It might almost be better to say that I have "transcribed" the text here from the German. My initial motivation was to have a copy for personal use only. I did not expect to make it public at the time. In a strenuous effort to avoid the AI translator from its tendency for creative whims, I set the parameters so strict that the result reads more like a word-for-word transposition from German to English. This can make it a tiring read. But for what it's worth, here it is for anyone interested enough to make the effort.

– Neil Godfrey, 17th January 2026

Investigations

on the

Origin of the Fourth Gospel

by

Julius Grill
Doctor of Theology and Philosophy
Ordinary Professor of Theology, retired, in Tübingen

Second Part

The Mystery Gospel of Hellenized Asia Minor Christianity

Tübingen
Published by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)
1923

The publication of the concluding second part of the “Investigations” has been made possible by the “Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft” (Berlin). To bear public witness here also to my deeply felt thanks for this generous assistance, I recognize as my foremost duty.

New Year 1923. The Author.

All rights reserved.

Printed by H. Laupp Jr. in Tübingen

In memory

of

Heinrich Julius Holtzmann

John 8:32:
The truth will make you free.

This too is our motto, even when in striving
we suffer the bitterest distress;
the ultimate goal of struggle is clarity,
the prize of victory the light of truth.

Contents.

First Section.

The revelatory method of Jesus in the light of the Logos idea of the Fourth Evangelist.

1. The distinctive character and treatment of the contemporary social circles of Jesus and of the persons in his surroundings; “signs” and the word of Jesus in general. pp. 1–66.

2. The significance of the word and of the “signs” of Jesus for the first-called disciples. pp. 67–73.

3. The sign at Cana and the expansion of horizons given with it. pp. 73–95.

Second Section.

The thoroughly Hellenizing typology of the Fourth Evangelist.

A. The Dionysian and related traits of the Christ-image. pp. 96–234.

1. The bringer of joy to humanity. pp. 103–105.

2. The giver of the water of life and the personified vine. pp. 105–107.

3. The wonder-working wedding guest, who is himself also bridegroom. pp. 107–120.

4. The zealot, who also appears as a raging one. pp. 120–123.

5. The one threatening with stoning. pp. 123–130.

6. The commanding ruler. pp. 130–132.

7. The seer. pp. 132–134.

8. The physician. pp. 134–138.

9. The liberator, purifier, and savior. pp. 138–148.

10. The shepherd. pp. 148–157.

11. The one roaming in the midst of the flock of his faithful and celebrating festivals. pp. 157–162.

12. The one who calls a deceased person back to life from grave and underworld. pp. 162–192.

13. The one who himself suffers death. pp. 192–210.

14. The risen conqueror of death. pp. 210–212.

15. The one who goes away and returns, who disappears and reappears. pp. 212–216.

VI

16. The exalted one. pp. 216–219.

17. The one who remains immanent to his own. pp. 219–231.

18. The guide. pp. 231–233.

19. The one who empowers his own to perform works like those he himself performs. pp. 233–234.

20. The exalted one who draws his own to himself and brings them into the Father's house. p. 234.

B. The intensification of typology in the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus in parallel with Dionysus–Apollo. pp. 235–239.

Third Section.

The mystery-character of the Fourth Gospel.

A. The New Testament and history-of-religions premises. pp. 240–289.

a) The religious term μυστήριον in the New Testament and in classical usage. pp. 240–246.
b) The question of the influence of pagan mysteries on the worldview and language of the New Testament in general. pp. 246–257.
c) Influence of the mysteries on the Christian baptismal sacrament. pp. 257–266.
d) Influence of the mysteries on the “Lord’s Supper.” pp. 266–289.

Jesus, first viewed historically as the host of his own (1–4), pp. 266–272;
then ideally as the Melchizedek of antiquity (5), pp. 272–280;
finally becoming the antitype of Dionysus of the mysteries (6), pp. 280–289.

B. The mystery-idea of the Fourth Evangelist. pp. 289–297.

Fourth Section.

Origin and purpose of the writing.

1. The contemporary historical-literary need for the work and its traditional apostolic attribution. pp. 298–326.

2. The transition of the Fourth Gospel from Hellenism to the universalism of the Christian world religion. pp. 326–346.

3. The doubtful historical foundation of the Gospel. pp. 347–366.
Symptoms: the new miracle narratives pp. 348–351;
the new persons and localities pp. 351–355;
the new type of Jesus’ discourses in content pp. 355–358,
in form p. 358f.;

the incorporation of later elements into the life-picture of Jesus and his contemporaries p. 360;
the strikingly frequent appearance of contradictions, lapses, and obscurities pp. 361–363;
the deviation with respect to duration and locus of the messianic activity and the date of Jesus’ death pp. 363–366.

4. The purpose of the work. pp. 367–370.

5. The method of presentation. pp. 370–374.

6. The religious, history-of-religions, and literary disposition of the author. pp. 374–377.

7. His nationality. pp. 377–381.

8. His name. p. 381.

9. His homeland. pp. 381–384.

10. The time of composition of the work. pp. 384–411.

Fifth Section.

Parsisnism in the Gospel of Matthew as a preliminary stage to the universalistic Hellenism of the Fourth Evangelist, demonstrated by the "Lord's Prayer." pp. 412–426.

Index of passages

to the New and Old Testament. pp. 427–441.

Abbreviations of citations of more recent literature. pp. 442f.

Corrections. p. 443. [I have corrected these in the text before translation - Neil]

First Section

The method of revelation of Jesus in the light of the Logos-idea of the fourth Evangelist

1. The character and treatment of the contemporary social circles of Jesus and the persons of his surroundings: “signs” and the word of Jesus in general

Joh. Albr. Bengel already spoke of a *divina Jesu methodus* with reference to Matt. 16 21. It will become clear that the application of the concept of method gains justification and significance in a quite different sense from that set forth there, when one enters into the particular character of the fourth Gospel. Among the peculiarities of the narrative of the fourth Evangelist belongs the fact that he has Jesus form a circle of disciples already before his public appearance and does not open his subsequent messianic activity with preaching of salvation, but with the performance of miracles. The former circumstance corresponds to the distinctive distinction which, precisely in this Gospel, is still accorded to the original apostolic circle of disciples even to the end. Just as the members of this circle appear, according to the testimony of the farewell discourses of Jesus, at the end of their period of instruction as those who are particularly deeply initiated into the mystery of the person and work of Jesus and particularly intimately bound to him (13 1. 15 15. 17 11. 21—28), so they are also the firstfruits given by the Father (6 37. 44. 45. 65) to the Son, and as such the first-graced ones foreknown and chosen by the Logos-Christ (1 47. 50. 2 25. 6 44. 13 18. 15 16. 17 6) 1. In the miracle report

that follows immediately upon their calling, however, a perspective opens up that is no less valuable for the evaluation of the Gospel. In view of what we learn from the Synoptic Gospels concerning the nature and significance of the “signs” 2, it must appear striking that, with the miracle of Jesus relocated to Cana, his first, no proclamation of the saving truth preparing understanding, not even one generally formulated, precedes it 3. To be sure, in the fourth Evangelist the signs repeatedly serve to introduce a significant discourse of Jesus 4; but with “the first sign that Jesus did,” a more closely related word-testimony follows just as little, whether immediately or mediately, as one precedes it. We therefore find ourselves unavoidably confronted with the question in what this contradiction with the mode of perception and tradition of the Synoptists may be grounded. It is commonly of the opinion that Jesus, by means of the

miracle of Cana as a means of revelation of his glory, intended only the strengthening of the faith of his disciples. This is inferred from the fact that nothing is said of an effect upon the wedding company, apart from the disciples (2 11). But in doing so essential moments of the narrative do not come into their own. The delicately sensitive participation of the mother of Jesus, through which the miracle is occasioned, leaves no doubt that, according to the Evangelist's own conception, it is at least initially a matter of a manifestation of the miraculous power

3

of her son on behalf of the celebrating family: they are to be helped out of an embarrassment and the honor of the house is to be preserved in a way that directs the gaze to the mystery of his personality 5. There is no ground for the assumption that Jesus disregarded the immediately given purpose altogether when he responded to the prompting of his mother. The seemingly dismissive answer (v. 4), however, already indicates, orienting and precautionary at this very first summons, that it is not yet time for a revelation of his innermost being, even if he begins with a miracle. The indeed prescient and zealous-for-faith, but premature and impatient urging toward self-revelation on the part of the son is rejected, because this revelation can occur only gradually and step by step, corresponding to the receptivity of the different social circles 6. That, however, the miraculous event did not become known exclusively to the servants and the disciples appears so self-evident that it need not be expressly noted by the narrator. On the one hand it is clear

4

that the role of the servants is highlighted only in order to establish the fact of the miracle. On the other hand, in 2 1 the specification "Cana in Galilee" — referred back to 1 43 ("on the following day he wished to depart for Galilee"), compared with 2 11 and 4 46, where the Cana of Jesus' first sign is again designated as Galilean, and with 4 48 (cf. also v. 43 f.), where Jesus emphasizes the difficult-to-satisfy demand for signs and wonders as a characteristic trait of the Galileans — makes it sufficiently clear that the proof of the miraculous goodness of Jesus at the named place was directed essentially to the wedding guests as representatives of Galilean popular character. If therefore nothing is reported of a saving effect upon the great majority of the festively assembled Galileans, this does not mean that the miracle was aimed merely at the faith of the disciples, but only allows one to surmise that that company conspicuously lacked the sense for the divine sign-language of Jesus. One should note the sharp contrast of the exceptional case in 4 53! To what extent, according to the Evangelist's own view, the circumstances of the festivity in question, unfavorable for impressions of a higher kind, contributed to this (cf. Luke 14 20), remains open.

An examination of the events at the first appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem, which follows almost immediately upon the journey to Cana (2 12 f.), leads us onto the same track: perception of the incapacity of the audience. The Evangelist immediately again presents Jesus as a miracle worker. There is mention of an indefinite number of signs which he performed. And here there is now no lack, among the multitude of the Passover festival-goers, of a certain success: "many

came to faith in his name" (2 23). It is readily assumed that this faith was directed to the Messiah, and from this success it is concluded that Jesus in Jerusalem directly or indirectly made himself known as Messiah. From this it is further inferred that he began with the proclamation of the nearness of the kingdom of God and confirmed this through his miraculous healings, which legitimated him as the bringer of salvation 7. On closer inspection a different state of affairs emerges.

5

The Evangelist in fact allows the preaching of the kingdom of God just as well as the self-testimony of the Logos-Christ to begin only (3 8. 11 ff.) after Jesus has introduced himself in Galilee and Jerusalem through the performance of miracles, and indeed not as Messiah, but as prophet 8. Even if it is not to be doubted that the narrator conceives the miracles performed in Jerusalem as accompanied by words appropriate to the individual occasion (cf. 2 4. 7. 8), it is nevertheless very much to be noted that of a proper act of discourse on this occasion just as little is made known as with the first and second signs in Galilee (2 11. 4 64). The two brief utterances, however, which are communicated at the very first appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem, at the cleansing of the temple, are of such a nature that those addressed could derive from them neither a reference to the nearness of the kingdom of God nor an instruction concerning the divine mystery of the person of the speaker. The word of rebuke of Jesus in 2 16, which is intended to justify his act of zeal, is not of such a kind that it could place the *homo novus* into the light of the eschatological prophecy of Mal. 3 1 ff.; it can make upon those affected only the impression that they have to do with a man who is a prophet or at least claims to be one. If he is in fact a man of God, a second Elijah or one like him (Mark 6 15. 8 28), then the right to such conduct cannot be denied him: for it is not directed against the cult as such, but merely against a nuisance detrimental to the worship of Yahweh, offensive to every pious Israelite. However much the Evangelist himself, when Jesus speaks of his Father's house, may think of divine fatherhood in the higher sense familiar to him, nevertheless for those to whom the word is addressed there could be no ground to interpret it otherwise than in the more general sense of later Jewish usage, as attested by the Apocrypha 9. The prophet from Galilee thereby placed himself in no other relation to the God of the people

6

than any pious person. That Jesus in reality and strictly speaking stood alone with his personal "conviction of God as a loving Father"10 remains undisputed. While therefore at a later moment the appeal of Jesus to his distinctive divine sonship is immediately rejected by the Jews as blasphemy and the latter are strengthened in their deadly hatred (5 18), in our case they find absolutely nothing offensive in the fact that Jesus speaks of God as his Father. The saying in 2 19, seemingly referring to the temple building, with which the demand for a legitimating miracle is rejected, is characterized as an enigmatic prophecy concerning the person of Jesus himself, which without question could only be misunderstood on all sides, as the Evangelist expressly notes that even the disciples only grasped the sense after the resurrection of the Lord. That the Evangelist has nevertheless recorded the saying at this point and in this connection must be grounded in his basic conception and in the overall design of his Gospel, with reference to

which for the present the first part of my “Investigations into the Origin of the Fourth Gospel” (pp. 1—31) may be cited. Under these circumstances there is no justification whatsoever for the assumption that the many who according to 2 23 began to believe in the name of Jesus recognized him as Messiah. They believed in the ὄνομα προφήτου (cf. Matt. 10 41), in the divine sending and prophetic ἐξουσία of Jesus (Mark 11 28 f.; cf. Matt. 21 11), in the prestige of his appearance. Such faith could under circumstances even lead to superstitious use of the name itself (Mark 9 38—41). But the more precisely the signs were decisive for it, as is expressly emphasized (2 23; 2 18. 4 48), the more external and therefore unstable it was, the more inferior and insignificant it appears (2 24; cf. 3 1 ff.). And that it is a matter here of a case of downright typical significance, of a definite salvation-historical

category of people, is betrayed by the Evangelist’s summary remark: “But he, Jesus, for his part did not entrust himself to their faith, because he knew all.” The result receives emphatic confirmation through the words with which, in the closely following narrative, Nicodemus introduces his conversation with Jesus (3 2). This theologian and hierarch manifestly bears witness, as an outstanding representative of those many, that the miracle-working activity exercised by Jesus proves his divine sending. He does indeed recognize in Jesus a teacher, whom he accordingly addresses as Rabbi. But that from this no conclusions are to be drawn concerning a preceding teaching activity follows, apart from what has already been set forth, also from the fact that Jesus is already called Rabbi by Andrew and the unnamed disciple in 1 38, although here no prior word-testimony at all can be in question. The emphasis in 3 2 lies rather upon the judgment of faith: “you have come from God.” As decisive for this judgment, however, Nicodemus significantly designates only the attestation of Jesus through signs. Miracles such as had shortly before been performed in Jerusalem itself explain themselves, according to the conviction of the Jewish scribe, exclusively from the special endowment of power of a man entrusted with a divine mission, a prophetic personality (cf. Acts 10 38). Despite the most powerful impression which he has received from the miracle worker Jesus, no inkling has yet dawned upon the ruler of the Jews of what Jesus is about to proclaim concerning the kingdom of God and the significance of his own person. This is shown by the course of the following conversation. The degree of incomprehension which he displays right at the outset is difficult to reconcile with the presupposition that he had already heard something of the fundamental preaching of Jesus concerning the conditions of entry into the kingdom of God (Mark 1 14).

From what, then, is to be explained the deviation of the fourth Evangelist from the synoptic tradition, so strongly emerging in the entire state of affairs hitherto set forth? It is grounded just as much in the christological as in the

soteriological-pedagogical presuppositions of his contemplation of history. Above all it must be recalled that it is the Logos-Christ who appears to the world in the person of Jesus. What this signifies for the word-testimony and the teaching activity is shown immediately by the

conversation with Nicodemus. Whereas in the miracles of the world-savior (4 42) there could only be continued or repeated what had already been accomplished by the Old Testament organs of revelation as miracle-workers for the presentation and confirmation of the saving truth, in the word, in the discourse, there offered itself to him a means for the production of new, specifically higher insights in the salvation-needing humanity. But since he is the Logos become flesh, he can proclaim the kingdom of God (3 3.5) from the beginning only in such a way that the essence of this kingdom is revealed at the same time with that of his own person. This presupposition of the Evangelist comes out with the very greatest force already in the first acts of discourse of Jesus (2 19. 3 11 ff. 4 10 ff. — Hierarchy, Nicodemus, Samaritan woman) 11. Whoever has become a participant in the life that proceeds from him and takes effect in communion with him, that very one has found admission into that kingdom. This is the fundamental thought of that conversation with Nicodemus, to which, characteristically enough, even outwardly the stamp of the mysterious is already impressed. The deeper, accordingly, the divine mystery is into which Jesus introduces [others] as soon as he begins to teach, the higher the demands its understanding places upon the hearers 12, the more consistently does the Evangelist expressly also ascribe to the didactic discourse of Jesus in the circle of the disciples the occasional

9

character of figurative speech (παροιμίαι 16 25.29) 13; but all the more urgently does there also take shape the need, presupposed by the Evangelist, of a preparatory directing of attention to the person of the new witness to truth, as this is accomplished precisely in the miracle-working that precedes the teaching activity of Jesus. Only when he had on this path been recognized and acknowledged as prophet did, as a rule, the hour strike for the revelation of his true essence through the word-testimony. That, however, that preliminary impression, given the sensuous determinacy of human nature, was most readily to be achieved through miracle-signs (cf. 11 47 f.), this the Evangelist allows Nicodemus himself to confirm sufficiently with his explicit appeal to the miracle-works of Jesus 14. Let there

10

also be recalled the significance that already Ex. 14 31 Num. 14 11 ascribe to the “signs” in the history of salvation of the old people of God.

More light falls upon the entire question when the peculiar difference of receptivity for salvation is taken into account which the Evangelist consistently marks in his characterization of the contemporaries and of the eye- and ear-witnesses of Jesus. The difference in question becomes all the more significant in that it is related to an intelligible act of will on the part of the individual, which is contemplated in mysterious unity with divine causality 15. This background of New Testament salvation history, the differing reception of the mediator of salvation, is a fact clearly conscious to the Logos-Christ and decisive for his conduct and the method of his redemptive activity. According to the presentation of our reporter, he has essentially to do with the contrast between compatriots (or fellow countrymen in the narrower sense) and foreigners, to which for that very reason special attention must be directed from the outset. It must first

strike one that in the fourth Gospel we encounter more than sixty times the designation “the Jews,” which sums up the fellow countrymen of Jesus and also includes the Galileans 16, a designation which (apart from the “king of the Jews” in the mouth of the Magi, of Pilate, and of his soldiers) is found only once in Matthew and Mark, and twice in Luke. In all likelihood the fourth Evangelist thereby intends to keep present to the reader the general contrast with foreign nationality already conditioned by the religious peculiarity of the Israelite people 17. This contrast is expressly emphasized

with regard to the Samaritans (4 9.22) and the Hellenes (7 35). The actual interest of the writer, however, lies in the specific demonstration of a different behavior of Israelites and Gentiles toward Jesus. And this task can itself again be adequately and comprehensively solved only in such a way that the sharply marked diversity of individual classes of the Jewish people with respect to their attitude toward Jesus is illuminated.

In the foreground stands the population of Judea and of the capital, whose characterization occupies the broadest space and most strongly expresses the resistance encountered by the revelation of salvation of Jesus on the part of salvation-needing humanity, in such a way that here again a progressive gradation of difference is worked out. A larger number of passages characterizes the disposition and attitude of a comprehensive middle stratum of this part of the people 18. Somewhat at least excusable appear those Jerusalemites who, despite all self-attestation by miracle and word, deny Jesus messiahship, appealing to the widespread belief in a mysterious emergence of the Messiah from concealment, because his homeland and origin are known to them (7 27). Other cases allow a deeper insight. A faith in his messianic dignity, exceptionally even brought about without a particular sign by the word-testimony of Jesus alone and indeed among a larger number of “Jews,” vanishes in the next moment, when their national pride seems to be injured and the truth is spoken to them concerning their bondage to sin (8 30 f. 45 f.). So greatly does this Judean people allow itself to be blinded by the prejudice of its religious-national arrogance and its self-righteousness, even in the face of the numerous proofs of the miraculous power of the Galilean, that still immediately before the raising of Lazarus “some of them” are able to give a mocking expression to their belittling and suspicious questioning of that power (11 37). There is precisely lacking among this class of people “natures” who are

“by origin akin in kind” to Jesus (10 25.26. 38) 19. Over against the divinely effected oral attestation of the Messiah Jesus, the understanding of these people proves so incapable, the sense for truth so far dead within them (8 37.44), that they do not shrink from declaring him with the abusive epithet “Samaritan” to be an apostate, heretic, and national enemy, and at the same time representing him as demonically deranged (8 48. 52. 10 20 perhaps not to be drawn in here; see below). It is mere dissimulation, however, when they occasionally seek to display their security and superiority by making the mocking remark, pointing to his lack of success in his homeland, that he surely will not go abroad and wish to try his luck among the Hellenistic

surroundings of the Jewish diaspora (7 35), or even harbor thoughts of suicide (8 22)? In reality they are not only filled with deadly hatred against him (8 37. 40), but increasingly fear, for political reasons (cf. 11 48) as well as for religious ones, the victory of his cause. They would most gladly stone him for his blasphemous delusion of grandeur (8 59. 10 31. 33. 11 8). The impression which his miracle on Lazarus leaves even in their ranks, and which has brought the danger of his acclamation as Messiah into immediate proximity, drives “some” of them to bring about the decisive turn by denunciation before the Pharisees of the Sanhedrin, which induces the appealed-to Roman authority to carry out their plan of murder (11 46). “Your nation and the chief priests have delivered you to me,” Pilate himself says to Jesus (18 35). This nation (ἔθνος) are above all the designated fellow countrymen who boasted of the fatherhood of God (8 42); they have shown themselves to be children of the devil (8 44).

If one looks more closely, it is admittedly not concealed that the resistance which Jesus encounters among that broad stratum of the Judean people is fully explained only from their dependence on the spiritual leaders (archontes) of the people 20, on the Sanhedrin (7 32. 45. 11 57. 18 3) composed of Sadducean chief priests and Pharisaic

13

scribes 21. This highest college (led by the Pharisees 1 24) had already been hostile to the Baptist because of the messianic expectation newly stirred up by him; it demanded legitimation from him (1 19). These same “Jews” accordingly already meet the mere prophetic authority with which Jesus introduces himself in the temple as a zealot for God’s honor (see above) with censorious mistrust and with the demand for proof by a miracle (2 18). They further betray, in the unbelief in which they persist toward the testimony contained in the entirety of his vocational activity concerning his divine sonship and sending from the Father, their lack of understanding and unreceptivity for revelation as such (5 36—38); strictly considered, they believe Moses as little as Jesus (and precisely because they do not believe the former, they also do not believe the latter, 5 46 f.; cf. 7 19). They cannot believe Jesus because they already lack, even in the investigation of Scripture, the sense for truth rooted in love for God, and thus allow their judgment to be determined by deceptive promises of false messiahs and by representatives of a misleading, vain scribal learning (5 39—44). It would indeed be astonishing if these hierarchs went so far as to recognize the Messiah in Jesus (7 26). What is archon (and still more Pharisee) is, after all, obviously not to be seduced to such faith (7 48)! In the eyes of these priestly authorities and masters of scriptural interpretation, that Galilean exegete who presumes to lecture in the temple on a festival day

14

appears only as an autodidact and dilettante not to be taken seriously (7 15). Nevertheless they fear that the many signs which he performs will, before long, convert all the people to him (11 48). Thereby, however, he becomes for them, to a troubling degree, a political opponent, whose possible acclamation as king threatens their land and rule with violent intervention by the Romans (11 47 f.). They kept special watch on him in this apprehension particularly on festive occasions (7 11) 22 and suppressed the free expression of opinion of the people about the

uncanny man (7 13). The ultimate aim of the authorities, however, from the moment when he healed a sick man on the Sabbath and induced him to carry his pallet, and in his self-justification appealed to his unique divine sonship, was nothing other than his death (5 16—18. 7 1.19.25). A first attempt at arrest, effected by the chief priests (at the instigation of the collegial Pharisees — thus by the Sanhedrin), is thwarted by the powerful impression which Jesus' speech has made upon the officers (7 32. 44 f.). To the high council, alarmed and undecided after the raising of Lazarus in view of the multiplying signs, the acting high priest Caiaphas himself 23 recommends sacrificing the life of the state-dangerous miracle-worker for the salvation of the people (11 49 f.; cf. 12 10 f.). This is followed by a "systematic" course of action by the chief priests (and Pharisees): repeated deliberations for the purpose of killing the hated one (11 53 f.) 24, measures for tracking down and arrest (immediately before the Passover, 11 55. 57), finally seizure by their servants (under cover of the Roman cohort of the place, 18 3.12). Even more than in what precedes, the outstanding share of the Sanhedrin comes to light in what follows — compared with the synoptic narrative. The initiation of the judicial proceedings by the acting

15

high priest Caiaphas 25, concerning which no further report is given (18 24. 28) 26, is preceded by a preliminary examination of the prisoner before the especially esteemed and influential "high priest" (18 19.22) Annas, the father-in-law and indirect predecessor in office of the former (18 13.19—21) — a move that brings out all the more strongly what was perpetrated by the Jews at the highest priestly level. The chief priests, led by these heads, as leaders and representatives of the "nation" of Jesus in the sense explained above, are the ones who deliver Jesus to the Roman superior official as an "evildoer" for execution (18 28 ff. 35) 27. These same "Jews" (v. 38; cf. 35) want nothing to do with the (corresponding to a Passover custom) 28 release of Jesus and instead stormily demand the pardon of the robber (insurrectionist? Mark 15 7) Barabbas (18 40) 29; they are also stirred only to still wilder desire for the punishment of crucifixion by the sight of the one scourged and mocked by the Roman soldiery before Pilate's eyes (19 6) 30 and finally, by overcoming Pilate's continuing reluctance through the intensification of their political accusation with an equally compromising religious one (19 7.12), they force the execution: the "chief priests" procure the sentence (19 15), and these same chief priests crucify Jesus (v. 16.18) 31. They also still protest

16

against the ambiguous designation of the crucified one as the king of the Jews (19 21) 32 and do not hesitate, under the hypocritical pretext of preserving the festival from defilement, to expose him to the last possible danger of a "second execution," the shattering of the legs (19 31) 33. Thus the word of Jesus to Pilate becomes intelligible: "the one who delivered me to you 34 has greater guilt of sin" (19 11), but also the fear of the disciples of the "Jews" 35 which determined them, after the passing of Jesus, to assemble behind closed doors (20 19).

What the Evangelist, according to the testimony of the passages discussed, has to say about the high priesthood of the Jews applies in essence to the entire high council. That, however, the evil spirit of the Sanhedrin is properly speaking to be sought in those members belonging to the

Pharisaic tendency, the doctors of orthodoxy and types of piety, to whom reference has already repeatedly been made in what has preceded, must be emphasized in particular36. It corresponds to their character that they are the first of all to take action. Just as they already call the forerunner of Christ to account, probably not without suspicion and uneasiness, on account of the manner of his appearance (1 19. 24 f.), so they are avoided by Jesus from the outset, because of their mistrustful and jealous attention, which finds telling expression even at the last, solemn entry into Jerusalem (12 19), in order to prevent conflicts as a result of premature recognition by the people (4 1. 3). They deny him (like the priestly archontes) the messiahship already on account of his Galilean origin, for which they have, in their opinion, a decisive proof from Scripture (7 48. 52). Some of them

17

take such offense, on the occasion of a miraculous healing, at his supposed violation of the Sabbath, despite his signs, that not even his prophetic mission is acknowledged (9 16; cf. v. 17 and the procedure of the members of the Sanhedrin in 5 9 ff. 16), and that even the testimony of the healed man and that of his parents encounters stubborn doubt (9 18, where after v. 13 the "Jews" are in any case primarily Pharisees). Their party comrades had indeed already accused Jesus himself of false testimony (8 13), and they themselves "know" that he is altogether a sinner (transgressor of the law) (9 24) 37. Many among them can explain his discourses only from the frenzy of one possessed (like the "Jews" 8 48. 52) (10 20) 38. That in reality their own condition is a sinful blindness they are expressly told from the mouth of Jesus (9 40 f.). How far, however, they go in their self-exaltation, their rigorism, and abuse of power is made clear not only from the fact that they declare the many members of the lower strata of the people who are inclined to faith in Jesus, just like all who are ignorant of the law, to be accursed by God (7 49), but also from the fact that they place under the ban everyone who confesses him as Messiah (9 22; cf. v. 34) 39 and even keep many members of the high council who belong to the Christ-believers back from confession through fear of exclusion from the synagogue (12 42). That it was the Pharisees who drove the chief priests to the first attempt at arresting Jesus (7 32. 44 f.) is understandable in light of all this, and that they were involved especially in the final deliberations and intrigues of the chief priests which led to the condemnation and execution of the accused (11 46 f. 53) is not otherwise to be expected.

In contrast to the firm and unified traits of this sharply demarcated class of the population, the not infrequently

18

appearing crowd (ὄχλος) 40 shows a rather wavering and unclear attitude, which most closely resembles that of the middle stratum of the Judeans first illuminated. Here too the evidence of their negative behavior toward Jesus comes into consideration first, in which motives already familiar recur repeatedly. Among the common people as well, the Galilean origin of Jesus partly constitutes an obstacle to faith in his messiahship (7 41). No less offense is taken at Jesus' prediction concerning his exaltation, which does not seem to accord with the people's belief in an eternal reign of the Messiah on earth, that is, with the expectation that he would remain alive

(12 34). In the case of the crowd which at times, when Jesus speaks of the deadly hatred of the "Jews," confronts him with the suspicion of a demonic affliction of persecution mania, one must think primarily of disoriented festival pilgrims (7 20); likewise in the case of those who represent him as a deceiver of the people (7 12). As in the latter case, so also with the persons whom his self-proclamation provokes to bring about his arrest, it is only a part of the throng of people that is involved (7 43 f.) 41. Yet shortly before his death Jesus himself is convinced that an extraordinary miracle, one arousing the highest attention, is required in order to move the crowd to faith in his messiahship (11 42) 42.

In a summarizing retrospective view of the behavior of the members of the high council, Jerusalemites, and festival pilgrims who represent the "Jewish nation" 43, the Evangelist further testifies that despite the multitude of Jesus' signs they did not believe in

him as Messiah (12 37), and that they could not believe, because their hardening had been foreseen by the (Logos-)Christ and foretold through the mediation of Isaiah (12 38—41) 44.

In spite of everything, however, there is no lack of individual bright spots in the repellent Judean overall picture, which are in turn distributed in characteristically different ways over the principal fields. It is not surprising if the Pharisees are here almost entirely excluded. In contradiction to other party comrades, at least some of them — tentatively — once argue that the supposed violator of the Sabbath may after all have proved himself to be one sent by God through his miraculous deeds (9 16) 45. On another occasion some (Pharisees 9 40) ask whether the miraculous healing of a blind man could have been effected by one possessed (10 21). By name we come to know only one Pharisee who adheres to Jesus: Nicodemus, who is at the same time a member of the Sanhedrin (3 1. 2). This man too had been convinced of Jesus' prophetic mission by his striking miracle-working, and indeed already soon after his public appearance (see above). How little he nevertheless (together with the other authorities of the Jewish people) is able to understand the truth-testimony of Jesus concerning the kingdom of heaven is shown by his conversation with him. The deficiency of his faith is also evident from the fact that he remains a secret adherent (probably with primary regard to his official position), even if he has the courage in the Sanhedrin to safeguard the general legal protection for Jesus over against his Pharisaic colleagues (7 50 f.). That he nevertheless adheres to his inadequate conviction is shown by his participation in the burial of Jesus with an extraordinarily rich honor-gift (19 39 ff.); it does not follow with equal certainty from this that he worked his way up to faith in Jesus as the Messiah 46.

Hardly more favorable are matters with the non-Pharisaic part of the Sanhedrin. To be sure, here in summary (see above) mention is made of many archontes who are said to have come to faith in Jesus (whether in his messianity?)47. But like the Pharisee Nicodemus himself, they conceal their faith out of fear of excommunication by the Pharisees (12 42); it is therefore not yet a full, life-vital conviction. According to Mark (15 43) and Luke (23 50), the "secret disciple"

Joseph of Arimathea, who requests permission from Pilate for the removal of the body of Jesus and together with Nicodemus provides for the burial (John 19 38 ff.)48, is also to be reckoned among these hierarchs, albeit probably as one of the best, most willing to believe among them49.

Noticeably pitched a tone higher is the assessment of receptivity for salvation in the middle stratum of the Judean population first described, although here too comparatively only few and in part faint points of light emerge. Already at the first Passover, at which it nevertheless remains doubtful whether the Judeans were present in the majority, many came under the impression of the (according to 4 45 numerous) miracles of Jesus to faith in his name, that is, in his prophetic mission, not in his messianity (see above). But how external in nature this faith was, how little corresponding to the demands of Jesus, the Evangelist himself emphasizes with a remark referring to Jesus' behavior toward those admirers (2 23 f.). Whether the messiah-faith to which "many Jews" were awakened through the concluding miracle on Lazarus

21

(11 45. 12 11), and which even caused the Sanhedrin to fear, because of a continuation of Jesus' miracle-working, the seduction of all (11 48), was in essence of a similar character, cannot be investigated. All the more deserving of attention is the fact that alongside this it is said of "many" Jerusalemites that they were moved by Jesus' discourses to believe in him (as Messiah) (8 30 f.), yet in such a way that we are at the same time informed by way of correction that the faith in question was present only fleetingly and gave way to unbelief as soon as the false national pride of those concerned felt itself offended by Jesus' statements (v. 45 f.). It remains doubtful whether the man born blind, who is brought to faith by Jesus through sign and word at his healing (9 38), had his eyes opened concerning Jesus' messianity in the ordinary sense or in the higher sense of the Evangelist50. In any case, this example constitutes to a certain degree a contrast to the average type of the middle class of the Judeans51, and it may be asked whether the convert is in reality not rather to be counted among the "crowd" still to be described. An otherwise distinctive exceptional position is occupied by the sibling triad of Bethany: the "friend" of Jesus and of his disciples Lazarus (11 11), the sister Martha, who confesses her faith in Jesus' messianity already before the raising of her brother, thus on the basis of Jesus' word-testimony (11 27)52, and Mary, who anoints Jesus' feet in foreboding of his imminent death (12 3). In view of the personal relationships to Jesus, this familial circle appears as a kind of counterpart to the circle of disciples of the "Twelve".

Finally, the picture of the crowd also presents

22

itself in a somewhat blurred way with respect to its positive behavior toward Jesus53. We learn first on the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles (7 2) that a part of the throngs (ὄχλοις) in general declare him to be a "good" man (ἀγαθός), that is, a person of honorable character who has the common good in view. It is surprising that at the same festive occasion, under the impression of Jesus' discourse (7 14. 16—19. 21—24. 28 f. 33 f. 37 f.), some hold him to be the

prophet preceding the Messiah, others the Messiah himself (7 40 f.), and that even the court officers cannot resist the spell of his speech, which holds the crowd captive (7 44 ff.). Otherwise, it is indeed also with this class that the miracles of Jesus decisively determine the judgment about him. Of many among the crowd54 it is testified, again at the said festival, that they were moved by the multitude of Jesus' miracles to faith in him (as Messiah) (7 31)55. Most powerful is the impression which the event of Bethany makes upon these circles. The miracle draws out a "great crowd of Jewish people" who wish to see Jesus and convince themselves of the raising of "Lazarus" (12 9)56, and drives the "great crowd" to an enthusiastic greeting of the Passover guest as the messianic king (12 12 ff. 18)57. A multitude of those who had been witnesses of the raising bear witness at the entry to the messianic miracle-work (12 17; cf. v. 13. 18).

Unique in its kind and not readily to be fitted into the preceding context is the appearance of John the Baptist (according to Luke 1 5. 39 a son of an Aaronic priest settled in the Judean highlands).

The Evangelist does not expressly call him so, because he does not perceive the specific significance of this "man sent from God" (1 6)58 in the pedagogical-ritual preparation of Israel in general for the advent of the messianic age (1 31), but rather in the fact that through special revelation he was the first to recognize the appeared (Logos-)Messiah and Son of God, the reconciler of the world (1 29) and spiritual renewer of humanity (1 33. 7 39), and to bear witness to him as such before the world (1 7)59 (1 7 f. 14 f. 26 f. 29—34. 36. 3 26—36. 5 33 ff.). If the fourth Evangelist thereby allows the Baptist to rise prophetically so far to the heights of New Testament Christology60 that nothing remains for him but to conclude his own mission with reference to the person of Jesus (3 30), then our Gospel also goes beyond the Synoptic account (Matthew and Luke) in that it does not allow the faith of the Baptist in the messianity of Jesus to be clouded by even the slightest shadow of uncertainty or disappointment and despondency (cf. John 1 31—34. 3 25 ff. as against Matt. 11 1—6. Luke 7 18—23)61. However one may determine the relation of idea and reality in this concluding Old Testament figure of splendor: in any case, in this typical organ of revelation there is reflected not the Judean people, but Israel in need of salvation and receptive of salvation.

In comparison with the manner of the reception of Jesus among the Jews in the narrower sense, the character and behavior of the Galilean population at first glance scarcely appear essentially different. Although the pressure exercised by the spiritual supreme authority upon public opinion does not make itself felt

in Galilee as immediately as in Judea62, nevertheless more or less generalizing statements of the Evangelist here too suggest a high degree of unreceptivity. That already the wedding narrative of Cana constitutes a problematic prognostic has been shown (p. 3). To be sure, the "Galileans" receive Jesus already soon after his first public appearance in Jerusalem on account of the numerous miracles performed there before their own eyes (4 45), and not long thereafter

the miracle of the feeding of approximately 5,000 people performed at the Sea of Tiberias without a preceding address (cf. by contrast Mark 6 34. Luke 9 11), who had followed him because of his healings of the sick (6 2. 5), makes so overwhelming an impression upon the people that they want to proclaim him (the messianic) king (6 14 f.). But to the same crowd Jesus declares solemnly, upon renewed pressing, that they are drawn by his miracle-works merely for their material value, because of their significance for bodily life, instead of allowing these signs to open for them an understanding of his divine being and of his messianic task aimed at the creation of eternal values (6 24 ff.). That in fact with this throng there can be no talk of a genuine messiah-faith is confirmed by them themselves, in that they immediately respond, with reference to the authentication of Moses through the gift of manna, with the demand for a sign surpassing the feeding miracle, one entirely beyond doubt (6 30). In his reply Jesus can under these circumstances content himself with repeatedly (cf. 6 26) establishing the fact that with all his self-revelation through miracles he is unable to help that mass of people to faith in him, because their thinking and desire adhere entirely to the earthly and sensuous (6 36); — as indeed they subsequently murmur and dispute over the supposed incongruity of the words of the son of Joseph concerning his heavenly origin and the indispensable means of grace of the consumption of his flesh and blood

25

(6 41. 52)63. No less significant, however, is the fact that on the occasion of Jesus' dispute with the crowd even a part of his Galilean adherents, "disciples" in the broader sense, take grave offense, which draws upon them Jesus' reproach of unbelief (6 60. 61. 64), and that finally many of these disciples fall away from him definitively (6 66). Indeed, not even his brothers, who harbored suspicion of self-overestimation on the one hand and of lack of courage on the other toward him, had come to faith in his messianity (7 3—5); that in 19 26 f. the dying Jesus does not entrust the care of his mother to one of his brothers is not connected with this, as will be shown later64.

In spite of everything, the overall picture which the Evangelist sketches of the character of the Galileans places the religious disposition manifested in their behavior toward the person and preaching of Jesus in a considerably more favorable light than that of the Jews proper. This already becomes evident negatively in the fact that in Galilee it comes neither to persecution nor to plans of murder65. A very telling positive supplement to the characterization is provided if the royal military official in Capernaum, who experiences Jesus' healing miraculous help on his son, is either to be counted among the Galileans or at least "with respect to the quality of his faith to be regarded as a representative of the Galileans"66. Jesus receives

26

the man seemingly with the prejudice that, like the population in general among whom he lives, he does not really want to believe in the dignity and mission of the one appealed to without having also in his own case received authentication through miracle-signs; in reality Jesus' intention is to put the official's faith to a serious test through repelling treatment and thereby to let it emerge all the more brilliantly (4 48). In fact, the one tested believes the word of Jesus

already before confirmation by the requested miracle and immediately follows the instruction received (4 46—50). The final result, however, is that through word and miracle together he with his whole household is converted to faith in his benefactor (4 53) — whether in the prophet or the Messiah is not indicated67. In the case of two Galilean female figures as well, a doubt remains in this respect. Whether with the mother of Jesus (see above p. 2 f.) it is presupposed that she had already before his appearance recognized or at least suspected his messianity and in Cana urged him to reveal himself in this capacity through a miracle (2 3. 5) is as little certain to answer (cf. the prophetic multiplication miracles 1 Kings 17 14—16. 2 Kings 4 42—44) as the question concerning the further development of her faith68. Nor does the fact that the dying one entrusts his mother to the beloved disciple (19 26 f.) in itself serve to bring complete clarification69. But what is reported of Mary Magdalene,

27

that she is the first to see her buried Lord, receives the first appearance of the Risen One, and brings the disciples at his command the first message (20 2—12), certainly provides no information about the prehistory of her faith70.

All the brighter and more reconciling, therefore, is the light which the fourth Evangelist casts from the inner circle of disciples of the “Twelve” (6 67.70) upon Galilean Israel71 — the despicable homeland of prophets according to Jesus’ own testimony (4 43 f.). Without being sought out, following providential guidance, Jesus attaches to himself a number of Galilean men just as he is about to enter upon the messianic course that is opening up before him. As with the Synoptics, we also learn here who the first called were; but even more than Luke

28

in relation to his side-sources, our Gospel in detail departs from the synoptic account as such. An orientation in this respect is not without interest for our investigation. Above all, it must strike one strongly that the one whom the Synoptics unanimously place at the head of the first called, Simon Peter, becomes the third in the fourth Gospel (1 41 f.). At first it is doubtful only which of the two disciples who are called before him and indeed simultaneously (1 35—40) is to take first place in the enumeration, Andrew or the anonymous one72. The circumstance that Andrew in the synoptic tradition is called together with Peter, whose brother he is (Mark 1 16 cf. 29. Matt. 4 18), and accordingly also occupies the second place in the apostolic list (Matt. 10 2. Luke 6 14)73, makes it probable that also in the intention of our fourth Evangelist Andrew and Peter are to be placed immediately together, so that the companion of Andrew receives the place of honor as the one first to be named — despite his anonymity! But who is this apparently unknown figure supposed to be? The observation presses itself upon us here of itself that of the sons of Zebedee, James and John, who in the synoptic calling narrative are ranged as the second

29

pair after Peter and Andrew, neither appears by name in the fourth Gospel, which is all the more striking since already the older New Testament tradition ascribes to this pair of brothers,

alongside Peter, the most intimate relations with Jesus and (based on this) claims to a special esteem (Mark 5 37. 9 2. 14 33; 10 35 ff.; cf. 13 3). That the author of our Gospel in reality, and precisely also in the introduction of the first disciples, should have ignored those two, will under these circumstances appear almost unthinkable. We shall all the less assume this, quite apart from the ancient traditional association of the fourth Gospel with the son of Zebedee and apostle John, and with all the more right expect to encounter at least one of the two in the Gospel, since the Evangelist repeatedly, at significant moments, mysteriously designates a particular disciple not by his name but with the addition “whom Jesus loved” (13 23. 19 26 f. 20 2; cf. 21 7. 20). That this “beloved disciple,” who during his discipleship — accordingly — came especially close to Jesus, is one and the same with the anonymous first-called of ch. 1, as well as with the “other disciple” of 18 15 f. 20 2.3.4.8 (who in 20 3 is expressly called “the other disciple, whom Jesus loved”), has from the outset the most in its favor. For after all, that he belongs to the Twelve can, according to the whole spirit and context of the calling narrative in ch. 1, give rise to no serious doubt74. If this is so, then in all probability the only remaining question will be which of the two sons of Zebedee the writer veils in anonymity and which he passes over. The assumption that the one passed over is James can in that case be somewhat justified by reference to his early death (43/44?)75, if according

to the Evangelist’s own historical conception the son of Zebedee John outlived his brother James by a considerable margin. Whether this really is the Evangelist’s presupposition remains for the moment undecided; it will be necessary to return to it in the fourth section. A surer point of orientation may perhaps be offered by a comparative glance at the first-called who are named. Andrew as well as Simon Peter and Philip appear in the tradition in various ways as apostles in the full sense, that is, as missionary apostles76. According to New Testament indications Peter appears — apart from his Jewish mission in Antioch — Syria being disregarded —77 not only as missionary of the Samaritans (Acts 8), but in Caesarea also as the first missionary to the Gentiles (Acts 10)78; his activity in Rome is most probably already presupposed by the author of the First Epistle of Peter (5 13). In extra-biblical tradition the old Acts of Andrew79, belonging to the (heretical?) literature of the earliest apostolic legend, already ascribe to Andrew a far-reaching missionary activity — in Achaia —80. Around the same time ecclesiastical writers place Andrew in Asia Minor: thus the Syriac Didascalia of the Apostles81 in Bithynia, alongside which the Muratorian Fragment82 suggests Ephesus83. Origen, however (in Eusebius, h. e. III, 1), shortly after 220 appeals to the tradition84 that Andrew received Scythia

as his apostolic sphere of activity85. With Asia Minor the tradition also remains which brings the apostle Philip, unmistakably as a result of a confusion with the evangelist of the same name that had already taken hold in the second century, to an end in Hierapolis86. With Nathanael identification presents difficulties87. In view of these lines of

tradition it is to be expected that the fourth Evangelist, who does not wish to repeat the synoptic calling narrative88, made his selection of those to be named in the present manner because from the standpoint of his Logos theology (1 1—18?) the missionary activity of the apostles, and indeed the extra-Jewish one, was a main point of view for him89. Precisely this activity, however, so far as we can see, did not come into consideration in the case of the son of Zebedee James. Had this disciple nevertheless been included, he certainly would not have been placed at the head, but as fourth, separated from John by the brother-pair Andrew–Simon, he would also have found no fitting place. All the more understandable, then, is it if the son of Zebedee John himself is the one who, as the beloved disciple, takes the first place — and thereby an apostle to whom already the author ad Theophilum (in Acts 8 14 ff.), contrary to Gal. 2 9, ascribes an activity in Samaria90, while ecclesiastical tradition since Irenaeus91 assigns him a later sphere of activity in Asia Minor (Ephesus), where he is also said to have composed the fourth Gospel.

Accordingly, the Galilean John stands at the top of the rank of the Twelve 92 as the ideal disciple, as the apostle after the heart of Jesus, without it initially being evident what moved the Evangelist

to this evaluation, as also to the non-mentioning of the favored one. All the more noteworthy is the characterization of the other members of the apostolic college, in which the observation of a certain gradation presses itself upon us 93. Immediately following the disciple who even at the tomb of Jesus shows that he is ahead of all the others, whose image is not darkened by even the slightest shadow 94, comes Andrew. For him it already suffices that, like that other one — without an experience of miracles — he is pointed out by the Baptist to Jesus as the Messiah (“Lamb of God” = Savior of the world), in order immediately, even anticipating the summons by Jesus, to make preparations to enter discipleship, to present himself, and to bring his brother Simon to Jesus (1 36—42). At the Sea of Tiberias he does not display the expected liveliness of the impression, strengthened by faith in the messianic miracle-power of Jesus, of the preceding signs, especially of the miracle at Cana, but no explicit reproach is made to him on this account (6 8 f.). Of all the deeper significance in the Evangelist’s conception is the fact that Andrew announces to Jesus the Greeks who desire acquaintance with him (12 22; s. o.). Already the circumstance that precisely here Philip is also involved, and indeed as the one first approached by the Greeks (12 20—22) 95, allows it to be seen that in the so striking placement of Simon Peter in the third position of the called (between Andrew and Philip), instead of the historically grounded and received synoptic tradition, the Evangelist’s intended

highlighting of the destiny of Christianity leading to world mission provided the guiding point of view. Peter had, in view of his importance, to retain one of the first places in any case. But as against the traditional precedence, from the indicated point of view it weighed heavily that he was expressly the apostle of the Jews (Gal. 2 7 ff.) and probably remained so 96. In addition, the strikingly strong contrast of light and shadow in the character and life-portrait of precisely

this outstanding apostle also made it difficult, on his part, for an immediate juxtaposition with the disciple “whom Jesus loved.” The distinctive recognition which our Evangelist accords to Simon is expressed in the following traits. Brought to Jesus as the Messiah by his brother Andrew, he immediately receives from him, by virtue of his supernatural knowledge, the announcement of his future honor-name Cephas (1 40—42; cf. Gal. 2 7 ff.). At the decisive moment concluding the first section of Jesus’ activity, where Jesus’ self-testimony so greatly offends a part of his Galilean adherents and provokes them to unbelief that many of these “disciples” fall away from him (s. o.), Peter answers Jesus’ question to the Twelve whether they too wish to depart, in the name of all and with appeal to the words of life of Jesus, with the solemn confession of him as Messiah (6 68 f.). The immediate disclosure by Jesus to the Twelve that even this closest circle of the chosen includes a devil (6 70 f.), and the repeated reference shortly before the beginning of the passion to the impending betrayal, drives Peter, for the liberation of the disciples from their anxiety, to induce Jesus through his favorite disciple to designate the betrayer (13 21—26) 97. Notified by Mary Magdalene of the opening of

Jesus’ tomb, he hastens at once with the favorite disciple to the tomb, enters it after the latter has only looked in, and comes — though not as the first, yet together with the other disciple who also entered after him — to faith in the resurrection of Jesus (20 2—9) 98. The Evangelist allows the weaknesses and failings of this striking personality to emerge only on the eve of the passion of Jesus’ death 99. A gentle rebuke from the Lord already strikes the false zeal for humility with which Peter refuses the washing of the feet, and the renewed lack of understanding whereby, after instruction about the salvific significance of the symbolic action, he demands still more symbolism than Jesus applies for his cleansing (13 6 ff.). Jesus answers the boastful promise of death-defying fidelity of discipleship with the announcement of the near-impending threefold denial, to be made good again through martyrdom (13 36—38). The attempt to rescue him at the arrest he rebukes to Peter as a god-opposing undertaking (18 10 f.) 100. Only a few hours of temptation are required to turn the infidelity of the disciple, prophesied by Jesus, into fact (18 16—18. 25—27) 101. Even in the twenty-first chapter, appended by a later, foreign hand (s. u.), which (in connection with Lc. 22 31 f.) is devoted to the equally very humiliating 102 as well as distinguishing rehabilitation

of the fallen Peter by the risen Jesus himself, nothing changes, upon closer consideration, in the Evangelist’s own subordination of Peter to the favorite disciple. However much the dignity of the former appears elevated by the fact that he is now assigned, up to his honorable martyrdom on the cross (Joh. 21 18), the task of supreme leader of the world mission and chief shepherd of the entire Christian community (cf. Mt. 16 18 f.), nevertheless even here the beloved of Jesus is the one who first recognizes the risen one revealing himself subsequently at the Sea of Tiberias (Joh. 21 7), and to whom, in comparison with Peter, not only a longer duration of his apostolate is reserved 103, but also an abiding higher significance 104.

Like the sons of John, Andrew and Simon Peter, so Philip follows Jesus who calls him, at his word. As Andrew brings his brother, so Philip immediately brings Nathanael to Jesus (1 43. 45 f.). Like Andrew, so Philip falls the mediating role in the announcement of the salvation-seeking Greeks (s. o.) (12 20—22) 105. On the other hand, Philip, at the feeding

37

at the Sea of Tiberias, brings to the miracle-working salvific will of Jesus just as little as Andrew (s. o.) the faith-filled understanding to be expected after all that has been experienced (6 5—7). Thus we would have with Philip, in the main, only a double of Andrew, if the image of the former did not receive in 14 8—10, through the further character trait there, a notably subdued tone: Philip desires for himself and the other disciples, in view of the impending departure of Jesus, a reassuring, immediate fore-vision of God 106 and is rebuked by Jesus on account of the deficient faith which, despite so long an association with him, has still not led him to full knowledge of his relation to the Father and thus of his own divine nature 107. In this connection, however,

38

it is to be taken into consideration that the singular address of vv. 9–10 passes without mediation in v. 11 into a plural, according to which the deficiency reproached in Philip may also incite the other disciples to self-examination.

A new element enters into the characterization of the circle of disciples with the skeptical reserve of Nathanael at the moment when he is made acquainted with the newly discovered Messiah Jesus by Philip (1 45—50). However much Nathanael, with the prejudice he brings against the “Nazarene” and “son of Joseph” 108, stands in contrast to the trusting readiness of those previously mentioned, he nevertheless receives from Jesus the praise of a guileless Israelite 109, and he allows himself already through a manifestation of the wondrous knowledge of Jesus 110 — thus like

39

his predecessors without the visible proof of a “sign” (σημεῖον) 111 — to be convinced of the messianity of the one who greets him.

More readily than with the previous series of disciples do we recognize in the peculiarly isolated Thomas, mentioned by the Synoptics only in the list of the Twelve, the “type of a kind” 112. He appears only at the moment when Jesus, with the highest earthly triumph of his miracle-power, the raising of Lazarus, seals his death-fate and prepares for the final path of suffering: frightened at Jesus’ resolve to return from Perea to Judea, heedless of mortal danger, he gives expression to his death-defying manly loyalty and calls upon the fellow disciples to die with him (11 16). Nevertheless, shortly thereafter he must be confronted by Jesus (like the others in indeterminate generality) with the still unovercome imperfection of faith-knowledge regarding his essential unity with God and his way of salvation (14 4—7; cf. v. 10 and the rebuke of Philip v. 9). And how well-founded precisely in the case of

40

Thomas the reproach of this deficiency is shown by the stubborn doubt which he finally sets against the report of Jesus' resurrection and which yields only to the offer of a tangible proof on the part of the risen one himself 113. The more surprising, however, the effect of this personal, unique experience is, which at once raises the "unbelieving" Thomas to the level of faith in the Logos-Messiah ("my Lord and my God!" cf. 1 1 and 5 23), thus even above the level of Peter's confession 6 69 114, the more noteworthy is the renewed, now reproachfully strict admonition to a Christ-faith which, by renunciation of sensory proofs, demonstrates its perfection (20 24—29). In this character-figure too, the overall impression accords with the assumption of a gradation which the Evangelist has inserted into the sequence of the disciples he has brought in. His Thomas indeed initially recalls, in various ways, now more, now less to his own advantage, Peter, Nathanael, and Philip, and thus presents himself in general sufficiently as a spiritual kinsman of the others and a fully entitled member of the innermost circle of disciples. But it does not happen without purpose that he comes conspicuously afterward and finally appears outright as a warning example at the close of the Gospel. The narrator was concerned above all, analogously to the synoptic procedure in Lc. 24 36—40, to have the fact of the resurrection of Jesus — this greatest and, next to the incarnation, most fundamental miracle accomplished by the Logos-Christ himself upon himself (2 18 f. 5 26. 10 17 f. 20 30) — explicitly and conclusively established, over against an unbelieving world, by a witness as untainted as possible from the midst of the Twelve themselves (20 24). And for this precisely the type of the sober man of understanding and born doubter, as presented by the disciple who demanded,

41

in the case of so incredible an event, the most palpable, most immediate proof of truth, was best suited. As certainly as the compliance of the risen one makes recognizable the esteem of the disciple on the part of Jesus, who does not wish to lose him (6 39. 17 12. 18 9), so in this case the literary purpose could be achieved in no other way than along the path of an intensified exposure of him 115. Not without some justification has one perhaps found the name of the disciple "Thomas" significant in the sense of the Evangelist 116: it is not to be overlooked that this Evangelist alone adds the Greek name-translation Didymos (twin), and indeed not only at the first appearance, but precisely also on the occasion of the rebuke of the disciple by the risen one (11 16. 20 24; 21 2 — appendix — is to be disregarded). The impression of a temperament moving in strong contrasts is fully intelligible 117. Only one must not allow oneself, on account of this trait, to be led to a misrecognition of the deeper character of the disciple, who despite everything is valued by Jesus himself as a nature of light, and of the true intention of the Evangelist.

The disciple Judas, who, like Thomas, appears only in the farewell discourses of Jesus ("not the Iscariot"; alias Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus Mc. 3 18. Mt. 10 3), despite the brevity of his sole utterance likewise lets his inner kinship with those previously mentioned emerge clearly enough (14 22); yet here too the descending sequence

42

of character types again becomes noticeable. If Thomas, at the announcement of the near departure of Jesus (13 33), confessed a sense of regrettable not-knowing, a lack of understanding for the goal and way of the savingly consummating activity of Jesus (14 4 f.; see above); if Philip at the same time, by demanding a theophany, acknowledged the inadequacy of his faith in Christ and his knowledge of Christ (14 8 ff.), then Judas, in what follows, confronts his Lord rather with a presumed superior knowing. The prospect opened by Jesus for those who love him, of a renewed self-revelation for the time after his departure, seems to him, as he interprets it, unsatisfactory. He therefore interrupts Jesus with the objection: How does it come about that for the time after your departure to the Father you envisage revelation only to your friends118, and not the (according to the prophecy119 to be expected together with the saving revelation) judicial revelation to the (hostile) world? As Judas thus, with his expectation, remains in general still wholly caught in the “political-theocratic conception of the national Messiah” 120 121, so he is further characterized in particular by the unmistakably pressing interest in the acceleration of the world-judgment (cf. Lc. 24 21. Act. 16) — in the strongest contrast to Joh. 3 14—17. 12 47: I have not

43

come to judge the world, but to save the world 122. As certain as it would have been a deviation on Jesus’ part to give even the appearance of acceding to this disciple’s reproach, so certain is it that in the undertaking of Judas there lies a parallel to Peter’s attempt to dissuade Jesus from his resolve to suffer (18 10 f.; see above) 123. The silence of Jesus in our case may therefore at first appear all the more surprising, since Peter, according to the report of our first two Evangelists, was rebuffed by Jesus in the analogous temptation (occurring in the region of Caesarea Philippi?) with the address: Satan! (Mc. 8 33. Mt. 16 23). But note that the disciple whom the fourth Evangelist here lets confront Jesus as tempter is already, by his name, involuntarily reminiscent of the betrayer, as he is also explicitly distinguished by the writer from the Iscariot. This conclusion of a characterizing gradation is further facilitated by the fact that Luke (diverging from Mark and Matthew) in the apostolic catalogue places the namesake of the betrayer as the eleventh immediately next to Judas “Iscariot” and calls him Judas of James (6 16; cf. Act. 1 13) 124. Given the well-known fondness of our Evangelist for allusions, one can indeed scarcely resist the supposition that even the striking coincidence of the names is meant to suggest a certain similarity of the persons 125.

44

This finally leads to the placing, within the circle of the Twelve, of that figure who in the Evangelist’s portraiture stands out most next to Peter, because he is sharply set off against all the other disciples, in order to present the deepest and most insurmountable opposition of human nature and striving to the Logos-revelation in Jesus. The heightened typology directed to this end in the depiction of the ungodly, light-shunning (13 30) and uncanny nature of Judas Iscariot could not be more sharply marked 126. On the generally human side his characterization is confined to the highlighting of a double trait, occasioned by the anointing of Jesus in Bethany. He persistently abuses the trust bestowed on him by the company of disciples for thievish embezzlement and yet, on that occasion, feigns the appearance of a compassionate

benefactor of the poor (12 4—6). That in doing so there also intrudes an utterance of envious disparagement which in the last instance is directed against Jesus himself, is suggested by the passages that illuminate the personal relationship of this Judas to Jesus and thereby, from the highest point of view, open a glimpse into the man's innermost being. Jesus himself designates him as διάβολος (6 70). This word, in the Evangelist's sense, is without doubt meant to recall the one who with him (8 44. 13 2), as with Matthew and Luke (especially in the temptation narrative), is called ὁ διάβολος: the Devil. Nevertheless, the translation "a devil" is problematic. If the Evangelist proceeded on the assumption that the word in question could also be understood by the disciples only in the sense of a "diabolical" man, it would then remain (particularly after the immediately preceding testimony of Peter vv. 67—69) wholly incomprehensible that

45

Jesus' disclosure made no impression at all, or at any rate no noteworthy impression, on the innermost circle of disciples: the Evangelist is silent. Was there anything less to be feared from a diabolical intruder than from a betrayer, the signaling of whom a year later aroused the most painful agitation among the disciples (13 21 ff.)? Under these circumstances the designation of Judas as διάβολος can, for the understanding of the disciples, have only the indeterminate sense that belongs to the appellatively used ישטן of the Old Testament: adversary. This Hebrew word is rendered by the LXX mostly with ἐπίβουλος, alongside with ἀντικείμενος, also with σατάν. Particularly instructive, however, is Num. 22 22. 32, where the angel of Yahweh confronts Balaam "as an adversary." Here the LXX translates לשטן once with διαβαλεῖν (to offer resistance), the other time with εἰς διαβολήν, and the context shows that in the Greek as in the Hebrew expression the notion of standing in the way is contained. Just as little as, in a synoptically reported case, the abusive word "Satanas" used by Jesus against Peter (Mc. 8 33. Mt. 16 23) caused the fellow disciples to doubt Peter's genuine discipleship, just as little do they, according to our Evangelist's presentation, immediately think of reprobation and betrayal in the case of the διάβολος present among them. The διάβολος here, like the Satanas there, is for them simply one who seeks to divert Jesus, the Holy One of God (6 69), from the path assigned to him by God, because he holds a different view regarding the messianic shaping of events. That the uncleanness of such a being, this God-hostile disposition of the unnamed one, resisted the word-testimony of Jesus (cf. Joh. 15 3), as well as the "moral effects of constant association with him" 127, right up to the end, Jesus censures indirectly at the last meal with the declaration to the disciples: you are not all clean (13 10 f.). Still more strongly than here he emphasizes the painfulness of his personal experience with the one still unmasked by highlighting, immediately afterward, the base ingratitude and

46

brutal treachery of the same (13 18). And finally Jesus' feeling rises to a disturbance in spirit 128 as he openly announces to the disciples that one of them will commit murderous betrayal against him (13 21) 129. But what deeper import this disloyalty has is taught by the Evangelist's remark that Jesus came to his resolve through the inspiration of the Devil (13 2) and to the execution of the deed through the Satan who at last entered into him (13 27). As this possessed and irretrievably lost one he is therefore also called by Jesus himself afterward, in the

high-priestly prayer, “the son of perdition” (17 12) 130: a man who, just as he was and wanted to be from the beginning, strove toward perdition 131, because he rejected the true and eternal life offered by Jesus (17 2. 3) and could not do otherwise 132. The grounding reference to the necessity of the fulfillment of Scripture in the case in question clearly contains the conception of a mysterious, conceptually ungraspable interweaving of human guilt and divine predestination (cf. Rom. 9 22). That the latter factor was already decisive for Jesus himself when he admitted among the Twelve a man whose criminal deed he foresaw 133, he expressly assures them of, in order to safeguard their faith in his “all-decisive personality originating from

47

above” 134 from dangerous disappointment (13 18 f.). It has not incorrectly been said: “Just as little as God excluded Satan from the community of the world, just as little should Jesus exclude his adversary from his community” 135. Precisely in this way, however, the truth uttered in the Prologue—“the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not seize it” (1 5)—was to be exemplified in the most significant manner, in that the disciple who at the same time typically represents the totality of Christ’s betrayers 136 and finally appears like an incarnation of Satan 137 was exposed to the same immediate radiation of divine truth-knowledge and life-glory in personal intercourse with Jesus as the entire circle of the Twelve closest to Jesus (14 9). This providential conduct of Jesus toward the false disciple throughout the whole time of his messianic activity corresponds also to the authority with which he himself finally hands over the son of perdition to the murderer of men from the beginning, to Satan (13 26 f.). Thereby, however, we are also drawn attention to another relation of the enigmatic disciple figure that is of special significance for our entire investigation. Judas is not only, as a man from Kerioth in Judah (Josh. 15 25), the only Judean in the otherwise wholly Galilean circle of disciples 138; he is at the same time a jointly culpable instrument of the Jewry led by the Pharisees, whom Jesus has designated as brood of the Devil (8 44). That it is again Jesus himself who rates the guilt of this betrayer even higher than that of the pagan ruler Pilate, who allows himself to be induced to judicial murder (19 11) 139, casts a final light on the context in which the fourth Evangelist wishes the Iscariot to be

48

understood inwardly. Receptivity to salvation has, in his case, from the outset sunk to the zero point, as with the great mass of his countrymen. Outwardly associated by Jesus with the chosen Galileans of the innermost circle of disciples, who, even if with difficulty, open themselves to the message of the love of God for the world (3 16) and to the words that his envoy speaks into the world (8 26), the Judean Judas nevertheless is and remains “a Jew” in the sense of violent advocacy of particularism and this-worldliness of the ordinary messianic expectation, which does not shrink even from heinous deed.

The contrast between this personality and the genuine disciples becomes most palpable when one brings to mind the general picture of discipleship, especially that contained in Jesus’ farewell discourses, which attains its highest transfiguration in the high-priestly prayer. Immediately after the calling of the first five disciples, these are jointly strengthened in their faith

in his messianity through the miracle at Cana as the first revelation of Jesus' glory 140 (2 11). Thereafter, however, Simon Peter bears solemn witness on behalf of "the Twelve" that they, in contrast to many disciples who have fallen away in the broader sense, have drawn from the words of eternal life heard from Jesus the believing conviction and, by virtue of this, the true knowledge of his messianity, which preserves them from apostasy (6 67. 69). The disciples were, from the outset, already God's own (cf. the parallel among the Gentiles 11 52), and thus, after they had been given to Jesus by him (6 37. 44), they have held fast loyally to God's word (from Jesus' mouth) and precisely thereby have come not only to the real knowledge of Jesus' divine origin but also to full faith in his divine mission

49

(17 6—8) 141. Nevertheless it becomes evident that even the faith of the disciples, fostered by the supernatural, divine knowledge of Jesus the knower of hearts (in his transcendent nature and divine origin) 142, had, before his departure, in essence not yet progressed beyond the level of childlike understanding 143 and beyond the danger of unfaithfulness (16 29—32) 144. And because they—like Jesus himself—are not of the world according to their innermost being (cf., alongside 17 6: 15 19), but have in the word of God (from Jesus' mouth) their law of life and are therefore hated by the world, they stand in continual need of the special divine preservation from the evil one (the Devil) that Jesus requests for them before his departure, and of the "self-sanctification" of Jesus, that is, his purifying and atoning death-suffering, which serves their "sanctification in the truth" (17 14—19). If, however, upon the painful separation from him in the shortest time the reunion (16 16) and thereby the elevation of the disciples to the highest level of their beatifying communion with Christ and God (16 20—28) is to follow, yet before Jesus' resurrection the capacity of the disciples' faith shows itself particularly little equal to the riddle of his word concerning the soon-to-come seeing again after his departure (16 17 f.) 145. Thus Jesus, in deference to the existing need, grants the disciples' messianic faith, before his passion, a

50

particularly impressive strengthening through the sign of the raising of Lazarus (11 15) 146, and he himself can testify that none of the disciples under his care has been lost except the son of perdition (17 12; see above), although the prophetic word spoken by Jesus already at the first Passover concerning the sanctuary of his body was to dawn upon the disciples only after his resurrection (2 22) 147.

The promising point of light that arose in the historical-salvation picture with its dark background through the fundamental calling of a Galilean selection of disciples by Jesus himself now receives, however, a striking, distinctive, and significant reinforcement through several flashes of light that fall upon the population of the other Palestinian regions, as well as upon entirely foreign nationality and culture of a far-reaching outer world. Just as to Galilee, so Jesus also leads his messianic activity three times into Perea, which offers nationally and religiously similar conditions 148. The more closely and in manifold ways Judaism here too came into contact with pagan, especially Hellenized, elements 149, the more significant it is that the Evangelist knows

to report of the success of Jesus' activity there only that many, through the prophecy heard from the mouth of the Baptist among

51

themselves concerning Jesus and through the confirmation that this prophecy received in Jesus' outstanding miracle-working, came to faith in the messianity of the latter (10 40—42). One may perhaps recall here the noteworthy circumstance that according to the fourth Gospel even the basic nucleus of the college of the Twelve was likewise gained by Jesus in Perea, and indeed precisely there where John was baptizing at the Jordan: for moreover the two first-called are introduced as disciples of John (1 28. 35 ff.). One asks involuntarily: How does it come about that the Baptist, according to our Evangelist, exercises his calling in this decisive period in Perea (whether now at the Bethany beyond the Jordan or at Bethabara) and not, as the oldest synoptic tradition would lead one to expect, in the "wilderness of Judea" (Mc. 1 4 f. Mt. 3 1. 5) 150? The correct answer will be: Just as the Evangelist lets Jesus begin his self-revelation not in Judea but in Galilee (and indeed with a mere miracle), so John, with him, opens his preaching and baptizing activity—by which he prepares the appearance of the Messiah (without the addition of miracles)—in Perea, because among the mixed population of that region there seemed from the outset to be more prospect of finding acceptance than in Judea. Quite aptly it has been said that the faith of the Pereans, as Jesus himself experienced it according to the statement of the fourth Gospel, contrasts (like that of the Samaritans) with the unbelief of the Jews and at the same time prefigures the evangelization outside Israel 151.

We are thus already invited also to a glance at the national counterpart of the Perean population, which appears in the Samaritans, those inhabitants of the central land who, sprung from a mixture of Israelite and variously composed pagan nationality (2 Kings 17 24—34. Ezra 4 2. 10), were for the Israelites, especially for the Judeans,

52

an object of contempt and hatred (cf. Sirach 50 25 f.), so much so that in our Gospel the Jews can inflict no greater insult upon Jesus than by calling him a Samaritan (8 48). The ground of this aversion lay chiefly in the heretical and schismatic deviation of the Samaritans 152, on account of which they were commonly classed with the Gentiles (Mt. 10 5), although their religion too was "a pure Israelite monotheism" 153. From this, however, it is also explained that in the third Gospel, in accordance with the strongly prominent salvation-universalism of its author 154, Jesus shows a warm heart for the Samaritans at a moment when, through their repellent behavior, they have aroused the disciples' feeling of vengeance (Lc. 9 51—56), indeed that he portrays them as "religiously and morally superior to the full-blooded Israelites" (Lc. 10 30—37. 17 16—19) 155. Whoever approaches the account of the fourth Gospel concerning Jesus' encounter with the Samaritan woman from this Gospel may therefore be surprised when here even Jesus aligns himself with those who see in the woman and her fellow countrymen "representatives of the Gentile world" (Joh. 4 22) 156. A correction of this impression, however, already emerges from the circumstance that Jesus at all engages with this person

53

and not merely asks her for a service, but immediately also endeavors to raise her above the lower level of her religious knowing and living. And the further course of the encounter with its consequences reveals most clearly how decisively the Evangelist, in continuity with the third Gospel, wishes to accord the Samaritans precedence over the Jews (that is to say: over Israel 4 9) with regard to receptivity to salvation. After the woman has recognized Jesus from his words, which manifested wondrous knowledge, as a prophet (4 19) 157, she hastens to draw the inhabitants of her city's attention to him and at the same time to stimulate, inspired by Jesus, the question of doubt whether the stranger might indeed be the Messiah. Following her summons, many who had received the wondrous report in faith immediately go out to learn to know the prophet themselves (4 26. 28—30. 39) 158. A requested short (two-day) stay of Jesus among the same Samaritans has the effect that through his mere word-testimony a far greater number of hearers come to firm conviction of his messianity (4 40—42) 159. "We now know that this one is truly the Savior of the world," runs their confession: not only the Samaritans and the Jews, but humanity will be helped. In wondrously distinguishing fashion, an intimation of the full, real significance of the stranger has dawned upon them.

The higher the fourth Evangelist has reached with this glorifying portrayal of the longing for salvation and readiness to believe of the Samaritan segment of the people, which psychologically presents

54

an unusual riddle 160, the less can the typical significance of the essential features of his depiction be overlooked 161; and all the more immediately does it become clear at the same time that, in the appearance of the Greeks reported shortly before the departure of Jesus, we are to perceive the consistent conclusion and final goal of the characterization of the salvation-historical types of humanity peculiar to the Logos Gospel (s. o. S. 33). Of the reverent modesty with which the Greek proselytes 162 who had come to Jerusalem for the festival let their request to be allowed to see Jesus reach him, mention has already been made. It expresses itself precisely in the fact that they speak only of seeing, not of hearing or speaking or even of a sign 163. That their desire in reality went no further than the viewing of a curiosity is not thereby said 164. One may also recognize a subtlety of the writer in the fact that he does not have Jesus immediately say to them what he would have to communicate to the pilgrims longing for salvation, as if he wished first only to let them sense the mystery of a new age dawning. Rather, the answer of Jesus is directed to the disciples themselves, with the confession that he greets the wish of the Greeks to make his personal acquaintance as a portent of the expansion of his salvific activity to the Gentile humanity—an expansion conditioned by his approaching death and casting his messianic dignity into full light—which moves his heart (12 20—24. 27 f.; cf. 10 16. 11 52. 12 32. 17 1 f.). How much the mocking Jews of 7 35 are put to shame by these representatives of the Greek world pressing toward salvation in Christ 165 scarcely requires explicit mention 166.

55

From the Roman representative of paganism appearing in the person of Pilate, however much he too appears as a character figure, we may here refrain, since for Jesus he comes into consideration only as judge and executive organ, thus in an official capacity, not personally and as an object of his salvific activity. Otherwise, in view of the bright prospects that, according to the fourth Evangelist, open up above all also to the salvific longing of the Greek world, the reader will feel all the more vividly the shadows falling in from the (again typified) 167 figure of the Roman imperial official 168.

The result of our investigation fully confirms our thesis that the fourth Evangelist has Jesus as the Logos-Christ begin his messianic activity with the performance of miracles (“signs”), not with the word-testimony, because, according to the view of this writer, the world first had to have its eyes opened in a sensibly perceptible way to the supraterrestrial glory of the light of truth and life that appeared in this Christ, and this most of all precisely where it was breaking forth. From the synoptically transmitted messianic picture of the time, the painting sketched by the fourth Evangelist otherwise differs just as much with regard to the distribution as with regard to the degree of the un-receptivity of salvation-needy humanity. While synoptic tradition,

from the appearance of Jesus up to the catastrophe, the impression of his teaching as well as of his miracle-working is so powerful, awakening longing for salvation and enthusiastic trust, that—apart from the high priests and scribes (Sadducees and Pharisees) and the “elders” (the synedrists who were neither priests nor scribes)—the people flock to him in masses (Mk. 1 33. 45. 2 4. 13. 3 20. 4 1. 5 21. 24. 6 33 f. 44. 53—56. 8 9. 9 14. 25. 10 46. 12 37; strong hyperbole in Lk. 12 1), and indeed not only from Galilee, but also from Judea (Jerusalem), Perea, Idumea, and the Phoenician border region (Mk. 3 7 f. 7 24. 10 1. Mt. 4 25. Lk. 6 17), so in the fourth Evangelist the corresponding strata of the population in Judea approach Jesus from the outset with prejudice and doubtfulness, prove themselves sensitive and prone to relapse in the face of evangelical truth, hence capable only of mere impulses of faith, personally rebellious, mocking, and slanderous, increasingly and ever more openly filled with deadly hatred and (according to the explicit testimony of Jesus) devilishly hardened. In the portrayal of the Galilean compatriots of Jesus, however, the Evangelist has especially emphasized the sensuous basic trait of their nature, clinging to the external and earthly, and has thereby already provided the explanation of their actual lack of understanding and incapacity for appropriation of salvation despite occasional, momentary enthusiasm. In contrast to the religious type common to the Galilean and the Jewish population, the isolated cases on both sides of a salvation-seeking and faithful reception of the Messiah and Son of God Jesus accordingly represent more or less rare exceptions, in such a way, however, that Galilee, through its considerable representation in the innermost circle of disciples, nevertheless has a very decided advantage. But that the soil receptive to salvation in humanity lay from the beginning far more outside Israel than within it, the fourth Evangelist indicates all the more emphatically and strikingly (e. 4), the further the author of the third had already progressed in precisely the same

insight 169. The relatively so general and persistent resistance against the revelation of salvation in Jesus among Israel according to the fourth Evangelist finds its explanation chiefly in the conduct of its spiritual authority (s. o. S. 12 ff.). While here the synedrists, already after the healing of the sick person performed by Jesus in Jerusalem on the Sabbath, in the middle period of his messianic activity, come to the decision to bring about his killing 170, synoptically murderous thoughts on their part, as foretold by Jesus (Mk. 8 31. Mt. 16 21. Lk. 9 22), are spoken of only after his entry into Jerusalem, in connection with the cleansing of the temple, either immediately or soon thereafter (Mk. 11 18. 14 1. Mt. 21 45 f. 26 3 f. Lk. 19 47. 20 19), and before that it is only the Pharisees as such who do so, in that already about the time when Herod had become attentive to the person and activity of Jesus 171, after the healing of a sick man effected by him on the Sabbath in the synagogue of Capernaum, they immediately consult with the Herodians about how he might be put to death (Mk. 3 6). Just as this latter synoptic feature at the same time teaches how to understand the inclusion of the parallel Sabbath-healing narrative concerning the synedrists in the fourth Evangelist, so it confirms the characterization that, according to this very Evangelist, we had to draw of the nature and activity of the Pharisaic party as the most extreme hostility to Christ and the most incurable blindness in the face of evangelical truth. Precisely in this respect, in the blackest portion of the picture of the time, the Synoptics and the fourth Evangelist agree most, so much so that we see the nature and conduct of the Pharisees of the latter Evangelist almost in all details prefigured in the externality and pettiness of religiosity, in false, slavish belief in authority, in spiritual pride and hypocrisy, in prejudice

and mistrust, in censoriousness, slanderous manner (Mk. 3 22; cf. Mt. 9 34. 12 24) and watchful spying, in ensnaring questioning and heightened demand for signs, of the synoptic representatives of the party—just as, on the other hand, even for the relative exceptional case of the Pharisee Nicodemus, whose historicity is to be examined later, isolated synoptic occurrences could correspond in their way 172.

In a peculiarly allegorical-pathological summary, complementing the overall picture gained thus far, the multifaceted environment of Jesus is illuminated by the narrative of the healing miracle at the pool of Bethesda (5 1—9) in such a way that special reference is made to a series of characteristically misguided religious community types of the Israelite people, and their representatives appear as a group of sick persons dependent on a common place of healing. The miracle story has independent value, although, according to the Evangelist's presentation betraying a combination of transmitted materials, it has taken up the motif of a Sabbath healing, and this motif at the same time has provided the guiding theme of the following dispute and Christological self-justification of Jesus (5 10—47). Since the pool named at the beginning has no significance at all in the healing story itself, not even that of 9 7 (Siloam), the indication of place in 5 2 appears all the less understandable the more elaborate it is. This alone already presses the suspicion that the details of the present place designation offer examples of symbolizing, ideological naming, as we have a particularly instructive instance precisely in 9 7 173; it could also be connected with the quite unusual obscurity and uncertainty of the text of 5 2. In this direction

59

already points the name of that pool given by A and C (and thereafter in the tradition): Bethesda. That nothing is reported by Josephus of the existence of a pool of this name must, especially where Jerusalem is concerned, be particularly striking and is all the more strange since the locality in question appears in our Evangelist as distinguished by colonnades, and the tradition of v. 4 moreover knows to tell of empirically recurring miraculous healing effects of the bath taken there. The healing narrative of the fourth Evangelist further clearly rests on the synoptic narratives Mk. 2 1—12. 3 1—6 174 and also strongly recalls the parallel in Acts 3 1—11, where Peter, in the company of John, heals the man lame from birth at the gate of the temple “in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth” and the healed man follows him into Solomon’s colonnade. Just as our Evangelist in 5 1—16 has sought to work together those two synoptic narratives into one, so he has also, indeed, in 9 1—34, concerning the healing of the blind man there, taken into account only one of the two synoptic reports Mk. 8 22—26. 10 46—52 (cf. Mt. 9 27—31. 20 29—34) 175. It has rightly been recognized that with this similarity of literary procedure in John 9 1—34 and 5 1—16 there goes hand in hand in both cases the “intention of intensification” and the “transposition of the factual into the symbolic”: as in John 5 the sick man had been suffering for 38 years, so in John 9 a man blind from birth is healed; “as there the sick man at the pool, so here the blind man on the way is the image of an entire class,” and “the miracle performed on both is made vividly intelligible in its ideal significance in comparison with the synoptic

60

models” 176. Viewed in this light, of the indications of the second verse of our pericope, first of all the (traditional) name Bethesda (if original) would hardly leave any doubt that the Evangelist saw the place of the miracle characterized as a site of חסד (divine beneficence—note the function of the angel of the gloss v. 4). Whether, however, the reading Bethesda is correct remains disputed. Certainly, over against it the reading Bethsaida, which makes the pool into a fish-pond, cannot prevail, although B and Jerome 177 have it. All the more weight, however, attaches to the form of the name attested by א (among others): Βηθ·ζα·θ·ά and the equivalent Βηζα·θ·ά of Eusebius 178, which above all are an indication that the miraculous healing is not meant to have taken place on the ground of old Jerusalem, not in the precinct of the temple, but in the upper part of the city, which by its name Βεζεθά, according to Josephus (Bell. Jud. V, 4 2), is designated as a new city quarter (καινή πόλις) (179 (= פצעתא. That the Evangelist, if indeed Βηθ·ζα·θ·ά is to be read, had this quarter-name in mind is hardly to be doubted; just as little, however, can it be doubted on the other hand that with the enigmatic name of the bathing place he wished, similarly to what we would have to assume in the reading Bethesda, to symbolize something pertaining to God’s old- and new-testament salvific dispensation. This would then also naturally result if, in view of the considerable consonantal and vocalic uncertainty of the transmitted name-form, we are entitled to read Bethsatta (= house of vines, vineyard home) 180, whereby we would obtain a pool belonging to the vineyard, that is,

61

conducive to the healing of the people of God 181. It is perhaps no coincidence that a later tradition in fact declared the “Israel Pool” (Birket Israil,—Israin) to be the one of Bethesda, and that the temple located likewise in closest proximity to our Βηθ·ζα·θ·ά was adorned with those gigantic golden grape-clusters that Herod had had affixed above the entrance into the interior of the temple (Josephus Ant. XV 113. Bell. Jud. V 54. Tacitus Hist. V 5). Into the same area moreover points the place determination ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ, which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as referring to the Sheep Gate (Neh. 3 1. 32. 12 39), in whose mention the Evangelist may chiefly have had in mind the access to the temple precinct and the people of Israel going in and out there as the flock of Yahweh (Num. 27 17. Ezek. 34 3. 5. 8. 10. 12. 15. 19 f. Zech. 11 7. 11. Ps. 74 1. 77 21. 78 52. 79 13. 80 2. 95 7. 100 3—in the LXX throughout πρόβατα). After all this, we shall also expect in the final indication, which speaks of five colonnades erected by the miracle-working water, a hint relating to salvation-historical conditions. The five books of Moses have been adduced 182,

62

but it has been overlooked that those colonnades, as a human work, cannot correspond to the divine work of the Torah, which would rather have to be signified by the healing pool itself. The colonnades stand in immediate relation to those lying beneath them, and their number five reveals that we are dealing, in the variegated crowd of sick persons to be brought there (v. 3), with a fivefold society. As sick persons we shall have to imagine members of the Old Testament people who have gone astray religiously (in faith and life) and thereby hinder the unified continuance and normal development of the community of God. Such a sick component of the people is, in the eyes of our Evangelist, above all the party of the Pharisees, to whom Jesus himself explicitly levels the reproach of self-incurred spiritual blindness (9 40 f.; cf. Mt. 23 26), and whose incapacity in matters of salvific knowledge one of their best already revealed in a startling and pitiable manner at the very first appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem (3 1—12). It seems that with that number five of sick-chambers the Evangelist wished to allude to the existence of religious aberrations that he found particularly characteristic and symptomatically significant for the time-history of Jesus and the apostles. Possibly, in the counting of such phenomena in one or another tradition-circle, the pentad was symbolically customary 183. Alongside the Pharisaic party, we shall first have to think of the Sadducean, which, like the former, is called a sect (αἵρεσις) in Acts (5 17; cf. 15 5. 26 5) and in Josephus (Bell. Jud. II 8 14. Ant. XIII 5 9. XX 9 1. Vita 2 and 38), although “the Sadducees are not such a unified and consistent phenomenon as the Pharisees” 184. That the Sadducees are not mentioned by name at all by the fourth Evangelist and are not further taken into account in their distinctiveness could appear all the more striking

63

the more principled and abrupt their denial of the resurrection and of the continuance of the soul after death in general contradicts the fundamental conception of the Evangelist, his concept of life 185. It must be recalled, however, that synoptically too, apart from Matthew, they appear only once, and indeed precisely with that principal question (Mk. 12 18 = Mt. 22 23. 34—Lk. 20 27) 186; and it perhaps deserves— with regard to the open question of time in our

Evangelist—still more attention that the Sadducees disappeared from history altogether with the downfall of the Jewish state 187. Their existence and significance at the time of Jesus, their powerful representation in the Jerusalem hierarchy, could by no means have been unknown to the Evangelist. As a further sick part of the Israelite body, the Samaritans present themselves particularly readily recognizable, for whose healing through Jesus, according to John 4, the most favorable prospects open up (s. o. S. 51 ff.). Similar, apparently, is the situation also with the party of the disciples of John 188, to whose beginnings the Evangelist has already directed attention in 1 35—39 and 3 22—36. One will

64

scarcely go astray if one infers from the utterance of the Baptist in 3 29 that the Evangelist has him announce the further growth of the Christian community from the ranks of his own followers 189. That nevertheless a noteworthy number of disciples of John for quite some time in the apostolic age still adhered to their original baptistic rule of life and messianic expectation in opposition to the Christian doctrine of salvation, thereby preserving their sectarian character, is sufficiently secured by Acts 19 1—7 190. If with what has been shown we have obtained four circles of people within Israel in which the salvation-historically normal development is variously hindered or suspended 191, which therefore represent just as many forms of illness to the Evangelist,

65

the conclusion readily suggests itself that with the number five in our passage one must still think of the Essenes, already reckoned by Josephus among the αἱρέσεις τῶν Ἰουδαίων. From the monastic order-character of this Palestinian religious community, which “although grown on Jewish soil yet in many points deviated essentially from traditional Judaism and exercised no decisive influence on the development of the people” 192, it readily explains itself that it plays no role in the evangelical narrative and is not mentioned. This direction could have been no more unknown to the fourth Evangelist than the Sadducean-worldly one. The more consciously and sharply the contrast of the five religious special directions in the age of Christ was articulated (there were Essenes throughout the land, in villages and cities of Palestine, according to Philo and Josephus over 4000), the more provocatively the fragmenting consolidation of the individual circles expressed itself above all in the name of the most powerful and dangerous party of the Pharisees, that is, the “separatists” 193, the more vividly one is reminded that precisely the unity of the community believing in Christ was, according to the fourth Evangelist, Jesus’ last concern and

66

prayer (17 11. 20—23; cf. 10 16) 194. The didactic purpose of the miracle narrative in itself is the visualization of the truth that Jesus, just as from the most desperate 195 bodily ailments (cf. 4 47—53), so also from the most severe inward sufferings (errors in faith, teaching, and life), for which the Old Testament institution of salvation scarcely offered a remote prospect of healing, can deliver by virtue of the divine life-powers dwelling in him himself (cf. 5 24). That this help of

his is conditioned solely on the side of the sick person, and indeed purely inwardly, is significantly indicated by the question of Jesus: Do you want to become healthy? (5 6): the will to attain health, whose presupposition is the recognition and painful awareness of the suffering (cf. by contrast 9 41), urges toward the necessary trust in the divine physician. If, however, Jesus did not even await an expression of this faith, but, discerning the sick man, immediately speaks the miracle-working word, then he here presents, even more strikingly than in the healing of the deathly ill man in Capernaum, the method characteristic of the Logos-Christ of the sign preceding self-proclamation 196.

67

2. The significance of Jesus' word and "sign" for the first-called disciples.

From the christologically grounded rule set forth above, the pedagogy of Jesus' self-revelation according to our Gospel has made an exception in the case of the disciples belonging to the innermost circle of the Twelve (see above, pp. 1, 27 ff.). The requisite appreciation of this circumstance will at the same time allow us to see more clearly how the Evangelist, from his theological and christological standpoint, has conceived the concept of the sign (σημεῖον) as a miracle determined teleologically in terms of salvation-history. When in his account Jesus says to the royal official of Capernaum: unless you see signs and wonders, you will not believe (4 48), the composite expression "signs and wonders," which is connected to Old Testament idiom, means as much as miracles that are signs, i.e., that by means of what those concerned are made to see with bodily eyes prefigure something higher, something pertaining to their inner life and salvation, 197. What sort of events the Evangelist has in mind when he ascribes to certain occurrences the significance of signs, or at least by all analogy certainly acknowledges it to them, can be determined with sufficient clarity from the Gospel. In Cana as on the eastern shore of the Lake of Tiberias, in Capernaum as in Jerusalem (ch. 5 and 9) and Bethany, Jesus reveals the power that belongs to him as the world-saviour sent by God the Father (3 17; 4 42), a power that creatively governs nature, through miracles (whether of the transformation or multiplication of material substances and means of sustenance, or of healing or complete revivification through

68

raising from the dead). In every case the physical benefaction thereby effected serves as an indication of the final and highest salvific purpose of Jesus' work; precisely for that reason the miracle has the purpose of a sign in the sense indicated. From this it already follows that the spiritual penetration and clairvoyance of Jesus that came to light at the calling of Simon and Nathanael, however much it presents itself as something miraculous and humanly inexplicable (1 42; 47 f.), does not constitute a "sign": here we have no revelation of the miraculous creative power of the Saviour. This state of affairs is incontrovertibly confirmed by 2 11, according to which the miracle at Cana was the first sign of Jesus at all, 198. It therefore remains the case that according to ch. 1 at any rate the calling of the five took place without signs. To what extent, according to the tradition represented by our Evangelist, a further gradation of receptivity to

salvation was assumed among the remaining members of the circle of the Twelve (cf. above, pp. 27 ff.), and to what extent in particular the consideration comes into play that Jesus, in his capacity as the Logos-Christ, foreknew as such the firstfruits of discipleship determined for him by the Father (see above, p. 1), escapes our view. Quite generally, however, 5 24 allows the inference that according to the Evangelist's conviction the means that is in and of itself alone necessary for the reception of salvation is the word (λόγος) of Jesus, and that the sole indispensable subjective condition is faith in God as the Father and sender of this bringer of salvation ("Jesus"), 199. From this it follows that the sign which, in

69

the procedure with the multitude 200, high and low alike, precedes the word of Jesus, is nothing other than an expedient corresponding to their weakness, 201. This also prevents one, when Jesus announces to Nathanael that in the time to come he will see "greater things" than what he perceived at his calling (1 50), from thinking of the signs of which further mention is made. For the chosen firstfruits of discipleship, who already at their calling had no need at all of a sign, what the subsequent period brings of that sort cannot possibly be something greater. Rather, 1 51 allows those entering into Jesus' following to sense the higher nature of the entire revelation of the incarnate Logos-Christ, who is also on earth in heaven: in full possession of the heavenly attributes and powers that belong to him in himself, and in their undiminished exercise insofar as the purposes of his salvific mission during his earthly activity require it, 202.

If, then, according to all that has been shown, the purpose and significance of the signs for the first-called disciples cannot have been the awakening of faith in Jesus' messianity, then according to our Gospel they can have had only the subordinate function of confirming and strengthening their faith. An effect of the sign, or a need for one, on the part of the disciples is not specially reported apart from the case of Cana (2 11) 203 and that of Bethany (11 15) 204, that is, apart from the first and last miracle.

70

If it occurs in the former case, the emphasis on the higher purpose and effect of Jesus' wondrous deed appears doubly motivated against the background of the festive enjoyment of the senses described in his surroundings. In the latter case, the highlighting of the strengthening of the disciples' faith is explained by the relation of the raising of Lazarus to the imminently impending pain of separation and the resurrection of Jesus. Characteristically, as with the other "signs," so also in the miracle of walking on the lake (6 19 f.), performed specifically for the sake of the disciples and only before them, no particular salvific effect is indicated, 205. From the consistently symbolic nature of the miraculous signs as set forth, it may further be inferred that the miracle of Lazarus is in fact the last σημεῖον. The resurrection of Jesus and the appearances of the Risen One that follow are not characterized as signs, because by their nature and purpose they do not belong to the category of the preceding miracles, 206. For the resurrection itself there is no eyewitness at all. The appearances of the Risen One, however, are not miracles in the realm of nature, but events of a spiritual, transcendental kind, and therefore perceptible only to the eye of the disciples that is open to the spiritual world, 207. They thus

present not something symbolic, but the thing itself. Yet here too it can be a matter only of preserving and strengthening faith. The disciples see the Lord and are glad (20 20): the comforting assurance of their Master (16 20, 22; 17 13) has been fulfilled. Thomas, at the sight of the glorified bodily form of the One who

71

appeared (without touching), 208 not only regains his faith in Jesus as Messiah (πεπίστευκας, 20 29), but is immediately raised to the level of faith in the Logos-Christ (v. 28: “my Lord and my God!”), while the beloved disciple and Peter, in that they already believe in Jesus’ resurrection before the appearance (20 8; see above, p. 33), have manifested faith “in its purest form, divested of all sensory mediations,” such as “was to count as a postulate for the future,” 209. Of any onset of unbelief after Jesus’ departure, 210 apart from Thomas, nothing is said or even hinted at among the disciples; their grief is to be assessed as an accompanying phenomenon of their faith.

From all this it is evident that in the retrospective summary that follows the scene between Thomas and the Risen One, which gathers together the entire miracle-working activity of Jesus (20 30 f.) and can at the same time appear as the conclusion of the original Gospel, the expression σημεῖα (v. 30) could be applied by the Evangelist only in an improper sense to the revelation of the Risen One, 211: even Thomas did not demand a “sign”; he wanted to convince himself by tangible means of the supersensory reality itself! In what way the Evangelist regarded as impossible the palpation of the Appeared One demanded by Thomas, which the latter even explicitly wishes to allow (v. 27), 212 remains a mystery, 213.

72

It testifies to the tact of the author that he merely hints at the actual omission of the act in question 214. Under these circumstances we arrive, on the one hand, at the result that in 20 30, where in the main there is certainly an allusion to the synoptic “signs” not reported by the Fourth Evangelist, in the case of the signs wrought by Jesus “before the disciples” it would, in the sense of the Evangelist, be less a matter of thinking that they were performed for the disciples themselves than rather that the latter are to stand as eyewitnesses of what occurred; on the other hand, however, we arrive at the serious question whether 20 30. 31 is not a first “appendix” to our Gospel. The “characterization of its main content as a selection of σημεία” 215, which here concludes the entire Gospel, contradicts, with its strong emphasis on miracles as indispensable stimulators and supports of faith in Christ, the view of the Evangelist, who indeed “everywhere elevates the concept of miracle to its summit,” but on the other hand “devalues faith in miracles” 216, and is, in immediate connection with v. 29, doubly disconcerting: a relapse from the ideal height of the Evangelist’s demand to the level of expectations adapted to lamentable experience (cf. already 12 37). In this way, as it were, the point has been broken off from the Fourth Gospel. In reality, no more fitting, more inspired, and more incisive conclusion of this writing can be conceived than vv. 28. 29, in which, corresponding to the opening words: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, the “unbelieving Thomas” bursts out into the confession: ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός

μου, and accepts as the final, weightiest word of the Lord the pronouncement: Μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες. One sees the ring close 217. That the only disciple

73

who rises to the confession of faith in the Logos-Christus 218 is the obstinate doubter Thomas 219—this precisely is of the highest value for understanding the conception and literary intention of the Fourth Evangelist.

3. The Sign at Cana and the Expansion of the Horizon Given with It

While, according to what has been set forth, in the wedding pericope 2 1—11 the circumstance that Jesus begins with a sign, to which "neither a special accompanying discourse precedes nor follows," finds its explanation in the christological and pedagogical presuppositions peculiar to our Evangelist, a series of other moments appears at first sight all the more striking and disconcerting. To this leads not immediately the question concerning the purpose of that miracle: to this v. 11 gives, after all that has preceded, the expected answer: ἐφανέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ 220; all the more, however, the question concerning its kind. According to the general finding of the manifold cases, Jesus, in the Fourth Gospel, makes use of the signs as symbolic indications—consisting in the preservation or restoration of natural well-being through the removal of material deficiency and bodily evils—of the higher, eternal good of salvation to be procured for compatriots and foreigners. If one now looks more closely, then alongside the concordant features a fundamentally essential difference between the miracle in question at Cana and all the other signs of the Fourth

74

Gospel (as also of the Synoptics) cannot be overlooked. While everywhere else it is a matter of help in real distress of body and life 221, Jesus here intervenes with his first sign in a case where it is merely a matter of enhancing the enjoyment of life of those celebrating a festival, an enjoyment already in itself bound up with the danger of intemperance, and to this end of helping the entertaining household out of a purely social embarrassment. One has vainly endeavored to efface the impression of a "luxury miracle" (— the choice of the expression is not a satisfactory one —) which this peculiar sign produces 222. The language which the Evangelist uses, when he lets Jesus place at the disposal of the bridegroom—obviously after a longer duration of the festive banquet (v. 10)—more than five hectoliters of wine, speaks all too clearly 223. In reality, already the occasion of the miracle, participation in a family celebration of joy, betrays that the narrator, through the manner in which Jesus here opens his language of signs, intends to emphasize in the strongest way precisely the moment of bestowal of joy and to make it the supreme point of view for the evaluation of the saving work of Jesus (cf. 3 29. 4 36. 8 56. 14 28. 15 11. 16. 20—22. 24. 17 13). To this corresponds precisely the notion of the abundant, of the measure of the gift that goes beyond what is necessary and customary 224. It is moreover to be

75

noted especially that the sign of Cana, as a “luxury miracle,” also differs from the more or less similar “miracles of the Old Testament.” To the manna bestowed under Moses the Evangelist lets Jesus himself be pointed by the crowd not satisfied by his feeding miracle (6 30 f.). The Old Testament report indeed presents the giving of that heavenly bread (Ex. 16 4. Ps. 105 40) as an unmediated gift of Yahweh (Ex. 16 4. 15), not as a miracle-sign of Moses 225. But even if a miracle-working mediating intervention of Moses in the case in question is really assumed by later writers 226, nevertheless his gift forms precisely at the decisive point no parallel to the sign of Cana: according to the narrator of the Priestly Writing the whole congregation fears a slow death by hunger (Ex. 16 3), and no gatherer is allowed to enjoy more of the miraculous food than he needs daily (Ex. 16 16—18. 21) 227. Also the feeding miracle of Elijah at Zarephath (I Reg. 17 12—16) and the similar one of Elisha at Baal-shalishah (II Reg. 4 42—44) is in each case only a help in the distress of scarcity, a fact not altered even by the surplus reported in the latter example. The superabundant measure of the divine gift, however, in the differently constituted

(as Ex. 16 is not uniform) feeding narrative of Num. 11 18—20. 31 f., which assumes a “natural secondary cause with regard to the appearance of the quails” 228, does not come into comparison already for the reason that in this respect it aims not at enjoyment but at punishment (v. 20 and again v. 33 f.). What holds true after all this of the Old Testament miracles applies further also to the miracles which Jewish theology expects of the Messiah 229. They are simply repetitions of the signs of Moses 230 and therefore introduce the luxury miracle just as little as those. Even the crowd of John 6 30 f. demands from Jesus, as messianic attestation, only one and the same sign as that offered by Moses or one equivalent and of equal value, not a still more abundant gift and a still higher enjoyment.

Under such circumstances, however, it becomes all the more difficult to understand how, according to the explicit assurance of the Evangelist, the first sign of Jesus could serve to strengthen the messianic faith of his first disciples (2 11)—quite apart from the question of the possibility of awakening such a faith among the rest of the wedding company: would not those disciples, rather, have been led astray by a miracle of this kind precisely for religious reasons? One would, it seems, most readily accept the narrative in an apocryphal gospel 231. The already discussed

intervention of the mother of Jesus, working toward veneration and glorification of her son, forms a subsidiary motif which in its own way might also seem to point in this direction. On the other hand, however, at first a linkage of the deeper sense of the pericope with ideas and images elsewhere in the New Testament cannot be denied. Only on closer inspection is this commonality not so far-reaching as has been assumed. It was found that in the giving of wine by Jesus, as in the whole section 2 1—4 45, “in the first instance the production of the New in place of the Old” formed the orienting point of view 232. The comparative inference applied here, however, is too external and schematic. The conversation with Nicodemus indeed says

that the sensual and sinful nature of the natural human being, opposed to the divine nature of the Spirit, is fundamentally to be overcome by a rebirth wrought from above by the latter principle of life. The concluding final testimony of the Baptist emphasizes no less strongly that the darkness effective in the twilight of his own proclamation of salvation (cf. 5 33—36) must be driven away by the true and perfect light that has dawned upon the world in Jesus 233. Corresponding to this also is Jesus' announcement

78

in the immediately following conversation with the Samaritan woman, that the sensually determined Old Testament worship of God must give way to the purely spiritually oriented New Testament one. While here everywhere the removal of something opposed, of something altogether different, forms the main thought, in the sign of Cana the dominant point of view is to be recognized in the positive thought that Jesus, through a symbolic miracle of transformation, points to the enhancement, ennoblement, and completion of human joy in life to be effected by him. The wine provided does not take the place of the cleansing water otherwise contained in the vessels as an inner means of purification, but has, according to the context, merely the significance of a means of enjoyment 234. And the water used in our case does not appear as something to be eliminated (by virtue of its nature), but as a natural gift of God which is only transformed by the operation of higher powers into a refreshment of a higher order, into a "spiritual" drink, such as otherwise comes from the vine. The jars in question play a role not because of the purpose of the usual water content, but because of their size. But even the cleansing of the temple does not lead to the negative basic idea of the removal of something useless, not fitting into the completion of the revelation of salvation. As the purpose of Jesus' action we recognize at first, on the contrary, the restoration and preservation of the ancient sacred order of the temple cult. Yet the more strikingly this act of zeal stands in contrast to the view set forth before the Samaritan woman in 4 20—24, the more clearly it becomes

79

recognizable that the Fourth Evangelist has taken up the synoptic Vorlage (Mc. 11 15—17. Mt. 21 12 f. Lc. 19 45 f.) only in order, on its basis, to let Jesus step forth already at this point in that light in which he shows himself according to 2 18—21. Jesus presents himself to the leaders of the Jewish community not merely by his manner of action, but immediately also by his speech, in such a way that he can be regarded as an over-excited madman (cf. 10 20): his summons to tear down the temple and his promise to rebuild it in three days necessarily sound to them alike adventurous and insane. But in that the Evangelist, going still further, declares the Jews' interpretation of the words of Jesus to be a gross misunderstanding and understands "this temple" (2 19) rather of the sanctuary of the body of Jesus, he has at the same time gained a turn that puts him in a position to present Jesus already at the opening of his messianic career as the Lord of life, who not only foresaw but also foretold the work of revivification of his body given over to death, to be accomplished in his own divine creative power. In this miraculous work, as one easily sees, we have once again, in the main, not to do with the negative moment of the removal of the old, but—speaking with Paul (Phil. 3 21)—above all to emphasize the positive conception of the transformation of the earthly corporeality of Jesus into a body of glory

235. Nevertheless, so much is to be maintained, that both the significance ascribed to the produce of the vine in the transformation of water into wine, as well as the occasion of that miracle-sign given with a wedding, point to a figurative language already initiated in

80

the Old Testament and running through the New Testament, and enrich it with an appropriate, profound, and stylistically fitting trait. In that Jesus, in the miracle of transformation, makes wine as a festive drink the symbol of the highest goods of salvation to be bestowed by him upon the world, he makes use of a symbolism which already the author of Isa. 25 6 employed in figurative speech for the depiction of the festive banquet provided by Yahweh at the consummation of salvation for the peoples of the earth 236. Synoptically, upon the same prophetic passage rests Jesus' declaration that he will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine until he drinks it anew in the kingdom of God: at the renewal of the world, "a wine such as has never yet been drunk" 237. More personally and inwardly conceived, we receive, on closer inspection, the same image in our Evangelist, when Jesus here calls himself the true vine and designates his disciples as the branches of this vine (15 1. 4 ff.): the life-sap flowing from the vine into the branches is again a parable of those divine powers with which Jesus wishes to nourish his disciples and, from them, humanity longing for salvation. It is only not to be overlooked that in this connection the influx of divine spiritual power corresponding to the image of wine is conceived in the first instance as a means of animation and fertilization driving toward ethical performance (vv. 2—10. 16), only in the second as a means of enjoyment (cause of joy v. 11) 238. As a sacramental image, appearing only veiled in the Fourth Gospel (6 53—56),

81

wine serves in the Lord's Supper for the representation of the messianic good of salvation mediated by the sacrificial blood of Jesus, a matter to be addressed later. To the wedding feast of a compatriot of Jesus that occasioned the sign of Cana, at which the latter comes into consideration only as a fellow celebrant, the popular New Testament figurative speech, which—following the customary Old Testament portrayal of the relationship of Yahweh to Israel—now represents him as bridegroom (Mc. 2 19 f. Mt. 9 15. Lc. 5 34 f. John 3 29) 239, now as wedding host (Mt. 22 2. 25 1. 5 f. 10. Apoc. 19 7. 9; cf. Lc. 12 36), now as husband (Eph. 5 31 f.), stands in no immediate relation. A mediated one, however, presses itself upon us all the more, since our Evangelist himself, and indeed already in the third chapter (v. 29), where he lets the Baptist testify to his disciples to the divine essential glory and authority of Jesus, introduces Jesus rather as the bridegroom of the messianic community of salvation, whose appearance and increasing radiance fill the forerunner, withdrawing from the scene of his activity, with the blissful anticipation of the friend and fellow celebrant. Alongside the Old and New Testament conceptions of a related kind, in this connection one may also recall the resonant figurative language of the Philonic Logos doctrine, according to which the Logos, as the divine wine-pourer (οἰνοχόος) and master of the drinking feast (συμποσίαρχος), presents the true draught of joy in the sacred bowls, in that, like his priestly prototype Melchizedek, he offers to the souls "wine instead of water," and indeed unmixed wine (ἀκρατιζέτω), in order to place them in divine

82

intoxication 240. Here we have a pure allegory 241, which is not the case with the transformation of water into wine by the Logos-Christus, insofar as it is understood by the Evangelist himself in the proper sense 242. More important than attention to such analogies of Philonic thought-world and manner of speech is the perception that the narrative of the miraculous deed at Cana, just like the pericope of the cleansing of the temple, fits clearly and appropriately into the context of the fundamental thoughts of the Gospel as it presents itself already in the first chapters: because Jesus, as the Logos-Christus, is possessor and mediator of life in the highest sense (1 4), he introduces himself at Cana as the almighty bringer of the highest joy of humankind 243 and indicates this in elemental visualization through a corresponding miracle of nature 244, in

83

such a way, however, that expressly the complete revelation of the saving life proceeding from him is reserved for the future (2 4; cf. above p. 3). But that this completion of his work is conditioned by suffering and the overcoming of death—on the part of the “Lamb of God” that takes away the sin of the world 1 29—is immediately indicated in a complementary way at Jesus’ first appearance in Jerusalem (2 19). With ch. 3 the Gospel then proceeds consistently to the question wherein, on the human side, the condition of full reception of salvation consists 245, and points on the one hand to the rebirth effected from above (“from above” v. 3. 7; cf. “from heaven” v. 27; thereto Lc. 24 49), bound to the mystery of baptism with water (v. 5) and wrought by the power of the Spirit (v. 5. 6. 8) (v. 4), and on the other hand to faith in the divine will of love revealed in the suffering unto death of Jesus, which grants eternal life to the world of humankind and thereby rescues it from its doom of judgment (vv. 12. 15 f. 18. 36) 246.

That, however, even these moments do not yet make possible a real and complete explanation of the acts of revelation of Jesus reported by the Fourth Evangelist already in the second chapter is easy to show. Questions remain whose answering, to all appearance, demands an expanded horizon and is indispensable if the “Johannine problem” is to be grasped in its historically concrete form and brought to solution:

1. Why must precisely the introductory miracle narrative of Cana serve, in the symbolic characterization of the evangelical good of salvation, to subordinate the point of view of heightened and increased enjoyment of life to the otherwise, in the miracle narratives of the Fourth Gospel as of the Synoptics, consistently dominant basic thought of preservation of life or rescue of life? 247.

84

2. What determines the Evangelist here to choose a transmitted material which lets precisely the wine-feast, as it was customary at wedding celebrations, appear in so sharply marked and striking a way as an image of New Testament enjoyment of

salvation?

3. Why has the Evangelist brought the wine miracle of Cana and the Jerusalem cleansing of the temple close together, and indeed in such a way that both events fall into the same season of one and the same year, so that thereby the cleansing of the temple—in contradiction to the Synoptics—is made one of the opening acts of the messianic activity of Jesus 248?

85

How, like the first two questions, so also the last presses itself upon us—especially the circumstance that the Evangelist has warded off objections against so far-reaching an advance dating of the cleansing of the temple—the supposition that in his conception and presentation of the person and life of Jesus a nexus of ideas of outstanding importance, not to be derived from the synoptic circle of thought, comes into play, one that must first be ascertained. That this is to be sought on the side of Hellenic antiquity is suggested from the outset not only by the oft-discussed Hellenizing character of the Logos christology of the Fourth Gospel 249, but also by the multiple points of contact of its soteriology with Hellenistic conceptions, to which our introductory investigation is to direct attention briefly once more. The peculiar character of our Gospel emerges in this latter respect both with regard to the good of salvation and with regard to the appropriation of salvation, and indeed in such a way that in both cases, with the historical transformation of the concepts, a characteristic displacement of them takes place 250. The fundamental concept for the Fourth Evangelist, comprehending in itself the entire content of the good of salvation—the concept of life—connects with the Philonic one and goes beyond it 251. Unmistakably peculiar in this connection is

86

the manner in which the affective side and the cognitive side of this good are emphasized. The life proceeding from Jesus is abiding (i.e., eternal) and perfect joy, the elevating and beatifying feeling of power, security, and satisfaction that springs from the community of love with Christ and the service to others that follows from it (15 11. 16 22.24. 17 13). As the pregnant hint in the image of the luxuriant pasture (10 9 f.) 252, so already at the beginning of the Gospel the hyperbolic depiction—reminiscent of Philo (cf. above)—of the fullness and preciousness of the enjoyment of salvation under the image of the nuptial feast of joy deserves special attention 253. On the other hand, that life reveals itself in the supernatural knowledge—conditioned by begetting from God 254—concerning the essence of God and of the Logos-Christ and everything effected and willed by God 255. If, however, the object of this knowledge is

87

summed up in the concept of truth, then thereby an element of thought and language is taken up that “is unheard of not only in the mouth of Christ and his first disciples, but quite generally in the mouth of every Israelite not influenced by Hellenism,” and presupposes “understanding for the philosophical mood of the age” of the Evangelist 256. Behind these characteristic features of

the good of salvation, the Old Testament–shaped synoptic concept of the kingdom of God with its righteousness and the forgiveness of sins that grounds it recedes noticeably in his Gospel 257. From the basic conceptual relations

88

operative everywhere here there also falls the necessary light upon the shaping of the doctrine of the appropriation of the good of salvation in the Fourth Gospel. To the grasping of this good in the concept of “life” there unmistakably corresponds most closely the figurative thought of “begetting from God” (a birth “from above”) as the objective condition of that process. In the foreground, however, stands another conception. The reception (and enduring possession) of divine saving grace is explained by our Evangelist in the first instance from a moral-religious natural determination of individuals wrought and ordered by the “Father,” in accordance with which they, in contrast to a sensually oriented, sinful majority (the “world”), bring to the Logos revelation—natural (1 10 f.) and Old Testament (5 46 f. 33 ff.) as well as perfected in Jesus Christ—a pure striving after knowledge of truth and a receptivity willing to hear and believe. It is evident that on this basis the requirement of a subsequent change of essence on the part of those concerned is all the less to be expected, since the Evangelist himself anticipatorily not only calls those drawn by the Father to the Son (6 44), given to the latter by him (6 39. 10 29. 17 2. 6. 9. 11. 12. 24. 18 9), “natures akin by origin,” who are of the truth and do the truth (18 27. 3 21), who are of God and work in God (ἐν θεῷ) (8 47. 3 21), the sheep of Christ (10 16. 26), but also children of God (11 52). Nevertheless, in 1 12.13, where he speaks of the lawful (ἐξουσίαν) entry of the believer into divine sonship prepared by the Logos activity 258, and in 3 3. 5, where

89

he points to the cleansing mediated by Christian baptism (v. 22) and in particular to the concomitant reception of a divine efflux of spirit that recreates human nature as an indispensable condition of entry into the kingdom of heaven, he makes use of the image of a new begetting and birth 259. By this he intends to characterize the saving effect in question as a process taking place “in a real way,” the divine πνεῦμα as an “autonomously effective creative principle,” and the corresponding human behavior as passive in that respect 260. Insofar, then, as the miracle of rebirth from above falling within the span of life includes within itself the moral condition of μετάνοια indicated by the baptismal symbol of cleansing water 261, and thereby takes up the presuppositions of the synoptic, Pauline, and deutero-Pauline conception 262, the appearance

90

of a gnosticizing mode of thought is, as far as possible, warded off—such as adheres especially to the dualistic-deterministic notion of a religious-ethical natural antithesis among human beings 263. Otherwise, however, it can hardly be denied that with this soteriologically fundamental doctrinal piece we stand to a considerable extent on ground connected with Hellenistic theology. One has found for the idea of a “begetting from above” a very close connection in Philo, when he (Cherub. 13. Leg. alleg. III 63) lets the virtues be brought forth in the female-conceived souls

by divine begetting 264. There the begotten is an abstraction. If this comparison did not at least directly concern the moral being of the human person, an even more fitting parallel would emerge in view of the ancient mysteries coming into comparison with Christian baptism, which bestow blessed immortality upon their initiates and called the consecrated, in this sense, renatus, in aeternum renatus 265. As the counterpart to the admission into

91

divine sonship brought about by begetting from above (1 13), there appears here “occasionally” (as, for example, in the Isis and Mithras mysteries, to say nothing of the late taurobolia and criobolia of the Demeter–Attis cult) the “adoption of the μύστης by the goddess or the god, an incorporation of the consecrated into the divine γένος,” effected in the rite of initiation 266. Does not even the mysterious, non-explicit reference to Christian baptism in 3 5—similar to that to the Lord’s Supper in ch. 6—recall the Greek mystery cult with its measures of secrecy 267? As for the other side, the discussed original ethical kinship to God of a selection of humanity, this is explicable only in connection with the Logos operations, into which it is already placed according to the testimony of the Prologue. For even the “drawing of the Father to the Son,” in accordance with the thoroughly transcendent nature of God in our Evangelist 268, ultimately comes down to the Logos revelation continuing in and alongside the perfected New Testament revelation 269. Thus here too we stand on the foundation of Hellenistic theology. The same holds for the anthropological presupposition, common to the author and Paul, of the opposition between “flesh” and spirit that runs through the entire doctrine of salvation

of the Fourth Evangelist 270. No less characteristic in the same direction proves to be our Evangelist’s position with respect to the subjective basic conditions of the appropriation of salvation to be derived from the Synoptic tradition: repentance and faith. It is not otherwise to be expected than that the peculiar prominence of knowledge discussed with regard to the good of salvation already influences the conception of faith that appropriates salvation. That faith has this fundamental significance comes to clear and emphatic expression, as 1 7 already shows. According to 1 12.13, the faith active in receptivity toward the manifested Logos (v. 11) and in acceptance of him—faith in his name (in the divine being revealing itself under the name of the Only-begotten from the Father, Jesus Christ v. 14.17)—is the lawful condition and subjective mediation of the salvation of divine sonship. Faith in the light—so it is stated quite straightforwardly in figurative language—is what leads to sonship of light 271 (12 36). While, however, synoptically (Mk. 1 15) and Paulinely faith, as a behavior that penitently lays hold of the forgiving and justifying grace of God in Christ, already suffices in itself for the appropriation of salvation, in the conception of the Fourth Gospel—according to which faith has as its object the messianic Logos mystery revealed in Jesus in its full breadth and depth—it finds its indispensable complement in the “knowing of the truth” 272. Strictly speaking, however, one cannot speak of a complement.

93

Whoever, in the sense of John 20 29, believes without having “seen,” holds the testimony of Jesus to be true and the one who bears witness to be truthful and accordingly allows it to

determine him, does so on the basis of an inner proof: the trust arising from the initial impression is already also an intimation and a first approach to knowledge of the essence and worth of the one presenting himself. The new element in our Gospel, however, is precisely that a moment which initially recedes in the concept of faith—the intellectual grasp of salvation and of the essence of its author 273—is brought to the fore 274 and, with a view to its capacity for development and intensification, is virtually designated as that behavior in which the appropriation of salvation is completed and which therefore, in this sense (not without qualification) 275, can be identified with the good of salvation itself 276. If, after

94

all this, the concept of faith that appropriates salvation in our Evangelist shows itself influenced by the Logos doctrine, then the at first sight surprising absence of the concept, or at least of the name, of repentance (μετάνοια, μετανοεῖν) 277 presumably stands in connection with the elucidated series of ideas concerning the mysterious ethical-religious natural determination of a part of humanity 278 and the “birth from above” (rebirth), presupposing this natural kinship to God and at the same time sacramentally conditioned 279: alongside the objective conditions of the appropriation of salvation 280 it apparently becomes difficult to bring the subjective ones (repentance and conversion) to bear in accordance with their original significance 281. Finally, it need only be noted that even a glance into the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel could only lead to confirmation of our result thus far. “All the moments of primitive Christian eschatology are partly—though by no means revoked—yet tacitly set aside, partly translated from the

95

Oriental-Jewish worldview, whose synoptic representational form sometimes still appears preserved, into the Hellenistic, or Hellenic” 282.

If, after all that has been shown, numerous relations of affinity between Hellenistic or Hellenic conception and the christology and doctrine of salvation of the Fourth Gospel undeniably emerge, then on the other hand the wholly peculiar wedding narrative introduced already in ch. 2—with the, even under symbolic interpretation, highly striking emphasis on the enjoyment of wine—and the intensified, frightful mode of appearance of Jesus at the cleansing of the temple following just a few days later (in stark contrast to the surprisingly friendly and compliant 283 demeanor on that earlier occasion) suggest a comparison with the world of ideas of Greek nature religion 284 and direct attention to no figure of the Hellenic pantheon so immediately and decisively as to Dionysus 285. Under such circumstances an investigation in that direction is not merely permitted but demanded, and the question will be whether the answering of the “Johannine problem” does not ultimately depend on the solution of precisely this task.

—----------

Second Section

The consistently Hellenizing typology of the Fourth Evangelist.

A. The Dionysian and related features of the image of Christ.

The Dionysus–Christ parallel, which already occupied the apologist Justin Martyr in his own way (Apol. I 54. Dial. 69), appears in an entirely new, exceedingly significant light as soon as we pursue further the trail to which we are led by the remarkable Christ-physiognomy of the certainly in one respect foundational second chapter of our Gospel, and bring the peculiar image of Christ that emerges in this context into clear view. The assumption that at first presses itself upon us merely as a conjecture will, upon calm and penetrating consideration, scarcely be any other than that the Evangelist, just as by incorporating the Logos-idea into Christology, so by assimilating the synoptic Christ-painting to especially characteristic features of the Dionysus-image of the Hellenic world, wished to give the Christian proclamation of salvation κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν a content and a form that would allow it to find entry among the “Greeks” all the more easily the more these, whether consciously or half unconsciously, despite all the foreignness of the “new teaching” (Acts 17:19), could feel themselves addressed both materially and formally. The more, now, especially in the cult of the named deity, the features that are offensive and repellent to Christian sensibility—naturalistic-sensual characteristics—came to the fore, the more difficult, of course,

had to become the demand that the Evangelist had to place upon himself, with regard to tact as such, in the selection of points of comparison and the manner of their use, in the entire handling of the brush. Yet it was not necessary to see in this difficulty an insurmountable obstacle 286. Decisive at first remained, after all, the astonishing wealth of religious motifs and forms of representation, the extraordinary popularity and diffusion, the outstanding general significance that precisely the worship of Dionysus had attained in the Greek world 287. Like scarcely any other, therefore, this cult was suited to serve as the representative of Hellenic belief and worship as such. But the more numerous and manifold were the points of contact that presented themselves to the comparative gaze under this broad perspective, the more also did the result of the highly suggestive history of development deserve attention, which precisely this Dionysian religion had undergone. The Dionysus of the vintage- and spring-festivals and of the trieteric-orgiastic epiphany celebration was, among the Orphics—whose religious practice Herodotus (II 81) straightforwardly designated as Bacchic 288—no longer the first bearer of his name. At the head there stood here a pantheistically oriented mode of thought 289 which, in its

mythologizing manner, placed Dionysus Phanes as the first appearance (Φάνης) of the personified theogonic and cosmogonic primal principle, the begetter of the original universe, who is thereafter swallowed by Zeus, who has become king of the gods, and who makes him the “perfect embodiment of the deity” and

98

the “re-creator of the world” 290. He is followed, as the second Dionysus, by Zagreus 291, begotten by Zeus with the earth- and underworld-goddess (Persephone), who, from childhood already appointed to be ruler of the world, is beguiled by the Titans, torn apart and devoured 292—with the exception of his heart, after the swallowing of which Zeus, in a renewed union with the earth-goddess (now Semele), causes him to come to life again as the third Dionysus in the form of the said “god of wine and of orgies” 293. Already the twice being swallowed and the repeated rebirth of Dionysus in this triad of theosophical-mythological narratives betrays that here several independent series of conceptions of differing origin and purpose have been brought into a connection that, by the nature of the case, could not be free of gaps, obscurities, and contradictions, whether real or apparent 294. Since now human beings not only have something of the being of Dionysus within themselves 295, but according to the Zagreus myth are also of Titanic nature 297 as a consequence of their origin from the ashes (or the blood) of the Titans punished by Zeus 296,

99

their god-related, eternal, and immortal soul requires a purification and liberation such as can be effected only through expiation of the “guilt” lying upon each individual 298 in the eternal cycle of the migration of souls, through ever-new entry into the bodily world and again into the realm of shadows. Dionysus, however (alongside his double Persephone) 299, is given by Zeus to redeem the souls from the misery of this “prison of the eternal recurrence of all things” 300. It can scarcely be assumed otherwise than that the Dionysus-image of this entire mythologically elaborated process of transformation, which makes the god not only creator of the world but also redeemer of the world and in this capacity brings him into a decisive personal relation to the individual human being as a creature to be freed from guilt of sin and impurity by means of special sacraments (mystical initiations and Bacchic orgies) 301 and strict asceticism, increasingly pushed into the background, among the Orphic religious adherents, the interest in the sensually coarse nature of the ancient traditional Dionysian cult. The features of the original “peasant god” indeed fit far too poorly with a worldview for which earthly bodily life as such fell under the all-dominating aspect of a culpable suffering, a state of punishment. Precisely thereby, however, the ground was also laid for a more ideal evaluation of the Dionysian religion as

100

such 302, which made a positive comparison with the Christian religion of revelation possible, despite the contrast between a naturalistic worldview not yet overcome and a perfected ethical one 303, and all the more suggested itself when from the outset the basic doctrine, Christology, had been brought into close connection with the Hellenic world of thought through the adoption

of the Logos-idea. Precisely this fundamental idea, according to which the appearance of God in Jesus Christ forms the continuation, the goal-point, and the completion of a graded 305 yet unified revelation that runs through the entire history of humanity 304 (John 1:4, 5, 9–11) 306, could lead one to recognize, in the belief and cult of the nature-religion and thus in particular of the Dionysian worship of the Greek world, alongside all aberration 307, a divinely wrought—however dark—presentiment of the perfect light and

101

an elementary-symbolic prefiguration of the perfect life that has dawned upon and flowed into humanity in Christ 308. Therewith, however, the premises were also given for the gradual formation of a tradition according to which Jesus as the Logos-Christ, in his messianic speaking and acting and no less in his suffering, dying, and rising again, not only consciously brought to fulfillment that, in a broader sense, revelation-historical (because effected by the Logos) real prophecy of paganism, but also attested it through manifold explicit allusion. Alongside such an evangelical tradition there thus stood, at the same time, next to the christological typology drawn from the Old Testament as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has developed it in broad strokes 309, a religions-historical parallel of a more general kind that specifically illuminated Greek culture 310. If it actually

102

came to this development, then we would already be standing, on New Testament biblical ground, before a worldview and view of history that rises high above the one-sidedly negative, Old Testament–oriented and more or less dogmatically oriented manner of consideration of the Church Fathers, who could explain the relevant relations of similarity between the ideas and rites of nature-religion and those of Christian belief and cult only by an influence of diabolical delusion 311. What historically stands over against such fantasies is to be investigated in what follows 312.

103

According to what has been set forth, it is at first and chiefly a question of the Dionysian typology in the image of Christ of our Gospel. It seems that the elementary analogies and pertinent allusions that press themselves upon us in this direction can, without constraint, be united in a more or less coherent series into a comparative overall picture. Particular attention, however, deserves the fact that here too, for purely substantive reasons, the points of view presented already in the second chapter of the Gospel come to the fore. As

1. the bringer of joy to humanity

Jesus is unmistakably announced by the Evangelist already at the conclusion of the Prologue (1:14–18). The **χάρις**, whose full glory appeared to the world in him, is in this fundamental passage not forgiving grace for sins, but rather the giving “divine favor” 313 as such, whose effect consists in blissful joy (χαρά) 314. Remarkable, not to say striking, however, is

104

not only that the wondrous deed reported in the wedding story of Cana, aimed at awakening or strengthening faith in the person of Jesus (see above), brings about an almost lavish-seeming intensification of festive enjoyment of the senses, that is, purely natural joy 315, but also that precisely this first “sign” is further expressly characterized as a distinctive revelation of the glory of the appeared Logos (2 11), with explicit emphasis on its effect. As a counterimage to this New Testament founder of salvation, who by his nature was θ’εός (1 1), no figure from the Hellenic pantheon could present itself to the Evangelist more readily than that of the Hellenic–Asia Minor god Dionysos. “Cities and states celebrate annual festivals for him, in which he is celebrated as the giver of the inspiring drink of the vine, as the daemonic protector and promoter of all growth and flourishing in the plant kingdom and in all nature, as the divine embodiment of the entire scope and richness of natural fullness of life, as the paradigm of intensified joy in life” 316. Already in early times he is called the delight of mortals (χάρμα βροτοῖσιν) 317, the rich in refreshment (πολυγηθ-ής) 318, the giver of joy (χαριδότης) 319; and his festive retinue consists above all of the Charites 320, the

105

goddesses “of cheerfulness, beauty, grace, first in nature, but also in human custom and manner of life” 321. The character of the bringer of joy to the world already attested synoptically (Luke 2 10: εύαγγελίζομεν ὑμῖν χαράν μεγάλην — παντί τῷ λαῷ; Matt. 2 10: ἐχάρησαν χαράν μεγάλην σφόδρα — the Magi from the East) Jesus manifests in the Fourth Gospel as

2. the giver of the water of life and the personified vine.

What according to 7 38. 4 10. 14. 7 37 he pours forth in divine spiritual powers and offers to human beings as a refreshing drink, which in them themselves becomes a spring of eternal life 322, and what according to 15 1 ff., in the capacity of the true, “belonging to the higher world,” “perfectly representing the idea” vine, (ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή), he lets flow to his disciples, as the branches organically connected with him, in a spiritual sense in power 323 and sap, in true joy of life (v. 11), correspond in the elementary sphere of natural religion, as it were paradigmatically, to the gifts and effects of Dionysos. To him “the driving force, the swelling sap of vegetation is ascribed, as it manifests itself in flowers and tendrils, in trees and their fruits” 324. He is therefore worshipped chiefly in moist places, and many sacred springs belong 325 to him; the nymphs, especially those of the spring-rich 326 woodland mountain of Nysa, are his nurses; and just as his name “Γης” (the Moistener), so too does

106

“Dionysos” itself, in all probability, mean the moisture coming down from heaven (bringing nature to life) 327 in a personifying religious conception 328. As the noblest, most delightful and most inspiring this dionysian moisture appears in the fruit of the vine, and thus also, corresponding to the self-comparison of Jesus with this plant, as it is peculiar to the Fourth

Evangelist, there stands with the Hellenic god the epithet εὐστάφυλος, and it also recalls 15 5. 8 the other, more comprehensive cult-name of the same: κάρπιος 329.

To the same basic ideas and images as above we return when Jesus is presented to us by the Evangelist right at the beginning of

107

the second chapter, in a richly referential narrative of outstanding symbolic plasticity and—supplementarily—in an inwardly related discourse concluding the third chapter (that of the Baptist), as

3. the miracle-working wedding guest, who himself is also bridegroom,

is presented. The Old Testament and New Testament as well as the Philonic–Hellenistic models of this conception have already been discussed in detail above (pp. 75–82). Here we need only look out for the similarities from the dionysian religious sphere 330. Dionysos repeatedly appears as the guest of an individual, who rewards his host with a gift. The Aetolian Oineus receives from him the first vine and becomes the founder of Aetolian viticulture; the Athenian Ikarios is initiated into viticulture and receives skins filled with wine 331. If these legends make recognizable the high significance that, among the gifts of the god, was above all attributed to the fruit of the vine, numerous other accounts that glorify Dionysos as the god of the ever-renewing life of nature in spring bring out the wondrous character of his activity in the strongest way, and this in such a manner that here too the gift of wine is chiefly

108

in view 332. According to the sacred legend of Elis, one of the alleged birthplaces (Homer hym. 34), he is said, at the Thyia there—the festival that brings about his return (epiphany)—as god of wine and its cultivation, to announce symbolically his power that spreads blessing and fertility, by the fact that three kettles, which had been set up empty in a chapel outside the city, are found filled with wine on the morning after the nocturnal celebration, although seals had been placed on the door of the chapel 333. Quite similarly, according to the testimony of the believing Mucianus (governor of Syria a. 67–69), on the island of Andros, nonis Januariis (on 5 January), the spring water of the temple consecrated to him always tastes like wine 334. According to other legends he reveals his wondrous abundance of gifts on the day of his marriage. Here the wedding celebration of Dionysos and the (related to Aphrodite) Ariadne (the “Most Holy”) on Crete and Naxos comes into consideration 335. Far more, however, deserves attention the annual ancient principal festival of the Attic Dionysia

109

falling in early spring (February) 336, the Anthesteria, which were also celebrated on the islands and in Asia under this name and in Athens lasted three days (11–13 Anthesterion). The first day was the festival of the opening of the casks (τὰ Πιθόφα), which united all worshippers of Dionysos, masters and slaves, in the first enjoyment of the fermented new wine. The third, the

festival of the pots (χύτροι), in which sacrifice was made to chthonic Hermes and to the spirits of the dead, pointed to the overcoming of the winterly death of nature in the newly sprouting life of spring 337. As in these two festival acts, so also in the middle, the most distinguished one, the moment of the wondrous creative activity of the deity does not come to the fore directly. All the more surprising is the light that from the characteristic features of the latter falls upon the evangelical

110

narrative of the wedding at Cana. For in the Anthesteria too it is a wedding celebration of Dionysos (Hesychius: Διονύσου γάμος). On the second festival day—and this was "the most significant part of the celebration"—the wife of the second archon, the "queen," was brought to the god and "formally betrothed to him in the sacred seclusion of the temple" 338. But the Evangelist does not fail, with regard to the wondrous wedding guest who at Cana transformed water into wine, to have it subsequently established through the mouth of his friend, i.e. bridegroom's friend, John, that in a higher sense he himself is the bridegroom (3 29), and to indicate that that wine miracle symbolically prefigured the outpouring of an immeasurable fullness of spirit (3 34; cf. 7 38. 4 10. 14. 7 37) upon the community betrothed to this bridegroom. If one keeps this in view, there immediately presses itself upon one a further comparison, which allows one to understand what it is all about with the six stone jars, together holding five to six or seven hectoliters (see above), filled to the brim, whose contents the Cana miracle turns into wine (2 6–10). The principal festival day of the Anthesteria is called the day of the choes (χόες: drinking vessels with jug or pitcher capacity). A great public banquet took place, at which each guest—slaves as well as masters—received his χοῦς of select wine 339, and under the sound of trumpets formal drinking contests were held. In addition one crowned oneself with the first flowers of spring, which were finally dedicated to the god of springtime joy in the oldest Dionysos sanctuary of the city, in the Lenaion, and gave the entire festival its name 340. One can scarcely escape the impression

111

that the Cana story is meant to offer a counterpart to this classical festival of joy, which, proceeding from an ennobling conception of the natural-religious celebration of the Hellenes, shows the providential typology contained precisely therein as fulfilled through Jesus, the Logos become flesh and θεός. With that, the seemingly offensive character of the narrative of our Fourth Evangelist, which causes embarrassment and distress to the exegete, disappears. And also upon further individual features of it, which can here only be touched upon, an unexpected light falls. One now understands how it comes about that the Evangelist, right at this point where we learn next to nothing more specific about the natural principal figure of the painting, the bridegroom whose wedding guest Jesus is, introduces not only the disciples but also the mother of Jesus, although the latter is left out of consideration altogether in the question of the purpose of the miracle-sign (2 11. 22). With regard to this further circumstance we involuntarily recall the stereotypical accompaniment of Dionysos at his festive appearances, the thiasos of the god with his mother Semele, who under the name Thyone (the Exciter, Urger—from θύω = Sanskrit dhū) is conceived as a maenad, "a constant companion of her son, both of his mysteries and of his

ecstatic processions and his triumphs” 341. She precisely, who is also called Τή and as such stands especially close to the caretakers of the god, the water nymphs, whose nature and task it is to heighten the creative power and creative urge of the spring god 342, allows one to guess why it is the mother of Jesus who urges him to perform the wine miracle (see above p. 2 f.). One must further recall that in the Bacchae of Euripides, “the classical image of maenadism,” in contrast to the otherwise customary wild frenzy of the female worshippers of Dionysos, as the poet depicts it in the Theban women driven mad by the god, the chorus of maenads consisting of the divine companions of Dionysos

112

“preserves a moderate, almost priestly dignity” 343. At the same time, however, the relationship of these companions of the god to the blessing of the year comes strongly to the fore: “they bestow, wandering about with Dionysos, the vine upon human beings, are thought of as harvesting grapes, depicted on vase paintings with vine-branch and grapes, with bowls and platters full of grapes and fruits” 344. If the mother of Jesus is, in the sense of our Evangelist, a Semele–Thyone 345 of a higher kind, then it is immediately explained not only that she urges Jesus to the revelation of his divine power of blessing, but also that it is precisely a wine miracle that she demands of him. But also the initially rejecting behavior of Jesus becomes intelligible (2 4). The mother, who with her request remains at the level of the sensory, unexpectedly receives from her divine son, the Logos-Christus, above all an answer that points her beyond the momentary external need of her surroundings to the satisfaction of a highest and at the same time most inward need of humanity, such as can be accomplished only through him. The granting of the maternal wish that follows immediately thereafter, however, is in the eyes of the miracle-worker himself only a beginning (ἀρχή) of the revelation of his glory (2 11): a symbolic prefiguration of the inexhaustible drink of life for the world that flows forth from his impending sacrificial death and the shedding of his own blood. For this the hour has not yet come for Jesus (cf. 7 30 and 8 20, where the same is said with reference to his arrest). Unmistakably, the allusion to this temporal circumstance, as strikingly as it occurs already at the first appearance of Jesus, serves as an emphatic announcement of the three-year number of years for the messianic activity of Jesus, which fundamentally distinguishes the Fourth Gospel from its predecessors also in chronology,

113

and to which we shall return in another context. Corresponding to this difference, on the side of the dionysian world of ideas there stands a no less striking anomaly of the number three, and indeed here too in the conception of time and cultic practice relating to the suffering and dying god: the “trieteric” celebration, taking place (instead of every year) after an intervening year in the same season of the second following year, for the restoration of the vanished god who in the meantime had dwelt in the underworld 346. And if one looks more closely, there emerges as the motive

114

of the peculiar chronological parallel of abnormality in the Fourth Evangelist the literary assumption of a revelation-historical typical relationship: the triennium (in the indicated sense of a full two-year period) of the duration of the "epiphany" (cf. Luke 1 79. Tit. 2 11. 3 4) of the Logos-Christus Jesus on earth presents itself as antitype to the trimester of the duration of the epiphany of Dionysos, the triduum of disappearance (John 14 19. 16 16–19) and of sojourn in Hades (2 19–21. 19 42. 20 1) as antitype to the three-month (or nine-month?) or even "three-year" ἄφανισμός

115

and sojourn in Hades of Dionysos 347. Finally, it may also be asked whether even the name of the locality to which the first miracle of Jesus is transferred does not find its ultimate explanation in the dionysian parallels. To begin with, nothing indeed hinders the assumption that one of the Cana located north of Nazareth is meant (probably not the quite neighboring Kefr Kenna of the older tradition, but rather the somewhat more distant Chirbet Kana, if not rather the present Christian village Qāna, 2½ hours southeast of Tyre, designates the ancient site where the place of the same name already lay according to Josh. 19 28) 348. But the circumstance that the appellative sense of the word form קנדי can hardly have been any other than that of the masculine קנדי, thus: reed, reed-stalk or the like (κάννα, κάννη; canna), according to which the Cana of the Gospel conceptually says the same thing as our very frequent names: Rohr, Rohrdorf, etc., recalls the fact that the sanctuaries of Dionysos were preferably established in moist and marshy places (ἐν λίμναις) 349, and that among the customary attributes of the orgiastic Dionysos celebration above all the thyrsus staff, i.e. a reed staff (νάρθηξ) with entwining of ivy, vine leaves, and sacred bands, belonged 350. That a Galilean "Cana" appears in our narrative could accordingly be connected with the fact that the place in question is, as it were, characterized as the site of a dionysian revelation

116

and celebration of New Testament kind 351.

The illumination of the sign of Cana, which in fundamental symbolism and prophetically (2 4) presents Jesus as the giver of the true drink of life and in this sense as the true Dionysus, is most appropriately followed here at once by the materially complementary investigation of the seemingly differently constituted section 6 5—13, where Jesus likewise symbolically reveals himself as the wondrous giver of the true food of life (cf. v. 26 f.). The account of the feeding of the five thousand reproduced by the Fourth Evangelist, taken from the Synoptics (Mk 6 31—44; cf. 8 1—10; Mt 14 13—21; cf. 15 32—39; Lk 9 10—17), however, is—as the Synoptic tradition itself already shows (Mk 6 45—52; Mt 14 22—33)—inseparable from the appended account of the sea miracle, which lets Jesus walk upon the stormily agitated water and suddenly bring the boat of his disciples to land (John 6 14—21). In this accompanying pericope one has found the "point of the matter" to be that for the humanity of Jesus no law of gravity holds, for his corporeality no spatial limitation applies. Rather, there must be something quite special about the latter, if it is to be enjoyed, as shown in the discourse that follows, as bread of life, indeed if the flesh and blood of Jesus are to become the object of a process of assimilation. This Christ,

as bearer of the pneuma, is sovereign lord over the elements 352. It will, however, be necessary to ask whether, for the realization of this Christological miraculous conception, reference to the Old Testament parallels that were adduced for the Synoptic

117

basis of our narrative 353 suffices, or whether in the Fourth Gospel one has also here engaged with the conceptual world of Hellenic antiquity, and indeed with reference back to the fundamental idea of the sign of Cana. In the first place, it is hardly to be overlooked that the feature which enters into the Christ-image with the miracle on the sea recalls in a certain way the figure of Poseidon. He is, like no other, the god of the sea, above all of the stormily agitated 354, but also of the pacified sea favorable to navigation and free of danger 355. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that, according to the conception of the Fourth Evangelist, the feeding of the five thousand is a complementary parallel to the miracle drink of Cana, from which it follows of itself that, just as the wine dispensed by Jesus symbolically prefigures the blood offered in the “Lord’s Supper,” so the food presented to the five thousand corresponds to the body of the Lord to be consumed in the sacrament 356. This, however, again leads to the conception of Jesus as an antitype in the history of revelation, in this case: of Poseidon 357,

118

insofar as the latter’s gift presents itself in bread and fish (“frutti di mare”) 358, whereas Dionysus is revered as producer of wine

119

and tree-fruit 359. That it would nevertheless be mistaken to see, with the inclusion of the feeding narrative, a breach in the consistently Dionysian typology of the Evangelist, and that, more precisely considered, Poseidon comes into view only as a double of Dionysus in a supplementary sense, is shown rather by a glance at the reciprocal relationship of the two deities, clearly enough ascertainable from mythology 360.

It continually strikes the reader of the Fourth Gospel as particularly strange that, contrary to the unanimous testimony of the Synoptics, he finds the cleansing of the temple placed here at the beginning of the messianic activity of Jesus (2 13 ff.; cf. above p. 84). The setting in spring, before the onset of the Passover season (2 13—23), remains the same—what is essential. But if one pays closer attention to the course of the event,

120

one discovers, apart from the entirely distinctive conversation of Jesus with the Jews present, that the pathos already strongly prominent in the Synoptics and characteristic of the whole scene in the being and behavior of Jesus has, in our Evangelist, experienced a significant intensification. In view of the unworthy activity at the holy place, he, as the Son of God, is overcome by such agitation that he even makes for himself a whip of rush-cords 361 and with it drives all the cattle and sheep of the temple market out of the courtyard with his own hand, but

when challenged by the Jews seeks to legitimate himself through a provocation that is not only completely unintelligible to his opponents but also brings upon him the suspicion of megalomania 362. The psalm-word 69 10: “Zeal for your house will consume me,” is appended by the Fourth Evangelist to the narrated episode, as it were, as a heading (v. 17); it is meant to let the principal viewpoint under which he wishes the event to be regarded stand out with particular clarity. An image

4. of the zealot, who also appears as one raging/possessed,

we thus have before us (cf. 10:20: *μαίνεται*; see above p. 79).We encounter this image, however, at the level of natural religion also in the Hellenic myth of Dionysus; and this parallel is all the more valuable insofar as it not only makes intelligible why, in the Evangelist’s tradition, the cleansing of the temple is shifted from the end of Jesus’ messianic activity to the beginning, but also why the season of the year (early spring) has been retained. Among the oldest attributes of the Greek god, which designate a fundamental trait of his being,

121

belongs a constantly recurring, deep and powerful agitation that throws him into a frenzy (μανία), by which his constant entourage, especially the group of vegetation spirits related to him, called Maenads, is also seized 363. If now in the Gospel narrative, with visible emphasis and following the scene of Cana, there is double strangeness in the account of the affect-laden, violent driving out of the various animals of the sacrificial market (as must be assumed: together with their sellers) from the consecrated precinct, this recalls the equally characteristic process, intensified to the wild in accordance with natural religion, of the tearing apart of animals, as it was carried out, according to the mythic conception of (Thracian-)Greek belief, at the festive epiphanies of Dionysus by the Maenads and, in Greek cult, by their orgiastic representatives, the Thyiads 364. The latter

122

do not merely imitate the god; they have the god within themselves—he himself rages in them 365. The time, however, in which Dionysus thus manifests himself and is correspondingly celebrated is that of early spring, which begins soon after the winter solstice, and of spring itself. Thus, for example, in Elis he is implored to return again to the holy temple (εἰς ναὸν ἁγνόν) 366 and to demonstrate anew his life-producing power (cf. above p. 108). There then follow in fact the renowned manifold nature-miracles of the world-renewing god (cf. above), just as in our Evangelist Jesus, immediately after the temple cleansing at Passover time in Jerusalem, performs effective “signs” (2 23). This series of parallel features naturally suggests the supposition that also, with the placing of the temple cleansing at the beginning in the Fourth Gospel, which is connected with the expansion of the temporal framework of the messianic activity into a two- (to three-) year coherence, a certain similarity of the nature and epiphany of the Hellenic deity and again of the Logos Christ is intended to be indicated (cf. above pp. 96, 99 ff.). It need not be repeated that already the saving revelation of the Logos itself, from the very

beginning, unfolds in conflict—against the spiritual power in the world that darkens the consciousness of God and hinders the reception of divine life 367.

123

The connection that has been indicated at the same time sheds light on the fact that with the fourth Evangelist — once again deviating from the Synoptics (Mt. 23 37 = Lc. 13 34 does not come into consideration) — Jesus is

5. the one threatened with stoning.

Two cases are reported (Joh. 8 59. 10 31 = 11 8); the second occurs during the eight-day Feast of Dedication of the Temple — around the time of the winter solstice (10 22). In both instances Jesus has to assert his right against one and the same rebellious class of Jewry, directed and incited by the Sanhedrin (s. o. S. 12), as in the case of the cleansing of the temple. His opposition here again forms the counterpart to the power that, in Greek myth, is to be combated by Dionysos, as we find it depicted especially in Euripides in the figure of the Boeotian king Pentheus (the “Mournful One”), who, like the Thracian Lycurgus, is an image of winter, “as he drives down from the mountains in wild storms and tempests and with grim fury disturbs all the natural jubilation of the year, only himself soon thereafter to die a most wretched death”368. Of special interest here is the punishment of stoning (λεύσιμος δίκη) that Pentheus has in mind for the Dionysos whom he does not recognize and whom he orders to be captured: “If you seize him, lead him here in bonds, that death by stoning may strike him”369. The natural phenomenon that underlies this mythical motif has been described by one of the greatest among the poets in the words:

> The old winter in his weakness
> withdrew into rough mountains.
> From there, fleeing, he sends only
> feeble showers of granular ice
> in streaks across the greening plain.

124

The stoning of Dionysos in question is of an atmospheric kind; its material consists of snow and hail370. Yet another point of comparison becomes noticeable that cannot be passed over: what incites Jewry in the Gospel to an attempt at stoning is, in the one case, the allusive reference by Jesus to his pre-existence grounded in divine sonship (8 42. 58), in the other case the explicit and unambiguous assertion of his unity with God (10 30), which appears as blasphemous self-deification. In the former case Jesus’ denial of the divine sonship of the Jews who are hostile to him and the assertion of their devilish and in this sense illegitimate origin immediately precede it: the unbelief manifested toward Jesus proves that their spiritual nature is not one begotten of God, not one sprung from the bond of Israel with its God Yahweh, and that therefore their appeal, resting on misunderstanding, to descent from Abraham, who was a hero of faith, signifies nothing. Over against these evangelical lines of thought

125

stands the fact that in the poetry of Euripides Dionysos likewise, at his very first appearance (Bacch. v. 4. 53 f.), presents himself as the god who has assumed the form of a mortal human being (μορφήν ἀμειψας ἐκ θεοῦ βροτησίαν—; “εἶδος θνητὸν ἀλλάξας ἔχω, μορφήν τ’ ἐμήν μετέβαλον εἰς ἀνδρὸς φύσιν”), and that precisely for this reason he has from the outset to defend himself against a grave suspicion. He complains (v. 26—29) that his aunts, to whom it least of all befits, deny that he is a son of Zeus; they allege that his mother Semele, having been married to a mortal man (νυμφευθεῖσα), lays the blame for the union upon Zeus. To this slander by relatives there is added, however, the identical one in the mouth of the enemy (Pentheus)371. That this manner of suspicion, entirely consonant with the nature of Greek myth, did not allow a direct antithetical utilization on the part of the Evangelist, that, in other words, it was only possible here to let the deeper thinker read something between the lines, is self-evident. A contrary inference from the fact “that the Jews at the time of the Gospel of John (according to 6 42) know Joseph as the real father of Jesus”372 would be hasty. The same Jewish people that in the spring (6 4), where it is initially only a matter of the instruction that Jesus is not of earthly, purely human, but of higher, heavenly origin, appeals to the fact that one knows his father Joseph and his mother, can, as it is generally characterized, quite well come in the autumn (7 2. 32),

126

under the impression of the further utterances of Jesus, to doubt the true hometown of Joseph. In the section 8 16—27, which continues the self-testimony of chs. 5—7, Jesus, when he speaks before the people and the Pharisees (v. 13) at a “much frequented” place of the temple precinct accessible to both sexes of his Father, does not speak of the one who is generally regarded as such, but of one who is unfindable for them (v. 19. 27)373. Of God, of whom he claims that he has sent him, it surely cannot — in their opinion — possibly be a question374. Does he then have something to conceal regarding his real origin375? In this connection the reader suffers

127

to a particular degree from the much-discussed impression of an excessive intensification of the incomprehension of the hearers of Jesus, which elsewhere already appears even among the disciples and here emerges almost more painfully376. The explanation lies, on the one occasion as on the other, wherever Jesus speaks as if from another world and arouses among the uninitiated the suspicion of megalomania, in the fact that the teaching of Jesus377 is to be regarded as an exuberant Logos-revelation tending toward its consummation, which precisely as such and therefore throughout incomparably transcends common human understanding and may appear to the Greek readers of the Gospel like the higher counterpart of that deeply inward state of excitation and that peculiar mode of revelation which they designate in Dionysos as a μαίνεσθαι378. That suspicion of the Jews, based on misunderstanding, concerning the origin of Jesus now appears, as it seems, to be presupposed as belonging to the actual history in 7 53—8 11 379. We have here an interpolation, the author of which in precisely this respect

128

seeks to assist the text of our Evangelist by utilizing “a piece belonging to the oldest evangelical material”380, by letting Jesus, in advance and diverting from such an aberration of thought, give an explicit, immediate testimony to the strictness of his own judging and feeling (8 11)381, whereby, on the other hand, it is striking that the woman person arrested because of adultery herself is treated with a certain mildness382. The apparent trustfulness of Jesus — who with the Evangelist himself is all-seeing and all-knowing wherever the purposes of his self-revelation require it — is all the more difficult to understand, since the adulteress was caught in the very act immediately before. One asks oneself involuntarily whether perhaps and in what sense the interpolator had in mind the manifold adulterous connections in Greek myth. Yet one must indeed reckon with this all the more, since the episode possibly also intends to recall a peculiar classical procedure of priestly justice. It is set on the morning following the last, the “great,” day of the Feast of Tabernacles (7 37), thus falls in the time of the Great Eleusinia (in the month Boedromion: transition from September to October), and thus suggests the outstanding day of the concluding celebration and the court session following it of the Eumolpidae entrusted with the conduct of the jus sacrum of the Eleusinian cult, at which accusations of impiety (ἀσέβεια) could be brought and decided according to unwritten laws383. In the case of adultery as well, the master (διδάσκαλος) Jesus, invoked before the people assembled at the temple as a spiritual legal authority by the scribes and Pharisees, decides over against the appeal to the written Mosaic law (8 5 f.)

129

in a certain sense according to a νόμος ἄγραφος, an overriding and all-encompassing standpoint of moral-religious inwardness384.

130

A remarkable contrast to Jesus’ behavior in the danger of stoning, where the one time he immediately becomes invisible and escapes (8 59), the other time lodges an unsuccessful protest and then slips away and departs (10 31 ff. 39 f.), is formed by his appearance after the betrayal by Judas in the face of the cohort arresting him together with the servants of the high priests and Pharisees. Here he presents himself as

6. the imperiously terrifying one.

“Since he knew everything that was coming upon him,” he went out from the garden, to which he had withdrawn with his disciples, and confronts his pursuers with the question: Whom do you seek? But to their answer: “Jesus the Nazarene,” he says: “I am [he].” At these words “they drew back and fell to the ground” (18 4—6) 385. Reference has been made to analogous cases from the history of Marius and M. Antonius;

131

yet it has rightly been observed that the biblical narrator evidently intends to relate an omnipotence-miracle that heightens the occurrences of 7 44—46. 8 59. 10 39 386, as would in any case also accord with the explicit testimony to his omniscience 387. Nor does it go too far when it has been said that the Johannine Gethsemane scene, with its voluntary surrender to the band of the betrayer that sinks to the ground at the ἐγώ εἰμι, resembles an old painting which only in faded outline still allows the originally depicted reality to be recognized, while the fresh colors with which it has been overpainted—the new, foreign features that have been drawn into the familiar image—are executed just as much by means of poetic imagination as in accordance with the demands of a metaphysical conception of the nature of the Logos-Christ, who casts down the world-power as he will do at the end—"with the breath of his mouth" (II Thess. 2 8) 388. Nevertheless, here too the parallel present in the characterization of Dionysos must not be overlooked. He likewise is "at once a very peaceable, but also a very warlike god 389, who puts whole armies to flight before he has come to close quarters with them 390, and who with his thyrsus can wound just as well as open up sources of abundance or arouse enthusiasm in the soul" 391.

If this trait unmistakably leads back once again, in Jesus as in Dionysos, to the active behavior of the self-revealing divine being, to the manifestation of the peculiar spiritual power of the one who can appear as a zealot, indeed also as a madman,

then those typical parallels naturally join themselves here which concern the divine vocation of both. The most immediate and fundamental is without question: that

7. of the seer.

The fourth Gospel, in the passages where Jesus is explicitly designated as such, does not, on closer inspection, express who he is, but rather what he appears to be in his surroundings, apart from the disciples. Whoever recognizes the one who is the Logos-Christ and "God by nature" only as a prophet judges according to more or less external and therefore inadequate, though in part correct, impressions 392. In this direction it is shown in ch. 9 how a healing miracle determines the healed man to regard Jesus as a (genuine) prophet in the most general sense (v. 17). Earlier, a magnificent feeding miracle had brought a (Galilean) crowd to see in him "the prophet who is to come," i.e., the Messiah (6 14). It is in any case noteworthy that in another instance it is the words (λόγοι) of Jesus which, among the crowd festively assembled at the temple, lead many to the conviction that he is the prophet to be expected as the forerunner of the Messiah (7 40). Nor will it be accidental that the first person who, according to the narrative of our Gospel, explicitly sees in Jesus a prophet is a Samaritan woman (4 19). The impression she has received is so significant that even she already asks herself whether she does not in fact have before her the Messiah, whom the Jew claims to be (v. 26. 29). The cause, however, lies in the utterly incomprehensible, miraculous knowledge that the stranger has revealed—an clairvoyance in external matters of the course of an individual human life—which encourages her, by way of diversion, to approach him with the request for a decision in a very general cultic-religious disputed question (v. 11 ff.). While now in these cases with Jesus

133

the exaltation that emerged right at the beginning of the messianic career—already known from occurrences of Old Testament prophecy (from Moses and Elijah), and according to circumstances passing directly into holy μανία—does not come into play, with Dionysos, when an ordered activity of prophecy is ascribed to him, his very designation as μάντις seems to indicate that this mode of operation is connected with the discussed, regularly recurring states of excitation of the god 393. In accordance with his entire earthly as well as heavenly, divine-and-human double nature, the (Thracian-)Hellenic religion also made the divination associated with his ecstatic and enthusiastic cult a regular form of revelation of the god himself 394. Euripides calls him the seer of the Thracians and places beside him the Thracian Rhesos as προφήτης 395. Teiresias, however, he has declare of him: Μάντις δ' ὁ δαίμων ὅδε· τὸ γὰρ βακχεύσιμον καὶ τὸ μανιώδες μαντικήν πολλήν ἔχει· ὅταν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ σῶμ' ἔλθῃ πολύς, λέγειν τὸ μέλλον τοὺς μεμηνότας ποιεῖ 396. At Delphi Dionysos was the original oracle-god, not Apollo, and indeed in his capacity as underworld god, i.e., as the winterly one, who foresees the approaching time of his renewed revivification and creative activity and through the latter at the same time prepares for the summerly

134

deity Apollo his earthly sphere of action 397. Corresponding to the superiority of the divine mantics of Dionysos over the divination of the mere prophet stands, as a counter-image of a higher order, the superiority of the self-revelation of the Logos-Christ over actual prophecy. But just as in the healing miracles already ascribed to the "prophet" Jesus

8. the physician

comes into appearance 398, so for Greek belief also in Dionysos the vocation of prophecy is united with that of healing 399: in this too he shows his essential kinship with Apollo, who bears the epithet ἰατρόμαντις 400. Dionysos has the cultic names Ἰατρός and Τυιάτης and is venerated as such, by order of the Delphic oracle, in Athens "because of the health-giving effect of wine" 401: "where he enters, there is jubilation and joy, and dead hearts become alive, sick limbs healthy" 402. One is involuntarily reminded that our Evangelist, immediately before the account of the healing of the son of the royal official in Capernaum, which took place from Cana, expressly remarks that this was precisely the place where Jesus had made the water into wine (had performed his characteristic first miracle) (4 46).

135

The Jerusalem healing miracle (5 1 ff.) has already been discussed in detail in another context (pp. 58 ff.). It might incidentally be striking that the healing of lepers, which stands out so strongly in the Synoptics, has been left unconsidered. It has been remarked in this regard that in the cleanly Greek world of Asia Minor, in which the author moved, such ailments were not so much a matter of course as among the Jews in Palestine. This may indeed deserve attention. But that these ailments also did not fit so readily into his symbolism, which moves in the

oppositions of light and darkness, life and death 403, appears all the more questionable since already according to Old Testament conception leprosy precisely represented that disease which, like no other, signified death in the living body and a divine judgment being enacted therein. Nor will the stylistic sensibility of our narrator scarcely come into consideration 404. Whether this would indeed have permitted the inclusion of a tradition of the kind of the “most wonder-loving of all miracle stories,” the story of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (Mark 5 1—20 = Luke 8 28—39; cf. Matt. 8 23—34) 405, may remain doubtful even in

136

view of the far-reaching realism of the narrative John 9 6. 7. But as regards leprosy in particular, it will at least have to be

137

reckoned with that in the Lazarus of the fourth Gospel, according to this narrator’s own presupposition, the place of healing has rather been taken by the raising of one afflicted by precisely this disease 406. We shall have to return to this in another context. Even more than the omission discussed, the complete absence of healings of demoniacs in our Gospel has caused surprise and called forth attempts at explanation 407. It will rightly have been emphasized that the alleged healing of demoniacs by incantation had become something so common in the second century A.D. “that scarcely even the lowest people, much less educated Greeks, could any longer be persuaded thereby of the higher nature of Christ. Demons and exorcisms were, in the time, region, and history of education in which and for which the author of the fourth Gospel wrote, not good form; the whole matter had, as one sees from Lucian, been so brought into disrepute by charlatans and deceivers that it seemed most advisable to keep Jesus remote from this entire domain” 408.

138

More important than any such argument is a more inward justification. Instead of allowing Jesus, through the healing of a demoniac, to reveal his power over the physical powers of destruction of the demonic world, whose existence was no less beyond doubt for the fourth Evangelist than for Jesus himself and the synoptic narrators, his Gospel depicts the struggle with demonic spiritual power as this confronted Jesus, in the ethical-religious conduct of hardened Judaism, with the life and light radiating from the Logos-Christus,—a struggle whose fruitlessness not only demonstrates the incurability of that part of humanity inspired by the devil, but at the same time signifies the self-judgment of this class of people. From this very fact is explained the extraordinary circumstantiality of the narrative of the healing of the man born blind, John 9: it was necessary to make the character of radical Pharisaic opposition vivid. In this form of possession the Evangelist obtains the strongest conceivable contrast to the divine sonship and indwelling of God (unio mystica) proclaimed by himself no less than by Paul and mediated through Jesus himself 409, in which, on the other hand, he may have discerned the revelation-historical antitype of divine possession in the sense of the Dionysian religion 410, as will be illuminated later.

To begin with, the comparison of the typical parallels leads to the vocation attributed to Jesus as

9. the liberator, purifier, and savior.

138

Our Evangelist has Jesus promise a portion of his Jewish audience in Jerusalem, in whom a stirrings of faith in his messiahship had occurred

139

(see above p. 11), conditionally the knowledge of the truth, with the double declaration that precisely this truth would make them free to a freedom which alone is real, because he himself, in his person, indeed the “Son” (of God), brings it about (8 31–36). In terms of its conceptual content, the passage in question is most closely connected with the Pauline and Deuteropauline complex of concepts designating the work of Christ: to redeem (ρύεσθαι, λυτροῦσθαι, ἀπαλλάττειν), to buy free (ἐξαγοράζειν), to rescue (ἐξαιρεῖσθαι), where sometimes the guilt of sin (Rom. 11 26 f.; Tit. 2 14), sometimes bondage to sin with its consequences (death, fear of death, condemnation in the final judgment) comes into view (Rom. 7 24 f.; 8 1; Gal. 1 4; 3 13; 4 5; I Pet. 1 18; Hebr. 2 15; I Thess. 1 10). But even if the soteriological concept ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερόω appearing in John 8 31 ff. is used both by Paul 411 and in Deuteropauline writings 412, it has nevertheless been correctly recognized and with good reason emphasized that in the fourth Evangelist, in that the concept of freedom is linked with that of truth (κατ’ ἐξοχήν), something distinctive is present 413. He understands by the truth that essentially (ὄντως)

140

makes free the reality and perfection of the divine revelation of salvation given in the self-attestation of his person as the Logos, as recognized by the true disciples of Jesus 414; by liberation, redemption from bondage to sin 415, as it can proceed only from the one who is in himself and absolutely free, the “Son” 416. If Jesus presents himself to his opponents as the only true liberator, he lays the theme of purification close to the heart of the circle of his intimates 417. He himself is their foremost purifier. During his messianic vocational life he effects the continual purification of his disciples (15 3), because his entire word-testimony addressed to them (cf. 17 6–12), which maintains them in his fellowship by virtue of their obedience of faith, works toward the removal of all impulses of the selfish, fleshly (3 6) nature, which as such—figuratively speaking—lead to the dying off of the branches of the vine (15 4. 6),—as it were a λουτρόν ἐν ῥήματι without water (cf. Eph. 5 26). The impulse proceeding from Jesus at the same time toward a corresponding self-activity of his own is portrayed by the pericope of the footwashing, John 13 1–15. This reports, as an immediate supplement following the institution of the Lord’s Supper, whose mention and description is omitted on principle (for reasons to be discussed later!), an obligation imposed by Jesus himself, under a symbolic act of purification, most emphatically and exemplarily upon the disciples (v. 4), to a brotherly love that proves and perfects itself in ever-renewed mutual confession and forgiveness. Through the humble removal to be accomplished in this way

141

of that which has disturbed or could destroy the brotherly relationship of love, precisely the specific saving effect of the Lord's Supper-agape, the uniting of the community with its Lord and Master (13 14), is to be secured as it were within itself. The element of purification in question is therefore essential 418, but not as an end in itself, rather as a means to an end, as an indispensable condition of the unified life of love of the community. The influx of life already given in itself, sacramentally realized in the Lord's Supper, together with the mystical unity of spirit between Jesus and his own (17 21. 23) (6 35. 40 f. 47–58), inevitably comes to a standstill if the said purification serving the unity and health of the community of disciples is lacking 419. Perhaps 1 29. 36 should also be placed here. If in 17 19 (ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν) "the Pauline theory stands in the background," then in any case also in 1 29 420, in the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world, there is figuratively thought of the expiating blood of the sacrificial animal: the blood of Jesus, says the author of the First Epistle of John, καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς from all sin (1 7; cf. Hebr. 9 14 and regarding the cleansing "blood of the Lamb" Apoc. 7 14; 5 6. 12. 13 8). Without question the Evangelist, with the image of the sacrificial lamb in 1 29, has at the same time alluded to the lamb-like suffering servant of Yahweh in Isa. 53 7. But when he has the one who appeared in the person of Jesus designated by the Baptist as

142

αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, the choice of αἴρειν, deviating from the ἀναφέρειν of the LXX for נשא (Isa. 53 11. 12), is certainly not accidental. It allows the element of penal substitution as a bearing of burden to recede behind the thought of its effect: the removal of guilt of sin (αἴρειν = to take away according to the prevailing usage of the fourth Gospel) 421. For that very reason, however, it further suggests the conjecture that the resonance of αἴρω with καθαίρω (καθαρίζω) was co-determinative for the author (note the juxtaposition of the two verbs in 15 2). Universally and comprehensively the vocational activity of Jesus is signified when he is designated in 4 42 as the Savior (more precisely: preserver, deliverer, σωτήρ) absolutely. It is not likely that the Evangelist, in using the word σωτήρ, fell back upon the σώζων of the messianic passage Zech. 9 9. Where he cites this passage (12 15) he precisely omits δίκαιος καὶ σώζων (as does Mt. 21 5). This too is probably not accidental. He has immediately thereafter to portray Jesus as one who himself stands in need of salvation: πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης (12 27) 422. It might rather at first glance be striking that of the New Testament instances in which Jesus (Christ) is called σωτήρ, possibly none or hardly any is to be dated before the second century. The horizon and interest of the earliest community are signaled only by the statements belonging to the author ad Theophilum, which in Luke 2 11 hold out in an indeterminate way to the theocratic people deliverance from all that from which the Messiah is to deliver, in Acts 5 31 promise to Israel

143

liberation from sinful nature and guilt of sin, and in Acts 13 23 promise to Israel and the proselytes redemption from guilt of sin and bondage to the law (cf. v. 38). In all other passages Jesus with "σωτήρ" is related to the Christ-believing humanity, whether of Jewish or of Gentile

origin, as the one to whom it owes its salvation: the removal of the impurity of the un-sanctified natural nature of the members of the community Eph. 5 23 (26), the redemption from defiling ἀνομία (sins of all kinds) Tit. 2 13 (14) and from the ban and defilements through false teachings II Pet. 2 20, the rescue from the danger of final-judgment condemnation and loss of eternal life Tit. 3 6 (7); 1 4 (2), from the danger of worldly lust and its consequences: physical corruption and loss of eternal life II Pet. 1 1 (4). 1 1. 3 2. 18 (17). To this very loss reference is made, according to the evidence of John 3 16, also in I John 4 14 (cf. 1 2; 2 25; 3 14 f.; 4 9; 5 11–13. 16. 20). Only Phil. 3 20 still remains in question, according to which Paul hopes from the Lord Jesus Christ as σωτήρ the deliverance from the humiliating mortality of the body (v. 21). The restriction precisely to this element has, in view of the foregoing result, something striking 423. Be that as it may, the late emergence of the usage in question in the New Testament is, according to more recent research, undoubtedly to be explained by the influence of Hellenism 424, whose horizon is indicated with particular clarity by the σωτήρ

144

τοῦ κόσμου of John 4 42; I John 4 14 425. The assumption that the true (ἀληθής) Savior of the world of the former passage should contain, in the sense of the speakers, the same conception as the expected “Messiah” of whom the Samaritan woman speaks (John 4 25) 426, does not accord

145

with the argument, teaching purpose, and course of the entire Samaritan section (see above p. 51 ff.).

To the series of christological characteristics discussed, elemental types were again offered to our Evangelist in the conception and designation of Dionysos. His relation to freedom is expressed above all in his epithet Eleuthereus (occasionally Eleutherieus) 427, which initially designates the god, venerated under this name especially in Athens, as one who came from Attic (originally Boeotian) Eleutherai: this place is said to be his birthplace or his foundation 428; the famous cult there was (perhaps already under Peisistratos?) transferred to Athens 429. But that for understanding the matter and the legend less depends on the place itself than on its name and the concept contained therein is evident already from the fact that according to other tradition the founder of Eleutherai is rather Eleuther (ending -ηρ as in αἰθήρ and others), and that this figure himself again appears as doubled 430. The surest clarification of the nature of Dionysos Eleuthereus is given by the circumstance that the festival of the capital city’s “great Dionysia” was dedicated to him, the most splendid cultic event of the Attic people and state next to the Panathenaea. Of primary importance is that this celebration was “the proper spring festival” (falling on the 9th to 13th of Elaphebolion, thus in March) 431. The fundamental idea was accordingly the heightened and culminating glorification of the powerful deity to whom land and people owed liberation from the bonds of winter with all its hardships and privations 432. A counterpart and a complement to the older

146

Dionysian principal festival, the Anthesteria (see above p. 109), was thus given. The intensification, however, is sufficiently betrayed even in the inconspicuous subsidiary circumstance that at the celebration of the “liberating” Dionysos even prisoners were permitted to participate, whereas at the Pithoigia opening the Anthesteria only the slaves joined their masters 433. Just as the self-accomplished liberation from the fetters of his winter confinement 434, so too the effect which the god, in an outstanding degree at the two principal festivals, exercised “through his strengthening, refreshing, care-breaking gift of wine, then through the inspiring impulses which proceed from this gift and from the entire epiphany of the god at the renewal of the year upon the body and mind of man,” earned him the related epithet of the redeemer (Λύαιος, Λύσιος): οὐδὲν ἄρα οὕτως βεβαίως δεδήσεται, οὐ νόσῳ οὐκ ὀργῇ οὐ τύχῃ οὐδεμιᾷ, ὃ μὴ οἷόν τ’ ἔσται λῦσαι τῷ Διονύσῳ (Aristid. I p. 49) 435. He proves himself in the narrower religious sphere especially thereby to be a redeeming deity that he also frees those participating in his ecstatic nocturnal rites from the painful excess of sacred frenzy into which he has placed them and lets them return to clear, calm self-reflection. He accomplishes in and with this entire process upon those concerned at the same time an act of purification 436, just as elsewhere in natural

147

cases of illness (plagues) he manifests his purifying (καθάρσιος) power 437. Among the “redeeming gods” Dionysos is moreover placed (with the epithet Λυσεύς, Λύσιος) by Dionysian Orphism, which holds out to those who through orphic initiations and orphic life have become “pure and free of all stain” the final deliverance from the tormenting ban of the soul’s imprisonment in the body and of transmigration of souls through this very god. “Purification” becomes ultimate redemption 438. In view of all this it could all the less fail that Dionysos also received the epithet Σωτήρ, since this had become extraordinarily popular and almost a general epiclesis of divine beings (especially of Zeus and Asklepios) 439. Precisely with Dionysos, incidentally, it recedes comparatively into the background 440.

148

Outstanding attention deserves, alongside the illuminated parallel series of conceptions, the image

10. of the shepherd,

as the Evangelist has applied it to Jesus in the tenth chapter in order to give vivid expression to the vocational activity of Jesus, which concerns both the totality of his own and the individual alike443. It will be better here to proceed from what is present on the Hellenic side. Dionysos too is ascribed the role of the shepherd (ποιμήν)442. If in this connection he was conceived as a herdsman of cattle (βουκόλος), this is evidently connected with the fact that from early times he was imagined as a life-creating, exceptionally generative potency in bull-form (βούκερως, ταυρόκερως), and was even directly addressed as a bull (ἄξιε ταῦρε)443: the leap of the imagination from the leading animal of the herd to the shepherd was mythologically not an especially great one444. For the Old- and New-Testamentally determined imagery of the

Evangelist, only the shepherd of sheep and the flock of sheep could be taken into consideration (cf. also alongside the ποιμήν τῶν προβάτων 10 2 the “Lamb of God” 1 29: Jesus sacrificial lamb and again shepherd of sheep). Precisely thereby there resulted effortlessly, harmoniously, and completely the comparative moments with which the preserving and protective governance of Jesus over the community of his believers, the intimate relationship and the tender, self-sacrificing care and guardianship, were to be portrayed445. If one now looks more closely, however, one discovers, in a context where one would least have expected it, that there presented itself incidentally to the Evangelist a further opportunity for elaborating his principal comparative theme from the history of religion. We obtain a particularly characteristic example of the vividness and freedom of movement of the imagination of our writer.

149

In order to demonstrate this, 10 1—5 must above all be brought more sharply into view. The incision and transition marked in v. e (“Jesus spoke this figurative saying to them; but they did not understand the meaning of what he spoke to them”) gives sufficiently clear guidance to regard vv. 1—5 as an independent allegorical piece, which in itself, according to the context, does not require an addition. One cannot say446 that Jesus resolves in v. 7 the riddle-speech about the door of the shepherd in v. 1 ff. by the equation: I am the door to the sheep. The θύρα of vv. 1. 2 is something different from the person of Jesus447. Jesus himself is to be understood as the shepherd of v. 2; and it is precisely thereby that he distinguishes himself from false (thieving and robbing) shepherds448, that he goes in through the door into the sheepfold, but does not climb in by cunning and violence for selfish purposes. Not an explanation of the figurative speech of vv. 1—5 is given by vv. 7—10, but a supplementary variation of the image of the shepherd and the door in its relation to Jesus. With this pair of comparative moments Jesus says two things about himself in contrast to the Pharisees, in order then to present himself in what follows as the good shepherd simply (vv. 11. 14): he is not merely the one who himself, according to his whole being (as the Logos become flesh, full of

150

grace and truth 1 14), enters through the door, that is, by the rightful, God-ordained way, to the sheep of the fold, but also the one through whom, as the door, others, that is, all rightful (God-appointed) shepherds, seek and find entrance to the flock449. If we now pay particular attention to the distinctive mode of expression that the Evangelist applies here, we see ourselves unexpectedly placed before an original interpretation of the epithet of Dionysos Διθύραμβος (Eurip. Bacch. 526) in its typological transference to Jesus. The self-designation of Jesus as the one who enters through the door (ὁ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας, v. 2) so palpably plays together with the preceding contrast of the one who climbs up from elsewhere (ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν, v. 1) as clearly as possible upon that designation of the Hellenic god. We must first recall the ancient interpretation of the latter, according to which it was traced back to the much-discussed double birth of Dionysos (the διμήτωρ, δισσότοκος, etc.)460; Διθύραμβος was supposed, according to grammarians of later antiquity, to mean διά δύο θύρας ἰών. Instead of this, the Evangelist explains the mythical Διθύραμβος more simply as ὁ διὰ θύρας ἀμβαίνων451, whereby he may have thought above all of the annually recurring festive entrance and

procession of the god in Athens at the great Dionysia (see above), at which the performance of the dithyrambic choruses played a principal role452. This (self-devised or traditional?) etymology was all the more valuable to him in that it opened to him the possibility of allowing the parable of Jesus the good shepherd also to echo covertly the Dionysian myth: the θύρα became in the image the door of the sheepfold, while the ἀναβαίνειν offered itself just as readily as a designation of the

151

procedure of the false shepherds453. Jesus himself thus also becomes, as the true Dithyrambos, the antitype of the “shepherd” Dionysos454; and just as the mystai of Dionysos, as

152

likenesses of the god himself, are also called βουκόλοι456, so could, corresponding to the Evangelist’s interpretation of the word, Jesus’ successors, all true shepherds of the spiritual office, be called dithyrambs456.

Particular attention, however, is now also demanded by the intensification contained in 10 11—18 of Jesus’ shepherd allegory from the image of the true shepherd (vv. 1—5; 7—10) to that of the good shepherd simply (ὁ ποιμήν ὁ καλός). Just as he shows himself to be the true (appointed by the Lord of the flock) shepherd before the sheep, because he enters through the door, and before the other shepherds, because he himself forms the door to the sheep for them, so he also attests himself as the unique, ideal shepherd by the fact that he voluntarily goes into death for the sheep and by this path saves the life of the entire flock of God (vv. 11—18). What are meant by the sheep (vv. 7. 16) are those of Israel and of the whole remaining world (cf. 3 16) who are receptive to the Logos-revelation and the Gospel, whom Jesus unites into an all-embracing community of God (ποίμνη), for which he procures eternal life through his sacrificial death (1 29; see above p. 141). The section on the “good shepherd,” when examined more closely, almost reads like an archetypal Vorlage for the image of Christ in early-church sepulchral art, insofar as this art has taken its motifs from Dionysian Orphism (see above p. 97). All works that are certainly of Christian origin and depict Orpheus appear to belong to the earlier period (2nd–4th century); they divide by their content into two classes, of which the first closely attaches itself to the pagan representation of Orpheus among the animals, while the second, approximated to the type of the good shepherd, places alongside the singing Orpheus only one

153

or also several sheep457. For a writer who was as familiar through observation and study with Greek religion as the fourth Evangelist, the figure of the pious singer Orpheus458—most closely related to Dionysos according to his nature and cult—and the extraordinarily multifaceted myth of his descent into Hades and the attempted retrieval of his wife459 could all the less have remained unnoticed, the more nearly it lay to his whole way of thinking to discern therein the anticipatory personification of a divine love that is in principle universally reconciling,

everywhere establishing harmony and cohesion within humanity, and redeeming human beings from the grave and the underworld (John 1 29. 3 16. 4 42. 6 33. 12 47. 17 11. 15. 16. 20—23. 5 28 f.)460. It is especially not to be overlooked that our section stands, so to speak, at the entrance to the cemetery of John 11461. That the New Testament as a whole

154

at least does not stand in the way of the recommended interpretation is shown by a closer inspection of the relevant passages. Since the Old Testament not only frequently represents Yahweh as the shepherd of Israel462 or at least as the owner and lord of this chosen flock463, but also repeatedly compares explicitly the position and activity of the Messiah with that of a shepherd464, the New-Testament finding can at first glance appear downright striking. Less so the fact that God is no longer simply designated as shepherd of his own, but (even where his love and care for individuals is emphasized) appears as owner and lord of the flock465; all the more striking, however, is the sparseness of the application of the shepherd image to Christ466 and the peculiar manner in which it appears467. There can scarcely be any doubt that the few

155

closer parallel passages to the “good shepherd” of John 10 all belong to a later period of New-Testament literature. According to 1 Pet. 2 25 Christ has become the “shepherd of souls,” in that through his exemplary innocent suffering he has turned the unrighteous (initially thinking above all of former Gentiles) away from sin and led them, like wandering sheep, to righteousness, while at the same time taking them into his care (as ἐπίσκοπος). 1 Pet. 5 4 designates the Christ who has entered into glory through suffering (v. 1) more precisely as the “chief shepherd” (ἀρχιποίμην): at his parousia the shepherds serving under him (congregational elders vv. 1. 2; cf. Eph. 4 11), as exemplars of the flock (v. 3), will receive the distinction of an amaranthine crown of rays (nimbus)468.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, celebrates in 13 20 Jesus, who on the basis of his bloody self-sacrifice has been led up from the dead (into heaven) by the God of peace, as the “great shepherd” of the sheep; and the reporter of the “appendix” to the fourth Gospel lets this same Jesus, whom the Evangelist has characterized as the “good shepherd,” on the occasion of the third appearance of the risen one before his “disciples,” transfer the task of a chief shepherd of the universal Church to Peter469. Here finally also joins the eschatological vision of the Apocalyptist, in which the Lamb representing the crucified Messiah470 in the midst of the throne shepherds those reconciled through his sacrificial blood, rescued from the final tribulation, and leads them to the springs of the water of life (Apoc. 7 17)471. If

157

we are on the right path with what has been set forth, then in view of the far-reaching and significant connection with Hellenic antiquity that also comes to light here, there will scarcely remain a need, for the explanation of the “good shepherd,” to adduce additionally the Poimandres of the Hermetic literature472 473.

If we have thus hitherto had before us the shepherd at the head of his flock, there is unbidden set beside it the image

11. of the one who moves about in the midst of the band of his faithful followers and celebrates feasts.

Among the most beloved mythical conceptions and cultic representations of the Greeks belongs the well-known festive procession of Dionysos, which shows him originally and in the main surrounded by the nymphs akin to him in nature, called Mainads on account of their ecstatic excitement (s. o. S. 111). “Even though themselves of divine being (θεαί), the Mainads are nevertheless only the handmaids and companions of the vegetation-god Dionysos, his περίπολοι, who follow him as their leader (Hymn. Hom. 26, 9. Soph. Ant. 1150 Paus. 4, 31, 4). They call upon him as their lord (δέσποτα), invite him to step into their midst, that they may form his thiasos (Eurip. Bacch. 56. 582)” 474. In another connection we have already pointed out that a principal figure of this company is Semele, and have been led to recognize in the portrayal of the mother of Jesus at Cana an allusion precisely to this mother of Dionysos: we had to designate the former as a Semele–Thyone of a higher kind in the sense of the typology of the fourth Evangelist (s. o. S. 111).

158

One might now infer from this that the Evangelist, in further elaboration of the parallel, regarded the mother of Jesus as a principal person of his retinue. That Jesus did not lack a numerous female following is indeed expressly reported already by the Synoptic tradition (Mc. 15 40 f. Mt. 27 55 f.). Luke sketches a picture of the messianic wandering procession embracing both sexes, in which the band of female devotees follows the circle of disciples (8 1—3). Nevertheless, the assumption in question would most probably be mistaken. That it is not supported already by the travel notice in Joh. 2 12 is evident from the fact that together with the mother and the disciples of Jesus his brothers are mentioned (vgl. o. S. 25). But already 2 1.2 shows clearly enough that Jesus with his disciples on the one hand and his mother on the other were, so to speak, two different parties of the festive company. One should also recall, alongside this, with regard to the intimacy of the personal relationship between Jesus and his adherents, the counterpart to the discipleship of the Twelve given in the mixed familial circle of friends at Bethany. It may in fact even be asked whether among the women converted by Jesus to faith in his messianic dignity the Samaritan woman does not deserve the palm. The mother of Jesus does indeed bring it about that the disciples are strengthened in the faith they had shortly before attained at Jesus’ word (1 37—51) by a particularly striking first miracle-sign 475. In contrast to this, however, the Samaritan woman, under the impression of Jesus’ words, by her stimulating testimony about him, helps a great number of her compatriots to faith in him, without any miracle being required (vgl. 20 29)! And it is certainly no accident that the only word of the mother of Jesus to her son that the Evangelist records consists in the hint: “They have no wine”!, whereas the Samaritan woman, in a long conversation, is permitted to make her confession of faith before Jesus and, through his profound answers, to receive a new religious orientation. In general it will certainly have to be said:

159

the salvation-historical position and ministry of the closed circle of disciples is an orderly, steady one, has, as it were, an official character (s. o. S. 1. 48 f.); that of the mother of Jesus as well as of his other female confidants appears more as a private one, occurring occasionally and incidentally, which, however, does not exclude that intervention on their part also at times acquires significance. We shall later have to return to these female figures from another side.

In view of all this, however, it can be almost even less doubtful that the typology of our Evangelist intends to bring before view in the band of disciples of the Twelve accompanying Jesus throughout his entire messianic vocational activity the salvation-historically ideal counterpart of the Dionysian thiasos. The events in which Dionysos makes his entry with his retinue among his worshippers are celebrated for his own sake. Apart from the “trieteric” festivals (taking place every second year; s. o. S. 113) 476, they are carried out particularly fully and splendidly in the annual cycle of the Attic Dionysia. These were “for the most part Attic–Ionian national festivals, which were therefore celebrated not only in Athens but also among the kindred peoples on the islands and in Asia. They are in part the harvest festivals of autumn and winter, in part the festivals of the coming spring and finally of spring entering in its full delight and glory” 477. What corresponds to this in our New Testament field of vision? Whoever comes to the fourth Evangelist from the Synoptic tradition will first notice that, despite the relatively extraordinarily broad space that the discourses occupy here, not only are numerous changes of location of Jesus likewise reported, but also the accompaniment by the disciples is almost throughout expressly mentioned 478. What must strike one,

160

however, is that this Evangelist, in contrast to the single festival celebration in the Synoptics 479, knows how to tell of a larger number of festivities that Jesus attended, and which (with the exception of a wedding) took place as religious celebrations in Jerusalem, in such a way that the total number of these, reckoned from the beginning of the public messianic activity at Cana, falls within the period of three successive years (a τριετία), but in itself spans precisely two full years—the time from one Passover to the second following one. Reference must here be made to the already discussed, strongly prominent significance of the trieteris in Dionysian myth and cult (as of the number three in general) (S. 113 f.). At the same time, however, it also becomes evident how unjustified and harmful it has been that the wording of Joh. 6 4, unanimously attested by the manuscripts and the translations—ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων—has been objected to and that the more precise temporal determination contained therein, or the whole verse, has been deleted by some or at least disregarded 480. The ἐγγὺς

161

τὸ πάσχα is all the less open to objection, since, viewed both forward and backward, it fits in just as naturally and in accordance with probability 481. This applies especially also with regard to the inner, substantive relation between this time indication and the “anticipated doctrinal

passage” 6 51—63, which remains incomprehensible without assuming an allusion to the Eucharistic rite and thus to the day “before the Passover feast” (13 1. 2) 482.

162

The fullness of allusions and relations backward and forward, characteristically acknowledged for the fourth Gospel, should here in particular have urged caution in textual criticism. The journeys of Jesus and his disciples to Jerusalem have at times also been called messianic campaigns of conquest 483. In doing so one is inevitably reminded of the so differently constituted “campaigns of conquest” which the (Lydian) Dionysos carries out as far as Phrygia, Persia, Bactria, Media, and Arabia (Eurip. Bacch. 13—16), in a triumphal procession that later legend (after Alexander M.) extends as far as India 484. What is involved here, as also elsewhere 485, is the real or supposed spread of the Dionysian cult and the culture associated with it. A similarly wide horizon opens itself to the religious and ethical community of interests of the peoples created by Jesus (Joh. 12 20—32). In contrast, however, to the band that follows the Greek god in ecstatic enthusiasm and sensual intoxication, the New Testament thiasos of Jesus already receives from the experience of Cana an intimation of what a wholly different spirit, what different task and joy of life, is destined for it 486.

As Jesus, at his first visit to a festival celebration, performs his first sign-miracle as proof of his divine commission and prophetic endowment, so he accomplishes his last and greatest on the final festival journey, in Bethany near Jerusalem. Here he reveals his divine sonship and Logos-glory (11 40—42) as

12. the one who calls a deceased person back from grave and underworld into life.

We are thus placed not only before the greatest “sign” of Jesus, but at the same time before the one whose deeper and complete understanding presents the greatest difficulties.

163

That this is indeed the case has been shown so frequently and in general so convincingly in recent and most recent times that in our context and for our purpose a renewed exposition is unnecessary 487. Nevertheless, it may still be asked today whether the — in part at any rate fully justified — method of allegorical interpretation of the Lazarus resurrection narrative, on the basis of the assumption of a “religious poem,” makes it possible to solve the riddle in the proper sense of the word and completely 488. At first glance, the perspective under which we have hitherto considered the entirety of the fourth Gospel — the typological parallel with the Dionysian faith — also seems not to provide any new elements or points of support. On the other hand, however, an obtrusive peculiar observation now compels anyone who has become familiar with the mode of thought and expression, with the world of images of natural religion, to investigate our pericope from a mythological point of view 489.

It is striking that in the fourth Evangelist we not only learn the name of the one on whom the miracle is performed 490, but that this name too, under mythological

164

presupposition, displays a significance that casts a surprising history-of-religions light on the described event and places name and matter into a larger context of things of like kind. The task of demonstrating this situation makes a further excavation unavoidable.

In order to obtain as secure a point of departure as possible, we must direct our attention first of all to the sister-pair of Lazarus, whose names are fortunately likewise communicated to us. The gaze falls above all on Martha, who “receives the instruction of Jesus and stands entirely in the foreground” 491. There can be no doubt that this is one and the same person as the namesake in Lc. 10 38—42. The behavior of the two sisters in the fourth Gospel corresponds to the picture in Luke: “Martha the active, busy one, Mary the quiet, contemplative one.” The busyness of Martha is, according to Luke, even so intensified in the service of Jesus that the honored guest combines a rebuke with his acknowledgment. We thus have before us a picture to which the personifying imagination of the natural religion of the Aryan Indians in the Rigveda (II 38, 4) provides a remarkable parallel through the poetic depiction of an everyday process, one that is suited to provide an initial orientation for our question. The verse in question is found in a hymn that glorifies the god Savitar, whose name (= stimulator, impeller) indicates that he keeps the clockwork of nature in motion and for this purpose especially effects the regular alternation of day and night (cf. especially Rigv. I 110, 1 ff.). The verse reads, in an as exact a translation as possible:

> “She rolled together her weaving, the weaver woman,
> the craftsman broke off his work in the midst of it;
> she sprang up, separating the times of day,
> Aramati, when the god Savitar arrived” 492.

165

It is initially clearly evident that the “weaver woman” rolls up her own fabric (“that which is stretched out”), that this drawing-in takes place in the evening, and that at the same time the “craftsman,” interrupting his work, sets aside his handiwork. This craftsman, however, is certainly the same Savitar who in the second hemistich appears not as evening god but as he does at sunrise. On the other hand, the unmistakable parallelism of the verse-halves requires, before the naming of Savitar, a female subject: the name of a divine being that (likewise from earliest times) has been designated as the weaver, even if this is only a by-name. Such is offered by the word *aramati*, which is to be explained from *a-j-rāmati* (see below) and aptly characterizes the morning and evening dawn (Usas, Eos), conceived as a unity, as the “restlessly” active one, tireless and unfailing, who in the early morning presents herself for her daily work (cf. Rigv. I 92, 3). She produces her weaving with her colorful threads of light (cf. VII 75, 3; 78, 1), which throughout the day are outshone by Savitar’s sunlight spreading over the whole sky, but become visible again in the evening 493. That she performs her work as the zealously serving companion of the god is pictorially suggested by her springing up at his arrival. She is also the one who, even before his rising, separates day and night as the genius of twilight (cf. VII 81, 1—4); she clears the way for the sun (I 113, 16) 494.

166

We seem not to encounter this (Usas-)Aramati in the Rigveda only here. In V 43, 6, where Agni, the god of sacrificial fire, is asked to bring Aramati to the Soma-drink 495, a number of factors speak in favor of this. Aramati is here expressly presented as a divine woman or maiden (*gnā devī*) and is thus placed among those personifications to which “from earliest times phenomena had led that were associated with the idea of female charm and above all maternal fertility,” and of which none has been sung with such preference as Usas, the dawn 496. The goddess is summoned at the named place in a longer sequence of invoked deities right in the middle, between Indra and the Aśvins (morning gods). She is called, as one shining far and wide, powerful and beneficent, *mahi*; likewise Usas (I 48,

167

14.16; IV 14, 3; VII 81, 4; VIII 9, 17. 19. 31) 497. Essentially equivalent is the added *bṛhatī*, which likewise applies to Usas (I 113, 19; 123, 2; V 80, 1.2; cf. X 36, 1; 110, 6; IX 5, 6). The additionally appearing *ṛtajñā*, which celebrates Aramati as one who knows and observes the right time and the right work in her sphere, recalls that according to IV 51, 8 the dawns awaken and move forth from the seat of *ṛta* (the personified [?] law of nature and world) 498. Finally, we shall also have to think of the (Usas-)Aramati in VII 36, 8. She is here too listed as a *mahi* among other gods; and if alongside Pūṣan, the double of the Greek psychopomp Hermes, who professionally wanders back and forth between heaven and earth and receives his offerings morning and evening, Bhaga is also associated with her, then it is also relevant here that this deity, like Pūṣan, belongs to the morning gods, and in particular that I 123, 5 designates Bhaga as the brother of Usas 499.

The situation is different in Rigv. X 92, where we encounter a *mahi aramati* in vv. 4 and 5. She is named in v. 4 following heaven and the expanse of space and immediately before Indra, Mithra, Varuna, and other gods; and v. 5 describes how,

168

with the thunderstorm, the streams of heaven pass over her, moistening everything 500. Here the earth is clearly meant, and for similar reasons as Usas (Eos) it bears the name Aramati. This is supported not only by the fact that the earth as a purely material component of the world is called *mahi* substantively in X 74, 4; 77, 4, adjectivally in I 131, 1.4; I 164, 33; III 30, 9; VIII 40, 4; X 60, 9; 85, 2; 119, 8, and is otherwise preferably described as wide-spreading (*urvī* etc.), but above all by the fact that from earliest times it has been conceived as a mother who tirelessly provides and works for the sustenance of her children (X 74, 4; V 42, 16) 501. Her pure goodness is praised in VI 51, 5. With tender feeling her motherhood is invoked especially at burials (X 18, 10 ff.) 502.

In the passages discussed we are dealing with an adjective derived from the root *ram* (to rest), which in its religious usage could variously be employed as a poetic epithet 503. The same word-form, however, could under the influence of cult from the outset suggest another

interpretation, which resulted from the explanation from *āram* and *mati*. The former word (accusative used only adverbially) contains the concept of meeting, readiness, compliance 504; the latter denotes — in the present case — religious reflection, as well as its expression in prayer. From this three further Vedic passages are illuminated, which speak of the religious disposition personified as a divine being, manifested in devotion, willingness to sacrifice, and prayer, under the name Aramati. Rigv. VII 34, 21 addresses this genius of piety as one who seeks goods from

169

the gods for the supplicant and sacrificer (*vasūyu*) 505. X 64, 15 in this sense calls her the highly praiseworthy (*panīyasī*). According to VII 1, 6, however, her essence and activity stand in particularly close relation to Agni, who is worshipped with offerings in the evening and morning.

If one keeps in mind that even in the Veda compliance on the divine as well as human side is expressly presupposed in cult, as for example the exhortation to the sacrificial fire in VI 4, 1 attests, then it is entirely understandable when Aramati in VII 42, 3 is the personified gracious devotion and attentiveness of the gods toward the supplicant and sacrificer — that is, what in VIII 31, 12 is designated simply as the divine disposition (*devasya manas*) 506. A secure point of reference for a more precise determination of the Aramati invoked also in the latter passage is lacking 507.

Further valuable light is cast upon the history that the word *aramati* displays in the religion of the Aryan Indians from the Avesta religion of the closely related Aryans of Iran. Since the oldest Aryan faith in the Avesta did not undergo a kind of “reformation,” as it has been very misleadingly called, but rather experienced a development that in principle strove for a spiritualization and moralization of the worldview, setting “in place of deified natural beings abstract, more or less personified concepts” under the traditional authority of

170

Zarathustra, the appearance of the deified morning and evening dawn is from the outset not to be expected in the numerous passages in which the Avesta likewise celebrates Aramati (more precisely Aremati; see below) 508. All the more firmly established, however, is the fact that the Aremati belonging to the highest deities after Ahura, the Amesha Spentas, is originally one and the same being as that Vedic Aramati which represents the personification of idealized piety 509, just as the etymology of the name is identical on both sides 510. There can be all the less doubt about this since, according to the evidence of the Gāthā collection of the Avesta, the religion of Iran also still knows and venerates an Aremati that arose from the deifying personification of the earth 511 and thus stands alongside the Aramati of the Vedic pantheon that signifies the same thing. In the Avesta religion, too, this opposing double sense of one and the same mythical name is explained by the fact that the word-form *aramati* in reality has two derivations, of which one, as in the Veda, deriving from *ram* (= to rest, to pause), yielded the concept of tireless activity 512. Given this situation, it could not but happen that

171

as a result of the homonymy of fundamentally different mythical beings, confusion as well as identification and manifold kinds of obscurity arose, as is shown in the Avesta even more unfavorably than in the Veda 513. The most important point of view for the result of our comparison, however, is that according to the Avesta as according to the Veda, under the common name Aramati (Aremati, Ārmati), we obtain two mythical types of being that form an opposition without excluding one another, rather in such a way that they mutually complement one another: on the one hand the ideal of religious life with its inwardness and cultic devotion, on the other hand the archetypal fulfillment of earthly vocation carried out in zealous activity.

This typical pair of opposites recalls so strongly and involuntarily the characterization of the two sisters in Lc. 10 38—42 and Joh. 11 and 12 in their behavior toward Jesus514 (s. o. S. 164) that, upon unbiased consideration of the question, one can hardly avoid asking whether, in the end, despite all contrary appearance, an originally mythical element of the tradition does not likewise enter in with those New Testament figures. It must not be overlooked that here Martha steps into the place of Aramati, and that already the name strangely enough echoes that other, very ancient one widespread in the Orient515. If

172

we now look more closely, we shall indeed be immediately referred away from the image of the productive Mother Earth to the notion of her namesake, the morning dawn that tirelessly, day after day, takes up its work anew at the earliest hour, as we encountered it already in the first, probably most archaic Rigvedic passage. There Aramati was still a synthesis of the morning and the evening dawn (more precisely of the rising and the setting daylight): in the morning she at once begins her weaving activity, in the evening she brings it again to an end; in doing so she works wholly in the service of the aforementioned all-quickening and all-governing god of light, who stands “in an especially close relationship” to the sun516. If the sister-pair Martha–Mary has a mythical substratum, then the former is with full certainty to be addressed as the counterpart of the morning dawn, the latter as that of the evening dawn517. Accordingly, in the event of Joh. 11, Jesus, the light of the world (812), first sees Mary only after a good while, after Martha has set out to receive him, and this circumstance is expressly emphasized (11 20. 28 ff.). Almost immediately thereafter, however, Jesus himself brings Mary, through the manner in which he expresses himself concerning the anointing of his feet by the humble and fervent worshipper, into an explicit special relationship to the sunset of his near-approaching disappearance in the night of death (12 7.8. 119 f. 14 19. 1616). In passing, it need only be pointed out in addition that ointment is a mythically favored

173

image of (colored) light and in the Rigveda serves several times for the depiction of the Usas (VII 78, 1· I 113,14. 124, 8).

First of all, the question will have to be asked whether and how the assumption of a mythical basic stock is supported precisely also in the figure of Martha's sister Mary by related pieces of tradition in the evangelical story. Leaving aside for the moment the most obvious parallel, a seemingly second and almost contemporary anointing in Bethany reported by Mark and Matthew (Mc. 143= Mt. 26.6), the quite compelling bringing in of the puzzlingly similar narrative of the sinful woman in Lc. 7 36—50 can only contribute to strengthening us in the pursuit of the path we have taken. The easily answerable question concerning the purpose of the inclusion of this pericope by the third Evangelist does not further concern our investigation518. The decisive point now lies in the question: is the situation described—if not outright impossible, then nevertheless hardly conceivable even in view of Lc. 7 29.34. Mt. 1119. 21 31. Mc. 2 15, already with regard to prevailing social norms519—certainly unequivocal, or does it too, upon sharper consideration, still allow an originally mythical substratum to shine through? Here again the Veda, passing over from the terrestrial to the meteorological event, provides significant parallels. The Usas520 appears as the young woman of the sun-god (Rigv. VII 75, 5) or his bridal beloved (I 123, 10. 11, cf. 3). Alongside this, however, she repeatedly shows herself as the paramour devoted to this god in faithful attachment; thus when it is said figuratively (VII 76, 3 f.):

"Many were these day-lights that stand eastward at the rising of the sun, from where, Usas, like a paramour approaching, you appeared, as though you did not wish to go away again521. They were there, table-companions of the gods—the piously disposed seers of ancient times522."

> Numerous were these day-lights,
> that stand eastward at the rising of the sun,
> from where, Usas, like a lover approaching, you
> appeared, as though you did not wish to go away again521.
> They were there as table-companions of the gods —
> the piously minded seers of ancient times522.

Elsewhere she is depicted as the seductively smiling and radiant one who adorns herself with a variegated garment like the dancer (I 92,6.11.4). These too are products of imagination that, self-evidently, were not only possible or present in ancient India; and it is not necessary to let the gaze wander still further to what the religious nature-poetry of other peoples of antiquity produced. For the illumination, however, of what New Testament religion in many ways—sit venia verbo—has unconsciously and unawares taken over from motifs of nature religion and put in its place, precisely our narrative in Lc. 7 furnishes an interesting exemplary case. That under these circumstances it is also not a matter of an event of historical character emerges further from another consideration. According to the tradition and the view shared by the Evangelist, the Simon in whose house the anointing of Jesus by the "sinner" (7 37. 39. 47 f.) took place would have been a Pharisee (פּ־ישׁ, one of the פּרישׁ ' א in the usual sense) (v. 36. 39). But just as we otherwise learn nothing about him, so it also remains completely obscure what kind of "city" it was in which he lived (v. 37). Not only the name Simon, however, but no less the designation of the man as a Pharisee is suited to give clarification if the narrative has a mythical basic layer that somehow related to the twilight of the (morning and evening) dawn. The Greek name-form

Σίμων rests in Luke, as otherwise commonly, on Hebr. שמעין (“hearing,” “obedience”), but immediately recalls the god Sraosa (“hearing,” “obedience”), whom we already know sufficiently from the Avesta as the personification of attentive, dutiful fulfillment of all religious obligations and accordingly as god of the early

175

light523. Φαριααΐος, however, explains itself, drawn into this complex of ideas, from an original פריש (spreading out), since פרש (cf. Aram. פרם) is said in particular also of light and thus specifically also of the dawn (Joel 2 2 524(כשחר. That in this connection the “city” of the “Pharisee Simon” cannot have been Jerusalem, but only—again speaking figuratively!—a πόλις έπουράνιος (of another kind than that of Hebr. 12 22), is self-evident525. Finally, as concerns the relationship of the presentation of the evangelical counterpart of the mythical evening dawn in Lc. 7 to that in Joh. 11 and 12, one readily recognizes that in Luke, as a consequence of the relocation of the event to a much earlier point in time, the prophetically burial-directed ultimate purpose of the anointing has fallen away. That nonetheless the anointer of Lc. 7 must originally have had something in common with the Mary of Bethany precisely in her capacity as a sinner is betrayed still by the circumstance that the latter too anoints not the head526, but only the feet of the one honored. If the former is nevertheless distinguished from Mary as an anonymous third person, this happened because the third Evangelist, in accordance with one of his well-known, strongly prominent character traits, wishes to bring the sister of Martha to honor as a converted sinner, which subsequently—in Lc. 10 38—42—goes so far that Mary is even idealized to a higher degree than according to Joh. 11 and 12 527.

176

At this point it may perhaps be best also to draw attention to a puzzling pair of names of male figures whom our fourth Evangelist likewise has brought into immediate relationship with the burial of Jesus: Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus (19 38—42). Upon these two figures as well, of whom mention has already been made (S. 19 f.), a surprising light falls from what has been shown thus far. Concerning Joseph all the Evangelists report strikingly in agreement: the tradition is evidently here relatively old. Nicodemus, by contrast, is a figure appearing only in the fourth Gospel and unmistakably already in Joh. 3 of specifically “Johannine” stamp. If one compares the two men who so zealously and self-sacrificingly endeavor to render Jesus the last honor, and of whom the one, Nicodemus, is again a “Pharisee,” one gains the impression that they represent kindred phenomena: the one as the other has a believing, pious inclination toward Jesus, but is and remains a timid man who does not get beyond the struggle for clear knowledge and firm conviction and does not venture the confession into the full daylight of publicity (19 38 f.). They stir themselves in the twilight and at the onset of night. But precisely thereby they call analogous phenomena of mythology all the more vividly to mind, since also their names and perhaps in addition their number as a pair point in that direction. We are especially accustomed to the appearance in pairs with deities of rising and setting light “in its transition from and to darkness”528, as for example with the Indian Asvins, the Greek and Roman Dioscuri529. As for the names themselves,

177

their primary religion-historical, nature-symbolic sense can, in connection with our previous results, be ascertained without great difficulty. In order to recognize Joseph of Arimathea, one must first bear in mind that he, whom his name Joseph interprets as the “increasing” one, performs the narrated work of piety at the time of the entrance of the (Paschal) full-moon phase, and that precisely in this phase the rising of the moon coincides with sunset530. Indeed, it is as though even in the indication of origin άπο Άριμαffacag the name Aremati (Ärmati) were echoed (s. S. 169 f.). The name of Nicodemus531, however, in accordance with all this, hardly allows anything else to be seen in it, figuratively grasped, than a personification of the sleep-inducing twilight light, with cause and effect conceived together. As the “subduer of the people” he recalls the δπνος πανδαμάτωρ of the Greeks (Hom. Il. 24,5. Od. 9, 373) and the depiction of the magical power of the god of sleep in the Veda532. From this it also explains itself that, on the one hand, in the mythical basis of Joh. 19 38—42, where it is a matter of service to one who has fallen asleep, he could become the helper of

178

the moon533, and, on the other hand, as Joh. 31 ff. immediately shows, could be suited to become the allegorical representative of a part of the people of Jesus. We may call him, in the sense of the Evangelist, an Endymion-type of a spiritual kind534. He embodies the vanishing minority of the “spokesmen of the Sanhedrin” who persist over against Jesus in twilight and sleepy indecision, and thereby forms a relative contrast to the overwhelming majority spiritually blind from birth and not to be converted to faith even by the greatest miracle, to which the man blind from birth of ch. 9, healed by such a miracle and brought to sight both bodily and spiritually, points as a shaming popular exception535.

A further survey — and it must not be omitted! — can only once again lead to confirmation of the result thus far obtained by our mythological explanatory attempt, since alongside other foreign materials taken up and reworked from the oldest Christian tradition in the Gospel literature, we are, according to all indications, dealing with an entire cycle of variations of the morning- and evening-dawn theme. It will even be necessary to ask whether the field of vision must not be extended still further into the Old Testament domain,

179

if the required orientation is to be achieved. To begin with, it is clear that the investigation of the nature of Mary of Bethany cannot be brought to completion without answering the question what is the situation with Mary Magdalene536. This already follows from the fact that, for the fourth Evangelist, the one Mary is just as definitively and emphatically brought into relation with the (death and) burial of Jesus (see above) as the other with the (death and) resurrection of the same (19 25. 20 1.2.11—18). The desired clarification is provided by the circumstance that, according to ch. 20, Jesus appears first to the Magdalene, thus even before Peter and the “other disciple, whom he loved” (cf. Mt. 28 9.10), after she had already gone to the tomb early, while it was still dark. This shows that here, insofar as once again the conception of a natural

process forms the overall basis of the events described, we have before us, under the name Mary, the “early light of the dawning day” that precedes sunrise537, which presses toward the conclusion that, just as the discussed mythical name Aramati in the Aryan-Indian religion of the Veda, so also the name Mary originally designated just as much the morning as the evening change of light (cf. with usas — evening glow Rigv. X 127, 3. 7). Quite unforcedly, this also renders intelligible the entirely isolated notice in Lc. 82, according to which seven demons had gone out of Mary, who is called Magdalene (cf. Mc. 16 9). We readily guess that, on the soil of natural religion, this kind of spirits represented the power of nocturnal darkness, that their number seven corresponded antithetically to the number seven of the highest gods of the heavenly

180

light (cf. the ādityas of the Vedic religion), and that the expulsion must have been the work of the sun, of whose seven rays repeated mention is even made in the Veda (Rigv. VIII 61, 16. Atharv. VII 107)538, and as whose counterpart Jesus is also otherwise regarded in the New Testament (cf. especially above p. 405). Perhaps something of substantive value can also be gleaned from the epithet that makes Mary into the Magdalene. That any secure basis is lacking here for a derivation from Magdala = el Megdel has been sufficiently recognized and conceded. It will, according to all appearances, turn out that the geographical interpretation, however old it may be, is secondary539. In this case as well we must proceed from the concept contained in the verbal stem of the epithet in question. By going back to the participle of the intensive stem of gdl, one would obtain the meaning: curl-twister, hair-curler540. The Magdalene would then presumably be placed alongside Mary of Bethany and the anonymous “sinner,” and a feature would enter that complements the role which the hair plays in these two (Joh. 11 2. 12 3. Lc. 7 38)541. Although this explanation is recommended by Aramaic usage with gdl, it may nevertheless be asked

181

whether, corresponding to the conception of the morning dawn personified in the Magdalene (see above), one should not rather, following the Arabic and Ethiopic semantic development of the verb gdl542, adopt the designation of this Mary as the combative one. She would then originally be the genius of the struggling daylight, possessed during the night by the demons of darkness, which is freed by the sun and is the very first to behold the risen day-star. This is all the more to be reckoned with since the Old Testament “Miriam” also displays this character, as indeed her name already makes resistance, defending oneself (מרה), into her essence543. Finally,

182

Joh. 19 25 once more brings us back to Mary Magdalene, where together with the “Mary of Clopas” she forms one

183

of the two pairs of women who stand at the cross of Jesus. Who this Clopas-Mary was in historical reality cannot be determined. Her juxtaposition with the Magdalene, according to the foregoing, much rather suggests with all probability once again the mythical personification of a natural phenomenon, namely that of the evening dawn most closely related to Eos (see above p. 179 and on the sister-pair Martha–Mary p. 172). In that direction points, according to all indications, also the at first sight incomprehensible designation ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, which for the Evangelist himself was probably a traditionally given one and not further to be explained. In order to grasp its meaning, we must recall one of the most salient features of the Eos myth, while at the same time noting that the goddess in post-Homeric conception, like Helios, traverses the heavenly course up to the midpoint or even entirely and sets in the evening sky544, and thus was even directly taken as the day545. This applies in particular to her relationship with Tithonos and Kephalos, whom she took to herself as husbands by abduction. One has rightly recognized in Tithonos a personification of sunlight, in Kephalos a condensation of the light of the star-world546. This suggests that Joh. 19 25b in its mythical basis corresponds to the doubled natural phenomenon: the evening dawn (the Mary of Clopas) abducts (takes to itself and lets disappear with itself) the sunlight, the morning dawn (Mary Magdalene) abducts the starlight. The common characteristic of the two phenomena is thus expressed in the name of the former, after the latter had already been characterized synoptically from another side by her special epithet. Classical myth too has for the action in question, the abduction, the fixed designation ἁρπάζειν (cf. ἀνήρπασεν Eurip. Hippol. 454). This, however, suggests the further conclusion that the Clopas-name of our passage originally belonged to a male deity who

was fundamentally akin to the two female light-beings, and this applies to Hermes like no other figure of the Hellenic pantheon. He is the professional intermediary who moves between heaven, earth, and underworld, between the inhabitants of the world of light (above all Zeus) and the denizens of the nocturnal realm of shadows, and thus stands in the closest relation to the alternation of day and night, to the twilight of dawn and dusk (ψυχαγωγός, ψυχοπομπός). As such he is “present everywhere where something is to be carried out cunningly and achieved by subtle practices, to steal, to snatch away, to abduct, for which kind of activity the Greeks had the characteristic expression κλέπτειν,” and he bears the epithets κλέπτης, κλεψίφρων547. To all this must be added that Kephalos, abducted by Eos, was a son of Hermes548, so that Eos also became the daughter-in-law of Hermes. With this we would indeed have what the Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ represents when viewed from the standpoint of the history of religion549.

If we now turn to the synoptic narrative, previously set aside, of the anointing of Jesus by an unnamed woman in the house of Simon the leper in Bethany (Mc. 14 3—9. Mt. 26 6—13; see above p. 173), we will at the same time find ourselves immediately confronted with the main task, the solution of the riddle of the raising of Lazarus. To begin with, it is clear that although the anointing carried out by the synoptic anonymous woman, like that of Mary in Joh. 12, falls in the evening time and in its manner has prophetic significance, the characterization of the unnamed woman differs from that of Mary (she anoints not the feet but the head, see above), and that in particular,

185

with the leprosy of the host, a new element enters the complex of ideas occupying us, which calls for explanation. The path to answering these further mythological riddles is fortunately already indicated to us by the fact that, in the tradition of the fourth Gospel, the brother of Martha and Mary appears alongside the leper of Bethany as one severely afflicted from the same hometown. Comparison of the two is prompted not only by the name of the latter: Lazarus (= Eleazar, “God helps,” probably also in the sense of divine compassion) and the place-name Bethany (= house of the wretched — whoever these wretched ones may originally have been), but also by the circumstance that in the Lukan parable of the rich man (16 19—31) the poor man not only again bears the name Lazarus but is also presented as one afflicted with ulcerous wounds (εἰλκωμένος), to which it should be noted that in Job 2 7 ἕλκος also appears applied to leprous sores. Of these three related figures, the Bethany Lazarus is brought most into the light by the narrative in Joh. 11 and is therefore determinable in the first instance. What has already been shown (pp. 171 f.) permits the supposition that, mythically, the arrival of Jesus at the two sisters and the miracle he performed in Bethany corresponded to a natural process which, in the springtime preceding the last week before Passover (12 1), fell into the period of one day to the next following. Who else could well be the primal type, sprung from the imagination of natural religion, of the deceased recalled to life by Jesus, the brother of Martha and Mary, than the moon, rekindled to new shining at the time in question after its disappearance?550. In this case it is precisely the spring new moon that provides the type: the miracle of Jesus’ raising of Lazarus is intended, in the sense of our Evangelist, to present itself as immediately and conspicuously as possible

186

as an announcement and portent of the Easter miracle of revivification (likewise effected by his own power)551 to be accomplished in himself552. Moreover, the manner in which the Evangelist describes the emergence of the newly revived Lazarus from the darkness of the tomb (11 44: the dead man came out, his feet and hands bound with wrappings, and his face wrapped with a cloth) unmistakably recalls the first appearance of the new moon, which does not allow the greater part of its body to be seen553. To this must be added that the mythical predecessor of Lazarus of Bethany is not the only personification of the moon that we encounter in the Gospels. The rich man and the “poor” Lazarus of the already cited Lukan parable are also grounded in the mythical conception of sun and moon. The compensatory reversal of fate that befalls the two is originally nothing other than the alternation of the summer and winter positions of the moon in relation to the sun: the low position of the former in summer is followed, during the low position of the sun in winter, by the elevation of the lunar path. With the humiliation of the one, the elevation of the other occurs simultaneously; note how Lc. 16 22 reports the death of the rich man and that of the poor man together554. Even if one is not

187

further prompted, in the case of the “poor” Lazarus, to ask what kind of skin disease his affliction constitutes555, in the case of the Lazarus of Bethany there is at least some ground for the

supposition that a form of leprosy is meant (see above p. 137)556. This is also supported by the remaining figure of our evangelical pictorial cycle: Simon “the leper” of Bethany. Jesus’ lodging in the house of this acquaintance occurs, according to Mc. 14 1, two days before the πάσχα and the ἄζυμα, that is, on the 13th of Nisan557, thus shortly before the Easter full-moon phase. According to all indications, this more precise temporal determination sheds light on the name of the host and on his affliction at the same time: the Hellenized Hebrew designation Σίμων, recalling names like Κίμων, seems in this case to have been chosen because it echoes the Greek σιμός = “bent inward; arched and rising upward.” It thereby already reveals in itself that originally the crescent-shaped or horn-formed moon was meant. This also makes immediately intelligible how it comes about that the bearer of the name could simultaneously be designated as the leper: the still darkened part of the disk could be regarded as pathologically disfigured. From this there further results

188

also the underlying mythical sense of the double place-designation: the narrated experience of Jesus befalls him “in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper.” In the latter respect it is evidently one and the same locality, characterized only from two different sides or appearances: in the original mythical conception it is the evening sky, which at sunset simultaneously shows in the east the nearly full moon and opposite it the evening dawn. The anointing woman of Mc. 14 3 (Mt. 26 7) is precisely the “wretched one” of Bethany; she could be so named already because she is the setting heavenly glow, falling prey to suppression by the nocturnal darkness, just as elsewhere, with regard to the moon, in view of the continually recurring, attention- and imagination-challenging darkening it undergoes, the religious-poetic language could easily highlight this peculiarity by means of the name Lazarus. That also the Mary who, in the fourth Gospel, stands over against the “woman” of Bethany of the first and second Evangelists, thus like the latter the evening dawn (see above p. 172), originally comes into consideration in the first instance when Lazarus and Bethany are mentioned, is still clearly indicated by Joh. 11 1 (cf. v. 5). In the most immediate and fullest sense, it is precisely the nature and function of Mary that correspond to the place-name “Bethany,” and not equally the role of Martha. This is also to be kept in view in the appearance of the two sisters in Joh. 12 1 ff.558. Finally, as regards the remark of Martha in the narrative of the revivification of Lazarus, that the dead man has already lain in the tomb for four days (11 39), this has its mythological basis certainly in the day-count corresponding to the new moon, but seems in the main to serve the highlighting of the extraordinarily aggravated miracle559.

189

If, then, from the entire foregoing context it becomes clear that, according to the Fourth Evangelist, we will in any case also have to presuppose a revelation-historical antitypology in the miracle of Jesus performed on Lazarus, there now remains for us the principal question to answer whether, or in what sense, Jesus is also presented here as a counterpart of Dionysos. As was already noted by way of introduction (p. 163), it initially seems as though the Evangelist, in taking up the all-transcending miracle-sign in question, had burst the unified framework of his large-scale religion-historical comparison, which would indeed be the case if Jesus were

conceived as the antitype of the sun-god. Yet it is not merely possible but probable that John 11 as well stands in connection with the typology of the Greek deity named. Dionysos comes into consideration here as the liberator of light and life (celebrated especially in spring) (see above p. 145), and our author seized the opportunity to allude to this where he lets Lazarus step forth from the tomb-cave at Jesus' summons. Upon closer inspection, the interest that the Evangelist took in describing the hindering grave-clothes of the reanimated one now becomes fully recognizable. Jesus himself must above all help him toward the necessary freedom of movement. But when, for this purpose, he issues the command: Λύσατε αὐτόν (v. 44)560, he suddenly again stands before us—and here from a particularly significant perspective—as that ideal and most perfect Liberator, who already in

another context presented himself to us as the antitype of Λυαῖος or Λύσιος Dionysos (see above p. 146). The more this obvious reference, lying within the Gospel itself, presses itself upon us, the more keenly felt and regrettable becomes the circumstance that we are almost entirely uninformed about the scarcely doubtful significance that lunar mythology also attained for the devotees of Dionysos. Perhaps hope need not yet be abandoned that a fortunate discovery may still cast light into this darkness. It is known, on the one hand, that the cult of the male-conceived Phrygian lunar deity Men (Μήν) in Asia Minor, especially in its western half, attained the greatest popularity and dissemination561. On the other hand, we know that the god Sabazios, in nature and cult closely akin to Dionysos and already early identified with him562, is just as native to Phrygia as Men563. That these latter two deities were also brought into closer relation with one another can likewise be demonstrated. This went so far that Sabazios even more or less assumed the character of Men564. Of greater importance for us, however,

is the subordinate position of the moon-god in relation to Sabazios, which the relief from Kolon represents565. It is very well possible that in the mysteries (τελεταί) of Sabazios-Dionysos the new-moon phase served to ground and support belief in immortality, and that the moon, personified in Men as the spring new moon, experienced reanimation (renewed illumination) through Sabazios-Dionysos as the deity who brings forth the new vegetation of the year566.

From the entire state of affairs set forth, it thus follows that we are dealing, in the exceptionally enigmatic religion-historical foundation of John 11, in all likelihood with a (not consciously perceived by the Evangelist) combination of the Babylonian–Mesopotamian–Palestinian and the Indo-Persian–Asia Minor myth of the spring new moon and the morning and evening dawn that precedes it. The chronological indication of John 12:1 (six days before the Passover) also points to this: it allows one to surmise that the raising of Lazarus, to which explicit reference is made, is indeed supposed to have taken place at the time of the spring new moon immediately preceding the Passover full moon. As for the origin of the basic form of the legendary narrative available to the Evangelist,

it is no more difficult to understand than the still earlier emergence of the synoptic story of the expulsion of demons from the possessed man of Gerasa (see above pp. 135 f.). One might be tempted to call the narrative materials of mythological origin—taken up into the earliest Christian tradition and the Gospels during the apostolic and post-apostolic period by psychological natural necessity and assimilated by them (cf. the parallel Old Testament phenomenon in n. 543)—the weeds in the field of revelation religion, were it not that we must gratefully acknowledge the frequently poetic and edifying charm of the naïve yet again inspired reworking into the personal and ethico-religious sphere (cf. especially John 11 in this regard—despite all objections of literary criticism; here one need only point to v. 35, the shortest verse of the Gospel: Ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς).

From the wonder-typology of Jesus in Bethany, comparative consideration leads the next step further, to view him as

13. the one who himself suffers death.

Here reference may first be made back to the discussion that the death-suffering of Jesus according to John 1:29, 36; 17:19 has already found in another context and from other perspectives (pp. 87, 141). There Jesus appeared above all as the world-sacrificial lamb of God that removes sin-guilt (ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). From this one might suppose that the body of Jesus, destined to be killed according to 2:19, 21, is at the same time, in the Evangelist's subsidiary thought, set over against the animal bodies destined for slaughter that Jesus himself removed from the temple (2:15; see above p. 121) as the true expiatory sacrifice. This, however, is contradicted by the fact that the body of Jesus is here rather viewed under the image of the temple: 2:19 refers not so much to the death as to the resurrection of Jesus567. What, apart from the passages first mentioned, is meant in

our Gospel to illuminate the death of Jesus, on closer inspection is limited to 10:11–18; 12:24; 19:11, in which the selfless voluntariness of the surrender of life568, the act of obedience thereby carried out toward the highest authority—God the all-ruling (19:11) Father of Jesus—and the necessity (even prefigured in nature) of treading this path for the renewal of the world are equally strongly emphasized. What does the parallel of Greek nature religion have to set alongside this at first glance? It sees its god Dionysos, in the strict sense, suffer death with lawful necessity, albeit in such a way that it thereby brings an annual event to view (see above pp. 113 f.). The god is in winter "a persecuted, tormented, and slain one, an allegory of the mutability of earthly natural life," for which reason he belongs both to the upper world and the underworld and in this conception (among the Orphics especially) was placed under the name Zagreus alongside Demeter and Persephone as son of the one, and occasionally even regarded as son of the underworld god Zagreus (Pluton)569. At Delphi, where this Dionysos was venerated with no less zeal than Apollo, one showed in the innermost sanctuary of the temple, beside the tripod and a golden image of Apollo, "the grave of Dionysos" (with the inscription: ἐνθάδε κεῖται θανὼν Διόνυσος ὁ ἐκ Σεμέλης Philochor. fr. 22). That the leaders of the priesthood there at the time of the shortest day offered secret sacrifices intended to effect the

revival of the god is explained by the fact that with the winter solstice his death was thought to have occurred570. He was imagined at the corresponding, extraordinarily widespread trieteric-orgiastic celebration as a bull (ταυρόμορφος)

194

(cf. above p. 148). It was in any case meant to point to the suffering inflicted upon him when, at that time, a bull was “slain with an axe, then torn apart and consumed in raw pieces”; this alluded to “the dying away of nature and all its power and joy under the torments of winter”571. The principal purpose of the orgiastic rite was undoubtedly to prompt the participants to relive the πάθη of the god. This re-experiencing could then, in Orphism, also be related to the theogonic-cosmogonic myth of the tearing apart of Dionysos by the Titans572. A comprehensive comparison of the classical and the “Johannine”-christological image of suffering in question yields positively, in the main, the following: the mythologically elemental savior and his revelation-historical antitype Jesus both submit, each in his own way, to the natural law of dying, in order to create for the earthly world a new life and new joy coming from heaven. They thus seemingly deny their divine nature, but in reality thereby correspond to the highest divine will and, through their death-suffering, bring an offering that attests not only their love for humanity but also their deeply grounded accord with the higher world: here too one may recall the beautiful idea contained in the epithet of Apollo: Dionysodotos (the one gifted to the world by Dionysos) (see n. 453); we shall yet have occasion to return to the significance of this name.

That there is indeed reason for a religion-historically comparative consideration of the passio magna of Jesus is also betrayed by individual traits of a peculiar kind in the Fourth Evangelist. The image that shows the Crucified and before him “his mother” and the disciple whom he loved, at the moment when Jesus, in his last will, installs the disciple into the filial relationship

195

to his own mother, is found only in John 19:25–27. That an allegory is present here, in which the mother of Jesus is most immediately to be interpreted in New Testament terms as the community of Christian-believing Israel, was already designated as the probable view (n. 68). On the other hand, attention has also been drawn to the fact that the religious class type embodied in Jesus’ mother does not represent the ideal, but only the average measure of faith- and knowledge-capacity of that portion of Jesus’ compatriots accessible to the Gospel (see above pp. 158 f.). All the more, therefore, does the question press itself as to how it comes about that this woman appears once more precisely at so solemn and highly significant a moment573. For precisely if and because she is an allegorical figure in the sense set forth, one may not assume on Jesus’ part a mere expression of the natural feeling of filial piety, exemplary though it might be conceived in itself. That this personal relationship in the usual sense is not in view here is also indicated by the fact that Jesus once again (as in 2:4) addresses his mother not as such, but as woman (γύναι). The motive that prompted our Evangelist to portray the scene in question lies, in all likelihood, in a religion-historical typology that, in accordance with his way of seeing, also presented itself to him on this occasion. It is evidently a most freely executed allusion, taken up into the Dionysian-oriented foundation of his religious comparison,

to the maternal pain caused by the loss of a beloved child, such as had found an outstandingly effective and popular expression in the Demeter cult574, closely related to the religion of Dionysos575.

196

Thus we have in 19:26 f. the counterpart of the classical mater dolorosa576. From this it may also be surmised what determined the Evangelist, as at Cana so at Golgotha, to suppress the name Mary. The mother of Jesus clearly bears for him, as such and antitypically, at the one time the character of the maternal goddess of the "earth swelling with fertility in the breath of spring," Semele, who at the same time, conceived as a maenad, urges her son (Dionysos) to procure the drink that animates nature (see above p. 111), at the other time the features of the autumnal Mother Earth, Demeter, who mourns her dying child577. But if the Evangelist in both cases refrains from naming Mary, this is connected with the fact that "Mary" was from the outset the designation of the virginally conceived mother (cf. Luke 1:27) of Jesus, of whom the Fourth Gospel does not speak at all, just as her mythical type is not drawn from earthly life, but belongs to the Eos cycle (cf. on this above pp. 178 f.)578

197

In 19 25, then, the "mother of Jesus," as the context allows one to infer, is the antitype of Demeter, while at least her "sister" is intended to point to her original antitypical character. She is included because, on the one hand, through her name Salome (cf. Mc. 15 40; 16 1; Mt. 27 56) she recalled Semele, the mother of Dionysos 579, in whom the Evangelist, as has been shown, recognized a type of the "mother of Jesus," and because, on the other hand, as the "mother of the sons of Zebedee" she had in John a son who, by virtue of his uniquely significant name, itself called to mind the name Dionysos (see below), and whose significance for the Christian Church the verses Joh. 19 26 f. are meant immediately to characterize: John first apostle to the Jews—thereafter

198

apostle to the Gentiles! By the nature of the case, the typology of the evangelical narrative in 19 25—27 could not involve more than the psychological basic motive. But that, even with the assumed incorporation of that motive, we nevertheless remain—on the general foundation of the typological mode of consideration of our Evangelist—will become clear from the answer to the further question: why does precisely the "disciple whom Jesus loved" appear in the mysteriously eloquent tableau as the one to whom the grieving mother is entrusted by the dying Son of God for care and guardianship? First of all, it is to be noted that here John 580 likewise comes into consideration, in principle, only allegorically, and that accordingly the omission of his name here was already indicated for that reason alone. If, however, anywhere, then at this point one gains the impression that the designation of the disciple as the beloved of Jesus 581 must have a special significance corresponding to the immediate context. A confirmation of this high distinction accorded to John in our Gospel is found in the Synoptic Gospels at least insofar as he belongs to a triad singled out by Jesus, even if by no means at its head (Mc. 5 37; 9 2; 14 33;

cf. 3 16 f.; 13 3; Mt. 17 1; Lc. 8 51; 9 28). On the other hand, however, there is a lack of sufficient historical grounding. It is striking that in the “pillar” triad of the Jerusalem community, in which the brother of Jesus, James, is accorded first place, he likewise comes last (Gal. 2 9), while Paul, on his first apostolic journey to Jerusalem, appears to have sought primarily acquaintance and understanding with Cephas and, in fifteen days, saw none of the apostles besides James alone (1 18 f.). Very peculiar, moreover, is the manner in which John appears in the Acts of the Apostles (ch. 3, 4, and 8) at Peter’s side as his double or as

199

a “statist” 582. The explanation is rendered all the more difficult by what has been handed down synoptically concerning the characterization of the disciple. Mc. 9 38—Lc. 9 49 f. shows John narrow-minded and intolerant toward a Jewish exorcist using the name of Jesus and reports the rebuke administered to him together with the other disciples by Jesus. Lc. 9 54 (cf. Mc. 3 17: Boanerges = sons of thunder) relates an even much stronger censure incurred by James and John in that they urged Jesus to punish with fire from heaven a Samaritan village community that had refused hospitality—an expression that went far beyond even the outburst and self-help of a Peter (Joh. 18 10; cf. Mc. 14 47; Mt. 26 51; Lc. 22 50). To this tendency toward vindictiveness and fanaticism that here came to light there is added in Mc. 10 35, 41 (cf. Mt. 20 20) the expression of a (inherited?) strikingly high degree of ambition: the claim of the brother pair James and John to the highest position of power, more precisely to the seats of honor in the “glory of the kingdom.” If Jesus directed a quite special love toward the latter, he could certainly have done so only in spite of those innate character defects highlighted by the Synoptics. The question what may nevertheless have moved him to do so thus remains unanswered on the basis of what has been given. And its answer becomes all the more difficult when we (see above p. 26) have correctly recognized, in the disciple who stands with the mother of Jesus before the Crucified One, the representative of the ideal apostleship as the one designated by Jesus himself to be the “caretaker of the community gathered from Israel but also from the Gentiles, far surpassing in significance figures such as Peter and James.” In particular, it must also be added that the fourth Gospel itself provides no further points of reference in the matter 583. If, in this situation, one keeps in view the consistently strongly prominent “fondness for profundity, secrecy,

200

double meaning (in the assumption of unconscious prophecies, the interpretation of words meant comprehensively as applying to specific occurrences, points that rest on the simultaneous use of words in their original and transferred sense, etc.)” 584 characteristic of our writer, then it can scarcely encounter any serious objection if we seek the solution of the riddle of the “disciple whom Jesus loved” precisely in the mysterious significance ascribed by the Evangelist to the withheld name of John. In the consonance of the names Ἰωάν[ν]ης 583 and Διόνυσος (epic Διώνυσος) 586 there was, according to his conception 587, expressed the providential and revelation-historical determination of the disciple John to be apostle to the Gentiles, and thereby his election for a discipleship that lay especially close to the heart of Jesus himself (cf. Acts 9 15). This John, as apostle of the pagan—more precisely Greek—world,

already by his name in a certain sense points to the true Dionysos, whose witness he is to be. That the name is nevertheless at first withheld from the readers of the Gospel

201

changes nothing in this; the reason for this concealment will become apparent in another context. Here it need only be noted further that, according to Luke (1 13, 60, 63), the same name John was already prophetically given by the parents, on divine prompting, to the greatest Old-Testament forerunner of Jesus. The allusion to this in Joh. 1 6 is scarcely to be overlooked.

The profundity and secrecy repeatedly recognizable in the context shown prompt one also to take into view the peculiar light that falls upon a series of further details of the passion narrative of the fourth Evangelist. To this belongs immediately the report that directly follows the scene just discussed (19 25 ff.) concerning the giving of drink and the last words of the Crucified One, which again allows the religions-historically typical background to shine through. The sense of 19 28: “After this, since Jesus knew that everything was already accomplished, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, he says: I thirst!” can—at first—hardly be anything other than that, at that moment, according to the clear consciousness of Jesus, for the now (ἤδη) virtually complete fulfillment of the scriptural prophecy concerning the conclusion of his earthly activity, his path of suffering 588, only one particularly significant feature was still lacking, the realization of which he himself brought about through the word from the cross: “I thirst.” It is certainly not accidental that the Evangelist who has narrated the story of the wedding at Cana passes over the (unsuccessful) offering of wine made before the crucifixion according to Mc. 15 23 and Mt. 27 34 (as Luke already does). He may also have been restrained, in view of the allegory of Jesus the vine (15 1 ff.), from speaking of it. For in this “hour” the Logos-Christ does not present himself as the bringer of joy to humanity (cf. Mc. 14 25; Mt. 26 29; Lc. 22 18); he truly himself, by divine determination and ordinance, suffers shattering bodily and spiritual pain (cf. Joh. 12 27; Lc. 12 50). In this situation, for the fourth Evangelist

202

not the symbol of the saving enjoyment proceeding from Jesus, but only the drink of vinegar 589 comes into consideration, which after the crucifixion is given to him also by all the Synoptics and in our Gospel is clearly related to Psalm 69 22 (LXX ὄξος with χολή) 590. The Dionysian typology of our narrator is thus not lost even in this feature of the passion narrative peculiar to him in 19 28: it explains precisely why, from the cry of pain of Jesus not reported by him (Mc. 15 34 = Mt. 27 46), he heard an expression of tormenting thirst 591, and why this element of his tradition even took shape in a new word from the cross 592.

It may be asked whether, in the presentation of the suffering image of Jesus, where the offering of the drink and the lance thrust are described (Joh. 19 29 and 34), a double allusion to the Dionysian thyrsus-staff hovered before our author. In the former case the reed-stalk (κάλαμος Mc. 15 36; Mt. 27 48) of a plant not certainly identifiable, by name hyssop, to which in the Old Testament a purifying effect—especially also in cases of death (in classical antiquity a life-giving influence)—was

203

ascribed 593, is employed. The sponge affixed to it can somewhat recall the pine-cone set upon the thyrsus-reed (νάρθηξ). In the parallel case (19 34) the comparison with the thyrsus is prompted by the spear of the soldier, since the thyrsus, for Dionysos as well as for his worshipers and imitators, also formed a weapon 594. Why the Evangelist laid particular weight precisely on this is shown by the whole context of vv. 31—37, which is meant to say: the equally voluntary (v. 30: παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα) and providentially ordained earlier death of Jesus, which occasioned the omission of the crurifragium and allowed the lance thrust to take its place, at the same time brought about—through the consequences of the latter, the flowing out of blood and water 595 from the corpse and the marvelous indication contained therein of life-forces still streaming forth from the dead 596—an exceedingly important strengthening

204

of faith in him. A twofold fulfillment of Scripture is discerned in the wondrous event 597. That belongs on the side of revelation-historical consideration. What the Evangelist could not express, but could only allow those initiated into the secret of his mode of contemplation to guess and feel, would be the religions-historically—typologically resulting, peculiarly tragic trait of divine irony that enters into the concluding passion scene of the Dionysos-antitype Jesus with the two analogous occurrences: the victory symbols of the Greek god, reed-staff and lance, appearing in the dying and in the death of the New-Testament antitype! One may therefore ask whether, in this case, to the assumed “threefold sense of Scripture” 598 there is not yet added a fourth.

It is in any case to be noted that the suffering utterance of the Crucified One fades out into the triumphal cry: Τετέλεσται (Joh. 19 30) and thereby once more receives a classical signature. The evidently pointed expression must attract attention all the more because it is certainly used deliberately with reference back to τετέλεσται and τελειωθῇ in v. 28. In this connection it is not to be overlooked that, instead of the τελειωθῇ that here stands in the sense of scriptural fulfillment, elsewhere in the fourth Gospel one consistently finds πληρωθῇ (12 38; 13 18; 15 25; 17 12; 19 24, 36; cf. 18 9, 32) 599. It is evidently intended that in 19 28 and 30 one should speak as audibly as possible out of one and the same mysterious nexus of ideas; and the underlying classical idea is that of the τελετή, the concluding mystery-initiation 600.

205

The word τελετή, familiar to the Greek in this sense, the Evangelist—following the fine-feeling and cautious tact of his whole mode of presentation—no more employs anywhere than the parallel term μυστήριον 601. But the substantive typology grasped by him nevertheless comes out clearly enough even so. The presentation rests on the general consideration that, in that Jesus himself has undertaken the consecration 602 of his mysterious death-suffering, which contains a divine mystery of salvation 603, he has at the same time founded for his own the consecration of the celebration of this mystery, conditioned by purification and sanctification 604. The ultimate purpose

206

of this twofold consecration lay in the release of the eternal life inherent in Jesus himself as the Logos-Christ and its mediation to the believers. With his “It is accomplished!” he bears witness, dying, with regard to himself, that everything that belonged to his death-consecration, everything that before his passing away had to occur as preparation through him 605, in him 606, and on him 607, had become fact. Typologically there thus offered itself to the Evangelist—if not already to the guarantors of his tradition—here too the possibility of a backward reference to conceptions and traditions of the religion of Dionysos, insofar as this god himself, according to older legend, had already received the initiations at Eleusis 608; just as, on the other hand, not only were the “lesser mysteries” of Demeter and the child of Demeter, celebrated as a preliminary initiation to the great Eleusinia in the Athenian suburb of Agrai in the month Anthesterion, called a μίμημα τῶν περὶ Διόνυσον 609, but also Jakchos, akin in nature to Dionysos in his chthonic quality as lord of spirits and souls 610, often outright identified with him and called Dionysos 611, had been introduced into the circle of deities worshiped at Eleusis,

207

indeed “soon almost counted as the principal figure of that circle of gods” 612.

Already the presentation of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, which leads over to the passion narrative, in our Evangelist (12 12–15), accords with all this and is to be briefly illuminated once more precisely in this direction. The inclusion of this, in comparison with the synoptic reporting briefly treated but nevertheless striking section (together with the explanatory appendix vv. 16—19), already surprises through the remarkable contrast between the messianic mode of appearance of Jesus depicted here, which is meant to identify him, in accordance with prophecy, as the King of Israel, and the all-dominating Logos-idea

208

of the narrator, which elsewhere, in similar cases, has led him, out of regard for this highest point of view, to leave aside significant experiences of Jesus transmitted synoptically, thus at the beginning of his Gospel the temptation narrative and toward the end not only the account of the inner struggle in Gethsemane, but also the preceding transfiguration narrative613. That this messianic king, by free decision, allows himself to be acclaimed by the festively celebrating crowd precisely on the back of a donkey’s colt (ὀνάριον), not enthroned high on a proud war-horse614, appears, according to the explicit remark of the Evangelist, even to the disciples so strange that the fulfillment of a scriptural word specifically referring to this does not at first come to their consciousness615. This scriptural word, however, according to the Evangelist’s mode of interpretation, has a particularly deep meaning, and this meaning in this case too extends beyond the standpoint of literal fulfillment of Scripture. To be sure, already the role of the royal mount, which is here assigned to the donkey (in connection with Zech. 9 9 and Mt. 21 5)616, is meant also to prompt the reader initiated into typological contemplation to recall at once that this same animal “not infrequently has the honor” of

209

bearing the god Dionysos617—this all the more likely since the enthusiastic reception of Jesus by the festival crowd gathered in the capital falls in the same season of the year in which the “great,” that is, civic Dionysia were celebrated at Athens (see above p. 145)618. But it must not be overlooked that the Evangelist, like the Synoptics (Mark and Luke; Matthew unclear), wishes to place the chief emphasis, in the case of the animal used by Jesus, on its young age619, and yet strikingly does not emphasize the requirement of unprofanedness as they do (Mark 11 2; Luke 19 30). This must have a special reason and suggests that the donkey’s colt in question is a symbol of the hopeful Hellenic world of peoples now to be taken into service by the messianic King of Israel and to be led to the ancient people of God (cf. 10 16)620, which—significantly enough—immediately after his entry into Jerusalem presents itself to him, eager for salvation (not curious), in the “Greeks who wish to see Jesus” (12 20 ff.). Evidently the Evangelist wishes, through the entire context of our narrative section, to let it be perceived

210

that just as the great Dionysia apply to the advent of the perfected manifestation of the god at the transition from spring to summer (and harvest time), so the festive reception of Jesus at his last, decisive entry into Jerusalem points beyond death and is rather to be understood as a divinely ordered pre-celebration of the immediately connected “glorification” of the Son of God as the Savior of the world (cf. 10 16; 4 35). In this, indeed, will also lie the deeper truth that necessarily had to remain hidden from the disciples at first. With what has been set forth we have already also been led over to the comparative consideration of

14. the risen conqueror of death.

Here too we encounter a surprising number of classical resonances in which the distinctive character of the fourth Gospel is reflected. That this Gospel presents the resurrection of Jesus as his own work can hardly be denied. For the Logos-Christ, death is in and of itself no natural necessity, because the “Son,” in the life that he has in himself (5 26), possesses the power to transform the assumed fleshly being (1 14) of his person, insofar as it is corporeality, into a higher kind of substantiality adapted to the divine spiritual being621. But just as certainly as, in death, he remained fully lord of himself and of his life622 and unrestricted lord of the life of the world (6 33.51), and accordingly arose actively by his own power (2 19. 10 17 f.), so certainly

211

was his dying in the main merely the natural path of departure to the Father (14 2 ff.), the exaltation (3 14. 12 32), thus the means of glorification (13 32. 17 1), chosen by him step by step (19 28; 20 9)623. As regards the resurrection from death as also asserted by the Hellenic nature-religion of its god Dionysos, a similarly determinate and immediate emergence of the moment of self-activity is, by the nature of the matter, not to be expected here. The conception of the process—belonging to Orphic poetry—unmistakably connects with the Delphic legend of the tomb of Dionysos at the tripod of Apollo. The limbs of the god torn apart by the Titans are

brought by Zeus to Apollo and by him buried “on Parnassus,” that is, at Delphi624. Concerning the event that followed, which is here in question, however, only fleeting and allusive reports are unfortunately given. While in one instance Zeus is simply said to have raised (ἐγείρας) the one shattered by the Titans625, another presentation of the mythical state of affairs merely indicates that the one torn apart, after the reassembly of the parts, “as it were came to life again”626. Whether here one should think of an autonomous manifestation of the miraculous power of Dionysos may indeed be asked, all the more so since another version of the myth has him rest for a time in the earth and then reappear as one who rends the earth (ῥηξίχθων)627. Be that as it may, more important in any case is

212

the fact that alongside the Orphic statements about the awakening or resurrection of Dionysos there stands, particularly in the theology of Delphi, a relation not connected with the former628, which allows the notion of his life-in-death to recede and views the reawakening of the god all the more decisively under the aspect of a wondrous and salvific self-activity. It is

15. the one who goes away and returns, the disappearing and reappearing one,

who is here brought before us. In multiple senses this applies to Dionysos. One must first recall the parallel of the two kindred and complementary deities Dionysos and Apollo. “Apollo was celebrated at Delphi, Delos, and Miletus, as well as at Metapontum in Italy, as one who departs to distant regions during the bad season (ἀποδημία) and returns with the renewal of the year (ἐπιδημία), and he was formally escorted with so-called songs of dismissal, just as in spring he was summoned back with songs of invitation”629. With the transition from spring to summer (the season extending into late autumn) the paean welcoming and then continually glorifying the god—especially at Delphi—replaced the dithyramb celebrating Dionysos and devoted to his return from the onset of winter through full spring630. Just as Apollo was thought to be among the Hyperboreans in the high, eternally bright north, or in Lycia (“land of light”)631, so Dionysos was supposed to have stayed in Asiatic Greece, especially in Lydia, where the return of the victorious god from the Orient, even from the Indians,

213

was celebrated (see above p. 162)632. People spoke of the periodically recurring disappearance (ἀφανισμός) and the subsequent epiphany (ἐπιφάνεια) of Dionysos633. More significant, however, is that according to another cultic tradition the vanished god had taken refuge in the depths of the sea or among the nymphs or the Muses (that is, spirits related to the moist interior of the earth)634. This already gives us a hint for understanding the further-reaching belief that Dionysos is “for a time in the underworld, in the realm of spirits and souls.” “For in Delphi too one knew of the death and reawakening of Dionysos; but the true conception, according to which Dionysos rested in the house of Persephone and at the time of the trieteric festival reappears in the upper world, raising his revel, shouting evoe and setting dances in motion, is unambiguously expressed in Orphic Hymn 53”635. He is indeed also “lord

of souls”636. These conceptions extending over earth and underworld then find their crowning conclusion in the oft-mentioned and celebrated ascent of Dionysos to Olympus637, to heaven638.

When now, in the discourses of Jesus as presented by the fourth Evangelist, the thought of his departure from the earthly scene of his activity and of

214

the subsequent reunion with his own639 forms a strikingly repeated and emphasized theme, this too certainly cannot simply be assigned to the realm of chance. Just as in this further convergence an unusual analogy again emerges down to individual details, so once more the assumption is justified that a typological reference by the New Testament writer to the conceptual and emotional world of Hellenic religion has taken place. The lively interest of our Evangelist in this theme is noticeable already formally, through the variation of expression when Jesus speaks of his departure (ἀφιέναι τὸν κόσμον, μεταβαίνειν, ἔρχεσθαι, ἀπέρχεσθαι, πορεύεσθαι, ὑπάγειν). To the “world,” whose perception is conditioned by earthly sense-experience because it closes itself off from the divine spiritual being revealed in Jesus and likewise from the one representing him after his departure, Jesus announces his disappearance forever (14 19. 22). The disciples too will no longer see him, but only for a little while (16 16. 17. 19): until the resurrection640. The question where he is going remains unanswered for the Jews and their spiritual leaders (7 35 f.; 8 14). Nor does the statement that he is going to the one who sent him (7 33; cf. 16 5) bring them the solution of the riddle. He goes to God (13 3), to the Father (13 1; 14 12. 28; 16 10. 17. 28; 17 11. 13), to the house of his Father (14 2), to a place not accessible to every human being (7 34—36; 8 21) in the upper beyond, from which he comes (3 31; 8 23), and where dwelling places (μοναί) also stand ready for his own (14 2—6)641. From there he comes again to them

215

(14 3. 18. 28; cf. 14 23)642 and will not only see them again (16 22), but will also manifest himself to them—and to each individual (ἐμφανίζειν 14 21 f.; cf. the epiphany of Dionysos): they too shall see him (in the era beginning with his resurrection) as he is (14 19; 16 16. 17. 19). That

216

according to the conception of our Evangelist the burial rest of the corpse of Jesus corresponded to a simultaneous stay of the same in the realm of the dead of the underworld, serving the completion of his work, is all the more certainly to be assumed in view of Old and New Testament, Jewish theology, and Orphism643, since everything that followed upon his death in fact belonged to his glorification644. At least indirectly this descent is still indicated by the mysterious description of the moment when the one intent on ascending from those depths to his heavenly Father, having emerged into the light of day, appears for the first time on the lowest level (20 14—17). No less noteworthy is that in 7 35, with the mocking question of the Jews whether Jesus intends “to go to the Jews living scattered among the Greeks and to teach

the Gentiles”640, there is a scornful allusion to the aforementioned triumphal processions of Dionysos (see above p. 162). More difficult becomes the comparison in the peculiar light that the Evangelist casts on

16. the exalted one

(3 14; cf. 8 28; 12 32. 34). The passage 3 14 cannot be adequately appreciated without an overview of the manifold biblical and religio-historical details presupposed in it. With the words of Jesus646: “And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, so that everyone who believes may have eternal life in him,” it explicitly refers to a significant Old Testament event. The relevant Elohistic tradition of the bronze serpent in Num. 21 4—9 in and of itself first of all recalls myths and magical practices of nature religion647.

217

For the Old Testament narrator, the animal image in question is clearly a symbol of the wondrous healing power of Yahweh, which, when contemplated in faith, renders this power effective in those in need of healing. It is placed on high in order to be visible far and wide. The revelation-historical, prophetic sense of this symbol, however, has according to the Evangelist648 come to fruition only in the person of Jesus in an ultimate, perfected manner, and according to the evidence of the context from 3 1—16 this concerns in the main the moment of the **exaltation**. Exalted649 from the earth (12 32) to the heavenly

218

mode of existence had to be the Son of God Jesus, whose origin as the heavenly “Son of Man” (3 13) is not only required because of the transcendent nature both of the New Testament salvific good (3 7.12) and of the mediator of salvation, but also because of the universal determination of salvation: for the world, that is, for the totality of those human beings who precisely through faith in the Christ removed from sensible visibility become partakers of eternal life (v. 16). The thought of an ascension in the manner reported in Lc. 24 50 ff. Acts 1 9 ff. does not in any case come primarily into consideration with this exaltation; rather, in the foreground stands the “glorification” that already occurred with the very fact of the preservation of life in death on the cross, of the overcoming of the power of death (s. o. S. 210 f.)650. That, however, the Evangelist with the repeatedly surprising inclusion of the Old Testament comparison has combined a typological side-glance toward (Dionysos-)Sabazios (s. o. S. 190 f.) is not only conceivable because in the Sabazios religion the veneration of the holy serpent (the οφις παρείας also consecrated to Asklepios) has central significance651, but especially also because as purpose and result of the exaltation of Christ the mediation of life is indicated, that is, of an imperishable essence not damaged by bodily death and of infinite growth, creativity, and enjoyment for

219

humanity652, and in what immediately precedes the rebirth has been discussed as the condition for receiving that salvific good653. Whether and in what connection the notion of an

exaltation (or ascent), as it has been demonstrated for Dionysos (S. 213), was already originally present also in Sabazios must for the time being be left an open question.

Through the exaltation of Jesus, however, more closely considered, so little has a separation arisen that rather through it the basis for a lasting and enduring personal connection with the believers and influence upon them has been laid. It is unmistakably one of the main concerns of the fourth Evangelist to portray him as

17. the one immanent in his own 654

This occurs by the nature of the matter chiefly in the farewell discourses. What is said there, however,

220

can only be properly grasped by taking into account those other christological statements of the Gospel that are of a related kind. According to 14 16.17.26; 15 26; 16 7.13.14, from the Exalted One there proceeds a unique bestowal of power upon his own, designated according to its ethical essence as the Holy Spirit, which is conceived in such a peculiarly substantial and unified way and thought in such an immediate, living connection with him himself that it could be ascribed the function of an almost personal representation of the one continuing to work in that Spirit655. That this inner possession, this indwelling of the Holy Spirit, will be a permanent one is emphatically assured (14 16 ff.), and indeed in such a way that the Evangelist is recognizably already speaking from his own experience656. The activity of this Spirit, according to what is said in the farewell discourses,

221

aims at the glorification of Jesus through the deeper initiation of his own into the knowledge of his divine being and work (16 14), in that he not only bears witness by reminding them of Jesus' sayings (15 26; 14 26), but also proclaims to them new things, proceeding from the Father, which he hears as the organ of revelation of the exalted Son (16 13 f.). That in this connection one must think primarily also of disclosures concerning the future (τά ἐρχόμενα), of "eschatological matters," thus of prophetic revelation, is explicitly noted. Otherwise it is established that the "truth" into which the Spirit is to lead (16 13) has a sin-liberating and thus cleansing power (8 31 f.)657. With this, however, light also falls upon the cleansing efficacy of the Father, of which 15 2 speaks: just as certainly as this continues after the departure of the Son (14 28 f.) among the later disciples in general (17 20), so it is here to be thought as mediated through the Holy Spirit representing Jesus658.

Of particular importance, however, is also the question how this immanence of the exalted Jesus comes about and by what it is maintained. From his Logos-being itself it follows quite generally that his self-communication to those given to him by the Father (6 39; 10 29; 17 2.6.9.11.12.24; 18 9; s. o. S. 88) is in principle and without exception effected through his word (λόγος, ῥῆμα), of which he expressly says that it is Spirit and life (6 63)659, just as also the fundamental communication of the "Holy" Spirit to the disciples occurs solely by virtue of such a

word (20 22); for the accompanying act of breathing upon them (ἐνεφύσησεν, not ἐνέπνευσεν) is a purely symbolic one (recalling back through Acts 2 2 and Ez. 37 5 ff. to Gen. 2 7). Precisely this symbolism of the communication of the Spirit, applied by Jesus himself and by him alone, and thus of the self-communication (cf. II Cor. 3 17), is, however, of interest because it is joined by a twofold mysterious effect — one bound to the believing use of certain

222

symbolic objects ("elements"), running alongside as an accompanying, secret operation — in the two sacraments, whose comparative consideration will also allow the nature of the same according to the conception of our Evangelist to be recognized. It is first to be recalled that in the light of his fundamental Logos idea the Christian sacraments appear as something essentially alien, explicable only from the contact of Christian conception and doctrine with the far-reaching ancient mystery cult system (S. 90 f.). Nothing shows more clearly what power the mystery idea and the need for mystery had attained among the peoples of the classical world — and not among these alone — in that epoch so incomparably outstanding in the history of religion, than the fact that the fourth Evangelist, despite all resistance of his ("by combination with synoptic tradition on the one hand, with Pauline theology on the other, modified") Alexandrianism660, which indeed did not prevent him from speaking of the "incarnation" of the Logos (1 14)661, has taken account of that need, as deeply rooted as it was widespread, and with what emphasis he has done so. Naturally, in doing this the connection with prophecy and typology of the Old Testament, as it reaches over into the creative new era with the Janus-like figure of the Baptist, could not be omitted662. From this side, therefore, nothing stood in the way of the inclusion of the Christian sacrament of baptism in symbolic respect, that is, formally. Not only the use of water as sacramental element, but also the symbolic relation of its effect to the reception of the ethically

223

effective Spirit (Ez. 39 29; Zech. 12 10) can be brought into unforced agreement with Old Testament conception and idiom. Beyond this circle of ideas one goes only specifically when the Baptist (1 33; following Mc. 1 8; Mt. 3 11; Lc. 3 16; Acts 1 5; 11 16) announces to the Jews that Jesus will baptize with the "Holy Spirit," provided — or rather because (s. o.) — this divine Spirit-being is according to the evidence of all parallel passages of our Gospel identical with the purely spiritual being (the totality of divine life-forces) of the exalted Christ himself. How far typologically image-creating imagination could go elsewhere precisely with reference to Christ is shown by I Cor. 10 4663. Just as — anticipating what is to be said — the transfigured Jesus can in a certain sense feed his own on earth with his body, just so also it stands in his power to baptize those who have come to faith with the streaming fullness of his Holy Spirit664, that is, fundamentally to cleanse and newly enliven inwardly, and thereby to incorporate them into the salvific fellowship of his community.

If already here with the Holy Spirit the notion of an admittedly dynamic, yet mysteriously personal-seeming (s. o.)665 and lasting inner connection of the Exalted One with his believers arises, thus introducing a mystical moment foreign to Old Testament faith and cult666,

224

then with regard to the Lord's Supper an even much further step in this same direction is taken667. Strictly speaking, according to what has been shown, it could hardly be a matter of a deepening of the sacramental basic idea of the most intimate and lasting personal union of the Lord with his community, the individual and the totality. But the manner in which the fourth Evangelist — deliberately veiled — takes up a position with respect to the symbolism of the Lord's Supper draws attention in a special degree. Above all it is to be noted that he places at the basis of his discussion of the sacramental mystery a general consideration which initially casts light only indirectly upon one of the two elements, the bread. He lets Jesus represent himself to the Galilean crowd668, corresponding to their reference to the manna given by Moses, as the bread bestowed by God, come down from heaven, which satisfies

225

the hunger of believing humanity with powers of eternal life (6 31—33.41.48.50.51.58), and thereby at the same time, in accordance with their desire, prove himself to be the true Messiah (cf. o. S. 75 f.). That in the image of bread food and drink, that is nourishment as a whole, are comprised, should already be shown by 6 35, according to which the bread in question puts an end to hunger and thirst together. Of the sacramental bread, therefore, one cannot yet speak. Nevertheless, precisely the materially ambiguous image of bread appeared suitable to direct the eye further toward that food (and that drink) which Jesus offers his community in the Lord's Supper (6 51). That the Evangelist indeed has expressed himself in this connection about the meaning of this sacred celebration is to be established with compelling reasons (s. o. S. 161) and is a fairly prevailing view669. Here, however, it must at once be striking that he designates as the mysterious correlate of the symbolic elements bread and wine, whose mention at the moment presented was excluded, not, like Paul (I Cor. 10 16; 11 24 f.27.29) and the Synoptics, the body and blood of Jesus, but his flesh and his blood (6 51—56), and indeed with a seemingly serious intensification of the sensuous moment669, which is to be surpassed when he here even directly lets Jesus say: Whoever eats me671

226

shall live because of me (6 57)672. All the more striking is this, since already with the very early (cf. Paul) received specific interpretation of the two elements as body and blood of Christ there was given an understanding of the sacrament which could in no way be gained from the Old Testament and Jewish standpoint673 and is comprehensible only from

227

the overpowering influence of the Hellenistic mystery cults. The whole context (6 22—65), which despite all contrary appearance has a unified character and shows a clear progression of thought, makes it evident that the Evangelist sees in the Lord's Supper a **double-sensed mystery**. According to his own conception it is in the first instance, as is already indicated by the transition in v. 51 (from Jesus who is the bread to the one who gives it), a making-present

and self-attestation of Jesus as the “bread” from heaven. In it he shows himself (according to his original being: cf. 1 14; 4 14) to the celebrating believers, individually and collectively, as the perfect possessor and giver of the powers of eternal life, as the personified divine salvific good of humanity. That the moment of eternal blessedness (“joy,” s. o. S. 103—105), to which the supplementary element of wine points, is included, is not explicitly stated; it results for deeper reflection from ch. 2 (s. o. S. 73 ff.). Only on this foundation does there come into consideration for the Evangelist, as we clearly see from 6 51, the ecclesially received understanding of the sacrament already evidently present to him, which on the one hand still brings into play, in connection with the Old Testament, the idea of the sin-offering (cf. Isa. 53 10 אשם; John 1 29.36; s. o. S. 141 f.) and of the positively supplementary sacrificial and communion offering (Passover John 19 36; I Cor. 5 7; I Pet. 1 19), but on the other hand proceeds beyond the appreciation of the suffering death of Jesus as a voluntarily offered sacrifice for the salvation of the world to understand, under symbolic relation of the elements bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ, the sacramental reception of the life-giving and beatifying salvific powers as a spiritually real effect mediated and conditioned by faith in the risen, spiritually transfigured Christ, of the surrender of his body and blood.

228

What, then, one asks involuntarily, has in reality precisely induced our Evangelist, in this mystical context, to let Jesus speak not of his body, but of his flesh? Is it perhaps still possible to ascertain the reason for this, at first glance, astonishing turn675?

A survey on the ground of Dionysian belief and cult is also suggested here. It will, in essence, have only to take into consideration a few outstandingly characteristic phenomena. To this belongs precisely the already mentioned (pp. 120 f.) incomparable manner, within the Hellenic world of gods, in which Dionysos, especially the trieterically celebrated one, takes inner possession of his worshipers676. They know themselves to be in a psychic bond with the god that repeatedly results in ecstatic states of excitation677, in which they prove themselves to be ἔνθεοι (“full of the god”)678, κατεχόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (κάτοχοι in short, god-possessed)679. That this enthusiasm (ἐνθουσιασμός) also manifested itself, among other things, in a kind of prophecy reminiscent of the revelation of the Pythia

229

at Delphi (cf. above p. 133) could no more fail to occur than a religious katharsis springing from it and corresponding to it (cf. above pp. 146 f.)680. In the conception here given of the indwelling of a divine personal being in human persons—one in which a clear consciousness of the opposition between spiritual and material being, and thus also a stable concept of personality, is lacking—we have an elemental mysticism that could present itself to the deep and far-seeing gaze of the Fourth Evangelist, the ingenious proclaimer of the Christian Logos-idea, as a naturalistic preformation and dark presentiment of the New Testament mystery of salvation (cf. above p. 138). This is also supported by a particularly striking parallel that forces itself upon the religionsgeschichtlich comparative investigation. Corresponding to the mysticism of the Lord’s Supper in our Evangelist, which, as we saw, is in form quite peculiarly

heightened, there appears in the cult of Dionysos a feature—considered even from the standpoint of natural religion—not less strange, here downright repellent681. This is the so-called ὠμοφαγία, the orgiastic eating of raw flesh (cf. generally above pp. 120 ff.). This religious practice corresponds so thoroughly to the ancient Thracian-Hellenic conception of the nature of Dionysos that it is not only practiced mythically and historically by his worshipers (Maenads, Bacchants, Thyads) as a principal element682 at his mysterious celebrations, but that the god himself, in his festive manifestations, is also conceived as proceeding in this manner, as he indeed in this capacity bears the cultic epithets Ὠμάδιος and

230

Ὠμηστής683, and on Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos even human sacrifices were offered to this Dionysos684. Of greater interest to us is the tradition according to which, on Crete, a living bull is torn apart with the teeth by the Maenads685, because, in all probability, in this animal the bull-shaped Dionysos himself (cf. above p. 148) was regarded as the torn and devoured one686. We have here “the crudest form of enthusiasm, the most primordial symbolism of a mysticism which, like all mysticism, wishes to make the god wholly its own”687. In view of this peculiar religionsgeschichtliche phenomenon, it will be difficult to reject the supposition that the Evangelist, by having Jesus instruct the Galilean “Jews” (cf. above pp. 224 f.) concerning the enjoyment of the Lord’s Supper as an integral sacramental means of grace in such a way that, as a consequence of their spiritual dullness, they find themselves instead confronted with an insoluble riddle688, intended by his chosen mode of expression a concealed allusion to the remarkable pagan cult-parallel of the Greek world, because he attributed to it, despite the sensuous coarseness clinging to it, within the horizon of the most general revelation corresponding to the Logos-idea, a kind of elemental typology. The Pauline word from the Areopagus in Acts 17:27 ff. (ζητεῖν τὸν θεὸν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν καὶ εὕροιεν — ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν — γένος ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ) has here, in a certain sense, found its most far-reaching echo.

As is already to be inferred from what has been discussed,

231

according to the Fourth Evangelist’s own conviction it is necessary, for everyone who is to penetrate into the depths of Christian saving knowledge and thus in particular also into the mystery of the Lord’s Supper, to be introduced by the highest divine initiate, by Jesus himself689. On this state of affairs, too, the parallel Dionysos–Jesus casts light according to the Evangelist’s view as set forth in the farewell discourses, insofar as it characterizes the one as well as the other as

18. the guide of the way.

The way that comes into view in 14:4 with peculiar emphasis690 (cf. above pp. 214 f.) is, according to vv. 2 ff.—that is, according to the Evangelist’s own interpretation—at first unquestionably the path of salvation on which one comes, in the eschatological sense, to the

Father (14:6) and thus to a lasting and most intimate union with God691. Jesus indeed does not first need to prepare the heavenly dwelling for his own (14:2 f.), but he must show them the way thereto, which leads through suffering and death to life and is passable only by one who believes in him. He is, in person, this way, because he fully and perfectly mediates to the believer the knowledge of salvific truth and consequently the reception of the powers of eternal life (14:6). He has already proven himself as this way and guide on earth by his word of truth and life in a preparatory manner and will, as the Exalted One, continue his work of salvation through his Holy Spirit692: he is

232

the true, the highest mystagogue693 and in this capacity presents himself as the revelational-historical counterpart of Dionysos, insofar as this Hellenic god, too, was celebrated as the one who leads in a distinctive mystery cult, who shows the way, as Διόνυσος Καθηγεμών694. Traces of this cult are found in western Asia Minor (Mysia, Ionia, Lydia, Phrygia). The principal seat was Pergamon, where the Attalid dynasty traced its lineage back to this Dionysos and devoted itself with all the greater predilection to his worship695. The mystery character of the cult is furthermore epigraphically attested in Philadelphia696 and Akmonia697. At least mention is made of the god with the epithet Καθηγεμών in Teos698 and in Thyateira (where, together with this, as elsewhere, mention is also made of the associated priest and high priest)699. The epithet is probably to be explained from the god's relation to the underworld;

233

we have to do with the chthonian Dionysos (cf. above p. 113, n. 346), who by this very designation already recalls the related god of twilight, Hermes chthonios. Just as the latter is, purely and simply, the god of ways and travelers and is accordingly called ἐνόδιος, ὁδῖος, ἡγεμόνιος, ἀγήτωρ, so he is, "with special reference to the underworld, called ψυχοπομπός or ψυχαγωγός as 'the one who leads the souls of the deceased into the underworld and again out of it, thus in general mediates the traffic between the upper and lower world'"700. In addition to this, it is in fact the case that Hermes also bears the epithet Καθηγεμών701, whereas, on the other hand, Dionysos also bears the cult-name Μύστης702.

In conclusion, two further significant sayings of Jesus in the farewell discourses could be adduced comparatively, with which, after what has been set forth, we need no longer linger. We are directed to

19. the one who empowers his own to equal works to those performed by himself

in 14:12–13. Opposed to the ἔργα703 which the believers in Christ—the first disciples and their successors—accomplish, to the honor of their transfigured Lord and in his power, imitating him and representing him in the sense of 17:18, 23, 26; 20:23, far beyond the sphere of his original earthly activity704,

234

there stand, on the lower level of the Dionysian religion, the wonder-works of his thiasos, likewise mirroring this god's mode of appearance, attributed to his influence, glorifying him and aiming at the spread of his cult, celebrated in legend and poetry705.

Even in the image

20. of the Exalted One who draws his own to himself, bringing them home into the Father's house

in 12:32; 14:3, a singular feature of Hellenic belief strangely enough resonates. We thereby return once more to the mother of Dionysos, Semele (cf. above pp. 112, 157), and have to recall the myth, connected with the conception of Dionysos as god of the earth and the underworld (χθόνιος), of his ascent to Olympus (cf. above p. 213). At several cult-sites of the god (in Lerna, Delphi, Troezen, on Samos) we encounter the legend that he descended into Hades and brought his mother up from there to Olympus706. At the enneateric festival of the Herois in Delphi, the ἀναγωγή of Semele constitutes the subject of the sacred rite707.

235

B. Intensification of the typology in the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus in parallel with Dionysos–Apollon.

If one now surveys the whole context and the fullness and diversity, including the not infrequently striking peculiarity, of the typical relationships as, according to the foregoing, the fourth Evangelist discerned them in comparing the character-figure of the Hellenic Dionysos and the divine manifestation in Jesus (14 9), one understands that he did not allow himself to be deterred, even by the morally offensive feature of the representation and veneration of the Greek god, the phallic cult rightly reproached by the Church Fathers708, from establishing the comprehensive religions- and revelation-historical comparison709. In

236

other respects it suffices here to refer back to what was set forth above (S. 96—103). A reproach, however, touches him all the less in this direction, since we can further demonstrate that he himself sensed the inadequacy of his Dionysian typology and did not fail, in continuation of it and at the same time with peculiarly heightened accentuation, to present Jesus also as antitype of the higher, mythologically purest and most ideal deity related to Dionysos, Apollon710.

This was made possible by the historical figure of the Baptist, and this is revealed by the characterization of this personality as it is given precisely by our Evangelist and by him alone. It is first to be recalled that to the Baptist there is ascribed so peculiarly significant a revelation-historical relationship to Jesus that his appearance even in the Prologue, which treats the all-dominant idea of the Logos-revelation, is repeatedly brought to mention and appreciation—and indeed with the express naming of his name John—before the only other one named there and here only once (117), the “lawgiver” Moses. This is a distinction of this “man” (16) such as the Evangelist could bestow only upon an Old Testament organ of revelation, to whom he was on the point of ascribing a wondrous presentiment of profound New Testament knowledge of Christ

237

(3 27—36; cf. 1:15.29 f.)711. But the further this was carried, the more the incomparable divine height of the one whom the Baptist was called to serve only as forerunner and witness came to light (cf. the image of a lamp that shines only for a time, 5 35). This ultimately demanded also a corresponding modification of the typology, a corrective intensification, which replaced the parallel Dionysos–Jesus with the parallel Apollon–Jesus, whereby at the same time the pair of friends John–Jesus became the antitype of the pair of friends Dionysos–Apollon. From the

difference of person and manner of life (already strongly prominent synoptically between John and Jesus; cf. Mt. 11 18 f.; Lc. 7 33 f.) one had to abstract in the newly gained parallel Dionysos–John; the comparison here is restricted to the analogy of the vocational position of the two in relation to those higher ones who follow them. To the prophet (Joh. 1 7.15.26 f.29—34.36. 3 27—36. 5 35), forerunner and preparer of the way (1 23.30. 3 28), John, Dionysos in his own way stands opposite in the same function (s. o. S. 133 f. 151 f. 212 f.). To the relationship of friendship with Jesus, to which the Baptist applies the image of the bridegroom's friend, corresponds the intimate bond into which Dionysos entered in the cult of Delphi with Apollon, and which went so far that the two exchanged their attributes and epithets and "finally all distinction between them seemed to be abolished." The Baptist's watchword: He must increase, but I must decrease (3 30), which intimates a voluntary subordination, self-restraint, and withdrawal, could thus appear to correspond, as the higher antitype, to the stance that the mythical conception ascribed to Dionysos at the transition from spring to summer712. The healing

significance of water in John on the one hand, and in Dionysos on the other (cf. Anm. 453), could also provide a point of comparison713. But that the fourth Evangelist, with the demonstrated intensification of his typology, in adopting the (revelation-historically and mythologically shaped) idea of a most perfect manifestation of life and light in a divine person, wished to attach to the highest standpoint given religions-philosophically by the Logos-idea of the Prologue (11—14) the most exalted conception of Hellenic as well as Christian religion itself, and from the outset to guide the reader to be initiated into the deeper mystery of evangelical truth to this thus inwardly connected twofold mode of contemplation, presses itself upon the reader 715.

240

Third Section

The mystery-character of the Fourth Gospel

A. The New Testament and religio-historical premises

a) It has already been emphasized (see above pp. 204 f.) that in the Fourth Gospel the word μυστήριον (like the conceptually related τελετή) is not used, and that in this omission special reasons of tact (of caution?) were presumably decisive. To begin with, it is evident without further ado that precisely this Gospel needed the explicit designation of its content or purpose as something mysterious all the less, the more strongly that very distinctive character emerges throughout in the matter itself. It may be asked, however, whether the Evangelist, despite the deliberate avoidance of those termini, nevertheless seized the opportunity, in consistent execution of his basic conception, to let shine through the typical relation of similarity that presents itself specifically between the New Testament mysteries and the classical mysteries.

241

As far as the highly mysterious character of the writing in general is concerned, it is a matter here, as already emerges from the first section, above all of the presentation of the impression that Jesus, as the Logos become flesh, makes through signs and word upon the great multitude (the κόσμος in this restricted sense), insofar as the possibility of understanding comes into consideration. In the whole world of humankind there is no one who can grasp the heavenly saving truth of the kingdom of God without mediation by the Son of Man who has come down from heaven: such a person would first have had to ascend into heaven (3 12.13). Even before the incarnation of the Logos, however, humanity as a whole had rather, owing to its natural darkening, resisted the reception of the light of his revelation (1 5), and it remained so after his appearance in Jesus: the world (“the hardened creature”) did not recognize his nature, despite the God-filled glory of his manifestation (1 10.11.14). This applies most of all to those to whom he stood immediately face to face in person, to the great multitude of his compatriots and fellow countrymen. His entire manner of speech (λαλιά) is incomprehensible to them, because for lack of faith they are incapable of apprehending the thought-content of what is spoken (8 43). So strange and alien does what they hear seem to them again and again that they believe they have before them a demonically deranged person (8 48. 52. 10 20). Involuntarily there presses itself upon the Evangelist, if he is to understand this incapacity and obduracy of the people, the recollection of the prophetic word Isa. 6 9.10, in which he in reality hears the pre-historical Logos-Christ himself already predicting this blinding of the contemporaries of Jesus—which is not to be remedied even by miraculous signs—as a divine judgment of punishment (John 12 37—41). From this, however, it further explains itself that the Jesus of his Gospel, markedly

diverging from that of the Synoptics, begins already at the outset of his messianic teaching activity with the presentation of the most exalted, far-reaching mysteries and the deepest, most enigmatic questions, and continuously makes demands upon the capacity of comprehension of

242

the “Jews,” by which the overtaxed great mass of the people together with their spiritual leaders can only be repelled718. From the makeshift of figurative speech, indeed, here— as 10 6 (with respect to the allegory of the good shepherd) expressly gives to understand—least of all could anything be expected719.

In relation to the numerous audience mentioned, the circle of the Twelve disciples now appears, according to the opening of our Gospel, to form precisely also with respect to understanding of the Logos-revelation effected in the person of Jesus the strongest conceivable contrast. Immediately after the calling of the first disciples, Jesus announces to them in a tone of most emphatic assurance that they will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man (1 51); and in the Prologue the Evangelist himself bears anticipatory witness720 from himself and his fellow believers721: the Logos became flesh and pitched his tent among us,

243

and we beheld his glory, a glory such as an Only-begotten from the Father has, full of grace and truth (1 14). In both utterances there is talk of perceptions that afforded the disciples insight into the wondrous divine mystery of the person and saving work of Jesus722. The seeing of v. 51 as well as the beholding of v. 14 presupposed in them precisely the eye of faith and is to be understood not merely as something continuous and repeated, but at the same time as something progressing from a lower to a higher stage723, which finally leads to the visio Dei possible only by this way (1 18; cf. 14 9). If one now looks more closely, however, one notices that the Evangelist has not omitted to mark the enigmatic character of the being and work of Jesus that also asserts itself vis-à-vis the disciples, hindering and slowing their progress. In a subtle manner he actually turns to this only after he has shown the incapacity of the dominant Jewish leadership and of the crowd dependent upon it and has illuminated their dismissal by Jesus in many ways. Only this had already had to be shown at the beginning of the evangelical narrative (in the episode at Sychar): how easily even the disciples, where they came before their “Rabbi” with a concern pertaining to natural life, could fail to grasp the deeper sense of his reply corresponding to his vocational interest and inner need, comparable in this respect even to the Samaritan woman herself (4 33 f.). A related trait is the uncomprehending fixation upon the external and the overestimation of the same on Peter’s part even on the occasion of the footwashing (13 8—10). With this we are already standing immediately before the farewell discourses, the imparting of the final disclosures of Jesus concerning his person and his work. What is offered here treats of the relation of

244

perfect communion of love of his own with God and among themselves, to be established by him and henceforth to be maintained, and serves for the eschatological clarification724 and mystical deepening of the saving knowledge of the disciples under the aspect of the imminently impending transition of Jesus into the state of exaltation and glorification. Knowledge of the self-testimonies he laid down before the Jewish leadership is of course presupposed. But the higher the reach already was with these, and the higher therefore the demands that the intensification in the farewell discourses placed upon the disciples themselves, the more intelligible and significant becomes the unmistakable endeavor of the Evangelist here all the more to let emerge (despite 6 68 f.) also the inadequacy of the intellectual capacity and the power of premonition of the most intimate followers of Jesus (τεκνία 13 33), to portray their spiritual immaturity and backwardness. They too are meant, right up to the end, to have it vividly brought home to their consciousness that in everything they see and hear in their master they are dealing with the highest divine mystery. The more they gradually believe they have penetrated into this mystery725, the more incomprehensible and contradictory there now appears to them above all the unbending, ever more clearly emerging will of Jesus to suffer, and the thought demanded of them of the necessity and decisive saving efficacy (12 23 f.) of his death. This is illustrated in a series of examples in the behavior of individual disciples or of their totality with their questions and objections (Thomas 11 16. 14 4—7; Peter 13 36 f. 18 10 f.; Philip 14 8 f.; Judas 14 22; some 16 17 f.) and in sayings of Jesus referring thereto (14 28. 16 5 f. 21 f.)726. If, however, in 16 29 the disciples

245

still emphasize in particular the difficulty of understanding the figurative manner of speech of Jesus, no reproach attaches to them thereby (cf. 16 25; see above pp. 8 f.). The same holds elsewhere—evidently according to the Evangelist's own conception—also of their incapacity noted in 12 16 in the interpretation of a single messianic prophecy: it was humanly impossible (see above pp. 208—210). The passages therefore in reality lie outside our context.

If, according to what has preceded, in the Fourth Gospel the interest of the disciples in the mystery of revelation in the person of Jesus— from one part of his Gospel to another increasingly—concentrates upon the (christological-)eschatological question, this is known to have a matter-appropriate precedent already in the synoptic narrative727. Corresponding to this, however, is further that also the New Testament word μυστήριον is found almost throughout precisely where the thought in last relation is eschatologically determined728. In all passages that come into consideration we are dealing with the eternally premeditated saving work of God for humanity, which through Christ comes to revelation, execution, and completion, whether it be that the whole is in view729 or individual details730, or whether

246

the general and the particular together are indicated731. In the Synoptics the pervasive fundamental view that the divine saving economy in Christ is already by its nature and for the whole world initially a mystery recedes perceptibly behind the secondary thought—belonging to the "theology" of the Synoptics themselves—that it remains a mystery for a certain part of

humanity (above all within Israel) because of the parabolic form of its presentation by Jesus. It is here called the μυστήριον of the kingdom of God732, not merely because it must first be revealed to human beings, but especially because it is not grasped by the great mass despite proclamation by Christ (Mark 4 11. Matt. 13 11. Luke 8 10). With regard to the use of the word μυστήριον occurring only here in the Gospels, one has thought of a “subtle beginning and transition to esoteric mystery-teaching”733. Whether sufficient ground exists for this may perhaps find its answer in what follows. For the moment it is only to be established that the word in question nowhere in the New Testament has the meaning, familiar from the classical mystery-language, of a cultic teaching or action to be kept secret.

b) But this leaves fully intact—and rightly so—the question already repeatedly touched upon (see above pp. 90 f. 204 ff.) whether nevertheless an influence of the pagan mysteries upon the conception and language of the New Testament in general734 and thus also upon the Fourth Gospel is to be recognized735. If

247

for the time being we leave aside those passages of the non-“Johannine” literature that relate to baptism and the Lord’s Supper, then after deduction of the more or less uncertain cases we initially obtain a relatively modest number of attestations. Foremost stand the testimonies of the Pauline literature.

Among the very uncertain and improbable examples I count above all μυεῖσθαι in Phil. 4 12, where the verb is unmistakably used in the also classically generalized sense, since the context in no way suggests the thought of anything mysterious736. In the case of χρίειν in II Cor. 1 21 (cf. I John 2 20. 27), used of consecration to the apostleship, alongside the plainly Old Testament foundation of word and matter the invocation of a solitary and dubious

248

Attis-mystery notice737 is exceedingly forced. Less simple is the state of affairs in I Cor. 3 2: γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα. Whereas with the “reborn” person in the sense of the Phrygian mysteries the milk-drink actually given symbolizes the nourishment appropriate to his religious stage of development, natural to it (“since the god in him or he in the god is still a child”), according to Paul the spiritual nourishment likened to milk appears as inadequate food for the (reborn-corresponding) Pneumatic. An analogy arises, however, insofar as precisely this nourishment must be applied to the multitude of imperfect, still undeveloped Pneumatics of the Corinthian congregation (cf. v. 1: νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ—“an image” that is at least prepared in the Phrygian mysteries)738. The assumption of an allusion nevertheless remains quite uncertain. It is also noteworthy that a pagan Vorlage would perhaps more readily have led to the contrast of milk and wine than to that of milk and solid food739. Nearly stating a contradiction, however, would it be, in view of the solemn statement of Paul concerning the fundamental fact of his vocational consciousness in Gal. 1 11 ff., to reckon with the possibility that the value he places upon his calling “derives from the role” which calling played in the Isis mysteries and perhaps also in others740. Should truly the uniquely overwhelming and lifelong unabated impression of

the ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ have later let arise in him the need to fall back upon an apparent analogy from the pagan mystery-sphere741?

249

Rather, with μεταμορφοῦσθαι in II Cor. 3:18, where one may think of a transformation wrought by the Spirit of Christ that is not merely ethical but also physical into an image of Christ, perhaps of “mysterious preliminary stages of eschatological transfiguration”742, a connection with the language of the mysteries could come into question, if the proof from Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* (XI 16. 27. 30.)743 were more satisfactory744. When in II Cor. 1:22 (cf. Eph. 1:13. 4:30) σφραγίζεσθαι is used as a metaphor for the assuring marking of the bearers of the Spirit of Christ (above all the apostles), it is to be recalled that the image of stamping and engraving is applied in the Old Testament to the divine

250

authentication of the Messiah, who himself appears as a signet ring on Yahweh’s hand (Jer. 22:24. Zech. 3:9)745. A connection of the Pauline expression with the σφραγίζεσθαι (signare, consignare) of the mysteries746, however close it may lie, need not be assumed; its possibility, however, must readily be conceded. The word τέλειος in I Cor. 2:6. 7 is here, as elsewhere in the New Testament, by no means the designation of a mystes in the technical sense, that is, of one cultically initiated into a religious mystery; it simply contains the concept of the intellectual and moral full maturity of the (Christian-)religious capacity for knowledge (cf. I Cor. 13:10. 14:20. Phil. 3:15. Eph. 4:13. Col. 1:28. 4:12. Heb. 5:14. Jas. 1:4.—Mt. 5:48. 19:21). If, therefore, there can be no talk here of a “borrowing” from the language of the mysteries, it must nevertheless on the one hand not be overlooked that the apostle immediately and expressly remarks of the divine wisdom to be presented among the mature (τελείοις) that it consists ἐν μυστηρίῳ (I Cor. 2:7), and on the other hand that precisely in Corinth, neighboring Megara and Eleusis, Demeter and Persephone belonged to the oldest and holiest deities747. This makes it at least possible that a hint on the part of the apostle may also be involved, the comparative reflection: just as the aspirants of the (Eleusinian) mysteries, so the Christians of the Corinthian community who in general have remained at the stage of fleshly sense-perception must first still be initiated into a supreme salvific mystery (extending also to existence after death)—each group in its own way748.

As a passage in whose mode of expression a reference to the mysteries can be recognized more or less definitely and surely, II Cor. 12:4 may especially be regarded

251

(“unspeakable words, which no human being may utter”); not to the same degree 4:6, where the effect of the apostle’s conversion-vision is designated, on the side of knowledge, as φωτισμός (cf. Eph. 3:9: φῶτίσαι: τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου)749. Particular attention, however, deserves Paul’s self-designation in Philem. 1. 9 as δέσμιος Χρίστου Ἰησοῦ. To Onesimus, Philemon’s δοῦλος (v. 16), the apostle here places himself at the side as one who stands in a

similar relation of belonging and service to Christ. But if he does not likewise call himself a slave, but intensifies this by calling himself a prisoner of Christ and thereby hints at the bodily imprisonment that has come upon him in his apostolic vocation (v. 10. 13), then in fact much speaks for the view that he at the same time alludes to the language and circumstances of the mysteries750. The expression δέσμιος together with κατέχειν and διακονεῖν (v. 13) recalls the "κάτοχοι or δέσμιοι of Serapis and Isis751, who in hope of the initiations often served for years, indeed for a lifetime, in the temple precincts." If elsewhere Paul transfers to his exemplary apostolic course of life—whose goal is the resurrection and the blissful vision of God—the image of a decisive race or contest, so in this private letter the simile of the period of exercise and probation presses itself upon him, which precedes the granting of the completing and concluding initiation into the mysteries (the epopteia)752. Attention should also be drawn to the simultaneous characterization

252

of the apostle as δέσμιος and of his gospel as μυστήριον (see above) in Eph. 3:1. 3. 4. It is added that in the Philemon letter itself (v. 10) ἐγέννησα (cf. I Cor. 4:15. 17) recalls a fundamental pagan mystery-concept (the γενεσιουργός τῆς παλιγγενεσίας)753. Purely formally, one should also not overlook the demonstrable fondness of the letter-writer for allusions in general, as it emerges in Philem. 10 f. 20 (with reference to the name of the addressee Onesimus). But as regards the eschatological simile of the seed-grain used by Paul in I Cor. 15:36 ff. 42 ff.754, the view that he adduces here an analogue "which, especially because of familiarity with the Eleusinian mysteries, could count on effect"755 will hardly be mistaken, even if "in Eleusis probably not the dying and rising (which in fact was not expected at all) was illustrated by the seed-grain"756.

A larger series of Pauline expressions, whose Old Testament origin and Old Testament foundational significance are established and which from the outset diminish the weight of comparable material within the language of the mysteries, or in which history-of-religions parallels do not arise within the language of the mysteries alone757, can—and must—remain undiscussed here (cf. above p. 246).

Likewise, the traditions, conceptions, and

253

expressions of the post-Pauline literature that have come into comparison largely lack the requisite probative force. Entirely to be disregarded is the untenable adduction of the mysteries of Petra and of the Attis mysteries to explain the doctrine of the virginity of the mother of Jesus; likewise the "precipitate and unmethodical" combination of the wording of the heavenly voice at the baptism of Jesus: "You are my Son, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε" (Luke 3:22 D) with the mystery-concept of rebirth or "the Egyptian belief that with baptism the elevation of the heir to the throne to godhood begins"758. Also an derivation of the report of the adoration of the infant Jesus by the shepherds from the well-known Mithras parallel is wholly uncertain759. It fares no better, with a view to the expression of Hellenistic Judaism that designates Moses as "mediator,"

to connect the New Testament title μεσίτης of Jesus in Heb. 8:6. 9:15. 12:24. I Tim. 2:5 with the mediator-name of Mithra760. Essentially different, however, are the circumstances with regard to the tradition concerning the authority of the keys of Peter, if I have rightly seen in the demonstration of the late origin of the Matthew passage in question761, 762. According to this, "one would indeed have to reckon with the possibility that the original version of Mt. 16:18. 19—which does not refer to Peter but to Christ—arose on the occasion of the missionary confrontation of Christianity with the Persian mystery religion, as this above all had to take place in Rome; all the more so, the more one might in general feel driven, in view of the large number of external points of comparison, to present Christ to the Mithraic community as the true Mithra." From the entire discussion of the details of the question it resulted,

254

however, "that a derivation of the biblical series of conceptions from the world of ideas of the Persian mystery religion is in no way indicated"763. At the very least, the possibility—if not rather the probability—of a relation of dependence or at least kinship between the striking accumulation of visions in the conversion-history of Paul and quite similarly in that of Cornelius764 and the challenging parallels of conception and experience among initiates of Isis and Osiris, of which Apuleius (*Metamorph.* XI 21 f. 27) has to report, must be conceded. Which side is to be thought of as influencing the other can hardly be doubtful. No less justified may be the conjecture that the (to be sure sufficiently Old Testament-grounded) expression ῥαντισμός (αἵματος Ἰη. Χρ.) Heb. 12:24 (cf. 9:13 f. 10:22). I Pet. 1:2 also incidentally alludes to the taurobolium of the Cybele and Attis mysteries. The latter passage in particular seems to speak for this, because the ῥαντισμός is immediately followed by the ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς765.

255

Unmistakable is the intentional application of a term from the language of the mysteries in the ἔποπται II Pet. 1:16766. For it is indeed a matter of an experience that in fact recalls the New Testament concept of μυστήριον (see above p. 245). Likewise beyond doubt is the image of new begetting and rebirth (I Pet. 1:3: ἀναγεννήσας; 1:23: ἀναγεγεννημένοι; 2:2: ἀρτιγέννητα; Tit. 3:5: παλιγγενεσίας), which is absent from the preaching of Jesus767, not arisen on the soil of Jewish but of contemporary Hellenistic religion. "Mystery piety made the beautiful conception of rebirth at home in the Mediterranean world of the Roman Empire"708. The conclusion lies close at hand that the simile of milk for the spiritual nourishment of Christians who, though again born, are nevertheless undeveloped (I Pet. 2:2)769 also stems from the language of the mysteries770. If then in the First Letter of Peter not only in 1:3—5 but indirectly also in 1:28—2:2 the rebirth is connected with

256

σωτηρία (salvation in the judgment) as eschatological purpose-determination (cf. what is indicated in Tit. 3:4—7 concerning the effect and final aim of the bath of rebirth), then the comparison with the transplantation into a new life of σωτηρία, as it occurs according to the Isis mystery through rebirth (renasci), rightly presses itself upon one771. The dogma of Hermetic

theology that no one can attain σωτηρία unless he is reborn772 may be mentioned alongside. The passage of the Letter to Titus just compared itself leads to a further side-glance into the realm of the mysteries when it lets the appearance (ἐπεφάνη v. 4) of God as our σωτήρ in the person of our σωτήρ Jesus Christ aim at our attainment of the promised good of eternal life (cf. 1:1 f. 2:11. 13), as this will occur with the appearance (ἐπιφάνεια 2:13) of the great God and our Savior773 Christ Jesus. One can indeed scarcely resist the impression that the writer of the letter, in thinking of this repeatedly occurring epiphany of the Savior Christ774, had in mind the elemental counter-image provided by the continuing succession of epiphanies of Dionysus, of which above (p. 212 f.) there was already mention in connection with the typology of the Fourth Gospel. In the present case it need only be recalled that the hope of the immortality of the soul was also “grounded on the Dionysus mysteries” (Plut. *consol. ad uxor.* 10 p. 611 D)775. That finally the explanation of the christological shepherd image in I Pet. 2:25. 5:4.

257

Heb. 13:20 (the great shepherd of the sheep) from the figure of Attis of the mysteries named after him or from that of the Poimandres and the like, in any case does not gain in probability through the inclusion of the “good shepherd” of John 10, should follow from what has already been set forth (p. 152 f.). We may perhaps in both cases ultimately be dealing with an echoing of the New Testament conception of the Dionysian mysteries776.

e) A more significant interest than all that has preceded is naturally offered by the question of the influence of the pagan mysteries on Christian baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Of the statements relating to baptism, insofar as they are of importance for the question mentioned777, the more generally framed ones may first be briefly illuminated. The baptism of the earliest Jewish-Christian church may be left out of consideration. It evidently attached itself to the baptism of John, which already has a relation to the messianic time, which indeed “according to the sayings of the prophets is to be inaugurated with a purification through water, with forgiveness of sins, and with an outpouring of the Spirit of God”778. The more definitely and comprehensively the activity of the Baptist appears, in the New Testament writings, to be brought into connection with Old Testament revelation, and the less anything secretive entered into the baptismal preaching of John that took place in full public view, in broad daylight, with strong attendance, the more is any side-glance here toward the pagan mystery-system excluded. This, however, permits conclusions to be drawn regarding the origin and formation of the earliest Christian baptism. Just as, on the basis of the wilderness preacher and messianic way-preparer found in the prophecy Isa. 40:3 (Mark 1:2 f. Matt. 3:1–3. Luke 3:4. John 1:23), one saw a multiplicity of messengers with the same preaching following from the Zion community (Isa. 40:9), so historically one could

258

discern in the performance of New Testament baptism by the increasing number of Christian community officials the completing continuation of the foundational baptismal work of John. If, however, we thus also obtain a purely Old Testament-oriented context, there is added to this, with regard to the character of Christian baptism, that the entire pneumatology of Old Testament

soteriology has nothing to do with mysticism and the mystery-system779. One might easily be inclined to expect a different situation in Paulinism. I Cor. 15:29 seems at first sight to point in that direction. In the custom of Corinthian Christians indicated here, according to which baptism was undertaken vicariously for unbaptized deceased persons in order to help them toward resurrection and blessedness, one decidedly receives the impression780 that it developed under the influence of the ancient mystery-system781. It certainly also permits a conclusion regarding the mysticism of precisely those circles in their understanding of ordinary baptism. An agreement of the apostle with the practice in question, thus in a certain sense an indirect influence of a mysterious kind, is, however, all the less to be inferred despite the reference to that practice, the more in his case precisely also here the all-dominant ethical character of his manner of thought and belief had to come into effect782. In I Cor. 10:1 ff.

259

Paul gives an Old Testament typology (τύποι v. 6)783. To the exposition that both baptism and the Lord's Supper were prefigured in the salvation-historical saving experience of Israel there is joined the reflection that, as in the Old Testament, so also in the New Testament "the reception of the means of grace does not protect from eternal ruin," and the warning against the "craving for the goods of the pagan past"784. This is not suited to suggest thinking of an underlying comparison of baptisms and meals of pagan mysteries785. Even if indeed the juxtaposition of the two means of grace might speak for the assumption of a history-of-religions reference, there nevertheless stands over against this the fact that their belonging together can be sufficiently explained from their essence and purpose786. From I Cor. 1:13 ff., where it is not the essence and value of baptism that is in question but merely the significance of the baptizer for the sacred act and for the baptized person, no argument results for our investigation.

Of greater importance, however, are the Pauline statements to be examined next, which determine the essence and value of baptism more precisely. As a cleansing bath it appears unmistakably, without explicit naming, when the apostle says to the Corinthians I Cor. 6:11: "you have had yourselves washed,

260

you have been sanctified, you have been justified through the name (the invocation of the name Acts 22:16 Rom. 10:13) of the Lord Jesus Christ and through the (thereby received) Spirit of our God," where, in all likelihood, water-baptism and Spirit-baptism are conceived as a unitary double act belonging together in substance and time787. But since here the triad of concepts purification—sanctification—justification, however disputable the contextual explanation of each individual term may remain788, stands in its essence palpably on Old Testament ground, an occasion for seeking a mystery-comparison lay far off789. A far more profound and stronger image is employed by the apostle in Rom. 6:3 ff. According to this, baptism, which takes place under the symbol of the cleansing and enlivening immersion-bath, is the fundamental assumption of the obligation toward Christ that demands the mortification of the sinful natural being, and, in connection with this, the empowering of the baptized person to fulfill that obligation through the reception of the Spirit of Christ that unites him with Christ and morally

re-enlivens him (cf. I Cor. 12:13. Rom. 8:9)790. The entire inner process is at the same time presented as the purely spiritual counter-image of what took place bodily in the sinless Jesus himself with

261

his suffering of death and his resurrection. In view of this christotypological grounding of baptism, which in itself is simply a comparison of completely heterogeneous things and as such has nothing in common with mysticism and its mutual interpenetration of disparate realities791, one will with good reason be little inclined to assume that the apostle received a stimulus through the “occasional intrusion of ethical demands” in the Asia Minor and Greek mysteries (specifically perhaps also through the notion of a—no longer clearly graspable and more closely determinable for us—dying in a figurative “sense”)792, and much rather will fall back on the Pauline fundamental conception of the opposition between flesh and spirit, whether the same is to be regarded as Hellenistic-dualistic or not793 (see above p. 91 f.)794. In I Cor. 6:11 as in Rom. 6:3 ff. the fundamental thought is the removal of morally-religiously impure and unhealthy life. The positive moment of the creation of a new life that already attaches itself here comes to particular expression in two further passages. When in I Cor. 12 baptism is portrayed as an inundation and again as a drinking through of the Holy Spirit of God (v. 13) (cf. Old Testamentally, with respect to the image of the

262

Spirit-drink, Isa. 29:10), one will hardly find here a motive for surveying the mystery-sphere. The situation appears somewhat different at first glance in Gal. 3:27: ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. The saying belongs to a context that throughout concerns πίστις and sets forth the contrast of faith in Christ and its saving efficacy with the self-righteousness of obedience to the law that is invalid before God. If here, in between, baptism is mentioned, this too happens only insofar as in this cultic act the decisive manifestation of faith for the admission of community members takes place. This is all the more to be noted since, moreover, the appended image of ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν according to all parallel passages does not point to baptism but to a purely inward process. It signifies in Rom. 13:14 (cf. 12:2. I Pet. 1:14) the appropriation of the disposition of mind and manner of action corresponding to the life-fellowship with Christ. The same applies also to Col. 3:10 and Eph. 4:24, where instead of Christ the new human being is designated as what is to be put on; for “if the result of the ἐνδύεσθαι τὸν νέον ἄνθρωπον is to be that Christ is πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, then Christ must be the νέος ἄνθρωπος”795. This also accords with the apostle’s self-designation as ἄνθρωπος ἐν Χριστῷ (II Cor. 12:2). The sense of Gal. 3:26 ff. is accordingly: You all (Gentile Christians as well as Jewish Christians of every status and sex) are sons of God (freed from the enslaving guardianship of the law) through faith in Christ Jesus, because you (through precisely this faith) have already, in the baptism that grounds your salvific state, put on Christ (appropriated his mind—νοῦς I Cor. 2:16; cf. Phil. 4:7—and clothed your inner human being, Rom. 7:22. II Cor. 4:16. Eph. 3:16, with the light proceeding from Christ; cf. Phil. 4:7 f. 2:15–17). The explanation of this subjective inward process is given here as well (see above on Rom. 6:3 ff.) by the reception of the Spirit

conceived in connection with baptism (I Cor. 12:13), who is the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:9) and as such also the Spirit of sonship (childship Gal. 4:5 f. Rom. 8:15–17). But even if

263

the conception of this divine effect undeniably approaches very closely the purely mystical mode of thought (cf. above), it must nevertheless not be overlooked that the apostle in Gal. 3:27 has in view primarily only the self-activity of those submitting to baptism, and that this is in itself essentially ethical in character. This makes it unlikely that he was led to the image of putting on that he used by its application in the pagan mystery-language796, all the more so since one can also point to the process of Old Testament conception and language, as Job 29:14 shows ("I put on righteousness, and it clothed me")798.

The Pauline understanding of baptism is also encountered in the Colossian and Ephesians letters and in the literature that is certainly post-Pauline, without anything essentially new for our question emerging there in general. Thus Hebr. 10:23 (6:2), Eph. 5:26, I Pet. 3:21 fall under the standpoint of purification799, and Col. 2:11 f. (cf. Rom. 6:3 ff.)

264

under the antitypical image referring back to Christ of dying—being stripped of the fleshly body (cf. Gal. 3:27), of being buried and of being raised up, where it is to be noted that even the prefixed Old Testament parallel, the presentation of baptism as the antitype of circumcision, does not prompt mystical contemplation. A new element would enter here if the "enlightenment" of which Hebr. 10:32 (6:4?) speaks were to designate the effect of baptism. That in this an attachment to the language of the mysteries (φωτίζειν, φωτισμός) might come into play is to be conceded (cf. above p. 251). With certainty, however, this may be assumed when in Tit. 3:5 baptism is called a bath of rebirth and renewal of the Holy Spirit (cf. above p. 255). It is hardly a mere "coincidence that this expression itself [new- or rebirth] is not used in the extant letters of Paul"800. One must find this all the more striking because Paul represents himself not only in a generalizing way as the begetter of the Corinthians and the Galatians in their capacity as Christians (I Cor. 4:15. Gal. 4:19), but also specifically as the begetter of the Christianized Onesimus (Philem. 10). This calls

265

to mind the spiritual "father" that became typical in the Hellenic mystery-communities (in the Isis cult on Delos, in the Phrygian mysteries, in the Mithras cult among the worshipers of θεὸς ὕψιστος and elsewhere)801, and the γενεσιουργός τῆς παλιγγενεσίας (the human father of the one to be reborn, chosen by the will of God802, who himself must again be reborn, must have become a son of God) in Hellenistic-theological literature (with respect to the ancient Egyptian gods of revelation Hermes, Isis, Ἀγαθὸς δαίμων, Asclepius)803. But if we are thereby led onto the path of mystery-comparison, it must not be overlooked that "among the forms in which primordial peoples conceive the highest religious consecration, the union with God, necessarily belongs that of a sexual union, through which the human being takes into himself the innermost

essence and power of a god, his seed"804. One may compare the initiation rite in the "evidently Hellenistic-orgiastic" mystery cult in Italy described by Livy XXXIX 8 ff. (beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C.), which symbolizes a sexual union with the god805. One may indeed ask whether Paul did not wish to avoid a designation of the inner transformation of the human being at his admission into the life-communion of Christ that could, by transferring

266

the image of a sexual act to God, recall the offensive parallel of the mystery religions. The chronological distance between the apostle and the later New Testament writers would in that case explain sufficiently not only the appearance of γένναν and ἀναγεννᾶν in I Pet. 2:2. 1:3. 23, but also the equally striking ἀπεκύησεν in Jas. 1:18 (he has begotten us!), likewise said of God with reference to rebirth. One should moreover also note here the connection effected by the purpose-determination: εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχήν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων, with the Pauline designation of those who are in Christ as a καινὴ κτίσις (II Cor. 5:17). The author of the Letter to Titus in 3:5 takes account of the same need by the addition: καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου806.

d) How, finally, is the question of the influence of the pagan mysteries on the Lord's Supper to be answered? Here too one must proceed from a brief retrospective on its origin807, which is equally hampered by the inadequacy of the traditional material and the multiplicity of factors cooperating in the course of events808.

1. The "Supper" arose from the celebration of the remembrance of the last meal of Jesus with his809 disciples. This farewell meal, which according to the Synoptic

267

tradition took place on the 14th of Nisan, was a proper Passover meal, but one that Jesus, in the spirit of his messianic self-consciousness, defined more precisely in a significant way. Like the Passover celebration of his Jewish compatriots and contemporaries, it was devoted to the remembrance of Israel's redemption from Egyptian bondage and its rescue from the danger of death, but it combined with the grateful retrospective on this all-determining saving revelation of God the hope-filled outlook, opening itself in the person and work of Jesus, toward the consummation of salvation in the messianic kingdom (cf. Mark 14:25. Matt. 26:29. Luke 22:16. 18).

2. From the original connection of Jesus' farewell meal with the Passover meal it followed initially also for the commemorative celebration of the former that it was an annual, once-yearly one. Jesus probably only called upon his disciples, at the yearly Old Testament Passover celebration (consumption of meat, bread, and wine), after his death, each time to remember his self-sacrificing act of love and his farewell until reunion, in believing expectation of the blissful reunion with him in the messianic kingdom (cf. I Cor. 11:26). The Jewish-Christian community could derive from its Passover celebration the

three typological points of view of rescue, confirmation of the relationship of grace, and anticipatory enjoyment of salvation.

3. It can, however, be all the less surprising if this Christian celebration from the outset did not suffice for the needs of worship and the veneration of Christ, since it was essentially also a matter of the presentation, strengthening, and deepening of Christian community. This necessarily soon led to the setting aside of both the external and the typologically internal connection between the farewell of Jesus and the Old Testament annual festival, and to the shaping of the New Testament commemorative celebration as an independent one, for whose meal the consumption of meat characteristic of the Passover thus fell away. In this way there arose the Lord's Supper (cf. the designation κυριακὸν δεῖπνον occurring in I Cor. 11:20) in the strict sense, a cultic act freely repeatable at any time

268

within the individual house-communities (κατ' οἶκον Acts 2:46) for the renewal and strengthening of the blessing signified by the simplest symbols (bread and wine) of the foundational facts of the life of Jesus. Jesus appeared in it (corresponding to his farewell meal) as continuing to work as the housefather, friend, and host (though no longer table-companion) of his own (cf. Luke 22:18; in Rev. 3:20 the meal—δειπνήσω—is only an image of the cultivation of the most intimate mutual fellowship in general). By means of the rite of the "breaking of bread" (κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; 27:35; cf. Luke 24:30), introduced with thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία, εὐλογία cf. I Cor. 11:24; 10:16; Luke 24:30) and indicating the togetherness of those celebrating, there was at the same time to take place on the part of the participants a vivid and solemn making-present of the personal being-together with Jesus, whom we hear say in Matt. 18:20: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them," (cf. Luke 24:31, where the Risen One has not yet ascended). It is, however, no less understandable if the same Christian communal need that early drove and compelled the formation of the "Lord's Supper"810 was thereby prompted to place alongside the purely religious a Christian-social communal meal, a love-feast (ἀγάπη)811 expressing the fraternal relationship of the believers in Christ, and also to bring the two celebrations outwardly into as close and regular a relation to one another as possible812. It lies close at

269

hand, in itself, when the agape was added to the Lord's Supper in the narrower sense, to think of a compensatory consideration for the omission of the consumption of meat813. In fact, however, the decisive motive is not to be sought in the sphere of material enjoyment of food, but in the idea of the religious love-feast as such. On closer inspection we also obtain here a corresponding, in its essence ideal, counter-image of a widely disseminated social institution of classical antiquity. This is the institution of communal meals known under the name syssitia (συσσίτια) in Greece, especially in Crete814 and Sparta, as well as on the Lipari islands and in southern Italy. The members of one and the same "brotherhood" (φρατρία, φράτρα) or association

(ἑταιρεία), “which we must probably originally think of quite literally as a blood-brotherhood,” and which everywhere (in blood-vengeance, in inheritance law, and in cult) entered as a complement and extension of the family, assembled in the service of the phratrial gods (in Athens, Zeus and Athena) for meals and sacrificial festivals815. In Sparta each

270

table-companion had to provide a fixed monthly contribution of barley meal, wine, cheese, figs (fish, etc.). The main component of the food was the so-called black broth (blood soup). Voluntary contributions of more costly dishes were permitted. The entire institution, however, “was designed not only to promote moderation in enjoyment, but also unanimity of disposition”816. Alongside the series of points of comparison already to be derived from what has preceded, a curious variation in the classical designation of the meals in question also deserves attention. In Sparta, instead of the general designation συσσίτια, the name φιλίτια or φιδίτια or φειδίτια came into use early817. Plutarch already gives the double interpretation of “φιλία (love-meals) and φειδώ (frugal meals).” That the exclusion of women from the Hellenic brotherhood- and love-meals did not stand in the way of the imitation of these in Christian syssitia, which united the two sexes, already follows from a correct appreciation of the dominant point of view of Gal. 3:27 f. (cf. Eph. 5:22–33; 6:10–17). How easily, however, it could come about even on the Christian side that one and the same brotherly meal became for one a full satiation, for another a suffering of hunger, Paul shows at a place like Corinth (I Cor. 11:21). As ideal and at the same time practically obvious as the fundamental idea of the institution was818, so inevitably it had to prove itself sooner or later as not viable, as history has also shown. A connection of the Christian communal meals with those of the Essenes, “which had the character of sacrifices” and are

271

also called συσσίτια by Philo819, is certainly not to be thought of in the first instance. With reference to the σύνδειπνα of the Jews (Joseph. Ant. XIV 10, 8) and the “Pharisaic associations,” still less is to be achieved.

4. A regrettable lack of clarity entered the course of events through the fact that from the earliest time onward within the Jewish-Christian community the Old Testament typological contemplation of the Lord’s Supper could exert influence in various ways. This is revealed by Paul himself. After the death of Jesus it could not fail to occur that his self-sacrifice was viewed by the primitive community in the light of the Old Testament sacrificial system. Already from the immediate succession of Jesus’ Passover celebration and his suffering unto death, that community would all the more have derived a providential impulse to transfer the Passover idea to the Passion of Christ, the more surprising and overwhelming the breakthrough of faith in the resurrection of the deceased had been. If he was truly risen, and had revealed himself as such not only to the apostles but also to a large number of “brothers” (I Cor. 15 4 ff.), then with his victory

over death and the underworld (and all hostile spiritual powers of the world cf. Eph. 4 8) a work of redemption had been initiated which presented itself as the antitype of the salvific event celebrated in the Passover. Thereby the thought was also stimulated that Christ gives his own, in his meal, to enjoy the salvific blessing (assuring divine grace and eternal life) which he has acquired for them as antitype of the Passover lamb (I Cor. 5 7)820 through his suffering unto death. But the typological need did not remain here either with what lay closest at hand. Paul already testifies, through his formulation of the transmitted words of institution, to the idea of the establishment of a new covenant with God effected by the shedding of Christ's blood

272

and his death (I Cor. 11 25)821. Although in fact, in this comparison of the Old Testament covenant-conclusion just as in that of the preceding Passover event, the peace-offering meal sacrifice זבח שלמים (Ex. 24 5) emerged as type822, it is self-evident that precisely Paul, in his understanding of the Lord's Supper, has "pursued" neither the idea of the covenant sacrifice nor that of the Passover sacrifice further, because for him rather here too, in accordance with the fundamental thought (ὃ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις) of his doctrine of reconciliation (I Cor. 15 3), the consideration of the death of Jesus as an antitypically substitutionary expiatory sacrifice (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν I Cor. 11 24) was "decisive"823. That, to be sure, the expiatory sacrifice strictly speaking was least suited to the typology of the Lord's Supper, because by its very nature it excluded a meal of the sacrificial community, is obvious.

5. It will now, however, be asked whether with these points of view the Old Testament typology coming into consideration is exhausted at all. The investigation will above all have to keep in view that what is bodily to be consumed in the Lord's Supper is only bread and wine. This, however, recalls the no less mysterious and solemn hospitality with bread and wine such as, according to Gen. 14 18 ff. (in one of the youngest and most enigmatic narrative sections of the Pentateuch), was bestowed upon Abram and his company by King Melchizedek.

273

That this wholly peculiar royal figure, otherwise not historically graspable, could still in later times strongly stimulate typological comparisons among New Testament writers is shown strikingly by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who, following the messianic characterization of the prefiguration of Melchizedek in Ps. 110 4 (You are a priest forever according to the manner of Melchizedek — κατὰ τὴν τάξιν M.), has presented Christ as the perfected antitype of Melchizedek (5 6. 10. 6 20. 7 1. 10. 11. 15. 17)82^. Melchizedek appears in Gen. 14 like a deus ex machina. Under these circumstances we are all the more dependent on seeking clarification in the personal details given, however brief yet evidently significant they may be. These unmistakably allow it to shine through that we are dealing with a being of a higher order, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has already expressed this in the most definite manner

(following an oral tradition?)825 (7 8: ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων)826. According to our New Testament witness this is already indicated by the distinction accorded to Melchizedek through the voluntary tithe-payment of Abram (the "friend" of Yahweh: Isa. 41 8; II Chr. 20 7; Jas. 2 23) (Hebr. 7 2. 4—8). A more definite and more reliable track is opened to us by the investigation of the names. The personal name מלכי־צדק, which does not mean "my king is Ṣedeq"827, but "king of righteousness" (βασιλεὺς

274

δικαιοσύνης Hebr. 7 2)828, irresistibly recalls the name Dharmarāj829, which in the post-Vedic mythology of the Aryan Indians is borne, in a certain sense as a god-man, by Yama as king of the dead in the underworld. The law (dharma) which he upholds is, according to its original sense, the natural order of things830, as it manifests itself in particular also in the universal destiny of death of human beings. But with him, as judge of the dead, the moral world order comes especially into consideration831. In contrast to this role, which makes Yama a feared numen832, the Vedic literature, seemingly in full contradiction, assigns him rather a sphere of activity in the highest heaven. Here too he is king (rājan), namely of the blessed righteous fathers, whom he, as the first mortal to have died and entered heaven (insofar as human), as pathfinder, path-opener, and guide to heaven, has gathered there around himself for the enjoyment of eternal bliss in the drinking-company of the gods833. With regard to this double role of the one Yama it is to be noted that already his name (yama = twin) points to something doubled. The whole myth becomes intelligible when one recognizes that we are dealing here with the personification of the originally

275

unified sunlight which at one time descends and at another ascends834. The picture of the beyond which the imagination of the easternmost member of the Indo-Germanic family of peoples has drawn from contemplation of nature shows itself in multiple respects akin to that of Hellenic antiquity, which is of special importance here as well. Opposite the gruesome god of death and king of the underworld (Il. 15 188) Aides (Hades) stands the much more popular conception, which emerged later, of the subterranean god as a giver of wealth, hence called Plouton835, and above all of the blessing of grain, "the venerable one pure and simple, whom one remembers with peculiar awe, but yet with trust and hope"836. He is distinguished by numerous epithets which celebrate him not only generally as the "benevolent one," but especially as the great gatherer of the people, host and entertainer, and the "equally distributing one" (Ἰσοδαίτης)837. What in this designation only sounds indistinctly, ancient Hellenic belief has splendidly expressed in that ideal of a just ruler represented by Rhadamanthys (ὁ δίκαιος, ὁ δικαιότατος), revered above all in Crete as the supposed king of the most ancient time, and in whom, characteristically, tradition once again ends eschatologically with a bifurcation838. Exactly the same trail as the comparison of these mutually related religion-historical

276

complexes of ideas with the image of Melchizedek the king, the righteous one, the hospitable host, is indicated biblically by the hint contained in the designation of place Gen. 14:18: “king of Salem.” The Old Testament otherwise knows no place of this name, apart from Ps. 76 3, where שׁלם, on the basis of our Genesis passage, poetically takes the place of the name Jerusalem. It may be asked what prompted the poet to this license. According to the character of his whole song, probably the intention to allude with this shortened name-form in his song of victory to the victory of Abram. For the explanation of the שלם of the Genesis passage itself, however, nothing whatsoever follows from this. But the suspicion lies close at hand that not only the narrator there, but already his predecessors, however many or few they may have been, thought of the locality of the later royal and priestly city Jerusalem-Zion. Whether this was with sufficient justification is highly doubtful. The characterization of the being of Melchizedek in the Epistle to the Hebrews brings us onto another track. This uniquely begotten being, unlike humans, whose existence is without beginning and end, can by his very nature have no earthly homeland, no earthly sphere of office; he belongs to another world, although tradition in our case exceptionally allows him to intervene in Old Testament revelation history and for this purpose to appear on earth at a consecrated place839, 840. As king of righteousness he is unquestionably also king of peace841. His peace, however, can be neither that of the cemetery (cf. Isa. 57 2) nor that of the shadows of the underworld, but only an Old Testament counterpart of the bliss of the heroes transported into the “land of the departed,” Elysium, or to the Isles of the Blessed,

277

the rapt heroes, the companions of Rhadamanthys842. The מַלְכִּי־שָׁלֵם of Gen. 14 18 was originally a מֶלֶךְ שָׁלוֹם (king of peace and salvation), cf. Hebr. 7 2: βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης). A surprising confirmation of this result is found in Isa. 9 5. 6, where a prophet, apparently post-exilic (c. 550–540), foresees in advance the uniting of the characteristic qualities of Abram and Melchisedek in the person of the Messiah 843. While, however, here Melchisedek is only made a ruler in a messianically typological figure, Psalm 110, in agreement with the Genesis passage, assigns to him as a messianic type also the priestly dignity, and here too the parallel gained in “King Yama” does not fail, insofar as the latter is preferably venerated together with beings of the intermediate realm, thus in Rigv. X 14, 3–5 with the Angiras, and the first and highest Angiras (Agni) is the most eminent priest and sacrificer (Rigv. I 127, 2) 844. Closer in character, however, lies the comparison of Melchisedek with the primeval man of Attica (cf. for the primeval man Yama Rigv. X 135, 1), Kekrops, who according to the popular tradition is the first king and celebrated hero of the land and was conceived as a “priestly king,” just as he not only dedicated the

278

first altar on the citadel of Athens to Zeus Hypsatos, the Hellenistic 845 ,אֵל עֶלְיוֹן but is also said to have founded an altar and a festival there in the land for Kronos (and Rhea) and to have consecrated the image of Hermes in the temple of Athena Polias in Athens. His chthonic origin is already indicated by his autochthony and his bodily form; he is an earth-born being (γηγενής) uniting a double nature within himself 846. Connected with this is the fact that Kekrops, according to his oldest conception, is also ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος 847. Corresponding to the very great age of the myth is the fact that Kekrops, in the cult of Zeus Hypsatos, instituted the mild sacrificial practices, in which only bloodless offerings, especially sacrificial cakes, were presented and wine was not permitted to be poured as a libation. This points very clearly to a time when the population of the Attic plain was still predominantly devoted to agriculture and its peaceful customs 848.

When now the same author of the Epistle to the Hebrews who compares the “high priest” Christ with Melchisedek also, in immediate connection with this, emphatically presents him as the one who through suffering and death has ascended to the glory of life corresponding to his nature 849, one may with good reason ask whether perhaps here too the remnant of a tradition underlies this which concerned the relation of Melchisedek

279

to the beyond. In any case, however, the author’s typology has the value that it lets a light fall beyond his own immediate field of vision upon the significance which the comparison of Melchisedek and Christ has for the historical understanding of the Lord’s Supper. At the moment when Jesus prepares to enter upon the path that first leads him into the underworld (cf. Mt. 28 6 with 12 40; Lc. 24 3.6. 24 with Act. 2 24. 31. Rom. 10 ^f. Apoc. 1 18. I Petr. 3 19 f.) 8·°, he presents himself even in his farewell meal, in which he offers bread and wine, prophetically to the most intimate circle of disciples as the Melchisedek-Messiah 851, whose dominion extends over the dead as well as over the living (Rom. 14 9. Phil. 2 10), and as the ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς (Act. 3 15; cf. 5 31. Hebr. 2 10), who invites his own to the heavenly meal of blissful enjoyment. How deep and lasting an influence the typology of the messianically interpreted Melchisedek figure, already beginning in the Old Testament (Ps. 110 4; cf. Isa. 9 5 — see above), exercised upon early Christian conception is attested, according to what has been set forth, not only on the one hand — quietly, as one might say — by the cult in the “Lord’s Supper,” but on the other hand also by the christological doctrinal exposition characterizing the ecclesial consciousness of the ancient Roman community, given by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews 852, who celebrates Jesus equally as the Son of God and as the divinely perfect high priest 853,

280

but also (still at the end of the 2nd century and thereafter) by the peculiar afterplay of the second Theodotus, who represented dynamistic monarchianism, and of the so-called Melchisedekians 854.

6. A completely new moment, however, now enters into the further development of the Lord's Supper when, in the symbolic interpretation of the eating of bread and drinking of wine as referring to the blessing of the suffering death of Christ and its enjoyment, the real conditioning and mediation of that blessing through the function of the material organ of suffering of Christ, his corporeality, comes into distinctive prominence, and in connection with this the traditional formula of institution: "This (to be eaten, to be drunk) is (in its meaning) my body — my blood" has taken shape. This modification scarcely finds a sufficient explanation without the assumption that the blessing of the holy meal began already relatively early, sooner or later more or less clearly and explicitly, to be conceived specifically also as an immaterial, but real, substantial effect proceeding from the "body of glory" of Christ (σῶμα τῆς δόξης Phil. 3 21) upon the corporeality of the believing recipient of the sacrament. We are then already in the course of New Testament history dealing with the process by which bread and wine were concretely reinterpreted from symbols of the total salvation proceeding from the dead and risen Christ into symbols of his body and blood sacrificed in death, and in this capacity at the same time into mysterious mediators of the life-forces of the spiritually transfigured corporeality of the risen Christ (required for the construction of the resurrection body of the believers). There thus made itself felt a desire deeply grounded in the natural sense

281

of unity of the individual personality 855, which is already early and with increasing clarity attested in the second century, when not only in Didache 10 3 it is said: ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον (cf. 10 2), but in the Ignatian Epistle to the Ephesians 20 2 the bread of the holy meal is designated as φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, as ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ παντός, and Justin, Apol. 1 66, remarks: ἐκ τῆς τροφῆς ταύτης αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν 856. With such a conception of a personal union and communication of essence of Christ that concerns not only the spirit of the human being but also his corporeality, we stand, however, in the realm of a mysticism that is rooted in the soil of natural religion and is in no way reconcilable with the fundamental presuppositions of Old Testament, Jewish, and Jewish-Christian conception. With its consumption of bread and wine, insofar as this mysteriously mediates the reception of the salvific forces streaming out from the body and blood of the glorified Christ 857 and also physically recreating, it forms, on the ethically pneumatic level of New Testament religion, the counterpart of that religious-historically elementary appropriation of the physical life-force of a higher, divine being, repellent through the crudity of its rites (omophagy), which characterizes the trieteric cult of Dionysos (see above, p. 225 ff.) 858.

282

What is reported to us concerning the words of institution of Jesus also allows, with respect to this last phase of the New Testament history of the Lord's Supper, a glimpse into the course of events. We must proceed from the oldest written testimony (not long after 55), the statement of Paul in I Cor. 11 24 f. What the apostle here, in accordance

with a tradition guaranteeing authenticity (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου), presents as a reproduction of the words of institution of Christ 859 represents the meal instituted by Jesus at the last gathering with his disciples as a celebration that is to be continually repeated in subsequent times and is intended to keep alive in them the remembrance of his person and of the atoning sacrificial death suffered for the benefit of the disciples (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). This conception fully corresponds to the presuppositions of the original Jewish-Christian mode of consideration (see above, nos. 1–4). The memorial purpose is emphasized with regard both to eating and to drinking; the atoning effect of the death is immediately indicated expressly by the word spoken over the bread as the symbol of the body of Christ; the community enjoying the sacrificial and table blessing 860 is initially the first circle of disciples (ὑμῶν). But the primitive Jewish-Christian conception of the tradition reproduced by the apostle also comes to expression in an even more characteristic way negatively. Parallel to the words: τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα one would expect: τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα

283

τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης (cf. Mark and Matthew). Paul, however, does not report it thus, although he certainly thinks just as essentially of the blood of Christ when drinking the wine as of his body when eating the bread. His report has the Lord drink τὸ ποτήριον (11 25–27; cf. I Cor. 10 16. 21) and brings the word αἷμα into only an indirect logical connection with the fundamental idea. The sense of the words in question is: this cup with its contents signifies the new covenant to be established through the shedding of my blood and its salvific content. This striking, seemingly arbitrary deviation from the natural, simple formulation of the Lord's word is no accident, but has its deeper ground in the after-effect of that horror which the Israelite, in accordance with a fundamental prohibition of the Mosaic religion, experiences at the thought of every kind of consumption of blood 861. How could this aversion, equal in strength to a horror naturalis, have allowed a genuine Jewish Christian — and thus all the more the former rabid zealot for the Law Paul — to accept the idea of an, even if only improper, most holy drinking of blood 862? If nevertheless sooner or later it came so far with Paul (and in spiritually related Hellenistically inclined Jewish-Christian circles) 863,

284

this was made possible for the apostle only because, according to his newly acquired conception, the corporeality of his Christ, continuing to work in the Lord's Supper, was stripped of its earthly materiality, and for that very reason the mystical sacramental drinking of blood meant only a reception of pneumatic power from the personality of the glorified Lord (see above). That this was indeed the case, and that Paul in fact thought of the glorified body of Christ as the source of power, cannot be immediately inferred from his reproduction of the transmitted words of institution of Jesus, but reveals itself clearly enough in the appended reflection concerning the proper enjoyment of the holy meal, which does not express what is believed in the Corinthian community, but what is firmly established for him himself. According to this, the unworthy recipient, who does not

discern the body of the Lord, eats and drinks judgment upon himself (κρίμα in the sense of punishment). “Therefore many among you are sick and weak, and a considerable number have fallen asleep” (11 30). This inference is not fully explained from the standpoint of v. 32, that a judgment is threatened “with the purpose of leading to improvement and preserving from condemnation in the final judgment” 864. Why then is there mention only of bodily sufferings of various kinds and of additional cases of death? We have here, in all likelihood, a reverberation of what elsewhere in antiquity is also reported concerning the punishment for the unauthorized enjoyment of alien property. A contribution is supplied by the poet of the Book of Job (20 12–16): the unlawful enjoyment of what has been acquired by the God-forgetter is transformed in the body into viper’s gall, acts like poison unto death, and what has been taken in does not come to lasting appropriation. An ancient Indian parallel is found in the Atharvaveda (V 18, 2–4. 13), where encroachments upon priestly sacred right and property, thus upon a grave religious offense, are protested against and a poison-like effect of what has been consumed is threatened. These similar conceptions, hovering between image and reality, lead, in the

285

comparison of the Pauline doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, to the conclusion that the apostle assumes that from the unworthily consumed glorified body and blood of Christ there proceed, as the case may be, harmful — under certain circumstances deadly — effects, as though in the recipient the communicated powers had been transformed into poison 865.

According to what has been shown, Paul, with the version of the words of institution offered by him, represents the Jewish-Christian, and elsewhere, however, indirectly in essence already also the mystical, Gentile-Christian conception of the Lord’s Supper. How does the synoptic tradition (Mc. 14 22—24. Mt. 26 26—28. Lc. 22 19. 20) relate to this? Throughout, Luke adheres most closely to Paul. If the latter impresses upon the holy meal the character of a memorial celebration equally with respect to the bread and to the wine, Luke does this at least with respect to the bread. In

286

Mark and Matthew this motif no longer comes to expression at all. At first glance, however, the relationship between the reporters Paul and Luke with respect to the emphasis on the expiatory-sacrificial character of the death of Christ is not entirely clear. To be sure, this occurs in both in connection with the first saying (Paul: τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; Luke: τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον). But it is striking that in Luke the same moment is also appended to the second saying, although Paul has not brought it out here. This anomaly is evidently explained by the fact that at this point in the third Gospel, alongside the primary, Pauline relation of the evangelist, the synoptic version, and indeed in an older form, has been taken up editorially: the grammatically unwieldy τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον (Lc. 22 20) was originally continuation and conclusion of the synoptic

“τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης (Mc. 14 24. Mt. 26 28)” 866. Particular attention should be paid to the Lukan–Pauline ὑμῶν in the first saying (not πολλῶν; the former corresponds far more to the farewell scene, see above). Just as a text-historical criterion emerges from this, so no less does one emerge from the striking brevity of the Markan (Matthean) formulation of the doubled word of distribution: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης 867. With the latter, peculiarly sounding expression “my blood of the covenant,” there is an allusion to the דם־הברית of Ex. 24 8 868, to which now the blood of the καινή διαθήκη (see Paul) is antitypically set over by Jesus

287

himself (see further p. 271 f.). But to assume that Jesus really, at the farewell meal, finally invited his disciples in plain words to drink his blood, soon to be shed on their behalf — in anticipatory symbolic representation — is, for anyone who has made the effort to think his way appropriately clearly into the limits of consciousness of the Jewish Christianity still in its first stage of development, represented by the circle of the Twelve, an impossibility. It would have been a horrendum dictu (see above) 869. Equally certain, after everything that has preceded, is that the placement of the saying Lc. 22 18, following upon the Passover meal, is in the right against Mc. 14 25. Mt. 26 29.

The overall result of our historical survey can now be briefly summarized to the effect that the scanty tradition at hand concerning the nature and origin of the Lord’s Supper is explained from a significant historical meal of Jesus: the messianic Passover farewell meal ([unleavened] bread, flesh of the Passover lamb, wine), and from a twofold ideal conception of it: from its typological combination with the Melchisedek meal (bread and wine) and from the conception of a typology of the mystical meal in the Dionysus cult (body and blood of Jesus) 870. With this, however,

288

strictly speaking, the question has in the main already been answered as to whether and to what extent — apart from the conception of the fourth evangelist 871 — the New Testament understanding of the Lord’s Supper shows an influence from one or another mystery religion. The older phases of its development, which remain at the purely symbolic enjoyment of the salvific good to be effected by Christ (see above nos. 2—5), may be disregarded: they have throughout and directly an Old Testament foundation. But it can just as little be doubted that the impulse, not to say the religious-psychological compulsion, toward the final transformation proceeded from the Hellenic mystery sphere, and indeed in such a way that we must think above all of the Dionysian mysteries, as they were developed particularly in the cult of Διόνυσος Καθηγεμών in western Asia Minor (see above pp. 231—233) 872. Here, on the soil of primeval nature religion (see above pp. 228 ff.), the characteristic cultic act of tearing apart and eating raw, compared with the sacramental Christ-meal, shows an elementary similarity of both means and purpose such as no feature of any other mystery religion 873: the god suffers a painful death (the πάθη Διονύσου),

289

and from the flesh and blood of the hostia that represents him himself (the ταυρόμορφος) his worshipers draw the immortalizing powers of the soul streaming forth from him. This may be assumed to be the fundamental idea of the Dionysian mysteries, however the cultic detail may have taken shape at different times and in different places. Significantly, it is above all to Orpheus, the mythical founder of the sect named after him, which was devoted to Dionysus as the lord of life and death above all other gods, that the invention (εὗρε, εὕρετο) of Dionysian initiations is ascribed 874.

B. The mystery-idea of the fourth Evangelist.

With the finding of our investigation thus far concerning the general question of the influence of pagan mystery-religion on the conception and teaching of the New Testament writers there now evidently accords also what has already earlier pressed itself upon us in another connection with regard to the fourth Gospel, and what remains still to be set forth for the sake of completion. The discussions of baptism (pp. 89 ff. 222 f.) and of the Lord's Supper (pp. 224 ff.) have, in my opinion, already sufficiently shown that according to the Evangelist's conception we are in fact dealing with two complementary Christian mysteries. It only remains to illuminate the complementary relationship of the two sacraments from a higher point of view, which allows the significance attributed by the writer to the mystery-idea to be recognized in its full scope, and duly to bring into relief the confirmatory, diverse indications of the text that assist in grasping the mystery-character of what is reported.

290

It can be regarded as established first of all that according to the fourth Evangelist, before the resurrection of Christ there can be no talk of "Christian" baptism any more than of a "Christian" Lord's Supper (with regard to the last meal of Jesus see above p. 266 f.). Baptism in the ecclesiastical-Christian sense, to which Joh. 3 3. 5 admittedly in reality refers, is the sacrament of the rebirth effected from above out of water and Spirit. The Spirit meant thereby, however, can only be the "holy Spirit" proceeding from the risen and glorified Jesus, brought by him to humanity, communicated to the disciples for the first time already at his appearance (1 33. 7 39. 20 22; in 16 7 the "sending" is thought of with reference to the later church period)875. And it is equally certain that the Spirit communicated in baptism, which recreates the human being, is conceived not merely as an ethical but also as a metaphysical principle of life876, which makes the baptized believer the possessor of the ζωή αἰώνιος (3 15 f.)877 and thereby transfers him into the kingdom of God (3 3: he will see the kingdom of God, 3 5: enter into the kingdom of God)878. With this, the conception of baptism presents itself just as definitively as that of the Lord's Supper as, in its essence, equally Christologically and eschatologically oriented: the all-decisive ultimate aim of the sacred act in both cases goes beyond temporal life and presupposes in Jesus himself death and ascent to the Father (20 17). That precisely herein a characteristic

291

basic trait of religious mystery-religion lies requires no demonstration. But that the Evangelist consciously and deliberately impressed the mystery-type upon both cultic acts, this he also further unmistakably allows to be understood. This is expressed above all in the fact that both the performance of baptism and participation in the celebration of the Lord's Supper are emphatically designated as indispensable conditions for entry into the divine kingdom of eternal life (3 3. 5. 6 53 ff.; see above n. 267). It suffices to recall what we know of the principal mysteries of Greece879. From this point of view it is therefore not only completely understandable that Jesus speaks of the baptismal mystery as such precisely before the spiritually dim Nikodemus (see above pp. 177 f.), and indeed at night and in a way utterly incomprehensible to him, but that on a later occasion he even expounds the Lord's Supper mystery before a gathered Galilean crowd in a far higher degree of misunderstanding and incomprehensibility (see above pp. 24 f.), but also that in our Evangelist so little is heard of an institution of the Christian baptismal sacrament by Jesus (Mt. 28 19) as of a foundation of the Lord's Supper by him. The one is just as much as the other, according to his conception (and tradition?), mystery in the cultic-technical sense. But this demands, as in Hellenic antiquity, in a certain sense and scope, "silence." The command of silence in the mysteries was twofold, for one was silent during the celebration and after it880. "In both forms one must not regard it as something externally introduced, but this secrecy belonged to the essential basic character of the mysteries. Silence during the initiation is the immediate consequence of the devotion wholly given over to pious service; silence afterward, officium silentii, as Tertullian

292

calls it, is to be explained in the same way as when particularly sacred names, e.g. the hidden one of Rome, were 'not to be used' in ordinary life"881. What was to be kept silent was also in the Eleusinia and other mysteries not a religious-theoretical secret, but a cultic-practical knowledge882.

With all this, however, there emerges unforced and at the same time in agreement with the overall conception of the fourth Evangelist already announced in the Prologue, as the final and highest consideration, an all-encompassing parallel, which we may perhaps bring to brief expression as follows: The fundamental facts of the revelation of God in Christ corresponding to the two sacraments — treated by our writer only mysteriously — are themselves also mysteries in the sense of mysterious, salvific divine experiences. In baptism as the bath of rebirth from above (Tit. 3 5. Joh. 3 3—7) and in the Lord's Supper the blessing of the mystery of the incarnation883

293

and that of the passion884 of the Logos-Christ are celebrated and enjoyed. The twofold Christological mystery,

294

however, viewed from the standpoint of the universalistic Logos-idea that expands the concept of revelation885, stands in antitypical relation to the double mystery of the Dionysus religion (that of the birth and that of the passion of the god)886.

295

Logos — Dionysus! In conclusion we thus see ourselves once more placed by our Evangelist before the overall mirror-image

296

of ancient Greek religion and philosophy of religion, as it is held up to us in his writing. It is not by chance that we enter his sanctuary, as it were through propylaea, through the Logos section in the first chapter and the miracle narrative of Cana in the second chapter. Whoever excises those sections or denies them their principially orienting significance strikes — to use another simile — the two eyes out of the unique Christ-image here presented. But how the Evangelist's vision of Christ could also in its own way give stimulus to the type-seeking modern consideration of the history of religion may be shown by the words which the Slavic poet and seer puts into the mouth of a "Cassandra" of the Renaissance:

> "My brother, who among men will understand it and tell the world how the wisdom of the vine-crowned one resembles the wisdom of the thorn-crowned one, of him who said: I am the true vine, and who, like the

297

> god Dionysus, intoxicates the world with his blood? — Have you understood what I am speaking of, Giovanni? — If you have not understood it, then be silent and do not ask, for there is hidden therein a mystery of which one may not yet speak today …" *
>
> * Dmitri Merezhkovski, *Leonardo da Vinci* (German translation by Dr. Eliasberg 1911) Book 15.

Fourth Section

Origin and Purpose of the Written Work

1. From the very beginning, for obvious reasons, it was to be expected that in the earliest Christianity, after the passing of the apostles, the desire would increasingly arise to preserve in writing, alongside the continuing oral tradition that initially fell to the disciples of the apostles, and in a timely, as complete and reliable a manner as possible, what those apostles had proclaimed about Jesus' person, words, deeds, and sufferings. What occurred in this direction before the emergence of our New Testament Gospels can unfortunately no longer be ascertained by us in any satisfactory way, and the history of the origin of this literature itself still offers more than enough gaps, obscurities, and riddles. The literary-historical and literary-critical state of affairs in question, which in more recent and most recent times has, from various standpoints, been subjected to thorough treatment and lucid presentation, and into which it is not possible to enter comprehensively in our context, is, however, on closer inspection fortunately not of such a kind as to exclude a sufficiently secure answer to the question posed with regard to the Fourth Gospel. The most generally acknowledged and convincing results of synoptic research, on the basis of their inner coherence and mutual interdependence, approach the "Johannine" Gospel in such a way that, for solving the question of its origin, precisely this connection already provides the most appropriate point of view. In doing so, as one easily sees, we do not have to begin with the question of the authenticity of

the transmitted synoptic Gospels or, more precisely, of the degree of justification of the associated traditional authors' names. This question played no role in the emergence of the Fourth Gospel and in the earliest reports concerning its composition. The critics were lacking. In our case, we can simply proceed from the actual existence of a corresponding ecclesiastically authoritative tradition, and there can be no doubt that for our δοῦς πον στω in the first instance the Gospel ascribed to Mark comes into view. With this written work, the ancient Church possessed, according to the conviction of the Asia Minor bishop Papias of Hierapolis, who around the middle of the second century appeals to a report he himself had heard from an older "disciple of the Lord" (Euseb. h. e. III 39, 15), a Petrine Gospel, insofar as Mark, who himself was not a hearer and companion of Jesus, but only later became a follower of Peter and in a certain sense an "interpreter" of the apostle, had "earnestly endeavored" to record, as well ordered, faithful to memory, and without abbreviation, what he had gradually learned about the "words as well as deeds of Christ" from the mouth of the apostle in his instructional discourses.

Whether, however, the “connection between Mark and Peter” assumed here has quite rightly been called into question in the most recent period887 or not,

300

the fact that our second Gospel, on the basis of the tradition represented by Papias, was only centuries later straightforwardly declared to be a work of Peter himself888 nevertheless speaks for the original difficulty, not to say impossibility, of such an identification. Indirectly, however, the fact bears witness precisely to this, that the “Gospel according to Peter,” which probably also originated in Syria in the time of Papias and expressly presents itself as a writing of Simon Peter, is unmistakably of heretical origin889. How strong the need and inclination were to ascribe apostolic origin to our canonical Gospels is shown, parallel to the situation with the second, by the tracing back of the content of the third to the great post-apostle (I Cor. 15 8 f.): according to Irenaeus (adv. haer. III 1, 1), Luke is said to have written down the Gospel proclaimed by Paul890. Significantly, however, there did not come to be a “Gospel according to Paul.” How then did matters stand with this apostle precisely with regard to knowledge of the “life of Jesus” and interest in external details of the same (cf. II Cor. 5 16)?891 What tipped the scales for the tradition of Irenaeus was hardly anything other than the unmistakable kinship of spirit between the evangelist in question and Paul, the shared universalism of the doctrine of salvation892. But precisely thereby an exceedingly valuable light is simultaneously cast upon the unanimous assumption from earliest times of the composition of our

301

first Gospel, or at least of its foundation, by the apostle Matthew, as soon as what was set forth already in the first section (pp. 31, 38 f.) concerning the calling of the disciple Nathanael (John 1 44–51) is taken into account. From this it follows that the author of the Fourth Gospel—characteristically—lets Jesus in this introductory prophetic section mysteriously greet the disciple (Nathanael-)Matthew as the pure, credible future author or at least guarantor of the Gospel named after him893. The joyful recognition of the “advanced and universalistic form of Jewish Christianity”894 of his predecessor was what the Fourth Evangelist wished to express. Perhaps the sympathetic appreciation of the Baptist in Mt. 11 9–11, which Luke reproduced (7 28), also played a role here. It was precisely the disciple formerly belonging to the class of the “tax collectors and sinners” (Mt. 5 4e f. 9 9 ff. 11 19. 18 17. 21 31 f.) to whom this distinction was to be accorded. Here we have the earliest attestation of the existence of the “Gospel according to Matthew,” whatever the more precise determination of the oldest form of the writing may be (and this can and must also be set aside here). But once this position, directly reaching back into the circle of the Twelve Apostles, had been gained in ecclesiastical tradition, then at the composition and after the appearance of another Gospel-like work, which brought the Hellenizing universalism of salvation to expression in theological, Christological, and soteriological respects in an even more principled, profound, and generous manner, nothing stood in the way, but rather under certain circumstances everything pressed toward invoking the authority of Zebedee’s son John as the second true “pillar apostle” (Gal. 2 9)895. And here now comes into consideration, as grounding and explanatory, the peculiar, deeply intervening subsidiary circumstance that has already been brought out above in another connection

302

(pp. 200 f.) and illuminated more closely, namely that our Fourth Evangelist (perhaps relying on the beginnings of a corresponding tradition) already discerned in the name of the apostle in question, resonant with Dionysus, Ἰωαν(ν)ης, the providential, revelatory-historical destiny of the same to be the apostle and evangelist of the Greek world, and thus to a vocation lying particularly close to Jesus' heart896. Nothing lies nearer than the thought that with this belief the path was from the outset entered upon that could lead to the seemingly self-evident assumption of an Asia Minor activity of Zebedee's son. In the eighties of the second century, in fact, the tradition had already arisen that he, during his stay in Ephesus, published the Gospel (ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον). The writer to whom we owe this report is Irenaeus (adv. haer. III 1, 1)897, who at the same time is the first to let the apostle's lifespan extend into the time of Trajan (II 22, 5. III 3, 4; cf. Euseb. h. e. III 23, 3 f. 28, 6. IV 14, 2–8. Chr. ad ann. 3 Traj.). Both statements are, as is known, subject to the gravest objections898. At first glance it is to the highest degree striking that, if John (the apostle!) really reached such an extraordinarily advanced age and also worked in the Asia Minor city, it was reserved only for a churchman at the very end of the second century to make known to posterity that in fact, as it has also been expressed,

303

the external testimonies "rest only on two eyes"899. This circumstance is all the more unfortunate inasmuch as the overall impression that one repeatedly receives of the literary personality of Irenaeus, insofar as it concerns clarity, sobriety, and reliability in statements regarding the history and tradition of the Church, is by no means a particularly confidence-inspiring one. What, then, should one generally expect from this reporter when he—as is known—cites approvingly, for example900, "from the mouth of immediate disciples of John and from the fourth book of Papias," that in the end time for the believers there would grow vines each with 1000 branches, each branch with 10,000 shoots, the shoot with 10,000 clusters, the cluster with 10,000 berries, and each berry would give 25 measures of wine, and from these elements (demonstrably belonging to Jewish apocalyptic: En. 10 19. Apoc. Bar. 29 5) makes a saying of Jesus guaranteed by the apostle John901 (adv. haer. V 33, 3 f.)902! In the present case, alongside the fact

304

that before the time of Irenaeus there is a complete lack of any immediate, explicit, and secure attestation of the alleged stay of the apostle in Ephesus that goes beyond uncontrollable hearsay903, it is almost of even greater weight that

305

the assumption of such a lifespan is opposed by the saying put into Jesus' mouth in Mk. 10 39 (= Mt. 20 23), addressed to the pair of Zebedee's sons: "the cup that I drink you will drink, and with the baptism with which I am baptized you will be baptized." That here martyrdom is announced both to James and to John, without explicit reference to the timing for the one and

for the other, and indeed not in the sense of a “suffering in general”904 but as a martyr’s death905, should not, in the most recent period, have been disputed again906. If

306

if it nevertheless occurred, then it would have been better, toward those judging otherwise, to refrain from the reproach of a lack of impartiality and

307

of strict objectivity should have been refrained from — in correct appreciation of the general danger of the old-sophistic τον ήττω λόγον κρείττω

308

ποιεῖν907, to refrain, toward those judging otherwise, from the reproach of lack of impartiality and strict objectivity. Whether in the passage cited there is a genuine word of the Lord or already a vaticinium ex eventu must for the time being remain an

309

open question; in any case, the inclusion of the transmitted saying in the Gospel of Mark and that of Matthew is explained most

310

simply and best by the present fact of the martyrdom of both sons of Zebedee908. But if

311

Acts in 12 2 does not also report the killing of John, this does not in itself necessarily presuppose

312

a “deletion on the basis of the Ephesian legend”909,910. The violent end of the temperamental (cf. above p. 199)

313

Jewish apostle (Gal. 2 9) may have been brought about unofficially, perhaps not even tumultuously (as in the case of Stephen), and thus have occurred

314

without attracting further attention. How much, then, do we learn before the last decades of the second century (Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, Tertullian) about the death of Peter and Paul?

The striking silence in Acts 12 2, however, takes on a new light when, for the purpose of orientation, attention is paid to the particular character of the interest that the author ad Theophilum (Luke 1 3; Acts 1 1) accords to the apostle John in the “Gospel according to Luke” as well as in the Acts of the Apostles. Our third evangelist does not fail (cf. above) to report the rebuke (lacking in Matthew) that John, as spokesman of the Twelve, receives because of their common behavior toward a Jewish exorcist (Luke 9 49 f. = Mk. 9 38–41); he even adds, expanding the religious

315

horizon and following his own tradition, the stronger rebuke with which Jesus dismisses the brothers James and John who are angered by the inhospitable behavior of Samaritans (Luke 9 51–55)911. Over against this, however, stands the fact that “Luke” is silent about the displeasure that the Ten expressed at the ambitious request brought to Jesus by that pair of brothers (Mk. 10 35–41; Mt. 20 20–24)912. And if one looks further in Luke and Acts, one easily notices how, as if by stealth, John begins to be shifted into a new position. Seemingly by chance he is placed before his brother James at the transfiguration of Jesus and immediately after the ascension (Luke 9 28; Acts 1 13; cf. note 73). In what follows, he appears repeatedly as a companion of Peter in a manner that we have already characterized elsewhere as peculiar. In the one case, Peter proves himself in Jerusalem as a worker of miracles and witness in word of the Gospel before the “men of Israel” and the Sanhedrin (Acts 3 and 4); in the other (8 14–25), he appears as a delegate of “the apostles” in Jerusalem to Samaria for the purpose of completing the evangelization begun there by the Seven-man Philip, and as a spiritually powerful opponent of an idolatrous Gnostic magic religion spreading around913. In

316

both cases John does not come to speech at all. To be sure, this looks as though the narrator wished him to be regarded merely as a secondary figure. But that is not the case. Determinative for the reporting in Acts was initially the procedure of Mk. 6 7 (cf. 1 12; 14 13) and Luke 10 1. The unanimity of the messengers of the Gospel presupposed here, serving mutual support, could hardly be expressed more strongly in the relationship of our two apostles: they are one heart and one soul; what Peter speaks and what he does happens throughout in the sense and name of John (particularly characteristic is Acts 3 4 ff.). This personal relationship is all the more significant in that it becomes apparent precisely at the point in time where, according to the tradition of our author, the two apostles received the first official impetus for the theoretical and practical recognition of the Gentile mission: the conversion of the Samaritans prepares the way for that of the “God-fearing” Gentile Cornelius by the same Peter. If Acts shortly thereafter lets Peter flee from Jerusalem and go “to another place” (12 17), Catholic interpretation has, since Eusebius and Jerome, thought here of Rome. But the whole thing acquires an entirely special value from the fact that it casts light on the passage from which we set out: Acts 12 2. Why can the author ad Theophilum, despite Mk. 10 39 (Mt. 20 23), say nothing about the martyr’s death of John, the brother of James, whether or not both brothers were executed at the same time? We evidently stand with the writer already so far removed from the year 44 914 that the emergence

317

of a tradition which ascribed to the second son of Zebedee, instead of an early death, an activity extending into old age, becomes sufficiently understandable, especially if one reckons with the high degree of probability that the home soil of the deviating tradition lay at a considerable distance from Jerusalem and Palestine. The main question will be what contemporary-historical interest constituted the driving force in the emergence and development of the secondary tradition. But the same twelfth chapter of Acts seems to us to point the way to the correct solution of this question, when it not only consigns John to obscurity by silence in v. 2, but also lets Peter mysteriously disappear in v. 17 with the remark: ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον915. Each thereafter goes his own way; but where the one and the other lead is to be made known to the reader by other reporting of the Church. What else, then, can be present here than the indication that at the time of the composition of our canonical Acts of the Apostles916 not only the Roman Petrine legend, but also the one pointing beyond Palestine and indeed toward Asia Minor, concerning the apostle John, were already present in their—however constituted—earliest beginnings, and the confession to this dual shaping of tradition? From a purely human perspective, hardly anything was more understandable from the outset than that the actual end of life of the greatest apostolic martyr Paul in Rome first gave rise to the emergence of that legend which was intended to preserve and, as needed, enhance the prestige of the foremost disciple

318

of the Gospels917, the Roman one, and that this legend itself, in accordance with the post-apostolic and ancient-church development of circumstances, called forth a supplement and at the same time a limiting correction, as came about with the transformation of the likewise purely Jewish apostle John into the highest post-Pauline authority of Greek–Asia Minor Gentile Christianity918. Thus, indeed, Mk. 10 35–41,

319

compared with 10 28–31 on the one hand, and Mt. 19 27–30 on the other, where in both cases the prerogative of the entire apostolic college is represented by Peter,

320

allows one to guess that the prestige of the two sons of Zebedee as the first blood-witnesses of the circle of the Twelve disciples

321

initially posed such an obstacle for the emerging Roman Petrine legend that this

322

first led to the retrojection of the opposition between those two and the “Ten” (Mk. 10 41) into the lifetime of Jesus and consequently to the—legendary—narrative of a rank dispute that took place between the pair of brothers and the Ten, but which in substance applied precisely to Simon Peter, who already in the eyes of a Paul (Gal. 1 18 f.; 2 7 f.) and in the oldest evangelical presentation stands at the head, and which Jesus himself, although he foresaw and predicted the martyrdom of the Zebedeans, decided in favor of Peter (significantly not expressly named)919. The challengingly self-confident and ambitious behavior of James and John reported in the Markan passage is psychologically almost incomprehensible at the moment characterized by 10 32 ff.920; it becomes intelligible only through the weaker Petrine parallel that precedes in v. 28 ff.,

323

which is immediately thereafter to be surpassed by the Zebedeans921. From this

324

perspective, however, the discussed Lukan passages now gain all the more clearly the significance of signposts for determining the course of development of the Roman and the Asia Minor apostolic legend. We see Peter and alongside him John already on their native soil growing beyond the original calling of the Jewish mission. While, however, from that point onward the traces of the Petrine legend in the New Testament almost entirely disappear922, it is, after what has already been set forth, precisely the Fourth Gospel that grants us a surprisingly deep and multifaceted insight into the nature, the growth, and the significance of the Johannine

325

legend. Thus, above all, in sharply emphasized contrast to the Peter of the synoptic-evangelical historical presentation, we encounter John as the explicit beloved disciple and intimate of the Lord (cf. above pp. 198 ff.), who in this illumination alone already lets it be seen that he is no longer the old one, that his character has become different, his significance higher. For the Fourth Evangelist, the ideal apostle John—who (as shown on pp. 301 f. and note 906 on pp. 311 ff.) through legend and belief of authoritative circles of his own broader homeland had already taken the place of the apocalyptic John—is the one who Hellenized the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that is, who beheld and bore witness in his preaching to the revelation of the divine “Logos” that occurred in the appearance of Christ (cf. Apoc. 19 13: ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ = the Messiah) and to the antitypical representation thereby completed of what was dimly sensed in the myths and rites of pagan (above all Hellenic) religion. Just as the apocalyptist prophesies in the name (note Apoc. 1 1. 4. 9. 21 2. 22 8) of the original John, so the fourth evangelist wishes, looking back and narrating, to write in representation and in the spirit of the Zebedee’s son John who had become Asia Minor–based (without, incidentally, speaking of “the disciple whom Jesus loved” in the sense of a self-designation of the one so named). In the spirit of this apostolic guarantor (sit v. v.) and on the basis of the tradition derived from him, he wishes, following the impulse of the inspiration that had himself been granted (cf. II Pet. 1 21), to design a picture of

Christ such as above all the growing Johannine community of his time and of coming generations requires923.

326

From these points of view we have therefore also to make intelligible to ourselves the literary peculiarity of our evangelist and the material and formal manner of executing his plan. Of what nature and to what degree and extent here the comparison of the New Testament spirit of revelation with the mode of apprehension, thought, and feeling of Hellenic religion has been carried out—this it was, from the history-of-religions side, the task of the preceding discussions (pp. 83–297) to show, but in the direction of philosophy of religion and New Testament theology a principal task of my "Investigations on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel I" (1902).

2. In this connection it remains for the present only to establish, by way of addition, that our author by no means directed his proclamation of salvation exclusively to the world governed by the spirit of Greek culture, but that his knowledge and interest rather also extended, alongside this, in a striking degree to the most important religious sphere of the Orient neighboring Asia Minor, that already from this point of view he expressly intended to write the Gospel of the Christian "world religion"924. This leads above all to the exposition of a remarkable relationship of affinity, occurring several times, between the Fourth Gospel and the

Avesta.

Parallels to the latter are found there:

(1) Jesus as the shepherd (10 1–5. 11–16. 26 ff.).

In the Ahuna-vairya, the most holy "prayer" and confessional formula (Yasna 27, 13), Zarathushtra is called "the one appointed as shepherd of the poor [by the highest authority]" (for details see below in the fifth section).

(2) Jesus as the king of truth (18 37).

That the self-confession of Jesus before Pilate: *I am a king; for this I have been born and for this I have come into the world, that I might bear witness to the truth; everyone who is of the truth hears my voice*, is "thoroughly Johannine," admits of no doubt. But whether it was "even only intelligible for a Greek ear" "when Christ in this manner is called not so much a king of the Jews as rather a king of the friends of truth"925, will have to be asked. Here occasion is given for a side glance into the documents of the religion of ancient Iran. If there the word *asa* (pron. äschä), which unites in itself the concept of the true and that of the right and obligatory, as a standing expression comprehends everything that is "holy, eternal right, divine order," then the statement about Zarathushtra in that most holy "prayer" of his believers, the Ahuna vairya (Yas. 27, 13), also offers in its part a history-of-religions explanation of the passion scene portrayed by our evangelist and by him alone. That statement testifies that Zarathushtra "in accordance with the *asa*926 is, like the best supreme lord (*ahü*), so also the (best) judge (*ratu*)927, who brings the works of life of the good mind to Mazdā and (thus) the supreme power to Ahura." With this,

Zarathushtra is characterized (“transferred to the religious sphere”) not merely as a simple investigating judge, but at the same time also as the executing “holder of royal jurisdiction

328

or its representative”; he counts as *ahü* and *ratu* of the material world, of “the entire material humanity” (Yast 13, 152), just as Mazdā does of the spiritual. “As supreme lord he sees to it that none of the believer’s good works be lost, but that they be recorded and kept in Ahura Mazdā’s house, while as judge he establishes the final impotence of the world of the *Drug* [lies] and the final sovereignty of Ahura Mazdā”928. Viewed from here, the alleged king of the Jews, standing before the highest local representative of Roman jurisdiction and awaiting execution, appears in a surprisingly new light. He himself appeals, in that he ascribes to himself royal rule in a kingdom that is not of this world (18 36), likewise to the vocation divinely allotted to him in the service of “the truth,” that is, however, of the all-surpassing, sole true “holy right.” If reference is here made to the *asa* of the Zarathushtrian faith, then it explains itself at once how with our evangelist the absolute ethical-religious concept of *ἀλήθεια* appears precisely where the entire context of the narrative leads expressly to that of law and specifically of (judicial) justice929. If those who are of the truth hear the voice of this king of truth, who elsewhere presents himself as the personified truth (14 6), then their contrast to the unbelievers, as they are depicted especially in 8 38–47930, already recalls audibly enough the distinction between the adherents of Zarathushtra and the companions hostile to him of the spirit of falsehood (the *Drug*), who by their very nature do not come to faith in his proclamation.

329

(3) Jesus as the one who stands up for the truth of his self-testimony (8 25).

The verse, with the answer that Jesus gives the Jews to their question, *Who then are you?*: τήν ἀρχήν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, presents an outstanding *crux interpretum*. Recently one has been repeatedly inclined to give preference to the translation: “in general, why do I speak to you at all?”931 932. The almost brusque-sounding, irritable dismissal that results from this rendering, however, fits very poorly with Jesus’ otherwise demeanor in the course of his entire dialogical discourse of instruction, 8 12—58, which, on the contrary, alongside a sovereign calm betraying the Logos-Christus, displays an untiring readiness for an apparently hopeless engagement and even allows, in between, many hearers (even if only temporarily) to come to faith in his messianity (v. 30). Already from this point of view the interpretation of τήν ἀρχήν in the customary sense of “from the beginning,” “from the outset,” retains all the more its justification, since in this way a completely contextually appropriate thought is obtained for the entire sentence. The “Jews” (primarily Pharisees v. 13) with whom Jesus has to do, first doubt his statements about the nature of his person (v. 13. 19), secondly ward off from themselves his condemning judgment (indirectly v. 22. 25. 48. 52, directly v. 33. 39. 41), thirdly demand a proof, an attestation (v. 13; cf. v. 14 ff. and 5 31—38). In response he assures the truth of his self-testimony (v. 14), defends the truth (full right and full justice) of his judging (v. 16), and appeals to the authentication by God his Father (v. 16—18. 26 ff. 38. 40. 42. 54 f.). In this

threefold sense Jesus gives to the question *Who then are you?* the answer: *From the beginning (I am) precisely that of which (ὅτι καί) I speak*

330

to you (now as before)933. The passage shows a remarkable similarity with Yasna 43, 7. 8, where Zarathushtra opens the answer to the threefold question addressed to him in the name of Ahura Mazdā by Vohu Manah934—"1. who he is, 2. to whom he belongs, 3. when he wishes to receive instruction"—with the words *Zarathustrō paourvīm* "Zarathushtra (am I) at the outset," and following upon this declares, as well as he is able, that he wishes to be a genuine enemy to the companion of the *Drug* (the spirit hostile to truth that makes the world), but a powerful support for the adherent of the *asa* (the divine truth and order of right)935. Here we have with Zarathushtra, who elsewhere in the Gāthās is called just as much the savior (*saosyant*: Yas. 45, 11. 48, 9. 53, 2) as the judge (*ratu*: Yas. 33, 1), likewise a nexus that turns on the relationship of revelation and confession of the mediator of salvation to God (Ahura Mazdā) and on his vocational stance and activity over against the moral-religious dualism of humanity. Under these circumstances the answer *Zarathustrō paourvīm* presses itself all the more as a parallel to John 8 25, since the adverb *paourvīm* as such, in the ancient as in the later language, does not mean merely "at first," but also simply "in the beginning" (ἐν ἀρχῇ). One can in fact scarcely resist here the question whether the author of the Fourth Gospel, who everywhere displays so lofty and wide-ranging a history-of-religions interest and penetrating study, had in some measure become acquainted with the oldest religious poetry of Iran and,

331

with conscious reference to our Gāthā passage, bestowed upon Jesus' answer to the questioners "from below," the representatives of the lying world (8 23. 44), the repeatedly so peculiarly striking wording936. One thus gains the impression that Jesus, as the divine witness to truth himself, in 8 48—59 is regarded and treated by his opponents as one who, in the Zarathushtrian community, would be viewed and dismissed as a companion of the *Drug*, of the spirits of the kingdom of lies.

(4) The Holy Spirit as the Spirit of truth and legal advocate
(in the farewell discourses) 937.

The Holy Spirit (14 26) as the Spirit of truth (14 17. 15 26. 16 13) and as the appointed advocate, representing Jesus himself, of the believers in Christ who are destined to be witnesses and martyrs of the truth (15 18 f. 16 2) (Paraclete: 14 16. 26. 15 26. 16 7), as well as his work—the conviction of the world mediated through their testimony: 1. of the sinful, lying nature of its unbelief toward the one sent by God (16 8. 9)938, 2. of the rightful (corresponding to divine *δικαιοσύνη*) state of affairs involved in Jesus' impending disappearance from the sensible world, insofar as this is precisely the vindicating going to the Father (16 5. 8. 10), 3. of the thereby already established judgment of punishment of the "ruler of this world" (14 30. 16 8. 11; the murderer of humans from the beginning and primeval liar 8 44)—all this forms a closed eschatological series of concepts and thoughts, to which in the Avestan religion there stands

opposed a strikingly exact parallel. Whereas the latter is unquestionably original, integral, and characteristic

332

in its proper place, one repeatedly gains, in the somewhat artificial and forced-seeming exposition of the Fourth Evangelist, the impression that he has used Jesus' farewell discourses to incorporate a motif by means of which he also wished to do justice to the apprehension of truth in the significant religion of the Iranian peoples. This is also indicated by the parallel that presses itself upon us already at the beginning of those discourses (14 2 f.) of the house of Ahura Mazdā and of the believers, to which attention has been drawn in another connection (see above p. 215). As will also be shown in Section V, the Avestan religion has applied the concept and name of holy (most holy) spirit in the highest sense to Ahura Mazdā himself. As τό πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is conceived in the relevant context of our Gospel, it corresponds just as much to the own spirit of that supreme deity, presented as Mazdā's servant (Yas. 43, 2), as to the double of this "most holy spirit," the *Amesha Spenta* Vohu Manah (the personified and hypostatized "good disposition") as such939. With this, however, the analogy of the essential relationship of the biblical as well as the other "holy spirit" to truth is already given. We thus return to the discussed, in the Zoroastrian religion fundamental concept of the *asa* (truth and right), which has been personified, consistently, in the originally highest *Amesha Spenta* Asa (Vahišta). Already from the very beginning, according to the purely dualistic worldview independent of the Ahura Mazdā cult940, the "most holy spirit" has by its very nature chosen the *asa* (truthfulness and right action) for itself (Yas. 30, 5). Corresponding to this are also the manifold statements that proceed from the conception of that spirit as the medium of Mazdā's revelation. Mazdā has taught,

333

through the mediation of Asa, what he will prepare for the two parties—the "adherents of the *asa*" on the one hand, the companions of the *Drug* (see above)—the power of lie, deceit, and injustice—on the other, in the final judgment through the (holy) spirit and fire as reward (Yas. 31, 3. 47, 6). The "adherents of the *asa*" are those who have not fallen away from the holy spirit (Yas. 47, 4), and Mazdā has promised them through this very spirit the best (Yas. 47, 5), paradise (Yas. 43, 2). To the disciples of Jesus inspired by the "holy spirit of truth" and to the community of believers in Christ won by them and henceforth expanding, there corresponds in the Iranian religion the following of the reforming priest-prophet and world-savior Zarathushtra, converted to belief in Mazdā and Asa and increasing until the renewal of humanity and the establishment of the eternal divine kingdom (Yas. 31, 3. 44, 2. 16. 46, 9—13. 18 f.), who can carry out his work of conversion only by the power of the holy spirit (Yas. 28, 1)941. The disciples and fellow believers of Zarathushtra also, under the influence of the same spirit, have the task and capacity to stand up for the truth of his proclamation (doctrine of faith and morals) with word, deed, and martyrdom over against the unbelieving world in such a way that it comes to recognize and feel the deception and injustice of its doubt and slanderous contradiction942. It is likewise the task of those same believers to cooperate successfully, vindicatively, and victoriously in Zarathushtra's conversion and beatification of the salvation-seeking, truth-open

part of humanity943, and thereby in the initiation of the complete defeat of the evil spirit Aka Manah (Aka Mainyu, Angra Mainyu, Ahriman), the cosmic counterpart of Ahura Mazdā (and Vohu Manah)944. As in the series of ideas of our

334

evangelist, so also according to the ancient Iranian mode of belief and expression the holy spirit has a significance hovering between a dynamic and a personal conception. On the one hand the adjective *cicitu* (thoughtful, careful) is applied to it (Yas. 43, 2)945; on the other hand it is striking that alongside the many passages in the Gāthās in which Vohu Manah is invoked (Yas. 28, 2. 9. 29, 7. 10. 31, 4. 5. 33, 7. 8. 11. 34, 5. 6. 15. 48, 12. 49, 1. 12. 50, 7. 10. 51, 15; cf. 30, 1), an invocation of the holy spirit is not found.

The question further presses itself whether perhaps, from the situation set forth, light may also fall upon the designation peculiar to the Fourth Evangelist for the holy spirit: *παράκλητος*. At the outset there can be no doubt that the evangelist brings the Greek word into connection with *παράκλησις* = consolation; this is made clear enough by 14 1—3. 18 f. 27 f. 16 1—6 (cf. 20 ff. 33). More significant, however, is that the chosen term, in accordance with the real and classical sense of the word *παράκλητος* according to 15 26 f., places what is carried out by the disciples and believers themselves and what is carried out for them from the divine side over against the unbelieving world under the viewpoint

335

of a concluding legal decision. The holy spirit is the divine legal advocate dwelling in the witnesses of the saving truth, representing Jesus himself in them (15 18—25. 16 1—4). This thought finds its explanation without strain in the experience that the earliest community had had in numerous cases of confrontation with the hostile world and of defense, in particular also before ecclesiastical or secular authority. Passages such as Mk. 13 11. Mt. 10 19 f. Lk. 12 11 f. 21 12—15 on the one hand, Acts 4 18. 18 ff. 5 29—41. 6 10. 7 55—60. 16 37. 18 9 f. 23 11. 26 24 f. II Tim. 4 16 f. on the other, allow conclusions in this direction. The all-embracing, unitary role of judge of the human world remains assigned to Jesus himself as an authorization by his Father (John 5 22), in such a way that the exercise of judicial power does not appear as an immediate purposive activity, but merely as the consequence, occasioned by the unbelief of individuals, of the exercise of his vocation as savior of the world (3 18. 36. 12 48; 3 17. 12 47. 8 15), and that the Son acts in perfect unity of will with the Father (5 30. 8 16). As an essential requirement of this position and task the human nature of the Son of God is recognized (5 27)946. Nor does this nexus of moments lack an analogy. The idea of legal decision corresponds entirely to the all-determining cardinal concept of the Zoroastrian worldview: the *asa* and the manner in which the course of the struggle of the two realms (the good and the evil, the divine and the demonic) is conceived. Zarathushtra and his disciples likewise conduct their victorious legal struggle with the truth-hostile world under the assistance (*rafedra* support) of the “above all first” to be implored holy spirit (Yas. 28, 1); and Zarathushtra is likewise the human world-judge appointed on earth by the highest divine authority947 (Yas. 33, 1)948, whose “holy,” after death independently continuing

spiritual being (*daēnā*) will assist that of each adherent after his passing on the heavenly journey, as though it concerned a friend, brother, or father (Yas. 45, 11)949. If the holy spirit is not itself the object of invocation (see above) according to the testimony of the Gāthās, scarcely needs reminding that the same holds true of the holy spirit of the New Testament. This also accords precisely with the explicit declaration of our evangelist that Jesus—in the capacity of world-savior as well as world-judge—will ask the Father for this spirit950 and will convey to his own the one granted by the Father (15 26. 16 7), so that the *παράκλητος* thus does not in the image represent the self-chosen advocate of the individual, but the permanently appointed attorney of a society by virtue of office951. Finally it may still be noted that also in the ("high-priestly") prayer of Jesus attached to the farewell discourses the theological mode of expression, with the New-Testament-unique *πάτερ ἅγιε* (see above note 655) and *πατήρ δίκαιε* (17 11. 25), peculiarly echoes that of the Avesta (above all the Gāthās), albeit in such a way that on the Zoroastrian side at the same time the naïvely naturalistic foundation of the concepts passing over into the ethical comes to light. We have also in Ahura Mazdā

before us the "holy Father" (*tā spenta*) and the "Father of right and righteousness" (*asa*).

(5) The Devil (8 44).

With the διάβολος ἀνθρωποκτόνος and ψεύστης of the evangelist, Num. 22, 2 is to be compared. Ahura Mazdā says to Zarathushtra: the lying952, much-destroying Angra Mainyu (see above) created for me 9 and 90 and 900 and 9000 and 9 times 10,000 diseases953.

It scarcely needs to be remarked that, given the well-known rejecting attitude of Hellenism toward the Persian mystery religion of Mithraism, rooted in the Avesta and interwoven with Babylonian-astrological cult ideas, as it made itself felt quite particularly also throughout the entire western half of Asia954, the omission of any consideration of precisely this religion by the Fourth Evangelist explains itself of its own accord,—all the more so if the latter perceived in the possibility of an emerging rivalry between the two mystery religions a danger to be avoided955.

Essentially different, however, it seems in any case to stand with regard to the question of the relations of the Gospel to the religious world of ideas of the Aryan Indians most closely related to the Persians. For the recognition of a striking similarity between the doctrine of the incarnation of the God-Logos (1 14; 20 28), respectively the "descent" of the "Son of Man"

(3 13), and the Hindu incarnation dogma, the avatars of the god and "Son of Man" Vishnu (Nārāyaṇa), and for the possibility of a more remote relationship or dependency, despite the plurality of the avatars of the Indian god, the result of a comparative investigation of the respective series of ideas speaks, as I have shown in detail in another context to which I must here refer956. It has been emphasized in this connection that the undeniable formal similarity

between the Indian avatar conception and the incarnation idea of the Fourth Evangelist becomes all the more noteworthy through the characterization on both sides of the self-revealing divine being as one that is already in itself archetypically human-like957, and that the descent of Vishnu likewise has as its purpose the preservation and promotion of the salvation of human society through moral redemption958. Nevertheless, in this latter respect it could only be established that a real explanation of the idea peculiar to the Fourth Gospel of the incarnation of the Logos and of the idea of the Son of Man inseparable from it and equally peculiar to it cannot in any way be gained solely from a contact of the evangelist's theological thinking with Indian circles of thought959.

339

All the more, in connection with this, the surprising similarity between a Vedic passage and the saying of Jesus (in relation to Nicodemus) in 3 8: *The wind (τὸ πνεῦμα) blows where it wills, and you hear its sound, but you do not know whence it comes and whither it goes; so it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit*, deserves attention. In the hymn glorifying the wind-god (Vāta—from vā, "to blow") Rigveda X 168 we read (vv. 3–4):

> *Rushing through the mid-air on a prepared path*
> *he never comes on any day to rest.*
> *The waters' first-born friend, the holy one—*
> *where was he born? from where did he come?*
> *As spirit of the gods and child of all the world*
> *this god moves as it pleases him;*
> *only his roaring is heard, not his appearance.*
> *Let us with sacrifice venerate this wind!*

Here, by the "waters," one is to think of the heavenly waters, the clouds, in whose fertilizing discharge—especially in thunderstorms—this nature deity is outstandingly involved. As the "first-born friend of the waters," the wind more remotely recalls the "Spirit of God," conceived as brooding, a cosmogonic principle over the primordial waters (Gen. 1 2), and it must not be forgotten that *ruaḥ* originally likewise means moving air, breath, wind. More noteworthy is the designation of the wind-god as a "holy" one (*rtavä* in the sense of what is lawfully constituted according to nature and reliable—Sāyaṇa: *satyavān*) and as "the spirit of the gods" (that is to say: the life-breath animating them and proceeding from them [*ātman*]). Over against all this, reference must be made just as much to the juxtaposition of the regenerating *ὕδωρ* and *πνεῦμα* in baptism John 3 5 as to the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* 13 3. Compare with this also in the Avesta Yas. 25, 5: "The *asa*-holy Vayu (god of moving air, atmosphere; likewise from *vā* 'to blow') we venerate; the powerfully acting Vayu, looking beyond the other creatures, we venerate; that which in you, Vayu, which in

340

you proceeds from the holy spirit, we venerate" 960. An "all-world child" (*bhuvanasya garbho*) is the wind-god, because he appears everywhere on earth and is at home there ("the wind, the

wind, the heavenly child," German poetry also says). One is astonished, here again, precisely in connection with one of the most characteristically formulated basic doctrines of the Fourth Evangelist, to be made aware of points of comparison of the most elementary kind in the conceptual world of Aryan nature religion. Questions press themselves upon us whose answering must be left to the future. To these belongs, in this case as well, above all the question whether and to what extent one is to think of a conscious contact with the mythic complex of ideas. In this same direction mention may also be made of a remarkable parallel that concerns the conception of the apostolic circle of disciples according to the Fourth Evangelist. It is striking that for him the number twelve of the disciples is indeed firmly fixed by tradition (6 67. 70. 71. 20 24), but that, in contrast to the Synoptics, he names only seven, apart from the Iscariot, "the devil," and does so in such a way that they present, in a characteristic sequence of stages (see above pp. 27—48), a unified gallery of portraits. One is strikingly reminded here of the coexistence of the number seven and the number twelve among the Ādityas of Aryan-Indian religion, the circle of the highest spirits of light, at whose head Varuṇa stands, and who are regarded as a special class of gods. Their number seven is given in the Rigveda (IX 114, 3; cf. X 72, 8 f.); the sun-god who comes closest to them in splendor joins them, as the latter passage shows, only as an unequal eighth bearer of the Āditya name. In Brahmana literature, however, and later generally, their number is increased to twelve "with obvious reference to the number of the months." It is also to be noted that in earlier times, and even more in later times, the individual names and their order are not fixed, which is explained by the essentially typological character of the total number (cf.

341

further the parallel number seven of the *Ameša Spenta* of the Iranians). By contrast, it scarcely needs reminding that the situation is similar with the names and the order in the apostolic circle (details can be passed over here). But as far as the question is concerned whether Jesus fixed the number of the *μαθηταί* in the narrower sense at twelve, corresponding to the initial, conscious restriction of their mission to the twelve-tribe people (Mt. 10 5. 19 28. Lc. 22 30;—Barnabas, Justin, Ebionite Gospel), and therefore actually sent them out thereafter in this number (Mc. 6 7) 961, attention will have to be paid, from the standpoint of our history-of-religions comparison as well, which must reckon with the possibility of a legendary reflex of an original myth, to the negative result of recent investigations 962. No lesser figure than the Fourth Evangelist is the one who, from his standpoint and in his manner, still lets the tradition of an apostolic college of seven shine through (cf., alongside the seven Ṛṣis, the "holy men of

342

primeval time" of ancient Indian belief, the "seven sages" of Greek antiquity).

That our author, however, in fact also has contact beyond the strictly religious sphere with the answering of the highest and most far-reaching questions of life of the Indian intellectual world, he may perhaps have betrayed in another connection 963. With consideration of this possibility, light will fall upon the saying of the Lord 8 31 f.: *If you remain in my word, you are truly my*

disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free 964. The “liberation” *as such* here held out in prospect to the disciples of Jesus recalls that, as in the religious-philosophical systems of India, so also in the popular philosophy of the Buddha, the hope of salvation was diverted from the outlook toward a divine beyond, toward help from above, thus also from belief in the significance of the avatars of Viṣṇu(-Nārāyaṇa), and the principle of redemption (*mukti, mokṣa, apavarga*) was placed in the human being. He is to redeem himself, and indeed through knowledge of the highest truth; *jñānān mokṣaḥ* (from *gnōsis* comes liberation) is the philosophical-religious slogan of the relevant circles of belief 965. The goal is reached when, through the perfect knowledge of the true essence of things (gained on the basis of a fundamentally negative valuation of the material world and a corresponding treatment of the instinctual life), the enduring absolute unconsciousness of the soul or the complete cessation of the existence of the individual is brought about (the former according to the Sāṃkhya 966, the latter—the *nirvāṇa* 967—according to Buddha).

343

Here we apparently obtain an Indian parallel to John 8 32 as a counterpart to the Avestan parallels of 8 25 and 18 37 that have been discussed 968. In 8 32 as well, it could only be a matter for the Evangelist of showing gloriously fulfilled, in the revelation of the Logos-Christ, what the most enlightened nature religion of intellectually elevated peoples had only imperfectly and more or less dimly or wrongly intuited: that there is a final, perfect salvation for everyone who allows himself to be instructed by the appointed witness of the truth. The two opposing series of ideas upon which closer comparison here comes may be briefly indicated. To the religious-philosophical Indian contemplation (in Sāṃkhya, etc., as well as Buddhist) there stands opposed the purely religious New Testament thought. On the Indian side, “knowing” liberates 969; according to the Evangelist, however, that which is known does so 970. On the Indian side, the truth to be known is the possibility of redemption from the ban of the physical and metaphysical total evil of humanity; with the Evangelist, it is the possibility of redemption from the moral cause of evil. Indian liberation of the human being is redemption from the suffering condition of all earthly life, and ultimately from conscious continued existence, indeed from life as such (see above); with the Evangelist it is redemption from bondage to sin (8 34 ff.) and from the consequence of sin: death (8 21. 24. 51 f. 3 36. 5 24). But since on the Indian side the human being exclusively has to liberate himself, whereas according to the Evangelist his liberation appears fundamentally conditioned by the revelation of the divine Logos, the doctrine of the Evangelist is in reality to be set over against both the soteriological theory of the philosophical systems of India in question

344

and the doctrine of Buddha as the antitypically higher, as the truth in the purest and most perfect sense. The literary fact that in the relevant double didactic discourse of Jesus 8 12—58 reference is made to the interconnectedness of the concepts *knowing* (*εἰδέναι*, cf. 4 22—24), *recognizing* (*γιγνώσκειν*), *truth* (*ἀλήθεια, ἀληθής, ἀληθινός, ἀληθῶς*), *freedom* (*ἐλευθερία, ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερόω*) a total of 30 (31?) times, whether indirectly or directly, will, I think, become to a considerable extent intelligible under these circumstances.

Apart from the sayings of the Lord discussed and from the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman (4 7—26) 971, as well as from the two difficult-to-grasp quotations 7 38 and 12 34 972, the “signs” of Jesus reported in the Fourth Gospel might possibly finally come into consideration, if one may think of a connection with Indian narrative material. Here it will first be asked what the situation is with the synoptic basis of John 6 5—13, the account of the feeding miracle. Indologists have recently on several occasions compared the present tradition (Mc. 6 31—44. Mt. 14 13—21. Lc. 9 10—17) with a Buddhist parallel as presented by the legend in the introduction to the Jātaka (the “previous-birth stories”) 78, according to which Buddha, with a loaf of bread that was placed in his alms bowl, first feeds his 500 disciples and then all the inhabitants of a monastery, and yet much bread remains over 973. It is rightly pointed out here that the similarity with the New Testament narrative is striking not primarily for the sake of the miracle as such, but rather because of the feature

345

that twelve baskets of fragments remain and because of the number five. “The smaller number 500 in the Buddhist narrative has, in comparison with the 5000 in the New Testament, the prejudice of originality in its favor.” Above all, it is added that “the number 500 is eminently Buddhist, as we could prove by numerous texts” 974. If in this case the reasons for assuming that the Buddhist story is the source of the Christian parallel are not to be underestimated 975, it nevertheless remains hardly particularly probable that the Fourth Evangelist adopted the synoptic narrative (obviously adapted to the context of ch. 6) with a view to its supposed more remote origin. In any case, however, we shall in fact, with the story of the miracle of the man born blind John 9 1—7, which has been brought into connection with the Buddhist (as well as Brahmanic) doctrine of the transmigration of souls and of the retributive power of deed, “have not the slightest reason to assume Buddhist influence” 976.

346

Greater weight than the question of the influence of Indian legend, such as has recently also been detected in the variously Gnostically influenced apocryphal Gospel literature977, has for the understanding of the Fourth Gospel the determination of its relationship to Gnosticism, which has been called “the western drainage channel of Oriental speculations,” “which brought all sorts of things into the ancient Christian Church, and among them things that Christianity has never again been rid of”978. With regard to this history-of-religions and at the same time church-historical relationship as well, reference can and must here be made back to what has already been discussed in my “Investigations on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel” I979 and above (pp. 89 f.). What now must still be expressly and summarily asserted as the main point of view for the correct understanding of the stance of our Evangelist also toward the characteristic fundamental doctrines of the Gnostics amounts, briefly stated, to the union of a polemical and an irenic980 interest, as was to be expected from the outset as a parallel to the treatment of contemporary religious Judaism by the same “theologian” and in accordance with the ideal universalism of his idea of salvation981.

347

3. The question answered in what precedes concerning the foreign materials (ideas and complexes of representations) taken up, worked over, and as far as possible assimilated by the Fourth Evangelist now already leads on to the investigation of the historical value of his Gospel982. Do we learn in this Gospel the real Jesus of history according to his nature, his own most characteristic words, and his deeds as well as experiences as immediately and reliably as in the Synoptic account, or even more originally, intimately, and better? That neither the latter nor even the former can be asserted I have sought to demonstrate in my “Investigations” I from the self-testimony of Jesus, which comprises almost the entire discursive material of this Gospel. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to go into this again here. Our next task will rather be to ascertain what clarifications,

348

in the direction in question, are to be gained from the demonstrated, Evangelist-specific resemblance of the biographical image of Christ to traits of outstandingly typical figures of nature religion (above all the Hellenic). The unmistakably secondary nature of the total presentation of the evangelical material offered here already follows from this dual character of the written work. If one looks more deeply, one can speak with regard to our author of a twofold reworking of the total image of the earliest tradition of Jesus the Christ: of an overpainting extending over the whole of the presentation with the halo of the Logos idea, and of an equally pervasive underpainting, though by the nature of the case by no means affecting all individual details, which shines through in correct illumination with parallel mythical types of Greek antiquity983. The work of art is thereby— to use another simile— so conceived that the portrait endowed with supermundane effective power shows a landscape background and appears framed with the depiction of biographically significant figures and scenes.

Above (in the first section) we had above all to discuss the fundamental significance of the distinction between word and “sign” for the “method” of the revelation of the Logos-Christus. How, according to the results of our associated research, does the matter now stand with the historicity of the miracle narratives of the Fourth Evangelist, and from what source did they arise? If we disregard those that are taken more or less directly and unchanged from the Synoptic tradition984, we are dealing with a set of four signs,

349

within which two healing miracles form a pair985: the healing of the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda (5 1—16) and that of the man born blind (9 1—34). As has been shown, the two narratives have in common that, by their entire habitus, they unmistakably present themselves as allegorical-didactic sections (pp. 58 ff. 138)986, through which “we are transferred from the life-history of Jesus into the history of his community,” and indeed in such a way that the one sick man as well as the other “is the image of an entire class”987. In both cases synoptic pericopes are not simply renewed, but—especially in 5 1—16, where combination with another healing story also comes into play—intensifyingly modified988. With the assumption of an allegorical form of representation, however, as closer examination likewise showed, we make just as little progress with the two most characteristic miracles of the Fourth Gospel, the first and

the last (cf. above pp. 162 f.). With the wedding miracle at Cana (see above pp. 73—83. 107—116) the foundation of the entire

350

typological Dionysus parallel of his Gospel is established in the most vivid and unmistakable manner. With the same definiteness, however, as has been demonstrated, we encounter in the unique miracle of the raising of Lazarus a mythological substratum capable of being grasped; and in this case as well the miracle-worker has confronted us clearly enough as the antitype of Dionysus (see above pp. 189 ff. 147). Involuntarily, precisely this last and most marvelous “sign” of our fourth reporter brings to mind the most wondrous of all miracle stories already discussed in another context (see above pp. 135 ff.), that which befell the Gerasene demoniac—despite the most conceivable diversity of character and impression in the two cases. For not only does the circumstance that the miracle of the named exorcism strikingly even came to expression in all the Synoptics (in Mark and Luke in the most original and detailed form) in itself already allow one to sense what high significance was accorded precisely to this messianic proof of Jesus in the earliest Church989, but, as far as the question of historicity is concerned, the same applies in the one case as in the other. It is precisely the intensification of the miraculous character, in both cases provoking the reproach of incredibility to an unusual degree, that places in our hands the indispensable final key to the understanding of the whole: the assumption of an originally purely mythical Vorlage. We have here examples of the unconscious and legendary transference (according to a psychological law of nature demonstrable in manifold ways through numerous testimonies of religious as well as profane history and literature) of correspondingly modified attributes of the natural forces and natural phenomena personified in the deities of nature religion onto ideal or idealized persons of history990. In unsurpassable realism the originally

351

pure natural process still shines through in the miracle story of Gerasa. But if the synoptic narrative of the healing of the demoniac there had most probably already taken shape and spread at the latest half a century after Christ’s death, then the literary adoption and processing of a church legend at most perhaps a few decades younger, incomparably more humanly appealing and imaginable in most of its traits (Asia Minor?), such as that of the raising of Lazarus, will appear completely intelligible in the case of the Fourth Evangelist. How easily Asia Minor paganism could, under certain circumstances, fall upon seeing in a miraculous healer the appearance of one of the principal Greek deities is shown, in the case of Paul, by the author of the Acts of the Apostles (14 8—18)991.

Emphatic confirmation of the conclusion already to be drawn solely from what has been set forth concerning the non-historicity of the two principal miracle narratives in question of our Gospel is provided by the result of the investigation into the persons’ and place-names involved, insofar as these too betray mythical origin992. The same, however, also holds true for several names that occur with the Fourth Evangelist not in connection with the miracle reports993. There further line up with

him place-names that are in themselves more or less securely graspable historically, but in whose case it is of essential significance that they occur within allegorical narratives. To this category belongs the Sychar mentioned in 4 5, “near the parcel of land that Jacob had given to his son Joseph; but there was there a well of Jacob.” This city (“unknown to the Old Testament”; *πόλις*, not “village”) has, according to the Evangelist, apparently received its name in use at the time of Jesus—one that seems to be glorifying—from Jacob’s spring-well, which had become famous for its former abundance of water (v. 12), *šĕkār*, and—according to his conception—by this name, reminiscent of *σίκερα* (intoxicating drink)994, prophetically points to the exhilarating drink of the water of eternal life (v. 14) that was to spring forth there for the Samaritans from the person of Jesus himself (v. 40—42). One may compare with this image, on the one hand, the sign of Cana ch. 2, and on the other hand the Pentecost miracle (Acts 2 12 f. 15. 33). The general didactic purpose already to be inferred from this characteristic feature of the pericope (see above pp. 52 f.) does not, however, exclude our seeing in the Samaritan woman, alongside the representative of her people, the scarcely still recognizable counter-image of the nymph conceived both as singular and plural, who in the first stage of Dionysus’ life plays an outstanding role as his nurse and caretaker in childhood—originally a personification of the moisture of atmosphere and earth that promotes the reawakening of nature995. That there is a quite similar state of affairs with the pool of Bethzatha in Jerusalem 5 2 as with the “spring” of Sychar, that here too we have “artificial history before us” 996, has already been shown in detail in another connection (pp. 58 ff.). Here, however, the pool of Siloam of

9 7.11 also belongs, whose allegorical significance is easy to recognize. The Evangelist himself betrays that a wordplay is involved: the sick man is healed at the place of the (water-)“sending” (*šālaḥ* [send]: cf. *šālaḥ* missile; shoot; *šĕlaḥôt* tendrils) as the one “sent” (*šālîaḥ*) there by Jesus. With the waters of Siloam, therefore, Jesus himself cannot be meant. Through him the miraculous healing is only initiated. It occurs precisely there because Isaiah (8 6) once already saw symbolized there the quietly helping, “to be grasped by faith,” activity of the God-king Yahweh, and is at the same time an irrefutable authentication of Jesus by God himself (John 9 31—33). Under these circumstances one should not be surprised if even with the remaining named local indications—the baptismal sites of John, Bethany “beyond the Jordan” 1 28 and Aenon “near Salim,” where there was much water 3 23, and the last place of stay of Jesus and his disciples before the beginning of his path of suffering, Ephraim, a “city near the wilderness” (of Judea) 11 54—even in the probable case that throughout “non-invented names” are involved997, nothing probative for the question of the historicity of what is narrated is to be gained, as is sufficiently shown by the history of the ancient and modern attempts at geographical identification998. Of personal names peculiar to the Fourth Evangelist, there finally come into consideration here: Nicodemus ch. 3 999 and Malchus 18 10. One reflects on how the author may have come, in the latter passage, not merely to portray Peter as the most violent defender of his Lord1000, but even to name the one injured by him. A secure answer to the latter,

quite subordinate question no one will expect. It may nevertheless perhaps deserve attention that the bearer of the not uncommon name Malchus, the servant of the high priest, who is involved in a process introducing the crucifixion of the arrested “King of the Jews” (19 19), strangely and to some extent recalls the Carthaginian general of the same name, who, banished from his father-city, during its siege had his son Cartalo—whom he accused of violation of filial duty—seized upon his arrival in the camp and fastened to the cross in priestly adornment, but after the capture of the city was accused of striving for sole rule and himself executed1001. It need finally only be repeated that in Nathanael, called by Jesus to be a disciple (1 45 ff.), Matthew has been recognized (see above pp. 31. 38 f.)1002. By way of explanation it must still be added, however, that the Fourth Evangelist wished to characterize this disciple and apostle, in whom he saw the author or at least guarantor of the Gospel named after him and acknowledged (see above pp. 300 f.), as a Christian mystery-companion by means of the suppression of his real name, just as he has distinguished the other apostolic evangelist, John, in a mysterious manner by not allowing him to appear with name at all (he is simply “the disciple whom Jesus loved”). It is as though it were meant to be indicated that the original Nathanael only as apostle and evangelist in the deeper and full sense had become the “gift of God”1003. Nor must it be overlooked, moreover, that even the manner in which our Evangelist introduces Nathanael (1 45 f.) and immediately allows Jesus to enter into a conversation with him (vv. 47—51) must, in the highest degree, surprise by its deviation from the synoptic reporting of the calling of the core

of the apostolic circle of disciples, which unquestionably lay before our author. The difference concerns (apart from other matters) both the number and the sequence of those enumerated: the Zebedean James and Bartholomew are lacking; Simon Peter comes third; but his brother Andrew has moved up alongside the mysterious anonymous primus (cf. above pp. 27—34. 340 f.).

If now everything that has preceded offers virtually no points of support for the assumption of a genuine historical tradition peculiar to the Fourth Evangelist, running alongside the evangelical tradition of the Synoptics, concerning the “life of Jesus,” whether this be based on literary knowledge or on oral inquiry, whether immediate or mediated, then it carries particular weight that the words exchanged between Jesus and Nathanael, the first actual conversation of Jesus according to the presentation of our Evangelist, stand in content—as a programmatic self-testimony of the Logos-Christ1004—in a fundamental and typically significant relationship to the totality of the completely homogeneous discourses of Jesus offered by the author. That with these discourses we are once again led beyond the realm of historical tradition in the narrower sense has already been noted above by way of reference back (p. 347)1005. Here it suffices, by way of supplementation, initially only to establish that for the exposition of the thoughts of Jesus in the discursive pieces in question of our Gospel, alongside the basic idea of the Logos revelation in Christ, not only the idea of the mystery character of the New Testament community of faith and cult has been determinative (cf. 3 3—13. 6 51—58: the mysterious intimation of the

salvific necessity of baptism and the Lord's Supper (see above pp. 88 f. 222 ff. 289 f.)), but also the idea of the typological relationship of Christian revelation to general—

356

and above all to Hellenic—religious history1006. How high a significance is attributed precisely to this latter point of view is shown by the quite striking recession of Old Testament typology. The two persons of Old Testament revelation history named by Jesus alone (and in the Fourth Gospel at all): Abraham (8 39 f. 52 f. 56—58) and Moses (1 17. 5 46. 6 32. 7 19. 22 f.)1007 stand in no typological relationship to him. Father Abraham rejoiced exceedingly (in paradise) for himself and his descendants when he saw the day of Jesus (8 56); the lawgiver (1 17) Moses, who could not give his people the bread from heaven (6 32), only "wrote" of Jesus (5 46)1008. Both can thus certainly not be types of Christ, just as this is not the case even with John the Baptist, who surpasses all representatives of the Old Testament (see above pp. 235 f.), in whom we have recognized the most perfected representative of Israel in need of salvation and receptive of salvation (see above p. 23). It is precisely—the same thing again shines through here—the divine Logos who has appeared in the person of Jesus (8 58: before Abraham came to be, I am), to whom there therefore corresponds in the typology of Hellenic religious history a divine-beloved

357

being1009. In the non-quotational allusion to the unnamed Jacob in 1 51, which occurs already at the calling of the disciples, the interest of the Evangelist unquestionably lies on the side of the angels, not of Jacob, as is already shown by the unmistakable reference that intrudes to the conception of Philo (*somn.* I 22)1010. In the not properly "scriptural" quotation 7 42 the Messiah comes into consideration only in terms of homeland; in 10 16 every reference to Scripture and David is lacking; in 12 15 the Messiah (in contrast to Mk. 11 10. Mt. 21 9) is not designated as Davidide (as with Luke). In the two Jesus sayings 13 18 ("he who eats my bread tramples me with his feet") and 19 28 ("I thirst"), in the unnamed personal types of Christ only the comparison of an external similarity concerning suffering enters in and seems, according to what has just been said, to be independent of the David of the Psalm superscriptions1011. The remaining self-comparisons attributed to Jesus—with the manna 6 31 f. 49. 58, with the exalted serpent 3 14, and with the temple 2 19. 21—contain no parallel of person to person1012. How even

358

where emphatic reference is made to Old Testament typology the history-of-religions element (the Dionysus parallel) can characteristically and evidently play a decisive role has already been shown with reference to 19 28 (p. 202)1013. Not to be underestimated alongside all this, however, is still another influence of the fundamental conceptions of the Evangelist upon the discourses of Jesus reported by him. It is hardly to be denied that the numerous and manifold objections raised against the formal character of these discourses almost throughout concern peculiarities that are explicable from the conception of the Logos-being of Jesus, that is, from the basic idea of the Gospel. That this idea in the first instance entailed an extraordinary

emphasis on the essential difference between Jesus and the “children of Abraham,” as with other children of humanity, has already come up in connection with the question of the mystery character of the Gospel (pp. 240 ff.). Under precisely this point of view, however, not only does the character of a multiple, almost scholastic-seeming1014 proclamation

359

of divine authority impressed upon the word-testimony of Jesus become intelligible, but on the other side no less so the often apparently careless1015 and not shying away from repeated self-contradiction1016 logical and dialogical freedom of the speaker, as well as further the schematic uniformity and artificiality of the course of discourse1017 and the related lack of vividness in the outward progression of the conversation and of unity and closure in the respective “freely created situation”1018. A reflection of the “Johannine” form of Jesus’ manner of speaking has even been thought to be present in the words put into Pilate’s mouth, *πόθεν εἶ σύ* (19 9).

360

The impression that one receives, after what has been set forth, upon closer examination from the most various sides, that in the Fourth Gospel we are not dealing with a historical work in the proper and full sense, is further considerably strengthened if one keeps quite especially in view the influence of Hellenic history-of-religions typology on the presentation of the passion narrative already demonstrated above (pp. 194—210. 293 f.), and in addition takes note of the demonstrably frequent incorporation of features of the post-apostolic age into the life-portrait of Jesus and of his contemporaries. Retrojections of experiences of Christendom into “the life of Christ himself”1019 have been recognized with regard to: “the Judaism of the time after the destruction of the Temple in its various attitudes toward the Christian cause (2 23—3 21. 6 41. 9 1—34), the partial conversion of the disciples of John (3 22—36) and of Samaritans (4 1—42), in general the missionary paths of Christianity (12 22), the formation of the Gentile congregation (12 24), the comprehensive world-religion (9 35—10 21) and its victorious progress (14 14. 16 24. 33)1020, the principle of the *nova lex* (14 15), the spirit of love of the congregations (13 35)1021, the external pressure of slander (6 59) and persecution (18 28—19 16), the apologetic task (7 14—52. 13 19. 16 11. 18 2. 37), the Passover question (19 34. 36), the duties of congregational leadership (9 35—10 21), the Christian mysteries (13 1—20. 19 34), baptism (3 22. 4 2), the Lord’s Supper (6 1—13. 51)”1022. Of lesser importance, upon closer consideration, is what has been advanced against the “narrative” of our Gospel under the title

361

of “contradictions”1023. As he himself in all probability wished to be understood by the reflective reader, an actual contradiction is for the most part not demonstrable. To this category belong not only the cases in which “the cancellation follows immediately upon the position,” such as 3 26 and 32 or 3 22. 4 1 and 4 2 or 7 8 and 10 or 12 37—40 and 42. Elsewhere too there are examples enough in which the non-agreement is only apparent. To this class belongs, in the reported utterances of popular opinion, for example, the relation of 7 27 and 9 29 1024. The

contradiction between 6 3 and 15 has arisen from the Evangelist's failure to mention the descent of Jesus that occurred in between, just as in 20 16 he lets Mary turn toward Jesus without having said that immediately beforehand she had turned away from him and again toward the tomb. There is no compelling reason to regard 6 25 and 59 as incompatible: vv. 26—58 summarize what Jesus spoke by the lakeshore and, following upon that, solemnly in the synagogue of Capernaum; reference is not made to the insignificant change of location after the subsequent mention of the principal place. One must abandon the notion of a division of the dialogue. But if the "dramatic events" expected after 7 30. 44. 8 20 do not occur, the verbal conflict rather continuing as though nothing had happened, one will not be able to speak of a contradiction here either. Nor does 4 54 admittedly conflict with the statements of 2 23. 3 2. The "one work" performed by Jesus in Jerusalem after 7 21 (consisting in a word through which another was enabled to perform an act of miraculous effect) accords perfectly with the indeterminately many miraculous deeds of 2 23. 3 2, because in 7 21, as is shown by vv. 22 f., only Sabbath miracles are in view: but the only

362

one of this kind is that of 5 5—9. That same verse 7 21 also does not collide with 7 3, since *μαθηταί* must here be taken in the wider sense (cf. 4 1. 6 60. 66 and thus the "many" of 2 23, to whom Nicodemus also belongs 3 2), and the emphasis does not lie on *μαθηταί* but on the fact that "they also see the works" (which was to be achieved most extensively in the holy city as festival city). The already won and the still to be won disciples are above all to be enabled to behold the miraculous proof of the messianity of Jesus, if he is to bring the "world" to faith in his self-testimony. It is also hard to say why it was "impossible" to attribute to the "Jews" of the Gospel, whom he is accustomed to portray as a religiously superficial and foolish sort of people, the misunderstanding of 7 35, as though Jesus intended a journey into the Diaspora, because of Jesus' preceding remark that he was going to the one who sent him. With more justification, however, the reader may indeed stumble over the fact that Jesus and his followers in 9 22. 34. 12 42 appear as excluded from the community of the synagogue, whereas 16 2 foretells such a fate for the disciples only for the future1025. But if in 11 2 reference is made to an event narrated only in 12 3 as one already having occurred and known to the readers, a secure, decisive explanation is scarcely possible here1026. Attention has also been drawn to the various "slips" and "uncertainties" that emerge here and there (cf., e.g., 6 16) and not least in the account of the last days of Jesus in Jerusalem when compared with the synoptic tradition (e.g., with regard to 12 16—see above p. 207—18 31. 19 7 f.). On closer inspection, however, we nevertheless receive on the whole predominantly the impression that, in the criticism of the narrative value of our Gospel

363

in question, we are more often made aware of blemishes of beauty that can be explained from the Evangelist's own broad, one might—despite the discussed cathedratic habitus of the discourses of Jesus—say with some justification: fluent manner of writing (cf. the light shed above on his literary freedom). In the main matter, however, precisely thereby once again a criterion emerges to the detriment of recognizing our written work as historical1027.

In no point at any rate has the Evangelist proceeded more incisively, and apparently less intelligibly, in asserting the historical picture he represents over against the synoptic tradition than with regard to the duration and the scene of the messianic activity and the date of the day of Jesus' death. As far as the former case is concerned, it has already been shown above pp. 112 ff. 159 ff. that the so striking and offensively invented chronological-biographical deviation of the Evangelist finds its explanation in its connection with his history-of-religions basic idea (the Dionysian typology). We need not return to this here. But the same state of affairs holds also in the latter case, with the "greatest puzzle within the entire biblical chronology"1028. It was fixed for the Evangelist (19 14. 31) as for his predecessors that the death of Jesus took place on the Friday of the Passion week. If, however, the same Evangelist makes this Friday the fourteenth of Nisan, not, with the Synoptics, the fifteenth, and a great number of modern scholars, in favor of the former calendar date, have declared the judicial proceedings of the passion narrative that fall on the fifteenth

364

according to the Synoptics to be an unthinkable profanation of the high festival day thereby affected by the representatives of Jewry, and incidentally have appealed to the synoptic statements in Mk. 15 21. 46. Lk. 23 26 themselves1029, then in opposition to this it has rightly been said: "But what are these factors to signify in comparison with the impossibility of making the origin of the synoptic narrative intelligible if the day was in reality another [the fourteenth of Nisan, which did not exclude those judicial proceedings]? By contrast, the deviation of John from the historical course is easily understood from the symbolic character of his Gospel. He carries through in the passion narrative the thought that Paul once threw out: Christ, our Passover lamb,

365

has been sacrificed (I Cor. 5 7)1030. Christ, the Lamb of God (1 29), dies on the day and at the hour when, according to the law, the Passover lamb is prepared. The Evangelist himself directs us to this interpretation when in 19 31—36 he reports how, in fulfillment of Scripture (Exod. 12 46), 'no bone was broken' of the Lord. If one further recalls the manner in which John otherwise likes to deal with the details of the life of Jesus, one will not wish, even at the present point, to dispense with the leadership of the Synoptics in his favor"1031. The main weight of what our Evangelist achieved on the basis of the Pauline thesis I Cor. 5 7, however, does not lie in the circumstance that the Old Testament typology of Jesus as the true Passover lamb (see above p. 271), already more or less suggested by the synoptic-historical state of affairs in general, now also appeared calendrically predetermined and historically given. Rather, we find ourselves also at this point within the demonstrated great, unified complex of ideas of his Gospel. The principal gain of the deviation from the historical tradition was that the day on which Jesus celebrated the last meal with his disciples, having been the thirteenth of Nisan, ceased to stand in relation to the Passover, so that with regard to the (mysteriously) not reported by the Evangelist (see above p. 291), prophetically foundational (see above pp. 267 f. 227 f. 289 ff.)

366

institution of the sacramental Lord's Supper by Jesus who was only then going to his death, no obstacle remained to bringing into effect the complementary history-of-religions typological conception, the parallel of the Christian and the Hellenic (Dionysian) mystery-meal. One sees: even whoever examines the historical source-value of our Fourth Gospel on the basis of the results of our renewed investigation will hardly be able to avoid agreeing with the admission: "I find not a single point with regard to which our knowledge of the life of Jesus would gain an unimpeachable increase through John"1032.

367

4. With the total yield of our orientation, however, decisive and determinative points of view have now also been gained for answering the question concerning the purpose of this Gospel, which has already been touched upon (pp. 325 f.). Clear from the entire previous finding is above all that the author did not intend to offer historiography, no biography, whether of a scholarly or of a popular kind. It is understandable that one has thought of the intention of supplementing the Synoptics. "John usually appears as the continuer of those lines by which Luke already went beyond the outlines of the older synoptic report"1033. That, however, if the alleged supplementation were to be regarded outright as the purpose, the very fact would already stand against it that a number of synoptic narratives recur in the Fourth Evangelist, has repeatedly and rightly been objected in recent times1034. How little, moreover, we are dealing in the relationship of our Gospel to the synoptic ones with an addition of homogeneous quantities has been evident from what precedes (as already from the "Investigations" I) from the most various sides. Much rather one might be tempted to explain the Fourth Gospel as a polemical treatise directed against contemporary historical-religious phenomena, as has recently been done repeatedly. One has seen in it "a document of the struggle between the believers in Jesus and the adherents of the Baptist"1035. The figure of the forerunner is said to be drawn (1 6—8. 15. 19 ff. 3 22 ff. 5 33 ff. 10 41) in such a way that it requires explanation. Everything seems arranged to depress the Baptist

368

in favor of Jesus. No independent significance could be more thoroughly denied him than is done here. It has rightly been remarked, however, that despite all this the combating of the Baptist sect certainly does not constitute the main purpose of our Gospel. Large sections, such as the farewell discourses, would thereby be utterly inexplicable. Accordingly, the determination of purpose in question has repeatedly been restricted to chs. 1—3. It has also been conceded that it might not even be maintained for these, because we do not know whether the sect of the disciples of John (Acts 18 24—19 7) possessed such great significance that "the lively polemic of the Evangelist" could be explained from it, and because the Gospel nowhere shows itself hostile toward the Baptist, not even disparaging. All the more, by contrast, attention has been fixed on the indisputable "vehement conflict of the Evangelist with Judaism" (in the sense of unbelieving Israel), which almost completely dominates chs. 5—12, a main part, and also emerges in the remaining parts of the writing and is retrojected from the present of the author into the time of Jesus (concerning the main question whether Jesus is the Messiah, whether he is the Son of God). "This standpoint of antithesis to Judaism, which governs the entire Gospel,

would also allow the statements about the Baptist to be subordinated. The Jews could have played John off against Jesus. To such attacks the Fourth Gospel would then give the answer”1036. This view has the advantage of being able to reckon with closed unity of the polemical aims of the author1037. Against this, however, it must be objected: if the “Jews” of the author and the disciples of John are supposed to have exalted the Baptist over Jesus with preference, emphasis, and confidence, and the main purpose of the Gospel were a correspondingly polemical one, the Evangelist could not have ascribed to the Baptist the significance already signaled in the Prologue, surpassing all Old Testament figures of revelation (see above pp. 22 f. 235 ff.), and

369

thereby accorded him an appreciation that even went beyond the synoptic (also Mt. 11 11. Lk. 7 28, according to which “no greater” appeared before him, but not: he himself was the greatest): he would thereby indirectly have lent further support at the same time to the standpoint of the opponent. Just as little as in the need for polemic against contemporary historical Judaism is the decisive occasion for the composition of our Gospel to be sought in the opposition of the author to Gnosticism (see above pp. 89 f. 346)1038. Here it need only be recalled to the above result according to which, in the Evangelist’s stance toward Gnosticism, the union of a polemical and an irenic interest prevailed.

Despite the statement of Irenaeus *adv. haer.* III 11, 1: *Joannes (voluit) per evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inseminatus est hominibus, errorem et multo prius ab his, qui dicuntur Nicolaitae*, the author of the concluding instruction John 20 30 f. will be in the right when he designates the overall purpose of the Gospel as a positive one. To be sure, that this work as such was not intended to serve the satisfaction of an aesthetic-religious need and is not to be assessed as a prototype of the “Messiad,” we need not waste a word, although even already in view of the sweep and the range announced at once with the Prologue, points of comparison might be found. The closest degree of kinship connects our Fourth Gospel nevertheless with the synoptic literature. But a fundamentally essential difference remains, precisely also with regard to purpose, in the circumstance that the Fourth Gospel in and of itself does not belong, like its predecessors, to early Christian missionary literature, as this is once again quite correctly established already by 20 30 f. (cf. above pp. 71 f.): “not foundation, but

370

strengthening of faith1039 is the purpose of the writing; it is not addressed to confessors of Mosaicism and believers in the religion of Judaism or to pagans as such.” If we summarize everything that has emerged in the relevant direction in our preceding investigations, we arrive at the result: the Fourth Gospel is an ecclesiastical-edifying didactic poem1040 cast in biographical prose, attaching itself to the synoptic Gospels only to a very limited extent, insofar as appropriate and feasible, most of all in the passion narrative, for the purpose of introducing Hellenic and Hellenistic (above all Asia-Minor) believers in Christ (those in the process of becoming and those already become) into the mystery of the revelation of God through the Logos-Christ Jesus and specifically into the liturgical mysteries of the Christian religion (see

above pp. 289 ff.). At the same time, however, it proves all the more decidedly to be the universal Gospel (3 16 f. 4 42), the more emphatically and extensively it has especially attested the all-embracing salvific interest of humanity represented in it (cf. above pp. 31 f. 36 f.) through recognition and indication of manifold ethnic affinities of ideas (see above pp. 327—344).

5. The method of presentation given in the main for such a work the Evangelist recognized in the, on the one hand, religio-philosophical, on the other hand, history-of-religions etiological illumination of the New Testament revelation from the standpoint of Hellenic antiquity. According to his conviction, the Old Testament does not suffice either for full knowledge of the person of Jesus or for full understanding of his work (life and suffering). The personality finds its last and highest explanation only in its Logos-being, and the work can, according to its entire significance, be properly appreciated only by one who has grasped the history-of-religions typology standing over against Old Testament revelation-historical typology, as it shows itself most

371

magnificently in Greek religion (cf. above pp. 355 f.). Also in this generally providential typology there had been predetermining forces contained1041. As clearly conscious as the Evangelist keeps in view the unity of the world-historical divine activity emphasized already strongly in the Prologue (1 3 f. 9 f.), so zealously, consistently, and comprehensively has he carried out his ideal literary basic idea in its elaboration that he not only, as already demonstrated, visualizes the passion of the incarnate Logos under the image of mystery-initiation (see above pp. 204—207), but also in the course of instruction and education of the discipleship (of the Twelve) lets one sense, if not see mirrored, the fundamental features of the ecclesiastical-sacramental preparatory institution corresponding to those mysteries, which in its later development is known to us from the time of Tertullian onward (around 200) under the name of the catechumenate. If in this ecclesiastical institution “the point of view of doctrinal instruction had not been the first,” but that of supervision and moral influence, “it has now already attained a higher weight”1042. Under these circumstances we shall be able to understand it if the Fourth Evangelist wished, in the procedure of Jesus in the formation of the first, foundational discipleship and the establishment of the germinal primitive community, to display the archetype of that which already in his own time within the Church was envisaged and instituted in the relevant direction. For in our Gospel, as in the synoptic ones, the situation from the outset is such that the treatment of the first-called disciples of Jesus did not consist so much in “supervision and moral influence, combating morally bad qualities,” as rather in illumination (cf. with the *φωτισμός* II Cor. 4 4, that of John 1 9) and strengthening of faith. According to our

372

Evangelist, Jesus had already at the calling of the apostles demonstrated a wondrous insight into the spiritual qualities and the character, indeed even into the future, of the individual (1 42. 47 ff.; cf. 2 23—25). The task, however, which according to this Gospel immediately confronted the faith and cognitive capacity (6 69. 10 38) of those called was even higher and more difficult than that set before them according to the synoptic tradition: this is already announced by the

word of Jesus to Nathanael (1 50 f.)1043. Initiation into the Logos-mystery revealed by Jesus and the gradual appropriation of his salvation is the all-determining immediate purpose of the course of instruction and education to be undergone by the Twelve. The result of the labor of faith and knowledge performed in this apostolic preparatory stage is expressed in the most significant manner by the disciple whom it cost the hardest struggle (20 28; see above pp. 39 ff.); and that the strengthening influence upon the faith of the discipleship was primarily intended already at the first sign of Jesus is emphasized in 2 11 1044. At the conclusion of the time of learning, practice, and testing, to which the series of chapters of the farewell discourses already externally alludes clearly enough, Judas Iscariot, mysteriously expelled by Jesus from the circle of disciples at the farewell meal, appears as the typologically most eloquent first precursor of the ecclesiastically excommunicated *lapsi* of the preparatory stage: he is excluded from the reception of the final, decisive initiation; he has irrefutably and irretrievably shown himself to be the *υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*. Opposed to him just as plastically, as the high-priestly prayer in 17 6—8. 12, "a presentation of the course of development of the disciples up to their now attained maturity," shows1045, stands the closed circle of the Eleven as the qualified and entitled candidates of the double

373

Christian mystery-initiation: first of all of the still outstanding baptism of the Spirit1046, which is conditioned by the glorification of Jesus (1 33. 7 39. 12 23. 13 31. 17 4 f.) and brings to the baptized, together with the forgiveness of sins, the renewal of his moral being through the Spirit from above (3 5—8), and following upon that also of the personally real union with the exalted Christ in the Lord's Supper (6 51—58; see above pp. 222 ff.). It is once again a characteristic subtlety of the Evangelist that the impartation of the Spirit reported in 20 21—23, although it is undoubtedly conceived as Spirit-baptism, is not brought into discussion under this sacramental aspect, but only as vocational equipment. It qualifies all disciples equally as apostles1047 for the assumption of the disciplinary authority entrusted to them by Jesus

374

in his last will, concerning both admission into the Christian community and excommunication1048, for the purpose of safeguarding the salvific goods of the Church, above all the mysterious ones. This feature of the Evangelist's presentation also unmistakably points into the initial period of the prehistory of the catechumenate. If, however, according to the same writer, Jesus, where he himself performs the first Christian baptismal act upon the apostles, likewise suppresses its name (*βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός; βαπτίζω*), just as already in the conversation with Nicodemus (cf. above p. 291), then the Transfigured one evidently once again marks this creative act of the Spirit, which at the same time points to the entry of the baptized into the stage of epopteia (see above pp. 209. 294)1049, with the well-known negative mark of the mystery1050. The orientation of the Fourth Gospel toward the Christianity of the Hellenic Church (in the widest extent) emerges once more convincingly into the light with this conclusion.

6. The entire result of our investigation thus far finds its final explanation in the answer to the question concerning the personality to whom we owe our Fourth Gospel. How is the peculiarity

of the religious, religious-scholarly, and literary disposition of the author to be more precisely determined? This becomes clear above all when the striking grandeur of his overall conception is taken into view, as it is fundamentally sketched already at the very beginning (Prologue). According to this, the revelation of God

375

present in the coming-into-being of the universe and in the whole of world history has found its absolutely primordial, unified, and all-embracing mediation in the revelation of the Logos. This, however, the Evangelist wishes to present in such a way that the inner coherence and development of the religious life of humanity (expressed in Pauline or Deutero-Pauline terms) is recognized as a divine “recapitulation” of the earthly with the heavenly “in Christ” (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Eph. 1 10)1051. According to his understanding and faith-conviction, this state of affairs manifests itself in broad outlines through a comparison that connects the history of religions and the history of revelation in the narrower sense, namely of paganism, Mosaic Old Testament religion1052, and Christianity. The pursuit of this idea, however, further led the Evangelist onto the path of a typological consideration of the Greek religion, which most prominently represents and lies closest to paganism, a consideration that complements the Old Testament typology of the New Testament writers, in such a way that the universality of the salvation-historical interest is at the same time expressed by repeated demonstration of relations of kinship toward the principal representatives of Oriental religious history1053. The discovery that the mythology and cult

376

of the god Dionysos, equally popular in Asia Minor and Greece, offered a startling series of typologically interpretable parallels to the synoptic-evangelical character portrait of Jesus and to the primitive Christ religion thereby given must have come extraordinarily effectively to the solution of the task. Everything indicates that to the Evangelist the elaboration and illumination of these cases of similarity lay close to his heart not merely in a religious but also in a national sense, not to say: appeared as a duty of honor; all the more so since what resulted for him from his pious contemplation was nothing other than a summation of the noble traits of the Hellenic deity. If, however, in this way he discerned in the history of pagan religions, the so-called nature religion, the most elementary stage of development of the Logos-revelation, and thereby brought the twilight of the “truth of life” and of “light,” which he recognized within the “darkness” of paganism, into the positive relationship of an essential and providential historical coherence of a higher order with that revelation, then it is precisely herein that the greatness and decisive force of his evangelistic and theological significance lies. We do not say too much when, from this point of view, we call him the first, in his kind ideal, humanist of the Christian Church, without wishing to forget how already Paul, alongside and despite his threefold παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (Rom. 1 24. 26. 28), at times fleetingly and with a sense of anticipation looked out in the same direction (Rom. 1 19 ff. 2 10. 14 f. 7 22 f.; cf. Phil. 4 8 and Acts 17 27 ff.). Under these circumstances there can scarcely be any doubt that formally and practically the Evangelist’s principal intention in his original shaping of the material to be mastered in writing was directed toward making the Logos-Christ revelation and the Christian religion founded upon

faith in it as intelligible, sympathetic, and congenial as possible to his Hellenic and Hellenistic readership. For the prospect of success was from the outset all the greater inasmuch as “the Greeks were inclined to rediscover their own gods among

377

foreign peoples”1054. A principal means for achieving that purpose was, as shown, precisely the typological infusion drawn from Greek religion, essentially the Dionysian. But what a high degree of care, skill, and tact the Evangelist in particular displayed in solving this task, how faithfully he remained true to himself and how clearly conscious he was of the religious as well as the artistic demands of his work, is once again revealed here by the mysterious veil of a mode of allusion which—apart from the deliberately attention-arousing programmatic miracle of Cana—consistently permitted only the finer ear and the more practiced eye to perceive the underlying typical parallel of nature religion, and was suited to stimulate continuously the inquiring reflection of teachers and learners alike according to the measure of their capacity1055.

7. If already these general basic features of the Gospel before us speak in favor of the fact that in the person of the writer we are dealing with a representative of Hellenic nationality, this assumption is pressed upon us

378

—quite apart from the impression of that profound national antipathy of his, which has expressed itself sixty-three times in the disparaging use of the name οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι1056—quite especially by the author’s all-sided intimate familiarity with Greek and specifically Asia-Minor religious life, and by the multitude and variety of spotlights that he casts in the most diverse directions with his typological parallels, with which he even in a sense surpasses the Old Testament typology of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. That a Greek who had become a Christian could have acquired, before or after his conversion, that degree of knowledge of Old Testament religion and of Judaism, including the literature of both sides, which the Fourth Evangelist displays, is far more readily conceivable already with the thought of the possibility of mediating proselytism1057 than that a Hellenistic Jew or a Hellenistic Jewish Christian could have attained, on the ground of ancient Greek as well as Greek-Asia-Minor religion, the level of orientation and understanding that we must admire in our author. This may be regarded as certain even quite apart from the question on which side the high interest to be considered in a comparative illumination of the religion of classical antiquity is more likely to have arisen. That an appeal to the linguistic character of the Fourth Gospel cannot prevail against this will be evident1058. It may furthermore

379

be asked whether from here also light does not fall upon the peculiar freedom that the writer displays in his relatively infrequent citation practice (see above n. 1014), in that he five times departs simultaneously from the LXX (cod. Sin¹ excepted in 2 17) and from the base text

(repeatedly with abbreviation) (2 17. 12 15. 40. 13 18. 19 37). To the same presupposition concerning the Evangelist's nationality all indications likewise lead in the discussion of the question how the emergence of the tradition added in the Fourth Gospel to the synoptic narrative material, regarded by the author as equivalent and processed by him, concerning the first and the last miracle is to be explained1059. Here too one is reminded of the event reported in Acts 14 8—18. We have before us within the New Testament field of vision two complementary, characteristic, and typical phenomena: cases of mythological reinterpretation of a historical occurrence stand alongside cases of historical reinterpretation of mythical events. For pagans, the miracle performed by a human being (such as Paul), of which they were eyewitnesses, could make the impression

380

that it could only be the deed of an incarnate god. But what the imagination of nature religion had to recount in miracles for the glorification of one of the most celebrated divine beings (such as Dionysos), this could in pagan-Christian circles (all the more so, the more strongly in general what the ancestral religion had offered that was stimulating, delightful, and mysterious continued to exert influence in perception and feeling) under certain circumstances appear as premonition and prefiguration of an indispensable link in the chain of miracle-acts of the God-man Jesus, and in this way readily bring about the emergence of corresponding evangelical miracle legends. On this basis the Fourth Evangelist too seems to have arrived at the adoption of the double tradition according to which Jesus revealed himself as the antitype of Dionysos not only by transforming water into wine at a festive occasion, but also by restoring a deceased person to life (in the latter case of Sabazios-Dionysos?—see above pp. 109 ff. 189 ff.). The only thing that is truly probable, however, is that our author himself was a Christian of Hellenic descent. This is revealed in particular by the fact that he made the sign of the wedding feast the first, and the cemetery sign the last, of the miracles of Jesus. By this he not only expressed his deep understanding of the distinctive history-of-religions parallel of the two fundamental themes of the Dionysian and the Christian religion—life and death—but also most clearly characterized precisely these two additional miracles as the principal miracles. How little such a turn was to be expected from a Jewish-Christian Evangelist is already sufficiently evident from the Synoptic tradition1060.

381

It is first only still to be added that the special tradition in question of our Evangelist, both in the case of the sign of Cana and in that of Bethany, according to what has already been established above (a. a. O.), is most probably of Asia-Minor-Hellenic origin, and that the in any case secondary Palestinian localization will already have been a given for the Evangelist himself.

8. With an Gospel that we must, after what has been shown, designate as a mystery-gospel κατ' ἐξοχήν, it will for internal and external reasons1061 not be surprising if the name of the author cannot be ascertained; and in fact the answer to the much-discussed question directed to that end can scarcely be otherwise than: "ignoramus, ignorabimus." In this we are no worse off than, for example, with the epoch-making evangelists of Old Testament salvation-universalism, the

so-called Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah. More important than knowledge of that name, however, is in any case the picture of its bearer, as it presents itself to the reader of his writing in a sufficiently deeply probing and far-sighted, methodically unified investigation. The overall impression of this picture is of such a nature that we can find it explicable only in the case of a genial personality transcending his own time: to the most brilliant star of the earliest New Testament literature, the most spiritually powerful apostolic character-figure of the Hellenist Paul, there steps in the Fourth Evangelist, the Hellene, the greatest “theologian” in the scientific sense of the word of the post-apostolic age, in the capacity of a didactic poet (see above p. 370), complementing and once again transfiguring in his own way, alongside1062.

9. To the question where we are to seek this great figure,

382

light has already repeatedly fallen in the course of our investigation thus far, which pointed with fairly definite certainty and not insignificant probability to western Asia Minor (see above pp. 115 f. 190. 232; cf. 302. 325 f.). Otherwise it suffices to recall how other research of more recent criticism likewise felt itself driven onto precisely the same trail. In doing so one has not only highlighted the early appearance characteristic of Asia Minor of “school heads” such as Polycarp, apologists such as Melito of Sardis, theological writers such as Apollinaris of Hierapolis, etc., likewise the fact that to this same region fell the emergence of Montanism, the simultaneous outbreak of the Paschal controversies, and the monarchian initiation of the Christological struggles, just as, on the other hand, since Cerinthus, the alleged contemporary of the “Ephesian” apostle “John” (end of the 1st or beginning of the 2nd century), it had already been a homeland of Gnosis. In addition it has been emphasized in particular that the Fourth Gospel provided the Montanists with the Paraclete, the like-minded followers of Claudius Apollinaris with the calendar date of the death of Jesus, the discussions concerning the intra-divine distinctions with their occasion and material, and finally also individual Gnostic schools with expressions and a stock of ideas. All these factors, however, were reinforced above all by the significance that Ephesus in particular acquired for the earliest history of Asia-Minor Christianity. In this “ancient homeland of Heraclitean Logos-speculation,” toward which also the earliest influence of Alexandrianism on Christian thought points (Acts 18 24. 28), and where “a developed Pauline speculation saw the primeval mystery of all religions fulfilled in Christ (Eph. 3 3—5. 8—11),” the concept of the Logos pressed itself forward, as it were of itself, as a form by means of which the full gain in religious goods that the Christian community owed to its transfigured Master and Lord could be expressed in a concise and rounded manner, surpassing and overcoming the Jewish Messianic idea in a universalistic spirit, yet at the same time, with all scholastic formulation, generally intelligible and familiar to average religious and philosophical

383

consciousness. Here in Ephesus, about the middle of the 2nd century, that conversation of the martyr Justin with the Jew Trypho took place, which, like the two Apologies of the same author, constitutes the first extra-biblical datum for the Christian Logos doctrine, which is otherwise

presupposed as known1063. That tradition therefore also lets the Fourth Gospel be “published” by its author in Ephesus (Iren. adv. haer. III 1, 1) has rightly been taken into account (see above p. 302)1064. To the same place might also point John 19 37, where the quotation from Zech. 12 10 (εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν) “seems to touch the base text only by a detour via Apoc. 1 7 and in any case stands quite foreign to the LXX,”1065 if here the influence of the identical translation of the Ephesian Theodotion, a proselyte of Judaism, who is “probably older than Aquila,”1066 has rightly been assumed. Nor was it to be overlooked, alongside this, that the explanation of the occasionally awkward “handling of Palestinian matters” in 1 24 (Pharisees) and 11 49 (high priest) follows naturally from Asia-Minor presuppositions1067. With all this there accords not only the fact that it seems to have been Asia Minor and no other land where our Gospel arose and (even if at first more as a doctrinal writing than as a historical source) attained a degree of ecclesiastical significance that had to lead sooner or

later to general reception, but also the fact that the “first1068 and at once quite serious objection” to the Logos-Gospel by the radical ecclesiastical party later called the Alogi, who also invoked the contradiction with the Synoptics, likewise took place in Asia Minor (Lydia). That the assumption to which the combination of the tradition represented by Ephraem Syrus—Johannes scripsit evangelium graece Antiochiae1069—with the mentioned tradition of Irenaeus might lead, namely that our Evangelist composed his work in Syria or more specifically in Antioch, but only “published” it in Asia Minor (Ephesus?), would, in view of the overall result of our investigation and in particular of the Greek nationality of the author thereby recognized, be in the highest degree forced and improbable, must be conceded1070. It is worth noting that the later of the two witnesses (died between 370 and 380) himself belonged to Syria.

10. That now, after all that has been set forth (see especially pp. 298—325), the composition of the Fourth Gospel in the first Christian century is not conceivable hardly needs to be stated in advance in the still outstanding answer to the question of the time of origin. As regards the more precise determination of this time, it will at first scarcely be doubtful that we are not to go beyond the second quarter of the second century. It is true that in itself both John 6 and John 13 ff. may possibly allow the presupposition that the views there expressed and modes of expression hinted at were already given in the first decade.

The mystical realism of the Eucharistic doctrine underlying John 6 51—58 (for the authenticity of the verse-sequence see above pp. 223 ff.) can without hesitation be placed alongside that made known already about 115, according to several more recent and very recent datings1071, by Ignatius in Eph. 20 3 and Smyrn. 7 1. “Very clear [indeed] these passages of Ignatius are not, although they are the only two in which the Antiochene sets forth his own view of the Eucharist somewhat more fully.” This view, however, was “certainly strongly realistic.” The flesh and blood of Christ existing in pneumatic being stands in a not further explained, but certainly quite realistically conceived connection with the bread and the wine of the Eucharist, and through this connection forces and substances are introduced into the earthly body of the Christian which

impart to the body the capacity to partake of immortality in the future life. Because of this close connection between immortality and the enjoyment of the Eucharistic elements, Ignatius can designate the bread as medicine of immortality1072. A relation of dependence between the Evangelist and Ignatius in this respect is not recognizable in any direction; rather, reference must be made back to what has already emerged in this respect fundamentally with Paul (p. 284). Likewise the assumption of an allusion by our Evangelist to the designation of the communal meals

386

(see above pp. 267 ff.) as agapai in ch. 13 ff.1073 would not stand in the way of dating his writing to the first or second decade: the name already appears in Ignatius (Smyrn. 8 2—whereby agapē Rom. 7 3 and agapan Smyrn. 7 1 may be compared)1074. On the other hand, however, the question whether passages of the Fourth Gospel appear to have been certainly known and intended in the earliest decades of the second century must now be answered with definiteness in the negative. Here Ignat. Philad. 7 1 comes into consideration in the first place, where of the Spirit of God it is said: οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει; and it is of course not surprising if, upon superficial comparison of this statement, one has inferred John 3 8 as its source1075. But if one observes that Ignatius speaks of a knowing of the divine Spirit, not of a not-knowing of the human being, of the coming and going of the Spirit, not of that of the wind, that is, of an elemental phenomenon, and that also in the Ignatian context quite unlike John 3 8 no illumination of the mystery of rebirth is intended, then one recognizes that the quoted words of the Church Father in themselves have a more or less general, proverbial, and multivalent sense, from which he in his case derives

387

the thought of orientation and immutability1076. Even more clearly still matters stand with regard to the likewise much-discussed passage in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians 7 1, where first of all I John 4 2.3 comes into comparison. To Polycarp's words: Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν there stands opposed in I John the text: Πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χρ. ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου —. To this II John 7 is added: ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος. Even more strongly than Polycarp's sentence concerning the correct Christian confession (ὁμολογῇ), the double ὁμολογεῖ of I John, together with the ὁμολογοῦντες of II John, recalls I Tim. 3 16: καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· Ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ. This latter passage, however, shows in the clearest way that in the three preceding ones there is reference to the general authority of one and the same fairly firmly formulated, fundamental Christological confession-statement1077. Besides the manner of expression1078, it further speaks for this that, just as in I Tim. (3 15. 4 11 ff.), so also on the one hand in I John (4 1. 4—6) and II John

388

(vv. 8—11), and on the other hand in Polycarp (6 8—7 2), the inculcation of the confession-duty in question serves expressly the warding off of heretical aberration and seduction. Under these circumstances the assumption of a citation in Polycarp (between 110 and 117) going back to I (and II?) John is all the less well-founded the less a stronger impression of originality is to be gained on the side of the more extensive formulation of the confession-statement in question in I (and II) John. That, however, on the basis of this state of affairs no proof can be furnished for the existence of the Fourth Gospel in the first decades of the second century is clear. On the reasons that speak for the fact that I John already presupposes this Gospel and, in accordance with the prevailing viewpoints and needs of a not much later time, repeatedly takes a modifying stance toward it1079, reference has already

389

been made elsewhere1080. For the time being the dating of the one as well as of the other writing shall still be left aside. What, however, I have remarked a. a. O. on John 1 14—ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο—that the anti-docetic thought is even more sharply expressed by the phrase σὰρξ ἐγένετο than by ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα in I John 4 2 (ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί II John 7), finds its confirming explanation when one keeps in view the characteristic phenomenon of the numerous cases set forth in the course of our entire investigation of a mysterious and significant, whether forward- or backward-pointing, mutual referencing of substantive and linguistic individual features of our Gospel, and from this standpoint surveys the whole of this writing, bringing σὰρξ ἐγένετο into direct relation with verses 8 f. 14. 17 f. 19—23. 24—29 of the concluding chapter 20. The entry of the god-like, eternally primordial Logos into the mode of existence of human nature uniting spirit and body is

390

deliberately and most emphatically designated, challenging the contradiction of the human organ of thought, as his becoming flesh, in order from the outset to establish the positive connection between the earthly corporeality of Jesus and the spiritually transfigured corporeality of the risen and ascended one (3 13. 6 62. 20 17) (cf. with regard to the evangelistic emphasis of this fundamental view Mt. 28 9. Lc. 24 30. 35. 39—43). What interest of our Evangelist was already decisive here is shown by 6 51—58. The bodily life of Jesus is transfigured with his resurrection into spiritual being to become the bread of life for human beings, in that it is given to believers to partake of it in the mystery of the Eucharist (to eat his flesh, to drink his blood). The underlying conception of the Evangelist, which we have difficulty following, is probably that at the resurrection of believers by Christ on the last day (6 39 f. 54 f.) the forces communicated to them in the holy meal will be set into activity for the transfiguring re-formation of the body as their specific effect1081. We thus have in John 1 14 compared with I John 4 2 only a (pointing to a particularly weighty moment, more already reminiscent of I John 1 1) intensified emphasis of the on both sides equally decisive opposition to gnosticizing docetism1082.

The less the earliest literature of the second century in the passages discussed as well as elsewhere1083 provides the necessary

391

evidentiary grounds for assuming a composition of the Fourth Gospel within the first decades, the greater importance there accrues to the unmistakable repeated allusion of the Evangelist to an outstanding religious- and world-historical event of the last period of the (extending to about 140)1084 post-apostolic age in John 4 21 and 5 431085. With the year 135 we stand at the grave of the Jewish state. Its death struggle had begun with the seven-year war under Nero and Vespasian (-Titus), whose final result was the destruction of Jerusalem (66—73), while during the final years of Trajan (115—117) the Jews in bloodiest uprisings1086, “as if carried away by a spirit of rebellion, rose up against their non-Jewish fellow-countrymen” (Euseb. hist. eccl. IV 2), and now ended with yet another great revolt under Hadrian (132—135). The principal role fell to Simon Bar-Kosiba, called Bar-Kocheba

392

(son of the star; cf. Num. 24 17), who had appeared as Messiah and had even been recognized as such by Rabbi Akiba, the most authoritative legal teacher of that time. The decisive motive was a religious one: resistance to the imperial prohibition of circumcision and to the construction of a temple of Zeus at the site of the sanctuary of Yahweh, already undertaken by Hadrian in 130. Just as Judaism felt itself “mortally struck” by that prohibition, so it had to experience the latter measure as a “slap in the face”1087. What, however, was achieved by this last attempt at self-preservation of its people and state emerges essentially already from the report of Dio Cassius (LXIX 14), that almost all of Judaea was a desert: 50 fortresses and 985 villages destroyed, 580,000 men (?) fallen in battle, countless others perished through disease or hunger and fire (cf. Euseb. h. e. IV 6, 1). “Toward the powerless remnant of the people, the prohibition of circumcision, already earlier decreed, was carried out, at least temporarily; in addition, the Jews were forbidden to enter Jerusalem and the hill country around Jerusalem at all; they were not even to be permitted to behold the ancestral soil from afar. Jerusalem itself was rebuilt as a pagan city; under the name Aelia Capitolina it became a Roman colony, and the temple of Capitoline Jupiter was now indeed erected at the site of the Jewish national sanctuary”1088. The light that these facts cast upon the cited verses, whose substantive interrelatedness is not to be overlooked1089, is the most fitting

393

explanation imaginable. What Jesus prophesies here is something that the contemporaries of the Evangelist had experienced1090—in characteristic contrast to the purely eschatological prophecy of the Jesus of the Synoptics in the so-called Little Apocalypse (Mark 13 5—37 and parallels)1091. Under these circumstances our interest is inevitably also drawn to the much-discussed question of the time of composition of the Epistle of Barnabas and in particular to its dating around 130. In my opinion it cannot be doubtful that in 16 4, where reference is made to the (in 16 3) unwittingly wretchedly distorted verse Isa. 49 17 (“Behold, those who have torn down this temple, they themselves will build it up” [!]), with the words: γίνεται· διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθηρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν· νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ [καὶ] οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν αὐτόν, the second καί transmitted only by the Sinaiticus is secondary. With

this, however, the frequently assumed textual sense, that now the Jews together with their pagan enemies will rebuild the Jewish temple on Zion,

394

falls away. The sense of the passage is rather, in accordance with the entire context of chapter 16, in which the worthlessness of all human temple constructions in God's eyes is to be demonstrated: the same enemies of the Jews who destroyed their house of God in Jerusalem are now on the point of rebuilding it. In doing so, however, a biting sarcasm comes to expression: the temple to be newly built will in reality be a pagan one—the sanctuary of Jupiter Capitolinus planned by Hadrian1092. We hear here a voice from almost exactly the same time as that of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. What the Evangelist in 4 21, more closely considered, already knows as a fact, the founding of Aelia Capitolina with the Jupiter temple, the author of the Epistle of Barnabas sees as immediately impending, and noteworthy is the fact that each, from his particular standpoint, arrives at the same religious explanation of the course of events in question: the only necessary, true temple can only be a πνευματικὸς ναός (Barn. 16 10); "God is spirit, and his worshipers must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4 24). The one writer brings this truth of faith to bear rejectingly over against the externalized and hardened orthodox Judaism, the other promisingly over against the salvation-seeking Samaritanism (and paganism): in both cases preservation and edification of the Christian community is the final purpose. That among the deities made native by Hadrian also in Aelia Capitolina precisely Dionysos was honored first alongside Zeus1093 may, after all that has emerged in the foregoing as a peculiarity of

395

his history-of-religions worldview, have appeared to the Evangelist in his way as particularly significant.

The earliest attestation of an acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel — apart from the New Testament itself (I—III John) (see above pp. 388 f.) — comes into question with the Gospel of Peter, Justin, and the Acts of John1094. The number of probative passages is, especially also in Justin, relatively small. One such occurs around the year 152 in Justin, Apol. I 61: καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐστίν. Here it is indeed at first only "evident" that, although a saying of Christ is expressly reproduced, we certainly do not have a scriptural quotation before us. In John 3 3—5 we do not have the verb ἀναγεννᾶσθαι (this occurs in the New Testament only in the First Epistle of Peter 1 3. 23), but rather γεννᾶσθαι ἄνωθεν (δεύτερον); and corresponding to the kingdom of heaven in John 3 3.5 is the kingdom of God. On the other hand, however, the objection placed in John 3 4 in the mouth of Nicodemus is in fact so absurd that it can be understood only from the idea of the allegorical figure of the man (see above pp. 176 ff.) and from the character impressed by the Evangelist upon the manner of teaching of Jesus over against Judaism (see above pp. 241 f.)1095. This does indeed compel the conclusion that the Justinian passage, whether mediately or immediately, rests upon John 3 3 ff.1096. Hardly less reliable is the positive

396

result of an investigation of the Gospel of Peter, preserved for us only in a fragment, and according to all indications likewise composed around the middle of the second century (in Syria)1097. With good reason attention has been drawn to the fact that the non-breaking of the legs of the crucified one (v. 14)1098 is attested only otherwise in John 19 33 (albeit with a quite different motivation), that the piercing of his hands (v. 21) is stated only otherwise in John 20 20 ff., that to the garden (v. 24) there corresponds only the garden (but not the “garden of Joseph”) of John 19 411099. At v. 60 the impression is almost unavoidable that it (together with the continuation lost to us) refers to John 21 ff., “where a catch of fish by seven disciples likewise under the leadership of Peter, an appearance of the Lord, and the institution of Peter into the pastoral office are narrated: an exceedingly fitting crowning for a Gospel of Peter”1100. We shall hardly be mistaken if we see presupposed by the apocryphal gospel, which arose “in circles of a moderate docetism,” not only the Fourth Gospel itself, but also the supplementary chapter 21. Less is to be achieved by the inclusion of

397

the (probably Asia-Minor)1101 expressly heretical Acts of John, because of the greater uncertainty of the dating and of the exegetical conclusions. To all appearance we can think only of the period between 150 and 180. Even with adherence to the Asia-Minor Johannine legend, one could not go up to about 130: “That not much more than a human generation after the death of the [Ephesian] apostle someone should have ventured such a drastic compilation of tasteless miracle-stories, whose historical content is mostly questionable, would be hard to comprehend”1102. In any case, a later dating is suggested by the peculiarly mixed overall impression, which has rightly been emphasized. On the one hand, “there is probably no depiction in the entire early Christian literature that illuminates docetism as a living historical phenomenon so glaringly” (as chs. 87—105); on the other hand, “the encratitic tendency does not yet appear with the obtrusiveness found in the Acts of Andrew and Thomas,” and the narrative is “intermixed with a strong sensual trait, which occasionally — in the story of Callimachus — even reaches the pinnacle of the repulsive. An unovercome residue of paganism emerges here not merely in the acting persons, but in the author himself”1103. For our question the following emerges briefly. In ch. 89 one has before one “a generalization of the situation of the disciple lying on Jesus’ breast in John 13 23. 25”1104. In agreement with this, John in ch. 90 explicitly characterizes himself as the one whom Jesus loved (ἐφίλει: = John 20 2 — otherwise ἠγάπα). In the same 90th chapter the word of the Lord addressed to Thomas in John 20 27: “Do not be unbelieving, but believing!” is transformed

398

into an admonition addressed to John1105. In ch. 97 (cf. 101) νύσσομαι strikingly recalls ἔνυξεν John 19 34 (νύσσω only here in the New Testament)1106. In view of this state of affairs, one will scarcely hesitate to maintain the repeatedly disputed assumption of the acquaintance of the author of the Acts of John with the Fourth Gospel1107; and one may feel further justified in doing so by the double consideration that the author of our apocryphon had in fact weighty

reasons to make use of the Fourth Gospel, like the others, “only covertly,” and that precisely also in his case the use of the Gospels in general was rendered ineffective by Christ’s relation to the written word (ch. 96 end: “By the word I have deceived everything and have by no means been deceived”)1108. With the non–New Testament testimonies for the existence of the Fourth Gospel we do not go beyond the middle of the second century.

It finally still asks into which time the appendix chapter John 21, already externally the closest to our Gospel, and I—III John point. That we can, indeed must, regard these traditionally “Johannine” writings as a historically coherent literary whole1109 may perhaps emerge from the third letter, not yet brought into the investigation above, in such a way that at the same time a desirable further point of reference for the dating is gained. In III John 12 the writer of the letter identifies himself and his ecclesiastical friends (ἡμεῖς 12. οἱ φίλοι 15) with the

399

plural of οἴδαμεν John 21 24, i.e. with the writer of this (and the following) verse and the fellow believers to whom he is an authority; and what he writes to the addressee Gaius he makes known as ὁ πρεσβύτερος (v. 1): as the presbyter κατ’ ἐξοχήν. In the same capacity he sent out II John, according to v. 1. But where we are to seek this presbyter can, after all that has preceded, scarcely be doubtful: it can only be the Christian metropolis Ephesus. From here he takes authoritative positions in the two short encyclical letters, by virtue of an Asia-Minor tradition referring to John as apostle and Fourth Evangelist, first given literary form by him, and of his personal, outstanding ecclesiastical official dignity, toward certain, though unnamed, communities or church leaders, while the author of I John, in the first letter already rightly designated as “catholic” before Eusebius1110, aimed at the illumination and correction of the faith and life of Greek-speaking Christianity as a whole from the same Christological and church-historical standpoint1111. The second letter, which most emphatically exhorts to unity in truth ordained by God, i.e. in orthodoxy, and in particular to brotherly love, and warns against seduction by traveling “progressive men” and “antichrists” to the (gnostic) error of docetism, is addressed to an “elect” (according to the divine plan of salvation taken out of the world and united with Christ as her bridegroom — κύριος —) community (κυρία). It attests the satisfactory impressions that the presbyter received from a portion of its τέκνα (members of the community) during a visit and holds out the prospect of an (official) return visit, with the inclusion of greetings from the “sister” community immediately subordinate to him. The letter could be designated as a kind of visitation rescript, if the expression

400

did not too strongly recall administrative documents. Special attention, however, is still demanded by the articless ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία of the address, insofar as “it is not excluded that under this addressed community every one could understand himself, and insofar also the whole church could be understood”1112. We will in fact have before us a document that was suitable for visitational communication with more than one community of the Ephesian–Asia-Minor church federation of the presbyter1113. Essentially different is the situation with the third letter, in which the Ephesian church head seeks to assert his superior authority over external

colleagues, partly approvingly, partly disapprovingly, by appeal to an immediate knowledge of the Johannine-apostolic historical testimony John 21 24. That the writing is composed under peculiarly difficult circumstances is already betrayed by the fact that even the striking three personal names (Gaius, Diotrephes, Demetrius), which probably all designate leaders of individual churches, seem to contribute nothing to geographical orientation. It is as though the letter writer, for weighty reasons, even employed ecclesiastical code-names for the case that his writing should fall into improper hands, just as already the omission of his own name in the address of II and III John gives the communication an official-confidential character1114. Under these circumstances we must not evade

401

the question whether the secret of the names of III John is not, despite all difficulty, to be deciphered. First of all it is clear that a bishop of Pergamum, according to later legend ordained by John (Constit. apost. 7 46), would not come into consideration, simply because he was actually called Gaius. The Gaius of the letter will have been so named because he significantly reminded the “presbyter” of another bearer of this name, whose comparison was perhaps even suggested by the local situation. This indeed suggests, in a letter whose main purpose is the exhortation to hospitable intercourse among the Christian communities (vv. 5—8; cf. vv. 9. 10), the model praised by Paul of the Corinthian member of the community Gaius (baptized by Paul himself)1115, even if we are not dealing with the clerical estate in his case. But if we see correctly here, and if the “presbyter” of III John in reality had in view the contemporary circumstances in Corinth and the colleague there who emulated the Pauline host of the community in the manner of his official conduct, then there can scarcely be any doubt that here, over against the like-minded highest representatives of the communities of Ephesus and Corinth, already connected in the days of the apostle Paul by lively visitation and correspondence, we have before us in the person of Diotrephes, who is unmistakably characterized as a bishop (v. 10), no other church superior than the most distinguished rival of the Ephesian one, the bishop of Rome. It is first to be recalled (note 918) that the

402

supplementary chapter of the Fourth Gospel (more precisely 21 1—23), serving the vindication of Peter and otherwise preserving the precedence of John, whose author we know as little as the Evangelist himself1116, was appended “very early” after the appearance of this work 1117, “evidently in order to smooth its way into the Roman West.” The letter III John, compared with this, illuminates, as one easily notices, the east–west relations at a somewhat later point in time, which already allows the contrast of ecclesiastical conception and practice and the rivalry of church leaders to emerge in sharp definition. It brands the slanderously dismissive behavior of Diotrephes toward the person and authority of the “presbyter” himself, the disregard of a letter for “the church”1118, and especially the strict prohibition of the hospitality recommended by the presbyter toward the brothers sent out by him (itinerant preachers), the violation of which even results in the excommunication of the offenders. These are circumstances and events that are nowhere historically more intelligible than in Rome. One really has the impression that one already senses there the atmosphere which, from the middle of

the second century onward, raised Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherus, Victor (nomina et omina!) to the episcopal throne. And the “presbyter” of our letter could hardly have revealed more clearly what was ultimately most offensive to him in his protest against the arbitrary and violent conduct of Diotrephes: he designates him as the φιλοπρωτεύων of the church (αὐτῶν: more precisely of the church leaders), i.e. as the one who claims not merely one of the first places, but the first place, or who behaves as if he occupied it. Indeed, if all does not deceive, our letter writer even allows one to guess, through the allegorical name of the severely rebuked one, who he really was. In this direction v. 11, when more closely considered, is significant, because it conclusively refers back to v. 10. In contrast to the beloved Gaius, Diotrephes appears as a church leader who is not from God and has not seen God (cf. I John 3 10. 4 1—6. 3 6). Thus his name presents him with biting irony positively as a cultor Iovis (Capitolini!), — as one who has denied the faith through the lack of Christian brotherly love and is worse than an unbeliever (Luther: heathen, I Tim. 5 8; cf. Apoc. 2 13. 3 8). In the events in question we shall in any case have to call to mind the situation of the Roman bishopric in the last period before Anicetus; and if in this connection Pius I comes into consideration, who (according to the oldest Roman episcopal list) held office for 15 years immediately before the named one1119, then the naming in III John becomes all the more sarcastic. This does not, however, prevent us from adducing, for explanation, if not outright justification, of the Roman church superior, the manifold facts characteristic precisely of that time, which need not be further illuminated here, and which do not make it appear impossible that the entire dispute might yet be viewed under a perspective less unfavorable for the Roman colleague of the “presbyter.” Accordingly, only brief chronological reminder shall be given of the phenomena already named above that characterize the period in question. Around the year 133 the Gnostic Basilides appears in Alexandria; around the same time,

if not somewhat earlier, Saturnilus in Antioch1120. In the second half of the thirties there come “the master of speculative Gnosis,” Valentinus of Alexandria, and the Syrian Cerdon (both under Bishop Hyginus 136—140), and around 140 also the Asia-Minor (Pontic) pupil of the latter, the “church reformer Marcion” (in the first year of Bishop Pius)1121, to Rome. In 144 Marcion founded his own church there1122. Soon after 150 “the heretical communities are generally in full bloom”1123. Around 157 the revolutionary ecclesiastical movement of Montanism then begins in Phrygia. Still in the first half of the fifties, however (“at the latest 154”), the visit of the Smyrnaean bishop Polycarp to Anicetus, instead of bringing about a desired agreement in the celebration of Passover, initiated the protracted, increasingly sharpening Paschal controversies between the Asia-Minor Quartodecimans (who appealed to the Gospel of John) and the Roman church. One will not be surprised if Bishop Pius, in such a multifarious and highly dangerous situation, not only strove in every way to counteract the rise of Gnosticism by ecclesiastical governance (as a practitioner)1124, but also regarded ecclesiastical itinerant preachers, and thus especially the guests who had traveled from Asia Minor already before Montanus (157), even if officially recommended, with more or less mistrust. He will doubtless have had corresponding experiences, if he eventually proceeded with the strongest defensive measures.

It is to be regretted that knowledge of the facts and insight into the course of events are lacking to us1125. That we

405

are, however, otherwise on the right track with the present investigation is finally also confirmed by the answer that we consistently obtain when it comes to identifying the last-mentioned person in III John: Demetrius (v. 12). If this name, like Gaius and Diotrephes, designates a churchman of episcopal character, which may be regarded as established1126, then the interpretation pointing to the bishop of Ephesus himself emerges unforced1127.

406

Then it can further only be asked whether “the Presbyter” understands by this the colleague in office and bearer of dignity standing nearest to him of the Ephesian community. It is emphasized to the honor of the one named that he not only enjoys general praise (μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων), but has been acknowledged “by the truth itself”: according to the context above all with regard to the hospitable duty of love, which to cultivate is one of his most distinguished professional tasks. If he has fulfilled it unimpaired, then he has earned for himself the testimony of the fulfillment of an explicit word of the Lord (Mt. 10 40 ff.; Joh. 13 20); he who is the truth in person (Joh. 14 6) stands up for him 1128. That we are in fact to think of that Presbyter (= ἐπίσκοπος cf. Act. 20 17. 28) who specifically presides over the community of Ephesus (and in an emergency also has to represent the letter-writer officially) emerges from the second half of v. 12, when “the Presbyter” κατ’ ἐξοχήν appends his own testimony 1129 for Demetrius (together with the community devoted to him cf. οἱ φίλοι v. 15) and thereby makes himself recognizable as the representative bearer of the Johannine-apostolic tradition and authority of the Asian church in Ephesus 113°. This is what the addition to the emphatic καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ μαρτυροῦμεν signifies: καὶ οἶδας ὅτι ἡ μαρτυρία ἡμῶν ἀληθής ἐστιν; for the (Corinthian) colleague Gaius knows of what special kind and significance the “testimony” of this Presbyter is, just as there is also no lack of “other indications of the supreme rank of dignity” of the latter. From this position he calls, like Paul the Galatians (4 19), the “Gaius” and his real community (φίλους v. 15),

407

like members of his own spiritual family, τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα (v. 4). From the consciousness of the same church-historical position it is explained that he calls the (Roman) colleague “Diotrephes” simply the φιλοπρωτεύων (of the great church, see above) and holds out the prospect of an opportunity when he hopes, on a visit 1131, to be able orally to “remind” him of his serious transgressions. Involuntarily the Gaius-community of Corinth presents itself to one’s eyes as the intermediate station between Ephesus and Rome, courted in a guardianship-like manner from both sides, when one recalls the First and the so-called Second Letter of Clement to the Corinthians. In the former, bishop and community of Rome already around 95, on the occasion of a factional dispute that had broken out in Corinth, arising from reprehensible jealousy, which had led to the deposition of some presbyters and had attracted attention abroad not only in Christian communities but also among Jews and pagans, sought to restore the disturbed unity

of the community by declaring themselves most decisively in favor of the violated presbyters 1132. The second writing, probably also sent to the Corinthians from Rome, presumably composed around 140 1133, was a homily, again an — this

408

time generally framed — urgent, eschatologically directed νουθετεῖν of the recipients (Euseb. h. e. IV 23 11). Indeed, in the end the question seriously presses itself whether we are not to see in "Diotrephes" the Pius of Rome, just as in Gaius the Corinthian bishop Primus, in whose time Hegesippus made his journey to Rome via Corinth (Euseb. h. e. IV 22, 2), by which we would once again be placed in the years around 150. Then, in the eyes of the Ephesian "Presbyter", a correct πρῶτος corresponding to the local circumstances would have stood over against the φιλοπρωτεύων of Rome in Corinth.

From what has been set forth one sees chronologically that the "Johannine" epistolary literature of the New Testament likewise does not lead us beyond the years around 150. Thus finally there remains only the question of the time of composition of the appendix of our Gospel (Joh. 21 1—23), which is clearly presupposed in III Joh. 12, compared with Joh. 21 24 f. (see above p. 398 f.). According to the above results concerning the dating of the Gospel (around 135) and of the three related letters (approximately middle of the fifth decade up to 150 ±), only the period 135—145 can be considered. If a more precise date is to be ventured, the church-governing irenic tendency of the chapter (see above n. 918 and p. 401 f.), which contrasts sharply with the sharply polemical tendency of III Joh. (vv. 9—11), speaks most strongly for the time around 140 (early period of Pius I) 1134. As for the three "Johannine" principal writers of the New Testament canon: the apocalyptist "John" (1 1. 4. 9. 22 8), the Evangelist, and the epistolary "Presbyter" (II Joh. 1. III Joh. 1), to whom I Joh. is also to be ascribed (see above n. 1118, p. 402), they characteristically have this in common, that they wish to write in the sense and name

409

of another who for their respective task counts for them as the most eminent, most reliable, and most authoritative authority 1135. The "Presbyter" of the letters writes just as much e persona of the fourth Evangelist as (according to what is set out on p. 325) the Evangelist writes e persona of the Asia-Minor–become apostle John of church tradition, and as the apocalyptist "John" (ca. 95) writes e persona of the actual apostle John the son of Zebedee 1136. The question whether one or the other of this triad was actually named John, whether in the case of the apocalyptist a purely literary name, in this case the nearest at hand, is to be assumed 1137, may be left unanswered. On the first concluding addendum of the Gospel 20 30 f. see above p. 72 f.

410

We rejoice, in a final glance at the wondrous work itself, which has been the subject of our entire investigation, that of it, in its own way and to an even much higher degree, the same can be said that has with full right been said in praise of the monument that Plato dedicated to his great

master, transfigured by death: “Plato has written for us the last wondrous conversation.” If what Plato gives us in his “Phaedo” is poetry,

411

humanity nevertheless cannot do without this poetry of Plato. It is filled with inner truth 1138. Something of this kind may in essence also have been felt by Luther, when he called the fourth Gospel “the one tender true chief Gospel”, which is far preferable to and higher than all three.

1138 Birt, *Sokrates der Athener*, in *Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte* (September 1918).

Fifth Section

Parsism in the Gospel of Matthew as a preliminary stage to the universalistic Hellenism of the fourth Evangelist, as evidenced by the “Lord’s Prayer”

That the Lord’s Prayer constitutes a very peculiar component of the synoptic tradition is already discernible from external symptoms on several occasions. The more clearly it bears the signature of a prayer formulated in the strictest sense, the more striking it becomes1139 that it is put into the mouth of Jesus himself and (in Lk. 11 1) is even designated as such a prayer which Jesus taught his disciples upon an explicit request. That in this prayer the mediatorship of salvation of Jesus does not find expression, at least not directly, might indeed seem to speak in favor of its authorship1140. But just as it remains on the one hand astonishing that Mark knows nothing of such a prayer, or at least reports nothing about it1141, so on the other hand the context in which the “Lord’s Prayer” appears both in Matthew and in Luke already gives rise to serious misgivings. In Matthew it disrupts the strongly prominent logical parallelism of the three-part section 6 1—18 through a sensitive overloading of the middle member (vv. 5—8), which further has the drawback that the apprehension of its purpose is made more difficult. The introductory οὕτως οὖν

(v. 9) lets the Lord’s Prayer appear as a model of an effective short Christian prayer, whereas the appended pair of verses 14, 15 directs the principal attention of the one praying to a single petition. In all likelihood the two verses are a gloss occasioned by the fifth petition1142. Anyone who even today, in the ecclesiastical-liturgical recitation of the Lord’s Prayer, often and frequently hears that petition emphasized in a manner contrary to the text, so that, contrary to the ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν (Mt.), the accent falls on “debtors” and “forgive” instead of on “also we” and “our”1143, will not need to wonder that already the ancient Church was concerned to ward off the appearance or the possibility of an appeal by the one praying to the meritoriousness of his own action (cf. the concealed claims in the Pharisee’s prayer Lk. 18 11), as this is evidently intended by vv. 14, 15 1144. The aorist ἀφήκαμεν almost involuntarily recalls the religiously primordial do ut des standpoint, such as is adopted in the highest naivety by the petitioners of the Rigveda. One should also note the remedial attempt in Luke (ἀφίομεν — in the present and future sense of self-obligation)1145, which takes account of purely Christian modes of thought and feeling. That, however, apart from the factual situation in 6 12, there was no reason to let the hint of the overall purpose of the prayer prefixed to it (vv. 7, 8) be followed at

the conclusion by an emphasis on a single petition, should be evident. The placement and the contextual relations of the Lord's Prayer in the third Gospel also make it sufficiently clear

414

that only with difficulty was accommodation found for it within the synoptic narrative, because evidently a definite tradition was lacking. Already remarkable here is the preceding grounding of the disciples' request in the need for a similar instruction in prayer to that which John the Baptist had granted his disciples. The parable following the model prayer, of the relentlessly importunate petitioner, together with the ensuing application (Lk. 11 5—13), raises the question whether the "Lord's Prayer" (v. 1: "Lord, teach us—") is, according to the Evangelist's conception, intended primarily to instruct and urge hearty and diligent (taking place by day as well as by night) invocation of God, or whether it forms the general foundation and preliminary stage for the most important commandment, the petition for the Holy Spirit as the highest gift of God, and whether herein its principal purpose is to be discerned1146.

Deeper-lying and more definite points of reference for answering the question concerning the history of the origin and the significance of the Lord's Prayer are obtained as soon as we compare the mode of belief and prayer of that religion of antiquity which, by and large, came closest of all pre-Christian religions to the Old Testament religion, the Zoroastrian. Here one makes above all the observation that the sequence of the petitions is in content remarkably reminiscent of the sequence of the highest deities next to Ahura Mazdā known under the name of the Amesha Spentas (Amesa spenta = immortal Holy Ones). We are dealing here with personified abstractions which express individual aspects of the being and activity of Mazdā, but which at the same time are again designated as his children or creatures1147. At the head stand the Amesha Spentas Vohu manah (the "good mind," as it already is in Mazdā himself and determines all his thinking, willing, and acting) and Aša1148

415

(the standing up for what is right, truth, law, and order in the widest scope of the natural and spiritual world, above all religiously and ethically; in extended name-form: Aša vahista = the best, that is, perfect Aša). In the Gāthās, the oldest component of the Avesta, which leads back to the earliest period of the Zoroastrian religion and does not yet apply the designation Amesa spenta, Aša appears as the deity closest to Ahura Mazdā, as his supreme "minister," whereas later Vohu manah is placed before it1149. The third place is occupied by Khsathra, the personification of the dominion of the highest God, in the younger Avesta called Khsathra vairya (pronounced varya), as that power which one is to "will" and "choose," and indeed in believing conviction and action, above all through conversion1150. Now one should note the succession of the name, the kingdom, and the will of God in the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer and the avestical state of affairs regarding the name of Ahura still to be set forth. What great significance this name attained over time is excellently to be learned from Yasht I 1—19 (the Ohrmazd Yasht), in which Ahura Mazdā, in response to Zarathustra's question concerning the most salutary word, bestows upon himself twenty names and extols the wondrous effect of his invocation under these names. At the conclusion the name Mazdā stands emphatically1151.

Such a motley heaping together of names naturally does not come further into consideration for our investigation. Of significance, however, is the address “most holy spirit,” with which Zarathustra directs his question to Ahura Mazdā1152 — all the more so since the first petition of the Lord’s Prayer concerns the “hallowing” of the name of God. Holy Spirit is Ahura by his entire being and perfectly1153. But he is not only such in himself; he also reveals

416

himself as such in the constant struggle which he, as the principle of the good, wages in the world against the spirit of evil1154. With this it is at the same time given that now also the power by means of which he manifests himself as this primordial principle of the good was itself conceived as Holy Spirit, which is proper to him1155. This, however, immediately further makes clear that in the later supreme Amesha Spenta Vohu manah, the “good mind” pure and simple, we fundamentally have nothing other than the most eminent objectification and personification of precisely that power of the revelation of the highest God as the Holy One1156. Involuntarily there presses itself upon one here the Old Testament analogue of the angel representing Yahweh himself in Exod. 23 20, 21, of whom Yahweh himself says: “my name is in him”1157. From here, however, a peculiar light also falls upon the transformation of the first petition of the Lord’s Prayer into a petition for the Holy Spirit of God, such as seems to have been present in the Lukan text (11 2) in Marcion1158. As the first petition, according to what has preceded, there would thus result, in accordance with the

417

canonical Matthew and Luke tradition, the thought intelligible and significant both for the Christian and already for the Mazda-believers: that toward the most holy being of God, the Lord of lords (Ahura–Adonai–Kyrios), a mode of conduct of humanity corresponding to his highest and most immediate revelation might be continually and progressively effected by God himself.

If now the second petition, in close connection with this, concerns the kingdom of God, then the author of the Gospel of Matthew himself has ensured that no doubt can exist as to the principal standpoint under which this kingdom is to be conceived. The numerous statements concerning this “kingship,” which here almost throughout is called the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, show, insofar as they remain with the image, that under the simile of a monarchical state-structure a community of a religiously inward kind, built upon a purely ethically grounded legal order, is envisioned1159. The peculiar, all-determining legal character of this kingdom of God, however, could hardly be more strongly emphasized than in Mt. 6 33 1160, where at the same time the requirement of the human will accommodating itself to this dominion is highlighted with the

418

greatest emphasis1161. Indeed, the wording of this striking saying: “Seek first his (the heavenly Father’s) kingdom and righteousness, and all these things will be added to you,” is such that one can hardly fail to recognize the analogy with the conceptual connection given by the theological personifications of the Mazdā religion (Aša vahista–Khsathra vairya). The kingdom

of Ahura Mazdā is likewise the kingdom of law and righteousness (aša) pure and simple1162; his ruling will likewise, as the best (vairya), has absolutely to be done1163. It scarcely needs to be recalled in addition that with the New Testament concept of the kingdom of God not only Old Testament and Jewish series of conceptions have been taken up1164.

That we are on the right track with what has been set forth is moreover shown with increasing certainty by the findings in the second part of the Lord's Prayer. The fourth position in the sequence of the Amesha Spentas is occupied by Ārmaiti (pron. Ärmati), who has a strange dual character (s. o. p. 169 ff.). On the one hand she is the personification of a pious devotion wholly corresponding to the being and will of Ahura, which impels human beings toward the same disposition1165. On the other hand she is venerated as the protecting and blessing goddess of the earth and of agriculture1166. Accordingly, in the sense of Zoroastrian belief she stands just as distinctly in relation to what, mutatis mutandis, is the subject of the Christian third petition as to what is implored in the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer: the attainment of our daily bread, to be newly asked each day from heaven and to be won from the earth through diligent vocational labor1167. On closer consideration,

however, with this same Ārmaiti we obtain not only a backward connection, but also a forward one: to the petition for the forgiveness of debts. From Ārmaiti's total nature, her all-encompassing relation to the thinking, speaking, and acting of the human being in his earthly as well as heavenly vocation (concerning the so-called second life)1168, it is explained that already according to the Gāthās the final word at the world judgment falls to her. "At the final end of creation"1169 Mazdā will come with his holy spirit, with Khsathra and Vohu manah, through whose activity house and estate are advanced by Asa; "the judgments rendered by them Ārmaiti will proclaim" (Yasna 43, 6. 44, 6). "Through this holy spirit," says the prophet, "you, O Mazdā Ahura, will carry out by means of the fire the distribution of the possession to the two parties with the assistance of Ārmaiti and Asa. It (the expected distribution) will indeed still induce many who wish to hear to convert" (Yasna 47, 6)1170. And thus in Yasna 51, 1 ff., where Zarathustra treats the matter of gaining the heavenly kingdom for himself and his own, it is asked with telling emphasis: "Where does recompense for suffering1171 take place, where the pardons?1172 Where will they receive the Asa [the justification]? Where is the holy Ārmaiti, where Vahista manah?" One sees: where forgiveness of debts is to take place decisively, there Ārmaiti belongs1173. That, however, the need for forgiveness of sins and its expression in prayer not only among the Mazda-believing but likewise among the Christian community from earliest times called forth the thought of the last judgment is certainly to be assumed. And just as little can it be doubtful that with the fifth

petition of the Lord's Prayer it was the same from the beginning.

The confirmation is provided by the two concluding petitions, whose full sense once again surprisingly points to the elementary Zoroastrian parallel. The twofold salvific good which the

Mazda-believer expects from the concluding pair of Amesha Spentas, Haurvatāt (pron. Harvatāt) and Ameretatāt1174, as the gift of Ahura, quite clearly resembles what on the Christian side is implored in purified, higher sense with the conclusion of the prayer: Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one!1175 It is well known that it readily suggests itself, and is in any case possible, to think in the sixth as well as in the seventh petition of the devil as the one who, as God's instrument, tempts human beings to unfaithfulness or apostasy for the sake of their testing. Whatever in any way entices to sin through desires and enjoyments or through trials and sufferings, and whatever in any way falls under the concept of evil and harm, belongs according to early Christian conception to the causal sphere of the devil and his angels (Mt. 25 41. II Cor. 12 7. Apoc. 12 7). Corresponding to this, in the world of the Mazda religion, with remarkable parallels, is the position and function of Angra mainyu (evil spirit, Ahriman) and his demonic companions and helpers, the Daevas (Drugs, Pairikas, Yātus)1176. That, however, the last two Amesha Spentas, who precisely promise and effect what their names signify, summarize the whole salvation that accrues to the pious partly through preservation from the influences and blows of the spirit world, partly through liberation and rescue; that alongside salvation as such (haurvatāt) immortality (ameretatāt), the perfect eternal well-being of the spiritualized life of a newly fashioned humanity to be attained after death

according to Yasna 57, 25. Yast 10, 93. 19, 88 f.1177, that is, the eschatological salvific good, is especially emphasized—this stands beyond question. The two Amesha Spentas therefore appear as inseparable, mostly together and in the dual, and thereby also recall the question that already in ancient times arose with regard to the Lord's Prayer, whether the sixth and seventh petitions are not in reality a unity.

With regard to the opening of the Lord's Prayer, it need finally only be remarked that Ahura Mazdā too is addressed as Father (patā, ptā, tā) in prayer, and indeed as Father of Vohu manah (as the First and the Last, Yasna 31, 8), as Father of Asa—"the deity Asa or also the Asa-realm" Yasna 44, 3; at the same time in the sense: the father of all who adhere to Asa 47, 2)1178; as "Father and Lord of the seven Amesha Spentas" (Yast 13, 83). The rudimentary thinking and feeling of the Zoroastrian religion also comes to light here when Mazdā is invoked as the "holy Father of the holy spirit" and is named together with Ārmaiti and Vohu manah, but also with the bull (created through the wisdom of the spirit) (Yasna 47, 5), just as he is also called, as creator of the spirit of agriculture, the father of the good mind (Yas. 45, 4). This "Father" too dwells in heaven (with the other deities and the deceased believers): in the bright "House of Praise" (garō demāna Yas. 51, 15; in the younger Avesta: -nmāna Yast 19, 44)1179.

A summary of the salvation proceeding from Ahura M., conditioned and mediated through all the Amesha Spentas, as it appears in Yasna 47, 1 as a confession, forms

after all that has been shown a kind of parallel to the credal confession presented in prayer-form in the Lord's Prayer.

Beyond this, however, the tradition concerning the higher origin and the outstanding cultic significance of the Lord's Prayer invites comparison. The Avesta contains four sayings which are recognized and used as the "holy prayers"1180. The foremost among them is the Ahuna vairya (Yasna 27, 13; s. o. p. 327)1181. It states: "As the best supreme ruler, so the [best] judge (is he—namely Zarathustra) according to the holy law, who brings to Mazda the life-works of the good mind and (thus) the supreme authority to Ahura,—he whom they have appointed as shepherd for the poor"1182. Here we do not in itself have a prayer addressed to Zarathustra, but a confessional statement (vacah) about him, which celebrates him as the "Lord" of human beings—as Yast 13, 152 also says: "Zarath. we worship1183 as the supreme lord and judge and as the first teacher of humanity." The high significance of the saying is likewise shown by the younger Avesta when, in the chapter Yasna 19 devoted to the explanation of the Ahuna vairya, it lets Ahura M. testify that he had caused this (prayer-)piece (bagā)1184 to be proclaimed already before the creation of the world1185 (§§ 3, 4), and that "this is the most efficacious saying among the sayings that have ever been spoken, are recited, and will be spoken.

423

marks (and) retains it, can save itself from dying" (Yasna 19,10)1186. That knowledge of this wondrous holy saying rests upon a special proclamation of Ahura Mazdā to Zarathustra is moreover most emphatically confirmed (Yasna 19, 1—4). The Ahuna vairya is therefore in its own way likewise the most pronounced "Lord's Prayer," and Zarathustra's community too has received the divine saying that has become prayer (Yasna 19, 6) from its lord and teacher1187.

In view of this result one will hardly be able to avoid reckoning, in the composition of the Lord's Prayer, with a typological reference to the faith and prayer practice of the Zoroastrian religion. To Zarathustra-believers who were to be converted or had been converted to Christianity and strengthened in the Christian faith, there could indeed be given no more ideal liturgical prayer, as a substitute and surpassing of the Mazda-worshiping prayer formulas, than the Lord's Prayer, which from beginning to end successively reminded them of the highest deities of the old faith (Ahura Mazdā and the six Amesha Spentas) and with classical brevity translated the essential content of their invocation into the corresponding conceptual substance of Christian monotheism1188. The conviction that Jesus could not have lagged behind the illustrious prophet and religious founder of the Orient in the urgently necessary instruction in prayer of his disciples and believers would least of all have failed to arise wherever Christianity came into closer contact and engagement with the confessors of the Iranian-Persian religion1189. Under these circumstances it will therefore be all

424

the less surprising if precisely the Lord's Prayer attained in the tradition the esteem to which both the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke bear witness1190. That after

425

all this one is not to think, with respect to this prayer, of one of individual character and not of “a cry of the soul of Jesus to God for what was needed at the moment of distress,”1191 requires no further discussion1192. Even the fourth Gospel bears eloquent witness to the extent to which the possession of a prayer of Jesus corresponded to a fundamental need of his community. The counterpart to the Lord’s Prayer of the first and third Gospels is the “High-Priestly Prayer” (John 17), which bears the character of the prayer of the “Lord,” as fitting only in his mouth and yet entirely valid for the community, in the purest and highest sense, and is one of the most distinctive and valuable pearls of Gospel literature1193. From the same fourth

Evangelist who, as we have shown, unified in a genial way the outlook and tradition of the earliest Asia Minor Christianity from the highest theological vantage point by Hellenizing them, the Parsism recognizable in the Gospel of Matthew has not only been taken up but also emphatically and extensively carried forward (s. o. pp. 327—337).

When one surveys all these connections, one can scarcely escape the impression that what is epoch-making in the work of our youngest canonical Evangelist rests precisely on the fact that already in the post-apostolic period of earliest Christianity, through the unified typological grasp of outstandingly characteristic fundamental features of the classical religion and religious philosophy of Greece as well as of the related Orient, and through their incorporation into the New Testament salvation-historical worldview, he ushered in the earliest renaissance, which—stimulated and prepared by Paulinism—was destined to prove itself alongside and together with it permanently as one of the most profound, ideal, and powerful driving forces of Christian religion and church history1194.