

advice the method was inserted. I think however that the more probable alternative, judging from the later work of Newton, is that first given. This would explain the lack of what I have endeavored to make out to be the true appreciation of Barrow's genius. Barrow saw that the correct development of his idea was on purely analytical lines, he recognized his own disability in this direction and the peculiar aptness of Newton's genius for the task; and the growing desire to forsake mathematics for divinity made him only too willing to hand over his discarded child to the foster care of Newton and Collins "to be led out and set forth as might seem good to them," as he says in his preface. Who can tell what might have appeared in a second edition, "revised and enlarged," if Barrow, on his return to Cambridge as Master of Trinity and afterwards Vice-Chancellor, had had the energy to make one; or if Newton had made a treatise of it instead of a book of "Scholastic Lectures," as Barrow warns his readers that it is? But Barrow died two years later, and Newton was far too occupied with other matters.

J. M. CHILD.

DERBY, ENGLAND.

[Note.—Since writing the above article, the author has found that the *Lectiones Geometricae* form a perfect calculus. This will be explained in a forthcoming volume of the *Open Court Classics of Science and Philosophy*.—Ed.]

POLYXENA CHRISTIANA.*

A REVIEW OF BOUSSET'S "KYRIOS CHRISTOS."

"But she, though dying, none the less
Great forethought took, in seemly wise to fall."

—Eur., *Hek.*, 568f.

By odds the most imposing and important apologetic of recent years is the deep-learned, deep-felt and deep-thoughted *Kyrios Christos* of Prof. Wilhelm Bousset, well known by his *Religion des Judentums*, his *Offenbarung Johannis*, his *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, and as editor with Wilhelm Heitmüller of the *Theologische*

* This review, written in the first half of the year 1914, has been withheld from the press thus far, along with several other such essays, in the hope that after the cessation of hostilities in Europe it might more readily "fit audience find, though few"; but the coming of such a season seems now too likely to be indefinitely delayed.

Rundschau. True, it is in many ways a questionable service this large-minded and high-hearted scholar has rendered the cause of historicism, a "sad relief" like that brought the Briton by "the blue-eyed Saxon" of old. Even Bacon seems to view it askance, with suspicious eye, and Bousset himself foresees that his own "theses" will be held to "dissolve with Drews and B. W. Smith the person and Gospel of Jesus" (p. xv),—where the double inversion¹ is exceedingly rhetorical. Yet he holds that his "book is a continuous refutation of their theses" (xv)! Certainly the volume is a weighty one, most interesting, instructive and worthy of careful study. It teems with the most valuable truth and is in general informed by a spirit of great modesty, honesty and conscientiousness. However, in spite of all these and other excellences, the book fails entirely at certain critical and decisive points to yield the "continuous refutation" as which it is offered to the world. The nature of this failure it is not hard to make clear in general terms; a detailed examination such as the work deserves, as it would be a pleasure to give, and as would be entirely convincing, would call for several such papers as the present.

What then is the stately fabric of thought reared by the Göttingen professor? What sea-wall would he heave up against the rising tide of radical criticism? Bousset attempts a genetic reconstruction of the elements of proto-Christian doctrine, a restoration and rational exhibition of the original historic process through which the early Christian mind was carried from the days of the *Urgemeinde*, the first Church in Jerusalem, down to the great catholicizer, the heresy-hunting Irenæus. By rehabilitating this process more carefully, more systematically, more thoroughly, with greater learning and with higher plausibility than any one has done heretofore,—but more especially by reforming the whole front of the Liberal criticism, by abandoning stronghold after stronghold and advancing boldly forward to the radical positions and assuming them quite as if they were his own,—Bousset would persuade his readers that since all these things *may* have happened this way, therefore they *must* have happened and surely *did* happen just this way, that so did Christianity come into being. Now, to begin with, here is a logical lapse: the very most he could thus attain would be a more or less satisfactory theory, developed from the *hypothesis*

¹ Compare the words of A. Schweitzer in his *Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (p. 490): *Drews, wie seinem grossen Meister Smith.*

of an historical Jesus. But no such theory, even though far more satisfactory than our author's, could ever prove or verify the hypothesis; to do this latter he must not only show that his theory is perfectly satisfactory, that it explains all the facts in the case, but he must also show that no other theory developed from the opposite hypothesis either does or can explain all the facts in a manner equally satisfactory. Until he does this, it is quite impossible to convert his *may be* into a *must be*; and yet it is precisely this conversion that is absolutely essential to his argument. It is a more or less clear perception of this state of case that now leads discerning German critics to admit that the historicity of Jesus "cannot be proved," that it is at best "altogether probable" (*überaus wahrscheinlich*).

Now Bousset has made no effort whatever to meet these unescapable logical demands; hence his whole elaborate structure is swung in the air. The radical holds that *everything* so carefully explained by Bousset on the hypothesis of historicity may be explained fully and in fact far more readily on the hypothesis of the non-historicity; and until Professor Bousset takes this fact into account, all his learning and patience and constructive ingenuity are of little logical avail.

This is not nearly all, however. It is not enough to consider the facts, no matter how many nor how important, that may be readily explained on a certain theory; it is absolutely necessary to consider the facts that are *hard* to explain. It is precisely these that form the proper tests; to slight or to shunt them is to abandon scientific procedure. Now there is a host of facts assembled in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* and *Ecce Deus* that are admittedly very hard to fit into any theory of an historic Jesus; it becomes then the bounden logical duty of Bousset to consider these facts above all others, not one nor several nor many, but all of them, for all of them must be explicable on his hypothesis, *if it be correct*; not one can be excepted. The notion that by ingeniously ordering a great many other more tractable data, one may evade the logical necessity of fairly meeting and managing these seemingly unmanageable data,—this notion, no matter in what high quarters nor how zealously it may be cherished,—this notion is a delusion and a snare.

Such general considerations show plainly that our author has not fulfilled the logical requirements of the situation. At this point, though they cannot outbid him in other great qualities, such men as Schmiedel and Klostermann have shown a keener and surer

sense. Of these the former has seen clearly that such paths as Bousset's cannot conduct to the goal, that there *must* be discovered certain facts that can be explained on the hypothesis of historicity and cannot be explained on any other. This is exact science. There is no other way by which "the historical character of Jesus" can be saved. Schmiedel thought he had discovered nine such data and named them not inappropriately the Nine Pillars, and his disciples have thought to widen the sacred ring. But alas! this discovery has not been confirmed. The pillars are not such granitic facts as he supposed; at the touch of criticism they crumble, they have been abandoned even by historicists themselves. Klostermann admits that appeal to them is vain, that "new and doughtier weapons will have to be forged."

But it is not only such general logical dereliction that vitiates the thought-process in *Kyrios Christos*. Flaws scarcely less serious run this way and that, throughout its structure. Let us take some examples. *Tacit assumption* abounds in this work. The author speaks regularly of "Jesus of Nazareth," thereby assuming the historical character. Yet he must know that the better phrase is "Jesus the Nazarean," and that this adjective has, at least apparently, naught to do with Nazareth. "Of Nazareth" is merely a false interpretation of *Nazaraïos*, which such a critic as Bousset cannot countenance. At this point it is enough to refer to such as Oort, Friedländer, Burkitt, Abbott, Soltau, Vollmer, Burrage, and others.

Again, Bousset begins very properly with Jesus in the faith of the *Urgemeinde* (primitive congregation), which he calls Palestinian and locates definitely in Jerusalem (*die Gemeinde in Jerusalem*). Herewith he quietly assumes nearly everything. Who knows that this *Urgemeinde* was in Jerusalem? And how does he know it? From the first chapters of Acts? But Bousset himself rejects these repeatedly and decisively as unauthentic. Even Moffatt admits that the trustworthiness "rises" as the story advances. What is therein more pretentiously accurate than the account of Paul as persecutor? Yet Bousset assures us that it is all fiction. "By no means (*nicht einmal*) is it sure that Paul himself was concerned in the persecution at Jerusalem" (p. 92), though Wendt could declare he was its soul! The story in Acts ix. 1 ff. "bears the brand of the unhistorical plain on its brow" (p. 92). *Such was the contention in "Der vorchristliche Jesus,"* p. 26 f. Since in Acts we are dealing so largely with free creations and "not any way authentic documents"

(p. 97), all reason for placing the *Urgemeinde* in Jerusalem vanishes. But the immovable reasons against it remain, some of which have already been set forth in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (pp. 24 ff.). The only natural thing for the Disciples to do after the crucifixion (if there was any) was to return to Galilee, and the oldest account represents them as so doing (Mark. xvi. 7; Matt. xxviii. 10, 16-20). The contradiction of Luke (xxiv. 47-53; Acts i. 4-8, 12 ff.; ii. 5, 14) is perfectly open, deliberate and intentional, and has a definite aim, to represent the propaganda as emerging from Jerusalem, *against the facts in the case*. Only think how utterly absurd! A few *Galilean* peasants beginning in *Jerusalem* a campaign for the deification of a man that had just been crucified *in Jerusalem*! How did these few fanatics support themselves in the midst of the crucifiers? Even at a very low cost for living they must have had some little bread—where did they get it in the midst of contemptuous enemies? What madmen to begin to preach Jesus as a God there in *Jerusalem*, where he had never done any mighty work, where his cause, whatever it was, had gone utterly and instantly to wreck! If Jesus were really a God-Man, if he really left his grave and rose from the dead and appeared to his disciples and endued them with supernatural power from on high (as the orthodox logically maintain), then such a course might seem in itself possible, though still sharply contradicting the Gospels and the oldest tradition; but Bousset accepts not one of these allegations, he denies them one and all, and so must explain not merely the contradiction of tradition but also the incredible folly, the downright impossibility of the disciples' stay in Jerusalem. This he does not do, this he makes no attempt to do. No! The idea that the *Urgemeinde* was in Jerusalem is entirely baseless and defiant of common sense.²

Bousset himself must have felt the error of his thought at this point, for he writes very rationally about the proto-Christian Gentile church, justly recognizing it as one of "the weightiest of established facts" that the Gentile Christian church neither began with

² But even if correct it would not help historicism in the least. For of whom could the church have consisted? Surely not of Jerusalemites. Without amazing miracles they could not be converted, as the author of Acts clearly perceived. But if of Galileans, then the maintenance of the church becomes unintelligible, and the sudden spread in *two years* over the world (see p. 294) becomes incomprehensible and inconceivable. Think of a few *Galileans* in Jerusalem successfully preaching the Gospel of a Crucified and Risen and Deified Jesus and spreading it instantly over all the earth! Here we have an illustration of Bousset's characteristic method; he yields so much of the Liberal position to the Radicals that the little he would retain is no longer tenable.

Paul nor was determined by him, neither at Antioch nor at Rome nor elsewhere. "The full stream of the new universal religious movement was already at flood when Paul entered on his work, and he also was at first upborne by this stream" (p. 93). This is what was expressed far less picturesquely in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (pp. 24 f., 28, etc.) by the multifocal origin of the early propaganda. One is delighted to find Bousset again in such full accord. Now remember that Paul's conversion is placed by Wendt at the very extremest date as only six years after the beginning, in the year 35, the crucifixion being placed in 29 A. D. Remember, too, that Deïssmann's new Gallio inscription brings Paul to Corinth early in 50 A. D. instead of 53, as heretofore assumed, which reduces these six years to *three*. Remember also that Bousset places Paul's persecution in Damascus, where then there must have been a Christian congregation. So then we have the "universal religious movement" and the heathen mission flooding the world (*flutete*) at the very most within three years after the crucifixion and quite independently of Paul! In all of this Bousset, gladly agreeing with Heitmüller and sadly confirming *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, is entirely right, but how shall we reconcile it with the notion of an historic Jesus who (according to Harnack) had no notion of any world-mission, how with the notion of a narrow intensely Judaic *Urgemeinde* in Jerusalem, of whom Harnack says, "crushed by the letter of Jesus they died a lingering death"? What critic has attempted, what critic will attempt any reconciliation? We need not go beyond Bousset's own pages to find the final refutation of his contention. No! the proto-Christian movement did not issue from Jerusalem, it issued from the Jewish Diaspora, from the midst of the Hellenists. As Bousset himself recognizes, the representation in Acts is fictive on its face, and herewith the central pillar of the historic theory crumbles into dust.

Once more, Bousset finds that the pivot of the Christology of the *Urgemeinde* was the conception of "Jesus as the Messiah-Son-of-Man" (*Jesus der Messias-Menschensohn*). Rejecting the notion that Jesus called himself the Son-of-Man, Bousset distinguishes two ideas concerning this Messiah-Son-of-Man; one of a Messiah, a "David's son," a more or less wonderful man; the other of a strictly "overearthly being, heavenly, spiritual, preexistent." *It is only as this latter* that Jesus appears in the earliest known faith of the *Urgemeinde*. Bousset is very cautious but nevertheless explicit,

“So soon as the Symbol in Daniel was interpreted messianically, just so soon must the Messiah become an overearthly figure” (p. 16. Cf. *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, p. 89). Nor can Bousset point to any stage in the primal faith at which this exaltation had not taken place; so far as we can see or know, *from the very first* Jesus was so conceived as the supramundane Son-of-Man. Here, as so often elsewhere, Bousset’s words are worth quoting: “It may indeed (*es mag wohl*) in the beginning have been the prevailing opinion that Jesus as simple man (*παῖς θεοῦ*) walked here upon earth and was exalted (*erhöht sei*) to be Son-of-Man only after the end of his life. But certainly (*freilich*) the time is not at all distant (*gar nicht fern*) when Jesus will become out and out (*ganz und gar*) a heavenly spiritual being preexistent and descended from above” (p. 19). “*Es mag wohl!*” This sop to Cerberus was necessary. Surely it is tiny and wizen enough, what greed could grudge it? But such a “prevailing opinion” has nowhere a basis in tradition or in fact, its *problematic existence* is only an *inference* from the false assumed premiss of the pure humanity of Jesus. That any such opinion could have undergone any such “rapid” transformation, that the crucified Rabbi should have been transfigured almost instantly into a God, indeed into *the* God and made everywhere the Lord,—in Palestine, in Jerusalem, in far off and widely separated heathen capitals,—and the center of “the monotheistic Cult of the Jesus” (Deissmann), this is incredible if anything can be, and neither Bousset nor any of his peers has any explanation to offer. It is here, as elsewhere, that Bousset by his concessions (as his German reviewers complain) has given away the whole lost cause of historicism.

Such reflections as the foregoing are aroused from page to page of this great work, but we must hurry on. In *Ecce Deus* a section is given to the epithet Lord (*Kyrios*) as applied to Jesus, and it is argued that the early use of this term indiscriminately to denote both the Jehovah of the Old Testament and the Jesus of the New indicates clearly that the Jesus must have been thought as in some sense Jehovah, not perhaps as absolutely identically God but as representing the godhead in some vague way as an aspect or person thereof. This argument seems to stand yet unbroken in strength. Bousset seeks apparently to turn its edge by a very thorough study of the use of the term *Kyrios*. He finds it comparatively rare in the Gospels and Acts, much more frequent in the Paulines, and

concludes that it is characteristic of the Gentile church and derived not from Cæsar-worship, but from the heathen cults with which the church was surrounded, but he is careful to concede its regular use in this church from the very start. Now it might be granted that the example of the heathen cults around, with their Lord Osiris, Lord Sarapis, and the like, may have given occasion to the Gentile Christians to speak of their Lord Jesus. The question, however, is not, how did they come to use the term, but rather, how *could* they use it of a mere man, however exalted, or even of a supernatural being not in some wise identified with Jehovah, the Lord of the Old Testament? For it is well known that the early Christians were familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures in the Septuagint or other translation, that they recognized these Scriptures as the highest if not the only authorities, and that Lord (*Kyrios*) therein is the peculiar appellation of Jehovah, the supreme God. No matter, then, what the abandoned heathen cults might say, the Gentile Christians could not but know that Lord (*Kyrios*) meant the highest God, and it remains as hard as ever to see how they could use the term both of Jehovah and of Jesus (often indiscriminately), unless they in some manner or measure identified the two. While then Bousset's investigation is interesting and valuable, it merely answers a collateral question and leaves the original argument as well as the original difficulty untouched.

One other point. In accumulating instances of the term Lord applied to the center of a cult, it is noteworthy to find all are gods and not men, with one sole apparent exception, which Bousset pushes to the front, that of Simon and Helena: "Hippolytus reports of the followers of Simon Magus that they reverence Simon in the form of Zeus, Helena in the form of Athena, him calling Lord and her Lady. This very interesting notice is expressly confirmed by the representation of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies" (p. 117). Both these statements lack warrant. What Hippolytus says is that "they have an image both of Simon in form of Zeus and of Helena in form of Athena, and these (images or forms) they worship, him calling Lord but her Lady. But if any one by name shall call among them, having seen, the images whether of Simon or of Helena, an offcast he becomes as unknowing the mysteries." Whence it appears that they worshiped these images in form of Zeus and Athena not at all as Simon and Helena, but in all likelihood as symbols of mysterious powers of nature and of thought, and the charge that they were

worshipping Simon and Helena is merely one of many silly slanders that Bousset should not encourage. This view, and not the one quoted from Bousset, is confirmed by the Homilies, where we read (II, 25) that Simon "says he has brought down this Helena from the highest heavens to the world, this Helena being Lady (*Kyrian*) as all-Mother, substance and wisdom. . . . for she who is really the truth was then with God supreme." How little such high theosophy offended the early Christians is seen in the immediately following statement that "we (Aquila and his fellow Christians) were his (Simon's) fellow workers at first." Again (XVIII, 2): "We (Peter and Christians) do not hold, Simon, that from the mighty power also the Lordly (*Kyrias*) called, proceeded two angels, etc." Whence it appears as clearly as we could hope that the feminine form (*Kyria*) is used only because it refers to feminine nouns, abstractions, such as Power, Substance, Truth, Wisdom. Simon may have tried to explain the myth of Helen (as in fact is said in II, 25) in terms of these concepts, but to think of these Simonians (*an early name for Christian*,—Orig., *Con. Cel.*, V, 62) as worshipping Simon and Helena, is a conceit that blots the page of Bousset. Lastly, the clause "him calling Lord but her Lady" is simply a pious invention of Hippolytus, of course, "for the greater glory of God." The words are not in Irenæus (I, xvi, 3, Harvey), from whom this good Bishop is quoting. It is in fact almost too well known for statement that the Catholic representation of Simon is simply an atrocious slander, to which Harnack lends no sanction whatever, declaring Simon to have been "the counterpart of Jesus," who made "an attempt to create a universal religion of the highest God," of whom "the later tradition is the most distorted and tendentious conceivable." That this great monotheist Simon is the original of the Gospel Simon, into whom he has been transformed in Christian tradition under the name of Peter, is a proposition I have maintained for twelve years with unshaken confidence, without finding leisure for its open discussion. It seems very late in the day to remark that the whole legend of Simon, especially of his carrying round with him a harlot Helen, is an utterly scandalous libel, always with some a favorite form of argument. This one triple question, however, I would submit to critics who have some sense of depth, of a third dimension, in construing old Christian scriptures:

1. Is it possible to read Acts viii. 4-25, particularly 13, in connection with Origen, *Con. Cel.*, V, 62, and the whole Simonian legend,

especially such words as those quoted from Aquila, without feeling that *Simon Magus was a proto-Christian*, that he stood in some close and vital connection with the early propaganda, however he may have fallen later into disrepute?

2. Is it possible to read the Gospel story of Simon Peter, of his trying to walk on the water and failing, of his being rebuked as Satan, as a scandal, as minding not things of God but of man (Matt. xvi. 23, compared with Acts viii. 20-24), of Satan's desire to sift him (Luke xxii. 31), of his denial of Jesus, of his rebuke by the Risen One (John xxi. 15-23), of his (Cephas's) crookedness at Antioch (Gal. ii. 12),—is it possible to read all this in connection with the Simonian legend and not feel that Simon Peter also had much to his discredit in early Christian tradition, that he was most conspicuous as a proto-Christian leader, and yet that his antecedents left a great deal to be desired, and that it was not possible to set him forth as a genuine unwavering disciple of the Jesus?

3. Lastly, can it be an accident that the Fourth Evangelist so studiously relegates Simon to a secondary place, that he declares three times for no apparent reason and with no apparent ground that Iscariot was Simon's son, that he represents Peter as abandoning the cause and returning to his earlier craft ("I go a-fishing", xxi. 3), that he declares three times that Peter was "standing" (xviii. 16, 18, 25), although he must have known that the Synoptics declared he was "sitting" and that "standing" was the fixed and recognized epithet of Simon Magus? If all such indications be misleading, and all such coincidences mere chance, then farewell to the interpretation of documents and to the doctrine of probability.

In dealing with "the empty grave" and the resurrection, Bousset appears at his best. The former is dismissed like the snakes of Ireland—there was none. We are told that the resurrection was really the exaltation (*Erhöhung*), the installation of Jesus-Son-of-Man at the right hand of the Majesty on high, that it had naught to do with any resuscitation of the Crucified. In Phil. ii. 6 ff., Paul makes mention not at all of any resurrection, but only of the exaltation, which alone is emphasized in the John's Gospel also, where "rise from the dead" (xx. 9) and "when therefore he was risen from the dead" (ii. 22) are recognized as secondary additaments. With fine analysis this notion of the exaltation of Jesus is traced through the growing Scriptures, until finally "the belief in the exaltation of the Son-of-Man took the more concrete form, that he arose on

the third day bodily from the grave" (p. 79). This seems most excellently said and certainly correct. In the essay "Anastasis" in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* something very similar is hinted, "*Nur mit ein bischen andern Worten,*" where it is maintained distinctly and at length that the locution "God hath raised up Jesus," referred originally not to any resuscitation but to the establishment of the Jesus in power as pro-Jehovah at the right hand on high, the phrase "from the dead" being recognized as a later addition. It is highly gratifying that Bousset has attained late but independently (for he makes no mention of the essay on "Anastasis") to views so very accordant, and this fact is a very strong guarantee of their correctness. In *Der vorchristliche Jesus* emphasis was laid upon the fact that the Hebrew *qûm* in the familiar Old Testament phrase "God raised up" is translated by the exact Greek of Acts, *anestēse* (thus Acts ii. 24, "whom God hath raised up" repeats the very Septuagint words of 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, "whom the Lord raised up"); Bousset likewise says, "finally the different formulæ (also the *hypsōthēnai*) may go back to the Hebrew *qûm* (Hos. vi. 2, *yqimēnû*)." On the whole, one may say, *Nun, man kommt wohl eine Strecke.*

Less satisfactory is Bousset's treatment of the general subject of "the miracle." His first and chief (though mistaken) effort is to minimize this element in the Gospel story. It seems to him a nimbus gradually thrown about the person of Jesus by the faith of the Congregation. In the earliest (Q) source it was comparatively insignificant. The Passion week also remained nearly quite free. Even in Mark some "most valuable" sections are without miracle, in others (as the first day of Jesus's activity) miracle is not in the foreground. We must always look to see whether "the interest" of the Evangelist is in the deed or in the spoken word. Still, he admits, "very early the conviction arose in the Congregation that miracles were the most important constituent of Jesus's life." So it must have been that "he did have the gift of healing, that he did cure the sick and drive out demons." Gradually tradition dipped the life of Jesus deep in the miraculous, far beyond healings and exorcisms. In some measure the Old Testament contributed to this result, which was mainly due however to the popular love of the wonderful. All sorts of marvelous stories told of others gathered round the form of Jesus, as clouds about mountain tops. Parallels may be found here and there both in Jewish and in pagan legends. From all sides miracles migrated into the life of Jesus and settled

there. In particular, the account of the Gadarene demons was at first merely a "funny story" (*lustige Geschichte*) of "poor deceived demons," but was afterward attributed to Jesus. Then there are certain "foreign bodies" also encysted in the life of Jesus, such as the transfiguration, pitched as high above as the Gadarene tale is below the ordinary level; such as the Cana miracle, which comes from the myth of Dionysos at whose temples in Naxos, Teos, Elis, such transubstantiation of water into wine was wont to take place; such, too, perhaps were the miracles of the feedings, which depict a god reigning among his people and dispensing his gifts. Like a magnet the personality of Jesus drew from all the environment all possible materials and legends to itself, where the skill of evangelic poesy fused them together so deftly that only the keen eye can recognize and discern the constituents.

Such is Bousset's diagnosis of the situation, and it might safely be left to the judgment of readers, for there are few whom it is likely to mislead. It is special pleading throughout and does no manner of justice to the most evident facts. That the Q source, a collection of sayings, should contain little reference to deeds, whether mighty or not mighty, is too natural for any comment, much less for any inference. But that the Mark source, almost if not quite as old, should be specially full of such marvels (as, generally admitted, in spite of Wendling's vivisection), is in itself a refutation of the theory of gradual accretion. Take the instance of the first day (Mark i. 14-34), to which Bousset strangely appeals as showing no main interest in the miraculous. In these twenty-one verses, Jesus calls Simon and Andrew, then James and John, all four instantly leave their nets to become fishers of men,—plainly in the meaning of Mark it is superhuman power that constrains them. Then Jesus enters the Synagogue and astounds all by his doctrine and authority,—again the deed is superhuman. There he meets a man with unclean spirit, who instantly recognizes Jesus as the Holy One of God, come to destroy such spirits. The man is cured instantly by a word of miraculous might. The people are amazed, his fame spreads instantly all abroad. Coming out of the synagogue Jesus enters Simon's house and instantly cures his wife's mother of a fever. The cure is complete, instantaneous, she rises forthwith and goes to work. At sunset all the sick and demoniac are brought to his door; he heals many and casts out many demons, and will not

let them speak, because they know him, recognize him as their destroyer.

So then it appears that this "first day" is one unbroken round of miracles, one long exhibition of superhuman might molding everything with equal ease to its will. How Mark could show any greater interest in the miraculous, it seems hard to see. The notion of the transmigration of the miraculous may be in some measure correct, but it is irrelevant even in its correctness. Doubtless a painter will and must dip his pencil into the dyes at hand, but this affects not the meaning of the picture he makes. Naturally the evangelist would draw upon the general milieu of phrase and fable, of thought and expression, for the materials and forms of his symbolism. Knowing nothing of leprosy he would not represent the sin-smitten world as a leper; having never heard of demons, he would not think of depicting the overthrow of idolatry as casting them out. But being familiar with the whole framework of contemporaneous life he did precisely as Homer and Kipling did, he boldly took what'er he did require, no matter what it was nor where he found it. Then he molded it to his own purposes and after his own ideals. He gave it his own meaning, he filled it with his own conceptions. Such is the method of every artist in every age.

Take the example of the wedding at Cana. The Dionysian parallel has not escaped my notice. It seemed and still seems possible that the particular form of the miracle was suggested by the classic myth. But what of it? Did John tell the story of Jesus simply because it had been told of Dionysos? Impossible. Whoever he was, this John was surely deep-thoughted and desperately in earnest. While it is conceivable that he might have told an actual incident just as a mere matter of history, without reflecting and without attributing to it any significance, yet it is quite inconceivable that he would invent such an incident or extract it from the mythology he despised and affix it to his Logos-God in mere wantonness, without intending something thereby. He must then have had some meaning, and this meaning was the symbolic sense of the miracle. The appeal to Bacchus merely emphasizes the necessity of understanding the miracle as a symbolism of the author's.

Similarly with respect to the exorcism at Gadara. Even if one admitted the queer conceit that it was a "merry tale" of "poor deceived devils" (thus attributing a Teutonic consciousness to the evangelist), yet this would explain only the unessential feature of

the swine, it would leave the formidable grandeur of all the rest untouched. And why should such a "funny story" of some vagrant exorcist be decked out in such regal attire and told of the godlike "center of the cult"? Here again it seems certain the fancy of the evangelist was not merely running wild, he was not talking solely to hear himself talk, he must have been narrating either because the incident actually occurred (in which case it was certainly worth preserving) or else because he *meant* something by it, because he had an idea that he wished to set forth; in this latter case, the miracle is a symbolism—and in fact too patent to escape the open eye.

The like may be said of the transfiguration; whencesoever may have come the materials and the general features of the composition, it is clear as day that the evangelists are *thinking*, they are not idle scribblers, and their *thought* is the symbolic content of the miracle itself.

In at least one case Bousset has seen and avowed the figurative sense. He speaks of the blind-born man of John's ninth chapter as "that symbol of the Congregation, born blind and become seeing," and he interprets the phrase "they cast him out" (ix. 34) as referring to the expulsion from the Synagogue of such as confessed the Son-of-Man (p. 22). Now there are many traits in this "blind-born" that remind us of Paul, as Thomæ sets forth, and to me he seems to typify the proselyte, but it makes no difference,—the point is that Bousset recognizes here a symbol and a symbolic statement of broad facts of early Christian history. If this be found necessary in the case of this miracle, which is adorned with so many details and so much local color, how much more must it be necessary in a score of cases where the symbolic sense lies stripped and bare and unmistakable?

Bousset says naught of the cripple at Bethesda, naught of the supreme miracle wrought on Lazarus. Since he recognizes the blind-born as a symbol, can he fail to recognize these as symbols also? Does any logical principle forbid the extension of this mode of interpretation? Does not the chief methodological maxim, the Principle of Parsimony, *require* its extension to every case where it *can* be applied?

The notion that the personality of Jesus attracted to itself all manner of marvelous elements, as a magnet draws iron filings, is the merest figment of fancy. What do we *know*, what have we

any ground to believe, about this personality as historical, that suggests such an idea? Nothing whatever. But if by *Personenbild* Bousset means the personality merely as it existed in the minds of proto-Christians, then, though the thought be in a measure just, it is without pertinence. For the question arises, How did they think of him? If as a man, then what in his humanity explains the magnetic attraction? *If as a God*, then indeed the attraction may be explained, but *cui bono*? Thereby the radical theomonistic view is strongly recommended, and the liberal andromonistic theory is not strengthened but is hopelessly weakened. The notion of Bousset seems to be a kind of *last resort*, which indeed assumes everything in dispute. This in fact Bousset does openly without any semblance of proof in declaring that "the historic reality of this life offered a certain basis for this further development (of the miraculous). For it cannot be denied that Jesus in his lifetime exercised the gift of healing the sick, and that healing the sick and "driving out demons" were characteristics of his wandering life" (p. 71). But it actually is denied with daily waxing emphasis, and why not deny it? How do we know that such was the "historic actuality"? Bousset is silent, he gives no hint. He merely assumes everything to be proved. Now the fact is that this notion of Jesus as a wandering healer and exorcist is utterly impracticable and intolerable to reason. Consider only that this "historic actuality," this "wandering life," (supposedly) began quite suddenly, without any reported premonition (the birth-stories are admittedly late inventions), that it lasted only a few months, and that it ended ignominiously on the cross. Instantly then the crucified is preached everywhere round the Mediterranean as the supramundane Son-of-Man, as the Lord in heaven. What possible "gift of healing" and of exorcism can make such a course of events in any degree intelligible? Such a human personality must have been unspeakably marvelous, and his followers unspeakably silly! The fact is that the historic view supposes that early Christianity was born and developed among a widespread community of madmen, that the whole Roman Empire was at that time virtually insane, even as Binet-Sanglé has inexorably expounded in *La folie de Jésus*. But even on this wholly extravagant hypothesis the cause of historicism is still lost. For if Jesus had really been such a living miracle we should have heard something about him in contemporary history and some traces of the wondrous man would have been left on the early Christian

consciousness, whereas contemporary history so far as it exists is absolutely dumb about any such man Jesus, and not the faintest trace of his memory or human personality can be detected in the early Christian consciousness itself. Bousset admits that the consciousness of the *Urgemeinde* is not of the man Jesus but of the supramundane Son-of-Man, and that there is no sign of such a human character in the religion of Paul (p. 143). According to the historicist theory the whole of early Christian times is a period of meaningless miracles.

But even if we were willing to admit all such, the case would be just as hopeless as ever. For all of these unmeaning marvels stand in the closest connectivity with an endless web of contemporary, antecedent and succedent religious and philosophic life, from which they cannot by any violence be extricated or torn away. Now in this connection this proto-Christian life is intelligible even in its minute details in the *absence* of any such prodigious personality as historicism assumes; and it is thoroughly unintelligible in this connection, even in the broadest outlines, in the *presence* of that personality.

Once more, Bousset makes appeal to the notions current at the time as favoring the hypothesis of such a wonder-worker and explaining in large measure the Gospel story. He thinks it was a superstitious age of miracle-mongers, when anything would be believed, and that the story of Jesus is fairly in line with many others. This is a favorite defense of the modern apologist, and it calls for careful consideration, but it is wholly incohesive and crumbles at touch.

It may be granted that marvelous stories have been told in every age of nearly every very notable man. These are in general very easily explained and need rarely mislead any one. But common sense says instantly and positively that they are not in any sense in line with the New Testament miracles. In all such cases there is a more or less firmwoven web of ordinary, perfectly credible narrative, close joined with the general fabric of human history, in which the miraculous elements appear as manifestly "foreign bodies" that can be shaken out or brushed off with little jar to the main structure. The miracles do not constitute the account, they are merely adventitious, often mere playful exaggerations, and not seldom transparent symbolisms.

But in the Gospels the case is wholly different. Here the

miracle is the very essence of the whole. Jesus appears, it is true, in a double character, as a Teacher or Lawgiver and as a Wonder-Worker. But even as a Lawgiver he is hardly less miraculous. For he teaches and legislates by his own immediate and personal authority ("But I say unto you," etc.). This he can do only by divine prerogative. He speaks even as God. "The Jesus says" seems quite parallel to "Thus saith Jehovah." Everywhere in the New Testament "the word of the Lord," i. e., of Jesus, is the court of last resort, is the end of controversy. So too his miracles are the deeds of his own might and person. He never appeals to God in working them. He invokes no name, he uses no instrumentality (a few apparent exceptions count for nothing). He does everything by his own word, by his own touch, by his own omnipotence. Moreover the story of Jesus exists for this Teaching and this Doing, and for nothing else. Take away these two notions, and what remains? Practically nothing at all. Even the Passion, though late and no part of the primitive Gospel, is set forth as a divine deed, not by any means as a part of the general fabric of history, but as an inroad from without, as his own voluntary self-surrender, as an act of God. Of human historical life proper of Jesus there is nothing in the Gospels whatever. Two or three incidents (as of the arrest by his friends, of blessing the children, of Mary and Martha) are exceptions only when misinterpreted,—as already set forth in *Ecce Deus*.

It is this manifest fact, that the story of Jesus is supernatural and nothing but supernatural, essentially and unalterably, from beginning to end, that distinguishes it finally and forever from all legendary stories of historic characters, where the historic and natural alone are essential and constitutive, while the supernatural is unessential, adventitious and easily removed. Whenever poetic fancy begins to weave legends about real heroes it produces results quite different from the Marcan source, textures in which the general course of human events is closely followed, with here and there a strange or marvelous incident thrown in for its edifying or glorifying effect. Such creations of fictive fancy are the first chapters of Matthew and of Luke, and even untutored literary feeling perceives at once that we enter another atmosphere in the third chapter.

If we would learn by example how the marvelous intrudes itself into history we cannot do better than to take the case of the great

Revivalist, Apollonius of Tyana. Some have thought his career so closely parallel to that of Jesus as to illustrate it and show that it was really historic. Others have found it so marvelous as to reject Apollonius himself as a creature of fancy. But the imagined parallelism is altogether unreal, in fact, on closer scrutiny there is revealed sharper and sharper contrast.³ The career of Apollonius is in its broad outlines, and in nearly all of its details, perfectly credible and very little remarkable. The marvelous elements are rare and trivial, they may all be removed, like moles from a face, without disturbing its main features or its general character. The biographer himself has no notion that his hero was aught but a man among men, born of a woman, and bearing the same name as his father. He claims on the whole for this hero nothing beyond extraordinary insight, foresight, and possibly occasional second sight. This Tyanean lives a hundred or at least seventy years, his career is followed from period to period, it attaches itself almost blamelessly to received history from point to point, and wherever it may seem to violate probability the explanation is close at hand. All this does not indeed quite prove the historical character of Apollonius (since one might invent a thoroughly credible history), but it does show that his biography presents no serious problem.

All this we find reversed in the case of Jesus. In the older tradition, as Corssen admits, his career is quite timeless. It attaches itself neither to month nor to year. Only in later layers is there an evident attempt to connect the story with some era in history. Nor is anything known of his antecedents or family. The accounts in Matthew and Luke are patent contradictory fictions. In Mark and John the Jesus simply appears full-fledged from the first, like Athena, and at once begins a career of miracles. Though John would humanize and sentimentalize, though he makes Pilate declare, "Behold the Man," though he strives hard to represent the Logos as become flesh, yet he does not succeed, despite his unquestionable literary and religious and philosophic genius, in producing the portrait of a divine man, nay, not even of a lovely man. Strive as he will, the features of the God still shine through the human traits,

³ Compare Norden's *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 35 f.: "When Hierokles, the foe of Christianity, compared this work of Philostratus with the Gospels and its hero with Christ, he indeed made the refutation easy enough for Eusebius [if only Eusebius had not been Arian!]; for literary connections there were none at all, and material parallels at most only in the sense in which F. Chr. Baur loved to conceive them. But the case is wholly different when the comparison is made with Acts."

which are plainly merely painted over and form no part of the primitive sketch. Say what you please, the Johannine Jesus is not lovely, is not attractive, as a man. There is much high-wrought theology and sublime religion in his discourses, and these we may greatly and justly admire. But these are manifestly merely the musings of John and give us no notion whatever of the man Jesus. Indeed the failure of the Evangelist to depict an attractive human personality is one of the most notable in all literature. His man Jesus is at every turn remote, austere, enigmatic, often mocking, unfeeling, unintelligible, and requiring apology. This is easily proved chapter by chapter.

What is there lovable in the Jesus of the first chapter? Nothing. In the Jesus of Cana? Nay, he is even stern and unfilial, the commentators must explain away his words. What in the Jesus in the Temple, where the deed is simply of power, not of justice or love? What is there to praise in his treatment of Nicodemus, whom he merely puzzles and mocks? In iii. 22-36 the Baptist talks precisely as the Jesus, showing that it is the Evangelist that is speaking all the time. At the well, what single word or deed of kindness? None at all. It is only unearthly authority walking on earth. Nor is there aught in the following verses. The second sign, the healing of the nobleman's son, is a deed of might solely, with no traces of love or human affection. The same must be said of the case of the cripple. It is only a defiant exercise of divine power on the Sabbath, no glimmering of human emotion. Nor is there any more in the long speech that follows.

Coming now to the sixth chapter, we find the five thousand fed. Is it an act of human sympathy, kindness, self-sacrifice? By no means, but only of divine power, symbolizing the all-sustaining exhaustless might of the Truth, the doctrine of Jesus. Likewise the miracle of the ship brought instantly ashore, by might of the God. The long address that follows is doubtless profound theology, but it merely mystifies the hearers.

Similarly chapter vii shows no really human trait, least of all any amiable trait, it only perplexes the auditors with doctrines deep below the utmost plummet of their understanding. Chapter viii contains the famous pericope concerning the woman (vii. 53-viii. 11), which surely displays no human quality but teaches the forgiveness of God for the wicked and adulterous (i. e., idolatrous) generation, which the Jesus-cult had come to save. As a historic incident it is

not defensible, and by the early church was not felt to be defensible; the rest of the chapter is discussion between Jesus and the Jews, in which there may be much profound theologizing, which none could expect the Pharisees to understand, but certainly nothing to move any one to love.

The ninth chapter gives the symbolic miracle of healing the blind-born; there is in it never a movement of human feeling, only the enlightening power of the "monotheistic Jesus-cult" is set forth and enforced. This was well worth doing well, but it teaches nothing whatever about the gentle humanity of Jesus. Chapter x sets forth that Jesus is the Door and the Shepherd. It is all doctrine and nothing but doctrine. Even the notion of laying down and taking up life is pure dogma, set forth with utmost frigidity without any tinge of human emotion. In fact it seems clear that x. 11-18 is an appendix, which Wellhausen has perceived, as also the Latinism in "placing" and "again taking" life (*theinai* and *palin labein*). Plainly these are words of a musing dogmatist and wholly impossible on the lips of any sane being addressing the Jews. Least of all do they present the Jesus in a lovable light, since they merely bewilder his audience.

The resurrection of Lazarus is beyond question a symbolism, whether Lazarus be this or that, the Gentile world, or humanity in general, dead in trespasses and in sins. Clearly no care for Lazarus controls the conduct of Jesus, who pays no heed to the message of the sisters, but waits quietly till Lazarus dies, solely in order that the Divine power may be exhibited in his resurrection. True, it is said that Jesus loved Lazarus and Mary and Martha, precisely as it is said that "God so loved the world." Divine love does indeed seem to wait upon the slow process of the suns, but not human love. A man that would wait till the last moment before helping his friend, in order to show forth his own power more brilliantly, would arouse only abhorrence. Some traces however of human passion seem to present themselves in verses 33-35, where it is declared he "groaned in spirit and was troubled" and "Jesus wept." But "groaned" is not the right word. Far better is Weizsacker's *Ergrimmte er im Geist und schüttelte sich*. It is wrath, not grief, that is meant by *embrimāsthai* ("to snort at," as in the "snorting of Jehovah"); even Godet concedes as much (*L'évangile de Saint Jean*, III, 231). This choler is not so easy to understand, but it is a fact in this representation. Neither then can we interpret

the weeping as the expression of tender sympathy. In fact there was little room for grief—at what? Lazarus was immediately to be resuscitated for the greater glory of God. The feelings of Jesus seem to have been directed not at all toward Lazarus, Mary or Martha, but solely toward the Jews and himself in relation to the Jews and to God.

In chapter xii Jesus is purely dogmatic and self-glorifying without any tincture of altruistic feeling. In chapter xiii he washes the disciples' feet, but in no spirit of humility or devotion, solely as a symbolism, apparently to displace the symbolism of the Last Supper. The new commandment (Love one another) is new only in putting *agapate* for *phileite*; the notion and obligations of mutual love were perfectly familiar both to Jewish and to Greek ethics. To say that among Christians the word was filled with richer meaning is indeed to say, but not to prove. But even if such were the case it would mean only that in the early religious community the flame of sympathy was kindled to a livelier glow—which would require no explanation. It would call for courage to contend that the Johannine Jesus must have been a lovely character because he exhorted his disciples to love one another.

Chapters xiv, xv, xvi are theology or Christology pure and simple, with still no play of human or indeed any other feeling. They set forth the doctrine of the Jesus and nothing else. The love frequently mentioned is love divine, toward God or from God, such as a saint might feel or a sinner might receive, but it is not a love that tells anything about a Man Jesus. The same must be said of the great high-priestly prayer, chapter xvii. It is nothing whatever but Christology, dogmas concerning the Jesus-Logos and the Father and the church, taught with the highest authority because placed on the lips of Jesus under circumstances of the deepest solemnity, but it gives no hint as to any human character of the Jesus. The love mentioned is a purely theological love, as the sin denounced (xvi. 9) is purely theological, "they believe not on me"; and the judgment also (the overthrow of idolatry), "for the prince of this world hath been judged"; yea, the righteousness also, "because I go to the Father and ye behold me no more."

Chapter xviii presents the Jesus in godlike majesty, imper-turbable before Annas and Caiaphas and Pilate, but still without human sentiment. Chapter xix describes the persecution and death of a God, but still with only the most insignificant touch of human-

ity. The sufferer does not really suffer, he merely plays a part in a sublime symbolic tragedy. It is to fulfil the Scripture that he says "I thirst"; then he proclaims, "It is finished," bows his head and *delivers up the spirit*. It is all quite voluntary; the nails have not slain him, no one has taken his life, he has himself given it up. The words to the mother and to the beloved disciple, "Woman, behold thy Son!" and "Behold thy mother!" breathe only the faintest breath of human sentiment. They are plainly allegorical and seem to refer to the complete passage of the "new doctrine" from the Jew over to the Gentile.

Neither after the resurrection is the human character of Jesus either more or less lovely. In all the apparitions,—to Magdalena, to the disciples, to Thomas, to the seven,—the same unearthly aloofness is present, precisely as before the crucifixion. Even in the conversation with Peter there is never a heart-beat. We are indeed told repeatedly that he loved one disciple, but there the story ends. That this disciple leaned on Jesus's breast is doubtless said symbolically, but even if said literally it would merely indicate position at the table, or at most only the fondness of the disciple, it would tell naught about the human character of Jesus.

In the foregoing no question is raised as to the unity of the Johannine text; the proof that the text has suffered extensive revision would not affect our general conclusion, but it would forcibly illustrate the all-important truth that all of our New Testament Scriptures, with very few and insignificant exceptions (if any), are gradual growths, the stratified deposits of centuries of intense religious activity.

It seems then that the Fourth Evangelist has not introduced into his portrait a single really attractive feature. As a human being his hero has not one element of loveliness; nay more, in spite of eighteen centuries of prejudice the fair-minded reader must admit in his own heart that the portrait is unlovely, that it is ghostly and uncanny, stern, harsh,⁴ and unfeeling. Nevertheless the Evangelist has evidently striven hard to make the picture both human and lovely. "Behold the Man" is a clear cry from his own soul. He has imagined details without number whose only function could be to make the painting vivid and realistic; he has wrought countless

⁴ Even Weidel cannot deny but has to admit this; see his *Persönlichkeit Jesu*, passim, especially p. 53 f., where he decides that not Love but Wrath, not the Mild but the Harsh, was fundamental with Jesus.

variations on the theme of love, he has studied earnestly to introduce tender and intimate relations. He has humanized to the utmost, he has sentimentalized to a degree. And yet—his failure could scarcely be more complete. From first to last, despite all these efforts, the Jesus remains a God, the same yesterday, to-day and forever, with hardly the slightest change in visage, in tone, in bearing, through twenty-one chapters, without a single warm pulse of blood, as “cold as the waveless breast of some stone Dian at thirteen.”

This result is remarkable. It shows how completely possessed was the mind of the Evangelist with the notion of Jesus as Divine. With extremest care he would paint a human form and face; but nay, the humanity is only the most transparent veil, through which gleams immovably and almost mockingly the visage of Deity. The other Gospel-writers have made no such studied attempt to depict a God-man; they have indeed historized and humanized, but in a far franker and more incautious manner, with far less care for detail, with broad strokes rather than delicate pencilings. Their failure to produce a really human figure is just as complete as their successor's, though far less conspicuous and impressive because they have essayed so much less; the disparity between the endeavor and the accomplishment is not so patent and painful. It is needless to go through the Synoptics chapter by chapter. Whoever does so will find that he seeks in vain for a genuinely human trait or deed, the few apparent exceptions have been sufficiently treated in *Ecce Deus*, such as the incidents of the little children, of the Rich One, and of Mary and Martha. The writers are not concerned, as was John, to make us “behold the man,” they draw their sketch much more naively, according to this or that divine model, whether the Suffering Servant of Jehovah, the Alexandrine Wisdom, or the Danielic-Enochian Son-of-Man. The point is that it is plainly a Divine being that moves before us, and not a man of flesh and blood.⁵

How enormously different is the representation here, even in the oldest strata of the Synoptics, from any depiction of any man, even of the most wonderful, is seen clearly in a single circumstance.

⁵ It seems almost impossible to state the case with due emphasis. That a man Jesus, even though far below the conceits of any historicist, should not have been thoroughly lovable and intensely human, is quite incredible; and that tradition should not have preserved one single trace of the lovable while deifying him as the God of Love, seems improbable to the verge of the impossible; it remains then that he was a humanized God, but never a man at all.

Apollonius is represented, and perhaps correctly, as absolutely chaste and virginal, yet as recognizing fully and wisely the rights of Aphrodite, and no one would feel the least shock, had he been represented as falling in love or as married. But in the case of Jesus any such representation would be blood-curdling, it would be felt as blasphemously impossible. To me at least the insinuations of Renan (to say naught of Binet-Sanglé), when I first read his "Life of Jesus" sympathetically many years ago, were immeasurably loathsome, as well as ridiculous, though I never dreamed then that Jesus was aught but the man of Galilee. The fact is that we all feel the jar and dissonance even when told that Jesus was an hungred or that he slept. We see at once that these traits have been introduced solely to vivify the story in the context, yet we also feel that it is a decided artistic defect of the story that it should require any such detail to make it vivid; but surely no one has any such feeling about Apollonius or any other human being.

In general, however, in their historizing the Evangelists have avoided such pitfalls most admirably; they tell us mainly that Jesus said or went or did, with little further specification; but these vague terms were necessary in the nature of the case, they were familiar enough as predicates of Jehovah—who could evade them in any anthropomorphization or historization? Add hereto the much rarer use of certain cognates and synonyms, such as "entered," "departed," "walked," "said," "heard," "knew," "perceived," "talked," and the tale is well-nigh told. All of these and even "sat" are used of Jehovah, and not improperly but of necessity. A few other still rarer uses have been sufficiently discussed in *Ecce Deus*.

Eating would seem to be more unbecoming to the Jesus than Byron thought it was to woman, though the ancients in general deemed not so, but conceived of the gods as feasting daily on Olympus though only on heavenly food, "For no bread do they eat, nor drink of the wine in its sparkle," and making a twelve-days sojourn in feast with the blameless Aethiopes; nor was the Hebrew idea much different. It would not be strange, then, if the Evangelists should represent the Jesus as eating, yet only Luke speaks of him so and remarkably only after the resurrection (xxiv. 43)—an apparent thrust at Docetism. True, a Pharisee desires that Jesus eat with him (Luke vii. 36) and Jesus declares "with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you" (xxii. 15), but it does not appear that he actually ate, for he adds, "I eat it not until it be fulfilled in

the kingdom of God" (Luke xxii. 16). Also directions are given to prepare "where we may eat the Passover," "where I may eat the Passover" (Mark xiv. 14, Luke xxii. 11, *not* "where I shall eat"),—"where thou mayest eat" (Mark xiv. 12), "for thee to eat" (Matt. xxvi. 17), and it is said that the disciples ate, but not the Jesus.

In John iv. 32 the idea of his eating seems to be distinctly rejected, while in the synoptics it appears to be avoided. On the whole the representation of Jesus as human is carried in the Gospel only so far as the general needs of the symbolism require, but hardly further. The vivid depiction of a striking personality is nowhere to be found; on the contrary, the notoriously unhistorical elements abound, the representation is thoroughly conventionalized and drawn after purely unhistorical and at least quasi-divine models, and the characterizations are so openly discrepant or downright contradictory as to render the task of ascertaining even a few principal features entirely hopeless. This general state of case is practically conceded by such competent critics as Bacon (*Christianity Old and New,—Characterization of Jesus*) and Weidel (*Persönlichkeit Jesu*), to name only the most recent (1914). But such as Bousset and Conybeare may say, "Is not the character of Apollonius equally uncertain?" The appeal to Apollonius grows daily louder and more insistent, and since historicism would change the venue to Tyana, to Tyana let it go. Nothing could please the present writer any better, for it is not hard to show that by this much paraded parallel to Jesus the historicity is finally and hopelessly condemned. However the question is a large one and deserves a full and separate treatment shortly to appear, much more minute than already given. Here be it noted only that Norden in *Agnostos Theos* holds firmly that Acts is dependent upon original memoirs of Apollonius.

In conclusion, what has Professor Bousset to claim for the simulacrum of an historical Jesus, which he has poured forth such wealth of learning to defend? The passage is eloquent and worth quoting in full. Not only does it show Bousset at his best, but it also shows the desperate plight of historicism even when such a shield of Apollo is spread above it in defense. It begins Homerically enough: "So has the church (*Gemeinde*) woven its poetry into the figure of its master's life. But it has done more than that and withal has preserved a good piece of the genuine and original life. [We prick up our ears in wonder, to hear the proof, but in vain,—no

attempt is made.] She has conserved the beauty and wisdom of the parables in their crystal form—a Greek church could not have done that. She has bowed herself beneath the strong heroism of his moral demands rooted in a faith-in-God quite as bold, and from them has broken away scarcely aught at all; the figure of the great warrior for truth, simplicity, and rectitude in religion she has kept faithfully against all false virtuosity: she has dared to reproduce his annihilatory judgment upon the piety of the ruling and directing classes, and without abatement; she has sunned herself in the glory of his trust in God, in his kingly free and careless attitude toward the things of this world and this life; she has steeled herself in his hard and heroic demand to fear God and not men; with trembling and quivering soul she has transmitted his doctrine of God's judgment and of the eternal responsibility of the human soul; with hallelujahs of joy she has proclaimed his glad message of the kingdom of God and the duty of the community in righteousness and love, in compassion and in reconciliation.

“But of late they tell us that this whole proclamation contains in fact nothing new and peculiar, nothing that was not already living long before, here and there, in the world around. As if in religion it was a question of the new and unheard-of! As if it were not a question of the primeval, the ever-present already, i. e., of the eternal and the universal, and above all else of the distinctness and the clearness, the compactness and completeness, with which the Aboriginal-Eternal is lit up anew and comes to consciousness, as well as of the impelling power and passion with which it seizes on the heart.

“But in this connection above all else we must heed how first in this peculiar combination of the historical figure of Jesus and of the proclamation of the church (*Gemeinde*), that Jesus-figure was created which for the history of Christian religious feeling (*Frömmigkeit*) has been so enormously effective. Only because the church placed behind the Gospel of Jesus the form of the heavenly Son-of-Man, of the ruler and judge of worlds, and allowed this latter's glory half-revealed, half-concealed, to glimmer transpicuous through his history, only because she sketched the figure of the wandering preacher on the golden background of the miraculous, overweaving his life with the splendor of prophecy fulfilled, only because she allocated him thus in a vast divine salvation-history and made him appear as its crown and consummation, did she make

this picture of Jesus of Nazareth effective. For the pure historical can never effect aught of itself, but only the vividly present Symbol in which the religious conviction proper represents itself transfigured. And an era that by no means lived on the simply moral and simply religious alone, but on every kind of more or less fantastic eschatologic expectations, on faith in miracle and prophecy, in a near-come, unheard-of peculiar inroad of deity into the course of nature and history, in all kinds of healings and messiahs, in devils and demons and the speedy triumph of God and his people over these hostile powers—such an era needed exactly this figure of Jesus, as the first disciples of Jesus created it and caught the eternal therein in the rich-hued vesture of the garment of time. This spectacle of the creation of a Jesus-figure sketched by faith will repeat itself for us yet once again, from the standpoint of a faith both purer and higher, more general and universally valid, yea, in strictness it repeats itself infinitely often in the whole course of human history” (pp. 90-92).

In reading this forceful and eloquent “conclusion,” so bold and withal in the main so true in its utterance, one cannot but recall the exquisite pathos of Euripides on the death of Polyxena:

“But she, though dying, none the less
Great forethought took, in seemly wise to fall.”⁶

In plain English, it would appear that the human life of Jesus as the source and center of early Christian life and thought is hereby formally and forever abandoned. It was not the historic Jesus at all, but the unhistoric, the ideal, “the Symbol,” the divine Son-of-Man that was “effective,” that alone worked the wonders of the first propaganda. Herein then we see fulfilled the tendency of criticism to reduce the life and personality of Jesus “to an utterly ineffectual source of Christian influence” (Ransom). At what a tremendous sacrifice does historicism seek to save its historical Jesus—at the complete sacrifice of everything worth saving! *Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*. Who can care a whit for an historical character of whose history and character we can recover naught with any confidence, who left no lasting imprint on the mind of any one, whose greatest apostle never knew him and derived in no measure from him (see *Kyrios Christos*, p. 143), whose followers departed instantly from his precepts and example, preaching a world-

⁶

ἡ δὲ καὶ θνήσκουσα δμῶς
πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμως πεσεῖν.

gospel of which he had never dreamed, whose memory was forthwith forgotten or transfigured into its own utter unlikeness? It is clear that this "historic" figure, as utterly ineffective, is utterly useless in the interpretation of early Christian history; it is only the divine figure that works. What reason then for assuming such human figure? None at all. Hitherto it has been held that the human Jesus was necessary to explain proto-Christianity; and hence the reality of the historical character was inferred. But now it appears that this same character is quite inoperative, that only the divine Jesus was "effective." How then are we to deduce the historic actuality of Jesus, since one premise in our syllogism is gone?

But the case is really far worse. Not only is "the historic Jesus" seen to be useless as a fifth wheel, but the notion is a positive and a heavy clog. If there was any such historic character, then the formation of the supramundane Jesus-figure becomes doubly, trebly hard to understand; the consolidation, the precipitation of all the elements present in the historic milieu into the Idea of the God-Jesus seems not impossible to comprehend; but their shaping into this *divine form* when deposited on an immensely different *human form*, this seems well-nigh inconceivable. Over against any tendency of these elements to crystalize into the New Testament image of the Logos or the Son-of-Man enthroned in heaven as world-ruler, would lie the obstinate facts of memory, of ordinary earthly life, of humiliating crucifixion. Bousset makes no attempt to show how such a transformation did or could take place. Even if it were possible for such a metempsychosis to occur in the minds of a few, it seems many times impossible for it to have taken place in the minds of all. Yet it must have done so, for we find the same doctrine of the Divine Jesus on the lips of all the early missionaries, unaffected by a thousand variations in detail. Add to this that the transformation took place practically instantly; for before Paul's conversion, before the end of five years at most,—nay, the recently discovered Gallio inscription (of Deissmann) brings Paul to Corinth early in A. D. 50 instead of 53 as hitherto thought, so we must now say at most *two years*,—after the crucifixion we find the Gentile mission "flooding" the world with the doctrine of the heavenly Jesus—and not only the inutility but still more the impossibility (without a continuous psychological miracle) of the doctrine of the transformation of the Jesus-figure becomes manifest.

What Bousset says the *Gemeinde* has preserved of the original

Jesus-figure is too vague for argument. Not one of these elements can be traced back with any confidence to a personal Jesus; they are altogether as easy, yea, they are much easier to understand as the products of the general religious consciousness dominant in proto-Christian circles. Of course this consciousness came to expression only in individuals, many of whom were doubtless notable personalities, *none of whom was the God-Jesus* any more than Isaiah was Jehovah. Bousset himself seems to admit that there was naught new and peculiar therein, but holds that it was a question of fire, energy, vividness, passion and power. All this appears most true, but where, pray, are we to seek for all these elements of efficiency? In "the historic Jesus," or in the preachers of "the doctrine of the Jesus"? Common sense cannot hesitate. Assuredly it is the contagious zeal of the early missionary movement, the boundless enthusiasm of a prodigious idea, of militant monotheism, that accounts for all that Bousset rightly stresses. To this exalted religious consciousness, this transport of a sublime faith in one God among many idols, this amazing conception of a Kingdom of the Heavens, of a converted world, this inner voice, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel," this vision of the angel flying in mid-heaven and crying aloud, "Fear God and give him glory"—to this religious consciousness, the birth of brooding centuries, must we ascribe the high and distinctive qualities that Bousset so clearly discerns and so brilliantly sets forth.

In particular it is the elevated style of the New Testament, the *élan vital* of its religious rhetoric, that enthralled the reader and makes him exclaim, "never man spake as this man." But this supreme quality has certainly naught to do with any human personality of Jesus. It presents itself under a hundred Protean forms in the New Testament, in the Synoptics, in the Johannines, in the Paulines, in Hebrews, in the Epistles, in the Apocalypse, every instant changing and everywhere the same spirit, whether in Peter or in Paul, in John the Baptist or in John of Patmos. It is the spirit of the "new teaching," the conscious burden of the message of Salvation, the Glad Tidings of great joy, of the Redemption of Humanity from the ancient tyranny of the demons of idolatry into the Kingdom, into the freedom of the sons of God. This was undoubtedly the greatest propaganda ever proclaimed to the race of man, and it would be strange if it had not heated the furnace of religious feel-

ing to sevenfold ardor and expressed itself in a sacral literary style of peculiar energy and unction.

The proto-Christians themselves took exactly the right view of the matter, saying, "It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father that speaks through you," and to the Spirit they ascribed all the mighty deeds of the Apostolic age. Such was really the case; it was the Holy Spirit, the communal religious consciousness shared by all alike but in varying measures and forms of manifestation, that inspired the "mission-sermon" of the monotheistic crusade and wrought the amazing wonder of converting an empire. If in later centuries the church has achieved no triumph commensurate with the first, the reason is simple enough; it has not been animated by any Idea comparable in sublimity or in truth with the proto-Christian Idea, the monotheization of the pagan world. No greater error than to force individual religion, the desire for personal salvation, to the front in this far-flung battle-line of missionary religion. Of course the Apostles wanted to be saved, but they felt sure they were already saved, it was the salvation of the lost that concerned them; they set up high standards of moral and religious conduct, to which they strenuously exhorted their converts, but the supreme matter was to worship God and Him alone, all the rest was secondary and sequent, even as perfectly expressed in Matt. vi. 33: "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." A deep sense of personal guilt, with longing for personal salvation, might possibly make a St. Antony or a Blaise Pascal, but never an Apollos, never a Philip, never a Barnabas, and never a Paul.

It appears then that Bousset has rightly recognized the divine Jesus, i. e., "the monotheistic cult of the Jesus" (Deissmann), as the energetic element of proto-Christian life, *but he has failed entirely to connect it with a human earthly Jesus*, in fact, he has nearly shown the impossibility of any such connection. The Lord Christ Jesus, Son-of-Man in Heaven, has naught to do with "the historic Jesus," the fictive Carpenter of Nazareth. Above and beyond all question the former is independent of any human earthly life of Jesus, indeed it antedates any such life, and alone is present and effective in the early church; the latter is at best both problematic and functionless—it explains nothing but renders all else unexplainable. Why then retain such an imaginary unconnected with any

other symbol in the equation whose solution it embarrasses, yea, makes impossible?

It is upon this fatally weak spot, this yea-nay in Bousset's theory, that a critic equally acute and friendly (Max Brückner, in *Theol. Rundschau*, May, 1914), in a highly appreciative and deeply sympathetic review has laid firmly the finger of kindness. Speaking of Bousset's correct doctrine that "this belief in the exaltation of Jesus as Son-of-Man was not the consequence but much rather the presupposition of the appearances of Jesus," and of Bousset's attempted psychological explanation—through "the incomparably powerful and indestructible impression, which the personality of Jesus had left in the soul of the disciples and which was mightier than public shame, death, anguish, and overthrow,"—that the disciples "had no other choice" but to transfer the *already made* concept of the Son-of-Man to the Crucified, Brückner declares both wisely and frankly: "I must confess that these psychologic discussions of Bousset's do not satisfy me" (p. 173). After exposing the futility of Bousset's assertions he adds emphatically: "In no case can the screaming dissonance of the crucifixion of Jesus and his exaltation as Son-of-Man in the faith of the *Urgemeinde* be resolved solely by psychologic considerations." Yet *no other considerations has the historicist to urge*.

At this point, then, we must pause. The work of Bousset is no less of prime importance elsewhere and particularly in the treatment of Paul; especially noteworthy is his just judgment (p. 143): "It may be definitely maintained that what we call the moral religious personal character of Jesus had no influence and no significance whatever for the religious feeling of Paul." "The Jesus that Paul knows is the preexistent heavenly Christ," who alone is "the subject to all these predicates," and "not the historic Jesus" (p. 144). All of which is most just and true and shows to what position Bousset has advanced, a tent wherein he takes his noon-day rest, where it is pleasant to stop but impossible to stay. It would be interesting to determine yet more exactly the angle through which this great work marks the rotation of the critical firmament, did not space fail for any such measurement; but no one can lay it down after careful perusal and not exclaim, with or without Galilei, *And yet it moves*.

At the close of the leading article in the *Theologische Rundschau* of October, 1911, our author tempered his hostile criticism of the second edition of *Der vorchristliche Jesus* with these words:

"But these deviations of Smith's researches possess and preserve in their very forcefulness and originality a power of stimulation and of invigoration. They compel us to enter more carefully into difficulties and problems which investigation has hitherto passed by with indifference and without regard, and they help perhaps to bring many a new result of investigation forward to the light." This, our author's present volume, may be taken as a fitting commentary upon his earlier text.

WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS.

VEDANTISM, ITS INTRINSIC WORTH AND ITS VAGARIES.

Vedantism, the philosophy of ancient India, which sets forth the end or purpose of the Veda, the religious books of the old Brahman religion, is one of the most interesting and important phases in the history of philosophy. It is a remarkable attempt of ancient Hindu thinkers to reach a finality of thought by an intuitive comprehension of existence. No one who has become accustomed to scientific ways of thinking can approve this system of philosophizing, and least of all can he see a finality in it. To him the solutions offered are merely empty phrases which do not solve the great problems of existence that science of to-day undertakes to fathom by methodical investigation, by logic and rational thought, by experiment and by the systematization of all knowledge into one unified and consistent whole.

A study of the Vedanta is highly to be recommended, for we should understand it and be able to feel its grandeur, its beauty, and the truth it contains. It is necessary to grasp its truth in order to see that its truth is relative; an understanding of the relative character of its truth reveals its insufficiency; and, seeing its insufficiency, one transcends it, satisfied that there is no royal road to philosophic truth, or to a mystic intuitive wisdom such as that promised by Vedantism. A study of such systems as the Vedanta leaves one with a wholesome respect for and satisfaction with the results of scientific method which, though generally slow and tedious, is sound and sure.

The beauty of Vedantism has been felt by our American poet-