

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

PART 2

John S. Kloppenborg

University of Toronto
Toronto, ON, Canada



Journal for the Study of the
Historical Jesus

Vol. 4.2 pp. 203-223

DOI: 10.1177/1476869006064874

© 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 2 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 first half of this essay is found in the preceding issue]

Mark 1

According to the oldest Gospel, the beginning of the Gospel is John the Baptist, who is described much more briefly than in Matthew and Luke. This is in order to hasten to the moment when Jesus is anointed with the Spirit (1.9-11). Thus the first light of history falls on the beginnings of Jesus' activities—beginnings that are still wrapped in the darkness of legend. This light discloses the future messiah who comes to the Jordan, where John baptized (1.5), but who is immediately [480] drawn into the wilderness. At least in Mark, the entire beginning is told in a concise and economical manner. The account betrays obvious signs of eyewitness testimony in the mention that Jesus travelled in Galilee¹ and that he settled in Capernaum on account of the disciples whom he first called. After

1. Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte. Kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838), I, p. 58.

Mk 1.21, the activity that up to now was described rather sketchily is now described in much greater detail. Perhaps one might even say that an earlier casual approach of the Roman editor [i.e., Mark] gave way to a more literal-minded precision.² Thus, the actual account of Jesus' Galilean activities begins with the picture of his daily activities on a Sabbath in Capernaum. The demoniac is in the synagogue, Peter's mother-in-law is healed in her own house, and that evening Jesus is pressed long and hard in his house by those seeking help (1.21-34). Very early the next morning he leaves in order to be alone, but his four disciples catch up to him. As he discovers, his home in Capernaum is besieged again and so he turns to make a first circuit to other towns in Galilee, because these are also part of his calling. He heals a leper in one of the towns and soon he is not safe from the crowds, who seem electrically charged by his presence, either in the towns or in deserted areas where he withdraws (1.35-45).

Mark 2.1-3.6

After the first journey undertaken with four disciples we find Jesus in his house in Capernaum, besieged once again. Scarcely has the healing of the paralytic, who was let down through the roof and then walked out the door, divided the crowds, with the result that Jesus repairs to open spaces to continue his teaching by the sea (2.1-13). From this point on, Mark indicates that Jesus stayed in and nearby Capernaum (2.13, 23), apparently for several days, although he does not relate the precise sequence of the individual actions that he describes in the time spent there (2.14-3.6). Because Mark is vague on this point, the other two Gospels treat the material with some uncertainty, Matthew placing the two Sabbath stories on the same Sabbath (Mt. 12.1-8, 9-14) and Luke putting them on two different Sabbaths (Lk. 6.1-5, 6-11). One should note in any event that with Levi's call Jesus now has five disciples. Immediately after the healing of the paralytic the first signs of Pharisaic opposition emerge (2.6, 7), first directed only at the disciples (2.16). But soon it is aimed at the Lord himself (2.18, 24)

2. Heinrich Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1850), p. 194; 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]), p. 21 [ET: *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospels of Mark and Luke* (trans. Robert E. Wallis; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884), p. 20: 'It is only with ver. 21 that Mark's peculiar mode of handling his material begins,—the more detailed and graphic treatment, which presents a very marked contrast to the brevity of the outline in the annalistic record of all that goes before. Perhaps up to this point he has followed an old documentary writing of this character; and if this comprised also in its contents vv. 1-2, the introduction of the Bible quotation in vv. 2, 3, contrary to the usual custom of Mark elsewhere, is the more easily explained'.]

and they begin to lie in wait for him (3.6). This opposition mounts so quickly that already in 2.20 we find a saying in Jesus' mouth promising consolation [481] and by 3.6 the Pharisees' secret intention to destroy him is explicit.

Mark 3.7-19

The Roman editor [Mark] breaks off just before the words 'and they came back home' (3.20) and made his longest omission.³ This was an important day, including the selection of the Twelve and the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus had set out from Capernaum on the sea contemplating the new situation that was becoming more oppressive and ominous. Very soon he is not only besieged by those seeking help but also the curious, including some who even came from Judaea and Peraea. As soon as it is possible he withdraws and climbs a mountain, accompanied by especially selected followers. There he selects from a larger number of followers another seven to complement the five disciples already chosen.

With the mounting difficulties a larger organized circle of such persons seemed to him a necessity if he was to get a firm footing with the people. While the earlier disciples were called away rather casually from their jobs, there was a deliberate plan in the selection of the Twelve. A second select group was added to the first,⁴ but Jesus always remained and wanted in principle to remain completely unconnected to the large crowd.⁵ At this point he delivered to those disciples the sermon that the Roman editor had omitted. Luke had elaborated this sermon only at one point (Lk. 6.39-40), but Matthew thoroughly revised it in his Sermon on the Mount. Its original content was purely moral and did go much beyond the principles of loving one's enemies out of a holy patience, principles that have been clearly expressed and developed into universals and that, even then, as opposition to him built in its fateful intensity before his very eyes,

3. [Ed. note: Rather than attributing the skeleton of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount and Luke's Sermon on the Plain to the A source, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien. Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* [Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863], pp. 75-76) argued that a short version of the sermon belonged to 'A'. He was impressed by Heinrich Ewald's argument (*Die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 208-209) that Mk 3.19/20, καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον, points to an omission that is best filled by the Sermon and the healing of the centurion's son (Mt. 8.5-13 || Lk. 7.10), which occurs just outside Capernaum.]

4. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 191, 294. ['The first named students were the same four who afterwards always remained faithful to him, and gained prominence among the Twelve. Their call was not as premeditated as that of the Twelve, occasioned more by a momentary impulse, rather like the call of Elijah's greatest disciple in the midst of his daily chores (1 Kgs 19.19-21)'. The reference to p. 294 seems to be an error; perhaps p. 204 is meant, where Holtzmann continues his discussion of the call of the disciples in Mark.]

5. Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte*, I, pp. 388-89.

would have had to be maintained and made a firm and unflinching part of his very nature. Only by enduring opposition can the eternal victory of our life be won: Luke's Sermon on the Mount⁶ appropriately inculcates this solution on the newly chosen disciples in each of its verses. Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, by contrast, cannot be a speech delivered during any part of the course of Jesus' life, even though individual sayings that it comprises may be historical and authentic. If all of this is true of the Sermon on the Mount, it is proof enough of the fact that from the very beginning Jesus saw the cross looming ahead and that he [482] never laboured under the illusion of reforming the world or even being able to call the people of Israel to a general moral and religious reform, as if by a magic wand.⁷ It would be the plan of a fanatic to wish to create a theocracy in the midst of the Roman Empire.⁸

Mark 3.19–4.34

In the section from Mark 3.19, καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον to Mk 4.34 Jesus returns to Capernaum, though it need not be supposed to have occurred on the same day. The editor [Mark] again takes up the text of 'A' only after the accounts of the centurion who accosted him as he entered the city [Lk. 7.1-10] and the dumb man that was healed immediately thereafter [Lk. 11.14-15] have been recounted.⁹

6. [Sic! Holtzmann here uses *Bergpredigt* (Sermon on the Mount) to refer to 'A' sermon, which in fact is much closer in form and scope to Luke's Sermon on the Plain.]

7. Isaak August Dorner, *Ueber Jesu sündlose Vollkommenheit* (Gotha: Rudolf Besser, 1862), pp. 31, 45.

8. [Ed. note: Holtzmann here refers to the views of G.E. Lessing (1729–81), who treated Jesus as 'the first reliable, practical teacher of the immortality of the soul' (*Theological Writings: Selections in Translation* [ed. Henry Chadwick; London: A. & C. Black, 1956], p. 92 [original emphasis]); Franz Volkmar Reinhard (1773–1812) (*Versuch über den Plan, welchen der Stifter der christlichen Religion zum Besten der Menschen entwarf. Ein Beytrag zu den Beweisen für die Wahrheit dieser Religion* [4 vols.; Wittenberg and Zerbst: Samuel Gottfried Zimmermann, 1798]), who held that Jesus aimed to establish a purely moral and universal kingdom; Karl Heinrich Georg Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des grossen Propheten von Nazareth* (Kopenhagen: Schubothe, 1806); C.F. Ammon (1766–1849), *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, mit steter Ruksicht auf die vorhandenen Quellen* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1842–47); Heinrich E.G. Paulus (1761–1851), *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Heidelberg: Carl F. Winter, 1828); W.M.L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historischen kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (6 vols.; ed. Hermann Messner and Gottlieb Lünemann; Lehrbuch der Historisch Kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments, 2; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1860); Karl August von Hase (1800–1890), *Das Leben Jesu. Lehrbuch zunächst für akademische Studien* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1835), pp. 83-85, ET: *Life of Jesus: A Manual for Academic Study* (trans. James Freeman Clarke; Boston: Walker, Wise, and Co., 1860).]

9. [Ed. note: Holtzmann conjectured that 'A' contained not only the 'Sermon on the

Jesus is barely in the house when a large crowd of people presses in, filling the house so that he cannot even eat (Mk 3.20). This crowd did not consist merely of those living in and around Capernaum but also those mentioned previously in Mk 3.7-8 who had arrived from more distant parts. His mother, brothers and sisters were now a part of this group. Agitated by the gossip and pained by the tumult that occurred as soon as Jesus entered the town, they resolved to end the matter and apprehend this family member who had become so strange and incomprehensible to them and to treat him as insane—a feature that seemed so inappropriate to Matthew and Luke that both omitted mention of this detail.

Much more negative was the opinion of Jesus held by the Pharisees, who had been summoned from Jerusalem to Galilee by their partisans. They had come to assist their partisans, who had been embarrassed by Jesus' miracles, and did not hesitate to invoke against him the most popular explanation that Jesus was insane and even that he was possessed and thus claim that his miracles were demonic in origin. The calculation evident in this allegation prevents us from translating ἐξέστη in Mk 3.21 as 'fainting', as Linder has recently attempted to do.¹⁰ Scarcely has Jesus finished defending himself with vigorous arguments when his relatives in the meantime try to attract his attention. Because of this, Jesus unambiguously severs the ties with his natural family that interfere with his work (3.33-35). In a manner that is rather parallel to a saying from the other source Λ (Lk. 14.26-27 = Mt. 10.37-38), Jesus presses on since, despite their 'concern' about him, he sees that they lack any real consideration for his work, even to the point of planning to abduct him. [483] It is their lack of understanding that inclines him not even to go to the door to see them. At this point the evangelist provides 'a picture of Christ the teacher'¹¹ or rather, an overview of the days that will now follow, devoted to teachings that are not for outsiders (4.1-34). Therefore, if it is objected that Mark produced an obviously unhistorical arrangement by compacting into the course of a single day all of the pericopae in this chapter, since a single day was clearly not long enough,¹² those who take such a position have missed the essential point in the pericopae

Mount' (i.e., Lk. 6.20-49) but also the healing of the centurion's boy (Lk. 7.1-10 || Mt. 8.5-13) and the exorcism of the dumb man (Lk. 11.14-23 || Mt. 9.32-34; 12.22-30). Mark not only omitted most of the 'Sermon on the Mount' but also the Centurion's boy and the introduction and some of the speech material in the exorcism.]

10. J.K. Linder, 'Gedanken und Bemerkungen zu einigen Stellen des Neuen Testaments', *TSK* 35 (1862), pp. 553-76, here 556.

11. Bernhard Weiss, 'Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der drei synoptischen Evangelien', *TSK* 34 (1861), pp. 29-100, 646-713, here 668.

12. Heinrich Saunier, *Ueber die Quellen des Evangeliums des Marcus. Ein Beitrag zu den Untersuchungen über die Entstehung unserer kanonischen Evangelien* (Berlin: F. Dümmler, 1825), p. 80.

themselves.¹³ The parables speech must be considered in the context of the entire gospel, just as the programmatic speech of Matthew (Mt. 5–7) is treated.

Mark 4.35–6.6

From this point on, Jesus travels far more than he stays in Capernaum and his journeys take on larger ambits. On the one hand, as far as the east is concerned, Jesus found a nearby place of interest just across the Sea of Galilee in the area of Gadara. On the other, after a brief stay in Capernaum (Mk 5.21–43) he moved west all the way to Nazareth where events led him to express a similar bitter opinion regarding his hometown and relatives as he had regarding his family (6.4).

Mark 6.6–7.37

There is a major turning point here. Hitzig has quite rightly recognized in the scene in Nazareth the conclusion of the first cycle of Jesus' teaching and miracle-working itinerancy.¹⁴ Up to this point Jesus' twelve disciples were constant companions; but now the first phase of their schooling is over and they are sent out on their own. Through these pairs of disciples (δύο, δύο only in Mk 6.7) going everywhere, Jesus' name must have become known to everyone and, hence, Herod Antipas cannot but take notice of Jesus (Mk 6.14–16). The evangelist cites Herod's opinion of Jesus—that he might be the Baptist—and the account of the death of the Baptist which is appended to it as a way of enhancing the ominous character of this interlude, while he awaits the return of the disciples to Jesus. Hence, Jesus would have had a stronger and clearer sense of his own tragic death for the sake of something good. While he was still in Galilee, which was a region that was little affected by a sectarian spirit where he could hope for a ministry that his enemies were not able to obstruct to any significant degree, the main

13. Christian Gottlob Wilke, *Der Urevangelist, oder, exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien* (Dresden and Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer, 1838), pp. 603–604.

14. Ferdinand Hitzig, *Über Johannes Marcus in seine Schriften, oder: welcher Johannes hat die Offenbarung verfasst? Eine Abhandlung in drei Bücher* (Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1843), p. 129. [Ed. note: Hitzig argued that Mark is divided into two main sections, at 9.31. 'Besides the division (of the gospel) into two halves, there is another division into three approximately equal sections throughout the book. At Mk 6.1–6 Jesus comes once again to his hometown and with this completes the first cycle of his itinerant teachings and healings. In the next section the initial mission of the disciples and the beheading of the Baptist are described. From then on, this second section avoids as much as possible the territory of Herod Antipas'.]

stage of his activities was principally the northern part of Galilee [484] west of the sea, which he crossed at least three times in a short period. Now, by contrast, he led a mainly itinerant life: as much as possible he avoided Herod's domain; after the return of the disciples he immediately sought solitude and for this purpose he crossed into the tetrarchy of Philip (6.32); after returning from there, he also avoided the cities and wandered through the region of Genessareth (6.53-55), continuing his healing ministry and sharpening his criticism of the Pharisees. Finally he went straight into pagan territory, resting in the pagan territory of Tyre (7.24) and then turning again north he went to Sidon, finally returning through the semi-Gentile Decapolis (7.31).

7. Mark 8.1-9.50

This is the high point in Jesus' activity. Taken together, these sections represent a new period in Jesus' life, when he again seeks the shores of the sea (8.10, 22) in order to go back north into the region of Paniai (8.27). But then, drawn by the sense of his approaching death back towards Jerusalem, he enters Capernaum which he long ago abandoned (9.33), now incognito and for the last time (9.30). The public ministry of Jesus is now in the past; in fact from 8.27 on, Jesus has already devoted himself exclusively to the instruction of his disciples and this is especially true of Mk 9.31-10.45.¹⁵

This period represents the high point in his life, on the one hand, insofar as he is recognized for the first time as the Messiah by his disciples (8.29), and on the other, insofar as the transfiguration scene is described as occurring in the presence of three disciples immediately after this. In contrast to Peter's confession, the actual historical content of the transfiguration certainly consists in the fire that Jesus seems to have ignited in these three.¹⁶ This event is also the high point for

15. Weiss, 'Entstehungsgeschichte', pp. 651, 670-71.

16. Heinrich Ewald, *Geschichte Christus und seiner Zeit* (Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus, 5; Göttingen: Dieterichschen, 1855), p. 339; ET: *The Life of Jesus Christ* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1865), p. 218; Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1856), p. 259 [Ed. note: Ewald (*Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 218) interpreted the Transfiguration as an inner intuition of the disciples: '[A]lthough the outer glory [of Jesus] could as yet be seen by no eye of flesh, yet the spirit's eye was enabled already to see it; and though not yet clear and not yet permanently or by many with equal clearness, still already it could be seen by some chosen spirits in moments of higher intuition: and if everything spiritual can at first be seen only momentarily quite clear and shining as in heavenly transfiguration, wonderfully surprising indeed and inspiring is the first moment of this glory, when mortal man, so far as he may, is surprised for the first time by the glorious picture irresistibly overpowering him, and what his spirit inwardly sees as certain comes before him radiant also from without.']

the disciples, who realize the true nature of Jesus' messiahship. Since the disciples' perception of his nature is complete,¹⁷ the trajectory of Jesus' life from this point on is downward. 'Jesus descends from the mountain (9.9); but his sun is also setting: from now on he wanders in a southerly direction back to Galilee, and then through Galilee and Peraea, to the fate that awaits him in Jerusalem'.¹⁸ For this reason the passion predictions begin to appear and after 9.30-32 a grave and ominous air spreads out over the entire scene, so that even the disciples are afraid to ask about his fate, which is so near and yet so incomprehensible.

[485] If we glance back at these seven stages of the public ministry of Jesus, we can confirm the conclusion that it was only gradually, and only at the very end that the disciples decisively recognized Jesus as the Messiah, a recognition he did not force them to make. Of course, this view does not exclude the possibility that right from the beginning the disciples had a certain minimal confidence that they had found the Promised One. Likewise the suspicion that the Pharisees displayed while they were following him as he was in the process of realizing his messiahship is made amply clear even in Galilee where they watched him very carefully and sought to restrict his activity (2.6; 3.6, 22). For his part, Jesus took the first decisive step: he vigorously took up the struggle that had for him become unavoidable by deliberately opposing in each of his actions the meticulous Sabbath restrictions that had been the triumph of Pharisaic work-righteousness (Mk 2.23-28; 3.4). He also violated several favourite practices of orthodoxy (2.16, 18, 23; 7.1-5) and complained in stronger and stronger terms against the opponents who were spying on him (see esp. 3.25-30; 7.6-13). Consequently his opponents quickly reach the decision to bring about his death (3.6).

Thus the course of Jesus' life quickly drew on towards its tragic end, an end that Jesus himself regarded with ever-increasing clarity as the only possible one, but also as the only one of which he was worthy and as a fate that was sanctioned and predicted by God. From the beginning, the Pharisees' hatred and the indifference of the people left him no other alternative. That hatred could not help but be provoked in the strongest terms by the uncompromising severity with which Jesus exposed everything that the Pharisees were: persons without mercy; possessed of a morality that was internally riddled with decay; having only an outward appearance of virtue; and hypocritical in their arrogance. It was inevitable that a calamitous break with them would occur as a consequence of Jesus' inflexible opposition to these things—a break between one who, by all appearances, was intent on using the messianic hopes of the people for his own ends

17. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 270. [Ed. note: Ewald describes Mk 8.27-9.13 as 'the time when the Twelve are fully enlightened concerning the true nature of [Jesus'] messianic life and being and can comprehend certain truths about the true Messiah that earlier they could not grasp...']

18. Hitzig, *Johannes Marcus in seine Schriften*, p. 128.

and, on the one hand, the most stubborn, most easily offended hierarchy that ever there was. It was easy to foresee that even in Galilee only a minority of the people would dare to face with him the danger of such a break. For only *one* circumstance could have averted the death sentence that had been conceived earlier: a series of open and energetic demonstrations on the part of the people. In order to ensure that such demonstrations would take place, Jesus, if only temporarily, would have had to adopt the popular, powerful and inflammatory messianic ideas—or [486] rather, he would have had to give himself over to such ideas. By human political standards, this course of action would have been safe and it was available to him. But he did not take a single step in that direction. His refusal to follow this path in spite of the extraordinary opportunity that was at his disposal is the only adequate basis for explaining his fate. The thousands he had healed, the curious who streamed to him, those who had spread reports of his words and deeds in all directions (Mk 5.20) were also the Nazarene's relatives and the fellow countrymen with whom Jesus had had one of his most bitter experiences (6.1-6). They were only the more enthusiastic representatives of the difficult, morally coarse, and hardened stuff from which the whole people were formed. But his dark fate did not overtake him completely unexpectedly like bad luck; rather, he went out to meet it with a clear vision.

After his long and uninterrupted ministry in Galilee, and after all the experience he had gained of the acceptance of his teaching among the people and the opposition raised against it by his opponents whom he had already encountered, he resolved to leave Galilee and go to Judaea and to show himself in the capital at the seat of the authorities, whose entire system of rule his whole ministry had completely opposed up to this point. He must have taken this momentous step only out of the conviction of its necessity, that his cause, not having reached the critical point, must now be decided once and for all.¹⁹

Hence, in a narrative block cast in a single mould that begins with 10.1, the second Gospel gives an account of Jesus' final destiny—a fate, as we have seen, that had been prepared in advance. Apart from a few disagreements, the other two Synoptics have also adhered closely to the course of events as Mark narrates them. But it is only Mark's passion story that bears clearly the impression of originality, characteristic of the majority of its parts. One need only compare the accounts of the agony in Gethsemane, his indignant and grieved silence in the face of spiritual and temporal rulers, and the intense struggle on the cross, to reach the conclusion that the later accounts have contributed more to the completeness than to the intense verisimilitude of the portrait of Jesus. For what constitutes the character of the Saviour—the hunger and thirst that accompanied

19. Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1853 [2nd edn, 1860]), p. 38.

him during his homeless wanderings as he touched souls at their deepest level of need—is given its most concrete expression in Mark (1.38).

Mark's depiction does everything to emphasize Jesus' irresistible urgings and his sighs of compassion [487] flowing continuously and vigorously from his soul (cf. σπλαγχνισθεῖς, 1.41; 6.34; 8.2; 9.22; ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι, 7.34; 8.12). Because of these qualities, Jesus was always able to perceive in physical suffering the moral aspect and to see through suffering eyes into the sufferings of the soul (2.5).

On the one hand, this reminds us of the lively symbolism of communicative gestures in his outward appearance, which were also taught to the disciples (6.11) as the second evangelist makes perfectly clear: e.g., ἐναγκαλισάμενος, 9.36; 10.16; προσκαλεσάμενος, 3.23; 8.34; 12.43; ἐμβριμησάμενος, 1.43; στυγνάσας, 10.22; συλλυπούμενος, 3.5. One can also adduce such phrases as 1.31: ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός; 1.39: ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὰς (see Meyer's comment on this); 4.39: διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν; 5.40: ἐκβαλὼν πάντας; 5.41: κρατήσας τῆς χειρός (Matthew and Luke also have the phrase here, but in Mk 9.27, Mark alone has it); 8.23: ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρός, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας, and so forth. In addition, frequent words and phrases like περιβλεψάμενος (3.5, 34; 5.32; 9.8; 10.23; 11.11), ἀναβλέψας (6.41; 7.34; 8.24; 16.4), ἐμβλέψας (10.21, 27; 14.67), ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν (8.33) seem like the reminiscences for which an eyewitness to the events must have been responsible. This is especially likely in 10.14 (ἠγανάκτησεν) and 10.21 (ἠγάτησεν αὐτόν) where only Mark takes note of the emotion.

On the other hand, in each of the healings there is a certain directness that is evident—noted by all of the evangelists—in which Jesus takes note of the interior thoughts of people (see especially 2.8; 3.4; 8.17; 9.33–35; 12.15; also 3.16, 17; 14.18, 30). It is characteristic of his way of acting to assess people quickly and pointedly in the midst of their everyday activities. Examples of this style are the situations in which the disciples are called. He observed Peter as he fishes, John as he is mending nets, and Matthew as he goes about his duties as a tax collector (1.16, 18; 2.14). Similarly, he observes the woman as she contributes her money to the treasury (12.41). The *agraphon* that Justin once used to make another point (*Dial.* 47.5) seems to me no less to bear the stamp of authenticity: ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ [‘in whatever things I find you, in these will I also judge you’].

This way of making observations and comments evinces the same style, with swift, penetrating and incisive interpretations, from which we are able to infer certain features of his character and temperament. Just as he himself prefers unambiguous answers (12.34) but stresses the stimulation of the ethical in the face of spiritual dullness and indolence (8.17, 21), so his own [488] explanations are always surprising in their form. He is able to furnish the woman's unconscious act of love, when challenged, with a most beautiful interpretation of her

act (14.6-9); when he himself is questioned, he is never at a loss for the right word for the occasion (12.15, 17); he responds to questions with the appropriate counter-question (11.28, 29, 33). He relentlessly presses his case by appealing to general conditions and facts (8.19, 20) and overcomes his opponents with speech that is metaphorical but at the same time unmistakable in its pointedness (12.12). But even though he always has the advantage over his opponents in the endless debates and is able to refute the contrary opinions, whether expressed or not, with probing arguments (2.9, 25-28; 3.4, 23), eventually he shifts from the defensive to an unrestrained offensive (12.35-37). Here his speech again quickly reaches its original intensity and energy and draws on the fruit of long observation in well-aimed characterizations, which paint the whole picture with a few strokes (12.38-40).

These last-mentioned characteristics certainly have parallels in Matthew and Luke, so that Keim can attempt to describe 'the human development of Jesus' on the basis of Matthew's Gospel. The essential characteristics of his depiction are as follows. Just as every human consciousness is formed, he suggests that Jesus' consciousness arose at the mysterious point where personal awareness (*Selbstanschauung*) and outlook (*Weltanschauung*) meet. We find no indication in his life that he had *a priori* knowledge of either people or objects; if he had at his disposal some of the mantic talent that some persons display, almost miraculously, nevertheless 'all things considered, his understanding of the world came not from intuition but from perception, indeed, from an extraordinary acuity in sympathetic, critical and ironic observation of reality'.²⁰

Besides the stuff of nature and human society that he used so genially, he confronted three distinct factors that provided the strongest impulses for his authority as saviour. First was the people of the old covenant, who had become stagnant, whom he saw at his home, in the school, in the synagogue and who completely filled his soul. As far as historical-critical examination of those books and stories are concerned, as much as Jesus was a person of his times, he stood quite alone in his deep and probing treatment of scripture, in which he tirelessly adumbrated the moral core of the Law [489] out of its external outlines and connected it with the most sublime heights of the prophetic word.

Second, as far as the religious groups among the people were concerned, Keim rightly rejects any connection with the Essenes. He is right that it must have been Pharisaism to which the young Israelite in Nazareth was most closely allied. The later vehemence of his rejection of it betrays his acquaintance with the appealing and seductive impression that Pharisaism must have made on all true and hopeful hearts during the wretchedness of the unpatriotic (*unnationale*) and

20. Theodor Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung Jesu Christi. Akademische Antrittsrede am 17. Dezember 1860* (Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1861), p. 13.

pagan Herodian period. Hilgenfeld's counter observation²¹ only leaves greater room to think that Jesus' inner alienation from Pharisaism became even more rancorous to the degree that the course of his teaching activities brought him into direct confrontation with the undiminished Pharisaic model that he found being cultivated in Jerusalem at the very heart of the temple.

Third and finally, there is John, the wilderness preacher, whose style and behaviour Jesus initially emulated completely and in whose death he first saw his own dark fate.

These external factors, however, are matched by the hardiness of a real genius and a special, even miraculous, endowment from the depths of the divine, which designates even more ordinary persons for enigmatic mysteries. There is a special strength of will, resolve and inner direction that in its fullness and passion transcends what is seen elsewhere, and that is absorbed in the depths of his own spirit and in the revelation of God in humanity.²² 'Out of apparent contradictions and ambiguities, and in the context of his various controversies and struggle there developed the marvelous controlling conception of his existence that he was the Son of God and, as Son of God, the savior of the world'.²³ But this interior state was not a fixed state; it was the result of a process. The most important principle—the rejection of political messianism so as to be the humble servant of an ethical humanity—was always a deeply felt dilemma; peace reigned only at the cross and when he bowed his head to death. In the midst of such activities and moral struggles a conviction about his mission developed. He believed in his messiahship mostly for his own sake, when he offered himself to his time and to humanity as man of the hour, and as a man of God in power and

21. Adolf Hilgenfeld, 'Die Evangelienfrage und ihre neueste Bearbeitungen', *ZWT* 5 (1862), pp. 1-45, here 40-42. [Ed. note: When Keim (*Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 18) argued for Jesus' erstwhile association with the Pharisaic movement as an explanation of his later vehement opposition to it, Hilgenfeld argued the opposite: "'Our Gospels", as Keim himself admits, "show the Lord at the height of his development in a life-and-death struggle with Pharisaism, and indicate that he never formally belonged to the school of the scribes or Pharisees". That which the Gospels try to keep so well hidden, they tacitly affirm. The considerable precision of Jesus' knowledge of Pharisaism should be a decisive proof of the keen attention that Jesus paid to the Pharisees, and the seriousness of his opposition should actually call attention to his awareness of the thrilling and seductive impression that Pharisaism made on everyone, with exception. I believe that Jesus' thorough knowledge of Pharisaism was that of an opponent and I cannot admit that the ideas about the Kingdom promoted by the scribes and Pharisees would have been more successful in no other place than in the half-pagan Galilee, which from the death of Herod until the Roman census after the deposition of Archelaus and up to the destruction of Jerusalem had remained the centre of the messianic movement. The real representatives of Pharisaic teaching tradition came, as Mt. 15.1-2 shows, from Jerusalem...'] (p. 41).]

22. Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 22.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

spirit. [490] Out of the despair of the time, which he alone understood, he appealed to the heart of a fatherly God that could open itself to humanity only through him.

Messianic self-reliance, inner voices and views, the sharp separation from the sinful and dark world, and finally the tireless urge to throw out to a sick humanity and for a sick humanity the anchor of the reality of, and the hope for, the eternal—all this came to expression uniquely in the son of God.²⁴

Both features—the knowledge of his messiahship and his consciousness of his divine sonship—developed in parallel; the first idea led to and enhanced the second, but knowledge of his messiahship did not pass into and merge with the consciousness of divine sonship. Thus, right up to the last the nationalistic side asserted itself in his self-consciousness, so that alongside the spiritual kingdom of the cross one could also expect in the imminent future an actual messianic kingdom. But ‘the moral kingdom was the world-historical central idea; the idea of a messianic kingdom was the dispensable offshoot’.²⁵

As appealing as this general description of the lines of Jesus’ development has turned out to be, it could have succeeded in the case of an actual individual only if the author [Keim] had been able to work with few preconceptions in regard to the ‘darling of recent criticism’, Mark. As much as Keim distinguishes himself from his own teacher, Baur, by the unbiased and quite correct recognition of what can be regarded as historical because of its inherent originality, he remains, nevertheless, a true student of his master in his opinions regarding Matthew, both as a whole and in respect to Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount. The Sermon on the Mount is obviously composite, as can be seen by comparing Matthew’s sermon with that of Luke or even with itself, and by comparing the sections that immediately follow the Sermon.²⁶ But Keim finds only in the first Gospel a beautiful development in the depiction of Jesus’ self-consciousness, of the disclosure of that self-consciousness, and of various recognitions and rejections of Jesus on the part of the world. Yet as soon as one starts looking for primary disclosures of self-consciousness in this document, there is so much irrefutable evidence that the first Gospel went well beyond the two other Synoptics quantitatively by taking over as much speech material as possible. But this point aside, if one concentrates less on what had developed and more on the process of development, that is, on the earthly conditions and the palpable way Jesus’ appearance is pictured, Mark so clearly takes precedence over Matthew that we [491] are able to regard any account that ignores the relationship [of

24. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

26. [*Ed. note:* Here, Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, refers to his earlier treatment of the ‘Sermon on the Mount’ in A (pp. 75-77) and in Matthew’s redaction (pp. 174-78).]

Matthew to Mark] as obviously not the most complete or truest that might be achieved on the basis of the assumptions of modern scholarly investigation.

If I may be permitted a small observation: at many points Keim notes the gradual development of Jesus' foreknowledge—how it can be seen in the following series of pericopae in Matthew: 16.21 (where Jesus predicts only his death); 17.22 (the prediction of betrayal); 20.18-19 (the prediction of condemnation, being handed over to Gentiles, mistreatment, and crucifixion).²⁷ But that is precisely the same sequence as in the second Gospel: Mk 8.31 (ἤρξατο); 9.31; 10.33-34. By contrast, the Matthaean pericope, Mt. 26.2, which does not continue this tendency of escalation (of passion predictions), is missing both in Mark and in Luke. In fact Keim himself notes that Mt. 26.2 can only be understood on the basis of the organization that controls the entire second part of Matthew's Gospel. But this passage, like Mt. 19.1 (where Matthew picks up the thread of his story after an interpolation), is quite certainly due to the artistic work of Matthaean composition. The argument that Hilgenfeld has raised against me in this regard,²⁸ is settled partly though what was said in the tables in §§5, 12 and 13 on the pericopae concerned,²⁹ and partly through the observation that all of the evidence he adduces is also present in Mark, whom he should not have made responsible for the lack of a conclusion in 16.9.³⁰ Besides, in the first Gospel

27. Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, pp. 13, 30.

28. Hilgenfeld, 'Die Evangelienfrage', pp. 6-7. [*Ed. note:* Hilgenfeld argued: (a) that Mt. 19.1 (ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) is original and supported by Ptolemy's claim (*Geogr.* 5.16.9) that connects Peraea with Judaea, and that Mark's wording (10.1 in Alexandrinus), ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, is a replacement and correction of Matthew. (NA²⁷, following) B C* L, prints ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας [καὶ] πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου); (b) that the claim that Mt. 26.2 does not amount to an escalation of the preceding sequence of Matthaean passion predictions 'is completely unfounded'. Matthew here offers a completely consistent picture: 'The prediction of the time of Jesus' crucifixion agrees perfectly with the prophetic characteristics that the Matthaean Jesus has (Mt. 4.19; 9.9; 21.2). His prophetic knowledge is more and more in evidence and is increasingly more precise. To pass over Mt. 26.12 [sic! Hilgenfeld means 26.2], we need only recall Mt. 26.28 [sic! Hilgenfeld means 26.18], where Mark 14.14 again weakens the account when he omits the words ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγύς ἐστί, and on to the predictions of the scattering of the disciples and of the resurrection and appearance in Galilee, the threefold denial of Peter (26.30-31), and even Jesus' struggle in Gethsemane. Here we not only have clear evidence of the dependence of Mark, who in 14.28 retained from Matthew the announcement of Jesus' appearance in Galilee, even though he did not narrate this appearance; but we also have a clear escalation of prophetic predictions in Matthew, because Jesus here adds to the specification of the day of his crucifixion further details about the circumstances of the crucifixion and the place where he would appear after his resurrection. The artistic ordering of prophetic disclosures that Matthew offers has been weakened by Mark through his omissions'.]

29. [*Ed. note:* Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 95-99, 203-206, 237-42) attributes to 'A' the basic contents of Mark's passion narrative and Mt. 28.9-10, 16-20.]

30. [*Ed. note:* Regarding Mt. 26.2 Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 203) says:

there is a series of passion predictions that actually interrupt a sequence that is found only in Mark in its original undisturbed form. For this reason even Keim had to treat them as relocations and displacements. 'Historically speaking, the pericope Mt. 12.39 may have belonged after Mt. 16.4'.³¹ In fact it does not belong after Mt. 16.4 (cf. Mk 8.12) at all; rather, it agrees precisely with Mt. 16.4. Here we have merely one of a number of doublets that resulted from the fact that Matthew assembled his Gospel from two distinct sources.³² The fact that the relationship of Matthew's sources may be understood only in this way is demonstrated in particular by the great sermons, which contain things that the Christ of the second Gospel either could not yet have spoken, or could no longer have spoken. Keim himself is also forced to concede this fact when he 'allows some doubt' regarding the position of the saying about carrying one's cross which is found in the mission speech (Mt. 10.38) and regarding the mention of the Parousia in Mt. 10.23.³³ But both of these pericopae come from the Λ source, and hence there is no claim at all regarding the correctness of their position [492] in that context. But this illustrates the extent to which the entire second half of Matthew's composition of Mt. 10 is oriented to the departure speeches of Jesus. Keim rightly says, 'The idea of Jesus' return makes no sense at all in the context of the commissioning of the disciples, since it presupposes on the part of Jesus and his disciples the certainty of his departure'.³⁴ While this notion appears in Mark only at 9.1, after the passion predictions have begun, it is presupposed in Matthew not only in the mission speech but even in the Sermon on the Mount (7.22 and 7.23). This completely destroys the development of the kind that Keim proposes.

If the actual passion predictions in Mark form a sequence that is more clearly graduated than that of Matthew, we must nevertheless affirm again, relying on the second Gospel, that much of what in Keim's view occurred as a result of a

'The brief and simple historical note in Q is augmented in Mt. 26.1-5, first by the concluding formula for the preceding speech, and then by a more extensive description of Jesus' fore-knowledge and of the locale where the enemies plot against Jesus. It becomes a rather solemn introduction to the passion account'.]

31. [Ed. note: The reference is to Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 30 (note).]

32. [Ed. note: Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 257) discusses a series of doublets that are similarly produced by Matthew's combination of A with Λ : 'In these instances we find one version of the saying always in the same context and in the same form in Matthew and Luke as it appears in Mark; the second version appears only in Matthew and Luke, obviously taken from a source that was common to the two, but distinct from A, with the result that the duplication of sayings has its explanation in a duplication of sources'.]

33. [Ed. note: Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 30 (note): 'In regard to the original position of the saying about bearing one's cross (10.38) and even Mt. 16.24 there can be some doubt, and even more in regard to the mention of the coming (return) of the Son of Man in Mt. 10.23'.]

34. [Ed. note: Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 30 (note).]

development in the last part of Jesus' life as it is described by the Synoptics had in reality already at the beginning of the Synoptic account come to a conclusion. Thus, on our view, the development is and will remain uncertain, because we have only a few points of illumination from Jesus' last days. For example, the 'first mysterious saying about the departing bridegroom' (Mk 2.20) occurs apparently at the beginning of the Synoptic account, but it is in any event prepared for by the rapid appearance of implacable opposition to Jesus (Mk 2.1-17). What Keim has said regarding the suffering of the Baptist, which should be taken as a foreshadowing, is quite correct;³⁵ but while the two Matthaean pericopae he cites (Mt. 4.12; 17.12) have parallels in Mark (1.14; 9.12), the pericope in Mt. 14.13, which is clearly a combination of Mk 6.29 and Mk 6.30, cannot be adduced. It is true that from the death of the Baptist on, Jesus wandered restlessly; but even in Mark he immediately led his disciples into the wilderness (Mk 6.31) so that he could operate in the region of Gennesaret, quickly moving west to Tyre and then back again into the Decapolis, and then wandering to Caesarea Philippi. Only once, immediately before his final journey, we do find him again at his own house in Capernaum (Mk 9.33), just as in Matthew (17.24).

Mark [i.e., 'A'] also appears quite distinctive if we look at the contents of his speeches. Soon after Jesus left his home, as we have described above, we see the stream, which at first gushed forth in a sparkling torrent, flowing into more [493] peaceful wells. From that time on, his actual daily work (10.1) was an orderly teaching with a deliberately chosen method and form (4.33).

His first sermon (1.15), like those given by his disciples (Mk 6.12), still corresponded to that of the Baptist, as did his original *début*. The time, full of expectations of fulfilment when the kingdom of this world will merge with the Kingdom of God, is here; he wants to make people conscious of how the time of fulfilment weighs on every soul, admonishing them to take it to heart; his summons to moral conversion sounds throughout (Mk 2.15-17). Hence, while in Matthew the 'I' of the Lord, used specifically in regard to Jesus himself, appears right in the first instruction (5.11, 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44), Jesus' preaching in Mark does not focus in the first place on Jesus' person but rather his work, his Kingdom, and his community—the moral requirements for entry into his community (*Gemeinde*). 'Therefore he does not begin openly proclaiming himself to be the true King of the Kingdom of God; he begins instead by establishing the

35. Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 31. ['In order to produce the idea [of the cross] what was required was the consolidation and increasing tension caused by the hostility of the people and of the ruling parties; it also presupposed the fate of John, whose death shocked Jesus just a little time before he made his own tragic decision, and in which he saw his own fate anticipated'.]

Kingdom by means of his own effort and work, and by proving himself to be its first full citizen'.³⁶

Increasingly, however, from the depth of conviction about the work that he felt necessary, there also arose the strong self-consciousness of one who knew himself, and knew that he alone had been entrusted with this work. For this reason also, he was fearless in the face of a premature death caused by the forces of nature (4.38). This kind of special knowledge about himself is first indicated in Mk 2.10, where Jesus refers to himself with the expression 'Son of Man', which later becomes the usual self-designation (2.28; 8.31, 38; 9.9, 12, 31; 10.33, 45; 13.26; 14.21, 41, 62). The fact that Jesus was thinking of the Messiah in the Danielic sense when he used this expression is clear from Mk 13.26 and 14.62. However, from the account in Mk 8.27-30 we have to assume that as far as the disciples were aware, the concept of messiahship had not originally been part of the name 'Son of Man'. Because Jesus at first sought only belief in his person rather than in his claim to messiahship, he referred to himself in a more allusive way. Even Strauss rightly saw that the special use that Jesus made of this designation made a wreck of the now-obsolete hypothesis which tried to interpret the whole of Jesus' messianic activities as an ill-fated political undertaking.³⁷ Nevertheless, this allusive self-designation includes at least 'a reserved claim [494] of the messianic idea for himself and that he would make this claim public as soon as it was sufficiently formulated and established in its more nuanced sense'.³⁸ In his relationship with his disciples, this point came at Mk 8.29. From that point on, he not only started calling himself the Messiah (9.41), but also applied to himself the title 'Son of God', which went hand in hand with it, and in effect said the same thing with the expression, 'Son of Man'. The Jews understood

36. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 270.

37. Hermann Samuel Reimarus, *Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger* (ed. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing; *Fragmente des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten*; Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1778), p. 199; ET: *Fragments* (ed. Charles H. Talbert, trans. Ralph S. Fraser; *Lives of Jesus Series*; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. 150: ['It was then clearly not the intention or the object of Jesus to suffer and to die, but to build up a worldly kingdom, and to deliver Israelites from bondage. It was in this hope that God had forsaken him, it was in this that his hopes had been frustrated'.]

38. Ferdinand Christian Baur, 'Die Bedeutung des Ausdrucks ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', *ZWT* (1860), p. 274-92, here 280 [*Ed. note*: Baur's posthumously published lectures on New Testament theology (from the 1850s) made a similar point: 'We must therefore conclude that Jesus chose for himself the designation Son of man—which, to be sure, was taken from Daniel, but was not a very common and familiar term for the Messiah—not with the intention of directly declaring himself to be the Messiah, but instead to designate himself simply as a human being—in contrast to the Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, which expected solely a glorious heavenly figure—not as a human in the ideal state, but as one who shares our humanity, *qui nihil humani a se alienum putat*' (Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie* [Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1864], p. 81.)]

‘Son of God’ in a traditional way to mean ‘Messiah’ (Mk 14.61), and Gentiles took it to mean a hero. But Jesus, who with the expression ‘Son of Man’ let himself be known as ‘one of the heavenly ones’,³⁹ also seems to have had in mind pericopae in the Old Testament such as those in which angels are called ‘children of God’ because they are most closely related to God (cf. Mk 13.32 and 8.38). For this reason, the origin of ‘a beloved son’ come from God (Mk 12.6) is set over against the Davidic ruler (Mk 12.35-37). During the time of Jesus’ earthly activity, it does not seem that the expression ‘Son of God’ was the usual title for the disciples to use. In the Gospel of Mark only the demons call Jesus ‘the Holy One of God’ (Mk 1.24 = Lk. 4.34, from Ps. 16.10) and ‘the Son of God (the Most High)’ (cf. Mk 3.11; 5.7). The disciples, however, address him as ‘master’ (Mk 4.38; 9.38; 10.35; 13.1), and less commonly, ‘Lord’. The latter expression meant nothing more than ‘master’ (compare 11.3 with 14.14); but Jesus himself used ‘Lord’ in connection with his messianic status (Mk 12.35-37; 13.35). This messianic consciousness comes to its fullness in the final speech (cf. the contrasting confessions in Mk 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.

But this very prophetic speech indicates—just as the Lord was also fully conscious of this fact—that his role as the representative of God in the world, a role that no other could play, in no way implied that his own knowledge and will merged with that of God. Rather, as far as Jesus’ knowledge is concerned, our Gospel [‘A’] alone maintains a distinction in reference to the return [of the Son of Man], which was thought to be imminent (Mk 9.1; 13.30). As far as the development of Jesus’ will is concerned, Mark did not even hesitate to preserve the saying about God alone being good (Mk 10.18), a saying which [495] Matthew seems to have regarded as rather questionable. Even Keim had to cite this passage [Mk 10.18] rather than Mt. 19.17 when he was describing Jesus’ inner struggle about the moral task that he set himself and accordingly refused the honorific address ‘good’ for himself and applied it only to God.⁴⁰ It is downright inconceivable how contemporary theology can try to shield itself on the

39. Hitzig, *Johannes Marcus in seine Schriften*, p. 133. [‘In both (Mark and the Apocalypse) Jesus Christ is called not only the Son of God—which does not mean that he was not a human being —; but he also is a more exalted, heavenly being; and he is also the “Son of man”. This expression, which is Jesus’ usual self-designation in the Gospel of Mark (Mk 2.10, 28; 8.31; 9.9, 12, 31; 10.33, 45; 14.21, 41, 62; cf. Apoc. 1.13; 14.14) comes from Dan. 7.13, where the Son of man comes with the clouds of heaven in order to found the kingdom of God on earth... As one of the heavenly figures he makes himself known at the transfiguration to those who trusted in him’.]

40. Keim, *Die menschliche Entwicklung*, p. 44.

basis of purely dogmatic grounds from a conclusion that so clearly comes right out of the text itself.⁴¹

The task of the disciples was to convey to the world Jesus' consciousness of being both Son of Man and Son of God, and to transfuse his own intellectual outlook into the world. Nothing is more characteristic than the relationship that Jesus had with his disciples, which arose out of this task. It is a relationship of complete intimacy. Hence, their worldly goods, which were not as negligible (Mk 14.4-7), are held in common. As the patriarch, he speaks the customary prayer at dinner (8.6; 14.23). Within this group he found his family—or, to express the sublime with an even more sublime image, he lived as a bridegroom among his joyous guests (Mk 2.19). There is no mention made of formal training and schooling such was typical of other pupils of religion. Instead, the influence that he had on the disciples was along a single line—a genuine familiarity—, as he allowed them to listen to him whenever and to whatever he was teaching the people, and to how and where he answered his opponents. The solemn mission speech contains nothing beyond purely ethical instruction—that every ability that is achieved must also unfold in its own time—, nor does it equip the disciples to become sectarian leaders or the masters of little cliques. The disciples have only one special privilege over the people: that in clear contrast with the way he treated the people in general, the Lord was concerned that the disciples would understand his speeches (see Mk 4.24, 25, on the basis of which Matthew has correctly formed the question in 13.51; cf. also Mk 7.14). For this reason they could ask about the meaning of this or that speech (Mk 4.10, 34). Hence, the care that he lavished upon this spiritual family is the patience and the gentle correction that chooses for its instruments only a teacher's love when the disciples act in their embarrassing way (Mk 10.38; cf. also [496] Lk. 9.54;

41. Julius Müller, *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde* (Breslau: J. Max, 1844), I, pp. 110-11 [ET: *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 27; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1852-53), p. 112]. In contrast, see Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, pp. 165-67. [Ed. note: Müller (*The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, I, p. 112) argued of Mt. 19.17: 'The reading authenticated by external evidence and adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann and Tischendorf—τί με ἔρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός—might at first sight seem to have arisen from a doctrinal objection which the transcriber felt against the form of the expression as it occurs in the other synoptical gospels: τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός, Mark x. 18; Luke xvii. 19. But upon closer reflection, seeing that the reading in the paradoxical, disconnected, enigmatical, yet suggestive character of the answer, affords so deep a meaning, and falls in so naturally with the train of thought, we can hardly regard it as a mere correction of a copyist who wantonly makes alterations... The disconnected form in which the two latter render Christ's words may have had its origin in a very early inexact apprehension of their meaning, which emphasized the affirmative part of Christ's answer, and altered the interrogative part of it so as to harmonize with the question of the young man. We therefore feel justified in regarding the above reading [i.e., Mt. 19.17] as the original form of Christ's words without appealing to the disputed authority of the first gospel.']

10.41). Thus, there is a charming appeal to Jesus' genuine humanity through the form that his chastisement takes (Mk 9.36, 37; 10.13, 14). The normal note of friendship is abruptly and sharply broken only when one disciple's failing also conceals something that is a great personal temptation for him (Mk 8.33), so that love that is both perceptive and forbearing is bound first of all to be as vigorous as it is gentle.

If we put together with these tender and mild powers the stronger and more caustic powers mentioned above, and at the same time remember everything that I discussed in this and the preceding section⁴² regarding the characteristic features of Jesus, we can see the clarity and harmony of what constitutes vigorous persons: the convergence of understanding, emotion, perception, presentiment, genuine simplicity, and innocence in which unrivalled versatility is crystallized with such a wonderful energy as has not been attested empirically elsewhere. What is special about the character of Jesus is what more recent theology has in mind when it denies to him individual particularity.⁴³ But with this we have taken a dangerous step outside the terrain of the historical, of what may be demonstrated empirically, into the lofty realm of dogmatic wishful thinking. The 'A' sources offer precisely the points of reference for a vivid depiction of Jesus' activities, and if these occur mostly during the early part of his public life, it is only in the normal course of things that the powers of his personality, which could be seen originally in specific, singular, incidents, were involved in a continual and active process of interpenetration and exchange. If one may go so far as to recognize rightly and decisively the national particularity of the character of Jesus,⁴⁴ if one has established the full historical reality of his personality from

42. [Ed. note: i.e., pp. 443-68 entitled 'The Historical Character of the Sources of the Synoptic Gospels'.]

43. [Ed. note: Holtzmann has D.F. Strauss in mind here. Karl Barth (*Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History* [trans. John Bowden; London: SCM Press, new edn, 2001], p. 546) noted that 'Strauss... did not go to the trouble... to work out a character picture of Jesus. He was lacking in the vision which perceives... "that what truly gives human history its greatness, worth and power is the great personality of genius"' (quoting Heinrich Weinel). Helmut Thielicke (*Glauben und Denken in der Neuzeit. Die großen Systeme der Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983], p. 466) summarizes Strauss's view thus: 'The Christology of the New Testament can only be interpreted mythologically. To express this conceptually, this means above all that the particularity of Jesus as an individual can only have the symbolic significance that stands representatively for a super-individual idea (*eine überindividuelle Idee*).']

44. Michael Baumgarten, *Die Geschichte Jesu für das Verständniss der Gegenwart* (Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1859), pp. 239-41; Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'Kritischer Versuch über die Schriften des Lucas', in *Sämmtliche Werke*, vol. 1/2 (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1836), p. 107. [Ed. note: Michael Baumgarten (1812-89) studied at Kiel (1832) and became professor ordinarius of theology at Rostock in 1850. His efforts to promote liberal theology brought him into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities of Mecklenburg and in 1858 he was

this perspective, there is really no longer any reason to deny his individual particularity.⁴⁵ Indeed, when we recognize this, we feel ourselves to be on more secure ground, and are also more certain vis-à-vis the subterfuge attempted by a more serious camp of scholarship that the identity of the moral character of Jesus could be recognized apart from one having to believe in his historical reality.⁴⁶

deprived of his professorship. He then lectured widely in Germany on the life of Jesus. On several occasions (1874, 1877 and 1878) he sat in the Reichstag as a member of the progressive party.]

45. Cf. my comments against Dorner in Heinrich J. Holtzmann, 'Rez. Dorner, Ueber Jesu sündlose Vergangenheit', *Allgemeine kirchliche Zeitschrift* 3 (1862), pp. 578-80 [Ed. note: Isaac August Dorner (1809–84) was professor of theology at Kiel (1839–43), Königsberg (1843–47), Bonn (1847–53), Göttingen (1853–62) and Berlin (1862–84). Dorner had briefly taught at Tübingen, named as an *Assistent* in place of Baur's preference, Eduard Elwert. Dorner, influenced heavily by Hegel and hence, in Baur's words, 'not exactly a Pietist', was supported by the Pietist faction led by Christian Friedrich Schmid, who after the publication of Strauss's *Life of Jesus* became opposed to the form of biblical criticism represented by Strauss and Baur. According to Dorner, Jesus is a divine man who absolutely accepted God's Logos as the foundation and content of his life. On Dorner, see Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 41 and Barth, *Protestant Theology*, pp. 563-73. I owe the copy of Holtzmann's review of Dorner to the kindness of Dr Eve-Marie Becker, Universität Erlangen. Prof. Dr Christoph Heil (Universität Grätz) offers helpful comments on Dorner.]

46. Ernest Renan, *Études d'histoire religieuse* (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1857 [5th edn 1862]), p. 214 ['One must, without hesitation, admire Christ, that is, the character that results from the Gospel, because it is a sublime participation in the divine; the Christ of the Gospel is the most beautiful incarnation of God in the most beautiful of forms, the moral human. He is truly the son of God and the son of humanity, God in humanity... But as for the man of Galilee, what reflections of divinity have almost escaped our notice, what difference does it make if he escapes? Assuredly the historian should want to clarify this problem. But from the point of view of the religious and moral needs of humanity, there is not much interest in this. What difference does it make what happened in Palestine 1800 years ago? Of what importance is it that Jesus was born in such and such a village, or that he had a certain ancestry, or that he suffered on such and such a day of holy week? Let us leave such questions to the investigations of the curious. Will the Homeric poems be more beautiful if it is shown that the events that they describe are all historical? Will the Gospel be more beautiful if it is true that at a certain place and at a certain point in time a person exemplified, word for word, the characteristics with which the Gospels present us? The portrait of the sublime gains nothing from its conformity with a real hero. The truly admirable Jesus is sheltered from historical criticism; he has his throne in the conscience; he cannot be replaced by a superior ideal; he remains king forever.']