

HOLTZMANN'S LIFE OF JESUS
ACCORDING TO THE 'A' SOURCE:

PART 1

John S. Kloppenborg

University of Toronto
Toronto, ON, Canada



Journal for the Study of the
Historical Jesus

Vol. 4.1 pp. 75-108

DOI: 10.1177/1476869006061780

© 2006 SAGE Publications

London, Thousand Oaks, CA
and New Delhi

<http://JSHJ.sagepub.com>

ABSTRACT

H.J. Holtzmann's *Die synoptischen Evangelien* (1863) is not only regarded as having established Markan priority and the basic contours of the Two Source hypothesis; it also offered a sketch of the life of Jesus based on a Mark-like source that represents a starting point for the so-called 'Liberal Lives of Jesus' which prevailed from 1863 until the early 1900s. Holtzmann's 'Life' portrayed Jesus as an exemplary personality, and posited psychological development in seven stages in the career of Jesus. This essay discusses the intellectual context leading to Holtzmann's book and then offers an annotated English translation of Holtzmann's 'Life of Jesus'. This is Part 1 of a two-part essay.

Key words: D.F. Strauss, F.C. Baur, H.J. Holtzmann, Liberal Lives of Jesus, Markan priority, theories of psychological development, synoptic problem, *Ur-Markus*

The early 1860s marked an important turning point in the study of the historical Jesus. This transition was related to at least three developments: the demise of the Tübingen school, which had up to that point dominated the study of the early Jesus movement in Germany; a turn away from speculative theology and philosophy rooted in Hegel's philosophy of history and a return to Kantianism; and the ascendancy of theories of Markan priority and the waning influence of the Griesbach hypothesis, which put Matthew as the earliest of the Synoptics, a theory advocated by Wilhelm M.L. de Wette and championed by F.C. Baur.

German New Testament studies before 1860 were dominated by the school of Ferdinand Christian Baur, the 'Tübingen School', whose most prominent members were David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74), and Baur himself.¹ The 27-

1. For an account of this 'school', see Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975); Horton Harris, *David Friedrich Strauss and His Theology* (Monograph Supplements to the Scottish Journal of Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973); William Baird, *History of New Testament Research. I. From Deism to Tübingen* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 244-94.

year-old Strauss had rocked the theological world in 1835 with the publication of his famous *Das Leben Jesu. Kritisch bearbeitet*.² This was, however, less a 'life' in the sense of late nineteenth- and twentieth-century lives of Jesus than it was an analysis of the way in which 'myths' were determinative in the representation of the Jesus story.³ Strauss approached the Jesus tradition not with the goal of isolating a core historical tradition, but rather from the other direction, to detect the presence of myth, which he found virtually everywhere.⁴ What was important philosophically for Strauss was not the debris that could be recovered of the historical Jesus but rather the philosophical *idea* of God-manhood that came to expression in early Christian accounts about Jesus.⁵

2. David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu. Kritisch bearbeitet* (Tübingen: C.F. Osiander, 1835–36 [repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969]); ET: *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined* (ed. Peter C. Hodgson; trans. George Eliot; Lives of Jesus Series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972).

3. Strauss (*Life of Jesus*, p. 65), distinguishing himself from Rationalists such as Heinrich Paulus, Supernaturalists, and Deists, states: 'For as both the natural explanations of the Rationalists, and the jesting expositions of the Deists, belong to that form of opinion which, while it sacrifices all divine meaning in the sacred record, still upholds its historical character; the mythical mode of interpretation agrees with the allegorical, in relinquishing the historical reality of the sacred narratives in order to preserve to them an absolute inherent truth. The mythical and the allegorical view (as also the moral) equally allow that the historian apparently relates that which is historical, but they suppose him, under the influence of the higher inspiration known or unknown to himself, to have made use of this historical semblance merely as the shell of an *idea*—of a religious conception.... [T]he mythical interpreter...is searching out the ideas which are embodied in the narrative, is controlled by regard to conformity with the spirit and modes of thought of the people and of the age' (original emphasis).

4. Strauss's historical criteria (*Life of Jesus*, pp. 87–92) were essentially negative: (a) He first identified narrative that is 'irreconcilable with the known and universal laws which govern the course of events', which include not only miracles, apparitions, and heavenly voices, but also reports that are historically implausible (such as the visit of the magi, the call of the disciples, and the disciples' rapid transition from despondency to enthusiasm after Jesus' execution), and reports that are psychologically dubious (that the long speeches of the fourth gospel could have been faithfully remembered and recorded, or that the Sanhedrin would have believed that Jesus had risen from the dead when the [Matthaeian] guards reported to them). (b) He also excluded as unhistorical narratives that were internally inconsistent (e.g., the disagreements between John and the Synoptics of the beginning of Jesus' activity relative to John's imprisonment, the disagreements in the naming of the disciples, disagreements in the chronology of the clearing of the temple). Finally, Strauss treated as 'positive' his criterion that the presence of certain forms (poetry; hymns) and content (ideas that coincided with known myths and legends) signalled the presence of mythic narrative. From the point of view of the detection of historical narrative, however, this criterion is also negative. Peter Hodgson ('Editor's Introduction', in *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined* [Lives of Jesus Series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972], p. xxvii) rightly notes that Strauss had no criterion for isolating the historical, since 'it is by no means necessarily the case that, where the mythical criterion fails to apply, historical traditions are present'.

5. Strauss's debt is usually traced to G.W.F. Hegel, e.g., in his *Lectures on the Philosophy*

Strauss counted himself among the 'left Hegelians', insisting on both philosophical and historical grounds both that the idea of God-manhood must be distinguished from historical judgments about Jesus and that the 'truth of the Gospel narrative and the identity of the God-man cannot be demonstrated philosophically'⁶ as some of Strauss's contemporaries wished. It was a fundamental ambiguity in Hegel's thought that left open two possible interpretations, a 'left' and a 'right' Hegelian position. As Baur was later to characterize these:

Hegel's Christology does not move beyond [the proposition]... that Christ becomes the God-man for the faith of the world. It is not concerned with what lies behind this faith objectively in connection with the person of Christ; and it separates this view of the person of Christ from that which is concerned only with what he is for faith and in faith, approximately as Kantian philosophy distinguishes between the unknown *Ding an sich* and the appearance which exists for consciousness alone. Either one can say that actually nothing objective corresponds to this faith, that the whole appearance and personality of Christ are only the fortuitous occasion from which faith in the God-man has developed, that the two therefore stand in a purely external relationship to each other [the left-wing position]. Or on the other side one can attempt to establish the two as much as possible in an inner relationship to each other such that, with respect to his person, Christ is therefore held to be objectively what he is as God-man for faith [the right-wing position].⁷

Strauss not only advocated the left-wing position, but also held that the Absolute could not be realized in any historical individual, even though he held that Jesus' 'exalted character...exerted so powerful an influence over the religious sentiment, that it constituted him as the ideal of piety'.⁸ The historical was in fact ultimately less important than the idea enshrined in the historical:

Faith, in its early stages, is governed by the senses and therefore contemplates a temporal history; what it holds to be true is the external, ordinary event, the evidence for which is of the historical, forensic kind.... But mind having once taken occasion by this external fact, to bring under its consciousness the idea of humanity as one with God, sees in this history only the presentation of that idea; the object of faith is

of Religion (1827) (ed. Peter C. Hodgson, trans. R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson and J.M. Stewart; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984): '[T]he substantiality of the unity of divine and human nature comes to consciousness for humanity in such a way that a human being appears to consciousness as God, and God appears to it as a human being' (p. 312). 'There are two conditions for this appearance. The first is that consciousness can achieve this content, this substantial unity, the consciousness of which is given and which is its reconciliation. The second condition is the consciousness of the determinate form of this exclusive singularity [i.e., Christ as the God-man]' (p. 314).

6. Peter C. Hodgson, *The Formation of Historical Theology: A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur* (Makers of Modern Theology; New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 72.

7. F.C. Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschenwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (3 vols.; Tübingen: C.F. Osiander, 1841-43), III, p. 971, cited by Hodgson, *Formation*, p. 71.

8. Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, p. 773.

completely changed; instead of a sensible, empirical fact, it has become a spiritual and divine idea, which has its confirmation no longer in history but in philosophy.⁹

In a climate that had up to that point been dominated by two conflicting approaches to the Jesus tradition, one ‘supernaturalist’, accepting credulously the accounts of miracles, revelations and visions, and the other rationalist, supplying rational explanations for the miracles and a moralizing reduction of Jesus’ teachings,¹⁰ Strauss’s radical approach provoked a storm of controversy, one that cost him his academic career. As Holtzmann’s opening words in *Die synoptischen Evangelien* shows, nearly thirty years after its first appearance *Das Leben Jesu* still remained a force with which to contend:

For me it is a question of whether it is actually possible to recover the historical figure of the one to whom Christianity owes not only its name and existence but whose person it has also made central to its unique religious outlook in a manner that satisfies all the impartial demands of the advanced historical-critical sciences; whether it is possible, by the use of a conscientious historical-critical method—the only legitimate methodology—to recapture that which the founder of our religion really was, or whether we have to abandon once and for all the hope of attaining such a goal. It is this question whose solution is nowadays more than just an inescapable preliminary to every attempt to provide a candid and worthy explanation in the field of religion.¹¹

Strauss’s teacher F.C. Baur (1792–1860) privately wrote that Strauss’s conclusions were simply the natural consequences of work previously done, and agreed with much of what Strauss had proposed, but could not defend Strauss for fear of jeopardizing his own position at Tübingen.¹² Baur’s own view belonged broadly to the left Hegelian position.¹³ But he was critical of the meagre historical

9. Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 780-81.

10. E.g., Heinrich Eberhard Gottlieb Paulus, *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Heidelberg: Carl F. Winter, 1828).

11. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien. Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863), p. 1.

12. On Baur’s general agreement with Strauss, see Harris, *David Friedrich Strauss and His Theology*, p. 87; on his public silence at the time of Strauss’s dismissal from Tübingen, Harris, *The Tübingen School*, pp. 27-29.

13. Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis, oder, Die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen: C.F. Osiander, 1835 [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967]), p. 715: ‘For faith the appearance of the God-man, the incarnation, God’s birth in the flesh may certainly be a historical fact. From the standpoint of speculative thinking, however, the incarnation of God is no unique historical fact which happened once and for all, but an eternal determining of the nature of God by virtue of which God enters time and becomes man (becomes incarnate in each individual person) only in so far as he is man from eternity. The finitude and painful humiliation to which Christ as the God-man subjected himself, is borne at every moment by God as man. The finished act of reconciliation is no event in time, but God reconciles himself with himself eternally, and the resurrection and exaltation of Christ are nothing other than the eternal return of the Spirit to itself

harvest of Strauss's book and suggested that a more positive historiographical method would yield more historical data. Whereas Strauss had posited the presence of myth wherever he detected inconsistencies or contradictions with Gospel stories, Baur, a forerunner of the modern redaction critic, insisted that it was imperative to take into account the larger literary contexts in which individual stories appeared. This, Baur contended, would allow the critic to ascertain an evangelist's literary and theological intention in using and framing particular stories, rather than merely using contradictions and tensions between a story and its framework as *a priori* evidence of unhistorical tradition. Where Strauss's use of 'myth' as a negative historical criterion left him with little historical tradition, Baur's 'tendency criticism' allowed him to distinguish between the mythologizing aspects and historical aspects of traditions.¹⁴ Nevertheless, it would be 18 years before Baur produced his own treatment of the historical Jesus, in the first few pages of *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (1853).¹⁵

By the time that Baur turned from the study of Paul and the early church to an analysis of the Synoptics (1847) most of his students had already abandoned Hegelianism, and by the early 1850s Baur too had turned from speculative philosophy.¹⁶ What resurfaced was the rationalist view of Jesus as an ethical

and to its truth. Christ as man, as God-man, is man in his universality, not one particular individual, but the universal individual.' This is in fact the 'middle' view of Baur, who began quite conservatively and only adopted the philosophy of Hegel by the late 1820s. On his later view, see below.

14. F.C. Baur, 'Abgenöthigte Erklärung gegen einen Artikel der *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*', *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 9.3 (1936), pp. 179-232, here 206, cited by Hodgson, *Formation*, p. 79: 'Where is my criticism supported in even a single place in my writing by the mythical view? Where do I reject even a single historical fact which is of importance for the critical judgment respecting [the Pastoral] Epistles solely on the ground that it is a miracle, or where do I argue solely and alone from the inner contradiction of the contents? Above all, I proceed from definite, historically advanced facts and seek on this foundation to draw together for the first time the different threads of my critical combinations into a single whole. This holding fact to the historically given is the characteristic mark of my criticism...'

15. Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1853 [2nd edn, 1860]), pp. 21-41, ET: *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* (trans. Allan Menzies; Theological Translation Fund Library, 16; London: Williams and Norgate, 3rd edn, 1878-79), I, pp. 22-43.

16. Hodgson, *Formation*, p. 167. According to Lawrence Stepelevich ('The First Hegelians: An Introduction', *Philosophical Forum* 8.2-4 [1976], pp. 6-23) the core group of 'Young Hegelians' in 1830 comprised Arnold Ruge, Ludwig Feuerbach, Max Stirner, David Friedrich Strauss and Bruno Bauer. By 1848, however, the school had collapsed. What survived the failure of the liberal revolutions of 1848 was the younger generation who had turned Hegel's speculative philosophy into a social-political philosophy: Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Karl Schmidt and August von Cieskowski.

teacher.¹⁷ In contrast to Strauss, for whom the historical Jesus was at best the *occasion* for the birth of the idea of the God-man, for Baur it was imperative to ground Christian beliefs in the teachings and conduct of its ‘founder’:

Is it possible to speak in any real sense of the essence and contents of Christianity without making the person of its founder the main object of our consideration? Must we not recognize the particular character of Christianity as consisting in this, that whatever it is, it is simply on account of the person of its founder?¹⁸

It was not the Hegelian idea of the God-man that was central to Jesus’ teaching, but something much closer to Kant’s categorical imperative. The ‘new principle’ introduced by Jesus was a universal ethic:

that form of action in accordance with which we do to others what we wish that others should do to us. The morally good is thus that which is equally right and good for all, or which can be the object of action for all alike... Thus do the absolute contents of the Christian principle find their expression in the moral consciousness. What gives a man his highest moral value is simply the purity of a disposition which is genuinely moral, and rises above all that is finite, particular, and merely subjective.¹⁹

This also implied that the relationship of humanity to God could only be conceived as a moral one:

If man is perfect as God is perfect, then, in this absolute perfection, he stands in that adequate relation to God which is expressed by the notion of righteousness. Righteousness in this sense is the absolute condition for entering the kingdom of God.²⁰

Baur employs the trope of the contrast between inner and outer to account both for Jesus’ view of the Torah and his own Messiahship. Thus, while Jesus recognized the Pharisees as occupying the seat of Moses (Mt. 23.2-3) and while he ‘held as far as possible to the old traditional [legal] forms’, nonetheless the categorical and universal character of Jesus’ ethic meant that it could not help but be incompatible with the ‘old’. The new wine would inevitably burst the old wineskins.²¹ Analogously, Jesus invoked the idea of the Messiah as the hope of national redemption as a ‘fulcrum’ from which to launch his own distinctive view of the Messiah—though Baur argues that he preferred ‘son of Man’ since it emphasized Jesus’ full humanity. Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah, but not in the sense that was common among first-century Jews; instead, he was the

17. Here I use ‘rationalist’ not in the sense of the explanation of miracles offered by Heinrich Paulus (*Das Leben Jesu*), but the philosophical rationalism represented by the Enlightenment and typified in Kant’s *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone* (trans. Theodore M. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson; New York: Harper, 1960).

18. Baur, *Das Christentum*, pp. 22-23; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 23.

19. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 31; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 33.

20. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 32; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 34.

21. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 30; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 32.

Messiah only 'in an ethical sense', as one in whom ethical ideals found their highest expression.²² His appearance in Jerusalem was intended to confront the people with a decision:

[T]he whole nation must be called on to declare whether it would persist in that traditional Messianic belief which bore the stamp of selfish Jewish particularism, or if it would accept such a Messiah as he was and had shown himself in his whole life and influence to be.²³

This rejection of Jesus' universal, moralizing conception of messianism represented for Baur a 'complete and irreparable breach between [Jesus] and Judaism'.²⁴

Although Holtzmann was an opponent of the Tübingen school, he saw several positive developments in Baur's post-Hegelian phase, developments that led away from Strauss and Hegel:

While Strauss twenty-five years ago thought that he could trace back the entire content of the life of Jesus to the myth-making fantasies of the early church, Baur had shown in the meantime—or this was his view—that the somewhat exaggerated suggestion that a larger community as such possessed poetic creativity need not be made at all, since it is possible to account for the gospel writings in a more appropriate way on the basis of the intentional literary activity of the specific early Christian parties that undertook to write that history.²⁵

Holtzmann also cited approvingly Baur's conclusion that the essence of Christianity could not be discussed without a consideration of the historical Jesus,²⁶ and Baur's last article on the significance of Jesus' use of the title 'son of Man'.²⁷

But much had transpired since Baur's 1853 sketch of the historical Jesus that called for a new consideration of the problem of the historical Jesus. Not only

22. Harris, *The Tübingen School*, p. 174, citing Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie* (Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1864), p. 118: 'If now Jesus viewed and designated himself pre-eminently as the Son of God, then he himself can have conceived this relation from no other point of view than the ethical. In the depth of his ethical consciousness he perceived himself as the Son of God, in so far as the idea of ethical goodness was prominent in his mind in the purity in which he elaborated it, especially in the Sermon on the Mount, and in so far as he himself through his ethical endeavour was conscious of being the most perfect realization of this idea.'

23. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 39; ET: *Church History*, p. 1.41. A similar caricature of Judaism as a parochial and, Kant adds, pre-'religious' and 'pre-moral' faith can be seen in Kant's *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone*, pp. 116-17.

24. Baur, *Das Christentum*, 39; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 42.

25. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 3.

26. Above, p. 80 and below, p. 96 [469]. (In what follows, the original pagination of Holtzmann's book is given in bold.)

27. Ferdinand Christian Baur, 'Die Bedeutung des Ausdrucks ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', *ZWT* (1860), pp. 274-92. See below, p. 494.

had the speculative philosophy of Hegel fallen from vogue,²⁸ but the understanding of the relationship among the Synoptics that had been assumed and promoted by the Tübingen school was now much in doubt. And since 1860 it was difficult to speak of a Tübingen school at all.

Both Strauss and Baur had accepted the source-critical hypothesis that held that Matthew was the earliest of the Synoptics, that Luke used Matthew as a source and that Mark was a conflation of the two. Matthaean priority and Markan posteriority in the form of the Griesbach hypothesis was first mooted in Germany by J.J. Griesbach,²⁹ but was promoted and popularized in the widely used introduction of Wilhelm M.L. de Wette.³⁰ So dominant in fact was the Griesbach hypothesis during the first half of the nineteenth century that the rival hypothesis and forerunner of the Two Source hypothesis advanced by Christian Hermann Weisse in 1838³¹ was almost universally ignored until after the mid-point in the century, a neglect about which Weisse complained bitterly.³² Thus, it is not

28. See above, n. 16. Harris (*The Tübingen School*, p. 167) attributes this shift to Feuerbach's critique of Hegel (L. Feuerbach, *Das Wesen des Christentums* [Leipzig: O. Wigand, 1841]). Baur could not accept the atheism which Strauss, Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer saw as the logical consequence of Hegelianism, and after the late 1840s his reliance on Hegel waned.

29. Johann Jakob Griesbach, *Inquisitio in fontes, unde Evangelistae suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint* (Jena: J.C.G. Goepferdt, 1783); *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (Jena: J.C.G. Goepferdt, 1789–90), ET: 'A Demonstration that Mark was Written after Matthew and Luke', in Bernard Orchard and Thomas R.W. Longstaff (eds.), *J.J. Griesbach, Synoptic and Text Critical Studies, 1776–1976* (SNTSMS, 34; Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 103–35. Almost twenty years before Griesbach's first essay, a similar hypothesis had been advanced by Henry Owen, *Observations on the Four Gospels: Tending Chiefly to Ascertain the Times of Their Publication, and to Illustrate the Form and Manner of Their Composition* (London: T. Payne, 1764).

30. Wilhelm M.L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (Lehrbuch der Historisch Kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments, 2; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1826 [6th edn, 1860]); ET: *An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament* (trans. Frederick Frothingman; Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1858), pp. 129–74. De Wette (1780–1849), influenced by J.G. Herder and a student of J.J. Griesbach and H.E.G. Paulus at Jena, taught at Heidelberg, Berlin (as a colleague of Schleiermacher), and Basel. De Wette advocated the Griesbach hypothesis, but dated the composition of the Gospels much earlier than Baur: Matthew was written before the fall of Jerusalem and not, as Baur surmised, after the second revolt. From Herder he adopted the view that Matthew was composed on the basis of oral tradition; with Schleiermacher he concluded that various written fragments were available to Matthew.

31. Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte. Kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838).

32. Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1856), p. 85. Adolf Hilgenfeld (*Die Evangelien, nach ihrer Entstehung und geistlichen Bedeutung* [Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854], p. 11) thought that Weisse's

surprising that both Strauss and Baur would have embraced Matthaean priority and Markan posteriority.³³ Baur had offered his own analysis of Luke (1846) and later, of the Synoptics as a whole (1847) and Mark (1851), in which he defended the Griesbach hypothesis on the basis of the tendencies inherent in each.³⁴

By the time Baur died in December 1860, however, most of the other members of the Tübingen school had abandoned Matthaean priority in favour of some other hypothesis, or had abandoned theology altogether. Hilgenfeld—never a student of Baur's, but one who initially identified himself with Tübingen's approach—argued against the posteriority of Mark to Luke and defended a version of the so-called 'Augustinian hypothesis'.³⁵ Albrecht Ritschl, Karl Köstlin and Gustav Volkmar deserted in favour of Markan priority;³⁶ Eduard Zeller and Karl Christian Planck turned from theology to philosophy; and Albert Schwegl left theology altogether. Baur's successor at Tübingen was Carl Weizsäcker, a

solution had not gained ground over Griesbach because Weiss had dismissed too much of the Synoptics as unhistorical to be a real alternative to Strauss.

33. Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 71-73; Baur, *Das Christentum*, pp. 24-25; ET: *Church History*, I, pp. 25-26.

34. Ferdinand Christian Baur, 'Der Ursprung und Character des Lukasevangeliums, mit Rücksicht auf die neuesten Untersuchungen', *Theologische Jahrbücher (Tübingen)* 5 (1846), pp. 453-615; *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zueinander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung* (Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1847 [repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1999]); *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter nebst einem Anhang über das Evangelium Marcions* (Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1851), p. 110: 'The result of the foregoing research is that the origin of the Gospel of Mark can be fully explained by the presupposition that the author had the two other Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him, and used them for his account.' Even though Baur dated Matthew quite late (c. 132 CE) (and the other Gospels even later), he treated Matthew as essentially historical: 'If there is therefore in the list of our canonical Gospels one gospel in which we have before us the substantial content of the gospel story in an original, genuinely historical source, then it can only be Matthew' (*Evangelien*, p. 571).

35. Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Das Markus-evangelium, nach seiner Composition, seiner Stellung in der Evangelien-literatur, seinem Ursprung und Charakter* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1850), pp. 8-30, argued on the basis of 'Tendency criticism' that Mark was prior, not posterior, to Luke. On the inappropriateness of the term 'Augustinian hypothesis' to describe the view that holds that Mark used Matthew and Luke used both, see Henk J. de Jonge, 'Augustine on the Interrelations of the Gospels', in Frans Van Segbroeck, *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992), pp. 2409-17.

36. Albrecht B. Ritschl, 'Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien', *Theologische Jahrbücher (Tübingen)* 10 (1851), pp. 480-538; Karl R. Köstlin, *Der Ursprung und die Composition der synoptischen Evangelien* (Stuttgart: Mächen, 1853); Gustav Volkmar, *Die Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwicklung nach dem gegenwärtigen Stande der Wissenschaft* (Leipzig: F.U. Brockhaus, 1857).

Markan priorist.³⁷ Theodor Keim was one of the few who continued to maintain Baur's view of the sequence of the Synoptics.³⁸

By the mid-century the Griesbach hypothesis had come under severe attack, both from Baur's own colleague at Tübingen, Heinrich Ewald, who had published a series of essays and a monograph on the Synoptic problem (1848–1850),³⁹ and from the young Bernhard Weiss (1827–1918) at Königsberg (1861).⁴⁰ Weiss's criticisms went largely unanswered. After Baur's death and the dissolution of his school, the Griesbach hypothesis attracted few new supporters.⁴¹

H. J. Holtzmann

In the early 1860s the stage was set for a new approach to the historical Jesus, which came from the 31-year-old Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (1832–1910). Holtzmann, who had been educated in Heidelberg and Berlin and who would later go on to the chair at Strassbourg and become the teacher of Albert Schweitzer, was

37. Carl Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen, und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung* (Gotha: Rudolf Besser, 1864).

38. Theodor Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung Jesu Christi. Akademische Antrittsrede am 17. Dezember 1860* (Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1861).

39. Heinrich Ewald, 'Ursprung und Wesen der Evangelien [I]', *Jahrbuch der biblischen Wissenschaft* 1 (1848), pp. 113–54; 'Ursprung und Wesen der Evangelien [II]', *Jahrbuch der biblischen Wissenschaft* 2 (1849), pp. 180–224; 'Ursprung und Wesen der Evangelien [III]', *Jahrbuch der biblischen Wissenschaft* 3 (1850), pp. 140–77; *Die drei ersten Evangelien übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1850). Ewald's source hypothesis was baroque in its detail, involving a proto-Mark, the *logia* source, two editions of Mark, a 'Book of Higher history', canonical Matthew, three intermediate gospels, and finally, Luke. Nevertheless, his argument that the vivid character of Mark's descriptions, the lack of a consistent chronological framework, the lack of the infancy stories, and the use of Aramaic words ('Ursprung und Wesen [II]', pp. 203–206) was enough to 'convert' Heinrich A. W. Meyer to a theory of Markan priority in the second edition of his commentary on Matthew (*Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus* [Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 1.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 3rd edn, 1853]).

40. Bernhard Weiss, 'Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der drei synoptischen Evangelien', *TSK* 34 (1861), pp. 29–100, 646–713.

41. In 1866 Hajo Uden Meijboom wrote a critical assessment of the Markan hypothesis which included a defence of the Griesbach hypothesis, but passed over the criticisms of Weiss and Holtzmann in silence (*Geschiedenis en critiek der Marcus-hypothese*, Proefschrift, Groningen [Amsterdam: Gebroeders Kraay, 1866]). The dissertation was never published in anything more than its dissertation form and appears not to have attracted any notice until it was translated into English more than a century later: *A History and Critique of the Origin of the Marcan Hypothesis, 1835–1866: A Contemporary Report Rediscovered* (ed. and trans. John J. Kiwiet; New Gospel Studies, 8; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press; Leuven: Peeters, 1991).

then an 'auserordentlicher Professor' (a junior professor) at Heidelberg.⁴² Two years after Weiss's attack on the Griesbach hypothesis, Holtzmann published *Die synoptischen Evangelien. Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* [The Synoptic Gospels: Their Origin and Historical Character (1863)], which is often credited with establishing the (forerunner to the) Two Source hypothesis. Holtzmann's theory posited a proto-Markan source ('A') used by all three Synoptics, and a *logia* source (Λ) used by Matthew and Luke.⁴³

Although this is not the place for an evaluation of Holtzmann's source theory, it must be said that he proved far less than is usually supposed. His 'proof' took the form of showing how the *assumption* of the existence of two synoptic sources could account for the final state of the Synoptic Gospels; it was not a careful weighing and assessment of all of the logical alternatives.⁴⁴ That is, it was more a demonstration of how (proto-)Markan priority and the existence of a sayings source *might* explain the Synoptics than it was a case for how this was the *best* solution. Still less did it disprove or render improbable other hypotheses. Despite its several important argumentative flaws, however, Holtzmann's case was generally deemed to have won the day and Schweitzer was later to remark that Holtzmann had carried off its demonstration to such a degree that 'it can no longer be called a mere hypothesis'.⁴⁵ Between 1863 and

42. On Holtzmann's career, see Walter Bauer, 'Heinrich Julius Holtzmann: Ein Lebensbild', *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften* (ed. Georg Strecker; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1967), pp. 285-341; Hans Rollmann, 'Holtzmann, von Hügel, and Modernism', *DRev* 97 (1979), pp. 128-43, 221-44; David B. Peabody, 'H.J. Holtzmann and His European Colleagues: Aspects of the Nineteenth Century European Discussion of Gospel Origins', in Henning Graf Reventlow and William R. Farmer (eds.), *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850-1914* (JSOTSup, 192; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), pp. 50-131; William Baird, *History of New Testament Research. II: From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), pp. 111-22.

43. In contrast to modern versions of the Two Source hypothesis, Holtzmann's 'A' source contained not only Mark (minus a few later interpolations), but also the longer form of the words of the Baptist (Mt. 3.7-12 || Lk. 3.7-9, 16-17), the long form of the Temptation story (Mt. 4.1-11 || Lk. 4.1-13), a version of the Great Sermon (Lk. 6.20-49), the story of the centurion's serving boy (Mt. 8.5-13 || Lk. 7.1-10) and an expanded version of the Beelzebul accusation (Mt. 12.22-30 || Lk. 11.14-20). Holtzmann also assigned to 'A' the story of the adulterous woman from John (7.53-8.11) and the great commissioning from Matthew (28.9-10, 16-20). Correspondingly, the sayings source was shorter than modern Q, beginning only at Lk. 7.18-35.

44. For criticisms of Holtzmann's argument, see William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 36-47; John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), pp. 305-309.

45. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (trans. William Montgomery; preface by F.C. Burkitt; New York: Macmillan & Co., 1st complete edn, 1910), p. 202; *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (ed. John

William Sanday's (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (1911),⁴⁶ only Meijboom's 1866 dissertation and Wernle's 1911 monograph qualify as substantial reviews of the Synoptic problem, and the latter simply brought Holtzmann's theory into closer alignment with the modern Two Source hypothesis by collapsing Holtzmann's 'A' into Mark.⁴⁷

Why was the Markan hypothesis embraced with such enthusiasm, when Holtzmann's demonstration of it left much to be desired? In part it was due to the vacuum created by the demise of the Tübingen school, the failure of the few remaining proponents of the Griesbach hypothesis to offer a compelling defence,⁴⁸ and the lack of credible alternatives, including Hilgenfeld's 'Augustinian' solution. Such an explanation is incomplete, however, for it is hardly the case that Holtzmann's solution won simply by default. In searching for positive reasons for Holtzmann's success, one might consider a fascination with lost pre-gospel sources, especially when it is remembered that these played so important a role in the earlier solutions of synoptic problem offered by Lessing, Schleiermacher, Eichhorn, Lachmann and even Baur, who concluded that Matthew was composed from an earlier collection of *logia*. Yet in spite of the fact that Holtzmann's solution involved the positing of a sayings source that lay behind Matthew and Luke, there is no evidence that the appeal of Holtzmann's solution lay in the notion of pre-gospel sources. Indeed it is surprising just how little Λ figured in Holtzmann's book, and even less in his discussion of the historical Jesus—in fact it played virtually no role at all. Although he isolated the Λ source and even described its linguistic character, his real interest was 'A' and the way it might serve as the basis for a life of Jesus.

The pertinence of Holtzmann's volume to the study of the historical Jesus and much of the appeal of his source-critical solution resides in the 29 pages at the end of the book where he sketched the significance of his reconstructed 'A' source. This short essay would set the course for the next forty years of Jesus

Bowden, foreword by Dennis Nineham, trans. W. Montgomery, *et al.*; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), p. 175.

46. William Sanday (ed.), (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

47. Paul Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage* (Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899). On Meijboom, see above, n. 41.

48. Samuel Davidson (*An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament: Critical, Exegetical, and Theological* [London: Longmans, Green, 1868]) offered a 'defence' of the Griesbach hypothesis but in fact began by *assuming* Matthaean priority (p. 358). His argument throughout was impressionistic and responded to none of the arguments raised against the Griesbach hypothesis. H. Pasquier's (*La solution du problème synoptique* [Tours: Maison Alfred Mame et Fils, 1911]) defence of Griesbach was mired in self-contradictions, as Lagrange's systematic refutation pointed out ('Recension: Pasquier, La solution du problème synoptique', *RB NS* 9 [1912], pp. 280-84).

research, in particular, the so-called 'Liberal Lives of Jesus', which proposed that Jesus had attempted to found a kingdom of God in an ideal sense based on moralizing principles; that evidence can be found of the emergence and growth of his own messianic self-awareness; that this self-consciousness reached its height at Caesarea Philippi; and that, faced with increasing opposition and indifference, he began to suppose himself to be a suffering Messiah. This portrait, as Schweitzer described it, became 'the creed and catechism of all who handled the subject during the following decades'.⁴⁹

Holtzmann's portrait of Jesus was not based on Mark, but on his 'A' source, although at many points in his exposition (see below) he speaks of 'Mark' when, strictly speaking, he should have said 'A'. He speaks of 'the Roman editor' (*der römische Bearbeiter*) mainly when he wishes to distinguish Mark's source from Mark himself, who, *ex hypothesi*, added explanatory words and phrases.⁵⁰ Mark's most significant alterations of 'A' were his abbreviation of the extended description of the Baptist (Mt. 3.7-12 || Lk. 3.7-9, 11-12; cf. Mk 1.7-8) and the Temptation story (Mt. 4.1-11 || Lk. 4.1-13; cf. Mk 1.12-13) and his

49. Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1906), ET: *Quest* [1906/1910], p. 204 (this sentence is not in the 1913/2001 edition).

50. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 119-20 lists as additions to 'A': 1.1^{MA} υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ [see below, n. 100]; 1.2^{MA}: [the citation of Malachi]; 1.7^{MA} κύψας; 1.13^{MA}: μετὰ τῶν θηρίων; 1.33^{MA} [entire verse]; 2.14^{MA} τὸν τοῦ Αλφαίου; 2.16^{MA} (C λ φ): αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν; 2.18^{MA}: ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες; 2.25^{MA}: ὅτε χρεῖαν ἔσχεν; 2.26^{MA}: ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως; 2.27^{MA} [entire verse]; 3.17^{MA}: καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα Βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ βροντῆς; 3.26^(MA) ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν; 4.3^{MA}: ἀκούετε; 4.7^{MA}: καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν; 4.8^{MA}: ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ ἀυξάνόμενα; 4.19^{MA}: καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμῖαι; 5.13^{MA}: ὡς δισχίλιοι; 5.19: καὶ ἠλέησέν σε; 5.23^{MA}: ἵνα σωθῆ; 5.34^{MA}: καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιῆς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου; 6.3^{MA}: ὁ τέκτων (see below, n. 113); 6.13^{MA}: ἐλαίω; 6.37^{MA}: καὶ δώσομεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν; 6.48: καὶ ἠθέλειν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς; 6.50: πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδον; 6.52 [entire verse]; 8.32^{MA}: καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει; 8.35^{MA}: καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; 8.38^{MA}: ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶ; 9.12: καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθη καὶ ἐξουδενηθῆ; 9.49-50^(MA) [both verses]; 10.19^{MA}: μὴ ἀποστερήσης; 10.32^{MA}: καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτούς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἔθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο; 10.46^{MA}: ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαῖος; 11.10^{MA}: εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυὶδ; 11.13^{MA}: ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σῶκων; 11.16^{MA}: καὶ οὐκ ἦφεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ; 12.14^{MA}: δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; 12.27^{MA}: πολὺ πλανᾶσθε; 13.32: οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός; 14.20 (A D)^{MA}: εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα; 14.44: καὶ ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς; 14.68^{MA}: οὐτὲ ἐπίσταμαι; 15.21^{MA}: τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ρούφου; 15.40^{MA}: καὶ Σαλώμη; 15.43^{MA}: τολμήσας. Most of these additions are simple expansions, or historical touches, or 'authentic details which Mark created on the basis of tradition'. The additions in 1.1 and 1.13 are 'dogmatic' and the latter is described as an 'apocryphal' detail (following Baur, *Evangelien*, p. 540). It should be observed that most of the items in this list are so-called 'minor agreements' (all that are marked with ^{MA}).

complete omission of Jesus' great sermon (Lk. 6.20-49) and the two following miracle stories (Mt. 8.5-10, 13 || Lk. 7.1-10; Mt. 12.22-23 || Lk. 11.14; cf. Mk 3.22).

Even though these alterations of 'A' by Mark are not great, the distinction afforded Holtzmann two important 'advantages'. First, because almost all of the putative additions to 'A' by Mark belong to the class of data that we now call the 'minor agreements',⁵¹ Holtzmann was able to meet the objection to his hypothesis from the Griesbach camp against the priority of Mark. *Mark* was not in fact prior to Matthew and Luke; but 'A', which Mark used and modified slightly, was. Moreover, on a few occasions (1.13; 6.3) he seems to have nodded in the direction of Baur's analysis of Mark, which had detected elements akin to later 'apocryphal developments'. Second, and of more significance to his portrait of Jesus, the supposed presence in 'A' of the skeleton of the Sermon on the Mount (Lk. 6.20-49) placed in 'A' an epitome of Jesus' teachings. Like Baur, Holtzmann emphasized the moral elements in the Sermon, focusing especially on the principle of loving one's enemies, 'principles that have been clearly expressed and developed into universals' (below, p. 481).

A key influence on Holtzmann was Theodor Keim's 1860 inaugural address at Zürich, *Die menschliche Entwicklung Jesu Christi* [The Human Development of Jesus Christ].⁵² Keim had been influenced by Baur and was one of the few of Baur's students to continue to embrace Matthaean priority after Baur's death. But he also enunciated a theory of psychological development in the historical Jesus: Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah from at least the time of his baptism and Keim even speculated that during childhood Jesus had expressed a profound consciousness of God. Keim argued that the development of Jesus' consciousness was gradual, and distinguished his messianic consciousness, which was present at the baptism, from the consciousness of a suffering Messiah, a later development,

51. The literature on this phenomenon is considerable. See, e.g., Frans Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: With a Cumulative List* (BETL, 37; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974); Andreas Ennulat, *Die 'Minor Agreements': Untersuchung zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems* (WUNT, 2.62; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994); Georg Strecker (ed.), *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991* (Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten, 50; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).

52. *Die menschliche Entwicklung Jesu Christi. Akademische Antrittsrede am 17. Dezember 1860* (Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1861). Keim (1825-78) was educated at Tübingen, a student of F.C. Baur. He served briefly as an *Assistent* at Tübingen (1851-55), and later occupied the chairs at Zürich (1860-73) and Giessen (1873-78). He is best known for his three-volume *Die Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* (3 vols.; Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1867-72), ET: *The History of Jesus of Nazara* (trans. Arthur Ransom and E.M. Geldart; Theological Translation Fund Library; 6 vols.; London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1873-83). Unlike most other members of the Tübingen school, Keim never abandoned the Griesbach hypothesis, but dated Matthew (c. 66 CE) earlier than Baur. On Keim, see Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, I, pp. 384-90.

and both of these from the idea of divine sonship.⁵³ Holtzmann was critical of many aspects of Keim's thesis, not least his dependence on the Griesbach hypothesis and his attempt to derive a picture of developing consciousness from Matthew. He pointed out numerous instances where Matthew's representation of Jesus failed to support Keim's general thesis, and where Keim himself had to revert to Mark to make his point. This only showed, for Holtzmann, that Keim's general idea of development was right, but that he had chosen the wrong source theory by which to demonstrate it. What he had learned from Keim, however, was that the Synoptics,

not only describe the general fact that Jesus developed in human wisdom, discipline, and morality, not only do they describe a particularly portentous childhood; they also express spontaneously, almost against their own wills and unconsciously, through incidental and unobtrusive details the progressive development of Jesus as a youth and a young man.⁵⁴

Armed with his source theory and Keim's theory of moral and human development, Holtzmann set out to describe the life of Jesus and in this was remarkably successful, at least at the time. Mark (or 'A') lacked the 'dogmatic' features that were so evident in both Matthew and Luke and which obscured the picture of Jesus' development. Mark depicted Jesus who was possessed of 'the clarity and harmony of what constitutes a vigorous person: the convergence of understanding, emotion, perception, presentiment, genuine simplicity, and innocence' (below, p. 496)—a description that eminently served the theological goals of liberal theology, with its strong anti-dogmatic and romantic inclinations. Indeed, Schweitzer is probably correct in stating that '[t]he victory...belonged, not to the Marcan hypothesis pure and simple, but to the Marcan hypothesis as psychologically interpreted by a liberal theology'.⁵⁵

Holtzmann's life of Jesus posited seven stages of psychological development, beginning with his initial self-realization as the Messiah at the baptism when he experienced (and later described to his disciples) an intensification of his consciousness and a 'great enlightenment regarding his divine vocation' (see below, p. 107 [476]). Holtzmann was rather vague on the contours of most of the subsequent stages except the final stage, marked by Mk 8.1–9.50, where Jesus was first acclaimed by his disciples as the Messiah and when Jesus came to realize that death 'was the only possible [fate] and the only one of which he was worthy' (below, p. 485).

53. Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 32.

54. Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 11. Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 9) cites this approvingly.

55. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, ET: *Quest* [1906/1910], p. 204; *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2nd edn, 1913), ET: *Quest* [1913/2001], p. 177.

Although Holtzmann counted Baur and the Tübingen school as opponents, he had learned much from Baur, especially after Baur's abandonment of the speculative idealism of Hegel. I have already mentioned Baur's detection of 'apocryphal' elements in Mark and Holtzmann agreement with Baur on these points. Holtzmann cited with approval Baur's summary of Jesus' decision to turn to Jerusalem and was in essential agreement with the later Baur on interpreting the significance of Jesus' teaching as fundamentally moral.

Related to the virtual reduction of Jesus' teaching to moral principles is the almost complete elimination of eschatology, which is striking given the fact that Holtzmann's portrait of Jesus was based on a Mark-like document. Only a single paragraph in Holtzmann's essay discusses Mark 13 and it is invoked not in order to illustrate the apocalyptic character of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom but only to point to Jesus' messianic self-consciousness:

[Jesus'] messianic consciousness comes to its fullness in the final speech (cf. the contrasting confessions in Mark 13.6, 21); Jesus' outlook on the future that is attested there [in Mark 13] necessarily presupposes a fully developed consciousness and full awareness of the fact that the past of humanity is finished, and that the focal point of all being and becoming has been reached. Hence, the sudden reorientation that gives to primitive Christianity its eschatological thrust. (See below, p. 494.)

This evasion of the import of eschatology is not unique to Holtzmann, however, but was typical of the time. Baur's sketch of the Judaism contemporary with Jesus had stressed the universalizing tendencies of Alexandrian Judaism and had heroized the 'Essenes' as the Palestinian group that most closely approximated Philonic Judaism in their devotion to a 'deeply religious conception of life' that was not 'entangled either in the ordinances and traditions of the Judaism of the Pharisees, or in the purely external forms of the Levitic temple worship'.⁵⁶ Of course, Baur knew nothing of the Essenes of the Scrolls—if indeed the Qumran covenanters are 'Essenes'. The only form of messianism that Baur knew was political messianism, which in his view Jesus had decisively rejected. And even though neither Dillmann's study of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* nor Hilgenfeld's *Apokalyptik* had been published by 1863, making the case that these documents should be included in a reconstruction of contemporary Judaism, they do not seem to have made much of an impression on the study of the historical Jesus.⁵⁷ Indeed, Timothée Colani would argue in the year after Holtzmann's book appeared that Mark 13 represented a Jewish-Christian apocalyptic tractate

56. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 20, ET: *Church History*, I, pp. 20-21.

57. August Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch Übersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1853); *Liber Jubilaeorum qui idem a Graecis inscribitur: Versione Graeca deperdita nunc nonnisi in Geez lingua conservatus nuper ex Abyssini in Europan allatus* (Göttingen: Kaestneri; Kiel: Van Maack; London: Williams & Norgate, 1859); Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christenthums* (Jena: Mauke, 1857 [repr. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1966]).

interpolated into Mark and, hence, without significance for the historical Jesus.⁵⁸ The same year Schenkel was willing to concede that Jesus had predicted the destruction of the Temple, the priesthood and 'the theocracy' but argued that Jesus used figurative language, which the disciples mistakenly took literally as a prediction of a second coming. But John's Gospel had it right: Jesus was in fact only speaking of the coming of the spirit to his followers.⁵⁹ The apocalyptic idiom of Mark 13 is 'an unhealthy excrescence of the Jewish Messianic expectation, a remnant of the religion of the latter within the religion of the Spirit and of truth'.⁶⁰

Holtzmann moved beyond Baur in significant ways but also revived older notions. In his account we can see the influence of nineteenth-century romanticism and especially the quest for the religious hero, free of and uncontaminated by the entrapments of 'higher civilization'.⁶¹ Thus Holtzmann not only stressed the rationalist and Enlightenment view that Jesus was a teacher of morality, but also the emphasis on Jesus' *personality*, a notion that first achieved prominence in Goethe. Franz Rosenzweig's comments on the Liberal Lives of Jesus in general could well be applied to Holtzmann:

Precisely romanticism's insight that only living 'individuality' was called to rule the world, and not teaching—even if it taught the Truth itself—made the view of Jesus as the Teacher appear obsolete even before it could be fully developed. According to this new picture, a 'Teacher' could not be the one with whose appearance 'the time' was supposed to be 'fulfilled'. Schleiermacher found the problem-solving formulation, that 'the emergence of a revelation in an individual person' was to be regarded as 'prepared in human nature and as the highest development of its spiritual force'. Thus, not the 'teacher' but rather the 'personality' was the human essence of Jesus, from which Christianity sprang, today as well as once eighteen hundred years ago. 'Personality'... was inhabited by a being [*ein Sein*] that eluded history's deadening power. According

58. Timothée Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps* (Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 2nd rev. and expanded edn, 1864).

59. Daniel Schenkel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu* (Wiesbaden: C.W. Kreidel, 3rd edn, 1864), ET: *A Sketch of the Character of Jesus: A Biblical Essay* (London: Longmans, 3rd edn, 1869), pp. 254, 256-57.

60. Schenkel, *The Character of Jesus*, p. 259.

61. See Dieter Georgi, 'The Interest in Life of Jesus Theology as a Paradigm for the Social History of Biblical Criticism', *HTR* 85.1 (1992), pp. 51-83, esp. pp. 77-79. Georgi says of Ernest Renan's Jesus (*Vie de Jésus* [Histoire des origines du Christianisme, 1; Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1863]): 'Jesus was depicted as a unique personality, full of unspoiled naiveté but at the same time full of dignity and wisdom, the ideal image of bourgeois nostalgia. The fact that Renan's Jesus was an idealized rural figure who was destroyed by the terrifying and deadly metropolis did not contradict the bourgeois flavor; instead it reflected the many bourgeois portrayals of country life. The description of Jesus' end fitted the views of liberal bourgeoisie as well: Renan's representative of an uncorrupted biblical Judaism was destroyed by a hardened Jewish establishment.' Much of this also applies to Holtzmann's Jesus.

to this thought, so it seemed, one could—indeed one had to—grasp the existence of Jesus, once one was determined to avoid dogma.⁶²

‘Hierarchy’ comes in for a beating by Holtzmann’s Jesus, since it is inimical to the simplicity and honesty advocated and exemplified by Jesus. In one of his most anti-Jewish remarks, he describes Jesus’ opponents—apparently including the Pharisees (!)—as ‘the most stubborn, most easily offended hierarchy that ever there was’ (p. 485). It seems likely that this bit of venom was as much a reflection of the attitude of scholars such as Holtzmann towards the Lutheran hierarchy as it was a judgment about the Judaism of Jesus’ day. Elsewhere Holtzmann endorsed Keim’s suggestion that Jesus had been initially attracted to the Pharisaic movement but had finally rejected it in favour of his vision of a moral kingdom. Moreover, where Baur in his post-Hegelian phase gestured in the direction of making the ‘person of the founder’ decisive for Christian faith, Holtzmann argued that the religion of Jesus was normative for Christian faith and Jesus’ individuality and personality was its foundation.⁶³

During the next four decades a string of ‘lives of Jesus’ were published, all adopting Holtzmann’s general approach and most treating Mark (or *Urmarkus*) as an essentially reliable historical source, although Schweitzer rightly observed that many of these also rather promiscuously turned to John when it was convenient.⁶⁴ Daniel Schenkel (1864, ET 1869),⁶⁵ Carl Weizsäcker (1864),⁶⁶ Theodor

62. Franz Rozenzweig, ‘Atheistic Theology’, in Paul W. Franks and Michael L. Morgan (eds.), *Franz Rosenzweig: Philosophical and Theological Writings* (Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co., 2000), pp. 10-24, here pp. 12-13. I am indebted to Paul Franks for this reference.

63. Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, II, p. 112.

64. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung; Quest* [1913/2001], p. 175.

65. Schenkel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, ET: *The Character of Jesus*. Schenkel argued that at the baptism, Jesus realized that John’s message of repentance and renunciation was ‘fundamentally wrong’ and instead embraced a vision of reconciliation and regeneration (ET, pp. 41, 48); although the restoration of Israel had been Jesus’ initial aim, he later expanded his interests beyond Israel’s borders (p. 130); at some point Jesus came to believe that he was the Messiah, though not in the way that the ‘hierarchical party’ (= the Pharisees!) believed, and by Caesarea Philippi the disciples had also come to think of Jesus as the Messiah in the sense of the ‘founder of the inner, spiritual kingdom of God’ (p. 141).

66. Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*. Weizsäcker held a source hypothesis similar to that of Holtzmann, with an *Ur-Markus* used by all three synoptists, and a sayings source, used by Matthew and Luke. Using both of these sources along with John, which he regarded as embodying some reliable historical tradition, Weizsäcker constructed a life of Jesus which began with Jesus’ realization of his messianic call at the baptism, and continued by Jesus proclaiming spiritual and moralizing kingdom. He thought that there were two other key turning points in Jesus’ ministry: the (Johannine) incident of the crowd attempting to make him a king (John 6) and Peter’s confession.

Keim (1867–72, ET 1873–83),⁶⁷ Bernhard Weiss (1882),⁶⁸ Willibald Beyschlag (1885)⁶⁹ and Oscar Holtzmann (1901, ET 1904).⁷⁰ Typical of these ‘lives’ was the interpretation of the kingdom of God as a spiritual kingdom of repentance and the conviction, based on Holtzmann’s reading of Mark, that Jesus’ messianic consciousness developed, precipitated principally by a ‘Galilean crisis’ in which Jesus came to face the failure of his mission. The spell of Mark (or *Ur-Markus*) would not be broken until Wrede demonstrated that the ‘messianic consciousness’ that the liberal lives had attempted to detail was a creation of Mark.⁷¹

After the publication of Wrede’s book, Holtzmann replied with *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Leben-Jesu-Forschung* [The Messianic consciousness of Jesus: A contribution to Life-of-Jesus research]⁷² in which he sought to defend his conclusion that Jesus thought himself to be the Messiah,

67. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, ET: *History of Jesus*. Although Keim continued to advocate the priority of Matthew, his life of Jesus was similar to Holtzmann’s in many ways, presenting the kingdom as ‘the implantation of God in human nature...the penetration of humanity into the divine perfection and its saturation with that perfection’ (*History of Jesus*, III, p. 65).

68. Bernhard Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu* (Berlin: Hertz, 1882 [2nd edn, 1884; 4th edn, Stuttgart: I.G. Cotta, 1902]), ET Bernhard Weiss, *The Life of Christ* (3 vols.; trans. J.W. Hope; Clark’s Foreign Theological Library; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883–84). Weiss’s source theory is more complicated than Holtzmann’s, involving a ‘Logia source’ that was much more extensive than Holtzmann’s Λ, upon which both Matthew and Mark depended, and ‘L’, used by Luke. Both Matthew and Mark used the Logia source; Matthew also used Mark; and Luke used Mark, the Logia source, and ‘L’. See Bernhard Weiss, *Die Quellen der synoptischen Überlieferung* (TU, 32; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1908). Weiss divided Jesus’ life into six sections: the ‘preparation’; the early public ministry where Jesus preached an ethical kingdom; a period of conflict and the beginning of the failure of his public ministry; a crisis constituted by the feeding of the multitude when the crowd wished to make him king (cf. John 6) (*Life of Christ*, 3.7) and Peter’s confession; the ‘Jerusalem period’, including the raising of Lazarus; and finally, the ‘time of suffering’.

69. Willibald Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu* (Halle: E. Strien, 1885 [2nd edn, 1887; 3rd edn, 1983]).

70. Oscar Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901); *The Life of Jesus* (London: A. & C. Black, 1904). Holtzmann adopted Mark as the basic witness to the life of Jesus, treated the baptism as a visionary experience in which Jesus’ belief that he was the messiah was awakened (pp. 136–37), and divided Jesus’ life into five periods: (1) from his birth to the baptism; (2) the first portion of the ministry (ending in Mk 7.1–23); (3) from the ‘flight’ of Jesus to Peter’s confession; (4) from Peter’s confession to Mark 11; (5) the entry into Jerusalem and Jesus’ death. He conjectured a shift between the third and fourth periods, when Jesus no longer avoided danger and feared that his death might scatter his disciples, and now resolved to end the period of ‘purposeless wandering’ (p. 334).

71. William Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901); *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J.C.G. Greig, foreword by James M. Robinson; Greenwood, SC: Attie, 1971).

72. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1907).

for it was only this that could account for his execution. '[T]he historian must by all means hold fast to the verdict: Jesus confessed himself as Messiah, he was condemned as a false messiah, and was executed as a messianic pretender'.⁷³ However, the spell of Mark's Gospel as a reliable framework for constructing a life of Jesus was broken. Adolf von Harnack would attempt, in 1907, that Q provided nearly direct access to the mind of Jesus,⁷⁴ but that suggestion too would fall prey to the assumptions of form criticism, seen already in Bultmann's first and only essay on Q (1913), in which he argued that Q, far from being an untrammelled source for the historical Jesus, was already infused with the apologetic and dogmatic interests of the Jesus movement which transmitted it.⁷⁵

Notes on the translation: I have annotated and corrected Holtzmann's footnotes, citing the arguments of the authors with whom he interacts, supplying biographical information on these scholars, providing the full bibliographical references to the works that Holtzmann does not fully document, and in a few places, correcting his errors in citation. All such annotations are in square brackets; Holtzmann's footnotes are unbracketed. All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. Page numbers of the German are given in **bold**.

The Portrait of Jesus' Life according to the 'A' Source

[468] I consider it to be perhaps the most valuable result of my investigation that, because of it, we are in a position to have a clear picture of the historical character of the person of Jesus and of the tenor of his life. At the same time I think that this study has made a very important advance, for we may now put behind us once and for all the conclusions of the Tübingen school without having to resort to the blunt weapon of apologetics based on dogma. To be sure, I

73. Holtzmann, *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, pp. 35-36.

74. Adolf von Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas* (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 2; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1907), ET: *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (trans. John Richard Wilkinson; New Testament Studies, 2; London: Williams & Norgate; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), esp. p. 171: 'Q is a compilation of discourses and sayings of our Lord, the arrangement of which has no reference to the Passion, with an horizon which is as good as absolutely bounded by Galilee, without any clearly discernible bias, whether apologetic, didactic, ecclesiastical, national or anti-national'.

75. Rudolf K. Bultmann, 'Was lässt die Spruchquelle über die Urgemeinde erkennen?' *Oldenburgisches Kirchenblatt* 19 (1913), pp. 35-37, 41-44, ET in 'What the Saying Source Reveals About the Early Church', in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. and trans. John S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), pp. 23-34. See my comments in Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, pp. 343-45.

do not wish to underestimate in any way their conclusions, unlike Strauss. Earlier I have referred to the fact that mere assertion and counterassertion, as occurred in the debate between Strauss's *The Life of Jesus* and the theology of the past 20 to 30 years, would itself be based upon a completely one-sided view of the accomplishments of this quarter-century, if it took only the Tübingen school as a starting point. If such were the case, we would have to discount everything that was said from the opposing perspective in regard to the improbability that legends could so quickly have sprouted and blossomed in so rich a manner in the soil of sober monotheism and in the time of decomposing intellectual culture.

[469] By way of introduction, let me refer in this connection to the book of Karl Reinhold Köstlin⁷⁶ that I have frequently mentioned during the course of this study and that treated this point with a care and erudition that one all too often misses in the more conservative discussions. What he says regarding the 'undoubtedly authentic depiction of the teachings and discourses of Jesus'; regarding the representation of history in the Synoptic Gospels that 'harmonizes completely in its main contours' with the teachings and discourses; regarding its 'unadorned, natural simplicity'⁷⁷—all this is quite opposed to Strauss's 'mythology'. Even the most colourful of the artistic garlands that Strauss weaves into his wreath of legends must be recognized as living blossoms and fruit sprouting from the actual soil of history preserved in the Gospel tradition. In this respect, even if Köstlin surpassed the later achievements of his teacher,⁷⁸ one can find something very similar in the last of Baur's writings, as Weisse already recognized.⁷⁹ Earlier one could say that the Achilles' heel of Baur's view of history

76. [Ed. note: Karl Reinhold Köstlin (1819–94) was influenced by F.C. Baur and became a member of the Tübingen School. In 1850 he published an article, 'Zur Geschichte des Urchristentum', *Theologische Jahrbücher (Tübingen)* 9 (1843), pp. 1-62, 235-302, where he departed from Baur's view, which posited a fundamental dialect between Pauline and Jewish-Christian circles, arguing instead that the rise of Christianity should be traced to a conciliatory middle party. In 1853 he abandoned the Griesbach hypothesis, which had been championed by Baur, in favour of a form of Markan priority, which posited an *Ur-Markus* on which Matthew and Luke depended but kept canonical Mark as the most recent of the Gospels (*Ursprung und Komposition*). After 1862 his publications were almost exclusively in the area of philosophy.]

77. Köstlin, *Ursprung und Komposition*, pp. 398, 397.

78. [Ed. note: That is, F.C. Baur, who qualified Strauss's thoroughgoing mythological approach by arguing that one could identify historical tradition in at least Matthew: 'If there is therefore among our canonical gospels one Gospel in which he have before us the substantial content of the gospel story in an original, authentic historical source, then it can only be the Gospel of Matthew' (*Evangelien*, p. 571)].

79. Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, pp. 75-76. Baur himself said something similar in his *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (*Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, 5; Tübingen: Ludwig Freidrich Fues, 1862), p. 399: 'My method of criticism is like that of Strauss, because it proceeds from the question that Strauss, more than anyone, put most plainly. One cannot make the life of Jesus the object of criticism so long as there is no critical view

was the fact that he supposed that Christianity congealed from well-known ideas with which the era was impregnated and that he effectively made the apostle Paul the author of Christianity and pushed back the person of Christ into the obscure past. Now, however, Baur has raised the more pressing question.

He asks:

Is it possible to speak in any real sense of the essence and contents of Christianity without making the person of its founder the main object of our consideration? Must we not recognize the particular character of Christianity as consisting in this, that whatever it is, it is simply on account of the person of its founder? Hence, would it not make any difference to conceive the essence and content of Christianity from the point of view of its setting in world history, if its entire significance is so conditioned by the personality of its founder [470] that historical investigation can only proceed on the basis of that personality?⁸⁰

He finds Christianity's 'immediate and original character' expressed in its most unmistakable form in the Sermon on the Mount and the parables. We find here 'the thing speaking for itself: it is the inner power of the truth, penetrating straight into human hearts, which here announces itself in its world-historical significance'.⁸¹

'There are other things that belong to the character and content of Christianity and these can be related to what is its original and simple beginnings in various ways. But it is certain that the purely moral, from which all else flows, remains Christianity's immediate and substantial foundation. This can never be removed without denying its true and most essential nature. It is to this foundation that one always had to return as often as it went astray in that excessive dogmatism, whose logical conclusions were found to undermine the very foundations of the moral-religious life'.⁸² Thus, what guarantees and determines the identity of Christianity is always the person of Christ, whose exuberance and inexhaustibility permeates the Gospel accounts.

When we consider the way Christianity actually developed, it is clear that its entire historical significance depends only on the person of its founder. How soon would everything that Christianity teaches as true and significant have been relegated to the list of long-outdated statements of noble humanitarians and of the wise teachers of antiquity, had not its teaching been transformed in the mouth of its founder into words of eternal life?⁸³

concerning the documents which are the source of our knowledge about Jesus, and concerning the relationship of these to one another. My method is for that very reason even more conservative than that of Strauss insofar as it can distinguish the historical elements from the non-historical within a definite framework.'

80. Baur, *Das Christentum*, pp. 22-23; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 23.

81. Baur, *Das Christentum*, pp. 25-26; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 27.

82. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 35; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 38.

83. Baur, *Das Christentum*, p. 36; ET: *Church History*, I, p. 38.

Statements such as these come from a mind incomparably more receptive and with a deeper understanding of the forces that actually move history than those rather abstract and a-historical beliefs, dreams, and ideas of an offbeat group in an odd book that was thrown into the world. These forces must provide an occasion for the entire development of Christianity, which in the eyes of the most sober historian will always be regarded as having unleashed the power of morality in an unparalleled way.

Of course it cannot be said that Baur's school produced a very clear or definite portrait of the person and life of Jesus. According to Ritschl,⁸⁴ [471] the blame for this lies with the inner ambivalence of Baur's basic philosophical views.⁸⁵ In his explanations of the person of Christ, which were always delivered with a certain hesitation, Baur showed a characteristic vacillation between some statements, which refer to certain features—thus already in 1835, 'at least in respect to the form of knowledge, *although only in this one respect*, [he] ranks the theistic philosophers above the historical Christ'⁸⁶—, and others, according to which it was not so much the person of Christ but faith in his person that was the actual ground for the historical development of Christianity.⁸⁷ In any event it is clear that the so-called historical-critical school could not reconstruct a very clear picture of early Christianity, because Baur's school assumed that the primary sources themselves and their editors had inbuilt theological tendencies and artistic affections that would prevent any single perspective from emerging clearly. But

84. [Ed. note: Albrecht Ritschl (1822–89), initially influenced by Baur and 'tendency criticism' in his *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas. Eine kritische Untersuchung* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1846), argued that Marcion's gospel was not a mutilated version of Luke but an original composition (*Ur-Lukas*) which Luke had used as his source, adding anti-Marcionite elements. By 1847, however, Ritschl had begun to break with Baur. He abandoned the Griesbach hypothesis in favour of Markan priority in 1851: 'Die Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien'. After 1857 he published only in the area of dogmatics.]

85. Albrecht B. Ritschl, 'Über geschichtliche Methode in der Forschung des Urchristentums', *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 6 (1861), pp. 429-59.

86. Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis*. [Holtzmann cites p. 7, but the correct reference is p. 718; the emphasis was added by Holtzmann. 'How could faith in him as the God-man have arisen, unless he was in some way objectively that which faith understood him to be? The necessary presupposition is, in any case, that the self-evident truth, the unity of divine and human natures, became in Christ a concrete truth, a self-conscious knowledge, and was expressed and taught by him as the truth. Herein lies the real superiority of Christ. However, one can immediately raise the question: how could Christ have known this truth? Was it in its only adequate form, as an immanent idea? Or in the inadequate form of a representation? In the undeniable fact that the teachings and sayings of Christ in New Testament documents are available in a form that is fundamentally different from the perspective of speculative knowledge one of course feels compelled to deny the first assumption and affirm the second and therefore concede the fact that philosophy of religion, at least in respect to the form of knowledge, although only in this one respect, ranks the theistic philosophers above the historical Christ.']

87. Baur, *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, p. 447.

instead of concentrating on this real problem, the so-called ‘faithful method’ (*gläubige Kritik*) had in the meantime continued on in its customary laziness, conceiving the Synoptic Gospels in a superficial way. Thus, for example, one critic proposed that Matthew was describing the Lord as the Son of Man, Mark as the son of the Father, and Luke as the son of Mary, and many other such worthless impressions.⁸⁸ Obviously, all kinds of principles of classification drawn from every sort of human perspective are available, plucked out of the air by sleight of hand, just as is the case with devotional literature. An example of this is the essay by [Karl Ludwig] Kalchreuter, who thought that he had finally discovered in the common early Christian memory the only source and satisfactory explanation for the relationships among the Gospels—in short, the true *Urevangelium*. This Gospel, according to Kalchreuter, was edited by Mark so that Christianity would appear as perfected Judaism or as a universal Israelite church, by Matthew as the apostolic church uniting both Jews and Gentiles, and by Luke as a popular church whose beginnings and whose destiny lay with Israel.⁸⁹

For my part, I wish to skip ahead to a time when the literary relationship among the Synoptics had been proved conclusively by the tedious and persistent labour of two generations. Even though this was not achieved through three completely parallel inquiries, there is, nevertheless, a long list of individual conclusions that resulted. [472] I want to pass over the earlier work to the agenda for the present, namely, a careful investigation of the Gospel of Mark, for everything else depends upon the correct interpretation of Mark.

In this connection I have already mentioned an important advance that recently occurred within the Tübingen school itself.⁹⁰ Baur noticed Mark’s ‘habit of using in particular those images that produce the most concrete portrait of their subject and that make the strongest impression of its outward appearance’.⁹¹ After Baur, Volkmar⁹² on the one hand had at least cleared up the purely

88. [Ed. note: Holtzmann here refers to Anonymous, ‘Review of W. Bauer, *Das Evangelium St. Marci in Bibelstunden*’, *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 91 (1860), pp. 1082-86, esp. p. 1083. I am indebted to Prof. Jens Schröter, Universität Leipzig, for locating a copy of this obscure publication.]

89. [Ed. note: Karl Ludwig Kalchreuter, ‘Das Urevangelium’, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 6 (1861), pp. 507-21, here p. 519.]

90. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 388.

91. Baur, *Das Markusevangelium*, p. 41.

92. [Ed. note: Gustav Volkmar (1809–1895) was one of the most radical, revolutionary and embarrassing members of the Tübingen School. In ‘Über das Lucasevangelium nach seinem Verhältnis zu Marcion und seinem dogmatischen Character, mit besonderer Beziehung auf die kritischen Untersuchungen F. C. Baur’s und A. Ritschl’s’, *Theologische Jahrbücher (Tübingen)* 9 (1850), pp. 110-38, 185-235 he criticized Ritschl’s 1846 argument that Luke was a revision of Marcion’s gospel and caused Ritschl to reconsider his view. Stripped of his Hessian citizenship for his outspoken criticism of the State, he eventually found a position in Zürich. He later

critical side of the issue by advocating the priority of Mark, even though in fact he did not think that there was much historical content to his proto-gospel beyond the prosaic facts of Jesus' baptism, his teaching in Capernaum, his travels in Galilee, and his journey towards death in Jerusalem.⁹³ On the other, Hilgenfeld,⁹⁴ as much as he still refused to accept the results of genuine criticism, nevertheless did not share many of Baur's unjustified scruples about Mark. In the contrast between the ever-increasing hostility of the Pharisees to Jesus and the increasing receptiveness of the disciples, Hilgenfeld recognized that there was an inner progression within Mark's story of Jesus. The result of this progression is that the unanimously favourable impression of Christ's activity that is found at the beginning is gradually dissolved into two mutually opposed camps.⁹⁵ But as luck would have it, at every place where Hilgenfeld argues for Mark's independence of Luke (against Baur's position), he himself nonetheless clings to certain presuppositions that can be weakened through a thorough investigation of the position that Jesus occupies in the Synoptic Gospels in general.

The following points are relevant. While it is unique to the oldest view in 'A' that Jesus is elevated by God to be the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ and that the name $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is given in the first place as part of his messianic identity—to which identity also his miracles belong (Mk 3.11; 5.7)—Matthew is the one who first introduced the story of the supernatural conception of Jesus and who, consequently, eliminated any allusions to Christ's 'becoming'. Matthew's alteration of Mark

endorsed the priority of Mark (*Die Religion Jesu*, pp. 202-76) against the position of his erstwhile mentors, Strauss and Baur.]

93. Volkmar, *Die Religion Jesu*, pp. 268-76.

94. [Ed. note: Adolf Hilgenfeld (1823-1907), a prolific author, studied in Berlin and Halle but was initially influenced by Baur (through he never visited Tübingen). Later Hilgenfeld tried to distance himself from the 'tendency criticism' of Baur, offering instead 'pure literary-historical interpretation' (*Die Evangelien*, p. iv). After 1854 his relationship with Baur soured. Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 39), however, criticized Hilgenfeld for not abandoning tendency criticism fully: 'He does not try to determine the origin of Matthew by means of a thorough comparison with the text of Mark and Luke but abruptly, by means of various dogmatic perspectives that he shares with Baur.' Hilgenfeld parted with Baur on the relative position of Mark: Mark was dependent on Matthew but not on Luke; instead, Luke used Matthew and Mark (*Die Evangelien*, pp. 121-50).]

95. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 145. ['The difference between Mark and Matthew consists by and large in the inner characteristics of [Mark's] plot. It is not merely the perspective of constant forward movement that runs throughout the entire Gospel story. This constant movement, which no one at all denies, is characterized by a contrast, by dissolution of the initial and singularly positive impression that Jesus' appearance makes into, on the one hand, the enmity of the ruling parties and the indifference of the people that appears again and again, and on the other, the increasing receptivity of the disciples. The whole plot of the Gospel [of Mark] is explained so easily from this perspective, that it is difficult to imagine arguments could reasonably be raised against this interpretation.']

in Mt. 19.17, for example, is an indication of this.⁹⁶ But the idea of a supernatural conception did not mean for Matthew that he had laid the groundwork for shifting the understanding of Jesus' actual relationship to God from a religious and ethical basis to a metaphysical one. Matthew does not leave untouched simple pericopae such as Α's ταπεινὸς τῆ καρδίᾳ ([Mt.] 11.29) or [473] A's temptation account (Mt. [4].1-11),⁹⁷ which depict Jesus as the *homo labilis* [weak human] who maintained his messianic dignity through his actions. Instead he makes his own additions, which all derive from a similar point of view: Mt. 3.15, πρέπον ἔστιν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην and the citation of Isaiah in 12.18. If Köstlin rightly underscored saving philanthropic love as a special characteristic of the Matthaean Christ, he drew a one-sided and erroneous conclusion when he suggested that he could find the transcendent Christ only in Mark and Luke.⁹⁸ In a similar comment informed by a mixture of historical and dogmatic views, De Wette's usual acumen failed when he wanted to see in Mark 'a view inclining in the direction of docetism'.⁹⁹ In fact, the view of Jesus found in 'A' is nowhere more transparent; by contrast, Mark's interest in Jesus' [divine] origins, which is betrayed in the υἱὸς θεοῦ of Mark 1.1¹⁰⁰ and in Mark's omission of υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ

96. [Ed. note: Mk 10.18: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός. Mt. 19.17: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός.]

97. [Ed. note: Α (for λόγια) is the siglum that Holtzmann used for the sayings source used by Matthew and Luke. According to Holtzmann, Α began with Luke 7.18-35 rather than the Baptist material in Luke 3 and Matthew 3. Sayings and stories in Luke 3.7-7.10, including the longer version of the Temptation story (Luke 4.1-13), are attributed to 'A', which canonical Mark abbreviated (see my discussion in Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, pp. 300-309). Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 140, 147) argued that Mt. 11.28-30 belonged of Α but was omitted by Luke 'because he took offence at the ταπεινός and probably also, as a Paulinist who had abandoned the Law, as the ζυγός and φορτίον' (p. 147).]

98. Köstlin, *Ursprung und Komposition*, pp. 10-11, 127. [Ed. note: Köstlin argued that Matthew emphasized Jesus' compassion and sympathy in his miracles, 'whereas the other gospels emphasize above all the supernatural power and grandeur which shines out of Jesus' thaumaturgic activities (cf. Lk. 6.19; 8.44-48; Mk 5.30); the special characteristic that Matthew has, namely that he often has two persons healed when the other two evangelists mention only one, comes from the same tendency to have the saving activities of Jesus appear in their greatest possible scope'.]

99. De Wette, *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments*, p. 184; ET: *Introduction to New Testament*, p. 163 note b. [Ed. note: De Wette argues: 'The absence of a supernatural birth of Jesus in no wise proves the originality of the second Evangelist; for he has the idea of the miraculous generation (vi.3, cf. Mt. xiii.55), and of the divinity of Christ (i.1, iii.11, v.7, xv.39).' In the note 'b' he adds that 15.39, 44 imply that Jesus' death was not a natural one, and one that was apparently voluntary.]

100. [Ed. note: Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 67) concluded a *propos* of Mark 1.1: 'It is difficult to reconstruct the literal beginning of "A", because the designation of Jesus as υἱὸς θεοῦ appearing in small letters [in Codex Sinaiticus] immediately points to the

in Mark 6.3,¹⁰¹ was nowhere more easily stuck on and, therefore, just as easily removed, as it is in these passages. Unhappily, De Wette found in the combination of Mark 15.39 and 15.44 evidence that the Evangelist tried to represent Jesus' death as a voluntary one. But if something of this sort can be found in Mark's account,¹⁰² it is not Mark who came up with the idea. It was already present in A—this is indicated not only by parallels, Mt. 27.54 = Lk. 23.47 (parallel to Mk 15.39), but even more by the absence of parallels to Mk 15.44.¹⁰³ Finally, according to Tübingen's tendency criticism,¹⁰⁴ Luke's depiction of the person of Christ should be put precisely at the transition point between the Synoptic υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and the Johannine λόγος. But in any event, Jesus is hailed as the son of David both in A and in Lk. 18.38, while Luke introduces the idea of the

hand of the editor [Mark] that can be seen clearly in Mark 6.3.' Thus, he uses variations in the textual history of Mark to reconstruct 'A': 'A' lacked 'son of God' but it was added by Mark, whose gloss is then reflected in the corrector of Sinaiticus. Holtzmann had both Griesbach's edition of the New Testament (*Novum Testamentum Graece, Textum ad fidem Codicum Versionem et Patrum recensuit et Lectionis Varietatem* [Halle: Iacobus Curt; London: Peter Elmsly, 2nd edn, 1796–1806]), which included υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and Constantine von Tischendorf's (*Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio secunda* [Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1862]), which omitted it from the text of Mark 1.1.]

101. [Editor's note: Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 82) argued: 'Besides A probably had the question οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, as the agreement of Mt. 13.55 and Lk. 4.22, which are dependent upon it, indicates. Mark altered this [to "carpenter"] because of his dogmatic interest in the "son of Mary" and not (as Matthew has it) into "the carpenter's son"'. Both Syriac (syr^{sc}) and Latin (it vg^{ms}) versions of Mt. 13.55 add Ἰωσήφ to τοῦ τέκτονος. Thus Holtzmann uses the 'minor agreement' of Matthew and Luke to reconstruct 'A'; but he agrees with the critical editions of his day that (canonical) Mark 6.3 lacked a reference to 'Joseph'. However, both 'A' and Mark designated *Jesus* as a carpenter, a detail that was either omitted (Luke) or applied to Joseph (Matthew).]

102. Ritschl made the same discovery in Luke 23.46: *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas: eine kritische Untersuchung* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1846), 201 [Ed. note: Despite the formulation of Lk. 23.46, πάτερ εἰς χεῖρας σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, which he ascribes to *Ur-Lukas*, Ritschl argues that 'Jesus is depicted in his expectation of death not as the powerful master of all things, but as a weak human being. This feature corresponds completely to view that Jesus in his earthly life is not absolute.' *Ur-Lukas* was Ritschl's hypothetical source of both Marcion's gospel, and the canonical version of Luke. See above, n. 84.]

103. [Ed. note: The point seems to be that Mark 15.44 (ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθηκεν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλα ἀπέθανεν) implies that for A, to which Holtzmann attributes this verse (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 98), represented Jesus' death as somehow under his control. Matthew and Luke not only eliminated Mark 15.44, but also omitted ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν from Mk 15.39 and focused instead on the circumstances that occasioned the centurion's declaration. Besides, the omission of Mk 15.44 would leave ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν in 15.39 dangling (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 107).]

104. Baur, *Evangelien*, p. 490.

messianic king in Lk. 19.38 in contrast to A. As the Messiah of the Jews, the Lukan Jesus submits to judgment in 22.70 and 23.3, and hence the υἱὸς θεοῦ title that is used at these places has not yet lost its original [messianic] significance. Luke sticks so closely to the views of his sources that he even takes over the key words, πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου in Lk. 10.22 from Λ, in agreement with Matthew. We may ignore what Baur has said about Lk. 10.22 and other indications of the almost-Johannine perspective of Luke—should one conclude that the Logos-concept is already anticipated in τίς ὁ λόγος of Lk. 4.30?¹⁰⁵ [474] For anyone who has followed me up to this point, all these arguments have been rendered irrelevant by other considerations. If, for example, one claimed that Jesus appears in the third Gospel as the conqueror of demons—that is, the powers of paganism¹⁰⁶—I can show that it is much harder to extract such a characteristic from the third Gospel than from the second, in which the concept fits much better.¹⁰⁷ Köstlin explained that ‘of all the Gospels, Mark is the most decisive in asserting that what is special about Jesus’ activity is his overcoming of the supernatural forces of evil’.¹⁰⁸ But insofar as the theories of the Tübingen school are cogent, the conclusion [about Jesus and paganism] fits passably with the obviously Pauline and universal character of Luke.¹⁰⁹ Luke’s account begins with an even more detailed representation of the divine origins of Jesus’ person than that found in Matthew and it also concludes with repeated references to the salvific purpose at work in the life of Jesus and with an account of his ascension into heaven (Lk. 24.26, 44-53). But when Köstlin tries to conclude from this that from beginning to end the characteristic of the third Gospel consists in a more emphatic presentation of the divine character of Jesus’ person and work,¹¹⁰ this conclusion can be supported less from the actual historical matter

105. Baur, *Evangelien*, pp. 492-94.

106. Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, pp. 196-98; Baur, *Evangelien*, pp. 429-31, 490-91.

107. [Ed. note: Holtzmann refers to the next and final section of his book, ‘The Synoptic miracles stories’ (pp. 497-514).]

108. Köstlin, *Ursprung und Komposition*, p. 317; cf. p. 313.

109. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 390-401.

110. Köstlin, *Ursprung und Komposition*, p. 181. [‘As a consequence of this view, which departs so completely from that of Matthew, the focus for the evangelist [Luke] is not the teaching of Christ, but his person and work, his self-revelation as υἱὸς θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (8.28) through activity and its effects that represent his dignity (περὶ τῶν πεληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, 1.1; ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν, Acts 1.1). (Luke’s) narrative is thereby distinguished from that of Matthew above all by the fact that it begins with a string of events, which in a prophetic, preparatory manner point to the divine origins and character of the work of Christ, and with an extensive account of the divine origins of his own person, and even concludes with an additional reference to God’s plan of salvation that has been realised in the activities of Christ (Lk. 24.26-27, 44-49). Hence, from the beginning to the end the characteristic of the third Gospel is that it emphasizes in particular the divine character of the person of Jesus, his appearance, and his activities...’.]

that derives from his sources than from the colours with which Luke has painted this material. As cases in point, I adduce not only the designation of Jesus as the κύριος, the editing of the temptation account, the designation of his teachings as λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (5.1), the remarkable reference to Jesus' ἀνάληψις (9.51), but also that event in which Jesus' earthly story finds its real purpose and climax and Luke's deliberate emphasis of Jesus' death as his returning the πνεῦμα to God (23.40). The Paulinism of the author is also related to the fact that Jesus appears as the agent of the good ruler who is opposed to the 'power of darkness' (Col. 1.16), while the Jewish opponents, by contrast, appear as instruments of the power of darkness (23.53). But if it is correct that the continual prayers that Luke ascribes to Jesus are meant by the evangelist to convey the impression of Jesus' close relationship to God,¹¹¹ there is no real similarity to John's Logos. This kind of ethical mediation [475] of Jesus' relationship to God would make any metaphysical basis seem superfluous. Hence Luke's Gospel, like the two other Gospels, belongs to the 'pre-dogmatic period' in respect to its conception of the person of Jesus.¹¹²

I cannot deny that in 'A' and Mark, respectively, we are much closer to the person of the Lord than we are in Matthew or Luke. In comparison with the other Gospels, Mark reduces least of all what is historically conditioned—human individuality—in favour of the universal and the divine. On the contrary, to the eye of the scholar Mark offers so many fine details, painted with earthy colours whose texture reflects contemporary and local, even individual, conditions, that we can conclude that nowhere does what the person of Jesus stand out so clearly as in 'A' and in the Gospel of Mark. While the other Synoptics depict the person of the Lord within the preconceived framework of his messianic call and works, while we therefore encounter in Matthew (1.21) and Luke (1.31-35) a special dogmatic program in the very sequence of events of the life of Jesus that they have assembled, all such features are missing in Mark. Entirely absent is the mysterious prelude of the infancy account, whose composition the first apostolic age left to the next generation. In Mark it is only 'Jesus of Nazareth' (1.9) who is said to come to the Jordan at the time of the Baptist's activity. So completely

111. Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, p. 199. ['One should take care not to confuse the view of the person of Jesus as ultimate with the idea of absoluteness as it appears in the concept of the Logos'. Ritschl adds the note: 'I suggest that the frequent prayers that Luke describes (Lk. 5.16; 6.12; 9.18; 18.29; 11.1) have for the evangelist the sense of conveying Jesus' relationship to God, just as in the fourth Gospel this relationship is found in the fixed formula of the Logos concept.']

112. Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, p. 200. [*Ed. note:* Ritschl notes that Paul also did not feel obliged to formulate a 'fixed and final conception of the Person of Christ, and it is quite wrong to view [Paul] as a witness to the idea of the Logos' (pp. 199-200). 'In respect to its conception of the person of Christ, the gospel of *Ur-Lukas* also belongs to the pre-dogmatic period, as its particular characteristics show.']

does he seem to rise out of the soil of Galilee that his mother, brother, and sisters are all known. Joseph is not named, perhaps because he died earlier. This is probably the same reason that Joseph disappeared early on from the Gospel history as a whole. In his place Jesus is called ‘the carpenter’ (6.3),¹¹³ but from the beginning of our account his occupation is that of a public teacher. His contemporaries immediately placed him in a line with the Baptist and other prophets (6.14, 15; 8.28). But neither they nor, as it would seem, our first sourcebook, knew anything to the effect that something special had happened at his first appearance. The fact that in Mark 6.3 the ‘son of Joseph’ was not taken over in Mark’s text is due to Mark himself, who in Mark 1.1 also calls the Lord ‘Son of God’ without any further explanation. It is only by distinguishing between ‘A’ and Mark that we can settle the debate between Köstlin, who rejects the assumption of Jesus’ supernatural origins in the second Gospel,¹¹⁴ and Hilgenfeld, who affirms it.¹¹⁵

[476] In Mark what is unique and extraordinary in the life of Jesus begins with the act of baptism in which the Holy Spirit, with whom Jesus had no prior special relationship, ‘descended upon him’ (1.10). Although it is impossible to recover what actually happened from Mark’s telling of the miraculous event (1.10) and the divine address (1.11), nevertheless his account, which perhaps goes back to an original statement of Jesus himself,¹¹⁶ must be regarded as more

113. The τέκτων, according to Baur (*Das Markusevangelium*, p. 47), may be apocryphal. [Ed. note: Baur contrasts Luke’s simple declaration that Jesus is ‘son of Joseph’ and Matthew’s, that he is ‘son of the carpenter’, with the identification that Mark attributes to the people of Nazareth, that he is ‘son of Mary’, which creates an ironic contrast with Mark’s own identification of Jesus as ‘son of God’. In this light, Mark’s other identification of Jesus as a ‘carpenter’ looks like an augmentation. ‘Such augmentations, which in their subsequent course of development merge with the apocryphal, betray the interests of a later scribe; we could pursue this “carpenter” further in the references that we find in the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* (ch. 13) and in Justin (*Dial.* 88) to ploughs and yokes that Jesus built’ (p. 47).]

114. Köstlin, *Ursprung und Komposition*, p. 323. [Ed. note: Köstlin (pp. 322–23 note) takes issue with both Hilgenfeld and Baur, ‘who assume that the alteration of ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός (Mt. 13.55) to ὁ τέκτων in Mark 6.3 [both thought that Mark used Matthew] proves that Mark also presupposed the virginal conception of Jesus and even wanted to point to it in this pericope. But one is hardly justified in drawing this conclusion, since τέκτων is chosen by the author because of his love of the contrast it creates with the σοφία and δύναμις of Jesus and to provide a motivation—Mark has many other such comments—for the astonishment of the people of Nazareth at Jesus.’]

115. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 135 n. 2. [‘Mark cannot tolerate a reference to Joseph’s paternity on the lips of the people of Nazareth and therefore converts Matthew’s “son of the carpenter” (Mt. 13.55) into simply “the carpenter” (Mark 6.3). It is not very likely that Mark would have assumed that Jesus was fathered naturally, as Köstlin supposes.’]

116. See Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte*, I, p. 474. Compare Lk. 10.18. [Ed. note: Weisse argued that ‘this account probably [represents] in its original form the genuine, verbatim

original than the other two Synoptics, who in varying degrees objectified the events. In any case, it is the view of the source-book ('A') that a real intensification of Jesus' self-consciousness occurred; 'he experienced a great enlightenment regarding his divine vocation, which struck him like a thunderbolt or like the voice of God in his ear'.¹¹⁷ So from that time on, his whole person and being, at least in one specific respect, has something that lies beyond our grasp. It establishes in him a power for which we lack analogies from ordinary experience to understand. Indeed, according to our reporter, a powerful and urgent expression of the Spirit occurs from the very moment of his baptism, an urge that allows its bearer no rest until its work is in full swing.¹¹⁸ The first result of this powerful activity is that the Spirit 'cast him out' into the solitude of the desert (1.12) where he could finally attain the state of mind necessary for his work. What follows is the obscure period in the desert that lies behind the legend; the sojourn in a zone full of terrors and deprivations—the temptation story.

The chief service of the second evangelist is that while he brought the semi-historical introduction to a close more quickly than did 'A',¹¹⁹ he described the characteristics of Jesus' first prophetic appearance in as light colours as A. The Lord himself appears in Mark as the first born of those who lay violent hands on the kingdom of heaven.¹²⁰ As Kalchreuter observed, his life 'sometimes appeared to be driven by a hurricane'.¹²¹ This characteristic is not merely seen in the lively expressions characteristic of Mark, but [477] in fact the description of Jesus' appearance in the first moments of his mission creates the impression of an irresistible storm, of a powerful and violent passion. There must have been an extraordinarily compelling movement that rattled and shook starting from the moment of his initiation. The first actions that Mark attributes to Jesus are performed with a decisive display of skill, as one would expect of a person who

report of a statement which Jesus himself made about what happened to him at the moment of his baptism', and adduced an analogous report in Lk. 10.18, 'I saw Satan fall from heaven'.]

117. Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 188.

118. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 161.

119. [*Ed. note:* Holtzmann held that 'A' was significantly longer than Mark at this point, containing not only the source of Mk 1.12-13 but also the longer version of the Temptation story preserved in Mt. 4.1-11 and Lk. 4.1-13.]

120. See Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte*, II, p. 70 on Mt. 11.12 = Luke 16.16: 'Jesus describes the coming of the kingdom of heaven on earth as a violent act that he and everyone who follows him commits against the kingdom of heaven. He describes it thus, not without irony, in view of the gradual, cautious and measured way that contemporary Jews acted in respect to God's kingdom—as though the Messiah's kingdom would be offered to the idle in their sleep.'

121. Kalchreuter, 'Das Urevangelium', p. 518 ['Finally, we should take into consideration the literary characteristics which are in evidence, for example, in Mark, according to which events race along from the beginning to the end as if they were driven by a hurricane (Mk 1.21, 35, 35-36; 3.21; 6.45; 8.10; 14.42-43; 15.1).']

feels that his vocation is to put his shoulder to the wheel, turning with the powerful movements of human history and to give it another direction, a new speed.

With a feeling of the urgency of the incomparable moment in which God's entry in world history was to be recognized clearly as never before, Jesus looked for a particular type of activity, but not until he had understood clearly his own divine calling and the era which he was about to enter. Only then could he say, *πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός* ['the time is fulfilled'] (only in Mk 1.15).¹²² To begin with, he sought for assistance. These he found, and quickly at that. With a carefully measured appeal he called his first disciples from their occupations (Mark 1.17) and immediately they followed, leaving family and business behind (Mk 1.20; 2.14). But we see a very odd kind of vocation, a play whose plot we can observe but whose mystery we cannot understand. As soon as he enters the synagogue and expresses himself with his strikingly new energy and powerful speech (1.21, 22), he becomes the talk of the town, from palace to cottage. On occasion those who hear him have no understanding. There are scenes that recall much of what the western understanding of our century has explained mainly through foreign phenomena (1.26).

When the 'spirits' of those who hear him react in a powerful convulsion, he attacks them both in his speech (*ἐπιτιμᾶν*, 1.25; 3.12; 9.25) and his actions (*ἐκβάλλειν*, 1.34, 39). This emotional colouring of Jesus' conduct asserts itself in a striking way, for example, in Mark 3.5 (which Meyer describes well as 'the alternation of anger and compassion'¹²³) and in Mark 8.12, 33; 9.19; and 11.14. In these pericopae action flows with passion from the inner self, which time and again seems abrupt or strange, even unimaginable or unintelligible. Thus, for example, [478] he not only uses severe rebukes in his struggle with the demons, but also dismisses the healed leper quickly and even angrily shows him the door (1.43)—it is not said and, there is nothing more to be said, of why he does this. In the prejudiced or malicious view of Jesus' opponents all these actions contribute to the impression of his being demon-possessed (3.22, 30). To his own family he seems insane (3.21)—an opinion that the church also had to face when the Spirit was at first poured out in the world (Acts 2.13).

Because of the extremely surprising nature to his activity, Jesus, especially at the beginning, is continually besieged—in the true sense of the word—by the people. These descriptions represent a special motif in 'A' (Mark), which

122. Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte*, I, p. 316; *Philosophische Dogmatik oder Philosophie des Christenthums* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1855–62), III, pp. 289–91.

123. [Ed. note: Holtzmann refers here to Heinrich A.W. Meyer, *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas* (Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 1.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn, 1846 [4th edn, 1960]), ad loc., ET: *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospels of Mark and Luke* (trans. Robert E. Wallis; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884), p. 40.]

Matthew and Luke occasionally take over (cf. Mk 1.32, 33, 45 [= Lk. 5.15]; 2.2, 3, 15; 3.7-10 [= Mt. 12.15, 16; Lk. 6.17-19]; 3.20; 4.1 [= Mt. 13.2; Lk. 8.4]; 5.21, 24 [= Lk. 8.40, 42]; 6.31, 54-56 [= Mt. 14.35, 36]; 8.1; 10.1 [= Mt. 19.2]). More often than either Matthew or Luke, Mark describes the impressions that Jesus' teachings, his miracles—in Mark 9.15 even his mere appearance—made, so that despite all of Jesus' efforts to prevent it, his voice was heard in ever-widening circles (Mk 7.36). The longer this continued, the greater were the crowds, coming from a great distance. Thus, right from the beginning his own house became for him the scene of uninterrupted displays of power (1.33; 2.1, 15; 3.20). He soon therefore began to avoid the cities and began to expect the people to come out to him (1.45; 2.13; 3.9). But he still required the same amount of solitude, even as the public nature of his activity increased. In the early morning (1.35) and late in the evening (6.46) he would withdraw to the quiet of nature to pray at length to his father and find relief from powerful strains of physical and spiritual exertion. This habit continued right up to his final hour of solitude in the garden of Gethsemane (14.35, 39). In the early part of the Gospel the place of his withdrawal is first called ἔρημος τόπος, an expression which appears in 1.35 (= Lk. 4.42); 1.45; 6.31, 32 (= Mt. 14.13); 6.35 (= Mt. 14.15; Lk. 9.12); then Gentile areas are mentioned in 7.24. The latter case (of the Syrophenician woman) shows just how much he considered such occasions of respite to be his right, and did not immediately respond to her call for help, even when she pursued him in a rather importunate way (7.27).

If we now ask where we find the outline of the course of Jesus' public ministry that began so energetically, the answer is clear: among the Synoptics it is found only in the Second Gospel. It is almost universally agreed that there is [479] chronological and geographical disorder in the third Gospel, at least in the great insertion (Lk. 9.51–18.14). In this respect Matthew also suffers from defects that were mentioned above:¹²⁴ that even in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus speaks as the Messiah and yet continues to withhold a declaration of his messiahship; that as early as 14.33 the disciples acclaim Jesus as Son of God and yet only in 16.16 does Jesus' messiahship dawn on Peter; and so forth. It is impossible to keep track of progress of this seemingly ever-present Messiah. By contrast, in Mark we almost always know exactly where we are, for the circles the Lord describes in his journeys are enlarged gradually and deliberately. The movement that prevails in the external plot parallels that found in Jesus' inner development and the gradual emergence in him of the messianic idea. Throughout, a strong and bright light shines on Jesus' Galilean activities as he attends to matters in his house—or, more probably, Peter's house (Mk 1.29)—a house

124. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 103-104, 431-35.

with only one story (2.4)¹²⁵ but furnished with a courtyard (2.2). Here he welcomed the disciples (3.20)—a detail that Matthew and Luke have obliterated—and occasionally, even other persons whom he happened to encounter (2.15). No other Gospel mentions Jesus' house as often as Mark (see also 2.1; 9.33).¹²⁶ However, the public activity that is begun in this house in Galilee can be divided into seven ever-expanding circles. These circles can be delineated quite precisely, although the evangelist need not always have been aware of each transition. I will sketch them briefly.

[The second half follows in the next issue.]

125. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 197 [‘The house in which Christ usually resided in Capernaum was probably a single story, but with a small upper room on the flat roof to which a staircase on the outside of the house led.’]

126. I cannot agree with Bleek (*Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien* [ed. Heinrich Holtzmann; Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1862], II, p. 29), who thinks that Jesus' house in Capernaum is also mentioned in 7.17; 9.28 and 10.10, since in 10.10 the Lord is not even in Galilee (and has not been there since 10.1); in 9.28 he is not in Capernaum (where he arrived only in 9.33); and the scene in 7.17 is more easily placed in the area of Gennesareth, in agreement with Heinrich A.W. Meyer (*Markus und Lukas*, ad loc.; ET: *Mark and Luke*, pp. 89-90). The house mentioned in 7.24 is obviously not in Capernaum but in the region of Tyre.