Albert Schweitzer,

The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede (Produced by class of Fall 2005)

I. The Problem

- A. Introduction: According to S. "the greatest achievement of German theology is the critical investigation of the life of Jesus" (1). It is of higher value than the study of dogma, since the former works for the future while the latter works with the past (2). The early Christianity (Paul) was indifferent to the historical Jesus and clung to the Christ, since it knew the idea of the historic Jesus would bring "the inner division" extremely difficult to solve (2). Since the world continued to exist, "the supra-mundane Christ and the historical Jesus of Nazareth had to be brought together into a single personality at once historical and raised above time" (3). By "sublimating the historical Jesus into the supra-mundane Idea", all justification for and interest in the investigation of the L-of-Jesus and his personality were set aside (3). Further, the self-contradicting doctrine of the Chalcedon "cut off the last possibility of a return to the historical Jesus" (3).
- B. The historical investigation of L-of-Jesus began not out of the historical interest, but of the dogmatic interests. Even after it was freed from its dogmatic interests, the Jesus created remained to be the reflections of the epoch and the characters of individuals (4). The historical Jesus became lively only when the strong love or hate of the individual was breathed into (4). Reimars, Wolfenbttel Fragentist, David Friedrich Strauss produced Jesus out of their hatred toward Christ in dogmas.
- C. The difficulty of the historical study of L-of-Jesus lies in method and sources. Methodologically, it "has had to create its own methods for itself" (6). However, there is "no direct method solving the problem in its complexity; all that can be done is to experiment continuously, starting from definite assumptions" (6). Difficulties with sources lie in the difference btw Synoptics and John and "the lack of thread of connection in the sources" (6-7). We need to fill the gaps with historical imagination. The making and testing of hypotheses are the best and only way to discover the connections lacking both in historical events and the actions/discourses of Jesus.
- D. The history of L-of-Jesus is fallen into two periods: before Strauss and after Strauss. The main interest of the first period was the question of miracles. Strauss made clear that "these events have no rightful place in the history, but are simply mythical elements in the sources" (10). The main historical problem of the life of Jesus slowly arose: "What was the significance of eschatology for the mind of Jesus?" With this question, the problem of self-consciousness of Jesus is closely associated.

E. S's attempt of the work:

- 1. "To trace genetically in the successive works the shaping of the problem as it now confronts us"
- 2. "To give a systematic historical account of the critical study of the life of Jesus (12).

II Hermann Samuel Reimarus

- A. Summary: The monograph was published after his death by Lessing who grasped its significance. R. distinguishes between Jesus' teaching and the teaching of the Apostles. The former is contained in two phrases: "Repent, and believe in the Gospel," "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" (16). Since there is no explanation to the concept of kingdom of Heaven, Jesus must have adopted the Jewish Messianic expectations without any corrections. There were two lines of Messianic expectation in His Time: a. "The political ideal of the prophets" (the scion of David's line) and b. "Another Messianic expectation which transferred everything into the supernatural sphere (in the Apocalypses and certain Rabbinic sayings) (20). Jesus must have understood himself in the line a. He preached that in the time of the coming Kingdom, the new righteousness, namely "a new and deeper morality", is needed (18). After Jesus' failure, the disciples overcame the initial shock by employing the messianic expectation of the line b.
- **B.** Evaluation: S. evaluates R. highly by calling it a "magnificent piece of work" both in the history of criticism and in literature (15). It was "the first time that a really historical mind, thoroughly conversant with sources, had undertaken the criticism of the tradition" (15). Its excellence lies in grasping "the fact that the world of thought in which Jesus moved was essentially eschatological" (23). However, R. saw the eschatology in a wrong perspective. All his mistakes came from his misunderstanding that Jesus' preaching had the Messianic ideal of the political ruler.

III The Lives of Jesus of the Earlier Rationalism

A. Earlier Rationalism

- 1. Summary: According to S., the earlier rationalism was a less complete rationalism, not yet separated from a "simple-minded supernaturalism" (27). However, an impulse to write the L-of-Jesus was first manifested in this half-developed rationalism (28). Though the battle about miracle had not started, miracle no longer played any important role. The firmly established principle was "that the teaching of Jesus, and religion in general, hold their place solely in virtue of their inner reasonableness, not by the support of outward evidence" (28). The treatment of the teaching of Jesus is really rationalistic. The miracles are reduced as much as possible.
- 2. Evaluation: S. calls the period "wholly unhistorical", for "what it is looking for is not the past, but itself in the past" (28). Further, aesthetically, these older rationalistic works are "among the least pleasing of all theological productions" due to its boundless "sentimentality of the portraiture" and the "want of respect for the language of Jesus" (29). All said, S. says we must not be unjust to these writers. "What they aimed at

was to bring Jesus near to their own time, and in so doing they became the pioneers of the historical study of His life" (29).

- B. Johann Jakob Hess (1741-1828) Geschichte der drei letzten Lebensjahre Jesu. (History of the Last Three Years of the Life of Jesus.) 3 vols., 1400 pp. Leipzig-Zurich, 1768-1772; 3rd ed., 1774 ff.; 7th ed., 1823 ff.
 - 1. Summary: The work is "a paraphrasing history" (29). Miracles are "essential to the Gospel narrative and to revelation" since they would not have been needed, if Jesus had been only a moral teacher and not the Son of God. He insisted Christians must be careful "not to prize miracles for their own sake, but to look primarily to their ethical teaching" (29).
 - 2. Evaluation: S. is very critical of H. saying, "the parables are barely recognizable, swathed, as they are, in the mummy-wrappings of his paraphrase; and in most cases their meaning is completely travestied by the ethical or historical allusions which he finds in them" (30). Accordingly, the "peculiar beauty of the speech of Jesus" is destroyed thoroughly (30).
- C. Franz Volkmar Reinhard (1753-1812) Versuch liber den Plan, welchen der Stifter der christlichen Religion zum Besten der Menschheit entwarf. (Essay upon the Plan which the Founder of the Christian Religion adopted for the Benefit of Mankind.) 500 pp. 1781; 4th ed., 1798; 5th ed., 1830.
 - 1. Summary: In order to prove Jesus' uniqueness, R. demonstrates that "his plan for the welfare of mankind was something incomparably higher than anything which hero or sage has ever striven for" (32). With the intention of "introducing a universal change, tending to the benefit of the whole human race," Jesus attaches his teaching to the Jewish eschatology. However, only the form of his teaching was affected by eschatology, since "he gives an entirely different significance to the terms Kingdom of Heaven and Kingdom of God, referring them to a universal ethical reorganization of mankind" (32). His plan was completely independent of politics; he never claimed his Davidic descent. Jesus died in a shameful way because "he wished to destroy at once and for ever the mistaken impression that He was aiming at the foundation of an earthly kingdom, and to turn the thoughts, wishes, and efforts of His disciples and companions into another channel" (32). The essence and the content of his discourses are "moral instructions" (33). Jesus worked for "the establishment of a purely ethical organisation" as "a social reformer" (33). What was of primary importance for him was "the alliance of religion with reason" (33).
 - 2. Evaluation: R.'s account of the teaching of Jesus was "historical in the sense that all dogmatic considerations should be excluded" (32). However, S. raises the following questions: "what kind of relation was there between this rational religion taught by Jesus and the Christian theology which

Reinhard accepted? How does he harmonise the symbolical view of Baptism and the Lord's Supper which he here expounds with ecclesiastical doctrine? How does he pass from the conception of the divine teacher to that of the Son of God?" (34)

- D. Ernst August Opitz. Geschichte und Characterziige Jesu. (History of Jesus, with a Delineation of His Character.) Jena and Leipzig, 1812. 488 pp.
 - 1. Summary: He follows the track of Reinhard (34).
 - 2. Evaluation: It is "disfigured by a number of lapses of taste, and by a crass supernaturalism in the description of the miracles and experiences of the Great Teacher"(34).
- E. Johann Adolph Jakobi. Superintendent at Waltershausen. Die Geschichte Jesu für denkende und gemiitvolle Leser, 1816. (The History of Jesus for thoughtful and sympathetic readers.) A second volume, containing the history of the apostolic age, followed in 1818.
 - Summary: J. recognizes that much of the miracles are secondary additions, but he is critical of thoroughgoing rationalism, "whose would-be helpful explanations are often stranger than the miracles themselves" (34). A certain amount of miracle must be maintained, "to surround His life with a guard of honour" (34).
- F. Johann Gottfried Herder. Vom Erioser der Menschen. Nach unsern drei ersten Evangelien. (The Redeemer of men, as portrayed in our first three Gospels.) 1796. Von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland. Nach Johannes Evangelium. (The Son of God, the Saviour of the World, as portrayed by John's Gospel.)
 - 1. Summary: H. recognizes the unavailability of attempts to harmonize the synoptics with John. John was "a protest against the narrowness of the 'Palestinian Gospels'" (35), while synoptic Gospels were also written with their special concerns. It is possible to find "pure history" in neither synoptics nor John. H. claims that in order to find the L-of-Jesus in the Gospels, we must read them "with taste" (36). In this way, miracles cease to be an offence.
 - 2. Evaluation: S. evaluates H. highly. He did an outstanding work to grasp many problems, distinguishing him form other contemporaries. But his allowing the miracles keeps him yet among the primitive rationalists.

[CHAPS 4-9]

X The Marcan Hypothesis

A. Introduction to Christian Hermann Weisse

Weisse continues the work of Strauss, shows the "Jesus of history" becoming "the Christ of faith" with recourse to philosophy. Thus reconciles philosophy with religion, against theology. Strauss derides his work, Schweitzer defends

it: Weisse improves on Strauss by looking for connections in the gospels that would indicate an underlying history, thereby exposing the remaining mythical material.

B. W's argument for Markan priority.

- 1. Details in Mark lacking in other synoptics are too insignificant to have been inserted for reasons of embellishment, therefore were probably omitted by Matthew and Luke. Disconnected and fragmentary shape combined with underlying narrative connectedness suggests a real story taking shape from collected material, vs. John. Simplicity of Mark, vs. Luke's "perverse design" (123).
- 2. S lists five propositions as Weisse's main arguments for Markan priority: common plan in elements shared between Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but not in elements shared between Luke and Matt; Mark mediates the agreement of the other two in shared elements between all three; The Logia of Matthew, which he describes as the other common source for Matt and Luke, does not disrupt Markan ordering; divergences of wording are greater in Lukan and Matthean Logia passages than in Markan passages; and Matt reproduces the Logia better than Luke even though his gospel appears to be later.
- 3. Wilke's "The Earliest Gospel" provides the conformation of Weisse's hypothesis.

C. W's theory on John.

- 1. G. John is negatively portrayed as the product of doctrinal creativity and the author's desire to portray Jesus struggling with 'the Jews'. Originally a series of speeches composed from a fading memory aided by theoretical speculation. Narrative portions added by John's disciples.
- 2. Difficult to maintain- unlikely that John would have turned to Hellenistic speculation vs. his portrait in the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline epistles. W Admits that Johannine authorship is improbable but claims that the weight of the authority of the church is decisive. Schweitzer argues that W's portrait effectively excludes John from historical study.
- 3. Alexander Schweizer conversely tries to attribute narrative portions to John, divides between a spiritual Jerusalem gospel and material Galilean gospel source. Schweitzer holds the distinction to be untenable Schweizer's contribution is nullified.
- 4. Strauss reacted negatively to the theory of Markan priority owing to its association with the rehabilitation of John, did not look closely enough at W to see similarities in judgment.

D. W's treatment of Mark.

1. W looks for historical causes for Markan myth, rather than following Strauss in seeing it as pure myth. Myth in the baptism, transfiguration, resurrection etc. accumulates around historical fact. Mythmaking is particularly noticeable in the effort to counteract prevalent Gnosticism. The resurrection is an account of an historical spiritual/psychical visionary experience, not of a material resurrection. Improvement over Strauss, highly regarded by S but for its lacking "the eschatological premise"

- (131). W cautiously focuses only on the historicality of the main outline of the gospel. W's work is also better than later forced historical interpretations (e.g. Schenkel).
- 2. Weisse's critical failure, one taken up senselessly by those to come after him, is his spiritualization of Jesus' eschatology in his treatment of Jesus' self-designation 'Son of Man.' W argues that the apostles and early Church mistook and distorted the Jesus' teachings on the Son of Man for Jewish eschatology when in fact it was an original and mysterious spiritual messianic conception. Weisse's error successfully blinded theology from fully understanding NT eschatology until the time of Johannes Weiss.

XI The First Sceptical Life of Jesus

A. Introduction to Bruno Bauer

S begins with introductory detail of B's life (1809-1882). B was associated in philosophy "with the Hegelian "right." Like Strauss, he received a strong impulse from Vatke" (137). Was forced to stop teaching at Bonn. Worked on secular history. Work after the 50's ignored. Eventually forced to side with conservatives. His literary conception of the gospel tradition begins with John's "fixed reflective conception" (138) and works backward to find where this was derived from "the intuitive prophetic idea of the Messiah" (138)- this is critical for the shape of his work.

B. John as a literary invention

In *Kritik der evangelishen Geschichte des Johannes* (1840), B views John as an artistic, literary production. S says B is both an aesthete and a critic. Depicts the synoptics as solid historical resources vs. the fantastical John, but ends by wondering whether the other gospels aren't also affected by the creativity of their authors.

- C. Mark as a literary invention
 - 1. In "Criticism of the Gospel History of the Synoptics" (1841), considers the Markan hypothesis correct, asks in turn the critical question of what, then, lies behind Mark. If one considers the possibility that there is no Logia behind Matt and Luke then all three rest on Mark, which could, like John, be a literary invention. Points to birth narratives and other material in Mt. and Lk. that is not in Mk to show its inventedness. Luke is the transition from Mk. to Mt.
 - 2. Argues that Jesus' Messiahship cannot be shown to be known before Mark. Proves against received wisdom that there is no evidence for widespread messianic speculation or expectation at the time of Jesus' life, so the synoptics, i.e. Mark, are the only evidence for it. The "reflective conception of the Messiah" (143) is established originally by the early Christian community. Mark portrays a Messiah like John portrays the revealer of the Logos.
 - 3. Argues that this has been obscured by apologists and theologians.
- D. Gospels as the religious experience of the early Church
 - 1. B wants to continue Strauss' work but to replace 'legend' or 'myth' with 'reflection,' i.e. the reflection of the early Church.

- 2. Offensive portions of the gospel are not from Jesus but the church.
- 3. Temptation, sending of the twelve, parables, baptism, miracles, and secrecy sayings are all better explained with recourse to the needs of the early church.
- E. Cannot explain the parables as artistic unity, resorts to an 'ur-markus' which implies traditional materials vs. artistic creation. Potential breakdown in method.
- F. S argues that B proves the priority of Mk. by indicating that the version where Jesus does not claim from the start to be the Messiah is original because it is more complicated/difficult.
- G. Historical difficulties with the life of Jesus which Bauer illuminates- literarity of transfiguration and thrice repeated passion prediction, difficulties and inconsistencies in journeys from Galilee to Jerusalem, the eschatological discourses, the story of Lazarus (that it's not in the synoptics), treachery of Judas, the Lord's Supper (that it's gross), literarity of Gethsemane, the resurrection.
- H. Hatred of and contempt for theologians and apologists
 - 1. Imagines a web of deceit perpetuated by them, particularly concerning history.
 - 2. However, hatred has to do more in S's view with B's concept of true religion: For B Jesus is not the Jewish Messiah but the reconciliation of God and humanity and the support of religious consciousness. Religion is frozen by the gospel narrative into its first stage of transition to true religion (true religion is the victory of the self over the world). Christianity is only opposition to the world, not a true victory and is informed by the Roman Empire, philosophy, and the OT. By freezing religion at this point Christianity/God/Jesus becomes an absolute universal mechanism of domination and vampirism, sapping the life out of humanity. Bauer sees his work as freeing humans up for true religion by showing that the Jesus Christ of the gospels is only the experience of the early church. Theologians are responsible for perpetuating the false religion.
 - 3. In the end B's work shifts from the historical Jesus to the idolatrous Jesus created by theologians and the early church- the historical Jesus becomes irrelevant.

I. Later Work

Tries to return to historical Jesus, decides there wasn't one. Tries to demonstrate that Seneca and Josephus are the precursors of the system of domination that is established in Paul. Christianity comes out of Roman philosophical and worldly culture and begins at the time of Pliny's letter to Trajan. S sees this later work as a failure of B's original intention.

J. Lasting contributions

B made it hard to take Mark as historical evidence had a negative influence by that token. However, asked many important questions for the history of criticism. S argues we should be more interested in questions than answers in looking at past critics. B also understood the nature of humanity as the body of Christ under the Roman Empire.

XII Further Imaginative Lives of Jesus

A. Hennell, Venturini, Weisse.

Hennell plagiarized Venturini. Hennell depicts Jesus as tool of Essenes, resuscitated after crucifixion by same. Venturini had looked for solutions to real problems, and had imagined the connection of Jesus' life to late Judaism and contemporary thought. Problems were not solved by rationalism or by Strauss and Weisse. Hennell's work is derivative, a mere romance. Weisse had failed to connect Jesus' teachings to contemp. Judaism, thus imaginative lives of Jesus followed in the wake which tried to used Jewish ideas to understand Jesus: Gfrorer, Richard von der Aim, and Noack, in whom "begins the skirmishing preparatory to the future battle over eschatology" (162).

B. Gfrorer (1803-1861)

- 1. Had renounced Christianity and Hegel. Christianity endured because of custom, had "commended itself to antiquity 'by the hope of the mystic kingdom of the future world and having ruled the middle ages by the fear of the same future" (163). Aims to be purely historical, show the non-originality of Xanity. Messianic expectations, Philo lay groundwork for Jesus and Paul.
- 2. "The Sacred Legend," second book, written after Strauss, tries to emulate him. Polemic against Weisse: Papias' statements are untrustworthy, Luke was first and most trustworthy evangelist. Synoptics written long after destruction of holy city from Xtian legends near Sea of Tiberias. Church suppressed individual doubts about gospel authenticity. Mark shows doubts about earlier accounts. John is authentic, though Jesus did not speak that way. Five Johannine miracles are retained, explained with recourse to Venturini. Gfrorer imagines himself free of Hegelianism, uses 'historical mathematics' to prove that Jesus' death was spiritual not political (since he was crucified by his own people, not the Romans). Jesus was informed by Platonic ideals and speaks in spiritualizing concepts (e.g. the resurrection of the dead is spiritual- present eternal life). He was resuscitated by Essenes, church grew from Essene order. "The work closes with a rhapsody on the Church and its development into the Papal system" (166).
- 3. S says the need for a 'fixed point' keeps Gfrorer from fully executing criticism, leads him to Catholicism.

C. Ghillany (1807-1876).

- 1. Improvement on Gfrorer; does not spiritualize but focuses on eschatology in the historical setting of Venturini's work. Writes life of J with eschatology in mind. He abandoned the clerical profession, wrote controversial but historically advanced work as Richard von der Alm. Could not find an appointment in diplomatic service because of his views.
- 2. Holds Matt later than Luke, Mark is extracted from the sources. John is not authentic.
- 3. Early Christian church develops Jesus out of Mithraism, Gnosticism. John Bap. was an Essene, Jesus was at first similar, wanted to teach, did not claim Davidic descent (an invention of dogmatic theology).

- 4. Jesus held himself to be the Messiah. Messiah is concealed, suffering, notions taken from Jewish scripture. Messiahship is passive because God will intervene, Jesus does not try to found a political kingdom but waits. Dies in order to compel God's intervention. "In this respect Ghillany grasps clearly the character of the eschatology of Jesus- more clearly than anyone had ever done before" (168).
- 5. Life of Jesus: J was Essene tool. Essenes, headed by Joseph of Arimathea, want to mystically, not politically bring about Kingdom of Heaven. Used Jesus to propagate that message, letting him believe in the resurrection so he'd go to death for the cause; hence Jesus' own anxiety (Gethsemane) and reluctance to tell the disciples until later. Last supper was Essene love feast. Jesus' "eloi, eloi..." displays continuing hope for intervention. Disciples had visions of resurrection.
- 6. Early Xtian community was a "mixture of Zealotism and Mysticism which did not include any wholly new element" (170). In S's view, Ghillany converts rationalism to history and rids the story of all miraculous elements following Strauss. Rid of uncertain and fictitious elements "you have a life of Jesus in which the motive-power is a purely historical force" (171). S praises G for placing Jesus in Jewish eschatological setting, for its "valuable historical conception" (171).
- 7. Ghillany's accomplishment is in part based on his deistic notions: G wanted to found a church based "only what was according to reason in Judaism and Christianity" (172). By freeing himself from responsibility to tradition (i.e. historical Christianity) and abandoning prejudice he is able to freely conceive of history. Thus imagines a Jesus with "no individuality", "a mere eschatological machine" (172).

D. Noack (1819-1885)

- 1. Martyr-like life of poverty owing to his theological views. Prolific, critical, and knowledgeable but given to poetry and imaginative reconstruction instead of careful historical work. Wrote the only life of Jesus that is based entirely on John.
- 2. Held John to be the original Gospel, composed in 60 by Judas, the beloved disciple minus all "Jewish doctrine and miracles" (174). Some miracles are explained rationalistically. Jesus mostly limits himself to self-revelation to the disciples. The Gospel is misunderstood and ignored for a long time until Luke apologetically adds miraculous exorcisms. N uses Marcion's Luke as the original. Argues from this that the Johannine Christ worked in Galilee. S characterizes this part of N's work as "nothing short of criminal" (175) in its use of sources, philology etc. For the next 50 years John and Luke are the only gospels, along with Paul's work. Then Mark, living in the Decapolis, appears after 130 and adds the Jerusalem crucifixion. Added magical acts to the casting out of demons. Finally Matthew is the culmination of the admixture of the real and legendary, and is responsible for adding Jewish elements to the story when in fact Jesus did nothing Jewish. Luke and John are thus later redacted.

- 3. S praises Noack for attempting to explain, rather than harmonize differences, in spite of the wildness of his speculation.
- 4. Public life of Jesus in Noack's view: Jesus' ministry begins with his self-consciousness of who he was, aided by J. Bap., lasts from 35 to 37. Mainly influenced by Greek thought, not Messianic ideas, becomes Son of God in an ecstatic trance following Philo. Jesus was "pre-disposed to ecstacy, since He was born out of wedlock" (177). His understanding was predicated on imagination and enthusiasm, flights above the 'hard reality' of life, that allowed him to replace his earthly ego with a spiritual one. His death was a consequence of ambition, recognition of the necessary fate of the Son of God. Fights with Sadducean hierarchy. Question of the adulterous woman is meant to be personal attack on Jesus, his response is depicted by Noack as heroic, difficult. Jesus wished to die on the day of the Passover in the Jordan uplands. Judas helps him accomplish this by "betraying" him at the critical moment so as to avoid public arrest.

XIII Renan

A. The Verdict

ERNEST RENAN (1823-1892) published his *Life of Jesus* in 1862. Like Strauss, Renan designed the book to form part of a complete account of the history and dogma of the early Church. His purpose, however, was purely historical; he did not intend to develop a new dogmatic system of dogma. His book was the first Life of Jesus for the Catholic world, which with the characteristic French mental accent presented to the Latin world the results of German criticism. Renan addressed a general reader with the issues of historical criticism and aesthetic interpretation. Yet, Schweitzer argues, his aesthetic feeling scarcely ever goes beyond the lyrical and sentimental, the artificial, and the subjective without distinguishing between truth and artificiality.

B. The Sources

Renan makes his readers acquainted with the criticism of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Colani; also, he outlines the relation of John to the Synoptists. Renan views the gospels as legendary biographies and gives preference to the account of John, aesthetically the best biographer of them all.

C. The Method

The author avoids discussion of supernatural and aims at speaking only as an historian. He combines the gospels into a single account. Everything is included, but nothing appears in its historical setting. He shifts individual incidents in the most arbitrary fashion and treats them without consideration of their importance in the narrative.

D. Renan's "Play"

1. *The Prelude*: Jesus lived in Galilee before He came to the Baptist and became his follower and imitator. The Baptists' gloomy character was harmful for Jesus' "sunny religion" shaped by the glorious natural scenery of Jesus' home. Fortunately, the Baptist soon disappeared. Jesus returned to Galilee and regained his happy state of mind once more. He had learned

- from the Baptist how to influence the masses, and became a powerful preacher able to gain great influence over the people.
- 2. *The First Act*: Accompanied by a gentle and peaceful company of Galilaean fishermen, young Jesus brought the Kingdom of Heaven down to earth through "the infinite tenderness which radiated from Him." A company of his followerss, "all of the same youthful integrity and simple innocence," constantly repeated "Thou art the Messiah." The sweet theology of love and his gentle preaching, "full of nature and the fragrance of the country," won Jesus all hearts.
- 3. The Second Act: Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the Passover at the end of this first year and comes into conflict with the Rabbis. Thus, the teacher, who "offered forgiveness to all on the sole condition of loving Him," found resistance to his charm. Consequently, upon his returned to Galilee, Jesus reassessed his life. He had abandoned his intention to bring about the triumph of the Kingdom of God by natural means, by teaching and influencing people's morals, and became a revolutionary. The period of joyous simplicity is past. His "Kingdom of God" was still essentially the great spiritual kingdom of the soul, but now he preached it as the kingdom of the Apocalypsis.
- 4. *The Third Act*: A longing for persecution and martyrdom took possession of Jesus, and he rides his donkey to Jerusalem, to his passion and death, taking the scepter of his Kingdom and initiating the centuries of worship.
- 5. *The Epilogue*: Jesus' story will call forth endless tears, and his sufferings will soften many hearts of the best; never ever there has arisen a greater person than Jesus.

E. The Assessment

Although the book was a bestseller and had eight editions in three months, the rising French school of critical theology was disappointed in Renan's account, full of melancholy, idyll, and moral philosophy, which by popularization of the ideas of the school severely damaged its work.

XIV The "Liberal" Lives of Jesus

- A. Strauss intended to write his book *A Life of Jesus for the German People* (1864) as thoroughly adapted for Germans as Renan's was for French. He has failed: his book had nothing new to offer, and what it did offer did not become popular. His previous work of 1835 was full of suggestions and rich in thoughts; that was lacking in the second, where Strauss attempted at giving a definite portrait. In the process of harmonizing he had to reject the finest thoughts of the previous work because they did not fit into the picture.
- B. The works of Renan, Strauss Schenkel, Weizsacker, and Keim are in essence only different ways of carrying the same design. To obtain the works of Schenkel and Weizsäcker one only needs to weaken down Strauss' sharp discrimination between John and the Synoptists so far as to allow of the Fourth Gospel being used to some extent as an historical source, in some "higher sense." Schenkel and Weizsäcker do need any critical discrimination between original and secondary elements in the Fourth Gospel; they are content to use as historical whatever their

- instinct leads them accept.
- C. Holtzmann affirmed that one needs first to reconstruct separately the Synoptic and Johannine pictures of Christ, composing each of its own distinctive material. It is only when this has been done that it is possible to make a fruitful comparison of the two.
- D. Keim believes that the life of Jesus is to be reconstructed from the Synoptics, denying the possibility of using the Fourth Gospel as an historical source. The plan of his Life of Jesus depends on the sharp antithesis between the periods of success and failure. When the narrators do not support his conclusions, he suggests that they desired to conceal the truth. In regard to the question of eschatologyKeim does justice to the texts, admitting that eschatology forms an integral part of the preaching of Jesus. However, in the end he allows the spiritual elements practically to cancel the eschatological.
- E. Hase does not answer the question of the use of John's Gospel side by side with the Synoptics. He always avoids a final decision, and, having been influenced by Strauss, believes that the true life of Jesus lies beyond the reach of criticism.
- F. The chief excellence of Beyschlag's Life of Jesus consists in its arrangement. Although he recognizes that the Gospel of John has not the character of an essentially historical source but rather a subjective portrait and a didactic as much as an historical work, he produces his Life of Jesus by combining Synoptic and Johannine elements. Beyschlag gives a prominent place to eschatology, so that in order to combine the spiritual with the eschatological view his Jesus has to pass through three stages of development.
 - 1. In the first He preaches the Kingdom as something future, a supernatural event which was to be looked forward to, much as the Baptist preached it.
 - 2. Then the response which was called forth on all hands by His preaching led Him to believe that the Kingdom was in some sense already present,
 - 3. As His failure becomes more and more certain, "the centre of gravity of His thought is shifted to the World beyond the grave, and the picture of a glorious return to conquer and to judge the world rises before Him."

This peculiar interweaving of Synoptic and Johannine ideas leads to the result that there is no clear conception of the eschatology, and makes Jesus think in a half-Johannine, half-Synoptic fashion.

- G. Weiss' shares with the authors of the liberal "Lives" the assumption that Mark designed to set forth a definite view of the course of development of the public ministry of Jesus. His approach is arbitrary; he is fond of the "argument from silence." On points of detail, however, there are many interesting historical observations.
- H. Summary: The results of the liberal Lives of Jesus:
 - 1. elucidating the relation between John and the Synoptics. Holtzmann, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, and Hase took up a mediating position on this question; Beyschlag and Weiss accepted the possibility of reconciliation of the two for ecclesiastical and apologetic reasons. Later, Weizsäcker, like Holtzmann, rejected the possibility of reconciliation, and gave up the Fourth Gospel as an historical source.
 - 2. inability to escape the fundamentally eschatological character of the

teaching and influence of the Marcan and Matthaean Jesus. It is only when the eschatological question is decided that the problem of the relation of John to the Synoptics is finally laid to rest. The liberal Lives of Jesus grasped their incompatibility only from a literary point of view, not in its full historical significance.

- 3. approaching the fact that Jesus had never, previous to the incident at Caesarea Philippi, given Himself out to be the Messiah or been recognized as such. The perception of this fact marks one of the greatest advances in the study of the subject. This result, once accepted, ought necessarily to have suggested two important and provocative questions:
 - a. why Jesus down to that moment had made a secret of his Messiahship even to His disciples;
 - b. whether at any time, and, if so, when and how, the people were made acquainted with his Messianic claims.

I. Conclusion

The liberal Lives of Jesus, although often unconsciously, prepared the way for a deeper historical inquiry—"a deeper understanding of a subject is only brought to pass when a theory is carried to its utmost limit and finally proves its own inadequacy."

XV The Eschatological Question

A. Colani

- 1. *Argument*: According to Colani, the Messianic hopes of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus lacked homogeneity: there was
 - a. the prophetic conception, according to which the Kingdom of the Messiah belonged to the present world-order
 - b. the apocalyptic conception, which transferred it to the future. In the first period of his public ministry, Jesus had never designated himself as the Messiah; only when the success of the preaching of the Kingdom gradually affected his mind, he took on the idea of being the Messiah. He points to mankind as a whole, not merely to the chosen people, as the people of the Kingdom, and substitutes for the apocalyptic catastrophe an organic development. In the moment he accepted the title, he resolved to suffer. The influence of his Passion upon the souls of people is the means of establishment of his Kingdom. Jesus did not expect to come again from heaven to complete his work—it was completed by his death. Neither the Jewish, nor the Jewish-Christian eschatology as represented in the eschatological discourses in the Gospels, can, therefore, belong to the preaching of Jesus. Therefore, the Jewish eschatology should be expelled from the text on critical grounds.
- 2. *Assessment*: The new feature of Colani's view was the recognition that rejection of eschatology necessitated a critical analysis of the text.

B. Volkmar

- 1. Argument: Volkmar's construction rests upon two main points of support:
 - a. the sole source for the Life of Jesus is the Gospel of Mark; the other two of the first three Gospels belong to the second century,

- and can only be used by way of supplement
- b. according to the eschatology of the time, Jesus could not possibly have come forward with Messianic claims—the Messianic Son of Man, whose aim was to found a super-earthly Kingdom, only arose in Judaism under the influence of Christian dogma, whereas the contemporaries of Jesus knew only the political ideal of the Messianic King.
- 2. Assessment: Volkmar's contribution to the subject consists in the assertion that it was only after his crucifixion that Jesus was hailed as the Christ. His work demonstrated that the elimination of the eschatology leads also to the elimination of the Messiahship of Jesus.

C. Weiffenbach

- 1. *Argument:* Weiffenbach sums up the results of the previous discussions dividing the scholarship on:
 - a. those who ascribe the expectation of the Parousia to a misunderstanding of the teaching of Jesus on the part of the disciples (Schleiermaeher, Bleek, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Colani, Baur, Hase, and Meyer)
 - b. those who maintained that the Parousia formed an integral part of Jesus' teaching (Keim, Weizsacker, Strauss, and Renan).

He concludes that any attempt to advance the discussion of the Parousia will be useless until a new channel is found for it. He aims at discovering the relation between the declarations regarding the Second Coming and the predictions of the Passion. Weiffenbach carries this series of tentative suggestions to its logical conclusion, advancing the view that the link of connection between the Jewish-Christian Apocalypse and the Gospel material in which it is imbedded is the thought of the Second Coming. Jesus must have given expression to the thought of his near return; Jewish-Christianity subsequently painted it over with the colors of Jewish eschatology.

2. Assessment: Weiffenbach has the merit of having gathered together all the eschatological material of the Synoptics and examined it in the light of a definite principle of the "authentic thought of the return," which is free from all apocalyptic and Jewish-Christian speculations about the future. Thus, Weiffenbach fails to bring the Jewish apocalyptic material into relation with the Synoptic data.

D. Baldensperger

- Argument: Baldensperger adopts and explicates the idea that the "Son of Man" Messiah of the Similitudes of Enoch was the last product of the Messianic hope prior to the time of Jesus, and that the fully developed Danielic scheme with its chasm between the present and the future world furnished the outline within which all further traits were inserted.
- 2. Assessmentz; Baldensperger does not explain Jesus' sayings about himself will be in the light of the Jewish Messianic ideas. Nevertheless, he strongly suggests that Jesus possessed a fully-developed eschatology, and thus provides a new basis for discussion and an impulse to the study of the

subject

E. Weiss

- 1. *Argument:* Before Weiss, the study of the life of Jesus had two alternatives—he provides the third:
 - a. *either* purely historical or purely supernatural (Srauss)
 - b. either Synoptic or Johannine (Tübingen school and Holtzmann)
 - c. *either* eschatological or non-eschatological (Weiss)
- 2. Assessment: Weiss was the first correctly to grasp the general conception of the Kingdom of God. All modern ideas, he insists, must be eliminated from it; when this is done, we arrive at a Kingdom of God, which is wholly future. Jesus does not establish the Kingdom, but only proclaims its coming, waiting for God to bring it about by supernatural means.

XVI Against Eschatology

- A. Wilhelm Bousset, Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeshichtlicher Vergleich (1892)
 - 1. Bousset's arguments (according to Schweitzer):
 - a. The preoccupation with the Lives of Jesus masks the study's standstill and reluctancy to address unanswered problems.
 - b. Source criticism with respect to the life of Jesus is finished: separation between Synoptists and John, two-source theory for Synoptists.
 - c. Despite the possibility of finding the primitive kernel of Mark, what is needed is "a firmly-drawn and life portrait which, with a few bold strokes, should bring out clearly the originality, the force, the personality of Jesus." (202)
 - 2. Although Weiss and the realistic school rightly note that Jesus belongs to background of eschatology, he was its negation rather than its consummation.
 - a. Late-Jewish eschatology had realistic and transcendental elements, but it never overcame the particularism of the Jewish national ideal.
 - b. Jewish apocalyptic thought is probably not Jewish, as it must originally come from Persia. (203)
 - 3. The starting point is that Jesus must be a living man who came into a dead world.
 - a. His idea of a living god as Father is his most essential act. Eschatological preaching is actually a renewal of old prophetic preaching with its positive ethical emphasis.
 - b. Jesus' joy in life is an outcome of his personal piety which he communicates with others. Jesus contrasts with John the Baptist's repentance for the future. (204)
 - 4. The presence of the kingdom was not, however, developed by Jesus in teaching, but was set forth only in paradoxes and parables (Mark 4). Jesus completes process of spiritualizing ancient Israelite expectation, though without providing a theoretical basis for this step. (205)

- 5. Schweitzer's conclusion on Bousset:
 - Bousset's position is not tenable because the opposite view has at its disposal inexhaustible reserves of world-renouncing, worldcondemning sayings.
 - b. The promise of earthly happiness is absurd because the present conditions which are good serve only to support life in waiting for the future. (207)
- B. The eschatology of Jesus:
 - 1. Schweitzer's summary of scholarship:
 - a. Ehrhardt's The Fundamental Character of the Preaching of Jesus in Relation to the Messianic Hopes of his People and his own Messianic Consciousness asserts presence of twofold ethic in Jesus' teaching: eschatology did not attempt to evacuate everything else of all value, but allowed the natural and ethical goods of this world to hold their place. (208)
 - b. Albert Réville in his Jésus de Nazareth (1897): apocalypticism and messianism were not native to Jesus' thought, but were forced upon it by outside influences. (208)
 - c. Wendt in Lehre Jesu (1890, 1903) Jesus could not help but transform the tradition from within, despite their outward appearances. Christliche Welt (1893) clearly expounded and defended against Weiss that the kingdom of God was already present for Jesus. (208)
 - d. For Weiffenbach, inspired by Baldensperger and Weiss, the younger apocalyptic school is to be rejected because it sprang from the younger generation's inability to handle the unfulfilled expectation of Jesus. We cannot see clearly past their insertion into the mouth of Jesus that the parousia was simply returning from death with power. (208)
 - e. In the same year, 1895, Bernhard Haupt's work on The Eschatological Sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels contradicted Bousset in taking as starting point eschatological passages, working from the Synoptics and tracing each back to their Johannine key. (208)
 - 2. Schweitzer's conclusion: Eschatology makes it impossible to attribute modern ideas to Jesus and then by way of "New Testament theology" take them back as a loan. (209)
- C. Question: how did eschatological early Christianity admit Greek theology?
 - 1. Harnack's What is Christianity ignores contemporary limitations and adopts gospel which carries him to 1899. (211)
 - 2. Paul Wernle, in Das Anfange unserer Religion (1904), claims Jewish eschatology is convenient position by urging that there was no appropriate place for a "Messiah: within the new kingdom.
 - a. This concept was obsolete for Jews.
 - b. The Messiah of Zealots was exchanged for the "waiting" Messiah of rabbis. (211)

- D. Going backwards from Jesus to Judaism: Wellhausen and Schürer repudiate results of the eschatological school.
 - 1. Wellhausen in Israelite and Jewish History finds Jesus is out of the Jewish frame entirely.
 - a. Rather than desire to be the people's conception of a Messiah, he only accepted a higher messianic ideal.
 - b. Wellhausen only retains sermons by John. (211)
 - 2. Emil Schürer in Das messianische Selbstbewusstsein Jesu Christi (1888) is also informed by John and cites Mark 12:37 where Jesus fears kindling 'political enthusiasm. (212)
- E. Question of absolute or only partial dominance of eschatology: a survey of scholarship
 - 1. Wilhelm Brandt in Gospel History (Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums auf Grund einer Kritik der Berichte uber das Leiden und die Auferstehung Jesu) (1893) takes a Cartesian approach.
 - 2. The cry probably happened in the way it was reported.
 - 3. Peter was unlikely to have been only smiting-sword of the disciples—others must have joined in.
 - 4. Jesus attitude toward eschatology was contradictory: he believed in the imminent kingdom of God, yet he found time to train disciples.
 - 5. Schweitzer claims this attempt to understand the pragmatism in the life of Jesus from purely historical perspective is important.
 - a. Schweitzer criticizes the 'reign of terror' of the possibilities, as exemplified by Brandt's treatment of Peter.
 - b. Schweitzer thinks Brandt would have greater impact if he used a purely constructive form.
- F. Question: How can Mark 4:11, 12 state that parables embody mystery of kingdom of God and yet this is not true because we understand them?
 - 1. Before eschatological question stated by Johannes Weiss, Bernhard Weiss claimed the parabolic form was a means of separating the receptive from the unreceptive listeners. (216)
 - a. Adolf Jülicher in Die Gleichnisreden Jesu (1899) claims Jesus spoke the parables, but Mark made the comment about their purpose, namely being unintelligible.
 - 2. Mark 12 was one of the vaticina ex eventu representing an average man's view of history with a witness to the crucifixion and yet with a belief to his being the Son of Man.
 - 3. Schweitzer criticizes this because it excludes discourses as inauthentic when they do not fit his theory. (216-7)
- G. The most prominent problem: "Son of Man"
 - 1. There was a paradigm shift in scholarly conception of the "Son of Man."
 - a. Previously, the Danielic Son of man entered only as far as it would not endanger other presuppositions.
 - b. At this point, the conception of eschatology had changed: either Jesus meant this in traditional Jewish way or he had not said it. (219)

- 2. Johann Weiss formulated the problem clearly in claiming that the two passages where the Son of Man mean man in general, only Daniel and apocalypse are demanded by context. (220)
- 3. Most writers did not free themselves of inconsistencies.
 - a. On one hand, the apocalyptic element is dominant in expression.
 - b. On the other hand, Jesus had to have altered conception. (220)
- H. Appropriation of "Son of Man" by Linguistics: Lietzmann's article on "The Son of Man" (220)

XVII Aramaic, Rabbinic, Buddhist

- I. Dalman's *Grammar of Jewish Palestinian Aramiac* (1894) was the first identification of the dialect of the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount.
 - A. Eusebius' "Syrian" and the distinction among Syriac, Hebrew, and Chaldean were not understood previously.
 - B. Joseph Justus Scaliger (died 1609) gave a sketch of Syrian dialects which overturned the notion that Syriac was the mother tongue of the gospels—the apostles spoke a dialect of Aramaic ("Chaldean") and Syriac. (222)
 - C. Kautzsch's Grammar of Biblical Aramaic (1884) and Dalman were the result.
- II. Influence of Aramaic on Jewish literature was noticeable by 600 B.C.E.
 - A. Book of Daniel is written in 167 B.C.E. with alternation of Hebrew and Aramaic.
 - B. It is unknown when Aramaic became the vernacular.
 - C. The three languages in Jesus' Galilee were Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. (223)
- III. Scholarly developments on Aramaic
 - A. Dalman attempts to identify the language of composition of works.
 - Hebrew compositions were: Ethiopic book of Enoch, Assumption of Moses, Apocalypse of Baruch, Fourth Ezra, Book of Jubilees, Testament of Twelve Patriarchs, and Maccabees.
 - Aramaic compositions were: synagogue discourses and Jesus' teachings.
 - A. Franz Delitzsch and Resch though Jesus and disciples taught in Hebrew, but Adolf Naubauer compromises between the two positions.
 - B. Wellhausen believes the gospels were originally spoken and probably written in Aramaic
 - C. Meyer collects phrases to show Aramaic origins: "abba," and decisive "Eloi eloi lena sabacthanei" which occurs in hour of need.
 - D. Independent question is whether Jesus could speak Greek: Josephus says that Greek knowledge was rudimentary even among elites. (225)
- IV. "Son of Man"
 - A. In 1896, Hans Lietzmann claimed Jesus had never given himself Son of Man title because the title did not exist in Aramaic: *bar enosh* was "a man." (226)
 - A. Arnold Meyer and Wellhausen expressed themselves in the same sense as Lietzmann.

- B. The passages where Jesus uses the expression in unmistakably messianic sense are, according to them, because of early Christian theology. "Man in general" was unfamiliar linguistically to the Greeks so they appropriated Danielic 'Son of Man.'
- B. Lietzmann subsequently argued that the 'Son of Man' arose in the Hellenistic environment on the basis of Daniel 7:13. (227)
- C. In 1898, Dalman wrote in *Die Worte Jesu* that Biblical Aramiac does not differ from Hebrew concerning *bar enosh*. *Enosh* is a man, *bene aneshim* is men, and *bar enosh* is used in imitation of the Hebrew text of the Bible. (228)
- Authentic passages are those where the expression in the apocalyptic sense goes back to Daniel. (Mt. 10:23, Mk 14:62, Mt 25:31-46) (230)
- Jesus did not veil messiahship with the phrase but used it as the only possible expression of his coming office. (230-1)
- The passages where the title does not have an apocalyptic valence are of literary origin. (231)
- A number of passage are not what they seem on the surface. Jesus could not have used expressions 'this age' and the 'future age' in the eschatological sense and probably did not use them at all. 'Amen' is used as a curse.
- D. Schweitzer notes that the scholarly problem is that many obscure sayings of Jesus is not a matter of linguistic difficulties but an enigmatic meaning. (233)
- V. Schweitzer notes problems with parallel sources outside the NT
 - A. Rabbinic parallels are much later than the third century C.E.
 - B. Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* from the middle of the second century C.E. has apologetic, church interests and is necessarily representative of the Jewish view.
 - C. Josephus is circumscribed by his Roman audience, and Philo is dominated by Hellenistic speculative interests. (236)
- VI. Eschatological hopes and messianism around the time of Jesus
 - A. Paul sees the messianic kingdom only as one stage in final history. (237)
 - B. The assumption that the eschatological movement in Christianity did not last because it advocated a messianism contrary to the people's beliefs is false. The eschatology is the same as the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch. (238)
 - C. The author of Daniel in 165/4 B.C.E. has an eschatology which ignores his received prophetic tradition and the messianic kingdom. The fates of the individual and the world are his main concern.
 - D. The Similitudes then synthesize Daniel's Son of Man with the anointed Davidic king. (240)
 - E. The Psalms of Solomon and the Shemoneh Esreh in the first century B.C.E. show scribes resume pre-Danielic notions of a Davidic king, purification of the house of Jerusalem, and the gathering of the dispersed Israel. (241)
 - F. Sybilline Oracles and the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra decisively preserve the super-terrestrial character of the events which bring in the rule of God. (243)
 - G. Talmud does not include human activity in the arrival of the kingdom.

- H. Schweitzer insists that the reference to the Davidic Messiah should not mislead us, as late Judaism never goes into the question of the birth as this being (unlike early prophecy). (244)
- A. The main characteristic of late Jewish eschatological is the hope of resurrection. (246)

VII. Jesus and the Son of Man

- A. Schweitzer notes that Jesus always preaches about the Son of Man—not the anointed—whereas everyone recognizes him as the son of God (Mt 16:16), the anointed (Mk 8:29), and the Son of the Most High (Mk 14:61).
- B. Jesus' appearance is surrounded by the angels of heaven, which is not reported elsewhere of the messianic kingdom. (253)

VIII. Nineteenth century's attempt to explain tradition of Jesus within context of Buddhism

- A. Renan and Havet referred to Buddhist parallels to parables of Jesus. (261)
- B. Max Müller noted that Buddhism and Christianity have seeming similarities, but he had not found any substantive point of connection. (261-2)
- C. Seydel postulated a third source along with Ur-Matthew and Ur-Luke: a poetic, apocalyptic gospel with Buddhist sympathies. (262)

XVIII The Quest of the Historical Jesus at the End of the 19th Century

- I. Schweitzer claims that the ideal Life of Jesus at the close of the 19th century is the one not written by underlying Heinrich Julius Holtzmann's commentary on Synoptic Gospels and his New Testament Theology.
- II. Oskar Holtzmann wrote the first Life of Jesus (aptly titled *Das Leben Jesu*) in 1901. (265)
 - A. Schweitzer praises his distinction between Markan hypothesis and Life of Jesus—Mark 7 makes mention of "old" and "new" religion that was clearly from Mark's time and not from Jesus' time.
 - B. Schweitzer doubts his ability to conjecture perfectly and thinks it is better to admit what is not known. (267)
 - C. Schweitzer finds problematic his "Alexandrian symbolic exegesis" in reading Lukan scenes as symbolically in Mark. (268-9)
- III. Other Lives of Jesus are more problematic for Schweitzer.
 - A. P. W. Schmidt's *Geschicte Jesu* (1899) confines itself to pure narrative.
 - B. Some focus on old problems: Hermann von Soden (1904) and Otto Schmiedel (1906). (270)
- IV. Schweitzer considers Otto Pfleiderer as making the move to rationality.
 - A. *Urchristentum* (1887) in the first edition shared the contemporary constructions Schweitzer finds as more modern theology than rationality.

- B. Second edition had been influenced by Brandt and those proposing eschatological understanding of Jesus. (278)
- V. Schweitzer notes the speculations and redundancies in connecting Jesus with primitive Christianity
 - A. Albert Kalthoff notes that the fire lit itself, and Schweitzer finds him speculative. (279)
 - Many crucified claimants of messiahship existed alongside Jesus. (280)
 - A communist proletariat movement arose in the Roman Empire. (281)
 - B. Eduard von Hartmann claims pessimism of Jesus has nothing to do with Buddhism, but rather it deals with the depressing social conditions of his day. He realizes the importance of eschatology, but he doesn't properly recognize it since he uses only rabbinic material. Like Reimarus, he holds that Jesus and his teaching is properly Jewish. Schweitzer finds him redundant. (284)
 - C. De Jonge finds Jesus was a disciple of Hillel in a process Schweitzer finds highly speculative. (286)
 - D. Moritz Friedländer repeats the claims of Gfrörer and Noack in claiming Christianity arose out of the 'am-ha'aretz (country people) who were opposed to the Pharisees. Schweitzer finds it promising but speculative, especially Friedländer's linking the community with the Essenes. (287)
 - E. Wolfgang Kirchbach embodies for Schweitzer the misguided attempt to bring the modern spirituality to the past. (288)
- VI. Schweitzer notes the need to keep transcendental elements out of the study of religion. (289)
 - VII. Schweitzer summarizes the more imaginative accounts of the Life of Jesus, which to him are all the same. (289-95)

XIX Thoroughgoing Scepticism and Thoroughgoing Eschatology

- A. Unified objections of Scepticism (Wrede) and Eschatology (Schweitzer) against modern historical theology's reconstruction of Life of Jesus
 - 1. Wrede takes a literary criticism approach and Schweitzer a eschatological-historical approach, but both call into question the historicity of the accepted view of the life of Jesus according to Markan priority.
 - 2. Modern historical theology (MHT) uses psychological conjecture to insert unproven details into the text in order to demonstrate the development of Jesus, disciples, and circumstances.
 - 3. MHT uses a faulty method to pull out the "historical kernel" from the context of the narrative through psychological explanations that reflect the presuppositions of the critic.
 - 4. MHT has found connecting links between pericope that cannot stand under critical skepticism.

- a. S. lists problems and questions that arise from the narrative of Mark (i.e., why do certain things happen, how do people know certain things, what do certain events or sayings mean).
- b. S. criticizes the naturalistic-psychology approach that downplays or harmonizes problems against the simple reading of the text.
- c. Lack of connection between pericope is due to the presence of two conceptions of Jesus in the narrative: natural and supernatural.
- 5. Rather than recognizing the tension of the presence of two conceptions of Jesus in the narrative (natural and supernatural/Messianic), MHT weaves the dogmatic element of Messianic secret into the description of the Life of Jesus in order to "portray a Jesus who was the Messiah, not one who at once was and was not Messiah as the Evangelist depicts Him" (337).
- B. Divergent solutions to the inconsistency of Jesus' public life and Messianic claim
 - 1. The eschatological solution holds the inconsistencies of the narrative in tension and views the Markan account holistically as history.
 - 2. The literary solution sees the dogmatic element as an insertion into the tradition and so removes the Messianic claim from the history.
- C. Schweitzer's summary of Wrede's Scepticism/literary approach
 - 1. The representation of Jesus' Messiahship is a product of early Christianity, so the scholar must distinguish between external, historical events and internal, dogmatic ideas through the contradictions in the narrative.
 - 2. Over the external history, the gospel writer laid a theological element that raised Jesus to supernatural status.
 - 3. The movement of the narrative is driven by the theological overlay, and not by the historical elements; thus, the gospel account gives a theological, rather than historical life of Jesus: "In this sense the Gospel of Mark belongs to the history of dogma" (Wrede quoted by Schweitzer, 339).
 - 4. The gospel writer reads the "real Messianic event" (339) of the resurrection back over the life of Jesus as a Messianic secret.
 - 5. Jesus was only a teacher; the intrusion of the resurrection destroys the historical element of the narrative.
 - 6. The Marcan narrative arose from a desire to put the earthly life of Jesus in Messianic form.
- D. S.'s critique of Wrede
 - 1. Against Wrede's conception that the Messianic secret derived from early tradition
 - a. Wrede sees the gospel writer as weaving elements of the Messianic secret through the narrative without altering it; however, a community would alter the whole tradition more consistently and boldly.
 - b. Wrede explains anomalies in the Messianic secret (e.g., Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, Jesus' before the High Priest, Peter's confession) as evidence of a second tradition that he cannot bring in line with a theory of secrecy.

- c. Wrede's admission of tradition undermines his literary hypothesis because it assumes a historical background for Messiahship.
- d. If Jesus was not condemned as Messiah, there must hve been another tradition describing the real reason for his conflicts and death that Mark replaced completely with a description of his secret Messiahship. This theory does not account for details such as Jesus' public appearance in Jerusalem.
- e. Early tradition did not have historical concerns, but eschatological concerns; only when the eschatological concerns decreased did Christianity become interested in the conception of a historical Messiahship. A historical focus on Jesus as Messiah arose in response to Gnostic controversies (Gospel of John).
- 2. Wrede fails to explain how Messianic beliefs arose in the 1st c. if the historical Jesus was only a teacher.
- 3. Wrede fails to explain how a psychological experience of resurrection could have proven to the disciples that Jesus was the Messiah.
- 4. Wrede's theory of the Messianic secret has contradictions because he does not take into consideration the eschatological nature of Jesus' teaching.
 - a. Wrede assumes that Mark sees miracles as proof of Messiahship, but S. argues that this is a feature of John, not Mark or Matthew.
 - b. Wrede equates the mystery of the Kingdom of God with the Messianic secret, but S. finds no trace of this in the parable of Mark 4.
 - c. S. sees Wrede's connection of Jesus' desire to be alone and unrecognized with the Messianic secret as arbitrary.
 - d. S. questions Wrede's theory that the sudden appearances and disappearances of Jesus and the crowds represent Mark's attempt to create a mysterious atmosphere of secrecy.
 - e. Wrede attributes everything inexplicable to the Messianic secret and labels it as unhistorical; but S. sees evidence of the Messianic secret in only a few places.
- 5. Wrede fails to deal with Jesus' teaching adequately, and so missteps in subsuming the bigger mystery of the KOG into the special mystery of Messiahship, rather than the other way around. According to S., the Messianic secret is really a part of the larger mystery of the KOG).

E. Schweitzer's eschatological theory

- 1. S. sets out to critically examine the theological aspect of the life of Jesus with the assumption of a pervasive eschatology in the 1st c., in order to consider whether what is theological might actually be what is historical.
- 2. Wrede left eschatology out of his work because of the eschatological school's application of an eschatological explanation only to Jesus' preaching and not to his entire public ministry.
- 3. S. gives a sketch of the course of events in the public ministry of Jesus, which he argues lasted less than a year according to Mark.
- 4. Predestination and eschatology:

- a. Jesus' preaching is limited due to predestination. He announces the KOG generally in public, but gives special teaching about the KOG only in parables so that only those predestined can understand them.
- b. Predestination is linked with eschatology, because those who are not predestined are thrown into hell, and those who have a place in the KOG are called to it rather than earning it.

5. KOG and eschatology:

- a. The mystery of the KOG is about the nature of its growth
- b. The parables of the KOG assume an initial insignificant fact ("sowing") that a miracle builds into something great by God's power. The initial fact is the repentance preached by John the Baptist; the miracle of God's power is the preaching of Jesus.
- c. The KOG is connected temporally with the harvest; this is the last harvest that brings about the KOG and new age.
- d. Jesus expected the KOG at harvest time, so he sent the Twelve immediately to warn Israel (Matt. 9:37-38).
- 6. The mission of the Twelve as an eschatological turning point in the narrative
 - a. Jesus did not expect to see the Twelve back from their mission, but thought the Parousia/his revealing as the Son of Man would happen while they were gone. The failure of the Parousia recorded in Matt. 10:23 is the decisive moment that changes Jesus' plans and attitudes so that he withdraws from public, only travels with the disciples, and resigns himself to die.
 - b. The prediction of suffering associated with the Pariousia also goes unfulfilled (Matt. 10:21-22). While the disciples are away, Jesus expected the strife and confusion he had just predicted to take place, for him to be manifested as the Son of Man through supernatural revelation, and for the Holy Spirit to be outpoured. All these expectations are doctrinal rather than historical; however, the discourse itself is historical for the very fact that its contents must be deemed unhistorical.
 - c. Supernatural transformation is a necessary part of eschatological expectation. Jesus expected that he would be transported to heaven and descend as the Son of Man. After his unfulfilled expectation, the resurrection becomes the eschatological metamorphosis and is simultaneous with the Parousia (for Jesus, then for Paul).

7. Background of Jesus' eschatology:

a. The background is found in the apocalyptic literature between Daniel and the Bar-Cochba revolt. Jesus had self-consciousness that he was the Son of Man to be revealed, and this led him to predict coming events both in general and with regard to himself. The theology of the Baptist, Jesus and Paul explains Jewish

- eschatology, rather than the other way around. At the same time, the eschatology of the Baptist, Jesus and Paul is unique.
- b. Jesus' eschatology is also influenced by that of the ancient prophets, e.g., the call to repentance and the outpouring of the spirit.
- 8. Jesus' Messianic consciousness vs. understanding of people
 - a. Jesus had some messianic consciousness from the start. People would not have recognized it in his miracles, but would have recognized it in his other actions (e.g., pronouncing the forgiveness of sins in Mark 2:5ff) and teaching (that those who are persecuted and despised for his sake are blessed, Matt. 5:11; that the disciples will confess him, love him above father and mother and follow him to death, Matt. 10:32ff). In spite of this, Jesus' followers were reluctant to see him as Messiah.
 - b. Jesus declares John the Baptist to be Elias, contrary to the understanding of the people. Jesus makes the Baptist out to be Elias because he believes that his own manifestation as the Son of Man/Messiah is coming, and Elias must come first. Jesus declares the Baptist to be Elias after his death, forcing "the eschatological events into the framework of the actual occurrences" (376).
- 9. Eschatalogical sacraments as the seal that guarantees salvation in the face of coming judgment include the feeding of the multitude is a Messianic feast, the baptism of John the Baptist and the Last Supper.
- 10. Peter's confession at Caesarea Phillipi as a second turning point
 - a. The historical sequence is out of order in Mark's presentation, the transfiguration having happened first, which is where the Messiahship was revealed to the three disciples of Jesus' inner circle in a combined ecstatic experience. The transfiguration is the source of Peter's knowledge of the Messiahship he confesses at Caesarea Phillipi, and Jesus reacts to Peter's failure to heed the injunction to silence he had given these disciples on the way down the mountain.
 - b. After Caesarea Phillipi, Jesus separates himself from the crowds and speaks to his disciples about his suffering, death and resurrection. Wrede says that because the concept of the resurrection is dogmatic, it is unhistorical; to the contrary, S. insists that because it is dogmatic it is historical.
 - c. The explanation of Jesus' resolve to suffer is not found in Jewish eschatology; rather, it is first apparent in Jesus' self-consciousness. After Caesarea Philippi, Jesus speaks of suffering as particular to himself. Now it is not others who suffer, but he who will suffer on behalf of others in order to bring in the KOG. This change stems from the non-fulfillment of the Parousia upon sending out the disciples. Jesus had expected the trial of the necessary suffering to happen when he sent out the disciples;

now he had to take on the trial of suffering himself by giving his life for his followers.

11. Jesus in Jerusalem

- a. Jesus went to Jerusalem with the express intention to die there. Jesus at first believed that his closest three disciples would suffer and die with him (e.g., he takes them to Gethsemane with him and asks them to watch and pray that they will not have to endure the trial). Jesus needs to die not for historical reasons, but for thelogical-eschatological reasons.
- b. The High Priest tried to have Jesus condemned on other charges first, but when they would not stick he accused Jesus of having made a Messianic claim, and this was gotten by Jesus' own admission and not by any witnesses since no one thought of Jesus as Messiah.
- c. Jesus could not have made a Messianic entry into Jerusalem: the Messianic features of the entry were due to Jesus' design, and not to the response of the crowd. They saw his entry as that of Elias, not as Messiah.
- d. "The tradition is incoherent" (395) because the events on which it is based were directed by he self-consciousness and purposes of Jesus, which were not fully understood by the disciples who passed that tradition on.
- e. How was Jesus tried and condemned as Messiah if no one knew except for him and his disciples? The betrayal of Judas was not where to find Jesus, but upon what charges to convict him: Judas betrayed the Messianic secret, giving the High Priest the grounds to charge him. The fault traces back to Peter, who betrayed the Messianic secret to the disciples against Jesus' injunction to silence after the Transfiguration. The High Priest brought Jesus up on other charges at first, because he had no witnesses; then he got Jesus to confess himself to be Messiah and used that as the basis of the charge. The fickleness of the people when Pilate intends to release a prisoner is due to the priestly leaders spreading the Messianic secret through the crowd. In the eyes of the crowd, Jesus goes from esteemed prophet Elias to fanatical blasphemer.

XX. Results

A. "The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the Kingdom of God, who founded the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give His work its final consecration, never had any existence. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in an historical garb" (398).

- B. The Life of Jesus reconstructed by modern has fallen apart due to the emergence of historical problems. The thoroughgoing skeptical and thoroughgoing eschatological schools brought about the final demise.
- C. As a result, the historical Jesus may only be seen as Messiah as the result of Mark's literary creation (Wrede), or as the result of Jesus' eschatological Messianic consciousness (Schweitzer), foreign to modern religion.
- D. A rationalistic, liberal, and modern-theological historical foundation for Christianity that can be confirmed or justified scientifically does not exist. The significance of Jesus for today cannot be confirmed historically.
- E. The contribution of German research on the Life of Jesus to religious life and study cannot be overestimated. Yet, modern theologians read current ethical standards and psychology back into the history rather than letting the history speak for itself. Eventually, modern theology's "artificial history" was exposed by "genuine history" (401)
- F. It is not the historical Jesus, but the spirit of Jesus that is important for modern time. For this, Jesus must be conceived of eschatologically rather than historically. The eschatological nature of Jesus' words makes them eternal and powerful