration, whether written or oral, solely with the intention of not letting the content of the Apostle's tales be lost. It is sufficiently clear from the words he puts into the mouth of the Presbyter that the latter's opinion was that Mark only set his hand to his work after Peter's death. For why would he write from mere incidental recollection if he had written earlier, when it was so obvious to have his master himself correct and complete the distinguished parts? The latter, or rather an approval and authentication of Mark's writing by Peter, is indeed claimed by some later sources *), but these must fairly give way to the older testimony of Irenaeus **), consistent with Papias, according to which only after the deaths of Peter and Paul did both Mark and Luke write their Gospels.

*) Euseb. II. E. II, 15. Hieronym. catal. scr. eccl. 8.

**) Iren. c. haeres. III, 1.

Even in Clement of Alexandria, who indeed shares the (undisputed) opinion that arose perhaps from the effort to lend greater authority to the Gospel, that Mark had been prompted to the written recording of this Apostle's lectures during Peter's lifetime, there is still the note preserved*), that Peter was indifferent to this venture, neither supporting nor hindering it.

*) Euseb. H. E. VI, 14 (from Clement's Hypotyposes). We do not fail to note that this passage, as well as the one previously quoted from Eusebius, speaks of Peter's κήρυγμα in a way that indeed could suggest that this κήρυγμα, or the διδασκαλία of Peter, consisted in detailed narrations of the kind we find in Mark. But this is the perception of a later writer, who concluded from the significance that the written Gospels had gained in his time, the position that the narration of those tales held in the earliest community. Certainly not according to Papias or John the Presbyter, who stated that Peter made his διδασκαλία as needs arose, but not as if composing an orderly account of the Lord's sayings.

We do not believe we are mistaken if we take this note as an echo of the true state of affairs, whose memory at least still fought against the claim of an explicit authorization of Mark by Peter. — If we add to all this that the general content of those testimonies, contentious points aside, is confirmed in many ways by church writers of the older time, from the end of the second century: the fact that a student and interpreting companion

of Peter, Mark (whether the same as John Mark of the Acts of the Apostles or the Mark mentioned as a son in Peter's first letter, will hardly be ascertainable), processed the scattered occasional tales of that Apostle into a written essay on the Lord's speeches and the events of his life in the Greek language (this, indeed, is indisputably to be assumed of one whose profession is interpreting into Greek, and is confirmed beyond any doubt by the contrast in which Eusebius sets Papias's account of Mark against the Hebrew Matthew) — this fact might well be considered as credibly authenticated as the authorship and the circumstances of the origin of any other literary work of older times. We do not yet speak of the relationship of this once-sufficiently-confirmed writing to the one unanimously held to be the same by all writers since the end of the second century, nor of the question of the authenticity or inauthenticity of the latter. We turn to the other testimony of Papias, to that concerning Matthew's Gospel writing. As unanimous as those circumstances concerning the otherwise unknown author's personality, so unanimous here, with regard to the otherwise personally known author, is the note confirmed by a numerous series of subsequent writers that he composed a Gospel writing in the Hebrew language. But concerning the scope and content of this writing, there is, or seems to be, in Papias a statement that lacks explicit evidence elsewhere, and can therefore be decided not from external but only from internal reasons.

34

We see that we are talking about the question recently so vividly raised by Schleiermacher *) concerning the meaning of the word *Λογία*, with which Papias designates the writing of Matthew.

*) In his essays "on the testimonies of Papias," first published in the theological studies and critiques, year 1832, and later included in the second volume of his collected works.

The fact that this word, in its original and never-exceeded sense in any other use, would indicate a collection only of the speeches and expressions of the Lord: this circumstance, inherently undeniable and thus behaving, was first pointed out by the above-mentioned researcher, and he tried to base on it a view differing from the previous one regarding the original form of Matthew's Gospel. It has been objected to him that Papias himself, in what we have just cited concerning what he says about Mark's writing, seems to take this expression in a broader meaning, and that, in general, that word seems to have evolved into a designation a potiori for the Gospel writings. — The latter cannot be effectively disputed. Schleiermacher himself cites a passage from Photius, which he seeks to render harmless for his opinion not without coercion; but

decisive is a passage in the interpolated recension of Ignatius's letters *), where even the Acts of the Apostles is included in the expression λογία.

*) Ignat. ad Smyrn. 3.

But the question is whether, even if this is granted, the first transfer of this term to writings of this kind is sufficiently explainable without the assumption that the first such writings, or one of the first among them, had a form in which the speeches and utterances of Jesus were the main thing, in a sense different from that in our present Gospels. We indeed have no objection if one wants to regard them as the most important, spiritually significant part of their content in these latter; we ourselves consider them so; but by the authors of our canonical Gospels, they have not been regarded in such a sense as would presuppose that it should have been expressed in the naming of these writings. Clearly, the purpose of these writings is to provide a complete overview of the life of Jesus, whether from his conception and birth or from the moment of his declared divine calling; but this purpose, which has determined the entire external form and plan of these writings, is not expressed by the word. We also find this expression in only a few places; the far more common and natural term for the historical writings of the New Testament, before the subsequently typical expressions are used for them (since Irenaeus), is: Memorabilia (απομνημονεύματα). If all this already makes it generally likely that that word as a name for Gospel writings is only a particular term, initially given to a single writing for which it was suitable, and only incidentally transferred to the genre, an unbiased look at Papias' statements will only find this likelihood confirmed. Papias called his own writing "Explanations of the Logia of the Lord," and Schleiermacher has already shown how this writing does not belong to the same category as the canonical Gospels but actually dealt exclusively or primarily with the utterances of the Lord. In the present context, it is only a superficial appearance that the expression σύνταξιν τῶν κύριακῶν λογίων ποιείσθαι appears to be used interchangeably with τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεγθέντα ἢ πραγθέντα γράφειν. Rather, in the context in which Papias uses the latter words, the explicit contrast: ἢ λεχθέντα, ἢ πραγθέντα points to the possibility that a Gospel writing could aim for completeness and strict factual order of either the spoken or the happened, not necessarily both simultaneously. Papias himself seems to have striven for the former in his work, thus setting himself the task of both ἐξηγήσεις and a σύνταξις τῶν κύριακῶν λογίων, which he misses in Mark. If he then uses the same expression for Matthew's writing, we are at least given a sufficient invitation to look further into what particular reason the use of this expression might have had here.

Schleiermacher thought he had found a clue to this further investigation in the passage itself. Papias adds: ἡρμηνεύσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος, — a double-meaning expression that can be understood both from a translator and an explainer or interpreter. Indeed, the former interpretation is closer here, since there is explicit talk of a work in a foreign language; also, it is questionable whether the "everyone" (ἕκαστος) can rightly be applied to individual authors who, as Schleiermacher wants, expanded and explained the writing further, rather than to the great multitude of those who, in the absence of others, had to rely on that writing for their lectures or their own use, in short, whether it is not to be understood as written translations or explanations. That Papias really had revisions of Matthew's writing before his eyes or knew of their existence, which later became significant in the Church: against this assumption it can be objected that Eusebius, who is out to gather testimonies about such writings, mentions nothing of Papias's acquaintance with our Greek Gospels, except for Mark, and also leaves at least doubtful his acquaintance with the Hebrew Gospel. He mentions that Papias tells a story found in the aforementioned Gospel and leaves it seemingly undecided whether this can be taken as proof of his acquaintance with this Gospel. On the other hand, it can be argued that Papias seems to characterize the state of the community where there were nothing but the Hebrew λόγια as a thing of the past, and thus seems to presuppose Greek revisions of that writing. — But even if, after all this, we must hesitate to make use of the statement of our author in the way Schleiermacher suggests, we do not therefore give up pursuing the path indicated by that interpretation. The author of that interpretation would hardly have come to the idea of it if it had not become probable to him, by another insight, what the interpretation aims at, namely, the emergence of a group of Gospel writings and among them one or some that we possess, from a narrative revision of Matthew's original writing. Schleiermacher himself goes on to attempt to demonstrate in the canonical Gospel, named after Matthew, a duplicity of components, a series of collections of sayings, and a series of narrative parts that, intertwined and interwoven with each other, have not grown into a real unity in such a way that the different origin of both could not still be clearly found out. We do not think we are mistaken if we consider this insight to be the original one that the famous theologian had inadvertently obtained in his effort to break down the Gospels into their simple components, so that he only undertook his interpretation of the Papias passage to support it. We want to follow Schleiermacher further on this path first trodden by him, and investigate whether perhaps on it some insight into the meaning of the λόγια can be gained, even without taking that questionable interpretation of the other words of Papias as aid.

In this endeavor, we have a predecessor who has taken an important step forward from Schleiermacher's standpoint, explicitly in the direction we have indicated. Lachmann, in the treatise we mentioned earlier, has not only expressed the explicit insight into the independence *) of Schleiermacher's insight from his interpretation of Papias' words; he not only articulates this independence with the strongest words, but he also provides valuable information about the way in which the collection of sayings of the original Matthew has been integrated into the context of a continuous Gospel narrative.

*) *Matthaei evangelium illud intellego, quod Schleiermacherus dixit (et satis fuit dixisse, vel sine argumentis: ita veritas rei primo aspectu patet; ut si Papias testimonium aliter atque ille fecit accipias, tamen debeat concedi'), illud inquam ex collectis et quasi contextis domini Jesu Christi orationibus compositum primo, cui postmodum alii narrationes inferserunt.*

[= I understand that Gospel of Matthew which Schleiermacher spoke of (and it was enough to say it, even without arguments: the truth of the matter is evident at first sight; so that if you take Papias' testimony in any other way than he did, it must still be conceded), I mean, that it was first composed of collected and somewhat woven together sayings of the Lord Jesus Christ, to which others afterward added narratives.] A. a. O. S. 577.

He points out how, in the composition of our Gospel of Matthew, the same order, the same thread of narratives is followed in substance as in the Gospel named after Mark, so that the partial deviations from this order, either all or most of them, can be explained by the consideration that the redactor took of the content of the speeches he included and inserted. Lachmann also seeks to demonstrate something similar concerning the Gospel of Luke, to which we will return later. This intertwines the investigation into the original form of Matthew's writing in a very interesting and surely fruitful way for the progress of this entire research, with the question of the origin of the rest of the Gospel narratives. It presupposes, as one can see, a view of the Gospel of Mark, which is essentially different from the one common among the majority of current theologians, about which Lachmann speaks harshly, but not unjustly *).

*) *Multo minus probandi sunt, quibus placet Marem esse ineptis simum desultorem, qui nunc taedio, modo cupiditate, tum neglegentia, denique vecordi studio, inter evangelia Matthaei et Lucae incertus teratur atque oberret. Nempe bis quaedam Griesbachii disputationis sedulae subtilitatis specie illusit, curo tamen minime ingeniosa sit, sed frigida tota et jejuna.*

[= Much less are they to be approved, who are pleased to regard Mark as a most inept and rambling narrator, who is torn and wanders uncertainly between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, sometimes from boredom, sometimes from desire, then from neglect, and finally from mad zeal. Indeed, a certain argumentation of Griesbach twice deceived under the appearance of diligent subtlety, although it is by no means ingenious, but quite cold and insipid.] Similarly, Tholuck (*Credibility of the Gospel History*, 249.): not the futility of Griesbach's hypothesis, but its incorrectness can be demonstrated.

However, the aforementioned researcher does not go any further on this path than the general outline of Schleiermacher's view on the genesis of the Gospels, which he did not abandon even after that felicitously captured insight, allows him to go. In all those parts of the gospel story that do not belong to the Matthean collection of sayings, he reverts to the assumption of individual fragments that have gradually taken on a specific, even verbally fixed form in tradition and are supposed to have been organized into a specific sequence by that same tradition. Thus, a canon of this tradition is said to have already been completed before the drafting of the canonical Gospels. The author of our Gospel according to Mark is said to have followed this canon most faithfully, while the authors of the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke, but mixed it with the Matthean collection of sayings and (especially the latter) with other components as well, and thereby often rendered it with many alterations in both order and expression.

40

Returning to the hypothesis of tradition, as far as Lachmann is concerned, is entirely consistent insofar as he has set aside from the outset the testimony of Papias and all other external evidence, and has tried to arrive at a conclusion about the origin of the Gospels purely from an internal perspective. It must also be admitted that the tradition hypothesis, in the form in which Schleiermacher and subsequently Lachmann present it, is not struck by all the objections we made earlier against the form in which Gieseler, and against that in which Strauss, have introduced it. They both explicitly allow that tradition, from which our evangelists are supposed to have drawn, to exist not in formal sermons but in private communications and occasional narratives; they declare that a written composition of at least part of these stories from the very beginning is not unlikely; and so they also allow the traditional sequence of them to emerge more from the gradually forming habit of linking certain individual stories (Lachmann calls them "*historiae evangelicae corpuscula*") together, and partly from collections of written essays gradually agreeing with each other, rather than from a type passed down from the beginning and only expanded over time*).

*) Recently, Neander has adopted the same view as the basis for his treatment of the gospel history.

Nevertheless, the astute philologist who has so successfully advanced insights first gained from these assumptions must not overlook that, as long as he is not bold enough to break down those bridges behind him that have led him to where he now stands, he cannot yet trust that he stands firm on the ground he has already taken or is about to take. Schleiermacher, at the conclusion of his treatise, has, as a result of his closer adherence to historical evidence, almost unknowingly pointed to another goal of research, which, if attainable, would undoubtedly provide better support for those results but would also refute the hypothesis from which they were first derived. He calls for an attempt to shed light on the relationship between Papias' testimony about the original Matthew and our canonical Gospel according to Matthew, similar to what has been done with respect to his testimonies about Mark. Admittedly, Schleiermacher, still too entangled in his hypothesis, assumes right away that our Gospel according to Mark cannot possibly be the same as the one Papias speaks of, or even be in an exclusive relationship to it. But if closer examination should reveal the opposite of this assumption, it becomes apparent how a true and at least sufficient explanation, more in line with the oldest evidence than any conceivable form of the tradition and primitive gospel hypothesis, could be obtained about the origin of the synoptic Gospels and many related questions. Meanwhile, under the assumptions of Schleiermacher and Lachmann, the actual answer to this problem is always just pushed further and further into the indeterminate, thereby keeping the results already found uncertain and wavering.

41

The most significant objection, already raised by Schleiermacher and subsequently repeated against the possibility that Papias is indeed referring to our Gospel of Mark, is known to be this: that according to the words of John the Presbyter, Mark "not in order" (οὐ τάξει) recorded what Jesus had spoken or done. Schleiermacher, the aforementioned researcher, conveniently used these words for his favored hypothesis and categorized the writing of the respected Mark among those scattered essays and occasional writings, which he considers as the precursors of the connected Gospels. Excited by such a discovery, he was led to declare it "the most unlikely thing in the world" that Mark, if he wrote as Peter's interpreter (which seems most probable), and thus could barely steal the time for it, should have produced a work like our Gospel. "For our part, we find ourselves compelled to reverse these judgments about probability and improbability. The idea that Peter's interpreter would, during the apostle's lifetime, sneak time to jot down details from his speeches, without even thinking "of an actual audience,

of public announcement," must be recognized as just as unlikely as that after Peter's death, Mark would recall everything in his memory to put it down in writing for a broader audience, which seems probable and appropriate. Concerning the individual anecdotes at the moment of their hearing, the more memorable and significant they appeared, the less fear there would be that they might be forgotten; one would have to assume a deliberate listening for the purpose of publication, imagining Mark to Peter as Las Cases or O'Meara to Napoleon on Helena, or Falk and Eckermann to Goethe. If such a procedure was in line with the thinking and habits of the time and the circumstances of the apostolic environment, why do we not find it happening more often? Why, in particular, would there not have been skilled hands found among Jesus's own entourage, who felt the drive and vocation to provide this service to posterity? On the other hand, after the apostle's death, the need arose to save what one had previously heard in living speech from his mouth and continually recalled to memory, now that this possibility was closed, from complete loss by a coherent, as complete, and as accurate representation as possible. This is so natural that it would be astonishing, even utterly incomprehensible if it had not happened. The latter, the striving for the highest possible completeness in the communication of what came from Peter, is also expressly attributed to Mark by John the Presbyter, contrary to Schleiermacher's assumption. He does not speak of Mark's writing as mere loose notes but clearly as something that could give rise to the opinion that it was a complete historical portrayal. He also undoubtedly assumes its publication, its ἐκδόσις. Both his statement and Papias's account appear in their entire nature as intended not to acquaint the latter or his readers with the existence of such a writing but to explain why a supplement and completion to it should not be superfluous.

43

What, in this context, can the "not in order" (οὐ τάξει) statement mean? We believe it can mean nothing other than that there may be some discrepancy in the order in which Mark tells the events, since he did not hear them in order from Peter but, deprived of his master's assistance, had to conceive of such an order as best he could. To read more into these words, as Tholuck correctly observes, would be to strain them in a way that can hardly be justified given the weight of the other circumstances that argue against this interpretation.

*) Credibility of the Evangelical History, p. 245.

That, in striving for completeness, Mark still had to follow a certain order, meaning that — for the nature of the subject does not easily allow for another order — he had to place his narratives in a generally specific chronological context, and that he could not

simply place diverse things side by side at random, is indeed obvious. Also, in the opposite case, neither John nor Papias would have found that explicit criticism necessary. Assuming only that John is speaking of a writing known to Papias, and Papias of one known to his readers, those words considered problematic testify most explicitly that a formal order was indeed present in this writing. Furthermore, that the judgment expressed by the Presbyter was indeed the general judgment is evidenced, assuming what we are inclined to presuppose, by the actual conduct of Mark's successors. The authors of two of our Gospels have permitted changes in the order of events compared to the third, which, no matter how one arranges the relationship between these three, testify that one could find writings of the kind, like our canonical Gospels, that do not lack chronological form, written οὐ τάξει (not in order).

44

After all this, one will probably admit that in the words of the testimony itself there is no sufficient reason that would force us to dispute that the testimony is speaking of one and the same writing, just like the later testimonies, concerning which there is no doubt that they are speaking of the canonical Gospel of Mark. If, however, the former has been disputed, the real reason for it lies in the supposed inconsistency of the actual character of our Gospel, not with the particular content of this single testimony, but with the common content of all those testimonies.

Made distrustful by skepticism, stirred up in other points of the research on evangelical sources, primarily and chiefly regarding the Gospel of Matthew, against the accounts of the ancients about the authors of our canonical Gospels in general, people thought they had discovered circumstances in the particular character of our second canonical Gospel that made its composition by an intimate companion of the First of the Apostles utterly inconceivable. If we ask what these circumstances are, we are indeed referred once again to the long-known fact of the relationship of the synoptic Gospels. From this fact, the alternative is spun that either the three Gospels have drawn from a common, written or oral source, and then the author of the second, who has nothing, or as good as nothing, peculiar compared to the other two, could not have drawn from that source supposedly unique to him; or else, the second Gospel drew from the first and the third and is nothing but a patchwork of the first and third; but something like that could have been even less likely to come from a disciple of an Apostle who was in the relationship that has been reported to us about Mark.

That besides these two there is a third possibility, namely this: not that Mark drew from Matthew and Luke, but that the latter two drew from him, seems to have been completely overlooked recently. Even though earlier, Herder and Storr had already

indicated something of the kind, albeit from narrower viewpoints, from which current research might not unjustly distance itself. And yet, it is precisely this assumption that we hope to bring to evidence, not yet through the present preliminary examination, but through the entire course of our work, which, as we openly confess, is essentially built on it. We hope that through it, all the difficulties that have so far stood in the way of a clear and universally satisfying, historically accurate understanding not only of the sources of evangelical history but also of this history itself will be resolved.

45

The first advantage that results from this assumption, which is of course only a hypothesis at the moment, when we look back at the course of our investigation up to now, consists in the clearer light that it gives to the content of Papias' double testimony about Mark and about Matthew, and about his relationship to the later testimony of the church. The writings of both are apparently mentioned there as the first gospel writings, probably as the only ones that Papias still knew. From one of these writings, that of Matthew, it has appeared probable to us in the above that we only have it in a revised version, which, as admitted, was translated into a foreign language, but also expanded and, in particular, augmented with narrative components. Where could the editor have gotten the material for this expansion, provided, as one may well presume, that he was concerned to give the added elements of equal authenticity and credibility, already acknowledged, as those after which his work has been named? From where else but first and foremost from that historical source which Papias treats here as a source of equal rank with that one? —If we recognized earlier that the origin of the Gospel of Mark, which results from the message of Papias, as one that corresponds entirely to the nature of the matter, then the origin that would result from our present context for the Gospel of Matthew is no less natural according to the matter. The apostle himself had no interest in writing down an actual description of the life of the Lord, just as little as, according to our previous remarks, a student of the apostle could have any interest in writing down individual stories about the life of his master at that time, which was by no means a pleasure to write. What the later generations contrived as the intention of that supposed recording by Matthew: that Matthew, in his travels among foreign peoples, wanted to leave behind his Gospel writings to his countrymen as a keepsake; this trait, like so many similar ones, is of legendary nature. When it comes to the apostles, it is certainly appropriate to attribute the composition of such writings to them. However, it is worth insisting on what Paul says about himself and his companions: that they considered themselves servants not of the letter, but of the spirit; that they felt called to write the commandment of Christ not with ink, but with the living spirit of God, not on stone tablets, but on tablets of the heart made of flesh *).

*) 2 Cor. 3, 3ff.

Certainly, on the other hand, it could occur to an immediate disciple to record the speeches and sayings of the Lord in writing; here, a strictly literal preservation was of essential interest, both for the personal needs of the disciples and for the needs of the doctrine. To retain these in memory required a much more explicit effort and assistance than was needed with regard to events that were not even the proper subject of teaching in their detail. This recording was done in Hebrew, or more probably, as we often find confused, in Aramaic — a circumstance that should not be omitted, also to be considered as an argument for this form of the first writing of Matthew. Not entirely without reason have older, especially Protestant interpreters (in the interest of the theory of inspiration and the literal validity of the Greek original text), found it improbable that the oldest Gospel should have been written in a language other than the most widely used and familiar to Jewish Christians, Greek; and a newer Catholic scholar (Hug) has agreed with them. This objection is resolved if that writing was only a collection of sayings. The same interest in preserving the sayings of the Lord as literally as possible, which prompted the Apostle to compose this collection at all, must also have induced him to write it in the same language in which the Lord had spoken. As the eyewitnesses gradually died off and the need for a proper life story of Jesus arose; as the beginning of a written recording of that history was made by Mark; it was natural that one wished to see the wealth of that collection of maxims utilized for these historical representations, just as conversely, the addition of speeches and sayings without the nourishing flesh of events and facts *) became unpalatable to the era when the latter had already receded further into the distance.

*) It may seem daring, but the author cannot refrain from interpreting the peculiar, isolated story found in Clement of Alexandria (Paedag. II, p. 174, Pott), that the Apostle Matthew abstained from meat and lived only on seeds and vegetables, as a mythical allegory about the nature of his Gospel writing.

Attempts emerged to combine both elements; the form of the life description naturally became the predominant one, and the name "Gospel," which had previously been used for the proclamation of the divine kingdom and the salvation manifested in Christ, was transferred to these writings containing the historical embodiment of the message of salvation. Now, given the lack of other written monuments of the same kind and the insufficiency of oral tradition to independently supplement this deficiency, if the work of Mark became the common basis for all or most of these, more or less literally used, then (probably only at a somewhat later time) the individual writings were not named according to this common fundamental element shared by all of them, but according to what was peculiar to each one of them, and so it happened that the one that had most

completely, and most in the original form and order, included the λόγια (sayings) of Matthew within it was designated as εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου (the Gospel according to Matthew). Thus, the Gospel grew out of the λογίους (sayings), and the Greek Matthew emerged from the Hebrew; for Greek was naturally the language of the Gospel proclamation, and the more such a writing strove for completeness in the content of this proclamation, the more indispensable was this language of the educated world, in whose use the Gospel of Mark had already preceded it *).

*) In this view of the origin of our Greek Matthew, as you can see, the objection also falls away, which has been raised against the assumption of a translation from the Hebrew original due to the nature of the Old Testament passages cited in it, in which a reference to the Septuagint can be seen throughout. These quotations, in fact, belong with few exceptions, to which that remark does not apply (e.g. Matt. II, 10), not to the genuine Hebrew Matthew, but to the Greek editor.

48

This interpretation of the relationship between the first two canonical Gospels will not be denied the concession that, according to it, the authority of the witnesses, especially that of the great, certainly not carelessly disregarded testimony of the Church, is more justly served than by any other interpretation that does not outright ignore the undeniable relationship between the two writings. That those heads of the Church, from whom, in opposition to the heretical sects of the second century, the determination of the New Testament canon emerged, would have included a writing that was nothing more than an arbitrary and principle-less excerpt made from two others, embellished with equally arbitrary additions and decorations, directly beside these two originals in the canon, and named it after a known disciple of the Apostles: this assumption is obviously a much more violent one, greatly impairing the judgment of those men *), than the reverse is: that those same men would have granted a place under the name "Gospel according to Matthew" to a second writing that, in addition to a few other additions, particularly combined a translation of those highly valuable sayings of Matthew with the concise content of the authentic, unadulterated Mark.

*) The Gospel of Marcion was so definitively recognized by the Church Fathers as a mutilated Luke, and yet it is not likely that its agreement with Luke was a literal one everywhere. How should no single scholar of the Church - and also the heretical sects, whose interest it was to return such accusations to the orthodox - have found the corresponding thing about Mark if it had indeed been so here? - Besides, we fully agree with the statement also cited by Tholuck (Glaubwürdigk.

d. ev. Gesch. p. 291) from Baumgarten-Crusius: "In fact, the public opinion of the Church about the holy books was early balanced and established, and we must concede to it that, as far as the New Testament is concerned, it proceeded with foresight and knowledge. For the criticism will increasingly agree that the books introduced as canonical have everything in their favor, and that at least they always have some reference to the persons of the men whose names they bear, and that finally the difference between them and all those who have otherwise made a claim to an equal name and rank is clear and great."

But even this itself, that two similar writings, whether derived from oral tradition or compiled from earlier writings, possibly named one after Matthew and the other after Mark according to mere coincidental hints or guesses, presupposes a much greater arbitrariness of procedure than we are entitled to assume as long as the possibility of another explanation still presents itself. Indeed, we too believe that we must assume that at least part of our evangelical writings were known and circulated without a specific name before they took their place in the canon under their now existing names. Even in the case of Mark, we consider this likely without prejudice to the authenticity of the well-known Gospel, not only for the reason common to all the Gospels that the earliest quotations from the written Gospels do not name them, but also because of the way the Presbyter John and Papias, who followed him, talk about it, which presupposes the work as known but does not seem to assume its author as named at its head. Even more clearly would the same be true concerning the Gospel of Luke if, as remains the most likely scenario after all recent discussions about it, it turns out that this Gospel was the basis for the heretical Gospel writing of Marcion. The latter, as we learn explicitly *), was not attributed an author by Marcion; but how could Marcion have omitted this when Luke was already known and explicitly named as the author of the work he used? Our remark seems to apply especially to the canonical Matthew. For, according to all indications, it seems to be preferably this one whom we have to look for behind the Justinian "Apostles' Memoirs" (ἀπομνημονευσματα των αποστόλων) and perhaps behind some other expressions from the same time *).

*) Tertull. c. Marc. IV, 2.

*) The main reason why it still seems doubtful to so many whether Justin really used our canonical Gospels, and especially the Gospel of Matthew, does not lie in the partial deviations of his citations. Here one has come to the conclusion that such deviations can easily stem from the free manner of citation; just as later church fathers often enough have similar deviations in their New Testament citations and Justin himself in his shorter citations from the Old Testament. The tendency of the older commentators to suspect an apocryphal word, or at least a

different reading, wherever they found such a deviation, must be regarded as something outdated. On the contrary, the reason for this contradiction lies precisely in the fact that Justin, contrary to his other custom, does not name the authors of the citations of his ἀπομνημονεύματα. But how could he name them if the writings were still nameless at that time?

51

This name was certainly given to it as a typical and distinguishing name by the organizers of the canon, and if we find the same name used here and there for other writings, especially the apocryphal Gospels of the Hebrews, Ebionites, and Nazarenes, this by no means necessarily implies identity, or even an explicit relationship of those writings to ours, but only leads us to conclude that they were compiled in a similar way to the canonical Gospel of that name, from the collection of sayings of the Apostle and from other sources, most likely also from the Gospel of Mark **).

**) The traces of origin from the Greek Gospel text that one has wanted to prove in these Aramaic Gospels do not necessarily presuppose a use of the Greek Matthew. — Concerning the Gospel used by Cerinthus and Carpocrates, it is explicitly said that sometimes it was Mark (Irenaeus III. 11), and sometimes a mutilated Matthew (Eusebius, Church History XXVIII, 5).

***) Perhaps to these Gospels one could relate the reproach of Celsus (Origen, Against Celsus II, 27, p. 411 ed. Paris) that "Some of the faithful remelted their Gospel three, four times or more often from the original text;" if not, what seems to us even more probable, Origen is right in his response, and the reproach only hits the way the heretical sects used to handle the written Gospels. But in any case, this note also proves the custom of using nameless Gospel writings until the establishment of the canon.

There, however, that naming retained something fluctuating; it was not generally accepted but only posited as a conjecture by individuals. When, in reference to our Gospel, the Fathers of the Church sanctioned it, they did so not without caution and without consciousness of its merely relative truth. Such consciousness we believe to perceive clearly in the designations like κατὰ Ματθαῖον (according to Matthew), etc., for this as well as one or other of the remaining Gospels. Indeed, this expression, which we find scrupulously observed for a long time by subsequent church writers and which we also find apocryphal Gospels modeled after, likely originated in the earlier meaning of

the word Gospel; it was intended to retain the unity of the evangelical proclamation in all its various representations, so that the different writings should not appear as different messages of salvation, their different authors as different authorities, and Christ as "divided" *).

*) 1 Cor. 1:13.

52

Nevertheless, the authors of the canon, had they really wanted to assert the authorship of those named by them in the strict sense, would likely have chosen another designation; the one they chose does not exclude such authorship, as indeed it could not be excluded in relation to some Gospels, but without expressly asserting it. — That the memory of the actual origin of the Gospels did not generally get lost, however, is evidenced by the views of the Manichaeian Faustus, a remarkable testimony. This heretic would hardly have been able to form and express his bold and admittedly excessive but keen and spirited hypotheses **) so freely if at least in certain circles a remembrance of the data on that origin had not been preserved, a memory that was indeed soon suppressed in the orthodox church.

**) "Neither is it established that it (the Son's testament, i.e., the gospel) was written by him, nor by his apostles, but long afterward by some men of uncertain name, who, lest they should be believed in writing what they knew not, partly took the names of the apostles, partly those of those who seemed to have followed the apostles, and affixed them to their writings, asserting that they had written what they wrote according to them." Words found in Augustine's *Contra Faustum* XXXII, 2. "Neither are these things from him, nor from his apostles, but much after their assumption, by I know not whom, and among themselves not agreeing semi-Jews, they were learned through rumors and opinions." Ibid. XXXIII, 3. On the contrast of the genuine and spurious in the Gospel, Faustus (XXXII, 7) explains in such a way that he only allows internal (indeed fundamentally dogmatic) characteristics. Among the spurious he counts: "Born shamefully from a woman, circumcised Judaically, offered sacrifices like a pagan, baptized humbly, led around by the devil through deserts and by him tempted most miserably"; but among the genuine: "the mystical crucifixion of the cross, by which the wounds of our soul's passion are shown; then his salutary precepts, then the parables and all the divine speech." — Similar views about the Gospel, Faustus also harbored about the Old Testament, for it was to him (XVIII, 3) a general fact: "there are many tares, which some night-wandering sower has scattered in contagion of the good seed in the Scriptures."

Here it was undoubtedly only the ever-increasing inclination towards a strictly enclosed dogmatism that led the orthodox church fathers from Irenaeus onwards to seize and hold onto the opinion of the real authorship of the apostles and apostle's pupils with such determination.

53

In this comprehensive exposition, we have not yet paid close attention to the particular nature of the Gospels before us. It is clear, however, that the truly decisive factor must be sought in this nature itself, through which all our previous findings must either be confirmed or refuted. Without underestimating the difficulties that confront the questions of internal criticism everywhere, we may presume in advance that in a case of this kind, in any way, whichever way the decision may turn out, the relationship between the first two Gospels of our canon to each other will bear traces of the true origin of this relationship. Such traces, which cannot be overlooked in a genuinely thorough and unbiased investigation, will reveal the truth in a completely unambiguous way. Now we can assume, as generally accepted, that such traces are indeed present, as far as the general relationship between both works is concerned. There is probably no theologian who does not find it necessary to explain this relationship in some way, be it by tracing it back to the common source of tradition, or—as is the only choice for those who still insist on believing that the Apostle Matthew wrote a real historical account—by assuming that Mark made use of Matthew. But even of this assumption, we assert that its untruth can be brought to evidence through a closer examination of both writings. In the consciousness of such reliability of what is testified by the appearance itself, Lachmann spoke the confident words mentioned earlier about the composition of Matthew's Gospel; words that, as bold, even presumptuous as they may appear to some, we do not hesitate to endorse with full conviction. If we now dare to extend that assertion by Lachmann with equal confidence to the effect that the same appearance, relying on which we come to the result that the Gospel contains the *λογια* as one of its original independent components, also convinces us that the narrative supplementing the *λογια* there, in all its main moments, is drawn from Mark, the same Mark that we still possess as an independent Gospel, — and if we further proceed to assert, regarding Mark himself, that not only is there no similar appearance leading either to a corresponding composition of this Gospel or to a borrowing from Matthew or other writings known to us, but that here the appearance speaks entirely for the creation of the work as a whole and independent of written predecessors: — then we can at least harbor the consciousness of having been led to this assertion completely independent of all preconceived opinions, solely through the study of the writings themselves. — Prejudiced, as most of those who undertake such investigations today are likely to be in

advance for the hypothesis of tradition, and only slightly appreciating the weight of the testimonies, which, as shown earlier, speak so loudly for a higher significance of Mark's Gospel than what would usually be attributed to it, we thought nothing less than finding in this Gospel the actual root of the narratives and the key to the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels with one another until, as said, the evidence convinced us and now also taught us to consider the significance and historical context of the testimonies in a different light.

55

The reasons that speak for the authenticity of the second Gospel have been tried to be compiled several times, both from points of view where the relationship of this Gospel with the other two was entirely disregarded, and from those where, while admitting such a relationship in general, a relative independence of the aforementioned Gospel was claimed in the way it was drawn from the common tradition or utilized the other two synoptic Gospels, either both or one of the two. However, it is in the nature of the matter that the presentation of these reasons will take on a different shape if it is undertaken from the perspective that we have preliminarily indicated here; that is, if one seeks to prove the dependence of the other two Gospels on it along with that authenticity. The other two, we say; it is indeed important for the further course of our consideration to include the third, the Gospel of Luke, from the outset. If we assert that it stands in a corresponding relationship to Mark, like the Gospel of Matthew, that it, like the latter, only in an even freer treatment and with an aim for a certain pragmatism in the narrative, interweaves the narrative of Matthew, along with a considerable series of other communications, into the thread of Mark's account, but remains completely independent of our Matthew's Gospel, just as this remains of it, then one will not find any preliminary external justification for this view necessary, as it is in no contradiction with the historical reports on Luke's Gospel. That Luke used foreign communications, closer to the first source, about the life of the Savior, he tells us himself in the opening words of his work. By these words, he puts himself in a substantially different relationship to his subject than, according to the credible tradition, Mark stands to it, who drew not from many sources but only one. Such a relationship mediated by several intermediaries fits well with what we personally know about the author of this Gospel, who was not, like Mark, a pupil of an immediate disciple of the Lord, an eyewitness of the events. But that among the sources he used, the writings of Mark and the genuine Matthew were included: assuming this is so close to everything noted so far that we would be highly surprised if it had not happened. Therefore, we can also continue on the chosen path with respect to Luke, confident in the consciousness of remaining in the best possible agreement with the historical testimonies.

While we now take into account in this way, along with the authenticity of Mark, the dependency of the other two on him as the focus of our observation, through this perspective, a circumstance gains evidence for that authenticity, in which people have not previously been able to find such evidence, but which justifiably takes precedence over all the rest for us. This circumstance lies in the moment which, with Mark, and through Mark with the others, constitutes the actual beginning of the gospel narrative. We are not talking about the beginning that Mark, following the traditional type of apostolic proclamation *), makes with the baptism of John.

*) Acts of the Apostles 1, 22. 10, 37.

Indeed, even this itself, that he only starts from this moment and not, like the other two, from an earlier one, speaks certainly, if nothing else, at least for his independence from those. For had he deliberately left out the genealogies and the stories of the youth, such an omission would have certainly been charged as heresy, as later with Marcion **) and the Ebionites ***), and his work would hardly have been included among the canonical books.

**) Tertullian, Against Marcion, IV, 7.

***) Epiphanius, Against Heresies, XXX, 3.

The complete truth about this point, however, is that the apostolic age, to which Mark is closer than the other two, did not concern itself with the youth of Jesus at all, but left the enhancement and development of the legends about it to the next generation. From the presence or absence of the youth history, the conclusion to be drawn about the respective age of the Gospels is precisely the opposite of that drawn by Clement of Alexandria, who famously regarded those Gospels that have the 'genealogies', apparently for no other reason than this itself, as the oldest †).

†) Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History II, VI, 14.

But as said, this is not what we mean here; for this circumstance, favorable as it is to the age and independence of the Gospel, is still not in any closer connection with what we personally know about Mark. Rather, there is another factual circumstance that is in such connection, which concerns the place that we may rightly call the second beginning of our gospel narratives, the beginning with which these narratives begin to be relations according to the report of eyewitnesses. This place is, as no one who

follows the narratives with some attention will dispute, the one where Jesus, wandering on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, recruits the brothers Simon and Andrew to be his disciples. *)

*) Mark 1:16. Matt. 4:18. Luke 5:1 ff.

To prove this, we must, of course, presuppose here many things that we can only explain clearly in what follows; in particular, that the report of the baptism of John cannot have been drawn from the mouth of an eyewitness. Concerning the story of the temptation, people will admit this to us anyway, and as for the infancy gospel, at least it is clear that it is separated from the later events by a wide gap and cannot, in any case, have been drawn from the mouth of the same witnesses as those events. But if all this is granted to us for the time being — which, insofar as it is not clear in itself, will be strictly proved in our subsequent books — it will not be overlooked how, first of all, in the first two Gospels, the aforementioned event, introduced only by some remarks held in the form of generality about the appearance of Jesus **), opens the uninterrupted series of such narratives, which by the character of particularity and detail they bear, reveal themselves as originating from eye- and ear-witnesses, albeit not exactly in the form in which they are presented, but at least in their first origin.

**) Mark 1:14-15. Matt. 4:12-17.

In Luke, a few other events are indeed sent ahead of that one; among these, however, the first is such that one can easily see the intentionality due to which it was taken from a later context ***), the other two are those that are told by Mark immediately after that calling of the disciples, and in the first Gospel even somewhat later, and in which that rearrangement reveals itself as an erroneous one, as the acquaintance of Jesus with Peter is obviously presupposed in them †).

***) Luke 4:16 ff. compared with Mark 6:1 ff. Matt. 13:54 ff.

†) Luke 4:31-44. compared with Mark 1:21-39. Matt. 8:14-17.

Even into the fourth Gospel, the habit of opening the actual evangelical narrative with the report of the calling of those disciples has been perpetuated; although there it is narrated in a different way than in the Synoptics, something that will be explained by the particular nature of this Gospel*).

*) John 1:35 ff.

— Now we ask, is this circumstance not one that, almost taken by itself, independent of the consideration that has already led us down this path, must lead to the assumption that our evangelical reports have flowed either directly or indirectly from the account of those two disciples, or one of those two? The fact that Jesus's public acts did not begin only at the moment of that calling is hinted at by the Evangelists themselves: if the tradition had formed from the communications of various individuals, how come we do not also encounter narratives of a similar kind from that earlier time, as we do from that moment onwards? — In any case, even if one does not want to concede such strong evidential power to this circumstance, one will at least not dispute that it entirely confirms the historical reports about the origin of the Gospel of Mark and the traces of its use by the other two Synoptics.

59

However, even this confirmation must be completed — rightfully, this demand is made of us — by showing, as at the beginning, so also in the progression of the synoptic narrative, if not at every single point, yet occasionally at prominently standing places, similar traces of the tradition originating from Peter. Such completion can hardly appear superfluous, as Peter and Andrew were called by Jesus as disciples almost at the same time as the brothers of Zebedee, so our reports could just as well be traced back to one of them. Indeed, people have often examined the second Gospel to see if it sufficiently authenticates its authenticity by such traces. This attempt had to fail from the previous points of view and seem to fall against Mark because the mentions of Peter, the narration of events concerning him, or speeches spoken by him or addressed to him, are not more frequent in Mark than in the other two Evangelists, who even have a considerable number of such mentions ahead of him. However, this circumstance will not mislead us as far as the general, communal nature of such places for all three Synoptics is concerned, provided that they are numerous and significant enough to justify what is intended by them. No attentive reader will dispute that this is the case. Almost immediately after that beginning, even before it in Luke, we encounter an event that may be considered insignificant among so many similar ones, the healing of Peter's mother-in-law from a fever. This would certainly not have been told if the Evangelists had had as great a number of detailed events at their disposal as is commonly assumed *).

*) Mary Magdalene had been freed from seven demons by Jesus; undoubtedly a much more significant act than that fever healing. Why do we not learn the details of this, just as we do of the other?

Shortly thereafter, as Mark collectively mentions the disciples, the companions of Jesus, he calls them: "Simon and those with him" **).

**) Mark 1:36.

A remarkable phrase that he would hardly have used if it had not been convenient for him for personal reasons to think of Peter first when mentioning the disciples. — We consider it unnecessary to highlight individually all the other places in this Gospel and the corresponding ones in the other two where Peter stands out among the other disciples. It is evident and will probably be denied by no one that these places are frequent and significant enough to prove, assuming our line of inquiry, what needs to be proved, especially since few or no ones exist that would allow similar conclusions about a different origin of the Gospels. — On the other hand, some of the places in Matthew and Luke where Peter is specifically introduced without the explicit precedent of Mark deserve and require special consideration. Among these are two of such a nature that from them, in the most surprising and striking way, the dual proof of the dependency of those two Gospels on Mark and for the authenticity of the latter can be demonstrated. The first of these places is in the conversation that Jesus has with the Pharisees and his disciples about the purification rituals. For there, a question that in Mark is asked by the disciples in general is, in the first Gospel, specifically put into Peter's mouth *).

*) Matthew 15:15, compare Mark 7:17.

At first glance, this seems to be in sharp contradiction to the assumption that the Gospel of Mark is drawn more directly from Peter's narratives than the Gospel of Matthew. But upon closer examination, the puzzle of this peculiar circumstance unravels. The author of the first Gospel had interposed some words, also elicited by a question from the disciples and drawn from another source, into a narrative he had borrowed from Mark **).

**) V. 12 — 14. That these words are indeed interposed by him, and that Mark did not omit them, is evident from the fact that they most strikingly interrupt the connection between V. 11 and V. 15.

As he returns to Mark's account, he feels the need to distinguish the disciples' new question from the earlier one, since they cannot have been asked in an uninterrupted sequence of conversation. Now, assuming that Mark, whom he had before him, had heard this question, as well as the whole conversation, from Peter, and that Peter would likely have reported his own speeches first, he puts this question directly into Peter's mouth. Similarly, Luke in the account of the woman with the issue of blood *).

*) Luke 8:45, compare Mark 5:31.

Here too, the reason can be clearly shown, which may have led the author of the third Gospel to transfer an answer that is given by the disciples in general in Mark specifically to Peter. He found this answer, as he read it in his predecessor, not sufficiently clear unless it was motivated by the preceding remark that, to Jesus' question of who had touched him, all would have claimed to know nothing of it **); whereupon one among them replied: "Master, the multitude throng and press thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?"

**) αρνουμενων παντων ειπε κ.τ.λ.

Here, it seemed necessary to him to name this one to distinguish him from the rest, who gave only a negative answer. Now, since the answer was told by Mark, this one had to be Peter; but to not stray too far from his predecessor, Luke adds "and those who were with him."

62

However, as convenient as these two cases are, and perhaps even a third one ***), far from endangering our view, they can even be used to support it. We must not omit to mention that the same does not apply to a number of other cases.

***) Luke 22:7, compare Mark 14:13.

In particular, in a not insignificant series of passages in the first Gospel †), and a couple of times in Luke ††), statements and other anecdotes about Peter are narrated, of which Mark knows nothing, so there remains nothing but the assumption that the authors of those Gospels drew them from other sources.

†) Matthew 14:28f, 16:17, 17:24, 18:21.

††) Luke 5:3, 24:12. (24:34).

But this assumption itself has nothing contradictory to our basic assumption, especially when one considers that the very greater detail or greater liveliness of Peter's narratives, which led to the emergence from Peter's surroundings of the first and only cohesive written portrayal of Jesus's life story, might also have given rise to many other anecdotes that circulated about him, including perhaps even legendary traits associated

with his person. We indeed notice how the history of the Apostles after the Lord's death, up to where Mark's account does not reach, is almost exclusively linked to Peter's person, until Paul emerges more prominently and becomes the center of this history. We have good reason to believe that even this history, as Luke tells it to us, may have been drawn from Peter's narratives up to the mentioned point, albeit not directly. Similarly, we also notice how later ecclesiastical legend has adorned no apostle's figure as richly as that of the supposed founder of the Roman episcopal seat and the opponent of the arch-heretic and magician Simon, with its inventions. The character of this legend comes closer, as we will prove in detail later, to most of the places here alluded to. They are not drawn from sources in the Synoptics of equal rank with Mark but probably from a tradition that partly already borders on the realm of the apocryphal.

63

Related in this way of arguing to the side as to how far it has the authenticity of Mark's Gospel as its goal, there are some other conclusions that have been attempted or can still be attempted in this regard. This includes, in particular, the repeatedly made observation that Mark uses the Latin expression at various points for subjects related to Roman state and military affairs (Centurio, Speculator, etc.). This has been associated with the information that he is said to have written his Gospel in Rome at the request of the Roman community. However, we would not place any special weight on this circumstance, partly for the sake of the matter itself, since those technical terms and Roman coin calculation *) were undoubtedly as common everywhere as in Rome, and partly also because the alleged residence of Peter, and thus also of Mark, in Rome is still subject to many doubts *).

*) Mark 12:42.

*) Compare the essay by Vaur in the Tübingen Journal for Theology, 1831, No. 4.

More weighty is the fact that Justin the Martyr seems to cite our Gospel as απομνημονεύματα Πέτρον; which only the preconceived opinion that Justin did not yet know our canonical Gospels at all could have led to denying **).

**) Dial. c. Tryph. 106. I cannot agree with Gieseler, who (histor. crit. Attempt p. 58) considers it more likely that at this point under αὐτοῦ, not Peter but Christ is meant. Grammatically considered, this explanation would be correct, but since everywhere with Justin the genitive attached to the απομνημονεύματα indicates the authors, this meaning is to be assumed here too. The passage evidently before Justin is Mark 3:16.

By far the most interesting aspect in this context, and one that also refers to the relationship of Mark to the other [Gospels], is the particular inclination of this Evangelist, especially recently so often and in so many different senses discussed, towards embellishment and illustration of what is narrated by added individual traits. If this characteristic feature of the second Gospel has recently been able to be interpreted to its disadvantage, the reason for this lies in the distorted turn with which the undoubtedly correct insight had previously been presented. By assuming the independence of the other two Synoptics from Mark, or at least the priority of Matthew over him, it was thought that the greater detail of Mark could be explained by the fact that he, enabled by Peter's narratives, had taken care to fill in the general outlines of the tradition more completely than they, with various detailed traits. Opposed to such a presupposition, criticism had an easy task in presenting Mark's procedure as absurd, the supposed enrichments of the narration as empty artifices. Indeed, if Peter, from the treasure of his precious memories, knew nothing better to add to what was already known than traits of the kind that there were four men who carried the paralytic into the house in Capernaum, and that to get the stretcher from the roof into the room, they had to uncover the roof first *), or that the herd into which Jesus drove the demons consisted of two thousand bodies **), and the like, then both Peter and Mark could have spared themselves the trouble of narrating and recording foreign narratives and of inquiring and writing down.

*) Mark 2:3, 4 compare with Luke 5:18, 19.

**) Mark 5:13 compare with Matthew 8:32, Luke 8:33.

Especially since in the majority of cases where such detailed features are found, one of the other two, either the first or the third Evangelist, also has them; which is why it is quite logical if opponents of that view, but who start from it, follow the lately favored opinion that our second Gospel is merely a mosaic of the first and third. However, the matter takes on a completely different shape if one considers whether the first-mentioned Gospel might rather be seen in reverse as the source of the other two. Here, the triviality of those embellishments becomes an explanation of how the authors of the others could have felt justified in omitting them, while, on the other hand, if one considers them the sources, one doesn't know how to provide even a semblance of a reason for omitting the most numerous and important pieces of information (which are only highlighted all the more by the greater detail of what is included). — We are not intent on asserting the detailed depiction of Mark as an everywhere fully accurate flow of the eyewitness account of Peter; but we believe we can demonstrate as thoroughly founded in the nature of the matter that a writer, who wrote under circumstances like

Mark, must have been drawn to a greater detail in description than his successors. Mark was the first to record the events: not only the echo of liveliness and vivid power that we must undoubtedly presuppose in the narratives heard from Peter's own mouth, but even more, the certainly natural desire in such a situation to give the narratives shape and color, and thereby substance and permanence, could, indeed had to, evoke in him a certain richness of picturesque detail. In his case, as in other historians whom we do not accuse of actual infidelity or falsification, it is not to be assumed that this detail everywhere with scrupulous accuracy reflects the factual circumstances themselves, or even what was actually told by Peter; rather it falls into the category of those liberties conceded to the historian, by which a certain genre of historiography somewhat approaches the art of poetry *).

*) Compare about the inadmissibility of demanding perfect fidelity in the narration of history in all those incidental details, which nonetheless cannot be spared if a lively and vivid picture is to be given, the excellent remarks in Lessing's well-known "Duplik" (Works Vol. 5, p. 102 ff.) and the treatise by W. v. Humboldt "On the Task of the Historian" (in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy, 1821, p. 305 ff.).

Mark's successors, who received the narratives as already established and authenticated, could more quickly gloss over those trivial circumstances, recognizing their insignificance, and perhaps also presupposing in themselves that correct insight into their relative truth, without which they could not have taken such great liberties, as they indeed do, both with many details of the historical narrative, and with the order and sequence of them as a whole.

66

Now, that the representation of Mark and, compared to it, that of the other two evangelists truly carries the character that we have tried to designate here, discovering this from the comparison of their three works in detail, must indeed be left to the critical judgment of the reader. A proper demonstration is impossible in things of this kind; only hints can be given for the independent contemplation to be undertaken by anyone who is concerned with their own conviction, and even in such things, a historical work of broader tendency, such as ours, cannot delve into the details as an exegetical one could. Only the following general points, concerning primarily the writing style of Mark, may find their place here. It is agreed that Mark, in his Greek style, is the most Hebraizing of the evangelists. We need not remind ourselves how much more plausible it is to assume a paraphrase from Hebraizing into pure Greek than the reverse, which would indeed probably be the only example of such a thing in literary history. But this

remark can be extended further, in which, if properly and sharply defined, it might exhaust everything that can be said for the probability of Mark's use by the others and the improbability of the opposite. The Hebraisms of our Gospel itself are, if you like, a consequence, albeit nebulous, a sort of necessary aspect of a more general and pervasive characteristic of his writing style, one that speaks most convincingly for its independence and originality. This characteristic can be described on one hand as clumsiness and ponderousness, specifically as it arises from unfamiliarity with written expression, either in general or in its application to this particular subject, which had not previously been written about in a similar way by our author. On the other hand, the same trait bears the mark of fresh naturalness and unassuming vitality, by which Mark's representation distinctly stands out from all other evangelical representations. We believe we can justify calling the Gospel of Mark, despite those external shortcomings, nevertheless, in terms of the essential spiritual qualities of the style, the best-written of all the historical books of the New Testament. For although it lacks the agility and easy mobility of Luke (of the first and particularly the fourth Gospel, we would not have much to praise regarding the writing style itself, unless one wants to credit the first with the style of the speeches, faithfully translated from the authentic Matthew, as its invaluable merit): it is, however, something that cannot be boasted of the former, drafted from a vivid overall perception of the subject, from an image present in the mind as a whole, and thus also evokes, alone among all Gospels, a corresponding overall picture of its content, while one must study such an image out of the others. In comparison to Mark's narratives, the author of the first Gospel is, in the parts they have in common, mostly epitomizing, with few exceptions. Where he stays closer to his predecessor's portrayal, he strives to soften its harshness, erase its idioms, and particularly to replace Mark's constantly recurring connection by 'And' with more varied and alternating ones. The third evangelist is also an epitomator in some places, but often an elucidating paraphrast, who really aims to make Mark's somewhat stiff representation flow, to smooth the edges, and to help the individual connections through various pragmatic interjections.

68

A consideration that is distinct from the observation of writing style and the portrayal of individual details is that of the composition and arrangement of the whole. In this, in particular, we would like to place the ultimate, decisive weight for our view on the emergence and mutual relationship of the synoptic Gospels, and indeed it is what we will continue to pursue beyond the present introductory section through the combed course of our historical presentation. It is clear from the foregoing that we regard the second Gospel as a simple composition, drawn from a single source and completed in one casting, but the first and third as being more complexly composed. Indeed, the

Gospel of Mark also bears very much the traces of its emergence from a presentation that was by no means orderly and coherent but scattered and fragmentary. It is not like the work of an eyewitness, nor like the work of one who had the immediate opportunity, through careful and inquiring questioning of eyewitnesses, or even of researchers who had already made a coherent study of the subject, to fill in the gaps, assign the right place to each individual part, and bring the whole together into a unity that is not merely internal on one hand, and merely external on the other, but truly organic. The evangelist, although the whole was vividly present to his soul as a spiritual whole from the narratives of his master, was still compelled to connect the fragments from which this whole consisted in a way that cannot but still make us notice that they were indeed nothing but fragments that he had to connect. We draw attention to this circumstance with particular emphasis for a twofold reason. First, because it is what has already given the Gospel of Mark the shape by which the hypothesis could also be applied to it, not without some appearance, according to which all the synoptic Gospels are supposed to have arisen from the processing of a series of fragments that were largely already written and disseminated before them. The way in which Schleiermacher has attempted to carry out this hypothesis with respect to Luke does indeed find support, in part, in the real heterogeneity and cross-cutting of the components of this Gospel. However, upon closer examination, it is unmistakable that it is rooted even deeper, namely indeed already in the nature of the sources of Luke. Even in Mark, from whom Luke has borrowed some of those transitions, there are, especially in the first part of his work *), such general content remarks between the individual anecdotes or anecdote groups that Schleiermacher takes everywhere as closing or opening words of those evangelical 'logia' that, according to him, should make up the original components of the larger collections, to which he also counts our Mark.

*) e.g. Cap. 1, 28. 35. 45. Cap. 3, 6. Cap. 4, 33 f., etc."

But especially in Mark, if one looks more closely, one will unmistakably perceive how those intermediate remarks (they almost all concern the manner in which the fame of Jesus spread, how the crowd began to gather around him, the sick pressing towards him, etc.), far from closing off the individual components, rather link them together with the intent of not presenting them as a randomly strung together group of anecdotes, but rather as a cohesive narrative. Through these and through many similar remarks interwoven into the telling of individual anecdotes, Mark has succeeded in creating a vivid impression of the sensation that Jesus caused in Galilee, and from Galilee to Jerusalem, of the gradual influx of the crowd to him, of the more intimate attachment of the actual disciples, and in contrast to all this, of the emergence of the hostility of the Pharisees and scribes against him. An impression that the individual anecdotes, dryly strung together, would have been altogether inadequate to evoke. The other two

Synoptics, who either mechanically borrow these remarks from Mark along with the specific facts or just as mechanically connect the truly heterogeneous pieces of their composition through similar remarks, have not been able to achieve this to the same degree. However, the significance of these scattered remarks becomes most striking when one casts an attentive eye on the consequences of their absence in the fourth Gospel. We do not doubt that Schleiermacher's followers will there interpret this absence as evidence of the unity and homogeneity of the narrative of this Gospel. But in fact, it is only proof that the editor of this Gospel possessed a less comprehensive view of the whole of the evangelical history than Mark, and adhered more one-sidedly to individual details. Anyone who reads the fourth Gospel alone, without regard to the rest, would, not as if the Evangelist intended it, but mainly as a result of that deficiency, get a completely false conception of Jesus' relationship to the people. He would, misled by the content of the individual narratives, come to the opinion that the attitude of the people towards him was hostile throughout and from the outset; that Jesus only momentarily astonished the crowd with miracles but otherwise defied the popular resentment with a band of disciples for a while, until he finally succumbed to it, which he, of course, constantly provoked anew with incessant invectives.

71

The second consideration, which naturally attaches itself to our view of the genesis of Mark's Gospel, concerns the manner in which the opportunity and possibility were given for the further compilations of the other Synoptics. Surely, one could not have thought of such compilations if Mark's Gospel had not been seen to originate from an incomplete, fragmentary series of narratives. But just as much, the strength of resistance shines through in the liberties that those Evangelists take with him, which the series of narratives of Mark, as an already compact mass, was able to oppose to a complete dispersal and confusion of its components. That, despite all deviations, even contradictions in detail, a thread of the story runs through all three Gospels, is recognized. For the explanation of this agreement, the assumption of a type of tradition has also been resorted to here. But this assumption itself contained the tacit concession of a most striking coincidence in this arrangement; otherwise, it would obviously be closer to refer directly to its factual, chronological truth. This coincidence is far more naturally and unforcedly explained if, instead of that type, the influence of one author is placed, whose work, laid and used as the basis by the others, gave them a certain norm for the arrangement and grouping of their material. But then this explanation is brought to evidence by the not emphatic enough circumstance that the trace of such a common norm is found everywhere only in those parts that the first and third Evangelist have in common with Mark, not in those that they have in common with each other but not with him *).

*) The author recalls having found this sentence expressed somewhere by those who assumed a use of Mark by Luke but not by the author of the first Gospel: "In the parts that Luke has in common with Matthew and Mark, he follows the expression of individual details from Mark, not from Matthew."

To make this highly important and hitherto almost universally (except perhaps for those who make the remark, too clearly revealing itself as an emergency solution, that "Mark has adhered more faithfully to the tradition than the others") overlooked fact appear completely in its proper light, allow us to combine it with another that at first seems to concern merely the individual writing style of the three Evangelists, but we have deliberately saved for this place because it mutually clarifies and complements the one just mentioned. Also, in those parts that all three Synoptics have in common, the agreement of the other two is always mediated by Mark: that is, the other two agree in these parts, both in the overall arrangement and in the wording of the details, only to the extent that they also agree with Mark; as often as they differ from Mark, they (with some insignificant omissions, where the coincidence may be regarded as accidental) always also differ from each other. In the other sections that they have before Mark, there is indeed enough agreement among them, but only such that lies in the facts and indeed also in the expression of value, nowhere, or as good as nowhere (some apparent exceptions *) will be noted and explained later in their place), such as lies in the arrangement, and least of all, such as lies in the determination of the relationship of these components to those borrowed from Mark.

*) This specifically includes the position of the anecdote of the centurion at Capernaum in relation to the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 8 and Luke 7. Besides, the latter two show a striking agreement in the way they weave into the conversation told by Mark 3:20 ff. some sentences foreign to the latter (Matt. 12:27-30, Luke 1:19-23). Here it is to be assumed that the entire conversation, including these additions, was also found in the Hebrew Matthew, which is also confirmed in the motivation peculiar to our Matthew (12:22, compare 9:32 ff.) and Luke (11:14) as opposed to Mark.

From this, it is undoubtedly to be concluded that those two must have used another common source besides Mark. But this source will have been one in which, as in the narrative of Mark, a specific sequence of events did not assert itself as a significant factor, one in a word, as we have just described the *λογια* of Matthew 8. The assumption of a type of tradition, however, which could have determined the sequence of narratives independently of Mark, is also most strikingly refuted by this consideration.

Although we, insofar as proving all of this through specific examples still falls within the scope of the task we have set for ourselves, intend to follow up on these examples only later, where they will naturally present themselves in the actual course of the historical portrayal, let there nevertheless be immediately introduced here, in place of many others, one example that can serve simultaneously and at once as evidence for the various observations made previously. The passage in the ninth chapter of Mark, from the thirty-third verse to the end, is among those in which the element of randomness, dating from the emergence of this gospel, stands out even more strikingly than elsewhere. A dispute among the disciples over the precedence of one or another of them, which Jesus has observed unnoticed, prompts him to a brief response on this subject. This is followed by a number of other utterances of the Lord, which are only very weakly related to each other and to the former, partly in such a way that one might not inappropriately call it a lexical connection, that is, one that is determined only externally by the similarity of a word or a phrase, which, occurring in one sentence, reminded the evangelist of another in which it also appears *).

*) A similar composition based on such a lexical connection has recently been demonstrated by Lehrs (in his writing: *Quaestiones epicae* Region. 1837) at a series of points in Hesiod's 'Works and Days'.

To this passage, a parallel passage is found in each of the other two gospels **), and the relationship of these three parallels is highly characteristic and, with any interpretation other than our own, inexplicable.

**) Matt. 18, 1 ff. Luke 9, 46 ff.

To demonstrate this, we will examine the passage in detail. The beginning, according to Mark, contains a detail that the other two have omitted, namely that Jesus, entering the house in Capernaum, asks the disciples what they have been talking about amongst themselves on the way, whereupon they remain silent, embarrassed by the above-mentioned content of the conversation. Clearly, this detail is one of those that would be trivial to assume that Mark had added specifically upon Peter's inquiry as a correction of his predecessors or tradition, while on the other hand, it commends itself through its unpretentiousness and truly dramatic liveliness, without in the least giving room to suspicion of artificiality or intentionality. Had Mark invented it intentionally, he must have done so in response to Luke's account, who also lets Jesus notice the dispute of the disciples, but without that more detailed report *), while the first evangelist

introduces the disciples by directly asking them who among them would be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

*) A philological friend, to whom the author communicated his view on this passage, drew his attention to how the words of Luke: ἰδὼν τον διαλογισμόν της καρδιας αυτών (seeing the reasoning of their hearts) unmistakably point to Mark's account. Or does one think that here, too, the tradition should have provided a template according to which both Mark composed his accounts, and Luke arranged his words?

How much more likely, however, is it the other way around, that these two omitted what seemed to them to be inessential in the depiction of their predecessor, while Luke still left the trace of the original turn, which the other completely eradicated. However, here we might still give, as unlikely as it is, the possibility of an opposite relationship; in what follows, even this possibility is ruled out for the unbiased observer. The response Jesus gives is, "If anyone wants to be first, he must be last, and the servant of all." Then follows, without a clear connection, the story of how Jesus took a child, placed it among them, and, wrapping his arm around it, said, "Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me, and whoever receives me receives not me but the one who sent me." Now, how do the other two behave here? We answer: in a way that hardly allows any other explanation than that of a (failed) effort to introduce a connection where there is none in Mark's account. Both, in fact, proceed from the assumption that what Jesus does with the child must have a reference to the disciples' dispute over rank. This connection is expressed by the first evangelist, artlessly enough, by transforming the more general words of Mark's response into the following more specific ones: "Whoever humbles himself like this child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." We will speak separately at another place about the implausibility that Jesus actually spoke these words. Now disturbed by the consciousness of having attributed invented words to Jesus, the evangelist inserts a few other words really spoken by him, but in another context *), which he takes out of that context **) and transfers here: "Truly I tell you, unless you change and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven."

*) Mark 10:15; Luke 18:17.

**) Matthew 19:14.

But he follows those words he invented with words about receiving children, which he now — whether rightly, can be doubted — thinks he has motivated better than Mark. — Of these preparations by (Pseudo-) Matthew to artfully establish a connection between

the disconnected, Luke knows nothing; but he takes another, shorter, but even more strange route to achieve the same purpose. He reverses the order of the sentences, has the depiction of the child along with the words spoken about its reception precede, and then follows with a "For" the pronouncement: "Whoever is least among you all is the greatest." Indeed, a peculiar "For," which only someone as superficial as Luke, who rushes over the connection here and elsewhere, could place! — If the referent may trust his critical feeling, then he must assert that even if we did not have Mark's account, that double, evidently forced and contrived connection in Matthew and Luke would lead to the hypothesis of a foundational account underlying both, which, being disconnected in itself but prompting the search for a connection, neither of the two revisers would seek to improve through his paraphrase. We now have such a portrayal in Mark. Here, the two sentences, the first that gives the response to the dispute over rank, and the second that contains the action regarding the child, indeed stand next to each other without inner connection (only connected, in the evangelist's manner, by an "And"), and no one who looks a bit further and becomes aware of how the evangelist continues to link a series of completely heterogeneous pronouncements only superficially, according to random characteristics by which they presented themselves to memory, will doubt that they do not belong together, that rather Jesus did and spoke what the one and the other says, without any mutual relation, probably at completely different times. But as these two sentences already deceived the immediate successors of Mark with the appearance of a connection, they still deceive the interpreters today, and one prefers, against all rules of sound criticism, to derive the natural wording of Mark, instead of vice versa, from the contrived turns of Matthew and Luke. — But the striking nature of the way Matthew and Luke have used Mark at this point intensifies further. The expression "in my name" (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου), which appeared in the second of those sentences, reminds our evangelist of a statement Jesus had made on the occasion of a case brought to him by his disciple John, where a stranger had cast out demons using Jesus's name. Matthew omits this anecdote, but Luke retains it, somewhat abbreviated. Here now, considering this feature alone (the abbreviation aside, which can be explained better than the opposite extension in Mark), Mark might as well have followed Luke as Luke followed Mark. But what do those say, who once and for all want to make Mark the follower of the others, when we immediately find a similar lexical connection common to Mark and Matthew, but missing in Luke*)?

*) Both lexical connections have also been noticed by Strauss. (L. J. first edition, 1, p. 615).

For, on this occasion, it is not the external but the internal connection of thought that, referring to the remark about the admission of the children, has led to a related remark *) in which the word 'cause to stumble' (σκανδαλίζειν) occurs, so one of these two

Evangelists is reminded on this occasion of one, the other of two other remarks in which the same word also occurs to us.

*) Mark V. 42. Matthew V. 6.

The one who remembers the one is Mark, the one who remembers the two is the author of the Gospel of Matthew. Among these two pronouncements, the one common to both evangelists **) is such that, no matter how one considers it, it simply does not fit into the context in which it is presented, while the one peculiar to Matthew ***) fits very well with the preceding one and could very well have been made at the same time, just as Luke, at another place †), lets both (but not also the third one) be made at the same time.

**) Mark 9:43-48. Matthew 5:8-9.

***) Matthew 5:7.

†) Luke 17:1 ff.

Now I ask: what kind of procedure is assumed in Mark if one first searches for purely accidental lexical connections from Luke and Matthew, then spurns a truly appropriate one that was offered in the latter, but instead adopts the inappropriate one, not merely adopting it, but making it even more inappropriate by rendering it in a glaring form in the already paradoxical pronouncement? Such rendering in a glaring form would certainly have to be how we describe the expression given by Mark for the sentence about cutting off the hand and foot and plucking out the eye if we were to recognize Matthew's expression as the original, which it is not. On the other hand, everything is most naturally explained if we assume the use of Mark in reverse, both in that first connection by Luke and in this last one by Matthew. To accept both connections at once was too much for these evangelists, who indeed had the prejudice to find the real connection of a conversation here, and thus one chose one, and the other chose the other. Some of the pronouncements that Mark pushed together here, they found, either separated or incorporated into another context, in their unique source (that of Matthew's). So notably the statement about the "stumbling" of the "little ones," which the first evangelist inserts here in its complete form, but Luke prefers to reserve for another context. The quite heterogeneous paradoxical saying, which is only lexically connected with it, was also found in that source, and the fact that our first Gospel, which had already given it from that source in the context to which it was undoubtedly already incorporated there *), nevertheless brings it again in the present place, is a circumstance which appears to be expressly intended to give the final confirmation to the exposition we have undertaken of the true relationship of the three evangelists to one another.

*) Matth. 5, 29 f.

For such a striking repetition, especially of this sentence, which because of its harsh expression the third evangelist preferred to omit entirely, undoubtedly requires an explanation; and what explanation could be closer at hand than this, that he had found it expressed in two different sources, in different contexts **)?

**) In his treatise on the credibility of the evangelical history, Tholuck (p. 248ff.) pointedly and convincingly criticizes the incorrectness of the still so popular Griesbachian hypothesis. As evidence for the inconceivability of a paraphrase of the other Synoptics by Mark, he cites (p. 252) the parallel passage Mark 1:21-28, Luke 4:31-37, commonly seen as particularly convincing for this view, and adds: "What writer would think of, when copying another, where the latter has κατήλθεν, to write instead εισπορεύονται; where this one has ριψαν, to write instead σπαράξαν; where there is ἐγένετο θαμβος, to put ἐθαμβήθησαν in its place, etc.? A plagiarist who does not want his theft to be noticed? An English dandy who alters the cut of his coat just because someone else has the same? Yes, but certainly not an honest, sensible man." — It may now seem that the same remarks should also apply to the reverse assumption of Mark being used by Luke, and it is likely that this was the intention of the writer. Therefore, we do not consider it inappropriate to make an explicit attempt at that point to demonstrate the conceivable, even probable, opposite relationship from the one against which Tholuck rightly argues. First, the general observation that once a concise paraphrase of a text is desired for the purpose of merging it into a more comprehensive one, as a result of the habit of freer use, some indifferent changes will occur naturally, even without quirks or the intention of secretive plagiarism; evidence for this could be found with little effort in many modern writings, particularly historical ones, where such uses often cannot be avoided. However, as far as the present passage is concerned, we don't even need this concession; for all the individual deviations of Luke from Mark, as minor as they may be, can still be given sufficient reasons.

1) V. 31 (Luke) κατήλθεν for εισπορεύονται is, not to be overlooked, at the same time the transformation of the plural into the singular, and the present into the aorist. The former is because Luke has spoken previously of Jesus alone, whereas Mark also mentions the newly recruited pairs of disciples; the latter is to establish uniformity of construction with what follows.

2) The substitution of εἰσπορευεσθαι with χατερχεσθαι is explained by the fact that Luke has just used the word εἰσπορευετο (V. 30), and the omission of εὐθεως is because Mark spoke of an entry into Capernaum after a walk by the sea, while Luke speaks of the relocation from Nazareth to Capernaum. In the same way, he uses ἡν διδάσκων for ἐδίδασκε, to denote the habit of teaching, which Mark had already incompletely indicated with the plural σαββασιν.

3) εἰσελθων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν is omitted because of the preceding κατήλθεν.

4) V. 32. ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἢ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ for ἡν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, as the easier and more pleasing expression, since after the immediately preceding ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Mark's words seemed somewhat awkward. However, this required the omission of καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς, which in Mark forms a most expressive and lively addition, far from artificial, but thoroughly characteristic, an addition that the author of the first Gospel has retained when transferring Mark's words from this omitted narrative to the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 8:28f.).

5) V. 33 Luke corrects, by virtue of his better knowledge of Greek, a Hebraism in Mark (ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ).

6) The transformation of σπαράξαν into ῥῖψαν in V. 35 and the addition of μηδὲν βλαψαν enlarges the miracle but at the same time generalizes the concept of it in a way that is easily explained in Luke, for whom the perception of such miraculous healings had already become distant, and the characteristic traits of those scenes had become incomprehensible. The same explanation seems to account for the transfer of φωνὴ μεγάλη from the departing spirit to the demon's initial address (V. 33).

7) V. 36 ἐγένετο θαμβος ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ συνελαλοῦν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, a smoother and more fluent expression for ἐθαμβήθησαν πάντες, ὥστε οὐζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

8) τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος; for τί ἐστὶ τούτο; τίς διδασκίη ἢ καινὴ αὕτη? because the discussion is not about a teaching in the proper sense; however, Luke would hardly have used λόγος if he hadn't had his predecessor's διδασκίη in mind, which he had already exchanged for λόγος in V. 32, in a more suitable manner.

9) ἐξέρχονται for ὑπακούουσιν, because there is no example given of a different kind of obedience from the spirits.

10) V. 37 ηχος for ακοη, the more common Greek expression.

11) The same verse. Once again, the omission of ευθως, because, as Luke rightly noted, a reputation does not spread suddenly.

12) εις παντα τόπον της περιχωρου instead of εις ολην την περιῳχων της Γαλιλαίας, because the remark should neither be confined to Galilee nor (the other possible meaning of this genitive) should Galilee be excluded from it. — What also speaks for the borrowing we have asserted in these words is the connection by και, always (even once more often) repeated by Luke, as by Mark. Although this is found now and then in parts of the third Gospel, which are not borrowed from Mark, but from the Acts of the Apostles, especially from the last part of them, where Luke writes from autopsies, we see how completely foreign this is to his natural style of writing; so the assumption arises that he unintentionally adopted this habit (as such appropriation seems very consistent with his fleeting, nimble nature) from Mark.

80

With this last observation, we have not only obtained confirmation of our view for this individual case, but have unexpectedly opened up a new category of evidence that we can use for the way we assert our Gospels were composed. Especially in the first Gospel, a whole series of what might be called "doublets" of individual sayings of the Lord can be demonstrated, namely those where one example belongs to the series of narratives that this Gospel shares with Mark, while the other is drawn from that other main source from which the Gospel takes its name. The so-called Sermon on the Mount, in particular, contains a considerable number of aphorisms that also occur in Mark, either within the solid context of a conversation or an event, or as in the previously mentioned example, merely externally attached to others. But also in the rest of the collections of sayings put together into longer speeches by Matthew, e.g., in the sending speech to the Apostles and the condemnation speech against the Pharisees, and even presented as individual anecdotes, such occurrences are not uncommon *).

*) One of the most striking examples of this kind: the demand by the Pharisees for a sign from heaven, recounted twice in the first Gospel (12, 38 ff. 16, 1 ff., the second time following Mark 8, 11 f.). — Other evidence for our assertion can be found below in the fifth book, where we will highlight and discuss each case of this kind.

In most of these cases, the evangelist, if he has already given the maxim from Matthew earlier (as is usually the case), repeats it where he comes across the place in Mark that also contains it, nonetheless once again; only rarely does he remember the ones previously added and hold them back the second time. This follows from the artless composition of the Gospel; the translation of Matthew's aphorisms is probably almost everywhere a literal one, and their order is as little disturbed as possible, but the paraphrase of Mark, however much it may abbreviate in the narrative parts, still wants to lose as little as possible of the Lord's sayings reported by Mark and therefore shies away from no repetitions, — perhaps with the belief that the Lord may well have made the same statement twice, or perhaps also with the respectable conviction that even in the specific twists and circumstances under which the saying is each time handed down, there might lie a significance. Such repetitions are rarer in Luke, although they are not entirely absent *).

*) E.g., the saying about the light on the lampstand in Luke 8, 16 after Mark 4, 21 and Luke 11. 32 after Matthew 5, 15.

Luke, in particular, tends to overlook Mark's report in such cases and to transmit the aphorism in the form he received it from Matthew, yet in his own free way, placing it into a self-chosen context or embellishing it anecdotally.

83

This leads us to briefly consider the mutual relationship of the other two Synoptics to each other, apart from their common relationship to Mark. We have already noted that we recognize this relationship as independent, namely independent in the use of common sources by each of the two, but not in the sense that each of the two, consistently or for the most part, would have used different sources than the other. Not only is Mark a common source to both, but also, according to our firmest conviction, Matthew's collection of sayings. Whether the latter is to be assumed in its original language, or whether a commonly used Greek translation should be assumed, we dare not decide. It is not difficult to notice that the deviations of the two evangelists from each other, as far as the wording is concerned, are overall greater in the parts where both have drawn from Matthew, than where they have drawn from Mark. The latter are undoubtedly those from which, if not solely, then certainly primarily, the unmistakable and justified conclusion has already been drawn so often that the agreement of the Synoptics with each other can be explained in no other way than by assuming a use, either of one by the others or of a common Greek source. However, even concerning the other parts, the relationship is not the same everywhere, but here and there the agreement is so striking that we must leave it to experts in the Hebrew and Aramaic

languages to make the decisive judgment whether such agreement could possibly also have been brought about by a mutually independent translation. But we must emphatically oppose that recently popularized hypothesis that Luke drew part of his narrative, especially such sections whose content is also found in Matthew, from the accounts of eyewitnesses, enabling him to tell more faithfully and completely than the latter. This view is known to have originated mainly with Schleiermacher, who sought to substantiate it in detail in his work on Luke. There is no doubt that the famous theologian himself would have recanted this view if he had been able to pursue further the excellent overview he later provided on Papias's testimony and the nature of Matthew's Gospel. This, as it had already led him to recognize that we possess in our Matthew, if not the whole, at least a large part of the genuine Matthew's collection of sayings, would have inevitably led him, upon closer examination, to admit what he had set aside in his first treatise arising from this overview *) that Luke must also have used this collection, either directly or indirectly.

*) Works, Vol. 2, p. 383.

It is all too striking how, with a few exceptions, Luke almost always has every statement that the first Gospel gives from its unique source, often in words and expressions, but always in meaning, in the same way; how he, at least in one very striking place, the only one where a specific sequence of the narrative borrowed from the renowned Matthew is visible in the first Gospel, goes hand in hand with him in this sequence of the narrative *); how, however, in the frequent enough cases where he omits individual components from a context in Matthew, he has either already anticipated them, or brings them in later, often when one least expects it **).

*) We mean the previously mentioned sequence of the Sermon on the Mount and the anecdote of the centurion at Capernaum.

**) The most striking example of this kind is given by the Sermon on the Mount. A very surprising one is in Matt. 11, 2 f., compared with Luke 7, 29. 16, 16.

The latter would, of course, prove little if we had reason to hold the view (underlying many a hypothesis about our Gospels) that the wealth of sayings, speeches, and parables of the divine Master could in any sense be considered exhausted by our Gospels. Then one would find the convergence of the Evangelists in the selection of the same sayings only natural. But that assumption itself must appear to anyone who becomes aware of it as so strikingly incorrect, the wealth of our evangelical treasures compared to the wealth of what was undoubtedly spoken by Jesus as so entirely disproportionate, that it hardly needs serious refutation. No observer with any attention

can fail to see that the coincidence of the first and third Gospels in the choice of what is narrated by both can only be explained as arising from a commonality of sources for both. Where indeed an apophthegm of the first Gospel remains without parallel in Luke, it is often found, perhaps in most of the cases where there is no intentional omission, that it is also suspicious for internal reasons and probably drawn not from the genuine Matthew but from less pure sources ***).

***) Among the examples of an omission of genuine sayings of Matthew in Luke, one of the most striking is probably the already mentioned Matt. 5, 29 f. But here, Luke, as already noted above, also omitted the identical speech in Mark 9, 13 ff. Parall. Matt. 18, 8 f., thus showing the intentionality of such omission. The same intentionality may have prevailed in other omissions where Luke thought parables of Matthew were superfluous because of their apparent similarity to others, which corresponds well to his superficial character and the way he otherwise deals with the sayings of the Lord. But I consider the following sayings missing in Luke to be inauthentic: Matt. 12, 40. 16, 17–19. 17, 21–27. 18, 15–20. 25, 31–46., about which, along with many other things only hinted at here, I refer to the explanation to follow below.

— What had led to this view was mainly the fact that a considerable number of sentences, which appear unmotivated, inappropriately connected, or carelessly combined in Matthew, are transferred by Luke into a seemingly more suitable context. But lately, particularly Strauss and de Wette have rightly pointed out how in almost all these cases it is only the superficial appearance of a better explanation or a more correct connection that gives Luke the advantage over Matthew. How completely illusory it is to want to notice traces of an eyewitness in those combinations of Luke everywhere, as Schleiermacher, in particular, is so fond of doing *), one will best realize when one tries to invent reasons for unmotivated sayings, be it in Luke himself (for there are still plenty of them there) or in other Evangelists.

*) In some cases, however, the opposite has been found even according to that earlier view of Schleiermacher's. For example, Schl. has claimed to have discovered that Matthew must have had the Sermon on the Mount from such a reporter who "had a more favorable place to hear" than the reporter of Luke.

It is not at all difficult to find such reasons, which do not look any worse than most of those given by Luke himself, which are just as randomly invented and plucked from the air as those. Luke is a pragmatic historian who takes the same liberties with his material without intending to distort, as without exception the ancient historians did with theirs. If between him and these there is a reverse relationship in that the latter usually invented

speeches for the events, while he rather likes to invent events for the speeches, the reason for this lies in the different nature of the sources that were given to one and the others. Indeed, Matthew's collection of sayings, after the relation of Mark had preceded (previously, of course, this thought was more distant, and Mark, as we see, gave the pattern for the entire evangelical historiography), could invite such a pragmatic treatment, and the rest of the material that Luke had probably received through oral communications also fit into it. In the Acts of the Apostles, however, we see how our Evangelist, where there is an opportunity, does not disdain to invent speeches. It should not be difficult to demonstrate in the speeches he puts into the mouths of Peter, Paul, Stephen, Gamaliel, and others, exactly the same speech pattern peculiar to the historian, as in the speeches of Livius *).

*) Tholuck also ('Credibility of the Evangelical History', p. 335) compares Luke's procedure with that of Livius, but he overlooks how this comparison, considering Livius's free, rhetorical-poetical manner in using his sources, speaks more against than for the literal credibility of the Evangelist, which is nevertheless claimed for Luke (not for Livius, nor for any proto-writer).

An example of real historical portrayal from eyewitness testimony, however, is given to us by Luke himself in the latter half of the Acts of the Apostles — disregarding the scattered speeches here, which, by the way, may contain some traces of really individual truth. The comparison of this writing with the character of our Gospels should have long since convinced us how far the latter, without exception, are removed from the nature of those relations, which (this applies also to the relation of Peter) are made directly by eyewitnesses for the purpose of written recording.

88

The so-called travel report has created the most illusion of the kind that we have criticized here among the critics who have taken up Luke's cause, which, according to Schleiermacher, is to contain the entire main bulk of this Gospel from Chapter 9, Verse 51 onwards to the end of the nineteenth chapter, or at least to Chapter 18, Verse 15, where the parallel with Mark begins again. The many contradictions that this alleged report contains, in that the most varied ideas of places and landscapes that Jesus is said to have touched, and directions in which he is said to have wandered, appear thrown together without any discoverable order — (difficulties that are further increased when one wants to reconcile the notes of the fourth Gospel with this report of the third) — soon led to the assumption of not one such travel report but two or more, that are to have been fused together in our Evangelist in a way that one could not give a clear idea of. Nevertheless, it was insisted upon, not only to consider the parallel passages that

these sections show with Matthew as independent of him but also to consider Matthew's accounts as exceeding in completeness and accuracy. Even the characteristic peculiarity of Luke, the essential uniformity of his writing style in all general, mental qualities, even if not always in words and linguistic turns, which he often still takes from his sources — even this could not prevent that for a time he was trusted to have taken his travel report, much like some other parts of his writings, verbatim and unchanged from elsewhere. And yet, just here our Evangelist's procedure reveals itself so clearly that hardly any doubt can remain for the unbiased observer. Up to the beginning of the supposed travel description, he had followed Mark, although not without multiple insertions and also without a very striking omission probably due to mere negligence (at least no even somewhat sufficient reason can be found for it) *), on the whole.

*) Mark 6:45 - 8:26 according to Luke 9:17. The hypothesis put forward by Hug, that this piece has fallen out of Luke's copies as a result of a similarity of endings (Homoioteleuton), is less likely than that it was omitted by Luke himself from similar negligence.

Even the occasion for the account of the journey to Jerusalem, which is unmistakably described by the the entire earth right from the start as the last one **), is still provided to him by Mark with his mention of a journey through Perea to the borders of Judea ***).

**) Luke 9:51. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ.

***) Mark 10:1.

But here he seems to have found a reason to mistrust Mark or to find him incomplete. His peculiar sources spoke of multiple encounters of Jesus with the Samaritans, but Mark made no mention of any passage through Samaria. This alone, since he understood Mark, whether rightly or wrongly, to have intended to mark the beginning of the last journey to Jerusalem with those words, may have determined him to insert at this point the bulk of what he had taken partly from Matthew's collection of sayings and partly from other sources, to enrich Mark's evangelical narrative. He was so unconcerned with the consistency of the various chronological and itinerant notes he had either compiled or improvised here that he often forgets in the next chapter what he had said in the previous one. Right at the beginning of the travel description, we find Jesus already in Samaria; at the end of the tenth chapter (assuming that the note of the fourth Gospel about the residence of Martha and Mary is correct) even already in Bethany, near Jerusalem, and yet, in the thirteenth, before we know it, back in Galilee or in Perea, and in the seventeenth, the journey seems to begin all over again. How can

there be the remotest talk of historical accuracy in the use of his sources with an author who allows himself such liberties? Finally, in the eighteenth chapter, Luke resumes Mark's narrative, omitting only a single conversation, the brief result of which he has given elsewhere according to Matthew, and follows it in a similar manner to what he had done at the beginning, right to the end.

90

In what has been noted so far, there is no indication of a real alteration that the speeches of the Lord reported by Matthew might have undergone in Luke. It might well be conceivable, as something similar can even now be undertaken by anyone willing to make the effort, that Luke merely separated the sayings of Jesus that often appear in Matthew as seemingly coherent speeches and invented more or less appropriate occasions for each without thereby changing anything essential in the speeches themselves. But this is not the case; rather, we find, when we compare the translation that Luke gives of the -w/sors with that in the first Gospel, that it is similarly paraphrasing, like the paraphrase of Mark's narratives. We can also observe from the procedure of both in relation to Mark how the author of the first Gospel, despite his otherwise epitomizing style, nevertheless takes up the Lord's speeches more unchanged than Luke does. The former undoubtedly did the same with regard to the other source peculiar to him, and therein lies the invaluable worth of the first Gospel, which unquestionably contains the richest and most complete material for understanding the personal spirit of Jesus as it manifests itself in his speeches. The changes that Luke allows himself, although often minor and inconspicuous in detail, do nevertheless detract from the power and fullness of the divine force that springs from these speeches, a loss that is not entirely offset by the numerous and by no means insignificant enrichments that Luke adds to Matthew. Anyone who wants to feel the force and depth of the impression that the personal appearance of the God-man can still make on us, in its purity and immediacy, must adhere strictly to Mark and Matthew. But anyone who has really felt and internalized this impression here will be as certain that he sees the true Christ in the flesh before him as he will also be unable to deny that the image of Christ in Luke is somewhat weakened, and even, on its own, without the aid of those two, hardly quite understandable. In most cases, this weakening is only a result of the habit of paraphrasing and the striving for a smooth and fluent flow of speech. Now and again, however, dogmatic judgments or favorite views come to light, which seem not to have been without influence on both the selection and, occasionally, the literal expression of the transmitted speeches. The striving for a consistently pragmatic connection has also cast some statements in a false or at least one-sided light and has especially led the evangelist in parables and other longer speeches to make alterations that really detract from the true meaning.

It would, however, be inadmissible to draw a direct conclusion from this character and content relationship of the two Gospels to the chronological relationship of their composition. As far as the Gospel of Luke is concerned, we consider the time of its creation to be generally historically established. That it was written by a pupil and companion of the Apostle Paul is irrefutably evident from the Acts of the Apostles; for the idea that the second half of this writing, where the author speaks in the first person as an eyewitness, is an inserted booklet from another hand, is a desperate move for which there is absolutely no apparent justification. Therefore, the naming of the author, as preserved first by church tradition and then explicitly determined by the canon, is undoubtedly as correct as the naming of Mark. Where there is absolutely no substantial ground for doubt, it is reasonable to assume that this naming was not groundless, although one may still recognize, as we ourselves do, that this Gospel was likely disseminated for a time without the express mention of its author; as Marcion probably received it without this name and used it for his purposes. As for the more specific determination of the time in which Luke wrote, we can only deduce with certainty from the writings themselves that this time cannot fall before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; for the reference to this event is too striking in some places for there to be any doubt about it. Another indication is the previously mentioned report of Irenaeus, which places the composition of the Gospel after the death of Peter and Paul. We have all the less reason to distrust this report here since the Church Fathers had no interest in dating the Gospels later than they actually were, but rather a strong interest in the opposite. For this reason, and also because of the admittedly very strong internal reasons, we will always have to recognize the later date as the more probable among the various possibilities in any case of doubt on questions of this kind; and the opposite hypotheses, which one might want to build on accidental circumstances that might just as well admit a completely different explanation, e.g., on the ending of the Acts of the Apostles with the beginning of Paul's Roman captivity, are hardly likely to be considered, - all the less so since they would also call into question all the previous results of our investigation. As for the time of the composition of the first Gospel, we lack similar notes, as we may consider it settled that it is not the original work of Matthew, like those that come to our aid regarding Luke.

*) Tholuck, op. cit., p. 137 ff. The "very high probability" which the author wants to find there (p.141) for the early composition of the Gospel, while he is reasonable enough to recognize the possibility of a later one, would indeed be present if the Gospel bore specific traces of an explicitly investigative inquiry of eyewitnesses. But as we have seen, the exact opposite is the case.

Probable traces of its use are not found until Justin Martyr around the middle of the second century, without, however, being able to conclude from this that its emergence was so late. For internal reasons, however, I would place the composition of this Gospel later rather than earlier than the third, partly because of the shaping of the infancy story, which I consider to be later than the one reported by Luke, as I will show in the next book, and partly because of some utterances attributed to the Lord that seem to me to relate to a shaping of the ecclesiastical constitution and church relations that is somewhat further removed from the apostolic age. Traits such as those recently criticized by many disputers of the apostolic origin of this Gospel, concerning the appearance of the departed saints at Jesus' death, the watch at the tomb, etc., have something strikingly akin to the apocryphal, which may have partly given rise to the doubts directed specifically against this Gospel, which in a certain sense affect all the Gospels, have been directed so far. Nor can it be denied that the composition of Luke's Gospel, although it thereby moves further away from the original truth of the tradition and, instead of enhancing, rather reduces the value of the work for us, has something more lively in itself, which better befits the character of an immediate disciple of an apostle, than the purely compilatory character of the first Gospel. This latter rather seems to indicate a later formation of the gospel historiography, to which the Gospel of the Hebrews, along with compositions related to it, may also belong. Their frequent confusion with each other and with Matthew's Gospel could hardly have occurred if it had not been in the manner of these writings to compile the existing written sources, without actual revision, with more or less additions from later tradition, into a comprehensive document.

94

So, we have in the three synoptic Gospels a circle of accounts concerning the life and personal teachings of Jesus, which in its formation unmistakably carries the imprint, not of the poetic or mythical, but of the historical, even though it certainly cannot be recognized as equivalent to legal documents from which legally valid evidence of facts is drawn, either in these main components themselves or in secondary parts free from all sorts of unhistorical mixtures. To demand more than this is to misunderstand the character of the historical when ascribing the historical character to the Passion of Jesus. By far the greater part of all that we believe to know historically, we find, when we trace back to the ultimate sources of this knowledge, resting on testimonies that can claim neither a greater immediacy of their relationship to the facts they attest, nor freedom from alien admixtures, which must first be separated out by historical criticism, in any more complete sense than our Gospel testimonies. Whether a genuine historical knowledge can be determined from testimonies of this kind in an individual case,

meaning one that affords us the vivid, organically interconnected view of a historical event or character, a personality of content and world-historical significance; that can only be decided everywhere by the art of history in the use of those sources. Those who, in the case at hand, under the pretext of immediate, documentary credibility of the sources, want to dispense with this art, through which historical truth is determined everywhere, confuse the concept of historical truth or factuality with that of legal fact, a concept filled with spirit with a soulless one*).

*) Compare the apt but unfortunately somewhat spiteful remarks by Arnold Nuge in the "Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung" (Leaves for Literary Entertainment), 1837, pp. 160-163.

But the fact that the actual truth of the Gospel story cannot be gleaned from the documents of this story in the manner of a species facti in a criminal investigation, but only through a spirited treatment, has in essence already been acknowledged by the old, unfortunately also grievously misunderstood and debased to the very opposite of a "recognition of the spirit" into the most spiritless literalism, concept of inspiration. This concept, in its origin, is clearly based on the insight into the inadequacy of these documents, as long as they are only considered as documents in the legal sense, to sufficiently demonstrate the fact of the evangelical revelation. Their evidential power is justified by the assumption that the divine spirit, despite their externally deficient form, has nonetheless, partly unbeknownst to the writers themselves, invested the full, complete truth of the historical Christ figure within them—that truth which is, of course, something other than just the sum of the individual traits that are incidentally reported to us about this figure. Indeed, this is the true miracle of the spirit, that its totality and fullness could reveal themselves so completely in a relatively so small and not even purely preserved scope of expressions and actions, that we still now, as well as the disciples who saw Him face to face, can recognize the Lord according to His true essence and Self. This, indeed, is our earnest, sincere belief, which we have undertaken to prove through the subject itself in the subsequent exposition. We will not be deterred in this endeavor by the contradiction of those who claim that in this way the objective factuality of the Gospel is surrendered to subjective arbitrariness, which would presume to place its combinations and hypotheses in place of the objectively given. What some like to call objectivity here is merely the rigid externality of the letter; true objectivity is not without the subjective spirit of the observer, in which the letter and the immediacy of the fact are cast into a spiritual form, while on the other hand this spirit, in the work of historical and philosophical research, divests itself of its accidental subjectivity and shapes itself to the truth of the object. — Certainly, we as individuals cannot accomplish this work, but we work as vigorous builders, according to our abilities, on the work that, in the face of the divine revelation of earlier centuries, strives

to give birth to it again in genuine, rejuvenated objectivity, a task that the spirit of our age, of our century, has undertaken to carry out.

96

Before we proceed, however, to our actual task, the presentation of the content itself from the sources whose nature and relation to their subject we have attempted to understand here in general, we still have an important task to complete in order to round off these observations, namely, the discussion corresponding to our previous considerations about the synoptic Gospels, concerning the Gospel that bears the name of the Apostle John. From various hints we gave earlier, it may already have been gathered that we do not fully agree with the still widely held view among the majority of theologians regarding the authenticity of this significant document, or that we do so only very conditionally—that we value it, in terms of its historical content, far below the three synoptic Gospels. To provide the complete evidence for our view: this task too cannot be separated from the actual elaboration of the content, just as the more complete proof of what was claimed about the Synoptics cannot be separated. But to indicate the general viewpoint from which the moments of this proof have emerged for us, this belongs, no less than everything hitherto dealt with, to this first, preliminary consideration to which the present book is dedicated.

With greater determination than with the synoptic Gospels, the old-faith view has appealed to the weight of external testimonies concerning the Gospel of John in response to the skeptical criticism of recent times, which speaks for its authenticity.

*) See above all Tholuck in the fifth edition of his commentary on the Gospel of John.

This appeal was not made without a certain concession to the difficulty posed by the internal nature of the Gospel to its acceptance. Only in this, not in the lack of external authentication, was the ground for doubt for those skeptics, and also, as we unreservedly confess, for us. The historical testimonies are such that no impartial person can deny that if it were a matter of a writing from whose content no basis for judgment concerning its author or the time of its composition could be taken, everyone would unanimously accept them, and not raise the slightest objection against them. If it is claimed that testimonies, to which this is conceded, must then also be strong enough to overcome a slight internal improbability that opposes them, at least to balance a greater one - so that the decision must remain undecided; then we have nothing to object to against that. On the contrary, we step forward right from the start with the confession that we ourselves are induced by the weight of these external testimonies to

make a concession, against which there still stands a by no means insignificant internal difficulty even after deducting all that is about and around it and not simultaneously conceded by us. What we actually concede, motivated by those external reasons, is that a part of the Gospel, to be defined more closely in terms of its scope, and indeed the most spiritually significant and characteristic part, the actual core of the Gospel, together with the evidently spiritually akin first letter of John, can in fact hardly be thought of as emanating from anyone other than the named Apostle. As already said, it is by no means easy for us to explain and make present how it could come about that an immediate disciple of the Lord, one who in the synoptic Gospels, in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Pauline letters appears in a character that does not hint at that spiritual metamorphosis, and one who was chosen as a Jewish apostle along with James and Peter against the Gentile apostles Paul and Barnabas at a relatively late time, when one would think that his formation must have been essentially complete, with the presence of Paul in Jerusalem at least fourteen years after the latter's conversion *) - that just such a person carries such a thoroughly Hellenistic imprint of thought and language, in short of the entire mental formation, and that he, the favorite and trusted disciple, as he is at least given in this Gospel named after him, knows how to conceive of his Lord and Master only in that foreign Hellenistic-speculative garb, and to present him to us speaking in this way **).

*) Galatians 2:9.

**) The consciousness of this peculiarity was later expressed in the legend that John was the one who translated the Gospel of Matthew into Greek.
Theophylact, comment, in Matthew, prooem.

But as difficult as this explanation is for us, and as harsh as the improbability seems to us that lies in these premises, which evidently brings with it the assumption of Johannine authorship for the letter and for those basic components of the Gospel, we would still rather admit the improbable, and would still rather submit to the burden of explaining what is almost unexplainable, than to persistently resist the weight of those testimonies and the authority of the entire Christian Church from the second century down to the nineteenth ***); especially since we find at least some points of reference in the Gospel and the letter on which we might base that explanation.

***) For reasons of internal probability, we would far sooner decide to recognize the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse than as the author of the letter and the speeches in the Gospel. But the external reasons, favorable as they are in general to the Apocalypse, decide for the reverse.

But we believe we have made a sufficient sacrifice to those aspects of historical externalities with only this concession, itself so difficult, and now all the more gladly and confidently seize an opportunity presented within these relationships themselves, which promises us the possibility of removing the still far greater, indeed, in fact, for every unbiased mind, unbearable contradictions that would arise from further concessions.

99

Such a moment is provided to us by those who have recently undertaken the defense of the apostolic origin of this Gospel. With a turn that aims to quash the exaggerated demands of an intrusive criticism through surprise, a testimony is asserted for the authenticity of the Gospel, the likes of which only very few of even the most authenticated written works of all time can claim for themselves: the testimony of immediate friends of John both for the composition of our Gospel by him and for the credibility of its content *).

*) Tholuck, Credibility of the Gospel History, p. 276.

By this, it is understood to mean the remark at the end of the Gospel, which has always been considered a part of it at all times when the Gospel was known and used. It is conceded that this remark could not have originated from the Apostle himself, a remark which assures the identity of the author of the writing with the Apostle, who had lain on the Lord's breast at the Last Supper, and about whom the rumor had spread that he would remain alive until the Lord's return, and along with this identity, simultaneously assures the truthfulness of his testimony in words that seem to refer to a plurality of those asserting it. — Therefore, it is not the Apostle himself who — this is evidently contained in that concession — has published his work, but it has been published by another's hand, presumably by the hand of one or some disciples and friends of the already departed. This hand found it necessary not to send the work to be published naked into the world, but to accompany it with some words of authentication, words that derived their force to secure the credibility of the work, not from a signed or prefixed name, but from the fact that the publishers, probably distinguished members, perhaps elders of the Ephesian community, were known to all to whom the work was to be communicated, as proven men. — Here now the question arises, whether by this concession far more is not lost for the cause than gained. Are the authenticating words — whether they come from one or several — of such weight that they offset what is dubious in the fact that the Gospel had to pass through foreign hands before its publication? Through such hands, which hoped they could confer upon it through self-imposed written additions a higher credibility than it possessed in itself?

How little that assurance, on which so much weight is laid, bears the character of a documentary, diplomatic testimony, which men of reputation and importance issue, on the strength of the weight that lies on their word, over a contested or possibly contestable fact: this will escape no one who does not read it expressly with the intention of finding the opposite in it. If it were really to be this, why then the superfluous postscript *) about the impossibility of summing up in writing everything that Jesus did — evidently just an idle repetition of the otherwise equally suspicious statement in the preceding chapter **)?

*) Verse 25.

**) Chapter 20, verse 30. The statement, "Jesus performed many other signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book," sounds particularly strange coming from an eyewitness, upon whom it depended, and who had explicitly undertaken to write down what had happened.

Not to mention how strange the singular οἶμαι appears after the preceding οἶδαμεν; which has already led to the suspicion that this verse might again have been added by a different hand than the preceding one. But what a procedure with an apostolic writing of such valuable content, if anyone who felt like it was allowed to enrich it with a useless remark from his own hand! Particularly striking, however, is that, when we compare other passages of the Gospel and also of the letter, the words of that assurance itself very much appear to be formed according to a pattern recurring in John, such as one his successor here mindlessly copied without intending to give a seriously meant testimony. So we find, not to mention the numerous passages where either μαρτυρεῖν or οἶδαμεν occurs on its own in externally similar, yet usually more content-rich and concise phrases, the combination of both in a surprisingly similar position in Chapter 5, Verse 32, where Christ refers to the testimony of another (interpreters dispute whether it is God's or John the Baptist's) and says of this testimony: he knows that it is true. — In another manner, perhaps even more detrimental to our passage, is Chapter 19, Verse 35, which is entirely related in content and character. There the narrator says of an eyewitness of the recounted event, whom he does not name, but who is presumed to be the narrator, the Apostle John himself: "he who has seen it has borne witness, and his testimony is true, and he knows that he tells the truth, so that you may believe." If we compare this passage with ours, we cannot deny: its character is so entirely similar, that with perfect (i.e., with very good) reason, by which our passage is taken for an assurance given by a foreign hand of the credibility of the apostolic testimony, that one is to be taken for it as well. This is even more so, as in it itself lies the clearest grounds

for suspicion, to regard it as a testimony from an apostle, albeit one that is most glaringly misunderstood, but by no means speaking from such testimony. We do not want to press the perfect tense μεμαρτύρηκε: one might still regard it as equivalent to the present tense and translate it as "he intends to have said it." But the content of the testimony itself is so utterly enigmatic and incomprehensible, on which all and every explanation has failed thus far, that it will hardly be possible to oppose anything substantial to us if we provide a new, we think evident, explanation of the same, but of course also give the certainty that the passage itself cannot possibly have been written by John, and that the subject of which it treats, however important a place it has occupied in the previous dogmatic conception, is purely imaginary. The testimony to which the publisher of the Gospel refers at that point is none other than that given by the Apostle in his letter Chapter 5, Verse 6: "that Jesus is he who came by water and blood." Read the whole passage along with the immediately following verses, and with some unbiased view, you will not be able to doubt that there must be a strange relationship between it and the one in the Gospel. Specifically, after that statement about the water and the blood, there follows such a strikingly repeated use of the word μαρτυρεῖν, including a double use of the perfect tense μεμαρτύρηκε, that only deaf ears could overlook the echo of this epistolary passage in the Gospel one.

102

Thus, the pursuit of the same trail, which was supposed to lead to the proof of the authenticity of the entire Gospel, has led us, on the contrary, to a very strong suspicion of its falsification. It's not as if we would not still concede a certain evidential power to that testimony for the apostolic origin of the Gospel. We admit it, insofar as it wants to prove nothing else but just such an origin in general terms, the existence of a foundation for this writing that truly originated from John. Used in this sense, this testimony of the editor of the Gospel joins with full force the undeniable traces that are found in Papias, in Polycarp, and elsewhere, of the early existence of the Johannine letter, whose authenticity, along with the authenticity of the speeches in the Gospel, undoubtedly and unquestionably stands or falls together. Nor is it made superfluous by these last-mentioned traces, but it can serve to dispel doubts that one might have about whether those apostolic fathers knew and cited the letter under the name of John *).

*) Eusebius expressly says of Papias that he had taken testimonies from the first letter of John and that of Peter; a phrase that cannot well be understood otherwise than as a specific mention of both, especially since Eusebius is not accustomed, and would also have had much to do, to trace the more hidden and doubtful traces of the use of writings in his authors everywhere. Nevertheless, Bretschneider, on the basis of his view of the origin of the Gospel and the

epistles, expresses the conjecture (Probab. p. 171) that Papias not only did not name the Apostle, but that he might have cited words sounding similar from tradition or from other writings.

The explicit mention of John, which one misses there, is indeed supplanted here by the identification of that disciple, whom the Church recognized as John, as the witness to whom those communications are owed. If that letter, of which we cannot doubt according to Eusebius's account of Papias, was known and circulated before the Gospel **) (as we indeed find references to Paul's letters in the writings of the apostolic fathers far earlier than to the written Gospels), — if it was not known as a work of the Apostle John, the editors of the Gospel would never have dared to present the latter as his work.

**) That Papias could not have mentioned the Gospel of John is something that nowadays, following the reports of Eusebius, hardly anyone would dare to deny. That he should have known it without mentioning it is nearly unthinkable for a writer who gives such precise accounts of the written sources of the Gospel history.

On the other hand, the note about the prior existence of the letter provides a hint about the way in which the publication of the Gospel may have taken place. Familiarity with the letter could easily lead to the idea of publishing records that the Apostle had probably made only for his own use, without any intention of publishing, and that, in the form in which they were found, were incoherent among themselves and spoke half in the person of Jesus or the forerunner, and half in the Apostle's own voice, and thus were not suitable for publication at all. Such records might nonetheless be handed over to the public, or perhaps initially only to a circle of friends, in a form that seemed to make them more appropriate for this purpose, as the epistolary form of the entire Gospel text that is hinted at in some places might suggest.

104

The relationship in which the Apostolic Fathers, on the whole, stand to the writings of John makes it likely that the dissemination and acceptance of the Gospel may not have occurred as quickly as that of the letter. Indeed, we would not want to date its composition too late, not least because the perspective on the evangelical history from which the editing of this Gospel started could hardly have been possible at a time when the Synoptic tradition had already become widely accepted, and more likely at an earlier time when numerous Christian communities were either uninformed or very

incompletely informed about the life and personal teachings of their Savior from written sources.

However, it remains striking how much the use of this Gospel even with Justin, if he knew it at all, which is still problematic, lags behind that of the Synoptics. Also, the fact that it was placed in the fourth position in the canon, and not rather in the first or at least second place as the documentary evidence of the most eminent of all eyewitnesses, seems to suggest, if not a continuing disregard for the consistent authenticity of the information contained therein, then at least an indication that at the time of the canon's establishment, it did not enjoy the same dissemination and prestige as the others.

*) The idea that its specific position was assigned to it because of its supposedly later composition is merely a conjecture of later writers, e.g., Augustine (*de consens. evang.* I, §. 3) and Eusebius (*H.E.* III, 24). This is already refuted by the fact that otherwise in the arrangement of the canon (e.g., in regard to the Pauline writings and the Apocalypse, which likely stands at the end of the whole for similar reasons), chronological considerations do not prevail at all.

— These circumstances further ease the explanation (which in itself does not pose a great difficulty) of how it could have happened that a work that had originated and was composed in this way began to be considered the immediate work of the Apostle himself for some time after its publication. We have no reason to suspect the editors intended any actual fraud. They probably only followed the otherwise common practice of publishing evangelical accounts without expressly naming an author. However, since they must have been aware that they were not called to this task for themselves, neither directly through their own experience or detailed narration of an eyewitness, like Matthew and Mark, nor by using already known sources, like Luke, they did not consider it superfluous to incorporate a hint about the source from which they had drawn into the work. More than this, the words at the end of the Gospel, "He is the one who wrote this," are surely not meant to testify to a complete composition of the Gospel by the Apostle — provided that, as most people now assume, the twenty-first chapter is by a different hand than the rest of the Gospel and was written under the assumption that the latter had the Apostle as its immediate author. Thus, nothing prevents us from assuming that the Gospel for a while was among those "memorabilia" that were generally attributed to the Apostles without attributing specific authors to them individually. Those who, like Polycarp, had heard the teachings of the Apostles directly from them, cared little about these writings and ignored them without their silence implying a rejection. On the other hand, the Gnostic Valentinus and his followers, Montanus and his followers, could make use of them (although this is not actually proven for the leaders of these two sects, there is also no sufficient reason to deny it)

without objection from the Catholic side. For neither was the assertion that John was the author included in that usage, nor could anyone at that time have thought of wanting to undermine the authority of an evangelical writing by denying such authorship. Similarly, Justin, Tatian, the author of the Clementines, and many others might well have known the Gospel and used it (albeit sparingly) without intending to regard it in any other sense as a work of the Apostle than in which, at the same time, all the numerous Gospel writings using the λόγια of Matthew claimed the authority of this Apostle for themselves, but not his name. The habit of explicitly naming it after John probably did not arise earlier than the formation of the canon *), and even here the question remains whether the real intention was to assert a genuine authorship of John in the strictest sense by the designation Εναγγέλιον κατά Ἰωάννην.

*) Theophilus of Antioch, the first to name it under this title, wrote exactly around the time when the canon (which appears to us as already established in Irenaeus) must have originated.

106

Let's now attempt to characterize the nature of the Gospel writing compiled in this way, and to more closely identify the probable relationship between the apostolic and non-apostolic elements within it. We must begin with the character of those fragments that, according to our assumption, gave rise to the composition of the whole. As already indicated, they are not of a narrative but didactic nature: speeches, mostly attributed to Jesus, some also to John the Baptist, and perhaps here and there reflections that the apostle had written down in his own name, but which, with the exception of the prologue, the compiler incorporated into the speeches. One might hence assume that these were similar to Matthew's λογιοις, a collection of the Lord's sayings that His close disciple faithfully preserved in memory and did not want to be lost to himself or others. However, we are struck by the extraordinary difference in character these speeches bear from the speeches of Matthew. It is all the more striking since Matthew's speeches in character and spirit, form and content, completely coincide with those transmitted by Mark, and also, in essence, with those that Luke has complementarily added, while the divergence of the Johannine speeches from all these is equally great and striking. This discrepancy is further surprising because, in contrast to the correspondence of Matthew's speeches with other likewise authenticated speeches of Christ, there is a corresponding and highly remarkable correspondence of the Johannine speeches — not with other known speeches of the Lord, but with John's own thoughts, phrases, and words in the prologue and his letters, and even with the speeches of the Baptist as transmitted by John. — It could not be avoided that this difference had to become the object of serious attention in more recent times when people began to study the Gospel

with a freer scientific eye. However, there is still far from unanimity among all theologians in approaching it with equal impartiality, and, which also essentially belongs to this, in recognizing and appreciating the peculiarity at least of the genuinely authentic, i.e., the synoptic speeches, as Bretschneider has done in his polemic against the authenticity of John's Gospel, a work received by the theology of our time with such prejudiced bias *).

*) The antithetical characterization that Bretschneider (Probab. p. 31 seqq.) gives of the synoptic and Johannine Christ speeches is very successful in regard to the former, as it is animated by genuine, warm feelings for their glory. In regard to the latter, it highlights only one side, thereby becoming unfair.

Hardly have the leading theologians of the present day resolved themselves to the concession that, in the case of John, just as presumably with the others, or perhaps even more so, Christ's speeches in expression (but certainly not in content!) might have received a coloring through the subjectivity of the recorder; from which the "apparent" difference in their character from that of the synoptic speeches is supposed to be explained. — However, when one considers the preference that still reigns in contemporary theology for the entire supposed worth of the beloved disciple, this concession is indeed very striking and concerning for the authority that is still claimed for the Gospel.

108

It is not our intention to delve into a detailed characterization of the synoptic and Johannine speeches here. We intend to present both in the following books completely, always pointing out their peculiarities; only in this way can we, as far as we are concerned, create the possibility of an independent judgment for the reader. For now, we only draw attention to one circumstance that, in our opinion, is decisive for the impossibility of placing both classes of the Savior's utterances under one category with regard to their authenticity. The synoptic speeches invariably and without exception in Matthew, Mark, and Luke have what one calls a punchline; of the Johannine, it is not too much to say that they, at least those spoken at greater length (which here are almost all), are consistently devoid of such a punchline. What we mean by punchline, however, as anyone who wishes to consider this question insightfully and without prejudice will concede, is the condition under which alone, without a miracle, it is conceivable that a spoken word, especially a more detailed speech or parable, not only imprints itself on the listeners' memory in its general content but also in its essential form, the form that expresses the spirit, the genius, and even to some extent literally and verbatim, and is perhaps preserved by it for many years. The punchline is, to use the image inherent in

this expression for our purpose, like the tip through which the speech hooks itself into the listener's soul and sticks to it if it is receptive. Through such punchlines, in whose ceaselessly free-flowing invention the unique, characteristically genius way of speaking of the divine Master consisted, it could happen, without any miraculous inspiration, not only that the Apostle Matthew, after a series of years, knew a considerable number of those sayings by heart and was able to write them down with almost literal fidelity, and that Mark was similarly enabled to do this through Peter's accounts, and that in addition to those singled out by these two, a not insignificant amount of others continued to propagate in oral tradition; but also that we can discern in all of them a very specific, individually characteristic imprint with the same clarity and determination as the writing style of an author whose works are before us, a style, different from that of Mark, Luke, and Matthew by whole heavens, that can indeed and in the deepest sense be called the style of the Holy Spirit. With John, on the other hand, this style and imprint disappear with those punchlines; not only is it replaced by another imprint, equally not without character, but one whose characteristic peculiarity is just as incompatible with the peculiarity of the style of the synoptic speeches as two faces on one person's head, but at the same time, the handles are lost, by which the speeches could have been grasped by the one who wanted to recall them to memory. Even for expressly practiced memorization, the Johannine speeches are among the most difficult tasks, because of the few footholds they offer to memory, because of the abstruse, un-pictorial expression, and the lack of logical order in the incessantly repeating and self-reverting thoughts. How unthinkable it is that they should have imprinted themselves on the memory of the disciple, who at that time could hardly have thought of recording them, at a single hearing? Not to mention what one usually completely overlooks *), that a not inconsiderable part of these speeches is spoken in situations where John could not even have heard them as an eyewitness, where they must have passed through the relations of several people.

*) So much so that it is still often stated that it lies within the plan of this Gospel to narrate only those events of which John was an eyewitness.

In short, as little as we may be inclined to deny that the Johannine speeches arose from a faithful and loving engagement with the memory of the exalted Master, from the endeavor to recall his teachings in a context most suited to the disciple's own way of thinking and character, it cannot in any way be asserted that we have in them, just as directly as in the synoptic, the very thoughts and words of Jesus himself. The difference between the two is, if not even more stark, to be presented as follows. The synoptic speeches are those that objectively imprinted themselves on the minds of the disciples through their power and peculiarity and, because they were present in their minds, pressed for their communication. The Johannine ones, on the other hand, are those that

the mind of the disciple, when the figure of the Master threatened to blur into a nebulous image, laboriously evoked in the struggle to firmly hold this image, to collect its already dissolving features, and to cast them anew into a form, with the aid of a self-fashioned or borrowed theory concerning the nature and purpose of the Master. For the Synoptics' image of Christ, the hearts of the reporting disciples are only an indifferent transition point; for John's, it is a factor co-operating in the creation of this image. **)

**) By far the most significant thing that has been said in recent times (that is, at all times, for earlier this point was never seriously discussed) in defense of the authenticity of the Johannine speeches from internal reasons, i.e., from the perspective of their character, is the detailed treatise that Tholuck gives on this subject in his book on the credibility of the evangelical history (pp. 312-348). However, it turns out that what Tholuck brings there is not in contradiction with what we are aiming at. With few exceptions, we can almost endorse the entire content of the astute and spirited treatise without thereby conceding any more to those speeches than we are already inclined to do. The author does indeed reject, on p. 317, any "middle position" in which "not the Johannine Christ, but a Christian John remains." But what he really brings in the following speaks, upon closer inspection, only for the Christian John, not for the Johannine Christ. The entirely correct remarks about the difference in equally fitting portraits of the same substantial physiognomy, about the Janus and Proteus-like figure of a Socrates, a Leibnitz, that could provide biographers with occasion and material from the most varied viewpoints, the reminder of the difference between the Xenophonic and Platonic images of Socrates, the various conceptions of Christ's teaching by James and Paul: all of this presupposes that we are dealing here only with representations of Christ, with more or less subjective conceptions of his character. However, according to the orthodox view, which in regard to the Synoptics is also ours, concerning the speeches of Christ shared in the Gospels, it is not just a question of such representations. It may indeed be correct to place the Johannine conception of Jesus parallel to the Platonic conception of Socrates (except for the incomparably greater art of portrayal in Plato, which can serve both to the advantage and the disadvantage of the fidelity of his image of Socrates). But to bring the synoptic Christ into an analogy with the Xenophonic Socrates must be recognized as improper by anyone who is aware of hearing the Lord's own voice in the synoptic speeches, not artificially conceived expressions and dialogues, even though from a not untrue concept of his character, like the undisputed ones attributed to Socrates by Xenophon. — If, moreover, the author maintains (p. 327) that his reasoning by analogy retains its validity even if the difference were total, which it is not, we can only consider this a mistake. A relationship, an affinity of the kind that can perhaps be demonstrated between

John and the Synoptics, is also found in the analogies he cites. Or does Tholuck think that the Christianity of Paul and that of James, that also the "spiritual development of the Eastern Church from the center of the doctrine of God," with that "of the Western from the doctrine of man," have nothing in common? What is further said, in order to explain the highly striking resemblance between the Johannine epistolary style and the style of his Christ speeches, about the possibility, already asserted by Origen, that John, as an entirely receptive "feminine spirit," had unconditionally modeled his writing style on the speaking style of his Master (pp. 338 ff.): this is, like all talk about possibilities, weak and proves nothing; and it is also plainly taken back by the author himself in the excellent, as fine as it is sharp, characterization that he himself gives of this style (pp. 341 ff.). For it often assumes that this style belongs to John, and not to Jesus (whose speaking style we are fortunate enough to know from purer sources). Thus we believe we are entitled, far from being "put into despair" by the "liberal" concession, which the worthy author, emboldened by his faith, hints at giving, possibly without detriment to this faith, at the conclusion (p. 347), to regard it as already factually given by him, despite his protestation that he sees "no reason for it," and to accept it with heartfelt thanks. Indeed, as the author says: "Many of the Johannine speeches (more or less all) were not given by Christ at all, for the Spirit that was in the Master's speeches had passed onto the disciple and formed those speeches out of him in the 'language of the situation.'"

111

So we must, — this is the result of these preliminary summary remarks on the character of those Christ speeches that we have assumed to be the genuine fundamental substance of the Gospel, — we must assume for John a fundamentally different intention of his records than we have to assume for Matthew and the other Synoptics. While the latter were guided by no other intention than that explicitly reported by John the Presbyter from Mark, to reproduce everything that was consciously known to them about Jesus as unadulterated and as completely as possible, John must have had a specific, doctrinal purpose in mind. This has also been noticed from time immemorial, and in this sense, a tendentious character has been attributed to the Johannine Gospel, which is supposed to distinguish it from the synoptics. If, however, following the procedure of the Ancients, one were to place this tendency in the intention of expressly supplementing the synoptic Gospels, which John is supposed to have already known; partly chronologically by adding various facts, especially earlier ones, preceding the imprisonment of the Baptist *), partly and especially by spiritually supplementing them in that the significance of the person of Christ as the God's Son come into the world, as

the incarnate Logos, would be set forth more clearly through his own speeches **): we regard this as a mistaken implementation of the undoubtedly underlying correct idea.

*) Euseb. Hist. Eccl. II, Book III, 24.

**) This is undoubtedly meant by the tradition reported by Clement of Alexandria (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI, Book II), that John, prompted by his friends and carried by the Spirit, wanted to write a spiritual Gospel, as opposed to the somatic one.

There is not the faintest trace in the entire Gospel of an explicit reference to other written accounts or of a familiarity with such accounts from personal observation, not just from hearsay ***).

***) Even the hints at the end of Chapters 20, 30, and 21, 25, from which one would most expect it, do not at all refer to anything else already distinguished in writing.

Considering the utterly insoluble confusions that the compilation of the Johannine reports with the synoptic accounts almost has in all points of the evangelical history as a consequence,—confusions which John could have solved everywhere with a word if he really possessed the knowledge of both his predecessors and the history itself that is attributed to him—: it means (even apart from the completely unnecessary repetition of various incidents already narrated by the Synoptics) attributing to the Evangelist an indeed unprecedented degree of thoughtlessness if one nevertheless wants to find an intention of supplementing and correcting his predecessors in him. The doctrinal character of the Johannine speeches is rather best explained, and most consistent with the overall character of the Gospel, if one assumes that John, driven by the interest of a teaching context that had shaped itself in his spirit more on the occasion of his master's teaching than directly through this teaching, aimed to find this connection in the teaching of the master himself, and for this purpose undertook to present to himself once more, not primarily for the purpose of communicating to others, what he still remembered of the Lord's speeches in the light of this connection. In this endeavor, he could proceed completely unbound without dishonesty towards others or himself, and it is psychologically entirely understandable if his own thoughts were increasingly substituted for the thoughts of the one he was making speak. The character of John, as he confronts us in his writings, is a completely subjective and inward one, such that one must find it very understandable if he, instead of reproducing a given with objective fidelity, rather gave the manner in which he had been affected by this given.

On the other hand, one can regard it as a trick played on the apologists by the double meaning contained in the concepts of "receptivity" and "femininity" when, from these qualities ascribed to John, they draw a favorable conclusion as to the faithfulness of his tradition believed to be able to draw, while it is well known that that reasonable resignation and renunciation of subjectivity, which belongs to a pure and clear, objective representation, is nobody's business less than women. — However, what that teaching context was that led John to these "studies" (this and no other should be the correct name for those records from which the Gospel has grown): we will come back to this in more detail later. For now, only the remark that they express a noble, thoughtful, and profound spirit, and that this explains the lively interest that the Gospel of John has drawn to itself at all times, not without reason. One can, indeed one must, recognize the individuality of John as both more amiable and more significant than the individuality of any other author of historical books in the New Testament, without this deciding something about the higher value of his image of Christ. Even if this preference has been extended to his image of Christ, if one has wanted to recognize the Christ of John as the true, genuine Christ, or even as a transfigured, idealized Christ: we can see in this, however respectable the authorities that may be cited in favor of this opinion, nothing else but a gross misunderstanding, albeit a still very understandable one. It is less a picture of Christ than a concept of Christ that John gives; his Christ does not speak from his person but over his person. But this is precisely the standpoint that suits most, especially those who are used to speaking publicly about such things. Few can endure the sight of the living God-man in his own flesh and blood; before the piercing gaze of his eye, before the shattering thunder of his voice, they collapse; the Christ they need and understand is rather only the abstract general concept of a man-become-Logos, without a definite individuality of his form dissolving in the formless infinity of human love, humility, and pious devotion, i.e., precisely the Johannine Christ.

*)

*) Nef. recalls having read in a brief autobiography by a highly honorable scholar and scientific researcher of our time the confession of how the gentle, thoughtful Melanchthon had suited him far better than the fiery, mighty Luther. In this confession — to which, however, one must also add the theoretical, dogmatic interests that are also at play — is reflected the preference of most people in our time for the Johannine Christ, i.e., fundamentally for the "Christian John," in contrast to the Synoptic, i.e., the true Christ. Of Luther himself, of course, we know that he too expressed a preference for the "unique, delicate, true main Gospel." But it can easily be shown that even with him this was a dogmatic illusion, arising from his particularly lively need to expressly confess and proclaim Christ as the only-begotten Son of God; as this is also expressed in Luther's harsh judgments on those biblical books in which Christ is not much explicitly

mentioned. According to his own individuality, Luther was anything but a Johannine nature. — Incidentally, it seems that even in ancient times there were those who, despite all recognition of the noble spirit expressed in this manner, felt somewhat bored by John's style. I believe that the well-known anecdote of Jerome (Galat. 6.) alludes to this, in which he tells of the dying John that, as he continually repeated the words, "Little children, love one another," the surrounding students and friends finally became impatient and asked him what he meant by that; to which John is said to have replied that it would be enough if only this command of the Lord were fulfilled.

116

So, then, was the nature of the writings, from which we assume that only after the death of the Apostle did the idea arise in his followers and students to make them known to others in a form that might occasionally appear as if the Apostle himself intended to give them. We do not believe we are mistaken when we confidently express the expectation that anyone who can manage to take an unbiased look at the overall shape of the Gospel from the perspective taken here will see a new light shed on its composition and entire inner nature. — Perhaps in no literary work in all of literature has there been as much talk of plans and intentions as there has been with the Gospel of John, which people have wanted to discover in its composition. And yet, it has not been possible to show any such plan that did not lead to the most glaring contradictions, both in positive content elements and in omissions, and that would thus make the author appear as the clumsiest writer in the world. Moreover, ancient writers, including biblical ones, where they really pursue such a plan, are by no means reticent in openly stating and explaining it; with John, however, we miss such a statement everywhere: a circumstance that alone would be sufficient to arouse the suspicion that the work had no underlying plan at all. Indeed, apart from the fairly uniform character of the speeches, the selection of narrated events appears so completely unplanned that the unbiased observer has no other explanation but to attribute it on one hand to chance, which allowed only these, but no other events to reach the author's knowledge, and on the other hand to the equally accidental possibility of linking these and no other narratives to the material available to the author for processing, i.e., to the speeches distinguished by the Apostle John. These speeches themselves remain, as our above characterization shows, despite the uniformity of their tone and content, free from any intentionality in design and execution. It could not occur to John to want to prove through them, as has often been attributed to him, the divine nature and mission of his Master to others who denied it. At least we have no reason to attribute to him such a lack of insight into the nature and requirements of such proof, that he would have thought the detailed reflections about himself that his Christ makes more suitable for

this purpose than the way in which he confirms no divine origin by speaking and acting in the Synoptics. But it is no more necessary to attribute this or a similar purpose to the editor. The editor had no other purpose than to communicate the written essays of John in a form that seemed necessary for their understanding and suitable for the taste that he presumed in his readers. That the form he chose for this purpose, the form of a complete life description of the Lord from the time of his baptism by John to the events after his resurrection, does not fit at all with the character of the speeches to be communicated, which were entirely composed from the subjective standpoint of the disciple and do not in the remotest describe the true scope of Jesus' teachings and statements, is indeed not something he was conscious of; just as it does not seem to have entered his consciousness that the knowledge he himself possessed of the events he wanted to describe was highly incomplete and uncertain, and that the hypotheses by which he wanted to fill the gaps in his knowledge were almost always mistaken and deceptive.

118

A difficulty may seem to arise with our explanation of the origin of the Gospel from the following circumstance. Both the idea of a revision in general and indeed some of what is found in the narrative parts must not be denied to presuppose a knowledge of other existing Gospel writings and also, at least in detail, a familiarity with the content of these writings, while the overall shape of our Gospel stands in such stark contrast to the basic components of all the others that have been preserved to us or about which we are informed, that a real consideration of them seems unthinkable to us. However, this difficulty remains the same with any other view of the origin of the work. It is also not resolved by the now popular view that the Evangelist did not want to take into account and correct our Synoptic Gospels, but did want to correct the Synoptic tradition. For then it would be least comprehensible of all how the same did not feel compelled to include an even far greater mass of synoptic material in his work. The most natural assumption will always be that the publishers of the Gospel knew of the existence of other writings of similar content, at least the books of Matthew and Mark, and were guided in their undertaking by this knowledge, and that perhaps some individual details from the special content of these books had reached them through oral communication (although this could also have happened in other ways without reference to the books) — but that the writings themselves remained inaccessible to them. The ignorance of John's surroundings or school in the events from the life of the Savior, for which the Synoptics also seem to have had no other source but Mark, can easily be explained from the spiritual peculiarity of the Apostle, as we had to describe it previously. The same character traits that made his written records something entirely different from faithful relations of the words and expressions of his Master also made it unlikely that he

would come to simply reporting narratives of the kind from which his students and friends could have formed an equally vivid picture of Christ's personality and career as Mark from the stories of Peter. If they nevertheless undertook to compile a Gospel history with the claim to completeness, or at least clarity, from the little they had heard from John orally, from his written studies, and from the scattered notes that oral tradition had otherwise conveyed to them, we must certainly presuppose a strong illusion in them about the relationship of their means to the goal they were aiming for. But without assuming such an illusion, on one side or the other, if one does not want to proceed to the far more questionable assumption of an intentional deception, one does not escape from it at all when comparing this Gospel with the synoptic ones; and where this illusion is to be sought, after everything that has been indicated so far (which we intend to elaborate and prove strictly in the following), can be no doubt for us.

119

However, the manner in which a product such as our Gospel could come into being on the path indicated here, both in form and content, can also be specified somewhat more precisely even at this point. We have already thought above in a passing remark of the incongruity that, if one wanted to adhere solely to our Gospel, a false conception would result of the position in which Jesus stood among the people during his public teaching, in the midst of whom he appeared. No one will deny us the right to say, a false one; for suppose one wanted to attribute no higher value to the testimonies, which can be taken from the Synoptics for an opposite relationship, than to those of the fourth Gospel in terms of their external credibility, yet in this case the inner truth is so striking on the synoptic side that even the most biased judgment will have to agree with us here. The omission of the synoptic testimonies about Jesus' extraordinary success in Galilee, success brought about not only by distant miracles but also very much by the power of his speech *) and the overwhelming impression of his personality, success that remained almost completely unclouded until his departure from there — this most striking omission of the fourth Gospel, no one has ever come to explain it as anything other than just what it is, and only perhaps wanted to excuse it with the fact that John could take that success as something self-evident.

*) Mark 1:22 and parallels.

But if, upon closer examination, this dual fact emerges: firstly, that a tacit assumption of what above all else should have formed the content of a life story of Jesus, in a writing that presents itself from beginning to end as such a life story and does not remotely suggest that it wants to be only a supplement to other such life stories, and whose most peculiar characteristic consists in assuming nothing at all as known to its readers, but

even in giving extensive explanations of the most well-known things — that such an assumption in such a writing is utterly inconceivable; secondly, that this alleged assumption is not present at all, but the evangelist at countless places with anxious toil takes care, alongside the bitter hostility he assumes to exist everywhere between Jesus and not just the scribes and elders, but the mass of the people, also to remember the passing success that Jesus managed to achieve through his miracles (of a success other than by miracles, this evangelist, who is supposedly the most spiritually minded of all the disciples of the Lord, tells us very little), here and there, but always only among a small part of the people *) ; — if this is the result of an unbiased examination of our Gospel, then there probably remains nothing but to look for a reason that could have caused this manifest, and in the eyes of an eyewitness and even in those of one who had heard somewhat complete relations from eyewitnesses, entirely unthinkable misunderstanding — for such it is.

*) John 2:11, 23; 4:45; 6:14; 7:31, 40, 41. Even at the end, the jubilation of the people at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, which appears in an entirely different light in the Synoptics, is said to have been due only to a miracle just performed. Cap. 12:18. Only in Samaria does an exception seem to be assumed, Cap. 4:41f., for what is said about the Jews in Cap. 8:30 cannot be meant seriously, as Jesus immediately complains about those same people described as believers here, that they want to kill him (V. 40). Likewise, Cap. 7:40, 49 is to be related back to the wonders mentioned in V. 31, even though in V. 46, but only by the servants of the Pharisees, the merit of Jesus' speech is praised.

But this reason, where would it be more obvious to seek it than in such a position of the evangelist, which made him hear mainly only of the last events in Jerusalem, the events at and before the catastrophe, and after these, partly also after what had become known to him about the persistent opposition of the Jews even after that catastrophe, while Christianity was mainly spreading among the Gentiles, allowed him to draft his overall conception of the relationship of Jesus Christ to the people that surrounded him? — Clearly, the editing of the Gospel proceeded from such a conception. It is, one might say, a fixed idea of the reporter to show the Jesus he had heard about, who had succumbed in Jerusalem to the hatred of the leaders of the people, especially the scribes, as engaged from the outset, immediately from his first appearance, in an unbroken struggle with "the Jews," — with the same mass of people that we know, however, stood by Jesus' side even to the end, even in Jerusalem, so that his enemies could only seize him by secret treachery. — But the way in which we presume that this misunderstanding may have arisen in the editor finds further confirmation in other signs and serves in turn to shed light on other, otherwise unexplained circumstances in the content of our Gospel. Here, in fact, is where the so often discussed and by no one

adequately explained circumstance receives its explanation, that the fourth Gospel has the events it narrates take place almost exclusively in Jerusalem, and knows almost nothing to report of Jesus' deeds in Galilee, except for a couple of miracle stories, some of which are shared with the Synoptics. What is to be made of the repeated journeys to Jerusalem that it must presuppose for this purpose, we will come to speak of further on. Here we only note the striking fact that our Gospel, presupposing only a single miracle performed in Galilee within the family circle, begins the series of Jesus' public actions in Jerusalem with the same act *), which he performed according to the Synoptics immediately after his last entry (which is also his first for them) **), and immediately after that relates the pronouncement ***), which was brought forward according to those as the ground of his accusation †).

*) John 2:14 ff.

**) Mark 11:15 and parallels.

***) John 2:19.

†) Mark 14:58 and parallels.

But if the evangelist, as could easily happen in the Ephesian-Hellenistic environment of the Apostle John, received only a more specific account of the catastrophe in Jesus' life and the disputes with Pharisees and scribes immediately preceding this catastrophe, and only a very vague and blurry one of the earlier career in Galilee; and if he found in John's written essays, as the dogmatic-speculative nature of these essays would entail, mainly only polemical discourses about the nature, divine designation, and mission of Christ: then it is quite understandable, especially if he was also, as we are entitled to assume of him in every sense, a writer of little talent and practice, how he himself could be deceived in his overall view of the life and work of the Lord, a deception that has given the work its present shape.

123

In the form of the work itself, as it lies before us, to fully demonstrate the composition that we believe we have discovered, in detail, is neither our business here, nor was it in regard to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. However, some remarks on this subject will be all the more appropriate, the rarer similar views have been expressed, especially as this Gospel, more than any of the others, has remained accustomed to being seen as a work cast in a single mold. Rarely has a work less deserved a reputation of this kind than the one at hand. If the difference between the narrative and the didactic part (the

speeches) seems less striking at first glance here than in parts of the first Gospel, it becomes evident upon closer examination as an even more decisive and thorough difference, in that at least in the parts borrowed from Mark, there is a real fusion and penetration of both elements.

In our Gospel, there is a noticeable consistent intention of the reviser to adapt the narrative part, which he added from his own resources, to the didactic part, which he found. This is something that could not happen to the same extent in those Gospels that sought to meld various already existing written sources. Hence, there is a greater uniformity of speech in all externals, in lexicology and grammar. The reviser could, especially given the lack of independence in his own spirit and within the common sphere of Hellenistic education, align with his predecessor in a way that does not make the different origin of the parts stand out particularly when looking at it purely philologically. On the other hand, in a substantive examination, what must first stand out is the forced and labored motivation for certain statements and longer speeches, the frequently failing, never truly successful art of dialogue, the complete incomprehensibility of some maxims and apophthegms in the places where they are conveyed.

It has been considered a general characteristic of Jesus' answers that they do not always seem to precisely fit the questions to which they are a response, and Bacon of Verulam has given an explanation of this phenomenon that is more clever than accurate, saying that it arises, firstly, because Jesus always looked into the interior, into the soul of the questioner, and hit the unspoken sense that was hidden there with his answer, and secondly, because he directed his words not only to the questioner but to all future generations, whom he knew would hear him.

*) It is to be noted admirably that the answers of our Savior to not a few of the questions that were proposed do not seem relevant but rather impertinent. The cause of this is twofold: one, that, since he knew the thoughts of those who were questioning, not from words, as we men usually do, but immediately and of themselves, he responded to their thoughts, not their words; the other, that he spoke not only to those who were then present but also to those of us who live, and to men of all ages and places to whom the Gospel would be preached. Bacon, "De Augmentis Scientiarum," Book IX.

This sounds agreeable enough, but upon closer inspection, it turns out that the criticism, which was to be eliminated by this clever remark, only applies to the dialogical parts in John, not in the other Gospels. There, the truly dialogical utterances of Jesus, i.e., those where the question is also handed down to us along with the answer, consistently and

without exception have something so directly apt and striking that any explanation of this kind must appear completely superfluous in relation to them. Of course, other passages do occur where the evangelists have not made any effort to establish a suitable connection; but these are, at least as they are presented to us, not of a dialogical nature. The reviser of John (and occasionally perhaps John himself) took the trouble to engage in dialogue in many places, since he had a freer hand in his revision than the others did, and from this, those incongruities between the answers and the questions arose, which we find anything but consistent with the true speaking style of Jesus *).

*) Examples of such incongruities: John 2:4, 3:5, 11ff, 4:16, 35ff, 48, 5:19ff, 6:26, 53, 79, 8:26, 11:9, 20, 12:23ff, 35, 13:27, 14:23, 20:17, 21:18, 22.

125

Strangely enough, as we are about to recognize the discrepancy between these two parts of our Gospel, the narrative and the didactic, as an actually existing and undeniable fact, a remark confronts us which, if it were true, would compel us to assume the exact opposite relationship between these two parts from the one we presupposed in distinguishing them. While one may more or less concede that the didactic part does not entirely correspond to the form and content of Jesus' speech, as it is otherwise known to us, and as we would have to presuppose its nature even if we knew it from no other sources, but rather that the evangelist must have added something of his own here, the narrative part, conversely, is believed to reveal signs that suggest the immediate proximity of the narrator to the recounted events and real eyewitnessing. For this purpose, the richness of details in individual stories and the vividness and vivid imagery of the narration are cited, by which, it is claimed, this evangelist distinguishes himself from all others and reveals himself as a personal observer and participant in the events. There is indeed some truth to this remark, in that the narratives of our Gospel do not bear the character that betrays the first and third as relations that have already passed through several hands and are reported by the last narrators, half episodically and half explanatorily. We must not deny the details by which the ones in question here stand out, a character of originality similar to the one we attributed to the corresponding features in Mark; such a character, that is, that arises from the endeavor to confer, through pictorial elaboration or plastic rounding, that vividness on an event of which the narrator is conscious of reporting for the first time as something still unknown to the circle before whom he speaks, through which it is introduced into the listener's imagination, and the listener is inclined to give it credence. But just as we already had the example in Mark that such vividness does not necessarily everywhere lead to the conclusion of real eyewitnessing, a similar thing is

found upon closer examination of the Johannine narratives. It is found in such an exaggerated contrast to the character of actual eyewitnessing that we do not dare to equate the editor of our Gospel with the Apostle John in the same way as Mark with the Apostle Peter. As in other respects, so also in this detailing, the text of our Gospel bears entirely the stamp of laborious work, by no means that freshness of memory that draws either directly from the first source or from a pure and richly flowing second one. To authenticate this judgment, we need only refer to what was said earlier, where we drew attention to the lack of a proper overall conception of the course of events during Jesus' teaching. If anywhere, such an overall conception should have proved itself in eyewitnessing, and it should also have proven itself in genuine and thorough instruction drawn from the eyewitnessing of others. A deficiency in this, a bias of the kind demonstrated by our evangelist both in relation to Jesus' relationship with the Jewish people and concerning his speech and teaching method to his students and opponents, speaks louder against the one so erring than all the details in the individual can testify for him. For these details can easily be won or invented in other ways; the solidity of the total conception, however, is precisely the infinite advantage that the one really familiar with the events has over every stranger. It is an advantage that asserts itself in the one who is really so favored, involuntarily and without his effort, even where he does not avoid mistakes or memory errors in the details; but where it is lacking, its absence almost inevitably betrays itself in a multitude of inadvertently slipping features that are all the more characteristic the less the author's consciousness partakes in them. In the category of the lack of that total view belongs the obscurity that has caused so much trouble to all critical workers on the evangelical history, concerning the changing scene of the events. He almost exclusively tells us of events that are supposed to have occurred at various points in time, during festival journeys, in Jerusalem, but we learn nothing more about the times in which these supposed journeys take place (no word assures us that these journeys, as is commonly assumed without further consideration, were the only ones, and that others, not explicitly reported, did not intervene; of one of them *) there is even known uncertainty about the festival to which the journey should have been devoted)—nor most of the time about the way Jesus spent the time between the festivals.

*) John 5:1.

In no way would an eyewitness here, or someone thoroughly informed in another manner, even if he didn't necessarily have to provide such a detailed travel description as Luke does in the second half of Acts, have omitted specific indications both about the chronological relationships of the narrative, and about the scope and nature of what was omitted between the particular narratives. His historical conscience would not have permitted him to do this; it would have prompted him, even without an expressly

prevailing intention of historical completeness, to provide indications of this kind. — However, we do not even need this inference from the omissions of our author. We need only look more closely at one or another of the detailed narratives to become aware of what the situation is with that highly praised vividness and completeness of picturesque or dramatic detail in our Evangelist.

128

Indeed, it will not be superfluous to substantiate our remarks about the narrative style of the fourth Evangelist here with an example; we will naturally come to discuss a multitude of other examples in the later course of our reflection. For this purpose, we choose a story to which we do not need to refer explicitly later, as its historical worthlessness will become convincingly evident to us here. It is the story in the fifth chapter of our Gospel about the healing of a sick man at the pool of Bethesda, a tale filled with details of the sort that people want to attribute as evidence for the eyewitness status of the reporter. But what is the nature of these details? We disregard the more preliminary circumstances for the purpose of answering this question, such as the uncertainty, as just mentioned, about the time and character of the feast that Jesus was supposed to have traveled to Jerusalem for; likewise the notice about the pool of Bethesda itself, about which the circumstance has already aroused suspicion for others before us that neither Josephus nor any other contemporary or older writer mentions it or its alleged healing power, but only later writers whose sole source may have been the present passage. We also leave aside the question of authenticity or inauthenticity regarding the often-doubted but nevertheless sufficiently corroborated words that describe the cause and method of healing in a somewhat adventurous way. We focus only on what directly pertains to the story itself to form an opinion about its character based solely on it. It is narrated that Jesus found a man at the pool of Bethesda who had been ill for thirty-eight years; He asked him, "Do you want to be healed?" — Here emphasis is placed on the detail of thirty-eight years, but it is overlooked that this is precisely such a detail that could least have been directly observed by an eyewitness, as indeed the Evangelist himself (v. 6) does not attribute to Jesus knowledge of the specific length of time, but only that the man had been ill for a long time. Another circumstance here, at the beginning of the narrative, speaks against the eyewitness status of the narrator, namely that one involuntarily gets the impression that Jesus, walking alone and unaccompanied, encountered the sick man, which also seems to be confirmed later (v. 13) by the fact that the sick man loses sight of Jesus, an individual, scarcely noticeable person, in the crowd. If this is accurate, then John can no longer narrate as an eyewitness; for if he had been present at the incident, he would undoubtedly only have been there as a companion to his Master. From the synoptic narratives, which never depict Jesus as speaking or acting otherwise than in the

company of his disciples and never lightly forget to indicate this environment even with a single word, it becomes more probable that this itself, Jesus' apparent solitude, is an error, or rather a narrative mistake of the Evangelist, one, however, that could hardly have been encountered by an eyewitness, who must involuntarily see himself in the recounted incident. — Furthermore, the circumstance that Jesus questions the sick man unsolicited gives rise to doubts.

130

In the Synoptics, we rather see everywhere the sick pressing towards Him, the possessed calling out His name, in short, the occasion for the action coming from outside, not Jesus seeking the opportunity to exercise His healing power arbitrarily. It goes on to say that the sick man, answering the question directed at him, complained that he had no one to help him into the water when it was stirred up; thus, it happened that others always got there before him. Jesus is then said to have called out to him: "Rise, take up your bed, and walk!", which the instantly healed man immediately did. Here it is incomprehensible how the utter inappropriateness of this call in this context has so generally been overlooked until now. After all, everything preceding implies that the sick man was not yet as paralyzed as the one to whom Jesus calls out the same words in the Synoptics *), so paralyzed, that is, that he could no longer walk by his own strength.

*) Mark 2, 11 and parallels.

For how else, without foreign aid, would he have come to the place surrounding the pool, and how could he even attempt to get into the pool itself? It therefore seems clear that these words were supplied to our Evangelist from that story preserved by the Synoptics through a distorted tradition, and that he, having lost the true connection, tried to supplement their connection in his own way, which, as we see here, cannot exactly be called successful. — Similarly, the immediately following connection of a reminiscence to the offense that Jesus gave to the Jews by His Sabbath healings is strikingly mishandled. According to our Evangelist's account, the Jews first confront the healed man for carrying his bed since it is the Sabbath. But if it was not permitted to carry a bed on the Sabbath, how then could the sick man have brought his own near the pool on that day? Surely, one would not want to assume, perhaps even with Chrysostom, that he had lain there for all the thirty-eight years of his illness, and might have lain there just as long if Jesus had not healed him? But whoever in what follows, in the conversation between the Jews and the healed man, as the latter only excuses himself by the command of his Savior, the Jews ask him who this Savior is, but the healed man replies that he does not know him, — whoever would find in this and so

many similar features of other stories particular traces of detailed knowledge from eyewitnesses: we would have to reply, as we have mentioned above regarding a similar claim about Luke, that nothing is cheaper, even for the most distant and ignorant, than inventions of this kind, to which the simplest analysis of the given situation can lead. Finally, it is added that some time later, Jesus encountered the healed man in the temple and called out to him: "See, you are well! Sin no more, that nothing worse may happen to you." I cannot help but view this trait, with Strauss*), as having arisen from a misunderstood memory of the related one in the aforementioned synoptic account, where the healing is also linked to the forgiveness of sins **).

*) L. J. Vol. 2, p. 132.

**) Mark 2, 5. 9 and parallels.

Apparently, this strange and incomprehensible call would have needed a closer motivation here if it was to prove itself true and worthy of Jesus, while there, in the synoptic account, the statement, "Your sins are forgiven," is both general enough not to require such motivation and also more sensible and significant in the context of that story.

131

As it is not our intention to repeat in detail at present all the objections that have been raised in recent times, particularly by Bretschneider and Strauss, and to some extent, although only in a problematic sense, by de Wette, against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, i.e., against its composition by the Apostle John, we would like to add just a few remarks that have a closer bearing on the manner in which we conceive its composition. It may be that many of those objections, when considered individually or when considering the passage they may immediately pertain to, apart from the others, appear to be of not very great weight, or that they can be dispelled in a way in which the improbability at least does not stand out too glaringly. This applies especially to circumstances that seem to reveal the editor's ignorance of geographical and antiquarian notes concerning the scene and surroundings of the events *).

*) Such as Bethany (Betharaba) beyond the Jordan, Chapter 1, 28, Aenon near Salem 3, 23; the city name Sychar 4, 5 and the alleged proximity of the city Samaria to the same 4, 7, the ambiguity about the distance from Cana to Capernaum 4, 52, the notes about the pool of Bethesda 5, 2, the strange explanation of the name Siloam 9, 7, which is also likely erroneously related to a

pool instead of a spring, the yearly duration of the high priesthood 11, 49 ff., confusion about the time of the Passover meal, etc.

Perhaps, under these circumstances, each individual point, if it occurred in an otherwise well-authenticated writing, would admit of a settlement, even if it were by hypothesis. However, when considered in conjunction with each other and with the other circumstances testifying against the Gospel's authenticity, they must undoubtedly raise and maintain serious doubts. The same might apply to what we wish to note now. In our Evangelist, there is a series of passages that, each considered individually, would hardly suffice to arouse significant suspicion. Yet their confluence leads to the conclusion of a persistent habit of such a kind that would greatly surprise an eyewitness of the events, while it would appear quite natural in a reviser of foreign writings who stands distant from the subjects. We are referring to the frequent references to another mention of the same name in our Gospel, whether it be a person, city, or region, contrary to the usual habit of all other New Testament writers. A considerable portion of these references is such that one involuntarily gains the impression that the narrator placed them as an aftereffect of the trouble that orienting himself in the setting and the personalities had cost him, with the intention of sparing the reader a similar effort; although he does not always do this in an appropriate manner. Thus he explains *) Bethsaida with the addition: "the city of Andrew and Peter," although it had not previously been designated as such; in the second mention of Cana **), he does not forget to refer to the earlier narrated water transformation; Nicodemus is described, also in the second mention, and likewise again in the third ***), as the one who once came to Jesus at night; in the mention of Bethany, it is likewise stated as an explanation, "the residence of Mary and Martha" ****), and immediately after †) the just-mentioned Mary is identified as the one who anointed the Lord, although this anointing is only narrated later, wherein the narrator again does not forget to make Bethany recognizable through the memory of Lazarus ††), just as he also later does not find the mere mention of Lazarus sufficient, without the addition: "whom he raised from the dead" †††); Judas Iscariot is repeatedly designated as the traitor even before the narration of his betrayal ††††), Philip, although already mentioned several times, is again made recognizable by the reminder of his birthplace *); the second mention of Caiaphas is accompanied by a cumbersome reminder of what was earlier narrated about Caiaphas **); no less cumbersome, and particularly striking, is the self-designation of the Apostle John at the very end ***).

*) Chapter 1, 45.

**) Chapter 2, 46.

***) Chapter 7, 50. Chapter 19, 39.

****) Chapter 11, 1.

†) Verse 3.

††) Chapter 13, 1.

†††) Verse 9.

††††) Chapter 6, 71. Chapter 13, 4. (Even later, Judas is mentioned with the addition: ο παραδιδούς αυτόν. Chapter 18, 3. 5.)

*) Chapter 12, 21.

**) Chapter 18, 14.

***) Chapter 21, 20.

Among the designations that arouse suspicion, there is finally the negative one of Judas Jacobi as "not the Iscariot"; †) with which the editor seems to betray his ignorance of the true personality of this Judas. — In any case, the habit of these designations must be added to the list of characteristics that, on the one hand, testify that the evangelist does not speak from the core of a living memory that views the past as immediately present in the events he narrates, and on the other hand, no less for the fact that he does not proceed without a certain laborious care, a care that is unfortunately not adequately supported in him either by expertise or by talent in presentation.

†) Cap. 14, 22.

134

The separation of the components, which, in our opinion, would make up the Gospel, to undertake in detail everywhere, is not within the limits of our current task; however, in the later books, there will be ample opportunity to discuss this and that relevant thing from time to time. As an example of such separation, we want to point here immediately to the beginning of the Gospel, where, it seems to us, the process of composition or revision of the whole can be recognized with particular clarity. The so-called prologue is, if anything in the entire scripture, undoubtedly by the hand of John himself. Here, if anywhere, one recognizes in all character traits the identity of the author with the author

of that letter, whose composition by the Apostle John is authenticated by external evidence much better than the Gospel, and is also less called into question by internal difficulties and contradictions. But that the author himself intended those contemplative words to serve as the beginning of a Gospel narrative does not become evident from them at all. Instead, this prologue deviates in tone and content so strikingly from the way historical writings are otherwise begun everywhere, and also in the New Testament, that the explanation of this circumstance that we obtain through our other view of the composition of the Gospel can only be welcome to us. Indeed, in those words, similar to the opening of Mark's Gospel, John the Baptist is mentioned concerning Christ, but not in a narrative tone but a contemplative one. We know from other reports that the apostles regarded Jesus' baptism by John as the beginning of the latter's teaching and probably also began what they called the preaching of the Gospel with a reminder of it. But as the content of this apostolic preaching by no means consisted in a historical narrative like the one we have in our Gospels, so the nature of our prologue, if one wants to think of it as the real beginning of the authentic Johannine records, would suggest a different character of these records, one more contemplative and dogmatic, just like that oral preaching was more didactic and paraenetic than historical. This now leads us to consider the subsequent historical narration from the nineteenth to the thirty-fourth verse as the elaboration added by the editor of the historical hints contained in the prologue. What internal difficulties this narration is subject to, and how we may not at all think that in it we find exactly the sense that John had laid down in those words, will be the place to prove later. For now, it may suffice to have drawn attention to how odd, if one reads the prologue and this narration in one breath, the beginning of the latter contrasts with the course of thought that the prologue had opened, how not at all this course of thought lets one expect such a new beginning, which, however, as the work now stands, must serve it as a commentary. This narration presents itself as a commentary on what precedes, especially through the repetition of the words: "The one who comes after me, was before me"; with which it has something strange about it, to read them first in the midst of a contemplative speech, then in the course of the historical report. — A reverse relationship between the original and the revised additions seems to prevail in the remaining part of the chapter. Here we believe that an authentic Johannine narrative (the incident between Jesus and Nathanael) is introduced by an imitation from the hand of the editor, an imitation that is apparent but very unfortunate. The editor may have heard from oral tradition that Peter and Andrew were considered the first disciples recruited by Jesus. He therefore feels it is his duty to insert a report about the calling of those two disciples before that anecdote, which he found in John, apparently standing alone and without context. Puzzled as he was about the actual course of this calling, he only reproduces the schema of the anecdote he found regarding Nathanael in this narrative, and weaves into it, similarly as later in the narratives of the death and resurrection of the Lord, the mysterious hint of his own

figure of John. Here, however, as is not uncommon also in the further course of the narrative, both pieces, the genuine and the added one, are fused into each other through the revision, and it is not as easy, as with the prologue, to pinpoint exactly where one ends and the other begins.

136

From these remarks about the fourth Gospel, a preliminary result emerges for us, which indeed stands in direct opposition to the currently popular view, often asserted along with the hypothesis that allows the synoptic Gospels to arise from tradition, and seen as their necessary complement—namely, the view that considers this Gospel as the preeminently historical one among all the monuments of evangelical history, serving to correct and supplement the others. On the contrary, this Gospel stands as a historical source a considerable step lower than the synoptic Gospels. It is itself, if not in every single detail (for here historical criticism might indeed find reason to side with it from time to time, even when it contradicts the synoptic Gospels, reasons that can only be discussed in specific cases), but certainly as a whole, in its overall view of Jesus's character, personality, and the course of His life story, in need of correction by the synoptic Gospels. Further details about how to use this secondary source in a scientifically rigorous treatment of Jesus's life would be out of place in the present context, just as details about the principles for distinguishing—or rather, transforming—the unhistorical or non-immediate historical components undeniably mixed into the first-tier sources, the synoptic Gospels, into genuine historical elements. The laws of this task can only be illustrated in the doing, as long as their nature isn't even more general, concerning not only the sources of evangelical history but all historical sources, so any preliminary remark about it would be superfluous. Therefore, we now conclude this first main section of our presentation, which was devoted to the origin and nature of the historical sources. Likewise, we consider it unnecessary to expound here on the utilization of other written monuments outside of the four Gospels, as sources of Gospel history—though they may all be considered for occasional notes or broader knowledge of the temporal and spatial context—for the same reasons apply to these other sources as to the four primary ones. Indeed, one particular circumstance might seem suitable for providing material for an even more extensive preliminary consideration, as is often prefaced to historical investigations. We refer to this: the question of the manner and way in which a general and indirect standard of rectification can be obtained in the entire history of that time and its documents, instead of that specific and immediate standard of correction which one might, but mistakenly, think to have in a history book allegedly written by an eyewitness to the events; particularly in such documents that, like the letters of the New Testament, were created in environments and conditions directly or closely related to the content of the gospel

history. The use that can be made of these documents in this sense is indeed very comprehensive; yes, at some of the most crucial points where we would remain either unclear or in error if we wanted to judge them from the Gospels alone, it may be decisive. But the most significant things we would have to say about this subject are too closely tied, partly to the specific facts related to this question, and partly to even broader philosophical considerations about the peculiar nature and essence of certain main moments of the evangelical history that seem to conflict with the general laws of history, for us not to think it wiser to reserve this for later sections of our work.

Second book.

The sagas of the Lord's childhood.

Through the thought process and the results of the preceding book, we have entered into a decided contrast against the view on the origin of our evangelical documents, which allows the content of them to take shape before its written recording in oral tradition, in the form in which these documents presently present it to us. We found ourselves in agreement with that view insofar as we are on common ground, at least as much as the narrative part of those documents is concerned, that we do not recognize the relationship of this part to the narrated events as immediate in the literal sense of the word, we cannot trace it back to an eyewitness account of the authors, neither all nor some among them. But the mediation that we therefore had to assume as lying in the middle between the events and their written recording turned out to be essentially different from the mediation that would have taken place according to the tradition hypothesis. For the larger and more important part from the mouth of one reporter, one who was himself an eyewitness and among the most prominent participants in the narrated events, in their other parts, either all or most of them, from a tradition of such a kind, in which we have no sufficient reason to presuppose a truly formative, reshaping force in relation to the transmitted content, the written-down narratives have arisen. Their form and external appearance, and likewise, at least for the most part, the supposed transformations that they may have experienced, whether through misunderstanding, or gaps in the tradition, or an excessively zealous attempt to give shape and color to the content through a more detailed report - they all are, at least as far as the positive aspect of the form is concerned, essentially attributable to the written representation itself, and not to a tradition preceding and serving as a source for this representation. — This, as mentioned, is the general result of a consideration based on a thorough examination of the documents themselves with a judicious use of the historical notes preserved outside them. However, the generality of the result thus found suffers an exception with respect to a particular part of the documents, an exception whose cause, nature, and character can only be brought to light by a consideration specifically dedicated to it, which also subjects the content and object of the part of the written Gospels in question to a discussion, along with the formal and literary aspects.

According to the sense that the tradition hypothesis has assumed among the majority of present-day researchers, two Gospels would primarily be affected by it, namely those named after Matthew and Luke. The work of Mark, as allegedly compiled from those two, as well as that of John as an immediate eyewitness, would not suffer any, or no immediate, application. This result has transformed for us into something essentially different, but in a way that explains the view that lies at the basis of it, namely that those two Gospels, which are allegedly derived primarily and foremostly from tradition, are the ones between which and the events narrated in them the relationship - in contrast to the other two, each of which has only one explicitly traceable link between itself and the object - is mediated by a multitude of notable and demonstrable intermediaries. Among these mediating links now, we must add, as one of them, but only with respect to a specific, precisely defined, and relatively not very extensive part of the evangelical narrative, also tradition, the legend. It enters, exactly in the same sense, or rather in an even more proper and stricter sense, as in which the hypothesis, against which we had to struggle in the previous book, wanted to regard it as the main source of all or most of the evangelical historical narratives. The parts of the two Gospels, which we assert to have been drawn from this source and no other, are the first two chapters of the first and likewise the first two along with a part of the third chapter of the third Gospel - of all parts of all four Gospels, known to be those which have preserved for us a series of enlivening reports about the descent and birth, childhood and youth of our Savior. That these parts cannot belong to those that, like the majority of the rest in those two Gospels, are drawn from a common source, is evident from their deviation among themselves. This is so great that, with the exception of the most general elements, which must underlie all such narratives, they scarcely have a single feature in common*).

*) According to the Manichean Faustus, who likewise saw them as mythical, these narratives would not have been included under the name of the Gospel (which, admittedly, originally referred only to the later events since John's baptism), but the expression of Matthew: βίβλος γενεσεως is intended to designate them. August. c. Faust. II. 1.

To assume various written sources from which both Gospels could have drawn is indeed a way out that many have already taken, and is also not rejected by us as improper from the outset. But with it, the origin of those narratives is by no means explained, so it necessarily compels one to go even further back; where one will then end up at the same concept as the last source, which we have provisionally already designated as such a source.

What indeed forces us to return to this source, which we otherwise hesitate to recognize everywhere as the source of the evangelical narratives, is the nature of the narratives presented here. If we dare to assert that their character is not historical: we may regard this assertion as having general agreement insofar as even those who have not yet given up believing in the literal truth of these narratives will nonetheless not want to place this truth, even in part precisely because it is supposed to be a literal one, in a class with such truth as is called historical in the narrow and proper sense. We have already reminded in the previous book of how historical truth - the recognition of such events and facts that, as a link in the chain of historical causal connections, take a place in the series of historical events - is not to be confused with mere, naked factuality, with that soulless and literal concept of truth that can be designated as the legal fact. Historical truth, the truth of historical knowledge, is rather a composite product of this factuality and free mental activity. The fact consists in the material underlying knowledge, which it first appropriates in an immediate way, in the manner of external, sensory perception. But the free mental activity is that which, based on philosophical knowledge of the general laws of historical life, carries such knowledge into that material, thereby supplementing its gaps, bringing together what has fallen apart, and thus giving shape and organic life to the whole. From this follows that only those events can become the subject of actual historical knowledge that is subject to the common laws of history. These laws are indeed of a living, flexible nature; they do not close within a narrow circle of abstract concept determination but are rather of such elasticity that their knowledge can also be expanded, conversely, through knowledge of particular events and is continuously being expanded. But they still rest entirely on a natural basis, as history itself is nothing other than nature striving toward the spirit, the process of liberating the spirit from natural life, essentially only through life and activity within nature and its laws. Where those physical laws, which everywhere and consistently form the basis of historical life, lose their validity or are broken, historical knowledge as such necessarily ceases. In its place steps, if any recognition at all, at any rate, recognition of such a kind, whose subject can no longer be described as historical, whose content can no longer be termed historical truth. The subject of such knowledge then lies altogether beyond the sphere of history as such, beyond the sphere of facts and events, in the realm of pure spirit. If, nevertheless, the nature of the factual, of the external event entering into the historical causal connection is claimed for this subject, the contradiction arises that the spiritual, independent of the mediation that otherwise elevates the natural to spiritual significance, to the significance of the historical fact, should still be simultaneously a natural, immediate, and factual thing. Thus it happens that, while the knowledge of the historical as such is everywhere and necessarily spirit-filled, spirited, precisely this knowledge of the spiritually absolute descends to

soulless immediacy, and the alleged highest facts of the spirit can only be ascertained in the manner of the poor externality of the legal fact.

145

In this category of immediate factuality, for which, with the claim of an absolutely spiritual significance, no historical knowledge is possible, but only a purely factual proof, belongs all that is miraculous in the common, vulgar sense of the word, all that is miraculous. This consists precisely in such a breach of the natural laws that apply to everything historical, allegedly by the absolute spirit, whereby the fact acquires the character not only of the supernatural (for supernatural are all the peaks and heights of the historical, which can therefore be called miraculous in a genuine, philosophical sense), but also of the unnatural, and, because unnatural, necessarily also unhistorical. With the impossibility of simultaneously philosophically and factually mediated historical knowledge of miraculous facts, for such facts, as long as they are still assumed and asserted, nothing remains but the legal proof of witnesses and documents, which, if its results are to be attributed a credibility that also binds science, must then really be conducted with the full rigor of a criminal inquisition proceeding strictly by legal means. — Admittedly, a certainty of another kind is also claimed for such facts from their spiritual side, a religious belief allegedly released by a testimony of the divine spirit from all natural and historical legality. If, however, such certainty were already what it is given for, namely certainty: it would know how to dispense with the factual proof of the miracle, which is nevertheless claimed to be required or given at the same time. It would, as we see it actually happen with the naive faith of an earlier time, refrain from any and all historical or purportedly historical proof of the facts: it would find full compensation in the testimony of the spirit for the moment of externality, which, apart from that historical mediation through which it would become historical truth, would only have value for the mind insofar as it gives the spiritual content a form for the imagination, for sensual perception, and representation. The view that believes in miracles, when it embarks on witness and documentary evidence, thereby abandons the standpoint of faith and thus exposes its subject to the full rigor of historical criticism. This, since it is a matter of the existence and non-existence of its own principles, would only be able to surrender if it were really presented with such proof, which the full validity of a legal one could not be denied. In any other case, criticism will insist all the more strictly on its right to a natural mediation of everything that is to be established as historical truth, as on the recognition of this right, its ability to work, on its part, for the knowledge of the highest spiritual truths, the truths of faith in the spiritual sense, shows itself to be completely based. When the facts, which are considered facts of faith, are subjected to historical consideration and scientific criticism: such action is based on the assumption that knowledge, scientific knowledge in the corresponding sense, is

possible from these facts, as from other facts of nature and history. The recognition of facts that are incapable of such mediation would be tantamount to abandoning this knowability of the divine. In front of an act of divinity that completely breaks through the laws of nature and history, in front of a miracle in that proper, unnatural, and unhistorical sense, we could only stand thoughtlessly resigned. The divine is thereby documented as dwelling in an unapproachable beyond, where no knowledge based on the laws of this-worldly truth can penetrate, and against which these laws and therefore knowledge itself on its own territory completely powerless and fades away as something untrue and merely imagined.

147

Now, the fact that the events of the childhood story actually bear, for the most part, this character of a miraculous nature, which is forever incompatible with the regularity of history and could only claim recognition in the form of a factual immediacy to which the laws of historical understanding would succumb, we may assume as conceded. All these events, have their center, — a center on whose credibility theirs entirely depends — in the account of the supernatural, purely virginal conception and birth of Jesus Christ. But this alleged fact is one whose character is in stark contrast to the character of the historical, whose acceptance or non-acceptance, therefore, is decisive for the abandonment or non-abandonment of a historical understanding (i.e., a scientific understanding in general, for no other scientific understanding is possible of the temporal factual, other than the historical) of the divine revelation in the person and teachings of Jesus Christ. All the regularity of the historical chain of causation rests on the continuity of generation, the propagation of the human race through itself. If this continuity is thought to be interrupted by an immediate act of divine creativity of the kind that the generation of a person on any path other than that of natural propagation would be, this creates a rupture in that chain of causation, by which the natural order and lawfulness of all history is utterly abolished, so that it could only be restored thereafter by a similar act of caprice that abolished it. — On the other hand, precisely this alleged fact is one concerning which a proof of witnesses and documents in the strict legal sense is virtually inconceivable. Even those who, in the whole rest of the evangelical history, insist most strongly on what is called historical credibility in the ordinary external sense, even these must here, in a way that would certainly not happen with any fact of a more indifferent nature, resort to the inwardness of belief. They must seek to establish the truth and reality of the fact, since they cannot do so positively, by a negative method, through the apagogical proof that without the explicit intervention of divinity, an extraordinary appearance such as the personality of Christ cannot be explained. — More than anywhere else, then, it happens here that the believing mind, seeking to justify its faith in the miraculous fact, is thrown back from the idea to the fact, and from

the fact to the idea, without being able to find a mediation between the two, which the idea itself, because of the otherworldliness of the region from which the concept would have to be taken, could make comprehensible and thus acceptable to the mind, and the fact, because of the impossibility of giving it substance and certainty as a fact within the domain of external reality, is so much in need.

149

It is our intention here, as in all similar cases - of which many will occur in the wide course of our observation - not to engage in a detailed polemic against the view hitherto considered orthodox. What could be said and done in this polemical direction has long since been dealt with on all main points, both those concerning the general and those concerning the particular. Specifically, it has been so fully and comprehensively summarized by the latest critical interpreter of this story that any new undertaking of this kind is rendered superfluous. The same polemical works have also sufficiently brought to light the contradiction in which, purely historically considered, the statements of the two different documents regarding the birth and childhood story stand in relation to each other, the inconceivability that they are drawn from the same, or even a mutually agreeing source. It is now our task, according to the task we have set ourselves in all parts of our work, to search here too for the positive historical truth through scientific mediation, and to establish it in such a way that, with its acceptance, which we will try to bring about as far as possible, the errors opposing it will fall away by themselves. We hope to achieve this concerning the story of childhood salvation precisely by grasping it as a legend, as a myth in the proper and strict sense, and attempting to present it in the same sense. — A similar intention, in name and word, has already been expressed by the aforementioned critical interpretation, and not only with regard to this part of the evangelical history but also, with certain modifications, to the whole. But as the character and tendency of this critique essentially hold in the negative, so it is, at least in relation to the historical content that we will seek to trace in the legend, an entirely negative concept of myth on which that work bases its "mythical view" of evangelical history. The "figurative clothing of early Christian ideas," which according to Strauss should make up the mythical element of this story, always turns out to consist in nothing other than the immediate, and therefore groundless and arbitrary transfer of messianic prototypes and prophecies of the Old Testament to the person of Jesus Christ and the events of his life. As mostly correct the perception of kinship behaves, which the critic strives to demonstrate between the Old Testament prototypes and the New Testament replicas, as long as this kinship is understood only as a transfer, as an external, mechanical transplantation of the plant sprouted from the soil of the Old Testament legend, there can be no talk of any proper, more specific, and historically or philosophically recognizable idea-content of the New Testament legend. All that remains

here of idea-content, that is, — for we are in the realm where idea and history would have to coincide — of genuinely historical content, is on the one hand the indefinite something of an effect which the mental power of Jesus exerted on a part of his contemporaries, so that they considered him the Messiah announced to the Jews, on the other hand, the mythological imagery draped around the chosen Messiah as an external tinsel. — Therefore, as we undertake expressly to draw out the truly historical content from those accounts through the mythological view and treatment, we will not be able to help but stand in opposition to that negative-mythological view, however grateful we may also acknowledge it for its critical preparatory work, just as against other ways of interpreting those reports.

151

It is well known that against the view which allows the narratives of the birth and childhood of Christ to arise from mythical poetry, the objection has been raised both often in the past and again recently that their simple and naive character, far from being poetic or artistic, contradicts this view. These narratives, it is thought, are cast entirely in the same mold as the subsequent historical ones, and therefore likely drawn from the same source, namely from accounts by eyewitnesses. — This objection could only be conceived in complete disregard of all analogies that exist historically for the preservation and transmission of legendary narratives. Even where the richest poetic representation of the myth precedes in the forms of art poetry, we quite often find a subsequent transformation of it into the form of simple narrative, stripped of all poetic ornamentation and all detail of execution. Thus, the Greek myth of gods and heroes, after it had already been glorified in the splendor of epic poetry by Homer and the Cyclic poets, was related by the logographers who followed them as simple history, in a sequence with the gradually adjoining real history of the Greek people. Even after the flourishing age of all other branches of literature had passed, when that mythical material had undergone the most varied and magnificent forms in lyric and dramatic poetry, in painting and sculpture, even then we still encounter, not to mention countless others who incidentally and for other purposes did the same, a Apollodorus, a Hyginus, who specifically made it their business to transmit the mythical content, stripped of its artistic garb, in naked prose. A gradual process of transition of the mythical tradition from poetry to prose, from fiction into history or history-like representation, we could observe in the Nordic saga since its adoption and processing among the peoples of Scandinavia, we could trace more or less in most legend cycles of the Germanic and Romance Middle Ages. Almost everywhere we see that the epic is followed by the romance, and the more elaborate, artful romance is followed by the simple narrative that propagates itself in folk books or even in historical works of a more scientific, scholarly character. Therefore, whoever could not conceive the emergence of mythical poetry

except through the mediation of works of real art poetry, would at least not have to regard the simple character of the reports by Matthew and Luke as an obstacle to thinking of such poetic representations as preceding those reports and as their source. He would be able to proceed in the field of evangelical history in approximately the manner of a famous researcher who sought to trace back the legendary components he had found in the earliest history of Rome to epic poems, from which history had gradually arisen.

152

However, we do not even need this detour, against which, to be sure, justified concerns of a different kind would be raised. The true myth is a structure that, as much as it is suited to serve as the object and content of art and artistic poetry, and as much as it possesses, so to speak, the drive to let artistic structures of all kinds emerge from its womb and shape itself into them, is nevertheless, in itself and fundamentally, something entirely different from real artistic poetry. It is, as has been rightly stated, a thoroughly objective poetry, a poetry that resides only in the invention or compilation of facts, but not in the form of expression and representation. Therefore, there is not only nothing to prevent the myth from being laid down as a simple history in unadorned, unpoetic narratives, long before it was shaped into the forms of poetry or actual works of art, but this is precisely the usual course of events arising from the nature of the matter. It is so, at least with those myths, which, through external circumstances, are brought earlier into relation to historiography than to poetry and art. Thus, to mention one of the most striking examples of this kind, we find in the old Latin historians of those Germanic peoples who came into contact with the cultured Roman world during the migration of peoples and thus received historiography before they had produced a national epic or other forms of artistic poetry from among themselves, in Iornandes, in Paulus Diaconus, in Gregory of Tours, Fvedegarius, and others, a multitude of legend-like traits. These, either preceding or interwoven with the actual history, are told in exactly the same artless tone as the latter, and do not bear the slightest trace of poetic origin in the form of their representation. Yet we must presuppose such an origin for them; indeed, it is expressly mentioned in the reference to folk songs of historical or rather mythical content, now and then by those writers. But the same category includes the numerous myths which, in the midst of historical time, almost in all significant events or personalities, particularly the "myth-bearing Hellas" (μυθοτόκος 'Ελλάς), but more or less all peoples of the poetry-rich antiquity and Middle Ages, added to the bare historical facts. They did not merely enliven these with poetic embellishments but, more so, to give expression to the spirit concealed behind the rigid immediacy of the factual. Such sporadic myth-making is interwoven into almost all large and small skilled works or historical documents of the early and middle ages, without any hint of real poetry. These

myths are notoriously not born of such poetry — in their series, however, rightfully belongs, perhaps as the richest and most beautiful of all the blossoms of this branch of legend invention, the mythical, which is interwoven into the evangelical history.

153

It is of importance in more than one respect to gain a better understanding of the character of this particular type of historical myths, under which, according to the preceding indication, we will have to classify the legends of the birth and childhood of the Redeemer. The neglect of such understanding has, in recent times, since the application of the concepts of legend and myth to the evangelical history has been stimulated, brought the double disadvantage that on one hand, such application was thought to jeopardize more than was fair the substantial historical core of this story, and therefore vehemently resisted any and all admission of those concepts to this field, and then on the other hand, that it extended the bounds of its applicability unduly, and, by coming close to dissipating the entire evangelical history into a myth, thus simultaneously lost the true content of the myth in the way we earlier described as the necessary consequence of this act. The mythical elements of the evangelical history, in fact, belong to the class of those myths whose significance essentially lies in that they lean on real history, presuppose events, and, both in their form, as well as their sense and content, remain entirely dependent on it. That such myths exist at all, no one will deny who has studied any part of history, e.g., that of classical antiquity, attentively from the sources. With what leaf and blossom decorations of fragrant legend twines did Greek antiquity surround, often even during their lifetime, almost always at least very soon after their death, almost every one of its great men! Not just those whose lives and deeds were, like those of Alexander the Great, by their nature inviting to a poetic, epic rendition, but also philosophers, statesmen, legislators, poets, those in a word, whose destinies and activities either vanished in unnoticed solitude, or in the prose of outer business life, and offered nothing less than a heroic, romantic character of view. The more such legendary traits appear in the midst of a historical time and environment, the more decisively they are usually rejected as untrue, deceitful inventions and fabrications. However, looking more closely, it is almost always found that they also possess a by no means negligible intellectual, historical content. They are, provided they are to be considered genuine myths and not perhaps empty fables that have forced themselves into their place, everywhere intended to complement history in detail, and particularly in an appropriate manner, just as the great cycles of myths that speak of the world of gods and heroes, supplement world history as a whole and on a large scale backward, and tie it to the Eternal and Timeless, from which all history has its origin, the purpose they have. They contain, figuratively expressed, in ingenious, bold symbolism, intellectual references and character elements of the events, ones that do not appear in

direct factuality and thus cannot be communicated in a historical narrative without that deeper reflection called the philosophy of history. They contain, in fact, a philosophy of history itself, dressed as the contemporaries of the events had to dress it, if it was to become understandable to them and take shape for them, or rather as the spirit of destiny dressed itself for them, without their doing, without any invention on their part, to reveal itself to them. Not always, nor everywhere, is it precisely the form of the wondrous, the supernatural, or magical that the spirit of history prefers to assume in these mythical arabesques; yet he does prefer this form, since in it he can most specifically distinguish himself from the immediate factual, into which he weaves his revelation, and point to his higher nature and origin.

155

Now that, among many others and before many others, the life story of Jesus Christ has become an occasion and point of attachment, or also, if you will, the subject and determination of content for the formation of legends of the kind described here, this is precisely a circumstance that, as it is flatly denied by the view which so far claimed the glory of Christian orthodoxy exclusively for itself, so it shows itself to a purely historical understanding as entirely founded in the nature of the matter. Indeed, the difference between the two views just mentioned is explicitly more far-reaching in the relationship in question here, and it may seem as if the legitimacy or illegitimacy, even here, of assuming mythical structures, depends on the answer to many preliminary questions. So the first questionable point here is this: whether among the people among whom the events of this history took place, and therefore in whose lap—this assumption is at least the closest—the myths would have had to be generated first, whether among them there was also any myth-making, both in general and specifically in the manner just described, to which the evangelical myths would join by their nature. This is also, of course, denied by the orthodox. The history of the Old Testament is considered by them no less than that of the New, from beginning to end, as a compendium of real, immediate facts to which no poetry is mixed. The historical view, on the other hand, has increasingly inclined in recent times to place the Israelite people in this regard in the same category as the other peoples of antiquity, and to attribute a mythical character to its history as well; a purely mythical one to the so-called age of the patriarchs and the prehistory up to the exodus from Egypt, and one interwoven with sporadic myths for the entire subsequent history down to Christ. — In fact, the answer to this preliminary question is not only of interest to ours because of the analogy that must undoubtedly arise from it for the latter, but it constitutes, in a twofold respect, a part of the answer to this latter itself. On the one hand, the history of the Old Testament is presupposed by Christ and the Apostles; they refer back to it in their speeches and teachings, and often explicitly point to such facts, about which the question is whether they are to be

understood as mythical or historical. But then, and this is the most important thing, among those contentious features of Old Testament history, there are essentially and especially those that are made the basis of their view of evangelical history by both standpoints, the dogmatic and the mythological alike. We mean the messianic proclamations and prophecies, which, emanating from divinely inspired prophets, had already become the general belief of the people when the event occurred, which, according to both the one and the other view, is to be regarded as their fulfillment. For just as, according to the dogmatic view, these prophecies are considered as immediate, miraculous foretelling of something later factual, so the mythological standpoint includes them in its concept of the historical myth; it declares them to be myths that, like other myths, represent a historical past, so a historical future in symbolic imagery. It will not be objected that this is an extension of the concept of myth introduced solely for the purpose of this particular fact, the messianic prophecies, and their fulfillment by Christ, as otherwise everywhere a myth is understood only as a tale of the past, not a proclamation of the future. This would indeed be an arbitrary restriction of that concept, one that is not justified by anything. In truth, we find that every genuine mythology, precisely because it is based on an ideal perception in the true sense of the word, i.e., one that sees the whole in the individual and always has the totality of the world's essence and history in the background, also looks into the future of this history, which it likes to clothe in imagery, just like all its other perceptions. Such glimpses are not entirely absent even in that mythology that has most completely enclosed itself in the views of the past and present, the Greek *); richer still are the Indian, the Persian mythology, and especially the old Nordic.

*) Even among the Greeks, there are mythical creations that hint at the eventual downfall of the Olympian divine world, at their overthrow by a higher power; but in exoteric mythology, they usually received the twist that the condition to which the prophecy of this overthrow is attached is still to be averted. Thus, with the prophecies that were linked to Zeus's marriage with Metis (Hesiod. Theog. 886 ff.) and with Thetis (Aesch. Prom. 908 ff.). Their main playground was probably in esoteric mythology, i.e., the mythology of the Mysteries, to which they were referred from the exoteric. Furthermore, in this category also belong the oracles, Sibylline prophecies, etc.

For the latter, or for their historical destiny among the Germanic peoples among whom they arose, it is of truly characteristic significance that they know almost more to tell of the future of the divine world than of its past.

If it can now be justified to attribute a mythical nature to those prophecies in connection with a part of the historical narratives to which they are linked in the Old Testament and with which they are in constant connection, then from this mythical realm a transition has been opened to evangelical history, which allows the application of this concept to a part of this history itself to appear in a new and unique light. At first glance, the suspicion may arise that this application will result in nothing other than what we have actually seen result from the interpretation that Strauß has attempted to give to the "mythical view": a mechanical transfer of those "future-proclaiming myths" to the present in which those prophecies are supposed to have been fulfilled. If understood in this way, the myths, as has already been reproachfully pointed out to Strauß on several occasions *), would be indistinguishable from empty fabrication.

*) Compare the well-known reviews of this work by Ullmann and Jul. Müller in the theological studies and critiques, and the treatise by Baumgarten-Crusius de mythicae evangeliorum interpretationis indole atque finibus in his Opusc. theolog. (Jen. 1836). In the latter treatise, the impossibility of explaining the myths of the evangelical history in this way, through the mechanical transfer of the Old Testament legends, is particularly convincingly demonstrated.

The evangelical narratives, instead of obtaining a higher guarantee of their inner spiritual truth through those prophetic myths, would sink far below the dignity of the historical myths of paganism itself due to this circumstance. — However, the matter takes on a completely different appearance if we proceed from the assumption that the myths of evangelical history, if myths really exist here, must be of the same nature and essence as all other truly historical myths, that is, that they must, like these, express the true spiritual sense and content of the events in a symbolic garment of a thoroughly individual nature, which applies only to these and no other events. If, granting the truth of this assumption, there is not an immediate identity, but rather a relationship and mutual relation of the evangelical myth, thus constituted, that is, truly creatively sprung from history itself, not externally adapted to it, with those prophetic myths: then a deeper validation of the latter by history itself, a fulfillment of the prophecies contained in them, must be admitted. Then all the other historical myths that are connected with those prophetic ones are also placed in an inner spiritual relationship to the fact proclaimed there, and in a broader sense, also (as has indeed often been considered and interpreted by more deeply reflective minds the entire Old Testament history or rather the entire mythical part of this history from this point of view) are elevated to messianic prophecies. The evangelical myths then appear as the necessary keystone of this circle of legends, which in truth encompasses the deepest ideal core of world history. They signify, in the moment of the fulfillment of those prophecies, the consciousness, not the abstract, reflective one, but the immediate, concrete, and lively consciousness inherent

in the events themselves, of this fulfillment. They are, as it were, the answer that the spirit of the fulfilling event gives to those prophetic voices, in which it recognizes itself just as those recognize and find themselves in it.

160

In this light, it will now be our task to present the legends of the birth and childhood stories, as completely and thoroughly as possible, developing both their origin, their genesis, as well as their content and meaning. We consider them, as one can see, as myths in the strict and proper sense of the word, not merely — granting the difference that one has recently taken to drawing between these two expressions — as legends. For they are not characterized, as we will see further on, like some other legendary components of the Gospel story might be, by resting on an entirely factual basis, only in a somewhat freer handling and partial transformation of this basis, as oral tradition tends to produce. Their foundation is, rather, like the foundation of all genuine myths, essentially ideal and spiritual. Creatively transforming, they draw history into the circle of the idea they want to express, and do not, conversely, allow only the ideal moment to play along as an ornament to the external fact. We cannot, therefore, endorse the endeavor, in which many still indulge, to pick out a few facts at any cost from all these poetic works, even if one partially recognizes them for what they are. By doing this, far from gaining historical content, the true historical content, the ideal understanding of the spirit of history contained in the myths, is inevitably lost. Instead of that spiritual content enlivening the external facts, we get some dry, external notes, which, since they remain outside the demonstrable connection with real facts, are devoid of all true historical interest. In contrast, the mere existence of the myths at this point, viewed from the world-historical standpoint, must appear to us as a fact of the utmost importance. It is indeed one through which we gain infinitely more for the understanding of divine revelation in history than we could even gain through the most accurate knowledge of the facts that have taken the place of those legends. In particular, as for the content of the legends, this has a much higher value if we interpret it as mythical rather than if it should be regarded as an immediate fact. The latter, the lesser value of the fact as such, is indeed also conceded by those who, like most nowadays, do consider what is narrated to be a fact, so as not to detract from the credibility of the documents, but expressly emphasize that faith in these facts (e.g., the Immaculate Conception of Mary *)) must not be made dependent on the essence of Christianity. On the other hand, we hope to show how the myths constitute a truly indispensable element of that divine revelation which reaches its climax in the person of Jesus Christ.

*) Cf. on this Schleiermacher's "Glaubenslehre," first edition, II, p. 214 ff.; — a passage that has set the tone on this point in modern theology. Although

Schleiermacher himself makes it clear enough that a literal understanding of the document is by no means absolutely demanded by the interest of its credibility.

161

That the revelation in Christ, in order to be understood and comprehended as a revelation, does not want to be regarded as an isolated fact but in connection with the rest of human history: this has also been recognized by the dogmatic view, in the way in which it also ties the New Testament to the Old. But this view suffers from the limitation that it wants to recognize a pre-Christian revelation only in the particularity of the Israelite people. The mythological view, without disputing the aforementioned people's claim to fame that it, partly through its monotheism, partly and especially through its prophetic myths, which the dogmatic standpoint calls Messianic prophecies, has proven itself to be the bearer of that highest revelation, the historical one in the narrow and proper sense, before all other peoples, recognizes a revelation process that runs through all the peoples of world history, one that reaches its peak and completion only in the person of Christ. It recognizes at the beginning of all history a primal revelation of God to the human spirit, which is so intimately intertwined with the primal history of the human race that the mythologies of all pre-Christian peoples can be considered a common monument, which the spirit of these peoples has set for both that revelation and this history. Now, with this mythological primal revelation, which is continued from the primal time of both the race and the individual peoples through sporadic myth formation within their history, but especially through the prophetic myths, the historical revelation in Christ comes into relation through the myths surrounding the birth and childhood of the God-man in a manner entirely corresponding to the birth and childhood of the human race. These myths are truly the mediating link, with the recognition of which we first gain the complete assurance that Christ is indeed the center of the ages, the fullness of the deity revealing itself in the course of time and world history. If the dogmatic view regards it as part of the completeness of the divine glory that Christ is worshiped not only by humans but also by angels, this itself is only a mythical expression for the demand that Christ also be recognized by those spirits that were the organ of divine communication to humans in ancient times, i.e., precisely by the spirits of the myth, as the Son of the eternal God.

162

If the myth of childhood is now understood in this sense, it becomes clear how all further questions about its origin are answered, all doubts that might arise from the obscurity of this origin regarding the historical character of the other evangelical narratives are dispelled. Myths of the kind described here, though filled through and through with

poetic spirit as they are by their nature, by no means belong in a row with what is more properly called poetry, fiction. They are never and nowhere the work of an individual; it can be regarded as one of the most infallible hallmarks by which the genuine myth distinguishes itself from arbitrarily invented fables, that the former never allows an inventor to be specified, but rather grows from the people with the unconscious necessity of a natural product. Admittedly, it cannot be assumed otherwise than that every individual feature of the myth must ultimately be traced back to an individual in whom this thought first arose, or perhaps to several individuals, in whom it arose independently of each other. But that which is invented by individuals as such is not yet the myth. The myth only arises from the convergence of a majority of such inventions, which proves to be predetermined, so to speak, by this ability to grow together, to bond with one another, to serve as an expression for a popular belief, rather an idea that is truth not only for the individual but for the people. Among the inventors, it must be assumed in most cases that they pronounce what they themselves invented, along with what has already been handed down, in the most perfect good faith in its truth, and pass it on further. They connect it by an unconscious conclusion to the already existing basis of tradition, the first such inventors to the immediately historical, those who follow later to the inventions of their predecessors. But as far as their personal consciousness is concerned, in which, as has been demonstrable in all earlier confessors of Christianity, spiritual and factual truth are not yet distinguished, they are just as faithful to the self-invented as to the handed down. This latter is especially difficult for us to imagine, especially in those moments of the myth where the symbolic nature stands out more strikingly. It is difficult for us because we are accustomed in such cases to distinguish between meaning and clothing, between content and form, roughly in the manner in which such poetry is subjected, which we call allegorical, and to attribute the same truth to the form under no circumstances as to the content. In cases of this kind (examples will soon confront us of themselves), if one cannot overcome oneself to recognize the meaning as really existing where one must admit that it was not expressly thought and intended by the inventor of the image in its distinction from the form, it will always be the more negligible to leave this meaning aside than, conversely, by assuming a knowing allegory, to question the fidelity and good faith of the inventors of the saga. The remarkable, even the wonderful thing about the mythical image is then precisely that it is of such a nature as to give occasion to the interpreter to find in it not just any arbitrary, general or remote sense*), but the innermost spirit and character of the events themselves, which it has pushed itself in place of, expressed.

*) This is a mistake against which attempts to interpret mythology, even in the field of what is more narrowly called, i.e., pagan mythologies, usually do not guard carefully enough, and which has contributed particularly much to discredit attempts of this kind. Nor are those who, like the famous but flawed work by

Creuzer with its undeniable great merit, mainly aim to interpret a system of natural symbolism from mythical forms of all times and peoples, free from it. — The author takes the liberty of referring to his writing, "On the Concept, Treatment, and Sources of Mythology" (Leipz., 1828) in relation to this and many other points coming to the fore in the present section.

It must therefore also be admitted that interpretations of myths cannot be dispensed with; one may at least reproach them with the fact that it is rather the interpreter's own spirit than the spirit of the myth that expresses itself in them. Paradoxical as they may seem, they are and remain the only possible way to take seriously the recognition and appreciation of myth, which for most people remains only a melodious expression.

164

Especially, however, it becomes clear, to now come back to our evangelical myths, what seems to so many an insurmountable obstacle, the possibility, indeed not just the possibility, but the necessity of their emergence at a time so close to the events to which they are attached. We find no particular need to push part of these myths themselves further, even than the historical evidence immediately compels us to do, namely into the age of the apostles, even back to the very lifetime of Christ. — We believe that we must keep the possibility that this may indeed be the case open, precisely because, indeed, the more a certain period is granted to the myth to develop and consolidate, the less puzzling the belief it finds can remain. That, however, at the time when our two evangelists recorded the infancy narrative, it was still very much in the process of becoming and forming: this is already shown by the complete difference in the shape in which it is handed down to us by one and the other. To assume that here one or the other of the two presupposes what the other has handed down, and only wants to supply what was omitted by chance from the other, is just as little reason as in many other cases where the gospels diverge from one another. Rather, the particular nature of what is handed down shows most clearly here how neither of the two had the slightest knowledge of the content of the other's tradition; which just allows us to conclude that the myths were not yet fully established. This is also indicated by the considerable number of apocryphal stories of the infancy, and their relationship to our canonical narratives. Indeed, the larger part of these stories no longer deserve the name of genuine myths. They are rather wild and unrestrained side-shoots of myth-making, which is why they also did not find lasting belief, or belief in a wider scope, in the bosom of the Christian community. Nevertheless, the continuity in which they stand with the genuine story can almost always be traced, and some of their features, which can be shown in part to be of the same age as the canonical ones, have also been maintained in currency with these. In any case, at least in regard to these

side branches of the story, we would not like to join in the declamations of the dogmatic believers that have recently become so popular. These, of course, have every reason to portray the difference between the apocryphal and canonical myths as starkly as possible, since the mere existence of the former, especially in the infancy story (why are they so strikingly rare in the later life of Jesus?), speaks so loudly for the mythical nature of this story. But the truth is that, in particular, the Gospel of James and the Protoevangelium of James, these two compositions that undoubtedly date back to a very high age, contain alongside much that is undeniably exaggerated and wrong, a not entirely insignificant number of features that, placed next to the sayings of the canonical gospels, do not appear at all heterogeneous to them, and give much not-to-be-despised insight into their genesis. In general, however, this is important for the understanding of our evangelical myth, that one does not view it as a finished and complete poem or as a random conglomerate of such poems, but, as is every genuine myth that is still immediately alive and only just emerged at the time of its recording, as a becoming and fluid form, striving towards the goal, i.e., the full expression of the idea from whose contemplation it arises, and finally as such, to which, without detriment to its integrity and spiritual unity, many features could still be added or from which also some could be taken away.

166

To facilitate the understanding of the myths at hand, there is a circumstance that does not easily occur in the same way with another group of myths; namely, that we can pinpoint with perfect accuracy the point at which their invention first attached. That we are able to do this here is itself owed to the relationship to those prophetic myths, which, if not, as some would have it, the only factor, is certainly a significant one in the formation of the myths in question here. Concerning the Messiah, whom the Israelite people expected, it was widely believed before Jesus that he would emerge from the descendants of King David. Investigating how this belief arose does not fall within the scope of our present task. Essential for our purpose is only this: that it is conceded to us that it was already in itself of mythical nature, thus not merely an empty invention of individuals, but equally neither a real prophecy claiming immediate factual validity. Thus, we can also leave it to the researchers of the history and poetry of the Old Testament to judge what those prophetic passages of the Old Testament, which speak of a future king of Israel, a Lord and Savior from David's line *), the so-called Messianic prophecies in the narrower sense, as to how far they are the basis and first cause of that legend, or rather how far they themselves have emerged from earlier beginnings of the legend.

*) The most important of these passages is undoubtedly the 11th chapter of the prophet Isaiah.

It is certain that at the time of Jesus' appearance, the designation of the Messiah as the Son of David was not merely linked to those individual passages, but that this designation had already become familiar to everyone, in short, in the truest sense, had become an article of popular belief. — Now, if the advantage is not to be lost that can be drawn from this preformation of the Messianic myth for the genesis and interpretation of the infancy story: what we need above all is the concession, not that Jesus, who really did descend from David's line, found support in the assumption of the Messiahship through that popular legend due to a random coincidence, but rather that precisely this, the transformation of the prophetic myth of the future Messiah from David's line into a historical myth, the myth of the Messiah who really arose from David's line, constitutes the first act of early Christian myth-making.

167

That Jesus was also actually a descendant of David, that the genealogies in which his lineage is handed down to us are based at least on the general factual truth of such descent: this cannot be directly proven as impossible, but an investigation free from dogmatic prejudices cannot recognize it as likely in any respect. Explicitly, two significant passages oppose this assumption: first, the question posed to the Pharisees by Jesus according to the Synoptics *), how the Messiah could be the son of David when he was called his lord by David himself; then in the fourth Gospel **), the objection made by the Jews expressly against the claim that Jesus was the Messiah, that the Messiah must be a descendant of David and come from Bethlehem.

*) Mark 12:35 ff. and parallels.

**) John 7:42.

That Jesus, whatever else his intention may have been with that question, would not have asked it if he himself considered himself a descendant of David or placed any value on this supposed descent, is so obvious that we consider any polemic against contrived interpretations of the opposite sense to be unnecessary. But as for the second passage, although we do not place any particular value on the expressed ignorance of the Jews about the Davidic descent of Jesus, we do consider it, combined with the silence of the fourth Gospel about this descent, to be proof that the author knew nothing of it. For with the author's otherwise so conspicuous habit in similar cases, if he had known about it, he would certainly not have failed to add an explanatory or corrective parenthesis here. But if, contrary to these two passages, we find Jesus addressed as

"Son of David" in some others ***), it has rightly been noted that this address simply expresses the belief in his Messiahship, not knowledge of his physical descent.

***) Mark 10:47 f. and parallels. Matt. 9:27. 12:23. 21:9. In the last passage, the first Evangelist has formed the Ωσαννά τω υίω Δαυιδ from the words that we read in Mark (11:10) as ευλογημένη η ερχομένη βασιλεία του πατρός ημών Δαυιδ.

Here, in these isolated and apparently lacking any other basis, expressions of randomly encountered individuals from the people, we have what we alluded to earlier: the beginning of the actual legend formation concerning the person of Jesus. The people, who greeted Jesus as the Son of David without concerning themselves with his actual ancestors, had a surer feeling about the ways of Providence and the true course of that divine necessity, revealed in the development of history, than modern dogma-believing critics, who think it necessary to insist on the factual truth of that descent to honor the documentary evidence. Such physical descent would appear to us, according to our mature views on divine guidance in the world, as only a peculiar play of chance. For the legitimacy of Jesus's royal dignity in the sense of Jewish theocracy is certainly not the point of the true, historical appearance of Christ. Even this may still appear doubtful, whether the apostles, when they, as notably Paul does*), speak of a descent of Jesus "according to the flesh" from David or "from the fathers", mean anything other than, with the awareness of the symbolic significance of this expression, the historical context in which the Lord by his birth is connected with his people and with the promises given to this people.

*) Rom. 1:3. 9:5. 15:12. Acts 2:30. 13:23.

However, it remains possible that already in Paul, who, as we had occasion to note in the previous book, was quite careless about the factual nature of the personality and history of his Master, this symbolic expression had already shaped into a kind of historical belief in the actuality of that descent.

169

If we now see this belief in Christ's descent from David, which has arisen among the disciples and followers of Christ along a path that we must already identify as the path of legend-building, translated into explicit genealogical attempts of the kind that we encounter at the beginning of two of our Gospels, we will have to judge that what has happened here is what we find happening in one way or another in all circles of legends of the same or greater scope as the present one. It is an observation confirmed in the consideration of the mythologies of all times and peoples that they, insofar as they seek

to close themselves off in any sense to the whole, strive to connect themselves to a genealogical basis, or where they do not already find such a basis historically given, tend to generate it themselves. The family trees of the gods and heroes form quite essentially the blueprint or skeleton of the actual mythology. They are the only expression that the legend as such has for the historical causal connection, whose concept, like any other intellectually developed and conceptually elevated idea, does not fall within its purview, while it cannot do without the idea of such a connection. In particular, genealogies tend to serve as the means by which various myths that have arisen independently of one another are linked and unified into a whole. We can observe this, for example, in Hesiod's *Theogony* if we compare it, along with the subsequent legends based on this foundational canon of Hellenic poetic mythology, with the partly certainly older local legends of the various Greek tribes and cities about the individual gods and hero figures, legends that either do not inform or only incompletely inform about this genealogical connection.

Closer still to us than the comparison with Greek, or also Indian, Egyptian, Nordic, etc. mythology, is the reminder of circles of legends such as those that arose in the Middle Ages about the heroes of Charlemagne's *) surroundings, King Arthur, etc. Even in these, we see the actual poetry of their lives and deeds not begin until after the lineage and ancestry of the hero has been fully set out in the most detailed discussions, and thus the figure's place in the context of mythological fate has been assigned.

*) Think, for example, of the detailed genealogy of the same in the *Reali di Francia*, from which the long series of subsequent poems used to draw.

Closest to us, however, and having the most direct influence on the creation of the Gospel genealogies, was the Israelites' own heroic mythology—so we may undoubtedly call the entire primeval history of this people, the legend of the age of the patriarchs, in short, everything contained in the Mosaic Genesis. If anywhere, here was a newly forming legend the schema for the genealogical connection of its figures to something previous. Only that, of course, in the case of the Gospel legend, this previous thing to which it had to be connected already bore a historical character, whereas in other cases it had to emerge from the fiction itself first.

171

In this sense, we feel justified in referring to the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, if not exactly in the form as they are written out by the authors of these two Gospels, then at least in their basic idea and general structure, as one of the oldest, if not the oldest, of all mythical components of the Gospel narrative **).

***) Perhaps this sense of the misunderstood legend underlies Clement of Alexandria (Euseb. H. E. VI, 14), who declares the Gospels containing the genealogies to be the oldest.

We cannot help but think of this very thing as the beginning of the formation of Gospel myths, that people proceeded from the assumption that Jesus, the Christ or Messiah authenticated by the testimony of the divine Spirit dwelling in Him and passing from Him to the disciples, could descend from no other lineage than that of King David, to the attempt to prove such descent, without concern for historical or diplomatic evidence, which could not easily be obtained, yet, in the good faith that it must and absolutely could not be otherwise, despite any opposing evidence, by listing the individual genealogical links. — But it would be mistaken to see in this beginning of the new myth-making nothing but a mere mechanical transfer of the old messianic prophecy to the great event of the present. We must rather imagine a lively, intuitive consciousness of the world-historical connection between the old glory of Israel and the newly appeared salvation as being present in those who made this transfer, just as the foreboding of this connection was present in the old prophets and inspired their prophecies. This consciousness is what finds expression in the invention of the genealogies and gives them, as worthless as they may be in their individual notes, a meaning in the whole and general that can be replaced by nothing else. This meaning has not been lost even after the myth had formed, probably a little later, that Jesus' conception was not by human fathering but by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit. True, the genealogies could hardly have arisen anew once this belief was present. But giving up those that had already arisen was by no means a necessity; rather, it remained in the interest of the legend to present Jesus' stepfather, like his father before, as a descendant of David. In fact, Judaism, which we see symbolically represented in the person of Joseph, is not actually the father of Christianity, but rather its stepfather. Aged and worn out, as Joseph is portrayed not by the Gospel legend itself but by the similarly inspired elaboration, he was unable to actually beget the divine son but only to raise the one directly begotten by the Spirit from above *),

*) The basis of this apocryphal feature, but one quite commonly accepted in the conception of the Church and art, is surely not only in the external motive to preserve Mary's virginal purity more securely.

— We may therefore venture to assert of the genealogical registers in our two Gospels that they, far from losing their significance through the seemingly contradictory context in which they are incorporated, rather gain it thereby, even if perhaps, it seems, unconsciously to the narrators. But this very significance essentially demands that the

genealogical lists be related to Joseph, not, as has been done contrary to the clear words of the Evangelist with Luke's, to Mary. Indeed, the legend soon began to also trace Mary's lineage to David's. Such are the apocryphal Gospels, which deal with the infancy narrative, and also Justin Martyr. But here we believe we clearly see the boundary line between genuine and apocryphal legend-building. That transfer to Mary is an unnecessary outgrowth, probably only arising when it was realized how the supernatural conception of Jesus had made his descent from David through Joseph illusory, without paying attention to the significance that, as we noted, can be found precisely in this stepfatherly relationship.

173

After all this, we will now take no particular offense at the external and internal contradictions that our two Gospel genealogies show, and will by no means agree with the numerous attempts to reconcile them, from Julius Africanus down to Olshausen. Instead, we consider these contradictions to be the most unambiguous feature of their mythical origin, and we even believe we are justified in seeing a kind of twilight of the awareness of their mythical nature in the fact that, despite their apparentness, people have generally been so little disturbed by them and have placed so little value on those attempts. Whether those two are the only ones of their kind, or whether there were others like them; whether their authors are the two Evangelists themselves, or whether they had received them from earlier; finally, which of the two is the older, and whether the other was made without reference to the former or with the express intention of correction: these are all questions that will hardly be decided. Only this we must express as probable, in consequence of what we have just noted about the way the legends arose, that if not they themselves, at least others like them preceded or were contemporaneous with the other legends that are there linked to them*).

*) Among those two genealogies themselves, Augustine (*de cons. evang.* 1, §. 4) notes the difference that Luke's is priestly, Matthew's is kingly. Rightly, the Church Father finds this contrast also corresponding to the rest of the character of the infancy narratives taken up by both Evangelists and expressed vividly (§. 9) by the apocalyptic emblems of the lion and the calf assigned to them.

— These other legends, in fact, all relate directly or indirectly to the second main moment of this circle of legends, which, however, can only have arisen after the genealogical legend, the legend of the supernatural begetting of Jesus.

174

The origin of this second moment is just as clearly apparent to anyone who looks impartially at the monuments of apostolic times as that of the first. Already in the Apostle Paul, the contrast between the fleshly descent of Jesus Christ, which is traced back to David, and his spiritual begetting by God and the Holy Spirit, by which he is called the Son of God, is most specifically expressed **).

**) Rom. 1, 3-4. "Concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh and was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead."

But nothing authorizes us to understand this contrast there as it has indeed been understood later ***): that under the descent "according to the flesh" only a fictitious lineage is meant, whereas under the spiritual begetting, the miraculous conception by a virgin is intended.

***) Not without explicit reference to that apostolic passage, Ignatius (Ephes. 18) still says of Christ: "He was born of Mary, from the seed of David, but by the Holy Spirit." But here immediately after (as with Paul nowhere) a virginity of Mary is mentioned.

For the New Testament also speaks in the most varied ways, in a more general sense not only concerning Christ personally, of a begetting, of a rebirth through the divine Spirit, through the Logos *). Especially in the writings of the Apostle John, the contrast of birth from blood and flesh, from the world or even from the devil, to birth from God and the Spirit plays one of the most important roles and is by no means referred only to the person of Jesus Christ, but to all believers.

*) "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth." James 1, 18. "You have been born again, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the living and enduring word of God." 1 Peter 1, 23.

In the prologue to the Gospel, these believers are most expressly designated as those "who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God" **).

**) John 1, 13.

Jesus himself is made to say that, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" ***).

***) John 3, 6.

In his own name, the Apostle calls "born of God" all the righteous †), all in whom love dwells ††), all who believe in Jesus Christ †††).

†) 1 John 2, 29

††) ibid. 4, 7

†††) ibid. 5, 1

— Who could miss here the analogy between this way of expression and the similarly typical one, which calls the Messiah the Son of David? Just as from the former the mythical genealogies had to arise, so from the latter, when it also encountered a discipleship inclined to a mythical view, the legend of the immediate begetting of the Messiah by God had to emerge, and it cannot surprise us in the least if we see that it has indeed emerged from it.

176

To explain, however, the genesis of this second main and fundamental view of primitive Christian mythology as completely as that of the first, we must take into account one more circumstance, which was not applicable in the previous case. We believe we can confidently say that this second myth belongs to the Gentile Christianity in spirit and origin, just as the first belongs to Jewish Christianity. Indeed, attempts have been made to prove this myth, like the first, as pre-formed in the Old Testament and explain it as the transference of a Messianic prophecy. This attempt was all the more plausible since the prophetic passage, to which one can indeed refer in this context *), is used by one of our Evangelists for this very purpose **).

*) Isaiah 7, 14. The passage Ps. 2, 7, which has been applied for the same purpose, can hardly be taken into consideration beside this.

**) Matt. 1, 22f. — The weight of this application is much weakened by the notoriously erroneous interpretations of other Old Testament passages that immediately follow, Chap. 2, V. 17 and 23.

But it has rightly been objected to this reference that it cannot be demonstrated at all that any Jew ever related this passage, which is proven to have originally nothing less than a Messianic meaning, to the Messiah. — Here, those who start from the

preconceived opinion that all mythical elements in Christianity must have no other origin than the mechanical transference of prophetic myths of the Old Testament, think that the mere existence of that Christian concept, especially the above-mentioned explicit reference by the Evangelist, is reason enough to assume the expectation of a virginal birth of the Messiah, even if not explicitly attested. Such an assumption, however, can be refuted by the not at all far-fetched combination of some notes, about which we are surprised that, as far as we know, no dogmatic believer has used them to contest the mythical view of the conception in question. From Irenaeus ***) we know that Jewish Christians ('Ιουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι), who did not want to believe in the virgin birth of the Lord, criticized the Septuagint for using the word "virgin" (παρθένος) in that place in Isaiah, where only a "young woman" (νεανίς) is mentioned.

***) Haer. III, 21; also in Euseb. II. E. V, 8.

(It is remarkable how it had already been Greeks who, even before Christianity, had seized upon that idea with respect to the Old Testament passage.)

[Correction published in second volume:

*p. 177, what is said in parenthesis in lines 5-8 can easily be misunderstood as if the Septuagint itself were meant by the "Greeks"; but these were, as is well known, not Greeks but Jews, even according to their own notes on the passages cited there. The context, however, shows that the reference is rather to those for whom the secondary translation was intended.- Incidentally, in order to explain the origin of the legend of the supernatural generation of Jesus, the remarks made in the second volume, p. 391, note **) may be compared; from which note, at the same time, what has been said in Vol. I, p. 51 about the Gospel of Cerinthus (which, as is evident from the passage of Irenaeus cited, was without doubt the Gospel of Mark) is to be corrected.]*

Now, however, we find in Justin *) that this correction of the translation was attributed to the Jews as such in their dispute with the Christians.

*) Dial. c. Tryph. 84.

From this, we may undoubtedly conclude that the Hellenistic-Christian interpretation of that supposedly Messianic prophecy was not at all familiar to the Jews but, on the contrary, must have seemed strange to them. Had it been in their own interest, they could not have contested the interpretation of that passage, but only the fact of its fulfillment in the person of Christ. — In addition to this, there is what has already been noticed by others before us: the inappropriateness of that idea to Jewish concepts of the

dignity of marital procreation and the curse of barrenness; concepts that were surely strong enough not to give rise to such a misunderstanding of an isolated prophetic passage, even if it could momentarily appear. Even the fact that the Hebrew language refers to the Holy Spirit in the feminine gender **), can be taken as evidence that the idea, according to which this Spirit takes not the mother's but the father's place with Christ, could hardly have been formed from a Jewish source.

**) One remembers the famous apocryphal saying quoted by Origen and Jerome: modo tulit me mater mea Spiritus sanctus.... Cf. Fabric. cod. apoc. N. T. I, p. 361 seqq.

177

How, however, the aforementioned manner of expression among the newly converted Gentiles and Greeks could evolve into the myth of a virgin birth of the Savior is easy to see. In their numerous myths of godly offspring, in the tales of the conception and birth of Dionysus, Hercules, the Tyndarids, to which similar stories about Pythagoras, Plato, Alexander the Great, and other heroes of political and intellectual history were added in historical times — in these myths, the Greeks had not merely a point of connection for that Christian idea if it was readily presented to them from the outside, but indeed also a motivation for its invention. A savior whose mission was to be authenticated by descent from the ancient king of a foreign, little-valued people would have remained alien to them. The same need that gave rise to mythical genealogies among the Jews must have directed the mythical creative power among the Greeks, from which the notion in question arose. As a result of this need, the previously mentioned language of the Apostles, which in itself is not yet to be called mythical, became an actual myth among them, just as the initially unprejudiced designation of Jesus as the son of David became a genealogical myth among the Israelite Christians. Here too, one can quite assume an initially equally unbiased and unintentional accommodation of the apostolic proclamation to the ideas and expressions of those peoples to whom the Apostles spoke. Involuntarily, the Apostle Paul found himself prompted to quote the Hellenistic poetic word to the Athenians that we are of "divine lineage" *); just as involuntarily, the Gentile Apostles could all remember those significant poetic fables when speaking to the Gentiles of all nations, but especially the Greeks, and, without any intention of deception, clothe the great truth that Christ is the Son of God in an expression that facilitated the understanding of that truth by connecting it to the known and familiar imagery **).

*) Acts 17, 28.

***) Thus, we find in a somewhat later time among the Apologists, explicitly in reference to the already formed dogma of the begetting of Christ, the invocation of those poetic fables, e.g., Justin. apolog. I, 21.

If the figuratively expressed words of the Apostles were understood by the Gentile Christians in a literal sense, or in the way they were accustomed to understanding their native myths, there is hardly any need to assume a retroactive effect of this mythical understanding on the proclaimers themselves to explain the origin of that doctrine, which soon became so important. From the Apostles themselves and all of their strict contemporaries, we have no reason to presume any real adherence to that mythical concept. However, from the actual congregation of the Jewish Christians, the so-called Ebionites, just as, according to the information from Irenaeus mentioned above, from various individuals converted from Judaism to Christianity, we know that they continued to reject the supernatural conception even later and considered Jesus the son of Joseph and Mary. Therefore, it is precisely the form that Christianity assumed among the Gentiles and through the gradually increasing prevalence of the pagan element over the Jewish within its realm, that we must trace back to the origin of the dogma of the virgin birth. — That we should not regard this origin as accidental, emerging from a random misunderstanding of the Apostles' arbitrary language, one would infer without our reminder from all that has been said so far. Already as a complementary contrast to the popular Jewish legend concerning the Lord's descent, this myth asserts its place as something necessary in a higher sense, by no means dispensable in the totality of the evangelical mythic cycle. Everything true and profound that is unmistakably contained in the Hellenic myths about the interaction of gods with humans, the marriage of mortal men to divine women, and the impregnation of mortal women by gods, has been purified and spiritually transfigured into it. Some have wanted to use this spiritual transfiguration, which undoubtedly characterizes the Christian myth, this complete turning away from all that is sensual and natural, which transforms the act of conception so vividly portrayed in such narratives by Greek mythology into an "overshadowing of the divine spirit" — to demonstrate the remoteness of this supposed event from the character of the mythical. But since here too, just as there, where the relationship to older Jewish legends was mentioned, no external, mechanical transfer is asserted by us, this objection does not affect our explanation. Here as well, the relationship of the pagan myths to the Christian is, in a sense, prophetic, although not as explicitly as with those Jewish ones. The great truth of the incarnation of the Divine, which is seen in the Christian myth as a present and accomplished reality, was anticipated in the pagan ones through images that, the further they stand from the fulfillment of that sublime truth, are all the more immersed in the sensual and the external.

Furthermore, concerning the meaning of this central and fundamental Christian myth, there arises from its genesis, as we have laid it out here, a remark that, while standing in stark contrast to traditional views, is important for understanding the entire historical and ideological context in which this myth appears. It is as follows: The idea that gave rise to this myth cannot be regarded as the one that was later used to express it, once it had already attained the status of dogma and its content was considered a direct historical fact. This idea is, of course, the notion of the sinlessness of Christ's conception and birth, in contrast to the corruption of the human race propagated through natural procreation. In previous Christian Church dogmatics, the supposed fact of the virgin conception has been founded on the assumption that the pure and spotless one could no longer be generated from the substance of human nature contaminated by the Fall; that, to create Him, a new creative act of divinity was needed. Even more recent attempts to justify this dogma, "speculatively," as it is called, always come back to this contrast between sinfulness and sinlessness. Thus, it may seem reasonable enough to apply the same conclusion to the invention of the myth, especially since the idea itself, from which it is derived, is old enough, and is already present in the Apostle Paul as a decisive dogmatic determination. Nevertheless, our above explanation shows how all the factors of the myth are based on other fundamental ideas and have little or nothing to do with that contrast. Even the apostolic idea of birth from God, rebirth in spirit, points indeed to an essentially higher spiritual substance in contrast to the human one, without wanting to label the human as corrupt, sinful in the Pauline-Augustinian sense, or in need of restoration to what it originally was but ceased to be through its fault. Even less can it be said that the pagan element, which, as we saw, entered into the creation of this legend, involves consciousness of sinfulness or a demand for the restoration of human nature to its original purity. Here, as there, it is essentially only the awareness of the substantial difference and mutual relationship between the Divine and the human, not the awareness of the contrast between sinful and sinless, that is expressed in the image of the generation of the Divine from God and by God. This is also why our evangelical reports of that event carry virtually no trace of the latter awareness. If such traces had been inherent in the myth from the outset, they would surely not have been so easily blurred.

*) Particularly characteristic in this regard is the fact that the Gospels indeed presuppose marital intercourse between Mary and Joseph after the birth of Jesus, while from the later dogmatic standpoint, it was logical to keep Mary, as the church view actually did, outside such intercourse thereafter.

Indeed, in those reports, especially in the speeches of the characters that appear, there is frequent mention of the forgiveness of sins; but always only in the sense of the old

Hebrew prophets, who indeed used to link forgiveness of sins to the salvation they proclaimed for their people, not in the sense of Pauline soteriology. Rather, they are imbued with a breath of cheerful, childlike poetry, a spirit that would have been necessarily stifled by the consciousness of sinfulness. Only later did this element join in; it did not invent the myth as such, but it did indeed fix it into the abstraction of dogma. The poetry, which was thereby driven from the event invented by the myth, took refuge in the figure of Mary, who gradually rose up from the active creation and shaping of the legend as a still, sculptured figure. — Even in this ideal figure, one cannot fail to recognize the contributing influence of the pagan principle that had entered into Christianity. The image of the virgin mother of God, as it was gradually elaborated in the imagination of the Christian peoples, relates to the Greek mythological images of the virgin and maternal goddesses in much the same way that the idea of the virgin birth of the Savior relates to the mythical marriages of gods with mortals. Neither the principle nor the spirit of Jewish legend-making, had it remained true to itself, would have sufficed for the creation of that figure or this idea. But certainly, as the history of later Catholicism shows, it benefited the nurturing and development of this ideal figure that she alone remained, after the consciousness of sin had contaminated and soured the rest of the world for the imagination, as the palladium of original purity and divinity of human nature.

182

The mythical nature of this second conception of Jesus' descent, which contrasts with the first yet is also related to it, entails that the fact of divine generation, as it was conceived and mythically established, could not appear so nakedly in the form of a mere note, as we assumed in the foregoing, but only in a setting and surroundings that may be called poetic, at least in a broader sense. These surroundings are formed by the additional legends of the Gospel of birth and childhood, with which we now have to deal primarily. At least part of these legends stands in the same relation to that mythical fact that constitutes their center as the genealogies stand to the simple mythical presupposition that Jesus was a descendant of David. They should not be seen so much as embellishment and further development of the already invented myth as rather having arisen simultaneously and, in a certain sense, constituting its body, the body through which the myth has become a myth, whereas before it was only a simple, bodiless thought. — This remark is important, among other things, because it might hold a key to the problem of the mutual relationship of the stories told in the first and third Gospels and the priority of one over the other. If we compare these two cycles of legends — for the narratives of each of the two evangelists do indeed form a unified and coherent cycle — if we compare them with each other and relate them to that basic myth that forms the center of both, we find that this latter is not the center in the same

sense for both. For one cycle, it is the center more in the way we just indicated, as a central idea that seeks to give shape and existence through the rest of the poem; for the other, more in the manner of a presupposition to which the other features of the poem refer, and from which they derive their content and meaning. The former applies to the legends that Luke tells, the latter to those that the author of our Matthew's Gospel conveys. We therefore believe that we have found in this circumstance a criterion from which, for us (in agreement with what we noted in our first book about the development of these two Gospels), the probability of a higher age for Luke's narratives over those of Matthew emerges. However, it is not our intention to claim a higher value or deeper content for the former. Such is not always the case on the side of the older legend, as long as myth-making is still in the living process of emergence. On the contrary, where it is permitted at all to follow a circle of myths in the chronological course of its development, one can often distinguish, as with other human things, an age of growth, enhancement, and deepening from an age of decline, degeneration, and wildness.

184

If the idea of the natural birth of the Savior was to take shape into a genuine myth, then this myth had to be motivated in the manner that myth-making entails, i.e., through other mythical creations. This necessity arises from the concept of myth as soon as it is understood not in the vague indefiniteness, as is usual, but in its historical and philosophical truth. This concept requires that what is to be expressed through the myth, what should constitute its content, meaning, or significance, should not be an abstract or generally remaining idea of the kind that in the present case was the one that we earlier showed, spoken through the mouth of the Apostles, was the cause, but nothing more than just the cause, for the arising of our myth. The idea of a birth from above, not of flesh and blood or the lust of a man, but of the Spirit of God; this idea applied personally to Jesus and misunderstood in the way that it thereby excludes physical generation, something that was not originally part of the thought, still does not make a myth. It only becomes a myth when, with the transfer to the individual historical personality, with the embodiment in the image of physical conception and birth, the totality of historical relationships is also brought into view, which makes the content of that idea an explicit, even exclusive predicate of this personality as one distinguished from all others to which the idea would apply just as well in and for itself. In the sporadic myth-making of the pagan world, the corresponding idea in most cases could be done in a very simple way by linking to the great overall circle of the gods and heroes' mythology. If, for example, Plato is called the son of Apollo, or Alexander the Great is called the son of Jupiter Ammon, then the ideal as well as the historical relationships are mainly contained in the specific roles that Greek mythology assigns to these two deities, which were to be expressed simultaneously with the general concept of descent

from the divine in those two particular cases. However, precisely because in this, as in most other cases of such sporadic myth-making on historical ground, the actual core of meaning is not self-contained in the newly formed legend but is hidden in reference to the larger whole of mythology, these myths have not been able to establish themselves in the beliefs of the peoples and acquire independent validity. They have not grown into complete mythic forms standing on their own but rather, as a kind of mythological arabesques (as we have elsewhere called them), constitute more of a playful appendage to the actual mythology. The situation is different in the case before us. The Christian myth, which, as we showed earlier, is to be thought of as emerging not among the Jewish but among the pagan adherents of the new religion, did indeed find among them, as we have also shown, a general mythological type after which it could shape and form itself, but not also a point of connection of the kind that those myths had within paganism, not only having arisen but also remaining. For the principle of this new myth to be formed, i.e., the idea of Christianity itself, whose historical genesis was to be depicted in this myth, could only break through by destroying those earlier mythic creations. The Jewish myth, however, only provided such an immediate point of connection for the Jews, but not for the pagans. How it was actually used by the latter for this purpose, but in a different context that could only be externally included in the mythological context in question here, we had the opportunity to notice in our consideration of the mythical genealogies. The foundation and motivation of the myth now under discussion could, after all this, be accomplished in no other way than through the creation of a unique circle of myths; one that, through its shape and nature, was intended to bring the historical relationships of the great fact, which primarily belonged to the Jewish circle, into view also for the Gentiles.

187

This has now happened in the circle of legends that is preserved for us in the first chapters of the Gospel of Luke, and for this reason, we find ourselves compelled to attribute to the poems of this circle, instead of considering them, like most other confessors of the "mythical view," merely idle ornaments of the main and fundamental myth, rather equal value and equal originality with it itself. We now want to attempt to interpret this circle of myths in this sense. In this task, we must never forget, equally in the interpretation of the other circle of legends preserved in the first Gospel, that the meaning that we will demonstrate as being contained in the myth was not brought to independent consciousness, separated from the image and the embodiment, by the inventors of the myth as explicitly as it is by us in the act of interpretation, or was incorporated into the image through explicit reflection. Had the latter been the case, then—this is to be said of all our genuine myths just as much as of the one at hand—the myth could never have been invented. For the mood from which every true myth arises

is, as has already been often noted, such that it entails that every spiritual content is hidden in a sensory shell and comes to view or consciousness only in the form that this shell gives it.

The first conspicuous feature that meets us when surveying this circle of legends is the manner in which we find another childlike figure paired with the figure of the infant Christ, along with the narratives of its conception and birth: the figure of John the Baptist. Some have sought the reason for this pairing in external circumstances; they thought they had found the correct one by assuming that it belonged to the time when there were still pure followers of John who had not yet converted to Christianity; it was supposed to entice them over by, based on facts and widely spread tradition, indicating in John's relation to Christ his own highest purpose, while still expecting a simultaneous external glorification of the people through Christ's return *).

*) Schleiermacher on Luke p. 25.

Assuming such occasions and motives as actually contributing to this emergence does not generally conflict with our view on the creation of myths. However, the actual meaning and purpose of the myth must not be placed in them. Rather, they must be sought more deeply everywhere, provided that a genuine myth, and not an empty fable, underlies it. In the present case, however, the hypothesis devised to explain that mythical feature lacks all historical basis. We therefore regard it as a makeshift, arising from a lack of deeper insight into its meaning, and reject it, in particular also because of the collision in which it comes with the much more probable assumption that these legends were invented rather for the Gentiles than for the Jews, to whom, as is well known, the followers of John belonged. If this assumption is correct, as far as the present point is concerned, it far more than the weakly-founded hypothesis facilitates understanding the significance that the figure of John takes in this context opposite to Christ. For this figure here undoubtedly has a more general, typical meaning: this is irrefutably proven to anyone whose eye for such things is somewhat trained by the character of the mythical narrative. The narrative is clearly aimed neither at glorifying the person of John nor, in the way Schleiermacher thinks, at a deliberate, albeit gentle and honorable, relegation of it behind Christ, but solely at making the moment of the begetting and birth of both heroes appear striking and significant. Now, however, as it undoubtedly is understood in this context, if the moment of Christ's birth is the essential one in the tendency of our myth, the one that could ultimately be aimed at: then nothing is more natural than to place the purpose of introducing the narrative of John in the fact that the significance of that great moment is more clearly and fully emphasized and highlighted by the pairing and contrast of the related with the related. Both the kinship and the contrast of those figures and events are essentially conditioned by the fact that,

like the figure of Christ, so also that of John is typical, meaning that, alongside or rather in and through its particular historical validity, it also has a general, ideal one.

188

To this typical meaning, which the myth has taken up and further elaborated, the person of the Baptist had been raised, so to speak, by Christ himself before, in the words where he described him as the last and greatest of the prophets, as the Elijah who, according to an ancient messianic legend *), should precede the appearance of the Messiah **).

*) Malachi 3, 23-24.

**) Matthew 11, 11 ff. and parallels. Compare Mark 9, 13 and parallels.

These words contain a connection to the prophetic myth of the Old Testament that is entirely appropriate, just as Jesus' greeting as the Son of David, according to our previous remark. In exactly the same way, as there, here too a continuation of that myth, a transformation of it into a mythical expression for the present and really existing, is initiated. In that very statement, we see the Savior, in the midst of praising John, whom he explicitly presents as the representative of the idea of old prophecy, also emphasizing most emphatically the contrast in which he, and in him prophecy in general, the whole national-Israelite form of religious worship and religious enthusiasm, stands to the kingdom of God, as revealed and realized in Christianity among men. In a similar sense, we then find the figure of John also understood by the Apostles and the entire early Church. The baptism received through him was regarded as the act of Christ's initiation into his Messianic calling, but the testimony that John was supposed to have given for Christ was used especially to the Jews as evidence of his divine mission, while they continued to regard John himself and his work as essentially still outside of Christianity. — We maintain that the significance of John in the childhood saga is a corresponding one, and it is only in this significance that the reason lies why this saga has excluded the figure of John at all and allowed it to play such an important role. Also, of this John, it holds true, what more or less applies to all personalities appearing in a mythical context: what is told of him does not so much concern him as John, this specific, once emerging personality in history, but rather the historical idea that he represents and brings to revelation. But this idea is none other than the idea of Jewish prophecy, in general, the Israelite nationality according to its spiritual, ideal, and especially religious side, as it stands in essential relationship and kinship, but also in equally essential contrast to Christ (i.e., not only to the personal Christ but to Christianity as an idea, as a world-historical total appearance). John was chosen for the mythical representative of this idea for that perspective that came from the Jewish

sphere of thought, through that statement of Christ and, we may add, through history itself, which placed him in the position where Christ could truthfully make this statement about him. But the further-spinning myth stepped out of this circle; it no longer addressed the Jews, to whom that simple designation of John as Elijah, just like the designation of Christ as the son of David, was sufficient, but the Gentiles, who needed a justification for the historical conditions under which Christianity had emerged from Judaism. As the circle to which this poetic symbolization of historical ideas was directed and in whose sense and perspective it was invented, we therefore surely do not think of the Jewish-Christian community, but with much greater rights the community of Gentile Christians. What the connection of the teachings and views of Christianity to the law and prophets was for the Jews through mythical genealogies and messianic prophecies: that could only be a new mythical figure for the Gentiles and Greeks to make the idea of Christianity comprehensible to them in its world-historical relations: a figure in which the essence of Judaism, according to its spiritual-religious character, simultaneously in its affiliation with Christianity and its subordination under Christianity, appeared.

190

The narrative begins with the parents of John, named as Zacharias, a priest from the division of Abijah, and Elisabeth, from the priestly tribe of Aaron. Both are praised as righteous before the face of God, walking blamelessly in all the commandments and statutes of the Lord. — Whether this notice is historically accurate, we cannot determine. In any case, the priestly character of the parent pair is of mythical significance in this context; in John's position, as far as it is historically known, we find nothing to suggest distinguished family connections. — The further mythically significant trait that is linked to this mention of the parents is that Elisabeth was barren and both were well advanced in years without producing a child. Here it does indeed seem most likely to assume a transfer from Old Testament tales of similar content, particularly the well-known ones of Abraham and Sarah, of Manoah and his wife, the parents of Samson, and of Eli and Hannah, the parents of Samuel. A reference to these tales is unmistakable even in the further course of the story; but that the transfer would have been so mechanical and thoughtless, as it would have been if the basis of the New Testament legend were only to be sought in those Old Testament ones, we cannot admit. We rather believe we are justified in assuming that a deeper sense underlies all these legends collectively and each one in particular, by whose convergence in the individual case the repetition of that type was conditioned, which mythical thought had created once and for all as its expression. By this sense, we do not mean that which the apocryphal Gospel of Mary's Birth points out to us in reference to the present case: that what is born of aged parents is recognized as a gift from God, and not as a product of sensual lust. This, rather, would be a sense of such a kind as might indeed attach itself

to myths already invented, but not usually give occasion for the invention of myths. The true meaning here is to be sought in a symbolism of the idea, whose bearers or representatives are the mythical persons. It is not the person as such, but the idea that should be referred to as the late-born; it is meant to express how new ideas or spiritual forms in world history and the life of the nations tend to appear only when those forms and ideas from which they are primarily produced, and which can be referred to as their parents, begin to grow old and powerless. This tardiness itself is depicted in the legend, as it is in the real, spiritually understood history, as a divine fate. Angelic appearances and oracular utterances must proclaim the long-awaited late birth. So now, we say, John also appears here as the late-born not of a single priestly couple but of priestly Israel as a whole. He appears in this character not as a single, random personality, as his contemporaries knew him, and as history shows us stripped of mythical adornment, but the legend sees in his form that last flickering of the Hebrew prophetic spirit, which preceded and accompanied the appearance of the one in whom all the prophecies of the earlier prophets of youthful Israel were to be fulfilled. In those earlier legends that resonate in the present narrative, the historical law of development, the historical birth of the new from the old, which they had often had the opportunity to test in their national history, was articulated for the Israelites' own view. In this later one, the destiny of the Israelite people in the creation and birth of ideas, for the realization of which this people served as a tool in world history, became the subject of contemplation for those nations over which the beam of these ideas was to spread. The communication of this view did indeed occur — this would be brought about by the context in which the New Testament revelation stands once and for all with the types of the Old Testament — in the forms that had taken on a typical shape in the earlier historical mythology of the Israelites. But the comprehensibility (the poetic, not of course the purely rational comprehensibility) of these forms even for the pagan world is not to be doubted. It is all the less to be doubted the more often we can observe how little difficulty the peoples of antiquity, accustomed to mythological thought and perception, had in adopting, along with Christianity, the entire structure of Old Testament religious typology and symbolism, as far as it had passed into the original form of Christianity.

192

The further report in the detail, in which we read it in Luke, mainly modeled after the story of the birth of Samson (from the Book of Judges, Chapter 13) goes as follows: Once, while performing his priestly duties, when he went to burn incense (a task during which other priests were also believed to have received divine revelations **), and went into the holy inner part of the temple, leaving the praying crowd outside, Zechariah saw an angel of the Lord on the favorable right side of the altar.

***) Joseph. Ant. XIII, 10, 3.

The angel speaks courage to the frightened man; he announces to him the fulfillment of his prayer, the birth of a son, and as a result, joy and delight, such that many will share with him. Interwoven with this promise is information about the name the son shall bear, a circumstance that seems to warrant a comment. For we find that even in the wider course of this legend, the naming plays an essential role, and there is a tendency everywhere to present the names of the heroes of this legend as given by God himself, as ones imbued with divine spirit power. This is an unmistakable, not insignificant feature. It's not that the specific names mentioned here, which are historical and thus random, carry weight. While etymologically meaningful, their meaning is general and comprehensive, not predetermined for these individual people ***).

***) Apparently wrongly, some have considered the etymological meaning of the name Jesus to suggest that his parents must have had special expectations for the child. However, this name was nothing less than unusual among the Jews of his time.

The meaning we find in this mythical feature does not concern these particular names but the moment of the name, the naming itself. Namely, as the effectiveness of distinguished historical personalities everywhere attaches to their names in such a way that for many over whom this effectiveness extends, nothing of the person itself is known except merely the name — the person itself and the idea emanating from it is only present in that name for them. Therefore, without any contribution from the particular linguistic nature of the name, the appearance arises as if in the name itself lies a particular divine power and ideal meaning. This is what the legend wants to express here and in all similar cases when it lets the names of people be determined not arbitrarily but by divine provision. — Following the proclamation and the naming, the angel further hints at the future greatness of John before the face of the Lord. According to the formula prescribed by the Mosaic Law *), a vow of abstinence is demanded of him, but at the same time, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are promised to him from the womb, by which he will convert many of the children of Israel to the Lord, their God.

*) Numbers 6:3.

Then, with the aforementioned words of the Prophet Malachi, which Christ himself had instructed to apply to John: he will go before the Lord in the spirit and power of Elijah, restore the dissolved moral bonds, and prepare the people for the Lord. — In these words of the angel, the legend has enveloped the moment from which, as we showed

earlier, the mythical perception and glorification of the figure of the Baptist first took its departure.

194

What follows is a strikingly mythical feature, with regard to which we must strive all the more for an interpretation explicitly suited to this particular context, as here no Old Testament model can be identified with certainty, after which it could have been modeled. Zechariah asks for a sign by which he may recognize the truth of what has been announced to him. The angel answers him, naming himself as Gabriel and identifying himself as one of the Seven, which according to the later Hebrew, the Persian legend modeled after the seven Amschaspands (a circumstance that does not tend to trouble the dogmatic interpreters much), stand around the throne of Jehovah. The unbelief that lies in this question, however, he punishes with immediate deprivation of speech, so that the thus mutilated one must communicate to the people, who are waiting for him and recognize from his silence that he has seen a vision, through signs.

*) The question has been raised as to what rule the people here should have concluded that there was a vision. It is most likely to refer to the place in Judges 13:22, where Manoah fears death after the sin of Samson because he has seen an angel of the Lord. This place may have inspired the inventor (or narrator) of the legend. It has a parallel in that book itself in the answer that Gideon receives from the Lord (Judges 6:23), and also in the famous passage Exodus 33:20 ff., compare Deuteronomy 18:16. But the belief in such a fate of those who have seen a god in his true form extended even further than just the Hebrew legend; Greek mythology, in particular, contains many such features. Especially related to our present passage is the story told by Pherecydes of the blinding of Tiresias. Apollonius. biblioth. III, 6, 7.

It has been rightly noted that this punishment stands in striking contrast to Jehovah's behavior towards Abraham, to whom a question similar to that which Zechariah poses to the angel is by no means considered a sin **).

**) Genesis 15:8. — An even more striking example of a likewise unpunished mistrust in divine speech can be found in Exodus 4:1.

It is in vain to look for a complete explanation of this feature in an external cause ***).

***) Such an external cause, interpreting Zechariah's question as indicative of unbelief, might perhaps lie in the answer that Isaiah 7:12 gives to Ahaz on the

request to demand a sign from the Lord, in the Muno. This assumption is not to be dismissed because the reference to this passage of the prophet in the present context was no less likely than in Matthew 1:22.

The same has its essential basis in that inner symbolism, unconscious or only dimly conscious to the inventors of the legend, which runs through the entire legendary structure. The priestly wisdom of the Israelites, represented here in the person of the priest Zechariah, could indeed be said to have been silenced at the time immediately preceding John and Christ, due to its unbelief in the promises of the Lord by a divine fate, and that only when the old prophecies began to be fulfilled was its tongue again loosened. Recall the striking stagnation of that nation's 'holy literature' at that time, and the prevailing idea among the Jews themselves that since their last prophet Malachi, the prophetic spirit had departed from Israel. Anyone who has ever glimpsed the wondrous depth, the delicacy and tenderness of mythical creations will not be surprised to see this historical view woven into the myth in a manner as ingenious as it is logical, and it is so clear that the myth has this historical circle, to which this fact belongs, as its content. — Finally, this story concludes with the note that Zechariah, after the days of temple service were over, returned home, that Elisabeth became pregnant, and hid herself for five months in quiet thanks to the Lord, who had taken away the disgrace of her barrenness.

196

Immediately adjacent to this announcement made to Zacharias, our gospel report places the announcement that is made to Mary. The same angel who had appeared to the pious priest is sent by God in the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy to Nazareth, a town in Galilee, before a virgin who was engaged to a man named Joseph, from the tribe of David; the name of the virgin was Mary. (If we may trust our feeling, this precise enumeration of personalities and place names, which the evangelist could assume as known, betrays a fairy-tale tone of the narrative, which is all the more natural here, as the narration had begun with the lesser-known names of Zacharias and Elizabeth.) He greets her with the greeting with which the angel of the Lord had also greeted Gideon in the old saga *) ; but also as highly favored, blessed among women.

*) Judges 6:12.

Mary is startled and ponders where this greeting might come from **).

**) Clever and charmingly picturesque—thus successfully employed by visual art—is the detail added in the Apocrypha that Mary first hears the angel's voice

as she has gone out to draw water, then hears his further words as she is engaged in working on the purple for the temple veil. Protev. Jac. 11.

But the angel repeats his assurance that she has found favor with God; he announces to her that she shall bear a son, to be named Jesus. This one is destined to become great and be called the Son of the Most High; the Lord will give him the throne of his father David and make him ruler over the house of Jacob for all eternity, so that his reign shall have no end. — It may seem to contradict our earlier assumptions that this promise aligns so completely with Jewish expectations, which in the circle we designated as the circle of its origin, had already been broken through by the universalistic ideas of Christianity. However, this very circumstance, this almost deliberate limitation of the legend to a standpoint that had already become foreign even to the Jewish Christians of that time, points to a higher spiritual freedom in the creators of the legend, who, even if they were Jews ***) , made such use of their popular conceptions here that they appear in their relativity and therefore still seem calculated primarily for the view of the Gentile Christians.

***) This latter point is made likely by the strong Hebraisms that are noticeable in these legendary parts of Luke's narrative.

— Characteristic of the childlike manner of this narrative is that Mary, although it would have been natural to refer the words of the announcement to a son to be produced by her in marriage with Joseph, yet addresses the angel with the question: how could this happen; for she knows not a man. Then the angel gives the famous answer: a Holy Spirit shall come upon her, and a power of the Most High shall overshadow her. There can be little doubt that this image of being overshadowed by a cloud is borrowed from this *), as both Jews and Gentiles conceived of their gods coming on clouds.

*) νεφελη επισκιάζουσα Mark 9:7. — Matthew 17:5 has this expression, oddly enough, applied to a cloud of light (νεφελη φωτός or according to the usual reading φωτεινη).

What is elsewhere said of those in vividly picturesque terms is here said more in a metaphorical sense of the invisible power of God, which is spoken of here. — If the angel adds: therefore that which is to be born will be called holy, and the Son of God, the mythical narrative thereby points to its origin, which undoubtedly lies in this name and in what is immediately associated with the name. Furthermore, if reference is made to Elizabeth's pregnancy (who is first called a relative of Mary), it reveals a consciousness not only of the significance of this analogy but also of this contrast between the two pregnancies, as found in the legend that has placed both so cleverly

beside one another, which can by no means surprise us. — What God promises, He can also fulfill, adds the angel, and Mary acknowledges herself as the servant of the Lord: may it happen to her as he has said; whereupon the angel departs.

198

Of the significance that we certainly do not wrongly attribute to this juxtaposition of the delayed conception of Elizabeth and the virginal conception of Mary, the circumstance also shows that the further evolving legend, as we find it characterized in some apocryphal stories, has found itself compelled to express the same contrast in different ways in the prehistory of the Gospels. The so-called Protevangelium of James and the Gospel of the Birth of Mary, both give in detailed features, to which we would not deny a deeper mythological significance, even if they are not presented there with the noble simplicity that distinguishes the stories of our canonical Gospels, a story of Mary's parents, whom they call Joachim and Anna, transferring to her what Luke tells of Elizabeth and Zacharias. Like John, Mary is also said to have been born of previously barren, advanced-in-age parents; this is narrated in a way that does not resemble the story of the Annunciation and birth of John but appears modeled directly on those Old Testament events, the influence of which cannot be overlooked there. Among the older Church writers, this note is considered no less historical than the canonical one, and if one does not doubt the historical character of the latter, it is not easy to discern by what characteristics the abrupt transition from the historical to the mythical in narratives of such related character should be justified; since the form of the presentation, in which the apocryphal stories are so disadvantaged compared to the canonical ones, can easily be separated from their core. But as for the hidden meaning, the contrast in the canonical Gospel is undoubtedly more striking. John, the late-born representative of prophethood, stands more prominently opposed to the one born through the divine spirit and by a virgin, than the virgin mother herself can, if she is understood as this world-historical late birth. Nevertheless, this latter also, if we interpret this type in the same way here, makes good sense. In this context, through the figure of this virginal mother, the purely human, historical moment in the generation of Christianity is portrayed, which can indeed be called a late birth in an analogous sense to the idea expressed by the figure of John, since for it also in the history of already aging humanity, a time of waiting and long barren longing had preceded.

199

To complete the poetic-mythical image, which was opened in those two scenes of blessing, in its ideal sense, the subsequent scene, in which the legend physically brings together both such wondrously fortunate mothers, is now essential. This meeting is

motivated by the kinship of both mentioned previously. As close as this alleged kinship may seem to be a historical feature, which forms the basis of the rest of the invention, even to some who may not be averse to the mythical view, we cannot decide to accept it as such. If it were so, similar to the possible real descent of Jesus from David, as we suggested earlier, more would indeed be lost for the spiritual content of the story than would be gained. Precisely in this bringing together of what is actually separate, in this symbolic representation of what is spiritually related through the image of physical kinship, here lies the activity of the absorption and comprehension of the historically given material, in which we see a providential moment with far greater justification than in the randomness of actual blood kinship, which is not the element in which providence likes to exert its power or wisdom. However, what we learn further about the relationship between Jesus and John, a prudent critique does not recognize as suitable to support the assumption of a blood relationship between the two; on the contrary, such an assumption would only complicate the understanding of that historical relationship but not facilitate it in any respect. Moreover, according to the evangelical view, (unless one wants to assume a relationship by marriage) like Elizabeth, Mary must also have been of a priestly family. This is actually found in the apocryphal "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," while on the other hand, among most church fathers of that time, the opinion took hold that also extends the descent from David to Mary.

200

Mary, according to the legendary report, seeks out her relatives in her homeland immediately after receiving the angel's message. This homeland of Elizabeth's is designated as the highlands of Judea; perhaps out of historical remembrance, or perhaps also to symbolize through the image of the rugged mountain country the character of him who was to be born there. Upon the blessed virgin's entry into the house, with the greeting she calls out to Elizabeth, it happens that the latter feels the child in her womb leap for joy, and, full of the Holy Spirit, breaks out in a loud voice into a blessing of the mother of the Lord and the fruit of her womb. In this bold brushstroke of the mythical painting, no one who shares our fundamental view of this legendary story will fail to see the meaning, which, although we can only express it here in general terms, nevertheless would not escape explicit application to the historical content interwoven into our narrative. It is this: that with the touch of a higher spirit, announcing its impending appearance, the ideas and spiritual formations that lie unborn in the womb of the world or national spirit begin to stir and give their first signs of life. — But as profound as the invention is, so simple is the art of execution, both in this and in all folklore poetry that has not yet been crafted into a proper work of art. To Mary, in response to Elizabeth's greeting, a song of praise is attributed, which, without a closer

motivated reference to the present situation, is modeled after Hannah's song of praise after Samuel's birth *), and is also mixed with other Old Testament memories.

*) 1 Sam. 2.

After this, Mary is said to have stayed there for three months and then returned to her own home, not Joseph's house.

201

In the further course of the narration, we find the birth of John briefly noted, but the events at his circumcision are reported in more detail; with Jesus, it is the opposite: the birth, and not the circumcision, that is marked by miraculous events. This reversed relationship has already been interpreted from the old-faith standpoint in such a way that the circumcision had to be a more significant act for John, as the last of the great prophets who lived under the law, than for Jesus, through whom circumcision, along with the law, was abolished. — The miracle that occurs at John's circumcision is as follows. As the friends of the house deliberate over the name, according to Jewish custom, that the boy should receive on this day, the father's name Zacharias is first proposed. But the mother objects to this and demands the name John. The friends, puzzled because no one in the family carries this name, inquire of the father by signs; he writes the name John on a tablet, to everyone's astonishment, and, to even greater astonishment not only of those present but of all the neighbors and mountain dwellers to whom the news spread, at that very moment his mouth and tongue are loosened, so that he bursts forth in praise of God. Here there seems to be a poignant meaning, especially in the circumstance that the regaining of speech is tied to the moment of writing; however, we do not venture to give this meaning a more definite shape or to attempt an explicit interpretation of this feature. Zacharias' speech, of prophetic nature and flowing from the fullness of the Holy Spirit, is subsequently added; it is almost entirely spoken in Old Testament expressions. "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, for he has looked upon and prepared redemption for his people, he has caused salvation to sprout from the horn of the wild beast for us! Thus he had proclaimed it through the mouth of his holy prophets of all time! Salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us! He has shown mercy to our fathers and remembered his holy covenant, the oath that he swore to our father Abraham, to grant us that we, being delivered from the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all our days. And you, child, shall be called the prophet of the Most High, for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways, to give his people knowledge of salvation by the forgiveness of their sins. So it was the mercy of our God, when a dawn from on high deemed to appear to us who sit in darkness and the shadow

of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace." — Finally, it is noted that the boy grew and became strong in spirit, and that he remained in solitude until the day of his public appearance in Israel. A supplement that clearly fits into this context, so that it would be wrong to conclude from it *) an originally separate existence of these narrations about John and the subsequent one about the birth of Jesus.

*) With Schleiermacher, who is pleased here, as in several other places, also in these introductory chapters of Luke, to sniff out seams and artificial combinations.

203

Thus far the legend of the child John, whom the Christian art of a later time loves to pair in truly genuine and intimate, albeit unconscious understanding of the legend, everywhere with the child Jesus, playing together in paradisiacal innocence. This is followed by the account of the birth of the Lord, in its tone and character still so similar to the preceding ones that we find no reason to doubt that it also arose directly in connection with them **).

**) That there are fewer, than in the preceding, detailed lyrical outpourings in it, is sufficiently explained by the fact that the simple thanks that could be expressed in this way were already exhausted in those.

— The scene of this birth had already been placed in Bethlehem by the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, the ancient birthplace of King David. Certainly, when the prophet Micah ***) proclaimed that Israel's future ruler should come forth from this city, the smallest among the cities of the tribe of Judah, this prophecy seems in itself to be as significant as that which designated the tribe of David as the starting point of the Messiah.

***) Micah 5:1.

But here too, the belief of the Israelites seems to have inclined to the literal interpretation of this word, and this feature of the legend seems to have arisen from it. For the Bethlehem birth of the Savior undoubtedly belongs only to the legend, since everywhere in the historical context we find or presuppose Nazareth as Jesus' hometown *).

*) The passage in John 7:42, already cited above, is particularly noteworthy here.

Even in the mythic account presented here, this assumption still shines through clearly. Luke knows no other way than that Nazareth was the home of Mary, and, as it seems the context of his narrative reveals, also of Joseph. It is one of the features of the higher age of this legend, as he tells it, especially in contrast to the one narrated in the first Gospel, that, still remembering this historical note, it resorts to an expressly invented twist to explain the supposed birth of the child Jesus, not in Nazareth, but in Bethlehem. On the occasion of a census, it says, held by the consul of Syria, Quirinius, under Caesar Augustus, who had arranged to tax the entire world, Joseph was compelled to travel to the original home of his tribe with his pregnant wife; there Mary gave birth to her first son. — The reasons are known that forbid viewing this alleged census and what it was supposed to cause as a historical fact. Recently, however, a great deal of ingenuity and scholarship has been expended in an attempt **), to save the historical accuracy of Luke's note, — attempts from which the possibility may yet emerge, to give the words of the evangelist, albeit only with the help of a change in the text, the interpretation as if they were not speaking of the well-known, considerably later, census of Quirinius from Josephus ***), but actually of an earlier one, otherwise unknown to us.

**) By Tholuck, in his work on the credibility of the evangelical history.

***) Joseph. Antiq. XVIII, 1.

But even if we are willing to admit that, in order to save an otherwise diplomatically precise historian from the suspicion of error, one should not shy away from such conjectures and the various difficulties attached to them, we must still recognize a truly committed mistake as far more probable than those suppositions resting on such weak, indeed in part wholly untenable supports *), through which the error is to be met, especially in a writer as careless as Luke has already shown himself to be and will further demonstrate, and in a context that can be termed mythical for so many other reasons.

*) How desperate and violent assumptions are needed, for example, just to make the accompanying of the heavily pregnant Mary on Joseph's alleged census journey seem explicable, and how little, if one allows these assumptions, is still gained for the removal of the remaining difficulties!

Especially since it can be proven that already early on, Luke, or perhaps even the source from which Luke drew here, was understood as the natural sense of the words of the text before us provides **).

**) How else could Justin Martyr (Apology I, 46) have said of Christ that he was born under Quirinius? — The honest Apologist is naive enough to appeal (ib. 34) to the census records of Quirinius himself to authenticate the birth of Jesus against Emperor Antoninus. An appeal that might fall into a category with the well-known reference to the supposed altar of Simon Magus in Rome (c. 26), and very likely also with that to the Acts of Pontius Pilate (c. 35).

— Moreover, it seems that the chronological difference between this alleged census and the actual one held under Quirinius had not escaped the Evangelist; which is all the more likely since he also shows himself otherwise familiar with this latter ***).

***) Acts 5:37. — Eusebius indeed (H.E. 1, 5) mentions this passage, as well as the corresponding one of Josephus, directly in connection with the Gospel one, as if they were in complete agreement and mutually confirmed each other.

As a result of this recollection, he refers to the census mentioned here as "the first under Quirinius," thus indeed showing good will to assist the legend, whose error he was on the trail of detecting. This he certainly did poorly, as he failed to properly calculate the years of Quirinius' proconsulship, simply assuming that Quirinius must have held another census before the otherwise known one. But in a writer who did not see fit to cast doubt on the nullity of the mythical notes handed down to him, such a procedure is by no means surprising.

206

This journey of Jesus' parents to Bethlehem is now used by legend to adorn the child's birth with other poetic and symbolically significant features. In a lonely rural setting, the mother is to have recovered from the birth of the divine child, — according to our canonical report, as it at least seems from the mention of the manger into which the child is placed *), in a stable, according to the apocryphal, which is also found in Justin Martyr and Origen, in a cave. After all, as the singer of that memorable Psalm expresses, which in concise words sings the entire history of Israel, King David was taken by the Lord who chose him from the sheepfolds **).

*) This tale of the manger was probably invented on the occasion of Isaiah 1:3, the same passage that gave rise to the fiction (Ev. de nativ. Mar. 14) that the newborn was worshiped by ox and ass. The Protoevangelium of James (c. 22) has the child placed in the manger to hide it from Herod.

**) Ps. 78:70.

— Here, however, we might, despite these undeniable allusions, consider the mythical narrative no less intended for the pagan point of view than for the Jewish one. It's not only that Greek and Roman mythology, in the stories of the birth of Zeus and other gods, of the childhood and youth of the most celebrated heroes, offers multiple counterparts to this fiction: the fiction itself seems specifically designed to present to the peoples dominating the globe through their culture and political power, the Savior, born in a despised corner of the world, in the unassuming environment of a people of shepherds and farmers, in a vivid image. Essential to the completeness of this image, to the spiritual as well as to the sensual, is the night in which the birth took place, which the canonical narrative does not explicitly say, but seems to suggest when it has shepherds, watching in the field at night, enveloped in heavenly radiance *), see the angel of the Lord who announces the birth of the divine child to them.

*) According to the Protoevangelium of James (c. 19), a glowing cloud (νεφελὴ φωτεινὴ) hovers over the birth cave.

"Fear not," cries the angel to the frightened shepherds, "fear not, for behold, I bring you great tidings of joy, to you and all the people. Today unto you a Savior is born, Christ the Lord in the city of David! And this shall be a sign unto you: ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger"! Then, it goes on to say, immediately a multitude of the heavenly host joins the angel, praising God and singing: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace; he looks upon humanity with favor"! — How the shepherds then journey to Bethlehem to see the word fulfilled that the Lord has made known to them; how they arrive hastily and find Mary with Joseph and the child in the manger; how those who hear the shepherds' tale marvel at it, but Mary keeps these words silently in her heart, and the shepherds return glorifying and praising God; these simple features of the straightforwardly reported tradition have become, so to speak, an eternal image for the Christian world's mind and heart and have become an inexhaustible source especially for artistic vision. But they could not have become this if they were merely a casual play of imagination, nor if they were a really occurring story fancifully dressed up by a belief in adventurous miracles. What they have become, they owe essentially to the circumstance that, with a necessity of shaping figures transcending arbitrariness and chance, an eternal story is laid down in them, the story of the birth of the Divine in simple and childlike humanity, the dawning consciousness of the innate Divine spirit in the human spirit returning to its pure original nature from the turmoil of cultural life and world history.

One might expect, with this narrative of the birth of the Savior, the mythical prehistory in the Gospel of Luke to be concluded, so that from now on we would step onto the ground of real, immediate historical representation. In fact, in the two anecdotes that are immediately connected to that narrative, one of the moments is omitted that designated the preceding as mythical, namely the appearance of angels, and the remaining character of the event seems to fit somewhat more into the ordinary course of things, although the miraculous does not cease. Nevertheless, we find ourselves obliged to agree with the latest criticism when it declares these pieces to be thoroughly mythical. The first of them contains prophecies that were supposed to have been spoken over the newborn child during a holy act, which had to be performed on the child according to Jewish custom. Here, with a somewhat strange twist, some have wanted to find evidence for the historical character of this narrative in the fact that the performance of this custom, the offering of purification for the new mother *) after the legal period of forty days **) and the presentation and redemption of the child as the firstborn ***) — (the circumcision that took place eight days after the birth had been briefly noted before) — is reported to have occurred in relation to the child born under such extraordinary circumstances.

*) Lev. 12, 8.

**) Ibid. 12, 3-4.

***) Ex. 13, 2. 12.

The myth, if this narrative also belonged to it, would, so one thinks, be expected to release the child born under such unusual providence and the mother giving birth in such a way from those customs, or at least if it wanted to subject them to these customs for the sake of what was to be connected with them, would have to invent some motive for such subjection. We find neither the one nor the other happening in our document, and from this, people believe they can conclude that it could be nothing other than the actual historical factuality of this event that caused its memory to be preserved; be it that with it the actual history begins and thus the paradox of this event is abolished by presupposing a natural birth, or that Mary, although recovered from her child under those wondrous circumstances, did not consider herself released from the duties prescribed by the law of her religion. So, as mentioned, the defenders of the historical factuality of this narrative. The truth, however, is that in a mythical account one must seek nothing less than such intellectual consistency. For one familiar with the nature and manner of legendary inventions, it should not be the least bit strange if the very myth that had previously narrated the birth of the divine child under circumstances elevating it above the order of nature and all rules of occurrence shortly thereafter

allows actions that seem to presuppose the ordinary order of things. For the myth is quite aware that the connection that links its content moments with one another is different from the external causal connection of factual events. Its work is directed entirely toward a goal other than devising such an illuminating causal connection for the reflecting intellect in the events it narrates. Therefore, the proof of not this external, but a deeper inner connection with the preceding is what matters if the narrative in question is to be considered likewise a mythical one, and not just mythical in general, but, where indeed our opinion is directed, explicitly as the continuation of the myth begun in the preceding.

210

Such an inner connection is indeed served by that very circumstance through which some have wanted to find the external connection disturbed. The performance of those holy customs in the Temple in Jerusalem marks the moment when the new prophecy concerning the child Jesus takes place, as one that stands in the same opposition to the moment of birth as to the first creation of man, to the paradisiacal innocence of the first human pair, the state that was designated for the Israelites by the law that Moses had given them. But it is precisely this opposition that puts the prophecies spoken over the child Jesus into their proper light. According to Jesus' own statement, already cited by us concerning John *), the law, i.e., the entire spiritual life led by the Israelites under the law, is of a prophetic nature; it points to the Messiah in whom it is to be fulfilled.

*) Matt. 11, 13.

If therefore in the revelation given to the shepherds at the moment of birth, the renewed relationship of the Divine to nature and the first humanity was depicted in the person of Christ: the prophecies made at the moment of His presentation in the Temple represent the same divine power as it is proclaimed within the confines of the life under the law by the mouth of the prophets, not merely of the coming Messiah, but of the present one, though as a child, i.e., in this symbolic context, not yet in esse, as a fully developed, perfected God-man, but only potentially present. Two elders speak this proclamation: Simeon, a just and devout man, full of expectation of the consolation promised to Israel, to whom the Holy Spirit, who was upon him, had prophesied that he should not see death until he had seen the Lord's Anointed, and Anna, daughter of Phanuel of the tribe of Asher, a widow of eighty-four years, who, married to her husband as a virgin, had lived with him for seven years, but now did not leave the temple, serving day and night with fasting and prayer. In these figures of the aged, legend has hardly preserved the memory of historical personalities - if they were such, their mention would still be of no essential interest to us since no further notice of them is preserved - but rather they are

figures of ideal, symbolic significance, similar to Zechariah and Elizabeth, like Joachim, the father of Mary, and his wife of the same name here appearing. Here too, the old age of these mythical figures symbolically represents the old age of the prophetic Israel, grown grey in the fear of the Lord and faithful observance of the law. The prophecies themselves, spoken here, although they must naturally be related to the words spoken above by the Lord and the heavenly hosts, are still, through their greater detail and the highlighting of the darkness that awaits the Lord and His followers, unmistakably contrasted with these. Led by the Spirit that drove him into the temple, Simeon sees the parents with the child Jesus; he takes the child in his arms and fervently exclaims: "Lord, now you are letting your servant depart in peace, according to your word; for my eyes have seen your salvation that you have prepared in the presence of all peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and for glory to your people Israel!" As the father and mother marvel at what was said about the boy - (again a naive turn of the legend, which knows no external causal connection) - Simeon blesses them and says to Mary: "Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel, and for a sign that is opposed - and a sword will pierce through your own soul also - so that thoughts from many hearts may be revealed!" Whoever sees in all the features of this legend nothing but mechanical reproductions of Old Testament speeches and events must necessarily be puzzled by these content-rich, oracle-toned words; for there is nothing that could serve as their model in that external sense. At most, it could be said that in them is compressed the quintessence of those sublime prophecies that, announcing suffering and distress to the "Servant of the Lord" *), had indeed been interpreted long ago as pointing to the expected Messiah.

*) Especially in the 53rd chapter of (pseudo) Isaiah.

But unquestionably, this grave woe-proclamation is not only indispensable to the completeness of this cycle of legends but is woven into this context all the more appropriately the more the fate that befell the Lord in His humanity, and the world-historical complications further connected with Christianity, are conditioned by their relationship to the law and to the entire earlier order of things. - Of Anna, who is also called a prophetess, there is only brief mention; it is told that she too approached the Lord with homage and spoke of Him to all in Jerusalem who were waiting for redemption. Then it is reported that the parents, after they had fulfilled all that the law required of them, returned to Galilee, to their home in Nazareth. But the child, it says, grew and became strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him.

So far, therefore, according to our earlier remark, we regard the story of Luke in all its main features as a mythical whole, which, roughly simultaneously and cast from a single mold of invention, clusters around that central myth, the legend of the supernatural birth of the Lord, and has fully shaped it into a myth in the complete sense of the word. We would not quite say the same of the last small story with which Luke closes this circle. Of it, too, we confess that in every other way its understanding remains closed to us unless we take it for a myth and interpret it as such. But it stands, both externally according to the chronological statement, and also in sense and meaning, isolated, and is only loosely connected, perhaps only in the random compilation of the evangelist, with what precedes it. — In the twelfth year of his age, — so goes the story, — the point in time that the Jews regarded as the boundary between childhood and mature youth, the parents took the boy with them to Jerusalem for the Passover, which they intended to celebrate through regular pilgrimage according to Jewish custom *).

*) According to the original arrangement considered Mosaic (Exodus 23:17, Deuteronomy 16:16), only the male members of the people were to appear before the Lord three times a year, on the three main feasts (Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles). A later custom extended this duty, but only concerning the Passover, also to women.

When they began their return journey after the end of the festive days, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem without Joseph and his mother noticing; both thought he was with the caravan heading from Jerusalem to Galilee. After traveling for a day, they inquired among their relatives and friends but without success; therefore, they returned to Jerusalem to look for him. Finally, after three days, they found him sitting in the temple among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions; all who heard him were highly astonished at his understanding and his answers. His parents saw him with astonishment, and his mother asked him why he had done this to them; she and his father had been looking for him in pain. The boy is said to have replied: "Why were you looking for me? Didn't you know that I must be in what is my Father's?" — No unbiased observer will recognize this answer as one that can be explained by the natural development of the divine child. To give it, Christ would either have to be exempt from the natural laws of human development, or else the thought of the Messiah's mission would have to be taught to the boy in an external manner and grasped by him more in a playful, childish way than with the seriousness it deserved. We lose nothing if we also renounce the immediate credibility of this anecdote, but we gain a new profound feature of the legend's poetry if we also classify it under the mythological viewpoint. For this, its meaning cannot remain hidden. It expresses how the youthful spirit of the growing Christianity, withdrawing from the care and supervision of any parents, meaning the boundaries set for it by Jewish law and the school of national

religious wisdom, turns on its own to the sanctuary of the Lord, engages there with mature human wisdom and science in exchange, and refers those who want to remind him of the duty towards those earthly parents or historical predecessors to the heavenly Father as the only truly genuine one.

214

So far the legends in Luke; a fundamentally different character is borne, as we already preliminarily noted, by the series of legends preserved in the Gospel named after Matthew. As an external characteristic of the younger age of this series of legends, the fact can be utilized, as already mentioned, that the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem here already forms a firm prerequisite and does not need to be motivated by the indication of special circumstances, as is still the case with Luke. Along with this determination of place, the fact of supernatural conception is also mentioned and treated in such a way that it implies an already recognized and established existence. The mythical narrative here does not deal with the introduction and immediate embellishment of this important event, but rather begins at the point where the conception has already taken place; it also knows nothing more specific to tell about the birth itself. However, it cannot be assumed that along with these main points, the Davidic descent and birth in Bethlehem on the one hand, the conception by the Holy Spirit on the other, the inventors of this new myth also knew and presupposed the more specific features of the previous cycle of myths. There is not only no explicit trace of this in it, but even explicitly contradictory circumstances, e.g. immediately this one, that instead of the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, rather a later relocation from Judaea and Bethlehem, as the original home of Jesus' parents, to Galilee and Nazareth is reported. Other, somewhat concealed but therefore no less actual, and not only against the possibility of a factual validity of both circles of legends but also against the unity or continuity of the mythical invention, decisive contradictions, recent criticism has brought to light in a rather considerable amount. — This seems to contradict the view that we expressed earlier about the circle of legends in Luke, that only through it those mythical basic facts were firmly established as real mythical entities that could have secure validity in the general belief of the congregation. But this contradiction is only apparent; for even if the myth immediately arose with such executing and embellishing features, it could nevertheless well happen that at first only the main content, but not also the subordinate features, found a place in the general belief, the latter only after they, along with other content of the written tradition, were disseminated by written recording. In fact, we have reason to assume that, as independent as they are unquestionably in their origin from the evangelical relations *), it is essentially only the preserved written record in the two Gospels named after Luke and Matthew that has secured both the one and the other of those series of legends the general acceptance in Christendom.

*) Traces of the legends of Matthew's Gospel, independent of the latter and partly divergent, are found in Ignatius in the letter to the Ephesians and in Justin in the Dialogue with Trypho.

Had they been excluded from these writings, both would hardly have been able to escape either complete ruin or such an ambiguous status as the apocryphal narratives. Therefore, let us assume as the most probable that the accounts in Matthew's Gospel are indeed older than the composition or dissemination of Luke's Gospel, but younger than the tale reported in this latter: then the relationship between the two mythical series to each other can have nothing puzzling.

216

The series of legends of the first Gospel falls into two main parts, which, separated from each other by the birth of the child Jesus, have no externally detectable connection with each other. We must leave it undecided whether the first, smaller part, the story of Joseph's dream, is also internally and by invention separate from the second, larger and more content-rich part, the story of the visit of the Magi and what is connected with it, or whether it is, despite the external separation, connected by a continuity of meaning with it; although we admit that we tend towards the latter view. In the former case, only minor importance could be attached to that part. It would then most likely be regarded as invented with the intention of answering the question, which, with the idea of the miraculous conception of Mary, can hardly be avoided from our prosaic standpoint: the question of how that extraordinary event had been authenticated for Mary's husband. For the story goes: Joseph, when he found his betrothed pregnant without having had marital relations with her, intended to separate from her secretly; as an upright man, he was reluctant to publicly disgrace her. (This addition, in particular, may indeed seem to indicate that the inventor of this story had expressly posed the question of how it had come about that the incident had not attracted more attention at the time it occurred.) Then an angel of the Lord appears to Joseph in a dream *), and calls out to him: "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary your wife home, for what she will bear is of the Holy Spirit!

*) It has been noted that the turn of phrase according to which such supernatural appearances come "in a dream" is peculiar to the first Evangelist, while it does not usually occur in other New Testament stories. A tendency towards natural interpretation can hardly be found in this, for this is completely foreign to our Evangelist. Rather, we would believe that the legend here and elsewhere wants

to express through this phrase the unconscious and unintentional decision made by divine destiny.

The angel also announced the birth of a son, and demanded that he be called Jesus, for he is to be, as indicated by this name, destined to save his people from their sins. Joseph, awakened from sleep, heeds the angel's warning and takes his wife home, without, however, having marital relations with her until the birth of her firstborn. — As mentioned, one need not be at a loss for an explanation of this anecdote if one takes it by itself; all the less so since it was invented with hardly unrecognizable reference to an older, though not found in biblical documents, but otherwise sufficiently known story about the father of Moses *).

*) Joseph. antiq. II, 9, 3.

But if we consider it as having arisen in connection with the following, infinitely deep and meaningful myth, which is made likely by the unmistakable similarity of tone and attitude of both, we cannot help but assume that a deeper meaning must also be hidden in it. Such a meaning, however, will not be too difficult to find if one considers the analogy in which the position of Mary, vis-à-vis Joseph, stands to the ordinary fate of all that is higher and divine when it seeks to make its way within earthly circumstances.

217

The following narrative, presented by our evangelist just as simply and plainly, even more unadorned, than the corresponding one in Luke, is without question the crown of all these mythical poems, both in terms of the depth and sublimity of meaning and the grace and beauty of invention. It is a creation that ranks among the most extraordinary and wondrous ever produced by the poetic imagination of all times and peoples. But the more wondrous the image in the genuine, true sense of the word, the bolder must necessarily appear the interpretation that seeks to translate its meaning into the form of a concept. We dare to come forth with such an interpretation, at the risk of being accused of replacing one great miracle with an even greater one, which the mythical view, as it has been understood until now, sought to avoid; we dare to do so, in the conviction that this glorious poem can only be given its due in this way. — When Jesus was born in Bethlehem, — this poem begins, — during the time of King Herod, a group of Magi from the East arrived in Jerusalem. They inquired about a King of the Jews, who must have been born recently; for his star had appeared to them in the East, and they had come to pay homage to him. — That such a star should announce the Messiah was indeed a presumption that could have passed into legend as a result of Balaam's prophecy about the star rising from Jacob *).

*) Numbers 24:17.

For this prophecy seems to have been understood by the Jews, both before and after Christ, as referring to the Messiah, and the star as a sign that must not be missing at the Messiah's appearance. Whether, as has been recently suspected by many **), this legend found support in a rare celestial phenomenon, such as the conjunction of the planets Saturn and Jupiter, calculated by Kepler to have occurred around the time of Christ's birth, we must leave undecided here.

**) E.g., by Münter in the publication: The Star of the Magi (Copenhagen, 1827).

In any case, we could not assign great importance to this question for our present consideration, since even in the affirmative case the star of the Magi would not become a historical fact. But just as the appearance of the star was prophesied, so too was the arrival of worshipful crowds from distant heathen lands. This prophecy can be found in that book of prophets, which, above all other books of the Old Testament, contains the clearest foreboding of the ideas that were to be realized in the true Messiah *), and regarding this as well, there seems to be little to prevent its inclusion at that time among the necessary criteria for the Messianic presence **).

*) In the prophetic sayings attached to the writings of Isaiah (from the fortieth chapter on) and bearing his name, although they can only date from the last period of the Babylonian captivity, Chapter 60, 6. Besides Psalm 72:10.

**) One can raise the question of why the author of the Gospel of Matthew, who is otherwise so eager to quote prophetic passages, neglects to quote these very passages that lie unmistakably at the foundation of his story or rather of the legend he recounts. Yet, with regard to Balaam's prophecy, Origen at least has noticed this connection, referring to it (c. Cels. I, 60) as the basis for the Magi's hope in the Messiah. In any case, the omission of such quotations can serve as a sign that the evangelist did not invent the legend himself but found it already formed. Though one must not infer the opposite, that any actual quotation of this kind points to the evangelist's own invention or compilation.

Thus, in the holy books of the Israelites, in the belief of the Israelite people, to which similar features could be found in the popular beliefs of the pagan peoples as well ***), the occasion was given, in good faith and without any intention of deceit, to invent the legend whose significance must be sought entirely elsewhere, not in these external causes.

***) It has often been noted the significance attributed to the comets that appeared in the time of Mithridates, Caesar, and others.

219

Indeed, we must agree with those who ascribe to this legend "a completely symbolic character at its innermost core," without, however, detracting from the influence of those prophetic sayings. The legend symbolizes that "by being recognized by the Gentiles as well as by the Jews from the very outset, Christianity wants to assert its right to extend beyond Judaism" *).

*) Schleiermacher on Luke, p. 47. However, we naturally cannot accept the contrast that this writer places between Matthew's account and that of Luke, which he wants to hold as directly historical.

But the legend has fulfilled this purpose not in a merely superficial way but with true, albeit unconscious, profundity, and indeed, as befits genuine, objective legendary poetry, in the simplest, most artless way. Its creative act consists, externally viewed, solely in bringing together those two features that appear separately in the prophecy: the appearance of the star and the arrival of the adorers from the East, transforming the latter, who are referred to in the prophetic saying as rich men and kings, into priests, into Magi **).

**) Incidentally, in the continually evolving legend, they were also considered kings, perhaps especially in contrast to the adoring shepherds on the night of birth.

That the homeland of these Magi is referred to as the East in general, rather than the "Saba" specified in the prophetic passage, is an untranslatable touch of the ingeniously generalized legendary poetry at this point ***).

***) This detail is peculiar to the canonical narrative. In Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, undoubtedly as a result of referring back to that passage, Arabia is repeatedly named as the homeland of those Magi.

To misunderstand the profundity that genuinely resides in the legend, rather than being arbitrarily imposed upon it, is to be willing, as recent criticism does, to see in this significant conjunction nothing more than "a feature that, given the star, followed of its own accord; for no one could understand its meaning better than astrologers, and the

Orient was considered the homeland of this knowledge." Truly, a creation that arose so completely only from the barest reflection could never have attained the high significance it has unquestionably achieved in the believing view of the whole Christian world, and especially in the artistic imagination of the Christian nations! Only a deeper, world-historical sense could lend to the legend, to the image, this weight, this wonderfully attractive force, even if it was instilled only with a prescient, unconscious genius, not with explicit, self-conscious reflection. And so let no one blame us if we attempt, by bringing the moment of reflection from our current science and education level to the legend, to draw this meaning from it and to put it into words that are also comprehensible to the intellect. We find, to put it briefly, in this legend, naively, the great view of the significance of pagan religions, of the meaning and content of the ancient priestly wisdom of the Orient in its relation to Christianity. The star that the Magi behold, whose appearance in the East directs them to seek the Messiah and then shines before them to his birthplace—this star is not a fleeting meteor or a particular constellation to be explored through external observation and mathematical calculation of the laws of star motion. It is neither more nor less than the total content of that natural symbolism that underlay the star religions of the pagan East, and through the mediation of that astrological basic view, the religious ideas of paganism in general; it is this content, encapsulated in a simple, easily understood image. That this symbolism, that the entire religious core of paganism, spiritually grasped and understood in its truth, points to Christianity, teaches to seek Christ and recognize the one found: this and nothing else is the clear meaning of the graceful and sublime miracle image. As far from claiming that the inventor of this glorious image, or any of those mysteriously appealed and inspired by the image, this meaning had matured into clear consciousness or conceptual knowledge: so clear and sure is our conviction that it was this content, glimpsed with a prescient seer's eye, that the poets of the legend, as if driven by a divine spirit, could, indeed must, instill in the images simply put together by them from the prophetic prophecy *).

*) Instructive for the history of education and the meaning of the legend is the passage in Ignatius's letter to the Ephesians (§ 19), where I would like not only to find a fantastic embellishment flowing from one of the recensions of the Hebrew Gospel. There, a star is mentioned, "of unspeakable and awe-inspiring light, which outshone all other stars, and around which the other stars, along with the sun and moon, formed a chorus"; it is also said of him that "in it all magic found its end." Much seems to indicate that here we have not so much a reference to the already formed legend as rather a moment of the fermentation process in which the images of the legend gradually settled. The star evidently symbolizes Christianity itself, with unmistakable reference to the views of paganism, which found their dissolution in it. It becomes apparent how it could have happened that

from this admittedly closer symbol, with the cooperation of the aforementioned prophetic passages, the more delicate and thoughtful one, which we find in our Gospel, could gradually develop.

The authentication of the legend was then significantly supported by the prescient belief prevalent in the Orient at the time it arose, that it was ordained by fate that a world ruler should come forth from Judea **).

**) "Fore, or esse in fatis, ut profecti Judaea rerum potirentur" — say, in almost identical words, Suetonius in Vespasian 4 and Tacitus (Hist. V, 13). The latter's history books show in several places how deeply this belief must have been rooted in the people at that time.

It is known how this popular rumor was applied by the Romans to their Vespasian and Titus; the Christians, when they heard it, could with even greater right apply it to the already appeared Lord and Savior of the World. It was not vain delusion, but a true consciousness of the world-historical destiny of Christianity that found in it the fulfillment of the prophecy that all nations should pay homage to the Lord, who had appeared in the form of a servant.

223

We cannot understand the continuation of the story as linking real historical facts, or those that claim to be without deeper historical-ideal content, to those symbolic premises. We rather believe in it as the mythical elaboration of the same basic theme, which almost necessarily follows from that starting point, and we do not hesitate to attribute to the myth, which drew the fundamental idea of its invention from such wondrous depth, the finely woven and meaningful fabric of such elaboration. — Through the words of the Magi, who, seeking the Messiah, come to Jerusalem, King Herod and all of Jerusalem find themselves disturbed. A gathering of the chief priests and scribes of the people is to decide from which direction the birth of the Promised One is to be expected. When these, according to the prophetic word, name the town of Bethlehem, Herod, plotting destruction, secretly summons the Magi to himself, inquires more closely about the time of the star's appearance, and upon dismissing them to Bethlehem, charges them to report back to him about the child, if they find it, so that he may also pay homage to it. The Magi set off, and wondrously! the star, which they had seen in the East, goes before them until it finally stops over the house where the child was. They, filled with high joy at the appearance of the star, enter the house, find the child with his mother Mary, fall down before him on their knees in homage, open their chests and present him with gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh. — Just as the homage-paying

priestly and poetic spirit of the ancient world offered the victorious Christianity the blossoms of symbolic art and poetry as a precious gift, the childlike Christian religion did not scorn this gift. Instead, it delighted in it as in cheerful play, wanting to adorn itself with joyful ornaments. This indeed is the meaning of the beautiful image of this offering, and in it is also found the key to the significance that this mythical scene has attained for Christian art. The latter must have loved to immerse itself in this scene because here, more than anywhere else, it rediscovered the concept, the awareness of its own essence, and in its work could offer this consciousness of itself, in homage to the higher idea, to the invisible Christ-child. — But at the same time as this main and culminating point of the mythical narrative, the rest of its course is also illuminated by the light of thought, which we have identified as its animating principle. Herod, in this, as indeed in the whole cycle of legends of Christ's birth and childhood, stands as the symbolic representative of worldly power, the kingdom of this world. Yes, as far as the present context is concerned, we may find in his person the concept of that empire that then ruled the world, of which we know how, sensing its fate-appointed rival in him, it sought to suppress the budding Christianity through bloody violence. That it is the Magi through whom the tidings of the truly born Messiah come to the king: this expresses precisely the fateful, world-historically significant, and providential aspect of the foreboding misfortune of the previous world rulers. The same religious consciousness of paganism, guided by the spirit of truth, originally implanted by their Creator in the pagans, which pushes towards Christianity and submits to it in homage, becomes, abandoned by that spirit, an involuntary impulse hidden in the dark background of fate for the persecution of Christianity by worldly power that arose from the pagan world; it shows that power the enemy that will overthrow it. — Above all, the one feature that most surprises by its ingenious subtlety and the depth of insight from which it has emerged, just as, considered as a real fact, it most decisively resists any attempt at naturalistic interpretation, is the reappearance and forelighting of the star on the Magi's journey to Bethlehem. Whoever wants to know what the legend strives to express through this feature should realize how, at the time of emerging and gradually growing Christianity, that deep natural foundation of the religions of antiquity, which we find here symbolized by the image of the star, that magical symbolism with its principle and focus in the observation of the star's course, surfaced once again in the consciousness of the pagan peoples, after it seemed almost to have vanished in the hustle and bustle of art and historical life. Through the pursuit of its interpretation, through the grasping of its innermost, hidden meaning, this symbolism, which indeed also manifested itself in dark superstition, in magic, theurgy, and oriental worship of the most adventurous kind, particularly in the philosophy of the Alexandrian-Platonic school, became involuntarily the guide to Christianity. It is this remarkable, world-historical phenomenon, whose awareness here the legend has appropriated with a deep sense that, while bordering on

the miraculous, should not be dismissed into the realm of the fabulous, and has embodied in the image.

225

The legend goes on to tell how the Magi, warned by a dream, avoid meeting Herod again and return home by another way. That is, if we continue to follow the connection that began earlier: worldly power is abandoned by the religious substance, by the priestly wisdom of ancient paganism, a fate which, as history teaches, the world empire of that time was indeed affected by. But not only the Magi, but also Joseph receives such a vision; he is prompted by it to flee to Egypt with the child and his mother and to stay there until the death of Herod. This aspect of the legend is among those that pose the greatest difficulty for an explanation, whether historical or mythological. That it should not be considered a historical fact is already revealed by the accompanying motive of a dream appearance, which, since the news of the real impending danger was so easy to obtain, must appear completely unnecessary. Moreover, all the difficulties that so strongly question the actuality of the intended and executed massacre of the children by Herod also oppose this alleged fact. Therefore, recognizing this, people have felt the need to stick to the prophetic passage *) referred to by the evangelist himself, and to seek in it the cause for the invention of that feature.

*) Hos. 11:1.

But since this passage speaks in clear terms not of the future Messiah but of the people of Israel, whom the Lord once led out of Egypt; since there is absolutely no reason in it to refer to the Messiah, the highest probability is that the messianic interpretation of it is not older, but younger than the present composition, and is only prompted by it. — The mere lack of sufficient external motivation thus forces us, in conjunction with our previous interpretation of this entire series of legends, to seek a deeper meaning for this feature as well. But what other meaning could it be, expressed in its generality, than this: pursued and suppressed by worldly power, youthful Christianity is compelled to emigrate from its homeland, in both the literal and figurative senses, and to hide from the eyes of the world rulers? That the land of Egypt is named specifically as the child's refuge may indeed be influenced by the memory of the Israeli people's stay in Egypt, the inclination to parallel the destinies of this people, depicted in the songs of its prophets also in the personal form of a "servant of Jehovah" **), with the destinies of the Messiah.

**) Without doubt, this is the most agreeable among the various interpretations of this expression, especially those recently attempted, that appear most frequently and prominently in the second half of Isaiah previously mentioned.

It is all the more likely to assume this, as the unmistakable story of the rescue of the Christ child refers back to the similarly miraculous rescue reported of the boy Moses. But even here, as a result of the view that we have taken once and for all of the inner structure of a mythical composition as genuine and deeply conceived as the present one, we cannot yet rest with a motive so externally pronounced. If we recall the fate that, in the first centuries of Christianity, made North Africa, and especially Egypt, the foremost stage of its emerging life and earliest development, while it remained almost banished from its homeland, both the original and the one assigned to it by the world spirit for the future, at odds with the power that ruled the world: then we cannot refrain - even if it's only to admire the coincidence which has so ingeniously spun this profoundly conceived and artfully begun mythical fabric. Although we do hesitate to express the thought hinted at here as the content of the legend in such a way that could be understood as speaking of a deliberately embedded meaning. For even less here than elsewhere, such self-conscious intent can be presumed, since that content for the inventors was not even a present or a past, but only a future one. But in other mythical contexts, both older and more recent, we quite often find grand foresights into world-historical futures interwoven, ones that, while on the one hand conditioned and, to a certain extent, given by the overview of the course of world history, which everywhere forms the actual soul of such myths, still retain something surprisingly wonderful and providential on the other hand. In the present case, a point of connection for that puzzlingly surprising feature might still be found in the significance that Egypt had already acquired at that time for the education and intellectual life of the Israelite people. That activity of the Alexandrian school, through whose mediation Egypt had indeed become the true cradle for Gnosis or spiritual, speculative knowledge within Christianity, had already begun at the time the myth was invented. The same intuitive depth of vision of the mythical poetry, which has so happily seized many other world-historical moments, could well have grasped this too, as it was undeniably in the direction in which the spirit of that poetry had once extended its feelers.

228

In the corresponding sense, we must now resolve to carry the interpretation of the mythical course to its conclusion from the point now reached, as alien as it may appear, as we must decide once and for all, to the adherents of all previous parties of scriptural interpretation, including those who profess the "mythical view." When, in the continuation of the story of Herod, it says that, seeing himself deceived by the Magi, he

falls into wrath; when he, in this surge of anger, resolves to murder all children in Bethlehem and in the vicinity of Bethlehem up to the second year of age, the thread of the explanatory approach we have attempted naturally provides us with the interpretation: that, no longer in the spirit of the old, nobler natural religion but forsaken and deceived by this spirit, the pagan power begins to rage actively against Christianity. We would have to assign this meaning to the fact of the massacre of the innocents narrated in this context even if we could ascribe to it an outward historical reality, like some of the otherwise freer-thinking researchers*).

*) It is well known that some people want to find this event quite fitting to the otherwise known bloodthirsty character of Herod; some even cite the testimony of a pagan writer of a later time (Macrob. Saturn. II, 4), who, however, most likely received the news of this event from the Christians themselves.

However, this is forbidden for us, additionally by the silence of Josephus, the purposelessness of this act, already criticized by several, but even more by the apparent conditioning of this narrative by the rest, as shown, of a purely mythical context. - Less superfluous it may be to inquire into historical circumstances that could have provided the outward occasion for this invention. Here, apart from those well-known facts from the history of Herod, we might place some weight on the facts of Christian persecution under Domitian as narrated by the ancient church historian Hegesippus and after him by Eusebius **), which fall fairly precisely into the time of the creation of our legend and are even included among the events to which the hidden meaning of the legend points.

**) Euseb. II. E. II, 19 sq.

This meaning indeed goes, as already noted, essentially to the fates not so much of the personal Christ but rather of the earliest Christian community. Through the killing of the children, while the divine child, for whom the act of bloodshed was intended, is saved, the martyrdom, the suffering, and the death of so many confessors of Christianity is symbolized, while Christianity itself remained unreachable to the cruel fury to which they fell victim. We express this interpretation, since its content was close enough to the inventors of the legend, without much hesitation and with some confidence; more fearfully, and only as a problematically added thought, the following about the conclusion of the narrative, which indeed reaches so far into the times that were then still future, that hardly anyone will be bold enough to grant us such a divinatory power of the myth. — When, as the point in time of the end of those persecutions, as the point in time for the return of the Christ child along with mother and stepfather to the homeland, the death of Herod is named, the consequence seems to require us to refer this to the

historical fact that the entry of Christianity into the homeland determined for it by the world spirit, i.e., its spread across the European world, coincides with the fall of Roman world domination. Likewise, when finally, the legend, returning to real history, reports that the returnees, instead of the Jewish land and the ancestral 'City of David,' chose Galilee and Nazareth as their permanent residence, deterred by fear of Archelaus, the successor of Herod, this province with a wholly Hellenistic character, inhabited more by people of pagan descent, by foreigners, than by pure Jewish kinsmen, it reminds us, after we have once carried on that parallelism of the legend with the great course of world history so far, involuntarily of the fact that historically Christianity, along with its parents, i.e., along with the ideas and historical memories by which it was nurtured and raised, as it spread over the then civilized earth, found itself compelled to change its home, and instead of the old Jewish one - which even then only exchanged a Herod for an Archelaus - it received a pagan, Germanic-Roman world from Providence. — If there were any prospect of validating these bold anticipations of the historical future as the true, substantial meaning and content of the legend, one might also utilize the fact that repeatedly, dream visions are those through which the actors in the legend are determined to take those symbolically significant steps, and their will is directed towards the goal that Providence has prepared for them. One might say that the introduction of these dream appearances involuntarily reveals the dream-like, visionary states that we would have to presuppose in the inventors of the myth if we were to assume that those wonderfully prescient anticipations were indeed made by them. But, as already noted, it cannot be our intention here to assert a real miracle, or to seriously regard these elements of our interpretation of the myth as ones that were somehow already present in the consciousness of the inventors of the myth.

230

However one may judge these and other problematic and paradoxical aspects of the interpretation we have attempted here, we hope that through them the important main moment, the assertion of which alone we were concerned with, will have become clearer than after the previous treatments of the original sagas. It is not enough that, once one has come to recognise these legends as legends, one only admits in general that they are more than mere fiction or even only fables. In order for this insight to become a truth, it is indispensable to take at least a look at the way in which ideas have taken the place of immediate facts in them. The correctness of the interpretation in individual cases is not so important. In any case, the nature of the matter itself makes it impossible to draw a completely sharp boundary between correctness and incorrectness, although in some cases interpretations can be found which, because of their evidence and striking force, must recommend themselves to all unless they stubbornly refuse to accept the standpoint itself. But this is certain, that an interpretation

of genuine kind will always only show such a sense in the legend that also explains its existence in this place and in this environment, not some distant and external one, but its own inner essence or as it were the idea of the events, in the midst of or in place of which the legend occurs. — Only in this way does the offence fall away that in every other case the devout, religious contemplation of Protestant history cannot avoid taking at the admixture of legendary poems in the context of this history. That is to say, what a saga of intuition offers that is thoroughly filled with the true, substantial content, with the idea of sacred history, can essentially be nothing other than religious, sacred content. The historical revelation of God in the Gospel loses not the slightest of its sacred content if a part of this content, instead of being considered as an immediate fact of such a kind in which the deity appeared more playfully than seriously, engaging in a paradoxical, half-poetic, half-prosaic game with its own sublimest work, is rather recognized as the ingenious, spirited work in which the circle of people, to whom the divine revelation of Christianity was first directed, invested a productive, creative consciousness of the descended divine spirit and the manner of its working. It is such a consciousness that has found expression in the sacred saga that is entirely appropriate to it. Therefore, we rightly regard the legend of the birth and childhood of the Savior as filled with that divine spirit that was poured out through Christ over his disciples, and by the power of this spirit as an indispensable moment of the evangelical proclamation; all the more indispensable because it is through it alone that the reference of this proclamation to the pre-Christian revelation of the divine spirit in the religions of paganism, that revelation which has for its organ primarily and almost exclusively the myth, is conveyed.

Third Book.

Comprehensive Presentation of the Gospel History
up to the Death of Jesus.

Among the most striking signs of how little the historical writing of our evangelists is based on a critical investigation of their subject, the lack of any more precise chronological determination about the time of the events they narrate is unquestionably conspicuous. How easy it would have been for them or for those from whom they gathered their information to arrive at a more precise notice concerning the birth year of Jesus if any of them had seriously thought to concern themselves with it! Instead, we find in three of our Gospels not even an attempt at a more specific chronological determination of this or any other event; in the Gospel of Luke, some indications are indeed given to effect such a determination, but they are either generally vague or conflicting with each other and other information that has come down to us from those times. The seemingly most accurate of these indications is the one stating that the appearance of John falls into the fifteenth year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius*); based on this, calculations of Christ's birth year have been made since ancient times, according to which the Christian world still numbers its years.

*) Luke 3:1.

However, this information becomes suspicious partly in itself because it contains a historical inaccuracy in its secondary details; - it names, for example, beside Pontius Pilate as Procurator of Judea, beside Herod as Tetrarch of Galilee, beside Philip as Tetrarch of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and beside Annas and Caiaphas as high priests, a Lysanias as the current Tetrarch of Abilene, whom history does not recognize but whose name has most likely been mistakenly transferred from an earlier period into this context *); - partly because the combination of this notice with other notices produces a result that, through its contradiction with other news from the other evangelists and even Luke himself, proves to be erroneous.

*) Some scholars who are otherwise free from dogmatic prejudices (e.g., Winer in the Realwörterbuch) have decided, in spite of the difficult-to-reconcile news of Josephus about the fate of Abilene after the death of the first Lysanias, to assume a younger Lysanias, on the grounds that Luke here evidently shows a striving for accuracy, and thus the error at this point becomes unlikely. However, this reason proves to be insufficient when one looks more closely at what exactly

is going on with this quest for accuracy in our evangelist. Obviously, at the present point (capriciously), he is only trying to name the tetrarchs completely, and since he couldn't find another name for the fourth tetrarchy other than that of Lysanias, he simply names him outright, without it occurring to him to ask whether this Lysanias was still alive then, and whether Abilene even existed as an independent tetrarchy at that time. His precision, therefore, is also entirely of the same kind as, according to our previous remark, where he, knowing full well that there was a later census by Quirinius, blithely and by good luck calls the one that legend had shifted to an earlier year the first. Such behavior also fits very well with the other literary character of Luke, especially, for example, his habit of inventing occasions for the traditional speeches of Christ, indeed, this groomed illusory thoroughness, by which many of today's researchers are still deceived.

According to our evangelist, Jesus was about thirty years old at the time of his baptism by John *).

*) Cap. 3, 23.

From this, one obtains, if one allows oneself to place this baptism in the same year as the appearance of John without further ado, precisely that result that led the monk Dionysius in the sixth century of our chronology to set the year of the birth of the Lord as the seven hundred and fifty-fourth after the building of the city of Rome (as the era of its building is determined by Varro). But this calculation does not agree with the further statement that Jesus was born under King Herod the Great. For he must have died, as the reports by Josephus show **), already four years before that point in time at which Jesus' birth is placed.

**) Principal place regarding the time of Herod's death: Josephus, Antiquities XVII, 8, 1.

Whether this latter note or the result of that calculation be preferred: the contradiction in Luke remains in any case, and the accuracy of his chronological statement is not saved, even if one wanted to prefer this result to that statement on the ground that the mention of Herod appears in him and also in the first Gospel only in a context that, as we showed in the previous book, is mythical. — We cannot even agree with this preference, for in contrast to this and in agreement with the statement of legend, the birth year of the Lord is usually set by all modern researchers several years earlier than it would fall due to the Dionysian era. The manner in which the legend, not the one in Matthew but the older one in Luke himself, mentions Herod only briefly and without attaching any significance to this note, makes it much more likely that this mention does

not belong to its own, poetically conceived context, but is taken only as a prerequisite from real history, or rather from an imprecise but essentially reliable recollection of Jesus' true age. The legend in Matthew, of course, uses the figure of Herod symbolically to express ideas that are quite distinct from the historical personality of this king. We also find later writers reading significance into this chronological determination in other ways, by wanting to find in it the fulfillment of the ancient Mosaic prophecy *), which proclaimed, "that rulers from Judah would not become extinct, nor leaders from his tribe, until he comes to whom everything belongs," in the fact that Christ was born under him, who was the first of foreign descent to rule over Judah **).

*) Gen. 49, 10.

**) Euseb. II. I, 6. Augustine. City of God XVIII, 45. This, however, whether Herod, as is claimed, was of foreign descent, is still doubtful. Cf. Joseph. Ant. XIV, 1, 3 and the commentators on Eusebius loc. cit. — It is also noted that then, as later also under Antipas and the Romans, men of low birth were appointed as high priests instead of descendants of the old revered lineage (cf. Joseph. Ant. XX, 10). Indeed, a symptom of the weakening of the old national principle, which could rightly be interpreted as pointing to the need for an expansion of this principle beyond its previous boundaries, as was indeed accomplished by Christ.

But neither the one nor the other proves that the chronological fact must therefore be fictitious. The real fact could just as well be used by the legend in the one case, and by the Christological interpretation in the other, for the peculiar purposes of both. On the contrary, in agreement with most recent scholars, we consider that, among all the notes on the time of Jesus' birth, some of which are given to us directly and some of which can be deduced from the legend, this one, that this birth falls in the reign of Herod, is the only one that can be established with any certainty, and, for reasons which we shall further explain, we are much less reluctant (as those who take Matthew's legend for real history cannot fail to do) to move that event up a few years beyond Herod's death than to move it down below it.

239

The parents of Jesus are to be named Joseph and Mary with the utmost confidence, and in such a way that he is recognized as their marital son, not as one conceived before marriage. The consequence that some have recently wished to impose again on the mythological view of the nativity story, as if the same "enlightenment" that denies the miracle of supernatural conception must proceed to accept birth outside of marriage,

must be rejected once and for all, since it is based on an almost willful misunderstanding of the principle of this view.

*) Parts on the Biography of Jesus, p. 40.

The legend of conception by the Holy Spirit does not require such an occasion as the birth of the child before the lawful time might have given. On the contrary, the assumption of such an occasion would cast an even greater flaw on both the nature of the myth and the factual nature of the event. The myth would then appear to have originated from a dishonest embellishment of the real flaw attached to the Lord's birth, while according to genuine mythological theory, it can have no other origin than a purely ideal, poetic-speculative one. Moreover, it has already been rightly noted that the accusation of an illegitimate birth would certainly not have been left unused by those who were hostile to Jesus at the time, as is known to have been expressly invented by the pagan opponents of Christianity in the time of Celsus for this purpose.

Concerning the descent and circumstances of Jesus' parents, since we have had to recognize the legends of descent from David as unhistorical, nothing more specific is known to us. Even this can only be reported as probable, not as historically certain, that Joseph may have been a carpenter by trade. The Gospel testimony *) on this point is uncertain, because it may have possibly arisen from a misunderstanding of the passage that calls Jesus himself a carpenter **).

*) Matthew 13:55.

**) Mark 6:3. At this point, and under the favor of the authority of Origen, who declared the legend that Jesus himself had been a carpenter as unbiblical, some have wanted to read ο τεκτονος υιός. But it is easier to understand how that reading could be transformed into this one, rather than vice versa. The same reason would argue, even if we were not already convinced of the originality of Mark's account as opposed to Matthew's, to derive the report of the second from the first, not the other way around.

The legend preserved outside the Gospels, that both father and son were engaged in making plows and harnesses, may be historically correct, or may have arisen from the interpretation given to this occupation at the same place that first reports it to us ***).

***) Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. 88.

— A state of oppressive poverty within the family in which Jesus lived is, according to general human probability and the silence of our historical sources, as unlikely to assume as the undisputed opposite of this state. It may be assumed, with a degree of probability bordering on certainty, that Joseph, Jesus' father, had died early, certainly before the public appearance of his son; for Joseph is no longer mentioned in the course of the Gospel narrative, but his mother and siblings are referred to more than once. This assumption also gives room, if not a reason, for the probably early legend, which presents Joseph as an old man at the time of Jesus' birth. The existence of physical siblings has been doubted by many, but probably without reason. The doubt is based, after the dogmatic scruples that formerly opposed the assumption of marital intercourse between Mary and Joseph even after Jesus' birth, can be considered as removed, essentially on the paradox that the same names, which are repeatedly mentioned as those of Jesus' brothers, appear at other places *) as the names of the sons of a Mary, who is called at another place **) the sister of the Lord's mother.

*) Mark 15:49, 47; 16:1, and parallels.

**) John 19:25.

Therefore, the hypothesis has been established that those supposed brothers are the same as the sons of this second Mary, thus not physical brothers, but cousins of Jesus; this has an apparent confirmation through the disbelief of these brothers in Jesus during his lifetime, as well as the fact that, according to the fourth Gospel ***), Jesus recommends the Apostle John to take his place as a son to his mother at the cross.

***) John 19:26.

However, the mention of siblings appears in the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles too often and too casually under circumstances that do not easily refer to other persons than real physical siblings †), so that one should prefer to seek the misunderstanding, if here, which is not even necessary to assume, such exists, rather on the opposite side, especially since some of the seemingly conflicting reports are only vouched for by the fourth Gospel, which is so little unsuspected in all such factual notes.

†) Mark 3:31; 6:3, and parallels, etc.

In particular, we are inclined to regard that James the Just, whom we see playing such a significant role in the community as "brother of the Lord" after the Lord's death, converted, it seems, from his earlier disbelief in a way similar to Paul, by an appearance of the Risen One ††), as indeed a physical brother of Jesus, and as such distinct from

that James of Alphaeus, whom we already find listed among the disciples of the living, and whom one usually assumes to be one and the same as the son of "Mary of Clopas" *).

††) 1 Corinthians 15:7, compared with Mark 3:31; John 7:5.

*) I can place no particular weight on the reason commonly given for the identity of this James of Alphaeus with James the Just, namely that Acts 1:13 still mentions the former, but then in 15:13 ff., without explicit indication of the difference from the former, a James appears, whom we have every reason to believe is the one referred to by Paul (Gal. 1:19; 2:12) as "brother of the Lord." The fragmentary character of the first half of Acts makes it quite understandable how Luke could introduce the latter James without explaining or perhaps even knowing how he came among the disciples, and that he is different from the one listed in the row of apostles. On the contrary, it would seem strange to me to find this James, although identical with James of Alphaeus, nowhere expressly designated as the latter.

242

Jesus' homeland was, as we assume to be unquestionable based on the findings of the previous book, the Palestinian province of Galilee, and His birthplace was very likely the town of Nazareth. We can find no place where the high historical significance of this fact has been recognized or even mentioned. Galilee was a province with by no means purely Jewish inhabitants; its people were mixed from various tribes **), so much so that from ancient times the province bore the name of "Gentile" ***), or "inhabited by foreigners" †).

**) This was true at that time for many other provinces of Palestine as well, but especially for Galilee. Indeed, Strabo (XVI, 2) first names Galilee among several other regions that he says this of.

***) Γαλιλαΐα των εθνων (Galilee of the Gentiles) Matt. 4:15 from Isa. 9:1.

†) 1 Macc. 5:15 ff.

The assumption has much to commend it, which has been made, that at the time of Jesus there, and mostly in Palestine as a whole, the Greek language was almost as much in circulation as the national language as Hebrew or Syro-Chaldean ††).

††) Compare Credner, Introduction to the N. T., §§ 75–77.

It is this character of the population of His homeland that we assert to be one of the most important factors for understanding the appearance of Christ. With a spirit that so powerfully broke through all barriers of nationality, it would be strange to have to regard Him in His origin as belonging, in the strictest sense, to such a particularly closed nationality as the Jewish one. We must not deprive the Israelite people of the glory that it was, above all other nations, primarily and foremost the positive element for the development and formation of this spirit; but from the standpoint of scientific historical observation, it appears as a necessity that what was to take place in Him and in His work in a true and inner way, that penetration and balancing of national particularities, had to present itself in the element of His origin, His earthly generation, in an external and factual way. The historical, providential necessity inherent in this circumstance takes the place, for conceptual knowledge, of that arrangement which is assumed in the descent from David, in the birth in Bethlehem. In these latter circumstances, only mythical thought can see something providential; serious philosophical consideration would recognize in what is supposed to lie therein only a game attributable to chance, rather than to divine providence, and therefore hardly worthy of it.

243

No less can at least part of the question be answered by looking at the character of the birthplace, a question that has occupied rational researchers of Jesus' history so often: the question of the external means and motivating factors of His mental and character formation. It is well known that to answer this question, all means of education that could be found in that environment were set in motion: careful home education under the influence of His mother, who was assumed to be a model of noble womanhood, the schools of the Essenes, the Sadducees, the Alexandrian Greeks, and above all, the study of the Old Testament, especially the prophetic writings. However, upon thorough consideration of the true content of that unique and incomparable spirit, one always came back to the conclusion that not a single one of these factors, and not even the coincidence of all of them*), was sufficient to really explain what one wanted to explain.

*) Such a convergence as occurred with Josephus, who (vit. 2) tells of himself that he had gone through all three main Jewish schools and, not yet satisfied with that, had retired to the wilderness with Banus for three years.

These factors will certainly not be made sufficient by the factor we want to remind of here, which must be added to the others, to which we don't want to deny their validity in their own way, or that the validity of the others must be modified by it: the friction of

national peculiarities, which must have taken place in a land like Galilee, so strongly**) inhabited by such a noble and robust race, itself arisen from a mixture of peoples, crossed by a frequently visited trade route, and in constant contact with countries with diverse populations, particularly also with cities inhabited by the most cultured people in the world.

**) According to Josephus (bell. Jud. III, 3, i), of the exceedingly numerous cities and towns of Galilee, the least had a population of at least fifteen thousand inhabitants.

It was inevitable that in such a country those intellectual formations and elements of culture that, individually, each in its proper homeland, stood opposed to each other sharply and repellently, would have to come closer to each other and become more adept at mutual communication and penetration of their peculiarities. What elsewhere was firm and rigid and one-sidedly closed in itself could, indeed had to be here, more easily brought into a flow, from which, as everywhere through such a union of the otherwise separated, new formations could generate and emerge creatively. This consideration, too, entitles us to assert that only from Galilee, not from Judea, could a historical character like Jesus Christ have emerged. Those aforementioned elements of culture, and several related ones, were indeed not only necessary prerequisites of His appearance in their historical existence but were also explicitly touching this spirit. They are therefore to be considered, not one or the other individually, but all together, as means of His mental and character formation. Not as if Jesus, to become what he became, had necessarily to go through a series of schools, or as if he had to possess an actually learned education, which, however, most deny, and we at least do not dare to assert unequivocally. But only in such an environment, as indicated here, is it completely conceivable how He could appropriate those elements when they came to Him in a probably only accidental and temporary manner, in a spiritually free way, not so much themselves, but rather only the spiritual ether that permeated and emanated from each of them, and could incorporate them into the totality of His individual spiritual being.

245

We mentioned among the otherwise known and recognized means of education that we must presuppose for Jesus, as undoubtedly the most significant and important of all, the study of the sacred books of the Israelite people. Here, however, the alternative arises to attribute to Jesus either only such an acquaintance with these books as we must assume the majority of the members of the Israelite people possessed, namely one acquired only by listening to readings from these books, as was customary in the

synagogues of the Jews, or rather, to presuppose in him a continuous, independent, and solitary engagement with them. There are no data to decide this question historically; but we confess that, after so many traces of familiarity with the content and language of the sacred writings that Jesus constantly gives in his own speeches, and given the intensity of his spiritual formation in general, the latter seems far more probable to us. This indeed leads further, namely to the assumption of a degree of engagement and education of the kind that distinguished the scholars among the Israelites, of attending schools that were not attended by everyone from the people; for there was hardly another way in which an independent study of the scriptures was accessible to the individual. But the reference back to the content laid down in those documents, to the sum total of the historical process of the spiritual development of his people, which had to represent humanity in this respect for him, makes too significant a moment in Jesus' spiritual existence for one to easily decide that such a superficial acquaintance, as could be acquired without that presupposition, would suffice to explain what should be explained by this presupposition. The relationship of the ideas on which Jesus' work and teaching were based to the Old Testament is not one that could be explained by picking up individual, half-understood passages; such as those that pointed to the appearance of the Messiah or were understood by the scholarly interpreters of that time as pointing to such an appearance. Jesus could not have formed his concept of the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom in this way, through such mechanical combination of prophetic details and externalities; nor could his consciousness of being this Messiah himself have been awakened in this way. This concept, this consciousness, rather, arose from the freest mastery of the subject matter of the messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, from the clear insight into their not external and literal, but inner and symbolic validity, from the self-active transfiguration of their physical and sensual form to the ideal and spiritual. Whether all this was achievable without sustained, comprehensive study of Scripture, without continuous and repeated reading of its individual books, whether even without the assumption of a more precise knowledge of the scripture in Jesus, that deep understanding of the spirit of scripture, that sharp and thorough distinction of its true content from the content imposed on it by the laws of the Pharisees can be explained: over this, although we do not dare to decide definitively, since the activity of the spirit, which supplements the gaps in the material given to it through its free creative power, does not allow such narrow limits to be drawn once and for all, yet no one will blame us if we find the greater probability in the negative answer.

That there are absolutely no explicit reports from Jesus's entire youth history, up to his baptism by John, that could be considered historical, can no longer surprise us, after all

we have learned about the nature of the sources of his history. The boy could hardly have been the subject of explicit observation by those around him, near or far, if there were no miraculous events, such as those reported in the mythical narratives, but only in these, that would have pointed to the extraordinariness of his appearance from the outset. But the fact that such events could not have actually occurred is attested to, besides their internal improbability and the unhistorical character of those narratives, almost louder than both, by the later behavior of the mother and siblings. We know that at that time when Jesus had already attracted great attention and gained enthusiastic followers, they did not believe in him *), and even came to the delusion that he had lost his mind **).

*) John 7:5.

**) Mark 3:21.

How can one find this remotely compatible with any extraordinary expectations of any kind that would have been associated with his person from youth? The way people in his hometown were used to seeing his appearance as not in the least stepping out of the realm of the ordinary is also quite explicitly noted ***).

***) Mark 6:32. Parallel.

But the psychological curiosity or desire for knowledge, which takes care with great characters to trace the course of their development back into the darkness of childhood after they have proven themselves as such, was foreign to that age altogether *), and especially to the relationship of faithful devotion rather than scientific observation, in which the disciples found themselves to their master.

*) This applies mainly not only to the Jews but also to the Greeks and Romans. Only around the time of Plutarch does that psychological curiosity seem to have arisen among these peoples; but here, concerning the heroes of earlier times, it was almost exclusively mythical features to which they found themselves referred for their satisfaction.

After all this, we do not believe we are mistaken when we take the remark that Luke interweaves into his mythical narrative, "that Mary kept all these things, pondering them in her heart" **), as nothing more than an arbitrarily invented phrase by the evangelist. We are hesitant to accept as factual only so much as narrations drawn from Mary's mouth concerning Jesus's childhood or youth were circulated by those who could draw from this source.

**) Luke 2:19.

248

Under these circumstances, there is indeed ample room for conjectures and hypotheses of all kinds about the developmental course and earlier life events of the divine youth; but these are merely possibilities about which one can speak or, better, remain silent. The only occasional and unintentional note given by Mark that Jesus practiced the trade of a carpenter, we are indeed justified, considering what was mentioned earlier, to regard as historical. According to the well-known Jewish custom, which also allowed Paul, besides the education and occupation of a rabbi, to carry on the business of a tent-maker, this note might still be valid, even if someone would feel the need to assume, contrary to a gospel passage that is not very suspicious in content***), that Jesus not only acquired the education of a rural rabbi early on but also began to teach in such a manner.

***) John 7:17.

But even this itself, whether it was indeed so, we can leave undecided, just as the circumstance to which much value was attached for a time, that Jesus, as a youth, did not fail to use the customary festival journeys among his people to Jerusalem to expand his mental education and enrich his knowledge of the world and people. We will show later how problematic the assumption of such journeys is; the note that one might want to draw from Luke's narrative mentioned in the previous book regarding the habit of Jesus's elders to participate in such journeys, can't be considered by us, as mythical. — Another conclusion that some have wanted to draw from the generality of Jewish customs on the presumed special life circumstances of Jesus is that, during that earlier time of his life from which we lack further information, he had been married but lost his wife and perhaps also children through death. However, we believe, this time probably in agreement with most, that such a conclusion is unjustifiable. The example of many among the apostles, from whom we do not learn that their celibacy had provoked offense among their compatriots, shows that such a state could not have been as uncommon among the Jews of that time as assumed, taking the generality of popular custom much more strictly than is conceivable for a people living in such advanced and complex cultural conditions. But we do possess an authentic statement from Jesus*), which does not need to be pressed too tightly to find the assumption in it that he had deliberately renounced marriage because he found it incompatible with his divine vocation.

*) Matthew 19:12.

Also, not only an ascetically distorted feeling but the genuine, healthy religious sentiment has always resisted thinking of the sublime object of the deepest religious veneration and worship as being akin to other mortals, especially in a relationship to which, as this human race is constituted, the consciousness of human weakness and sinfulness tends to attach above all else. It is not delusion or superstitious prejudice when this veneration feels disturbed or even defiled in its holy ardor as soon as it should think of its Lord and Savior as anything other than above the sensual relationship between the sexes; and the Lord himself, as sure as it was his consciousness and will to become the object of such veneration, could not but act in accordance with its needs in this as in all other matters*).

*) A specific reason for celibacy, which, however, undoubtedly coincides with that more general one in his consciousness, might perhaps have lain for Jesus in the care commanded to him by his calling for his physical healing power. From the many analogies offered by experience, we have reason to assume that this would have been weakened by sexual intercourse. However, we would like to place importance on this circumstance only insofar as it also expresses the general intellectual and moral inappropriateness of the marital relationship to the calling and dignity of the Savior, not insofar as one would want to regard it as an object of explicit reflection for Jesus.

250

Among the public events in the history of that time, especially that of the Israelite people, there is only one that enters the life story of Jesus in a decisive way, making an epoch and with decisive importance, in such a way that it constitutes a moment of this history itself in the fullest sense of the word. This is the appearance of John the Baptist, the figure of whom, as we saw in the previous book, has been woven into his creations in such a meaningful and symbolically significant way by the myth. Just as the annunciation and birth of Christ were introduced in the fiction, so too has the historical tradition preserved the memory of this remarkable man, his teaching, and his deeds almost solely in relation to the person and work of Jesus Christ. The history of the people to which he belongs remembers him only in brief outside of this context. Josephus, in the eighteenth book of his Jewish Antiquities, mentions him as "a good man, who taught the Jews to practice virtue, and, while devoting themselves to righteousness among one another and piety towards God, to unite in baptism. For the baptismal act would be pleasing to God in this way, if it were not practiced for the

expiation of individual crimes, but as a bodily symbol of sanctification, so that the soul had previously been purified to righteousness." The same historian reports that many turned to him, that they were strongly moved when listening to his speeches and seemed to give themselves entirely to John; alarmed by this, Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, imprisoned him and had him killed in prison. After his death, the disaster that befell Herod in the war against the Arabian king Aretas was seen by the people, among whom John's memory still stood in high regard, as divine punishment for the murder committed against him. — This is the only information that has been preserved about John, independent of our evangelical documents, and therefore also independent of the relation to Christ. The lack of more detailed and extensive information is undoubtedly a consequence of the fact that the work of this man was absorbed in the work and personal appearance of his greater successor. John's name has retained significance for posterity only insofar as he is the prophetic forerunner of his successor, insofar as he prepared the way for the latter's work, and insofar as, conversely, the work and teaching of the successor refer back to him. In this sense, his figure and deeds have been understood by the evangelical tradition and incorporated into the narrative of the life and deeds of Jesus Christ as an essential element. — This is a circumstance that must not be overlooked in the criticism of the information that our Evangelists give us about John. These reports are, even apart from the fictions of the infancy legend, not free from errors of various kinds: errors that all have their origin in the fact that the Christian reporters, also here indeed in the manner of legend while still somewhat consistent with historical memory, loved to transpose the spiritual, ideal subordination of John to Christ more into the realm of external reality than is consistent with historical truth.

252

An example of such probable alteration of the historical through this process is immediately given by the chronological determination of the temporal relationship between the public appearances of John and Jesus. According to our Gospels, although we miss a more precise statement about it, it would seem as if, just as the myth already brings the birth of both men so close together, so too John could only have preceded Jesus in his public appearance by a short period of time. For while the others do not explicitly determine the time, we find in the same Evangelist, who also gave the well-known chronological data about the birth of John on the one hand and Jesus on the other, the information that the call to John from God came in the fifteenth year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius. This information is partly set in the context of the narrative in such a way that the intention to use it simultaneously as a time determination about Jesus's appearance is unmistakable, and partly its content is such that the possibility of Jesus appearing considerably later is outright excluded. For it is subsequently stated

that Jesus was about thirty years old when he was baptized by John. However, this is the age at which Jewish law did not permit the public appearance of a popular teacher, which therefore must also be assumed in the case of John at the time of his appearance. Since John, according to Luke, was to have been only six months older than Jesus, the baptism must have occurred very soon after John's appearance according to this; but not only Luke but all the Evangelists allow the beginning of Jesus's teaching office to follow the baptism in the shortest time. — In contrast to this, important reasons are present, which compel us to assume that in truth it is only the spiritual disappearance of the "decreasing" John in the "increasing" *) Christ, whose realization in the minds of the Christian reporters also externally drew together so closely the time between the appearances of both; just as the birth of John was brought so close to the birth of the probably considerably younger Christ, probably only the spiritual sense of this proximity, to which both figures are brought together, gave the legend the occasion.

*) John 3:30.

For it would hardly be explainable, according to the ordinary course of human affairs, for which we have no sufficient reason to make an exception here, how John could achieve the effect on the people within such a short period, the extent and magnitude of which so many testimonies in our Gospels inform us. His prophetic and teaching activity, as much as it, concerning the higher order of the spirit in world history, has its truth and significance only in relation to Christ, has remained independent of Christ in its external appearance. Its immediate success among the Jewish people was,—this we may conclude from the report of Josephus and Christ himself has pronounced it **),—even more brilliant than, initially at least, the success that Christ found.

**) John 5:35.

In particular, it cannot be assumed that the considerable circle of actual disciples that John gathered around himself, some of whom only converted to Christianity a considerable time after the death of both masters ***), should have been won by him in the space of a few months and after he was so quickly overshadowed by a great one.

***) Acts 18:24 ff. 19:1 ff.

What has earned John the immortality of his name, what has secured his memory the high significance even within Christianity, is a single specific act, the symbolic centerpiece of his ethical-religious activity. It is the introduction of baptism as a covenant

sign for those who, having become conscious of the impurity of their previous lives, want to begin a new, sin-free life together. Similar practices to baptism were not unknown among either the pagans or the Jews before the time of John; but what the new and significant aspect of John's introduction consisted of, we find even more clearly, than in the Gospels, in the aforementioned passage in Josephus. Washings with water for the purpose not only of physical but also symbolic spiritual cleansing, the atonement of specific offenses, or other actions and events that were thought to defile the soul as well, were widely introduced among the Jews already by Mosaic law. The typical use that the old prophets make of the image of purification by water at several recurring places, the way in which a cleansing of this kind proceeding with the whole people is proclaimed as the beginning of a moral rebirth of the people to be brought about by Jehovah himself *), may have contributed to giving those ceremonies an even higher stamp of holiness.

*) Ezek. 36:25 and others.

In this sense, they seem to have been particularly among the Essenes, known as the religious school among the Israelites that, above others, sought the holiness of inner and outer conduct, to have constituted an essential part of their ascetic discipline more so than among the other Jews **).

**) Joseph. Jewish War II, 8, 5. 7.

But the deeper the use of washing and bathing as a means of ridding oneself of specific impurity took root in the life of the Israelite people regulated by the religious ceremonial law, the more frequent and varied this practice appeared in this life*), the more it could appear that sin, as well as cleansing from sin, was merely something specific, consisting of individual actions or relating to individual actions; the more it could promote that external law- and work-righteousness **), against which the teachings of Jesus and perhaps also that of John were so expressly directed.

*) Israel Judaeus washes daily because he is polluted daily. Tertull. on Baptism 15.

**) Compare Marc. 7, 2 ff. and parallels.

Here now is the great step that John took, namely that by transforming those particular, ceaseless repeated cleansings into a general one, valid for life, he would bring to consciousness the demand for the purity of the soul of the whole person, from which then the purity of individual actions should naturally follow. This is its significance, if we

find as an essential aspect of John's baptism that those to be baptized had to confess their sins and promise conversion from them ***).

***) Marc. 1, 4 and parallels.

We have every reason to believe that this formula has been transferred from John's baptism to the Christian one, in which we also know it very early †), not, perhaps, by a mistake of the kind that sometimes occurs with our evangelical historians, carried back from the Christian to the Johannine.

†) First Ap. Acts 2, 38.

For the latter still existed in the apostles' time independently of the Christian one, so that its form and its conditions could be known from personal observation ††).

††) Ap. Acts 19, 4, John's baptism is expressly contrasted by Paul against Christian baptism as βάπτισμα μετάνοιας; indisputably not in the sense that the latter was not such, but insofar as the former was only this.

— Thus, this important thought, which has also entered into Christianity as an essential and indispensable moment, the thought of a change of mind becoming a firm, externally attested fact through its activity in an external action, in a sacrament, as a beginning to a new, divine life, — this thought would be considered as the idea to express and implement, which was John's vocation. Not as if it was entirely foreign to the Israelites before him and in no way prepared. Indeed, the old prophets, with Isaiah at their head, had insisted on a holiness of disposition that, above sacrificial service and other externalities of the ceremonial law, is the sole true source of all righteousness of individual actions. From the use of Jewish proselyte baptism, if, as cannot be strictly proved but yet remains not unlikely, at least its beginnings*) should extend beyond the time of John, one could not well deny that it was from which John borrowed the external type for his symbolic action.

*) Compare Winer's Nealewörterbuch, article "Proselytes"; which might easily be the most carefully considered among the many things recently said on this point.

But even if this was the case — and we do not wish to deny that it may indeed have been so — the step that John took by giving that practice a significance that made it the subject of application within the circle of Jewish co-religionists themselves remains highly significant and truly original, and through it, Christianity was prepared in a genuinely prophetic way.

The scene of John's activity was the bank regions of the Jordan; not the so-called wilderness of Judah, which in some of our Gospel passages seems erroneously to be presented as such **).

**) Mark 1:4 and Matthew 3:1 seem to have fallen into this error from a literal interpretation of the prophecy about the voice of the preacher in the wilderness. Luke, on the other hand (3:2f.), has the voice of God come to John in the wilderness, but then has John himself go out with his preaching into the "entire region around the Jordan." — Besides, the misunderstanding might have arisen from a double sense in the word *ερημος*. Ἡ *ερημος*, known only by the author of the first Gospel, means the wilderness everywhere. The other evangelists (e.g., Mark 1:35, 45, Luke 4:42, 5:16) use *τά ερημα, έρημος τόπος, αί ερημαι* in a way that seems to mean just a rural area, in contrast to the city; they use it explicitly where Matthew also finds the same sense with other expressions. Η *ερημιά* in Joseph. vit. 2 is probably to be understood in the same way. — Also in the fourth Gospel, the unquestionably correct determination that John taught and baptized at the Jordan is found repeatedly, although the specific details are doubtful and likely not free from geographical errors (John 1:28, 3:23). The observation that John chose the place called Aenon because there was much water there borders on absurdity. As if any place on the bank would not have had enough water for the needs of baptism!

There he lived, according to the also known practice from other examples*) of such ascetic-religious sages, who found themselves unsatisfied with the prevailing wisdom of the Jewish sects, as a Nazirite, in the simplest and strictest manner in food and clothing.

*) Joseph. vit. 2.

The specific designation of the latter **) is clearly modeled after what the legend tells of Elijah ***), and therefore is not to be taken as historical, as it is likely not John himself but Jesus who first compared John with Elijah †).

**) Mark 1:6, Matthew 3:4.

***) 2 Kings 1:8.

†) We confidently conclude this from the words of Matthew 11:14, which bear entirely the stamp of an impromptu invention (εἰ θελετε διξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας). Also, the author of the fourth Gospel would certainly not have put a negative answer (John 1:21) into John's mouth to the question of whether he was Elijah if John himself had already declared himself, either in words or by external signs, to be Elijah.

The baptism was performed, it seems, for each individual by immersion in the Jordan. — These circumstances are not without significance for the character and tendency of John. The contrast of the "prophet in the wilderness" with the Son of Man wandering in the cities and markets of Galilee and journeying to the capital is the same as we find expressed in another way through the strict ascetic way of life in John and his disciples, through the liberality and detachment from this external severity in Christ and His followers. The same manner of his appearance gave occasion for the application of that prophecy to him, which, following the example of our evangelists, has become the typical expression for his character and his relationship to Christ. "Voice of one crying in the wilderness," thus spoke that unnamed prophet whose powerful speeches, addressed to the Israelites at the moment when they wanted to gather from exile, were found worthy to be united with those of the greatest of all prophets, Isaiah, in one book: "Voice of one crying in the wilderness: prepare the way of the Lord, make straight His paths! *)"

*) Isa. 40, 3. Luke (3, 5) adds the following verse, which does not apply well to John. In Mark (1, 2f.) this passage, naming only Isaiah as the author, is combined with another from Malachi (3, 1), cited by Jesus Himself in the first and third Gospels (Matt. 11, 10; Luke 7, 27) in another context, and in such a consistent deviation from the original text of that prophecy and the translation of the Septuagint, that Mark here appears to be suspicious of borrowing from those two, contrary to our assumption. But it has been convincingly demonstrated by Lachmann that those two verses in Mark are spurious.

That John himself referred these words to himself is not found in the synoptic Gospels; only the fourth Gospel puts them, in a context that we have already provisionally recognized above as an artificial commentary on the introductory words of this Gospel, into the mouth of the prophetic man himself. It is told there **), that the Jews from Jerusalem sent priests and Levites of Pharisaic school to John to ask him who he was.

**) John 1, 19ff.

John is then said to have answered, after admitting that he was neither the expected Messiah, nor Elijah, nor even a prophet, by responding to the question posed to him with the words of that prophetic passage. These questions have something very implausible about them. Had they really been asked, given what we learn from Luke*) about the attitude of the Pharisees and lawyers towards John, they could hardly have been asked in earnest; most definitely, the mention of Elijah betrays a foreign origin**).

*) Luke 7, 30.

**) Indeed, we find also in Luke (3, 15) the remark that the people (not the scribes) had come to think that John himself might be the Messiah. However, this remark is made in Luke's manner only to motivate the words attributed to John, in which he announces a Higher One. Therefore, we cannot place much weight on it, as we otherwise know that evangelist. The whole appearance of John was such that, even apart from his explicit declarations, hardly a Jew could have thought of him as the Messiah; we find no trace of this in Josephus, Mark, or elsewhere in a truly historical context.

John's response would be contradictory to itself, as by citing those prophetic words, he would not only be claiming the dignity of the prophet from whom he borrowed them but, according to the context elsewhere in which he is given the title of Elijah, he would also apparently have been claiming the dignity of Elijah for himself. — One point not sufficiently clarified in the history of John concerns the relationship of his followers. According to the words of Josephus, it would seem that baptism served as a sign of a formal covenant, somewhat similar to the Essene or the Orphic and Pythagorean connections among the Greeks, in which he wanted to gather his disciples. Nevertheless, there seems to be a necessity on the other hand to distinguish a smaller circle of true disciples from the wider circle of those who received baptism from him, which we must think of as very large according to the accounts of our evangelists*), such as the master, as we know from Banus, the teacher of Josephus, kept with him for a longer time to share his religious wisdom with them.

*) Matt. 3, 5. Luke 3, 7. 21. 7, 29.

We can hardly understand, except from such esoteric students, what is subsequently reported about the ascetic discipline of John's disciples **)

**) Mark 2, 18 and parallels.

For Jesus, who also received that baptism, cannot be assumed to have been bound to observe that discipline, just as it cannot be assumed from that multitude of people, of whom the evangelists tell us as having been baptized by John.

260

Among the other things we find reported about the Baptist, there is also a not inconsiderable number of speeches that he is supposed to have made. However, since we remain uncertain about the source from which these speeches are supposed to have been drawn, they require a careful, detailed critique before they can be accepted as truly spoken by John. The result of this critique, as we will show in a later context, is not favorable to their authenticity as a whole; however, they are of value and importance in another respect, a discussion of which we must also leave to that later context. — With the exception of some moral exhortations addressed to the people either in general or to specific classes among them, which are not of particularly significant content and which are attributed to him in Luke^{***}), all those speeches relate to his relationship with a Greater One coming after him, whose future he is supposed to have repeatedly and explicitly proclaimed.

***) Luke 3, 10 ff.

This general sense of his speeches is undoubtedly correct, as the general belief of the Jews at that time in a future Messiah was undoubtedly shared by John and was an essential element in his teaching and preaching. This significance was the admonition, as incidentally mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, that John gave to his baptizing followers: they should believe in the one who would come after him^{*)}).

*) ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΙΝΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΩΣΙ. Acts 19, 4. The interpretation: ΤΟΥΤ ΕΣΤΙΝ, ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΝ is added there (as well as perhaps the words: μετ' αὐτόν) by Paul in his own name, not in that of John.

John probably wanted to say nothing other than what was already inherent in the belief of the Jews and only wanted to emphasize the belief in the Messiah as a motive and point of attachment for the change of heart he demanded. Moreover, it is in the nature of a moral sermon of the kind, like the undisputed preaching of the Baptist, that along with the critique of the corruption and decadence of the age, the pointing to a better future must appear with stronger coloring than in the ordinary belief of the people, and that even without the preacher's express intention, the speech had to take a turn in which this future seemed to be announced as no longer distant. But whether John's consciousness really included seeing himself as the immediate forerunner of a Higher

One, only destined to prepare the way for this Higher One, or whether, as is also narrated so definitively, he recognized this Higher One as Jesus even before Jesus' public appearance, must appear to us as more than doubtful with sober consideration of both the general laws of all spiritual events and the particular historical data given to us about the Baptist and his relationship to Jesus. This question is one of the points that, only recently seriously raised by criticism, has caused the dogmatic belief to respond particularly vigorously against the doubts of criticism. In fact, we also consider this point to be one of the cardinal points to which the opposition must inevitably attach, not merely, as it has hitherto seemed, that of negative criticism against the old positive concepts, but also that of true, scientifically purified and grounded positive insight against both. In what sense this appears to us to be the case, we believe we must elaborate somewhat more extensively, while we defer the detail of the gospel narrative about the meeting of the two heroes of our story, as already noted, to a later context.

262

The legend of the explicit, miraculous proclamation of Jesus by John has undoubtedly formed on a historical basis, and in such a relationship to history that allows us to consider it only as a legend, not as an actual myth, like the birth story of John, with the unmistakable intention of glorifying Jesus and authenticating his divine mission. This intention has been fully achieved as far as those standpoints are concerned for which the legend was created, both the poetically and the dogmatically believing. First, the Jews, for whom the testimony of a teacher, whose authority was already established before Jesus's own, must have been an important element, but then all those who are not beyond the need to represent the inner authentication, which lies solely in Jesus's words and spiritual deeds, for the imagination in external facts—so all who believe in miracles in the ordinary sense of the word, all who have not reached the point, as the Lord himself demands, to recognize in the miracle of the prophet Jonah the only true miracle—these all will and can find themselves strengthened and fortified in their faith by the prophetic testimony of John if it is reported to them precisely in the way as the biblical narrative presents it to us. But the situation is different for the believers of that standpoint that we have in view in our present philosophical representation of history. To them, what appears to the former as a glorification and elevation of the dignity of their master must appear as an impairment of the same, as a partial transfer of what belongs to the divine master himself and only to Him, onto another, and thus, as a result of this division of the indivisible, as a negation of the divine dignity of Jesus Christ. For the philosophical, the scientific standpoint, the concept of the divine calling claimed for Jesus Christ implies that this calling can be recognized directly and immediately by no one other than Him to whom it is entrusted. For such recognition is precisely nothing other than the calling itself from its intellectual, theoretical side, which, as no one

acquainted with the nature of the spirit will deny, is as necessary to it as the real, practical side. This is precisely the wonderfully great, extraordinary, and uncommon, indeed the most genuine and truly divine aspect of the appearance of Christ, that in the simple Galilean craftsman Jesus of Nazareth, without his being distinguished by external characteristics of any kind from other mortals, the consciousness awakens that he is called to be a savior of mankind from the misery brought upon itself through its sin, a creative originator of the new salvation; that he, following only this consciousness, performs the act that could be done only once in world history, and initiates a new era of history, one that will endure to the end of all human affairs. Not as if this consciousness and this act were isolated in world history; both were prepared by the entire course of world history up to this point, and expressly for that consciousness itself by the previous fate and messianic promises of the Israeli people. But it is essential to such preparations, that is, it is required by the concept of the act prepared by them, that they must remain in the form of abstraction and generality in relation to the individual to whom this act is laid, that the reference to this particular individual cannot be contained in them. If the latter were the case, then the relationship of this individual, thus in the present case, the relationship of the God-man himself, to the historical premises of his appearance and to the fate by which these premises are set, would be an unfree one. The God-man, designated in his individual accidental personality by miracles and prophecies of the kind that legend tells of Jesus, would relate to that providential necessity expressed in these miracles, in these prophecies, as an external, indifferent means, as a mechanical tool. From here, however, one would logically be led to that separation of humanity and divinity in the person of Christ, which the church has rightly rejected at all times, while it still allowed the mythical premises, from which we cannot help but draw that conclusion, to persist. If the divinity in Christ is to be truly one with his humanity, as the true Christian faith demands, if it is to reveal itself not merely through external signs that point to a higher causality, which would then indeed be a hidden rather than a revealed one, but according to its true nature and self, fully descended into human nature: then it requires that the man Jesus, in a free way, that is, from himself, enlightened only by the inner light, not marked from outside, be it by miracles or by prophetic voices, has recognized and claimed himself as the Divine.

264

This, then, is the reason why we consider a deviation from the letter of the Gospel narrative, in relation to the testimony allegedly given by John at the baptism of Jesus, no less than in relation to the miraculous events of the birth story, to be not only compatible with true faith in the divine revelation in Christ, but also unassailably demanded by this faith. A testimony from John for Jesus as the true Messiah before He had manifested Himself as such, such a testimony would be - and let the stubborn

adherents of letter faith consider this - rather a testimony against Christ; it could serve only to arouse or nourish the suspicion of a prior arrangement, of an artfully contrived Messiah role between the two of them. The testimony of Christ about Himself, on the other hand, is only fully valid if, as His own speech *) (albeit truncated as it has come down to us) clearly suggests, it does not require any foreign testimony for its corroboration.

*) Joh. 5, 33 f.

Indeed, we consider ourselves justified by both the authenticated history and the philosophically apprehended concept of the fact, to reverse the relationship and instead proclaim the testimony of Jesus concerning John as the truly significant and weighty aspect in what is reported to us about the mutual relations between the two. That Jesus, without any particular prompting from John himself, recognizes John as the appointed herald and forerunner of Himself; that in His spirit awakens the insight into the meaning and truth of those ancient prophecies which had announced that an appearance of the Prophet Elijah would precede the coming of the Messiah; and that with the boldness and genius that well knows how to distinguish the actual content of those prophecies from their accidental garb, He declares the Baptist to be this Elijah: this is far more significant for the real Messianic calling of Jesus than any testimony that another might have given about Him. — We are rightfully reluctant to diminish the greatness of this view that Jesus cast back upon the figure immediately preceding Him and upon the entire series of historical figures that had preceded that figure, even by presupposing in John the Baptist a clear consciousness not indeed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, but nevertheless about the nearness of the expected Messiah in general and about the immediacy of his own personal calling to prepare the way for this Messiah. One could object here that with the same right by which we vindicate for Jesus the exclusive originality of consciousness about His calling, John must also be ascribed an equally original self-awareness about his own. But the case of the two is by no means the same. It is by no means to be said of John, as of Jesus, that a clear consciousness about the meaning of his calling forms an essential moment of the calling itself. Rather, it lies in the position of the lower to his higher, the predecessor to his great successor, that the latter alone should find in his still dark and deficient consciousness about himself its transfiguration, fulfillment, and completion. Even more so, as in any other case of a sequence of significant spirits that are creatively active in the same direction, this rule will suffer its application in the present case. For if John had to recognize himself as the immediate precursor of the Messiah, this would have required, if such consciousness were not to be presented as entirely accidental, thus false and untrue, that he also had consciousness about the nature of this true Messiah, about his difference from the Jewish Messianic conception; for only by means of such

consciousness could he recognize his own doing as identical with the Eliatic appearance announced in the Messianic prophecies. But this means precisely to anticipate in a way the very self-consciousness that only the real Messiah could have of Himself, the inadmissibility of which we have demonstrated above.

266

So much now as this natural, and precisely in the present case, a thoroughly indispensable relationship between the Son of Man and the preacher in the wilderness for profound insight into the true essence of divine revelation has undoubtedly been misunderstood by the evangelical legend, there are nonetheless historical traces enough left in it that point to the true shaping of this relationship and let us guess at it. Firstly, it is striking that we do not find a remotely attempted effort to establish a causal connection between the birth story in Luke, in which John also plays such a significant role, and the later relationship of John to Christ. Although the reason for this is not hard to find. With the exception of Luke, the other evangelists are famously unaware of this story. The narratives of the speeches and actions of John have been independently formed, both in general and specifically in the more detailed form they received in the fourth Gospel, from that myth. In this last-mentioned report, there is even an explicit remark in John's mouth that he did not know Jesus until the moment of his baptism when the miraculous revelation is supposed to have been made to him*.

*) John 1:33.

But what has given the adherents of biblical literalism even more trouble than this admittedly striking fact is the difficult question of how John, if he recognized the Messiah in the person of Jesus, could nonetheless have continued to act as the head of a school and preach and baptize in the same way he did before. This question will indeed present itself somewhat differently for us if we, as is reasonable, give enough credence to the specific statement of the synoptic evangelists**), that Jesus only began his career in Galilee after John had been imprisoned, so as not to be misled by the opposing, not sufficiently motivated statements of the fourth Gospel***).

**) Mark 1:14 and parallels.

**) The parenthetical remark John 3:24 that John was not yet thrown into prison at that time (i.e., during Jesus' allegedly first journey during his teaching to Jerusalem) clearly reveals how the evangelist presupposed in his readers the habit of thinking the Baptist had already left the scene after Jesus had entered it. Had he intended an express correction of his predecessors with those words, he

would have had to express himself quite differently here, as in many other cases if he wanted to proceed with some skill.

But far from being resolved by this twist in a way favorable to conventional assumptions, it rather serves to bring the question into awareness in its further, deeper meaning. The difficulty lies not only in how John could still oppose Jesus as a rival, already arisen and recognized by him as the Messiah; — this difficulty, which one vainly strives to remove from the depiction of the fourth Gospel, would be eliminated by the remark just made. The real problem is rather this: how, given the clear insight into the imminent appearance of the Messiah, John's activity did not have to take on a different form from the outset than it actually did. Say what you will in defense of the portrayal present in the Gospels; it will always remain incomprehensible how, with this insight, John could nonetheless, instead of contenting himself with pointing to this appearance and opening the minds of people to it, found a school evidently calculated for a longer duration, a school with precisely defined laws and teaching regulations, one that, as several traces point to, later came into explicit conflict with the community of Christ more than once. The authentic pronouncements of Jesus about John*) allow us to see him entirely in the light of an independent spirit, by no means unconditionally subordinating himself to the work of Jesus.

*) Matt. 11:7 ff. and parallels. Mark 11:30 and parallels. John 5:35.

They prove how the reception he found with his teaching among the Jews extended much further than the expectation of an imminent Messianic kingdom, which, if that view were correct, should have been directly tied to it. — But perhaps more than anything, the circumstance must raise concern that we see Jesus begin his appearance and his teaching, not, as one would expect, explicitly tied to John's promises from the outset, but only later and occasionally not those promises, but the entire person and activity of the Baptist taken into account. What would have been more natural than such attachment, what would have had to arise so completely unsought, if Jesus had really found the minds prepared by John for the imminent appearance of the Messiah? How was this compatible, — especially if he had been personally designated as the Messiah by his predecessor, but also if he had not, and John had only generally set an immediate connection between himself and the appearance of the Messiah, — how was that, by no means clearly expressed, but only veiled indication of his Messianic dignity compatible with that, which Jesus, for reasons that will become clear enough to us in the course of our consideration, preferred throughout his entire career before the unambiguous expression of this dignity? Obviously, John would not only have compelled him by the explicit designation of the person of Jesus ascribed to him but also through that general proclamation, if only something more was contained in it than

in the already widespread Messianic expectations of the Jews, — obviously, he would have forced him, given the widespread success of his preaching, to either explicitly oppose those promises at the very beginning of his career or just as explicitly announce himself as the one promised by John.

269

With all this, however, our opinion does not tend in the direction of completely denying a really occurred, even personal acknowledgment of Jesus by John. That such has in fact taken place would not fully convince us, although the reference to the testimony of John put into the mouth of Jesus in the fourth Gospel *) alone, but the fact that we have to regard this Gospel as the work of the Apostle John in our view, means we cannot help but attach a not inconsiderable weight to it. However, it becomes decisive for us through its conjunction with those expressions attributed to the Baptist by legend, which we would not dare deny any historical basis, even if they were not done in the manner reported; as well as the position that apostolic teaching assigned to John, a position that could hardly be based solely on the words of Jesus previously cited by us.

*) John 5:33.

— As dubious as this circumstance may appear for the result of our preceding critical consideration, it nevertheless can be combined most fully with it by a not too distant combination. An expression of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles lets John speak the famous words, which are also found in Mark *) and the other Synoptics: "A stronger one comes after him, who he is not worthy to untie the straps of the sandals," - after the completion of his course **).

*) Mark 1:7 and Parall.

**) ὥς ἐπλήρου ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον. Acts 13:25.

Now, since we take the expression literally, it cannot well mean anything other than that John said it in prison, thus at a time when Jesus had already publicly appeared, and when John could have learned a considerable number of his deeds and words. If the Baptist then recognized Jesus as the greater one, who would henceforth grow, while for himself the time of decreasing had come, then we cannot find in it the unnaturalness which would certainly lie in that early recognition, and which the latest criticism of Gospel history, with whose results we had to agree almost throughout until this present point, only giving them a more positive turn and interpretation, also wants to extend to this latter ***).

***) Strauss, L. I. I, p. 347.

That rigidity of character, which is supposed to make such acknowledgment so unlikely, is arbitrarily attributed to John. It follows neither necessarily from his own strict asceticism nor from the ascetic law that he prescribed to his disciples. Nor is it unprecedented in world history, especially in the history of literature and art, for an important character to recognize, pay homage to, and subordinate himself to a greater one who emerges after him, especially if this one, as was the case with Jesus, does not turn expressly antagonistic against the work or the tendency of his predecessor.

*) As a remarkable and particularly striking example of this kind (similar ones could be found with little effort in abundance, even if we want to admit that the opposite ones may be even more frequent), it is allowed to quote a letter from Wieland about the poet youth Goethe: F. H. Jacobi's correspondence (Leipzig 1825) I, p. 228.

— To find a starting point for this hypothesis in the Gospel narrative itself, we do not need to be at a loss. We find one in the most natural way in the report of the embassy, which John sends from prison to Jesus, with the question of whether he is the expected Messiah, or whether one should wait for another **).

**) Matt. 11, 2 ff. and Parall.

As rightly incompatible as this story has been found with the narratives of the earlier acknowledgment of Jesus by the Baptist ***), as inadequate as all attempts at reconciling this contradiction have been and will always remain, so well does it fit with the assumption of a simultaneous or later acknowledgment.

***) The keen-sighted Manichaeans Faustus had already noticed this in relation to the composition of the Gospels: Augustin. c. Faust. V, 1.

In the fourth Gospel, at the same place that we previously thought of as probably a true apostolic, another mission is mentioned, namely one that the Jews sent to John. This is commonly understood as the mission told in the first chapter of this Gospel. But if this latter, as shown before, is likely nothing but an invention of the publisher of that Gospel scripture, there remains an open space for another interpretation, closer to its context; namely that Jesus speaks there rather of a mission that the Jews did to the already imprisoned John, with the intention, not to learn about him, but about Jesus who had appeared in the meantime. It is obvious to see in this inquiry made to John the cause of

the inquiry that he made to Jesus himself. In any case, it cannot be surprising if he, who thus deigned to greet Jesus *), either in response to the answer he received or on other testimonies he heard about him, gave such a favorable voice about him, as we must necessarily assume to find the explanatory key to our Gospel representations. **)

*) Much offense has been taken that John should have been allowed to have such intercourse with his disciples in prison. Schleiermacher (on Luke p. 109) is thus determined to give preference to Luke's account, which does not mention the prison, over Matthew's; Strauss (L. I. I, p. 352), however, rejects the whole story as unhistorical. But both without sufficient reason. Solitary confinement was neither customary among the Ancients (think of the last days of Socrates), nor is it usual in the East (cf. Win er's dictionary, article "Prison" and the passage quoted from Rosen Müller A. u. N. Morgenland V, p. 101). A specific example of such permission of intercourse with relatives in prison is found in Acts 24:23, and as a rule, such permission is evidently assumed in Matt. 25:36. Moreover, the story in Matthew, along with the answer that Jesus gives there to John's inquiry, bears entirely the stamp of historical credibility. As for Luke, even if he does not expressly mention the prison at the questionable point here, we must nonetheless assume that he at least knew that John was not free; for he had already mentioned his imprisonment in chapter 3:20. He himself seems to have stumbled on this scruple and therefore omitted the notice of the prison here. We conclude this from the fact that he also omits that expression (Matt. 11:12) and where he brings it back (16:19) changes it, which sends John's activity back into the past.

**) Also, the statements that are told about the Baptist in John 3:27 ff. probably belong to that later time, and have been mistakenly placed at the earlier point by the editor of the Gospel.

273

So much about the character of the Baptist and his relationship to Jesus in general. What remains is to shed some more light on the moment when he enters the story of Jesus so significantly, which is, of course, the moment of the baptism received from him by Jesus. The fact of this baptism itself belongs to those facts of the gospel history that leave the least room for historical skepticism. It is not only unanimously reported in all the gospels, but it was considered, as the most repeated testimonies assure us, in apostolic history as the moment from which the gospel proclamation of the deeds of the Lord was to begin. A dogmatic interest that could have led to the invention of this event cannot easily be found; rather, the dogmatic concepts, which very soon took hold in the

Christian Church, seem to pose a difficulty in its explanation. How it came about that Jesus, he who is sinless and holy, was prompted to undergo an action that presupposes in the one to whom it is performed a consciousness of sinfulness, a need for purification, forgiveness of sins, and a decision for conversion: this question has not only occupied modern dogmatists in the most serious way; it seems, as the conversations told in our Matthew's Gospel*) and in the apocryphal gospels of the Ebionites and Nazarenes and the κήρυγμα Πέτρου show before the baptism, to have been raised early on.

*) Matt. 3:14-15.

The answer that Jesus gives in the canonical gospel to John's remark that he needs to be baptized by Jesus, rather than Jesus by him, "it befits me to fulfill all that is right," contains no solution to that difficulty, only an emergency measure by the narrator who wanted to counter that objection. In recent times, people have felt the inadequacy of this answer; partly driven by the objections of opponents of that dogmatic standpoint, they have tried to give a more definite account of the reason that may have determined Jesus to undergo baptism. Through these attempts, it must have been brought to consciousness that, given those dogmatic assumptions, the act of baptism would have to be attributed a different meaning concerning the person of Jesus than to all the others. With Jesus, if it is to have any meaning at all and not stand as an empty ceremony, it can have no other meaning than that of a consecration for his messianic vocation. In fact, this is, although more unconsciously than in a clearly developed way, the perspective from which the biblical legend, and all that has since been mythically or dogmatically attached to it, teaches us to consider that event. The miracle in particular, which this legend attaches to the act of baptism performed by John on Christ, unmistakably has the purpose of putting it in not only a general but an individually characteristic relationship to the Messianic vocation, and the interpretation that later the Gnostic sects gave to this miracle makes it directly to the origin and exclusive source of the divine spirit that animated Jesus.

274

However, if we look more closely at all of this in terms of the actual historical moment, we cannot conceal the fact that an explanation of it is by no means provided with that dogmatic turn. If baptism was introduced by John with an entirely different intention for his disciples and for the mass of the people, as it was for Jesus himself, both according to those assumptions themselves and according to the results of our previous investigation; if the presuppositions that the act of baptism laid down for the multitude of other baptized people, the demands that it made on them, were essentially different

from the presuppositions that it assumed in Jesus, from the demands that it could make on Jesus: then we still do not see what it was that could have induced Jesus to desire baptism for himself, as an initiation act into the divine calling he had already recognized before, despite the fact that those presuppositions did not apply to him and those demands seemed superfluous to his consciousness. In addition to this, the tradition itself allows that miracle, which, as just noted, it introduces as a sign for the higher significance of the baptism performed on him, to happen in a way that was at least unforeseen for Jesus. This very fact expressly indicates that the baptism was initially meant to be nothing less than this, but that it became the solemn opening act of the Messiah's career through a special divine arrangement of which the Baptist, but not the one to be baptized, had prior knowledge*).

*) John 1:33.

— Yet, through this reflection, we have come closer to the perspective that we dare to maintain as the only historical one, purified moreover from the externally miraculous that would cling to it according to the literally understood biblical narrative. We find absolutely no historical reason — we think differently about the dogmatic one — that could determine us to assume in Jesus a different motive for the desire for baptism than in all other baptized people. However, we believe ourselves to be justified, even from the purely historical standpoint, in assuming that at the moment of its actual occurrence, and after this moment, the ceremony of baptism really became something else for him than for those others, gained a significance for him that it could, by the nature of things, gain for no one else but him alone.

275

That Jesus must have approached baptism with an already fully clear, solidified consciousness of his divine calling is an assumption that, in general, is linked to the previous dogmatic view of his divine-human nature, especially with the literal belief in the content of the childhood story, but is also particularly favored by the chronological determination that our Evangelists have given concerning the relationship of that event to the beginning of Jesus's public teaching. If indeed there was such a short period between these two events, as has generally been concluded from the information in the synoptic Gospels, or if the latter followed the former as immediately as one might be tempted to assume according to the fourth Gospel: then indeed there remains no other assumption for the standpoint of the spiritual development of the divine baptizee at the moment of his baptism but the one just described. But this itself, whether it is in accordance with that chronological determination, is all the more subject to doubt since the same, in the letter of the Gospel narrative, is not even really contained but is only

read into it. Concerning the synoptic representation, one may indeed be exact with that "immediately"*, by which the immediate following of the temptation in the wilderness upon the received baptism in the Jordan is supposed to be indicated.

*) εὐθέως in Mark 1:12. The other two paraphrase this expression by fairly synonymous terms.

That Jesus's appearance in Galilee follows just as immediately after the forty days of temptation is not explicitly said in any of our Gospels, but the phrase that "after John was put in prison," Jesus traveled to Galilee to begin preaching the Gospel there**), rather suggests an intervening longer period.

*) Mark 1:14 and parallels.

In the fourth Gospel, however, there is no specific determination about the time when the baptism was supposed to have taken place. Instead, there is not the baptism itself, but instead, a later speech of John reported, one that would first have to be proven that it can't be thought of as spoken other than immediately after Jesus's baptism. As decisive, however, concerning this point, we consider what we will say later on the occasion of the temptation story. In this, as we later intend to show, there lies hidden information about the period that passed between the baptism and Jesus's appearance, which leaves no doubt about its longer duration. What we note here serves only the preliminary purpose of removing a difficulty that stands in the way of the view of baptism that we intend to express here. — We must still postpone the detailed exegetical justification of this view itself; it is based on the interpretation of that miracle story, which contains, in a half-symbolic shell, the spiritual core of this event. The general outlines of the same, however, emerge almost by themselves from what has been said so far. It is indeed a completely natural assumption, founded in the matter itself, and also essentially unrefuted in our historical sources: that at the time when Jesus let himself be baptized by John, he could not yet have had that clear consciousness of his divine calling, which we must indeed assume in him from the very beginning of his public activity; that, on the other hand, the act of baptism itself entered the series of moments, perhaps as one of the most important and essential, through which the awakening of this consciousness was conditioned. To assume the latter is sufficient motivation for us in the present context, where we have not yet given the interpretation of the miraculous event in which the significance, symbolically represented, that the act had for Jesus's self-consciousness, is the fact that the Gospel historical narrative places such great weight on this event, and that legend has employed such rich means in its embellishment.

So far, much value has been placed on the connection in the older view, which is established through baptism between "the one who should emerge as the last manifestation of the Old Testament prophethood, to form the prepared transition point for the immediate entry of the Messianic time itself" and the one through whom this time itself was brought about. But this connection emerges in a much more truthful and conceptually appropriate manner when John's baptism is seen as a necessary element in the development of the messianic self-awareness, than when it is merely regarded as an external ceremony to which Christ submitted with the vague intention of fulfilling the concept of righteousness under the law in its entirety. — Finally, — for this seems to have been the point of contention for the adherents of the old faith in the recent discussions of this subject *), — whoever finds an objection in allowing Jesus to come to baptism "with the consciousness of the forgiveness of sins and cleansing from sin, like others," let him consider the following.

*) See Neander L. I. p. 64.

The moment of consciousness of sin and the need for liberation from the consciousness of sin, even though it may lie in itself in the idea of John's baptism and be impressed upon the hearts of the baptized by the Baptist in oral speech and exhortation — this moment does not need to be thought of as a dogmatically established formula of this baptism, in such a way as to necessarily deter one who found no sin in himself through careful self-examination from submitting to baptism for his own person. What drove Jesus personally to baptism certainly could not have been a feeling or consciousness of his sinfulness; but one would also be mistaken to assume, with all the other baptized and each individual one of them, such consciousness or feeling as present in the whole scope and clarity, as the abstract concept of baptism seems to demand. John's baptism was known and recommended by John's authority as a means of religious elevation and strengthening in general; the various individuals could, without prejudice to the idea of it in general, seek and find the most varied things in it according to their individual religious need. But as for Jesus in particular, nothing is more natural than to assume in him, as the motive that drove him to baptism, a premonition of that divine clarity about his calling, which, as we may assume, was to be imparted to him through the medium of baptism.

However much we are now entitled, after all this, to assume that the moment of baptism marked an epoch in the inner spiritual life of the divinely inspired youth, we must not go

so far in this assumption as to think that by this event he suddenly and at one stroke reached that point of inner maturity that he could immediately and without any further preparation begin the career that we later see him pursue. We must not be misled by the apostles' habit of remembering that event in a way that seems to designate it as the immediate opening act of this career. This habit clearly has less of a historical than an ideal basis. Prompted by Jesus's own hints, as we will show later, to regard John's baptism in a spiritual sense as the inauguration of their Master's teaching, they spoke of it, without concerning themselves with the intervening time, of which they had no closer knowledge, in expressions that could very easily be understood as also marking an external beginning of this teaching *).

*) E.g. Acts 1:22, 10:37, etc.

— How, in contrast to this, the more inwardly probable assumption is supported even by the content of the Gospel narrative itself, considered purely externally, we have already seen. Far more important, however, is the moment that a deeper examination cannot help but recognize in the enigmatic event that is interposed in that narrative between the baptism and the public appearance of Jesus. We are speaking, as you see, of the famous event of Jesus's temptation by the devil in the wilderness. This narrative belongs to those parts of biblical history that even the otherwise most strictly faithful interpreters are reluctant to understand in a literal sense and to consider as actually having happened. We also postpone the detailed exposition of our view on this subject to later books, in which we intend to discuss the whole series of individual events from the life of the Savior. Here it is enough, for the time being, to express how we find in it the real history of Jesus's inner life during the period in which it is placed by the historians. The spiritual-moral development of the divinely gifted man, from the point at which, as we assume, baptism had placed him, could not be completed except in a serious and powerful inner struggle, as surely as it was a truly human development, and as surely as the God in him was acting and begetting not as a *deus ex machina*, but as an Incarnate in the true and full sense of the word. — It is not our intention, at this point in this purely historical exposition, to dwell at length on the much-discussed theme of Jesus's sinlessness. We must only note here, to continue the thread of the narrative, that we would not, under any circumstances, accept a concept of this sinlessness that would exclude an inner soul struggle of the kind in which evil is also present as a living spiritual power; as a power that need not become actual, not even the mere inner actuality of will not embodied in external deed and action. That in Jesus the impossibility of succumbing to temptation was already previously decided is indeed our conviction as well, and in that regard, we have no objection if one wants to say that the tempter only came to him externally, without finding in his soul a place that he could have called his own in any sense. But this externality must always be understood only as a relative

externality of tempting thoughts and desires, in contrast to the deeper inwardness of moral self-consciousness and will. In a broader sense of the word, it was indeed an inner enemy that Jesus had to fight, and his purity from sin can only have consisted, if his humanity is not to be doubted, in the fact that at no moment of the struggle, which was no more spared to him than to any other mortal, indeed that he fought at the same time for all other mortals, did the inner enemy win the victory.

281

For the historical context of Jesus' educational history, the substantial aspect that we have preliminarily obtained through the current consideration is above all to determine that the completion of that inner moral and intellectual educational process, which must have been completed and concluded at the moment of the first public appearance, is not to be thought of as preceding, but as following that important event, the only one we know as the moment of significant external stimulation to Jesus. Only through this assumption are both facts of the evangelical narrative in question, this time appearing in legendary garb, given their due, the baptismal miracle, and the miracle of temptation. With any other view, baptism and what happens at it becomes an empty spectacle; the temptation becomes either, according to old orthodox and naturalistic explanations, the same, or, as the latest interpretations make it, a barren parable of teaching or a similar myth. According to the view we have indicated here of both legendary events, however, we gain in them a genuine substantial content of that educational history, such content as has long been desired but usually sought in the wrong way. Just as this fact itself, that John's baptism made an epoch in Jesus' inner life and spiritual development in such a way, does not stand alone as an accidental fact but must lead to further insights into the inner conditions of the one in whom such an effect was achieved by this means, so on the other side, the indications about what followed that epoch open up a perspective no less rich in regard to the conclusion of that developmental process, not brought about by external influence but by a sublime act of freedom. That impartation of the Holy Spirit which took place in Jesus at baptism, although it is an inner act and only prompted from outside, can rightly be described as inspiration. It was a flash of high consciousness in Him, one which in itself does not yet carry the character of a moral act. It only became a moral act through the overcoming of the temptation which the rising of such consciousness inevitably brought with it for him as a human being. Indeed, this temptation is therefore not to be thought of as a struggle in which victory could have been in doubt for even a moment. But a battle in which the victory is decided from the outset by the nature of the divine Spirit that appears in Him as the fighter can nevertheless be a serious, even a harsh and powerful one. It becomes so because it is a developmental struggle, because the subjugation of the inner enemy is the indispensable condition for the self-becoming or personification of that Spirit, which

otherwise only resides as a general and impersonal one within the human individual. To let Jesus reach the full maturity of his divine calling without such developmental struggles means, as already said, to grasp the spirit in Him only as divine, that is, in this context, as lifeless, impersonal, and to grant the man no part in what the God in Him accomplished.

282

It is of great importance that we have received such a specific notice about the time and premises of this inner struggle, as we cannot fail to recognize in the legendary account of the temptation when viewed impartially. It becomes clear from what has been said that we must understand the forty days, which according to legend were the duration of Christ's temptation by the devil, as a symbolic expression for a probably considerably longer period of time. The number forty was known among the Israelites as a typical one, and here in particular, one will not fail to recognize a certain intentionality of parallelism with the forty years of the sojourn of the Israelites leaving Egypt in the desert. The note about the desert, in which the event is said to have occurred, is no less typical. Apart from a more specific symbolism, which we will demonstrate later, the most immediate interpretation of this would be of withdrawal, in which that developmental process, which by its nature was an inner, not an external event, unquestionably took place. In short, we confidently assert as a historical fact that immediately after the baptism received through John, during and through which the consciousness of his high calling had arisen in Jesus with a clarity never experienced before, but in the form of momentary enthusiasm, not yet morally established insight, Jesus lived through a longer — we must assume internally probable, several years lasting — period alone (i.e., without coming forward with what occupied him internally, not necessarily also in external seclusion from human interaction). This period was for him the period of fermentation and final settling of the idea awakened to consciousness in that great moment, implanted in him by the birth from above.

*) The unmistakable words of Matt. 11:12, "From the days of John the Baptist until now," etc., indicate a longer period between the appearance of John and the appearance of Jesus.

— That Jesus, whether during this whole period or part of it, stayed near John and associated with the pupils of this man: one might perhaps be tempted to suspect this from certain circumstances of our evangelical narrative; particularly by the fact that among the Synoptics, the return to Galilee is placed only in the time after the temptation, as well as by what the fourth Gospel tells about the scene and manner of acquiring the first disciples. If one considers, however, how the first-mentioned notice

unmistakably refers only to the fact that the Evangelists present the temptation as having occurred in the desert, and the second comes from a source that is rather suspicious here, these circumstances lose their weight, and we find ourselves prompted instead to reflect on the very substantial objections that oppose this hypothesis. The later expressions of Jesus about John are by no means such as seem to point to a previous closer relationship. Similarly, in Jesus' relationship with John's disciples, there is no trace of an earlier closer bond, no reproach, for example, of apostasy, which would hardly have been omitted by the latter, if they, as was not consistently the case, did not themselves convert to Jesus' discipleship. Since the evangelical reports lead us to assume a broader extension of John's baptism than over the actual circle of this man's disciples, the greater probability unquestionably argues that Jesus had already returned to Galilee after receiving baptism, and there, presumably within the circle of his family and engaged in the craft inherited from his father, he awaited the moment when the Spirit drove him to begin his teaching.

284

By extending the time periods that we have found necessary here and that we found necessary earlier in the question concerning Jesus' year of birth, the statement about Jesus' age at the beginning of his career is now called into question again. This statement, given only by Luke among all the Evangelists, has it that Jesus was about thirty years old ("thirty years more or less," according to Justin's expression, probably modeled after Luke) at this point in time.

*) This is at least the probable meaning of the words of Luke (3:23), indeed said in another context: ἦν ὥσπερ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος (he was about thirty years old when he began).

However, Luke provides this information in the account of the baptism and thus seems to have had in mind primarily the time of the baptism, despite the expression pointing to the beginning of the teaching, and to have mentioned the latter only with the belief that it was essentially the same as the moment of baptism. This is indeed how the Evangelist was understood by the older Church Fathers, e.g., by Irenaeus, who in a passage *) particularly noteworthy for this subject, strongly polemicizes against bringing the time of baptism and the time of the main events related in the Gospels to Jesus' teaching too close together.

*) Iren. adv. Haer. II, 22.

— We must leave it open whether Luke, in this statement, was following a tradition flowing from a genuine source, or whether he simply assumed this about Jesus without further consideration, with the preconceived notion that this was the age at which prophets and divinely called teachers typically began their ministries. The latter is by no means unlikely, especially given the qualifier "about," and it also aligns sufficiently with the approach we have come to know from Luke on similar occasions. Furthermore, one cannot help but notice that even this assumption that Jesus was thirty years old and no older at the time of his baptism does not sit well with the Evangelists' presumption, which has proven credible to us, that he was born under Herod; this assumes, of course, what must also remain open, the correctness of Luke's other statement about the year in which the Baptist is supposed to have appeared. — Now, if there is already uncertainty about Jesus' age at the previously indicated time point, and if there is already a not entirely insignificant probability for a number of years exceeding rather than falling behind the normal figure, then for us it can all the less rest with this number, which has been so generally accepted until now, when it comes to the actual beginning of his teaching. Added to this is the fact that here, which was not the case before, the internal probability asserts itself for a point in time of fuller manhood. While it is not absolutely impossible that a youth, or a man who had only just stepped out of youth, could exert the effects that we know of Jesus on the people and individuals, such early maturity in the individual chosen for such deeds and effects, marking the pinnacle of everything human, is something abnormal, the assumption of which is unsupported by any rational or speculative grounds and is too weakly supported on the historical side by that isolated and hardly compatible statement of the Evangelist, despite its widespread acceptance. We therefore confidently seize, for this reason, the support that the mentioned passage of Irenaeus offers us for an assumption of opposite content, and we would not like to overlook, as most do, the external credibility of what is reported there. Irenaeus mentions there as a definite statement of the Presbyters who had lived in Asia in the surroundings of the Apostle John and had partly seen other Apostles of the Lord as well *): that the time of Jesus' most famous deeds, as well as his suffering and death, falls between his fortieth and fiftieth year of life.

*) It is natural to think specifically of Polycarp, known to be the teacher of Irenaeus, in this connection.

He himself cites as confirmation of this testimony the passage in the Gospel of John **), where Jesus is described by the Jews, who are engaged in a verbal exchange with him, as not yet fifty years old, and it cannot be denied that this passage, although it can also be interpreted differently, but not without force, and has almost always been interpreted differently, and that testimony, by their coincidence, mutually support each other and gain considerably in weight.

**) John 8:57.

Moreover, Irenaeus's opinion, since he does not explicitly contradict Luke's statement, clearly aims to allocate the extension of Jesus' lifespan, gained through this lengthening, to the later period of his life, after his baptism ***).

***) He does this initially in opposition to those Gnostics who, for mystical reasons and with reference to the prophetic pronouncement of the "acceptable year of the Lord," wanted to limit the Lord's ministry to the period of one year.

He uses the apt argument that anyone who was to win such disciples as Jesus must have taught for a sufficient time beforehand; but he could not teach, so the argument continues, without having reached the age befitting a teacher. What is disregarded in this report, of course, is the contradiction against that note by Luke that John the Baptist appeared when Pontius Pilatus was already the procurator in Judea; for we know that Pilatus's administration did not last longer than ten years. Irenaeus might have overlooked this note, and indeed without significant detriment to the content of his statements. For we have no reason to trust Luke with greater accuracy regarding this statement than he has shown concerning so many other points directly connected with it. However, in no way could Irenaeus have overlooked how his assumption introduces into all the Gospels, even the fourth, whose statements he explicitly considers there, a chronological breadth that is foreign to their letter, but which he is fully justified in finding not at all foreign to their sense.

287

The synoptic Gospels, as already mentioned, give the specific detail that Jesus's first appearance occurred after John's imprisonment. As this chronological fact is simply reported in Mark *), we have no reason to assume a causal connection between these two facts, or even between the former and Jesus's subsequent return to Galilee. Such a causal connection was introduced only by the author of the first Gospel, undeniably through a misunderstanding of his predecessor, by the turn of phrase with which he paraphrases the latter's report **).

*) Μετά τό παραδοθήναι τον Ἰωάννην κ. τ. λ. Mark 1, 14.

**) Ἀχουσας ὁ Ἰησοῦ: ὅτι κ. τ. λ. Matthew 4, 12.

Hence, there is also no reason to assume an immediacy in the sequence of these events; there may well have been a significant time span between John's imprisonment and Jesus's appearance *).

*) The truth of this synoptic statement, and correspondingly the untruth of the contradictory narratives of the fourth Gospel, might be supported by the note (Mark 6:14 and parallels) that Herod, when he heard about Jesus, thought him to be John, whom he had killed but risen again, unless, as we will show further below, the sense of it was not the commonly assumed one but another, possibly consistent with the assumptions of the fourth Gospel.

The author of the first Gospel also immediately attaches to the aforementioned statement that Jesus then left his hometown of Nazareth and settled in Capernaum (Kapharnaum) by the Sea of Galilee, on the borders of the tribal territories of Zebulun and Naphtali. This note is hardly drawn from a source peculiar to the evangelist but inferred from Mark, who presupposes Capernaum as Jesus's usual residence and the center of his activity without explicitly stating when and how this city became so. Luke seeks to motivate the move from Nazareth to Capernaum by narrating a stormy scene that supposedly took place in Nazareth between Jesus and his countrymen **).

**) Luke 4:16 ff.

But not only does this narrative reveal itself by its overall character as modeled on another, internally and externally more authentic one, which tells of an event that occurred later in Nazareth ***), but a seemingly unintentional expression by the evangelist †) also explicitly reveals that Jesus must have taught and performed miracle healings in Capernaum before that event.

***) Mark 6:1 ff. and parallels.

†) V. 23.

We must therefore confess to being uninformed about the time or motives of this move. That Jesus lived in Capernaum in the house of Andrew and Peter is merely a hypothesis, just as all the suppositions that want to attribute Jesus's choice of this place to its significance as a transit point of a trade route, etc., are nothing but hypotheses *).

*) The statement in Joseph. bell. Jud. II, 6,3 has been used to speculate that Capernaum and the surrounding area belonged not to Herod Antipas but to Philip, and that Jesus preferred to live under the latter's rule. This is made

unlikely by the express mention of when Jesus entered the territory of Philip. Mark 8:27 and parallels.

[Corrected in second volume:

On page 289, line 2, the citation of Mark 8, 27 and Parall. is inappropriate, since Caesarea Philippi is there called Caesarea, as it often is, in contrast to the maritime city of Caesarea.]

The passage from Isaiah **), which the evangelist cites to demonstrate the messianic predestination of this region, refers in its original to the contemporary situation of the Galilean towns harassed by repeated Assyrian invasions. Cited for such an undisputed historical fact, it ranks among the means of proving how little right one has to seek, in consideration of such passages, the exclusive or primary cause for the legends mixed with the evangelical history.

**) Isaiah 8:23. 9:1. Matthew 4:15-16.

289

If we have only obtained an approximate indication of the time of Jesus's first public appearance, and a somewhat more specific indication of the place, we will now be led to the preliminary question about the duration and local setting of his career, as we wish to proceed from this point to accompany the divine hero of our story on his path. We must try to settle this question here all the more, as we do not find ourselves able, due to the nature of our sources, to follow step by step in detail according to place and time along that path. — As far as time is concerned, it will not be surprising if, adhering closely to the previously mentioned passage of Irenaeus, we dare to assert, in contradiction to traditional views, that one can hardly believe to be able to derive any determination about its duration from the statements of the evangelists; that, on the other hand, in the new likelihood, an expansion rather than a narrowing of it is far more advisable. It is deeply ingrained in the nature and character of the synoptic narratives, which we nonetheless recognize as a far more reliable guide in the outwardly factual than the Johannine ones, that any chronological breadth remains alien to them, that they seem to have the appearance of compressing everything as tightly as possible — without actually intending this, but rather out of ignorance of chronological relationships and lack of practice in historical style, from which one rightly demands that it should not fail at least to hint at the existence of such gaps where it is compelled to leave gaps. This characteristic can be clearly demonstrated in one of these writers himself, at a point in his writings where we are given the power to compare it with more precise

chronological details that have been handed down to us from another source. Who would remotely suspect, when reading the ninth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, that between the conversion of Paul, which is narrated there, and his stay in Jerusalem, which is mentioned in the twenty-sixth verse, there are three years, and within these three years, a longer stay of the Apostle in the land of Arabia, from where he returned to Damascus once more before entering Jerusalem, lies in between *) ?

*) Gal. 1, 17 f.

And who, when reading on from that place to the fifteenth chapter, where the discussion turns to a later stay of Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem, will not find themselves surprised to learn that at least eleven, if not fourteen years **) lie between that first and this second visit to the Jewish capital? And yet this double determination of time belongs to the most certain things that we can pride ourselves on knowing about the history of that earliest time of Christianity. We have the information from the best source, namely directly from the mouth of the one whose life story it concerns.

**) The question is whether the δια δεκατεσοάρων ετων. Gal. 2, 1 refers to the time of Paul's conversion, or to his earlier stay in Jerusalem.

— If we find such striking chronological contractions with Luke, the one of the three Synoptics who has most aimed at giving precise time determinations and at arranging his historical narration pragmatically: we can expect even more similar instances with the first two Evangelists, who do not even claim to give chronological determinations of any kind. Their primary sources, the oral narratives of Peter and the collection of sayings of Matthew, provided them only with facts and sayings of Christ, without any chronological thread; critical researchers who might have aimed to determine the historical truth in this as in other respects through repeated inquiry and comparative collation of the reports of several were simply not what they were. — As for the fourth Gospel, it can easily be shown that, apart from the mistrust with which we must regard its statements about Jesus' festival journeys, as will be shown shortly, one is by no means entitled to use these statements as a support for the chronological calculation of the years of Christ's teaching, even if only in its own sense or according to the intention of its author. The proof, indeed, that this ministry could not have been confined to the span of one year would indeed be possible, assuming the correctness of those notes, following the precedent of Irenaeus, from them; but it is by no means demonstrable that the author did not overlook other such journeys apart from those he narrated; that it was at all in his plan not to overlook any such journey. And assuming he did not want to overlook any, or overlook them; how easily could he have omitted mention of Passover festivals to which Jesus had not traveled; since he does once *) quite casually and

without any chronological intentionality mention one, and it can be shown how he passes over the mention of other festivals at some places, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Dedication, Purim, of which he tells at other times that Jesus also visited them?

*) John 6:4.

One of two things must have been assumed by the aforementioned Church Father, who truly cannot be accused of having attributed too little authority to the canonical Evangelists, with John, when he considers the statements of this Evangelist as evidence against the assumption of a shorter but not also against one of a longer duration of Jesus' teaching. — Obviously, with a writer who completely omits significant periods of Jesus' Galilean activity, which we know from the Synoptics, who otherwise reveals nothing of the supposed intention to provide a chronological outline of the life of Jesus, there is clearly no guarantee that he might not also have overlooked such epochs of time, essential for determining time, without mentioning them with a single word *).

*) How can one seek true continuity of narrative in a writer who, after just reporting a speech that Jesus gave in Jerusalem, then continues: he went on (μετά ταῦτα) across the Galilean Sea? John 6:1.

292

From this side, too, no less than from the side of the synoptic Gospels, we are free to determine the duration of Jesus' teaching according to inner probability, only within the limits that might be set by any other explicitly given chronological data. But there are no such data, except perhaps this, that Christ's death cannot have occurred later than before Pontius Pilate's departure from Judea, which is known to have taken place shortly before the death of the Emperor Tiberius, falling into the thirty-sixth or thirty-seventh year of the Dionysian era; a determination that, given the uncertainty about the beginning of that teaching, has very little to say. The inner probability, however, according to our feeling, speaks so loudly for a duration of not too short a series of years, that it almost seems incomprehensible to us how so far not more of the otherwise unbiased researchers have been persuaded to deviate from the traditional view. People are ready with the excuse that something as extraordinary as the life and work of Christ must not be measured by ordinary standards; that the great and powerful can happen and manifest itself even in the shortest period of time. But they do not consider how the revelation of the Divine is only a revelation in the true sense of the word in that it submits itself most fully to the laws of the ordinary natural course of human affairs and, in accordance with these laws, undergoes an organic developmental

process that coincides completely with other processes of this kind in all essential analogies, including the gradualness of its course, and the all-sided conditionality and motivation of its moments. Others may judge differently, but we confess that such a short duration of the life and teaching of Jesus, as people have wanted to deduce from the letter of the evangelical tradition in general so far, not supported by the rules of thorough criticism and hermeneutics, and in contradiction with such significant authorities as those cited by Irenaeus, gives us the impression of an internal incompleteness, half-heartedness, and immaturity of the great work, an impression from which we do not see why we should be forbidden to free ourselves by such an unbiased historical combination as the one presented above.

293

In no lesser deviation, albeit in another direction, we find ourselves from the traditional view concerning the question of the local setting of Jesus' activity. To our knowledge, up to the latest criticism, no one has come to distrust the accounts of the fourth Gospel*), which, as is well known, tells of repeated festival journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem, and thus alternates the residence between Galilee, and Jerusalem and Judea.

*) Even Bretschneider, surprisingly, passes over this point, one of the most important for the contestation of the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, in complete silence.

Since the Synoptists are silent about these journeys but do not expressly contradict them, no reason was found on superficial examination to doubt the compatibility of the information from both sides; and even if such a reason had been found, the resulting conflict between the Evangelists would have been decided by almost all in favor of John, according to the prevailing sentiment. Only recently has a thorough criticism demonstrated that the Synoptists are indeed uninformed about those journeys; of all previous critics, only Strauss has gone so far as to acknowledge it as doubtful on which of the two sides in this contradiction of the Evangelists the truth may lie. We, for our part, cannot bring ourselves to remain in doubt, but we find ourselves, despite recognizing the difficulties that stand against this view, compelled by careful consideration of the matter to decide in favor of the Synoptists' account. Indeed, we confess that this very circumstance, although we have not yet expressly thought of it in the critical discussion of the nature of the sources, does, and not as one of the least significant, enter into the series of moments that have led us to form such an unfavorable opinion about the authenticity of the narrative parts of the Gospel of John. We will attempt to give the most precise account possible of the reasons that have led us to this diverging opinion.

The first important main point lies in the relationship that the source, whose authority is the greatest for us in all the points where it comes to an overall view underlying individual details of the life of Jesus, takes to this question: the Gospel of Mark. It is clear without our reminding that as a result of the view we have taken on this document, the excuse falls away with which people recently wanted to gloss over the Synoptics' silence, both collectively and individually, about the Jerusalem journeys; the already so scant excuse that it is a Galilean tradition from which they have drawn, and that this tradition, except for the final catastrophe, dealt only with events that occurred in Galilee. There is no apparent reason why Peter, who undoubtedly accompanied his Master on these journeys as everywhere else, should have been silent about these journeys in his stories and only spoken of Galilean events. Of course, as we know, this disciple's oral communications were only accidental and occasional; thus it is possible, one might object, that chance never led him to remember the events whose mention we miss in Mark's account. We reply to this that we have already noted above as a special merit of Mark's presentation, and indeed as one that can only be explained from the vivid intensity and relative completeness of the life image emerging from the stories he heard: the vividness with which the individual narratives join together into a whole. This vividness undoubtedly presupposes that the subject was present to Mark himself as a whole, that he has that overall view in the background everywhere, which alone lets the individual appear in its proper light. But if this is really the case: how weighty must it seem to us when we notice, as we carefully examine the reports of this evangelist, how Mark, without showing any intentionality with which he might have wanted to place the individual scenes he reported in a specific environment, quite involuntarily, as a self-understood and not special mention requiring a prerequisite of his reports, lets this show through, that Jesus did not enter Jerusalem earlier than for the last catastrophe of his life? - That we do not arbitrarily introduce this assumption into him, but that it really lies in him, would, if one did not want to consider the great negative testimony sufficient, which lies in the silence of the evangelist about the opposite, undoubtedly give an irreproachable positive testimony two places of his work. We mean first those*), where, reporting the last, according to his presentation only, trip to Jerusalem, he speaks of the fear and astonishment that seized the disciples at the thought of having to follow their Master there, and this obviously in a tone that could not be the same if he presupposed similar journeys as having happened several times before. Then the even more striking passage**), where he lets those who have just entered Jerusalem look around in the Temple and take everything in, just like someone to whom all this is still strange and new.

*) Mark. 10, 32.

**) Cap. 11, 11.

The other two Synoptists share this assumption with Mark, although it would undoubtedly be expected that, if it had been false, a correction from one or the other could not have been omitted with such an extensive and conspicuous object. The author of the first Gospel carries the statement: "that he must go to Jerusalem," [***]) already in the first announcement of suffering, where they are not yet on the way there, and Mark and Luke do not yet know it. With Luke, among other things, we find that when he later remembers a word that Jesus had spoken earlier, he assumes without further ado that it must have been spoken "when he was still (ετι) in Galilee"†).

***) Matthew 16, 21. This announcement would, according to ordinary harmonization, fall not just immediately before the last, but already before earlier trips to Jerusalem.

†) Luke 24, 6.

The same Luke has the Apostle Peter speak to the Jews in the Acts of the Apostles in words that remind them of the word of Christ going out from Galilee, from where it had spread over all of Judea ††).

††) "You know the word which spread throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee." Acts 10:37. Cf. Luke 23:5.

— Concerning the entry into Jerusalem, as all the Synoptics report it, the other two following Mark's account, but each adding a characterizing detail of its own *), every unbiased reader will get the impression that the narrators intend to portray the Lord as entering the holy city for the first time.

*) Matthew 21: 10f. Luke 19: 42ff.

The popular jubilation that greeted the incoming one is narrated without mention of a motive, in a tone that leaves no doubt as to how the narrators see it solely as the result of enthusiasm, and want their readers to see it, excited by the thought that this is the moment when the David's son, long-awaited by his people, after elsewhere validating his divine mission through word and deed, now finally steps onto the sacred soil of the city of David. The moment evidently loses its meaning, and the narration of it its stance, if one brings in the assumption that Jesus at that time was just coming to Jerusalem at

festival time, as had been his long-established habit, as he had done often before. The author of the fourth Gospel, who adds this assumption, is thus forced to motivate the people's enthusiasm by specifying a particular reason. He does this **), but only after he has simply reported the fact, as it had come down to him from tradition; since it undoubtedly only occurred to him afterward to find this enthusiasm strange and to inquire into its cause, an enthusiasm that certainly does not quite agree with the view he himself had formed of Jesus' relationship to the people in general.

**) John 12: 18f.

— After all of this, especially with an unbiased consideration of the overall character of the synoptic presentation, which does not allow for any other explanation for this peculiar circumstance, we believe we are entitled to declare the Synoptics' ignorance of Jesus' earlier journeys to Jerusalem as evident, and to apply to those who want to evade this evidence through forced interpretations the words of Spinoza: "that with such a procedure the whole Scripture would be done for, if it were to be allowed to regard what is clear as dark and unclear, or to interpret it according to one's liking." *)

*) Spinoza, tract. theologico-polit. Opp. I, p. 180. ed. Paul.

298

The weight of that external testimony, which for us, insofar as we can refer back to what has been proven about the character of our sources in general, must in itself considerably outweigh the opposing testimony of the fourth Gospel, is further strengthened in this case by the fact that the synoptic assumption is in demonstrable connection with the correct basic view of Jesus' public life contained in these Gospels, while that of the fourth Gospel is in equally unmistakable connection with the incorrect one contained in it. We see the synoptic Christ in Galilee, probably for years, enjoying the most widespread, powerful success, and, with the exception of a hostility that indeed began to stir early on from the scribes and the Herodians **), but which remains powerless and hidden in the face of the enormous popularity of the people, is almost unclouded.

**) Mark 3:6 and parallels.

This success was granted to him, as can be seen clearly enough with all the economy of the news, by the fact that he, unconcerned about the political and hierarchical power that had its seat in Jerusalem, about its interests and its demands, in uninterrupted continuity of preaching and healing miracles, the masses of the people who were not

visited by him, as well as a narrower circle of actual disciples, were more and more captivated by the power of his speech and the extraordinary nature of his deeds, and were carried away to ever-increasing enthusiasm for him. The rumour of the unheard-of, which emanates from him, reaches Jerusalem; scribes and Pharisees come in droves to Galilee to test him, but are confused and silenced by the witty, striking answers he gives them. The general enthusiasm of the people is shared by the capital city; all Jerusalem is stirred when he finally, aware of the doom that awaits him there, decides to go there and receives him as his Messiah with jubilant homage. He teaches, probably for some time, with the same attendance as in Galilee, in and outside the temple, and it requires all the art and cunning of the party that has quietly formed against him among the heads of the state, to finally get him under their control and to execute him as a malefactor at the Passover feast, when the attention of the people is turned to another side. - Who does not see how in this magnificently simple view of the overall course of the life story of Jesus since his public appearance, which is entirely consistent with itself, the remaining away from Jerusalem until the final catastrophe constitutes an absolutely essential moment? Through the incessant festive journeys, that most characteristic feature of Jesus' activity, the sublime calm and impartiality, the lack of concern for all external interests and circumstances, and the resulting freedom and independence of his position, would inevitably have been lost. The dependence into which he would have placed himself by this conduct, on the one hand, from a popular custom which bore so much the character of particularity and arbitrariness, even though it was sanctified by law, would, if it were not to become a total subordination to Judaism in its former form, on the other hand, from the front, would, on the other hand, have brought about from the outset an explicit opposition to religious law and state power, and thus have produced that spectacle of an ever-repeated conflict with the heads of state, with the scribes, and with the two adherent masses of the people, which is actually portrayed to us in the fourth Gospel. -Therefore, we will also have to find the account of the fourth Gospel consistent in so far as that difference from the Synoptics in relation to the setting of Jesus is not isolated in it, but has its counterpart in a corresponding difference about the position of Jesus to the mass of the people. But if we ask whether from the divergent presuppositions of this Gospel there emerges an overall picture of the career of Jesus that is just as coherent, comprehensible and vivid in itself, then, with a certain impartiality of critical gaze, the answer must be quite different. Significant successes in his teaching and miraculous activity are, of course, also assumed there, but not only do we not gain any insight into the way in which these were achieved, but what we actually see and hear is everywhere in the most glaring contradiction to these assumed successes. In Galilee itself, the evangelist, in sharp contrast to the Synoptics, has explicit misgivings about letting him achieve this success, by extending the word spoken by the Synoptics *) about Jesus in Nazareth to all of Galilee **).

*) Marc. 6, 4 u. Parall.

**This remark is based on an interpretation of the strange passage Joh. 4, 44; but an unbiased view teaches that every other interpretation is untenable. No matter how one interprets the passage, it certainly proves how poorly the evangelist knows how to write; for, allowing for a moment the possibility of referring to Jerusalem or Judea, the evangelist, if he knew how to write halfway, could only make this remark here if he had better successes than the Judean ones to relate from Galilee. But just the other way round, he only lets Jesus find a favourable reception in Galilee this time because of the previous success in Jerusalem. - However, it is proven that the author of the fourth Gospel does not consider Judea, but Galilee as the fatherland of Jesus (cf. 1, 47. 7, 41. 52.), and in this sense also the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels of the Gospels.

But in Jerusalem, where according to him he should have achieved it, he does not present Jesus at all, as the Synoptics do in Galilee, surrounded by a crowd partly seeking help, partly listening to his words, but always stirred to the warmest enthusiasm for him. Instead, he portrays Jesus in the tensest relationship with his entire surroundings, in ceaseless wrangling with Pharisees, scribes, and the rabble, and always fully occupied in escaping their ambushes and murder attempts*).

*) Joh. 2:24. 5:16. 7:1. 10. 19. 30. 32. 44. 8:37. 40. 59. 9:22. 10:31. 39. 11:53 f. 12:10, etc.

— We can't help but find it natural that in Jerusalem, where our Evangelist relocates most of the scenes presented to us, Jesus must have experienced more opposition than support if he wanted to lay the groundwork for his mission there. But what we find very unnatural is that he should have chosen this stage, obviously only suitable for giving the already well-established and executed work its final completion, for laying the foundation of this work. What a color of an intentionality, completely foreign to the synoptic representation of Jesus, do the preaching of the Gospel and Jesus' miraculous activity receive through these Jerusalem journeys — yes, worse, an intentionality that constantly misses its target! No matter how much one may resist it due to a more accurate view gained from other sources: when reading this Gospel, one involuntarily gets the impression that Jesus has deliberately engaged again and again with that hostile crowd and ultimately set his sights on either their conversion or their defeat. That Jesus has escaped the persecutions, the murder attempts of his enemies (i.e., not just, as with the Synoptics, "the scribes and elders," but "the Jews" in general), slipped away

with difficulty and often only through a miracle, is so repeatedly and frequently narrated, even very close to the catastrophe*), that one eventually gets the impression, despite all the mystical references to the necessity of his death found in the speeches of this Gospel, that the final defeat occurred involuntarily, because he no longer knew how to help himself.

*) Joh. 11:54.

And this very catastrophe, how differently does it appear, how much is the magnificent freedom diminished with which Jesus made the decision and uttered the great word: "he must go to Jerusalem to be handed over to his enemies, mistreated and killed by them"***), if we are only to consider it as the last unavoidable consequence of a popular discontent that he himself so diligently nourished and continually provoked!

**) Marc. 10:33, and parallels.

302

Of Jesus' disciples, we know that all without exception, — not just the closer circle of the most trusted, the twelve apostles, but also the wider group of those over whom the Holy Spirit was poured out at Pentecost ***), — were Galileans. We learn the same about the numerous women in his entourage, according to the explicit remark of the Evangelists †).

***) Acts 2:7.

†) Mark 15:40 f. and parallels.

In Jerusalem, on the other hand, it is only Joseph of Arimathea and, according to the testimony of the fourth Gospel, Nicodemus, who behave as followers of Jesus at his burial; but we do not learn that they really joined the group of disciples, even after his death. How misguided and purposeless would that frequently repeated stay in Jerusalem therefore seem to us if Jesus did not manage to gain a single actual disciple there! — On the other hand, most people are inclined to think (though this is favored but not proven by the account of the fourth Gospel) that Jesus was led to Jerusalem for the three annual festival visits required by Mosaic law, without pursuing specific purposes related to his mission. They refer to the respect for Mosaic institutions expressed by Jesus himself *), and thus not only find those journeys justified but also deem the contrary, which the Synoptics presuppose so ingenuously and without any sign of offense, highly improbable. Against this view, it can be argued, first, that the fourth Gospel allows Jesus to attend such festivals or stay in Jerusalem during them, which an

Israelite was by no means obliged to celebrate there; so a special purpose must be assumed for this stay.

*) Matt. 5:17 ff.

This admittedly includes the Dedication, or Feast of Tabernacles **), one of the most recent among the Jewish festivals, for which no one has thought to extend the Mosaic obligation beyond our current context. The same would also apply to the Feast of Purim if it were correct, as the view finding so much approval among modern orthodox interpreters, that the festival at which the healing at the Pool of Bethesda is said to have occurred ***) should be understood as none other than this.

**) John 10:22.

***) Chap. 5.

Moreover, it has rightly been noted †) that the fourth Gospel speaks of Jesus' stay in Jerusalem more in a tone as if it considered this as the rule, and the journeys away from Jerusalem to Galilee or even to Perea and Ephraim as the exception, since it almost always gives a special reason for them, and sometimes even allows Jesus to stay in Jerusalem from one festival to another.

†) Strauss L. I. 1, p. 437.

We do not need to emphasize in particular how much this consideration strengthens the previously expressed concern. However, that point itself deserves a somewhat closer examination, as it does seem to stand in the way of an investigation free from prejudices for the Johannine Gospel: the necessity that is said to have been imposed on those festival journeys of Jesus by the law and national custom.

304

That the custom of traveling to the three great feasts of the Jewish people, which could only be celebrated worthily at the Temple in Jerusalem, was still widely prevalent among the Jews until the destruction of the capital city, would be in vain to deny. Even if we had nothing but the note that Josephus gives on the occasion of Jerusalem's capture by Titus about the throng of people assembled for the Passover feast *), it would suffice to give us a high conception of the conscientiousness with which the Israelites adhered to the obligation prescribed by Mosaic law. But we also find, in the writings of that historian and elsewhere, numerous accounts of the density of the crowds gathered in Jerusalem

at festival time, as well as of the desolation of stretches of Jewish land at those same times **).

*) Joseph. bell. Jud. VI, 9, 3.

**) But the regions mentioned on such occasions, as far as we remember having found, were always closer to Jerusalem. E.g. Joseph. bell. Jud. II, 19, 1.

Yet the suspicion has been expressed ***), that between a more distant region, largely inhabited by Gentiles, such as Galilee was, and the capital, the connection may not have been so close that every Galilean would have been expected to participate in all the festival journeys. This suspicion gains a great deal of plausibility not only in general through the nature of the matter, as such widespread desolation of larger tracts of land for a longer sequence of days would have been self-prohibited by the necessities of daily life, but also by the striking lack of evidence to the contrary in contexts where one might indeed expect such evidence.

***) Strauss, loc. cit., p. 443.

This suspicion gains a great deal of plausibility not only in general through the nature of the matter, as such widespread desolation of larger tracts of land for a longer sequence of days would have been self-prohibited by the necessities of daily life, but also by the striking lack of evidence to the contrary in contexts where one might indeed expect such evidence. That the synoptic Gospels, at least two of which undoubtedly stand closer to the Jewish circle of ideas than the fourth, accept the assumption of non-attendance at the feasts without any sign of objection on the part of their authors, has already struck others in this regard. Particularly noteworthy, to which we will return later, is that the last journey of Jesus in the Synoptics does not appear to be prompted by the festival, but this assumption has been imported from the fourth Gospel. Both those Gospels, and the fourth itself, also mention John the Baptist consistently in a manner that seems to presuppose that he, too, never entered Jerusalem, whether at festival time or otherwise *); and yet the Baptist was so much closer to Jewish law than Jesus.

*) Especially striking is the embassy that the fourth Gospel has sent from Jerusalem to John, while, had the assumption been the opposite, that scene would surely have been placed in Jerusalem.

— Particularly characteristic, we must find, opposite to that custom, is the behavior of the earliest Christian community and its apostles. Nowhere even the faintest trace of an obligation for such journeys imposed on those apostles and congregation members who

were not already in Jerusalem, while violent and repeated struggles arose over other articles of Jewish ceremonial law **).

**) The expressions of Paul in Acts 18:21, 24:11, no one would want to interpret as feeling an obligation to such festival visits after years of neglecting them. He chose the festival period to meet with so many more that he wanted to see there.

One would have expected that this very point should have been a main moment of contrast between Jewish and Gentile Christians; and yet we learn nowhere that the former counted the festive appearance in the sanctuary among the essential articles they took over from Judaism; indeed, the apostles *) expressly designated as "apostles of the circumcision," Peter and John, we later find both have wandered from Judea, with no trace of attachment to the national sanctuary.

*) Gal. 2:9.

— But indeed, even the circumstances of the Jewish people themselves, already before the destruction of the capital, were such that could not have been found compatible with a strict insistence on the old national custom. The life of so many orthodox Jews in the "Diaspora" (διασπορά) must have long been accustomed to no longer counting that regular temple visit among the indispensable duties of a faithful adherent of Mosaic law.

306

Now everything that is known about the Jewish conditions of that time compels us to assume that the custom of traveling to the festivals could not have existed in the same universality as in the earlier simple circumstances of the Jewish people. The question then arises whether Jesus, as we personally know him, would be expected to conform to this custom with greater stringency than many other members of his people at the same time. This question is fundamentally superfluous, since not even the fourth Gospel, from which the assumption of those journeys is solely derived, attributes such conscientiousness to Jesus. It rather lets him skip a Passover at one place**), without giving a reason for it, and at another place***) lets him respond to an invitation to participate in a Feast of Tabernacles, which his followers also put to him not in the interest of religious duty, but in the interest of expanding his fame and sphere of influence, with words in which one searches in vain for acknowledgment of such religious duty on his part.

**) John 6:4.

***) Cap. 7, 2 ff.

But still, the defenders of the statements of this Gospel, in a clearer or more obscure awareness of the difficulties that, as we think we have shown, oppose the acceptance of other motives, keep coming back to this one. So it is worth the effort to also shed some light on this assumed motive in Jesus. We know that Jesus was far from being rigoristic in observing important aspects of Jewish ceremonial law, that his and his disciples' disregard of the Sabbath caused offense on several occasions, that he did not impose fasting or other ascetic practices on his disciples, practices in which Jewish moralists otherwise tended to see an essential aspect of holiness, and that the traditional washing rituals and the like were also the subject of heated debates with the Pharisees on several occasions. That Jesus, as some have wanted to assume, made a precise distinction between what was commanded by Moses himself and what was added in later custom by an exaggerated interpretation of Mosaic law: this can neither be proven nor even assumed on any probable grounds. Where would one find, to mention just this one thing, a trace of Jesus participating in Jewish sacrificial practices? How the statement about the eternal validity of the law is to be interpreted, we will show further below; in any case, statements of equal weight can be opposed to a literal understanding of it, sufficiently attesting to the free stance that Jesus took, both personally and in his teaching, with respect to the law. — Besides, such slavish subordination to ceremonial law, as would have to be assumed to find those festival journeys necessary, also contradicts all ecclesiastical-dogmatic assumptions about the dignity of the Messiah. It can be consistently defended only by those who, from the outset at least, attribute a narrow-minded Judaism to the Lord and do not consider the purely human universality of Christianity his work, but only the work of his successors. For if the application of the principle that new wine must not be put into old wineskins was in place in any other article of ceremonial law, it was certainly so in the matter at hand. What a burden would Jesus have placed on his disciples by a scrupulous observance of the law in this respect, or how completely impossible would he have made the further spread of his religion if he had demanded that they follow his example in this respect; — if not, how much the strength and significance of his example, his precedent, would have been weakened in other respects! If one wanted to object here that Jesus foresaw the imminent destruction of the Temple and thus the elimination of that burden, the obvious rejoinder is how the interest of Christianity itself would bring with it that, until the destruction of the Temple, its independent existence from Judaism in all parts of the then-civilized world would be sufficiently secured. The latter has, of course, happened, but it could not have happened if the apostles and their students had observed that custom. Besides, in the same Gospel in which the festival journeys are reported to us, we find Jesus's most definite statement about the inadequacy of worshipping Jehovah in a particular place or specific space*); Jesus would thus have

placed himself in striking contradiction to his word by his deed, if he had nevertheless deemed it necessary to worship at that place at the appointed times.

*) John 4:21.

308

The notes of the fourth Gospel itself concerning the festival journeys, when examined more closely, whether in general or in detail, prove by no means suitable to instill particular confidence in their accuracy and reliability. We do not want to reiterate the concerns here that, although specifically applicable to this particular point, address the nature of the Gospel in general. This includes, for example, the lack of clarity in the relationship to the synoptic presentation, which this evangelist, in many eyes, seems to want to supplement and correct specifically here. Upon closer examination, he does indeed show himself, given the consistent lack of any demonstrable relationship to that presentation, to be entirely lacking in knowledge of its content, which contradicts his own. — In general, we find ourselves in a peculiar dilemma when attentively engaging with the fourth Gospel. - In order to find an explanation for the omission of the greater part of the Galilean events known from the Synoptics, we must presuppose a reference to these or at least to the circle of narratives in general, which John is supposed to have intended to supplement; and conversely, to find an explanation for the way he reports the festival journeys, we must presuppose unfamiliarity with other modes of presentation of the life story of the Savior, to which he would otherwise have had to refer. A difficulty, which, as noted, recurs in a similar way on all other points where the respective presentations touch, but must here become particularly noticeable to all more attentive observers.

309

Turning now to the details, we first encounter the circumstance already mentioned in the first book that the fourth Gospel begins the narrative of the very first stay in Jerusalem*) with two important facts, which the others, with far greater internal probability, allow to have occurred during the last and, according to them, only visit.

*) John 2:13 ff. See above p. 122.

— In the case of the second journey**), we miss a precise description of the festival that is supposed to have drawn Jesus there, and what is worse, this journey is narrated with circumstances that do not fit any of the known Jewish festivals.

**) Cap. 5, 1 ff.

All possible explanations here have been explored by interpreters in turn; each has found its supporters, but all have failed due to insurmountable difficulties. Recently, in recognition of these difficulties, most interpreters have declared themselves in favor of the hypothesis first proposed by Kepler that the festival in question is Purim, which the Jews celebrated since the Exile in memory of their deliverance from Haman's persecutions. But this hypothesis could indeed only be inspired by desperation; for, apart from the specific difficulties that also confront it in an insurmountable manner, the more closely one wants to stick to the narrative, there is nowhere to be found even the faintest trace of such a celebration of Purim. In our opinion, the true explanation is this: that the evangelist narrates thoughtlessly, without posing to himself the question of which festival could possibly be meant here, and without concerning himself with the consequences that the mention of this festival has for the coherence of his story. — The casual mention of a Passover*), about which we do not learn that Jesus attended it, serves only to explain the gathering of a crowd of people in the area where Jesus was.

*) Cap. 6, 4.

How characteristic it is for our Evangelist that he needs such an explanation, whereas the Synoptists, with their more magnificent conception of Jesus's relationship to the people, do not need to take offense at the fact that this crowd gathers only for His sake! Moreover, we will later show how the event that gives occasion to mention this Passover is of a fabulous nature, and thus the mention itself should not be taken as a directly historical note and used as such. — The next festival our Evangelist subsequently refers to is the Feast of Tabernacles discussed in the seventh chapter, about which his narrative, by the way, might be based on the memory of an actual event that really happened **), and sounds most peculiar. The brothers of Jesus urge Him to attend the festival to show His disciples (therefore, it seems, disciples in Jerusalem are assumed, of whom we otherwise know nothing) the works that He does.

**) The admonition of the brothers, as told here, together with Jesus's answer, has in itself nothing implausible, but is entirely in keeping with what we know about Jesus's relationship to his relatives and his disposition. But his answer was certainly not merely a pretense, as our Evangelist portrays it (as such it would be unworthy of Jesus), but it contains the true reason why Jesus did not go to Jerusalem earlier. Compare Luke 13:32 f.

In this context, the saying about the necessity not to hide one's light under a bushel is translated into the brothers' mouths, albeit weakened and expressed in abstract,

imageless terms, a saying that we know from Jesus's own mouth; nevertheless, it says, with a very ill-placed "for," that the brothers did not believe in Him either. Jesus refuses, on the pretext that His time has not yet come, and lets the brothers go alone; but later He changes His mind and follows them secretly (ὡς ἐν κρύπτῳ). The Jews seek Him at the feast, but not out of admiration or attachment; rather, it says right away that no one (i.e., no one among His followers) dared to speak openly about Him, "for fear of the Jews" ("for fear of the people," rather, according to the much more dignified and probable account of the Synoptics *) the scribes and elders did not dare to seize Him), — but for no other reason than to argue and quarrel with Him.

*) Mark 12:12 and parallels.

Around the middle of the festival, he begins to teach — contrary to what one must assume was his initial intention; we do not find out the reason for this, just as we can take no pride in having learned earlier how Jesus had managed to remain unnoticed up to that point — a Jesus whom we never see in the Synoptics except surrounded by his disciples and by crowds pressing in on him **).

**) The striking nature of this secret departure from Galilee is further increased when one considers that, according to the usual understanding of our evangelist's narrative style, this would have to be Jesus' last departure from his homeland. — Incidentally, this secrecy probably rests on a misunderstood memory of the fact, often related by the Synoptics, that Jesus did not want to be hailed and proclaimed as the Messiah by his disciples.

312

Finally, the last day of the festival is mentioned as the "great" day, whether the seventh or eighth is disputed among interpreters, a designation that, as it appears nowhere else, arouses justified suspicion against its historical validity and against the evangelist's sufficient familiarity with Jewish customs *).

*) Similarly, in Chapter 19, verse 31, a single day within a festival celebration is designated as "great," a designation that, apart from our evangelist, no one else knows about.

— After this festival, Jesus seems to remain in Jerusalem, without any reason being given for his stay, as is usually given for his departure, or even without a report of how he has reunited with his disciples, from whom he must have been separated at that time. — The mention of the Feast of Dedication **) is not necessarily to be taken as

specifically motivating the stay in Jerusalem, but it stands out because no other purpose for it is noticed other than chronological accuracy, a concern for which the evangelist elsewhere shows little regard.

**) Chapter 10, verse 22.

— The last festival mentioned in the Gospel is the Passover, on which Jesus' death falls, and what difficulties arise from its portrayal will be discussed further below.

***) We will refute the weak objections that Strauss, who, however, unmistakably inclines to our view, still opposes (I, p. 444) at the appropriate place.

Jesus remained, until near the end of his career, without other interruptions, except for those shorter journeys to the land beyond the lake and the Jordan and to other areas adjacent to Galilee, which we either find mentioned all, or some of them at various points in the synoptic Gospels *), in his homeland Galilee, alternately staying in Capernaum (uncertain whether in his own house or in the house of his disciple Peter), and wandering in the surrounding area, to teach and be active in his other ways in cities and villages, in open fields, on the shore of the lake, or in the mountains.

*) Mark 5:1, 7:24, 31, 8:27, 10:1 and parallels. The first of these journeys, over the Sea of Galilee to the region of the city of Gadara, the first Gospel places earlier than the other two (Matthew 8:28); probably for no other reason than that he wanted to narrate a demon expulsion at the right time (i.e., before 10:1), after he had silently passed over the account of the incident in the synagogue in Capernaum, for reasons we do not know.

As for these daily wanderings, they are not suited to forming a subject of historical narration in their chronological sequence; one has been wrong to treat them as such, along with those larger festival journeys. — To do so, of course, the presentation of the Synoptics might lead insofar as there the narration of individual events and speeches usually seems to be accompanied by a more or less precise indication of where they are supposed to have happened, and these indications are seemingly arranged in the context of a steadily continuing series. To avoid being deceived about this, it is necessary to form a correct understanding of the evangelists' presentation and narrative style. Looking back at what we have found concerning the origin of the oldest and most authoritative of the Gospels, the Gospel of Mark, on which the other two Synoptics are entirely dependent in this regard, we cannot be surprised at how its author, in the effort to compile the isolated narratives of Peter into the solid whole of a passion narrative, created, by the way he transitioned from one subject to another, an appearance of

continuity in the events, and thus also in the changes in the scene of the events, which a more skilled narrator, at least one who was also a critical researcher, would undoubtedly have avoided. Not having avoided this, one must not charge Mark and his successors with either actual unfaithfulness in narration or even a lack of awareness of the necessarily existing gaps in their narration; rather, this is in the nature of a presentation that is indeed lively and vivid, but lacking scientific and artistic cultivation, as one can easily convince oneself from the oral narrations of individuals who stand on roughly the same level of education as the evangelists. Moreover, through the freedom with which the authors of the first and third Gospels permit themselves in not a few places with the arrangement of Mark — and we may assume everywhere without specifically corrective notes that they might have had before Mark; for no other reason than that the arrangement, which they put in place of the one they found, seemed more appropriate in the individual case — through this freedom, they reveal a consciousness of the relativity of that chronological order, which we too, if we do not want to lag behind them in impartiality and freedom of spirit, must be careful not to view in all details as historical or to deduce historical truth from it in every individual case. How often Jesus went in and out of Capernaum, how often he climbed this or that mountain, how many times he crossed the Sea of Galilee, and whether the first of these journeys, the one where he miraculously calmed a storm, falls before or after those events placed before it by the first and after it by the second and third evangelists: these and all similar questions, which, in themselves, apart from the particular circumstances that might lend them historical interest in a scientific sense, lack it, also cannot be answered once and for all by critical historical research.

315

The beginning of Jesus' teaching is not marked by our evangelists through the narration of a particular single act or speech with which he would have opened it, but rather through two of them by the citation of words, which, as they have the appearance of a frequently repeated formula, could equally have been formed later in order to express the meaning of his speeches in general. They are quoted in Mark as follows: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is near; repent, and believe in the gospel!" *)

*) Mark 1, 15.

The first Gospel only has Jesus say: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near!" **) It is noteworthy that the same evangelist has already put the same words into the mouth of John the Baptist ***), and later includes them among the commands that Christ gave to the apostles †).

***) Matth. 4, 17.

***) Cap. 3, 2.

†) Cap. 10, 7.

It is likely only this latter occasion on which Christ has spoken them verbatim. That he should have repeated them at the beginning of his career in the manner of a formula multiple times, this we cannot consider likely, since casting his preaching into specific formulas was undoubtedly not in his spirit; still less that the Baptist should have already spoken them. To this latter, the concept of the kingdom of heaven or of God in the sense that Christ understood it was altogether foreign; if he had spoken those words, he would have had to speak them in a different meaning than Christ later did, and it does not resemble the latter to have repeated such a formula of his predecessor in the manner of a disciple, not suited to him, half thoughtlessly, half thinking something else ††).

††) As Strauss assumes (1, S. 474): somewhat peculiar, as it would have been much closer for this critic to deny those words to John; — evidently only to gain ground for the view of an initial dependence of Jesus on John and an incompleteness of his Messianic consciousness.

316

As Mark cites the words, they sound more peculiar, and it becomes clearer that the evangelist's intention is not so much to charge Jesus with speaking these specific words, but rather to briefly summarize the thoughts that he assumes were contained, expressed in one way or another, in all of Jesus' speeches at that time. Thus, the evangelist has obviously inserted into the words "The time is fulfilled" the notice he had from Christ that he did not begin to teach publicly until after he had gained a clear consciousness of his divine calling and of the temporal circumstances in which he entered with this calling. The other evangelists have omitted these words, not as if they had found reason to deny the Lord such consciousness, but one because the formula without these words was already otherwise familiar to him, the other because he did not see fit at all to open his presentation of Jesus' teaching in this way. — Only in the most recent time has skepticism been extended to this point, stimulated from so many other sides. The conjecture has been expressed that only during his public activity might Jesus' consciousness about his calling have been purified and completed to the stage on which it was undeniably situated at the end of his career. Some of this itself want to be understood simply in such a way that Jesus initially thought less of himself than later, regarded and presented himself only as a prophet, not as the Messiah. Others,

however, go on to think that this spiritual modesty was combined with worldly pride, in that instead of the purely spiritual, whose idea only later took shape in his mind, Christ should have meant to establish a worldly Messianic kingdom. What to make of these conjectures, and whether it is well done to give up the view from which Mark and the other evangelists proceeded, as a mistaken one, in the sense of the same or any other: we will be able to derive this from the consideration that we find ourselves prompted to follow next here *).

*) To be relatively brief in this so important matter partly prompts us the circumstance that we can refer to the thorough discussion by Neander's (L. J. S. 102—134), with which we may declare ourselves in agreement almost throughout.

317

At the present point, we are indeed pressed with the inescapable task of our research to ask how, from our historical-critical standpoint, we are to arrange the ideas and principles that we should think of as guiding Jesus at the start of his career; the question, as it is commonly expressed, of Jesus' plan. If it were possible to provide solid evidence on this, the answer to this question would take the place of those words which Mark puts into the Savior's mouth at the moment of that commencement; whether it is by elucidating and interpreting these words, or by improving and correcting them. The question itself, which we pose, we can initially understand in the simple alternative: was it only as a prophet, as a moral teacher in general, in a similar sense as perhaps John, although with partially differing views and tendencies, and perhaps also as a miracle-worker in, if not entirely the same, at least a similar way, as some of the old prophets had appeared before him, that Jesus appeared; or was it in a sense peculiar only to Him, with a consciousness that only He could harbor in a similar way for Himself, and no one else before or after Him? — If the former were true, then with the proof that it was or had to be so, that question would already be fully answered. Then Jesus' consciousness about Himself and the goal He wanted to pursue would be grasped in a general concept, but the particular form in which He began to act according to this consciousness could be left as a random and no longer determinable fact for us. The opposite is the case in the opposing circumstance. If this were the correct one, the task would be to open a closer insight into the entirely individual formation of Jesus' consciousness, referring to an entirely individual content, only once so existed, a view that could be put in a similar way as those words of the evangelist in place of a factual report on the proceedings of Jesus' first public appearance.

318

To decide preliminarily on the latter and, therefore, to look for a source for the insight just mentioned, an important motive for us must be the fact that in the evangelical documents, even though the designations that Jesus gives of himself, of the dignity and significance of his personality, may seem to change frequently, we search in vain for the designation of a proper epoch, such as would have had to be evoked by the completion of his consciousness about himself. That we miss such a thing: this in itself could be explained more easily by us than by others from the flawed nature of the sources, in which, as we have indicated before, we must not seek any actual chronological succession of the presentation. However, this nature of our sources itself testifies against the hypothesis of such an epoch falling into Jesus' career, as reported there. For if such an epoch had really been what its name suggests, it would have sharply marked the difference of times within that career so that even the Evangelists could not have left it undesignated; or if they had nevertheless failed to designate it, it would still have pushed through their representation clearly enough and made itself known to us. But upon unbiased consideration, we find the exact opposite. The tone and color of Jesus' expressions about himself, and also those expressions that only presuppose a specific form of consciousness about oneself without expressing it, are essentially the same in the synoptic Gospels from beginning to end, despite those differences. They are the same in the Gospel of John as well, not with those, but with themselves, and in this latter, even those differences that could have given rise to that supposition are admittedly absent. Likewise, we perceive no change of the kind in the relationship of the disciples and the crowd to Jesus that we would have been entitled to expect as the natural consequence of an increase in the demands that Jesus would necessarily have had to make on the disposition of both after such an epoch. Therefore, for anyone who, despite all this, would still want to deny or doubt the actual existence of the proper Messiah consciousness in Jesus at the beginning of his career, the task would arise of showing the origin and gradual completion of this consciousness in the course of the same; a task that, in consequence of what has just been noted, might well be harder to fulfill than that which we intend to undertake here. Indeed, we need not look far for a point of connection for the insight we are striving for here. Such is immediately given to us in such a way that we also receive with it the key to the explanation of what might seem to oppose our view in the narratives of the Evangelists.

319

The starting point that we mean lies in the use of the name that Jesus tends to ascribe to himself in his speeches and utterances – we must assume from the very beginning of his career, for there are no traces of a later adoption of this name – the name "Son of Man" (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). The explanation of this name has hitherto fluctuated

between two opposing extremes, both of which we can assert with equal confidence that, each taken in its one-sidedness, they are equally erroneous. On the one hand, people want to find this expression in Jesus's mouth synonymous with "man" in general, and see only arbitrariness or modesty when Jesus occasionally uses it to describe his person (since the generality, the typical recurrence of this word usage must then logically be denied). On the other hand, based on a passage in the Prophet Daniel*), the assumption has been made that this expression may have been in use among the Jews as a typical one for the designation of the Messiah, and Jesus may have accepted and used it in the same sense, in some places, to signify the concept of the Messiah in general, without explicit reference to his person, and in others, to personally identify himself with it.

*) Dan. 7, 13.

The former of these views requires no refutation, as it becomes all too clear in reviewing the individual sayings of Jesus, as already lies in the double article, and has long been recognized by most, that the use of this word is always emphatic, succinct, presupposing an entirely individual reference. Against the latter, however, it must be noted, firstly, even assuming that "Son of Man" as a typical expression for the Messiah, be it through that prophetic passage, or on some other occasion, was then already in use and understandable to the Jews, that it would still require an explanation as to why Jesus preferred this name, the rarer and more circumscribed than the outright one, to the more specific and certainly more widespread one. Then, however, we cannot fail to notice that this assumption itself not only remains unproven but is actually refuted by the almost explicit contrast in which this name is set in the Gospel history to the name of the Messiah. How could Jesus, if he was accustomed to ascribing to himself a predicate equivalent to the Messiah's name, still have repeatedly behaved in apparent opposition to being hailed as the Messiah? How could he, in particular, (if one wanted to give another interpretation to his dealings with the sick and possessed) respond to his disciple Peter's revelation that he believed him to be the Messiah, in a way that presupposes that he still considers this dignity a secret, which he shares only with a few disciples, those who come to it of their own accord, not through instruction from him*)?

*) Mark 8, 27 ff. and parallel. The same meaning has, as we will show later, the prohibition Mark 9, 9 and parallel. Compare also 9, 30.— As for that first passage, the turn of phrase that the first Evangelist uses for the question of Jesus, who the people think he is, is particularly characteristic in the parallel passage Matt. 17, 13 (τίνα με λέγουσιν εἶναί τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;). These words cannot apply to Jesus's own, but they clearly show how that Evangelist did not consider υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as equivalent to the name of the Messiah. They

show it all the more clearly as the Evangelist paraphrases the simple expression of Mark with these words, as if to make it explicitly understood that the already familiar expression υιοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου does not yet contain a sufficient determination of Jesus's dignity.

— In contrast to this, we will certainly not be mistaken if we specifically describe this as characteristic, that Jesus, regardless of whether he presupposes or does not presuppose his Messiahship, admits or does not admit, avoids using a coined expression for his calling and the character of his personality, and we assume that, in order to avoid the consequences that could be attached to any of the coined expressions, he deliberately chose an expression that was free from any such consequence at the time. This choice may well have been made with knowledge of the phrases by which a messianic meaning of this word is introduced in the Old Testament, in particular with regard to that passage in Daniel, and with full consciousness of the content and meaning of these passages;— we do not deny this, but find it even likely and worthy of Christ. In no case, however, should the reason for the choice be sought solely in this circumstance, nor should it be assumed that Christ expected the same awareness of this Old Testament meaning from all the hearers of his speeches. For them, the word should undoubtedly, according to Jesus's own intention, – whoever would want to declare this an unworthy one of Him would only betray their own thoughtlessness – have something mysterious, inviting reflection on its meaning. Jesus would not have to despise even a certain ambiguity of meaning, all the less so, as it was in any case to be assumed that, according to the diversity of individual mental constitution and educational level, the various would put the most diverse things into the concept of his personality and divine destination, and only a few, in the first time perhaps none, would gain the same insight that He had about it.

322

But now, as for the idea itself that Jesus wanted to express through that name, it seems to us that this has not yet been sufficiently understood by previous interpreters, not even excluding those who sought a correct middle ground between those two extremes. We consider downright wrong, however appealing it may seem at first glance, the interpretation as if Jesus thereby wanted to designate an expressly complementary contrast to the other expression used partly by, partly through the Messiah before him, "Son of God." For the opinion would have been that Jesus, assuming his divine birth and dignity, wanted to express the human nature and origin coming to him just as much from the other side. But this very assumption is what makes the interpretation of the name dependent on it inadmissible. Such an assumption would only be permissible if it were also provable or credible from other moments that Jesus harbored the conviction

of his divine nature in an equally concise and equally individual sense, not only for himself but also in regard to his disciples, or rather all those against whom he used that word, as something already settled and established. It would still be striking how he could place such emphasis on what was understood anyway, whether one wanted to acknowledge or not acknowledge, assume or not assume the divine dignity of his person. For in no case will one want to assume that the later error of the Docetists could have taken hold among his disciples or among the Jews of his time, and that Jesus would have needed to point out his humanity so explicitly against those so-minded. But even less can we assume what we recognized as the condition of such a procedure: the prior acknowledgment of Jesus as the Son of God, for it to have really happened. Considering just the subjective side alone, the aspect of Jesus' own self-awareness, we would have to recognize a complete reversal of the true relationship between the moments of the human and the divine, as we have to assume this relationship in the self-consciousness and self-proclamation of Jesus, and as it is also confirmed in the use we find everywhere in the Gospel of the expression Son of God. This latter expression designates either only that general sonship, which is also attributed to the people of Israel in general, and specifically to its prophets and kings, nothing specifically peculiar to the Messiah, where there could be talk of a complement through the moment of human sonship; or, when Christ applies it to himself, as so often in the fourth Gospel, but also in some poignant places in the Synoptics, he does so expressly teaching and proclaiming, not in the tone of a self-understanding or a premise already conceded by his listeners, but rather amid constant opposition and difficulty in understanding with his listeners.

*) Matt. 5, 45. John 10, 34.

**) Matt. 4, 3. 11, 27 and Parall. Mark 14, 61 and Parall.

Clearly, the expression "Son of Man" can only be intended to lead to that higher concept of the nature and origin of Christ, not vice versa, starting from it as something already attained, to be traced back to the realm of the human, in the sense that Christ is recognized as belonging to this as well. This use of the name would have been appropriate against the Gnostics and Docetists of a later time, not against the carnally minded Jews and Jewish apostles, to whom Jesus had all the trouble to impart even a hint of the true nature of his divine nature. Rather than the just-refuted interpretation, one could perhaps accept the interpretation according to which "Son of Man" is the archetype of humanity, in a sense similar to how, under the influence of Platonic idealism, Philo speaks of an archetype (εικὼν παράδειγμα) of created things, and especially of man, of a "true" or "divine man"*) and relates it essentially to the concept of

the divine Logos, which is to designate the one through whom this archetype is to be realized.

*) ἀληθινὸς ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ.

But when stated so unmotivated, this interpretation also hangs in the air and provides no insight into either how Jesus came to that concept himself or how he came to this expression of the concept, which is by no means self-explanatory. One would proceed more thoroughly if, starting from the immediate sense of the words, one wanted to mediate through this sense itself the ideal significance that is unmistakably hidden in the name. How such mediation might be found can be suggested to us by the evidently very related expressions of the Apostle Paul "second") or "new man"*.

**) ο δεῦτερος ἄνθρωπος 1 Cor. 15, 17, where the same is also expressly designated as ο κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

***) καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, Ephes. 4, 24. υἱὸς ἄνθρωπος, Coloss. 3, 10.

The former designation is used outright, exactly as "Son of Man" for Christ himself, and it is not a difference in concept, but only, as noted above, a new piece of evidence of how unfamiliar the Apostle was with his Master's own expression, if he does not use at this point the name chosen by the Master himself, or at least allude to it. For we do not think we are mistaken when we assert that what Paul wants to express with "second man," Jesus wants to express with "Son of Man": an enhancement of original human nature, a rebirth and transfiguration of the natural man to the spiritual man, as it were a second potency of humanity, such a humanity as the Apostle says of Christ*), which has the natural man as "Father in the flesh"***).

*) Rom. 9, 5. Gal. 4, 4.

**) Closest to the interpretations so far is the one proposed by Heinsius, Lightfoot, and others, according to which "Son of Man" should mean as much as "Son of Adam" in the sense that Paul speaks of Christ as the δεῦτερος or ἑσχατος Ἀδάμ (Rom. 5, 14 ff. 1 Cor. 15, 45). The polemic that Fleck has raised against this interpretation (de Regno divino, p. 116) has some justification insofar as these concepts, as dogmatically tailored as they usually appear in those interpreters, are indeed not to be presupposed in Christ's own consciousness. But the fact that it was one and the same idea that Christ wanted to express through υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and that Paul wanted to express through the above-mentioned expressions, is not refuted by those remarks. If, however, the

aforementioned writer wants to deny (ibid. p. 107) that Christ used that expression almost everywhere he speaks of himself, he can only refer partly to the Sermon on the Mount and partly to the Johannine discourses. Both references, however, do not mean much; for in the Sermon on the Mount there is no designation of the person of Christ at all, but Christ speaks there in the first person of himself; the Johannine Christ, however, is not the historical one in these and many other points.

Only thus does the expression appear, as one may well trust Jesus to have chosen such an expression, as one that is characteristically significant in its unique composition. In the choice of this expression, alongside sublime self-esteem, noble modesty manifests itself, which does not push forward the lofty sense it wants to express in a flashy manner, but shrouds it through ingenious combination in a mysterious darkness, yet in such a one from which those who are able to grasp it cannot fail to find it. By the nature of such an expression, and especially in a spirited application of it, its meaning will not be from the outset and not strictly an individually defined one, but, in addition to its relation to the person of Christ, it also has a general application to the higher, spiritually reborn humanity as a whole, whose concept in that personality has indeed its center and its highest expression, but not its absolute limit. In fact, there is also a series of passages in which, with perhaps intentional double meaning, this word is used in such a way that it can be understood both of the universality of the higher human spirit and of the personality of Christ*), while others indeed only admit the latter meaning.

*) We mean not only those in which, like Matt. 10, 23. 13, 37 ff. 16, 27 f. Mark. 13, 26 and parallels, John 5, 27 and others, the future of the Son of Man is spoken of, but also those like Matt. 8, 30. Mark. 2, 28 and parallels, John 3, 13 and others.

326

If we may now trust these insights obtained about the meaning of that memorable expression — the only one that Jesus repeatedly used as one that had become typical for his personal nature and purpose through himself (for "Son of God," as frequently as Christ proclaims such sonship of himself in the fourth Gospel, is never actually used by him in a typical way, as a name for him) — there can be no doubt about how the choice of the same presupposes an already decided and perfectly clear self-consciousness of Jesus about his Messiahship, but also the will, with this consciousness, neither to deny it before his disciples and the people, nor to impose it on them or to announce himself as that Messiah whom the Jews expected, of his own free will. That this choice was

closely connected with that proclamation, which is described by the Evangelists as the preaching of the "kingdom of heaven" or the "kingdom of God" *), or simply as the "Gospel," the "good news," we may assume all the more confidently, as a reference to a statement of the same richly Messianic prophet that had preceded the use of the word "Son of Man" cannot well be denied even in the conception of such a kingdom as Jesus shaped and expressed).

**) βασιλεία των ουρανών or βασιλεία του θεοῦ, the former notably in the first Gospel (probably as a result of the faithful translation of the Hebrew Matthew, from where this formula then also passed into the other parts of the Gospel), the latter in the others. That Justin also commonly uses the former formula is one of the main pieces of evidence for this Apologist's acquaintance with our Gospel of Matthew.

*) Dan. 7, 18.

But just as the Messianic meaning of the word "Son of Man" is confirmed by this reciprocal relation to the concept of the kingdom of heaven, so conversely, a brighter light is shed by this word and its interpretation given by us on the sense in which Jesus — and unquestionably he first, not possibly the Baptist before him**) — appropriates the expression "heavenly" or "kingdom of God" and makes it typical for the designation of the goal, which is pursued by him as a result of his personal calling.

**) As it might seem according to Matt. 3:2.

For in a corresponding way, as in the concept of the "Son of Man," the Messianic concept is indeed included but at the same time transformed, spiritualized, and wrapped in a veil accessible only to those spiritually and morally consecrated: in a completely corresponding way, we will have to both attribute and deny the identity with the Messianic kingdom of the old Messianic prophecies to the concept of the kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus. Also here, just as there, Jesus' intention clearly aims not at explicitly connecting the consciousness of his listeners to the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament and mediating the content of his preaching through the memory of those prophecies, but rather at embedding the reference to this connection into his teachings independent of the Old Testament context for the exoteric public in such a way that the identity of the kingdom of which he speaks with the Messianic kingdom, as well as the "Son of Man" with the personal Messiah, can only be noticed by those already sufficiently prepared to exchange that more outward, sensual conception with this higher, spiritually transfigured one*).

*) We can support this assertion by pointing to one of the most delicate, inwardly true, and spirited features of the synoptic portrayal. The moment in which the decisive word, that Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah, is first spoken from the mouth of a disciple (Peter) is the same moment in which Jesus begins to instruct the disciples about the necessity of his suffering and violent death. (Mark 8:30 ff. and parallel.) It is evidently indicated here how this proclamation was intended to counterbalance the consequences that could be drawn from the identity of the person of Jesus with the person of the Jewish Messiah. As long as the disciples remained uncertain about that identity, they also needed to know nothing of this necessity.

If Jesus had hidden a political plot from the outset under that proclamation of the kingdom of God, as some have wanted to attribute to him, he would have chosen for himself any other designation than one in which a transformation of the popular Messianic concept into a purely spiritual meaning is so unmistakable. Conversely, had he only wanted to proclaim the nearness of the kingdom of heaven as a prophet and not promise to introduce himself as the king of this kingdom, he would have avoided any designation of his person that could give rise to confusion with that of the Messiah.

328

It may be that the complete historical proof has not yet been established in the foregoing, that Jesus appeared from the first moment of his public activity in the sense here designated, under the predicate of the Son of Man ascribed to himself, and with the proclamation of a heavenly kingdom to be brought about by him personally, to be won through his followers, — a proof which, according to the nature of our sources, cannot be given in the extent and completeness, as is otherwise the case with similar proofs in the historical domain. At any rate, one will have to grant our assertion, that one must conceive of Jesus' appearance in this way and no other, at least the value of a hypothesis, by which the difficulties that all other ideas about the beginning of his public career suffer from are happily enough avoided. That the assumption of an explicit proclamation of the Messianic kingdom, a straightforward acceptance of the Messiahship in the Old Testament sense, whether with or without a political plan, is inadmissible, is clear, and after so much discussion about it, no more refutation is needed. But the assumption that Jesus might have been led only in the course of his career to that conception of the Messianic kingdom to be founded by him, and of the Messiahship personally belonging to him, which we must recognize as the only correct one, the only one grounded in our historical sources, this assumption, as it lacks any real historical basis, is made superfluous if not refuted by the aforementioned understanding of the newly shaped Messianic idea in Jesus' self-awareness. By the

latter alone, without any need for such assumptions, the circumstances that were otherwise sought to be explained by hypotheses of that kind are explained as naturally and satisfactorily as possible. — Certainly, we must confess that, with our view of a longer duration of Jesus' activity than is commonly assumed, its significance is not diminished but rather increased. If one could find it at all explicable during a one- or two-year duration of that career how an openly pronounced declaration by Jesus that He was the Messiah had not to take the entirety of the Jewish people either for or against Him in an even more general and pervasive way than history teaches that it actually happened during His life; then this circumstance indeed becomes strange when assuming a career of several years. It remains strange even if one, like us, were to place much importance on the remoteness of Galilee from the main seat of the Jewish hierarchy, more rightfully so than others might. — But apart from this aggravating assumption, we believe that, in the absence of more positive reasons or explicit testimonies from the sources, the main reason is to be found in the circumstance just indicated, which has perhaps unconsciously led so many to the hypothesis that we believe we have replaced with our explanation. The clearer one becomes aware of this reason, the more clearly one will see that, even with that assumption that we bring along, the difficulty does not lie in thinking of Jesus as aware of his Messiahship from the outset, but only in thinking of him as openly proclaiming it before the people. This very difficulty, however, is removed by the explanation we have given in a way that casts no shadow in any sense on the straightforwardness and sincerity of Jesus' chosen course. It is removed, especially with the help of our view that Jesus only taught in Galilee and the neighboring provinces until the end of his career, but not in Jerusalem. For certainly only there, and not in the Jewish capital, was it possible for him to teach and act for a longer period without being compelled to make an explicit declaration as to whether he was the Messiah. In Jerusalem itself, the high priests and scribes would have soon presented this question to him in such a way that he could not have evaded it, while in Galilee he certainly silenced intrusive speeches of this kind more than once by the force of his spirited answers. We do indeed see how even during the short time when he taught in Jerusalem, he could create peace for himself from the evident insistence of those aiming at this goal, only by putting them in embarrassment*), which they could easily have overcome in the long run; but finally, the catastrophe of his life is decided by the frank confession, actually wrung from him, that He was the Messiah**).

*) Mark 11:28 ff. and parallel.

**) Mark 15:2 and parallel.

Certainly, what we have said here in answer to the question about Jesus's original awareness of his messianic calling would have taken on a completely different appearance if, instead of relying on the synoptic gospels, we had based our response on the reports from the fourth Gospel. For in this Gospel, there is, from the outset, not the slightest doubt that Jesus, from the very beginning of his appearance, proclaimed himself loudly and continuously to his disciples and all the people as the Messiah and the Son of God. Not only does he announce himself in this manner, but even John the Baptist, not just to Jesus himself as in Matthew and Luke, but publicly before everyone, even before Jesus has appeared, speaks of him as the true Son of God *). The first disciples, whom Jesus finds partly at the explicit instigation of the Baptist, immediately hail him as the Christ and Messiah, as the one of whom Moses in the Law and the prophets spoke, as the Son of God and King of Israel **).

*) "I have testified that this is the Son of God." John 1:34.

**) V. 42. 46. 50.

Jesus himself, although he still calls himself the "Son of Man" among these first disciples *** (a term, incidentally, that is strikingly rarer in this Gospel than in the others), immediately steps forth on his first visit to Jerusalem with actions and words befitting only the recognized or immediately recognized Messiah ****); he speaks to Nicodemus of his divine descent† and tells the Samaritan woman that he is the Messiah ††).

***) V. 52.

****) Cap. 2, 14 ff.

†) Cap. 3, 13 ff.

††) Cap. 4, 26.

All the more detailed speeches that follow, which the evangelist always allows to be delivered to the masses, revolve around this theme; with a persistence that makes it unsurprising that many were reluctant to listen, Jesus keeps impressing upon the Jews what they cannot grasp or understand. And even when the Jews discuss and argue among themselves about him, the only alternative is whether he is the Messiah or whether he is possessed by the devil and a deceiver *).

*) Cap. 4, 42. 6, 14 f. 7, 40 ff. and others.

Finally, it is decided that anyone who calls him the Messiah should be expelled from the synagogue **); a report that, as unthinkable as its factual content is given the truth of the synoptic representation, probably arose from a misunderstood memory of the actual situation during Jesus's life — where, apart from the closest of his disciples, and apart from some quickly fading voices that greeted him as the "Son of David", no one knew him as the Messiah.

**) Cap. 9, 22.

— We do not believe we need to elaborate in detail on how there can be absolutely no reconciliation between these two views of the subject at hand, the synoptic and Johannine, but that only one of them can be true. After our preceding discussion, it should not be in doubt as to which side the inner truth lies; with regard to the elimination of the external difficulties raised by the authority of the Gospel of John, we may refer to other parts of our investigation.

332

Whether we now follow the authority of the synoptic gospels or that of the Gospel of John in the matter just discussed: in either case, it emerges for us – returning to where we began – with the same necessity, the premise that Jesus began his public career not otherwise than with a perfectly clear and well-formed consciousness of the nature of his calling and the scope of the work he had to accomplish. It is not necessary to elaborate extensively on how much this premise is supported by everything we know about his demeanor during this career itself and the successes thereof. The character of both clearly does not favor the assumption of an elevation of his self-esteem through success, as much as it does the idea of a disillusionment of the hopes which, according to some, he initially had regarding the possibility of inciting the people to embark on establishing a worldly messianic kingdom. If, however, one were to claim *) that the formation of a character like Jesus's at the height of his active life can only be conceived on the premise of a convergence of external experiences made during this activity with internal spiritual results, then indeed, if anywhere, here would be the right place to assert the incomparability of this character with all others whose origin and development lie within the scope of our perception.

*) According to the words of the poet:

"A talent forms in solitude,
A character in the world's stream."

Not as if we wanted to present Jesus, by virtue of his divine nature, as exempted from the very outset from what can truly be grasped as the natural condition of all human development: how could we, when our entire endeavor of a historical exposition of his life and actions opposes such notions? However, the dependence of the ethical development process of a grand personality on experiences of the kind demanded here cannot be demonstrated as a necessary element of this law of nature. If within our realm of perception, such dependence appears as a rule, the reason is essentially that in the characters available for our observation, the removal of internal obstacles often parallels the acquisition of positive aspects of their development, which can occur in solitude through mere internal work. Wherever such obstacles have once been encountered, whether self-inflicted or due to educational mistakes or other clouding impressions from early youth, they require, according to the law of organic development, a moral experience of the kind not acquired without conflict with the external world. On the other hand, if we assume a personality that is completely free of internal obstacles of that kind, that is, sinless and morally spotless, as we cannot help but think of Jesus not only for dogmatic but also for historical reasons, nothing prevents us from imagining the process of his ethical development and self-education as progressing solely on a straight path of purely internal experience, not on the winding and intricate one of external experience. — That the process going through only internal experiences is not accomplished without efforts and moral struggles, and that Jesus could not be spared such efforts and struggles, we have already acknowledged above and will acknowledge again when we come to the more specific interpretation of the temptation story. However, as decisively as we find traces of such an inner struggle in the story just mentioned, a struggle without which we would not recognize Jesus as a human in the full sense of the word, just as decisively it is expressed therein that at the time he publicly appeared, this struggle was already over, just as he had already gained awareness of his messianic calling in general before this struggle, but during the struggle, he had won the full purity, clarity, and firmness of this consciousness.

As a result of this view, which we have formed about the level of consciousness that Jesus had achieved at his appearance, we now find ourselves in a position to give a somewhat clearer account of some other related points, which are otherwise often left in the dark or undefined. Firstly, we must assume that all those moments of spiritual and mental and physical gifts, which form the substantial basis of his activity, had fully matured in him at that time, that they were present in his consciousness both in terms of

their positive nature and their necessary limits in such a way that he dominated them in the pure and full literal sense and used them only in the way that the concept of his calling, refined to the highest moral clarity of consciousness, would entail. This observation is particularly important with regard to one side of this gift, namely the one which, among the two that present themselves as essential for differentiation, we can describe as the first, as the physical or real one. By this side, we mean what is commonly referred to as the 'miracle gift' of Jesus. Although our concept of this miraculous gift differs from the common conception, we have no reservations about retaining this expression since we too aim to express the absolutely specific nature of this gift, distinguished in its specific uniqueness from every gift of other individuals, by the very name we use for it.

335

The traditional view of this miraculous gift, as we find even in our evangelists, conceives of it as wholly unrestricted. Under this notion, it could be described as a direct share in the divine omnipotence, the manifestations of which would be constrained by nothing except the goodwill and intent of its possessor. However, the critical perspective we've adopted from the beginning of our study saves us from an extensive argument against this view. This perspective is rooted in scientific historical research; all such inquiries, as mentioned earlier, operate under the assumption of a prevailing lawfulness in the events they investigate. It's entirely justifiable to insist that the understanding of the laws underpinning all events remains adaptable; in other words, rather than arbitrarily limiting events based purely on their commonality, this understanding should allow its boundaries to be informed and expanded by the events themselves, including the infrequent and remarkable ones*).

*) Cf. Tholuck *Glaubwürdigk, d. ev. Gesch.* p. 91 and the passage from Goethe referenced therein.

Yet, as unquestionably valid as this requirement is, it's worth noting that any interpretation of this adaptability that would, at any given event, negate the law altogether, supplanting rule with utter chaos, would undermine itself, rendering all scientific inquiry void. Hence, we assert that even the broadest principle of our historical investigation — and not just ours, but any self-aware scientific research that grasps its own principles — contains the inherent assumption that Jesus's miraculous gift must have been specific, congruent with the laws of nature and history, and restricted by them and its own inherent nature. This inherent nature dictates its inherent limits and in turn integrates as a vital component into the flexible understanding of that overarching lawfulness. Within this context of specificity and limitation, this miraculous gift would

have been a part of his self-awareness right from the start of Jesus's public ministry and consistently thereafter. Thus, it follows that before the manifestations of this miraculous power witnessed during Jesus's public life, there must have been a preceding developmental process — an assumption that would, of course, be unnecessary if we were considering an unbounded miraculous capability.

336

The natural viewpoint, for the purpose of forming a concept of this miraculous gift, whose undefined notion we had to reject here, is that it might have represented in Jesus the position of an innate talent, a specifically determined physical equipment, which is essential to every genuine spiritual vocation, as it constitutes the side of his immediate, external existence, the basis or foundation of his organic presence in the external reality.

337

This, indeed, is the truth which we are justified in adopting from the old dogmatic and supernaturalist viewpoint to our historical one: that the gift of miracles necessarily enters into the idea personally embodied in Jesus Christ. We align ourselves, to some extent, with the aforementioned viewpoint, opposing the common rationalist one, in that the latter, even if it concedes to the person of Jesus the possession of extraordinary powers, e.g., magnetic healing powers, recognizes this possession as nothing more than an incidental, or at most, a providentially arranged supplement to his true gift, which is purely spiritual. Ordinary experience, from which this rationalism derives its conceptual system, does not recognize the notion of necessity that ties the physical miracle-giving to Jesus's spiritual gift, or more precisely expressed, perceives it as an indispensable, organically necessary aspect of this gift. The concept of this spiritual gift itself does not fall within the confines of that common empiricism which nationalism regards as the only real experience, and yet it feels compelled to question or dismiss many of the spiritual moments of Jesus's appearance if it wants to make sense of it. But this is precisely the point where the elasticity of our conceptual system must prove itself, enabling the formation of a concept that, although transcending the boundaries of ordinary experience, doesn't contradict the experience grasped in a spiritual and elevated sense but rather complements and fills it. The identity of the spiritual and the physical in essence or fundamental existence, the mutual relation of the spiritual to the physical and vice versa, their corresponding appearance — all of this is so much a factual experience, or rather a fact underlying all individual experiential facts, that even by simple analogy, a corresponding moment of physical existence would be demanded for such a prominent spiritual manifestation as that of Christ; a moment where even the

natural conditions of this appearance emerge, as if the roots penetrating the realm of nature, this fertile ground of all spiritual life. Every artistic talent has its external side in mechanical skill, in an organic disposition of physicality; such peculiar disposition is presumed in every other comprehensive or deeply impactful activity of the spirit. How could the most profound and influential revelation of the spirit, which has intervened in the overall configuration of historical life and transformed everything down to its physical foundations, not also — and above all others — have brought to appearance not just manifestations of uniquely physical organic forces (for this expression might only suggest an externality, a side-by-side of the physical and spiritual), but also the physical root of this spirit itself? It would have manifested in a manner that, if the manifestation of the spirit is the greatest of all wonders, also stands as miraculous in a sense that does not preclude analogy with other natural facts or the possibility of tying to such facts, but indeed excludes direct equality, community of kind or species with them — excluding in such a way that in this sense the gift of miracles, like the substance of the spirit which manifested through it, is indeed to be described as unique and unparalleled in its kind?

338

If the actual nature of these miracles is to be determined through historical criticism, one cannot start by examining individual accounts of the miracles. This is because to use them as historical material, they themselves require critical scrutiny, which presupposes a general, preliminary concept of the subject they discuss. Such a concept can be gained in no other way than by considering the presuppositions which, often unintentionally, shine through these reports. Elsewhere, we often find that authors correct the errors of their explicit narratives through statements hidden in their reports, which they reveal without their own knowledge. It seems plausible to suspect the same of the Gospel writers, especially given our view of their relationship to the events and the composition of their works. The less likely it seems, according to this view, that they would have received their material transformed by legend to such a point that the mythological element in their portrayal, similar to the accounts given by Greek poets and historians about the age of heroes, could have permeated every pore of the historical substance. Therefore, for now, we aim to gain a historical note on the gift of miracles only in this general way and will leave a closer examination of individual accounts of miracles to later books dedicated to the specific content of our sources. Similarly, we will only briefly mention some general aspects of Jesus's speaking and teaching here and plan to go through the details reported to us by our source authors in the following books.

339

Of all the moments in the Gospel narrative that can be used for the insight we seek, undoubtedly the most crucial are the traces pointing to a persistent habit of performing miracles of a particular kind, namely healing miracles. It cannot be assumed that the Evangelists intended to explicitly distinguish between these miracles and other kinds of miracles, those that were performed only individually, as something extraordinary, not intended for regular repetition. None of them unambiguously provides, in a way that a clear consciousness of the relationship he himself would have established would shine forth, the note that a continuously ongoing series of such miraculous acts was linked to the proclamation of the Gospel of the divine kingdom, which is presented everywhere as Jesus's primary mission, and thus compels us to view these kinds of miracles as an essential, integral moment of his professional activity. Nevertheless, when reading especially the Synoptic Gospels, one involuntarily gets the impression that this really was the case. Even if Mark and Luke do not, like the author of the first Gospel perhaps only due to a coincidental rearrangement does *), precede the report of a specific, individual miracle with the general observation that "Jesus traveled through all of Galilee, teaching in the synagogues, proclaiming the Gospel of the kingdom, and healing all kinds of diseases among the people, as the sick from all the surrounding areas in and outside of Galilee were brought to him and crowds of people gathered around him"; if, on the other hand, they only provide these and other similar remarks occasionally in the course of the narrative in a way that, if taken literally, could only refer to individual, shorter periods of Jesus's activity: an unbiased reader will not be misled by this about their true view.

*) Matt. 4:23 ff. This passage parallels Mark 3:7 ff. and, it seems, was only placed in the earlier context by the author of the first Gospel in order to provide the scenery consistent with Mark (v. 13) for the Sermon on the Mount, which the Evangelist might have been prompted to place at this point.

It is evident from the combination of these occasional notes, (which are all the more characteristic when they, as is sometimes the case, are phrased negatively, and in detail negate what, as is evident from them, is generally affirmed*) — with other related notes, particularly with what we also occasionally learn, without the intention of an explicit account that the Evangelists might have intended to give on this point, about Jesus's relationship to the people and the reputation he enjoyed among them, — that this manner of performing miracles was a continuous habit throughout his entire public career, and not merely, like those miracles that did not consist in healing diseases, an exception in individual cases.

*) E.g., Mark 6:5 and parallel passages.

This might seem to contradict the fact that we occasionally see Jesus explicitly trying to prevent the news of his miracle healings from spreading too widely. Not only does he repeatedly forbid the demons to address him with the Messiah's name (which might still allow another interpretation), but he also explicitly forbids a leper whom he has healed to speak of this healing, not to mention several similar cases involving the blind, the deaf-mute, etc. When the healed leper disregards this prohibition, the Evangelist adds — though the purpose is not entirely clear — that as a result of the revelation of his deed, Jesus could no longer publicly show himself in the city, but rather, people flocked to him from all sides into the open where he had retreated.

****)** Mark 1:45.

Nevertheless, despite all this, we cannot assume that Jesus's intention was to generally keep those seeking healing away from him; perhaps to preserve the freedom to only occasionally make use of his miraculous healing power in extraordinary cases. The account of miracle healings recurs too frequently in all the Gospels, in accordance with the saying that one should not hide one's light under a bushel but must let it shine before all people. The healings take place freely and openly before all the people, in the synagogue, on the street, or elsewhere in full view of the crowd. Furthermore, the success that Jesus found among the people of Galilee corresponds to the account of these deeds, so we cannot seriously assume that he had the will, or even the desire, to keep his miraculous power a secret; just as a naive, blaring proclamation of it was not to his liking. That he had to restrict the influx of the sick and those in need of healing is evident, given the relationship of this miraculous activity to the purely spiritual, the teaching activity, even if we did not want to view this power as naturally conditioned and limited, resisting unlimited application. Thus, also with all this in mind, given the assumption to which we are inevitably led when considering our sources impartially not just in individual passages, but in their entirety, that Christ saw the practice of the healing power inherent in his body as an essential part of his vocation*), there is nothing mysterious anymore about his actions in this regard.

*) See Jesus's awareness in John 9:4; especially the words he replies to the messengers of John: Matt. 11:5 and parallels, as well as those directed at Herod Antipas, Luke 13:32.

342

People from various perspectives have wanted to find an essential characteristic of Jesus's miraculous activity in the fact that all his miracles had a benevolent purpose. If one were to take the accounts of the Evangelists literally at all times, this claim could

not be found correct, strictly speaking, or, with a slightly looser interpretation, only in a very superficial sense. In fact, this is the sense in which it has been presented so far. People distinguished the gift itself from its application, and placed that purposeful relationship only in the latter, but not in the former. It is believed that Jesus applied his miraculous power, which he could have just as well used for entirely different purposes, primarily for the healing of diseases and physical ailments because he was conscious of doing the most good for suffering humanity; he resurrected the dead, less for their own sake, than for their grieving relatives, for whose pain he felt compassion; however, he did not disdain to turn a few jars of water into wine to delight a merry feast, or to feed a hungry crowd with a considerable quantity of miracle loaves. — From our point of view, given the narrower limits we assign to this gift, we can go a step further. Grasping the essence of this teleological relationship more deeply, we can already assert about the gift itself, in its natural determination, that it only allowed for a benevolent use, not just a showy one or a use that served only an external purpose, even if that purpose was the proof of the divine nature or mission of the miracle worker. However, we must not stop there. We should not be content with merely having described the miraculous equipment that Jesus received in connection with his higher calling, even with regard to his physical existence, as solely healing in nature, but we must delve deeper into the relationship of this gift to the entirety of the divine idea that was revealed in the personality of Christ, and the nature of the gift itself that arises from it.

343

The manner in which Jesus himself recognized his physical healing power to be conditioned by his spiritual gift and his spiritual vocation is most clearly expressed in the requirement he himself posed as an indispensable condition for its efficacy to the sick who wanted to be healed by him: the demand for faith in him and in the healing power as such. The two aspects we mentioned side by side here are indisputably inseparable, even though in the passages of the Gospels that mention this requirement, the emphasis is primarily on the latter, faith in Jesus's healing power as such *).

*) Mark 2:5, 5:34, 5:36, 6:5, 7:29, 9:23, 10:52 and parallels. Matthew 8:10 and parallels, 9:28. Luke 17:19. — To my knowledge, it has not yet been noted that the fourth Gospel makes no mention of this moral precondition for the success of the miraculous healings. According to the traditional view of this Gospel, one would be ready with the excuse that John believed he could omit the reason as it was sufficiently known. But what if it could be demonstrated that the evangelist had heard of Jesus's requirement but had misunderstood it in the strangest way? We intend to demonstrate this further below in the account of the centurion at Capernaum.

The case that some of the sick would have decided to believe only in Jesus's healing power, just as nowadays one might believe in the healing power of a magnetizer, as a physical phenomenon, without the high moral faith in the divine mission of the man, might not have occurred at all given the educational level of the people at that time; at least we find no mention of such cases in our sources. However, considering the moral significance Jesus attributed to faith elsewhere **), we have every reason to believe that he would not have recognized such faith as genuine faith.

**) Compare Matt. 17:20. Mark 11:23f and parallels.

We also have, in what transpired in Nazareth, where, as the evangelists report, he felt hindered from performing miraculous healings due to the disbelief of the people in his person and his higher calling, an example of how closely intertwined these two manifestations of faith in him must have been. — For the understanding of Christ's gift of miracles in general, this demand for faith offers a rich perspective, as we realize that in the same ratio in which the physical event of healing in those healed through this means stands to the moral element of faith, exactly the same ratio must exist in Christ himself between the physical healing power and the spiritual substance that made him the Savior of mankind. It is certainly incorrect, although some in recent times tend to lean this way, to interpret the significance of the element of faith in those miraculous healings in such a way that this element appears not only as the condition but as the sole effective force, making the influence Jesus directly has on the believers appear merely psychological. If this were the case, the physical presence of the Savior would not necessarily appear essential for the success of the healing; examples of healing performed by the power of faith, even in the absent or already departed, would need to be more frequent, more regular, and better attested than they are. However, even considering the immeasurable power of the impression that the personality of Jesus might have had from a purely psychological standpoint, one might not consider the element of his presence insignificant. On the other hand, it is indeed unclear why one would want to find a greater difficulty from a physical or physiological standpoint in the notion that, in Jesus's personality, the extraordinary, morally creative spiritual power was physically manifested in the ability of active transmission of physical health, than the fact that in those healed, the moral power of faith was capable, not actively in relation to others but receptively in relation to themselves, and is still capable in many similar, sufficiently attested cases. We would rather argue that this power of faith, as far as it exists, albeit conditionally, is only fully explainable under the assumption of a higher connection between physical and moral healing forces; as it then also refers to this higher connection in reality and is conditioned by it everywhere. Namely, if the spirit of those in need of healing, in order to find its moral health, requires an object from which

the moral creative power emanates that is supposed to restore its health through the mediation of its faith, the analogy between mental and physical states presupposed in this entire process justifies us in assuming a corresponding need for an object from which the healing power emanates, also for the physical process of healing. Indeed, we are all the more driven to this assumption, the more undoubted in the normal course of events, the powerlessness of ordinary spirits is evident, even after having attained moral recovery, to restore the health of the body, damaged either by their own fault or the fault of their lineage.

346

Based on the above, in the demand for faith that Jesus places on those seeking salvation, the consciousness is expressed that his healing power is fundamentally based on a moral foundation. It is not merely meant to serve externally as a symbol or parable of the cure from moral ailments, but by its very nature and concept, it is the consequence and necessary accompaniment of a moral healing power. This same consciousness can also be found expressed in the relationship in which Jesus, according to a characteristic narrative of the synoptic gospels bearing the stamp of historical authenticity *), seems to have occasionally linked the exercise of this power to a declaration of the forgiveness of sins.

*) Mark 2, 5 ff. and parallels.

Many interpreters have wanted to see in this merely a condescension to prevailing Jewish notions, according to which illnesses and physical ailments of all kinds were viewed not only generally as a consequence of the sinful nature of humanity but also specifically as punishment for particular sins committed by the individual. However, it is undoubtedly more accurate to assume that Jesus did not merely conform to these ideas externally, but rather adopted them, only in a higher sense than the majority of the scribes might have understood, making them his own. In accordance with this, the healing of illness indeed appeared dependent on the moral moment of conversion in the sick, which, when truly understood, coincides with the moment of faith in the Savior. — Admittedly, one cannot attribute to Jesus the narrow-minded casuistry that assumed it could always externally measure transgressions against sensual punishments for these transgressions. Against this view, which clearly contradicts everything we know about the lofty spiritual freedom of the divine Master, one can rightfully invoke passages such as those about the Galileans slain by Pilate *) and about the man born blind **).

*) Luke 13, 1 ff.

***) John 9, 1 ff.

For even if in these two instances Jesus does not directly contradict the traditional belief among the Jews, they both contain a treatment of this belief so free that only one who had transcended its immediate, materialistic form could provide. In one of them, we can even find an explicit indication of the crucial point at issue. Namely, if God, as assumed in that narrative by Luke, directly imposes a punishment on some of the guilty and reserves future punishment for others whose guilt is no lighter, it precisely means that no guilt remains unpunished, but we are mistaken to directly relate the evils apparent to our immediate perception to the sins that caused them, such that the magnitude of the sin itself could be estimated by them. Accordingly, the forgiveness of sins pronounced by Jesus in certain cases of healing should not be taken as referring to specific sins that might have caused these particular illnesses. It is a narrow interpretation, into which modern interpretative art has strayed, to assume that Jesus, for example, with the healing of diseases caused by excesses, considered these excesses as atoned for, and that when he warns against relapse into sin ***) , he explicitly wants to warn against such offenses which could lead to the same disease again.

****) John 5, 14; a passage that indeed seems to presuppose that narrow-minded Jewish view, but surely only due to the evangelist's fault.

The meaning is rather, as the words themselves indicate *) , essentially this: that Jesus declares faith in Himself and His holy word to be the moment in which the sick person, if he remains true to it, already possesses the forgiveness of his sins and through which, as a seal of this forgiveness - but this only as a voluntary addition by the special, explicit grace of the Savior - he is also enabled to gain liberation from his illness, regardless of the closer or more distant connection of this illness with the sins he committed.

*) ἀφεωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου [your sins are forgiven] Mark 2, 5; words that apparently refer more to the sins of the individual in question in general, rather than certain specific sins, and seem to speak of sins already forgiven rather than sins to be forgiven.

Just as the susceptibility to illness of human nature in general is conditioned by the moral frailty of this nature, the act of healing in itself already has a moral significance, the significance of restoring the physical nature of man to the state which it forfeited through sin. The consciousness of this meaning, and thus at the same time the consciousness of the manner in which his personal calling to become a liberator of humans from their guilt of sin was expressed in the physical healing power granted to him: this double consciousness is what Jesus conveys in those words spoken to the

paralytic; words that he could, however, as should not be overlooked, only say to one who, through his faith in him, proved himself worthy of such forgiveness or, more precisely, had already shown himself to have partaken of it.

348

As much as we now recognize the miraculous gift of Jesus, that is, as we understand it, his physical healing power, both in terms of its existence as an inherent trait in his personality, and in terms of its manifestation and effectiveness in individual cases, as rooted in the moral and spiritual aspect of his existence and work: we must not forget that it truly had an external existence in him as a physical attribute, one which is still distinct from the power of the spirit and the will as such. In order to find its existence possible, or at least to make the reports about it accessible to scientific judgment, some believed they had to look for analogies in the rest of nature, as presented to our scientific research. Such an endeavor is not to be blamed; but it should not go so far as to set the goal of research to categorize Jesus' miraculous gift as a single instance of a type or category of similar gifts that also appear in other instances, perhaps only quantitatively different, at all times and even now. Such a turn has often been taken by the otherwise not to be rejected idea that this miraculous power, just like the similar ones reported in the Bible of both the Old and New Testaments about prophets, apostles, and others equipped by divine providence, may be related to the phenomena displayed by animal magnetism in our times and, undoubtedly, in earlier ones. — The main point of comparison here is that in the majority of cases described to us in detail by the evangelists, and, according to some occasional hints, probably in the bulk of the others, either actual physical touch or some other organic intervention that takes the place of such touch seems to have served as a means for transmitting the healing power. A kind of magnetic sleep can also be found hinted at in at least one case, specifically where Jesus heals a possessed boy through a magical incantation *).

*) Mark 9:26. Perhaps also Mark 7:30.

The truth of this analogy will not be denied by anyone who, with an impartial gaze, considers the gospel miracle stories and does not deliberately close himself off to experiences from the realm of animal magnetism. However, if one clings too narrowly to this analogy and tries to apply the data on the effects of magnetic forces, which are currently directly accessible to us, as a standard or universally valid measure to those stories, one is likely to gain an overly limited concept from the latter and will be tempted to expand the elements of fable or myth in the gospel reports more than is justified. For even assuming — an assumption we are willing to grant — the identity of the physical foundation of these mutual appearances in general: it is in the nature of things that they

must bear an essentially different character where they, as we must assume with Jesus and in a similar but lesser manner in some other biblical accounts, are the necessary expression of a morally and spiritually defined talent, compared to when they appear, as far as we know, sporadically in our time as a trait accidentally found in certain individuals. As permissible, even commendable, as it is to use the occurrence of magnetic forces as a purely physiological fact as a starting point for understanding those historical facts that belong to a higher realm; a skewed result arises if, forgetting the demand for elasticity of all concepts derived from experience, one wants to reduce those extraordinary facts narrated by history to the level of common experience. One should not object that here, since or insofar as it concerns a physical phenomenon, the alternative can only be framed in such a way that either those historical facts are placed under universally valid type and category concepts or are recognized as deviating from all regularity; for this is the character of physical regularity, to be valid in the same way at all times, irrespective of the changes of time. Indeed, we find that where physical regularity comes into direct contact with the regularity of mental life, it also gains a part of the elasticity and mobility of the latter. Even in artistic talents, which also have a side where they can be viewed as natural phenomena and fall under the concept of physical regularity, we have an example of how dispositions, organic predispositions, which nevertheless also classify themselves under the regularity of organic life where they appear, do not occur in the same form or under the same intellectual and moral conditions at all times or among all peoples, but are more or less closely linked to the higher stages of intellectual consciousness and intellectual creativity, and change the external form of their appearance according to these historically varying relationships. The assumption that healing and, as we can preliminarily add here, prophetic powers, related to those known to us from our own immediate perception and experience and based on the same ground of the regularity of organic life, had to serve during that time of profound moral upheaval, that religious transformation and rebirth of the human race, which must also stir up and shake all depths of natural life serving as a base for spiritual and moral life, in a manner and under circumstances different from any other time, at least not in our own, as the physical medium or organ for the mental processes, and for this purpose had to be linked to the individuals called to accomplish these processes in the form of extraordinary talents, gifts, or abilities — this assumption, to which we find ourselves irresistibly driven when impartially considering the historical documents, can have nothing more difficult or strange for the discerning researcher than the frequently recurring phenomenon in history that certain mechanical skills at individual moments or periods of world history gain a significance as organs of the spirit, as equipment of individuals called for the sensual revelation of the highest mental life, of the most intensive spiritual creative activity, which otherwise remains foreign to them, and also show a completely transformed appearance in their phenomenon. If we were to say that Jesus' miraculous gift relates to the natural healing power of a mesmerist somewhat as

the artistic genius of Mozart relates to the — still innate, not acquired by painstaking practice — talent of an ordinary virtuoso, we would neither feel that we are coming too close to the divine dignity of the Savior of humanity nor believe that we are drawing down phenomena, which, because they are extraordinary, therefore cannot escape all lawful order of nature and history, to the level of the ordinary and everyday.

352

Among the various types of magical healings reported to us about Jesus, those involving the so-called demoniacs are undoubtedly where the moral significance of this gift imposes itself most irresistibly, but also in the most puzzling manner. The synoptic evangelists, with Mark at the forefront (from whom, with the exception of perhaps two or three cases *), the others are entirely dependent on all mentions of such illnesses and their healing (as is well known, these mentions are entirely absent in the fourth Gospel, which we believe is due to unfamiliarity, not any particular intent), describe such patients as a very common occurrence in those days. Their healing, or according to the conception of that time, the expulsion of evil spirits from the sick, is described as one of Jesus' main tasks, especially, or at least it might seem so, at the beginning of his career **).

*) Matt. 12, 22, with which I consider the mention of the demonically deaf-mute in Cap. 9, 32 to be identical, Luke 8, 2 and perhaps Luke 13, 11. — Even in the words unique to Matthew and Luke, which Jesus speaks to John's envoys (Matt. 11, 5 and parallel), there is no mention of the demoniacs, probably because of the Old Testament reference in this passage.

**) Mark 1, 34. 39. 3, 11 and parallels.

Three such cases are narrated in detail *), with circumstances that indeed go far beyond anything that modern medical experience has credibly reported about magnetic cures.

*) Mark 1, 23 ff. 5, 1 ff. 9, 14 ff. and parallels.

By simply speaking to them in the simplest words, which the evangelist expressly communicates, Christ is said to have driven out of the sick the unclean spirits that possessed them, according to the popular belief that was so widespread at that time, not only among the Jews, and to have brought about their recovery, not without a violent convulsive shock, but without any lasting harm to those who were thus healed. In one of these cases the miraculousness of the event is increased for us by the addition of a circumstance which seems to have been regarded by contemporaries as a kind of

explanation of it, namely, that the exorcised demons drove into a herd of pigs grazing in the vicinity, plunged them into the lake and drowned them. - Since we do not have the direct report of an eye-witness of any of these cases - and what we say of these also applies in the main to the other evangelical detailed accounts of healing miracles in general - or rather, what matters here even more than eye-witnessing, the report of a scientifically educated observer or researcher: it is not possible to determine exactly how much of the circumstances that would be essential to explain the whole are missing from the account of the evangelists, or how much, without any intention of deception, and in the most sincere faith, may have been painted in the miraculous. With confidence, however, we dare to say that all of them are neither myths in the true sense of the word, nor misunderstandings of the kind that we will find in miracle narratives of a different kind in all four Gospels, such as have arisen from apothegms or parables from the mouth of Jesus, which have been mistaken for factual events. Thus we must judge, not only from the negative point of view, because we have not succeeded in discovering either the mythical character or the trace of a parable in them, but also from the positive point of view, because they bear the mark of history in two respects. On the one hand, they bear the mark of history through the individuality and idiosyncrasy with which they show Jesus acting and speaking in accordance with the rest of his character known to us; on the other hand, through the points of reference which can be found for their content in other historically authenticated phenomena of a similar kind from the same or sufficiently close times. Like that kind of disease which is attributed to demon possession. (We must leave it to medical historians to discover the common symptoms which gave rise to this view) - must have occurred more frequently at that time than they do now, now and then perhaps even in an epidemic manner: so we also find too many traces of a healing of the same by magnetic means or by magical discussion, and too strikingly related to the contents of the biblical narratives *), for us to consider it admissible to deny the existence of a general historical basis for the latter, even if we find such a basis in that which the Bible Old and New Testaments contain, even if we had misgivings about finding such a basis in what the Bible of the Old and New Testaments also reports of morbid conditions and their healing from both religious and after-religious sources (one thinks, as far as the latter is concerned, of the Simon Magus of the Acts of the Apostles, whose magical arts may well also have consisted in exorcising demons).

*) We recall here only the well-known account in Lucian (Philopseud. 16) of a Jewish demon summoner.

Here, too, we must decisively declare ourselves against considering Jesus' method to be purely psychological, no less than, on the other hand, against presupposing a rational, scientific method of healing and the use of externally tested means. However, in all or most of these diseases, the life of the soul was also involved, and like the disease, the cure also had to be of a spiritual nature, an activity which proceeded from the spirit and in the sick person seized the soul no less than the body and shook it beneficially. This explains the preferred direction of the Lord's miraculous activity towards the healing of precisely this type of sick person, and that in the reports of the evangelists it is precisely the cases of such healings that are obviously mentioned or portrayed with particular emphasis above all others. But even less than in other cases of illness, where the personal faith of the sick person comes between the physical conditions of the sick person and the working spirit of the Saviour, would a purely intellectual or purely ethical efficacy be explained here, where through the disturbance of the soul the sick spirit is all the more distant from the influence of a foreign spirit. Even if we consider, as not only those detailed narratives of the evangelists do, but also, in a similar way, other mentions, e.g. of Solomon's incantations, etc., of which the exorcists availed themselves, we may still conclude that there is a purely intellectual or purely ethical efficacy. Even then we would still have to insist on the existence of a magnetic force, which even in this form worked physically, and in no way could we admit the pure, i.e. the completely bodiless, spirituality of the effect. -- A further discussion of this question, however, would hardly be in its place in the present context, since such a discussion would have to return essentially to the general scientific conception of the relation of spirit and body, and would have to work against the errors rooted in the natural scientific and speculative spheres concerning the opposition of the spiritual substance to the corporeal. That our present remarks cannot be intended to deny the difference between the powers through which Jesus worked and those through which those exorcists who made a business of driving away dark powers and healing those who were shattered in body and soul worked, or to reduce it to an indifferent one, will be easily gathered from what we have said before. Both kinds of powers are related to each other, - also admitted is the real ability of those demon summoners to perform in detail, as Christ himself admitted it to them *), - as, according to our above remark, the miraculous power of Jesus in general is related to the sporadic occurrence of magnetic powers; to which kind of powers the ones exercised by them are indisputably to be added.

*Marc. 9, 38 f. and parall.

If the Pharisees wanted to ascribe the demon-driving power of Christ to the chief of the demons, this already implies the recognition of something extraordinary and far beyond anything that even the experience of that time knew of similar effects. But the answer

which Jesus gives them in Matthew to these accusations **) indicates how the Lord, notwithstanding the consciousness he had of the difference between his work and that of the Pharisaic exorcists, nevertheless had no hesitation in placing both activities under one and the same category.

****Matth. 12, 27 f.**

356

The business of exorcism is also associated with the Messiah's calling in a peculiar and enigmatic way, through the information, which we glean not only from individual accounts but also expressed as a general remark ***), that the demons knew Jesus as the Messiah. As he approached those possessed by them, they would, in painful fear, address him as such from the mouths of the possessed.

*****) Mark 1:34 and parallels 3:11.**

At first glance, for a contemporary interpreter, the temptation arises to suspect a legendary embellishment of the story. For nothing seems more bizarre and strange to our conceptions than such knowledge among the mad and insane, or even among the spirits supposedly speaking from them, about a fact that Jesus himself either deliberately concealed at that time or at least did not explicitly proclaim. And nothing could seem more plausible than, as some recently have interpreted *), the assumption of a popular glorification of the Messiah in the fiction of his acknowledgment by those very demons, whose realm he had come to destroy.

***) Compare Strauß L. I. II. p. 23 f.**

However, precisely here the "mythical view" lacks the point of reference it usually has at hand in similar cases, namely the assumption of an Old Testament memory or allusion that could have given rise to that legend. This becomes particularly striking when considering the synoptic parallel passages in which that note is given. In Mark and Luke, it is amidst a general mention of all kinds of sick people brought to Jesus for healing that they, mentioning the demonic as well, provide the note about their familiarity with Jesus' Messianic dignity. We find this note omitted in the first gospel, apparently because the author wanted to give more weight to the general mention by citing a Messianic prophecy that, as he understands it, says of the "Servant of Jehovah" that he will take away our infirmities and bear our diseases **), — a passage that certainly did not have any explicit reference to that peculiar fact.

****)** Matthew 6:17, after Isa. 53:4.

Another circumstance that doesn't support the assumption of a mythical origin of this detail is that everywhere with it, Jesus' reluctance to accept or allow the homage of these impure voices is also mentioned. "He did not permit the demons to speak," it says explicitly, "because they knew him as the Messiah" ***).

*****)** Mark 1:34.

In the interest of a legend wanting to glorify Christ through such demonic acknowledgments, such an addition would hardly make sense. Moreover, the repeated mention of this fact bears such a mark of spontaneity and simplicity and aligns so naturally with other related traits of the narrative that, despite all the enigma of the actual context, we would find it hard to withhold our belief. We are instead compelled to recognize here as a factual matter a mysterious relationship through which the higher, ethical-physical power with which Jesus was equipped, against its own will, revealed itself to the magnetically agitated states of these unfortunate individuals. Not that we believe the words that the evangelist puts in the mouths of the possessed in the synagogue in Capernaum and in the land of the Gadarenes were literally spoken by them. However, we believe that the words they might have uttered in the convulsive motion induced by Jesus' proximity must have given listeners an impression from which the evangelist, without intention of deceit and without any significant misunderstanding on his part, could form his account.

358

That it doesn't require the assumption that these were personal beings speaking from the bodies they possessed is probably needless to say. As long as it cannot be proven (which is admittedly not the case) that among the Israelites of that time in general, and among the evangelists in particular, the Greek interpretation of the concept of demonic possession, which made these so-called demons the spirits of deceased people, was widespread — an interpretation also mentioned by Josephus — one can interpret the way of speaking, which seems to presuppose the personality of these impure spirits, as being more figurative than literal. Especially with Jesus, it won't be his own entrapment in that superstition — for which we consider him free until proven otherwise more convincingly than what has recently been presented in his favor — nor a literal indulgence in foreign superstition, but merely the use of this traditional way of expression and speech that gives his expressions, at least in the accounts of the evangelists (which are not to be taken literally), the appearance of endorsing or sharing this superstition. After all, we find a similar way of speaking among the evangelists even

in contexts where the idea of a truly personal indwelling of Satan, said to dominate or bind the sick *), or to enter an evil person **), is even less likely: where would the definite boundary be beyond which this way of speaking ceases to be figurative?

*) Luke 13, 11. 16. Acts 10, 38. Compare Acts 16, 16. 18.

**) John 13, 27. — Compare also Luke 4, 39, where fever is treated as an evil spirit.

— Just as there's no need to assume such personal indwelling, according to our explanation of that puzzling fact, there's also no need to assume, as some have occasionally done, a clairvoyant ability inherent in the possessed due to their condition, enabling them to recognize Jesus as the Messiah sooner than their healthy contemporaries, even sooner than the Lord's own disciples. Clearly, this demonic prophecy, just like the undeniably similar phenomenon of the prophetic maid in Philippi ***), pertains only to the moment of agitation by the presence and the immediate magical influence of the person the prophecies referred to.

***) Acts 16, 16 sq.

The assumption of an independent ability of clairvoyance, as well as the opposing assumption of an impression received earlier by those persons in a healthy state, only recalled to their memory by the presence of the Savior, - both carry, each in its own way, foreign features into the factual events reported to us, as unnecessarily as unjustifiably.

360

As previously discussed, the other healings of paralytics, lepers, the blind, deaf-mutes, etc., as narrated by the evangelists in their specific circumstances, exceed what is otherwise known about the effects of magnetic forces. This is primarily due to the rapidity and immediacy of the outcomes, but also because they involve diseases for which there are no reliably documented experiences of healing, be it through this or any other means. We must, of course, include these accounts in our general concession that the stories should not be assumed to be reported with diplomatic accuracy. Although we cannot attribute the entirety of these stories to gradual embellishment by legends, the nature of such recordings is to fixate eyewitness accounts into a definite form with clear and distinct outlines. Thus, certain features may be included more from a recollection of general events than from specific memories of the individual events themselves. This is especially the case if the narrator lacks the level of scholarly education that allows one to capture generalities in their inherent vagueness and

indistinctness. Involuntarily, this results in an amalgamation of Jesus' overall miraculous activities into individual incidents, which may gain a kind of typological significance as a representation of many similar events. This could lead to transferring attributes from one event to another, consequently heightening the miraculous nature of individual cases. For instance, it's conceivable that the general knowledge about Jesus' rapid healing powers might have led Mark to somewhat exaggerate the immediacy and completeness of the outcomes in some of his accounts. This alone could substantiate the probability that those events, in reality, differed significantly from the Gospel reports. As for the nature of the treated diseases, Mark and the other writers likely relied on vague memories rather than detailed investigations, sticking to the fluctuating and uncertain information remembered from Peter's accounts. Additionally, Old Testament prophecies *), which Jesus might have alluded to more in a figurative than a literal sense **), could have led the earliest disciples to confuse real-life diseases with those named by the prophets.

*) Isaiah 45, 5-6, mentioning the blind, deaf, mute, and lame.

**) Matthew 11, 5 and parallels.

Thus, the task of the scientific researcher into the Gospel history will be to extract from these individual stories – whose literal accuracy we shouldn't cling too rigorously to – a general picture of Christ's miraculous activities. This general picture, even if more accurate details are assumed, could only be considered historical because individual facts, in a stricter sense, don't even belong to history. The solution to this task will provide a result that stands out as a whole, just as the content of each narrative would stand out when compared to similar occurrences from other historical contexts. It's more appropriate to locate the miraculous in the general nature of Jesus' abilities and activities during his entire ministry rather than in the specifics of individual events.

362

That Jesus' method of healing typically consisted of an instantaneous effect on the physical state of the sick is evident, assuming the accuracy of our Gospel reports, from the fact that, with perhaps the exception of Magdalene (where Luke's note on her could suggest a prolonged or repeatedly applied procedure), we find no sick people in his immediate vicinity who remained under his treatment for an extended period. We also do not encounter any male patients who, after successful treatment, were mentioned as having stayed in his company as followers or disciples. For the women who joined his entourage, such a reason is indeed presumed *).

*) Luke 8, 2. The desire of the healed Gadarene (Mark 5,18) is declined by Jesus.

Indeed, it would be challenging to sketch a portrait of Jesus' activity in which a method of treatment more aligned with actual medical practice could find a place without compromising his higher, spiritual effectiveness. Jesus' position amongst his disciples and in relation to the people seems to require that the healings he performed had to be presented as instantaneous actions, devoid of laboriousness and deliberate intent. There's no mention of any healing attempt made by him failing, as the only passage that might suggest this *) can also be interpreted as him refraining from such attempts due to the unbelief of the inhabitants of Nazareth. Similarly, there's no hint of allegations by his opponents based on such failures. Therefore, we have every reason to assume both rapidity and certainty in the outcomes of his healing actions.

*) Mark 6, 5 and parallels.

The reference to Elijah and Elisha and the limited number of miracles they performed, which, according to Luke's report, Jesus mentioned on that occasion in Nazareth **), indeed points to a clear awareness of the boundaries set for his miraculous power, both in scope and nature.

**) Luke 4, 26 f.

This paves the way for an assumption, momentous as it is, which we scarcely hesitate to admit: that an instinct of genius, or, if one prefers a more fitting term, the divine spirit in Jesus almost always foresaw with full certainty the success or failure of an action, acting only when success was foreseen. His careful discretion, avoiding uncertain and potentially unsuccessful attempts, might be a primary reason for his concern to keep some of his most notable miraculous healings secret – a concern that would indeed seem strange if we assumed he had unlimited miraculous abilities. Nevertheless, when we read in various hints from Mark and the other Synoptic Gospels about the massive influx of sick people brought to him, or those who desired merely to touch him to be healed; when we learn that merely touching even the hem of his garment was successful in all (or perhaps many) cases *): we must guard against both excessive skepticism and gullible trust in these general accounts.

*) Mark 3, 10. 6, 56. Compare 5, 26 ff. and parallels. Luke 6, 19.

Given what we said earlier about the external reality and physicality of the gift of miracles, we should not hesitate to admit that, apart from the limited number of cases

Jesus deliberately chose for active intervention, a significant number of other sick people might have experienced the beneficial effects of his healing power through mere touch or physical proximity. With these types of effects, failure could not be seen as the failure of an action initiated by Jesus himself, and the immense trust that, according to the Gospel reports, seems to have been placed in his healing power from all sides, could not be diminished.

364

Among the most remarkable circumstances reported about Jesus' miraculous power is its communicability to other individuals. We find in the three Synoptic Gospels, with Mark once again leading the way, repeated stories of how Jesus granted the most distinguished of his disciples, the Twelve he chose, the authority (ἐξουσία) to heal illnesses and cast out demons **).

**) Mark 3:13 ff. 6:7 ff. and parallels.

If this account were isolated, it might appear more legendary than many others. However, it is supported by a significant number of related accounts, which presuppose and corroborate it, so we must regard it among the most authenticated in the gospel history. Not only that, according to the account of one of the evangelists ***), those sent out by Jesus alongside and after the apostles return with the joyous news that demons obey them. They then receive renewed assurance from the Lord that He grants them power over snakes, scorpions, and all the enemy's might. Furthermore, in the probable apocryphal addition to Mark, among the other gifts that the Risen One bestows on those he sends out to preach the gospel, the power to drive out demons in his name and heal the sick by laying on hands is expressly mentioned again *). Also, other testimonies in the Gospels **), Acts of the Apostles, and the New Testament letters regarding the miraculous gift passed onto several of the apostles and other community members are so numerous and significant that the fact of this transmission, as far as historical certainty is concerned, stands on par with the actuality of Christ's own gift of miracles.

***) Luke 10:17.

*) Mark 16:17 f.

**) Especially compare Mark 9:18 ff. and parallels, where the account of the disciples' inability, in a challenging case, to heal a possessed person without their master's assistance, strongly supports the assumption that they already had a genuine ability for such healings.

Acknowledging this fact, two extremes must be avoided: on one hand, an overly mechanical conception of this transmission's nature, either leaning towards a miracle in the negative sense of the word or a naturalistic interpretation of the event and the gift of miracles itself; on the other, the belief that no real transmission took place and that the gift, as seen in all who appeared to possess it and as with Christ himself, was innate. — This latter view could be easily suggested by a mention in a Pauline letter ***), where among the "spiritual gifts" (χαρίσματα) alongside faith, wisdom, knowledge, prophecy, and the ability to speak in tongues or interpret them, "miraculous powers" (ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων) are also mentioned, as well as healing and discernment of spirits (διακρίσεις πνευμάτων).

[Retracted in second volume:

S. 366 Z. 4 is to withdraw as erroneous the interpretation there attempted of the expression διακρίσεις πνευμάτων.]

This is discussed in a manner that, casual and unassuming as it is, speaks of these abilities as if they were common knowledge in the community of that time, suggesting they were natural talents distributed unevenly among the congregation's members.

***) 1 Cor. 12:9 f.

One can undoubtedly use these and similar passages, which deal with the miraculous gifts of the earliest Christian community, to contest the mechanical view of their transmission. Just as Paul himself there compares the members of the congregation with the limbs of an organic body and their various gifts with the functions of these limbs, not only does this comparison, but the entire character and context of that passage, compel us to view these phenomena as having roots that lie deeper and more intimately intertwined with the individuality of their bearers than they could be if they were acquired by an external communication, like a mechanical trick, or through study and practice, as a more superficial knowledge or skill.

It is therefore without doubt to be assumed that Jesus personally would only have given the commission to perform healings and cast out demons to those in whom he already recognized a natural predisposition for this task. Perhaps this fact itself could be cited as one of the motives, and not the least significant one, that may have guided Jesus in the selection of the twelve apostles. Indeed, we must assume a more widespread distribution of these predispositions at that time than occurs at other times; an assumption that aligns quite well with the world-historical significance that these gifts

had at that time, and is, in a way, even demanded by the concept of this significance. Yet, after all this, we would not go so far as to doubt the fact of the transmission, whether in that first and most important case or in many later ones, or to view the gospel words reporting the aforementioned case as merely a cloak for the reason we have indicated for the selection of the apostles.

It is understood from what has been said here that such transmission should not be understood so much as an actual communication or transfer, but rather as a stimulation or awakening of an otherwise dormant ability by a related, especially superior in scope and intensity, power. However, we are not aware that with magnetic forces in the true sense, a stimulation entirely or essentially corresponding to what is being discussed here would occur by something similar *).

*) As can be seen here, the stimulation of somnambulatory states by magnetic treatment cannot be spoken of as something analogous; something truly analogous would only be the transfer of active or dynamic forces from one individual to another.

Yet analogies for this can be found in certain phenomena of priestly antiquity, of the oracle and prophetic nature **), and the idea of an essential unity, a unity of the Spirit, as Apostle Paul expresses it, which should govern in all the diversity of gifts of grace, seems to necessitate that this spiritual unity could also be presented externally, through an externally recognizable connection.

**) Regarding the element of the miraculous in Hebrew prophecy (in which, by the way, manifestations of healing power did not, as with Jesus and the apostles, form the main aspect, but rather clairvoyance and prophecy), we refer, in contrast to the extreme skepticism of Strauss, to the remarks in a book that certainly cannot be accused of too great an inclination towards belief or superstition, namely in Vatke's biblical theology, I, p. 416 ff.

— Indeed, on the occasion of a foreign exorcist, whom the disciples wanted to prevent because he, without belonging to them, invoked Jesus' name in his work, we hear the explicit words from Jesus that he wanted to regard everyone who is not against him as being with him *).

*) Mark. 9:38 ff. and parallels.

However, these words, like many similar ones, only attest to the liberality of the Savior regarding individual expressions of the Spirit, which he once and for all did not want to

bind to a narrow formula; but not that he would have deemed an explicit bond that should hold his own together, or an expressly continuous effect coming from him, as superfluous. In the apostolic church, according to some indications especially in the Acts of the Apostles **), it seems that it was baptism, by which, in a manner we scientifically cannot fully account for, but which we hardly doubt had a mysterious natural power at work, that awakened the dormant forces in individual individuals for the service of the divine kingdom.

**) Acts 8:39. 19:2 ff.

Later, the institution of ordination, which in earlier times was known to coincide with the sacrament of baptism, had a similar meaning, and, at least for a while, a similar purpose. — Moreover, in the account of the healings performed by the apostles during Jesus' lifetime, we find explicit mention of an external means, probably only used to guide the living healing power, namely oil ***); likewise, we find from Jesus the explicit recommendation of prayer and fasting, as a necessary practice to strengthen the healing power †).

***) Mark. 6:13. Compare the very similar use of oil in the apostolic church: James 5:14.

†) Mark. 9:29 and parallels.

368

As a general note about this aspect of Jesus' gift and activity, which we believed we had to consider before his spiritual being and doing, as the real, physical foundation. If, as some accounts from our sources and indeed the analogies of similar gifts from earlier and more recent times suggest, Jesus' miraculous gift may have also manifested itself in other ways, e.g., through miraculous visions into the future or into the hidden interior of the surrounding nature and human world, corresponding to magnetic clairvoyance: such expressions, since they do not have a closer motivated significance in the totality of his life's work, cannot be the subject of a general contemplation. — Even less, or rather only in a negative sense, can this be applied to the other miracles reported in our Gospels, those which cannot be traced back to the concept of a peculiar organic gift, but whose concept (if it is indeed permitted to use the word "concept" for something whose very nature would be to be utterly inconceivable) would be purely negative, transcending the usual course of nature, breaking the laws of this natural course. How these alleged miracles lack the conceptual foundation, the conceptual connection that we believe we have identified in what has been discussed so far; how one would have

to renounce all true conceptual understanding of the natural world order to consider them factual: they also lack - a fact which should be considered, although it is often overlooked recklessly - all those historical contexts both within and outside the evangelical history, by whose support the genuine miracles have presented themselves to us as so well authenticated. We believe we have shown how they are indispensable for understanding the appearance of Jesus in its historical relations as a whole, especially his position in relation to the people among whom he worked and taught, namely as it is described to us in the synoptic Gospels; of the latter, we can rightly say that they contribute nothing to this historical understanding, that they rather make it, just like the conceptual understanding, impossible. It is noteworthy that the same documents which give us such an accurate and satisfying account of the effects which Jesus' healing miracles had on the people, and of Jesus' position in relation to the people as it was shaped as a result of those acts, provide an inwardly true, consistent image, are completely silent about the effects of the other supposed miracles - we will call them, for distinction from the genuine ones, not miracles but marvels - and rather only report things that are in direct contradiction to the factual presupposition of these marvels. The most striking of the marvels told by the Synoptics, which as an actual fact among the people would have had to cause the greatest sensation, is undoubtedly the double feeding of a crowd of first five thousand and then four thousand people with a small number of loaves and fish. Note how the same reporters, who rarely fail to add a few words about the astonishment of the crowd, about the spreading of the rumor of the act, and about what else is attached to it after recounting a successfully performed healing or exorcism, just end those two stories with a dry note about the number of the fed crowd, without mentioning the effect on those masses, which we have to assume at no other occasion as numerous as here, even in one word *).

*) Mark 6:44, 8:9 and parallels.

They even tell immediately after the second of these events of a demand made by the Pharisees on Jesus: that he should authenticate himself before them with a sign from heaven; to which Jesus responds that no sign shall be given to this generation. To avoid the evident contradiction therein, some have resorted to emphasizing the specific nature of the requested sign, arguing that it had become popular belief through the prophets that the coming Messiah would be authenticated by signs from heaven. However, apart from the fact that this demand could hardly have been aimed at the Messiah as such, since Jesus did not publicly declare himself as such, any discerning researcher will grant us the suspicion raised by the fact that this demand for a miracle is recounted so dryly, without any consideration of the incredible event just described, and without any indication of why they did not want to recognize this event as fully valid, as if Jesus had truly not yet authenticated himself with any sign of any kind. — In the fourth Gospel, we

do find both the gap we had to observe in the others filled, as after the feeding of the five thousand it is recounted how the people "recognized Jesus as the true prophet and wanted to make him king" *), as well as repeated mentions of the impression Jesus made through his marvels, by which he seemed to somewhat compensate for the negative impression his teaching made on the majority of the people.

*) John 6:14 f.

However, we have already had several opportunities to notice the problems that this overall view of this Gospel entails, which, despite the greater emphasis it places on the "signs and wonders" (σημεία και τέρατα) compared to the Synoptics, still fails to avoid contradictions in its depiction of the people's sentiment towards Jesus that are quite similar to the ones we just criticized in the Synoptics. Here, we find not only, like there, shortly after the incident with the miracle loaves, but undoubtedly even more strikingly, in the middle of a conversation explicitly prompted by this event, a question about a verifying sign, even with a reference to the manna in the desert **).

**) Ibid. v. 30 f.

In short, in this Gospel just as in the others, the actual marvels are entirely isolated and are, once they have happened, as good as never mentioned in the further course of events, while on the other hand, concerning the miracle healings and their general success, the accounts this Gospel provides are far behind in clarity, vividness, and internal coherence compared to what the others provide.

372

So, while in relation to the genuine miracles the individual accounts of the evangelists are largely in harmony with the assumptions underlying their overall portrayal, some of which they might not have been consciously aware of, there exists a significant, indeed, in truth, an irreconcilable difference when it comes to the miraculous deeds. The individual accounts proceed from the belief, shared by the evangelists with subsequent dogmatic interpretations, that Jesus' miraculous power was completely limitless and that the concept of a miraculous gift surpassed all human comprehension. Without being overly fascinated by the miraculous, and without actively seeking out miracle stories like the apocryphal accounts do, the evangelists are always ready to accept the miraculous in Jesus' life story as self-evident. They assume the factual truth of anything presented to them as miraculous without questioning whether perhaps earlier narrators might have presented it with a different intention than to relay factual events. We will show later how, given this mindset of the evangelical writers, the origin of all accounts of genuine

miracles can be most simply and naturally explained as mere misunderstandings of a parabolic statement or similar anecdotes passed on orally to the evangelists. We do not need to invoke the constructive activity of mythological fiction in this explanation. Contrasting this, we find in those same writers — at least in the synoptic gospels — an overall view of the gospel's narrative that presupposes the content of those accounts as not having actually occurred. They base their accounts on a causal progression of the gospel's events into which those events could only have been disruptive. In a similar way, some of our evangelists recount the virgin conception of Christ and His birth in Bethlehem following the myth, but later, without being disturbed by the memory of what they themselves reported, speak of Jesus as the Nazarene, as the son of Joseph. In a very similar fashion, while all the evangelists can recount individual actions that go beyond the realm of the natural, they nonetheless take no issue with integrating the rest of the Lord's life into the general law of all things and the natural order, especially making Him acknowledge this subordination to the laws of nature and strongly oppose the Jewish demands for miracles. The previously mentioned statement, which is reported to us by the evangelists in two *) mutually independent forms and is thus all the better authenticated, undoubtedly refers to the actual miracles. Jesus thus rejects them as clearly and decisively as, on the other hand, he repeatedly describes the magnetic or healing miracles as essential to his mission and as confirming his divine mandate.

*) Matt. 12:38. Mark 8:10 ff. and parallels.

373

In the above, we began with the assumption that Jesus' consciousness of His divine calling, that consciousness which we must necessarily think preceded His public appearance as teacher and prophet, may have been partly kindled by the consciousness and the inner, and perhaps already externally tested, experience of the miraculous gift granted to Him. Only through this assumption is this gift rightly related to the very essence and concept of the Messianic calling, while, if one were to think of the consciousness of this calling as preceding that experience, then the miraculous power would merely be relegated to the status of an external, indifferent addition to the spiritual substance of this calling. — The consciousness of the miraculous gift had to especially serve to mediate, for Jesus Himself, the continuity of His Messianic self-awareness with the ideas and proclamations that the Old Testament and the Jewish popular belief provided about the expected Messiah. Not that a miraculous power, exactly in the form possessed by Jesus, was predestined for the Messiah in this popular belief, and that Jesus could have recognized Himself by it as an external sign of the one

who was to come. Wanting to hold such an externally mechanical view of the economy of the divine kingdom would be blasphemy. Even recently, the "mythical view" of the evangelical story hasn't even successfully attempted to trace or derive the notions underlying our evangelists' accounts everywhere to Old Testament prototypes or prophecies as they claimed. Even less so could this be done with the true, historical form of the miraculous gift, since, demonstrably, in this the main focus, indeed almost the only essential one, is that side which in the legendary stories of prophets of ancient times has only very incomplete prototypes and in the prophecies largely remains in the background, only occasionally emerging in hints that are more figurative than literal. That Jesus could recognize His miraculous power as the miraculous power expected of the Messiah: this itself remains, despite all connections that one might historically trace between the two, always a spiritual miracle, higher and greater than the physical miraculous gift itself. The God-human self-awareness arising from the consciousness of the physical miraculous gift, looking back comparatively at the Messianic prophecies, which expresses itself in the name "Son of Man" adopted by Jesus, is and remains after all this a creative primal act, the most powerful flash of spirit that ever illuminated an individual of the human race.

375

But when it comes to Jesus' own self-awareness and the tangible or foundational side of his calling, we must grant it some priority over the ideal and spiritual side. However, when considering his outward appearances, we have ample historical and philosophical reason to assume a reversed relationship between these two aspects. Here, the concept of the Messianic calling and the purpose of Jesus' appearance and activity demanded that the tangible side seemed more conditioned by the ideal side, rather than the other way around. In this regard, we cannot help but commend Mark for speaking of Jesus' teachings and the proclamation of the gospel before mentioning his miracles, and for attributing the great attention Jesus received initially solely to his teachings without mentioning the miracles *).

*) Mark 1:22.

In this sensible arrangement, the main emphasis of the author of the first Gospel is followed, and Luke still primarily mentions the teaching **), even though he oddly speaks of the fame Jesus gained before any of his actions or speeches.

**) Luke 4:15.

Only the author of the fourth Gospel speaks of miracles before mentioning any teaching activity. Even the recruitment of disciples, which he places before the miracle by which Jesus began his Galilean ministry at the wedding in Cana ***) , is not influenced by the charm of his teachings, but partly by John the Baptist's praises and partly by the astonishment that Jesus incites in these neophytes with samples of his miraculous knowledge.

**) John 2:11.

But even this evangelist probably doesn't act this way intentionally but due to a lack of a well-considered overview of his subject when planning his work. — We obviously can't discuss individual healings that Jesus must have performed earlier in smaller circles; otherwise, he wouldn't have gained that consciousness which we assume in him. For his public ministry as such, the right perspective would clearly be distorted if one were to assume that he first amazed the crowd with miraculous deeds and then demanded faith for his teachings, since we know that he instead demanded faith in himself as a necessary condition for the success of the miraculous healings. — The opportunity given to him by Jewish religious practice to begin his popular teaching was his appearance on the Sabbath in the synagogues to read and explain a scripture passage, which was liberally allowed for anyone who felt called to it. Repeated mentions of this kind of teaching in all four Gospels *) leave no doubt that Jesus initially appeared in this form and later returned to it, even when accustomed to masses gathering around him outside or at home, as it was the most convenient way to find an attentive and devout audience.

*) Mark 1:21, 39, 3:1, 6:2 and parallels. Matthew 4:23, Luke 4:15f, 13:10. The fourth Gospel only mentions retrospectively, after having already reported it, that a speech was given in the synagogue in Capernaum. John 6:59.

Specifically, in the synagogue in Capernaum, Mark lets Jesus perform the first among the miracles he reports, the healing of a demon-possessed man, but without noting that it was his very first miracle, unlike the fourth evangelist who labels the water-into-wine miracle at Cana as the "beginning of signs." Indeed, we must admit that we couldn't find a better fitting start for the latter in line with our overall concept of the mutual relationship between teaching and miraculous activity. It is certainly also characteristic in the sense we have indicated when we see the evangelist include the performed miracle under the concept of teaching at that very place *).

*) τίς ἡ διδάχη ἡ καινὴ αὕτη [= "What is this new teaching?"] ask those assembled in the synagogue upon witnessing the authority Jesus has over demons. Mark 1:27.

377

Regarding the content of Christ's teaching, it is not our intention in this section to delve deeper. Only a preliminary question concerning this teaching belongs to this general historical observation; however, even this only in a brief hint, since the actual proof we intend to give for our answer to it cannot be separated from the special treatment of the speeches and sayings of Christ, on which it is based. We are referring to the question of the relationship of this teaching to the morals and civil law of the Jews, especially to the Mosaic legislation: whether Jesus believed he was teaching in accordance with it, or whether he was aware of a contradiction to it; whether he sought to explain and complete it, or to transform it and surpass it. — It cannot be hidden from anyone that this question belongs to the vital questions concerning our concept of divine revelation in Christ. If Christ was indeed, as has been suggested recently, after earlier doubts in this direction were believed to have been adequately answered, and skeptical criticism now seems to be leaning in that direction again, if he was so entangled in the prejudices of his people and in the education he received, that he did not dare to grasp the idea of breaking through or abolishing the Mosaic law, and that he included its literal validity for all times, or at least until the time of his eventual return as a judge of the world, in his teaching and let it stand as a necessary precondition; in short, if the abolition of the law, which was carried out by Christianity immediately after Christ, was not intended and planned by Christ himself, but a work initiated by his followers on the spur of the moment due to the circumstances: then there can be no talk of an infallibility or of a mental grandeur of Jesus surpassing all other human beings. Jesus would then be a prophet and religious teacher, like many others, and only chance has made him the center of world history as the Son of God and Savior of mankind. — At this point, we content ourselves with briefly opposing this mistaken view with the correct one, the one that we will find confirmed by a closer examination of Jesus' individual sayings in the following books and by the overall impression we gain from them all. Indeed, Jesus did not explicitly declare the invalidity of the Mosaic regulations, be it as a whole or in detail. His work was not to dissolve or destroy, but to fulfill, that is, to realize the sense, the idea he recognized as hidden in the old law, to execute the purpose he found aimed for there but not fully achieved. However, such execution was impossible without the overthrow of the external, immediate form of the law, and to deny Jesus the consciousness of this impossibility, to deny it because he did not pronounce it in clear, explicit words, is thoroughly unhistorical. He did not express it in this unambiguous way - he hinted at it for those who could grasp it, both in word and deed, in many ways -

because the abolition of the old could and should only occur as a result of the new creation; yet this creation itself was founded by him only in idea, not in external existence. Until the new creation also emerged into external existence, not only could but also should the old persist, precisely because the new was not simply something different from the old, or in contradiction to the old, but the old in its inner tendency was already the new. However, how decisively Jesus in his own, personal action emancipated himself from the letter of the law, how freely the shape of his life — the ideal model of the church he wanted to found — stands free from all relations of sacrifice and temple cult and the entire Israelite ceremonial service: we have already proven this above, and Jesus himself has clearly expressed his consciousness about all this in the great words that the Son of Man is also Lord of the Sabbath, and that his presence is greater than the temple. But louder than perhaps any other of the words he spoke or actions he took testifies to the lofty freedom with which he hovered above the law, in which people think he sang, that very word itself, with which they want to prove that alleged entanglement *).

*) Matt. 5, 17 f.

How could Jesus, assuming he did not intend to say something in vain, how could he himself say, with such powerful, full-throated emphasis: that he did not come to abolish the law; how could he affirm the law with the same weighty emphasis if he did not possess the consciousness of being the one from whom the law, insofar as it is meant to continue to apply, will derive its validity? Without this awareness, it would never have occurred to him that any of his disciples might think that the law was abolished through him; but this very consciousness in and of itself already signifies the abolition of the authority by which the law had previously stood, hence the abolition of the law itself, insofar as it is not expressly reinstated by Christ. But this very reinstatement, far from being a literal one, is made clear by nothing else than by the fact that it is designated with such emphatic tone as a literal one at that very place. For by placing his assurance of the ongoing validity of the law on such a literalness of it – which is inherently, by the nature of the matter, unfulfillable – he thereby indicates that he does not at all mean literalness in the external sense, but rather that inherent infinitude of spirit, to which the external infinitude of the demands of the letter relates only as the asymptote relates to its hyperbola.

380

Regarding the form and method of the teaching directed to the people, to the masses as such, we believe that we need to consider more closely the hint found in our evangelists

*) about the difference between these exoteric lectures and the esoteric ones directed to the actual disciples, more than is commonly done.

*) Mark. 4:33 f.

It is stated there that he spoke to the crowd never otherwise than in parables and allegories; a note that is in perfect agreement with the Lord's own statements on this point **), as well as with the character of all those speeches reported to us by the Synoptics as having been addressed to the people ***).

**) Ibid. v. 11 f.

***) For instance, the so-called Sermon on the Mount does not belong here, according to the correct view. See Matt. 5:1 f. Luke 6:20.

Only the fourth Gospel has Jesus speaking to the people in such a dogmatic and speculative tone of instruction, as not even the first three have him speaking to the disciples. But the gross misunderstandings that necessarily arose in this context, as even that Gospel does not conceal, and to believe that Jesus was indeed to blame for them, will be hard for anyone who has drawn a better understanding of his teaching wisdom from the other sources and remembers how urgently he also warns his disciples not to throw their pearls before swine or their sacred things to the dogs. — As for the parabolic method of teaching, of course, everything depends on obtaining a correct and complete understanding if one is to properly assess the reasons that determined Jesus to choose it for his exoteric lectures and the objectives he might have pursued in doing so. Parables are commonly understood to serve merely a paraenetic (admonitory) purpose; they are seen as a kind of garb arbitrarily put on the moral teaching meant to be conveyed, more intended to clothe its nakedness, to make its abstract dryness more appealing through the colorful allure of a conspicuous form, than to clarify the obscure, or to facilitate difficult understanding.

381

At least the interpretations usually given for the individual parables preserved to us are such that they evidently presuppose this kind of view on the concept of the parable in general, even if one does not explicitly admit to it. The teaching that is presented as the core of the allegory in such interpretations is, in many cases, so plain and simple that it is more obscured than clarified by the imagery. Yet, often enough, it is also so superficial and barren that one cannot consider the figurative wrapping superfluous, as it might at least evoke the semblance of deeper content through its external,

occasionally poetic sounding adornment. One could perhaps argue, should one truly attribute to the great Master the intent to embellish the dryness of the teaching, that he would not have failed in this endeavor. The experience that many, even those who would find the teachings resulting from such interpretations trivial and contemptible when presented in their raw form, are nevertheless attracted by the imagery of the parables and, recognizing their excellence, overlook the insignificance of the content as it appears to them, can serve as evidence. However, the truth is that such excellence of the imagery is only possible because it stands in a very different relationship to the content than is assumed there. The excellence of the imagery in the parable is not independent of the content; it lies in its power to stimulate thought, to hint at thoughts worth thinking before they are fully grasped by the viewer of the image. For the imagery to achieve this, there must be a closer relation between it and the content than a mere parallel of sensual concepts with intellectual ones. Such parallelism does indeed exist in genuine parables, but the intellectual concepts running parallel to the sensual ones are not the sole or actual intent. One must go beyond them to something deeper, which contains the basis of this parallelism, to rational concepts that encapsulate the unity and, so to speak, the shared spiritual essence of both the sensual and the intellectual. In this sense, the essence of the parable is entirely theoretical — one could say speculative if one wanted to exclude from this term the connotation of the abstract, non-sensual form in which true speculation tends to appear. If, as has recently become popular, one attributes a fundamentally practical (or more accurately, paraenetic) nature to the parables spoken by Christ, this leads to the misunderstanding that seeks the essence of the parable in mere intellectual concepts. For concepts meant to directly serve action, specific actions as a norm, are just intellectual concepts. Rational concepts can also be represented in actions, but the relationship of the concept to the individual action is then necessarily mediated, either through a longer series of concepts or even through actions themselves, rather than being directly expressed in a particular, externally defined concept (i.e., precisely in an intellectual concept). For this reason, we dare to assert that Jesus never and nowhere pursues a specific purpose in his parables, which one commonly calls practical. He is not concerned with setting up rules or maxims that could be directly followed in action, but with awakening moral insight and stimulating a moral attitude from which actions in specific cases can and must take infinitely diverse forms for each individual.

382

It is inherent to the nature of the matter that between this exoteric, parabolic mode of teaching and that less figurative mode which we tentatively called esoteric, there won't be a stark contrast, but rather a gradual transition from one to the other. The following fact can shed light on the nature of this transition. There are a few instances in our

gospel narratives where Jesus' disciples explicitly ask him for the interpretation of a parable told to the people *).

*) Mark. 4, 10 and parallels. Matt. 13, 36.

Jesus provides such an interpretation, but the interpretation itself, as we will show in its proper place, transforms under his hands into a new parable. He establishes a series of concepts that run parallel to the sensual figures and events of the first parable; these concepts, in order to be the true interpretation of the parable, cannot be mere intellectual ideas. However, since the rational concept itself does not fit into that parallelism and instead resides behind both parallel series in a deeper realm, that second series of concepts again assumes the role of pointing to something even deeper. It once more takes the form of a body for the spirit animating it, adopting through its bodily nature a set of sensual elements. Because of this, the interpretation could very well be narrated as another parable, albeit not as directly understandable as the first. Thus, it becomes clear how the parabolic element had to continue even in the esoteric discourse. Similarly, the exoteric discourse in many places transitions to direct teaching, hinting at the meaning beyond the figurative language of the rest of the speech. Specifically, we find that Jesus tends to conclude his parables, especially the longer and more detailed ones, with a directly and non-figuratively spoken maxim. It is wrong to search for the deepest meaning or the complete content of the parable in such closing sentences; these sentences, in the examples preserved to us, hardly ever offer this. Occasionally, they don't even seem to fit the true content of the parable, which may partly be attributed to the imprecision of the transmission, to which we can easily assume that such maxims were not placed in their proper position more than once. However, there are certainly cases where a concluding statement genuinely incorporated by Jesus into a parable only expresses part of its meaning, not its entirety, with the intention of stimulating further thought about the meaning, but not exhausting it *).

*) For example, the saying: "Many are called, but few are chosen" is found after two different parables: Matt. 20, 16 and 22, 14; however, it probably only belongs to the latter, although even here it doesn't exhaust the meaning of the parable. Another example of a correctly placed, but not exhaustive statement is given in Matt. 25, 29; an example of an inappropriate position, or at least of a corrupted saying, is found in Luke. 16, 9.

— In any case, it would be erroneous to assume that because the parables were spoken to the people in a form that resonated with them, they must have had a popular meaning; that is, what is commonly referred to as popular, a meaning that the average

person could grasp even without the parable, and perhaps even articulate themselves. To believe that Jesus engaged in such trivialities or that he ever acted as a moral preacher in the usual sense, without explicit reference to what was unique to him and achievable only through him among all other moralists: we believe we have the right to declare this as completely impossible. For it is precisely by this that he is the Divine, the one who, more than any other mortal, reveals the essence of divinity in the appearance of his personality. Each single moment of this appearance, even the slightest word he spoke, carries the vibrant reference to the totality of the idea embodied in him; that the fullness of the Spirit, which elsewhere usually manifests itself in individual works, where the entire force of a gifted personality is poured, resides in him in every expression of his essence and personality, no matter how externally inconspicuous. How much or how little of this spirit each individual listener could grasp was left up to them; it suffices that Christ gave what he had to offer in a form that allowed each person to grasp exactly as much as they were capable of grasping due to their spiritual nature, while the rest, not due to the teacher's fault but their own, remained shrouded in an impenetrable mystery for them.

385

A circumstance that serves as a characteristic of parables as a teaching form for exoteric lectures, more than many other features, is found in the fact that, as far as our knowledge of Jesus' teaching method goes, they are the only recognizable means of connecting ideas that Jesus seems to have used in longer teachings, whether they were directed at the people inside or outside the synagogue. Structuring a lecture in the manner of abstract, rational reflection, which among us tends to provide the principle of connection for both didactic and rhetorical lectures, seems so out of place with the character of his teaching method, at least as presented in the synoptic Gospels, that we consider its absence not just an incidental lack in our sources. Jesus' manner of speaking, as can only appear appropriate to the elevation and simultaneous intimate vitality of his spirit, is thoroughly immersed in an element of serious, genuinely poetic inspiration, which is incompatible with that rational reflection. Consequently, it seems inherent in the nature of things that for the ideas Jesus had to convey, only two forms of communication were possible: on the one hand, a form where the thread of connection is provided not by abstract reason, but by that higher creative power of the spirit which can only express itself poetically, and on the other, a form that doesn't require any guiding thread—short, weighty maxims, concise aphorisms thrown into a context provided by chance or conversation. The latter might have been the manner in which Jesus primarily preferred to interact with his disciples; for we will show in our subsequent books how everything given to us as a longer speech to the disciples is composed of individual maxims, probably spoken at very different times and on very

different occasions, and owes its present form entirely to written recording. The less the divine Master's innermost core had the intention, in terms of his nature and essence, to emerge into the externality of a self-contained, autonomous work, like the spirit of an artist, the more this artless manner of communication, directly arising from and remaining undivided with life, must be recognized as the only truly suitable means of communication for him. This method doesn't shape itself into the form of a doctrine, nor into a particular art form, because, when genuine, it provides the concept and the object simultaneously, the appearance and the content and essence together. Specifically, in such occasional maxims and aphorisms, Jesus could place the deepest, truly esoteric content of his teaching because here, with the teaching, he truly gave himself or committed his whole personality to the teaching. From which, however, it follows for us that especially here in the tradition, we should believe least of all that we have everything present that Jesus put into his words at the moment he spoke them. The more he stepped out of the circle of this actual life exchange and addressed the people, the more his speech had to divest itself and externalize, the more it had to take on the character of actual lectures in content and the character of poetry in form.

386

With this observation that those who are repeatedly referred to as disciples or followers (μαθηταί) of Jesus in the gospel history must have distinguished themselves from outsiders not in the same way, but differently than usual disciples of a master distinguish themselves from non-disciples, it agrees that they are described as a closed, very limited circle. Members of this circle were selected by Jesus himself and equipped with deliberate favoritism over others with the gifts he deemed necessary to promote his work.

If one approaches the gospel history with concepts derived from the experience of such circles of disciples, which tend to form around other masters in religion and philosophy, in art and science, one would expect to find the spectacle offered by these circles; the spectacle of a gradually expanding mass of followers capable of increasing indefinitely. Given the loud and credible testimonies of the favor and reverence Jesus found among the people, and given that his teaching does not have such a character that could deter a large number of confessors either by the difficulty of scientific understanding or by the arduousness of required achievements, one would expect even more to find this spectacle here.

Contrary to such possible conceptions, the fact is that discipleship or followership in this sense did not form until after Jesus' death; and undoubtedly, during his lifetime, he did not, as can be concluded from his success, differentiate his followers from non-followers

with any sign or feature, because he did not want to. Throughout his life, we only find him surrounded by a small number of disciples who dedicated their entire lives to him **), apparently *) at his own invitation.

*) Matt. 8:22, 10:37 and parallels. Luke 9:62.

**) Mark 10:28 and parallels.

Towards the rest of the populace, he maintains a completely unattached position, and there is no mention of followers and non-followers, disciples and non-disciples. From this observation of the general relations alone, even if we were not in possession of the most explicit reports about it, we would have to conclude that in forming that inner circle, Jesus actively and consciously pursued a purpose that took the place of the objectives others pursue in the formation of schools and followings. This purpose differed in scale and depth from these objectives just as his work differed from theirs.

Just as his work was not intended, like those works, to appear only as a fleeting form in world history and be preserved only in the memory of the spirit, neither could its purpose be fulfilled in a circle of immediate followers and disciples, no matter how expansive one might imagine such a circle. What for others is the highest purpose of their doing and striving, the formation of such an immediate discipleship, could only be a means for Jesus, only the first inconspicuous beginning of his world-encompassing creation.

389

The assertion that the affiliation of those disciples, who later formed the circle of the twelve apostles, to Jesus during his public ministry did not transpire instantaneously but rather evolved over time, is underscored by the very nature of the situation, making it seem more plausible. However, notwithstanding this, we find, from the accounts of our evangelists, that for two of them, the calling of all twelve is depicted as a singular act. In Mark, and in the account corresponding to Mark's in the first Gospel, the calling of the two sets of brothers, Simon and Andrew and James and John, forms the beginning of all detailed narratives from Jesus' public life. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, this shouldn't be interpreted as if this event truly stood as the foremost narrative from that era. Instead, its interpretation naturally emerges from the source from which the Gospel of Mark was derived. The calling of those four disciples itself is narrated therein *) in a manner that one cannot but perceive not as the actual course of events but rather as a condensed representation of the same.

*) Mark. 1:16 ff. and parallels.

While walking along the shores of the Sea of Galilee, Jesus is said to have encountered the disciples, busy in pairs with their trade of fishing, and beckoned them to follow him, to which they reportedly responded promptly. A similarly depicted event is the account of another disciple, whom Mark and Luke refer to as Levi and the author of the first Gospel names Matthew, detailing how Jesus summoned him from the tax booth where he was seated, conducting his official duties **).

**) Mark. 2:14 and parallels.

Here too, just as in the earlier instance, the unsophisticated and overly literal manner of our evangelists is to blame for representing what in reality was undoubtedly a composite event, made up of various repetitive and interrelated incidents, as a singular event transpiring within a specific moment in time. An account markedly different from these synoptic reports can be found in the fourth Gospel, intriguingly also involving Peter and Andrew and likely John, though he isn't specifically named *).

*) John. 1:35 ff.

Here it is John the Baptist who first draws the attention of two of his own disciples to Jesus; these disciples are Andreas and another unnamed one. John describes Jesus to them as the 'Lamb of God.' Later on, through Andreas, Simon is also persuaded to follow Jesus as the 'Messiah.' However, the evangelist immediately adds another account, which is more similar to the synoptic account in the sense that Jesus first asks Philip to follow him. Philip not only obeys but immediately recruits another disciple, Nathanael — not designating him directly as the Messiah (as in the earlier event which seems implausible), but still as someone of whom Moses and the prophets wrote. However, the contradiction between this account and the synoptic reports is not just in the details — one could possibly reconcile them by assuming that at that time the disciples did not yet follow their new master forever. The bigger issue is that John the Baptist is attributed with a clear reference to Jesus at a time when Jesus had not yet appeared publicly; as we have shown above, this cannot be considered credible. The most important point for our current consideration is that we also find it highly unlikely that Jesus would have recruited disciples before his appearance or would have addressed them with such authority, as in the case with Simon, whom he immediately greets with a name change. Demanding such devotion, as he did from his disciples according to the most reliable historical accounts, and as is already assumed in that address to Peter, he could only have done so after publicly demonstrating his divine calling. To use his power over people beforehand to attract individuals and then achieve success among the masses with their help would have been a dubious method, not

worthy of him. We therefore believe this account — the one about Philip and Nathanael can claim its validity independent of it — to be far less credible than the synoptic ones. We feel compelled to limit the truth that might be at the base of it to the possibility that those disciples, like Jesus himself, might have heard John and received baptism from him *).

*) However, at least as far as Peter and Andreas are concerned, this is made unlikely by the fact that in Mark there is no trace of a relation of Peter to the Baptist.

392

In a similar manner to those mentioned in the passages here, the other twelve apostles might have joined Jesus individually at different times. Initially, they probably joined just as attentive listeners to his lectures and conversations. Gradually, from these frequent visits, the habit of daily interaction grew, and an ever-closer attachment to the Master developed, which was eventually sealed by him as a lifelong personal relationship. As for the question that has recently been raised by various researchers regarding the credibility of that report which is presupposed in the above-mentioned passages and also often in our gospels **), and explicitly in relation to all Twelve is told by Mark ***) and after him by Luke †) - that Jesus, by his own authority, called the Twelve and appointed them as apostles of his evangelical word - there's no need to present the alternatives as starkly as it seems some have done.

**) E.g. John 6:70, 15:16.

***) Mark 3:13 ff.

†) Luke 6:13 ff. The dependence of this passage on the previously mentioned one from Mark, which in our overall view and due to the particular nature of this passage, cannot be doubted, makes the doubts raised by Schleiermacher unnecessary, as to whether Luke is really referring to the selection of the Twelve at that time. However, it's not likely that the author of the first gospel, who, when naming the apostles, already assumes them to solely form the circle of disciples (Matthew 10:1) without mentioning how they came to this privilege, considered Mark's note to be incorrect. He simply omitted it because it did not seem to fit where he otherwise reproduces what Mark tells there (end of the 4th chapter) (not least because of S, S) and he couldn't find an appropriate place for it. The omission of the calling scene, as well as the detailed note about the regions from which the people flocked to Jesus (as mentioned in Chapter 4, verse 23 ff.), is

evident in Matthew 12:15 ff., which parallels Mark 3:7 ff. The evangelist, to somewhat fill the gap he left, provides an extensive citation from a prophetic passage (Isaiah 42:1 ff.) in place of the omitted sentences.

Certainly, Jesus did not recruit any disciple without the latter's own initiative, without a response from his side, and without taking advantage of the opportunity that arose to get to know him better. Even the sharpest insight into human inner workings, which we might presuppose in Jesus based on our Evangelists' accounts *), does not make this assumption unnecessary. Although, we must admit that this assumption is not supported by explicit testimonies from the sources.

*) This rapid insight, which we also find presupposed in many stories, is most explicitly attributed to Jesus in John 2:25.

However, this in no way precludes that Jesus, after the aforementioned Twelve, and perhaps many others, had joined him in the manner indicated, might have specifically chosen the former without excluding the others from his circle **), and conferred upon them those assignments, those gifts that might already have been grouped by him under the concept of the apostolic office.

**) Compare Acts 1:21.

To assume this act truly happened *), we are firstly moved by the authority of such a significant witness as Mark, which is further strengthened by the congruent assumption of all the other Evangelists, especially in the fourth gospel, which does not even seem informed about this event, and shows no ulterior motive.

*) Against Schleiermacher, about Luke p. 88.

Added to this is the important consideration of how in the foundation of the apostolic office, in this delineation of the inner circle of discipleship from the wider one, which as we showed above is a differentiation of the concept of Christian discipleship from every other kind — how this reveals a consciousness about the uniqueness and global mission of Christianity, which we can assume was present in no other spirit earlier than in the divine spirit of its founder. The number twelve, from which the appointment of the Apostles and their office originated, had a symbolic meaning in this consciousness, articulated by Christ himself in a profound symbolic saying **); it alludes to the foundation of a new, all-encompassing Israel, which, like the old Israel according to biblical tradition had twelve physical, should have twelve spiritual forefathers.

**) Matthew 19:28 and parallels.

As an explicit legacy of the Lord, this number was so sacred to the apostles themselves that, after the defection and death of Judas had left a gap in their circle, they found it necessary to complete it for this very reason ***).

***) Acts 1:21 ff.

But later, when Paul, transcending this number, became aware of having received a unique apostolic calling pertaining to his person through the testimony of the spirit, we see him explicitly and repeatedly ensuring to represent this calling as having originated personally from the Lord, who appeared to him at that significant moment before Damascus †).

†) Christ sent me, 1 Corinthians 1:17. Compare Galatians 1:1, 1:12. Hence the importance Paul places on having seen the Lord with his own eyes. 1 Corinthians 9:1.

395

Regarding the motives that might have guided Jesus, be it in the calling or the admission of individuals among those twelve disciples, there is little reliable to say, as we have more detailed knowledge of the character of only a few among them. It is indeed assumed that the selection was not without consideration of their intellectual and moral qualities. However, without undermining this general presumption, we would like to leave room for the possibility that there could have been considerations which, in an individual case, led to an exception from the rule that only morally impeccable individuals were admitted to Jesus's innermost circle. Indeed, without much difficulty, one can imagine a situation where, due to various combinations of life events and without the explicit intention of the Master, a relationship might have developed between Him and an individual - a relationship in which the Master recognized a hint of providence, and did not exclude that individual from the number of his disciples, even if he had not deemed him morally worthy. Anyone who would want to deny this possibility must also deny that there can be a moral relationship between good and bad individuals, a moral duty or obligation of the former towards the latter. — This is how we would most like to interpret the relationship between Jesus and Judas Iscariot, this difficult and much-discussed problem of gospel history; because we must confess our dissatisfaction with all other attempted interpretations of this relationship so far. To assume a genuine mistake of the Master concerning the moral character of Judas is not only incompatible with the concepts of past dogma, but also with what we historically

know about Jesus's spiritual greatness. However, to give a milder interpretation to Judas's betrayal in one of the previously proposed ways is prevented by an unbiased consideration of the historical data, especially the words spoken by Jesus himself about Judas on various occasions, which are certainly well attested in their main content *).

*) Mark 14:21 and parallels. John 6:70.

Judas Iscariot was — so we believe we can best interpret the reports handed down about him — a mentally gifted, clever, and world-wise man. From the outset, he rendered significant services to Jesus' cause, and not out of hypocrisy or selfish impulse, but drawn by the spiritual power of the Lord's personality, by the imaginative and poetic aura that surrounded His appearance — attractions to which the soul of the wicked can be just as receptive as the soul of the good. And perhaps he was also enticed by the allure of the resounding success Jesus achieved, which flattered his ambition. The explicit rejection of such a character at a time when he was still wholly devoted to his Master and actively working for him with all the strength of his richly endowed mind — which, if repelled by Jesus, could already then have turned against Him with a different outcome than later — would have been contrary to the moral wisdom we assume in Jesus, as in every magnificent and morally refined character. It would have prematurely stirred up discord among His disciples and followers and would have forced Jesus not only to renounce the support Judas provided but also to turn His own power against a different enemy than the one He was then primarily called upon to combat. No one should misunderstand us as suggesting that Jesus, like the sect that appropriated His name in later centuries, employed evil means for His lofty purpose and justified them through that purpose. Instead, history and our religious-moral conviction prompt us to assume that, in Jesus' presence and among the circle to which He directed His disciples' efforts, the evil and insincere element present in their souls was paralyzed; that even the poisoned spirit of an Iscariot could only act and work here in a just and noble manner. Perhaps this was the basis of the deep hatred the thus suppressed and in his wild expectations deceived malice of the disciple cast upon the divine Master. It was not Jesuitical cunning, but a lofty, all-encompassing sense, recognizing that henceforth, against their own will, the wicked would have to work with the good on His work (after all, in most human individuals, and perhaps in every single one of Jesus' disciples at the time, good and evil were mixed and inseparably placed side by side!) — and that only gradually, when the time would come, would the wicked find their ruin and their kingdom on this world come to an end. This led Jesus to include Judas Iscariot as a testimony and model for the future of the divine work, and as a monument to that world's fate, which, within this earthly existence, does not allow for a clear external separation between the good and the wicked, in the number of disciples

until he fulfilled his destiny, doing so in such a way that his own wicked deed converged with the divine act of the Lord's self-sacrifice as one and the same event.

397

A somewhat clearer character image of the individual apostles can be gleaned from the Gospel history itself primarily of Peter. Whether Peter's prominence in so many narratives of various significant and minor events points to a distinction he earned and maintained during the Master's lifetime due to mental and character strength, perhaps in part because he recognized Jesus as the Messiah before all others and expressed this realization *), — or whether it is merely a result of the fact that most of these stories have him as their source, cannot be definitively determined.

*) Mark 8:29 and parallels.

However, the fact that after Jesus' death and before Paul's emergence, we see Peter playing the undeniably primary role in the emerging community *), and that even the fourth gospel, which, as the Straussian critique has convincingly demonstrated in many places, intentionally pushes him behind John, still has to inadvertently recognize his significance through its frequent mention of him.

*) Not just in the Acts of the Apostles by Luke, where it is so striking that, as noted above, we indeed have reservations about explaining it solely from the historical truth of this preference, but also in some mentions in Pauline letters, etc.

No matter how much of the distinctions, which the historical tradition has heaped on this apostle both during Jesus' lifetime and after his death, might be attributed to legend — of which we also believe that much of it has transferred into the gospel accounts, especially in the first gospel**): the activity of this legend itself indicates that the apostle, whom it chose as its hero over others, must have indeed made an appearance in a manner that drew the attention of the myth-forming generation more to him than to the others.

**) It is only the first gospel, in whose list of apostles (Matthew 10:2) Peter is expressly called πρῶτος (first), although he also takes the first place in the others, which, as the contrast with Judas Iscariot shows, who is placed last, seems to indicate a distinction in itself.

— The impartiality with which Peter has conveyed accounts of his interactions with the Master is evidenced by some anecdotes that seem more embarrassing than flattering for him ***), specifically recounted by Mark, while other legendary glorifying traits are absent in this faithful reporter and are added from other sources in the first gospel.

***) Mark 8:32 f. 9:5 f. 14:29 ff. 66 ff.

All the more confidently can we trust the well-known character portrayal of Peter that emerges from the Gospel of Mark, which legend later embraced as faithfully as history, enriching it with details that might not be strictly accurate. However, this portrayal, while showing us a powerful but more impetuous rather than unyielding nature (hardly what we'd call a rock-like character), doesn't quite align with the name Jesus gave to the disciple previously known as Simon. This naming likely had a coincidental origin and its interpretation by the author of the first gospel, who specifies the timing of this naming as arbitrarily as the author of the fourth *), might not be entirely accurate **).

*) John 1:42.

**) Matthew 16:18.

— The same applies to the name Boanerges, which, according to Mark, the Lord attributed to the sons of Zebedee. Again, we can't determine whether it was meant as praise or, as recently suggested, with irony, labeling them "Sons of Thunder". Our understanding is further clouded not only due to the vague characterization of James, about whom, despite his privileged status among Jesus's closest disciples along with Peter and John ***), we know very little, but also because of the ambiguities surrounding John.

***) Mark 5:37. 9:2. 14:33 and parallels.

For the isolated traits we derive about the latter from the synoptic gospels †) and from the letters of Paul ††) don't seamlessly integrate into the image we inevitably derive from the gospel writing and from the letters that bear his name.

†) Mark 9:38. 10:35 and parallels. Luke 9:54.

††) Galatians 2:9.

Instead of a gentle, devoted, and humble figure, we there observe a passionate, ambitious, and proud youth. Instead of a contemplative thinker inclined towards speculative universality, we find a faith-warrior entangled in Jewish national prejudices. The note, by the way, about the special affection that Jesus is said to have held for

John, which is almost reckoned as fiction in the fourth Gospel, seems too daring, especially considering the stir such a claim would have caused among the numerous followers of the other apostles. We are more inclined to consider it as historical the less we intend, despite the aforementioned difficulty, to question the authenticity of the character image derived from the writings bearing John's name for this apostle. — We also believe that the note about the closer relationship in which, preferred over the other nine, both sons of Zebedee, along with Peter, stood to Jesus, is not something we can simply gloss over, particularly in light of our forthcoming interpretation of the Transfiguration miracle. This narrative, along with other accounts, suggests that Jesus indeed spoke to these three about his Messianic role and other related topics in a context that he, undoubtedly for well-considered reasons, did not dare to share with the others. The later legend by Clement of Alexandria, which names Peter, John, and James as recipients of a Gnosis or secret doctrine from Christ initially shared only with them *), deviates in two ways from our assumption: it refers to James not as the son of Zebedee but as the Lord's brother, and it suggests that they received these teachings only after Christ's resurrection. Nonetheless, we fundamentally consider this legend consistent with the note we discuss. These differences can be explained if we assume, on one hand, that due to the role we observe James, the Lord's brother, having in the apostolic community, it is highly probable that James took the place of the early martyred son of Zebedee alongside Peter and John *), just as Matthias replaced Judas **); and on the other hand, that the belief in secretive later revelations has its roots in the disclosures of the Risen One, which had been made personally and confidentially to two of these three main figures of the apostolic Church ***).

*) Euseb. H. E. II, 1.

*) As a στήλη (pillar) of the Church Gal. 2:9.

**) Acts 1:31 ff.

***) 1 Cor. 15:5, 7.

401

All other apostolic personalities apart from those highlighted here are unfortunately just names and numbers for us, and even as such, as is known, they are not uncontested due to various doubts. These doubts concern the identity or non-identity of some names listed in the apostolic lists of the three Synoptics or with other persons mentioned elsewhere as disciples of the Lord †).

†) Of these lists, we believe with certainty that they are essentially the same, namely, taken from Mark by the other two Synoptics. In addition to the reasons underlying our general view of the three synoptic gospels, what especially

authorizes us to think this way is the fact that the order of the listed names is exactly the same. The only exception is Andrew, who Mark mentioned after the sons of Zebedee (likely to give these more familiar disciples precedence), but the other two mention him right after Peter because he is Peter's brother. This difference is because the last two evangelists group the apostles in pairs, likely with reference to Mark 6:7, which mentions that Jesus sent them out in pairs. This connection was especially close for the author of the first gospel, who directly linked the list with the story of that mission. This is a rare instance where Matthew and Luke agree against Mark at a point they share with him. But this agreement is minor and explainable enough to be considered coincidental. Concerning other deviations from Mark, Matthew and Luke diverge from him and each other in similar cases. For instance, the author of the first gospel refers to Thaddaeus as Labbaeus, while Luke names another apostle, Judas son of James. Both evangelists must have had a specific reason for this deviation. For Matthew, the reason is of no interest; but Luke's deviation matches the mention of a "Judas, not Iscariot" in John 14:22, suggesting the existence of a disciple named Judas not mentioned by Mark. We can't ascertain why Luke chose to replace Labbaeus with this Judas. However, the hypothesis that he is identical to James the son of Alphaeus, and both were brothers or cousins of Jesus, seems unfounded.

The discrepancies found on this topic *) make it not entirely unlikely that, during Jesus' lifetime, there might have been changes in some of the apostles; an assumption that is less difficult for us the longer we presuppose the duration of Jesus' ministry.

*) Besides the difference just mentioned, John 1:46 ff. mentions a Nathanael as a disciple of Jesus. The only way to place him in the apostolic list is by identifying him with Bartholomew. The identity of Levi, mentioned in Mark 2:14 and parallels, with Matthew, who the first gospel places in his position, is still not proven. It is equally possible that both were tax collectors, but the author of the first gospel knew only the latter as a tax collector and therefore felt the need to replace him.

402

As for the specific nature of the relationship between the apostles and Jesus, this relationship is famously understood in our sources as one of the closest life-communion. The apostles are typically the constant companions of the Lord on all his journeys; only occasionally does the Lord withdraw from them, often accompanied by those three most trusted, into solitude, or sends them away for more general or specific purposes. The fact that the principle of complete communal property, which was

introduced and maintained in the apostolic church after Christ's death for a while, already had its model in that relationship is not unlikely in itself and seems to be confirmed by the report given in the fourth Gospel concerning Judas Iscariot's management of the purse. However, this latter note cannot be easily reconciled with another we occasionally find in Luke*), that some women, whom Jesus healed of illnesses, joined him and supported his living needs from their wealth.

*) Luke 8:2-3.

In general, it is probably more accurate and more worthy of Jesus to present the relationship in such a way that each individual viewed his property and goods as common with all others, rather than there having been an explicit obligation for everyone to contribute all their wealth. — The purpose Jesus had in mind with this communion should not be understood as a purely external pedagogical one, as it is commonly perceived; for example, as if he viewed his association with the apostles as a sort of seminary for future teachers of the community. Instead, this peculiar mode of apostolic discipleship temporarily took the place of the confines of a teaching system or a church constitution, the immediate foundation of which was not within Jesus's calling, and due to reasons, as already hinted, the universal significance of this calling could not be located therein. Through life-communion with Jesus, the group of apostles became the bearers of a substance of the divine spirit, a concept that wants to convey something other than just a subjective proficiency of individuals for the external transmission and propagation of their master's teaching. Seals of this substantial vocation were the miraculous powers bestowed upon the disciples and, after the Lord's departure, the Holy Spirit poured out upon them, a concept which also signifies something more than just a superficial, subjective enthusiasm of individuals as individuals.

404

The story of the sending out of the apostles into the neighboring regions to proclaim the gospel primarily sources from Mark, although the first evangelist enriches it with a series of sayings, ones that Luke in turn distributes to various parts of his historical account. As one can clearly discern in the original report *), and as the form given to the report by the first Gospel seems to suggest, this dispatch is not to be taken as a single event occurring at a specific point in time, as Luke apparently understood it, but as a frequently repeated, habitual action.

*) ηρξατο αποστελλειν Marc. 6, 7, which Luk. 9, 2 changes to απεστειλεν; just as he later adds υποστρεψαντες in V. 10, where in Mark V. 30 the συνάγονται by no

means indicates the return from a single, specific absence. However, it must be admitted that the misunderstanding seems to begin with Mark, who here, as often, might have only half-understood.

Jesus sends out the disciples two by two— this we initially learn only from Mark, though as mentioned above, both other evangelists do not neglect this note— to heal and preach the gospel. We don't believe this means he sent out all twelve simultaneously in pairs and remained alone, but rather more naturally that he only sent two at a time while keeping the rest nearby. The purpose of this mission was probably less the direct dissemination of his teachings by the dispatched disciples than their preparation for the autonomy they would achieve after his death. From this perspective, we will also consider the instructions the Master gives them, which we will discuss in more detail below; especially the restriction of these orders to the cities and landscapes of Israel. For Jesus has elsewhere expressed his awareness of the universal purpose of his work too clearly for us to attribute this limitation to an objective rather than a subjective reason. If, however, Luke lets a part of the words, which according to Matthew he spoke to his disciples on such occasions, be spoken not to the twelve apostles, but to seventy other disciples, whom, according to him, the Lord should have sent ahead on his journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, likewise in pairs of two: recent criticism has pointed out how entirely isolated the report of this last dispatch stands with a writer, known from multiple experiences, to be historically inaccurate, and how justified doubts about its credibility arise for this reason. For us, the difficulty opposing the acceptance of this report is further compounded by the view we established above regarding Jesus' relationship to the adhering populace, which, as we believe to have demonstrated with solid reasons, was far from being a relationship of true discipleship. However, we would not necessarily doubt the report of that dispatch as a whole, but rather the specific details that Luke attaches to it. That Jesus, in relation to the constant crowd around him, among which certainly many attached themselves to him permanently, established a relationship allowing him to use them occasionally or repeatedly as organs of his proclamation: this is by no means beyond the bounds of probability, and the less reason we find here to assume a legend-forming activity without such an occasion, the more advisable this assumption appears here. More problematic is accepting the significant number Seventy as if Christ himself had established it. If so, he would indeed have given the appearance, just as with the determination of the number of apostles, of wanting to encircle himself with a circle of disciples in such a way. However, the significance of the number could easily induce a foreign narrator to give it as a round sum of the approximate number of those sent out. We find the transfer of those words, obviously only calculated for the true disciples of the Lord, the apostles, to these certainly only extemporized disciples the least suitable, just as what Luke further knows

to tell about the power which the latter exercised over the demons *), obviously based on a confusion with what only applies to the apostles.

*) Luk. 10, 17.

406

An important enrichment to the accounts of the Synoptics regarding the commissions that Jesus gave to the sent disciples would be gained if we could recognize the note, which the fourth Gospel gives not in this context (which remains foreign to it), but rather in a very random, incidental mention **), about the practice of running adopted by Jesus, not for himself, but for his disciples, as credible.

**) Joh. 3, 22. 26. 4, 1 f.

However, reasons apart from the significant one based on the silence of the Synoptics, especially in that aforementioned context where the mention of the act of running would have been obvious to the narrator, also give us numerous and important reasons to doubt its credibility. The environment in which this note is found is far from inspiring trust or preparing historical ground for it. It relates to the misconception, previously identified by us as erroneous, that Jesus had made a public appearance in Judea ***), even before the imprisonment of John the Baptist; that the disciples of both masters had quarreled and argued, but John (who nevertheless continues to teach and baptize independently) had acknowledged the higher legitimacy of Jesus. It is in this context, which is already suspicious and made even more so by an odd, probably erroneous geographical note *), that we first hear on three separate occasions about Jesus performing the act of baptism, only to have a parenthetical correction added later that it wasn't Jesus himself, but his disciples who baptized.

***) Ibid. 3, 22.

*) V. 23.

— At the core of this narrative, as is common in the fourth Gospel, we find a longer reflection. This time, however, it's not attributed to Jesus, but to John the Baptist, such that he speaks it as a response to the news his disciples bring him—that the one, to whom John had previously given testimony, had now started baptizing, and everyone was flocking to him. Our overall view on the emergence of the fourth Gospel leads us to view this entire narrative as potentially a reworked overlay by the Apostle John. This assumption is surprisingly confirmed when we consider the striking similarity between

the words attributed to the Baptist and the preceding speeches of Jesus **), and juxtapose it with the differences in the narrative's outer layer.

**) In the conversation with Nicodemus: V. 1 — 21. See our discussion on this in the sixth book.

This difference is so striking that some interpreters have suggested that the words, which we believe to be the core of the message ***), are not words of the Baptist (as the context suggests), but are an interposed reflection by the evangelist himself.

***) V. 31—36. The words V. 27 — 30 still belong to the outer layer, and are therefore unlikely to have been written down by the Apostle John. However, they might be based on a reminiscence of what is hinted at in Cap. 5, 33, which, as we have shown above, points to a completely different historical context than the one narrated here.

Given the nature of the account, the peculiar manner in which the narrator takes back or corrects his repeated note about Jesus' baptism is all the more suspicious. It appears as if it's based on a piece of information, which also reached our evangelist, suggesting that it wasn't Jesus himself, but his disciples who introduced the act of baptism and did so—this is how we believe we should understand this note—after Jesus' death. The evangelist recalled this information only after he had narrated about Jesus' baptism, just as he recalled the note that Jesus only began his ministry after John's imprisonment when he was about to narrate a contradicting fact. Just as he thought he could dismiss the former note by parenthetically adding *), that John had not yet been imprisoned, he thinks he can satisfy historical truth here by admitting that only the disciples performed baptisms, but assuming this occurred during Jesus' lifetime.

*) V. 34.

408

Thus, as we have shown here, the passage is constructed, the only one in the entire New Testament, which supports the hitherto almost universally unchallenged opinion that the sacrament of baptism was instituted by Christ Himself, not only after His resurrection, but already during His ministry, and was immediately put into practice by the hands of His disciples. What else can be drawn from Scripture regarding positive circumstances, apart from that very crucial negative aspect, the silence of the synoptic gospels, to decide this question, all speaks entirely against, not for this assumption. From the Lord Himself, we have received a word which says of His disciples: "Indeed,

John baptized with water, but they shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit *); a statement that clearly implies a contrast to water baptism and would not have been said if Jesus had already introduced water baptism as an initiation rite into His community.

*) Acts 11:16 and similarly 1:5. Compare with the use of the word βαπτίζειν in the two places Mark 10:38 and its parallels and Luke 12:50, which also seems to speak against a typological use of the word and the matter already accepted by Christ at that time.

Even clearer is the later incorporation of the baptismal rite in the words of the Apostle Paul, where he says that all who are baptized into Jesus Christ are baptized into His death **), where he calls the baptized "co-buried with Christ" ***) and determines the meaning of baptism, as it happens "for the dead", depending on the truth of our faith in the resurrection of the dead ****).

**) Rom. 6:3.

***) συνταφέντες τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισματι Col. 2:12.

****) τι ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται τι καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν ; 1 Cor. 15:29.

The same is evidenced by the genuinely mysterious, but in a true, profound sense, mysterious connection in which we see baptism connected with the reception of the Holy Spirit in the early church; whether baptism is presented as a prerequisite for this reception †), or conversely, the power of the Spirit drives those upon whom it descends to be baptized ††).

†) Acts 2:38, 19:2-6.

††) Acts 10:44-48, 11:15-16.

For it is well known that the miraculous manifestations, described as the reception of the Holy Spirit, first appeared in the community after the Lord's death and were to manifest after His proclamation. On the other hand, if two of the synoptic gospels only attribute to the risen Christ the command to link the preaching of the gospel with the baptism of those converted to faith in Him, the Crucified and Risen †††), this, considering the manner in which we should interpret all the speeches Christ is said to have given after His resurrection, does not directly contradict the insights from those references. But Luke, who explicitly mentions only the baptism of the Spirit, which His disciples receive *), not the water baptism, which they should administer, seems to intend in that speech, which he allows Peter to give to the assembled crowd after the first reception of the

Spirit **), to actually depict the first introduction of the baptismal rite into the Christian community.

†††) Matt. 28:19, Mark 16:16.

*) Acts 1:5. Compare with Luke 24:49.

**) Acts 2:38.

410

The same result, which emerges as the more probable one for us from the unbiased compilation of these scattered notes, is — we do not hesitate to say it with confidence — elevated to the utmost certainty by a retrospect of the overall character of Jesus' activity as presented by us in the preceding, both in the smaller and larger circles of his environment. We are here at a point where historical research, daring to go even a step further in the way of negation than even that criticism which seemed to have reached the utmost of historical skepticism in the realm of gospel history, is redirected by this intensified negation towards affirmation, making a positive view of the overall spiritual shape of Jesus' work and beginnings possible. As is well known, among so many other doubts with which he seeks to shake the historical foundation beneath our feet, Strauss, in particular, did not want to question this: the introduction of the baptismal rite by the living Christ himself ***).

***) L. J. I, p. 552.

However, if we ask for the motive of this concession that he makes here to the gospel tradition, specifically to the tradition of that gospel whose reports appear to him to be the least credible, the only motive to be found is the dependency that Strauss places Jesus in, at the start and throughout the entire first period of his career, on John the Baptist. He suggests Jesus intended to initially follow in John's footsteps in this regard, as well as in many other aspects. — This supposed imitation of the Baptist is, in turn, only a consequence of the vagueness and lack of clarity in which that critic leaves the character and activity of the Lord. Had he continued to replace the old dogmatic conception of Christ with an idea of Christ gained through vibrant, philosophical historical reflection, he would have had to recognize how utterly incompatible that assumption, based on such weak historical grounds, is with this idea. We have previously shown how it was in the nature of Christ's teaching activity to, apart from the closest circle of disciples, not gather any students or followers around him and not to draw a firm line between followers and non-followers, between students and

non-students. We would have to very quickly forget what was said earlier, supported by such convincing reasons both from the nature of the matter and from the testimony of history, if we wanted to give even the slightest room to the idea that Jesus really administered baptism to the people flocking to him, or had it administered by his disciples. Through this act, an external distinction would obviously have been indicated, as that which it was later indeed used to indicate. Either baptism had no meaning during Christ's lifetime, or Christ would have wanted to establish the church, the external, visible church, directly by introducing baptism during his lifetime, while everything we know from his and his apostles' history compels us to assume that he himself directly founded only the internal, invisible church, leaving the foundation of the visible church to his apostles. — Admittedly, the concept of the sacrament, as previously understood by ecclesiastical dogma, seems to demand direct institution by the Lord, and from the standpoint of such dogma, our view presented here will be characterized as one that degrades the sacrament. However, as much as we are not meant to accept the boundaries of that standpoint as the boundaries of our research: we are aware that we confess this view not out of frivolous indifference to the dignity of the sacrament, but in the conviction that far better than by assuming an arbitrary arrangement of this rite, one that would have come not from a unique thought of the Savior but from the imitation of his predecessor, that dignity is preserved by remembering the circumstances under which, according to the testimony of history, the introduction of baptism in the apostolic community actually took place *).

*) The contradictions that the previous dogmatic view entangled itself in is illustrated by a curious example from a vigorously debated question in the patristic era: how the apostles, without receiving baptism, could have been saved. Various fanciful hypotheses were devised to explain this; some assumed that all the apostles had received the baptism of John. Others came up with the idea that the trip on the sea during the storm, which sprinkled them with water, might have substituted for their baptism. Tertull. de Bapt. 12.

— However, since we will have to return to this question later on two different occasions, we are content for now to have demonstrated the untenability of the traditional view here through historical means; a demonstration, by the way, that we believe is powerful enough on its own to potentially shake the faith in the infallibility of the historical reports of the fourth gospel.

413

On the impression that Jesus' teachings and deeds made among the people among whom he taught, or to whom his reputation reached, we have, although this would

actually be the place to discuss it in more detail, found ourselves compelled to speak in an earlier context. We have not failed to indicate how the impression one forms of this impact will differ depending on whether one bases it on the view given by the first three gospels, or that which is provided by the fourth gospel. Indeed, this is fundamentally a vital issue for the entire evangelical revelation. For as little as we may be inclined to ultimately authenticate the divine mission of Jesus from the testimony of the surrounding multitude, and as much as on the other hand the misunderstanding and disdain of the divine by the people to whom he was sent is characteristic of his essence and the significance of his appearance: the perception we gain of the impact that the Lord's personality had on his environment is by no means irrelevant for the spiritual idea we must form of him. The concept of that perfection and transfiguration of the human, through which the essence of this humanity directly coincides with the essence of the divine as one and the same; that level of elevation of humanity, which, according to Christian faith, humanity is supposed to have achieved in the Son of Man, undoubtedly also involves the notion of such a power that this Divine-Human manifestation exerts over the commonly human, as we find depicted in the synoptic gospels, but not also in the Johannine. Not a power that asserts itself in miraculous ways at particular moments; not a power of the sort that the author of the fourth gospel, as if to compensate for the loss he has suffered in his other portrayal, allows the hero of his story to exert over his captors at the very end, during the moment of his capture *), but rather a gentle and gradual power, in the manner of all things great and beautiful in nature and the world of the spirit, yet all the more irresistible, not arbitrarily at this or that time on this or that individual, but, in the face of the stubbornness and hardening of many individuals, truly effective on the whole.

*) John 18:6.

Only the image of a teacher who gathers and inspires the people around him with such a quiet, enchanting power, in the best sense of the word, can still exert a corresponding power on our imagination today; whereas, if we were not previously biased by dogmatic prejudices, we would turn away incredulously, even reluctantly, from the image of a prophet who incessantly parades his Messiah dignity and pushes abstract formulas onto the people, convincing no one except a small group of stubborn disciples. By the way, the admiring crowd did not consider Jesus to be the Messiah, as he had not announced himself to them as such. In general, they regarded him as a prophet of the character and calling of the ancient prophets **); some went so far as to see in him, as he saw in John the Baptist, the appearance of Elijah, who, according to ancient prophetic legend, was to precede the coming of the Messiah, and others, including Tetrarch Herod Antipas, named him after John the Baptist, after John's death - but this probably only means simply noting a similarity or relatedness of his appearance to that of John *).

**) This is how I believe the προφήτης and εις των προφητων in Mark 6:15 and 8:28 should be understood. The άνέστη, which Luke adds in both parallel places, and the 'Ιερεμίας, which the author of the first gospel adds in the second parallel place, unnecessarily (the former not necessarily) pulls popular belief into the realm of the miraculous.

*) According to the only original and authentic account of Mark, there is no need to attribute to either the Jews or Herod the tasteless, completely unmotivated, and in ancient times almost unprecedented miracle belief that the soul of John, who had been killed only recently, or at most a few years ago, had actually entered the body of Jesus, who was already alive and fully mature. The words Herod says in Mark 6:16, ον εγώ απεκεφάλισα 'Ιωάννην, ουτος [εστιν, αυτος] ηγέρθη εκ νεκρών, say nothing more and nothing less than what we can still hear every day: that this or that known person of the past has risen again in this or that person similar to him. Likewise Mark 8:28. But here, especially Luke, by the way Herod understands the people's rumor in Luke 9:9, has given cause for the erroneous understanding of that place in which he himself was probably caught.

Jesus seems to have been addressed as "Son of David" only at the end, during his entry into Jerusalem; earlier traces of this or a similar greeting are uncertain and seem to have been transferred from a later time to an earlier one **).

**) This is likely in Matthew 9:27. Jesus's greeting as Son of God, whether only by his disciples or by all those with them on the ship, in Matthew 14:33, is probably conjured up by the evangelist, since it is missing in the parallel passage in Mark. Likewise, the intention of the people to proclaim Jesus as King in John 6:15.

415

Regarding the composition of the crowd that was directly influenced by Jesus, we find in the synoptic gospels that Jesus himself initially traveled and taught only within the borders of Galilee ***). However, the crowd that flocked to him in response to the call that spread about him came from all surrounding regions: from Judea and Jerusalem, from Peraea, from the so-called Decapolis, from Idumea, and from the regions of Tyre and Sidon †).

***) Marc. 1, 30. Matth. 4, 23. Luk. 4, 14 f. 44.

†) Marc. 3, 7 f. and Parall.

However, since the language in which Jesus taught was probably only the Aramaic dialect, which was the common language in Palestine at that time and not the Greek language which was also spreading in these regions, it is unlikely for this reason alone that the note of Phoenician listeners would refer to Gentiles. Also, the content of the speeches passed down to us, and numerous other circumstances from the gospel history and from the subsequent events, leave no doubt that the audience that heard Jesus consisted solely of confessors of the Mosaic religion. It is all the more admirable that Jesus expressed so loudly and repeatedly the awareness of the universal mission of his teaching. This consciousness had its precursor in some hints from the old Israeli prophets. But that Jesus — despite the continued restriction of nationality for him, which made it necessary for him to advise his apostles initially to abstain from interacting with the Gentiles — could find the fulfillment of these hints in himself: this fact of his consciousness is one of the most convincing moments of the evidence for the divine nature of this consciousness. Based on the prohibition he gives to his disciples*), we probably cannot assume that the Samaritan land and people were initially excluded from Jesus's immediate influence. However, concerning this, there are several mentions in the third and fourth gospels that provide evidence both for Jesus's far-seeing consciousness that extended beyond this limitation, and for the efforts of the apostolic era to justify the rapidly transforming relationship of that people to Christian teachings through explicit proclamations by the Lord **).

*) Matth. 10, 5.

**) Ap. Acts 8, 5 ff.

— The characteristic anecdote that Jesus found few believers in his immediate hometown of Nazareth should not mislead one, as the fourth evangelist seems to have done*), to extend this to all of Galilee.

*) John 4, 44.

Indeed, we have already had several opportunities to note how the nature of this land, the composition of its inhabitants, and its relationship to the center of Jewish religious community life made it more suited than others as a stage for his activity. History provides multiple examples that testify Jesus found receptive minds for his teachings and active collaborators for his initiated work especially among his Galilean countrymen. We do, of course, hear of a lament that Jesus pronounced over the Galilean cities of Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum **).

****)** Matth. 11, 21 ff. and Parall.

However, the words of this lament do not refer to a persecution he personally suffered there but to the corruption of their inhabitants in general. These are words that a serious, moral anger could speak over a rabble of followers and admirers just as well as over a mass of enemies. And we would not at all agree with those who, due to their completely incidental position in Luke's gospel, wanted to deduce that Jesus must have spoken them upon leaving Galilee, out of anger over the minimal success he found among its inhabitants.

417

That alongside the followers, whom we, according to both individual accounts and the overall impression of the synoptic gospels, could confidently assume - though initially only in terms of external and superficial sentiments; Jesus could only expect a few individuals to delve deeper due to the nature of his teachings - constituted the vast majority of the people in all the regions Jesus either visited or where his reputation spread. That alongside these followers, opponents had to emerge early on, and throughout the period of his public ministry, is a natural consequence and is not disputed by us. The Jewish scribes, especially those of the Pharisee sect, consistently appear as the most zealous and bitterest of these opponents. The Sadducees, who later opposed the apostolic church so hostilely because of its belief in the resurrection *), only appear late and on isolated occasions. The Essenes are not mentioned among his opponents at all.

***)** Ap. Acts 4, 1. 5, 17. 23, 6 ff. and others.

The Pharisees were predominantly the dogmatists and literalists among the Jews, as well as those who placed the most emphasis on righteousness by works and ceremonial service. Naturally, they were the first to sense the threat posed by the spirit of the new teaching to the old religious structure and sought most diligently to counter it. Even if we may assume, as is probably more likely, that Jesus' explicit attacks against them were not unprovoked but were triggered by their opposition to his actions. There may have been few scribes in Galilee itself; instead, we find explicit remarks **), that some had come from Jerusalem, seemingly with no other intention than to listen to him and gather information.

****)** Mark 3, 22. compare v. 7 f. Chap. 7, 1 and Parall.

Thus, even if we find Pharisees mentioned in conversations with Jesus or his disciples during their stay in Galilee on various occasions, the continuous series of exchanges with Pharisees and scribes in the synoptic gospels only really begins with Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem. Alongside the Pharisees, the "Herodians" are mentioned twice as opponents of Jesus and as plotting against him, once in Galilee ***), and the second time during his stay in Jerusalem †). We would understand this not so much as a Jewish following of the Tetrarch, but rather, especially in the first instance, as his officers and informants.

***) Mark 3. 6.

†) Ibid. 12, 13 and Parall.

It cannot be surprising if we see the creatures of this prince, whose externally imposed rule on the Jewish people for this very reason had to view all popular movements with suspicion, secretly or publicly observing Jesus because of the following he found among the people, and for this purpose aligning with their usual enemies, the Jewish scribes, as these did with them. Indeed, we read in Josephus *) , that the reason Herod imprisoned and killed John was his fear of public unrest; a remark that, even if one wants to give it more credence over the more detailed accounts of our Gospels regarding the end of the Baptist, with which it is by no means incompatible, proves at least that there was reason, and that Herod himself must have had multiple causes to attribute such fear to him.

*) Josephus. Antiquities. XVIII, 5, 2.

However, we do not find that the action against John had in any way influenced Jesus' own actions, or that he found serious reason to fear danger from Herod for himself. Even in response to the explicit warning he receives about Herod's plots, he answers in a manner that, however one interprets it, certainly implies that the danger is not yet so imminent **).

**) Luke 13, 31 f.

— One should not neglect to assert this fact in favor of the Gospel account of the true reason for John's imprisonment and execution; which, aside from the overly dramatic portrayal, against which not unjustly a geographical difficulty has been raised, especially in the form in which we read it in Mark, aligns very well with everything we know from other sources about the character of Herod *).

*) The historical core of Mark's narrative (6, 17 ff.) is essentially this: it was the influence of his wife, Herodias, which caused both John's imprisonment and his execution. This matches perfectly with what we also read in Josephus (Ant. XVIII, 7) about the influence Herodias exerted on her husband: an influence that turned disastrous for him when she persuaded him to travel to Rome and, in rivalry with his nephew Agrippa, seek the crown. Another characteristic feature in Mark, which is blurred in Matthew's retelling (14, 3 ff.) but not entirely (as seen in Matthew 14:9), concerns Herod's attitude towards John, that he feared him as a just and holy man (not τὸν ὅχλον, Matthew 14:5, which doesn't fit the context), showed him some consideration, and enjoyed talking to him. This feature finds a surprising counterpart in what Luke, who omits the whole story of John's death, narrates about Herod's behavior during Jesus' trial (23, 7 ff.). Both anecdotes mutually validate each other, either in their immediate factual truth or at least in their presupposed basis. Together, and with the aforementioned trait, they offer a far more telling, intrinsically truer, and historically confirmed character portrait than if we were to simply label this Tetrarch as a bloodthirsty tyrant. — How Mark's narrative is undoubtedly the original source for Matthew's account is apparent from various details, one striking evidence being the context and sequence of the events. Mark introduces the story incidentally, at a point where it's considered past; so it stands, as expected, outside any direct context with Jesus' deeds. The manner of introduction in Matthew is quite the same, but the author forgets to close the loop, letting John's disciples, after burying their master, go to Jesus (an interaction we otherwise never hear of) and inform him of what happened. Jesus, upon hearing this, withdraws to solitude (14:12 f.). As for Luke, his dependence on Mark is especially evident in Herod's statement (9:9), which evidently distorts the meaning. In Mark, Herod, as others did too, referred to Jesus as a sort of resurrected Baptist; in Luke, he hears the rumor that John has resurrected as Jesus, takes it seriously, and becomes attentive to Jesus.

If indeed the following John found among the people had been the sole or main reason for his violent removal, it can be safely assumed that Herod would not have watched Jesus' activities within his territory as long as he indeed did.

Explicitly, in relation to the reported schemes of the tetrarch Herod, Jesus spoke that remarkable word in which he revealed his awareness that his calling required him to be

active in Galilee with teaching and healing for a time determined by providence, and then to journey to Jerusalem to meet the end that was destined for him*).

*) Luke 13:32-33.

— We have already hinted above at how the grand view of Jesus's life story, which forms the basis of our synoptic Gospels and emerges from them for us, has as one of its essential elements the fact that Jesus, after concluding his teaching and when the time for the completion of his work has arrived, for the first and last time in his life, fully conscious of the fate awaiting him, sets out for Jerusalem accompanied by his disciples to confront certain death. While previously our concern was to clarify the external, factual foundation of this perspective from the clouding introduced by the misconceptions of the fourth Gospel, our present aim is to establish its true, spiritual content against the doubts that have been raised from various quarters and that can seemingly be raised with some justification. For this purpose, the aforementioned word serves us well. Its authenticity (while the literal authenticity of many other sayings in which Jesus is introduced predicting in more detail and clarity what will happen to him in Jerusalem can indeed be doubted *) is all the firmer, given that it is recounted by the evangelist in a confused and unclear context, and thus has remained indisputably misunderstood and unnoticed by him.

*) e.g. Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:33f and parallels.

Certainly, no discerning historian would think that the reporting of this word was deliberately invented by the disciples after the event to more easily bear and justify the outcome as foretold by Christ himself, rather than as something unforeseen. The incident bears too distinctive a mark to be concocted, and the narrative is too casually and superficially impressed upon, to entertain the idea of a deliberate art in its incorporation into the overall context of events. — The same can be said, upon closer inspection, for several other speeches and stories of similar content, and perhaps for all of them if we handle them correctly and penetrate through the external shell of the tradition to their core. This applies immediately to the first of those predictions, the one linked by our evangelists to the moment when his disciple Peter expressed his belief that he [Jesus] was the Messiah *).

*) Mark 8:31 and parallels.

The same is reported to us initially in a form from which, due to its overly precise detail in listing the moments of suffering, we too believe is unlikely to have come directly from the lips of the Savior. However, the immediately associated scene between Jesus and

Peter, who expressed disbelief at this prophecy, is so vividly characteristic in itself and is so authenticated by the apostle's own testimony (which he certainly could not have fabricated to his own glory) that a favorable presumption of credibility at least falls back on the more general content of the preceding prediction of suffering and death. — Even more convincing for us, and at the same time of even greater importance for understanding the context in which Jesus became aware of the necessity of his violent death, is another passage not far removed from the former. We refer to the word reported by two of our evangelists in connection with the transfiguration narrative, which Jesus spoke concerning the appearance of Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah prophesied by the scribes **).

**) Mark 9:11 ff. and parallels.

We will provide an interpretation of this word further below, which we hope will recommend itself through its inner truth, from which it will emerge that, on one hand, Jesus opposed the literal sense of the messianic prophecies and the expectation of a sensuous glory of the earthly Messianic kingdom, and on the other, expressed the meaning he found in these prophecies. But this meaning was none other than that not worldly power and glory, but shame and death awaited the Messiah here on earth. The manner in which Jesus ties this intimation of the meaning he discerned to the disciples' raised question about the appearance of Elijah, which he unexpectedly interprets as referring to the person of John the Baptist, is so thoroughly peculiar, bearing entirely the stamp of the authentic speeches of the Lord and not the stamp of a later legend, that there is even less room here, than in the two cases mentioned earlier, for the idea of the possibility of such a later invention. The incidental remarks in which, just before the impending catastrophe, he once again announces its occurrence are just as undoubtedly from Jesus's own mouth *), as are the parables in which he, though figuratively, still clearly and unambiguously points to it **), and finally the longer speeches to the disciples about the fates impending for them, in which Jesus's certainty about his own fate is assumed ***); these references are only perhaps somewhat less weighty than the latter expression, as they, when considered on their own due to their greater proximity to the catastrophe, would rather suggest they speak of a now first, unforeseen inevitability of his fate, not of such a fate to which he had voluntarily submitted.

*) Mark 10:33-34, 10:38, 10:45, 14:7-8, 14:21 and parallels.

**) Mark 12:1 ff., Matthew 22:1 and parallels.

***) Mark 13:1 ff. and parallels.

Even the numerous hints in a similar sense contained in the fourth Gospel, when viewed in conjunction with the ones mentioned here, gain weight and evidential force, although in the form in which they are presented there, they probably could not have been spoken by Christ himself †).

†) John 2:19, 3:14, 6:51, 8:28, 10:15 ff. and others.

424

If we have already pointed out in the foregoing how Jesus, recognizing himself as the Messiah promised to his people, could not attain this recognition in a mechanical way, through the fulfillment of external signs or characteristics, but only through a self-elevation of his consciousness above the standpoint of those messianic prophecies, through an entirely independent interpretation of these prophecies, free from all national prejudices: then this sublime freedom and independence of his messianic consciousness has manifested itself most strikingly and magnificently in this very insight, peculiar to him, not derived from the notions of his time, into the necessity of suffering and the violent death awaiting the Messiah. To be able to properly appreciate the greatness, the truly divine sublimity and depth of this self-acquired consciousness of Jesus: this is among the significant positive advantages that our historical view of the life and personality of Christ has over the old dogmatic system. The latter, indeed, finds, and must for the sake of the consistency of its other teachings, that this insight, in all its aspects, was already contained in the proclamations of the prophets. If this were really the case, all credit for Jesus's independently acquired insight would be negated, and he would appear, at least in his humanity, merely as a suffering instrument of an external inevitability. Fortunately, however, this view is as ahistorical as it is spiritually unwarranted and contrary to the true, refined concept of the divinity of Christ's consciousness. Admittedly, there is a passage in a prophetic book of the Old Testament that, from the standpoint that turns the entire Old Testament into a continuous, not just spiritual, but literal prophecy of the Messiah, had to be understood as an announcement of the suffering and death of the Messiah. We refer to the famous fifty-third chapter of the Isaiah prophecies, which we have mentioned several times, that speaks in undeniably grand, profound mysticism of the vicarious suffering of an ideal personality, that "Servant of Jehovah", which had to be taken for the Messiah within the consistency of the dogmatic system*).

*) For the true meaning of this highly important prophetic passage, which has been widely discussed in recent times, and the underlying notions, we refer to

the interpretation by Vatke, which is entirely in line with our own conviction: Biblical Theology of the O.T. section 20. (p. 525 ff.).

However, another question is whether that passage really speaks of the Messiah; more specifically, whether it was understood by the Jews before Christ and during the time of Christ as speaking of the Messiah. Attempts have indeed been made to demonstrate the latter, but with so little success that even critics, who would apparently benefit from accepting this interpretation due to its connection with the view on the mythical origin of the concept of the vicarious suffering of the Messiah, have found themselves compelled to admit this failure *).

*) As Strauss, L. I. p. 318 ff. The interpretations of the Isaiah passage, which there (p. 319, note 14), following de Wette's lead whose writing "de morte Christi expiatoria" has addressed this topic most comprehensively and exhaustively, are taken from the Targum Jonathan and from Origen, must seem to every unbiased observer as compelling against the assumption of a messianic interpretation of that passage by the Jews, as the passages (p. 176 f.) we cited earlier against the messianic interpretation of Isaiah 7:14.

Rather, both the course of the gospel and apostolic history in general, and many individual passages that testify to the contrast between Christ's personal view of the fate of the Messiah and the then popular belief of the Jews**), speak so loudly and decisively for different messianic concepts that one must willfully blind oneself against the spiritual greatness of Jesus if one wants to see that sublime idea as borrowed, rather than as independently conceived by him.

**) Mark 8:32, S. 1t ff. and parallels; Luke 24:21, John 12:31, and others.

Indeed, He himself expressly and repeatedly ***) refers to a written proclamation of the suffering and death of the Messiah.

***) Mark 8:12, 14:21 and parallels.

It is not unlikely that he meant the prophetic passage we mentioned, as the apostles after him often explicitly cited it in this sense *).

*) Acts 8:32 f.

However, regardless of whether he meant this or any other passage, it remains both an ahistorical view and one unworthy of Christ — even if put forth with the intention of

glorifying him — to attribute to him a literal belief in the alleged prophecy and to suggest that he embraced suffering and death because he found it written about the Messiah. Rather, the fact that he could find this meaning in those passages, contrary to the prevailing view of his people, can only be explained by his having arrived at that sublime idea through a deep and powerful insight. Even here, as elsewhere, he rises freely above the letter of the Old Testament and interprets the letter as the spirit requires, instead of, like our dogmatists, adapting the spirit to the letter. — The perception of this high spiritual freedom, from which Jesus creatively generated the idea of his vicarious suffering, is not too costly a price to pay from our perspective by sacrificing both the originally messianic meaning of those prophetic sayings, and the supposedly similarly intended prophecies of Simeon and John the Baptist, which, if they had really been spoken in the way our gospel accounts tell us, would transfer part of the glory that only belongs to Jesus to those who supposedly uttered them, thus destroying this glory by dividing the indivisible.

427

Similarly, as from the theoretical side, Jesus' awareness of his purpose in terms of loftiness and genius is achieved by removing those external motives attributed to him both from the orthodox and rationalist perspectives, in a similar way, from the practical side, the divine man's resolution to take up his cross and face the fate awaiting him gains in magnitude, nobility, and freedom. We find it directly enacted and executed in his conscious decision, based on the belief that "only there a prophet should meet his death", in the final decisive moment of his journey, specifically his journey to Jerusalem. — The common view that turns this most sublime act of his life into a regular festival journey imports into the genuinely historical documents, which in this case, as elsewhere, are only the synoptic Gospels, an assumption from the fourth Gospel that is entirely foreign to those documents*).

*) The only thing that perhaps one or another might want to point to as a basis for such an assumption are the greeting formulas taken from Psalm 118:37 f., Mark 11:9 and parallels, which also occurred during the Feast of Tabernacles and Passover. However, anyone who considers how characteristic it is of writers such as our synoptic Gospel authors, in a case like this, to put a specific formula in the mouth of the people even without having received such a tradition, will not find it strange if they simply grabbed the first readily available one and applied it here, with modifications as circumstances required. Thus, we also find in Luke (19:38) a self-conceived addition to the same.

In them [the synoptic gospels], one searches in vain for any trace that it was because of the festival, or even on the occasion of the festival, that Jesus decided to go to Jerusalem. Certainly, a Passover occurs during Jesus' presence in the capital, and it is this Passover that brings him to death; but we learn absolutely nothing about the time that elapsed between his arrival and the Passover. The evangelists narrate here just as without specific chronological determinations **), as in the entire previous course of their narrative; the first mention of the Passover ***) occurs in a context that suggests everything other than the idea that the celebration of this Passover was the purpose of Jesus' presence. And the voices that rise in the Jewish Synedron, suggesting that, for the sake of the people, from whom unrest was feared, he should not be seized and executed during the festival *), clearly indicate that they knew Jesus' stay in Jerusalem was independent of the festival celebration and didn't assume he would leave immediately after it.

**) Especially noticeable is the lack of such specification in Luke 21:37; a passage that strikingly demonstrates how the Synoptics conceive of Jesus' stay in Jerusalem as being of indeterminate length.

***) Mark 14:1 and parallels.

*) The same, V. 2.

Thus, as far as the presentation of the Synoptics is concerned, which we recognize, as said, as the only credible source, we have free room to imagine Jesus' stay in Jerusalem as long or as short as we want; and if certain particular circumstances seem to suggest a somewhat longer duration **), we will all the more readily allow ourselves to be guided by them in determining the probability of this point, as undoubtedly our overall view of the life and death of Jesus rounds off into a whole with this assumption, and the more space is thus gained for the motivation of individual events. Indeed, Jesus entered Jerusalem with the will to die and the certainty that he would find his death there; but the circumstances under which he entered were such that they suggested everything other than the fulfillment of his prophecy.

**) Among these, I particularly count the words in Matt. 23:37, which Strauss cites as one of the moments that make the assumption of a one-time stay of Jesus in Jerusalem questionable.

Welcomed with loud cheers from the people, who probably for the first time (not in Galilee, as he did not present himself as such) hailed him as the Son of David, and in the temple, where he taught, surrounded by countless followers who impatiently awaited

his arrival every early morning ***), he was to the leaders of the people and the scribes an object of fear more than of hate, and as their conversations with Jesus and their repeated attempts to trap him with words show, it certainly required many and protracted consultations before they agreed on what should be done concerning him.

***) Luke 21:38.

An event of such weight is not the work of a moment; the death of the Lord does not appear to us as a historical event in the significance it actually has if we regard it only as an extemporized incident, if we do not think of it as being preceded by the back-and-forth play of the forces active on both sides in the full breadth of time and space required for the development of such a drama *).

*) About Jesus' stay in Jerusalem, as in fact about his entire life history, what Lessing says in the critique of a dramatic work applies (Works Vol. 24, p. 325): "It's true, I see no physical obstacles as to why all these events couldn't have happened in this time frame, but all the more moral ones."

430

Concerning the signs by which Jesus recognized at his departure from Galilee that his time had come, we have no detailed information. The most obvious assumption would be that he might have seen the degree of maturity reached by his apostles to continue the work entrusted to them as an indication that his own mission was fulfilled. However, what we learn, for instance, about Peter's behavior during the course of the catastrophe, makes the moral maturity of even the most distinguished among the disciples seem very incomplete. Apart from that, the concept of such maturity, being inherently infinite, is too relative, and there is too much evidence to suggest that Jesus relied more on extraordinary support from above for his disciples than on their own strength to settle with this assumption. The more accurate assumption, in this as in all similar points, is undoubtedly that Jesus made his decision not based on reflection and rational reasons, but based on a general feeling of a necessity rooted in the divine order of things—a feeling that we can confidently assume guided him more securely in each of his steps than any wise contemplation *).

*) Consider the poignant prophetic word, which claims a general feeling analogous to the instinct of animals for duty in the higher sense: Jer. 8, 7.

— Only as a conjecture, to which we do not wish to attach any significant weight, may we raise the question of whether among the elements that made up this general feeling,

there might have been an awareness of a decrease or weakening in the power of miracles. What brought us to this conjecture is the fact that during Jesus' stay in Jerusalem, there is no mention of miraculous healings that he would have performed there, as he did earlier in Galilee; not only in detailed narratives but also in brief incidental mentions, with the sole exception of a note in the first Gospel that looks very improvised **), and then perhaps the healing of the ear of the soldier injured by one of the disciples, which only has the testimony of Luke ***) to back it.

**) Matt. 21, 14.

***) Luk. 22, 51.

Also, the words already mentioned earlier, in which Jesus announces his intention to remain in Galilee until his time comes †), can be interpreted in a way that would presuppose in him the awareness of using the physical duration of his healing power as a measure for the length of his life's mission.

†) Ἴδου, εκβάλλω δαιμόνια καί ἰασεις επιτελώ σήμερον και αυριον, καί τη τρίτη τελείουμαι. Luk. 13, 32.

— Admittedly, it cannot be assumed that Jesus would have waited for the actual extinguishing of this power; for several reasons, and especially because one of the most striking acts in which that power was manifest is reported just before entering Jerusalem during his passage through Jericho. Also, refraining from healings while teaching in the temple might have had the explicit reason that Jesus, so close to the end of his journey, wanted only the purely spiritual side of his work, independent of his personal existence in this world, to emerge. But the premonition of the impending decrease of that power, which from the beginning had constituted the real basis of the Messiah's mission for his consciousness, might have been among the hints through which the Heavenly Father called him from the earth: this assumption, when given as a mere conjecture as we do, will have nothing objectionable to those who do not consider the gift of miracles as something that has absolutely nothing in common with the rest of the natural world.

432

The path by which the Lord traveled from Galilee to Jerusalem has always been a subject of numerous critical disputes. However, these largely lose their interest for us, as they are based on the assumption of a greater accuracy and completeness of the reports, especially of the third and fourth gospels, than we can grant to any of these documents. In the first two Synoptics, in contrast to the latter two, this journey seems to

be linked with a journey of Jesus to Peraea, and through Peraea to the border of Judea *), suggesting that this journey marks the path of the former.

*) Ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας δια τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου are the words at Marc. 10, 1, and we have every reason to read the words at Matth. 19, 1: ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, which admittedly give no proper sense, to be nothing but a mutilation of those, probably arising from the fact that the expression τό πέραν was strange to the Evangelist; as we find also elsewhere that the Evangelists avoid using the article in this connection. Marc. 3, 8 and Parall. Joh. I, 27. 10, 40.

Accepting this as the actual travel route, without undue consideration of the conflicting reports, seems plausible to us, based on our general understanding of the relationship and credibility of the Gospels, especially since it aligns well with the mention of Jericho as a place of passage in all three Synoptics and also traces of a stay in Peraea shortly before the last trip to Jerusalem are found in the fourth Gospel *).

*) John ibid.

However, we cannot help but note that in Mark's narrative, which the first Gospel entirely relies upon, there is no inherent need to consider the aforementioned journey and the last one to Jerusalem as the same. The mention of Jericho cannot decide this; for even if the location of this city primarily indicates the direction from Peraea to Jerusalem, it is certain that many of those who went to Jerusalem without crossing the Jordan touched this city. It even seems that roads from both directions converged here **).

**) For instance, Josephus (Bell. Jud. IV, 8, 1) notes that Vespasian, who initially came from Samaria on his campaign to Jerusalem, met one of his generals in Jericho, who came from Peraea.

That Jesus had traveled through Samaria on this journey seems to be supported by Luke's repeated mention of this land *).

*) Luke 9:52, 17:11.

As imprecise as Luke's relation appears in this travel report, this deviation from Mark seems too deliberate **), suggesting it originates from a note Luke received, indicating a need to supplement and correct his predecessor.

**) We already noted how the beginning of Luke's travel report (9:51) matches Mark's mention of the journey to the borders of Judea (10:1). The immediate difference can't be coincidental.

Given that we also find a specific report of Jesus staying in Samaria in the fourth Gospel, which can hardly be considered entirely fictitious (though its context can't be accepted historically given its mention of earlier pilgrimages to Jerusalem), and since the assumption of other visits to this country contradicts the direct prohibition to the disciples not to enter it: it seems advisable to recognize this, albeit not very important to us, as a question that remains problematic given the data available for its answer.

434

Of more essential interest to us is the moment of entry into Jerusalem, which again appears very different depending on whether one regards the depiction of the first three Gospels or that of the fourth Gospel as more credible. According to the Synoptic Gospels, the jubilation and greetings of the people on this occasion are for the first entry, as we have already stated above, of the Son of David into the City of David; according to the author of the Gospel of John, it is due to a miracle that Jesus had performed some time earlier, without, however, entering the capital itself, in its vicinity, namely, the resurrection of Lazarus at Bethany *).

*) John 12, 18.

In the former, this glorious moment appears as the result of the total past life and deeds of Jesus on the brink of the catastrophe, which now depends on his free resolution and will; in the latter, it is an isolated, incidental event, just as accidental as the cause that elicited it, and just as disputed and ambiguous, as according to this Gospel, the whole life of its hero was but a continuous fabric of disputes and party struggles. Consistent with this, according to the Synoptics, that entry truly marks the goal and conclusion of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, while the opposing reporter only portrays it as a trip from a nearby village, where Jesus often stayed with good friends, and from where he had recently secretly fled with his disciples to the small town of Ephraim to evade the plots of his enemies, who, it seems **), had placed a bounty on his head.

**) Ibid. 11, 57.

***) Ibid. V. 54. What might have moved Jesus to evade these plots at that time, and then so soon afterwards to expose himself to them, indeed to explicitly provoke them (Cap. 13,27), for this we lack any attempt at justification.

Based on all that has been said so far, we do not hesitate for a moment to align ourselves with the former depiction, as the only worthy and internally true, as well as externally fully motivated one, and interpret the incident with the colt, which the Lord mounted after sending his disciples to fetch it ****), as a sign given by Jesus himself of his intent, be it explicitly in the dignity of the Messiah and King, or at least as a powerful and recognized prophet, to enter the capital.

****) Mark 11, 1 ff.

Only from this moment do the expressions of joy and the acclamations of the crowd begin *), which Jesus explicitly approves of in Luke and rejects the admonitions of the Pharisees to curb them **).

*) Mark 11, 8 and parallel passages.

**) Luke 19, 40.

According to the Synoptics, the throng itself does not consist of those coming from the city during the procession, as in John, but of Jesus' entourage; however, that this entourage was a festival caravan would surely have been indicated by the reporters if this were truly the case and if this detail were not an entirely arbitrary addition. Luke refers to the multitude that started the hymns of praise as the "crowd of disciples" (πληθος των μαθητων) and thus seems to presuppose, which also fits well with the other circumstances we learn, that wherever Jesus entered or passed through, a multitude of admirers and devotees flocked to him, joined him, and accompanied him for shorter or longer stretches of the way.

436

According to Mark's account, it was late in the evening when Jesus entered Jerusalem. The addition in the first gospel that the entire city was stirred upon his entry ***), may not necessarily have been drawn from specific documented traditions. However, it remains a vivid testimony of the impression that the overall image of that entry made on later narrators and can indeed be regarded as historically accurate in this sense.

***) "the whole city was stirred" Matth. 21, 10.

After having looked around everywhere, a characteristic note from Mark, Jesus left with the Twelve to spend the night in Bethany—a custom he probably observed throughout

his entire stay in Jerusalem. Later, we find him there again †), and learn that he regularly spent nights outside the city. Luke, possibly by mistakenly generalizing from the last night (which seems to have been an exception), associates this with the Mount of Olives *).

*) Luke 21, 37. 22, 39.

This preference for Bethany suggests the presence of a friendly house that opened its doors for him. The fourth gospel's claim that it was the house of the sisters known to Luke, albeit in a different context, as hospitable hostesses of the Lord **), is not necessarily to be dismissed. However, we should approach with skepticism what this gospel has to say about the supposed brother of these two sisters and the unjustified conflation of the episode in the house of Simon the Leper ***) with the house of Martha and Mary and the person of Bethany's Mary †).

**) Luke 10, 38 ff. Bethany is not mentioned at this point, and, if one views Luke's travel account as consistent, it probably wasn't meant.

***) Mark 14, 3 ff. and parallels.

†) John 12, 1 ff.

Every morning, Jesus regularly went to the city to teach in the temple. On the first of these mornings, following the detailed account of Mark (other Synoptics omit the night that elapsed between the entry and this incident), he took a remarkable action emblematic of his power and authority: he drove out the merchants and money changers from the temple. As the celebration of the entry was symbolic in the way Jesus allowed or perhaps even orchestrated it, this act, too, was symbolic, especially in light of his intention to teach in the temple. It's unlikely that Jesus aimed to literally cleanse the Jewish temple worship. If so, this act would contrast starkly with his general disposition, making him appear even more zealous than the Pharisees and scribes. Instead, the true intention was to give a tangible sign of the authority he was granted at that moment to cleanse the sanctuary in a higher, spiritual sense. The less it suited him to show, during the ensuing catastrophe, the freedom with which he submitted to it, and the power to avoid the catastrophe if he had wished, except through subtle hints; the less he was allowed to elaborate on the motives of his actions and suffering in long, boastful speeches, the more factual demonstrations of power he was capable of exercising over the people at those moments were in place. However, this incident loses its significance when, according to the fourth gospel, one wants to date it back to the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. From Jesus' perspective, it then appears as

pointless pedantry; how such a power move, already exaggerated by that particular narrative, could have been allowed by the Jewish authority is utterly incomprehensible.

438

It is certainly based on a very accurate understanding of the context of events when Mark directly links the beginning of the hostile plots against Jesus by the scribes and chief priests to this incident*).

*) Mark. 11, 18

The other two Synoptics also provide this note in the same place, presumably depending on Mark, but they indicate not that particular incident as the cause, but rather the success that Jesus found among the people in general**).

**) Matt. 21, 15. Luke 19, 47.

Especially Luke had already mentioned during the entry a dissatisfaction of the Pharisees with the jubilation of his followers***), and corresponding to this, the first evangelist, with a turn that very much seems to favor a psalm he puts into Jesus' mouth*), attributed the criticism of the chief priests and scribes to a Hosanna cry that is said to have been heard from a bunch of children in the temple.

***) Luke. 19, 39.

*) Ps. 8, 3. Matt. 31, 16.

According to the fourth Gospel, the hostile plots of the high council, about whose deliberations this gospel tells in detail but with the inclusion of obvious errors**), would have been aimed at the last great miracle which Jesus is said to have performed in Bethany some time before the feast, the raising of Lazarus.

**) John. 11, 47 ff.

However, Jesus, as mentioned earlier, would have avoided these plots for a while by retreating to a hidden place, whereas in the Synoptics, traces of which have not been completely erased even there***), he is protected, on the contrary, by the publicity of his actions and by the approval his teachings still receive†).

***) John. 12, 19.

†) Mark. 11, 18. 12, 12. 37 and parallels.

Admittedly, this approval, as further events show, must have been very superficial and unreliable from the crowd's side; but it was, as we clearly see from the synoptic account, directed at his person and his teachings, not just a single miracle. — Now, if we focus on Mark's account, which has been proven to be the most vivid and consistent: looking back at that starting point of events in Jerusalem, the temple cleansing, we indeed first have to relate this event to the question with which this evangelist, and following him the other two Synoptics, open the series of disputations of priests, scribes, and elders with Jesus††). They ask him: by whose authority does he do this? To which Jesus, who feels called to reveal himself as the Messiah through actions, but not (like the Christ of John) to argue with those ignorant about his messianic dignity, silences them with a clever evasive answer. Only in a parable*) does he consider it appropriate to confess to them, still following his previous habit of speaking to the people, that he is the "Son of God".

*) Cap. 12, 1 ff. and parallels.

But just as he had previously linked the revelation of his Messiahship to his disciples with the proclamation of his suffering and death, he also gives this proclamation as content to the parable. Further on **), he poses a question to his opponents on his own initiative, the purpose of which is to force them to admit the futility of their conception of the Messiah, anchored in the letter of the Old Testament prophecies, as if he necessarily had to be a biological descendant of King David.

**) V. 35 ff. and parallels.

440

In another way, however, than by this actual assumption of the Messiah's dignity, we see Jesus during his stay in Jerusalem explicitly acting against the Jewish hierarchy. He speaks to the people, who crowd into the temple in droves to hear him, in the strongest terms against the hypocrisy, against the greed for money and honor of the scribes, who then formed such a numerous and influential class and effectively held the management of the internal affairs of the Jewish people in their hands. We might indeed concede that not all of the thunderous reproofs, which, on the occasion of the brief note Marcus provides about this attack ***), the author of the first gospel incorporates from the collection of sayings of Matthew at this point †), were spoken at this time, but some perhaps earlier. For even Luke, though he too does not skip that note from Marcus *),

places them at different occasions. But we should not doubt that these speeches, in their sense and tone, match what Jesus might have spoken then.

***) V. 38 ff.

†) Matth. 23, 1 ff.

*) Luk. 10, 46 s.

When we juxtapose these speeches with the polemics contained not at one single point, but from beginning to end in the speeches of the fourth gospel, not so much against the Pharisees and scribes in particular, as against "the Jews" in general, a striking difference emerges. The polemic of the latter is merely defensive, defending only the divine dignity and mission of Jesus against the disbelief and misunderstandings of the adversaries, albeit certainly not lacking in strong accusations of the stupidity and obstinate obduracy of these adversaries; while the former is completely offensive and doesn't mention any personal offense Jesus might have suffered from them. As much as we're inclined to recognize the unique value of those Johannine speeches, in this case, we must insist that only from the synoptics can we extract a faithful image of Jesus's relationship with the Pharisees and scribes as it had then formed. The immense frankness with which the sublime master, surrounded by throngs of an astonished crowd that cannot resist the power of his word, exposes the baseness of that class, which this crowd had been accustomed to revere as its chief authority, not only offers a far more majestic, divine-worthy image than those half-boastful, half-impotent defensive speeches, but it also more fully explains the hatred that class bore towards Jesus, and how this hatred dared not manifest openly against him until, through secret betrayal, they had him in their hands. — Moreover, one shouldn't overlook how these reproofs, and juxtaposed to them the proclamation of an imminent severe tribulation for the city of Jerusalem and the Jewish people, which, according to the Synoptics, Jesus expressed simultaneously to the more intimate of his disciples *), mutually elucidate and authenticate each other.

*) Marc. 13, 1 ff. u. Parall.

Only the well-founded conviction of the irredeemability of the Jewish state in its then conditions could justify such an attack against the class upon which the hierarchical constitution was based; only the insight into the corruption of this class could bring about such a conviction. — With this outlook into the future of the Jewish state and people, the divine visionary perspective is linked to the outlook into the future of world history; in spirit, he sees the apostles, to whom he feels mysteriously close and present

even after his imminent death, laying the foundation of his church and preaching the gospel all over the world. He also sees the dreadful battles and tribulations his followers will have to endure, from which they can hope to be completely freed only at the end of the world, when he himself will return and establish his kingdom among them in another sense.

442

Regarding the motivations of Jesus' opponents in the plots that ultimately led to His condemnation and violent death, the simple portrayal of the Synoptists, which does not explicitly inquire into these motives, leaves us in no doubt. The Fourth Gospel might rather cause confusion with its seemingly more thorough assertion that the chief priests and Pharisees feared, due to the growing following that Jesus was gaining through His miracles, a danger to the country and people from the Romans **).

**) John 11:48.

However, this remark, which is not remotely supported by any other moment in Jesus' history, is clearly made for the sake of an odd anecdote, very much in the taste of this evangelist, so much so that we cannot avoid suspecting that, at least in the form he tells it, it might be attributed solely to him. Caiaphas, it is said, the high priest of that year—(it is well known that the high priesthood did not change annually, and yet, the words repeated by the evangelist on three different occasions *) can't be interpreted otherwise with an unbiased reading)—Caiaphas chided the others for their zeal and pointed out to them that it would be better if one man died for the people than for the entire nation to perish.

*) v. 49, 51, and Chapter 18, verse 13. The error probably arose because the author of the Gospel always heard Annas and Caiaphas simultaneously mentioned as high priests (cf. Luke 3:2, Acts 4:6), which he could not understand other than by assuming an alternating administration.

However, according to the evangelist, due to a superstition about double-meaning prophecies which is unique to him among all the New Testament writers, to which is added another superstition, even less fitting for an apostle of Jesus, and not even justified by a provable popular belief, the superstition of a prophetic gift inherent in the high priesthood—by saying this, Caiaphas unknowingly alluded to the death that Jesus was about to endure in a completely different sense for His people and for humanity.

**) Bretschneider and de Wette rightly pointed to similar instances in Chapter 12:32 f., 15:20, 18:9, 32, and 19:24. Both overlooked the most striking of all in Chapter 2:21.

— Without a doubt, the scribes knew, as they were more intent on enticing Jesus into making statements by which they could have implicated Him to the Roman authorities ***) , very well that an insurrection of the people, which could have provoked the Romans against the Jewish people, was not to be feared from Jesus. The pretext they used before Pilate, according to Luke's account *), to depict Jesus as a rebel even against the Roman regime, was nothing more than a pretext, not the expression of a genuinely meant concern.

***) Mark 12:14 and parallels.

*) Luke 23:2.

444

So, without letting that often dubious note delude us into the illusion of a more precise knowledge of the events of that consultation, we still adhere here to the simple report of the Synoptists. According to them, as the Passover approached, the priests and scribes gathered (in the residence of the high priest Caiaphas, the first evangelist adds) to discuss the execution of the bloody resolution against Jesus, which envy and revenge had inspired in them. The initial result of this consultation was that it would be better to let the festival pass so as not to risk a popular uprising during it **); but soon it seemed to emerge that the very dispersion caused by the festival customs, and the overcrowding of the city with a multitude in which the people already devoted to Jesus were lost and could not easily come together as usual, might be an especially opportune time.

**) Neander's opinion (L.J.S. 570) that the words in Mark 14:2 and parallels refer to a decision to kill Jesus before the festival and thus could confirm the view apparently arising from the fourth Gospel about the day of his death, is not only against the natural sense of the words but also against the fact that the crowd would unquestionably already be just as large so shortly before the festival, and thus the concern about unrest would be just as imminent as during the festival itself.

Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve, offers to deliver Jesus into the hands of the priests, for which they promise him a sum of money. Now, as he contemplates an appropriate

time to carry out his plan, the most suitable moment, as we must conclude from the context of the Synoptists' depiction, appears to be the night after the Passover meal. Jesus had made explicit arrangements to celebrate it with his disciples in the city **), contrary to his usual habit of having the main meal not in Jerusalem but in Bethany *).

*) Mark 14:3 and parallels.

**) As far as we are otherwise aware of the endeavour, in a manner that was once and to some extent still is popular, to inject a pragmatic context into the narratives of the evangelists, we confess that in the present passage we have given in to the temptation, which is indeed close enough here, to weave in some features of this kind into our account. The report of the priests' and scribes' deliberations before the festival, and that of Judas' betrayal, are narrated individually and without any connection to each other in the first Gospels. In Luke's account, they do come directly together, due to the omission of the narrative of the meal in Bethany (since the evangelist had already anticipated some aspects of this story earlier in C. 7, 36 ff., which prevents him from retaining it here), and they indeed merge into a single account. This is why the evangelist omits the words: *μη εν τη εορτη* etc., and instead, as an inadvertent testament to the omitted narrative, includes: *εφοβουντο γαρ τον λαόν*. Our task now is to reconcile these two conflicting pieces of information better than Luke did, and I believe I have accomplished this in the text. The observation by all three synoptists that Judas sought an opportune time to execute his plan (*εζήτει, πώς ευκαίρως αυτόν παραδῶ* in Mark, a somewhat harsh expression which the other two, each in their own way, have replaced with a more delicate one), clearly indicates that such an opportunity would be described in the subsequent narrative. Considering the literary character of Mark, I don't doubt that this evangelist intended to establish such a connection in his account, although he lacked the articulateness of expression, and his successors lacked the insight into the context to provide evidence of such a connection. In any case, everything pushes us to assume that Judas intentionally chose the time of the meal held exceptionally in Jerusalem (because it was an exception) due to Jewish customs, which required the celebration of this meal in the city, and the subsequent nocturnal journey to Gethsemane; presumably because he did not find it advisable to apprehend Jesus in Jerusalem during the day, and equally not at night in Bethany among his host friends and other followers. It also seems plausible that Judas recognized how favorable the moment was when the entire population of Jerusalem, along with the multitude that had flocked in, were occupied with the Passover meal and preparations for the subsequent festival. Whether this line of reasoning truly belonged to Judas or not, it was certainly

more accurate than the earlier opposite reasoning of the scribes, which might have been influenced by memories of previous unrest during festival times. The fact that Jesus' execution took place without resistance from the people, despite his considerable and well-documented following, is quite remarkable. However, as one can see, our entire view of the present context is based on the correctness of the synoptic assumption that that night was indeed the night of the Passover meal. I refrain from delving further into the debate on whether it was or wasn't, as I have nothing new to add to the extensive scholarly discourse on the matter. Some defenders of the complete authenticity of John's Gospel still prefer to interpret its seemingly contradictory information in a way that resolves the contradiction, rather than, like many theologians who adhere to the tradition hypothesis regarding the synoptic Gospels, considering the synoptists' account as erroneous and John's presupposition, that Jesus was crucified before the actual start of the Passover, as more accurate. For those who, like us, doubt the authenticity of the narrative parts of John's Gospel but place even greater weight on the authority of Mark, this matter is naturally easier. Thus, without necessarily agreeing with Bretschneider's hypothesis that the error stemmed from the difference in day counting between the Jews and other peoples, we have no reservations about considering John 18:28, which seems to be the main source of the difficulty, as entirely misunderstood. Similarly, I do not doubt that in John 19:14, the expression παρασκευή του πάσχα means nothing other than the term παρασκευή used in V. 31 for the same day, which context shows refers to the following day, not as the first day of Passover but as the Sabbath, and that this otherwise unusual expression is solely due to the carelessness and ignorance of the evangelist.

At this meal, Jesus, who, as we know, had already been sufficiently prepared, is seized by a vivid premonition of what is imminent. He tells the disciples that one of them will betray him; a hint not understood by those from whom Judas had managed to hide his plot. He offers them the bread and the cup as His Body and His Blood, which He is about to sacrifice for them, and thus establishes - regardless of whether He expressly commanded its future repetition in His memory, for that is not the main point here - by this act, the commemoration meal which is celebrated among Christians to this day as a sacred legacy of their Lord. As they leave the meal, He announces to the disciples that all of them will fall away from Him that night, a statement which they respond to with assurances of their loyalty even unto death. Having reached the Mount of Olives, in the Garden of Gethsemane, He takes the three trusted disciples with Him to support Him in prayer. Seized by deep distress, He awakens them several times from their sleep, which they keep drifting back into. There, a band of armed men, sent by the priests, the

scribes, and the elders, and led by Judas Iscariot, ambush them. Judas identifies the Master to them with the prearranged sign of a kiss.

*) These, however, were probably not present, as assumed in Luke 22:52. The armed men were undoubtedly only temple servants, not a Roman military unit, as suggested in John 18:3. The notion that they informed Pilate of their intention and sought his support does not fit with the usual character of the conspiracy's proceedings, and would probably not have been successful.

The disciples want to defend themselves, and one of them wounds the servant of the high priest. Still, whether they succumbed to the overwhelming force or, as all the evangelists (except for the one whose testimony we regard as the most important) report, albeit without a consistent account of the circumstances, Jesus himself forbade them to resist with arms. Soon they scattered, and Jesus was led away by the captors **).

**) It is undoubtedly significant, given our understanding of the relationship of the Gospels, and this understanding itself is confirmed by the fact that the narrative of Mark is the simplest and most straightforward here. It is free not only from the miracles interwoven by the last two evangelists but also from the strange speech which, instead of those, the first one (Matthew 26:53) puts in Jesus' mouth. The fact that this particular event — undoubtedly, at the time, the most contentious and objectionable point in the entire life of the Lord for many listeners — underwent various transformations early on is inherent in the nature of the matter. However, it is now fitting for us to penetrate these embellishments to the pure truth and to discard the false ornamentation that Jesus no longer needs to be recognized by us as the divine being he is. The event is most distorted in the fourth Gospel. Here, Jesus is said to have voluntarily approached the captors (with Judas standing idly by, his purpose unclear) and to have so startled them with his presence that they fell to the ground before him. What role do the disciples play if, after such a demonstration of Jesus's power, they still flee? Admittedly, their flight is not explicitly reported there; instead, in a twist, Jesus commands the captors to let them go, and this is said to fulfill a previous word of his (John 17:12, in one of the genuine Johannine speeches, the assertion of which is unfortunately commented on here in line with a habit of this Gospel). Not much more appropriately appears the miracle of the healed ear of the wounded servant (Luke 22:51), especially since Christ had just previously (v. 36) ordered his disciples to arm themselves with swords. In our view, based on Mark's account, it is unlikely that Christ expressly forbade the disciples to defend themselves; if he had, his earlier announcement in 14:27 would make no sense.

This prohibition was conceived to illustrate the willingness with which Jesus accepted his fate. Still, anyone who has correctly understood the course of events does not need such a depiction. On the contrary, the grandeur of the deed suffers if, at the moment of decision, Jesus's submission appears only as an act of arbitrariness and not as a foreseen and intended necessity. The same evangelist, by the way, whose account omits all those features whose omission, if they had been historically true and already reported by earlier writers, would be neither explicable nor forgivable, while their addition by later writers is quite explicable and indeed forgivable, also attests his originality through another detail. That is, he (Mark 14:51 f.) recounts the minor (because of its insignificance omitted by the others), but picturesque and characteristic detail of how a young man (apparently a stranger, not an apostle) wanted to follow Jesus. Still, when the captors grabbed him by the linen garment he had wrapped around his body, he left it behind and fled. A detail that had obviously remained in the memory of our evangelist only because through it the entire scene had gained form and vividness for him. It would not have occurred to him to add it, omitting other, much more important details, if he had already found the rest of the story elsewhere.

449

What has most engaged, and undoubtedly in the most interesting way, the art of historical interpretation in the course of this catastrophe, is the search for the motives that might have led the betrayer to his dark deed. Quite rightly, the motive of greed, as indicated in the original documents, was found insufficient to explain this act. This insufficiency seemed all the more pronounced since one of the evangelists cites a disproportionately small sum as the price Judas was said to have received — a piece of information which, by the way, we have ample reason to distrust*), — and another passage, although not entirely beyond doubt**), mentions an illicit, probably much larger gain that Judas, as the treasurer of the group surrounding Jesus, is supposed to have made earlier.

*) Matt. 26:15; undoubtedly on the occasion of Zechariah 11:12; compare Matt. 27:9.

**) John 12:6.

Furthermore, two other considerable points suggested a more favorable view of the unfortunate character: the tolerance of Judas within the circle of disciples, and perhaps even the explicit calling to be a disciple. It's hard to convince oneself that Jesus would

have granted this to someone utterly unworthy. Additionally, there's the remorse which, according to the report of the first gospel***), Judas later displayed through his suicide.

***) Matt. 27:3 ff.

From the consideration of these circumstances, those interpretations of Judas' deed arose, suggesting that this disciple did not act out of greed, but possibly due to unmet expectations, wounded pride, or even in the interest of Jesus and his fellow apostles — trying to push the former to a bolder stance, or to reveal his anticipated political plans, or even to demonstrate more profound and consequential manifestations of his miraculous powers. Or, as an old misguided mysticism could once suggest, due to a genuine insight, imparted by God Himself, into the necessity of Jesus' redemptive death. As for our beliefs about Judas' character — which are based partly on the straightforward testimonies of historical documents, and partly on considering what aligns best with the overall sequence of events, especially with the personal spirit and character of Jesus as we otherwise know him — we have already expressed them above. Consequently, we can only perceive the motive of his betrayal, whatever it may have been, as purely malicious. We are further convinced of this view because we find no trace in the scriptures of any motive of a better nature that could be expected in one of the previously mentioned possible cases. However, we are hesitant to simply label this motive as sheer greed. Such a base, sordid character as Judas would then possess is hard to imagine within the circle of disciples. Besides, even Judas' act seems to require a degree of strength of character that common, selfish malevolence doesn't have, but deeper-rooted wickedness does. This type of malice is hinted at in the Lord's own comments about the lost disciple, not just in various pertinent sayings of the fourth Gospel*), which deserve attention given their genuine Johannine origin, but especially in the terrifyingly sublime lament He pronounces over the wretched one in the Synoptic Gospels, "better for him if he had not been born"***). We'll also explore parables and other sayings which seem to point to an evil that emerges within the circle of the called ones*).

*) John 6:70, 13:18, 17:12.

**) Mark 14:21 and parallels. Early Church Fathers observed (and they weren't entirely wrong in this observation, even if Christ's intent wasn't to pronounce a dogma) that these words express a degree of damnation deeper than other statements of rejection.

*) E.g., Matt. 13:48, 22:11 ff. Perhaps also 12:32, 45, and others.

In the account of Judas' suicide, we find no obstacle to this assumption; because, given the irreconcilable contradictions between the Acts of the Apostles and the later legend reported by Papias, and considering the internal improbability of such a rapid change of heart as reported, its credibility is highly questionable. Even if one were to accept the suicide as a historical fact, it would not so much attest to the remorse of a better spirit as to the wild despair that even the most committed villain can experience. Moreover, as convinced as we are that Jesus saw through Judas from the outset of their acquaintance, we find it neither likely nor necessary to believe that he foresaw the details of the betrayal early on, or that he identified Judas as the betrayer during the fateful night. The former is presupposed in the fourth Gospel, but certainly only due to the prejudice of assuming Jesus' supernatural omniscience**). The narrative of the latter seems to arise from a misunderstanding, which we will clarify in its proper place.

**) John 6:71.

452

Regarding the interrogation that took place with Christ before the High Priest Caiaphas on that same night, we receive from Mark, to whom the author of the first gospel follows with great fidelity, a report distinguished by its inherent probability and by as much accuracy as can be expected from a scene where one or some of the disciples could only hear from afar, if at all. Indeed, this report omits a detail that some consider a testament to the eyewitness nature of the author of the fourth gospel: namely, an interrogation with Annas, the former high priest and father-in-law of Caiaphas, which preceded the one with Caiaphas. However, it's questionable whether this omission should be seen as a historical oversight; because it's not evident from the account in the fourth gospel why Annas would have had the authority to hold such an interrogation. Moreover, it remains uncertain whether the detailed account in the fourth gospel refers to the interrogation with Annas or, as most now believe (though not supported by the natural meaning of the text), to the one with Caiaphas. In any case, it offers nothing new, as the statement attributed to Jesus in response to the High Priest essentially aligns with what he said according to the Synoptics at the time of his arrest*.

*) John 18:20f, compared with Mark 14:48f. The reason for the hesitation to consider the interrogation in the fourth gospel as having taken place before Annas is known to be its intertwining with Peter's denial story, which according to the Synoptics occurs during the interrogation with Caiaphas; the method by which one tries to attribute it to Caiaphas is by interpreting ἀπεστείλε in verse 21 as pluperfect. However, one should not overlook that this method is forced and that the evangelist at least, as also noted by Strauss, appears to be a poor

storyteller. He indeed appears to be so especially since he skips the essential content of the interrogation (which he assumes in Chap. 19:7) and only reports less significant details. A reason for the evangelist to invent the whole interrogation with Annas might be found in v. 15, where he presupposes an acquaintance of the Apostle John with Annas and sees this acquaintance as the source of the news about the events during the interrogation.

— The report in Mark, however, speaks of a formal testimony, which was unsuccessful because the testimonies of the witnesses, who were instigated by the opponents, could not be reconciled. Regarding the content of these testimonies, which he repeatedly calls "false," the evangelist has provided an example in the statement attributed to Jesus: "I will destroy this temple made with hands, and in three days build another, not made with hands." That Jesus actually made this statement is not made certain by the way the fourth gospel, with only minor changes, refers to it in a different context*.

*) John 2:19.

For this gospel might very well have derived it from the tradition of the interrogation and found the motive to include it as a genuine saying in the peculiar mystical explanation, which it does not fail to add explicitly**), implying that Jesus, in talking about the temple he would destroy, was referring to his own body.

**) v. 21

Nevertheless, in the saying, if it is understood spiritually and symbolically in a better sense than the fourth evangelist does, there is something unique and characteristic of Jesus's teaching, which does not make us believe that it could have been spontaneously invented by his adversaries. The reminiscence attributed to the martyr Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles*** also seems to refer to words genuinely spoken by Jesus, not falsely attributed to him.

***) Acts 6:14.

However, if Jesus spoke these words, he did not utter them as disjointedly as they appear here and certainly not in such a boastful tone. — When the testimonies did not lead to the desired outcome, the High Priest rises and first asks the accused in general what he has to say in response; and when he remains silent, he poses to him in clear, concise words the question: whether he indeed is the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One. To this question, Jesus responds with a definite, unequivocal "Yes." What our evangelist adds next, the proclamation of the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of

power and coming on the clouds, would not be aptly placed in this context*), and it may, without diminishing Mark's general credibility, be doubted whether Jesus, whose individual words a distant witness, like Peter in the best case, could hardly have heard distinctly, really said them**).

*) It is only out of hostile intent against the higher concept of Christ that Strauss (L. I. II, p. 486) retains these words to be able to perceive "in that last distress the birth hour of the idea of a dying Messiah." If this idea had remained alien to Jesus until then; if he had remained trapped in the notion of envisioning "his messianic glorification without mediation through death": then this "last distress" could indeed shake him in those notions, but not suddenly elevate him to the heights and glory in which we find them expressed by the Christ of our gospels.

**) Luke (22, 67 ff.) felt the need to provide a closer justification for these words, but he was only able to do so in a way that the significance of that *εγω ειμι* — "the greatest word ever uttered by a mortal," rightly called by Schleiermacher in "Speeches on Religion" — more than it elevates it.

— After the fateful word was spoken, the High Priest tears his clothes: "What further need do we have of witnesses? You have heard the blasphemy. What seems right to you?" — upon which all declare him deserving of death. The maltreatments that follow, which are not in any way shaped according to related prophet passages as they are narrated here, do not necessarily have to be thought of as directly initiated by the priests and scribes themselves; — it is incorrect to have sought an advantage in Luke's account in that they are expressly attributed only to the servants.

455

In the morning, Jesus was handed over to the Roman Procurator Pontius Pilatus — as it seems from the accounts of the first two gospels, after another consultation of the Sanhedrin. Perhaps due to Pilatus's presence in Jerusalem (the usual residence of Roman Procurators was the coastal city of Caesarea), the Sanhedrin was made aware of the responsibility it might incur if it instigated a tumultuous killing of the condemned, which initially seemed to be their intention. That such tumultuous scenes frequently occurred during Roman rule in Judea is well known from various examples. It is also undoubtedly evident, even apart from the words put into the mouths of the Jews in the fourth gospel, from the legal state of Roman provinces, that such an act was illegal, and the judgment of life and death ultimately lay only with the Roman authority. — The interrogation before the Roman governor, as described by Mark, was quite straightforward. After repeated questioning, Jesus maintained his earlier claim that he

considered himself the Messiah*); otherwise, he remained silent in response to all other questions.

*) The reply "σου λέγεις" appears peculiar if one takes Mark 15:2 literally, as does the preceding question from Pilatus, given that Jesus would have had to assume a different meaning to this question. But both the answer and the question are narrated by the evangelist not with the intention that they should be taken verbatim, but, as is often the case with writers of this type, as a brief representation of the conversation's content.

Pilatus, who noticed the bias of the verdict given by the Sanhedrin but seemed to have reasons not to overlook it, possibly recalling Jesus's following among the masses and wanting to gauge which faction was stronger, attempted to use the custom that allowed him to release a prisoner to the people during the festival. However, a crowd, likely influenced by the priests, had gathered, which sought not the release of Jesus, but another, accused of insurrection and murder, Barabbas**), and demanded Jesus's crucifixion instead.

**) John 18:40, probably confusing him with the two who were crucified with Jesus, calls him a "ληστής" (robber).

Subsequently, Pilatus, intending to satisfy what appeared to him as the will of the people, made his decision.

457

He released Barabbas and subjected Jesus to scourging, which according to Roman custom typically preceded execution, and simultaneously exposed him to the ridicule and mockery of the soldiers in the Praetorium.

This simple account has received multiple additions and modifications in the other Gospels, but few of them seem justified by internal or external plausibility. In the first Gospel, two anecdotes are inserted into the narrative of Mark, which is otherwise almost verbatim retained: one is about a message from Pilate's wife to her husband regarding a dream she had, which warned her of the fate of the innocent*); the other, possibly a consequence of the former, is that Pilate, to proclaim his innocence in the bloodshed of the righteous, washes his hands in front of the crowd, and the people exclaim, "His blood be on us and on our children!"

*) The note in the Gospel of Nicodemus that this wife was inclined towards Judaism might, like the legendary note in the canonical Gospel, arise from confusion with Drusilla, the wife of Procurator Felix (Acts 24:24).

Luke has the priests accusing Jesus of inciting the people to disobey the Romans and to refuse the census; an accusation that could well have been among the various ones that Mark does not explicitly mention. Similarly, we wouldn't wholly reject, as noted earlier, what the same evangelist further tells of Pilate sending Jesus to Herodes Antipas, who was in Jerusalem at the time, as it aligns well with what we know of this prince's character elsewhere**).

**) However, we must not overlook the very plausible reason for inventing this narrative (always with the best faith in its accuracy), especially for Luke, could lie in the events recounted in the 25th and 26th chapters of Acts. The manner in which Paul is introduced to King Agrippa by the Procurator Festus, who also expresses his prior wish to hear him (25:22), bears a striking similarity to that account. That Justin mentions the latter does not provide evidence for us, as Justin likely drew from no other source than Luke himself.

Furthermore, if this sending did indeed take place, the intent was certainly not to hand him over to Herodes as his rightful judge. Pilate clearly viewed himself as the only competent judge; he simply wanted to hear Herodes's opinion on his compatriot, or perhaps to indulge a wish of the Tetrarch that had come to his attention. Thus, any difficulty posed by Jesus's silence before the prince, who he should have viewed as his rightful authority, is resolved. However, the mockery that Jesus is said to have endured here from Herodes and his entourage when the former's expectations were disappointed, is repeated too often in this narrative and in too similar a manner. One might suspect Luke is transferring what Mark recounted about Pilate's military entourage to Herodes's surroundings*).

*) The "bright robe", which according to Luke 23:11 Herodes put on Jesus, is clearly the same as the purple garment that, according to Mark 15:17, the soldiers of Pilate placed on him. This description by Mark is omitted by Luke in verse 25, as he had anticipated it earlier.

Similarly, in the further description given by the same evangelist, we can recognize nothing more than a paraphrased revision of Mark's account. Luke seems to have forgotten the Roman custom of preceding an execution with a flogging and thus transformed the flogging reported by his predecessor into Pilate's offer to chastise Jesus and then release him. — As for the account in the fourth Gospel, it is typically

hailed as the most accurate, as the only one bearing the trace of its narrator's eyewitness testimony; but in it, we can find nothing other than the dialogical style that runs throughout this entire Gospel, leading here to notably striking incongruities and internal improbabilities. Just as in the two Synoptic Gospels, Pilate's eagerness to save Jesus has been unquestionably exaggerated, and combined with similar misunderstandings, such as those we just criticized in Luke, leading to the portrayal of the peculiar scene where Jesus, already mistreated, with a crown of thorns on his head and a purple robe around his body, is presented once more to the rabble assembled by the priests. Instead of being moved to compassion by this sight, they demand his crucifixion*).

*) John 19:4 ff.

More specifically, we cannot bring ourselves to replace the profound silence that, in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus maintains, as he did earlier before the Sanhedrin, and later before Pilate and Herod, with the more detailed explanations that this evangelist (it's unclear from what source, as he situates them inside the Praetorium) attributes to Jesus in his dialogue with Pilate, accepting them as truly spoken.

459

This silence is indeed a trait essential and indispensable for the completion of the character and life portrait that we were striving to sketch of the divinely-inspired man. Anyone who impartially and carefully surveys the situation described here will have no doubt that — viewing it purely from a human perspective, and not invoking any supernatural powers Jesus might still have had at his disposal — it was within his power at that moment to refute the accusations of his enemies with a strong and calculated defense before Pilate's judgment seat, and at least avoid public prosecution. Compare this situation with that of Apostle Paul when he first fell into the hands of the Roman tribune**), and was then handed over by him to the procurators Felix and Festus. Upon a careful comparison of the respective situations, it's unlikely that one would attribute the more favorable outcome of Paul's well-argued defense solely to the protection of Roman citizenship that he could claim for himself*).

**) Acts 21:36 ff.

*) Acts 22:25 ff.

A fair and unbiased disposition, indeed the express desire to save him, we must attribute to Pilate just as we do to Festus, as portrayed in the Gospel narratives,

regardless of our otherwise unfavorable impression of this Roman's character or our skepticism towards the more heartfelt involvement in Jesus' fate that the less authentic elements of the Gospel narrative might attribute to him**).

**) One main motivation for Pilate's initial reluctance was probably his aversion to Judaism, as expressed in an anecdote told by Philo (in "On Virtues"; Opp. ed. Mang. II p. 589 s.), where, from the perspective of the Jews, Pilate's character is described as: ἀκαμπής και μετά του αυθαδοις αμείλικτος.

Any potential advantages in Paul's situation, who likewise faced vehement enemies***), over that of Jesus might have been offset by the far superior mental strength of the latter, and by the enthusiasm a significant portion of the people held for him, which he could have easily leveraged before Pilate.

***) See especially Acts 23:12 ff.

Thus, there remains nothing but to acknowledge that Jesus, through his silence, deliberately brought about the execution of the verdict pronounced upon him; a fact that in itself should have sufficed to dispel any doubt regarding his foresight of the impending fate and, above all, his autonomy in accepting it. For if this blow had struck him unexpectedly and unprepared - if, as modern skepticism wants to persuade us, it thwarted rather than fulfilled his plans - nothing would have been more natural for Jesus in that situation than to muster all his strength to save himself, and through that, the cause he represented. In his defense, the same demeanor would have behooved him: as wise as it was resolute, as moderate as it was courageous, through which, in the aforementioned case, his disciple Paul undeniably better fulfilled his high calling than by an untimely martyrdom. That Jesus, in a comparable situation, acted differently than Paul, undeniably indicates that his mission was different from the disciple's and that he recognized it differently. He acted silently in the same spirit as he did actively when he journeyed to Jerusalem with his disciples. Of course, this should not be understood as if he had, in one case or another, arbitrarily decided on this course of action based on a self-conceived theory of the necessity of his atoning death, and then stubbornly executed this resolution against circumstances, which conditioned its implementation not just externally but also spiritually. We can more confidently assume that, in the case at hand with Caiaphas and Pilate, there was no possibility of a more dignified and grandiose demeanor for Jesus, considering the situation's unfolding. He remained silent, not because he had decided to be silent or saw silence as the safest means to bring about the verdict he intended or to expedite its execution, but because he recognized silence as the only appropriate response at that moment, given the circumstances. The fact that the circumstances unfolded in such a way, which made this

fateful silence seem right and fitting, validated the truth of his prophecy and the correctness of his prior decision. Viewed in this light, the divine's course of action appears in its full—true, not arbitrarily imposed—grandeur and sublimity; equally distant from defiant arbitrariness and from that external, un-free inevitability, both of which would distort or impair it to the same degree.

462

The execution of the pronounced judgment took place on the same day; in fact, almost immediately after the verdict, specifically in the third hour by Babylonian timekeeping, which starts counting the hours at sunrise. This is the explicit statement of Mark, which, apart from its external credibility*), also recommends itself by its inherent likelihood since if the crucifixion had been carried out later, the death of the crucified could not have possibly occurred on the same day.

*) Comparing this statement (Mark 15:25) with the differing one in John 19:14, the former seems more substantial, as it is the only one in the entire Gospel that provides such a precise time reference, addressing a moment which makes it understandable why the evangelist deemed it worthy of such a detailed mention. However, in the fourth Gospel, it appears whimsical that not the moment of crucifixion, but a moment preceding the sentencing - a detail of seemingly no interest - is specified with such exact timing. Almost as whimsical as the time references found elsewhere in this Gospel (1:40, 4:6) where there seems to be no discernible reason for their inclusion. Moreover, the hypothesis which tries to reconcile these conflicting accounts by suggesting that John was using the Roman business timekeeping (which was not commonly used in everyday life) has rightly found little approval. Whether it will gain any acceptance, especially after Tholuck recently adopted it (Commentary on the Gospel and on the Credibility of the Gospel Hist. p. 308), remains to be seen. From comparing the two passages of Josephus, which he cites as evidence that this writer sometimes uses Babylonian and sometimes Roman timekeeping, I cannot find this to be evident, just as Lücke (Commentary on the Gospel of John I. p. 515) couldn't find the corresponding point regarding *msrtxr. ?ol^o*. For Vit. 54 speaks of the custom of having breakfast on the Sabbath, while bell. Jud. VI, 9, 3 speaks of the Passover feast meal; these are clearly two different things which could have occurred at different times.

The hastening of the execution might be viewed as a result of the concern that the priestly faction still had for the populace loyal to Jesus. Additionally, this speed can be sufficiently explained by the known custom of the Jews, especially during major

festivals, to carry out such acts in front of the larger crowd that had gathered in the city. Regarding the details of the crucifixion, we again have a somewhat more detailed account in the report of Mark. This account's credibility is less likely to be contested, as it contains details that could have been noticed even by distant witnesses. Such witnesses, in this case, were the women from Jesus' entourage, who, as all the Synoptic Gospels *) expressly note, watched from a distance.

*) Mark 15:40 ff. and parallels.

That one or another of Jesus' relatives, or indeed any other persons not involved in the execution, would have been allowed close enough to converse with the crucified, either before or after the crucifixion, or to hear His words, is in itself unlikely. This is completely ruled out by the simple, vivid reports of the first two Evangelists and is inadvertently confirmed, at least in part, by the less straightforward accounts (like that of John) based on opposing assumptions from the last two Gospels**), as they report so little about the alleged exchanged words.

**) The idea that (John 19:25) the entire group of women, including Jesus' mother (whom we never find accompanying Him elsewhere - how unthinkable that the Synoptics would have remained silent about her among so many other inconsequential women's names!) and the "beloved disciple" stood directly beneath the cross: this is, especially given the explicit contradiction of the Synoptics, who offer no reason for omitting such a close proximity while mentioning their distant stance, such an unlikely invention that it alone could suffice to open one's eyes about the nature of this Gospel. The Gospel story does indeed become poorer by one detail in which modern sentimentality finds special edification, but fortunately not by one essential to the characterization of the Lord.

The disciples probably did not dare show themselves publicly during the tragic act. Had they, or had any one of them been among the witnesses, it would certainly not have gone unnoticed, just like the testimony of the women or Peter's presence during the interrogation in the High Priest's house.

464

The report begins with the note that a Simon of Cyrene, father of two men known during the apostolic times, and probably only specifically named in this context, who happened to be coming from the field, was compelled by the Roman soldiers who were leading Jesus away*), to carry the cross for Him. Upon arriving at the execution site, Golgotha,

in line with the humane Jewish custom, which the Romans seem to have tolerated, Jesus is offered a pain-numbing drink of spiced wine, which He refuses.

*) One of the confusions in the narrative of the fourth Gospel is that here (19:16) Pilate hands over Jesus to the Jews for crucifixion. Also, famously in that account, Jesus carries His own cross.

This, combined with the moistening of the crucified shortly before the moment of death with the sponge, later led to the misunderstanding that He was mockingly offered a mixture of vinegar with gall, supposedly to fulfill a prophetic prediction**).

***) Ps. 69, 21.

***) This is probably where the transformation of οίνον εσμυρνισμένον in Mark 15:23 to οξύς μετά χολῆς μεμεγμένον in Matthew 27:34 originates. Here, Jesus first tastes the drink before refusing it, of which Mark knows nothing and doesn't need to, since Jesus would have known the purpose of the drink being offered.

The soldiers carry out the crucifixion; they attach a sign to the cross that reads: "King of the Jews" and, according to Roman law, they cast lots to divide the crucified's garments among themselves. This event too recalled the words of a Psalm, which, being an alleged lamentation of King David, seemed more apt than others to be interpreted as a prophetic reference to the sufferings of the Messiah*), and the author of the fourth Gospel has reshaped this note as he felt this passage demanded**).

*) Ps. 22:18.

***) Isa. 53:12.

Similarly, the fact that two wrongdoers were crucified alongside Jesus. Here, Mark himself (assuming these words were not added later) references a prophetic passage, believing it to be fulfilled in this context. However, with this single, debatable exception, this narrator, from whom the others mainly drew, shows no indication of molding his account to fit those Old Testament prophecies, so there's no reason to suspect that those prophecies could in any sense be the predominant motive for his narrative.

The Divine on the cross being an object of mockery for some passers-by, especially the priests and scribes who may have come specifically for this purpose, is also explicitly

reported. This is recounted with more detailed mention of the contents of these mocking speeches, which appear not just as a result of applying prophetic passages to the dying Messiah. "He who claimed to destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days; he who always wanted to save others, let him now save himself. Let the King of Israel come down from the cross; if we see this, then we will believe in him!" Among those who mocked were also the two co-crucified; a statement which seems at least more plausible than the conversation that Luke allows one of them to have with Jesus. The darkness mentioned in the narrative might have been a natural event, perhaps painted a shade darker by the veiled imagination of the disciples; its mythical character in Mark's account is no more evident than even the tearing of the temple veil, be it at the moment of Jesus' death or shortly before or after. One may attribute such occurrences to chance; but it cannot be denied that in such crucial moments for those seized by the significance of the moment, even chance takes on a meaning. — The last words of the one dying faster than usual on the cross, as reported by that credible narrator, are words of intense anguish, which the surrounding soldiers, apparently unfamiliar with Hebrew, took to be a call to Elijah. However, the disciples believed they recognized the beginning words of the twenty-second Psalm. We cannot bring ourselves to consider this cry of pain, wrung out by his tortured nature, as unworthy of the Divine, and even less, as some recent opponents would have us believe, as a sign of dashed hopes. We also don't see the need to put arbitrarily invented sayings into his mouth to save his divine dignity, as the third and fourth evangelists do. — A soldier offered him a sponge soaked in his field drink, the posea, to quench his thirst; he drank and passed away with a piercing sound, which was so moving to the listeners that the supervising centurion, struck by a sense of the Divine departing from this body, declared him, be it in the sense of the true or in the sense of his pagan belief, to be a son of a god.

Fourth Book

Gospel Stories and Speeches according to Mark

By far the greater part of the content of our evangelical history books consists of the narration of individual events that are either unconnected or only internally connected, not externally. These are not suitable to be the subject of a continuous historical account. For the most part, they are speeches, conversations, or sayings from the mouth of Jesus, but not insignificantly, they are also singular miraculous or otherwise noteworthy actions and deeds of the divine Master. Both the actions and the sayings, like everywhere such deeds and speeches whose significance lies essentially only in the personality of the actor and speaker, not in an objectivity external to this personality, are individually of the highest interest and important for understanding this personality, which is primarily and almost exclusively the focus of the entire evangelical history. However, they do not also combine into the objective unity of a sequence of causes and effects. Therefore, in our representation, we believe that we best correspond to the character of these stories when we simply reproduce them as a series of anecdotes without claiming either strict chronological sequence or, even less, objective context—claims that would only distort the true content of these invaluable vignettes, not in any way elevate or promote their understanding. The natural order in which we will present them is given to us by an external circumstance, namely the diversity and the random nature of the sources from which we have to draw. Since most of these sources are common to several of our Gospels, it is natural that we first present them according to the account of that Gospel which we are justified in assuming either served as a source for the others or is closest to the common source. The former is the case, as we have provisionally demonstrated in our first book, regarding the Gospel of Mark in relation to the Gospels named after Matthew and Luke. The latter occurs first in relation to the Gospel of Matthew to the Gospel of Luke, and then, in a different way, all three synoptic Gospels to the Gospel called after John. This results in the natural order for us, to start with the narratives of Mark, then progress to Matthew and Luke, and conclude with John. To avoid unnecessary repetitions and to facilitate the historical critique of each story, we will not only precisely indicate the parallel passages of the others for each narrative that is common to the Gospel we are using and one or some of the rest, but also immediately notice any deviations from the former in the latter and try to obtain a correct result from the comparison. Only in one case will we occasionally allow ourselves a small repetition when the later Evangelist tells the same anecdote as his predecessor but demonstrably not from him but from another source, because it can indeed be of interest here (especially concerning the Gospel of Matthew in relation to its

double main source, Mark on the one hand and the genuine Matthew on the other) to compile everything belonging to one source. The order of the anecdotes within the individual books remains the same in which the Evangelist has told them, although this already cannot be considered strictly chronological with Mark, and even less so for reasons that lie in the origin and nature of these Gospels, with the other three.

471

1. Jesus comes from Nazareth in Galilee to John and is baptized by him in the Jordan. At the moment when he rises from the water, he sees the heavens split open and the Holy Spirit, like a dove, descend upon him. And a voice resounds from the heavens: "You are my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased *)!"

*) Chap. 1, V. 6 ff. Parallel. Matt. 3, 13 ff. Luke 3, 21 f. (John 1, 32 ff.)

This first story seems predestined to put our view of the mutual relationship of the Gospels in the most favorable light and to make the consequences thereof appear in their full scope and weight. The insight that Mark is the sole original reporter here and that the others either retell his story with self-willed changes and additions or draw the event from a very obscured tradition - this insight provides us in the simplest and most unpretentious way a completely satisfactory explanation about this miraculous-sounding event in relation to all the evangelists, and at the same time about the origin of the various differing accounts of it.

In recent times, it has been generally agreed that the event told here should not be seen as an external event but, as some early church fathers already viewed **), only as an inner vision.

**) Origen and Theodor of Mopsuestia.

It is believed that a more specific authority has been found in the words of the Gospel of John, where John the Baptist speaks of the Spirit descending upon Jesus during the baptism as an apparition he himself witnessed. Thus, the Johannine account of this event is considered the original and authentic version. The Synoptics are believed to have misunderstood or mythicized it into an external event; however, among these, Matthew is considered superior in that a trace of the original subjectivity of the apparition in relation to John is supposedly found, even if this conflicts with the correct grammatical understanding of his words *).

*) Such understanding specifically requires the words αὐτῷ and εἶδε V. 16 not to refer to John but to Jesus. Compare with Fritzsche's view.

— Based on what we discussed in the previous book about the relationship between John and Jesus, we cannot accept that this interpretation contributes anything essential to understanding the event. It replaces an external miracle with an internal one, and the objective machinery, supposedly infusing the Spirit into Jesus, remains mere machinery when it's changed to a subjective attestation or testimony to this Spirit **).

**) The editor of the fourth Gospel took care to make the miracle even more miraculous through a foretelling of the same (V. 33), making the machinery of this supposed Spirit testimony even more mechanical.

We would only recognize a genuine, true spiritual miracle in the event if we indeed considered it a vision, an inner spiritual perception, but one in which the seer is not John but Jesus. Not only are we allowed to interpret it this way, but when we bring our general critical assumptions to it, we are even compelled to do so by an impartial compilation and comparative criticism of the Gospel accounts.

472

It is unjust to, without further consideration, include Mark in the accusation of externalizing the miraculous event. Indeed, Mark knows nothing of a vision that the Baptist had; however, one only needs to take his words in a simple, literal sense to be convinced that what he reports he initially wants to be understood as nothing other than a subjective process in the soul of the divine baptizee. The expressions in which he tells of the vision completely coincide with the words in which Luke reports Stephen's vision*), which, to my knowledge, no one understands as referring to an external event or the vision of another apart from the martyr himself.

*) Acts 7, 55.

However, when he goes on to tell of a voice that came from the clouds, nothing prevents us from, in the immediate context of the previous, understanding it as implying that only Jesus was the listener. This interpretation becomes more plausible by the fact that the evangelist here lets the voice address Jesus in the second person, whereas elsewhere when he really wants to tell of the vision of one or more others, the same words from a heavenly voice speaking to these others are put in the third person**).

**) Cap. 9, 7.

Luke, of course, retains this, although he otherwise undoubtedly turns Mark's account into an external, objective event; however, he thus betrays his dependence on Mark, just as the first evangelist, who really converts those words into the third person and lets the heavenly voice speak not to Jesus, but to John or other listeners, reveals the same dependence by the way he, although with a visible inclination towards externalizing the event, does not yet fully detach his account from the reference to the person of Jesus that it has in his predecessor***).

***) ἰδοῦ ἀνέωχθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρανοὶ καί εἶδε κ. τ. λ.

However, there isn't the slightest trace in all three synoptics of an explicit reference of the apparition to the person of the Baptist; on the contrary, the first Gospel, by allowing John to greet his baptizee as the chosen one of the Lord even before the baptism, stands in a very clear contradiction to the account of the fourth Gospel, according to which John should have only come to know Jesus through the heavenly sign. Indeed, that greeting is just as unhistorical an addition to Mark's simple report as what is told in the fourth Gospel is an unhistorical twist of the entire event. However, the account of the first Gospel as a whole is still closer to the original report than that of the fourth; from the latter of which it would still need to be proven that it truly only speaks of a vision of John and not of an external, physical incident.

474

In this manner, we believe ourselves entitled to consider this story in its original form as perhaps the literally faithful relation of a statement that Jesus himself might have made about what had transpired within him at the moment of his baptism by John. We have a perfectly fitting, even striking analogy for this brief, figurative expression of a spiritually self-experienced moment in the documented words spoken by Jesus: "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" *), an analogy indeed that makes any doubt about the authenticity of this statement unnecessary, trusting that we may have almost the complete statement before us if we just convert the words of Mark from the third person into the first **).

*) Luke 10:18.

**) εἶδον σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον κ. τ. λ.

The reasons compelling the assumption that John's baptism marked a significant epoch in Jesus' inner life, perhaps the moment when he first became conscious of his lofty calling like a flash of inspiration — we've discussed these reasons in the previous book (p.274 ff.). In the present account, we find further documentary confirmation for what previously appeared to us as almost an inevitable historical presupposition. The image Jesus used to describe this spiritual event, that same image which the "mythical view" has unsuccessfully tried to prove as being transferred from other pictorial representations to the Messiah *), is in this context a wholly unique, original expression for the inner state of a moment of enthusiasm, a moment when a mysterious assurance of his extraordinary divine election was granted to the seer in the deepest recesses of his spirit.

*) Strauss, L. J. I. p. 385 ff.

The fact that this image, later embellished by legend and expanded into the externality of a physical event, is accurate. We find such glorifying traits almost simultaneously with the canonical portrayals in the apocryphal Gospel of the Ebionites and in the Dialogue with Tryphon: a luminous glow from above, a fire that shines from the waters. Perhaps the Old Testament words **), which the canonical Gospels attribute to the heavenly voice, do not belong to Jesus' own narration but to apostolic tradition.

**) Ps. 2:7, Isa. 42:1.

However, this does not make the origin of the image itself mythical. Instead, those mythical additions to the original image relate roughly as the doctrinal statement of speculative gnosis since Cerinthus, which dogmatically wanted to fix the moment of baptism as the one in which the divine Logos descended into the Son of Mary, and the man Jesus became the Christ, relates to the actual inner fact that Jesus wanted to express with that image. Neither that mythical nor this dogmatic invention could have arisen without the true, spiritually factual foundation and without the figurative expression that Christ had given to this fact.

475

2. One day, as Jesus walked along the shores of the Sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and his brother Andrew casting a net into the sea; they were fishermen. He said to them, "Come, follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. "*)

*) Chapter 1, Verse 16 f. Parallels Matt. 4:18 f. Luke 5:10 f.

Regarding the authenticity of these words, as long as they simply convey the notion of transforming the current fishermen into fishers of men, there is no doubt. However, the issue arises as to whether Jesus, as the story seems to suggest, spoke these words to the brother pair, previously unknown to him, and whether they immediately followed him, leaving behind their nets. This is to say, as the narrative unmistakably implies and Luke explicitly states, abandoning their previous profession. Likewise, there is the subsequent immediate following by another pair of Galilean fisherman brothers, James and John, the sons of Zebedee. To demonstrate the supposed mythical nature of this scene, some have drawn parallels with the Old Testament tale **) of the prophet Elisha's calling by Elijah and declared the current account to be a recreation of it.

**) 1 Kings 19:19 ff.

From our side, we neither deny the similarity or the connection between the two stories. Moreover, we find no significant reason in the current account to believe in the dual wonder of an immediate insight into the inner beings of the four soon-to-be apostles by the passing Master and an irresistible, almost magical influence his gaze and voice might have exercised upon them. However, we believe it's feasible that Jesus himself, in this and other instances, might have intentionally invoked the Old Testament memory and integrated it into his actions. The fact that he explicitly voiced those words as an invitation to the then-hesitant disciples to follow him and entirely devote themselves to him is corroborated by other passages which emphasize it wasn't the disciples who chose Jesus, but Jesus who chose the disciples ***).

***) John 6:70, 15:16.

476

3. Once, while Jesus was teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum, there was a man possessed by an unclean spirit present. This man cried out, saying, "Leave us alone! What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are – the Holy One of God!" Jesus rebuked the spirit and said, "Be quiet and come out of him!" The unclean spirit convulsed the man, cried out loudly, and came out of him. Everyone was amazed and asked each other, "What is this? A new kind of teaching—and with authority! He even gives orders to unclean spirits, and they obey him!" *)

*) V. 23 ff. Parallels Luke 4:33 ff.

— This anecdote represents the general type of healings of those possessed, as we defined in the previous book **), but it has nothing individually distinctive. Perhaps this is the reason the author of the first gospel omitted it.

**) S. 352 ff.

— However, the subsequent anecdote in our text, specifically concerning the healing of Peter's mother-in-law from a fever by simply taking her hand ***), was undoubtedly included by the author without any hesitation, even though, apart from the personality of the sick woman, it also has nothing more individualistic.

***) V. 30 f. Parallels Matt. 8:14 f. Luke 4:38 f.

Possibly noticing this, Luke attempted to elevate the miraculous nature of the event. He did this partly by adding the adjective "great" to the fever and partly by depicting Jesus as standing over her and rebuking the fever as if it were a demon he intended to cast out with words. — However, when we see both anecdotes accompanied by the same or similar remarks about the immediate results of these miracles and other related events †) from all the evangelists who have included them, it doesn't necessarily attest to the factual accuracy of this connection. Instead, as we've assumed from the outset, it indicates the dependency of two of these writers on the third.

†) Specifically, the note about a journey through Galilee, which the author of the first gospel uses to interpose (8:18–34) various travel notes, including some that Mark mentions later, but which he found pertinent to introduce here.

478

4. A leper approached Him, pleading, as he clasped His knees: "If you want, you can make me clean!" Jesus, moved with compassion, extended his hand, touched him, and said, "I will, be clean!" And as he said this, the leprosy immediately left the man, and he was cleansed. With a stern warning, He sent him away, saying to him, "Make sure you tell no one, but go and show yourself to the priest and present the offerings Moses commanded, as a testimony to them." However, the man went out and spoke about it everywhere, so that Jesus could no longer enter the city openly but remained outside in the open.*)

*) V. 40 ff. Parallel: Matt. 8, 3 ff. Luke 5, 13 ff.

— If, in this narrative, which given the gravity and persistence of the disease, and the immediate healing by Jesus's miraculous power is indeed problematic, one were to think of its origin as anything other than purely historical, then it would make more sense to consider that statement of the Lord in which He also refers to the cleansing of lepers **), as the reason for it, rather than, as Strauss does, those Old Testament tales that speak as much of resurrection as of the healing of leprosy, or even of not immediate, but only mediate healing.

**) Matt. 11, 5.

— By the way, the location of the incident is undoubtedly to be thought of as inside a house ***), not, as per the first gospel †), an open field surrounded by a crowd, which would render the prohibition against publicizing it meaningless or awkward.

***) This is indicated by the term ἐξεβαλεν in V. 43 and the resulting necessity for Jesus to avoid the city (Capernaum) as per V. 45. Luke describes the event as taking place "in one of the cities", clearly with reference to what precedes in Mark (V. 38 f.), which he incorporates here, although he himself had interposed another narrative.

†) The author of this gospel seems to have taken issue with the circumstance that Mark, immediately after letting Jesus depart from Capernaum, nevertheless recounts an anecdote occurring in Capernaum. This consideration might also have influenced Luke in the procedure mentioned earlier.

The command concerning the cleansing sacrifice therefore could not have been added by Jesus to display his obedience to the law in front of the crowd *), but either belongs to the narrator or is simply to be understood as an assurance of the complete healing.

*) Specifically, this is how Fritzsche wanted to interpret εἰς μνητεριον αυτοις (V. 44), which according to the natural word connection (compare Cap. 6, 11) should rather refer to the one who should make the offering.

479

5. Some time later in Capernaum, when word spread that He was home, a crowd quickly gathered around Him, so that no one could enter through the door. A paralyzed man was then brought in, carried by four men. When the bearers couldn't get through the crowd, they removed the roof above where He was and lowered the mat the paralyzed man was lying on. Jesus saw their faith and said to the paralyzed man, "Son,

your sins are forgiven!" However, some scribes were sitting there and thought in their hearts: "Why is this man talking blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but God alone?" Jesus, sensing in His spirit what they were thinking, said to them, "Why do you think such things in your hearts? Which is easier: to say to the paralyzed man, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Get up, take your mat and walk'? But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins..." He said to the paralyzed man, "I tell you, get up, take your mat and go home." The man immediately stood up, took his mat, and walked out in front of everyone, causing all to be amazed. They praised God, saying, "We have never seen anything like this!" **)

**) Chap. 2, V. 1 ff. Parallel: Matt. 9, 1 ff. Luke 5, 17 ff.

— If anywhere a picturesque detail bears the mark of factual truth and announces itself as not necessarily (as one often inaccurately expresses in similar cases) directly from an eyewitness but from a report faithfully and unpretentiously retold by an eyewitness *): then it is, if we can trust our feelings, the one that constitutes the external image of the present story. And there is absolutely no reason to consider this trait, shared by Luke and Mark, as a later embellishment of the original story (which is then presented more purely in the first Gospel, where this trait is missing).

*) Regarding the objections or excuses that have been made against the removal of the roof, we refer, as others before us, to Josephus, Antiquities XIV, 15, 12.

Partly due to this consideration and partly considering the extraordinarily characteristic nature of the speeches spoken during this incident **), I have no hesitation in counting this story, as extraordinary as it is, among the most authenticated in the entire Gospel history.

**) How firmly these speeches were imprinted in the tradition, regardless of the undoubtedly correct context passed down by Mark, we already had the opportunity to demonstrate earlier in the first book (p. 130) with reference to John 5:8.

The individuality of these speeches forbids thinking of the event recounted here as having taken place over a longer duration and being briefly summarized by the narrator, as some other similarly recounted events might be. The significance of the speeches is instead entirely, or at least regarding the main moment (— whatever precedes this moment can be thought of as filling a longer time span), tied to the sudden and surprising success. — That Jesus, however, considered each individual healing as the same act as each individual forgiveness of sins and accordingly regarded each

individual illness as a punishment for a specific sin: this is not even suggested by the literal meaning of these words, much less the spiritual one.

480

6. A newly recruited disciple of Jesus, a tax collector by trade, holds a feast in his house. Jesus, with his disciples, finds himself amidst a large gathering of tax officials and other individuals who were looked down upon by the Jews and simply called "sinners". Pharisees and scribes confront the disciples about this, but Jesus, overhearing, replies with the words: "It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners!" *)

*) B. 15 ff. Parallel: Matt. 9, 10 ff. Luke 5, 29 ff.

— Whoever cannot bear to hear Jesus, in the current context, declare the Pharisees as those he wants nothing to do with, because he recognizes them once and for all as incorrigible and irredeemable; whoever, to complete their ideal of Christ, cannot do without that humanity that hesitates to exclude Pharisees and scribes from the kingdom of heaven: they should frankly admit that the real Christ does not meet this ideal.

481

7. People pose a question to Jesus: why is it that the disciples of John and those of the Pharisees practice fasting, but His own do not? To which He replies, "How can the guests of the bridegroom fast while he is with them? The days will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them; then they will fast" **).

**) Cap. 3, V. 18 ff. Parallel: Matt. 9, 14 f. Luke 5, 33 ff.

— Some have wanted to diminish the brilliance of this saying, which, according to our only correct and original portrayal, was directed not, as the first evangelist thought, to John's disciples, or, as the third believed, to the Pharisees with whom Jesus had had the previous conversation, but rather to some unspecified inquirer in the account, perhaps one of the disciples at an unspecified time*). Some believe this by the unwarranted assumption that John's disciples fasted only to mourn the imprisonment of their master.

*) Recently, there's been much debate about which of the two—Matthew or Luke—got the portrayal of this event right. That the truth might lie in the middle, namely in Mark, has occurred to no one. Nevertheless, this dispute clearly

showed that each of these interpretations faces significant substantive difficulties. It was therefore logical to resolve these difficulties by referring back to the neutral portrayal in Mark, as such reference also most satisfactorily explains the root of the difference between them. Nothing, indeed, is more natural than to seek the reason for this difference in the varied interpretations of Mark's words *καὶ ἔρχονται, καὶ λεγούσιν αὐτῷ*; which one of the evangelists referred to John's disciples, and the other to the Pharisees, as Mark mentioned both in the preceding phrase. But in Mark itself, they are undoubtedly said impersonally. Of course, those two seem to have noticed that it's hardly conceivable that Pharisees and John's disciples would join forces to pose such a question, and that they would refer to themselves in the third person in the question itself. Luke, however, didn't avoid this inconvenience, showing his dependence on our source, where the unspecified could indeed speak so.

People fail to realize that by this interpretation, the magnitude of the saying is lost. This magnitude lies in the profound self-awareness of the blessing that the presence of the Divine brings to His disciples, not only those physically around Him but also those spiritually near Him and who feel His spiritual closeness. This word is a timeless one: in the presence of the Lord, we should also rejoice and not fast or mourn, except when we feel abandoned by Him. Of course, such times must come; they cannot be avoided in both spiritual and physical senses. The Lord, in His wisdom, foresaw this and early on combined the proclamation of the highest spiritual joy with the announcement of the mourning that His suffering and death would bring to the disciples of His time and all future times. The Catholic Church wanted to derive the necessity of its fasting practices from this statement: rightly, insofar as she could assume the recurrent feeling of abandonment by the Lord within her domain, but wrongly, insofar as she wanted to impose this feeling on every Christian at specific, regularly recurring times.

483

8. "No one sews a patch of new cloth on an old garment; or the new piece will pull away from the old, making the tear worse. And no one pours new wine into old wineskins; or the new wine will burst the old skins, and both the wine and the wineskins will be ruined. New wine must be poured into new wineskins." *)

*) Cap. 2, V. 21 f. Parallel: Matt. 9, 16 f. Luke 5, 36 ff.

— Mark, followed by the first Gospel (Matthew), presents these words directly in line with the previous ones. However, it is more accurate, as Luke does (not guided by a

different source, but by proper reflection **)), to separate them or, at least, to leave their connection undecided.

**) The same, but less fortunate reflection, is also evident in the different expressions that Luke uses for the first parable.

Separating both sayings can only enhance, not diminish, their value. The previous one could only fully impact the inquirers if no further explanation was attached to it. However, the parables shared here only achieve their purpose when they are not taken as a direct response to those individual questions, but, as their meaning requires, as a clear and neat declaration by Jesus not wanting to pour the new wine of His teachings and spirit once and for all into the old wineskins of Jewish righteousness.

484

9. Once on the Sabbath, Jesus walked with His disciples through a grain field; the disciples began to pick ears of grain and eat them. This act caused offense to the Pharisees. But Jesus said, "Have you not read *), what David did to satisfy his need when he and his companions were hungry?

*) 1 Sam. 21.

How he entered the house of God and ate the showbread, which only the priests should eat, and gave some to his companions?" And He added, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. Therefore, the Son of Man is also Lord of the Sabbath." **).

**) Cap. 2, V. 23 ff. Parallel: Matt. 12, 1 ff. Luke k, 1 ff.

— Another time ***), when He was about to heal a man's withered hand in the synagogue on a Sabbath, and noticed that they were going to take offense at this as well, He asked, "Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do evil? To save a life or to kill?" †).

***) This too, according to an accurate reflection by Luke, 6, 6. ff).

†) Cap. 3, 1 ff. Parallel: Matt. 12, 9 ff. Luke 6, 6 ff.

— Here, in these speeches, much is meant as a response to the inquirers for that specific situation; not as if Jesus seriously wanted to rely on David's authority when He

occasionally broke the strict Sabbath rule, or as if He only wanted an exception to that rule for the sake of extraordinary acts of kindness. Some have projected onto these and similar events, as described in other gospels, the assumption that Jesus made a distinction between acts forbidden by Mosaic Law on the Sabbath and those forbidden only by the meticulous customs of the Pharisees — that He wanted to free His disciples only from the latter, but not the former prohibitions. There's no clear evidence for such a distinction in our sources, and the statement where Jesus unambiguously declares Himself the Lord of the Sabbath suggests the exact opposite. The notion that the Mosaic institution was conditional could not have been expressed more clearly than in the (unique to Mark but certainly not arbitrarily added by him) words that the Sabbath is for the sake of man, not man for the sake of the Sabbath. To deny Christ such awareness or even accuse Him of deliberately accommodating Jewish law and custom is to deliberately belittle the grandeur of spirit in which accredited history portrays Him. Also, our evangelist surely had a good reason to date the plots of the Pharisees, in collaboration with the Herodians against Jesus, from the healing of the withered hand on the Sabbath *).

*) V. 6. Parallel: Matt. V. 14. Luke V. 11.

485

10. Among the large crowds of people who had squeezed into the house around Him were also scribes who had come from Jerusalem. They proclaimed that He had Beelzebul, and that He drove out demons by the chief of the demons. Jesus called them over and said, "How can Satan drive out Satan? If a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand; if a house is divided against itself, that house cannot stand; and if Satan opposes himself and is divided, he cannot stand but is finished." — To this, the Evangelist adds words which we must leave undecided whether they were really said in the same context and immediately after the former: "No one can enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods unless he first binds the strong man; then indeed he may plunder his house. Truly, I say to you, all sins will be forgiven the children of man and whatever blasphemies they utter. But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness but is guilty of an eternal sin." **).

**) Cap. 3, V. 20 ff. Parallel: Matt. 12, 24 ff. Luke 11, 15 ff.

— These speeches contain more of a clever, spirited dismissal of the Pharisaic blasphemies than actual dogmatic doctrines. If one were to understand them as doctrines, one could rightly object that the realm of evil is, in reality, anything but a unified entity sustained by its unity; that fighting against individual evils does not

necessarily prove freedom from evil. Yet, viewed in its actual context, the speech is perfectly apt, even striking. Jesus' battle against the realm of demons is not impotent, like the infighting among demons; it is powerful and victorious. This proves that it cannot be a demon fighting against another demon. How could Satan, whom you admit has a realm—admit it because you cannot deny it—how could he survive if he destroyed his own kind by engaging in the type of successful battle you see me fighting? This is Jesus' point, and with this straightforward and sound reflection, he aims to refute the flawed reasoning that attributes noble actions and great successes to low or impure motives or forces. The scribes are acting towards Jesus as if they were servants who see no heroes because they only view heroes through a servant's perspective. — The parable of the strong man *), who must be bound if one wishes to rob his house, conveys, from another angle, the same message as the parable of the tree and its fruits, which Matthew indeed repeats in this context **).

*) Perhaps a reference to Isaiah 49, 24 f.?

**) Matt. 12, 33. See also 7, 18.

Whoever destroys the works of the devil must first have bound the devil himself; just as the fruit of divine works can only grow on a tree of divine nature. — The closing words of the conversation appear in Matthew in a different form and in a different original context; hence, we will discuss them there.

486

11. The news of his mighty deeds had reached his relatives, but there it was said that he had lost his mind. Therefore, his mother and brothers set out to find him; the crowd prevents them from entering the house. Jesus is informed of their arrival, but he responds: "Who are my mother and my brothers?" And looking around at those sitting around him: "These here are my mother and my brothers. Whoever does the will of God, he is my brother, and sister, and mother" *).

*) Cap. 3, V. 21. 31 ff. Parallel: Matt. 12, 46 ff. Luke 8, 19 ff.

— In our gospel, this account is woven together with the previous one, thereby providing at the same time the motive for that visit of Jesus' relatives, which is missing in the two other gospels. It might be that this connection doesn't reflect factual truth but belongs to the representation of the evangelist. But precisely this connection could only be motivated by the knowledge of the stated reason, and the representation of the other two, most clearly that of the first gospel, where both stories are still closely adjacent **),

shows that the separation of the two and the omission of that motive did not originate from a primary source, as that of the second gospel, but rather, notwithstanding the dependence on the latter, was introduced into what was drawn from it.

***) It even says here of the relatives: "they stood outside", which only has meaning in Mark, but not in Matthew; in the latter, it was not noted that the events were taking place inside the house.

So, we have no reason to dismiss the instruction this source gives us about the motive for the harsh, yet deserved, words Jesus speaks about his closest relatives here.

487

12. From a boat on the Sea of Galilee, Jesus spoke the following words ***) to the crowd gathered on the shore: "Listen! A sower went out to sow. And as he sowed, some seeds fell by the wayside, and the birds came and devoured them.

***) Cap. 4, 1 ff. Parallel: Matt. 13, 1 ff. Luke 8, 4 ff.

Some fell on stony places, where they did not have much earth; they sprang up quickly because they had no depth of earth. But when the sun was up, they were scorched, and because they had no root, they withered away. Others fell among thorns, and the thorns sprang up and choked them. And some fell on good ground and yielded a crop, some thirtyfold, some sixty, and some a hundred." He exclaimed, "He who has ears to hear, let him hear!" When they were alone, his close disciples asked him about the meaning of this parable. He replied *): "You do not understand this parable? Then how will you understand all the others?"

*) V. 13 ff.

The sower sows the word. There are some who are by the wayside where the word is sown; when they hear, Satan comes immediately and takes away the word that was sown in their hearts. Those on the rocky ground are those who, when they hear the word, immediately receive it with joy; however, they have no root in themselves but are temporary**). When tribulation or persecution arises because of the word, they immediately stumble.

**) πρόσκαιροι. Cf. 2 Cor. 4, 18, where the visible is set against the invisible as πρόσκαιρα versus αἰωνίους. — Luke 8, 13 clearly paraphrases this concept and term, and nowhere more strikingly than here do the synoptic parallels present

themselves as somewhat smoothed-over paraphrases of Mark's direct wording (but not vice versa).

Others are those among thorns. They are the ones who hear the word, but the cares of this world, the deceitfulness of riches, and desires for other things enter in and choke the word, and it becomes unfruitful. Lastly, those sown on good ground are those who hear the word, accept it, and bear fruit, thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and a hundredfold." I am unsure if I should consider it a mere stylistic peculiarity when in this interpretation, the sown seed seems to represent not so much the word spoken by the teacher, as expected from the introduction, but rather the individuals who hear the word; an interpretation also retained in the paraphrases of the other two gospels. It almost seems as though Jesus means something deeper by the "sowing of the word" and the fate that the sown experiences, than just the fate of an externally spoken teaching. The essence of the Divine within the human heart, not laid by an individual teacher, but by the Creator directly in each individual, or through the instruments of his earthly revelation, and which constitutes the true nature, the innermost self of the creature in which it is laid — this essence seems to be implied by that "word". This "word" would then have to be understood simultaneously as the seed and as the earth that receives the seed. But this is precisely the characteristic of the spiritual sowing process: that seed and soil are not as externally separated as in the physical process; that every spiritual ground is in a certain sense already a fertilized one, and that conversely, the sown spiritual seed, if it is to sprout, must itself assume the nature of the soil, which here means the substance of the spirit that receives it.

489

13. Between the presentation of the previously shared parable and its interpretation, in Mark's account *), and following his lead also in the other two Synoptic Gospels, some words of Jesus to his disciples are inserted that could hardly have been said in this context as a response to their request for an interpretation of the parable, which Jesus later reminds them is so easily understood.

*) V. 11. 12. Parallel: Matt. V. 11 - 15. Luke V. 10.

"To you, it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God. But to those outside, everything comes in parables. They may indeed see with their eyes and not perceive, and hear with their ears and not understand; lest they should turn, and their sins be forgiven them." — Instead of rebuking Mark for, despite this alleged commendation of the disciples for their thirst for knowledge, subsequently following up with criticism over not understanding such an easily comprehensible parable, one should rather praise him

for expressly preserving this criticism and explicitly separating it from that praise through his own inserted words. The other Synoptic writers show their dependence on Mark in that they, too, include what was wrongly inserted in the latter, but unlike him, they do not separate it from the foreign context but rather incorporate it directly and sacrifice the hint of the real connection that remained there. — This statement by Jesus contains a reminiscence from the Prophet Isaiah *), whose words the first evangelist, as is his habit, but this time precisely according to the translation of the Septuagint, hastens to cite.

*) Isa. 6, 9 f.

The meaning is, not the intention of rejecting those unintelligent listeners, but the recognized certainty of their rejection. This latter apparent harshness cannot be removed from this speech of the Lord, as with so many of his other speeches. However, to the former, to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, this passage, correctly understood, provides as little basis as all the others that have been used for it.

490

In the continuation of the parable shared under No. 12, a series of other statements were made, which, however, are separated from that one and from each other by intervening words (which the other evangelists do not do in similar cases). These are as follows (Nos. 14 — 17).

14. "Is the light brought in to be placed under a basket or under the bed? Isn't it brought in to be placed on a lampstand? Nothing is hidden that will not be revealed, nor is anything kept secret that will not be made known. If anyone has ears to hear, let him hear **)."

**) V. 31 ff. Parallel: Luke 8, 16 f.

These two statements, which are not found in Matthew at this point but appear in larger contexts, one in the Sermon on the Mount ***), the other in the Missionary Discourse *), have, as we see here, also been preserved separately, relating to each other.

***) Matthew 5, 15. Parallel: Luke 11, 33.

*) Matthew 10, 26. Parallel: Luke 12, 2.

491

15. "Take heed what you hear. With the measure you use, it will be measured to you. For to the one who has, more will be given, and from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away **)." "

**) V. 24 f. Parallel: Matthew 13, 12. Luke 8, 18.

The situation with these statements is similar to the previous ones. The first appears in Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount ***), the second at the conclusion of a parable †), both times with parallels in Luke.

***) Matthew 7, 2. Parallel: Luke 6, 38.

†) Matthew 25, 29. Parallel: Luke 19, 26.

Our current passage has no direct parallel in respect to the first sentence, but in respect to the second sentence, each of the two other evangelists has a parallel, meaning it appears twice in both of the latter. The reason for this omission is not hard to find. It clearly lies in their inability to find a connection between that sentence and the context of the narrative in which all these sayings are arranged. Indeed, even for the other two sayings, the connection is rather loose; this is acknowledged by the author of the first Gospel through his omission of the first, the one mentioned under the previous number. Clearly, Mark strings together some otherwise known sayings here simply because he knows of no other context for them, and it seems possible to him that Jesus might have said them in relation to his parabolic expression: the first, to point from it to the meaning as the light that cannot remain hidden, the second, to indicate the significance that understanding would have for the disciples, and how those who do not wish to delve deeper might lose even a superficial, merely literal understanding. Both, as said, provide only a loose connection and hardly the genuine, original meaning of these words, that is, in the context in which Jesus himself had spoken them. Of all the statements, the most surprising in this context was: "With the measure you use, it will be measured to you." Hence, both evangelists omitted it, especially since they had found it, as was the case with the others, in another, more illuminating context. — By the way, we cannot subscribe to the opinion that these sayings, or some of them, should be taken as proverbial phrases, woven by Jesus only for the purpose of clarifying a specific context; they rather bear the full imprint of Jesus's own spirit. The profound paradox, in particular, contained in the last statement, when spoken by Jesus, applies only to such possession that possession in itself is already a merit — not to the use of what is given, for that is a flattening, debasing interpretation of the statement, an interpretation which posits a superficial, mechanical relationship between possession and use, between

being and doing, between ability and accomplishment even in the spiritual sense. Thus, even if Jesus had already encountered this saying or similar ones, it at least received a fundamentally new and higher meaning in his mouth.

492

16. "Thus is the Kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knows not how. For the earth brings forth fruit of itself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full grain in the ear. But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he puts forth the sickle, because the harvest has come" *).

*) V. 26 ff.

— This memorable parable, unique to Mark, clearly and simply expresses the true concept of human freedom like no other. Here, the sower is probably not merely an earthly teacher; not even the Son of Man, as far as he stands outwardly as a teacher against the hearers; if this were so, the parable could not be extended to the image of the harvest. The sower is rather God Himself, the Creator, or Christ as the eternal Son, in whom all things were created **) and who will once judge the world.

**) Colossians 1:16.

Certainly, the words which we have translated as "he knows not how" ***), as well as the "sleep at night", contradict the traditional dogmatic notion of God's omniscience and omnipotence.

***) ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΣ.

But this idea is, upon closer examination, nothing but an equally false and lifeless abstraction, which should not be imposed on Christianity. God's creation would not be worthy of being created by Him if it did not behave independently of its Creator, just as the cast seed does to the sower. However, the image of creaturely freedom, which is taken from what happens to this seed, is so excellent because it also indicates that the creature's freedom does not consist of arbitrariness, which arbitrarily chooses between opposites, but rather in the inner development that cannot be replaced by any external force, although conditioned by external forces. The existence of every living creature is based on such a process, corresponding to the development of the seed grain to the fruit-bearing plant; but the process is called free only in such creatures whose development is a development towards self-awareness and to what exists only in

self-consciousness as such, to good or evil. The seed that rises in such creatures is that seed of the kingdom of God, of which the present parable speaks.

494

17. "With what can we compare the Kingdom of God, or what parable will we use for it? It is like a mustard seed, which, when it is sown on the ground, is the smallest of all the seeds on earth; but when it is sown, it grows up and becomes the greatest of all shrubs, and puts forth large branches, so that the birds of the air can make nests in its shade" *).

*) V. 30 ff. (Matthew 13:31 f. Luke 13:18 f. draw, as closely as they coincide with Mark, probably not from him, but from the λογίσις.)

— Likewise, a multifaceted parable, which fits Jesus' teachings and their impact on human history quite well. Yet, it is spoken not just in this historical context but equally in the ethical sense, where the mustard seed symbolizes the divine kernel embedded in every individual soul. In the image of the tree, I believe I recognize a reference to passages from the prophets Ezekiel and Daniel **).

**) Ezekiel 17:23. Daniel 4:7 ff.

18. During a spontaneous crossing over the Sea of Galilee, according to the attached note by our evangelist ***), a fierce storm arises, such that the waves crash into the boat, threatening to sink it.

***) The words, which only appear in Mark and are only possible for him because he connects the news of this crossing directly to a scene taking place on the lakeshore (an order the others have altered), belong to those small details that it would be nonsensical to consider artificially inserted by this evangelist into the narratives of others. Similarly, the small picturesque touch in V. 38. In contrast, Luke, among other circumstances, reveals himself in συνεπληρουντο in V.23 and φοβηθεντει in V. 25 as paraphrasing Mark.

Jesus sleeps on a cushion in the stern; they wake him and say, "Teacher, don't you care that we are perishing?" He awakens, commands the storm and the sea to be calm; the storm subsides, and there is a perfect calm. He then says, "Why are you so fearful? Why do you have no faith?" However, still filled with fear, they say to one another, "Who is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" *).

*) V. 35 ff. Parallel. Matthew 8:23 ff. Luke 8:22 ff.

— A kind of anecdote frequently told about saints and miracle workers of all times. Its origin can be explained in a myriad of ways, without necessarily resorting to the assumption of a myth, of which the present narrative shows no trace, or of deliberate invention. Even against the presumption of its complete factual truth, we don't have much to argue; except that one would then have to decide to attribute this sympathetic power over nature, which Jesus is said to have exercised on this and other occasions, not only to him but also to those saints and miracle-workers, extending even down to Siberian shamans. — Of greater importance is the subsequent incident; however, its direct connection with the former in all three Synoptic Gospels, just like any such convergence of the three elsewhere, doesn't necessarily testify to the historical truth of either one or the other, or even of their linkage itself **).

**) As Neander proposes, L. J. S. 362.

495

19. When he disembarked on the other side of the sea, in the land of the Gadarenes **), he was met by a possessed man of such ferocity, who came forth from the tombs where he used to dwell. This man had often shattered the chains with which people had tried to bind him, and no one could restrain him. Day and night he wandered among the tombs and in the mountains, screaming and lacerating himself with stones. When he saw Jesus from a distance, he ran to him, fell before him, and cried out in a loud voice, "What do you want with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God?"

**) As is well-known, this reading is now increasingly accepted among all three Synoptic Gospels. It doesn't face any geographical difficulty other than, at most, the proximity to the city seemingly presupposed in Matthew V. 31. However, this difficulty naturally vanishes with Mark's representation (V. 14, 20), which appears to be the more original.

496

"I implore you by God, do not torment me!" Jesus had commanded the evil spirit to leave him, and now asked its name. It replied, "Legion is my name, for we are many!" They repeatedly pleaded with Him not to drive them out of the region. Nearby on the hillside, a large herd of pigs was grazing. The demons begged Jesus to let them go into the pigs, and He permitted it. The impure spirits left the man and entered the pigs, and the herd—about two thousand in number—plunged down the steep bank into the sea

and drowned. The herdsmen fled and spread the news in the town and countryside. People came from all around to see what had happened. They found Jesus and saw the previously possessed man sitting clothed *) and in his right mind, and they were filled with fear.

*) Luke notes that the man was previously naked, which is a characteristic smoothing of his account. Luke's narrative in this instance contrasts sharply with the more direct and unpolished version from his predecessor (compare Mark 5:5 with Luke 5:29, Mark 5:9 with Luke 5:30, Mark 5:16 with Luke 5:36, etc.). See verse 27.

Those who had witnessed the events recounted the healing of the possessed man and the incident with the pigs. The people then began to plead with Jesus to leave their region. As Jesus was boarding the boat, the man He had healed begged to go with Him. However, Jesus did not permit him but told him to return home to his own people and tell them how much the Lord had done for him and how he had shown him mercy. The man went and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him **).

**) Chap. 5, 1 ff. Parallel: Matt. 8, 28 ff. Luke 8, 26 ff.

496

Some have raised issues with the originality of the above story, pointing out the many contradictions within it, which, in the two parallel accounts from the other Synoptics, are avoided or at least softened. For example, the possessed man running towards Jesus, whom he fears, the demon within him invoking the name of God while addressing Jesus, the statement that Jesus had already ordered the spirit to leave, etc. If one were to claim a literal interpretation based on the story's originality, these objections would indeed be valid. However, we believe that the narrative's overall vividness and unforced liveliness make the assumption that these contradictions—evidently resulting from cumbersome expression—were artificially inserted less plausible than them being intentionally smoothed over or balanced out in subsequent summaries or explanatory paraphrases. The first Gospel account clearly fabricates the duplication of the possessed individuals. This might stem from a misunderstanding of the plural form in which the predecessor of this Gospel allows the demons to speak out of the possessed man *), or, which seems even more likely to us, with the intention to compensate for an omitted prior demon expulsion (see above No. 3).

*) However, this is contradicted by Matt. V. 31, where the demons are also introduced as speaking from the possessed.

It can be noted as characteristic, and also instructive for other similar cases, how such an addition is made by the same evangelist who otherwise only provides an excerpt from the narrative of the two others. Furthermore, with all the picturesque detail of the description, the story contains nothing that, as with the one listed under No. 5, carries with it at least in one main aspect the guarantee of its literal accuracy. Thus, it is permissible here to place that detail aside as essentially only pertaining to the presentation and portrayal, as we characterized the picturesque detail of our evangelist in the first book, and to highlight this as the actual core of the story: that Jesus healed a patient of the kind that those possessed were, by magically transferring his illness to a herd of pigs; along with what is then reported as a consequence of this event. However, regarding the factual truth of this core, both a negative and a positive answer face almost equal difficulties. The "mythical view" has not, even with all effort, been able to bring about an explanation of the origin of this narrative that would make it appear in the light of a true myth, or even offer a probable point of connection in similarly sounding legends from an earlier time *).

*) Compare Strauss L. I. II, p. 38 ff. What Strauss considers here as causes for the emergence of this supposed myth are nothing but, in part distant enough, analogies of the contemporary belief in demonic possessions and exorcisms, a belief whose content, in all the moments from which those analogies are taken, is everything else rather than of the nature of the myth.

According to this explanation, the incident remains an arbitrary, completely groundless invention of the kind that the synoptic gospels, and especially Mark, do not otherwise tend to offer, and which the present story, which is naive and unadulterated in all its features and even bears the stamp of the strictest historical truthfulness in some, does not, with the exception of the wondrousness of its content, give any occasion to assume. Especially how do you explain, if you think the story was invented to glorify Jesus, the detail that the inhabitants of the region where the miracle was performed, instead of admiring and praising Jesus for it, driven by terror and fear, wanted to send him away as soon as possible? Even the admonition with which Jesus dismisses the one he healed, who wants to follow him, is anything but in the tone in which one could recognize a legendary prototype for such events. On the other hand, of course, all attempts to explain the incident entirely or partially in natural terms have been even more conspicuously unsuccessful, and the final result, which one finally arrived at from these, that during the operation Jesus performed on the possessed, "a confusion arose in the herd for an unknown reason to us," will hardly be reassuring. The alternative

remains that the main fact of the story, the transfer of the illness of the possessed to the herd of pigs by the miraculous power of the Savior, must either be factually true or invented. Without wanting to allow ourselves a decision here, but still leaving open the possibility of the origin of this anecdote perhaps from a misunderstanding of a figurative speech by Jesus (which kind of origin we will later prove for so many other miracle stories, which, however, for the reasons mentioned above and because we do not find any other point of reference here for them, does not seem very probable to us in the present case), we do, however, allow ourselves to point out how even such researchers of the forces and states of animal magnetism, who are completely removed from the assumption of a personal demonic possession and therefore an exorcism in that actual sense, against which the scientifically educated consciousness of our time mainly rebels, nevertheless, with explicit reference to this evangelical incident, have allowed for the possibility of a transfer of demonic states "to others and even to animals" *).

*) Kiefer, System of Tellurism, Vol. II, p. 72.

499

20. When Jesus returned to the other side of the lake and again a crowd gathered around him, a synagogue leader named Jairus approached him, fell at his feet, and begged him to come to his house: his young daughter was near death, and he wished for Jesus to lay his hands on her and save her. Jesus granted the request and went with him, with a throng of people pressing in on them. Among them was a woman who had suffered from bleeding for twelve years and had spent all she had on doctors without any help; in fact, her condition had worsened. Having heard about Jesus, she approached from behind in the crowd to touch his cloak, for she believed that by merely touching him she would be healed. She did so, and instantly the source of her bleeding dried up, and she felt healed. However, Jesus immediately realized that power had gone out from him. He turned around in the crowd and asked who had touched his clothes. His disciples pointed out the crowd pressing around him and wondered how he could ask such a question. Yet, as Jesus looked around to see who had done it, the woman, scared and trembling, aware of what had just happened to her, fell before him and confessed the whole truth. He said to her, "Daughter, your faith has healed you; go in peace and be freed from your suffering!" While he was still speaking, messengers came to Jairus and reported that his daughter was dead and he shouldn't trouble the teacher any further. But Jesus, upon hearing this, told Jairus not to fear but to believe. Accompanied by Peter, James, and John, and having sent everyone else away, he entered Jairus' house to find people weeping and wailing. He said, "Why all this commotion and wailing? The child is not dead but asleep." They laughed at him, but he ordered them all out, took the child's parents and his companions with him, and went in

where the child was. He took her hand and said, "Talitha koum," which means, "Little girl, I say to you, get up!" Immediately, the girl stood up and began to walk around; she was twelve years old *).

*) Here, we'd like to point out that Luke brings this detail to the beginning of the narrative (V. 42), which clearly looks much more like a revision than the reverse in Mark.

Everyone was utterly astonished; he instructed that the child be given something to eat **).

**) V. 21 ff. Parallel. Matth. 9, 18 ff. Luk. 8, 40 ff.

This narrative also belongs, especially so, to the series of those stories which the two middle evangelists recount more elaborately and vividly than the first evangelist; concerning this story, recent critical views have fluctuated, initially favoring the latter two, especially the third evangelist, over the first, but later vice versa, favoring the first over the other two.

***) Schleiermacher, Schulz, Sieffert, Schneckenburger, and others.

*) Strauß, de Wette.

In this case, as in all similar ones, we must assert that the appearance of an artificially revised version of a previously simpler narrative can apply to Luke, but not to Mark, and only seems to apply to both because of the unfounded assumption that Mark could in no way be more original than Luke. From how the story is presented in our source, we believe that an unbiased reader will not necessarily favor its literal accuracy but will appreciate its independence from other written accounts and its freedom from artifice and intentionality. Upon closer inspection, neither of the two events interwoven into the narrative appears especially strange or unbelievable, assuming one accepts the necessity of the miraculous and extraordinary in the physical aspect of Jesus's appearance and activity in general. Regarding the healing of the bleeding woman, not only naturalistic but even supernaturalistic and orthodox interpreters have recently been bothered by the fact that Jesus's healing power here acts involuntarily and purely physically **); this is too reminiscent of superstitious tales about the healing power of discarded clothing, sweat cloths, etc., of saints and miracle-workers.

**) Some have even wanted to find a merit in the presentation of the first Gospel, arguing that it doesn't necessarily assume this. However, an unbiased reader,

even without considering the other two, will hardly see anything other than confirmation of such an involuntary healing in the words in which Jesus, according to V. 22, speaks of the faith of the sick woman, which, as we learn from V. 21, specifically referred to that also involuntarily acting healing power, saying: "she has been saved."

502

— In this instance, we find ourselves in the position of having to defend the accuracy of the Gospel account against those who adhere strictly to the letter of scripture, just as we previously sometimes had to push doubt even beyond the boundaries where it had previously stopped. However, while we did the latter in the true interest of positive faith, we do the former here in the interest of a genuinely literal or philosophical understanding of the concept of miracles. As we demonstrated in the previous book *), this concept indeed posits such an external aspect of physical existence that it can encompass involuntary action.

*) See pages 336 ff. and 364.

This external manifestation of a purely physical existence, though bound to and mediated by the spirit, replaces, for the rational view of miracles, that alleged supra-rational incomprehensibility of miraculous power which the dogmatism of those who adhere strictly to the letter of scripture must attribute to the essence of that power, even if they place each individual exercise of it in the realm of will and free deliberation. Furthermore, when critiquing this incident, one should not overlook the detail that Jesus himself refers to the sensation of a power that had emanated from him; a detail that, on one hand, shows a distinct analogy to authenticated experiences from the domain of animal magnetism, and on the other, does not correlate at all with any context that could have prompted its arbitrary invention.

As for the account of the more significant event in which the smaller one is interwoven among all three Synoptic Gospels: the main question is whether it should be taken as an actual resurrection from the dead or not. In opposition to a large number of interpreters, both rationalistic and even orthodox, who find in Jesus's own statement **) an irrefutable authority that the child was not truly dead, recent criticism has insisted that the Evangelists' intention is unmistakably to report the miracle of the resurrection of someone genuinely dead, and that therefore, from a purely exegetical point of view, the incident can be understood as nothing other than such a resurrection.

**) Verse 39.

This, when treated purely exegetically, as mentioned, must certainly be conceded. Not only in the first Gospel, where the father initially approaches Jesus with the plea to revive the one he declares already dead, and in Luke, where the expression used about the child from the start is at least ambiguous *), but also in Mark, since no commentary by the Evangelist is added to the message the father receives about his daughter's death during the incident with the woman suffering from a hemorrhage, it cannot be otherwise inferred than that it was also the Evangelist's intention to convey that the content of this message was accurate.

*) αὕτη ἀπεθνήσκειν. B. 42. Also in verses 53 and 55, Luke adds a few more confirmations of the actuality of death.

However, this concession does not definitively conclude as much about the actual facts of the incident as those critics wish to assume in one direction or the other. The events could have transpired almost exactly as Mark narrates them, and yet the child might not have been truly dead, or even apparently dead. In the latter case, which frankly seems more probable to us, it would have to be assumed that the content of that message should be attributed to the narrative, just as many smaller details in our Gospel might be. The lamentation of the household members that welcomes the entrants could have been due as much to their anticipated proximity of death as to an already occurred death. That musicians were also present among the crowd **), to celebrate the burial of the deceased according to Jewish custom, is again an addition in the first Gospel, of which the other two are unaware.

**) Matthew 9:23.

The absence of apparent death is, by the way, suggested by the fact that no detailed description is given of the child's appearance when they enter her room *); also, the request to revive the dead, despite the caution Jesus exercised here against making the incident too public, would certainly have been directed at him more frequently if he had even seemingly performed such an act.

*) Mark 5:40 f.

Furthermore, the remark that Jesus only took the three more intimate disciples into Jairus' house indicates this event as one "authenticated by the testimony of these three", and is here, as everywhere it appears in Mark, by no means to be treated lightly **).

****) As Strauss does, who, without any basis, sees in the dismissal of the other disciples a reason to suspect the incident (p. 136).**

504

21. Jesus arrives in his hometown Nazareth accompanied by his disciples; he teaches on the Sabbath in the synagogue. A murmuring arises among the listeners: "From where does he get these things? What kind of wisdom is this that has been given to him? And what sort of miracles are those that are supposed to be performed through his hands? Isn't he the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joseph and Simon and Judas? And aren't his sisters here with us?" In short, they wanted nothing to do with him. Then Jesus said, "A prophet is not without honor except in his own town, among his relatives and in his own home" *****).**

*****)** Cap. 6, 1 ff. Parallel. Matt. 13, 54 ff. (Luke 4, 16 ff. John 4:44).

— If there is any striking example of the power of deep-rooted dogmatic prejudices, it is how for centuries people have been reading this characteristic anecdote, memorizing it, applying it in every conceivable way, without realizing the striking contradiction it has with the assumption about the extraordinary events before and after the birth of the Savior. To us, it comes as confirmation of everything we noted in the previous book about the inconspicuous beginnings from which he rose— without diminishing the spiritual grandeur and glory of the Lord, but, we believe, elevating it. — However, from the fact that Jesus refers to himself as a prophet here, it should not be concluded that at that time he considered himself as nothing more than just a prophet. The fate that befell him in his hometown is not unique to him as the Messiah but is common to all prophets, that is, to all extraordinary spirits. That's why he uses the designation common to him and them. ***)**

***)** V. 31 ff. Parall. Matth. 14, 13 ff. Luk. 9, 10 ff. (Joh. 6, 1 ff.)

505

22. Jesus, with his disciples, takes a ship to a secluded place to escape the crowds that surround him; but in vain, for they notice and soon people pour in on foot from all the neighboring towns. He comes out and sees the dense crowd; a melancholic emotion seizes him, for they were like sheep without a shepherd; he begins to speak to them, teaching various things. As it gets late, the disciples approach him, pointing out how the place is remote and the time has advanced; he should dismiss the crowd so they can spread out to the fields and nearby settlements to get food; for they have nothing to eat.

But he replies to them: they themselves should provide the crowd with food. They then ask him: should they go and buy bread for two hundred denarii and give it to the people? He asks, "How many loaves do you have? Go and check!" They investigate and reply: "Five, and two fish." He then commands everyone to sit down in groups on the green grass. They sit in groups, some of a hundred and some of fifty. He takes the five loaves, looks up to heaven with a prayer of thanks, breaks the bread, and gives it to his disciples to distribute to the people; likewise, he also distributes the fish among them. And everyone ate and was satisfied; indeed, twelve full baskets of leftover pieces from the bread were collected, and also from the fish. But there were five thousand men who ate *).

*) V. 31 ff. Parallel. Matt. 14, 13 ff. Luke 9, 10 ff. (John 6, 1 ff.)

506

Before we undertake to trace the origin of this most curious and adventurous narrative (which, as the latest orthodox biographer of Jesus' life rightly points out, yet hurries over it so quickly and responds so faintly to its naturalistic interpretation, that we can hardly remain in doubt about the weakness of his own faith in it**), the climax of all miraculous deeds reported about the Lord, but also, as we will soon see, in a certain sense the archetype by which we have to judge all similar, genuine miracle stories, we must preface some remarks about the relationship of the gospel accounts to one another and to a second narrative of very similar content.

**) Neander L. J. S. 368 f. 373 ff.

Among the three synoptic gospels, one would hardly find any significant difference other than those which consist in a smoothing out of the very harsh and strikingly Hebraizing expression of Mark ***).

***) For example, the συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασαι πρασαι of Mark V. 39 f. is omitted by the other two, yet each of them retains a trace of that phrase from Mark, one (Matt. V. 19) the επι τους χότρους, the other (Luke V. 14) the ανά πεντήκοντα. What nonsense to want to assume here, conversely, that Mark collected these details from the other two and then arbitrarily added those sharply Hebraizing expressions!

Luke names the city (or perhaps the territory of the city) Bethsaida as the location of the event, with unmistakable reference to the mention of this city that follows in Mark †), whether he overlooked the journey to and fro on the lake, or whether he considered it,

together with the miracle that occurred on the return journey, which is missing in his account, as are several subsequent events ††), not as a factual event, but as a story based on a misunderstanding.

†) Mark V. 45.

††) Compare above Book I, p. 88 f.

Mark's hint about the feeling of compassion that the assembled crowd evoked in Jesus is believed by the other two to refer to healings Jesus performed at that time. They, however, convey this as evidenced by the words they use for it, independently of each other. The author of the first Gospel, recognizing the significance of the words Mark uses, inserts them at another place, aptly introducing words of Jesus he sources from elsewhere *).

*) Matthew 9:36. As evidence that these words are missing from our story in Matthew, and not, conversely, added by Mark, Matthew 14:14 still states:
εσπλαγγίσθη επ αυτοις (correct reading instead of the usual επ αυτους).

— Next to the relationship of the synoptics to each other, we also have to consider their relationship to the fourth Gospel, which, in rare agreement with the others, also provides this story. There's no question of literal borrowing here; however, the presentation in which this Gospel provides the story is entirely characteristic of this evangelist's manner, by no means more original than the synoptic account, blended with the content itself. The scene is also placed on the opposite shore of the lake, and on a mountain. The congregation of the crowd is doubly motivated, as per this evangelist's habit which doesn't attribute as much impact to Jesus' mere words on the populace, by miraculous acts they previously saw him perform on the sick, and by the proximity of a Jewish Passover. The question of how to feed the crowd is raised by Jesus himself, and right away (the evangelist explicitly says so, not implying other conversations beforehand) upon first seeing the crowd. He directs it to a specific disciple, Philip, one of those this evangelist likes to introduce, and with the intention, as the narrator doesn't fail to parenthetically add, of testing whether he has enough faith in his master's miraculous power to find buying bread unnecessary (!!). Philip responds with the same number that we also find in Mark — certainly a sign of how detailed this story must have been handed down from various sides *) — : two hundred denarii worth of bread wouldn't be enough for each of the people to receive even a little.

*) Similarly, the mention of the grass, which this evangelist doesn't forget to mention that (V. 10) much of it grew in the land.

Another disciple, specifically named Andrew, points to a boy who has the familiar small number of bread and fish with him from the synoptics; but how could that help? In the report of the feeding itself, the miraculous is elevated by the addition that each received as much bread and fish as they wanted, and afterward, it is Jesus himself who, not without pointing ostentatiously to the performed miracle, commands the disciples to collect the leftovers. Finally, this evangelist seems to have posed a question, the answer to which is oddly missing from the synoptics (as is also the description of the crowd's behavior before and during the distribution of bread, especially noticeable given Mark's otherwise vivid narrative style) — the question of the impact the successfully performed miracle had on the people. It's indeed logical that after such a striking proof of his superhuman power, the people would recognize him as the true Messiah and want to proclaim him their king right away; if only this fact would otherwise fit more plausibly into the course of the gospel history, and wasn't rather contradicted by the evangelist himself, by what he allows to follow immediately after!

509

The judgment about the present story cannot be determined further without immediately considering another, very similar story in its content, which, in Mark and in the first gospel, which exactly parallels Mark in these parts, follows the current story after the insertion of some other anecdotes. This begins, after only a general notice which is sufficient for the conversation, as in the previously mentioned place of the fourth gospel, immediately with Jesus's words to the disciples: "I feel sorry for the people; they have been with me for three days and have nothing to eat. If I send them home hungry, they will collapse on the way, because some of them have come from afar!" To which the disciples are said to have replied, "How can one feed these in the wilderness?" He asks how many loaves they have; they say: Seven. He then instructs the people to sit on the ground, takes the loaves, says a prayer of thanks, breaks them, and gives them to his disciples to distribute. The disciples distribute them among the people, as well as a few small fish they had with them. They eat and are satisfied, and seven baskets (σπυρίδες — in the first story it was κοφίνοι) full of fragments remain; but the diners were four thousand.

*) Mark 8, 1 ff. Parallel Matt. 15, 29 ff.

It is characteristic of the standpoint on which gospel criticism currently stands, i.e., among the majority of theologians, that in relation to both of the above stories, one is almost universally content with the result one believes to have obtained through this criticism, namely being able to reduce both stories to a single one. This outcome is, as

is easily to be guessed, due to the tradition hypothesis. Since the third and fourth evangelists, especially the latter, which one is convinced stand closest to history, know only of one feeding, it seems obvious that the misunderstanding of a second arose from variations of the traditional accounts of that one and entered into the presentation of those two evangelists. With our theory of the origin of the synoptic gospels, this assumption is not so easy to reconcile. However, since this theory still has to prove itself when considering the individual details, we cannot readily cite it as a decisive instance against that assumption, but must see if perhaps the problem before us offers it an insurmountable obstacle. The fear that this might indeed be the case seems all the more evident the more we have to admit, apart from that strange doubling, that we have a fact before us that would not fit all too well into a truly historical context, as according to our assumption Mark, the student and interpreter of Peter, should have given. To clarify this, we must first of all fully present the documents contained in our gospel itself that are relevant to the decision of this question. We therefore immediately connect with those two stories a conversation that our evangelist, and hand in hand with him the author of the first gospel, almost immediately lets follow the second *).

*) Mark 8, 14 ff. Parallel Matt. 16, 5 ff.

510

"Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod!" – says Jesus on a boat trip to his disciples. They do not understand the warning; they assume Jesus is rebuking them for not bringing food for the journey, suggesting he's warning them of poisoning. Noticing this, Jesus says, "Do you still not perceive or understand? Are your hearts hardened? Having eyes, do you not see, and having ears, do you not hear? And do you not remember? When I broke the five loaves for the five thousand, how many baskets (κόφιννοι) full of broken pieces did you collect?" They replied, "Twelve." "And when I broke the seven for the four thousand, how many baskets (σπυρίδες) full of leftover fragments did you collect?" They answered, "Seven." And Jesus said, "Do you not yet understand?"

511

This conversation, in our opinion, provides the key to the correct understanding of the two narratives it refers to, for anyone whose eyes are not as blind or whose mind is not as stubborn as those of the disciples at the time. A deeper understanding becomes clearer when one recalls the disciples' repeated failure to understand the parables spoken by Jesus to them or the crowd in our gospel *).

*) Cap. 4, 13. Cap. 7, 18.

Consider the following. Jesus had metaphorically warned the disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees. What he meant by this leaven isn't essential in this context. The author of the first gospel interprets it as the doctrine of the Pharisees, mentioning the Sadducees in the appendix instead of Herod (perhaps Mark mentioned him by mistake since he often pairs Pharisees with Herodians **). Luke, in a passage that may or may not refer to Mark's account, translates Pharisaic "leaven" as "hypocrisy" (ὑπόκρισις ***).

**) Marc. 3, 6. 12, 13.

**) Luk. 12, 1.

Suffice it to say that this phrase is intended metaphorically, and the sharp rebuke of the disciples that follows can only be aimed at their taking a metaphorical statement literally. If this rebuke recalls an earlier incident, it seems likely that this incident would have been a lesson to the disciples about understanding such metaphors. However, the traditional understanding of this reminder does not relate to their misunderstanding of the recent statement but to their belief that even in the presence of the Lord, concern for physical sustenance remains relevant. – We won't discuss the absurdity of attributing to Jesus such a reminder, implying that he would regularly resort to miraculous powers for sustenance. Even the staunchest believer in dogmatic miracles should object to this interpretation, as it's generally conceded that Jesus practiced restraint in performing miracles and would consider it blasphemous to rely on his miraculous power for sustenance. We focus on the logical and grammatical position of Jesus' words, arguing that the inference Jesus wants drawn is only valid if the metaphorical understanding he demands in the conclusion is already present in the premises. This becomes clearer when we read the appended words of the first gospel, which, even if not authentic, involuntarily present the meaning of Jesus' words we consider correct. We find there the concluding words, "Do you not yet understand," further elaborated as, "that when I told you to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, I was not speaking of bread." This "not speaking of bread" (οὐ περὶ ἄρτου εἶπον) indicates a direct inference from the admitted metaphorical nature of the foregoing to the metaphorical nature of "leaven," not an indirect conclusion skipping several intermediate steps. The narrative, despite the author's intention, reveals its natural meaning. This exposition is also reflected in the added note by the evangelist that the disciples finally realized he wasn't talking about the leaven of bread but about the doctrines of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

If this explanation is correct, it clearly emerges for the two narratives to which the conversation refers that their true content cannot be actual events that occurred, but parables spoken by Jesus. The attempt to reduce them to a single incident then appears as superfluous as the effort of a naturalistic interpretation and not much more fruitful than both, the reference to an alleged myth. All the historian's effort will instead be primarily directed at explaining how the striking misunderstanding of those parabolic words could arise from a reporter who is as close to the events as our Mark, who also faithfully recorded the conversation from which we were able to glean insight into the former. However, this work still finds many points of contact, more so with the "mythical view"; for it cannot be denied how such a transformation of the parable into a miracle presented as a historical fact certainly offers some analogy with the emergence process of a myth, although the result is not yet to be described as a myth in the strict sense of the word. - I believe I have found the key to a profound insight into the process of that transformation concerning the present narratives and also some other similar stories we will come to later, in an apostolic letter. Paul, in the first letter to the Corinthians *) speaks of the spiritual blessings which the fathers had already received in Moses' time; he speaks of them in the images offered by the mythical history of the Old Testament.

*) 1 Cor. 10, 1 ff.

He mentions "how they were all under the cloud and went through the sea, and how both, the cloud and the sea, were a baptism for them in the name of Moses." He further recalls a "spiritual food" (βρώμα πνευματικόν) and a "spiritual drink" that they all enjoyed, adding about this drink, "it sprang from a spiritual rock that accompanied them on their journey, but this rock was Christ." - We cannot investigate in detail whether Paul says all this in the sense of a purely spiritual understanding of those Old Testament narratives, thus with the correct insight into their mythical nature, or whether he, which is more likely, although believing in the factual truth of all those miraculous facts, interprets them allegorically in a similar manner as he does in other parts of his letters, and as many of his Jewish and Christian contemporaries and successors did. It is enough that the sense in which he cites those legendary images here is unmistakably and irrefutably, as the words he uses himself testify, not a material one, but a spiritual one. The application he makes from all this is equally spiritual. He points out the bad use the Israelites made of those spiritual blessings back then and warns his brothers in faith against a similarly bad use of the corresponding blessings that have come to them in Christ. He further explicitly *) designates these last blessings with the images corresponding to the aforementioned ones of the chalice and bread, whose communion represents to them the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

*) V. 16 f.

Who is not reminded in these words of the analogy with the apostolic words **) we cited above, in which the spiritual generation of Christ, and not just Christ, but all believers, is discussed, from which, as we showed there, the myth of the conception by the Holy Spirit arose?

**) Book II, p. 174 f.

The analogy would be even more complete if Paul, in the same spiritual sense in which he speaks of the bread that the fathers received through Moses, were to speak directly of a bread distributed by Christ. But even as the passage stands, we consider it, especially when we compare it with the detailed discourses of the Gospel of John on the heavenly bread given by Christ to people, in which the Mosaic manna is also mentioned ***), sufficient to illustrate how, through a process quite similar to what we observed in the origin of the myth of Mary's virginal conception, the present stories are also included in the sequence of historical events from the life of the Savior.

***) John 6:31 f.

The image of a spiritual bread that Jesus distributed belonged just as much to the "types" (as Paul calls the Old Testament images in that context) of the apostolic proclamation, as the image of conception, the rebirth from above or from the Holy Spirit; it belonged even more so the more it found an external connection in the holy practice of the commemorative meal. Just as there, through the addition of other manifestations of the myth-making activity, an actual myth arose, so here from this type, through the added memory and retelling of a parable told by Christ himself, the legendary story of one or two actual miraculous feedings of a large crowd by Jesus emerged. Amidst the real, verified history, this legend stands just as foreign and unconnected by any conceivable causal link as the myth of infancy. No slightest attempt is made to clarify how the miraculous food was procured in detail (an attempt which, even with the utmost applied art of representation, could hardly have turned out anything other than fanciful to the point of absurdity); and just as well, the crowd, which the evangelist had gathered for the sake of the miracle, disperses as if nothing had happened, without any trace of the extraordinary event remaining, whether in their own hearts or even in the hearts of the Lord's disciples.

The memory of the heavenly bread with which the Israelite people were fed during their exodus from Egypt in the desert has been used by the "mythical view" in another sense than we do following that Pauline passage, to explain the problem at hand, namely, along with two other Old Testament miracle stories of the prophets Elijah *) and Elisha **), it has been seen as a direct cause for the invention of this New Testament miracle story.

*) 1 Kings 17:8 ff.

**) 2 Kings 4:42 ff.

We do not disregard the influence that these older legends undoubtedly exerted in the emergence and fixation of our own, yet we believe we must perceive this influence differently than those who, referring back to them, see the main reason for the emergence of this new alleged myth, and find only an incidental cause in Jesus' own words, especially the Johannine ones about the heavenly bread emanating from him *).

*) As Strauss, L. I. II, p. 213 ff.

We find this alternate interpretation particularly necessary because, in this narrative, we cannot assume any shape-forming activity of the myth, as with the infancy legend. This is prohibited partly by the place where we find it — the Gospel of Mark, in terms of its age, origin, and overall literary nature, lies outside the realm where the nascent myth-making of the Christian world takes place — and partly by its unique character, which is far more the character of the parable than of the actual myth **).

**) To be a myth in the proper sense, the story is too abstract and general, and lacks specific historical references. Also, in its form, much indicates its origin from a discourse in which even the individual words were the subject of the listener's attention. For example, in Mark, the striking uniformity in the use of the word ἄρτοι, which, of course, the others occasionally substitute with other expressions, and then the corresponding use of the words κόφινοι and σφυρίδες in the conversation Cap. 18, 19 f. to Cap. 6, 43, and Cap. 8, 8.

Its form and elaboration, misunderstood as a physical miracle story, was undoubtedly given by Christ's own mouth: as evidenced by the conversation reported by the evangelists, which first guided us to the correct origin of the story. It was presented by Christ not exactly in the same, but certainly in a very similar manner, largely probably already in the same or corresponding expressions as we read in the gospel, as a parable. Therefore, to the extent one would be led to assume that those Old Testament

reminiscences have already entered into its form, one would have to seek them in the development of the parable by Christ himself. Indeed, the assumption that it was not invented without explicit reference to those seems not at all to be dismissed. As already mentioned, John expressly puts a memory of the manna into Jesus' mouth, in a context that is probably drawn by the apostle from our parable, but not, as the editor of the gospel misunderstood, assuming the feeding story as a real event. Even more striking is the similarity with the story of the Prophet Elisha; so striking in fact, that an unconscious coincidence would have to be counted among the most peculiar accidents. What if Jesus, with an explicit reference to both narratives, and perhaps even to the third about the Prophet Elijah, whom he also mentions himself on another occasion *), had invented the present parable with the explicit intention of highlighting the spiritual, symbolic meaning of the former?

*) Luke 4:25 f.

If he, in a similarly free and inspired manner as we hear him elsewhere, for example, reinforce the prophetic prophecy of the appearance of Elijah by assuring that Elijah has already appeared, or refute the belief that the Messiah must be a physical descendant of King David by pointing out the contradiction in which the messianic prophecies, taken literally, stand to themselves, would he not also, in this case, have wanted to affirm, interpret, and surpass the legends of those deeds of Moses and the prophets by symbolically referencing his own actions, in a manner that suited him, but indeed only him? It would hardly be objected that such an understanding of these legends should not be attributed to him, especially when considering the understanding that even Paul demonstrates in the aforementioned passage. Even less objection will be raised when one recalls the many clear examples of deep, spiritual scriptural understanding that Jesus elsewhere has demonstrated, as we have already shown in various instances and will further demonstrate. However, it must be admitted that it is also difficult through this method to ascertain with any certainty the form in which Jesus might have presented these parables, about which he must have made himself the subject in one way or another, more or less directly or indirectly. Probably, in this discourse, the details were also significant: the individual phrases (of which we believe we see a remnant, for example, in the parable of the sheep without a shepherd) and the specific details regarding the quantity and other characteristics of the miraculous gift. Specifically, we believe that in the gathering of the fragments, we discern a feature that is unlikely to be there solely to indicate the fullness of satisfaction that the assembled crowd receives from the heavenly breads. Likely, Jesus intended to hint at the deeper truth of how true spiritual satisfaction, whether in individuals or a crowd, always offers more than just satisfaction, and that from it, something also spills over to others, which again, quantitatively, is more than the initial means of satisfaction.

23. After the first of the events recounted in the preceding section, Jesus instructs his disciples to cross over to Bethsaida ahead of him, while he intends to dismiss the crowd. Then he ascends the mountain to pray. Evening comes, and the boat was in the middle of the lake, but he was alone on land. He sees them struggling with the oars, for they were against the wind. Around the third watch of the night, he approaches them, walking on the lake, and looks as though he would pass by them. However, when they see him walking on the lake, they assume he's a ghost and cry out in fear. They all see him and are terrified. But he immediately speaks to them, saying, "Take courage, it is I, don't be afraid!" He climbs into the boat with them, and the wind subsides. They, however, are completely astounded and filled with wonder. For they had not understood about the loaves; their hearts were hardened. *)

*) Chapter 6, V. 45 ff. Parall. Matt. 14, sr ff. (John 6, 16 ff.)

Regarding this miraculous event, the primary problem that presents itself is its connection to the previous one. This connection cannot have arisen merely from a coincidental link made by our Evangelist. This is evident because the same connection appears in the fourth gospel, which is independent of our own. However, to regard this connection as resting on the factual relationship of both events, one would first have to acknowledge the factual nature of the events themselves. This is as difficult for the current event as it was for the previous one. Given these circumstances, we welcome the clarification provided by the aforementioned passage in the Corinthians letter. Just as the passage through the sea by the Israelites is immediately linked with their being fed with manna from heaven as a type of Christ's spiritual blessings: it's plausible to think that during the proclamation of the gospel, to correspond to this typology, as the proclamation often seems to have attached itself to Old Testament types *), those two narratives were linked not as historical facts, which were not the focus of the proclamation, but as symbols of the miraculous activity of the Holy Spirit. This connection, misunderstood by our Evangelists as factual, just like the event itself, then made its way into their gospels.

*) Consider the Letter to the Hebrews and the Letter of Barnabas, two documents that perhaps more than any others from that era embody the character of the gospel proclamation in its proper, strict sense.

About the origin of the story itself, with this assumption—which we consider so likely that it appears to us to sufficiently solve the problem, which otherwise, we don't deny,

might threaten our core beliefs in one way or another—admittedly, nothing has been clarified yet. That it also originated from a parable told by Jesus: there are few points of connection in Mark's account that suggest this. A stronger hint might be the passage inserted by the first evangelist *), where Peter, seeing the Lord walking on water, asks him to grant the power to walk towards him, but immediately becomes fearful and begins to sink when his request is granted. Jesus then extends a hand, reproaching him for his weak faith.

*) Matthew V. 28 ff.

Indeed, one could interpret this as a parabolic admonition from the Lord directed at the disciple about the nature of his faith, which is passionate but too easily faltering in moments of danger; from which the origin of the rest of the story could be explained without much difficulty. — In fact, it's not impossible that in this case, the first gospel, which often adds apocryphal supplements to the stories of Mark, might for once have retained an authentic detail, which could provide a proper clue about the origin of this anecdote; especially since it wouldn't be hard to find a reason for its omission in other gospels that have included the story. If the tale was indeed presented in the typological-didactic manner we tried to explain earlier, the part concerning Peter, even if perhaps originally the essential core of the anecdote, would seem out of place, and its omission would be less surprising given these narratives' non-historical content and character. However, this point remains problematic, and we must also consider it possible that this addition unique to Matthew was allegorically added later on, and we would then have to search for another explanation of its origin. The similarity of this story with John's account of the appearance of the resurrected Christ during fishing in the Galilean lake *), as pointed out by Strauss, might provide a hint on where to look. The disciples' mistaken belief in seeing a ghost could remind us of the impression made on them by the appearances of the resurrected Christ, as described in our gospel accounts.

*) Strauss L. I. II, p. 191.

The connection with the previous anecdote would in this case not be easier, but also not much harder to explain than in the other; in both cases, it remains a connection caused by the coincidental circumstance we mentioned earlier. — Notably, Mark's comment (V. 52), reminiscent of the previous story and anticipated from the conversation about leaven, is curious. It almost seems as if the evangelist mistakenly incorporated it into his portrayal from a lecture on the anecdote, which referred to its parabolic nature, just as it clearly did in that conversation.

24. Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem had seen some of Jesus's disciples eat with unwashed hands **).

**) Cap. 7. V. 1 ff. Parallel. Matth. 15, 1 ff. (Luk. 11, 38.)

It was a tradition among the Pharisees and all Jews from ancient times to wash their hands before eating. Following this tradition, they also had to observe several other rituals, including the washing of drinking vessels, wooden and bronze utensils, and benches. Therefore, they asked Jesus why his disciples broke this tradition and ate with unclean hands. Jesus replied, "There is nothing outside a person that by going into him can defile him, but the things that come out of a person are what defile him. If anyone has ears to hear, let him hear!" Later at home, the disciples asked him about this parable. He said, "Do you also fail to understand? Do you not realize that whatever enters a person from outside cannot defile him? It does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and then out of his body, thus purifying the food." And then, "What comes out of a person is what defiles him. For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts: adultery, fornication, murder, theft, greed, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, blasphemy, pride, and foolishness. All these evil things come from within and defile a man."

The sharp witticism with which Jesus dismisses the Pharisaic pedantry here has profound depth. One should not think that the interpretation Jesus gives his disciples at their request exhausts the meaning in its raw truth. This explanation is still symbolic. The physiological process of digestion, which separates the impurities from food and only assimilates what is compatible with human nature, is in Jesus's answer also a metaphor for the moral process of assimilating and processing external impressions by a person's spirit and soul. The healthy, i.e., the moral soul, is incapable of being tainted by such impressions because, like the physical nature through the digestion process, it discards what's impure. However, impurities can form within both the moral and physical organism. Only these truly defile a person, or rather, they reveal his inner impurity when they manifest outwardly. — The religions of antiquity, by accepting the possibility of external impurities and addressing them through purification laws, demonstrate that they remained at a restricted perspective of the moral worldview. They symbolically acknowledge that the spiritual self, not just the one still in development, but even the matured self, can be morally tainted by external influences without its own fault or agency. Christianity alone advanced the understanding that "to the pure, all things are

pure," recognizing the true moral freedom of the individual and freeing its followers from the bondage of external ceremonial laws once and for all.

524

Similarly to how, in the parable of the sower, there are foreign components inserted between the parable and its interpretation, here too, between the question of the Pharisees and Jesus's answer, unrelated components have been added: two statements that Jesus might have made on similar occasions against similar questioners. As before, our evangelist's presentation proves to be more original by letting signs of separation remain even in the combination of the disparate elements. The two subsequent expressions in Mark, separated by "And he said," are merged in the parallel account in the first Gospel. There, their order is reversed; a reversal that, presuming unity as that representation does, would indeed be appropriate, but its very appropriateness reveals its intentionality.

25. "Isaiah prophesied very well about you, hypocrites, as it is written: 'This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men *). Turning away from the commandments of God, you cling to the traditions of men; you observe washings of utensils and drinking vessels, and many other such things. **)

*) Loosely based on Isa. 29:13.

**) V. 6-8. Parallel. Matt. B. 8. 9.

26. "Indeed, you set aside God's commandment to uphold your traditional precepts! Moses said: honor your father and your mother, and: whoever insults his father or mother should be put to death. But you allow someone to say to his father or mother, 'I will make an offering of what you should have received from me,' so that he no longer needs to care for his father and mother. Thus, you nullify the Word of God with your traditions! And you do many other such things!" *)

*) V. 5-13. Parallel. Matt. V. 3-6.

— The same critics who recently wanted to deduce from these and similar passages a distinction that Jesus explicitly made between the Mosaic Law and the Pharisaic precepts, suggesting he wanted his disciples to continue observing the former in its entirety, — these critics also acknowledge, and have even informed us, that what was considered the Mosaic Law during Jesus' time was not considered so during the time of

those prophets whom Jesus cites here and elsewhere; that the mass of Levitical rules filling our Pentateuch, and which was already filled in those times, had not yet been adopted into the Law during the prophets' time but was still evolving and was explicitly opposed by the greatest of those prophets. How then would Jesus have related to these spurious parts of the Law, which were widely accepted as genuine in his time? Would he have wanted to uphold them too, and thus have been less insightful than his predecessors, the prophets? Or do we prefer to imagine him equipped with that scholarly critique that has managed to sift out these components in modern times?

525

27. Once Jesus was in the border regions of Tyre and Sidon. He stayed in a house there and did not want anyone to know about it, but he could not remain hidden. A woman, a pagan of Syro-Phoenician descent, had heard about it; she had a daughter possessed by an evil spirit, so she came to him, fell at his feet and begged him to drive the demon out of her daughter. Jesus said to her: "Let the children be fed first; it isn't right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs!" She replied: "Yes, Lord, but even the little dogs under the table eat the crumbs that the children drop!" He said: "Because you have said this, go; the demon has left your daughter!" She went home and found her daughter lying in bed, freed from the demon *).

*) V. 24 ff. Parallel. Matt. 15, 21 ff.

526

From this anecdote, which in many respects is similar to the story of the centurion in Capernaum, which we will discuss in more detail in the next book, I am very inclined to believe that, like this and many other miracle stories, it arose from a misunderstanding of a parabolic speech of Jesus, perhaps similar to the parable of the Good Samaritan. To assume an effect of Jesus's miraculous healing power from a distance, without prior establishment of a personal relationship with the sick person, seems to me, despite all inclination, not to overly narrow the limits of that miraculous power, but still questionable. And the two only examples of this kind that we find in the Gospels, by no means demand it with necessity, since both, one as much as the other, submit without force to another interpretation. With operations of this kind, no path of natural mediation can be discerned (for even the examples of magnetic long-distance effect, which one might refer to, always presuppose a rapport already established between the magnetizer and the somnambulist): they would fall under the category of actual miracles, which we, as we have repeatedly stated, cannot accept once and for all. In fact, in the narrative presented here, as well as in the story of the centurion in

Capernaum, the need for such a mediating element, which is missing in none of the other healing miracles, is silently recognized; as such a moment serves here the faith of the pleading woman, as there the faith of the centurion. But as faith not of the sick person himself, but of a third party, its action cannot in truth be considered mediation. If it were to be considered as such, it would cast a false and misleading light on the meaning and power of faith in Jesus's entire miraculous activity; faith would appear, as only superstition has taken it at all times, as an external, mechanical condition to which the Lord would arbitrarily have attached his benefits, not as the inherent moral power that makes the organism receptive to these benefits. In the interest of true faith in miracles, we must resist such faith in miracles, which also includes these facts, just as the other miracles. And as for the present story, we lose all the less, as the moral wisdom of Jesus revealed in it can only gain, but not lose, by being transformed into a parable. If the story were understood factually, Jesus could hardly be acquitted this time of the charge of narrow-hearted confinement in national antipathies, which is so unlike his usual thinking and acting. If, on the other hand, we take the whole thing as a parable invented by him, the harshness which lies in the first answer to the woman's request is lifted by the intention in which the whole story was conceived from the beginning. The punchline of the whole thing then rests not in that first answer, but in the woman's response; and it very much confirms our explanation that these words play such an important role in the story as it stands. We will have the opportunity to show in several other examples that significant words that the evangelical tradition puts in the mouths of other people are almost always to be considered as spoken by Jesus himself. By the way, in this explanation, just that circumstance in the story understood as factual, the miraculous effect from a distance, takes on a peculiar meaning, the development of which we postpone to the story of the centurion in Capernaum, as it can be demonstrated even more clearly there.

527

The modifications that the author of the first Gospel made to this anecdote only aim to motivate and thus make more understandable Jesus's first answer, which seemed somewhat harsh and incomprehensible in Mark. Specifically, for this purpose, the author drew the statement about the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" from the address to the apostles *) here.

*) Matth. 10, 6.

528

28. They bring (on the other side of the lake, on the borders of Decapolis) a deaf and mute man to him, asking him to lay his hands on him. Jesus takes him away from the crowd, puts his fingers into the man's ears, spits in his hand and touches his tongue; then he looks up to heaven, sighs, and says: "Ephata," which means "Be opened!" and immediately the man's ears were opened, the bond of his tongue was loosened; and he could speak correctly **).

**) Marc. V. 31 ff.

— To this anecdote, we immediately add another one, whose setting is moved to Bethsaida, which shares with the former that only Mark recounts it, and none of his successors have included it ***).

***) The first evangelist, however, seems to have anticipated both in Cap. 9, 27 ff.

Here, it's a blind man they bring to him, with the same request as before. Jesus takes him by the hand and leads him out of the village. Then he spits on the man's eyes, lays his hands on him, and asks if he sees anything. The blind man looks up and answers, "I see people; it seems to me as if they are trees walking around." He then lays his hands on the man's eyes again and lets him look up. And he was restored and saw everything perfectly †).

†) Cap. 8, 22 ff.

— In both cases, there is also a prohibition added not to publicize the event: the first time directed at all the witnesses, the second time at the healed person himself. In the first case, however, it is explicitly stated that the prohibition bore no fruit and that the incident quickly became common knowledge and was the subject of general astonishment. — Without wanting to explain these two healings as natural in the sense of rationalist interpreters, which came about through the otherwise known methods of medical practice, one can still rightfully use them to support a natural understanding of the miraculous activity in a broader and better sense of the word. It might be that many details of the picturesque execution are due to the evangelist's endeavor for vividness. However, the very choice of such details testifies all the more to how, in his conception, Jesus' miraculous activity in general contained those intermediations through touch, through the use of saliva, which antiquity also knows as an effective or guiding medium in magical healings, etc., and even a certain gradualness of the event. Both stories have nothing in them that, admitting the miraculous healing power of Jesus in general, could raise suspicion that they were invented groundlessly and on the spur of the moment.

29. While on a journey, Jesus asks the disciples who people say he is. They reply, "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others say one of the prophets." *)

*) For the meaning of this answer, see above, Book III, p. 414 ff.

He then asks, "But who do you say that I am?" Peter responds, "You are the Anointed of the Lord." But Jesus sternly warned them not to tell anyone about this. He then began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and scribes, be killed, and after three days rise again. He spoke this openly. Peter took him aside and began to rebuke him. Turning around and looking at the disciples, Jesus rebuked Peter, saying, "Get behind me, Satan! You are not thinking about God's concerns but human concerns." And summoning the crowd along with his disciples, he said, "If anyone wants to follow me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me. For whoever wants to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake and for the gospel's sake will save it." *).

*) Cap. 8, v.27 ff. Parallel Matt. 16:13 ff. Luke 9:18 ff. (Matt. 10:38 f. Luke 17:33).

— The first part of this conversation undoubtedly shows that, at the time when he spoke this, Jesus had not yet explicitly announced himself as the Christ, i.e., as the Messiah expected by the Jews, to either the people or even his disciples. But it proves no more than that. The Lord could very well have a full awareness of his divine nature and his historical purpose; he could, as we see him do, infuse this consciousness into all his discourses; indeed, he could recognize that if any Messiah should come to his people, He was that Messiah. Yet he could still have good reasons not to declare himself as the Messiah expected by the Jewish people or to allow others to declare him as such **).

**) The addition by the first evangelist, letting Jesus refer to himself as the Son of Man when asked who people say he is (B. 13), is undoubtedly arbitrary but attests to the correct consciousness that even if Jesus then first let himself be called Christ, that unique designation of his dignity could not only have originated from this date.

Thus, the command given here to the disciples not to speak of him as Christ does not show a "shock at a then-new thought" but solely a reluctance to indulge Jewish expectations and imaginations of the coming Messiah. It is significant, as noted earlier, how Jesus immediately ties the proclamation of his suffering and death to this first mention of the name Christ, partly to quash any false expectations that might arise from

his acknowledgment of Messiahship. Both the conversation and this proclamation essentially form a whole, and therefore should not be separated by us. Against any doubt about the factual correctness of such proclamations from Jesus' mouth stands the following scene between Jesus and Peter, which, directly drawn from this disciple's account, bears such evident truth that defending it is superfluous. It is not to be assumed that legend would have put such a harsh rebuke of the foremost apostle into the Lord's mouth without reason, and even less is it to be assumed from this apostle himself, to whom we have every reason to trace back this account.

531

It appears that Mark has attached the following sayings directly to this conversation due to a subjective association of thoughts, which we, to give each its due, elaborate on separately here (Nos. 30 — 32).

30. "What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul? Or what can a man give in exchange for his soul?" *)

*) V. 36 f. Parallel Matt. V. 26. Luke V. 25. (Luke 17:33).

— The enigmatic form of this statement cannot be overlooked, through which Jesus points to the idea of eternal life as something still foreign to his listeners. He speaks directly only of physical life, emphasizing—as is clear to any thoughtful reflection—how the value of all worldly goods is contingent upon life, and without it, no other good can be spoken of. However, the fact that physical life itself stands in relation to another, which in the true sense is called "life", just as external goods relate to it: this is hinted at in this gnome for those who "have ears to hear". Our evangelist, and following him, the other two, appropriately connect it to the end of the above conversation; there too, in the way life's "loss" and "gain" were discussed, there was an imperative to move beyond the immediate, sensory understanding of life and progress to the concept of a higher form of life, eternal life. Nevertheless, one must imagine at least a longer pause between the previous saying and this one, and just as much between this and the following one; perhaps all three were spoken completely independently of each other. For what, like these gnomes, is meant not to be taken at face value but to guide through its literal sense beyond its literal meaning, fails its purpose if the thought is immediately diverted in another direction by something following it. For the current gnome, the disadvantage arises, not that the spiritual meaning is lost over the sensory image—because of its context, that cannot happen—but that, as has happened, for example, in Luther's translation, the spiritual meaning, by translating the word which here primarily means "life" (ψυχή), into the actual expression for "soul", is made direct

from the outset. However, this makes the gnome lose its profound, meaningful stimulation; it becomes an insignificant, almost trivial saying.

532

31. "Whoever is ashamed of me and my words, here among this faithless, sinful generation: the Son of Man will also be ashamed of him when he comes in the glory of his Father, accompanied by the holy angels!" *)

*) V.38. Parallel Matt. V.27. Luke V.26. (Matt. 10:33. Luke 12:8f.)

533

32. "Truly I tell you, some who are sitting here will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God coming with power. "*)

*) Cap. 9, V.1. Parallel Matt. V.28. Luke V.27.

— What could be said about these two statements ties in with what we will note on the occasion of the more detailed discussions about the future of the Son of Man. There is no doubt that these speeches were understood by all the apostles, and thus undoubtedly by the evangelists who report them, as referring to an imminent, bodily reappearance of the personal Christ. At least they were understood in this way after his death; during his life, the disciples probably did not have a more specific idea in mind. However, the very fact that these statements are closely related to the eschatological theory of the disciples, which was established only after the death of the Master and under the particular influence of the extraordinary events that followed his death, makes it likely that this theory in turn has influenced the form in which they are handed down to us. The first of the two statements mentioned here seems to have been somewhat affected by this retrospective influence; the notion of the Son of Man appearing with the angels and in the glory of the Father already shows clear traces of the dogmatic outline it received in the apostolic church. The second statement, on the other hand, understood in an unbiased manner and in its natural sense, clearly contains nothing but the proclamation that during the lifetime of the disciples present then, all or some of them, Christ's work would gain significant strength and ground. An inclination to interpret even this statement in terms of the "Parousia" expected by the disciples can indeed be discerned on the part of the tradition, already due to its association with the preceding one, but this doesn't compromise the credibility of the reported word in itself in the slightest.

33. With Peter, James, and John, Jesus (our Evangelist adds, six days after the conversation recently told in No. 29 with the disciples) ascends a high mountain, separated from the others. There, before their eyes, his appearance transforms; his clothes become shining, white as snow, so bright that no dyer on earth can produce such a hue. And Elijah, along with Moses, appears to them, conversing with Jesus. Peter then says to Jesus, "Master, it is good for us to be here; let us make three tents: one for you, one for Moses, and one for Elijah." For he did not know what he was saying; for they were terrified. — Then a cloud appeared and overshadowed them, and from the cloud, a voice said, "This is my beloved Son, listen to him!" When they looked around, they saw no one but Jesus alone with them. As they descended the mountain, Jesus instructed them to tell no one of what they had seen until the Son of Man had risen from the dead. They discussed this among themselves, trying to understand what he meant by "rising from the dead." *)

*) Cap. 9, V. 2 ff. Parallel Matt. 17, 1 ff. Luke 9, 28 ff.

Strauß rightly notes regarding this story **), that it particularly demonstrates how the natural explanation — (but even here, in our time, most supernaturalistic theologians tend towards the natural explanation, even though this miracle, even when taken literally, does not lead to as absurd and inconceivable notions as, for example, the miracles of feeding, water transformation, and others) — while wanting to maintain the historical certainty of the narrative, loses its ideal truth and sacrifices content for form.

**) L. J. II, p. 274.

But we cannot find this ideal truth even in the "mythical view" in which Strauß has taken this event. This supposed myth was said to have the dual purpose of: "firstly, to repeat the transfiguration of Moses ***) on Jesus in an elevated way, and secondly, to unite Jesus as the Messiah with his two precursors, presenting Jesus as the culmination of the Kingdom of God, as the fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets through this appearance of the lawgiver and the prophet, the founder and reformer of the theocracy, and further, to affirm his majestic dignity through a heavenly voice."

***) Exodus 34, 29.

If this is truly the case, then in such an external glorification of the Messiah, we have an invention that's as irrelevant and insignificant as the event itself. The narrative can only have a genuine, ideal content under the premise that it reports, albeit in a figurative

form, something that genuinely occurred with the disciples who appear in it as witnesses to Christ's transfiguration. Otherwise, what the mythical view provides as such content remains mere embellishment and tinsel. However, what this actual ideal content might be is beyond dispute among those who share our insight. It has long been noted *) that for people closer to nature, especially for Easterners, and particularly Hebrews, every spiritual elevation and deeper gaze of intelligence is expressed in the image of a vision, a sight of luminous figures, and the hearing of heavenly voices.

*) See, for instance, Herder, *Values for Theology*, XII, p. 202 f., a passage after which one could reasonably expect that the theology of our time would not regress to the simultaneously uninspired and adventurous views that are refuted there.

Many similar features, not just of older but also of recent mysticism, have been recalled. When they try to account for the nature of their spiritual intuition, they (think of the equally naive and imaginative statements of Jakob Böhme about the revelations he received) never know how to describe it other than in a way where the intellectual content appears more or less as a vision, a simultaneous sensual rapture. Especially relevant here is the inner vision which the Apostle Paul recounts in his second letter to the Corinthians, narrated in terms that leave us no doubt that he is not speaking of a physical phenomenon based on a bodily affliction, but of a purely intellectual insight *).

*) 2 Corinthians 12, 2 ff.

A vision of such a nature is undoubtedly also contained in the present narrative: a spiritual, not a sensual one, an awake, not a dream vision **), a vision, in the end, which the three named disciples themselves, not someone else, and not just one of them, had seen.

**) The remark in Luke V. 32 has indeed given rise to the latter hypothesis, which can be described as unfortunate in every respect. Luke added this remark off the cuff in his hasty manner because he interpreted the words of Mark in this way.

To justify this statement, everything depends on interpreting the content of the vision in a way that is consistent with this explanation. We believe we can do this most naturally and comprehensively based on our already presented overall view of the spiritual foundation of the Lord's teachings. In a manner that, we hope, will not only provide a revelation about the present narrative that is as surprising as it is satisfying but will also shed new light on many things related to it.

The indisputably most important circumstance of the event, the one on which our main focus must be directed, the real crux of the story in short, is without a doubt the appearance of Moses and Elijah. If it were to remain the case that, as all previous explanations suggest, they were either seen as a dream vision, a mystification of the disciples by two members of a covenant with which Jesus was in mysterious communication, or finally as mythical revenants from the shadowy realm of messianic prophecies: then our previous discussion would not have yielded any significant results. With respect to the core of the story, we would still be at the same point, only faced with the difficult task of explaining how such an adventurous event could be recounted on that authentic foundation. But far from being satisfied with this, or believing we should continue in this direction, we find in this most challenging part of the legendary report the most surprising confirmation of our view of the whole. If the vision of the disciples was a spiritual intuition in the sense we suggested: its content could only be the recognition of Christ in the spiritual meaning of his appearance, a meaning that was then still hidden from the people and even the majority of the disciples, the recognition of him as the Messiah proclaimed by the prophets, in the entirety of the relations which, according to the prophetic myths, belonged to the concept of the Messiah. This content of the vision given to the three disciples is also unmistakably indicated by the position of the report in our documents. The precise specification of a number of days (six *) since that event in which Jesus' first address as the Messiah appeared is undoubtedly to be seen as a factual memory of the temporal proximity and the factual connection of both events.

*) Luke, as is well-known, mentions "about (ὡσεὶ) eight days" instead of the six; undoubtedly adapted to the well-known Greco-Roman method of counting, from which he presumed a deviation in Mark. — The suggestion by Strauss to trace this number back to Exodus 24:16 is as unlikely as the also suggested reference of the number of those three disciples, who saw the Transfiguration, to verse 9 of the same chapter. For the specific circumstances in both stories are so different that there is no sufficient reason to assume a dependence of one supposed myth on the other.

Once the great word was spoken, the Master found it timely to offer those of his disciples whom he deemed capable a glimpse into the deeper spiritual and historical context in which the idea of his Messiahship had formed for his own consciousness. It is this context which, through the teaching of the divine Master, shaped itself to that inspired vision for the three disciples, which they could only express as a vision in which they saw the two first heroes of the Law and the Prophethood, coming and conversing

with Jesus. Any question as to which characteristics the "intoxicated witnesses" *) might have recognized the figures that appeared to them, whether by their own speech or by an inquiry later drawn by the Master, is redundant, if not absurd; what they saw were not the physical, bodily figures of Moses and Elijah, but the ideas associated with these mytho-historical personalities.

*) ἐπόπται της του κυρίου μεγαλότητος is the explicit designation for those blessed by this event in 2 Peter 1:16.

Indeed, in order to grasp an idea of the manner in which this lofty intuition was evoked in them through the Master's communication, one must first have a different conception of the Master's own consciousness and understanding about his relationship to the Law and the Prophethood than the spiritless one of either the common orthodoxy or any historical theory that keeps Jesus trapped in the superstitions of Judaism in some way. Only through his own free insight that transcended the letter of those prophecies, an understanding of the manner in which the messianic prophecies had been fulfilled in him, was he able to also open the disciples to the understanding of this fulfillment. He led them to the point where, instead of continuing to await a physical appearance of Moses and Elijah, who were supposed to proclaim the Messiah to them along with the uninformed masses of their compatriots, they rather saw both as already present in spirit and related to their Master in the way in which the Messiahship of this Master was revealed to them, as if by a heavenly voice.

539

Namely, that our narrative refers back to Israeli Messianic expectations, and specifically to what was contained in these mythical expectations about those predecessors of the Messiah: this is readily admitted by the "mythical view". Although, concerning Moses, there's no direct proclamation of his personal appearance as a forerunner of the Messiah in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, as is known of Elijah in Malachi. However, since the books of the Talmud certainly are aware of such an expectation, we have no reason to doubt that Moses and Elijah are paired together in our passage in the same sense. However, this by no means implies that our narrative was invented solely to show the fulfillment of these expectations in the story of Jesus. Had it been invented for this purpose, it would have been very poorly devised; what could be less in line with the meaning of those expectations than such a secret conversation, held before the eyes of only three, perhaps even drowsy, disciples, while it had been said of Elijah*), that he would turn the hearts of the fathers to their children and the hearts of the children to their fathers?

*) Malachi 3:24.

Indeed, the Jews would have been quite right not to want to know anything about a Messiah, if such anecdotes were recounted to them for his authentication! Moreover, we have from Jesus himself an authentic interpretation regarding Elijah, one that points to a very different fulfillment than that implied by the mythical view of the present narrative. This interpretation, as the next section will show us, is given directly in connection with the present matter; clearly proving that the evangelists could not have intended the appearance of Elijah as narrated here to be that which Jesus said had already taken place. Instead, this very connection suggests the true meaning of the current event; namely, that through the Master's teachings, the disciples gained insight into the true meaning of those expectations and proclamations, a meaning they had to recognize as already fulfilled, not yet to be fulfilled. This insight was based, as already hinted at, on a deeper understanding of the spiritual, not just literal sense of the prophetic myths, and of Jesus' true relationship to the Old Testament revelation, to the Law, and to the Prophets. From these two alone, the disciples could develop that vivid, passionate vision of the tripartite idea of the Law, the Prophethood, and the Messiahship of their Master, which appeared to their excited imagination as a tangible, sensual form in the image of those three personalities. But when you consider what it took for the disciples, who, like all their compatriots, grew up in the carnal Messianic expectation and the literal belief in the narratives and proclamations of the Old Testament, to be led to exchange this for a spiritual belief in the fulfillment of the prophecies and the presence of the Messiah — a shift which seems so obvious in relation to both Jesus personally and the apostles, yet strangely enough, seems to have occurred to almost no one so far — you will not only find it unsurprising, but rather completely in order and necessary, that on the one hand, this realization did not dawn on all disciples at once, but only initially on a few favored by the Master, and on the other hand, that these few were initially thrown into a daze, a sort of ecstasy or spiritual intoxication, in short, into a state about which they later could only speak in the manner reflected in the present narrative.

541

How excellently all the other circumstances of the story fit with our interpretation of the current miraculous event is clear in relation to some of them in itself, while others will only need a hint to put them under the correct perspective that reveals their understanding to us. If the event takes place on a mountain - on a high mountain *), as Mark significantly adds - then this is to be understood not in the literal sense, but symbolically, as the height of knowledge, and the mountain is to be sought not on the map of Palestine, but in the depths of the spirit.

*) The first Gospel has preserved this detail; however, Luke, in whose story the narrative is most strikingly dragged into the realm of the sensual and the merely factual, omits it, but instead attributes the intention "to pray" on the mountain to Jesus spontaneously.

Similarly, the "metamorphosis" of Jesus's form and the brightness of his garment is a trait that naturally arises as a symbol for the intuition of the spiritually transfigured idea of the personal Messiah; and it is entirely unnecessary to assume an explicit reference to the shining face of Moses **) in this context, as this Pentateuch narrative has so little in common with ours.

**) Exodus 34:29. Only perhaps the addition in the first Gospel και ελαμψε τό πρόσονπον αὐτοῦ ως ἥλιος can, given this evangelist's preference for such reminiscences, possibly have arisen from one such instance.

Contrasting this brilliance, but entirely in terms of meaning, is the cloud that covers the apparition; it signifies the vague and misty state into which the disciples momentarily lose their clarity of understanding, which they are currently unable to firmly grasp ***).

***) Also, here Mark's words: εγενετο νεφελη επισκιάζουσα. αυντοις are to be recognized as the purer and original, in contrast to the contrived interpretations of both the first evangelist and Luke.

What remains directly from this recognition is only the certainty that their master is the Son of God and the Savior of Israel. This certainty is expressed in the voice from heaven, the words of which may well be composed of Old Testament reminiscences *), without the voice itself having to be considered as such.

*) Ps. 2:7, Isa. 42:1, Deut. 18:15. However, here too, the reminiscence, especially in relation to the second passage, is more striking in Matthew and Luke than in Mark.

Above all, however, what confirms our view, and conversely gains its proper understanding from this view, is Jesus's prohibition to speak of this event. It evidently has the same meaning as the previous prohibition ***)) to speak of his messianic dignity at all, while in any other interpretation of the incident it would seem purposeless or suspicious.

***) Chapter 8, 30.

Finally, by the same token, the only still unexplained circumstance also receives its explanation, which after all previous attempts at explanation remained unexplained and superfluous, and which some commentators found it advisable to pass over in silence. We are referring to the strange remark by Peter, described by our evangelist himself (the other two omitted this remark, undoubtedly also on their part "without knowing what they were doing") as arising from unconsciousness of what he was saying. This remark occupies a very similar place in the current event as in the story of Jesus walking on the sea, the anecdote also concerning this apostle inserted in the first Gospel's account ***).

***) Matthew 14:28 ff.

Just like this, it is to be understood figuratively, and its meaning becomes almost self-evident in the context of our interpretation of the whole. It means nothing else than that Peter, after this high spiritual insight had been opened to him by the Lord, quickly showed a tendency to dogmatize it and to put it into a ready-made formula for further dissemination. Such a tendency is, given the otherwise known character of this disciple, quite plausible for him; after all, Peter has remained in later tradition the symbolic representative of dogmatism and the positive, ecclesiastical principle in Christianity. But how could this inclination and the hasty expression of it against the Master, who had shared the high insight with them for a completely different purpose, — how could both be expressed more ingeniously and aptly than by the proposal attributed to Peter, there, on the mountain of transfiguration, where Jesus appeared to them, radiant with the glory of his Messianic dignity, in conversation with the legislators and prophets of antiquity, to build a hut for each of these three, Jesus, Moses, and Elijah? — Of course, the question arises here as to who might have come up with this ingenious idea, which does not exactly cast the insight and wisdom of the most distinguished of the disciples in the most favorable light; and it might easily seem that with our interpretation, which most will consider quite blatantly pointing towards a myth, a significant conflict with our assumptions about the origin of the Gospel of Mark cannot be avoided. However, we believe we can resolve this difficulty satisfactorily. It seems to us not at all unlikely that the creator of this designation was none other than the Lord himself, he, to whom we are most inclined to attribute such pointed words put into the mouths of others. As a starting point for this assumption, we have here the expressly narrated prohibition of Jesus not to speak publicly about this event, i.e., about the deeper knowledge opened to them, until after the events that were to come after his death, a more complete insight into the context of what had now been communicated to them would be opened. This prohibition clearly presupposes that Jesus, after having already made those disclosures to the disciples, returned to what had been discussed between them after perhaps a short period of time. How close it is here, given his known preference for parabolic language, to assume that he might also have depicted the behavior of the disciples

themselves in figurative terms on this occasion, which would then include that very expression. Perhaps much else in the form and expression of our narration and in the symbolic details of the same has been taken in a completely corresponding way from these own, figuratively expressed explanations of the Lord, and that in this way the Lord himself had given the disciples the occasion to clothe that entire event in the symbolic form in which it lies before us here.

544

34. TThe three more intimate disciples ask him: "Why do the scribes say that Elijah must come first?" Jesus answers: "Elijah was supposed to come and restore everything. But how could it be written about the Son of Man that he must endure many sufferings and abuses? But I tell you, Elijah has already come, and they have done with him whatever they wanted, just as it is written about him." *)

*) B. 11 ff. Parallel. Matth. V. 10 ss.

This brief conversation is directly linked to the preceding one by the two evangelists who have included it (Luke, probably feeling the inadequacy to be mentioned immediately, has omitted it). The problem arising from this connection is evident and has already been noted by several. It is in vain to try to remedy this inadequacy by saying that the disciples' question does not refer to the appearance of Elijah in general, as they are supposed to have just seen this appearance themselves, but specifically to such an appearance as the scribes used to proclaim based on the prophecy of Malachi. This proclamation, as we have not failed to note, indeed could not be found corresponding to what had just occurred.

545

Indeed, the question can be understood neither from the account the evangelists provide nor from the correct interpretation of the preceding incident. The former because the evangelists have made no slightest reference to the preceding in either the answer or the question; the latter because, according to this interpretation, the discussion here about Elijah must already be contained in the conversations which, as we have shown, constitute the true content of that event. Instead, from this interpretation it emerges that the present conversation can be thought of more as the introduction or the cause of Jesus' detailed conversation with his intimate disciples than as a supplement to this conversation. — But concerning the content of the present conversation itself, a meaningful interpretation can only be obtained if the priority of Mark's presentation over the parallel in the first gospel is recognized. Namely, this

interpretation requires the first sentence in Jesus' answer, which to our knowledge no one has thought of so far, to be understood as a question *).

*) Whether this is grammatically permissible, we admittedly could not confidently judge ourselves; however, upon philological inquiry, we received a completely affirmative answer, particularly referring to Godofr. Hermann's *Opusculum*. Tom. 1^o, p. 233, where examples are cited of the use of the particle μέν in question sentences. Such as the one under discussion, which presupposes an affirmative answer from the one addressed but simultaneously implies a negation or limitation in the background.

For only in this way is justice done to the contrast which is evidently present in the subsequent text to that first sentence. The following evidently does not aim to confirm the statement that Elijah will come and bring about a restoration but to refute or limit it in such a way that its truth is no longer the one intended by the scribes who uttered it, but rather another one that they did not foresee. This meaning of the first sentence as a question is evident from the arrangement of the sentences in our source, and it has been overlooked until now only because of the prejudice that Mark depended on Matthew. — The latter, Pseudo-Matthew, has not only caused this misunderstanding of his predecessor among the later readers but also demonstrates this misunderstanding himself. Otherwise, he wouldn't have eliminated the second question from this context, which Jesus in Mark contrasts with the sentence contained in the first question: "how can it be written about the Son of Man that he must suffer and be mistreated?" and, having turned it into an assertive sentence, positioned it at the end of the remaining speech. This alteration creates the problem that the statement immediately following the first sentence in Matthew: "Elijah has already come," remains completely unmotivated and forms a stark contradiction with the restoration of all things by Elijah conceded in the former. While in Mark, together with what is further said about this already appeared Elijah, it is mediated in the most complete and (but only under the assumption that, as said, the first sentence is a question) logically correct manner.

546

If, now, without any textual change, as such violently proposed by a modern interpreter, the true meaning of this remarkable statement has emerged more clearly and purely than before, solely by understanding the true reciprocal relationship of the two gospel representations: then it may be time to draw attention to the significance of its content, which, to the best of our knowledge, has not yet been appreciated by anyone in terms of the full extent of its implications. Here, perhaps more clearly than anywhere else, we have an example of the lofty spiritual freedom with which Jesus treated the Jewish

messianic message, as he saw through its meaning. If he, like the scribes of both his time and even now, had been pedantic enough to cling to the messianic prophecies of the Old Testament in an external and literal sense: he could never have realized that Elijah, the very Elijah who was to precede the Messiah, had already appeared. The contradiction he raises against the scribes is not merely against their arbitrary interpretation, but indeed against the prophecy of Malachi itself, in which the "Apokatastasis," which Christ here denies to expect from Elijah, is clearly proclaimed by him. Thus, this passage, understood as it undoubtedly must be understood, can serve as a warning on two fronts: on the one hand to the orthodox interpreters not to take the so-called messianic prophecies more seriously than the Lord himself, in whom they were fulfilled, did; and on the other hand to the skeptics, not to attribute to the Lord in another similar context, e.g. concerning the Mosaic Law, a narrow-minded fixation on the letter, which he so unmistakably contradicts here. — The insight that should be awakened by these warnings should immediately be tested here, in the interpretation of the further statement Jesus makes about the fate of the Messiah. Namely, when Jesus refers to a scripture that predicted suffering and contempt for the Messiah: the Orthodox tend to conclude that such statements must indeed be contained in the Old Testament exactly in the sense of the present statement; the skeptics either, if it can be shown that some statements of the Old Testament were understood by the Jews of that time in such a way that this belief of his contemporaries must have been transferred to Jesus, or, in the opposite case, that Jesus could not have made these statements at all, but that they were attributed to him only after the fact. But all these conclusions are equally wrong; all assume a similar spiritlessness in Jesus in his relation to his time and the past. The same lofty spirit, whose bold and penetrating gaze recognized in the appearance of John the fulfillment of those prophecies pointing to the appearance of an Elijah: how could he not also have discerned and brought to consciousness in those prophetic sayings *), which speak with such true depth of soul of the sufferings and disgrace that the servant of Jehovah had to endure, the hidden reference, the unconscious hint at the fate that also awaited him; even if he stood quite alone in this recognition at first, neither the scribes of his time had preceded him in it, nor had the prophets themselves, who spoke these sayings, directly embedded such knowledge in them?

*) Isaiah 53.

As the Jewish scribes had formed their Messiah theory from a part of the old prophecies, which flattered their national pride the most, with narrow-minded letter-of-the-law belief: so He formed His own from another, more hidden part of the same prophecies, with a free overview of the whole and partial explicit rejection of individual parts, in spirit and truth. Such a theory transitioned directly from the loftiest

self-awareness into the highest self-denial. Similarly, an insight, revealed by the Lord to the disciples, into the hidden content, the prophetic sense of those Old Testament passages that no one had related to the Messiah before, was undoubtedly also a significant factor that entered into the overall view revealed to the disciples by the Lord. This insight reinforced their belief that their master was the Messiah, even if the conviction of the necessity of his suffering and his violent death did not seem to have taken root in them at that time.

548

Some have taken particular offense to the fact that a similar statement about the prophecies concerning the fate of the Messiah is attributed to Jesus concerning Elijah. Concerning the latter, it is said that what was written about him had indeed happened to John, whom Jesus means here. Yet, one searches in vain throughout the Old Testament for a passage that could be meant here. The most likely explanation is that the evangelist, due to a memory error, added this reference where it did not fit and was not spoken by Jesus. However, it remains possible that Jesus wanted to include the "greatest of the prophets" in the various general statements scattered throughout the Old Testament about the fate of the envoys of God and prophets in general *).

*) Compare Mark 12:5 and parallels.

The explicit mention of John, by the way, was taken by the first evangelist from another context **) into the present one ***).

**) Matthew 11:14.

***) That Justin (dial. c. Tryph. 49) also knows this addition and emphasizes it in explicit words may well be one of the most convincing proofs of this apologist's acquaintance with our Gospel of Matthew.

According to Mark, it seems that in the present context, Jesus only hinted at who that Messiah might be. Just as in the Gospel of Mark, there is a trace of that undoubtedly originated from Jesus transfer of the prophetic myth to John †), but not the explicit designation of the latter as Elijah.

†) Chapter 1:6. Compare above p. 257.

549

35. When he returned to the other disciples, he found a crowd gathered around them, and scribes discussing with them. The people saw him and were taken aback; they rushed over and greeted him. He asked what they were discussing; someone from the crowd answered: "Master, I brought my son to you, who has been muted by an evil spirit. When he gets attacked, it seizes him, he foams, grinds his teeth, and weakens. I asked your disciples to cast out the spirit, but they couldn't." Jesus then said: "O faithless generation, how long will I be among you? How long shall I bear with you? Bring him to me!" They brought the boy, and as soon as he saw Jesus, the spirit took hold of him, and he fell to the ground, rolling around and foaming at the mouth. Jesus asked how long he had been like this, to which the answer was: "Since childhood. It often throws him into fire or water, trying to kill him. If you can do anything, help us and have pity on us!" Jesus replied: "If you can believe. Everything is possible for the believer!" The boy's father cried out, "I do believe. Help my unbelief!" When Jesus noticed the crowd gathering, he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying: "Deaf and mute spirit, I command you, come out of him and never enter him again!" The spirit cried out, gave a violent convulsion, and left the boy. He lay there like he was dead, and many thought he had died. But Jesus took him by the hand, raised him, and he got up. When they returned home, the disciples privately asked Jesus why they couldn't cast the demon out. He replied: "This kind can only be driven out by prayer and fasting."

*) V. 14 ff. Parallel: Matt. 17:14 ff. Luke 9:37 ff.

The character of this story and its relation to the parallels in the other two Synoptic Gospels essentially corresponds to the character and relation of similar accounts of miraculous healings that we've already observed several times. Here too, we find no trace of deliberate exaggeration **), but a vividness which suggests both the factual authenticity of the detailed features and, at the very least, the originality and good faith of the narrator.

**) The ἐξεθαμβηθη V. 15 interpreted by Strauss in such a way is rightly defended by Neander (L. J. S. 302). However, the deliberate yet insignificant addition is the μονογενής in Luke V. 38.

The parallel passages, each completely independent of the other ***), contain extracts from the story presented here, in which all seemingly superfluous picturesque details, especially some harshness incomprehensible to the revisers, have been omitted.

***) The only possible objection to this independence might be the fact that both other sources added και διεστραμμένη to the words ω γενεά άπιστος Marc. V. 19. This addition is obviously an Old Testament reminiscence (Deut. 32:5, 20; Ps.

58:4). Both could have arrived at it independently. However, it is also possible that these words might have been found in their common source (the genuine Matthew), possibly related to Matt. V. 20, and thus gave rise to this addition, while both evangelists inserted them at the corresponding place in Mark.

However, the first gospel also has an addition that appears to be borrowed from another source rather than invented on the spot, as Luke also incorporates it into a different context *).

*) Matt. 5:20. Luke 17:6, both clearly independent of Mark 11:23, which in turn is paralleled by Matt. 21:21.

This addition, like some features also found in Mark, concerns the power of faith; it may therefore indeed suggest the idea that, in a manner similar to this addition, perhaps one or another feature that originally did not belong to the context of the event narrated here, may have been mixed in the evangelist's memory with this context and thus incorporated into it. While the purely factual aspects of the event align with the prerequisites that we found to be plausible and credible regarding Jesus's miraculous activity; while it carries the hallmark of historical credibility both in this respect and in terms of the formal character of the narrative: it cannot be denied that some of the interposed speeches seem somewhat out of place and insufficiently motivated by the context. Like the lament about the unbelief of this generation, about which there has been disagreement as to whether it should refer to the disciples or the seekers of healing **); but even more so, this criticism applies to the words exchanged later between Jesus and the father of the possessed boy.

**) The verse of the first gospel clearly believed, as can be seen from the aforementioned addition, that it should refer to the disciples.

To us, following the rule we established once and for all about the significance of faith in Jesus's miracles *), these must seem all the more out of place, given that the one from whom faith is demanded here is not the person to be healed, but a third party, albeit closely associated with him.

*) See above Book III, p. 343.

Thus, the same reservations arise here as we made in the story of the Canaanite woman, and to an even greater extent because Jesus demands faith, which is freely given there, as an external, machine-like condition, not as an inherent condition determined by the nature of the matter, for the miracle to occur. These concerns are

addressed if we assume, as the sequence of the narrative already suggests as likely, that Mark mistakenly combined some foreign yet factually true features with the current story. We are further strengthened in this assumption by a circumstance similar to ones we have already encountered several times. The words, namely, which are put into the mouth of the boy's father (V.24), are so poignant (though the first and third evangelists have eschewed them because of the harshness and paradox they contain) that they seem to us, like many similar ones we encounter elsewhere, to be more likely spoken by Jesus himself in some exhortative, perhaps also parabolic context, rather than by an indifferent person in a real event. If the oral tradition had lost that context and only this spirited word had been preserved from it, it's easy to see how our evangelist could have been tempted to insert it into another context that seemed suitable to him.

553

36. While traveling, He noticed how the disciples were arguing amongst themselves. Upon arriving home in Capernaum, He asked them what had transpired among them. They remained silent; they had been discussing who among them was the greatest. He then sat down, called the Twelve to Him, and said, "If anyone wants to be first, he must be the very last of all and the servant of all!" *)

*) V. 33 ff. Parallel: Matt. 18:1 ff. Luke 9:46 ff.

— Up to this point, the anecdote goes, which, since Jesus's statement is repeated more elaborately later, is characterized primarily by its external trigger. The other two synoptic gospels omitted this trigger and artificially linked Jesus's words to the following events in the manner we criticized earlier **).

**) Book 1, p. 74 ff.

According to the first gospel, which was believed to contain the most complete account of this event, it goes like this: The disciples come to Jesus and ask Him who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Jesus then calls a child, places him in their midst, and says: "Truly I tell you, unless you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven! Whoever humbles himself like this child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven!" Just as in Mark, which only mentions the child Jesus places among the disciples and embraces after the aforementioned statement, the further word is linked: "Whoever welcomes one such child in my name welcomes me" — omitting the addition found in our [Mark's] version and also in Luke: "and whoever welcomes me does not welcome me but the one who sent me."

Our assertion, as can be seen, is that this latter statement is to be regarded as completely independent of the former, and that the more elaborate form that the former received in the first gospel is solely due to the desire to link the two together. The evangelist believed (whether Mark might also have meant it this way is debatable) that the presentation of the child should serve as a kind of response to the disciples' dispute. However, the words spoken by Jesus during this act did not match this; the evangelist thus speculated that his predecessor might have omitted some of the words spoken at that time, and when he, looking forward a few pages in that text, found words that seemed to fit into the current context as he imagined it, he did not hesitate to transfer them from there. The gap that remains in his version *) can be considered a testament to this action.

*) Matt. 19:14 compared with Mark 10:15, Luke 18:17.

— Until then, however, his behavior could still be excused; although indeed the pantomime with which he, in order to shame the disciples, presents a child to them as a model, is somewhat peculiar. Considering the impression this scene must have made on the child, a wise educator would have several objections. But this speech of Jesus is completely distorted by the words added by the evangelist on the spur of the moment, in order to restore the response found in Mark to its rightful place and to incorporate its meaning into the context: "Whoever humbles himself like this child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." The inappropriateness of this statement, the inconceivability that Jesus could have said it, is evident. Disputes of the kind he wanted to rebuke in the disciples are nowhere more frequent than among children; how can one find it probable that Jesus would have presented to his disciples the accidental shyness of a child, who finds himself placed among adults, as an example of self-denying humility?

554

From the account of the first gospel, therefore, nothing remains for us but the above-mentioned words about caring for children, which also appear in our version. These words, taken on their own, might seem to have a good meaning; however, I confess that I have not been able to find a reason that could have led Jesus, contrary to his usual habit, to attribute such emphatically pronounced value to an act of ordinary human kindness. That anyone without distinction who takes in a child also takes him in can obviously not be his intention, for — "do not even the Gentiles do the same?" *)

*) Matt. 5:47.

The difference must therefore lie in the "in my name." But this very difference, if it is to be more than a mere formality, doesn't it then hinge on the aspect which in other related statements**) forms the distinguishing feature of one who is accepted in Jesus' name; namely, that he is a disciple of Jesus, or, what can undoubtedly be considered equivalent, is to be raised as a disciple of the Lord?

**) Matt. 10:40 ff. Luke 10:16. John 13:20.

— The question therefore arises whether the said statement of our evangelist should not be understood as the same as the latter thought, and perhaps only transferred to children as such †) due to a misunderstanding of the expression "the least," which Jesus elsewhere ***) uses for his disciples?

***) Matt. 10:42.

†) Compare Strauß L. J. I, p. 614.

555

After this speech, our evangelist follows up with some others (No. 36 - 40), which he evidently connects to it by mere accidental circumstances.

36. [*sic - numbering error acknowledged in concluding notes*] The disciple John reports how they saw someone driving out demons in Jesus' name, and how they forbade him from doing so because he did not follow them. Jesus replies, "Do not stop him. No one who performs a miracle in my name can in the next moment say anything bad about me. Whoever is not against you is for you!" ††)

††) V. 38 ff. Parallel: Luke 9, 49 f.

— As previously noted, this statement is only connected to the preceding one by the phrase "in my name." Either John was reminded of what he had to tell the Master by this expression, or, more likely, the evangelist used this keyword to attach the anecdote for which he found no other place. The incident itself is significant. Firstly, it shows how little Jesus viewed the formality of a church association for individuals as a mandatory condition to partake in the blessings of his work. Secondly, it demonstrates that what he did to establish an explicit association of his disciples was not meant in an exclusive sense. The saying with which he concludes his reply, understood correctly, also opens the door to the kingdom of heaven for the Gentiles who have heard nothing of Jesus.

37. Similarly, prompted by the same (though differently translated here) phrase "in my name," our evangelist, and this time he alone, immediately follows the previous with the proclamation: "Anyone who gives you a cup of water because you belong to Christ *), truly I tell you, they will not lose their reward."

*) A more accurate interpretation might be found in Matthew, who presents this verse separately from the present context (10,42): "because you are disciples." It seems unlikely that Jesus called himself Christ, even if he allowed others to refer to him in that manner.

And if anyone causes one of these little ones who believe in me to stumble, it would be better for them to have a large millstone hung around their neck and be drowned in the depths of the sea." **)

**) V. 41 f. Parallel: Matthew 18, 6.

— Clearly, the connection of these two proclamations to form a single antithesis, as we find in our evangelist, is more original and accurate than the connection of the last part of this antithesis with the statement about welcoming children, especially in the manner we found in the author of the first Gospel. For the "little ones" here are clearly not children — how could they be described as believers in Jesus? — but those who are similarly termed by the same evangelist in a phrase he uses elsewhere *) for the first part of the present antithesis **).

*) Matthew 10, 42.

**) The second phrase also seems to have been found by the evangelist in a source particular to him, and he only followed Mark in its placement. I infer this from the difference in expression (μύλος ὀνικός instead of λίθος μυλιχός) and from the added part, both of which Luke (17, 2) shares with him.

The author of the first Gospel had our version in mind. Recognizing the arbitrariness of his combinations, he believed he was improving it by omitting everything in between, down to the point that he, like the beginning of the supposed coherent speech, could also relate to children. However, apart from that arrangement, which presupposes that the first statement also speaks of children, our evangelist presents a better antithesis. Here, reward and punishment are juxtaposed, while in the other version, the harsh threat is oddly contrasted with "he welcomes me and the Father." Moreover, the

meaning of this bold proclamation, like many similar ones Christ made regarding people's behavior towards him and his disciples, is only fully understood when taken in a historical context, as prophecies regarding the fate of nations depending on their behavior towards Christianity. We'll discuss more of this when we address Matthew's missionary speech.

557

38. Once again, prompted by the word "lead astray" (σκανδαλίζειν), this further saying follows: "If your hand wants to lead you astray, cut it off; it's better for you to enter life with one hand than to keep both hands and go to Gehenna, into eternal fire. If your foot wants to lead you astray, cut it off; it's better for you to enter life lame than to keep both feet and be thrown into Gehenna, into eternal fire. And if your eye wants to lead you astray, tear it out; it's better for you to enter the Kingdom of God with one eye than to keep both eyes and be thrown into Gehenna, where their worm does not die, and the fire is not quenched."

*) V. 43 ff. Parallel, Matt. 18, 8 f. (Matt. 5, 29 f.)

558

These powerful words were certainly worth being spoken on their own, with the detail and intensity as reported here; not merely, as in the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, briefly mentioned among many others, where they might have been more shocking due to their paradoxical expression than stimulating deep reflection on their serious content. The fact that critics have recently emerged again, insisting on taking these words in their strict, literal sense—though such a view, and the sentiment from which it arises **), is hardly commendable—shows that the common interpretation of them as hyperbolic or figurative often remained somewhat inadequate.

**) Not exaggerated rigorism, but rather indifference to the content of what Christ has spoken.

The intention behind this bold imagery is clear: to teach a self-denial and self-control in a deeper and more substantial way than what is commonly associated with these terms. There are tendencies, habits, and ways of thinking and acting that form parts of our spiritual selves, just as the limbs of the body are parts of our physical selves. Indeed, there are those tendencies — and Jesus undoubtedly alludes to this with the escalation from the image of a hand or foot to the image of an eye — which we too readily count among the nobler, amiable, or magnificent aspects of our spiritual nature due to

self-love or a blurred understanding of the true nature of good and divine. Jesus demands us to renounce these, to forcefully eradicate and destroy them as soon as we recognize their impurity — a requirement that is, in fact, harder and more challenging to execute than even the strictest physical mortification. The meaning of this parabolic speech could have been deduced from the "self-castration for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven" that Jesus speaks of elsewhere. *)

*) Matt. 19, 12.

Understood this way, the contrast of the threat of hellfire also gains a more fitting context than in any other interpretation. The underlying notion (not explicitly expressed to maintain the brevity and impact of the words) is that, physically, a disease (like cancer) could spread throughout the body from a single infected limb, necessitating the sacrifice of that limb for the preservation of the whole. This idea shines through when, in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, the body is explicitly named as what shall be thrown into Gehenna. With this notion in mind, the corruption of the whole appears, contrary to a punishment arbitrarily inflicted from the outside, as a natural necessity reigning even in the realm of the spirit, just as Jesus intended. The imagery of Gehenna is borrowed from the prophet Isaiah **) ; it transfers the image of physical decomposition to spiritual states.

**) Isa. 66, 24.

Jesus did not just pick up this imagery at random, intending to give merely a vividly terrifying depiction of the torments of hell. Instead, he did so with a deeper understanding that the physical decomposition and agony of fire aren't arbitrarily chosen but are provided by the nature of the matter and the analogy of the physical with the spiritual, as a depiction of that spiritual hell which the souls of the wicked carry within themselves and continuously generate from within.

560

39. "Everyone will be salted with fire, just as every offering is to be salted with salt" *).

*) V. 49.

— One of the most difficult sayings for which a satisfactory explanation has not yet been found by interpreters. The sense in which the evangelist understood it can hardly be in doubt; it's safer to stick to the most obvious interpretation than to resort to audacious text alterations, which are not corroborated by any manuscript authority and are also

unsatisfactory in terms of meaning. It is unmistakable that the saying has a connection to the Mosaic law concerning the salting of meat offerings **); however, it is unacceptable to translate the sentence, by a forceful and linguistically unjustifiable hypothesis ***), into a mere reproduction of that passage in Leviticus, whereby it would lose its autonomy and, combined with the following, would also not make much sense.

***) Leviticus 2:13.

***)) Πάσα πυρῖα αλισθήσεται, instead of πας πυρῖ αλίσθήσεται, according to Scaliger.

The essential meaning of the saying undoubtedly points to the necessity of a purifying fire; its connection with the preceding is merely lexical, as is the connection of the subsequent with it. The reference to the salting of the meat offering, however, remains imperfect and hence obscure. We may be allowed to seek an explanation for it by a hypothesis that doesn't change the text but presupposes an incomplete understanding of the true meaning and the true words of Jesus by our evangelist. Just as the evangelist mistakenly linked it to the previous saying merely because of a lexical connection, he could have misunderstood it, and the difficulty of the words does not necessarily need to be attributed to a corruption of the text. I believe that here, too, I must follow the principle that I find to be true for all of Jesus' teachings: always expect a vivid and clear figurative language, never partial or oblique, but always complete analogies of the sensual expression with the spiritual meaning. Such an assumption would only suffice for the image of salting in fire if it referred not directly to the spiritual, as our text seems to require, but first to the sensual, namely to the salting of actual meals. This interpretation would then have the advantage that the connection to the subsequent clause would be clear, and this clause would not be superfluous or indifferent. The traditional idea of purification through fire, a baptism of fire, as Jesus himself seems to have expressed elsewhere, is here illustrated and completed by the image of cooking a sacrifice, which needs both salt and fire to be properly permeated. It is not the fire that flavors the food; similarly, suffering alone does not season a person for the kingdom of heaven. But just as fire allows the salt to properly permeate the sacrificial food, so suffering allows the seasoning of God's word to truly be incorporated into the human soul. Based on this, the saying might be expressed as: "Whatever is salted is prepared in fire; and every offering must be prepared with salt." — The main objection that can be raised against this interpretation is this: the salting of sacrifices among the ancients did not have the direct meaning assumed here since the sacrifices were burnt but not exactly cooked. The question, however, is whether Jesus might still have derived his image, with a mere general reference to the sacrificial practice, from

the process of cooking, as both salt and fire always belonged to the sacrifice, and the transition from one notion to the other was not too far-fetched.

561

40. "Salt is a good thing. But if the salt becomes dull, with what shall its strength be restored?" *)

*) V. 50 (Matt. 5:13, Luke 14:34.)

— Again, this is linked to the preceding through a mere lexical transition. The reference is first to the disciples, as seen in the sermon on the mount that precedes this saying. Mark continues with the admonition "to keep the salt within oneself and to live in peace with one another." The latter appears to be stated merely to connect this conclusion of the supposed overall speech to the beginning (No. 35). Matthew more aptly says in the sermon on the mount regarding the disciples that they are the salt; for if it is to be truthfully stated that once the spiritual element (compared to salt) has become dull, it cannot be restored, then it must not be portrayed as something externally acquired, but as something identical with the innermost self and essence of man.

562

41. The Pharisees pose the question to Him whether it is permissible for a man to send away his wife. He replies, "What did Moses command you?" They say, "Moses allowed writing a certificate of divorce and sending her away." Jesus responds, "Because of the hardness of your hearts he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female. Therefore, a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. So they are no longer two but one flesh. What God has joined together, let not man separate." At home, the disciples question Him again on the same subject. He says to them, "Whoever sends away his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; and if she herself divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery." **)

**) Cap. 10, V. 1 ff. Parall. Matt. 19, 3 ff. (Matt. 5, 31 f. Luke 16, 18).

It is noteworthy that in the first gospel, both in the parallel passage to the present one and in the same sentence in the sermon on the mount, a few short words are added that exclude the case of a woman's infidelity from the prohibition of divorce. I am inclined to consider this as an arbitrary addition either by the evangelist or perhaps a

later hand, seeking to harmonize Jesus' statement with the prevailing custom in Christianity *).

*) A similar addition in Matt. 5:22 has already been noticed by others; there, of course, based on the testimony of manuscripts, which is missing here.

Luke, in the passage not taken from Mark but directly from Matthew's source, does not have this addition. It is not characteristic of Jesus' speeches to explicitly add such restrictions, which can only serve to weaken the power of the spoken word, but not to comprehensively depict the rule of behavior to be observed in such cases. If a divorce is permitted in one case, as has been correctly observed, other cases can be imagined where it would not be considered impermissible. However, Jesus' intention is not to specify such cases, but rather to assert once and for all that cases necessitating or justifying a divorce can only occur presupposing a moral fault, one that (morally, not legally considered) equates to adultery. Only in this way does the contrast to the Mosaic law, to which Jesus himself first refers (and thus cannot explicitly want to contradict), become clear. He is content with that law, or any other that might emerge under the influence of existing conditions at other times. He can only want to influence legislation in the heart of the Christian community indirectly, not directly, through his proclamation. But he states once for all that such laws are given only for human frailty and hardness of heart; that the morally pure and blameless will not apply them. To exclude from this the case designated in the first gospel, the case of the definite moral guilt of one party, whereby the other would be completely absolved of all guilt in the event of an actual separation, can hardly have been expressly intended by Jesus. Rather, it seems that in the emphatically emphasized word that both are one flesh, the meaning lies in the fact that if one party is genuinely at fault, the other can never be entirely innocent; that, assuming the sinful desire in the woman is so profound that even the blameless behavior of the man cannot eradicate it, then the man's very entering into marriage with her was a fault – in truth, more an act of adultery than a marriage.

564

42. They brought children to him so he could bless them through his touch. The disciples wanted to prevent this, but Jesus became displeased and said, "Let the children come to me and do not hinder them; for such is the Kingdom of God. Truly, I tell you, whoever does not receive the Kingdom of God like a child will not enter it." And he took them in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them *).

*) Cap. 10, V. 13 ff. Parallel. Matth. 19, 13 ff. (18, 3). Luk. 18. 15 ff.

— The aphorism that Jesus speaks here seems more likely, as our Evangelist and following him Luke recounts it, to have been spoken spontaneously upon seeing children, rather than in the forced and presumptuous context into which the first Evangelist places it, having violently torn it from its natural setting. If the statement that one must become like a child—to attain the kingdom of heaven—is to be true, then it must also be spoken in a childlike, i.e., in a candid and unassuming manner. For nothing has less to do with the Kingdom of Heaven than the contrived, affected childlikeness which many, not without the blame of the Evangelist, have read into that situation where a child is set as an example to the Lord's disciples.

43. Along the way (on the journey to Jerusalem), someone came to him, embraced his knees, and asked, "Good teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus answered, "Why do you call me good? No one is good except one, God. You know the commandments: Do not commit adultery, do not murder, do not steal, do not bear false witness, honor your father and mother!" The man said, "Teacher, I have observed all these from my youth." Jesus then looked at him with a kind expression and said, "You still lack one thing: go, sell everything you have, and give it to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come and follow me!" But the man became disheartened by this statement and went away sullen, for he was very wealthy. Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, "How difficult it is for the rich to enter the Kingdom of God." The disciples were amazed at his words, but Jesus said again, "Children, how hard it is for those who trust in riches to enter the Kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God." They were greatly shocked and asked each other, "Who then can be saved?" Jesus looked at them and said, "For humans, it's impossible, but not for God. Everything is possible for God!" *)

*) Cap. 10, V. 17 ff. Parallel. Matth. 19, 16 ff. Luk. 18, 18 ff.

565

What Jesus says in the present conversation against wealth does not need to be, as has recently been suggested, attributed to the influence of the Essene sect, to which Jesus is supposed to have submitted here. The fact that the great master was also beyond this limitation is evidenced, among other things, by the later story of how he tolerated a woman anointing him in devoted love with precious ointments. He does not make the demand he places here on the inquirer **) to everyone without distinction, but only to those he wants to test if they are capable of every sacrifice, even the highest ***).

**) The inquirer is referred to as "a young man" only occasionally (V. 22) in the first Gospel, probably by mistake, as the phrase "from my youth" doesn't quite fit.

***) Indeed, we find in Luke (12:33) this demand generalized, but surely only as a result of a misunderstanding arising from the practice of the apostolic church and the individual mindset of this evangelist.

— In rejecting the address "good teacher," as many modern thinkers and also the first Evangelist seem to have taken a dogmatic offense, especially if the reading of Origen adopted into the text by Griesbach and Lackmann is correct, in which the word "good" in both the question and the answer is related to what the inquirer should do, which clearly doesn't align well with the subsequent reference to God. Indeed, Jesus would hardly have made such a rejection if he had explicitly attributed to himself an sinlessness distinguishing him from all other mortals, in the sense of older and modern dogmatics. This doesn't mean, however, that Jesus might not have tolerated this predicate from others, or perhaps even given it to himself or others. — The image of the camel going through the eye of a needle will only be found apt if one thinks of the "narrow door" that leads to the kingdom of heaven, according to another statement *).

*) Matth. 7, 13. Luk. 13, 24.

Wittily, in contrast to this, the one burdened by his wealth is depicted as a clumsy, ponderous mass, like a camel. — The concluding words of the conversation are not meant to point to God's omnipotence, disposing arbitrarily over humans, but rather to indicate how the only moment by which man alone attains bliss is not within his power, or he cannot claim or acquire such precisely as a human, i.e., by virtue of the integrity of his reason and his merely finite mental capacities. In short, what is expressed in these words is a counterpoint to Pelagianism **).

**) An apocryphal reshaping of this anecdote is narrated from the Hebrew Gospel by Origen in his commentary on Matthew at that point.

566

44. Immediately following the previous, our Evangelists connect the subsequent conversation, and nothing prevents us from thinking of both as genuinely connected. Peter begins to speak to him: "Behold, we have left everything and have followed you." Jesus replies, "Truly I tell you, no one who leaves house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or fields for my sake and for the gospel's sake will fail to receive a hundredfold in this age—houses, brothers, sisters, mothers, children,

and fields, with persecutions—and in the age to come, eternal life. But many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first." *)

*) V. 28 ff. Parallel. Matth. V. 27. 29 f. Luk. V. 28 ff.

— It is wrongly assumed, in Peter's question—which, indeed, was distorted by an addition in the first Gospel **), that he expressed self-interest and materialistic greed. Instead, it expresses concern for the salvation of the soul, which can be no reproach.

**) τί ἀρα ἐστὶν ἡμῖν; concluding Peter's question.

From the concluding words of Christ's answer, we might rather assume that they were transferred here from another context (as Matthew also attaches them again to the parable inserted on the occasion of these words ***) than to assume they were spoken to rebuke the disciple for his question.

***) Matth. 20, 16.

— Moreover, one should be cautious not to attribute too literal, physical meaning to Jesus' words. As has often been observed about the Lord's speeches, they are not addressed only to those immediately around him—including Judas Iscariot, to whom the promise spoken here surely cannot apply—but to disciples of all times and nations. "Leaving" means "committing everything"; therefore, the very things promised as temporal rewards for such sacrifice might indeed include what is committed. As for the meaning of these promising words, one should be reminded of the previous statement No. 11.

567

45. They had set out on the road to Jerusalem; Jesus leading the way; however, they marveled, and as they followed him, were overcome with fear. Then Jesus gathered the Twelve around him and began to predict what would happen again. "See, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death; then they will hand him over to the Gentiles; they will mock him, spit upon him, flog him, and kill him; and after three days he will rise again." *)

*) V. 32 ff. Parallel. Matth. 20, 17 ff. Luk. 18, 31 ff.

— How significant this passage is for the historical view of the most prominent moments in Jesus' life and career, we already had an opportunity to note in the previous book. Although it remains unlikely that the words reported by Mark and subsequently the other two are precisely those spoken by Jesus, the fact remains that when Jesus embarked on his journey to Jerusalem—not a random festival trip but the first and only one expressly undertaken by him with the intent to fulfill his destiny—he called his disciples to himself and instructed them about what was to come. We must also not doubt that he added to this dreadful message an indication—probably one uttered by himself in mysterious, enigmatic words—about something extraordinary that would happen after his death to establish and strengthen the disciples.

568

46. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come to Him and say, "Master, we have a request, grant us what we will ask of You." He replies, "What do you want me to grant you?" And they say, "Let one of us sit at Your right and the other at Your left in Your glory." Then Jesus: "Can you drink the cup I drink and be baptized with the baptism I receive?" They replied, "We can." And Jesus: "The cup I drink, you will drink, and the baptism I receive, you will receive. But to sit at my right or left is not for me to grant, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared." When the other ten heard this, they began to be indignant with James and John. But Jesus called them and said, "You know that those who are considered rulers among the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones have authority over them. It should not be so among you, but whoever wants to be great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first among you must be a servant of all. For the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many." *)

*) V. 35 ff. Parallel. Matt. 20, 20 ff. (Luke 22, 24 ff. Matt. 23, 11 f. Luke 14, 11. 18, 14. John 13, 16.)

It is well known that according to the first Gospel, it was not the brothers themselves, but their mother who made the request. This has an inner probability and could have been drawn by the author of that gospel from historical tradition without our needing to doubt his dependence on our narrative, which is also evident in many details. **)

**) E.g., that although the mother begins the conversation, it continues only between Jesus and the brothers, in the same way as in Mark, and the indignation of the others is directed not at Salome but only at the brothers.

— The answer which the disciples give to Jesus' first question is interpreted by some commentators as a misunderstanding. Jesus might have expected a negative answer to be able to decline their request, and only by this misunderstanding did he feel compelled to modify his reply. I believe I discover a stronger meaning in the latter if I assume that the disciples genuinely show the will to endure everything Jesus will endure. The Master reinforces them in this trusting disposition, saying: see, do what you can to see your wish fulfilled; I can't guarantee you the actual fulfillment, but whether it's destined for you, will only be evident from your behavior in suffering and endurance. Even in the following, there is no real disapproval of the Zebedees' wish but rather guidance to see it fulfilled. The admonition to attain the high honors in the kingdom of God through humility is directed as much at the others, who begrudge the two brothers the place they desired, as it is at the brothers themselves. — A lot of contradictions, as interpreters often notice, arise from the seeming disparity between Jesus' expressed inability to grant their request here and the "Son of Man's" world-judging role claimed elsewhere. The right answer might be that the role of the world judge is only to pass judgment on already completed life paths, not to guarantee the outcome in advance to those still on their path. However, this passage can indeed be used to argue that Jesus, under that "Son of Man" who would come to judge the world, might not have so directly, in the external and sensual understanding without further definitions, understood His own person.

570

47. As Jesus was leaving Jericho with his disciples and a large crowd that had joined him, a blind man named Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus, sat by the roadside begging. When he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth passing by, he began to call out, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me!" Many rebuked him, telling him to be quiet; but he shouted all the more, "Son of David, have mercy on me!" Jesus stopped and ordered him to be called over. They summoned the blind man, saying to him, "Take heart; get up, he is calling you." He threw off his cloak, jumped up, and came to Jesus. Jesus asked him, "What do you want me to do for you?" The blind man replied, asking for his sight to be restored. Jesus answered, "Go, your faith has healed you." And at once, he regained his sight and followed Jesus on the road *).

*) V. 46 ff. Parallel. Matt. V. 29 ff. Luke 18, 35 ff.

Since this story is one that, due to the variations found in the accounts of the three Synoptic Gospels, has particularly engaged scholars, it is worth noting a striking feature that we previously discussed* regarding the nature of the underlying unity amidst the

variations: namely, that the variations in the other two Gospels are entirely different in nature, and that they only agree where they also correspond with our own version.

*) Book I, p. 72.

The discrepancy begins with the description of the event's location; Luke places it during Jesus' entry into Jericho. Here, the first evangelist remains true to our version. Luke, however, made this change so he could describe the encounter with Zacchaeus in the following chapter, and wanted a crowd to have already gathered around Jesus; for this, it seemed most convenient to use the story of this incident. On the other hand, this evangelist agrees with our version in stating that only one blind man was healed (though he omits the name), whereas Matthew (so-called) mentions two blind men, likely confusing it with another similar incident he described earlier **).

**) Chapter 9, verse 27.

Similarly, Luke notes, in agreement with our version, that the blind man was begging. The awkward expression Mark uses to state that the blind man heard of Jesus has been paraphrased by both, each in his own way; Luke in a more detailed manner, and Matthew more concisely ***).

***) ακουσας ότι 'Ιησους ό Ναζαραιος εστιν Marc. ακουσαί δε οχλου διαπορευομενου, επυνθανετο τί ειη τούτο; απήγγειλαν δε αυτω, ότι 'Ιησους ό Ναζαραιος παρερχεται Luk. άκοϋσαντες υτι 'Ιησοϋς παράγει Matth. [= "hearing that it is Jesus the Nazarene" Mark. "Hearing a crowd passing by, he asked what was happening. They told him that Jesus the Nazarene was passing by" Luke. "Hearing that Jesus was passing by" Matthew.]

The dramatic touch, where people try to silence the blind man who shouts even louder, is retained by both. The conversation between Jesus and the blind man in both is quite similar, though Matthew omits Jesus's last words and mentions a touch to the eyes, indicating his customary expectation of a physical touch during miracles. That the blind man joined Jesus's procession is reported by all three, a noteworthy detail given Jesus's past tendency to dissuade healed individuals from following him. *)

*) Mark 5, 19 and parallel accounts.

We dare not doubt the credibility of this event, given its details and especially the mention of the name in Mark. That there was a notable blind man's healing during Jesus's final days, particularly during his stay in Jerusalem, is also evident from the narrative in the ninth chapter of the Gospel of John. Perhaps the event described there, although reported differently, has the same historical foundation as the current account.

48. As Jesus and his disciples approached Jerusalem, near Bethany and Bethphage at the Mount of Olives, he sent two of them ahead, saying, "Go into the village opposite you, and immediately as you enter it, you will find a colt tied, on which no one has ever sat. Untie it and bring it. If anyone asks you why you're doing this, say, 'The Lord needs it and will send it back immediately.'" They went and found a colt tied at a door outside in the street and untied it. Some of those standing there asked, "What are you doing, untying the colt?" They replied as Jesus had instructed, and they were allowed to go. They brought the colt to Jesus, threw their cloaks on it, and he sat on it. *)

*) Chapter 11, V. 1 ff. Parallel: Matthew 21, 1 ff. Luke 19, 29 ff. (John 12, 14)

— This anecdote, faithfully recounted by Luke, is modified in the first Gospel to state that the disciples brought a donkey and its colt. The entire act was to fulfill a prophecy suggesting the Messiah would enter Jerusalem on a donkey (or its colt, which the Gospel author mistakenly understood as an addition, when it's only a predicate in the prophetic passage *).

*) Zechariah 9, 9. Perhaps there's also a reference to Genesis 49, 11, which Justin Martyr (Apology 1, 32) relates to this context.

In the fourth Gospel, referring to the prophetic passage but omitting the miraculous discovery, it's mentioned that Jesus entered Jerusalem riding a young donkey he happened to find. Considering all these narratives, the most plausible original is Mark's, suggesting that Jesus rode on a colt of a horse, not a donkey. The Old Testament reference and its associated donkey seem to be later embellishments. With this understanding, Mark doesn't seem to have any vested interest in inventing this event. Therefore, either we must assume some misunderstanding in the initial oral traditions or accept the event as Mark describes it. Which of these perspectives one should adopt remains open. One may also consider that moments of "magical foresight" were attributed to Jesus. If so, Jesus might have used this moment to underline the significant nature of his entry into Jerusalem.

49. On the day after his arrival in Jerusalem, he entered the Temple and began to drive out the buyers and sellers; he overturned the tables of the money changers and the seats of the dove sellers, and did not allow anyone to carry vessels through it. While doing so, he said, teaching: "Is it not written *): 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations'? But you, you have **) made it a den of robbers" ***).

*) Isaiah 56:7.

**) Jeremiah 7:11.

***) V. 15 ff. Parallels: Matthew 21:12 f., Luke 19:45 f., (John 2:14 ff.)

— In this account, our evangelist has internal probability on his side, first against the other two Synoptic Gospels, which condense Mark's account and let the incident occur right after the entrance into Jerusalem, while Mark more appropriately first lets Jesus merely look around the city †), and only on the following day, after a return from Bethany where he had spent the night, he lets him cleanse the Temple.

†) V. 11.

However, and even more significantly, both of them collectively go against the author of the fourth Gospel, which places the event much earlier, supposedly during Jesus' first pilgrimage to a feast. At that time, even if this alleged journey had ever taken place, Jesus' authority for such an action would not have been nearly sufficient. Moreover, it is adorned with a somewhat unbelievable detail, namely, that Jesus made a whip out of cords for this action. The reason that might have led the latter evangelist to this anachronism is not hard to find, given our assumptions about the economy of this gospel. It was known that the cleansing of the Temple was the first public act Jesus performed in Jerusalem. The evangelist, who believed that Jesus was present in Jerusalem for all major festivals, must have understood this to mean that this action took place during the first of these festivals when Jesus was teaching publicly. — Regarding the action itself, I find a difficulty not so much in how Jesus as an individual could commit such an act of violence against a multitude — this is easily explained by the esteem in which he was held by the people at the time, as explicitly attested *), and some details, e.g., the overturning of tables and benches, might be exaggerated — but rather in the fact that Jesus showed such care for the Jewish Temple, given his awareness that his mission was not tied to this Temple.

*) Chapter 12:37 and parallels.

Nevertheless, this concern is not enough to question the historical credibility of the action, and it might therefore be best to assume that Jesus performed it in a symbolic sense, to loudly declare himself as the one who came to cleanse the Lord's sanctuary, both in a spiritual and physical sense, from the polluting elements that had accumulated therein, among Jews no less than among Gentiles. A more specific, personally motivated reason for this act I have previously indicated (Book III, p. 438).

575

50. On the morning of the same day, as he walked from Bethany into the city, he felt hunger; he saw a fig tree in full leaf and approached it to see if he might find any fruit on it. But he found only leaves, for it was not the season for figs. He said to the tree, so that the disciples could hear: "No one shall ever eat fruit from you again!" The next morning, as they passed by again, they saw the tree withered from the roots. Peter remembered what had happened and said to him: "Rabbi, look: the fig tree you cursed has withered." Jesus replied, "Have faith in God. Truly, I tell you, whoever says to this mountain, 'Be lifted up and thrown into the sea,' and does not doubt in their heart, but believes that what they say will come to pass, it will be done for them. Therefore I tell you, whatever you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours." *)

*) V. 12 ff. 20 ff. Parallel. Matth. 21, 18 ff.

The explanation of how this miracle story arose and the maxim on the power of faith was linked to it is closely suggested by two passages in the third Gospel **), such that the "mythical view" has found the right track here, which it has missed in many other similar stories where the signs of origin are more hidden.

**) Luke 13, 6 ff. and 17, 6.

Without a doubt, as Strauss indicates ***): the story of this incident arose from a parable presented by Jesus, either the same one preserved by Luke or another similar one.

***) L. J. II, p. 249 ff.

The maxim about the power of faith, however, was attached to it because in it, as can be inferred from Luke's account, which is taken from the collection of sayings of the genuine Matthew, the talk was not about moving a mountain, but a fig tree; which, it seems, in Mark's memory might have blurred into a vague reference to the image of a fig tree. It almost appears as if even Luke had an inkling of this origin, since he is the only one in which we find that parable and that saying in its original form, leaving out the

current narrative. — The way, however, in which Mark incorporates this into the events in Jerusalem, and his explicit mention of Peter, whom we must consider, as always, his informant, albeit misunderstood by him — both make it likely that the parable, which the evangelist mistook for an actual event, was indeed spoken at that time, and not without direct reference to the matters that must have primarily drawn Jesus and his disciples' attention. Perhaps Jesus explicitly saw Jerusalem, the Jewish land and people, in the fig tree that bore only leaves but no fruit and was therefore cursed and doomed by its master; perhaps Peter believed he recognized the fulfillment of this curse pronounced by the Lord in the events that affected this land and people after Jesus' death, expressing this realization in his teachings in a way that could be seen as a continuation of that image, that parabolic story, and was understood by his credulous students as a continuation of the actual miraculous event. This would especially give significance to, or provide a corresponding motivation for, the fact that in Mark we find the curse of the tree and the fulfillment of this curse at two different times; both of which, in the first gospel, are unmistakably merged into one moment for the sake of brevity.

577

As for the maxim about the power of faith, it is essential to clarify the element by which the paradox of its expression is justified. There is audacity in how Jesus uses the tangible image to express the certainty of the fulfillment of true faith and trust in God, i.e., an ethical kind of faith, a faith that has for its content only an object that can, by its nature, become the subject of such trust—an object of the kind that Jesus explicitly taught to ask for in prayer. In this audacity, there is unmistakably a certain idealism regarding those tangible things from which he draws the image. He would not have used the image if he did not have the insight that, for true faith, whose objects can never and will never become such things, it is completely indifferent whether the mountain remains in its place or is submerged in the sea; because a thing of the kind, like a mountain, has no truth or reality for the spiritual vision of the believer. — It is noteworthy how Paul refers to this statement in the First Letter to the Corinthians [*]; he treats it like a proverbial saying when he wants to describe the faith whose value he places far behind the value of love. In any case, it's evidence of how freely the apostles dealt with the sayings of the Lord that had happened to remain in their memory.

[*] 1 Corinthians 13:2.

578

51. "When you are about to pray and you have something against someone: forgive him so that your Father in heaven may also forgive you your trespasses. But if you do not

forgive, your Father in heaven will not forgive your trespasses either." **) — A reminder that the Lord seems to have expressed repeatedly in different contexts, both directly and parabolically. Mark inserts it here in his memory (independent of the other records we have) simply because the mention of prayer provided him the opportunity.

**) V. 25 f. (Matthew 5:23 f. 6:14 f. 18:35.)

52. The chief priests, scribes, and elders question him in Jerusalem about the legitimacy of his actions. Jesus responds: "I too will pose a question to you. Answer me, and I will tell you by whose authority I do this. John's baptism, was it from heaven or from men? Answer me!" They deliberated amongst themselves, thinking: if we say it was from heaven, he will ask us why we didn't believe him; but if we say it was from men, we fear the people, because everyone held John as a prophet. Thus, they responded: "We do not know." Whereupon Jesus said, "Then I will also not tell you by whose authority I do this!" ***)

***) Cap. 11, V. 27 ff. Parallel: Matt. 21, 23 ff. Luke 20, 1 ff.

It is commonly believed that Jesus gave this answer to avoid scrutiny that would arise if he publicly declared himself a prophet or the Messiah, for the Sanhedrin would have the right to assess his legitimacy. However, there's no evidence of a legally established right of the Sanhedrin to examine new prophets, least of all from the passage often cited for this claim *).

*) John 1:19.

Since Malachi, no prophet had emerged; in earlier times, there was no Sanhedrin or scribes: so how could such a law have been established? The entire preceding history of Jesus, as well as that of John, indicates that there was no intent from Jerusalem to exert any legal oversight over them; if they could have prohibited Jesus from teaching by official authority, they would have certainly done so long ago. — Moreover, regarding this speech, we must say that rather than gaining clarity from that explanation, the true understanding is evaded. Jesus, with his counter-question, suggests how futile it would be to proclaim or acknowledge his higher status to those who lack the necessary prerequisites to grasp its significance. Anyone without judgment on such a clear, loud sign of the times, like John's appearance, cannot understand the manifestation of the Higher One he heralded, even if he gave a clear account of who he is. Framed this way, this response aligns closely with the principle adhered to by the Lord throughout his journey, not to prematurely label his status with a name already familiar to the people. And how this cautious restraint contrasts with the audacity with which the fourth Gospel

has him assert his stature as the Messiah and Son of God on every occasion, even to a dull, resistant, and hostile crowd!

579

53. "A man planted a vineyard; he surrounded it with a fence, dug a winepress, built a watchtower, leased it to vintners, and then traveled abroad. In due season, he sent a servant to the vintners to collect some of the fruit of the vineyard. But they seized him, beat him, and sent him away empty-handed. Then he sent another servant to them; they stoned him, injured his head, and sent him away battered. Again he sent another, and they killed him. And so with many others; some they beat, and others they killed. He still had one person left, his beloved son; he sent him last, thinking, 'They will respect my son.' But the vintners said to one another, 'This is the heir; come, let's kill him, and the inheritance will be ours.' They took him, killed him, and threw him out of the vineyard. Now what will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the vintners and give the vineyard to others." *)

*) Chapter 12, V. 1 ff. Parallel: Matthew 21:33 ff. Luke 20:9 ff.

— This parable, which Mark and, following him, the other two also fittingly incorporate at this point, even if it's not necessarily assumed that Jesus told it directly in continuation with the preceding conversation, would clearly lose its significance if we were to assume that Jesus had already explicitly declared himself as the Son of God to the masses. It references a parable from Isaiah **) where the people of Israel are compared to a neglected vineyard; by presupposing that this parable and its meaning are known to his listeners, Jesus guides them even more directly to understanding his own. However, it wasn't his style to first give the teaching and then the parable.

**) Isaiah 5:2.

580

54. "Have you not read the scripture ***): 'The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; it is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes'?" †) — A statement that clearly differs from the preceding parable, suggesting that it shouldn't be viewed as a unified whole, as the Evangelist seems to suggest.

***) Ps. 118, 22 f.

†) V. 10 f. (Acts 4, 11. 1 Peter 2, 4 ff.)

55. Sent by the authorities to entrap him with tricky questions, some Pharisees and servants of Herod approached him and said: "Teacher, we know that you are true and care for no one; you do not regard the position of men but truly teach the way of God. Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor, or not? Should we pay them, or should we not?" But he, aware of their hypocrisy, said to them: "Why are you putting me to the test? Bring me a denarius and let me see it." They brought one, and he said to them, "Whose head is this, and whose title?" They answered, "The emperor's." "Then give to the emperor the things that are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's!" *)

*) V. 13 ff. Parallel: Matt. 22, 15 ff. Luke 20, 20 ff.

— To give to God what is God's does not mean, as some trivialize this statement to suggest, to pay the temple tax; nor does it simply mean to be pious, pray, live a moral life, etc. Instead, it means to seek the Kingdom of God where it can be found and not to mix it with external and earthly matters that are irrelevant to it.

56. Some Sadducees, who deny the resurrection, asked him: "Teacher, Moses wrote for us that if a man's brother dies, leaving a wife but no child, the man should marry the widow and raise up children for his brother. There were seven brothers; the first married and, when he died, left no children; and the second married her and died, leaving no children; and the third likewise; none of the seven left children. Last of all, the woman herself died. In the resurrection, whose wife will she be? For the seven had married her." Jesus said to them, "Is not this the reason you are wrong, that you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God? For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven. And as for the dead being raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the story of the bush, how God said to him, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not God of the dead, but of the living; you are quite wrong." **)

*) Exodus 3, 6.

**) V. 19 ff. Parallel: Matt. V. 23 ff. Luke V. 27 ff.

An old tradition and the apocryphal Gospel of the Egyptians preserved a statement similar to the current one regarding gender relations. In response to Salome's question about when the Kingdom would come, Jesus is believed to have said: "When the two become one, and the outside like the inside, and the male with the female is neither

female nor male" (Clem. Rom. Hom. 11, 12), or, according to another account that explicitly cites the Gospel of the Egyptians as the source (Clem. Al. Strom. III, 13): "When you discard the clothing of shame, and the two become one, and the male" etc. This statement, which the sect of the Encratites used to portray marriage as sinful (Clem. Al. I. I.), is spoken too much in the tone of dogmatic mysticism for its authenticity to be considered probable.

582

In this question of the Sadducees, as in the previous questions of the Pharisees, there seems to be an intention to derive grounds for an accusation against Jesus from his answer, specifically to entice him to expressly reject the authority of Moses. These Sadducees may therefore, even if it is not explicitly mentioned, be regarded as instigated by those leaders who wanted to destroy Jesus. We infer this from Jesus' reply, which seems entirely calibrated to counter such deceit. While Jesus understood the purpose of his mission as transcending the letter of the Mosaic Law, he did not conceal this when it came to asserting this purpose and the spirit of his teachings as a whole. But expressly eliminating the validity or authority of the Law was not within his personal mission. With a clear conscience and without any deceit, he could follow these tempters on the grounds of the Law, to put them to shame using the Law itself; all the more since he clearly recognized the "prophetic" nature of the Law and its purpose to prepare for the higher teachings he brought *).

*) Matt. 11:13.

From this viewpoint, particularly the citation of the Mosaic passage to confirm belief in resurrection is to be judged, from which some have wanted to conclude a prejudice of Jesus, requiring that all higher truths be explicitly expressed in the Old Testament **).

**) Strauss L. J. I, p. 620.

One who, with such freedom of thought and skill, used that passage—where surely no one before him had so easily sought an argument for belief in immortality or resurrection ***) —as such an argument: we have no reason to attribute to him the delusion that Moses, in putting those words into Jehovah's mouth, did so with the explicit intention of teaching or confirming immortality or resurrection.

***) The rabbinic passages that are cited to make this seem at least possible prove nothing because they could just as well have been drawn from the New

Testament. But it does not resemble Jesus to have used an already current argument for belief in resurrection against the Sadducees.

However, the manner in which God is spoken of as the God of certain individuals (even if these individuals are merely mythical), that in this the belief in immortality is, so to say, wrapped or hidden: this is perfectly true and correct, and was discerned with true greatness of vision by Jesus. For it gives the individual, in their uniqueness, a relation to God, and conversely, attributes to God a relationship with the individual in their uniqueness which, although not yet explicitly grasped as an everlasting duration of the individual in certain religious and philosophical viewpoints, when further developed in consciousness, necessarily leads to the concept of such duration. In the Israelite religion, the high value that individual personalities - the patriarchal, legislative, prophetic personalities - asserted in the face of the national god, the explicit selection of such personalities by Jehovah to realize his purpose through them - that is to say, this very thing was the element from which the belief in personal immortality had to organically develop over time. Therefore, we cannot help but find it significant and recognize a deep, world-historical insight when we see the divine master explicitly tying the proof for the belief in resurrection to this element and its biblical expression.

584

57. Amid these and similar conversations that Jesus had with his adversaries and those envious of him, a scribe approached him with friendly intent, having heard his astute answers. He asked him which of all the commandments was the foremost. Jesus replied, "The foremost of all the commandments is: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one; you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength *).

*) Deuteronomy 6:5.

This is the foremost commandment. A second is similar to it: You shall love your neighbor as yourself **).

**) Leviticus 19:18.

There is no greater commandment than these." To this, the scribe responded, "Well said, Teacher. You have spoken the truth. There is only one God and no other besides Him; to love Him with all the heart, with all the understanding, with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbor as oneself is more important than all burnt

offerings and sacrifices." Seeing that he answered wisely, Jesus said, "You are not far from the kingdom of God" ***).

***) V. 28 ff. Parallel. Matt. V. 34 ff. Luke 10:25 ff. (Gal. 5:14. James 2:8.)

The portrayal in our account deviates more than is typically the case for parallel passages, i.e., where one Gospel writer borrows from another, or both draw directly from the same source. In the first Gospel, the scribe is termed a Pharisee, or more precisely, a "lawyer" (νομικός), and is portrayed as testing Jesus *).

*) Both of these circumstances align with the third Gospel. This coincidence might be purely accidental, considering both modifications are closely related, which doesn't necessarily suggest a source different from Mark. However, it's possible that this anecdote was also present in authentic Matthew and becomes even more probable considering its placement in Luke, which deviates from the order of Mark – a deviation Luke rarely allows.

The motive might have been to maintain consistency with the preceding account, disregarding the genuine nature of his question, which in itself, isn't contentious. Furthermore, it's improbable that the Pharisees would have been more eager to avenge the Sadducees rather than rejoicing over their defeat. Consequently, the scribe's reply is omitted in the first Gospel. Yet, neither this reply nor Jesus's counter-response—where he appears hesitant to acknowledge the scribe's closeness to the kingdom of heaven—raises any suspicion. Instead, the first Gospel attributes the following words to Jesus: "On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." These might seem borrowed from another similar context **); however, it's feasible that Jesus said something similar on various occasions.

***) Matthew 7:12.

When our evangelist remarks after this conversation that no one dared to question him further, this note might seem arbitrarily placed, but it's justified by the narrative. The fact that even a scribe felt compelled to agree with Jesus supports this. The first evangelist, without this context, places this note after the following pronouncement, which he has deliberately rephrased into a dialogue *).

*) Luke, as previously noted, omits the account at this point, having presented it in an earlier context. Nevertheless, without it, he still provides (V.40) that concluding formula, which in his narrative, directly follows the dismissal of the

Sadducees. These minor details are characteristically enlightening regarding the origins of our Gospels.

— Moreover, it's not surprising that this pronouncement of Christ belongs to those that attained a typical significance in the apostolic community, as can be deduced from its repeated mention in the letters to the Galatians and James.

586

58. “How can the scribes say that the Messiah is a son of David? For David himself says in the Holy Spirit **): 'The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet.' So, David himself calls him Lord; how then would he be his son?” ***)

**) Ps. 110, 1.

***) V. 35 f. Parallel: Matt. V. 41 ff. Luke V. 41 ff.

According to Mark, Jesus speaks these words while teaching in the temple, while according to the first and, through a different phrasing independent of the former, also the third evangelist, he directs them as a counter-question to the previous questioners. Admittedly, the latter seems more probable, and here we may assume a genuine improvement of Mark by his successors. Such an improvement could easily arise from context, whereas it's hard to understand how Mark, if he had the others as predecessors, could have reached his peculiar phrasing. — Jesus speaks the words without explicit reference to himself since he was not in the habit of announcing himself verbally as the Messiah to the people and the scribes. But there's an implicit reference because, through action, he acknowledged this role. One can conclude that he studied the messianic prophecies of the Old Testament in depth, reflecting on their relation to him and his calling. It's confidently assumed that, if he had been, as legend claims, a descendant of David, he would not have spoken these words. — As for the authority Jesus seems to attribute to that (in correct interpretation, not actually) messianic prophecy, it's viewed from a perspective similar to previous references or the declaration about Elijah's appearance.

587

59. “Beware of the scribes, who walk around in grand clothing, want to be greeted in the squares, seek the best seats in the synagogues, and the places of honor at banquets!

They devour widows' houses and for appearance's sake make long prayers. They will receive the greater condemnation!" *)

*) V. 38 ff. Parallel: Luke V. 45 ff. (Matt. 23, 1 ff. Luke 11, 39 ff.)

—These brief words, in place of which the first evangelist inserts a long anti-Pharisaic speech found in Matthew, are retained by Luke in this context almost verbatim. Another striking proof of both's dependency on our source.

60. Sitting opposite the treasury in the temple, Jesus watched as the people put money into it. Many rich people threw in large sums. Among them, a poor widow came and gave a small coin. He called his disciples and said, "Truly, I tell you, this poor widow has put more into the treasury than all the others. For they all gave out of their wealth; but she, out of her poverty, put in everything, all she had to live on!" *)

*) V. 41 ff. Parallel: Luke 21, 1 ff.

—This little anecdote appears more like a parable, especially since there's an inaccuracy regarding the treasury, which was not a single collection box in the women's court of the temple. Mark, followed precisely by Luke, placed this story here due to the previously mentioned widow. The author of the first Gospel seems to have forgotten this due to the lengthy speech he inserted.

588

61. As they were leaving the temple, one of the disciples praised its magnificence and the massive stones. Jesus replied, "Do you see these grand buildings? Not a single stone will remain on another; everything will be destroyed." And when he sat on the Mount of Olives, facing the temple, Peter, James, John, and Andrew asked him privately about when his prophecies would come to pass and the signs they should look for to recognize that time. Jesus replied with the following speech. "Be alert so that no one deceives you! Many will come in my name, claiming to be me, and many will be misled by them. If you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed. These things must happen, but the end is not yet. Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be earthquakes and famines and disturbances in various places; these are just the beginning of birth pains. But be on guard for yourselves! They will hand you over to the authorities, you will be beaten in the synagogues, and you will stand trial before kings and governors because of me, to testify to them. But first, the good news must be proclaimed to all nations. When they arrest you and hand you over, do not worry about what to say, nor dwell on it. But say whatever is given to you at that

moment; for it will not be you speaking but the Holy Spirit. Brothers will betray brothers to death, and parents will betray their children; children will rebel against their parents and have them executed. Everyone will hate you because of my name. But the one who endures to the end will be saved. When you see 'the abomination of desolation' standing where it should not be *) ("let the reader understand," here the evangelist, not Jesus, added in parenthesis for the readers of the Prophet Daniel, from whom Jesus borrowed this image **): then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains; if you're on the roof, do not go down into the house or enter it to take anything; if you're in the field, do not turn back to get your cloak ***).

*) "At the holy place." Matth.

**) Dan. 9, 27. 11, 31. 12, 11.

***) Compare Luk. 17, 31 f.

Woe to those who are pregnant and those nursing infants in those days! Pray that your flight doesn't take place in winter †).

†) "Or on a Sabbath," adds the first evangelist.

For in those days, there will be such tribulation as hasn't been seen since the beginning of creation which God created until now, nor ever will be. And if the Lord hadn't cut short those days, no one would be saved. But for the sake of the elect, whom he chose, he shortened those days. If someone then tells you, 'Look, here is the Messiah!' or 'Look, there he is!' don't believe it. For false Messiahs and false prophets will rise up, performing signs and wonders to deceive, if possible, even the elect. But watch out! I have told you everything in advance!" ††)

††) Cap. 13, V. 1 ff. Parallel Matth. 21, 1 ff. Luk. 21, 5 ff.

590

Only to this extent do I believe myself authorized to recognize a direct connection between the speeches, which according to Mark, and even more so the further ones, which according to the first Gospel are said to have been given from the Mount of Olives, among themselves and with the indicated occasion. Even here, however, it remains problematic whether some parts might have been inserted from a different context. In particular, it stands out that amidst prophecies announcing misfortune, there is an admonition to the apostles about their behavior before the court and other related

matters; which the first evangelist, who had presented it from another source in an earlier context *), omits **), while the third faithfully writes it down again, following our text (who, by the way, has shown particular diligence in smoothing out its rough edges here).

*) Matth. 10, 17 ff. Parallel Luk. 12, 17 f.

**) That it is the first evangelist who has thrown out the passage from the current context, and not conversely the second and third evangelists who have transferred it from Matth. 10: this must become clear to anyone who compares the passage in Chap. 24, V. 9 — 14 with the latter, which, so to speak, contains the rough scar of the wound sustained by the removal from the context.

However, the entire speech, in the form delivered by Mark and — one with additions, the other with omissions, both not without various changes and omissions but with demonstrable dependence on him — the others have passed on, has been given a skewed meaning by directly linking the words proclaiming the appearance of the Son of Man (No. 62) to the preceding prophecy of misfortune. The subsequent text in Mark (No. 63 — 65) could more likely have formed a whole with that prophecy; however, it would be too bold to attempt to establish the correct connection. I therefore prefer to present the pieces separately, each of which, when viewed individually, conveys a sense worthy of the divine speaker.

As for the words at hand, they seem to presuppose that the disciples were not so much inquiring about the time of Jerusalem's destruction, which the Lord had just announced to them, as they were about the end of the world and the return of the Son of Man as proclaimed by Jesus. This assumption has also been made by all interpreters, and already by the author of the first Gospel *); but to conclude the speech in accordance with this assumption, there is by no means a need for another explicit proclamation of such a return, as what has been said here suffices for this purpose.

*) Matth. 24, 3.

The same is evidently said with the intention of warning against mistaken expectations, which could possibly be tied to the upheavals of events that Jesus foresees as imminent, and as happening soon. The proclamation of these upheavals doesn't necessarily have to be interpreted as narrowly, as is commonly done, and as Luke has already done, to signify the fall of Jerusalem. Jesus, by virtue of the greatness of his spirit, sees both the imminent fall of Jerusalem (concerning which it doesn't seem at all impossible, nor even unlikely, that a genuine gift of prophecy, a magical foresight was

involved), and generally the struggles and trials that his work will face. Even the momentous event of the world's history, which was to intervene between his word that the gospel must be preached all over the world and its fulfillment, was already dimly present to his view. That particular and imminent event, if it was indeed explicitly present in his mind, thus naturally merged in his perception with the broader proclamation of the world's fate, by which the growth and prosperity of the seed he had sown was determined. But this fate also posed for his teaching the danger not only of external destruction but even more of distortion and misinterpretation. Hence the prophecy that false prophets and pseudo-Messiahs will appear; a prophecy that, when understood literally, admittedly has not come to pass (for history knows of no or only insignificant individuals who would have claimed to be Christ), but precisely because of this, and with it these collected speeches in the first two Gospels, is protected from the suspicion that unjustly strikes some more specific alleged prophecies in Luke. - Therefore, we will also not agonize over assigning a more precisely determined meaning to that "abomination of desolation," which Luke believed he recognized in the destruction of Jerusalem, and, after the fact, attributed this prophecy to the Lord. Jesus uses the image created by the prophet Daniel, just as he uses the same prophet's image of the appearance of the Son of Man in the clouds, to generally indicate, without direct reference to a particular event, a destruction that spares not even the holiest. In such a case, he advises, perhaps not without a symbolic undertone, everyone to flee without looking back, that is, to decisively turn away from the old that is irrevocably lost and to seek salvation only in an entirely new order of things. He laments the pregnant women and those nursing, i.e., those who still wish to create or procreate within the old order; he also laments those whose flight falls in winter, meaning in a harsh, inhospitable time that bears no fruit for the spirit *).

*) If the addition by the first evangelist: "or on a Sabbath" is not to be rejected, it would mean: "in a time when festivities are held, when there is nothing proper to be done." Thus, the offense given by the apparent contradiction of this word to Jesus' liberal view of the sanctification of the Sabbath is removed. However, the addition probably did not come from an authentic source.

He depicts the time as one apt to annihilate the entire human race if it weren't "shortened for the sake of the elect" **).

**) This particular phrase especially shows the inappropriateness of connecting the subsequent passage with the current one. For why would it be necessary to shorten those days for the sake of the elect, so they wouldn't be completely wiped out if the Parousia of the Son of Man, and therefore no continuation of the earthly generation, were to follow immediately?

He concludes with a repeated, emphatic warning against deceptions of all kinds, and his speech can thus be considered better concluded than if we wanted to add the subsequent part; for the warning against believing in false times is the only appropriate answer to the question of a time and hour which even the Son doesn't know, as its determination is reserved by the Father.

593

62. "One day the sun will darken and the moon will give no more light, the stars of the sky will fall, and the powers of the heights will be shaken. Then people will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds *), in great power and glory. And then he will send out his angels and gather his chosen ones from all parts of the world, from the farthest end of the earth to the farthest of the heavens." **)

*) In the first Gospel with a, probably intended, example: "The sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky, and a horror will seize (κόψονται) all the peoples of the earth, and they will see (οψονταί) the Son of Man" etc.

**) V. 24 ff. Parallel Matth. V. 29 ff. Luk. V. 25 ff.

Our evangelist, and likewise the other two, connects these words explicitly with the preceding ones; suggesting that what is proclaimed here will occur immediately after the distress described earlier. The importance of this connection is, undeniably, further reinforced by the widespread belief in the apostolic era in a near return of the Lord, an imminent end of the world, and Last Judgment. The presumption that this belief was grounded in real announcements and proclamations given by the Savior is hard to dispute, as it's unclear what other impetus could have given rise to it. But as much as we don't intend to discard this presumption, we must emphatically state that the conceptual connection we have before us in all three synoptic Gospels cannot be considered authentic. It's not an exaggeration to say that the announcement of such a Deus ex Machina, as in this context the Parousia of the Son of Man would be, would utterly negate the meaning of the preceding speech. That speech was meant to announce the destinies that the divine kingdom will have on this earth and to attach the relevant warnings to it. The great sense, the enlightened view, which inspired these announcements and warnings: where does it remain if, in the soul of the speaker, immediately afterwards, instead of that lofty overview of the world's course and fate, the strange phantom arises, which, taken literally as they would have to be in this context, the words here would express? Indeed, what resists attributing such a whimsical delusion to the great master is not just a so-called "Christian feeling" or "Christian

consciousness", which, as such, without a clear understanding of its basis and its legitimacy, would rightly be rebuked with a "mulier taceat in ecclesia!". It's the clear realization that, just as surely as a vine doesn't bear thorns, or a fig tree doesn't bear thistles, a spirit of such greatness, as Jesus proved in the preceding speech, cannot succumb to a delusion of the kind that only arises in a diseased brain. Let no one object that Jesus, like all great men, "in a genuinely human way struggling with the limits and prejudices of his time, could be subject to these in a hundred minor details" *).

*) Strauß, L. J. 1, p. 620.

For neither was the belief in an imminent coming of the Messiah in general, or even of that Messiah whom only He and a few disciples recognized as such, i.e., of His person, a belief in the coming of this Messiah in a cloud appearance—neither was this belief really a prejudice of that time, nor is the view of the future of His teaching and of the fate of the world a minor issue for the spirit from which Jesus spoke. Precisely by this spirit is he so uniquely great, precisely by this, and by nothing else, did he produce such profound effects, that in a clarity that he derived solely from himself, he recognized the overall course of the world's fate, in which he saw himself as the center, and that from this insight, he knew how to control the views, ideas, and prejudices of his time and his people with the most free superiority, to reject their falsehoods and to use their truths by genuine interpretation for himself. From the same mouth that proclaimed the preaching of the Gospel under distress and need of all kinds, amidst the most violent national conflicts all over the globe, the next moment could not possibly come a statement composed of the most limited superstition about the symbolic speech of a fantastic book, which, by error or deceit, had been attributed to a long-famed prophet, and of the most extravagant, semi-insane imagination!

595

However, the statement, as we read it here—just not in the same context and with the same introductory words—was as certainly spoken by Jesus Himself as any other. But it takes on a completely different appearance as soon as we assume, what only a slavish adherence to the letter of the Gospel tradition can prevent us from assuming—that the Savior here processes Old Testament sayings and images into a symbolic expression for a truth he wants to emphatically communicate to his disciples. This passage is composed of a double Old Testament reminiscence: the announcement of a shaking of the heavens, an eclipse of the sun and moon, is borrowed from genuine prophetic passages *), which proclaim a mighty judgment of the Lord, which is to befall guilty Israel; the image of the appearing Son of Man in the clouds, however, is from that

passage of the Pseudo-Daniel, from which Jesus perhaps generally took this expression, which he is known to use for himself **).

*) Primarily from Isa. 13, 10; but also Isa. 34, 4, Ezek. 32, 7 f. and Joel 3, 3 f. contain similar images.

**) Dan. 7, 13.

This free connection already shows that liberality of use, which Jesus everywhere allows himself to make from prophetic and other passages of the Holy Scriptures. How could one think that he seriously intended to relate those images to himself—to imagine that because Daniel once claimed to have seen in a vision "One" coming "in the clouds like a Son of Man", he himself would physically ride in the clouds a few years after his impending death to judge the world?!—No doubt the apostles misunderstood him in this way **), as they often took metaphorical statements literally.

**) This is evident especially from Peter, from whose accounts Mark has drawn, as seen in 1 Pet. 4, 7. The second letter, attributed to Peter, seems expressly intended (cf. Cap.3,4ff.) to refresh the expectations that were found to be mistaken.

He himself undoubtedly meant, with that image on the one hand, the judgment that world history exercises every day and every hour, in which He, being the head and center of world history, could rightfully call himself the judge, (here actually only as the one who gathers his chosen ones around him) — on the other hand, indeed also the judgment at the end of days. However, we must not assume that Jesus imagined it in such a sensually external form as the later church dogma did. The blending of this statement with the immediately preceding and subsequent ones must be attributed to our evangelist, whose flawed compilation the other two did not avoid in their independent treatments of this speech. A reason for this blending might have been given by the fact that Jesus himself attached the image of the Son of Man, who judges the world in world history and gathers the chosen ones around him, to those announcements about the struggles and tribulations of world history. We must assume all the more that such an alignment took place, as only through it the grand image is put in its proper light. But he could not have done it in the way it happened in our Gospels. For here, indeed, the interpreters are right when they assert that the present image can only be understood in the literal sense, not in a figurative one.

63. "Learn a lesson from the fig tree. When its branches swell and produce leaves, you know that summer is near. So also, when you see this happen, know that He is near. Truly, I tell you, this generation will not pass away until all this happens. *)

*) V. 28 ff. Parallel. Matt. V. 32 ff. Luk. V. 29 ff.

— Of course, these words must refer to something preceding. But to what? This cannot be determined precisely, as it has proven inconceivable to us that Jesus, in the literal sense of the word, would have announced the end of the world within the span of a human age. We would rather decide to think of the present in direct relation to the previous (No. 61), since Jesus was fully entitled to announce those struggles as imminent for the current human age and had an urgent reason not to withhold this news from his disciples.

64. "Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away." **)

**) V. 31. Parallel. Matt. V. 35. Luk. V. 33.

— This great word is here only by coincidence, namely because of the word "pass away" (παρερχεσθαι), which, having been said about the current generation in the preceding, reminded the writer of this short statement in which it appears twice. — In this spiritual manner, the Divine grasped the eternity of his work; he had such a sublime consciousness of the conditionality of everything sensual and external. From the height of such a viewpoint, there are no phantasms of the kind that the weaker intellectual power of the disciples attributed to the Master.

598

65. "No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. Watch and pray, for you do not know when the time will come. It's like a man going away: He leaves his house and puts his servants in charge, each with their assigned task, and tells the one at the door to keep watch. Therefore keep watch—you do not know when the owner of the house will come back, whether in the evening, or at midnight, or when the rooster crows, or at dawn. If he comes suddenly, do not let him find you sleeping. What I say to you, I say to everyone: 'Watch!' *)

*) V. 32 ff. Parallel. Matt. V. 36. V. 42 ff. Cap. 25, V. 13. Luke V. 34 ff. (Luke 12, 35 ff. Acts 1, 7.)

— Jesus here speaks of the future of the Son of Man in an advisory, not in a prophetic or dogmatic sense. It's wrong to think that such parables presuppose a completed dogma about the Parousia; the habit of speaking about the coming of the Son of Man seems to have arisen from such parables. But it's even more wrong— though our evangelist's incorrect positioning of this statement suggests it— to take the ignorance of the day and hour in a literal sense, so that while the time of the event is generally known as the lifespan of the current generation (see above No. 32), the exact timing within this boundary remains unknown. Jesus explicitly states that what he tells the bystanders, he tells to everyone. For even after we have long ceased to believe in a near end of the world, that admonition remains valid for every individual.

66. In Bethany, where Jesus usually stayed during his visits to Jerusalem, at the home of Simon the leper, a woman came with an alabaster jar of expensive perfume, which she poured over his head. Some were indignant and said, "Why this waste of perfume? It could have been sold for three hundred denarii and given to the poor." But Jesus said, "Leave her alone, why are you bothering her? She has done a beautiful thing to me. The poor you will always have with you, and you can help them any time you want. But you will not always have me. She did what she could; she has anointed my body in advance for burial. Truly I tell you, wherever this gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her." *)

*) Cap. 14, V. 3 ff. Parallel. Matt. 26, 6. (John 12,1 ff.)

These magnificent words, which Jesus, like many others, said not only to his disciples (as he realized that the woman's actions would, by necessity, be passed down to posterity), speak against all overestimation of the principle of utility and material interests. Like the anointing of the devout woman, every effort to outwardly glorify the divine, whether in art or worship, provided they are genuine, can be seen as an honor given to the body of the Lord. For the external appearance of the spirit is the body of the divine, separated from its soul, but not forever abandoned. There's always time to promote the physical well-being of human society, but the right moment to promote the spiritual must not be missed. — This story is one of the few synoptic ones also adopted by the fourth gospel. According to it, the incident occurred at the home of Lazarus and his sisters. The woman who performed the anointing (though the anointing itself is told with slightly different circumstances reminiscent of another synoptic narrative **) is named as Mary, Lazarus's sister, and the objecting disciple as Judas Iscariot. To him, superfluously and somewhat disruptively, the motive is attributed: as the treasurer of the group formed around Jesus, he wished for a constantly filled purse to steal from it at his discretion.

****)** Luke 7, 36 ff.

Jesus's words are not transmitted without truncation; nevertheless, in them, there is no consideration of the motive with which Judas supposedly raised the objection, as one would expect from the one whom the fourth gospel, in particular, celebrates as the knower of hearts *).

***)** John 2, 25. 6, 64.

600

67. On the day when, according to the old custom, the Paschal lamb was eaten, his disciples asked him (outside the city, perhaps in Bethany) where he wanted the meal to be prepared. He then sent two of them and said: "Go into the city; there you will meet a man carrying a jar of water. Follow him, and wherever he goes in, say to the owner of the house: The Master asks: where is the guest room where I can eat the Passover with my disciples? He will show you a spacious room, furnished with cushions: prepare it there for us." The disciples went into the city; they found everything as he had told them, and they prepared the Passover **).

****)** V. 12 ff. Parallel. Matt. 26, 17 ff. Luke 22, 7 ff.

— I can only give the same opinion on this story as above regarding the similar No. 48. Curiously, here too, much like there, the account in the first Gospel is modified in a way that might easily tempt one to consider this version as the more original one and to base an attempt at explaining the incident on it. For if there the account of the first Gospel seemed to offer a hand to explain the reported incident as a tale arisen from the memory of Old Testament prophecies: so it seems equally obvious here to use the corresponding report for a natural explanation of the fact in question. There, it only says very simply: the disciples should go to "a certain man," who is not named, but whom the evangelist seems to presuppose as someone known to Jesus and the disciples, and announce to him that the Lord, whose time has now come, wants to celebrate the Passover with him. Nevertheless, I cannot help but persist in my conviction of the thorough dependence of the first Gospel on the second in all their common parts of the narrative. Precisely at this point, there is not the slightest trace of a peculiar source from which the author of the first Gospel might have drawn, and it is very conceivable how his account could arise from the remodeling of the second, with which the account of the third also agrees here, while the reverse assumption remains entirely inappropriate.

601

68. While they were at supper, Jesus said: "Truly, I tell you, one of you will betray me, one who is eating with me." The disciples became sad and said to him one after the other: "Surely, not I?" But he answered: "One of the Twelve, he who dips with me into the bowl! The Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born!"
*)

*) V. 18 ff. Parallel. Matt. V. 21 ff. Luke V. 21 ff. (John 13, 18 f. 21 ff.)

The conviction of Mark's independence from the other evangelists and the dependence of the other two synoptics on him enables us to explain this passage. To date, due to prevailing biases about the relationships of the evangelists to one another, such an explanation hasn't been reached. However, it is clearly demanded by the context in our evangelist and gives a more noble and dignified picture of the entire scene than that which, in part arising from a misunderstanding of Mark's words, is presented in the first and the fourth gospels and has been spread by these two documents. Almost universally, the words, "he who dips with me in the dish" (ο εμβαπτόμενος μεν ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τραβλῖον), have been understood as a direct designation of this one individual. In terms of literal meaning, this isn't incorrect. An imaginative writer, fully proficient in the language, would only express himself in the way Mark does if he intended to convey the specific meaning with his expression. There's no doubt that the author of the first gospel understood Mark in this way. By omitting the words "he who eats with me" in the previous statement and "One of the Twelve" in the current one, and by adding the conclusion "it is he who will betray me", he excludes any other interpretation of these words. Furthermore, he later expressly has Judas refer to these words and ask if he is the betrayer, which Judas can only do under the impression of already being personally identified by Jesus. Nonetheless, we are convinced that Mark's words must be understood differently. The construction is exactly the same as in the preceding words "he who eats with me". There, both the nature of the matter, since all the disciples were eating with Jesus and not just Judas, and the uncertainty these words leave the disciples about which one of them is meant, indicate that these words should not explicitly denote Judas, but, as we expressed in our translation, one from the group in general, indefinitely whom. Similarly here, "he who dips with me in the dish" says the same thing, but in a more sensuous manner, as "he who eats with me". This designation remains general and pertains to Iscariot no more or less than any of the other disciples *).

*) In relation to ὁ ἐσθίων, this interpretation has also been adopted by Fritzsche (Lv. klare. P. 613), with a very fitting reference to a similar use of the article: John

3:10. For ο εμβρόχμενος, Künöl and Henneberg have extended it, but with an erroneous extension to the parallel place in Matthew, which seems to have harmed the credibility of this interpretation so far.

The article is used, as it often is in general statements that are detached from any specific reference to a particular personality, instead of the descriptive words that would express the indefinite generality of the relationship. Admittedly, this rhetorical figure cannot be deemed well placed here, as it almost inevitably led to that misunderstanding; a more skilled writer than Mark would probably not have used it. Nevertheless, it is indicative; it expresses more forcefully than a circumlocution would have, the severity of the act that someone, who stands in such close relation to Jesus, is about to commit. — The correctness of our interpretation is proven by the fact that in Mark no further consequence is given to that designation, even though, if Judas was really personally identified, one would expect a word to be said about his behavior at that moment. The author of the first gospel tried to fill this gap, which only appeared as such in his account; though in a very clumsy way, as he still lets Judas ask, after the Lord has already identified him as the betrayer, whether he is the one, and one doesn't see why. Moreover, our interpretation of this passage is confirmed by Luke's paraphrase, which deviates from Mark in the opposite direction. In Luke, the words that led to the mentioned misunderstanding are completely omitted, and the scene ends with the disciples questioning among themselves whom the Lord might be referring to. This clearly shows that this evangelist could not have understood his predecessor as speaking of an explicit identification of Judas; yet, he reveals his dependence on this predecessor by the way he rearranges his account. For since, in Luke's version, the institution of the Last Supper, which Mark follows after that conversation, occupies a broader space, he precedes it and only appends the words indicating the impending betrayal. Nevertheless, what he then says about the movement among the disciples refers not, as one would expect, to the entire previous speech, but only to those appended words; an inconsistency evidently prompted by looking back at the account of Mark, the content of which was still to be briefly added.

604

We also see here how the account of our evangelist stands in the middle between those of the other two synoptics in a way that cannot have arisen from a combination of these two, but rather on the contrary provides the most valid testimony for its originality and for the dependence of the other two on him. By comparing with those two, our explanation of the words of this account is justified from an exegetical perspective. Whether our interpretation, or rather the assumption of the factual truth of the report understood in this way, also deserves preference over the opposing view for internal,

substantive reasons: in our opinion, there should be no doubt. The personal identification of Judas appears in the account of the first gospel (we are not currently talking about the fourth) so utterly purposeless, so thoroughly disturbing to the solemn celebration of the sublime moment, that it can only be considered a gain if it is eliminated. The allusion to the betrayal in general, being hatched in the midst of the intimate circle of disciples, is grand and gripping; the account of it in Mark is so straightforward, so simple, and of such compelling truth that anyone who focuses solely on it, without being misled by the distortions it has experienced at the hands of the other evangelists, will certainly find no reason to doubt its factual faithfulness; especially since it doesn't even require the assumption of a miracle to explain how Jesus could have detected the betrayer *).

*) The fact that, as Strauss wants (L. J. II, p. 431 ff.), the whole scene has only emerged from an interpretation of the Psalm cited in John 13:18 is, aside from the evidentiary power of the narrative's internal truth, which by no means bears the stamp of fabrication, all the more unlikely since there is not the slightest hint of this passage in the synoptic gospels. For in Mark 13:21 and parallels, Jesus speaks only of a prophetic proclamation of his suffering and death in general (like Mark 9:12 and parallels), not, as Strauss seems to have understood these words, explicitly of the betrayal that befell him.

However, the same does not apply to an explicit exposure of the betrayer. Jesus could only reasonably and worthily proceed to this if he intended to preempt the betrayal; an intention which is categorically ruled out by the portrayal of all the evangelists. Not to mention that such an explanation would have had to provoke a movement among the disciples that the evangelists could not have ignored; unless one wanted to transfer a secrecy of that identification from the fourth gospel to the depiction of the others, for which there is no reason in these themselves. — We believe we can disregard the objection that has been raised against the assumption that Judas Iscariot still took part in the Last Supper. One should finally get over portraying the institution of the Last Supper as an act of modern sentimentality in which Judas' presence could have been perceived as a disturbance; just as one should hopefully be over the idea that by partaking in the Last Supper, Judas would have indeed further sharpened his damnation.

605

69. While they were eating, Jesus took bread, broke it with a prayer of thanks, gave it to the disciples and said, "This is my body." Then he took the cup, offered a prayer of thanks and handed it to them, and they all drank from it. And he said to them, "This is

my blood, the blood of the (new) covenant, which will be shed for many. Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God.” *)

*) V. 22 ff. Parall. Matth. V.26 ff. Luk. V. 15 ff. (1 Cor. 11, 23 ff.)

In this important account, we find, as in some previous ones, the third gospel almost exactly coinciding with ours. Luke, however, who paraphrases Mark's account with added content, also includes an addition that Jesus urges his disciples to continue doing this (i.e., initially breaking or eating bread) in his memory. He adds this only in passing, making it quite inconspicuous and seeming like a mere addition by the narrator. But the fact that it does come from a context in which it had meaning, and that Luke, a student of Paul, retained it consciously, becomes clear from Paul's mention of the Last Supper's institution. There, that urging is repeated with an explicitly reinforcing clause; leaving no doubt about its deliberate nature. Rightly has this coincidence been used as one of the proofs for the connection of Luke's gospel with Pauline teaching, just as, conversely, this presumed connection informs us about the origin of that addition in Luke. — Without deciding whether this addition is also to be regarded as a historical completion of the words reported by Mark, I initially point out how, precisely because of its omission, Mark's account has a peculiar value for authenticating the authenticity of this entire event. Some have recently speculated, based on the supposed low probability of Jesus's specific foresight of his imminent death, that the account of the Last Supper's institution directly by the Lord might have been formed in the way of legend from the Christian community's custom of celebrating the memory of their founder at communal meals *).

*) Strauss L. J. II, p. 440.

If this assumption were valid, undoubtedly the urging for repeated celebration would have formed the fundamental moment of the alleged legend, the one that would have had to be most prominent and least likely to be lost; instead, even in those accounts that have retained this urging, we see it only as a subordinate element. — However, the question of whether the original form of the institution words was more correctly and completely transmitted by Mark or Paul, in our opinion, can remain undecided without detracting from the dignity of this sacrament. Even without the explicit command to repeat the action in his memory, Jesus's words sanctify it, with the natural, even necessary consequence being its ongoing repetition in the community. In fact, such a merely factual and silent institution of the sacrament, allowing for the necessity that must call forth a sacred use of this kind based on that simple act, seems even more fitting for the Lord and in line with his other actions than an explicit directive, which could

easily appear arbitrary. As we have already indicated *), concerning the sacrament of baptism, we are critically obliged to assume its origin independent of an explicit institution by the Lord. Much less should we hesitate to trace the second sacrament back to a word of the Lord, but not to one explicitly commanding this action.

*) Book III, p. 406 ff.

— The Lutheran view of the Eucharist would, we argue, rightly understood, have an interest in considering the account of the first two gospels as more original and historically accurate, while the Zwinglian view would prefer the account of Paul and Luke.

607

The authenticity of the beautiful concluding words of this inaugural speech, for the flattening interpretation of which *) there is no slightest indication within the text, must be deemed all the more certain as, upon closer inspection, they seem to little match the idea formed in the early Christian community, in which the glory of Christ in the kingdom of the Father begins immediately upon his ascension.

*) Strauss L. J. II, p. 412.

608

70. After the meal and the hymn that concluded the meal, they went out to the Mount of Olives. Jesus said to them, "You will all fall away from me tonight; for it is written **): 'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered.'"

**) Zechariah 13:7.

"But once I have risen, I will lead you to Galilee." Peter then said, "Even if everyone falls away from you, I will not." Jesus replied, "Truly I tell you, tonight, before the rooster crows twice, you will deny me three times." But he kept insisting over and over, even if he had to die with him, he would not deny him. All the others said the same ***).

***) V. 26 ff. Parall. Matthew V. 30 ff. Luke V. 31 ff.

— Later that night, when Jesus was taken before the high priest for interrogation, Peter followed him into the courtyard of the high priest. As he stood there warming himself, a servant girl of the high priest saw him, looked closely at him, and said, "You were with

that Nazarene, Jesus." He denied it, saying, "I don't know what you're talking about." He then went out into the entranceway, and a rooster crowed. The servant girl saw him there again and said to those standing around, "This man is one of them"; but he denied it again. Shortly after, those standing around said to Peter again, "Certainly you are one of them; you're a Galilean, your accent gives you away." Then he began to call down curses on himself and swore, "I do not know this man you're talking about." At that moment, the rooster crowed for the second time, and Peter remembered the word Jesus had spoken to him, that before the rooster crowed twice, he would deny him three times. He broke down and wept *).

*) V. 66 ff. Parall. Matthew V. 69 ff. Luke V.54 ff. (John 18, 25 ff.)

609

The anecdote related last, which the first and third evangelists recount with many mutual variations from one another and even more so from the underlying account of Mark **), and the fourth recounts based on an uncertain memory aided by arbitrary reflection ***), commends itself as credible due to the vividness and inner truth of many of its details, as well as the nature of the event itself.

**) According to the first evangelist, who in all other respects coincides almost word for word with our account, it was two different maidens who confronted Peter. Luke, having previously elucidated Mark's *θερμαινόμενον* in his own way, speaks of a second and third address, seemingly by two male persons, but with additions that convince of the identity of his account with that of Mark's. He seems to have taken issue with Peter referring to Jesus in Mark as *τόν άνθρωπον τούτον*, and changes these words to the address: *άνθρωπε*. At the third denial, to more poignantly motivate Peter's realization, he has the Lord look around and gaze at the disciple, not considering that Jesus was inside the house, and Peter was in the courtyard.

***) Peter's recognition by the high priest's household is motivated by the recognizer being the brother of the man Peter is said to have injured during his Master's arrest.

Nothing is more unlikely than the idea that legend would have fabricated such a weakness of the foremost among the disciples without reason, solely with the intent to attribute to the Master the paltry glory of having foretold it! However, if the disciple of his own accord confessed to this weakness (which we have to assume all the more as he probably did not have a witness among his fellow disciples), he probably had no other

motive than recognizing a duty of piety in it because of his Master's prior proclamation. Thus, this incident casts a favorable predisposition back on those proclamations themselves, of which only the one concerning Peter has something miraculous in the literal sense, although even this is nothing of the kind that hasn't also occurred to other individuals in moments of intense agitation. However, the idea that Jesus, on this fateful night, had no inkling or foresight of what was impending is far more implausible than the opposite. Only the announcement to lead the disciples to Galilee after his resurrection, which would be presupposed by him as already known, might indeed have been conveyed differently in the account than it was in reality. However, to assume a general admonition to gather in Galilee, and a comforting promise linked to it as having been truly spoken, poses no difficulty; in fact, everything compels us to presuppose it as having actually occurred.

610

71. They arrive at a piece of land called Gethsemane (Oil Press). There, he asks his disciples to sit down, as he wishes to pray in the meantime. He takes Peter, James, and John with him; he is overcome with dread and distress. He says to them: "My soul is sorrowful unto death; stay here and keep watch!" He then moves forward a short distance, falls to the ground again, and prays that he might be spared this hour if possible. His words were: "Father, everything is possible for you; take this cup away from me. Yet not what I want, but what you want!" He comes back and finds them asleep; he says to Peter: "Simon, are you sleeping? Couldn't you keep watch for one hour? Watch and pray so that you won't fall into temptation. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." Once more, he goes away and prays with the same words; when he returns, he finds them asleep again; their eyes were heavy, and they didn't know what to answer him. For the third time, he comes and says: "Sleep on now and take your rest; it is enough, the hour has come; behold, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Get up, let's go; look, my betrayer is at hand!" *)

*) V. 32 ff. Parallel: Matthew V. 36 ff. Luke V. 39 ff.

611

We consider the recent doubt about the historical truth of the story narrated here, which has been expressed in various forms, as unfounded and unwarranted, in its general aspect. Of course, the words of the prayer that Jesus is said to have spoken could not have been directly heard by any of the disciples given the narrated circumstances, and assuming a retelling of these words by Jesus himself is entirely impermissible. But these words seem intended to express the approximate sense of the prayer as one

would be justified in imagining. The three-time coming and going, reminiscent of a mystical numerical type, can be discarded as only inappropriate for the portrayal, just as the appearance of the angel and the sweating of blood, with which Luke has embellished the story **).

**) That the author of the Dialogue with Trypho (cap. 103) also mentions both of these last details testifies as clearly to his acquaintance with our Luke, as the previously noted (No. 33) does to his acquaintance with our Matthew.

But what remains at the core of the story after subtracting all of the above, namely, the journey to Gethsemane, Jesus' withdrawal with the three favored disciples, the sleeping of these disciples, and the repeated waking of the same by the Master seized with fear and grim foreboding: these are characteristic features of such a nature that they bear nothing of the mark of legendary invention. A contemplative observer would not be inclined to suspect them, especially not when they would, at the same time, throw doubt upon such a well-founded assumption as the source of these tales being from Peter himself. The state of Jesus' soul, as indicated here, offers two perspectives, both of which are necessary to complete the image of divine humanity that we perceive in the Savior. One perspective, even though not miraculous in the truest sense, can classify the event under the category of the wondrous. Unmistakably, what we see here is a premonition of what's to come, generated not by a logical calculation of circumstances. Despite the clarity and calm conviction with which he approaches the fate he chose for himself, embracing suffering and death willingly, it is not a closer insight into the immediate unfolding of events leading to the impending catastrophe but rather an involuntary, and therefore all the more overpowering, foreboding of this catastrophe. A clear insight of the kind just mentioned would not have led to such agonizing fear. It is psychologically grounded that only the uncertainty about external circumstances, combined with foreboding and inner certainty about the approach of the fateful moment in general, can produce such soul distress in an utterly lucid and self-aware character. Socrates' situation, which some like to compare to that of the Savior, differs precisely in this regard. There is no moment in the history of Socrates where his fate could have been an object of mere foreboding, not of clear external recognition. Now, this also touches upon the other side of this state of mind, namely that in it the naturalness of the soul's life is fully justified. In Jesus, because he is not a philosopher like Socrates, who subdues nature within himself through the power of abstraction, this aspect should not be portrayed as weakened or pushed into the background. Especially in a personality like Jesus, who is not active in one specific direction or with a single soul power but in his life and actions embodies humanity in its entirety and wholeness — nature acts in all its might. The least spared to such a person is the vibrant feeling and awareness of suffering inflicted by fate, which the speculative philosopher, more accustomed to living

in the abstraction of thought than in concrete reality, can far more easily dismiss. I am inclined to see this as the truth hiding behind the ecclesiastical-doctrinal view that what Jesus felt at this moment was not a sensual fear of personal suffering but rather compassion for the sinfulness of humankind and the divine wrath over it. The relationship of this view to the one presented here is: firstly, that in both, the anguish is seen not as a fear arising from reflection on external circumstances but as a direct, non-reflective emotion. Mainly, it recognizes a unique energy of general human nature in Jesus because the divine in him should not appear as in other figures, in the form of a single soul power, but in the form of the totality of the human. As far as being subject to pain in human nature is seen as a result of the fall into sin, it is consistent to label this full sensation of pain and fear in the God-man as empathizing with humanity's sinfulness.

613

72. When Judas comes with the crowd sent by the chief priests, scribes, and elders to arrest him, Jesus says: "You come out to arrest me as if I were a robber, with swords and clubs. Yet, I was among you day after day, teaching in the temple, and you did not seize me. But the Scriptures must be fulfilled!" *)

*) V. 48 f. Parallel: Matt. V. 55 f. Luke V. 52 f. (John 18, 20 f.)

— As credible as these words are in essence, it still seems unlikely that Jesus would have spoken of Old Testament prophecies in this context. This time, the author of the first Gospel seems to have been guided by a correct intuition when he attributes the recollection of these prophecies to his own voice, not to Jesus's. We will also excuse Luke if he inserts, likely invented by himself to round off the expression, the words: "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness."

End of the first volume.