Footnotes

Footnotes 1-285 (p. 1-95)
Footnotes 286-707 (p. 96-234)
Footnotes 708-715 (p. 235-239)
Footnotes 716-886 (p. 240-297)
Footnotes 887-1138 (p. 298-411)
Footnotes 1139-1194 (p. 412-426)

pp. 1-95

1
Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, third, newly revised edition, edited by W. Bauer, 1908, on John 1:42.

2
Cf. also in the Markan appendix: *τοῦ κυρίου — τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων* (16:20), and H. Holtzmann (*Hand-Kommentar zum N. T.*, 3rd ed. 1901) on Matt. 21:23: “For Matthew it goes without saying that Jesus everywhere, first, teaches, and second, performs miracles.”

3
The announcement of 1:60 does not come into consideration for the company at Cana, as will be shown later. A beginning of preaching is in any case not assumed by the Fourth Evangelist even on the occasion of Jesus’ brief stay in Capernaum (2:12) (cf. Loisy, *Le quatrième évangile*, 1903, p. 281). Particularly noteworthy in this regard is also the reporting of the miracle events of chs. 5 and 9, where in both cases it is most emphatically stressed that the person healed by Jesus had no idea whom he was dealing with, and that the performance of the sign proceeded from Jesus’ own initiative (without any prior request from the sick person).

4
Cf. Holtzmann–Bauer, pp. 119 f.

5
If it is presupposed that the mother had already experienced something miraculous in her son—which naturally does not come into consideration in the counting of the miracles of the messianic period of activity (2:11)—this would suggest an apocryphal background (cf. in general Holtzmann, *Syn.*[8], p. 30), material that would form an analogue to Luke’s narrative of the boy Jesus in the temple (cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.*[8], p. 41), but which in kind would already go beyond it: note in this direction the hint in John 21:25. That the word addressed to the servants by Mary (“Do whatever he tells you!” 2:5) is not simply to be assessed as an expression of renunciation of all personal will, intended to stamp the mother’s conduct toward her son with the type of the

faithful Old Testament community (Holtzmann–Bauer, p. 294), but that rather a confident expectation shines forth from that word, should be sufficiently evident.

6
Accordingly, there can be no talk here of a "surprising, unmotivated change of will on the part of Jesus" (Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 1897, II 422 f.; ²¹¹¹, II 472) in vv. 7 f. The "incarnate Logos" and "Son of Man" of 1:14, 51 cannot yet dispense the true wine, of which the mother has no notion; therefore, what is desired must not be lacking. That the passage already contains a "reference to the salvific drink in the Lord's Supper" (Ed. Meyer, *UA.*, I 337) is not improbable, given the Evangelist's characteristic fondness for ambiguity (more on this later!).

7
Cf., for example, Bernh. Weiß, *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, ad loc.

8
Only his words to the disciples in ch. 1 characterize him as Messiah, and even then merely in the theocratic sense.

9
Cf. (Stade-)Bertholet, *Biblische Theologie des A. T.*, II, 1911, pp. 370 f.

10
Schmiedel, "Die Person Jesu im Streite der Meinungen der Gegenwart," *Protestantische Monatshefte*, 1906, p. 267.

11
"Even in his discourses the Johannine Christ denies the contrast explicitly emphasized in Matt. 16:21 between an earlier period in which the Kingdom was the theme and a later one in which his person formed the theme. Rather, all Johannine discourses are merely self-testimonies and as such elaborations of a few fundamental ideas" (Holtzmann–Bauer, p. 2).

12
The Evangelist brings this to expression in the highest degree through the foolish, obtuse remarks, questions, and answers that repeatedly arise among the people and the disciples. "A crude misunderstanding of the type regularly encountered in the Fourth Gospel" is offered by Mark 8:14–21 and parallels (Holtzmann, *Syn.*, p. 146).

13
Ταῦτα (16:25) can naturally be referred only to the farewell discourses, in which the figurative mode of presentation is repeatedly applied, among other instances also (15 ff.), as in the discourse to the Pharisees (10:1–18), allegorically (primarily: the image of the departing one and those left behind, who feel orphaned and oppressed; of the legal advocate appointed for them; of the common father's house; of the joy of reunion; of being taken home; secondarily: the image of the woman's joy after the travail of childbirth; standing on its own, the image of the vine and the branches). In passing it may merely be remarked that one can indeed seriously ask

whether 13:36—14:31 did not originally follow chs. 15–16 and was subsequently placed earlier in order to bring out more strongly the peculiar relationship of contrast and similarity between Peter and Iscariot (13:36–38; 21–30) (cf. the appendix ch. 21!). It cannot be doubted that in 16:25 and 29 the Evangelist conceived the figurative teaching form on Jesus' lips as such to be a suitable means of illustration, of awakening interest, and of facilitating memory. Special attention, however, deserves on the one hand the fact that Jesus still deems this didactic-pedagogical means appropriate for the select, innermost circle of hearers and pupils even at the highest stage of preparation for the immediate, purely spiritual contemplation of truth; on the other hand, that the disciples themselves finally recognize the help thereby granted to them all the more as a mere provisional aid, the deeper and more exalted, the more indescribable the mystery to be revealed is in its entire essence. For the more recent literary-historical treatment of chs. 15–17 see Holtzmann–Bauer, pp. 253 f. Following Wellhausen, Ed. Meyer (*UA.*, I 313) has also most recently entertained the idea of a later interpolation. It will, however, become evident that already the allegory of the vine (15:1–10) is one of the most pronounced characteristics of the Evangelist's distinctive mode of thought.

14
Note also how John 4:54 "wishes to highlight as noteworthy that Jesus' entry into Galilee was accompanied twice by miracle-signs in Cana" (Holtzmann–Bauer); "the Fourth Gospel differs here from the Synoptics in that with them Jesus almost allows himself to be compelled to work miracles, whereas in the former the sign is a gladly employed means of proof" (ibid. on 2:23).

15
Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, I, 1902, p. 94.

16
The Synoptics are accustomed to use the collective term *ὄχλος*, *ὄχλοι*.

17
Cf. Horace, *Sat.* I, 5, 100–103 (*credat Judaeus Apella, non ego*).

18
3:25 cannot be utilized because of the uncertainty of the text.

19
Cf. Holtzmann–Bauer, p. 202.

20
Likewise often referred to simply as "the Jews."

21 Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*[4], 1907, II, 248, 456. The scribes in the general sense of the "mostly pharisaically minded" γραμματεῖς, spread throughout the whole land and the principal opponents of Jesus in Mark, do not occur as such at all in the Fourth Gospel (83 does not apply). Cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.* 43. Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*, 1899, p. 255. Our Evangelist mistakenly thinks the Pharisees "settled in Jerusalem as a constantly active authority there, or as members of such an authority." Cf. concerning the fact

and its explanation (“under the presupposition of Asia Minor surroundings” of the writer) Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 60 n. 13 (following Osk. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.*², pp. 15, 164, 191).

22 Cf. concerning the “Jews,” Loisy, *Le quatrième évangile*, 1903, p. 495.

23 “In the sense of selfish politics” and yet at the same time unconsciously following a “prophetic inspiration” (cf. B. Weiß and Holtzmann-Bauer).

24 “Almost as if in permanent session” (Holtzmann-Bauer).

25 On the question of literary criticism cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 282 f.

26 His position has already been characterized by the Fourth Evangelist in 11.49 f.

27 The presentation in vv. 29–33 is best explained if, according to the Evangelist, the accusation of high treason immediately made the impression on Pilate that this was a matter of condemning a half-mad fanatic,—a view against which the accusers protest in v. 33.

28 Cf., however, Merkel, *Die Begnadigung am Passahfeste* in *Preußische Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1905, p. 293 ff.

29 According to the Synoptists this takes place rather through the people (at the instigation of the high priests).

30 Here, too, there is no explicit mention of the people.

31 In Mark and Matthew it is the soldiers who do it; in Luke, the high priests (and archons) together with the people (23.13, 18, 23–26, 33). It is no coincidence that the Fourth Evangelist speaks only of the high priests, although the participation of others is not excluded by him either.

33 This feature as well, which hints at the bitterness of the inscription and is lacking in the Synoptists, is characteristic.

33 Likewise peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. Those who act are the “high priests of the Jews” of 19.21.

34 A collective.

35 Before the hierarchs of the Sanhedrin (as in 7.13).

36 B. Weiß calls them (on 12.42) the party most hostile to Jesus; Loisy, *les adversaires officiels du Christ, comme si ce parti religieux constituait une personne morale* (p. 530, 593).

37 From the attempt of the scribes and Pharisees, by means of the particularly insidious question 8.3–6, to get at him, one may here refrain for reasons of literary criticism.

38 The “Jews” of 10.19 = Pharisees of 9.40 (B. Weiß)?

39 According to vv. 13, 15 f., 18, 27 Pharisees; others think of priestly superiors.

40 To what extent, in this connection, especially when festival times are taken into account, pilgrims from other regions are included alongside the Jewish population cannot be determined.

41 In v. 44 τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν refers to the crowd of v. 43; after 44b, however, it must be mentally supplied: also not those court officers who were already (according to v. 32) sent out and were among them (cf. v. 45).

42 Nothing definite can be inferred from 5.13, where the crowd is an obstacle only through its presence for Jesus in dealing with the sick man.

43 Loisy, p. 695.

44 Grill, *Unters.* I, 23.

45 Cf. B. Weiß.

49 Cf. Loisy: “It is useless to seek whether Nicodemus, who formerly was so closed to spiritual truths, has now arrived at perfect faith. — The author wishes to say that Christ received a very dignified burial at the hands of the most respectable Jews” (p. 895 f.). On the question, not pursued further here, of the relationship between history and type in the figure of Nicodemus, reference may be made to Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 93 f. We shall return to this.

47 That, given the total number of members of the Sanhedrin, 70 (71), the number of friends of Christ cannot have been very high has been emphasized by Loisy (p. 698).

48 Loisy remarks that both were *not disciples parfaits*, and that not without reason they are the *agents de la sépulture*, not the *témoins de la résurrection* (a. a. O.).

49 Whether, however, Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea are historical persons is a question to be examined later.

50 For the former, B. Weiß, Loisy; for the latter cf. Holtzmann-Bauer and Grill, *Unters.* I, 19, 49, 73.

51 Cf. Loisy (on the question to the blind man, 9.35): *en l’opposant en quelque façon à la masse des Juifs incrédules.*

52 On the prominence of Martha in the Fourth Evangelist cf. Jean Réville (*Le quatrième évangile*, 1900 f.), Loisy, Holtzmann-Bauer; alongside her treatment by Jesus, which is indulgent toward weak faith (11.40), the “anger” of Jesus at Mary as well as at the Jews on account of it (11.33, 38) is to be noted.

53 Whether and in what proportion Galilean festival pilgrims are to be thought included cannot be determined from 7.12, 31, 40 f.; 12.9, 17 f.

54 Holtzmann-Bauer et al. think of festival-celebrating Galilean believers in signs; against the necessity of this assumption cf. Loisy, p. 515.

55 “This measurement of the number of miracles” is characteristic of the “instability of faith” (B. Weiß).

56 B. Weiß wishes to reckon them among the “principled opposition to Jesus.”

57 “It was by no means yet a ‘full faith’ which the excitement over the Lazarus miracle had aroused” (Holtzmann-Bauer).

58 His nationality remains unconsidered (as in Mark and Matthew), however strongly his purely human nature is emphasized (3.27 ff.).

59 Loisy, ad loc.: *« Tous les hommes ont besoin de la foi, et la parole de Jean, de l’homme envoyé de Dieu, vaut pour tous. »*

60 Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I, 336, 1.

61 Cf. Brandt in *ZntW.* 1910, p. 247 f.: “The Baptist appears [to the Evangelist John] as the first Christ”; likewise Spitta, *Die Sendung des Täufers zu Jesus* in *Studien und Kritiken* 1910, pp. 547–551.

62 Cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.* on Mark 3.22.

63 The “Jews” are the Galileans of vv. 2, 5, 10, 14, 22, 24 ff.: so called because “the former sensuous half-belief already begins to turn into specifically Jewish unbelief” (B. Weiß).

64 Insofar as the brothers of Jesus, as can hardly be denied, have a *typical* significance in 7.3–5, they represent the Galilean populace, not the “Jewish people,” the “old community” (Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 423; II, 472) as such. In 20.17, however, where Jesus speaks of his brothers, there is no reason to think of bodily kinship (cf. Loisy, p. 910).

65 Cf., on the contrary, the failed attempt at murder in Nazareth (Nazara) in Luke (4.29)!

66 His nationality is disputed; Loisy thinks of a proselyte. It deserves attention that the section follows immediately upon that concerning the Samaritans, and that Capernaum lies in “Galilee of the Gentiles” (Matt. 4.13, 15).

67 Cf. Loisy, p. 379.

68 The only thing that is certain is that she does not belong together with the brothers who are unbelieving toward Jesus (7.5) (note the absence of the mother in 7.3–5), but rather, as a type of the faith-willing Old Testament community, forms a contrast to them. This is also the case in

2.3 (despite v. 4 — cf. above, p. 2 f.), where one mistakenly wanted to discern in her just as much an “intrusion of the Jewish spirit” as in the brothers in 7.3 (Holtzmann, *N. Th.* a. a. O.). On the brothers see above.

69 It will hardly be mistaken if one here recognizes in the unnamed disciple the representative of the ideal apostleship, as the one determined by Jesus himself, “who far surpasses figures such as Peter and James in significance, the shepherd of the community gathered from Israel but also from the Gentiles” (Holtzmann, *N. Th.* a. a. O.), and accordingly in the mother of Jesus an allegorical representation of the community of believing Israel. Cf. Loisy: *Le judaïsme converti doit regarder comme fils légitime de l’ancienne alliance le christianisme hellénique et celui-ci doit recueillir comme sa mère la tradition de l’Ancien Testament; mais la mère doit loger chez le fils et non le fils chez la mère* (p. 880). The question, however, whether the “mother of Jesus” (who is mentioned in 6.42 alongside Joseph, but nowhere in the Fourth Gospel is called by name) in 2.1 ff. and 19.25–27 has a purely allegorical meaning (cf. Loisy, p. 259; Holtzmann-Bauer, pp. 75, 294), will have to remain open so long as the general question remains undecided whether the Evangelist, alongside the synoptic historical tradition, still had a special source.

70 That “neither the anointing Mary of 12.3 nor the Magdalene of 19.25, 20.16, 17 according to Luke 7.37, 39, 47–50; 8.2 are characterized” has rightly been connected with the peculiar anthropological and soteriological presuppositions of the Fourth Evangelist (see further in Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 475 f., 521 f.). According to Holtzmann-Bauer (p. 295) and predecessors, the temptation lies near to solving, in a purely allegorical way, even “the riddle of the three Marys” in 19.25 (the community of the faithful in Israel at the foot of the cross). The solution will in no case be fully achievable without comparison with Mary of Bethany and without taking into consideration the question whether perhaps the circle of evangelical Marian tradition originally contained a mythical element. We shall have occasion to express ourselves on this elsewhere.

71 As regards Philip, in our question, in view of the dispute whether two or one Bethsaida are to be taken into consideration, it is decisive that for the Fourth Evangelist himself he was expressly from Bethsaida in Galilee, the “city” of Andrew and Peter (1.44; 12.21). Did the knowledge of the “city” Bethsaida Julias, founded by the tetrarch Philip northeast of the Sea of Gennesaret, perhaps have exerted an influence on this statement?

72 It must of course not be presupposed that, in the sense of the Evangelist, there is nothing further at issue with the person of the unnamed one (against Loisy, p. 246)! There may be reasons for this non-naming which only become recognizable upon deeper penetration into the nature and purpose of the Gospel.

73 While Matthew and Luke also maintain the chronological point of view of the enumeration in the catalogue, Mark, moreover, here (3.16 f.) brings the traditional *discipleship rank-order* into effect, as it appears synoptically stereotyped in the triad: Peter, James, John after the calling of the Twelve. The question wherein the inconsistency of Mark is grounded cannot be answered with certainty. Should the distinction reported here, bestowed by Jesus through honorific names (— for such they surely are, thus Boanerges not to be explained according to Luke 9.54, but in

the sense of zealots *in bonam partem*?) — have prophetically grounded the preferred position of those three in what follows? Is the present text of the passage original? Attention also deserves the fact that Luke, at the transfiguration and after the ascension, places John before James (9.28; Acts 1.13), just as elsewhere he passes over not only Andrew but also James (5.8 f.; 22.8).

74 Cf., for example, the artificial attempt at interpretation with reference to the Asia-Minor presbyter John in v. Soden (*Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte* 1905, p. 216).

75 One may recall, for example, how even the seventeen-year activity of Paul, which preceded "the great history of his mission, his memorable march through the Roman Empire," has "almost disappeared from historical memory" (Weizsäcker, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*², p. 78).

76 In this context the question concerns only the existence of relevant traditions, not their historicity.

77 Weizsäcker, *a. a. O.*, p. 466.

78 Weizsäcker, *a. a. O.*, p. 175.

79 Late second century? (Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* 1904, p. 463; cf. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* I, 1904, p. 175).

80 Might this tradition underlie, among other things, John 12.22? According to Hennecke (*a. a. O.*, p. 464), at least the possibility must be regarded as not entirely excluded that the apostle came from Asia Minor to Greece and here found his end.

81 Harnack, *Chron.* II, 496; cf. Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I, 195.

82 Harnack II, 333.

83 Hennecke I, 459.

84 ὡς ἡ παράδοσις περιέχει.

85 Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* 1902, pp. 367, 373, 444; ³1915, II, pp. 12, 20, 152.

86 According to Polycrates of Ephesus in his letter to Victor of Rome (Euseb., *hist. eccl.* III 31.3; V 24.2) and Clement of Alexandria (Euseb. III 30.1). Cf. Hennecke I, 41, on the Acts of Philip.

87 Of those Twelve Apostles whom one had in mind, Matthew appears in Origen (Euseb., *hist. eccl.* III 1) and Bartholomew in Eusebius (V 10) as missionaries. Loisy, however, wishes to see in Nathanael only a typical ideal figure in whom traits of several persons of the tradition are united (p. 246). Such a conceptual personification, however, is entirely improbable in the midst of names of concrete historical significance, such as we see here strung together. There can hardly be any doubt that the name Nathanael, in the sense of the Evangelist, is only a variation

of the name Matthew and designates that apostle to whom early Church tradition traces our First Gospel: the former tax collector Levi (Mark 2.14; Matt. 9.9; Luke 5.27). This apostle, “most eminently qualified to be a writer” (Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.*³1892, pp. 82, 376), the Fourth Evangelist could not pass over. If Matthew, by virtue of his official position, had belonged to the most despised class of the people, regarded as heathen (Matt. 5.46 f.; 18.17), and thus in a certain degree also represented converted heathendom, it must be added that the Gospel “according to Matthew,” already used by the Fourth Evangelist himself alongside Mark and Luke (Holtzmann, *Einl.*, p. 440 f.), despite its polemically sharply defined Jewish-Christian basic character and purpose (*ibid.*, p. 381 f.), nevertheless “in the most pronounced manner represents the universalism of the Gentile Church and in many respects already directly approaches Catholic Christianity” (Holtzmann, *Syn.*, p. 35). It is therefore of the apostle and evangelist Matthew that the Fourth Evangelist is thinking when Jesus says of Nathanael: “Behold, truly an Israelite in whom there is no deceit,”—one who, despite his reservations about this place (John 1.46), receives in faith the Messiah from Nazareth in Galilee of the Gentiles (Matt. 2.11; 4.15) and overcomes the prejudice of Jewish salvation-particularism. Instead of ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλείτης one might still have thought of ἀλ. Ἰουδαῖος, if Pauline tradition were present (cf. Rom. 2.28 f.), but no longer—despite John 4.22— with the Fourth Evangelist, as is shown by his sharply marked depreciatory usage (attested more than sixty times) precisely with regard to this ethnic name (see above, p. 10). The apostles who appear in the Fourth Gospel only at a later stage are likewise explicitly characterized by legend as missionaries: in the case of Thomas, by the ancient Acts of Thomas (beginning of the third century—cf. Harnack, *Chron.* II, 176; *Miss.*¹, p. 445; ³H, p. 152); in the case of Judas (Lebbaeus), only by late, mutually contradictory ecclesiastical reports.

88 Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 70.

89 If, in accordance with the overall result of recent and most recent research, the composition of our Gospel after 100 is possible or even probable, then from the outset there is all the less reason to doubt the author’s acquaintance with the beginnings of the apostolic legend, which in any case reach far back.

90 Cf. the valuable critical attempt on Acts 8.5–40 by Waitz in *ZntW* 1906, pp. 340–355.

91 We may safely assume that Irenaeus “can hardly have been born before 91, but not after 130” (see Corssen in *ZntW* 1903, pp. 155–166; likewise Th. Zahn).

92 That a mention also in 13.6 (at the foot-washing) was out of the question is obvious.

93 Insufficiently noted by Loisy (p. 262).

94 Just as he even precedes Simon Peter on the way to the tomb, so in 20.8 fundamental significance is attributed to the origin of *his* faith in Jesus’ resurrection, not to that of Peter; in this sense he thus “again gains precedence over Peter” (Holtzmann-Bauer; cf. Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.*, p. 514). The reading of the *Syr. Sin.* bears the character of a harmonizing correction of vv. 8 and 9 (“and they saw and believed”). Another concluding turn is already not to be

expected, given the striking subordination of Peter in v. 1, in accordance with the entire literary character of the Fourth Gospel.

95 It has rightly been noted that both disciples themselves also bear Greek names.

96 Even if he should ultimately still—what is unprovable and improbable—have found an activity in Rome. Cf. on this question what is to be discussed in the fourth section, and Grill, *Der Primat des Petrus* 1904, p. 62 ff.

97 Perhaps one should also think of heightened and foreboding inner unrest on his own part? Cf. on this and on the characterization of Peter in the Fourth Gospel in general: Grill, *a. a. O.*, p. 19 f.

98 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 302; Loisy, p. 903.

99 In contrast to the considerate omission of the pericope of the rebuke of “Satan” Simon (Mark 8.31–33; Matt. 16.21–23; Luke already eliminates precisely this personal feature), it is striking that the Fourth Evangelist (6.70 f.) introduces “the devil” Judas as the son of a Simon. Cf. on this Grill, *a. a. O.*, p. 20.

100 Only the Fourth Evangelist designates Peter as the perpetrator (questionable according to the Synoptists); his deed forms in a certain way a parallel to his behavior in the region of the city of Caesarea Philippi, not reported by (Luke and) our Evangelist (Mark 8.27 ff.; Matt. 16.13 ff.).

101 The third denial has also been weakened in Luke (the conditional self-curse found in Mark and Matthew is lacking here).

102 Opposite the disciple who is simply called Jesus’ beloved stands Peter, whom Jesus must ask three times about his love.

103 The author of the appendix, like the Evangelist, already thinks in the case of the beloved disciple (as will still be shown in the fourth section) of the John whom legend ultimately lets migrate to Asia Minor, and who, according to Irenaeus, is said to have lived into the time of Trajan.

104 Hardly did the author—belonging to the school of the Evangelist—content himself, in the words “If I will that he remain until I come,” with the thought that, according to Jesus’ will, in contrast to the impending martyr’s death of Peter, the other disciple should live considerably longer and only then—dying a natural death—be taken home by Jesus (cf. 14.3). Rather, one gains the impression that the rank relationship of the two disciples is meant to be definitively determined: the first place, the highest apostolic authority, is to remain—despite the brilliant active and passive rehabilitation of Peter—with the ideal beloved disciple, and indeed to remain effective until the fullness of the Gentiles has entered (Rom. 11.25), that is, until the Parousia, the coming of Christ, etc. Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 314 f.; Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 387; ²II, 433 f.

105 Philip appears indeed as the nearest confidant of the Greeks, Andrew as the most immediately responsible front man of the former within the apostolic college (see above, p. 33). Loisy perhaps rightly thinks that precisely these two apostolic names were authoritative at the place where the Gospel was written, and he emphasizes the respectful address of the Greeks to Philip: *Seigneur*. Indeed, one is involuntarily reminded, in this apostolic mediation, of Gehazi in 2 Kings 4.8–37, who stands, as it were, as a "minister" beside the prophet Elisha as a "high, unapproachable lord" (Wellhausen). In any case, the summoning of two intermediary persons from the circle of disciples, which has the appearance of an official chain of instances, is meant to lend particular emphasis to the outstanding importance of the matter. As regards Philip himself, it must not be overlooked that the apostle who announces to Jesus the desire of the Greeks is the first disciple whom Jesus himself encounters, and at the same time the one who is immediately called into discipleship—thus into his постоян companionship—by the solemn "Follow me!" (Matt. 8.22; 9.9 = Luke 5.27; 9.59) (Loisy; Holtzmann-Bauer). Moreover, in the repeatedly occurring pair of disciples Philip–Andrew (6.5, 7, 8; 12.21 f.) one is involuntarily reminded of the names of the founders of the Hellenistic era, Philip and Alexander: the distinctiveness of the Fourth Evangelist makes it highly probable that an allusion is intended.

106 It goes without saying that what is meant is not a theophany perceptible to the outward senses, but a visionary revelation (after the manner of that of Isa. 6.1; perhaps also of Exod. 24.9–11 and 33.18 f.). The main point, however, is the immediate and distinguishable, purely personal confrontation of God the Father of Jesus.

107 Aptly Loisy: *Ses propos ne manifestent pas la hardiesse de sa foi, mais plutôt un doute et la faiblesse de son esprit; ils prouvent que lui-même ne connaît pas Jésus comme il faut, et Jésus va le dire; on ne peut admettre, par conséquent, chez Philippe l'intelligence du discours précédent, comme s'il avait compris que l'on voit réellement, bien que spirituellement, le Père dans le Fils. Jésus corrige doucement la méprise de son apôtre, et sans indiquer où gît l'erreur, ce qui serait contraire à la règle des dialogues johanniques, il insiste sur la réalité de la vision spirituelle, faisant ainsi entendre l'inutilité d'une théophanie particulière* (p. 747). True faith recognizes precisely in the person of Jesus himself the most perfect and most immediate conceivable revelation of the Father, "the face" (*panim*) of God (cf. vv. 9, 11; 2.14, 18; and on the Old Testament theologoumenon, Baentsch [in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum A. T.*], *Exodus–Leviticus* 1900, p. 278; Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des A. T.* 1911, p. 87 f.).

108 The question, "Can anything good come from Nazareth?" rejects the thought of the Messiah because prophecy knows nothing of Nazareth but of Bethlehem; at the same time, however, it also objects that the alleged Nazarene Messiah should be the son of a Joseph who, though known to the people (7.27 f.), is otherwise obscure, not the Davidic son of prophecy. One may set aside the assumption of an allusion to Mark 6.1–6, as well as the other conjectures concerning Nazareth.

109 The deeper sense of Jesus' words of reception is this: this man's misgivings are ingenuous; in taking offense at the son of Joseph and at the Nazarene, he rightly senses that the one of whom Moses and the prophets wrote cannot, with respect to father and birthplace, be of earthly origin at all. Cf. Pauline Christology and Loisy, p. 526 f.

110 Of a seeing at a distance, which is at the same time a spiritual penetration and foresight (analogous to that of v. 42). Nathanael, the "God-given one" (according to the Fourth Evangelist = Mattaniah; see above, n. 87), under the fig tree already announces, in Jesus' eyes, the Israelite who stands in the enjoyment of the blessings of the messianic age (Micah 4.4; Zech. 8.10), and thereby at the same time points to the one who is about to bring this age to pass and who later presents himself to the disciples under the image of the vine (15.1 ff.). Fig tree and vine belong together in the Old Testament image of the time of salvation; the Evangelist, however, significantly appends immediately to Jesus' encounter with Nathanael the miracle of the transformation of water into wine. One may compare how in Hos. 14.9 even Yahweh appears under the image of the fruit tree as the one to whom Israel owes all fruit that accrues to it for its preservation and enjoyment, and how also in Greek religion the giver of joy, Dionysus, stands in particular relation to vine and fig tree. Cf. on Διόνυσος σύκεάτης, Preller, *Griechische Mythologie* I (4th ed. by C. Robert, 1894), p. 709, and on the Διον. Μειλίχιος fashioned from sacred fig wood in Naxos, Voigt in Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 1884 ff., I.1, 1061. We shall return to this. Given the well-known fondness of Old and New Testament writers for artificial name-giving and name-interpretation (cf. already the strange case of Gen. 14.14), and in accordance with the strongly marked distinctiveness of the Fourth Evangelist himself, it may indeed be asked whether the latter, with the choice of the name form נתנאל, did not at the same time intend an allusion to אל־תאנת.

111 Cf. 2.11 (B. Weiß; Loisy).

112 Loisy: *Ce disciple à l'esprit critique et à la parole hardie est le type du croyant malgré lui, dont le cœur vaut mieux que la tête* (p. 640); *il est le type de ceux qui ne veulent croire que sur le témoignage matériel de miracles* (p. 918). Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 307.

113 The bare ἑώρακας of 20.29 allows the inference that in reality there was no longer any touching of the Risen One, because the appearance was overwhelming (cf. Loisy; Zahn; Holtzmann-Bauer).

114 "One of the high points [and originally also the goal and concluding point] of the Gospel of John" (Deißmann, *Licht vom Osten*³ 1909, p. 274).

115 A comparison with the situation in the case of Peter presses itself upon us here in particular. According to our Gospel, Peter, despite his wretched lapse into cowardice that led him to deny Jesus, has a faith that enabled him to grasp the Easter message immediately, and thus, in the Evangelist's view, seems already on this ground alone to take precedence over Thomas among the other disciples.

116 Loisy: *Ce n'est peut-être pas sans raison que l'on relève sa qualité de jumeau; les anciens ont trouvé de l'analogie entre cette moitié d'homme et sa demi-foi — Δίδυμος, δίψυχος* (p. 640). Cf. also Holtzmann-Bauer on 20.21 (Nestle; Zahn).

117 Thus he also appears in the calendar at the winter solstice immediately before Christmas.

118 How Judas, according to the Evangelist's conception, imagined this revelation—whether only as an outward one—is a question not certainly answerable and irrelevant for understanding the context.

119 Since the question of Judas arises on the occasion of the announcement of the sending of the Spirit from the Father (14.16 f., 26), one may above all adduce the eschatological passage Joel 3–4, as well as the specifically messianic Isa. 11.4. See further Schürer, *Gesch.*[4] II, 621 ff.

120 Meyer (*Kommentar über das N. T.*, 1867) on Luke 24.21.

121 Palmer: "The man finds Jesus' sayings enigmatic because he has taken something Jesus said about his reappearance in the still narrowly Jewish sense as a glorious manifestation, which was precisely to appear to the world for judgment. So firmly was this notion fixed in people's minds that the disciple evidently heard nothing else, but always related everything to this notion. Now, however, he can no longer restrain his astonishment that the reappearance of Jesus, held out in prospect, should apply only to the disciples and not to the world" (*Vorlesung über das Evang. Joh.*, 1874).

122 The disciple fears a postponement of the catastrophe in question, not a renunciation of it.

123 The two cases already have a prelude in the desire of the mother of Jesus, rejected by Jesus in Cana (cf. above), and in the disapproved counsel of his brothers in 7.3–9. Here, too, one easily notices the escalation: mother and brothers ask Jesus to do something before the time that he is to do; the two disciples seek to entice him to something he is not to do—Peter to self-glorification without suffering, Judas to a summary act of judgment that would let the greater part of the world loved by God (3.16), humanity, perish instead of saving what can be saved of it.

124 One may ask whether the appearance of Thomas, Philip, and Judas in ch. 14 (vv. 5, 8, 22), together with 6.67–69 (Peter), is not intended as a counterpart to Mark 8.27–33 and parallels.

125 On the later tradition concerning Judas Jacobi and Judas Thomas, the "twin brother of Christ," see W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* 1909, p. 444 f.

126 One should note, among other things, how at times a base, unideal trait that appears synoptically (Mark 14.4; Matt. 26.8) among the disciples in general becomes so concentrated in John 12.4 ff. in the Iscariot that the others no longer come into consideration and therefore remain unmentioned.

127 Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 235.

128 The expression is presumably meant not merely to indicate "the powerful reaction of his moral sensibility" (cf. B. Weiß on 11.33), but at the same time the agitation of the Spirit, as the life-principle belonging to him in divine fullness, against the threatening power of death (cf. 6.63 and Grill, *Unters.* I, 35 f., 290, 292, 300).

129 The inalienable, all-governing strength of Jesus' Spirit at once reveals itself in the majestic calm with which he confronts Judas and his fellow murderers (18.3 ff.).

130 Just as in Matt. 23.15 "son of hell" designates one who is inwardly so constituted that he belongs in hell and comes to it, so here the son of perdition is one who, by his entire nature, is doomed to perdition.

131 Loisy: *un prédestiné à la ruine, qui devait se perdre et non pas précisément qui s'est livré à la perdition et s'est perdu lui-même*, like the other *enfants du diable* (p. 206).

132 Cf. Grill, *a. a. O.*, pp. 291, 306 f.

133 6.64. Cf. Grill, *a. a. O.*, p. 43.

134 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 8.24.

135 Luthardt, *Das johanneische Evangelium*²1875, I, 526.

136 Holtzmann-Bauer on 17.12.

137 Loisy, p. 481.

138 The appendix also makes Nathanael (21.2) into a Galilean (from Cana).

139 By the "traitor" Judas is meant (18.2, 5; possibly him as the principal figure together with the hierarchy).

140 This δόξα, according to the fundamental passage 11.4, is the radiant manifestation of the full possession of divine life and light belonging to the incarnate Logos, as it was repeatedly accomplished during his earthly activity for the eyes of believers in wondrous outward manifestations and continuously in the spiritual disclosure of divine grace and truth, and bore witness to the unique divine sonship of Jesus Christ (Grill, *a. a. O.*, p. 313).

141 On the inverse relationship of the concepts knowledge and faith in 6.69 cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, pp. 16, 153 f.

142 They have recognized that he knows everything and has no need that anyone should question him in order to gauge his capacity for comprehension and his need for explanation; 16.30 (the passage rests on 2.24 f.). Note the strong emphasis that here too (cf. 1.47–49) is laid by the disciples precisely on the wondrous seeing and knowing of Jesus (thus no "sign").

143 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 16.31.

144 "You will be scattered, each to his own place, and will leave me alone," says Jesus. On the rather external adoption of a synoptic prophecy of Jesus (Mark 14.27), which does not accord with the Evangelist's own presentation of events, see Loisy, p. 796; Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 267.

145 Their faith is *encore assez mal instruite et logée dans des esprits étroits* (Loisy, p. 794).

146 That the Evangelist, just like the Sanhedrin (v. 47), counts this miracle among the "signs" of Jesus is not to be doubted.

147 The "law of progression," which according to our Evangelist becomes noticeable in the three sojourns of Jesus in Galilee, has been sketched by Holtzmann (on 6.31) as follows: first, only the disciples come to faith at all (2.11); the second time, the Galileans themselves only to miracle-faith (4.45, 48); finally, they are no longer capable even of this, but show only a keen sense for the material enjoyment connected with the miracle (6.26), indeed completely break away from Jesus, so that only twelve disciples remain as followers (vv. 66–71).

148 The first time as messianic authentication before the Baptist and through him before the public (1.28 ff.); the second time for the revelation of his miraculous power before the Galilean crowd that followed him to the eastern side of the Galilean lake (6.1 ff.); the third time for shorter activity among the Peraeans themselves, concerning whom, however, nothing further is reported.

149 See Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 12 ff.

150 The intermediate link is Luke 3.3, where John comes out of the Jewish wilderness into the whole surrounding region of the Jordan, thus being made into a miracle-preacher (Holtzmann-Bauer).

151 Loisy, p. 631.

152 The mixed people were all the more hateful to the Jews "because the worship celebrated on Mount Gerizim at Shechem likewise applied to the One God and was intended to replace the temple service at Jerusalem" (Holtzmann, *Syn.* on Luke 17.17).

153 Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 20 f.

154 Cf. above all Acts 8.5–8 and Holtzmann-Bauer on John 4.42.

155 Holtzmann, *Syn.* 392 f. Let it be recalled that not only Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* III.3) reckoned the Samaritans in the broader sense as part of the Jewish population, but that even rabbinic Judaism never treated them simply as "foreigners," did not deny their belonging to the "community of Israel," but only described it as doubtful, indeed in regard to their observance of the Law in many respects placed them on a level with the Gentiles, yet distinctly distinguished them from idolaters (Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 8, 22 f.).

156 Holtzmann, *Syn.* 358; Holtzmann-Bauer *ad loc.* The seemingly disdainful treatment by Jesus recalls the saying 4.48 (to the royal official in Capernaum); see above, pp. 25 f.

157 The wondrous knowledge of Jesus, which had already come to light at the calling of Peter and Nathanael, here reveals itself in a new, heightened way.

158 Whether belief in Jesus as Messiah already exists remains—probably deliberately—just as much in question as the nature of the woman's immediate messianic faith (cf. on the latter Loisy, p. 359).

159 Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 110 f.: The Samaritans appear as a model of a normal faith mediated not by seen signs but by the heard word.

160 Cf. Loisy, p. 367.

161 The contrast between the Samaritan type and the stereotyped demand for signs and unbelief among Galileans and Judeans.

162 Proselytes in the broader sense (Schürer, *Gesch.* III, 123 f.), like the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8.27.

163 Cf. what was noted above concerning the Peraeans and Samaritans.

164 Cf. Loisy, p. 684.

165 Cf. Acts 11.20 and on this Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.*, p. 88.

166 On the contrast between the actual behavior of Jews and proselytes toward the Christian mission in the apostolic period cf. Weizsäcker, *a. a. O.*, p. 92: "The regular result of activity in the synagogue is that the majority of the Jews soon turn into enemies and that therefore the activity in the synagogue ceases, whereas the proselytes show a much greater receptivity, and thus a community forms in which Jews indeed also participate, but which nevertheless is composed predominantly of proselytes and other Gentiles."

167 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 291.

168 In this connection it must not be overlooked that our Evangelist characteristically more than the Synoptists seeks to relieve the procurator of guilt for the death of Jesus and to lay it upon the Jews (Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 292).

169 Cf. Holtzmann, *Einl.*, p. 389.

170 The "Jews" of 5.10, 16, 18 are the members of the high council (= the "high priests" or the "high priests and Pharisees"); of "scribes" as well as of "elders" there is no mention in the Fourth Gospel (8.3, 9 is to be disregarded for textual-critical reasons).

171 Cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.*, p. 125.

172 Cf. Mark 12.28–34; Matt. 8.19 (cf. 21), insofar as the scribes appearing here are to be thought of as standing on the side of the Pharisees. They can be designated precisely with respect to their qualification according to status, not according to party.

173 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer *ad loc.*

174 “Only a renewal of synoptic pericopes.”

175 From a different point of view and with a different choice, the same thing has already happened with the Third Evangelist (Luke 18.35–43). On the healing of the two blind men in the Matthean passages (where Matt. 9.27–31 is a “combination” of 20.29–34 and Mark 10.46–52 with freely constructed scenery), see Holtzmann, *Syn.* 89 and 230 (where line 8 from below erroneously has “Mark 8.22–26”).

176 For further details cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 193 (following Inthardt, Pfleiderer, et al.).

177 de Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra* 1870, I, 108.

178 *Onom.* I, 240.

179 See Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ I, 605 (“Bethesda” = olive grove), and against this Schlatter in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* 1913, p. 30 f.

180 In this case we would be dealing with the Aramaic *sattā*, which in Syriac (as a feminine noun) has the meanings *surculus*, *vitis*, *uva* (root ʿṣṣ; cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, §106), and would obtain with *Beth-sattā* a counterpart to the name of Bethphage situated on the Mount of Olives (fig-house). “The at least predominant dominance of Aramaic in Judaea may be concluded with certainty from the place-names belonging to Jerusalem and its surroundings” (Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* I, 1898, p. 6; cf. our ignorance of Jewish and Galilean Aramaic at the time of Jesus in Nöldeke, *Die semitischen Sprachen*² 1899, p. 38 f.). At the same time we recall that the fig tree, like the vine or the vineyard, is an Old and New Testament symbol of Israel (fig tree: Jer. 24.2–10; 29.17; Mark 11.12–14; Hos. 9.10; Matt. 21.19; Luke 13.6–9; vine: Jer. 2.21; Ezek. 19.10; Ps. 80.9, 15; Hos. 14.8—entire people; Hos. 10.1—northern people; Jer. 6.9—Judah; vineyard: Isa. 5.1–7—entire people; 3.14—Judah; Mark 12.1–12; Matt. 21.33–46; Luke 20.9–19). The *kerem* (vineyard), so called, the assembly and workplace of the scribes in Jabneh, or what preceded it in organization and name “probably already in the time of the New Testament” (Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 386), can hardly be considered as a parallel.

181 On the association of vine-planting and water cf. Ezek. 17.5, 6, 8; 19.10, 13.

182 Thus in more recent times, for example, Pfleiderer: Bethesda, with the five porticoes, is “the place of grace which the sick Jewish people indeed sought in its legal religion (the five books of the Law and the five chambers of the Temple) but had never yet found, until in the word of salvation the true source of grace appeared” (*Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren*² 1902, II, 359).

183 Cf. already the “number five” of the destroyed cities of the Valley of Siddim (Sap. 10.6).

184 Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 475.

185 Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 459. Grill, *Unters.* I, 4–31; 285–307.

186 The manner in which in Matt. 3.7; 16.1; 6.11–12 the Sadducees are added to the Pharisees, whereas in the cross-references to 3.7 there is mention only of crowds (Mark 1.5; Luke 3.7), to 16.1 only of the Pharisees (Mark 8.11) or only of the people (Luke 12.54), to 16.6, 11, 12 of the Pharisees and Herod (Mark 8.15) or only of the Pharisees (Luke 12.1), gives the impression of a later report freely arranging the material.

187 Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 488 f.: “When there was no longer any politics to be made, their hour had struck. While the Pharisaic direction, as a consequence of the collapse of political conditions, only strengthened itself all the more and gained ever more unconditioned dominion over the Jewish people, the ground on which the Sadducees could exist was taken away from them.”

188 The Synopsis speaks only of the fasting exaggerated in Pharisaic fashion, which caused the disciples of John to take offense at the freedom of Jesus’ disciples (Mark 2.18–22; Matt. 9.14–17; Luke 5.33–39), and of the inquiry conveyed by two disciples of the Baptist on behalf of their master, still oppressed by doubt, to Jesus, whether he really was the Messiah (Matt. 11.2–6; Luke 7.18–23). Matt. 14.12, according to which the disciples of John not only buried the Baptist but also informed Jesus of his death, rests on a misunderstanding of Mark 6.30.

189 The partial defection of the disciples of John (John 3.22–36) and of the Samaritans (4.1–42) are “retrojections of experiences of Christianity into the life of Christ himself” (O. Holtzmann, *Das Johannesevangelium* 1887, p. 78; Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 4).

190 According to Weizsäcker, the internal contradictions of Acts 18.24–28; 19.1–7 do not permit the assumption that there still existed in Ephesus a truly continuing school of pure disciples of John (*Apost. Z.*, p. 341); nevertheless the conjecture remains open that there were Jews there who adhered to the prophet John without passing over to faith in Christ (p. 529 f.). Cf. on Acts 18.24–28 Schmiedel in the *Handkommentar zum N. T.*² 1893, II, 55 f. H. Holtzmann found in Acts 19.1–7 the kernel of the repeatedly overpainted picture in the fact that a remaining group of the Johannine school—consisting, to be sure, of only about twelve men (“according to the number of the tribes of Israel and of the disciples of Jesus?” Cf. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* I, 517; Weizsäcker, p. 341)—entered the messianic community as a result of contact with Pauline Christianity (*Die Apostelgeschichte*² 1901, p. 120), and speaks with reference to John 3.22–36 of the “significance which, according to Acts 18.24–19.7, the Johannine school still possessed for a longer time after the departure of Jesus” (thus also Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 99). The inference of a purely allegorical sense of the passage in question in the Acts of the Apostles (see Weizsäcker, *a. a. O.*) is not exactly favored by the approximate numerical indication (ὡσεὶ).

191 One may compare the almost entirely corresponding enumeration of the pre-Christian Israelite divisions still found in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* (I.54): *Erat ergo primum schisma eorum, qui dicebantur Sadducaei initio Johannis jam paene temporibus sumpto. — Aliud Samaræorum schisma est. — Scribae quoque et Pharisaei in aliud schisma deducuntur. — Sed et ex discipulis Johannis qui videbantur esse magni segregantur se a populo et magistrum suum veluti Christum praedicant.*

Haec autem omnia praeparata sunt schismata, ut et fides Christi per haec impedirentur et baptisma (Gersdorf, *S. Clem. Rom. recognit.* 1838, p. 29 f.). If here the scribes and Pharisees were thought of as two distinct schisms (Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte* 1884, p. 36), we would even already have a pentad; but the wording (*aliud schisma*) and Matt. 23.1–33; Luke 11.37–54 speak against this. In any case, at the Pseudo-Clementine passage (apart from later additions) one gains the impression of a relatively older report when one compares, on the one hand, the statements of Josephus, and on the other those of the Christian heresiologists. Josephus adds to his three ancient Jewish "heresies," the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, only the differently constituted one of Judas of Galilee (*οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεοικώς*) (Ant. XIII 5.9; XVIII 1.2; *Bell. Jud.* II 8.2; Ant. XVIII 1.6). The enumeration of pre-Christian divisions by the Christian heresiologists (Justin, Hegesippus, and later writers), although also connected with Josephus, fluctuates greatly in detail and in general works with far more names, repeatedly in such a way that a number seven emerges (see Hilgenfeld, *a. a. O.*, pp. 84–86).

192 Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 654.

193 Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II, 465–468.

194 Subsequently it may still be pointed out that Josephus gave to the Pharisees and Sadducees the character of philosophical schools, just as he ascribes to the *αἵρεσις* of the former a similarity with what among the Greeks is called the Stoic school (*παρ' Ἕλλησι Στωικὴ λεγομένη*) (Vita 2; Schürer, *Gesch.*⁴ II 475, 452). Does perhaps from here a light fall upon the choice of the figurative expression *πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα* (5.2)?

195 The thirty-eight years of the duration of the illness do indeed recall the same chronological indication in Deut. 2.14: the long time of suffering in the one case corresponds to the long duration of the state of punishment in the other (cf. the entirely customary, kindred, typical full number 40). Since, however, the sick man in question evidently belongs to those lying in the porticoes, he cannot, according to what has been shown, represent the people of Israel directly as such, but only insofar as his placement in a particular section is deliberately left open to the reader.

196 That the miracle of ch. 5 is, in the sense of the Evangelist, to be reckoned among the "signs" cannot be doubted, even though it is not expressly designated as such.

197 In the intention of the public, the emphasis in the request lies on the miracle; in the intention of Jesus, if he complies, on the sign. The connection of the two concepts is found, as in the Fourth Evangelist, so also synoptically (in Mark and in the parallel Matthean passage) once each, but repeatedly in the Acts of the Apostles; on Acts 2.19 Holtzmann correctly remarks that the strict concept of miracle lies only in *τέρας*. In the Old Testament *אות* (*σημεῖον*) also = miracle (2 Kings 20.9), *מופֵת* (*τέρας*) also = symbol or portent (Isa. 20.3; Ezek. 12.6, among others).

198 B. Weiß: "Not yet in the proofs of superhuman knowledge, but only in this activity surpassing all human capability does the Evangelist see a sign in his sense" (ad loc.). Against this, however, the rebuilding of the temple promised to the sign-demanding Jews as a challenge

(2.18 ff.), if taken literally, would be conceivable only as a symbol of the impending resurrection of Jesus and would then indeed have been a — for them incomprehensible — sign. But a serious intention on Jesus' part does not come into consideration, since the occurrence of the conditional case appears excluded.

199 The emergence of faith is in this respect itself again explained by a drawing of the Father toward the Son, an inner divine working in the human being (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 6.44). This will remain valid even for 11.42 ("for the sake of the crowd I have spoken, so that they may believe that you sent me").

200 Not to place Peraeans, Samaritans, and Greeks together in this regard (see above, pp. 50–54).

201 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer (following O. Holtzmann), p. 307.

202 Grill, *Unters.* I, 48 f., 128 f.

203 *ἐπίστευσαν*: their "faith in his messiahship (1.41, 45, 49) could, on the basis of this beholding of his glory, become firmer and richer in content" (B. Weiß).

204 *ἵνα πιστεύσητε*: "Jesus rejoices that he was not standing at the sickbed; otherwise the opportunity to strengthen the faith of the disciples would not have arisen" (Holtzmann-Bauer).

205 Insofar as the overcoming of the law of gravity and the subduing of the power of the storm, together with the subsequent transport of the boat and its occupants, aim at the calming and rescue of the disciples from mortal danger, this miracle too may be regarded as a sign, even though, in comparison with the others, despite the accumulation of miraculous elements, it bears an elemental character.

206 Accordingly, in my *Unters.* I (line 6 from above) the words "as the greatest sign" are to be deleted. On 2.18 ff. see above, n. 199.

207 This condition is also presupposed in the case of the woman disciple Mary Magdalene (see above, pp. 26 f.). Cf. Luke 24.31.

208 See above, p. 40, n. 113.

209 Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 307 (where only the alleged need for a *σημεῖον* on the part of Thomas is, according to the foregoing, to be denied).

210 Cf. the two Emmaus walkers who did not belong to the Twelve, who are rebuked by Jesus in Luke 24.25 and in the Markan appendix 16.14.

211 Cf. the corresponding interpretation of a saying of the Lord himself by the Evangelist in 2.18 ff.

212 One might compare this compliance with the offer in 2.19.

213 Cf. the *Noli me tangere* of 20.17 and in connection with this Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.*, p. 9: “That repulse can only be explained by a special theory of the Evangelist, according to which the body of Jesus only through the ascension attained a new mode of being and that state in which his full manifestation then became possible.” See also Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 303.

214 B. Weiß has rightly seen this when he remarks on v. 28: the skepticism of Thomas, who now no longer requires actual touching for his faith, turns into an unreserved confession.

215 Holtzmann-Bauer, ad loc.

216 The same, p. 321.

217 To the thoughtful reader it can scarcely escape, in view of the two aorists *ἰδόντες–πιστεύσαντες*, that the Evangelist here allows Jesus to speak essentially already from the standpoint of the later time. We shall return to this in a later context.

218 In this sense *ὁ θεός μου* is meant. Peter’s confession in 6.69 applies to the Messiah Christ.

219 One should note in this connection that the question remains unanswered whether Thomas, at the moment in question, is already to be thought of as partaking of the Holy Spirit. If that were not to be assumed, then an even stronger and more significant emphasis would fall upon the act of testimony of the converted unbeliever.

220 See on this Grill, *Unters.* I, 45 f.

221 Cf. also the cases of material need in Matt. 17.24–27.

222 Cf. especially the attempts regarding vv. 6 f.: “Scholars have provided manifold remedies, by reducing the quantity through benevolent calculation (Bunsen), or by not having the entire mass of water become wine (Lücke), or by not letting all the wine be intended for immediate drinking (Luthardt), or by shifting the quantitative conception onto the Evangelist’s conscience (B. Weiß), at the very least assuring that the presence of Jesus would have prevented any excess (Hengstenberg)” (Holtzmann-Bauer, ad loc.).

223 B. Weiß: 5–6 *hl*; Zahn, Holtzmann-Bauer: 5–7 *hl*. How, under these circumstances, B. Weiß can speak of “the lack of earthly life,” into which Jesus “brings the richest abundance of divine gifts in God’s power,” is difficult to understand.

224 Cf. the *περισσόν* given together with the *ζωή* in 10.10. How this quantitative aspect can at least enter as an intensifying moment even in a genuine miracle of help is shown (as already on synoptic grounds Mark 6.31–44; 8.1–10 and parallels) by the multiplication miracle in the feeding narrative, John 6.1–13.

225 Cf., on the other hand, the latter’s cooperation in the giving of water in Exod. 17.6 f. (Num. 20.8, 11) and in punishments from heaven, Exod. 9.22 f.; 10.21 f.

226 Cf. moreover already Ps. 105.40 with vv. 26, 27 and following. The Evangelist presupposes the same conception in 6.30 f. with regard to the crowd.

227 Worth noting is how later one ascribed to the manna the quality of a miraculous delicacy: it revealed the "sweetness" of God, in that it met the desire of the one who consumed it and transformed itself into what one wished (Wis. 16.20 f.). The midrashic legend in *Shemoth Rabba* on Exod. 16.4 explains: "He — God — caused the manna to fall, in which were all kinds of flavors, and every Israelite tasted what he wished to have," and *Bemidbar Rabba* on Num. 11.16: "Everything after which they longed, the manna produced in their mouth, as it is said Ps. 78.29: And he granted them their desire, and their craving he brought to them" (see Aug. Wünsche on *Shemoth* p. 189, on *Bemidbar* p. 412). Cf. also Siegfried on Wisdom, who further points to *Yoma* 75 and Philo, *quod det. pot. insid.* 31 (Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* I, 502).

228 See Baentsch, *Numeri* (in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum A. T.* 1903), p. 504.

229 IV Ezra 13.50: "Then he will show them (the remnant of Israel) yet many great wonders." Bousset rightly also recalls Matt. 11.4 ff.; Mark 8.11–13; Matt. 12.38 ff.; John 7.3, 31 (*Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*² 1906, p. 264).

230 Midrash *Kohelet* on 1.9: *Redemtor prior descendere fecit pro iis manna, sic et redemtor posterior descendere faciet manna.* Cf. the *Pesikta* of Rab Kahana (Piska V): At the end of forty-five days (of the concealment of the Messiah) the Blessed One (God) reveals himself to them and causes the manna to fall for them again, for there is nothing new under the sun; it is said, Micah 7.15: As in the days when you came out of the land of Egypt, I will show him wonders (Wünsche, p. 58), and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 29.8: At that time the stores of manna will again fall down from above.

231 Yet even among the miracles of the narrative attributed to Thomas concerning the boy Jesus there is none comparable to the miracle of Cana. The one hundred *kor* (cf. Luther on Luke 16.7: one hundred *Malter*) of grain which grow from a single grain of wheat are distributed by the boy to all the poor of the village (the remainder goes to Joseph). Cf. A. Meyer in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I, 71; II, 139.

232 "The transformation of water into wine and the temple cleansing that follows it, which gives occasion for the juxtaposition of the old and the new sanctuary, are only the title vignettes for an entire group of discourses which now treat of the new birth (3.3–8), now of the withdrawal of the Baptist behind the greater one for whom he prepares the way (3.22, 30), now of the exaltation of the new worship of God over the previous cultic sites (4.20–24), in general of the contrast between the Old and the New, of the all-renewing activity of the Logos-Christus" (Holtzmann-Bauer — following Hönig).

233 What the Baptist could offer was only a wondrous presentiment of New Testament truth attained through special revelation (1.8), but not its realization and personal embodiment, as this was accomplished by the one who is greater than all the greatest of humankind (Matt.

11.11). Cf. above, p. 23. A synoptic parallel is formed by the comparison of the New Testament religious life, which bursts the Old Testament forms of piety with their outward asceticism, to new wine that bursts the old wineskins (Mark 2.22; Matt. 9.17; Luke 5.37 f.).

234 The interpretation according to which, through Jesus, "externally cleansing water is to be transformed into heart-strengthening wine" (Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 74) introduces a troublesome lack of clarity into the context by inserting the moment of purification (and by drawing in the element of Johannine baptism). The comparison with the Old Testament water provisions in Exod. 17.5–7; Num. 20.6–11 must already for this reason be set aside, because in those cases it is not a matter of procuring an object of enjoyment.

235 That the Evangelist conceived the resurrection of Jesus in this manner leaves the narrative in ch. 20 (vv. 11 ff., 20, 27) in no doubt. "The concept of resurrection rests precisely on the identity of the body" (Schmiedel on 1 Cor. 15.35–49). This identity, however, could scarcely be emphasized more strongly in Jesus than it is in John 20, however much "the obscurities and contradictions governing the synoptic account with respect to the conception one is to form of the continued existence of the one raised from the dead, of his corporeality and entire mode of being" may all recur here (Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 306).

236 The strained wines highlighted alongside the rich foods designate the goods to be enjoyed as select, precious, and supremely refreshing; at the same time they are conceived as a foretaste of what is to come.

237 Matt. 26.29 seems, with the formulation "I shall not drink from now on of this fruit of the vine until the day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," to intend to bring out especially the specific typology of wine-drinking in the Lord's Supper as a foretaste of the heavenly festive joys. Cf., by contrast, the more general formulation in Matt. 8.11 and Rev. 3.20 (where in both cases wine is not explicitly mentioned).

238 A more distant relation exists to the synoptic parable discourse of the vineyard (Mark 12.1–9; Matt. 20.1–8; 21.28, 33–41; Luke 13.6–9; 20.9–16), in which wine is not the image of the gracious gift of blessedness effected by the Messiah, but of the moral-religious yield of God's Old Testament salvific activity conditioned by the conduct of the covenant people themselves. Cf. Isa. 5.1–7, according to which Yahweh expected grapes, i.e., justice and righteousness, from his people.

239 Cf. Mark 2.19; Matt. 9.15; Luke 5.34: the disciples as "sons of the bridal chamber," i.e., friends of the bridegroom; 2 Cor. 11.2; Rev. 21.2, 9: the community as bride.

240 *Somn.* II 37 [III 298 Cohn–Wendland]; cf. II 27 [III 288 C–W]; *leg. alleg.* III 26 [I 131 C–W].

241 Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I, 126 f. It is better to refrain from the Philonic passage *spec. leg.* II 7 cited there (p. 124) concerning the bridegroom of John 3.29, since the comparison in question does not emerge with sufficient definiteness.

242 The remark “and his disciples came to believe in him” (2.11) can only be intended to attest and highlight a historical fact authenticating the preceding narrative. Therefore there can be no question of a merely “artful didactic fiction, a richly referential allegory” (Holtzmann-Bauer). Only the question initially remains open whether, and in what way, the traditional material taken up by the Evangelist, which forms the basis of the Cana wedding story, originally arose from a pure allegory. As the evangelical narrative stands, it must in particular be striking that nothing allegorically corresponding to the bridegroom distinguished from Jesus is specified.

243 On the interconnection of the concepts of life and joy (3.29 f.; 4.36; 16.20 f.; cf. 1 John 1.1–4) see Grill, *Unters.* I, 290 f. It is certainly no mere coincidence that joy (*χαίρειν*) among the disciples is repeatedly mentioned precisely where their gaze is directed toward the death and resurrection of Jesus (14.28; 20.20), and that Jesus himself appears joyful where he is about to restore Lazarus to life (11.15), as though something of the familiar Hellenic grave-greeting *χαῖρε* were to resonate here (cf. Rohde, *Psyche*² II, 345 ff.). One may also point to the joy of Abraham (*ἠγαλλιάσατο – ἐχάρη*) in paradise over the appearance of the Logos-Christus (8.56).

244 He brings forth, in divine miraculous power, something intended for the enjoyment of the surrounding circle of family and friends which otherwise exists only as a product of the life-forces of organic nature (Grill, *Unters.* I, 5 f.).

245 Ibid., I, 340 ff.

246 Ibid., I, 7 ff.

247 See above, pp. 73 f., and *Unters.* I, 103, 1: “Significantly enough, the narrator opens the series of Christ’s signs with a miracle serving the elevation of human festive joy, not with a healing of the sick.”

248 At first glance one may be strongly tempted to ask why the wedding story was not inserted after 7.1 and the temple cleansing not after 7.11. One would then obtain the following textual sequence: 1.1–51; 2.12 (instead of *κατέβη*: *ἐξῆλθεν*, cf. 1.43; “and his brothers” to be deleted); 1.3, 23–25; chs. 3–6 (with omission of 4.46, 54); 7.1, 21 (“on the third day” to be deleted); 2.2–10 (v. 11 to be deleted; the somewhat striking assurance here in view of 1.35–51, “his disciples believed in him,” would after 6.67 ff. be superfluous); 7.2–14; 2.14–22; 7.15, etc. In this way not only would a close connection be preserved between 1.43–51; 2.12–13; 23–25, but the wedding story within the section 7.1–13 would also present itself as a well-integrated element: the mother of Jesus would appear only shortly before the Feast of Tabernacles of 7.2 in Cana, after reference has been made to her, and around the same time the unbelieving brothers of Jesus (6.42), thought of as being with the mother in Galilee, would urge him to exploit the festival occasion in the center of the holy land for a self-revelation in the broadest public sphere, so that his misguided, apostate disciples (6.60–66), in the face of his dark sayings, might also see his works (7.3; *καί* is to be taken more closely with *θεωρήσουσιν τὰ ἔργα*). To the symbolic feeding miracle of 6.5–13 and the indication of its deeper meaning in 6.26–58 there would then follow, between 7.1 and 2, the wedding miracle of drink and its spiritual counterpart proclaimed in 7.37 ff. To the accusation of temple offense arising from the relocation of 2.14–22 (the temple

cleansing) into the context of 7.14 ff., Jesus' renewed defense against the charge of Sabbath violation (7.21 ff.; cf. 5.16 ff.) would then correspond. The *ἐδίδασκεν* of 7.14 recalls that of the temple-cleansing narrative (Mark 11.17). Above all, it would weigh heavily that in this way, even in the Fourth Gospel, the temple cleansing would be brought relatively close to the passion narrative, so that the objections long and rightly raised against placing it at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 80) would fall away. The more all this seems to recommend the suggested textual operation, the more weighty must have been the reasons that led to giving the composition instead the form we have before us. The following investigations will show that we are indeed dealing here with the Evangelist himself.

249 For further details see my *Unters.* I, 105–176; Holtzmann-Bauer, pp. 50–58.

250 For the present purpose it suffices merely to point to a series of more or less generally acknowledged results of New Testament exegesis and theology.

251 *Unters.* I, 324: In fact we see him here as well connecting with Philo and overcoming him—connecting with him by extending the concept and term *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* to the earthly life of salvation as substantively identical with the otherworldly, and overcoming him by abandoning the distinction between true and false life, setting only death over against life, and thus applying the concept of life in complete exclusivity to the salvific good flowing from Christ; no less decisively, however, by eliminating the Alexandrian religious-philosophical dualism between spiritual and bodily being on the basis of Christology and the revelation-historical concept of God. Cf. ibid., pp. 298 f.

252 *ζωὴν καὶ περισσόν*: life and abundance. Cf. n. 224 and *Unters.* I, 297.

253 It may perhaps be recalled in passing here how Hölderlin (in the poem *Patmos*) rendered, with wonderfully delicate and profound empathy, the Johannine Christ himself, as he, "at the hour of the banquet, at the mystery of the vine, in his great soul calmly foreseeing death," departs from his friends with a conquering gaze, as "the most joyful." In this respect it has rightly been pointed out not only to the Hellenic cast of our poet's spirit, but also to "the side akin to Hellenism in the Evangelist's conception" (Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 241).

254 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 488; ²II, 537.

255 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 378; ²II, 421: "Similarly to Ephesians and Colossians, 'knowing,' 'knowledge,' here too receives supreme valuation." How this is also expressed in our Evangelist in the concept of light I have shown in *Unters.* I, 308 ff.: just as surely as we do not arrive at a purely intellectualistic concept, so on the other hand it cannot be denied that the theoretical moment stands in the foreground (p. 309).

256 O. Holtzmann, *Joh.-Ev.*, p. 85; Holtzmann, *N. Th.*, loc. cit. The Evangelist's idea of truth in this respect points back to that of Plato's ideal realism (Grill, *Unters.* I, 205).

257 The concept "life" has in the Fourth Gospel (apart from 3.3, 5) "virtually replaced and displaced" the concept "kingdom of God," though at the same time having been "very

substantially modified" (Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 82); cf. Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 516–518; ²II, 578 f. On the disappearance of the question of righteousness—which is "mentioned only once (16.8) and here resolved by the higher knowledge that Jesus has gone to his Father"—see Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.*, pp. 521 f., and Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 379; ²II, 423 ("in place of the question of righteousness comes that of knowledge"). If, by contrast, the concept of judgment emerges rather strongly (*κρίνω, κρίμα, κρίσις*), this too involves a transposition "from the Oriental-Jewish worldview into the Hellenistic, or Hellenic" (for the demonstration see Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 514 f.; ²II, 575 f.). As for the forgiveness of sins, while in 1.29 and 17.19 the death of Christ is clearly enough presented as a sin-offering (not a consecratory offering), and while in 5.14 and 20.23 "final remnants of the synoptic forgiveness of sins" remain (Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 475; ²II, 523), it has rightly been observed that in our Gospel the person of Jesus stands in the foreground rather than his fate, and that correspondingly, behind the main purpose of the appearance of the Logos in the flesh—the revelation of "truth"—the Pauline teleology, the concentration of the mission of the Son of God upon the atoning death (Rom. 8.3), recedes. Conversely, the altered position of Jesus with respect to the law ("for him it does not exist," Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.*, pp. 521 f.; "it simply no longer concerns Christians," Holtzmann, loc. cit. II, 361; ²II, 401) could no longer place the same emphasis on forgiveness of sins as in Paulinism (Holtzmann, loc. cit., pp. 474 f.; ²II, 521). From this very situation it may be explained that our Evangelist "separates the idea of the Lord's Supper, by developing it in the wake of the feeding narrative, from the passion narrative" (Holtzmann, loc. cit. II, 503; ²II, 562). Here it may also not be inappropriate to recall Reitzenstein's apt general remark: "The terrible seriousness of the preaching of guilt and reconciliation is lacking, so far as I can see, in Hellenism.—When the first Christian community connected the death of Jesus with this deep sense of guilt and with faith in the forgiveness even of the gravest sins, then—but only then—did the Christian doctrine of the *σωτήρ* gain what is most its own, its world-conquering power, and its Hellenistic rivals could only prepare the way for it through a world that had once again learned to feel sin" (*Poimandres* 1903, p. 180).

258 Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I, 98 f.

259 With the ambiguous *ἄνωθεν*, insofar as it signifies repetition, true divine sonship is not set over against the improper (merely "potential") sonship sporadically effected by general Logos-activity, but against purely natural origin caused by the human generative drive. To transfer outright the concept and name of divine sonship to that kinship with God which in certain individuals appears like a natural disposition (cf. e.g. Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II, 493) is, on closer examination, not permitted by the conception and mode of expression of our Evangelist (see my *Unters.* I, 342 f.). The use of similar passages from the First Epistle of John is methodologically inadmissible in view of the disputed authorship question (see my *Unters.* I, 305 f.). The relevant introductory question will be addressed in a later context.

260 Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 86; Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 468 f., 487; ²II, 545 ff., 535.

261 Attention should be drawn to the continuing need for moral purification of Jesus' disciples emphasized at the foot-washing (13.10). When the purely spiritual inner renewing action of God upon human beings is viewed under the image of the causal relation underlying natural human

generation, this is done here without any comparative consideration of the components of the natural process. Cf. the correct remark by Scott, *The Fourth Gospel* 1908, p. 367, and Clemen, *Die Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums* 1912, p. 58; on the transformation of such images "into the purely ethical" in the author of the *Odes of Solomon* 42 see Gunkel in *ZntW* 1910, p. 304.

262 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 83; Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 468; ²II, 546.

263 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 383 f., 491 ff., 494 f.; ²II, 428 f., 540–545; Grill, *Unters.* I, 94 f. Cf. Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II, 490: "The religious determinism which John shared with Gnosis does not exclude either moral responsibility or moral obligation, but rather grounds both, as the doctrine of faith and love shows." One may recall the coexistence of a naturalistic "spirit"-dualism and a worldview in transition toward monotheistic ethics in the earliest Avestan religion of the Gāthās (cf. Yasna 33 and 44.5, and Bartholomä, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* 1904, col. 1139; *Die Gāthās des Avesta. Zarathushtras Verspredigten* translated 1905, p. 125; Tiele–Gehrich, *Geschichte der Religion im Altertum bis auf Alexander den Großen* II, 153 ff., 1903). On the difference between New Testament and Stoic modes of thought with regard to the antinomy in question, Bonhöffer remarks: "The New Testament takes this dualistic opposition, which finds its sharpest expression in John (8.23: *ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ*), far more strictly and, so to speak, tragically than the Stoa, which knows no genuine pain over the lost condition of the majority" (*Epiktet und das Neue Testament* 1911, p. 308).

264 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 470; ²II, 548; Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 84.

265 Cf. in general on the transformation of baptism from a purely symbolic act into "a kind of theurgic action" Holtzmann, *N. Th.* I, 384ↄ ɔ ɔ ɔ; ²I, 454.

266 Rohde, *Psyche*² II, 400, 421 f.: "This notion of rebirth through initiation does indeed recall Christian ideas of 'rebirth' through baptism (which themselves developed from older Jewish conceptions: see Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 111 n.). It is nevertheless one that arose among Greeks themselves, and early. To conceive initiation as adoption into the divine *γένος* seems not to have been far removed even from the *μύσται* of Eleusis." Cf. the designation of the initiate as *γεννήτης τῶν θεῶν* (one related to the gods) in Rohde, loc. cit., p. 422 f., and in this connection *ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν* (John 1.13) and the mode of expression in 3.3–6. Correct treatment of the matter and further literature may be found in Holtzmann-Bauer, p. 83.

267 The relation to the parallel of the classical mysteries should also be kept in view if the question of the "relative human necessity" of baptism (Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II, 497 f.) is to be answered correctly.

268 Holtzmann, loc. cit., II, 390 f.; ²II, 437.

269 One is reminded of the analogous observation that "the conceptions of Logos and Spirit fundamentally express the same thought" (Holtzmann, loc. cit. II, 458; ²II, 509).

270 For further details one may refer to Holtzmann's discussion (loc. cit. II, 13 ff., 20 ff., 38, 466; ²II, 16 ff., 22 ff., 37 f., 519).

271 See my *Unters.* I, 98 f.

272 If, following the explanation that human beings were supposed to be moved by John toward believing reception of the Logos (1.7), the world is nevertheless testified to have not recognized that true light (1.10), then the Evangelist's thought is probably already here that this occurred despite all the world's philosophy and "gnosis." Otherwise it would presumably read: "and the world did not come to believe in him" (cf. *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* v. 12). In 6.69 and 10.38 knowledge appears as the consequence of faith; alongside this, in 17.8 (cf. 16.30) the existing reciprocal relationship is also expressed (the *ἔλαβον* can only be understood in the sense of believing acceptance).

273 It scarcely needs to be remarked that what is meant is not a purely theoretical knowing, but rather one that is essentially directed toward moral-religious determination of the will (Unters. I 296).

274 The heightened significance of the concept of *knowing* (knowing, understanding, perceiving, knowledge) already manifests itself, in contrast to the Synoptics, in the strikingly large total number of relevant passages. But even where the Synoptics already speak of the *mystērion* (Mc. 4 11) or the *mystēria* (Mt. 13 11; Lc. 8 10) of the kingdom of God, it must be noted that what is meant there is the pictorial representation of God's grace-dispensation that calls for repentance and is difficult or even impossible for the natural human being to grasp (Mc. 4 12; Mt. 13 15), whereas the mystery of the proclamation of the Fourth Evangelist is essentially christological and culminates in the Logos-mystery. Peculiar—and itself again a riddle—is the illumination of the evangelical mystery from both of these sides in Mt. 11 20–30.

275 Unters. I 296.

276 According to John 17 3, the knowledge of God and of Christ is eternal life, alongside which 6 47 states that the one who believes (in Jesus) *has* eternal life. Faith itself cannot also be eternal life, insofar as it ceases when sight comes (cf. II Cor. 5 7). Holtzmann rightly also draws attention to the fact that the Gospel speaks of the knowledge of God and of the vision of God possessed by Christ (7 29; 8 55; 10 15; 17 25), but never of *his* faith in God. The element of dependence upon external testimony that lies in the concept of faith cannot be transferred to one who, with his testimony of God himself, constitutes the highest authority. In 16 30, however, a *knowing* (οἴδαμεν) marks the high point in the development of the disciples' faith; whereas in the case of the apostate believers of 8 30 precisely the supplementary element of *gnōsis* (8 32) was lacking (N. Th. II 488; ²536).

277 στρέφεσθαι occurs only in 12 40 (in an Old Testament citation).

278 Because of the "transcendental determinateness" of human beings that precedes their empirical religious behavior, that conversion, that turning-back must come under pressure; indeed, the free moral acts that in the original Gospel bring with them satisfaction and

refreshment, peace and forgiveness of sins, must altogether recede into the background. How much this is the case is already evident from the fact that even from the mission of the Baptist the preaching of repentance has “disappeared” [apparently! cf. below, n. 1047] (Holtzmann, N. Th. II 476; ²522).

279 Moreover, one should recall what was noted above concerning the symbolism of baptismal water as an indirect reference to μετάνοια. Cf. my discussion in Unters. I 342 f.

280 Particularly noteworthy is also how in 20 22 f. the forgiveness of sins appears as conditioned by the impartation of the Holy Spirit of the Glorified as a revivifying power.

281 One should note, however, 1 29. 36 (where the Baptist immediately again designates Jesus, with the strongest emphasis, as the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world) and 20 22 f. (where the final word of Jesus to his “brothers,” the apostles [v. 17], concerns the abiding ecclesial basic need—self-evidently conditioned by repentance—of forgiveness of sins!).

282 Holtzmann, N. Th. II 514; ²575 f.

283 Despite v. 4, as vv. 5–8 make sufficiently clear. Cf. above, p. 2 ff.

284 It scarcely needs to be recalled here the “great process of adaptation” which the Septuagint Bible already represents in religious-historical terms in general, and in accordance with which, for example, a Jewish festival is approximated to the religious usage of the surrounding world through the choice of a secular word (Deißmann, *Licht vom Osten*³ 1909, p. 82, on σκηνοπηγία).

285 It is in fact not all that surprising when John Robertson (*Die Evangelienmythen*, p. 227 ff.) even arrived at the thought that certain works of art depicting Dionysus created the wine-miracle, the bread-miracles, and the story of walking on the sea (cf. Jeremias in *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 1911, p. 178).

———————
pp 96-234

286 Cf. already the interesting protest of Teiresias against the suspicion of Dionysus as a seducer of the Maenads (*καὶ γὰρ ἐν βακχεύμασιν οὐδ’ ἡ γε σώφρων οὐ διαφθαρήσεται*, Eurip. *Bacch.* 317 f.; see also 685 ff.).

287 Cf. Preller–Robert p. 659: “There is no other cult in which the pantheism and hylozoism spread throughout all nature-religion emerge in so manifold a manner and in equally vivid and apt traits. But for that very reason this cult is also richer in imagery, more inspired, more animated than any other.”

288 Ed. Meyer, *GA.* II 735.

289 Ed. Meyer, *GA.* II 743.

290 Ed. Meyer II 740 f. On the question whether in the Phanes myth a world-development progressing from evil to good, or conversely, is to be assumed, see Gruppe in Roscher III 2, 2263.

291 “The great hunter.” The same name is also borne by the god of the underworld (Hades) as the one who carries all things off (Rohde, *Psyche*² II 116).

292 “Here, having become murderers of the god, they represent the primordial power of evil” (Rohde, a. a. O. II 118).

293 From the numerous subordinate individual details of the fantastic elaboration one can and must here refrain.

294 See Rohde, a. a. O. II 120, 2 (on the question of the origin of human beings), and (with regard to the figure of Phanes, which is already not foreign to the older strata of Orphic poetry) II 416, where it is perhaps rightly remarked concerning the *κατάποσις*: first Zeus devours Phanes, then the heart of Zagreus; fundamentally both are meant to say the same thing. Otherwise, cf. especially Gruppe in Roscher III 2, 2261 ff. on the interpretation of the Phanes myth and on the question of its origin.

295 *μέρος αὐτοῦ ἐσμέν* (“we are a part of him,” Orphic doctrine according to Olympiodorus); *ὁ δ’ ἐν ἡμῖν νοῦς Διονυσιακός ἐστιν καὶ ἄγαλμα ὄντως τοῦ Διονύσου* (according to Proclus). For details see Rohde II 121.

296 Rohde II 120, 2.

297 “Hence the struggle of good and evil in the human being, for the good in him is of Dionysian descent, and Dionysus is to be our lord and god” (Preller–Robert 706). Cf. the allusion in Plutarch (*de esu carnium* I, 7): *τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν ἄλογον καὶ ἄτακτον καὶ βίαιον οἱ παλαιοὶ Τιτάνας ὠνόμασαν* (Rohde II 119, 2).

298 Rohde II 126, 3: The soul is enclosed in the body *ὡς δίκην διδοῦσης τῆς ψυχῆς* (according to the Orphics), *ὧν δὴ ἕνεκα δίδωσιν*. Plato, *Cratyl.* 400. “The more precise designation of this ‘guilt’ of the soul in Orphic mythology has not been preserved for us.”

299 The two deities of the life-force that overcomes death anew each year.

300 “Salvation is brought by Orpheus and his Bacchic initiations; Dionysus himself will redeem his worshippers from calamity and from the endless path of torment. — Not by their own power, but by the grace of ‘redeeming gods,’ is human beings to owe their liberation” (Rohde II 124).

301 Ed. Meyer, *GA.* II 745.

302 Cf. further, with regard to the “expansion and ennoblement of the ancient Eleusinian rites, as is to be expected, in accordance with the character of almost all Greek innovations in the religious sphere, especially of those of the Peisistratid period,” and with regard to the

“introduction of Orphic conceptions into the Eleusinian doctrines under Peisistratos and the Peisistratids, and then probably also under their explicit or tacit approval,” Gruppe in Roscher (art. *Orpheus*) III 1, 1137.

303 One may also recall the Platonic doctrine of the fall of the soul into the sensuousness of the earthly world (*Phaedr.* 246 C) as a not religious-ethical (as with Empedocles) but “intellectual fall into sin” (Rohde, *Psyche* II 270, 4). As for the basic condition of pious Orphic life, asceticism, cf. Rohde II 125 f.: “It does not demand the practice of civic virtues; discipline and moral reshaping of character are not required. The sum of morality here is turning toward the god, turning away not from moral transgressions and errors in earthly existence, but from earthly being itself.” The prescriptions of the priestly ideal of purity thereby gained heightened significance.

304 Acts 14:17: *οὐκ ἀμάρτυρον αὐτὸν ἀφῆκεν*; 17:27: that they should seek God, whether they might perhaps feel for him and find him (“he thus does not merely will, but he can also be known,” Wendt, Holtzmann).

305 “Natural revelation” — Old Testament — New Testament.

306 Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I 92 f., and (with regard to the Pauline preliminary stage of this consideration in Rom. 1:19 f.; Acts 14:16 f.; 17:26–28) Holtzmann, *N. Th.* I 459, 535.

307 According to Acts 17:30 Paul in Athens even speaks only of an *ἄγνοια*.

308 How matters stood for the Gnostics has been aptly illuminated by Arnold Meyer: “More than other Christians, especially Alexandrian ones who thought similarly, they saw in Christianity not only the final and highest revelation of divine mysteries, but also the fulfillment of all the speculations, doctrines, customs, and festivals by which declining paganism sought to satisfy its longing for God. Thus precisely they were inclined to adopt pagan customs and cults and transform them into Christian ones” (*Das Weihnachtsfest, seine Entstehung und Entwicklung* 1913, p. 13).

309 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 300, 339: “The guiding idea of a high-priesthood parallel to that of the Old Testament, yet at the same time superior to it, governs not only the doctrine of the person, but even more the doctrine of the work of Christ treated in the second main section (8:1–10:18)” (thus the central doctrine of the entire epistle). — On the Alexandrian-Platonizing peculiarity of the concept of type in Hebrews (8:5; 9:24: the elementary thing is the ‘antitype’; cf. Philo) as opposed to the Pauline usage (Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 10:11; cf. 1 Pet. 3:21: the elementary thing is the ‘type’), see Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 292 f., 331 f.

310 More remotely, such a form of Hellenization of the Gospel might also recall, in a certain sense and extent, the later Germanicization of the same in the Old Saxon gospel harmony with its “Christ among the Saxons” and the “Christianity transformed into German blood and life” (Vilmar), so that the Fourth Gospel could in its own way be called the Heliand of the Hellenes. On the *Heliand* cf. especially Wilh. Scherer, *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur*[4] p. 46 ff. (1887). In the portrayal of the divine appearance of Christ, the popular attempt to incorporate striking features of the Germanic ideal of rulership into the human image of Jesus was preceded

by the mysteriously embedded reference to significant redeemer-figures of the Greek world of gods.

311 Cf. in particular Justin, *Apology* I 54 and *Dialogue* 69, where in both cases, on the basis of Gen. 49:11, Christ is placed in parallel with Dionysus (cf. above p. 96), and it is explained that the pagan myths are inventions of demons who imitated the Old Testament prophecies concerning Christ in order to undermine the foundation of Christian faith. This, however, does not prevent Justin, on the other hand, when discussing the sublimity of Christian moral teaching in connection with belief in resurrection and retribution, from referring without a polemical side-glance to similar doctrines among pagan poets and philosophers (Plato, the Stoics, the comic poet Menander, etc.) (*Apology* I 20). Cf. Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II 627 ff. In the sphere of cult, however, the ancient Greek-oriental church, as is well known, was so little afraid of *ὁμοίως τοῖς Ἕλλησι λέγειν* (Justin, *Apology* I 24) that, following a Gnostic impulse, it adopted for the festive dating of the "appearance of Christ," as well as of his messianically inaugurating wine-miracle, the date — indeed the very day of the year — of the Epiphany festival of the Trieteric Dionysus (6 January). On this cf. now also Arnold Meyer, loc. cit. pp. 7–25. Of the later Jews Duhm occasionally reproaches them (on Jer. 2:11) with their "lack of understanding for pagan religions, of which they knew only the sensuous exterior."

312 In the addenda to his work *Die Philosophie des Heraklit von Ephesus im Lichte der Mysterienidee* (1886), Edmund Pfleiderer says: "I am convinced that the ancient Christian writers, with regard to such resonances — the rival parallel of the Christian *μυστήριον* with the pagan — were often far more harmless and unprejudiced than we are now inclined to assume, and with full justification found no offense in allowing themselves to be stimulated, at least in terms of ideas, also by the venerable and profound conceptions of their pagan environment; for they felt within themselves the power to fill the somewhat borrowed form on their side with independent and far truer content and thereby to far surpass what was foreign (cf. John 15:1: *Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή*). At most one will have to ask to what extent one may speak here of a 'multiple' borrowing."

313 B. Weiß ad loc. Holtzmann-Bauer 45. Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I 102. Some after-effect of the realistic conception of the word χάρις in the outlook and language of religious Hellenism (cf. Wetter, *Charis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums* 1913, pp. 138 ff., 152 ff.) may perhaps to some degree be taken into account. To describe the "grace" and "truth" of our passage from this point of view "as a kind of salvific substance," however, goes far too far: it could only be a matter of the quasi-hypostatizing conception of a force-quantity thought of as efficacious, enlivening and illuminating human beings. Cf. also Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* 1904, p. 25 f.

314 *χάρις* in classical usage means not merely what arouses joy, but also pleasure, enjoyment, joy itself (among tragedians, Plato, etc.). The word occurs in the Fourth Gospel only at 1:14, 16, 17; in the Synoptics only in Luke, and there likewise in the sense of benevolent favor (said of God — also of human beings — toward the child Jesus, 2:40, 52, and of that of God toward the mother of Jesus, 1:30, for which one may compare *κεχαριτωμένη* with "endowed with divine

favor," 1:28); moreover perhaps with the meaning: attractive or compelling force (of speech), 4:22; of 6:32–34 — *χάρις* = thanks, cf. v. 35 *ἀχάριστοι* — may here be disregarded.

315 It must not be overlooked that in v. 10 the wedding which Jesus celebrates is presented quite realistically as one of those festivities at which drunkenness **customarily** occurs. "It is contrary to the sense of the words to reinterpret it: 'when they have drunk plentifully,' since the intoxication is the essential, though relative, concept in the verb" (B. Weiß ad loc.).

316 Rohde, *Psyche*² II 44.

317 Hom. *Il.* 14, 325. There can be no doubt that the gift of wine is meant here. Since, however, wine in Homer does not appear to be brought into any special relation to Dionysus, the authenticity of the passage remains questionable. Cf. Voigt in Roscher (art. *Dionysos*) II 1, 1030, 1064.

318 Hesiod, *Op.* 614: *δῶρα Διονύσου πολυγηθέος* (of wine-drinking); on the Pindar passages cf. Voigt, loc. cit. 1064.

319 Antonius is flatteringly greeted as the image of the god in Ephesus under this name (Plutarch, *Ant.* 24); elsewhere (Plut., *Demetr.* 2) there is talk of *πρὸς εὐφροσύνην καὶ χάριν ἐμμελέστατος*.

320 With Dionysus as co-inhabitant of one of the six double-altars in Olympia and belonging with the same to the local system of the Twelve Gods (Voigt, loc. cit. 1058; Stoll in Roscher I 1, 878). On the joint invocation of the god and his companions at the Thyia-festival in Elis cf. Voigt, loc. cit.; Preller–Robert 695, 3.

321 Their name is derived by the ancients (Chrysippus, Apollodorus) from *χαρά* (Preller–Robert 481, 1); the name-form Χάρις is found in Sophocles (cf. Stoll, loc. cit. 873).

322 Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I 9, 16, 289 f.

323 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer and B. Weiß ad loc.; Grill, loc. cit. 26.

324 Voigt, loc. cit. 1059.

325 Preller–Robert 707.

326 Preller–Robert 663, 707.

327 From an original *Διο(ς)-συο-σος* (cf. Voigt, *ibid.* 1029 — following Ahrens, *Philol.* 23, 210 — and note the Sanskrit verb *snu* = to cause to flow, alongside *snā* = to bathe, *snih* = to become moist). On the varying pronunciation of the name and the history of etymological attempts see Preller–Robert, 664; on the Greek (not Thracian) word formation see Rohde, *Psyche*² II, 38 f. The name of the god's homeland, Nysa, probably derives from the same root. A supplementary element will be provided by the discussion of the name *Dithyrambos* (note 453).

328 Cf. the image of the spring and the stream with reference to the Philonic Logos (*Unters.* I, 127).

329 The synonymous attributes *σταφυλίτης* and *εὔκαρπος* occur in poetry (Preller–Robert, 707 f.). That the image of the vine appears precisely among the words spoken by Jesus at the Last Supper suggests that it is intended to point in a special way to the drink handed out by Jesus at the supper, precisely because the evangelist deliberately did not report the story of the institution of the sacrament (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 15:1, following Loisy and Heitmüller; also Wrede in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1900, p. 18, on Baldensperger, *Prolog des 4. Ev.* p. 62). Nor should one revert to the "holy vine of David" in the Lord's Prayer of the *Didache* (9:1, 2) (cf. on the obscurity of the matter Drews in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II, p. 270), nor to the vine belonging to the (destructive!) spring in the forest vision of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch chs. 36–39 (cf. Ryssel in Kautzsch, *Apokr. Pseud.* II, 424 f., according to which the text of 39:7 says that the dominion of the Messiah is like the spring and the vine). What is closer at hand is the recollection of the Logos as *οἰνοχόος τοῦ θεοῦ* in Philo (see above, p. 81 and *Unters.* I, 126 f.). Edmund Pfleiderer, however, at least had a correct intuition when he found it permissible "on the ground of unbiased historical consideration" to "recall, in the Johannine expositions on the vine and the branches (perhaps also in the miracle at Cana), the natural-symbolic significance of the Dionysian vine" (*Heraklit*, p. 379). The same applies to O. Pfleiderer's discussion in *Urchr.* II, 378.

330 On the wedding pericope 2:1 ff. Clemen remarks (*Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N. T.* 1909, p. 279) that the story of the miracle at Cana was already traced back by Dupuis (1794), then by Barrows (1899), and finally by Heitmüller (in J. Weiß, *Die Schriften d. N. T.* II/3, 207) to similar narratives about occurrences in Dionysian sanctuaries (cf. also the relation of the wedding at Cana to the Dionysian mysteries already in Schelling and Keim [Holtzmann-Bauer 74 f.]); whereas Gunkel (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des N. T.* 1903, p. 71) here, as with the feeding miracle, thinks of something purely mythical. Clemen adds: "But how could one have come to transfer all this to Jesus? There must surely have been some occasion for it, and if there was such a historical core, then it did not require those models for its embellishment." The argumentation of this objection rests, as the following investigations will show, on erroneous presuppositions.

331 Cf. Voigt, *ibid.* 1064; Preller–Robert, 666 f.

332 He and his Bacchants strike with their thyrsus-staves springs of wine and water, of milk and honey, out of the ground; in Teos it was said that at his birth a spring of the most fragrant wine on earth had burst forth (Preller–Robert, 707 f.). Cf. on this and on what follows: Weniger, *Das Kollegium der Sechzehn Frauen und der Dionysosdienst in Elis* (1883), pp. 8–14.

333 Theopompus in Athenaeus I, p. 34a; Pausanias VI, 26, 1; [Aristotle], *mirab.* 123. Cf. further on the relationship of this "miracle" in Voigt, *ibid.* 1057 f.; Arn. Meyer, *ibid.* p. 16 f. (on Hero of Alexandria, *de autom.* XIII, p. 256). The Thyien festival of Elis corresponded, as it seems, to the Theodaisia on Andros and elsewhere (Preller–Robert 680, 3; 685, 4; 692, 2; 695, 3).

334 Pliny, *n. h.* II, 231; Philostratus, *imag.* I, 25; Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* I, 2170; Preller–Robert, 680. Cf. also Arn. Meyer, *ibid.* p. 17, 132: “Even the zealously believing Epiphanius (367–403), bishop of Salamis on Cyprus, assures that on 6 January springs and rivers here and there are transformed into wine — and adduces this as proof that Christ was truly born on 6 January and thirty years later turned water into wine (*haer.* 51, 30, 29); one clearly sees how Christ has here taken the place of Dionysos; at the same time, however, it should also become clear that the story of the wedding at Cana itself is a transference of a Dionysian miracle onto Christ.”

335 According to the cult legend common to both sides, which achieved the widest circulation and acceptance, the named union takes place anew each year. It appears that the festival in question was celebrated under the name *Θεοδαίσια*, a widely distributed name that expresses the celebration of a banquet bestowed by a god, probably a wedding banquet (Preller–Robert 672, 3; 680 f.). The marvelous character of this festal banquet is illuminated by the legend from Naxos, according to which, at the union of the divine pair, “the most precious and still ever-flowing nectar [god-wine] sprang forth from hard rock” (Propertius, *eleg.* III, 17, 27; Stephanus Byz. s.v. Naxos; Preller–Robert 707 f.). On the time of the month Theodaisios see Preller–Robert 680, 3. With regard to the cult myths here juxtaposed, one must bear in mind that the Epiphany festivals of Dionysos falling near the time of the shortest day allowed both an earlier approach, connected with the winter solstice, and a later one, nearer to spring (cf. Preller–Robert 696, 4), and accordingly could just as easily lead to the idea of a resurrection from the sleep of death or a rejuvenation through rebirth as to that of a wedding of the one who has returned with renewed generative power. There is therefore no difficulty in the fact that the wine-bestowing acts symbolizing the essence and activity of the god occur at one time or the other. Hardly any mention is needed of the close parallel of the Delphic Apollo festivals, especially the Theoxenia likewise celebrated in spring, at which Apollo appeared simultaneously as guest and host (Preller–Robert 265; cf. also Weniger, *ibid.* p. 12, and on the question of the relevant festival dates p. 14).

336 Thucydides 2, 15: *τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια* (Voigt, *ibid.* 1071).

337 One also thought of the return of Persephone from the underworld (Preller–Robert 672 f.).

338 The “queen” thereby represents symbolically the women and with them community and land as the receptive nature (Voigt, *ibid.* 1073). Cf. on the one hand the likewise springtime *ἱερὸς γάμος* of Zeus and Hera Antheia (Preller–Robert 164 f.), and on the other hand the custom attested in countless inscriptions that the wives of the king, the highest officials, and the priests are the spouses or concubines of a god (Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 230).

339 The day as a whole was accordingly dedicated to *Διόνυσος Χοιρότης* (Athenaeus 12, p. 533d; Voigt, *ibid.* 1073).

340 Preller–Robert, 672.

341 Jessen in Roscher IV/1, 663 f.; Preller–Robert 685, 717.

342 Preller–Robert 662 f., 707, 720 f. The water nymphs are also above all bridal deities and protective divinities of marriage (Preller–R. 721).

343 Rapp in Roscher II/2, 2255; cf. 2265 ff.

344 For details see Rapp, ibid. 2249.

345 For the individual history of the two names reference may be made to Jessen, loc. cit. On a hydria in the Museo Etrusco in Florence, Dionysus appears with Thyone at the famous wedding of Peleus and Thetis (cf. Bloch in Roscher III/2, 1838).

346 Cf. Voigt, loc. cit. 1039; Preller–Robert 687, 688, 4 (*Cithaeron mons est Boeotiae, ubi arcana Liberi patris sacra celebrantur tertio quoque anno, quae trieterica vocantur*, Probus, *Verg. Georg.* III 43), 692 f., 695; Rohde, *Psyche*² II 12 f. The expression "trieteric" is explained by the fact that the festival year from which the reckoning was made, although the celebration itself took place only in the last month (Poseideon of the Boeotian year), was itself still counted as the first year. On the basis of Pausanias X 4, 2 (αἱ δὲ Θυιάδες γυναῖκες μὲν εἰσιν Ἀττικαί, φοιτῶσαι δὲ ἐς τὸν Παρνασσὸν παρὰ ἔτος, αὐταί τε καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες Δελφῶν ἄγουσιν ὄργια Διονύσῳ), Kern states: even Attic women travelled every year to Delphi in order to take part in the Dionysiac festival on the heights of Parnassus (Pauly–Wissowa V 1018). According to Ginzel (*Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* 1911, II 370 f.), however—drawing on what Schmidt and Mommsen have pointed out—in the determination of "every other year" (παρ' ἐνιαυτόν, παρὰ ἔτος) a general popular usage of language intervenes, and the Romans say in the same sense: *tertio quoque anno*. "Several of the ancient festivals were in fact celebrated 'every other year,' i.e. trieterically (—Dieteries, as some called it Trieteris—), such as the Corinthian Isthmian games [of Poseidon], and the very widely disseminated Dionysiac festival." Accordingly, the invocation of the latter god in the Orphic Hymn 53 is also to be understood (cf. Quandt, *De Baccho ab Alexandri aetate in Asia minore culto* 1912, p. 260): Ἀμφιετῆ καλέω Βάκχον, χθόνιον Διόνυσον, ἐγρόμενον κούραις ἅμα νύμφαις εὐπλοκάμοισιν, ὃς παρὰ Περσεφόνης ἱεροῖσι δόμοισιν ἰαύων κομίζει τριετῆρα χρόνον (cf. hymn 52, where with ἀμφιετηρίῃ the trieteric festival is designated). The Dionysiac trieteris has been connected with an ancient intercalation cycle (Preller–Robert 693; cf. Pauly² I/1, 1040); see, however, on the oldest Greek system of intercalation Ginzel, loc. cit., and cf. Voigt, loc. cit. ("the inner reason for this cycle has not yet been recognized"). The triadic number of years in Hellenic myth ultimately rests again, from earliest times even outside classical antiquity, on the symbolically significant number three of days for renewal (already presupposed in Hos. 6:2), whose natural substrate was given by observation of the phases of the moon and (in parallel) of the winter solstice. One recalls that the moon was also "the third weekday (reckoned from Saturday according to oriental custom), which was called *Lunae dies*, holy" (Pauly, *RE* IV 1228). From the very ancient religious and frequently cultic observance of each recurring change of the moon (cf. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des A.T.* I § 88; Schrader–Zimmern and Winckler, *Die Keilinschriften und das A.T.* p. 362; Drexler in Roscher II/2, 2764), which undoubtedly goes back into prehistoric times and regularly marked the day of reappearance, there developed sooner or later the celebration of each new year on the third day, i.e. on the first day after the winter solstice, as the principal date (cf. the Brumalia, the "day of the unconquered sun," 25

December). This festival of the winter rising of light was heightened in the Dionysiac cult into a "trieteric" one: in every second year it was celebrated orgiastically and exclusively by female worshippers of the god as representations of his Maenads, evidently with reference to the number three characteristic in another sense for the cosmic alternation of light—sun and moon. But since, according to the conception of the official Dionysiac cult, the god, as the creative renewer of enlivening light and of the fertilizing moisture of the fields, after producing the vegetation and completing the three winter months sacred to him, yields place during the remaining nine months to Apollo, and subsequently—corresponding to the withering, falling away, and winter rigidity of vegetation—dies and returns to the underworld (cf. the Delphic belief in Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 9, and Rohde: "Only during those three months is the god in the upper world," *Psyche* II 53, 3; originally, to be sure, a gradual process was imagined), the trieterically intensified cult gave rise to the myth of Dionysus' regularly extending stay in the realm of Persephone until a third year—in contradiction to the real natural processes that underlie the original overall myth of this deity.

347 On ἀφανισμός and ἐπιφάνεια see Rohde, *Psyche* II 12 f. If now the Fourth Evangelist has also imparted to the activity of Jesus, in his own way and antitypically, a Dionysiac coloring by means of the trieteris, then, apart from this, only the kinship of the ideas of restoration and resurrection remains to be noted, and accordingly the "great importance and frequency of the number three" in healing spells and healing miracles (cf. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder* in Wünsche–Deubner VIII/1, 116, 160 ff.), and further the extraordinary significance that the number three in general consistently has throughout his Gospel (cf. the more detailed proof of the "over-refined mysticisms of the triads" in Holtzmann, *Einl.* 438 f.).

348 Cf. Dillmann ad loc. and *Euseb. onom. sacra* (ed. de Lagarde 271): ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ θεὸς Ἰ. Χ. τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον φύσει μετέβαλεν. The distance presupposed in 4:52 would then fit better.

349 Hence Διόν. Λιμναῖος, Λιμναγενής (Preller–Robert 670; Höfer in Roscher II/2, 2050).

350 Preller–Robert 715.

351 For readers in Asia Minor the name could at the same time have sounded familiar, since the geographical name-form Κάγη, Κάνα occurs several times on the Aeolian coast. The city of Κάνα lay opposite the island of Lesbos, one of the chief centers of the Dionysiac cult. This also sheds light on the Fourth Evangelist's presentation of Cana as the homeland of Jesus and his own (cf. n. 1033). On the Evangelist's own predilection for "depth of meaning, mysterious sense, double meaning," cf. Holtzmann–Bauer p. 3.

352 Holtzmann–Bauer 138 (following Schanz and Loisy). Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I 12 f.

353 The Yahweh passage Job 9:8 (he strides upon the heights of the sea) is above all to be noted! Cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.* 81.

354 For the unrestrained and untroubled walking about (περιπατεῖν, also in Mark and Matthew) of Jesus—apparently absorbed in thought and therefore not heeding the disciples—upon the

raging “sea” (an extraordinarily fine motif of the evangelical tradition), cf. the non-sinking of Poseidon’s chariot wheels, whose steeds themselves are the waves of the sea (Hom. *Il.* 13.29 f.).

355 He was also frequently invoked as ἀσφαλής. As such he appeases the agitated gods and waves of the flood, sends favorable winds, and guides the ship with gentle hand into the harbor (Preller–Robert 582).

356 Cf. Grill, *Unters.* I 13.

357 He is also the god of sweet water, thus of rivers and springs, venerated at inland lakes as ἐπιλίμνιος (Preller–Robert 585 f.; E. H. Meyer in Roscher III/2, 2816–2822). The expression θάλασσα, which, though in continuity with synoptic usage, appears strikingly often (four times in John 6:16–21) as the designation of the sea called λίμνη in Luke (5:1–2; 8:22, 23, 33) “Gennesaret” (on the history of the name-form cf. Schlatter, loc. cit. p. 38), could be explained by the intention to allude to the Poseidonian element standing in the foreground of popular imagination. The Poseidonian cult itself knows more than one inland “θάλασσα” of the god (E. H. Meyer 2817).

358 In the sense of a “nourisher of plants and seeds” he bears, especially among the Ionians, the cult-name Φυτάλμιος and became an agricultural and harvest god (E. H. Meyer, loc. cit. 2820 ff.), hence closely connected with Demeter. Might not the name Ποσειδῶν (on the various pronunciations see E. H. Meyer 278, 8 f.) originally designate the god as a “bestower of drink” (cf. πόσις and πότος, drinking—both from the root pā and Skt. *dāvan* [at the end of a compound] = giving, bestowing), insofar as he waters the grain-giving earth (ἐσιόρος ἀρούρη) with the waters of heaven (cf. Dionysus, as will still be shown)? “As a sea-god he can hardly belong to the very oldest Greek deities, since neither the Hellenes nor the peoples most closely related to them originally dwelt by the sea.” In this connection I cannot avoid a question that almost forces itself upon us, whose answer may under certain circumstances cast further light on the history-of-religions motifs of the composition of John 6. In the eyes of the Evangelist, does his typological interpretation of the miraculous feeding consider only the bread, or are the fish also to be taken into account? This question—given the extraordinary inclination of our author to adopt multiple layers of meaning (of which more will be said below)—is doubly suggested by the most recent investigations into the fish symbol, already certainly present at the end of the second century (in Tertullian) and used “to designate Christ as the Savior” (Garbe, *Indien und das Christentum* 1914, p. 68). I believe in fact that already with our Fourth Evangelist we must at least reckon with the possibility of reference to that christological symbol, and I am of the opinion that, even if one assumes the simultaneous emergence of the well-known Alexandrian booklet on “Christian zoology, or better animal symbolism” (called the *Physiologus*) and of the Fourth Gospel (Garbe, loc. cit. p. 61 f., 67), the absence of the said symbol from the former work—which treats, as the only fish, the whale (a double image of the devil!)—cannot be taken as a compelling counter-proof. Matters would be even less intelligible if the *Physiologus* were to be dated somewhat later. That the Alexandrian author, however, should have exhaustively presented what in his time was to be found of Christian animal symbolism also, for example, in Asia Minor, seems to me not demonstrable—already because the fish symbol as such “is rooted

in ancient popular ideas whose origin reaches back to the beginnings of humanity." Attention should here be directed to the word ὀψάριον (from ὄψον, *zukost*—in contrast to bread and meat; cf. ὄψον θαλάσσιον, fish) instead of the synoptic ἰχθύς (Mark 6:38, 41, 43; Matt. 14:17, 19; Luke 9:13, 16) in John 6:9, 11, where the suspicion presses itself upon us that allusion is intended to the "Lord's Supper" discussed mysteriously in vv. 51–58 as the Eucharist, insofar as the Evangelist has brought the word into connection with ὄψις, ὄψα (John 6:16, 20). One should note not only that the "solemn" εὐχαριστεῖν of John 6:11, which in v. 23 is taken up again instead of the "promiscuously used" εὐλογεῖν of the Synoptics (Holtzmann–Bauer 137), unmistakably points to the Eucharist, but also that the vocabulary ὀψάριον recurs in John 21:9, 10, 13 (otherwise nowhere in the New Testament), and indeed in a concluding pericope that seems, among other things, intended to provide a certain substitute for the Evangelist's omitted account of the institution of the Lord's Supper for reasons still to be determined: it depicts a final farewell meal of Jesus with the disciples, which is followed by a fishing expedition undertaken with the onset of night (21:3). If we are on the right track with this, we shall not be surprised that the sequence of letters in ἰχθύς within the Greek Church enticed the need for edification of a later time to the well-known wordplay: Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ (cf. Garbe p. 69 f.).

359 Preller–Robert 587, 707.

360 Φυτάλμιος is a common by-name (E. H. Meyer, loc. cit. III/2, 2820; Furtwängler in Roscher I/1, 1089). How far the commonality of the predicates could extend—so far, indeed, that Dionysus assumes traits of a sea-god—is shown not only—at one of his principal cult sites, Naxos—by the myth of the transformation of the Tyrrhenian pirates into dolphins, in which we recognize "an echo of the veneration of the god as Δελφίνιος, i.e. as the helpful guide of his seafaring worshippers" (Voigt in Roscher I/1, 1083), but also by the Roman poet (Horace, *Odes* II 19, 17): *Tu flectis amnes, tu mare barbarum* (addressed to Bacchus).

361 The σχοινιά (v. 15) could point to the reed shaft of the thyrsus also borne by Dionysus himself (originally [?] a shepherd's lance: Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 11c; cf. Rohde, *Psyche* II 10, 6; 15, 2).

362 How "enormous difficulties" Origen already felt pressing upon the literal understanding of the pericope as such—hence his resort to symbolic interpretation—and how even the earliest textual witnesses "took offense elsewhere as well," has been shown in detail by W. Bauer (*Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* 1909, pp. 156 f.).

363 Hom. *Il.* 6.132: μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο. Hdt. 4.79: ὅστις μαίνεσθαι ἐνάγει ἀνθρώπους. Cf. Voigt, loc. cit. 1030; Rapp, *Mainaden* in Roscher II/2, 2243 ff. In Rohde, *Psyche* II 5 f., the habitual misunderstanding of the natural side of the myth takes its revenge. The essence of the god can scarcely be expressed more aptly and appealingly, according to its most prominent aspect, than in Preller's words:

"He signifies the sap and the power of earthly life as it manifests itself in bush and forest, in gushing mountains, fruit-bearing trees, moist greenery. Transposed to natural life in its yearly movements and oppositions, Dionysus is all the jubilation and all the pain of this vegetative life of the earth, as it drives out of the moist into the green in spring, revels in blossoms and fruits,

ripens in the rays of the sun until it is consumed by them, in order then in winter to decay again and, buried in cold flood and dark gloom, to suffer even the utmost itself and to evoke the related mood in the human breast" (Preller–Robert 659).
The creative drive of nature, after the onset of a new year, breaking forth ever more violently and luxuriantly in an atmosphere often agitated by storms, led to the image of the raging Dionysus and leaves no doubt that the "nurses" or "caretakers" (τιθήναι) of the god (cf. Homer, loc. cit.) are above all to be sought in the mountain and forest streams swelling and foaming at that time, which, personified, belong together with the Maenads as nymphs and represent "vegetation spirits" (loc. cit.).

364 According to the interpretation of the ancients, this wild behavior of the god's entourage is an imitation of the sufferings endured by him in winter (μίμησις τοῦ περὶ Διόνυσον πάθους; cf. Lobeck, *Aglaophamos* 563) and of his struggle with the winterly powers to be destroyed or driven away, which likewise appear mythically personified (as in Lycurgus and Pentheus, whose nature corresponds to that of the Titans of the cosmogony). Cf. Voigt, loc. cit. 1040; Rohde II 14, 2; Preller–Robert 688 f., 696 (and on the German "driving out of winter" and related customs, Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*⁴ II 637; Simrock, *Deutsche Mythologie* 555). This classical conception is indirectly attested also by the Evangelist through the narrated antitypical removal of a disturbance at the sanctuary by driving out the harmful intruders. That he is also well acquainted with the other, the positive side of the Hellenic myth and cult will become evident in another context.

365 Rohde, *Psyche* II 14 ff.

366 Preller–Robert 695.

367 Cf. Holtzmann–Bauer on 1:5, and in Philo's allegory the priestly work of punishment and purification of the Logos entering the temple of the human soul as ἔλεγχος (*Quod det. pot.* 28). Grill, *Unters.* I 119 f.

368 Preller–Robert 688 f.

369 Eurip. *Bacch.* 355–357 (in Donner, *Euripides deutsch*² II, pp. 316 f.).

370 One should recall the significance of hailstones as heavenly missiles in the Amorite battle, Josh. 10:11. — A noteworthy variation of this mythical notion of the danger of stoning the (Thracian-)Hellenic god is offered by the symbolism of a Dionysiac festival belonging to the same circle of ideas on Tenedos. Here a newborn calf is sacrificed—almost certainly every year—to the man-tearing (ἀνθρωπορραίστης), i.e. raging god. The sacrificers wear hunting boots. But the one who has struck down the animal with the axe is, before all eyes, pelted with stones and flees to the sea (Aelian, *nat. anim.* XII 34). Here, accordingly, the slayer of the sacrificial animal, which symbolizes newly emerging vegetation, must represent the winterly enemy of Dionysus, and this enemy himself is driven away by stoning—up to the barren sea, where he can do no harm. The pursuing sacrificers appear, like the Maenads (Rapp, loc. cit. 2251), as hunters. The rejuvenated god wishes, at the time when he needs the greatest

expenditure of power for self-liberation and generative, creative activity, to take into himself, enjoying it, young, fresh life. Whether the celebration of the λιθίνη βαλλητύς in Eleusis and the Αἰθοβολία festival in Troezen—two events connected with the cult of Demeter—concerned related nature-religious ideas, and whether the timing of the first threat against Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles, that is, also of the Great Eleusinia, was determined by the βαλλητύς, can unfortunately no longer be ascertained (cf. Preller–Robert 794 and Stoll in Roscher I/1, 738 s.v. Auxesia).

371 Neither Sarah nor Isaac need have hovered before the Evangelist himself when the Jews appeal to their honorable descent. On the other hand, it is quite possible—indeed likely—that the narrator, for his part, intends to hear in the Jews' demand for credentials, alongside doubt about Jesus' messianic authority, doubt about the legitimacy and honor of the bodily origin of the *homo novus*. Origen (Comm. on John XX 16 [= 14]; see Holtzmann–Bauer on 8:41) may therefore have seen rightly with his conjecture in that direction. The whole scene thereby gains sharper, mood-laden significance and tension. One may compare the series of verses 8:14, 19, 23, 25, 42, 52 with the series 33, 37, 41, 44, 47.

372 Arn. Meyer in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II 71.

373 The suspicious and inquisitorial character of the objection emerges especially clearly in the wording: "Where then is your father?"

374 In the numerous passages from 1:—8 where Jesus designates himself as one sent, God is almost always called his Father; in chs. 3 and 4 this is not yet the case.

375 Note the emphatic ἡμεῖς ("we are not born of fornication") in v. 41 placed first, and by contrast the absence of the pronoun in v. 33. Whether the Evangelist already knew the Panthera-legend in any form may remain open (see further Arn. Meyer, loc. cit. pp. 51, 53 f., 66 ff., 71, 98; Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* pp. 458 f.; Ed. Meyer, *UA* I 66); likewise whether the correct interpretation of the enigmatic name, attested in numerous inscriptions of the imperial period, as well as in Attic contexts, among men and women (Deißmann, *LO* 46), has been found. In view of what precedes, it would perhaps be most natural to look for an explanation on the ground of Greek mythology. The panther (also so named, among other designations, in Syriac) plays a prominent role among the symbols of Dionysus, alternating with the lion: "both following the model of Asia and the cult of the Great Mother, but especially the panther with its spotted hide and its ardent, spring-ready nature; hence Bacchus often drenches it with the blood of the vines and clothes himself with its skin in works of art" (Preller–Robert 714). Voigt emphasizes the early appearance of the panther in mythological art—"it is the oldest certainly non-Hellenic attribute of the god, a Bacchic animal of Asia-Minor origin" (Roscher I/1, 1095 f.). If Jesus was designated as belonging to the panther lineage (*ben Pandera* [= Panthera]), he could from this side too be conceived as a kind of Dionysus. In any case, the explanation is aided by the fact that, in contrast to the lion from the tribe of Judah (Rev. 5:5), he is intended to be portrayed as a pseudo-messiah. The statement in Celsus that his father was a στρατιώτης (Arn. Meyer p. 53), as well as the supposed *Paneter* and the like, may be set aside. It also seems that the other designation of Jesus, *ben Stada* (Meyer pp. 51 ff.), points along the same track as *ben Pandera*,

if σταδαῖος = “upright” (and the related adverbs στάδην, ὀρθοστάδην) may be adduced. We might then think of the phallus, celebrated especially in the Dionysiac cult, which also achieved personification (cf., alongside Διόνυσος Φαλλήν on Lesbos, Φάλης as a distinct deity; see Höfer in Roscher III/2, 2242 f.). Nothing certain can be determined.

376 “Countless difficulties through magnificent disregard for the listeners’ capacity of comprehension” (Holtzmann, *Einl.* 430; Holtzmann–Bauer 24).

377 On the unity of Jesus’ entire preaching since his appearance—according to the Evangelist’s conception—cf. Loisy 525; Holtzmann–Bauer 167 (on 7:40).

378 Cf. the effect of Paul’s discourse on Festus: Μαινῇ, Παῦλε· τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει (Acts 26:24), alongside the effect on a Jewish audience in John 10:20 (δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαίνεται), to which the synoptic ἐξέστη (Mark 3:21) should also be added.

379 On the text-critical question see B. Weiß 314 ff.; Holtzmann–Bauer 169 f.

380 Cf. Bauer, *Leb. J.* 525 f.

381 Holtzmann–Bauer: “with a brief but effective call to repentance; his standpoint is Ezek. 33 and following.”

382 Augustine, who regarded the section as genuine, assumed it had been removed from the Gospel by weak believers or enemies of the true faith because of the dangerous appearance *peccandi impunitatem dari mulieribus* (*De conjug. adult.* 2, 7).

383 Preller in Pauly¹ III 91, 101.

384 In support of the correctness of assuming a typological motive on the part of the interpolator of 7:53—8:11 there is especially a parallel almost immediately preceding in 7:33—39. The customary conjecture (cf. Schanz, Zahn, Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer et al.) that Jesus’ words in vv. 37 f. refer to a “water-libation” associated with the Feast of Tabernacles, “as it was established by the Pharisees in the post-exilic period” (Schenkel, *Bibell.* IV, 12—15), has recently again been rejected on the ground that in that case it is not a matter of drinking (Holtzmann–Bauer; cf. B. Weiß). But the matter is by no means thereby settled. It must be considered that the Feast of Tabernacles falls in the same season as the great annual festival of the Eleusinian Mysteries, introduced by a week-long pre-celebration. How strongly a side-glance into Greek religion presses itself here is already revealed by Plutarch, when he (*Sympos.* 4, 6) regarded that Jewish autumn festival as a kind of Dionysiac celebration (cf. the designation θύρσοι borrowed from the latter in 2 Macc. 10:7; Josephus, *Ant.* XIII 13, 5). But even if it is established that Dionysus “and the other gods” were also sacrificed to at the Eleusinian festival (as Demeter and Persephone themselves were a day earlier; cf. Preller, loc. cit. III 97), and that Dionysus appeared as χθόνιος essentially akin to the two principal deities of the place, still no typological allusion to this god is discernible in the verses of John 7. Above all, it should be noted that the mysterious announcement of Jesus’ fateful death contained in vv. 28, 33 f.—which led the Jews to think of an intended professional journey into Greek lands—both precedes and follows (8:20

f.) the saying in v. 37 f. at the same location (in the temple) and almost at the same time. Thus the religious question of questions, the eschatological one, is drawn in—also central to the Greek mysteries, especially those of Eleusis (cf. Pauly¹ V 335). The concluding act of the main festival likewise consisted of a water-libation, the so-called πλημοχόη, a libation toward sunrise and sunset from peculiarly shaped clay vessels, which, like the libations themselves, were called πλημοχόαι (and already by their name evoke the idea of an abundant measure: πλήμη = πλήσμη, flood; details in Preller–Robert 794, 1). These water-libations were offerings to the dead and thus signified refreshment (παραψυχή) for the deceased (cf. Rohde, *Psyche* I 241 f., 243, 2). That only pure water was used appears to be connected with the fact that this autumnal mystery-rite originally already referred to the hoped-for reanimation of the plant world through the flood of the coming spring rains and thus formed a fundamental prelude to the Chytren-festival concluding the Dionysiac Anthesteria (see above p. 109). If one now brings to mind the Eleusinian ritual libation in comparison with John 7:37 f., it appears at least not impossible that the Evangelist wished secretly to set Jesus over against the dispensers of that meager refreshment of the dead as the one who is able and destined to become, for the living who go toward death, the overflowing fountain of the Spirit of eternal life (cf. 4:10, 14; 7:38; 14:23 f.). This assumption is further recommended for 7:37 by the fact that the Eleusinian libation in fact likewise took place only on the last day of the festival, whereas the water-libation of the Feast of Tabernacles occurred on all seven festival days. In addition, the allusion by Jesus in 12:24 to a natural process—already taken up, at least on one side, by the eschatology of the Demeter mysteries (cf. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluß auf das Christentum* 1894, pp. 11, 146)—is immediately preceded by the arrival of the “Greeks” to him, with unmistakable reference back to 7:35. That the image of the κοιλία in 7:38 also incidentally has the outward appearance of an Evangelist’s hint at “Hellenic sculpture at springs and fountains” (cf. Holtzmann–Bauer 166) may be added. Finally, as to the later water-libations of the Feast of Tabernacles, by which, according to Jewish tradition, abundant rain was to be procured for the following season of new sowing, it remains to be asked whether these too are not to be derived from offerings to the dead of the most ancient prehistoric period (cf. Stade, *Bibl. Theol. d. A.T.* I 169 f.).

385 In the parallel passage Matt. 26:53 Jesus speaks of more than twelve legions of angels that he could ask of his Father. Here the notion of the royal field-commander still shines through, to be compared with the royal title claimed in John 18:33—37.

386 Holtzmann–Bauer 279.

387 Grill, *Unters.* I 40, 43.

388 Holtzmann, *Einl.* 450.

389 Macrob. *Sat.* 1.19: Bacchus is surnamed Ἐνυάλιος (the warlike).

390 “He also appropriates a part of Ares; for when an army stands armed and ready for battle, fear scatters it before it has lifted the spear; this too is a frenzy that Dionysus brings about”: Eurip. *Bacch.* 302—305 (Donner 263—266).

391 *Cum thyrsum tenet, quid aliud quam latens telum gerit?* (Macrobius, loc. cit.). Further evidence in Preller–Robert 712.

392 In 4:— Jesus also generally ranks himself among the prophets.

393 Rohde, *Psyche* II 56, 3 doubts the correctness of the association—often repeated since Plato—of μάντις with μαίνεσθαι, perhaps without sufficient reason? He thinks rather of the Doric μανύω (= μηνύω). Cf., however, also Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* 1892, p. 191; Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* 1916, pp. 608 f.

394 Rohde, *Psyche* II 20 f.

395 Eurip. *Hecuba* 1245 (1267 Prinz–Wecklein); *Rhesus* 965; Rohde, loc. cit. 22, 1. προφήτης originally denotes only the interpreter of an oracle, who hears the utterance from the deity or the ecstatic seer and proclaims it. In Hellenism, by contrast, "*vaticinari* and προφητεύειν generally mean nothing other than ἐν πνεύματι λαλεῖν" (Reitzenstein, *Hellenist. Myster.* p. 89).

396 Rohde, loc. cit. 21, 1: "With the greatest clarity and precision the inner connection of inspired divination with the 'possession' of ecstatic excitation (not at all of drunkenness!) is designated here."

397 Cf. Rohde, loc. cit. 59 ff. Jesus, who already in spirit beholds four months before their time the onset of the harvest (the signs of the impending conversion of the Gentiles; John 4:35 f.), is evidently to present himself, viewed from here, as the antitype of the seer-god Dionysus.

398 On the same image in Philo's λόγος see Grill, *Unters.* I 127.

399 Cf. the general discussion of the "activity of the seer" in Rohde (II 69 f.): "The gift or art of divination, of purifying the 'defiled,' of healing diseases, seemed to flow from a single source."

400 Aeschyl. *Eum.* 62; Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 315; Roscher I/1, 442; Preller–Robert 289. A son of Apollo (Apis) is also called thus, because he freed Argos from harmful animals (Roscher I/1, 422).

401 Athen. I 41 p. 22 E; II 2 p. 36 B. On Pliny (on the medicinal use of wine), on the name Διόν. Παιώνιος, on the divinatory sleep at the sanctuary of Dionysus (as otherwise with Asclepius): Voigt in Roscher I/1, 1065; Preller–Robert 710, 2.

402 Cf. also Eurip. *Bacch.* 279—283 (Donner 239—243).

403 Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* 1864, p. 444.

404 According to (J. Réville, Loisy), Holtzmann–Bauer: "it is repugnant to John to know Jesus at table with a former leper (such as Simon in Mark 14:3)" (on John 12:2).

405 Holtzmann, *Syn.* 75. For understanding the strange pericope—whose content Garbe (*Ind. Christ.* p. 59) places in a series with the wedding story of Cana, among other things under the heading “purposeless magic acts”—and concerning which Harnack remarks: “The story forms one of the strangest pieces of sacred history, over which believing and rationalistic explanation alike have labored in vain” (*Miss.*¹ p. 95 = ³I 140)—a few indications may still be permitted in view of its outstandingly instructive significance for the history of religions and precisely because of the apparent hopelessness of any attempt at explanation. That precisely the place-names Gerasa (Gergesa) and Gadara appear is not of **historical** significance; rather, it is to be explained etymologically in connection with the content of the narrated event: it concerns the experience of one who is expelled (גרש = to expel, drive out), socially confined in seclusion (גדר = to wall in, shut off). The account is the naïve rendering of an unconscious, legendary transference and reinterpretation of a (north-Palestinian?) mythical conception of a natural process into the history of the messianic experience and activity of Jesus.

The struggle of the supreme power of the atmosphere with the demonic forces dwelling in it—forces that hold back the heavenly light and water and exhaust themselves in the phenomena of the thunderstorm (cf. still the conception in Eph. 2:2)—one of the most widespread, most popular, most variable, and most significant mythical motifs, receives a grotesque earthly counterpart. In place of the demons taking refuge in the clouds and offering resistance, harmful to deity and humanity alike, Jesus here confronts a legion of evil spirits (δαιμόνια) in a possessed man, in whom they become a terror to an entire region; the plurality is at the same time regarded as a closed unity and speaks of itself in the singular (Mark 5:8–9).

In the depiction of the immense strength and unbridled behavior of the unfortunate man one is involuntarily reminded of the portrayal of Vṛtra combated by Indra according to Vedic belief (the impetuous, wild one—*dodhat* Rigv. I 80, 5; VIII 6, 6; the hard-to-grasp—*durgrbhisvan* I 52, 6; the one to be overcome only by Indra—*badbadhāna* I 52, 10). The stones with which the mentally deranged man strikes himself (κατακόπτων ἑαυτόν λίθοις) still point back to the original conception of the hailstorm serving the demon’s self-defense (cf. Rigv. I 32, 13: “Neither lightning nor thunder helped him then, nor the mist he poured out, nor the hail; when Indra and the dragon fought, the Mighty One won the victory for all time”—see Grassmann, *Rig-Veda* II p. 34; biblically Josh. 10:11—the hailstones as Yahweh’s missiles—may at least be compared more remotely).

The repeatedly emphasized dwelling of the sick man on the mountains corresponds entirely to the scenery of Vṛtra as it meets us most vividly in Rigv. I 32 (Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda* 1894, pp. 136 ff.; ² pp. 134–139). That, however, as with the gods of the thunderstorm (the Maruts; cf. Rigv. V 54, 1. 3. 5 f.), the image of the “cloud-mountains” comes into play—whose water content the demon prevents human beings from receiving—is unmistakable. This, too, can guide a correct understanding of the other features of the gospel narrative.

Admittedly, from one side the role assigned to the pigs may already be sufficiently explained in purely biblical terms by the typical uncleanness of the animals. Far more persuasive, however, is the assumption that this feature of the picture is integral and, in this respect as well, leads back to a mythical conception connected with what precedes. It is easily demonstrated from both Greek and Roman mythology and cult practice that the pig was accorded a special relationship both to earth deities and the underworld (cf. the swallowing of part of the herd of Eubouleus by Hades at the abduction of Persephone into the underworld), and to the nymphs,

the daughters of the rain-god Zeus, the goddesses of fertility and household blessing (cf. the sacrifice of the δῖος δορβός Eumaeus, *Od.* 14, 3. 435; Preller–Robert 399; Bloch in Roscher III/1, 517; Preller, *Röm. Mythol.*² 355; Peter in Roscher II/2, 2236). Perhaps from here light also falls on Mark 5:3, 5 (the possessed man's dwelling among the tombs). The significance of boar and pig in the Babylonian cults of Tammuz and Ninib (cf. Zimmern, loc. cit. pp. 398, 5; 409 ff.) may be left entirely aside. Cf. further the discussion of the "cloud-pigs" in de Gubernatis (–Hartmann), *Die Tiere in der indogermanischen Mythologie* 1874, p. 347.

The result of our investigation of the synoptic miracle narrative of the healing of the demoniac of Gerasa—which in this case presses itself upon us almost irresistibly—may serve for preliminary general orientation with regard to the most wondrous sign of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, to be treated only later (the raising of Lazarus). The question whether one can dispense with a comparative glance into the world of myth will arise again even there.

406 In rare cases tubercular leprosy runs an acute course, i.e. within a few weeks (Kamphausen in Riehm, *Handwörterbuch der bibl. Altertümer*, art. "Aussatz").

407 For details see Strauss, loc. cit. pp. 452–455.

408 Strauss, pp. 454 f. (following Bretschneider). Cf. Harnack, *Miss.*¹ p. 96 = ³I 141.

409 Cf. also Reitzenstein on John 7:19 f.; 8:48 ff.; 10:17 ff.: "The antithesis to true divine inspiration is also in the Johannine Gospel the accusation δαιμόνιον ἔχειν, which is attributed to the Samaritans" (instead of discovering it in oneself). — "The author of the Johannine Gospel has the similarity of Jesus' appearance to that of such pseudo-prophets emphasized so forcefully in order at the same time to refute it through the entire sublime portrait of Jesus that he draws" (*Hellen. Myster.* p. 152; *Poimandres* p. 223, n. 2).

410 κατοχή; κατέχεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (Rohde, *Psyche* II 11; 18 f.).

411 Christ has liberated Christians (Gentile Christians as well as Jewish Christians) from the bondage of external cultic form, of Mosaicism (Gal. 5:1). This liberation is mediated through the Spirit of the "Lord," whose essence is wholly pure, divinely powerful spirituality. This Spirit of Christ also frees his own from the bondage of the letter and of a deceptive Mosaic faith in authority (2 Cor. 3:17); the law of the Spirit of life active in Christ has freed the Christian from the enslaving law of sin (impurity and lack of freedom) and of death, unto righteousness, sanctification, and eternal life (Rom. 8:2; 6:18–22). Cf. also Gal. 2:4; 5:13; 1 Cor. 8:9; 9:19; 10:29.

412 1 Pet. 2:16 (Knopf ad loc.: the reborn have become inwardly free and stand above the world; ἐλεύθερος and ἐλευθερία are also major themes of deep content in Stoic-Cynic preaching). Jas. 1:25 (νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας); 2:12. On the ancient background, including the entire body of "freedom-sayings in Paul and John," see Deißmann, *LO* 246–286 f.

413 In the Synoptics and Acts, ἀλήθεια is only quite generally factual reality; ἐλευθερία and ἐλευθερόω do not occur synoptically; ἐλεύθερος only at Matt. 17:26 = tax-free. By contrast, note on the Hellenistic side the Hermetic sayings: οὐδὲν ἐν σώματι ἀληθές, ἐν ἀσωμάτῳ τὸ πᾶν

ἀψευδές· οὐδὲν ἐν οὐρανῷ δοῦλον, οὐδὲν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐλεύθερον (Stob. *Ecl.* I 275 f.; Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* pp. 49, 160; Wetter, *Charis* p. 60).

414 Grill, *Unters.* I 203.

415 The entire section 8:12–59 shows that the bondage to sin to be abolished among the "Jews" goes hand in hand with diabolical darkening, self-deception, and incapacity for understanding. Cf. Holtzmann, *N. T.* II 493 = ²542.

416 On the particularly noteworthy influence of Greek thought on the Evangelist's concept of truth, see above p. 88.

417 The cleansing of the temple had to be discussed in another context (pp. 84; 119 f.).

418 Against Loisy p. 716 (*l'idée de purification est tout à fait accessoire dans le symbole du lavement des pieds*).

419 The interpretation of Jesus' symbolic action as referring to all services that Christians render to one another in mutual subordination and self-denial—such as "the hospitality practiced in the humble service of the community" (cf. 1 Tim. 5:10 and Holtzmann–Bauer on John 13:14)—does not do justice to the unified image of the washing and to the essential moment of purification, and is also contextually inappropriate because of the close connection with the farewell meal thought of in 13:2 as immediately preceding. Even in this foot-washing—whether or not a rite within the Evangelist's community is also being presupposed—the basic purification assumed is not baptism (the Christian baptism, which is at the same time baptism of the Spirit, the disciples have not yet experienced after ch. 3), but that indicated in 15:3 (see above).

420 Holtzmann–Bauer ad loc.

421 Cf. in the closely related literature 1 John 3:5: *He appeared ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ* (Holtzmann, *N. T.* II 480, ²527): "for a real removal of sins").

422 It is striking that precisely this situation corresponds to the *passive* sense of יִשַּׁע in the Zechariah passage, by which the Messiah is not characterized as σωτήρ (L.: helper) or as conqueror (the newer view), but rather as one who is helped (in oppression and suffering), who is rescued (by Yahweh). The later saying proclaims the certainly impending fulfillment of Jer. 23:6 despite all hindrances and humiliations. יִשַּׁע Niph. in the sense of experiencing divine help is entirely customary (cf. especially Ps. 33:16).

423 Brückner (*Die chronologische Reihenfolge, in welcher die Briefe des N. T. verfaßt sind* — 1890, p. 222) deletes σωτήρα, but also v. 21.

424 Cf. otherwise especially the exposition by P. Wendland: "Most cases in which σωτήρ and σώζειν are predicated of Jesus do not go beyond the Jewish conceptual sphere or beyond the immediate impression of the personality and its activity. — Beyond this leads us the Fourth Gospel 4:42 (cf. 3:17; 12:47), 1 John 4:14 (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4; 4:10; Petrusevangelium IV 13). Here

we have in ‘world-savior’ a concept which is equally remote from Jewish messianic belief as from Jesus’ own understanding of his calling. The concept is current in the Hellenistic world, and it is found in the latest stratum of New Testament writings, in which other Hellenistic influences are also demonstrable. But any doubt is removed by two other passages of the Pastoral Epistles, which show a whole complex of ideas united from the sphere of the Hellenistic ruler-cult: 2 Tim. 1:8 ff. (σώσαντος χάριν, αἰωνίων, ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος, φωτίσαντος, ζωήν, ἀφθαρσίαν, cf. Tit. 1:2–4); Tit. 2:11 ff. (χάρις σωτήριος, ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ); 3:4 ff. (ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος, χάρις, ζωῆς αἰωνίου). The epiphany of the σωτήρ, which brings salvation and light to all human beings, the union of θεός καὶ σωτήρ (cf. 2 Pet. 1:1), the eternity of his person and his activity, his χάρις and δόξα, his φιλανθρωπία — all these are concepts which we encounter in similar combination in the Hellenistic and Roman ruler-cult. — Thus the concept of σωτήρ, in which Jewish and Greek notions have flowed together, has become one of the forms in which even for the Gentiles the impression of Jesus’ significance transcending the human sphere could be vividly expressed, into which the content of Christian soteriology could be poured” (*Σωτήρ. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, in *Z. n. t. W.* V 1904, p. 349 f.; see also Deißmann, *LO* p. 276). With reference to related passages (without the designation σωτήρ), Wendland further remarks: “So far as I survey the material, in the case of σωτήρ one did not primarily think of the healing activity which the Gospels more often denote by σώζειν. This meaning increasingly recedes. For an age permeated by belief in evil spirits filling the world, the Christian soter is above all the rescuer and liberator from the dominion and tyranny of evil spirits, the founder of the new realm into which he introduces his own. Redemption from sin, death, and judgment is only the less vivid expression for the same matter” (p. 351). Cf. also Knopf on 1 Pet. 2:16. On the fundamental significance of the struggle with the world of evil spirits for the formation of the redeemer figure in Gnosis (ultimately traceable back to the Babylonian solar myth), reference may be made to the valuable discussion by Bousset (*Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* 1907, pp. 238–276).

425 The κόσμος of John 4:42 is the same as in 3:16; 6:33; 12:47. The universalism of the Fourth Evangelist places Christ, going even beyond Paul, always in immediate relation to the whole world, whose light he is (Holtzmann-Bauer 90; Holtzmann, *N. T.* II 361, ²401).

426 The reference to the fact that the Taheb, whom the Samaritans expected, was also to be a converter and savior of the Samaritans, the Jews, and the Gentiles (Zahn), fails to recognize the peculiarly pregnant sense of ἀληθῶς in the Fourth Evangelist (cf. my *Unters.* I 202–204). Even according to B. Weiß, ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου is “naturally put into the mouths of the people by the Evangelist.”

427 Erroneously Eleutheros in Hesychius and Eleutherius in Arnobius VI 23 (see Jessen in Pauly-Wiss., s.v. *Eleuthereus*).

428 Diodorus III 66. IV 2.

429 Preller-Robert 666 f. 673.

430 According to Plutarch, *Quaest. Graec.* 39 a son of Lycaon; according to Steph. Byz. a son of Apollo (Schultz in Roscher I 1, 1240 f.).

431 On the course of the whole and on the individual details cf. especially Preller-Robert 673 ff.

432 “Freed from ice are stream and brook through spring’s gracious, enlivening glance.” The epithet of Dionysus from Eleutherai: Μελαναίγις (he in the black goat-skin, cf. Preller-Robert 667, 714 f.) seems to point to revelation in the dark, rain-announcing storm-cloud (cf. the aegis of Zeus as image of the “storm- and thunder-cloud,” Roscher I 1, 149 f.). Voigt thinks of the “liberator from orgiastic frenzy” (Roscher I 1, 1070).

433 Preller-Robert 673. 671.

434 Eurip., *Bacch.* 498: λύσει μ’ ὁ δαίμων αὐτός and 649: Οὐκ εἶδον [ἤ] οὐκ ἤκουσας ὅτι λύσει μέ τις (Dionysus means himself in both cases!).

435 Cf. Plut., *quaest. conv.* V 6: ἡμᾶς ὁ Διόνυσος καὶ Χορεῖος εἰς τάξιν ἱλαρὰν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον καθιστῆσιν. On the two name-forms, of which the latter (Λύσιος) is native in Thebes, Corinth, and Sicyon, together with attestations, see Preller-Robert 665, 679, 690, 709 and Höfer in Roscher II 2, 2163, 2212. The New Testament has only the nominal form λυτρωτής, and indeed as a designation of Moses (Acts 7:35).

436 “The participant in such festivals is consecrated; through the mountains, raging bacchically, he initiates his soul into the hosts of the god with holy purifications” (Eurip., *Bacch.* 75 ff.). The purification takes place here also through the incitement of the soul to excess of religious excitation; as “Bacchaeus” Dionysus awakens the holy madness, which he himself ultimately, in its highest intensification, brings to release and pacification as “Lysios,” Meilichios. This is a further development of the old Thracian excitation-cult, carried out on Greek soil and from a Greek mode of thought (Rohde *Ps.* II 50). In passing it may be recalled that the symbolic purification of the disciples by Jesus likewise takes place in nocturnal celebration.

437 Soph. *Antig.* 1143. Preller-Robert 712. The questionable purification of Dionysiac ecstasy effects, as otherwise that brought about by priestly activity, quite generally and essentially the “warding off of demonic hindrances” (cf. Rohde a.a.O. 110 f.). Cf. New Testament, on the connection of the concepts redemption and purification, Hebr. 9:12.13; Tit. 2:14. On John 1:29 see above.

438 Rohde *Ps.* II 124. 130.

439 Höfer in Roscher IV 1, 1248.

440 Dionysus is attested as Soter on coins from Thracian Maroneia, otherwise only in Lycophron (*Alexandra* 206) and in the Delphic paean of Philodamos of Skarpheia, where he is invoked as a benevolent protector of the city (see Höfer a.a.O. 1250, where the inscription from Plarasa adduced by Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* I, 189 no. 72 [cf. Quandt, *de Baccho* p. 189], is not unjustly regarded as very uncertain). This is easily understood, since he

shares the property of a purifier and the epithet σωτήρ with Zeus and Apollo, and in part also corresponds as Eleuthereus to Zeus Eleutherios (Jupiter Liberator) (cf. P. Wendland a.a.O. p. 348, 5).

441 On the Philonic Logos as shepherd cf. my *Unters.* I 125.

442 *ποιμενὶς δ' ἀγραύλων ταύρων, Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο υἱεῖ κισσοχίτων*, it is said in the pseudo-Orphic *Lithika* 260 (Rohde *Ps.* II 15, 3).

443 Plut. *De Iside* 35; *Qu. Gr.* 36. Preller-Robert 695, 3; 713 f.

444 Cf. on the parallel of the Thracian Sabazios Rohde a. a. O.

445 On the integration of the passage in question into the larger context of the evangelical composition cf. my *Unters.* I a. a. O. 448. Holtzmann-Bauer on vv. 6, 7.

447 What is intended is a mode of religious stimulation and influence corresponding to the spirit and purposes of the divine Logos-revelation, such as first occurs within the Old Testament community of the pious (note vv. 4, 5, 8).

448 Image of those who tear the believing circles (πρόβατα) away from the salutary influence of divine life-truth and thereby from the true Lord of the community, God, and bring them to ruin. If in v. 8 all who came before Jesus (πρὸ ἐμοῦ) are designated by him as thieves and robbers, then what is clearly meant are personalities who, within the contemporary Jewish people prior to the appearance of the Messiah Christ (cf. 4:25 f.), appeared in misleading fashion as religious teachers and party leaders, the Pharisees foremost among them (cf. 9:40), so to speak: his more or less immediate competitors. That the organs of Old Testament revelation (Moses and the prophets) cannot be meant no longer requires proof.

449 On the totality of the moments in 10:1—18 see my *Unters.* I 19 f. The reading proposed by certain modern scholars on the basis of the Sahidic translation, *ὁ ποιμὴν τῶν προβ.* (instead of *ἡ θύρα τ. προ.*) in v. 7, is in just as bad a state as the deletion of *πάντες* (D) or *πρὸ ἐμοῦ* (א it syr. sin. pesh) in v. 8. Other attempts may be disregarded. Cf. Stoll in Roscher I 1, 1188. Preller-Robert 601 f. Jessen in Roscher IV 1, 672 f.

451 Instead of *ἀναβαίνων*; cf. *ἄμβασις, ἀμβάτης, ἀμβάλλω, ἄμπωτις* (ebb), *ἀμφάδον* (openly), and others in poetry and prose.

452 Cf. Ps. 24:7, 9; Ed. Meyer *G. A.* II 787.

453 That what is said in v. 3 of the *θυρωρός* is "an embellishment not to be further interpreted and in that respect more parable-like" is easily recognized (Holtzmann-Bauer ad loc.). On the question of the actual etymology of *διθύραμβος* only an indication can be given here. The three components are recognizable as *δι*, *θυρ*, and *(α)μβος*. The first syllable has nothing to do either with the numeral for two or with *διά*. The length of the vowel betrays a contraction, such as we encounter, for example, in *Διπόλια* = (and alongside) *Διιπόλια* (name of the very ancient festival

annually celebrated on the Acropolis in honor of the city-god Zeus Πολιεύς); cf. *διπολιώδης* alongside *διιπολιώδης* ("old-fashioned"). *Διθυρ(α)-* thus yields a compound of the sense: *Gate-Zeus*, i.e. opening of heaven. What is probably meant thereby is the light streaming from heaven (as in Rigveda I 48, 15: *dvárau divas* and 69, 10: *dúras*, cf. 113, 4; VII 79, 4 and Oldenberg *RV* 149) and the moisture likewise coming from there, through whose inflow the entire life and productivity of earthly nature is conditioned. One should recall, with regard to the applied image as such, in Old Testament terms the "gate of heaven" (Gen. 28:17 — heavenly light-effect) and the "windows of heaven" (Gen. 7:11; 8:2 — outpouring of heavenly waters). If Dionysos was called *Διθύραμβος*, then through the word-formation suffix *-μβος* (*-μφος* in the satyr-name *Διθόραμφος*; cf. *κόρυμβος, κορυφή* and thereto Curtius, *Griech. Etym.*[*3] 480, who thinks of a diminutive development (?); Skt. *bha* in *gardabha, ṛṣabha, vṛṣabha*, etc.) the god was brought into a special relation to the opening and self-unfolding of heaven as the one belonging thereto or occupied therewith (cf. *janitor*, gatekeeper). What is meant thereby can hardly be doubtful: Dionysos is characteristically a gatekeeper of heaven. His festivals sufficiently reveal that not merely the annual opening of the sluices of heaven (especially in spring thunderstorms) is one of his manifestations of life (cf. above p. 106), but that also the renewed bursting forth of sunlight after the winter solstice belongs here. (Cf. the light-appearance effected by him, deceiving Pentheus [cf. above p. 123], in Euripides *Bacch.* 630 f.). Only incidentally should it be noted that the song-type *dithyramb*, which arose from the "Dionysian peasant religion," is named after the god to whom it is dedicated as its most characteristic festival song, just as the original *paean* bears the name of Apollo "Paian," whom it celebrates in a distinctive manner. Both gods were to be incited — especially in spring — to manifestation of power through a particularly vigorous song. That Apollo yields to Dionysos with the transition from spring into the summer season is still revealed by the cult-name of the former: *Διονυσόδοτος*.

454 It is easily seen that 1 Clem. *Cor.* 48:2,4; Ignat. *Philad.* 9,1; *Hermas Sim.* IX 12,1—6 allow just as little a conclusion regarding their dependence on John 10:9. In Clement and Hermas Christ as mediator of salvation is not called *θύρα* but *πύλη*, and in all three passages only *εἰσέρχεσθαι* is spoken of, not *ἀναβαίνειν*. Cf. on the *pastor* H. Weinel in Hennecke *N. Apokr.* II 316.

455 Rohde *Ps.* II 15 f. On the designation of service in the Dionysos cult with *βουκολεῖν* cf. Eisele in Roscher IV 1, 216.

468 Cf. further the Dithyrambos as companion of Dionysos, a figure of the *thiasos* (Stoll in Roscher I 1, 1188).

457 Rossi, *Bull. d'arch. Christ.* 4, 5, 1887, p. 29 ff.: "Jesus accomplishes, first, as Piper (*Mythol. u. Symb. d. christl. Kunst* I, 1847, p. 126) notes, in the moral world the same miracle as Orpheus in the bodily and irrational; secondly, however, he is not merely a model, but at the same time redeemer. — In order that traits of the pagan founder of religion could pass over onto the redeemer, this figure first had to be stripped of his pagan traits. This, however, had occurred through the Christian interpolations of the Orphic poems. — Without the Christian Orphica, the Church would hardly have come to the sepulchral use of Orpheus representations" (Gruppe, *Altchristl. Orpheusdarstellungen* in Roscher III 1, 1202 f., 1207). Cf. on the conjecture that

Christians conceived their redeemer as the true Orpheus and therefore placed the image of Orpheus as a symbol of Christ in their catacombs also (following Heußner, *Die altchristl. Orpheusdarstellungen*, 1893) Knapp (*Über Orpheusdarstellungen* 1895, p. 32 f.).

458 Orpheus, conceived as founder of Orphism, is called the founder of Dionysian initiations (Rohde *Ps.* II 103, 1). He is in all probability a double of the chthonic Dionysos, so to speak a special representation of the same. Cf. Preller-Robert 687, 3 and Gruppe in Roscher III 1, 1110–1171, 1112.

459 Gruppe a. a. O. 1157–1165. On the conjecture that an older version rather told of the happy restoration of Eurydice see Gruppe 1196, 1158.

460 Cf. Preller-Robert 832 f.

461 Attention should also be drawn once more to the repeated emphasis on the *voice* (φωνή) of the good shepherd (10:3 ff.): his sheep listen to it and to it alone. One is involuntarily reminded of the typical artistic representation of the effect of Orpheus' song amid the circle of listening animals, whose enchantment indeed goes so far, where only irrational creatures are concerned, that even ravenous beasts cannot resist. The ancients also wished to derive the name Orpheus from the *ὠραία φωνή*, *vox optima*, of the wonder-man (Gruppe 1062).

462 Isa. 40:11; Jer. 31:10; Ezek. 34:11–16, 17–22; Mic. 2:12 f.; 7:14; Zech. 9:16; Ps. 23:1; 80:2 (78:52? cf. 77:21).

463 Isa. 63:11; Jer. 13:17, 20; 23:1–4; Ezek. 34:2 ff., 8, 10, 31; Zech. 10:3; 13:7; Ps. 74:1; 77:21; 78:71; 79:13; 95:7; 100:3 (leaving aside passages such as 2 Sam. 7:7; Hos. 4:16; 13:5 f.; Zeph. 3:13; Ps. 29:8).

464 Ezek. 34:23; 37:24 f.: the Davidic prince of his people (the messianic dynasty) appointed by Yahweh for the time of salvation will be for it the true shepherd in the sense of a selfless and just ruler; Mic. 5:3: the messianic shepherd of the people predestined by Yahweh will prove himself as such through a powerful and glorious world-rule.

465 Matt. 2:6; 18:12–14; Luke 12:32 (Jesus the shepherd, the circle of disciples the little flock of God, of their all-ruling "Father"). Cf. Acts 20:28 (reading: *ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ*).

466 In the entire New Testament it is nowhere else elaborated; in Paul it is not found at all; it is touched upon (each time in a single verse) four times within deuteropauline literature; among the Synoptics altogether only five times (including one parallel); in Acts and Revelation (likewise in the appendix of the Fourth Gospel) once each.

487 In Matt. 2:6 it appears subordinately within a messianic citation of the chief priests and scribes (freely after Mic. 5:1,3), and indeed in such a way that shepherding (*ποιμανεῖ*) according to an old, widespread usage is an image of (forceful) ruling activity (cf. the *ποιμὴν λαῶν* in Homer). Matt. 25:32 compares to the activity of the shepherd an eschatologically concluding judicial act of Christ. Matt. 26:31, reproduction of Mark 14:27 (with completion of the citation

from Zech. 13:7 through inclusion of *τῆς ποίμνης* from LXX A), rests on a misunderstood messianic interpretation of the Yahweh-saying probably directed against the Greek-friendly high priest Alcimus (d. 160): “I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.” That the words put into Jesus’ own mouth were related to him as the one going to death for the disciples is also shown by John 16:32, although here, in a noteworthy manner, the image of the shepherd and the blow striking him is not drawn in because of the strong emphasis on the voluntariness of Jesus’ death-sacrifice in 10:11, 15, 17, 18. Thereby it also follows that, in distinction from Matt. 2:6 and 25:32, the shepherd comparison in Matt. 26 (= Mark 14) is related in its main thought to that of John 10: in both cases it concerns the soteriological relationship of love between Jesus and his own (cf. 10:11; 15:13; 16:27) and the testing of the same; Matt. (Mark) illuminates specifically the behavior of the disciples, and indeed negatively; the Fourth Evangelist places the (positive) behavior of Jesus toward the totality of his believers in the foreground of consideration. The final synoptic passage Luke 12:32 also agrees at least insofar with the shepherd image of John 10 as Jesus assures the small flock of disciples of the temporal and eternal care of God (the verse strongly recalls Isa. 41:14). Despite the inclusion of the parable of the lost sheep (15:4–6 = Matt. 18:12 f.), which emphasizes “God’s interest in the lost, despised and abandoned in the eyes of the world,” Luke nowhere comes to speak of Jesus as *ποιμήν* or of his *ποιμαίνειν*.

468 Cf. on the “very ancient conception,” probably transmitted from the Greeks into later Judaism and Christianity, of the radiant halo, reminiscent of Rev. 2:10; 3:11; 4:4, 10; 6:2; 12:1; 14:14: Knopf p. 191.

469 See above p. 35 f. Cf. Holtzmann, *N. T.* II 387, ²433 f.

470 See Holtzmann-Bauer (in the *Hand-Comm.*³) on Rev. 5:6.

471 According to P. Schmidt (*Anmerkungen über die Komposition der Offenbarung Johannes*, 1891) the Christian interpolations of the Apocalypse, “to which above all the well-known insertions of the ‘Lamb,’ already noted by Vischer and in part even by Völter, belong,” derive from the redactor and at the same time translator of the three Jewish sources of the book, who worked only after 112 (see Holtzmann, *Einl.* p. 413). Acts 20:28 (reading *κυρίου*) is to be disregarded, since it remains undecided whether Christ is conceived merely as owner or also as (supreme) shepherd. In any case it would be conceivable that here the program of the Pastoral Epistles, thus probably the time of “consolidated Gnosis” (from the days of Hadrian?), finds expression. Cf. Holtzmann (in the commentary) ad loc.; *Einl.* p. 187. Moreover reference should be made to the general exposition by Holtzmann-Bauer on John 10:1—21 (p. 201): “The entire allegory already presupposes the Christian usage of shepherd duties; cf. Acts 20:28. The Evangelist already has an ordered shepherd-office in view — The same chronological background is also illuminated by the fact that our discourse [in John 10:16] culminates in the thought of ecclesial unity conditioned by the reception of the Gentiles — This is the counter-image to the conception of the original religion-unity of the ancient ‘god-filled’ nations, which also appears again as an ideal of the future, of the consensus and solidarity of all peoples of the world with regard to belief in God in Plutarch, Celsus, Minucius Felix, Maximus of Tyre [references ibid.]; also Tatian (*Or. ad Gr.* 28) perhaps already in retrospective reference to John

10:16, as likewise Origen when he assures that Christianity has realized that ideal which appeared unattainable to Celsus (*Cels.* 8:72). In any case our passage also harmoniously fits into these manifestations so characteristic of the second century, with its wide knowledge, its comparison of the most remote, its comprehensive view of the most diverse."

472 Reitzenstein, *Poim.* 31, 3; 245.

473 From Attis etc. (cf. Clemen *Rel. Erkl.* 269 f.) entirely to be set aside.

474 Rapp in Roscher II 2, 2245.

475 Cf. moreover the details above p. 2.

476 See especially Rohde *Ps.* II 12.

477 Preller-Robert 669.

478 Only in 3 cases out of 18 (4:43 ff.; 5:1; 7:1 ff.) is nothing said, without our being entitled to infer the absence of the disciples from this.

479 The death-Passover in Jerusalem, Luke 2:41 ff., does not come into consideration.

480 This is not the place to sketch the history of suffering of the passage, which seems already to have begun in the time of Irenaeus and reaches into the most recent period. As often happens in cases of textual criticism, instructive examples have been provided precisely in the most recent years: in 1906 Klug identified *τὸ πάσχα* with that of 2:13 (to which Dausch immediately objected). Fendt ("*Die Dauer der öffentlichen Wirksamkeit Jesu*" in Knöpfler, *Veröffentlichungen aus dem kirchenhistor. Sem. München*), who likewise does not delete the Passover of John 6:4, maintains that since in John the determining factor is locality rather than time (cf. temple cleansing), *μετὰ ταῦτα* in v. 1 does not prove that a Passover after that of 2:13 is intended. In contrast, *τὸ πάσχα* is deleted by Belser (following van Bebber), prompting Heinrich Holtzmann to remark: "Indeed the reasons advanced for the inauthenticity of *τὸ πάσχα* deserve every consideration, and only the relation of the nameless *ἑορτή* of 5:1 to Pentecost and the likewise nameless one of 6:4 to Tabernacles 7:2 is still needed to remove all ground from the traditional view, i.e. to establish the theory of Jesus' activity lasting only one year" (*Theol. Lit. Z.* 1906, col. 75). In 1907 R. Schütz also speaks in favor of deleting the disputed words, whereupon in 1908 Zahn (in the commentary) and in 1911 Pfättisch (*Die Dauer der Lehrtätigkeit Jesu*) again argue for the correctness of the text (cf. on the latter Hennecke in *Theol. Lit.-Z.* 1912, no. 10). Cf. further Holtzmann-Bauer 134 f.; Zahn a. a. O. 313, 708–712; ²318, 717–721; Holtzmann *Einl.* 429 f.; Bauer *Leben Jesu* 279 f.

481 From 6:4 it can by no means be concluded, as shown, that the striking explicit reference to the four months until harvest in 4:35 "cannot with full certainty be used as a calendrical date" (Holtzmann-Bauer). Quite deliberately the notice, which places the scene in December, is included for a very specific purpose: it is meant to orient with respect to the festival mentioned in 5:1, which is introduced as indeterminate (*μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδ.* ABD) because it was

not a temple festival but only a synagogal celebration (already in Josephus' time according to *Ant.* XI 6:13 generally widespread, lasting two days) with guest-banquets, etc. It bore the name Purim (Esth. 9:26) and fell in the late winter period (14th and 15th Adar), thus in close proximity to the harvest beginning in April and exactly one month before Passover. Jesus' return from the spring stay in Jerusalem (5:1 ff.) is not expressly reported (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 136). Shortly before Passover we find him at the Sea of Tiberias (6:1 ff.) and then hear (7:1, 2, 10) that after a longer stay in Galilee (forced upon him by the continued hostilities of the Jews; cf. 5:10, 16, 18) he went up to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles (thus in October). He therefore omitted the Passover journey there. This becomes all the more understandable when one recalls the position Jesus takes in the Fourth Gospel toward Jewish cult in general and toward the binding force of the Law. Precisely 7:2, 8, 9 shows that for Jesus an obligation of strict observance of Jewish temple and festival order is not recognized. The stone temple building is for him only a shadowy prototype of the true dwelling of God (2:19, 21). The 'Jewish purification' (2:6) is rendered obsolete. In 5:16–18; 7:19–23 Christ simply proves himself, through alleged Sabbath violation, as lord over the Sabbath, and according to 7:19, 22, 23 he also stands independent of the patriarchal and Mosaic commandment of circumcision. In this direction as well "Alexandrianism already makes itself felt" (Holtzmann *N. T.* II 363–365, ²404 f.). The Evangelist makes it quite clear that the main purpose of Jesus' festival journeys lay in making use of the opportunity, abundantly offered precisely along this route, for self-revelation through miracles and teaching.

482 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 150; Holtzmann *N. Th.* II 503, ²561 f.

483 Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*⁴ I 294.

484 Preller-Robert 702 ff.

485 Preller-Robert 695—702.

486 Cf. 2:4 (see above p. 3); moreover especially ch. 15.

487 Cf. in particular the summary treatment in Holtzmann-Bauer 213—215.

488 According to H. Holtzmann, in this miracle narrative (as also otherwise still in the Evangelist) the theory of religious poetic creation fails to some extent, according to which the historical form would be merely a clothing for the conclusions arising from those ideas; and it remains a riddle that and how, for one who as a disciple had daily seen and heard the real Jesus of history, personally experienced and fixed in memory actual events could be so easily and without resistance, so docilely and pliantly poured into ideal forms, which would then want and need to be understood simultaneously as allegories, such as the transformation of water into wine, the healing of the man born blind, the raising of Lazarus (Einl. 445 f.).

489 In this case one decides for particularly weighty reasons only with special difficulty.

490 In the case of Jairus' daughter the Synoptics give only the name of the father ("Jairus" he raised); in the case of the youth of Nain (Naim) only the name of the place. Cf. on both Nestle,

Philologica sacra 1896, p. 20 f., and *ZntW.* 1906, p. 185. One should also note in passing that Nain (Naim) lies in closest proximity to Endor, the place of necromancy.

491 Correctly emphasized by J. Reville, Loisy, Holtzmann-Bauer (on 11:20).

492 *Punāḥ samavyād vitatam vayanti*
madhyā kartor nyadhācchakṣaṇa dhīraḥ |
ut saṃhāyastād vyṛtīnradardhar
aramatiḥ savitā deva āgāt ||

493 Cf. de Gubernatis: *Quest' Aramati (la nostra aurora) è nel Rig-veda chiamata tessente (vayanti); quando la notte arriva, cessa dall' opera; quando sta per arrivare, al mattino, il divino Savitar, essa ripiglia il suo tessuto abbandonato la sera* (*Letture sopra la Mitologia vedica* 1874, p. 102). On Eos: "She is also the light of day and hardly ever identical with the actual day-goddess" (Preller-Robert 440).

494 While the verb *utsthā* in II 38, 1 as in VI 71, 4; VIII 27, 12 is predicated of Savitar, in II 38, 4 it refers to Aramati — the morning (through Savitar occasioned) resumption of daily work. In precisely this sense, however, *utsthā* is repeatedly used of the dawns (VI 64, 1; VII 77, 2). Alongside this, however, it is likewise clearly to be noted that the fourth verse, in the context of the "evening song" into which it is incorporated, has a disturbing effect. How much so is shown clearly enough by vv. 5–6 taken together with vv. 1–3. We are dealing with an insertion (at any rate a very old one), which rests on misunderstanding and perhaps occurred under the influence of *ud asthāt* (v. 1), *ramate* (v. 2), and *arramat* (v. 3) (cf. e.g. X 18, 11 and Grassmann on this). The image of the weaver Aramati is an elementary Indo-Aryan counterpart to that of Penelope: she rolls up in the evening what was woven during the day (ceases working on it), whereas Penelope dissolves her day-weaving upon the onset of night (*λύεσκε* — in essence with the same effect and meaning). The originally Arcadian nymph Penelope perhaps already means by name a weaver (cf. *πήνη, πῆνος, πηνίζομαι*; and the interpretation of Odysseus as the sun, for which see Roscher III 2, 1911 f.). From what has been shown it also emerges that the weaver of our Vedic passage cannot be the night (*moki* v. 3), as likewise that in *aramati* of our verse one is not to think of "the punctual (brief) prayer" (*ara[m]-mati*); the former was conjectured by Oldenberg (in *Abh. d. Kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Philol.-hist. Kl. N.F. XI 1908/09), the latter by Geldner (*Pischel-Geldner, Vedische Studien* 1897 II 257).

495 Cf. on Agni-Uṣas: VIII 19, 31; X 8, 3 f.; 92, 2 (Agni is the friend of the dawns, who precedes them; they kiss the reddish-shining one in greeting).

496 "Permeated by the poetry of the morning freshness and free from reference to the mystical subtlety of sacrificial technique, these compositions have a charm which the actual sacrificial hymns lack" (Oldenberg, *RV.* 236 f., ²242).

497 Cf. the especially frequent designation of Uṣas with the related adjective *maghoni* and the summary portrayal of the goddess, widely advancing, powerful, and richly bestowing, in VI 64 and VII 77. She is "the most beautiful light of lights" (I 113, 1), the "eternal light" (VII 76, 1).

498 Cf. the Uṣas attributes *ṛtapā* and *ṛtajātā-satya*.

499 From interpreting Aramati in VII 36, 8 as the earth-goddess (thus Tiele-Gehr II 148) one must therefore refrain. On Bhaga cf. also Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie* 1902, III 91—95. For our etymological and mythological explanation of *aramati* there remains only the reference to a series of passages which illuminate the nature of Uṣas precisely in this direction: she returns again without stopping, in regular, swift sequence (I 113, 3; V 37, 1); she is not tardy in her lighting-up (so that the sun does not burn her) (V 79, 9); she drives away the darkness like a swift charioteer (VI 64, 3); she hastens (*iyate*) to awaken the sleepers and bring them to their feet (I 48, 5; IV 14, 3; I 92, 1); she goes her path straight onward (I 124, 3); she journeys around the world in one day (I 123, 8; IV 51, 5; VII 75, 4).

500 Cf. *tiro mahlm aramatīm* with *anu mātaram pṛthivīm* VIII 92, 2.

501 In X 149, 1 the question may arise whether with *pṛthivīm aramnāt* an incidental allusion is not intended to the name Aramati as well (and with which interpretation of the earth-name in question).

502 She is especially frequently venerated alongside the “father” Heaven.

503 The simple adjective *ramati* occurs several times in Vedic usage (in the sense of gladly remaining, attaching oneself — of animals). With regard to the negative *aramati* cf. *aramamāna* (not resting — of Soma IX 72, 3).

504 Cf. *aramanas* (obedient to thought, VI 17, 10).

505 Cf. *vasūyu* as an attribute of the work of devotion in I 186, 11, of the morning worship in VII 67, 5.

506 Cf. *dhiyam yajñiyam*, the sacrificially worthy favor (of the gods), X 101, 9.

507 On VIII 31, 12 see Oldenberg in *Abh. d. K. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Gött.* a. a. O. XI 347. In the only remaining attestation V 54, 6, where the wind-gods are asked to guide the *aramati* of their worshippers toward well-being, one might, by comparison with v. 15, think of the same genius of piety as in VII 1, 6; 34, 21; X 64, 15. The immediately following verse 7, however, much rather presents the worshippers themselves as the object of divine guidance. The question therefore arises whether v. 6 did not originally have the word order: *aśa smā nah sajoso aramatim cakṣur iva yantam anu negathā sugam* (for indeed it leads us — like the eye the swift wanderer), whereby a subsequent proof for the adjective *aramati* from *ram* would also result (cf. *ajira* and *sarin*, the swift one, sc. Pūṣan I 138, 2. 3).

508 One might nevertheless ask whether traces of the very ancient conception are not still to be found here as well (e.g. Yašt 13, 3).

509 *Yasna* 28, 3; 33, 13; 34, 9–11; 43, 1. 10; 44, 7. 16; 47, 1; 48, 5; 51, 2. 11. 20. *Visprat* 3, 4. *Yasna* 12, 2 ff. *Yasht* 1, 27. 29. *Videvdāt* 18, 51.

510 The customary pronunciation is Ārmati (written Ārmaiti). Underlying this, entirely analogously to the Vedic name-form, one is to think: “so, as it is right, so it should be” (cf. *aremmati* “right thinking,” *aremmakhti* “right speaking,” Bartholomä, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* col. 188 f.). In contrast, the meter requires a four-syllable pronunciation, thus *aremaiti*. How one arrives from there at the spelling *ārmaiti* remains unclear. On the basis of the Armenian loanword *spandaramet* = Bacchus, one must conclude that in Arsacid times it was still pronounced *aram-* [*aramati*] “spoken” (Barthol. *A. W.* s. v. *ārmatay* col. 337).

511 *Yasna* 31, 9 (cf. Barthol. ad loc.); 45, 4 (likewise); 46, 12; 48, 5. On the transition from earth-goddess to earth-body see *Yasna* 47, 3; 16, 10; *Videvdāt* 2, 10 f.; 3, 35; 18, 64.

512 See on the verb *ram* Barthol. p. 1511. Cf. on the “stirring” (*thvakhṣā*) of the “house- and homestead-promoting” Ārmati, *Yasna* 46, 12. The adjective *thvakhṣa* is applied to Haoma, just as *aranamāna* (restless) is to Soma.

513 One should note passages such as *Yasna* 48, 5: “Good rulers shall rule — together with the works of good doctrine, O Ārmati! You, O Best One, bring for human beings the future birth (sc. the other life); but for cattle (create) agriculture! Let it be established firmly for our nourishment!” (Barthol.).

514 Attention should be drawn to the fact that in Luke 10:38–42 in 11:1–4 there immediately follows the section containing the Lord’s Prayer, whose close relationship to the Zarathustrian religion will still be demonstrated in the final section of our investigations.

515 One naturally thinks at first of coincidence. Cf., however, the historically actual combination of the names Salome and Semele in the nativity legend of the *Protevangelium of James* (c. 150), where likewise a consonantal interchange plays a role; Arn. Meyer (*Das Weihnachtsfest* 1913, p. 56). If with regard to Martha there should also be a relationship of dependence in reality, then the name, through Semitic reshaping (Μάρθα = מַרְתָּא: the mistress of the house), would have lost much of its characteristic determinacy.

516 Oldenberg, *RV.* I, 64.

517 There is therefore a good — religion-historical — reason why the evening bell is called the Ave Maria bell. On the name cf. Herzog, *Real-Encykl.*² V 191; ²VI 708.

518 Reference may be made to the brief discussion in Holtzmann, *Syn.* 346 f.

519 Cf. Holtzmann a. a. O. 120 on Mark 2:16: to the lurking scribes of the Pharisees the sight must have appeared all the more offensive, since table-fellowship was particularly difficult and painful for the legally strict Jews (Acts 11:3; Gal. 2:12).

520 Originally the one being appearing in the morning and again in the evening (see above); in the numerous hymns, as is only to be expected, celebrated above all as the morning deity.

521 She leaves him with the onset of full daylight.

522 Cf. Graßmann, *Rig-Veda* 1876, I, p. 360.

523 On the further matters in detail and in their interconnection it is not possible to enter here.

524 Cf. also *Rigv.* I 124, 5 (*vi prathate* — the dawn) and VII 78, 1; on the other hand, the characterization of the actual Pharisees in Matt. 6:1, 5: their giving of alms before people in order to be seen by them, their praying in public places in order to display themselves to people.

525 The “opened heaven” of the day in question, brought about by the spreading early light.

526 Cf., by contrast, Mark 14:3; Matt. 26:7. “In fact, two attestations of deeply felt gratitude are to be distinguished: the one proceeding from the pain of repentance of a pardoned sinner (to which belong tears of repentance and the kissing of the feet), the other from the deep feeling of loving veneration (to which belongs the anointing of the head)” (Holtzmann, *Syn.* 347).

527 The remaining seated at home (rendered by Luther entirely correctly in terms of sense) and the having-to-be-fetched of Mary (John 11:20, 28 f.) thus viewed receives a further special emphasis; in particular also the indignation of Jesus (11:33).

528 Cf. Furtwängler in Roscher I 1, 1154.

529 Cf. the two men or angels in Gen. 19:1, 15 (“in the evening” and “when the dawn rose”) and in Luke 24:4; John 20:12, where the duality is certainly not “an addition of the angel in Matthew and the angel in Mark” (H. Holtzmann), alongside which in the preceding context (John 20:2 ff.) Peter and John form a modified parallel to Martha and Mary. The pair of Marys in Mark 15:47 and Matt. 27:61 should also be included here: here too the two temporally separated forms of appearance of the daily change of light will have been combined, because by their nature they belong together.

530 From the perception of precisely this natural process one can explain not only Matt. 27:60 (the burial in Joseph’s own tomb; — in John 19:42 presumably assumed), but also the reappearance of the multi-formed Mary-type in Mark 15:40, 47; Matt. 27:56, 61; John 19:25. That a particularly transparent lunar myth is also contained in the Old Testament Joseph story may be noted in passing. One should compare especially Böklen, *Die „Unglückszahl“ dreizehn und ihre mythische Bedeutung* (*Mytholog. Bibliothek* V 2, 1913, p. 32).

531 On the Nicodemus of the Talmud from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, who is said actually to have been called Buni ben Gorion and to have been a disciple of Jesus and who “can at any rate have stood before the eyes of the Evangelist,” cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 93: the Nicodemus of the Evangelist is a “type of certain phenomena which Judaism certainly offered even into the times of the Evangelist.”

532 Cf. Grill, *Hundert Lieder des Atharva-Veda* 1888, pp. 51 f., 119 ff.

533 He did not grasp the spirit of the one who confronted him; thus his final act of homage is directed toward the preservation of the corpse.

534 It will hardly be necessary to recall the parallel of the allegorical designations of heretics in Rev. 2:6, 14 f. (Nicolaitans; Balaam, cf. Weizsäcker, *Apost.* Z. 509), which moreover, even according to their etymological sense, strangely correspond to the name Nicodemus as applied by the Evangelist. Whereas in the naturalistic myth-world of the Greeks the genius who represents the image of sleep-drunkenness (Endymion) appears as the beloved of the moon conceived as female (Selene), in the Zoroastrian religion, as a consequence of its ethical tendency, the corresponding deity *Būšyānstā*, the personified sleepiness and sluggishness, is outright branded as a seductive demon in the service of Ahriman. See especially the splendid passage *Videvdāt* 18, 14—17 (Wolff, *Avesta, die heiligen Bücher der Parsen übersetzt* 1910, p. 419).

535 One should note the deliberately literary, heightened circumstantiality and ponderousness of the exposition (with its negative result).

536 The relationship of the synoptic reporting with its details (Mark 15:40, 47; 16:1 ff.; Matt. 27:56, 61; 28:1; Luke 23:2; 24:10; Mark 16:9 ff.) to that of the Fourth Gospel is of no special relevance for our specific question. Of Mary, the mother of Jesus, whom our Evangelist nowhere names, there was and still is to be spoken of in another connection. The non-use of the Marian name is especially noteworthy precisely in her case, since the name of her husband Joseph is repeatedly used (1:45; 6:42).

537 The Eos of the Greeks (Preller-Robert 440).

538 Cf. Grill, *Hundert Lieder des Atharva-Veda* p. 193 f. (on XIX 53, 1). In *Rigv.* IV 50, 4 it is Bṛhaspati who blows away the darknesses with his seven rays.

539 Cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.* on Matt. 15:39.

540 Cf. de Lagarde in *Nachr. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen* 1887, pp. 371, 375.

541 Just as our Lorelei “combs her golden hair,” so the Magdalene too would presumably curl her own hair, and the intensive stem could indicate a desire to please. Willingly or unwillingly, the question would then also arise whether perhaps in the “Do not touch me!” (John 20:17), which is certainly not equivalent to “Do not detain me!”, a particular allusion might be contained. In the *Gospel of Peter* a very strong fear of the Jews is attributed to Magdalene and her female companions, which prevented them from giving timely expression to their grief over the death of Jesus (see Stülcken in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* 132); on the transfer of the attribute of a hair-curler (*megaddelā*) and at the same time of a prostitute to the mother of Jesus (Miriam) in the Babylonian Talmud see Arn. Meyer, ibid. II 51 f.

542 Cf. Arab. *gādala* “to quarrel, to oppose”; *gadāl, gadāl, gidāl* “strife”; *gadil, gadalīj* “quarrelsome”; Ethiop. *tagādala* “to quarrel”; *gadel* “strife”; *tagādālī* “quarreller”.

543 That this feature emerges both in Exod. 15:20 f. and in Num. 12 is obvious. We are here, understandably, also transferred into the realm of the very numerous **revelation-historical night-drive myths** (cf. Herm. Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*[4] p. 224 f.: “revelation myths”). On the

traditional presupposition of a report about historical events, the narrative of the latter passage in particular remains unintelligible. In Exod. 15 Miriam presents herself more indirectly than directly as the “female striver,” in that after the rescue accomplished by Yahweh (the God of heaven) for his people during the night (Exod. 14:20 f., 24–27) she strikes up the paean to him as commander and victor, alluding in v. 27 to sunrise and the disappearance of the host of stars at the new moon following Passover. The children of Israel (cf. the children of light and of the day, 1 Thess. 5:5) are mythically the endlessly multiplying days of the year (the twelve months), which at the beginning of spring — at Passover time — are freed from the winter night through the mediation of the numen of daylight (the sun). Cf. Volz, *Was wir von den babylonischen Ausgrabungen lernen* in *Zeitschr. f. Theologie und Kirche* 1904, p. 219, and on the quite analogous ancient Chinese conceptions Grube, *Geschichte der chinesischen Literatur* p. 188. This war-enthused Miriam is in fact the splendidly ascending spring dawn-red. With this we have already also gained the necessary point of reference for the interpretation of the much more difficult section Num. 12. Here Miriam herself is the striver: together with her brother Aaron she contests Moses’ right to the marriage with the “Cushite,” and indeed on account of the privilege arising from this union of Moses as mediator of revelation for Yahweh: “Has Yahweh spoken only with Moses? Has he not also spoken with us?” In Exod. 15:20 Miriam is called “the prophetess.” If mythical conception lies at the basis, then she is also in Num. 12 the personification of a phenomenon of heavenly light, namely of early light and the dawn: she announces sunrise and thereby comes into competition with the oracular deity belonging to the underworld *κατ’ ἐξοχήν*, the night (cf. Pauly, *Real-Enc.* V 720 and P. Weizsäcker in Roscher III 1, 572 f.), which is simply stigmatized as the dark Cushite (cf. Jer. 13:23). One recalls in this connection that morning dreams were considered truer than those before midnight (Pauly VI 1, 1285 f.). If, however, Aaron (whose name strikingly echoes that of the Vedic Atharvan; cf. also Merx, *Chrestomathia Targumica* 1888, p. 167) supports the jealous sister, this is explained by the fact that in this elder brother of Moses the sun is mythically conceived differently than in Moses himself: Aaron originally signifies the sun as the deity that kindles daylight (cf. the Agni of the Aryan Indians) and thus as the archetype of the priest, who not only sends up the daily sacrifice in fire toward the early-morning sky but is also mediator of revelation (holder of the Urim oracle). As far as Moses himself is concerned — said here incidentally — insofar as a mythical prototype is to be assumed, everything points to a **sun-hero** (originally sun-god) who unmistakably bears the traits of Apollo (the prophet, the *ἀρχηγέτης*, i.e. leader and settler of wandering tribes [Preller-Robert], the shepherd on God’s mountain, in a certain sense also the slayer of the serpent, Num. 21 f.), perhaps also of Heracles (cf. e.g. the *ἄθλοι* with reference to Num. 12:3). His name already brings him, as it seems, into a special relationship with the history of Israel’s emergence as the one who redeems the people from the night of Egyptian captivity and leads them through many hardships to Canaan: he is the hero of exodus and wandering, the personified *moschi* (thus according to Memphitic pronunciation; Theban: *moosche*) = *iter, ambulatio, exitus* (cf. Peyron, *Lexicon linguae copticae* 1835, p. 112 f.; Steindorff, *Koptische Grammatik* 1894, p. 72*). This is also supported by the Egyptian *p-sahō* (“secessio,” the departure), Hebraized in the form *nסָֽחַ*, the emigration (from *sahē* = *amovere, recedere*; with reciprocal suffix “to remove oneself”; cf. Peyron p. 223; Steindorff p. 79*); cf. especially Exod. 12:11: Passover is the festival of departure *κατ’ ἐξοχήν*. Further matters (also of a literary-critical nature) must be left aside here. That the image of the (partially) entered-upon (white) leprosy

(cf. Lev. 13 f.; Num. 12:10) indicates the paling and disappearance of the dawn following sunrise scarcely needs to be said. The account of Miriam's exclusion for seven days uses the myth for the purposes of ceremonial legislation (cf. Lev. 13). The consequence that Israel must halt for the same length of time (Num. 12:15) serves to reinforce the emphasis of this conclusion in terms of purity law, which — in substance — is evidently secondary.

544 *κατῆλθεν ἐς δύσιν ἠώς* (Musaeus 110).

545 Rapp in Roscher I 1, 1255.

546 Rapp a. a. O. I 1, 1265 ff., 1269.

547 Preller-Robert 408 f.

548 Apollodorus III 14, 3. See Rapp a. a. O. 1268.

549 The *o* or derivations from *ἀστὴρ* have in later times frequently passed over into *ω*. The answering of the question which light, according to what has been set forth, comes into consideration in Luke 24:18 (*Κλεοπᾶς*), where likewise the evening time comes into view (— evening star together with the morning star?), would lead too far. For a most recent attempt at a non-historical attribution of the name-complex see Ed. Meyer (*U. A.* I 74).

550 On the influence of the Babylonian-Mesopotamian moon cult on the Old Testament and Judaism, which "by all appearances was particularly strong," cf. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das A. T.*³ p. 364 ff.

551 Cf. *Unters.* I 300.

552 One should note by way of comparison that the cult of the dawn celebrated in the Rig-Veda had its place only at the beginning of the year, which is at the same time the beginning of spring. As I believe, the comparison teaches us unequivocally that the Aryan primeval period did not at all know a divine personification of the dawn, detached from the sun and set over against it as a special figure beside it or opposite it. This separation is only the result of a later development, which bestowed upon the Indians their Uṣas, upon the Greeks their Eos in this special shaping (L. v. Schröder, *Arische Religion* 1916, II 16 f.).

553 The wording of the verse renders what is narrated almost unimaginable, as is also demonstrated by the manifold artificial attempts at explanation. The question how the Evangelist himself conceived the process is, in view of what has been said above, of wholly subordinate significance.

554 It is not possible here to go into all the details of the parable. That it has undergone an "expansion" in vv. 27—31 has long been recognized. With regard to the dogs appearing with Lazarus at the gate of the rich man, reference has been made to related conceptions, such as those discussed in particular by de Gubernatis (*Die Tiere in der indogermanischen Mythologie*, translated by Hartmann 1874, p. 351 ff.). Perhaps the figure of the Egyptian magician Setme

Khamuas, concerning the rich and the poor in the hereafter and in the underworld (see Arn. Meyer in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II 53), goes back to the same mythic basic conception as the parable in Luke. The latter, in its reinterpretation and elaboration of the original nature-motif, shows especially the shaping power of religious imagination, which in unwilting freshness adapts itself to the historical transformations of modes of conception. Cf. also Gräßmann, *Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus* — with Egyptological contributions by G. Möller in *Abh. Berl. Ak.* 1918, and Ed. Meyer, *U. A.* I 224.

555 The epithet “afflicted with sores” originally belonged to a different context; the parable is based on a combination of two different lunar myths.

556 Cf. how in Job 2:12 the complete disfigurement of Job, which makes him unrecognizable, is emphasized.

557 Cf. Holtzmann, *Syn.* 171.

558 One also notes that here the form of appearance of Lazarus is disregarded (it corresponds to “six days before the Passover,” the half-moon phase). He stands at least on the point of regaining his full (healthy) appearance.

559 It may therefore remain undecided whether and to what extent an influence of Parsism (cf. *Vend.* 19:27 ff.) comes into question here: three days pass before the departed soul has fully torn itself loose from the earthly sphere; only on the fourth day is its fate definitively determined (cf. Lehmann in Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*² 1897, II 200 f., ¹ II 221; Böklén, *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie* 1902, p. 27 ff.; Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 151). In any case one will repeatedly recall the general remark of Simrock: nothing leads the myth-interpreter more easily onto cliffs than the effort to dissolve every poetic detail into thought (*Handbuch der deutschen Mythologie*³ p. 207, ² 213).

560 That here immediacy was required by a sense of style is self-evident.

561 On the extraordinarily strong epigraphic and pictorial, above all numismatic, attestation cf. Drexler in Roscher (art. *Men*) II 2, 2687—2763. It may perhaps also be recalled here that in Mesopotamia (Ḥarrān) the Babylonian lunar cult (of Sin) had found a principal seat.

562 As regards the identification of Sabazios and Dionysos in more recent and most recent times, reference is to be made to the well-founded objection of Eisele (following Gruppe and O. Crusius) (Roscher IV 1, 258 f.).

563 From Asia Minor, where Phrygia and Lydia were the principal centers of his cult, he found his way to the islands, to Greece, and into the Roman Empire (Eisele a. a. O. p. 235 ff.).

564 Cf. Proclus in *Timaeus* 4, 251, according to which Men was sung as Sabazios in hymns in the rites of Sabazios (Eisele p. 262). “Of myths in which Men plays a role we know nothing. Yet we can safely assume that such existed. For everywhere in the world myths attach themselves to the moon. For Men Smirnoff (*Über den phrygischen Gott Men*, 1895, p. 130) infers a myth

from the circumstance that Tertullian *Apol.* 14 names among the gods whose myths were parodied on the stage the *mascula luna*" (Drexler a. a. O. 2763).

565 The representation seems to bring before us the solemn procession of the cult statue of Sabazios led by Men. See the illustration and discussion in Eisele pp. 243 f., 262.

566 Cf. Drexler a. a. O. 2764: "That the mysteries of Men promised the blessed immortality of the god we may conjecture by analogy with other oriental cults (cf. Rohde, *Psyche* p. 687, n. 1) and from the circumstance that even today various peoples associate the idea of rebirth with the new moon." It may perhaps also be pointed out that Men, with the epithet *Καταχθόνιος*, is designated in Asia-Minor inscriptions, similarly to Selene, as protector of the tomb. "We find his image on grave reliefs — and on a tomb erected to him himself in Dorylaion" (Drexler 2768). Another possibility would be, instead of Dionysos-Sabazios, to think of the double of Dionysos: *Ἀπόλλων Διονυσόδοτος* as *Νεομήνιος* (Prel.-Robert 238 3. 247. 263). We shall return to the modifying parallel: Jesus and Apollo.

567 Likewise, the striking similarity of the mode of expression (*λύσατε*) in 2:19 and 11:4 appears, despite the difference in meaning of the verb in the two passages, to be intentional. The customary translation "break down" in 2:19 is therefore not to be called satisfactory, even if German offers nothing better.

568 In the usage of the verb *λαμβάνειν* (10:17–18), which means receiving as well as taking, a special nuance lies.

569 Cf. Prel.-Robert 686, 805.

570 Further source attestations see in Prel.-Robert 686 f.

571 Ibid. 695 f.

572 See above p. 98. Rohde, *Psyche* II 117 f. On the reflection thereby suggested concerning the injustice (*ἀδικία*) of the murderers of Dionysos, which demands repentance and punishment, and on the philosophical parallel of the doctrine of Anaximander, see Rohde p. 119.

573 The Marys explicitly mentioned by name in v. 25 can be disregarded here. Concerning the Magdalene see above p. 179 ff.

574 See above p. 193. It must not be forgotten that, just as Demeter, so also the mother of Dionysos, Semele, is a personification of fertile earth (cf. Prel.-Robert 660). On the Orphic Dionysos as the son of Zeus and Persephone, called by some also Sabazios according to the mythological handbook used by Diodorus IV 41, see Eisele in Roscher IV 1, 235 and above p. 190 f.

575 Especially in the "great mysteries" of Eleusis (Prel.-Robert 793). It may be noted in passing that from these mysteries, among other things, a surprising light is also cast upon the cock of the Passion narrative, which belongs to its basic stock and thus also appears in John 13:38;

18:27. “In works of art Persephone appears, like Pluton, with a cornucopia or with ears of grain and a cock, the symbol of her rising in spring, when the beautiful season calls her to the light.” That the bird is also to be regarded as a domestic animal in Eleusis is shown by Porphyry, *De abst.* IV 16. Cf. Prel.-Robert 803.

576 In the case of Demeter *Achaia*, for whom the Boeotians celebrated a mourning festival (called *ἐπαχθής*) in the month Damatrios (the sowing month, October) (*ὡς δ᾽ διὰ τὴν τῆς κόρης κάθοδον ἐν ἄχει τῆς Δήμητρος οὔσης* Plut. *Is. Os.* 69 p. 378 D), according to a common explanation of the ancients the character of the sorrowful one (cf. *ἄχος* and *ἄχθεσθαι*, and Curtius, *Grundzüge der griech. Etym.* 8180) would already be expressed in the name. The cult of the old Gephyraean goddess, who in reality was designated as Achaean, had also become established in the vicinity of Athens. Cf. Prel.-Robert 752.

577 The freedom of typological comparison here also becomes evident in the fact that, in the case of Jesus, the wine miracle and death fall in the same season.

578 The Hellenized New Testament form of the Hebrew name of the mother of Jesus (Mirjam): Μαρία (in Luke almost throughout archaistically Μαριάμ) could easily remind the Hellenic reader and interpreter of names of *μαρμαίρω* (to shimmer, to gleam; in Homer also said of the sparkling eyes of Aphrodite) with its numerous derivatives, and thus in particular also of the strongly mythic personal name Μαῖρα (the Shining One — applied, among other things, to the feminine Sirius as well as to the moon). In this connection one may compare that already the Veda distinguished Eos (Uṣas) precisely with the epithets *citrā, vibhātrī, rocamānā, śukrā, subhrā, bhadrā*, all of which mean “the Shining One”; indeed, Uṣas itself already means: the Luminous One. How much ground there is, however, for such a combination could in its own way also be recognized in the southern hymn to the “Virgin” Mary:

Vergine bella fra tutte le belle,
Cinto lo capo di dodici stelle!
Vergine santa fra tutte le sante,
Ricco lo manto di luce fiammante!

She appears here, with the diadem of stars upon her head, wrapped in the ascending fiery glow of the morning sun. At the same time, on the other hand, the Veda once again makes intelligible how in the Lazarus story the same name Maria can bear the evening glow (see above p. 172): there too Uṣas in *Rigv.* X 127:3.7 is this latter light-phenomenon; she is urged, at the onset of the star-bright night, to collect the debts from her sister like a gambler, i.e. to draw the remainder of daylight to herself and depart (cf. Graßmann ad loc.). On how in the Veda Aramati can also designate morning and evening glow see above pp. 165, 179.

579 On the combination of the two names in the *Protevangelium of James* see above p. 172 and cf. A. Meyer: “The origin of this Salome is hardly doubtful: she is a transformation of Semele, the mother — according to others the nurse — of the Dionysos child born in the cave” (Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II 127).

580 On the question of identity see above pp. 27–32.

581 Whether 13:23 *ἀνακείμενος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is intended at least to recall 1:18 (the bosom-friend of Jesus corresponding to the child in the bosom of God)?

582 Cf. Waitz, *Die Quelle der Philippusgeschichten* 8:5–40 in *ZntW* 1906, pp. 340–355.

583 On 13:6 see above n. 92.

584 Further details see in Holtzmann-Bauer 3.

585 Westcott–Hort: Ἰωάνης. On this see Nestle, *Einführung in das griech. N. T.*² 1899 pp. 130, 203; ³1909 pp. 175 f., 267, and Chapman (*The order of the Gospels in the parent of Cod. Bezae*) in *Z.nt.W.* 1905 p. 345: “It is interesting to find that the older spelling was Ἰωάνης. We may infer that this was the spelling of the name in the Western New Testament of the second century, as it is also the spelling of the neutral text. In this case it is certainly the first century orthography.” The Hebrew proper name Jehochanan, Jochanan is rendered variously in the LXX. On the spelling Ἰωάννης in Josephus see Schlatter in *Beitr. z. Fördr. christl. Theol.* 1913 p. 56.

586 On Διόνυσος and still other name-forms conditioned by dialectal variation see especially Prel.-Robert 664 and Rohde *Psyche* II 39 f. The loss of the initial *d* from the root *div* (to shine) in names of Indo-European mythology is shown by Latin in a series of examples such as *Jovis, Juppiter, Juno*. In view of this phenomenon on linguistic-historical ground, one should not be surprised in our case at the questionable effect, already suggested by popular combinatory thinking, of the similarity in sound between Ἰωαν[ν]ης and Διόνυσος.

587 Whether purely personal or on the basis of a tradition that had come to him?

588 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 295 f.

589 The sour wine (*posca*) prepared from grape pomace, of the Roman soldiers.

590 It is no less understandable that in the Fourth Evangelist, in contrast to the Synoptics (Luke 23:36 f.; Matt. 27:47, 49; Mark 15:35 f. suffers from obscurity), mention is omitted of a coarse, mocking behavior of the Roman soldiers in the giving of drink to the dying man, whereby, of course, the exceptions reported in Mark 15:39; Matt. 27:48, 54; Luke 23:47 also fall away. The general salvation-historical evaluation of paganism in comparison with Judaism, as it has been elucidated (see above pp. 55 ff.), seems to have been decisive here. At the same time, however, we are reminded that in the same Evangelist it is a Samaritan woman who, at the beginning of the messianic activity of Jesus, in a significant moment complied with his request for a drink of water (4:7; see above pp. 52 f.).

591 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer (following Keim) 295.

592 One should note in passing that the first word which, in the only conversation between the mother of Jesus and her son reported by the Fourth Evangelist, comes from her mouth is *οἶνον* (with deliberate fronting of precisely this word), and the last word of Jesus before his *τετέλεσται* is: *διψῶ!* Cf. on this above p. 112 n. 345 (Semele–Thyone).

593 Cf. Baentsch, *Exodus–Lev.* p. 101 (on Ex. 12:22). Nowack, *Hebräische Archäologie* 1894 p. 298. The subtle conjecture of Joachim Camerarius, still repeatedly approved even in recent times — *ὑσσῷ προπεριθέντες*, according to which the sponge would have been placed on a throwing spear — is tempting. But apart from the dubious intensification of the expression of roughness in the soldiers' procedure that would thereby arise, it is here especially improbable that the Fourth Evangelist wished to depart from the conception of the Synoptics (in both cases *περιθεὶς καλάμῳ*). In view of the significance typologically assigned by him to the reed (see above p. 115 n. 350) and his acknowledged strong inclination toward hidden allusions, it is more plausible to explain the choice of the plant name *ὕσσωπος* by the fact that it covertly contained the word for projectile *ὕσσος*. This combination also corresponds, as will immediately be shown, to the parallel mystery of the lance-thrust, with which we obtain the synonymous *λόγχη*.

594 See above p. 131 (n. 391). Dionysos is also called *δορατοφόρος* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus; his thyrsus is *telum, cuius mucro hedera lambente protegitur* (Macrob. *Sat.* I 1–9 1; Prel.-Robert 712). On the thyrsus-weapon of the Maenads cf. Eurip. *Bacch.* 25, 733, 1199 f. It deserves attention that according to the *Gospel of Peter* (3:9), as well as according to the *Acts of John* (ch. 27) and the Sibylline Oracles (I 374; VIII 296), Jesus is pierced with a *κάλαμος* (for details see Bauer, *Leben Jesu* p. 209).

595 The double counterpart of Homeric *ἰχώρ*, the life-fluid of the immortal gods, the *ἄμβροτον αἷμα* of the *ἀναίμονες* (Il. 5.340, 416).

596 Cf. *Unters.* I 16.

597 Holtzmann-Bauer: "However strange this sign-language perceptible on the corpse of Jesus may appear to our taste, such a synoptic view of Old and New Testament history was of all the greater importance for the one who sought, along the path prepared by 1 Cor. 5:7, to demonstrate the displacement of the type by the antitype that had taken place" (p. 299).

598 Holtzmann-Bauer: "The entire scene opens itself only to an understanding of the threefold sense of Scripture" (on 19:31–37).

599 With reference to scriptural words, only *τελείωσις* (of something spoken) in Luke 1:45 and Judith 10:9 can be compared with *τελειοῦν*.

600 Cf. Prel.-Robert 795.

601 Cf. Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* p. 95. Hans von Soden (*μυστήριον* and *sacramentum* in the first two centuries of the Church) in *ZntW* 1911, p. 190.

602 The divine consecration of Jesus effected with reference to the entire revelation of the Logos in the flesh (10:36; cf. 6:69: the one sent by God, vv. 29, 38, 39, 44, is the Holy One, the Consecrated of God [Mark 1:24]) forms the presupposition and foundation of his self-consecration in expiatory suffering unto death (17:19: ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν). On this basis the Evangelist introduces, in the concluding context of the passion narrative, the figurative conception of a mystery-consecration taken over from Jesus with reference to death and the *res post mortem futurae*. This is also betrayed by the mode of expression: τετελείωται = fulfilled in accordance with the mystery. Note incidentally in Luke 12:50 βαπτισμῷ τελεσθῆναι with reference to Jesus' suffering unto death!

603 That it was foreseen and then unfolded in accordance with Scripture, in part down to details, is repeatedly noted by the narrator.

604 Cf. what was said above (pp. 140 f.) on the connection of the footwashing and the Lord's Supper. With respect to the suffering unto death itself, the *mater dolorosa* (see above, p. 196) has already led to a comparison with the Eleusinian mysteries. Here too the suffering and death of a divine being are re-enacted in holy and mysterious celebration, and the hoped-for effect for the initiates consists in "better and sweeter hopes beyond the end of life and a consoling view of the whole of human existence" (Prel.-Robert 793 ff.). See on this the statements of Pindar, Sophocles, Isocrates, Cicero, and especially Rohde. He emphasizes that the Eleusinian festival, through the hopes it opened to those initiated into it and from which these arose—namely, that only to them was granted to live truly in Hades, while for the others there was only evil to be expected there—was distinguished from all similar celebrations (Ps. I 289 f.). He speaks outright of promises of a "blessed" immortality. As regards the required προκάθαρσις and προαγωγή for this celebration (cf. Prel.-Robert 790, 5), it must of course not be forgotten that "no one speaks of any moral obligation in the mysteries and accordingly of any moral effect of the celebration" (Rohde, loc. cit. 299).

605 In particular one may well think of the raising of Lazarus, the footwashing, the farewell discourses, the high-priestly prayer, the exposure and exclusion of Judas, the warning of Peter, the self-responsibility, the bequest for the mother and the beloved disciple.

606 Cf. 11:35, 33, 38; 12:27; 13:1, 31.

607 Anointing in Bethany, voice from heaven (12:28—despite v. 30), festive reception in Jerusalem, appearance of the Greeks, betrayal, denial, condemnation, mistreatment.

608 Cf. the Neoplatonic dialogue *Axiochos* 371 D.

609 Stephanus of Byzantium, s.v. "Ἄγρα" and "Ἄγρας." Prel.-Robert 790 f. The Dionysian spring festival of the Chytrai (see above, p. 109) stands in an inner relationship to the autumnal (Dionysos-)Iacchos festival of the great Eleusinia, at which this god is brought in effigy from his temple in Athens to Eleusis and participates with his worshipers in the mystery of the motherly earth (Demeter): at this point in time he goes to meet his death like Demeter's child Persephone.

610 Rohde, *Ps.* II 44 f.

611 Höfer in Roscher II 1, 4. Prel.-Robert 793, 1. We probably have before us originally only two different personifications and designations of one and the same natural phenomenon.

612 Rohde, *Ps.* I 284. — In the peculiar interlude, the mockingly coarse rebuke of Peter in the courtyard (Mark 14:66; Matt. 26:69; Luke 22:55; John 18:15) of the high priest by his maidservant, one is involuntarily reminded of the similar intermezzo in the mourning case of Demeter: she is cheered up at the πέτρα ἀγέλαστος by the coarse jokes of the maid Iambe. Should the latter scene, which with its astonishing effect forms a completely naturalistic trait of Greek-religious sensibility, already have tinged—*mutatis mutandis*—the synoptic relation of the evangelical passion narrative (there comedy, here tragedy; there lightening, here reproach of unfaithfulness and cowardly dissimulation; there the mother of the mourned divine person, here the disciple of the God's Son to be mourned—in the presence of participating eye- and ear-witnesses), and in the tradition of Matthew's Gospel, with the additionally appearing "other" maid, unconsciously have been influenced by Baubo (according to the Orphic version of the saga replacing Iambe; nurse in the service of Demeter, wife of Dysaules in Eleusis; Prel.-Robert 789, 2; Roscher I 1, 752 f.)? As I noticed only subsequently, Butler had already conjectured something similar (though mixing dissimilar things; cf. on the mockery of Jesus the excursus in C. Clemen, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion im ältesten Christentum* 1916, pp. 100 ff.): namely, that the mockery of Jesus by soldiers and people corresponded to the jokes made at the Eleusinia and other mysteries (*Nineteenth Century* 1905 LVII 495; cf. Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 145). A counterpart to the burlesque inserted into the autumnal passion festival of the Eleusinian cult is offered by the late medieval Church with its "Easter laughter," which often followed the spring festival of the *passio magna Christi* "as compensation for the hardships of the fast" (Christlieb in Herzog, *Real.-Enc.*² XVIII 512).

613 With the Logos-Christ, strictly speaking, the temptation, like the wrestling in Gethsemane as conceived by the synoptists, would be contradictory in itself. For the transfiguration of the Logos-Christ, however, the hour struck only after the completion of the messianic work, as this consisted entirely in revelation and thus also in the glorification of God. Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 17:5.

614 Note the threefold ταῦτα in v. 16.

615 It is essential that here the entry, unlike with the Synoptists, is not an action of Jesus involving a pair of disciples; rather, Jesus experiences what befalls him providentially, as it were, accidentally (ἑωρών v. 14), from which it also follows that ἐποίησεν v. 16 cannot be referred to the disciples; especially, however, that our narrator—although he adheres to Matthew with the reference to Zech. 9:9—nevertheless does not take over the royal predicate πραΰς reproduced by the latter and rightly placed at the front, and thus has made the messianic riding animal stand out even more.

616 Left doubtful in Mark and Luke (πῶλος).

617 Here not as a peace animal, but on account of its priapic character (Prel.-Robert 714).

618 It should further be expressly noted that the death of Jesus falling in the springtime, in analogy with the Dionysian festivals that allow the god at this time to come to full expression of life, is not in contradiction insofar as that death in reality was no dying (11:26; 5:26), but an immediate transition into the stage of the completed, pure, spiritual life-revelation of the Logos-Christ (as for the disciples, in the mystery of their inner life-conduct, it brought entry into the *epopteia* and ζωή αἰώνιος). On the other hand, it is added that Dionysos himself, after the lapse of the three winter months sacred to him, yields his place to the light-god Apollo (the "Dionysodotos"); Prel.-Robert 245; see also note 712.

619 v. 14: ὄναριον; v. 15: πῶλον ὄνου.

620 One scarcely needs to recall the Old Testament's favored use of the animal image generally to depict the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Cf., besides Deut. 32:11, 33:17, especially Hos. 10:11 (Ephraim and Judah as plowing and harrowing work-animals) and Zech. 10:3: "Yahweh looks after his flock and makes them his proud war-horse." How readily our Evangelist, starting from the image of the flock where it concerns Christ as the shepherd, also comes to the pagan world of peoples, is shown by the cited passage.

621 Cf., by contrast, on the Hellenic mode of conception, Rohde, *Ps.* II 375 f.: "It is proper to the god—as Plato still clearly expresses it—to live eternally in an inseparable union of body and soul" (*Phaedr.* 246 C–D; *Tim.* 41 A/B).

622 19:30: παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα does indeed not mean "he gave up the spirit," but rather: he handed it over, whereby there can be no doubt that the Father is meant (cf. 17:1–5; 11:41). This trait, which reaches back beyond the τετέλεσται and attaches itself to the διψῶ of v. 28, cannot have been conceived by the Evangelist in contradiction to 5:26. What was to be emphasized was the psychologically genuine human element in the final moment of Jesus' earthly life (perhaps consciously anti-gnostic?). Cf. 11:35.

623 Cf. *Untersuchungen* I 359 f.

624 See Rohde, *Ps.* (I 132 f.) II 132, where it is at the same time pointed out that this version does not belong together with the one according to which the human race arose from the Dionysian-Titanic substance of the Titans' bodies destroyed by lightning (cf. above, p. 98).

625 Himerius, *Or.* IX 4. Cf. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 569. Prel.-Robert 696.

626 Origen, *c. Cels.* IV 17. The reunification of the limbs of Dionysos likewise mentioned in the Orphic-theogonic rhapsodies and attributed to Apollo does not, according to Rohde (loc. cit.), refer to a reanimation of the dead one but to his burial. The same he conjectures for the Διονύσου μελῶν κολλήσεις according to Julian, *adv. Christ.* p. 167, 7 Neum.

627 Cf. Dieterich, *De hymn. Orph.* 51. Jessen in Roscher IV 1, 664. See also, on the miraculous self-help of the bound god in the struggle with his mortal enemy Pentheus, above, pp. 123, 146 (note 434).

628 Cf. Rohde, loc. cit.

629 Prel.-Robert 244.

630 Cf. the plague-song of the women of Elis: Ἔλθειν ἥρως Διόνυσε Ἁλίον ἐς ναὸν ἁγνόν etc. (Prel.-Robert 695).

631 The same, 245.

632 The same, 698.

633 Rohde, *Ps.* II 12, 2.

634 Cf. Prel.-Robert 486, 488, 695. What is involved here is the contrast to the rigidifying power of winter.

635 Rohde, *Ps.* II 13, 132.

636 Cf. above, p. 194. Rohde, *Ps.* II 45, 1. On the contradiction between the general Dionysos myths (corresponding to the annual change in nature) and the trieteric ones (determined by a different chronological numerical symbolism), see above, pp. 113 f. That, according to the "predominant" Greek conception, Dionysos is in the water during winter was emphasized by Usener (*Sintfl.* 179) (cf. Ernst Schmidt in Wünsch–Deubner, *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* VIII 2, 89): vegetation is to be driven forth only out of the moist ground of the earth.

637 Horace, *Epist.* II 1, 5; cf. *Od.* III 3, 13. Prel.-Robert 685. Further details follow.

638 Origen, *c. Cels.* loc. cit.: Διονύσου—οἷον ἀναβιώσκοντος καὶ ἀναβαίνοντος εἰς οὐρανόν.

639 The "seeing again": a concept introduced into the Christian worldview in 14:18–21 and 16:16, 17, 19, 22 (Holtzmann-Bauer 249).

640 See, however, Holtzmann-Bauer on 14:18: "Even if the ἔρχομαι πρός ὑμᾶς must, because of 20:19, 26, be referred to the appearances of the Risen One, these nevertheless come into consideration in this context only insofar as they are intended to ground the consciousness of imperishable communion with the one removed beyond the limits of finitude. — In any case, the assumption of a double sense remains justified."

641 The word μοναί (places to remain) is deliberately chosen; it is perhaps also meant incidentally to suggest that these dwellings are already waiting for their inhabitants before Jesus' ascent (μένειν τινί). Cf. *Pesachim* 54a; *Nedarim* 39b: paradise is created before the world, i.e., "it forms a component part of the eternal plan of salvation of God" (Weber,

Altsynagogale palästinische Theologie 1880, pp. 330; ²344). The train of thought of 14:1–4 seems to be this: Let not your heart be troubled (at the thought of the announced separation: 13:33, 36); believe in God and believe in me (provision is made for you). In my Father's house (to which I am going) there are many dwellings (also for you). If it were not so, I would have told you: "I go away to prepare a place for you, and when I have gone and prepared a place for you, I come again and will take you to myself, so that you also may be where I am." (Such preparation, however, is not required.) And as for the place to which I am going, you know (already) the way (by which, after my return, I shall fetch you into my Father's house;—this way, as v. 6 shows, is no other than the faith in Jesus as the Son of God demanded in v. 1). It is possible that the Evangelist, with the οἰκία and the μοναί of 14:2, had in mind the contrast to the δόμος (the δόμοι) of Zeus καταχθόνιος, Hades (Aidoneus) (cf. Prel.-Robert 798 ff.). In Hellenic religion nothing stood in the way of also making Dionysos the son of the underworld Zeus (Plouton, Zagreus) (see above, pp. 97 f., 193). Positively, an allusion to *garō demāna* (-nmāna)—the dwelling destined for the "orthodox" humans (Yasht 3, 4), the abode of Mazda and of the Blessed, paradise—could come into consideration. The souls of the deceased righteous rest in sunny dwellings of the deity of righteousness (Aša): *Yasna* 16, 7; *Visperad* 19, 2; *Yasht* 3, 1 (Barthol., *AW.* 1424). In *Yasna* 46, 14 the poet prays: "You who will unite in the same house (with yourself), O Mazdā Ahura, those—I will call" (meaning the chief supporters of Zarathustra's work of conversion). Not entirely remote would be the Buddhist dwellings in heaven (cf. Garbe in *Ostasiat. Zeitschr.* 1912, p. 363), which already by their name *vimāna* (= traversing) refer back to the basic conception of the gods' chariot flying through the atmosphere (already *Rigv.* II 40, 3), as a comparison.

642 In the first instance, in 14:3, according to the context, the Parousia (in allusion to ideas such as in 1 Thess. 4:16?) is probably meant in any case. The mode of expression, however, also has here something shimmering about it, which just as well allows one to think of the ongoing "home-bringing" of individuals at their death (one recalls 2 Cor. 5:8; Matt. 16:28), as of the mystical union of the believer with the transfigured Christ and through him with the Father, not conditioned by any external event and not datable (cf. John 14:23).

643 Cf. also Bauer, *Leb. J.* p. 246 ff.

644 Heitmüller, Holtzmann-Bauer on 13:32 (see above).

645 Holtzmann-Bauer, ad loc.

646 On the imperceptible transition from Jesus' discourse into the Evangelist's reflection from ch. 3 onward see Holtzmann-Bauer.

647 The "brazen serpent" is originally an image of the lightning that flashes through the storm-cloud (cf. the "flame of the flashing sword," Gen. 3:24) and, through its discharge, of the serpent that bestows water and bread upon humanity (v. 5)—the serpent that, according to the Veda, is identical with the "son of the waters," the "serpent of the deep [cloud]": *ahir budhniyas*; cf. especially *Rigv.* VII 34, 14–17, i.e. the lightning, which in the Veda, also represented as a thunderbolt, is frequently called brazen (*āyasa*: *Rigv.* I 52, 8; 56, 3; 80, 12; 81, 4; 121, 9; VIII 85,

3; X 48, 3; 96, 3, 4). This lightning-serpent is an attribute of the supreme being (corresponding both to Zeus *κεραύνιος* and to Zeus *ἀλεξίκακος*, *ἀποτρόπαιος*, *ἐξακεστήριος*, *καθάρσιος* of the Greeks), and thus certainly also belonged immediately to the being depicted in Nehushtan and worshiped in the temple (2 Kings 18:4), as associated from the outset with the weather-god Yahweh. As such it therefore forms—although called *saraph* (cf. the seraphim, Isa. 6:2)—the opposite of the death-bringing serpents of the Numbers narrative, whose name *seraphim* already designates them as burning, and evokes scorching and drying sun-rays of the sirocco season, which render humans mortally endangered not only through increased hunger and thirst, but also through diseases such as "sunstroke" (cf. Gen. 41:6, 23, 27; Hos. 13:15; Ezek. 17:10; 19:12; on sunstroke: Jonah 4:8; Isa. 49:10; Ps. 121:6). In Greek mythology, the piercing effect is regarded as a principal characteristic of the rays of Helios in general (cf. Rapp in Roscher I 2, 1999–2001). The image of the serpent also lay close at hand with regard to the daily breaking forth of light-rays from the subterranean darkness and their evening slipping back into it. While therefore Weinreich's assumption (in Wünsch-Deubner, *RVV* VIII 168–170) that the brazen serpent served "as an image of the harmful thing for the removal of harm" is not applicable, the biblical case nevertheless shares with numerous instances of profane talismanic usage (*telesmata*) the believing gaze upon the saving image; and the latter is at least so constituted in Num. 21 that it at the same time recalls the being rendered harmless.

648 On parallel passages for this typology see Holtzmann-Bauer 89.

649 Through crucifixion, contrary to the will of those crucifying (8:28).

650 Cf. on this and on the "essential identity of the conception of being glorified (*δοξάζεσθαι*) with that of being exalted (*ὑψοῦσθαι*)" Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 428 f.; 478 f. The death presupposed in the exaltation is in 3:16, as it seems, only allusively referred to, because in the overall context it forms a subordinate moment, with the verb *ἔδωκεν* (cf. *παρέδωκεν* Rom. 8:32). Strictly speaking, *κατέπεμψεν* would have had to be said (cf. the simple *πέμπειν* in 4:34; 5:23, 24, 30, 37; 6:38, 39, 41–44; 7:16, 18, 28, 33; 8:16, 18, 26, 29; 9:4; 12:12, 44, 45, 49; 13:20; 14:24; 15:21; 16:5).

651 The serpent is the incarnate god (cf. Eisele in Roscher IV 1, 252). Serpents were foreign to the Greek Dionysos cult, but not to the Thracian one, from which they were derived (Rapp in Roscher II 2, 225; Küster, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion* in Wünsch-Deubner, *RVV* XIII 2, 118).

652 *Unters.* I 290 f. — "The hopes of blessedness of the Sabazios mystai are illustrated by the images on the monument of Vibia (in the catacombs of Praetextatus) and of Vincentius. — How this Vincentius, who calls himself a worshiper of the gods and an *antistes Sabazis* (= Sabazii), could pass as a Christian among Christian archaeologists is difficult to understand" (Rohde, *Ps.* II 400 f.; cf. Eisele in Roscher IV 1, 255).

653 The golden serpent drawn through the bosom during initiation into the Sabazios mysteries (Clemens *Protr.* 2, 16; Arnob. 5, 21; Firmic. *Mat. de errore prof. rel.* c. 10) made present the act of the god's marriage with the believer—represented thereby as the female part—and at the

same time the begetting of a new human being, a god-related being in the mystery (his rebirth in this sense). One may compare how in the Orphic Hymn LII 11 the trieteric Bakchos is also invoked: *ὑποχθόνιε* (Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie* 122 f.). “This holy wedding is the actual climax of the cult and the great mystery of the Sabazios religion, which makes the initiate into a *Sabos* and assures him of participation in the divine fullness of life” (Eisele in Roscher IV 1, 254). One sees: here too we encounter the connection of the themes of rebirth and eternal life (see above, p. 87 ff.). On the “important, but not always clear role” of the serpent in Greek mysteries (of Eleusinian Demeter and of Sabazios) see further Küster, loc. cit., pp. 146–149.

654 Cf. on the manner in which in the Fourth Gospel “popular conceptions of the hereafter and expectations concerning the beyond are thoroughly spiritualized” and “the whole eschatology enters under a new illumination,” the summary remark of H. Holtzmann: “It is the categories of immanence into which a considerable part of the original Christian world of thought laid down in the synoptic Gospels is here translated” (*Einl.* p. 432 f.).

655 πνεῦμα ἅγιον could in itself designate something physically effective (Matt. 1:18; Luke 1:35; 3:22; Acts 2:3) as well as something ethically effective. In John 1:33 (7:39 is to be excluded), 14:26, 20:22, where the expression is used only by the Fourth Evangelist, the contrast to sin and world demonstrably enters everywhere. The same applies to the only other place where the adjective ἅγιος is found in this Evangelist: 17:11 (*πάτερ ἅγιε*). In the ethical as in the metaphysical conception of πνεῦμα, the concept of δύναμις is throughout fundamentally essential (cf. on moral power: חֵיל *ἰσχύς* Yahweh’s, Num. 14:17). For interpreting πνεῦμα ἅγιον as an actual personality distinct both from the Exalted One and from the believer, the name παράκλητος (helper) is by no means necessary. Against this, John 20:22 must ultimately be safeguarded, even if one can ascribe to the reported physical act of inspiration only symbolic meaning. The Holy Spirit is another παράκλητος (14:16) in the sense of a similar one. The similarity, however, does not exclude an essential difference precisely with respect to the question of personality. Jesus, in his relation to the Father, corresponds—despite his vocational dependence (12:49, 50)—by virtue of the independence of his possession of life (5:26); nothing of the sort applies to the Holy Spirit, alongside his analogous dependence on (God and) Jesus (14:26; 16:13–15).

656 Cf. Heitmüller, Loisy, Holtzmann-Bauer ad loc. On the relation of this passage to 14:23 (the indwelling—*μονὴν ποιεῖσθαι*—of the Father and the Son with the true adherent of Christ) see *Unters.* I 136, 3.

657 B. Weiß, ad loc.

658 Cf. the relation to forgiveness of sins ascribed there also in 20:22 (especially in connection with reception into the community?).

659 *Unters.* I 35 f. Holtzmann-Bauer ad loc.

660 Holtzmann-Bauer 57.

661 Cf. on this Holtzmann-Bauer: “He became what he previously was not, without thereby, of course, ceasing to be Logos.” What, with the *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, was demanded of the understanding of the Hellenic or Hellenistic reader of the Prologue was, in its way, compared with the demand made in 6:51–58 upon the capacity of comprehension of the Jewish audience of Jesus, scarcely a more difficult task.

662 From related phenomena (cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*³ III 129 f.; (Stade) Bertholet II 321) one may refrain.

663 Cf. Schmiedel (in agreement with Holsten) ad loc.

664 In the image of 7:38 the abundant water serves for drinking, in 13:3 for bathing; the conception of the refreshing and enlivening effect, however, is common to both. Cf. *Unters.* I 16.

665 H. Holtzmann speaks (on 16:7–11) of the “Christ reproducing himself in those who are his own” and of an identity of the glorified Christ and the Holy Spirit “in the relative sense of the Pauline-Johannine school” (*N. Th.* II 463. 514*).

666 Duhm rightly expresses himself cautiously when he speaks of an “almost mystical devotion” of immersion in the all-effectiveness of God in Ps. 139 (*Die Psalmen* 1899, p. 289). With regard to Judaism cf. Köberle (*Sünde und Gnade* p. 518): “Official Judaism has a tendency averse to everything excessive, unnatural, mystically obscure”; Bertholet (loc. cit. pp. 469, 485, 493 f.): “Foreign and especially Greek ideas were immediately re-thought on Jewish soil. Thus union with God, for example, means something like union with the patriarchs (IV Macc. 5:37; 18:23; cf. Luke 16:22). — In the notion of a union of the individual with God, as it was expected here after death, lay the natural starting-point for a mysticism of the kind that at that time penetrated into the most diverse religions. That Judaism was touched by it only quite peripherally is again a testimony to the great sobriety of Judaism, especially also to its strong sense of the distance between God and human beings. — In Philo the path to God breaks through all rational limits in order to end in mysticism and ecstasy. According to Philo, faith is in no way the result of human effort, but rather a divine being-seized, an *ἐνθουσιασμός*. Abraham is the type of the soul that departs from itself and steps outside itself like the Corybantes and the possessed, seized by Bacchic frenzy. These are the unmistakable tones of the mystery religion”; Bousset (*Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*² 1906, p. 520): Philo is “the first mystic and ecstatic on the soil of specifically monotheistic piety.” Reference should also be made to Ziegert (“Über die Ansätze zu einer Mysterienlehre bei Philo”) in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1894, pp. 706–732, and to Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d’Alexandrie* 1907, pp. 196–205.

667 Against excising 6:51–58 as a later interpolation, Schnitzen (*Das Abendmahl im N. T.* 1895, pp. 77 f.) and others have already spoken emphatically, in particular Holtzmann (*N. Th.* II 499, 505; 558 f., 565; cf. *Archiv f. Religionswiss.* VII, 1904, pp. 66 ff.).

668 See Holtzmann-Bauer on 6:41.

669 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 146 f. I refer to *Unters.* I 13 f., 295, 299 and what still remains to be set out.

670 Cf. Hos. 8:13 (where the lust for eating flesh at sacrifice is castigated).

671 As though desire were to become greed? Note incidentally the wording *ὁ τρώγων με*, which is chosen neither simply (H. A. W. Meyer on Matt. 24:38) nor without special intention (B. Weiß), "merely by chance" (Holtzmann-Bauer on v. 54). Paul (1 Cor. 11:26–29) uses the verb *ἐσθίειν* for the bread of the Lord's Supper. As with Paul, so also synoptically the *eat!* in the words of institution (except Matt. 26:26) is not present at all (*φαγεῖν* is "belonging to *ἐσθίω*"); *τρώγειν* occurs in the New Testament apart from John 6 and 13:18 only in Matt. 24:38, where it is applied to the sensual, frivolous way of life of people before the Flood. It is all the more striking that our Evangelist himself puts it into Jesus' mouth in 13:18 at the last meal precisely where he designates the co-eating Judas as his betrayer, and it must further be expressly noted that in the Psalm passage cited there (41:10 = LXX 40:10) the LXX has *ἐσθίων*, not *τρώγων*. We may assume from the outset that the contradiction in the Evangelist's choice of expression is only apparent. He most probably wishes—after first, following upon the figurative eating (*φαγεῖν*) of the bread that has come down from heaven (vv. 32–51a), also calling the sacramental eating of the *σάρξ* of Jesus (vv. 52, 53) a *φαγεῖν*—by means of the divergent *τρώγων* in vv. 54–58 to have Jesus himself point to the offensive peculiarity of the lesson solemnly delivered by him in the synagogue, which, with its figurative clothing, had to arouse in the sensually oriented Galilean audience the thought of cannibalism and the grave offense of blood consumption, and to make him himself appear mad (cf. 10:20 and see above p. 126 f.). That indeed "the half-belief of the Galileans, as a result of Jesus' discourses, turned into complete unbelief" (Holtzmann-Bauer) is only indirectly indicated by the Evangelist in that he reports the negative effect of Jesus' discourse within his wider circle of disciples (6:60–66; see above p. 25).

672 *δι' ἐμέ*, because I remain in him and continually communicate my life to him (B. Weiß).

673 What it may have cost the nomistically and ritualistically oriented Saul of Tarsus—despite a latent mystical disposition—after his conversion to appropriate precisely the, in the highest degree offensive, Lord's-Supper mysticism of flesh-eating and blood-drinking (symbolized by means of bread and wine) is difficult to imagine. It has good reason when, in a self-justification, 1 Cor. 11:23, he emphasizes that he owes his knowledge of the words of institution to a tradition going back to Christ himself (to *ἀπό*—not *παρά*—cf. Schmiedel in *Handcomm. z. N. T.* II* 162). But if our Evangelist in 6:51–56, with unmistakable deliberateness, allows the *σάρξ* of Jesus to take the place of the *σῶμα* of Christ, then in doing so not only was the significance ascribed to *σάρξ* in 1:14 determinative on the one side, but also on the other—corresponding to the substitution of *τρώγειν* for *ἐσθίειν*—the thought of a provocative intensification of the alienation and indignation of the unbelieving crowd through Jesus (cf. 12:37–41; Mark 4:10–12; and Holtzmann, *Syn.* p. 72 f.).

674 Cf. also in this connection 6:35 (self-evident coherence of food and drink) and the Old Testament *locus classicus* Ps. 23: Yahweh as shepherd and host—grassy pastures by waters, a richly set table with full cups).

675 What is peculiar is that this formulation caused the dull-witted hearers to think specifically of the flesh-parts of the body. It is sufficiently understandable and pardonable if not only Judaism took offense, but also pagan society in the Greek world, in its ignorance of the actual state of affairs, was already from the 2nd century onward, or even earlier, induced by what was reported by rumor—often enough misunderstood or distorted and slanderously misrepresented—about the sacred rite, to speak of the *θυέστεια δείπνα* of the Christians. Proof-texts from Justin Martyr and bibliographical references see in Holtzmann-Bauer 150.

676 The truly believing: *πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, παῦροι δὲ τε βάκχοι* (Orphic verse according to Olympiodorus; cf. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 813).

677 *ἔκστασις* is a *ὀλιγοχρόνιος μανία* (so Galen and Aretaeus); originally one thinks of an actual "departure" of the "soul" from its body (Rohde, *Ps.* II 19).

678 *ἔνθεός τε γίγνεται καὶ ἔκφρων καὶ ὁ νοῦς οὐκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἔνεστιν* (Plato, *Ion* 534B): "there transferred to inspired poets, properly with reference to the Bacchants" (Rohde, loc. cit.). Cf. the *ἔνθεοι γυναῖκες* Soph. *Antig.* 963, the *μαινάδες θυοσκόοι* Eurip. *Bacch.* 217: "Still within the finite I they feel and enjoy the fullness of infinite life-power" (Rohde, *Ps.* II 20, 21).

679 "The *ἔνθεος* is completely in the power of the god; the god speaks and acts out of him" (Rohde II 25, 1).

680 It scarcely requires remark that Old Testament prophetism offers nothing comparable: Yahweh does not reveal himself personally in the prophet, but only mediately, dynamically, through his "spirit." On the *καθαρμοί κατὰ τὴν μαντικήν* (Plato, *Cratyl.* 405AB) see Rohde, loc. cit. II 70.

681 Cf. Clemen, "Der Einfluß der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum," in Wünsch-Deubner, *RVV* XIII, p. 56.

682 Cf. Clemens Alex., *Protr.* 9D: *Διόνυσον μαινόλην ὀργιάζουσι βάκχοι ὠμοφαγίᾳ τὴν ἱερομανίαν ἄγοντες* (Rohde, *Ps.* II 19). "The beasts of the forest and mountains, especially roe-deer fawns and goats, also bulls and calves, are torn apart limb by limb and their flesh devoured raw" (Voigt in Roscher I 1, 1037).

683 For further details see Voigt 1038.

684 Prel.-Robert 693. Voigt a. a. O.

685 Prel.-Robert a. a. O.

686 That the bull torn apart in the Bacchic orgies represented the god himself (and this not only in the Orphic but from of old also in the Thracian cult) was fully present to the ancients; it is expressed repeatedly (e.g. in Firmicus, *Math. error prof. rel.* 6.5), but quite especially clearly in the Orphic *ἱερὸς λόγος* (Rohde, *Ps.* II 118, 2; cf. Gruppe in Roscher III 1, 1171).

687 Rohde, *Ps.* II 15, 1.

688 Jews are to eat his flesh, drink his blood?! They are to eat him?!

689 More precise discussion follows immediately.

690 The passage recalls, in New Testament terms, on the one hand the eschatological concept of the way to life in Mt. 7:14; Acts 2:28, and on the other hand the "entrance into the sanctuary" of the New Testament relation of grace, which Christ effected for us through the sacrificial blood of his death and which he opened into a "living way" (Heb. 10:19 f.; cf. *Unters.* I 247 f.).

691 That this thought, however, on closer inspection does not remain with the oldest "purely eschatological" contemplation, see above n. 642.

692 Cf. *Unters.* I 25 f. and above p. 219 f. Holtzmann-Bauer on 16:13: "As Hermes–Nous leads the soul to knowledge (ὁδηγεῖν; cf. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* 23; Dieterich, *Abraxas* 1891, pp. 18. 76 ff.), so for Christians the Spirit will be guide over the whole domain of truth."

693 On the deliberate avoidance of this terminus see above p. 204 f. Concerning the use of the word μυστήριον in the New Testament cf. Holtzm., *Syn.* p. 73: "In connection with 1 Cor. 2:1.7.41; Eph. 3:4 it also stands in Mark 4:11 = Matt. 13:11 = Luke 8:10 in the service of grounding apostolic prerogative and authority on the one hand, while on the other hand a certain elective affinity with παραβολή and thereby a faint approach and transition to esoteric mystery doctrine takes place."

694 Cf. Drexler in Roscher II 1, 1002 f.

695 S. Quandt, *De Baccho ab Alexandri aetate in Asia minore culto* 1912, pp. 120–128. Dionysos Καθηγεμών is repeatedly characterized in the Pergamene inscriptions as the triēteric god (Quandt 262). His cult was made serviceable to its own veneration both by the kingdom of the Attalids and by the Roman Empire (Quandt 126). On the titulature and gradation of the relevant mystai in Pergamon and elsewhere (ἱεροφάντης, ἀρχιβούκολος, βούκολοι, θηγοδιδάσκαλοι, etc.) see Quandt 123 f. 179 f. 246. 249 f. 252 f. 254 f.; cf. Rohde, *Ps.* II 15 f.

696 Quandt 179 f.: *Philadelphiae Bacchum Καθηγεμόνα adoratum esse nihil habet mihi vel singularis, quod illam urbem a Pergami incolis conditam esse certum est —*

697 Quandt 211.

698 Quandt 152 f. Dionysos was in Teos, which regarded him as patron, the most highly revered god (156); *Bacchi cultum extollendum ejusque gloriam per totam Asiam propagandam curavit artificum Dionysiacorum collegium, quod ut in aliis urbibus ita maxime Tei floruit* (158 f.).

699 Quandt 182: *Pergamo vero Bacchi Καθηγεμόνος cultum hanc quoque in urbem translatum esse satis veri est simile.*

700 Prel.-Robert 393. 400. 403–405. Rohde, *Ps.* II 127, 2. Cf. above p. 213 on Dionysos as lord of souls, and on the hope of immortality of the soul, also Orphically grounded in the Dionysian mysteries (Plut. *consol. ad ux.* 10 p. 611 D; Rohde II 127, 4).

701 On an inscription from Sparta (see Drexler a. a. O. II 1, 1003).

702 As such he had, alongside Demeter, a temple in Korytheis (Arcadia); his cult was connected with the Telephos saga linking Arcadia and Mysia (Paus. VIII 54, 5). Cf. Prel.-Robert 692. 749.

703 According to 5:36 σημεῖα, but not exclusively to these; words and discourses are "by no means included" among the ἔργα (B. Weiß; Holtzmann-Bauer).

704 "What is meant is the more extensive effectiveness, as in 4:36–38; 12:24: going into all the world, overthrowing pagan altars, gathering heathens and Jews into one church, but also the signs accomplished by Christians in apostolic and post-apostolic times, the numerous wondrous manifestations of the Spirit, which early Christianity knows" (Holtzmann-Bauer following Loisy 749).

705 See above p. 112 and Voigt in Roscher I 1, 1042 f.

706 If in this process the old conception of the earth-goddess was lost, this is explained partly by that poetic tendency which retrospectively transferred all gods to Olympus: "if Dionysos lived there, then his mother too had to dwell there"; but on the other hand also by that influential Theban poetry according to which Semele was a daughter of Cadmus, hence a mortal. She therefore first had to be made immortal by the indicated path; myth formation here connected with the cult of the relevant places, wherein "Dionysos and his mother were summoned from their dwelling beneath the earth to their festivals." In an entirely different way the divinity of Semele is explained by the certainly old legend according to which she was transferred immediately to Olympus by the lightning that killed her at the "fire-birth" of Dionysos. Cf. Jessen in Roscher IV 1, 662–667. Further variations may be disregarded here.

707 Plut., *Quaest. Gr.* 12. Voigt remarks concerning this festival that it "certainly had a general significance assuring salvation to all participants," that here "the deep intimacy of Greek worship, which allowed the feeling of veneration for the son to overflow onto the mother, brought about the apotheosis of the god's mother. The son fetches his mother up to Olympus, just as upon the *ascensio Christi* the *assumptio Mariae* followed." Thus Pindar sings how she lives among the Olympians, loved by Pallas, father Zeus, and her son (Ol. 2, 25); see Roscher I 1, 1048. — On the translation of Dionysos' consort Ariadne to Olympus see Stoll in Roscher I 1, 542. According to Prel.-Robert 685 she too is "fetched up" by Dionysos.

———————

pp 235-239

705 See above, p. 112, and Voigt in Roscher I 1, 1042 f.

706 If in this connection the old conception of the earth-goddess was lost, this is explained on the one hand by that poetic tradition which subsequently transferred all the gods to Olympus: “if Dionysos lived there, then his mother too had to dwell there”; on the other hand, however, also by that influential Theban poetry according to which Semele was a daughter of Kadmos, thus had been a mortal. She first had to be made immortal along the prescribed path; the formation of myth here attached itself to the cult of the relevant places, in which “Dionysos and his mother were called up from their dwelling beneath the earth to their festivals.” In an entirely different way the divinity of Semele is explained by the at any rate ancient legend according to which she was transferred immediately to Olympus by the lightning that killed her at the “fire-birth” of Dionysos. Cf. Jessen in Roscher IV 1, 662–667. Further variations may be disregarded here.

707 Plut. quaest. Gr. 12. Voigt remarks concerning this festival, which “certainly had a general significance assuring salvation for all participants,” that here “the deep intimacy of Greek worship of the gods, which allowed the feeling of veneration to overflow from the son onto the mother, effected the apotheosis of the mother of the god. The son fetches his mother up into Olympus, just as upon the *ascensio Christi* the *assumptio Mariae* followed. Thus Pindar sings of her, how she lives among the Olympians, loved by Pallas, by father Zeus, and by her son (Ol. 2, 25).” See Roscher I 1, 1048. — On the translation of the consort of Dionysos, Ariadne, into Olympus see Stoll in Roscher I 1, 542. According to Prel.-Robert 685 she too is “fetched up” by Dionysos.

708 Clem. Al. protr. 34 p. 29 P. Euseb. praep. ev. V 36. Arnob. V 39. Cf. Prel.-Robert 712 f.: “Thus in his cult, just as in that of Hermes, the symbol of the phallos was at home, which in the mysteries signified him himself, but was also erected at the ordinary festivals of the rural grape-harvest or the urban spring celebration and carried about with special songs, of which Aristophanes in the *Acharnians* 241 ff. provides an example.” On the appeal of the Naassenes to the veneration of Hermes in the cult image of Kyllene (Arcadia) Reitzenstein remarks (*Poimandres* p. 33): “After all, ‘Christian’ communities in the 2nd century after Christ did venerate under the symbol of the phallus, thus corresponding to that cult image.”

709 Reference should be made to the very noteworthy, more general observation of Deißmann: “Traditional lines of the picture of the ancient world would be different if one attempted to draw this world today on the basis of a study of its own most authentic testimonies.” — This dark picture of the ancient world, in my view, stems chiefly from the fact that it has been drawn first according to the literary self-testimonies of that world and then under the impression of the polemical exaggerations of zealous Church Fathers. Paul is not to be held responsible for this: despite his feeling of superiority over this passing world and its hollow wisdom, and despite his insight into the corruption of the great city, he did not overlook the bright sides, and he never merely vilified the opponent in an advocate-like manner. Different are the later champions of the “faith befouled by the world to the point of blood” (LO p. 211 f.).

710 Apollo, originally god of the sun or rather of sunlight, is “the god of light *par excellence*, born in the light and dwelling in the light, and insofar the most exalted figure of Greek religion, still today deeply moving the spirit, most closely related to Zeus, but throughout of a highly solemn, serious character; scarcely has even the most frivolous poetry dared to spread irreverent

notions about this god" (Prel.-Robert 231). The basic conception (of the sun-god) had in historical times completely vanished from the Hellenic people (Prel.-Robert loc. cit.). Cf. with this John 8:12: "I am the light of the world" (Jesus the counter-image of the sun) and Holtzmann-Bauer on 8:14. 9:5. 12:35 f.; 1:9.

711 See above, p. 23.

712 Rohde, *Ps.* II 53 f. Cf. Voigt in Roscher I 1, 1033. It is indeed as though the Evangelist, in the presentation of the relationship between John and Jesus 3:27–30, intended in the most palpable typological manner to point to the similar relationship of Dionysos to Apollo (the Διονυσόδοτος, as he was called and venerated in the Attic deme Phlya, Paus. I 31, 4) (see above, notes 453. 566. 618 and p. 194; Prel.-Robert 263. 311, 4. 686, 3).

713 John 1:26. 31. 33. 3:23 (cf. 3:5).

714 That the Evangelist does not address readers who still had to be made acquainted with the events reported by the Synoptics (sayings and deeds) (cf. more precisely Holtzmann, *Einl.* 440 f.), that he also does not simply and consistently take into account the level of education and the needs of popular circles, he could not have indicated more discreetly and emphasized more strongly than is done with the Prologue (cf. also Holtzmann loc. cit. 443). Nevertheless, to rank the Fourth Gospel among the New Testament "popular books" on account of its retention of the Hellenistic colloquial language used by the Synoptics (Deißmann, LO 43. 180 f.) will not be possible without reservations.

715 John the Baptist can have been taken up into the oldest, mythical-legendary template of the calendar only as the image of the winter that yields and prepares the way for spring and summer. He corresponds to the Germanic Ullr in his relationship to Baldr, the god of summery sunlight, who is called the former's friend (Simrock, *Handbuch der deutsch. Mythol.*³ 289). As such he belongs where the disciple and evangelist John is positioned (cf. the repeated confusion of the Evangelist with the Baptist, Simrock loc. cit. 490): in the time of the Christmas festival, in which the re-ascending sunlight is likewise celebrated. Displaced from his rightful place, he takes up a position on 24 June, following the summer solstice, which makes him rather the representative of the summer that is in decline, bending itself toward winter (cf. Clemen, *Die Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums* 1912, p. 444 — on the Martyrology of Carthage).

———————

pp 240-297

716 Cf. on the history of the two expressions Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* p. 95: "neither μυστήριον nor τελετή is a fixed concept for Hellenism."

717 It has a similar affinity with this fact, that the name *Logos* is used at least only in the Prologue, not in the Gospel itself. The traces of religious-historical underpinning as well as the religious-philosophical points of contact of the presentation should in general shimmer through

now more, now less; the former, by the nature of the matter, at numerous points extending across the entire work of art.

718 Whether he speaks about his pre-existence (8 57 ff.), his sinlessness (8 46), his divine sonship (5 18; 8 19; 10 33–36), his unity of being with God (10 30), his origin and sending from God, his return to God and unfindability (8 14; 7 28 ff.; 8 33–36), his resurrection as revivification through himself (2 19 ff.; 10 17 f.), his exaltation (10 34), the communication of eternal life to believers through his word (8 51), or about rebirth from above (3 3–12), the Lord's Supper (6 52. 60 f.), what he says always remains his *mystery*, whether it is interpreted as falsehood or as blasphemy or as madness or, in the most favorable case, as eccentricity. Particularly noteworthy in this connection is that the series of themes, already at their first appearance in Jerusalem, is opened with a proclamation whose logically assailable wording virtually challenges the misunderstanding of the hearers and must make the speaker appear deranged, and that moreover the real meaning of what is spoken is a (upon closer inspection doubled) prophecy, the understanding of which, according to the Evangelist's own statement, came only to the disciples, and indeed only after its fulfillment brought about by the resurrection of Jesus (see above p. 121 f.). One sees: the discourse 2 18–20 has a programmatic character.

719 It is as though the Evangelist wished to suggest: not even with the shepherd image known from the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Lk. 24 44) did they know what to do. Cf. further p. 7 f.

720 Whether he was in reality one of the Twelve must for the present remain undecided.

721 ἡμῖν can scarcely point to anything other than to the subject of the (pregnant) ἐθεασάμεθα, thus to the discipleship of Jesus belonging to the period between the appearance of Jesus and his exaltation, pre-eminently the Twelve. The Christophanies of ch. 20 are therefore also to be drawn into consideration here.

722 For further details see *Unters.* I 48 f.; 100–105.

723 On the significance of the word and sign of Jesus for the stimulation and advancement of the narrowest, oldest, and fundamental circle of disciples, see above pp. 67–73.

724 In what sense and extent there can be talk at all of eschatology in our Evangelist is aptly shown by Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 511 ff.; 572 ff.

725 Characteristic is its repeated presumption of superior knowledge (11 8; 13 6; 8 9. 37; 14 22).

726 Further details see above p. 33 ff. On the question whether the Evangelist had "more precise acquaintance with dialogical literature, in which the speeches of the main person are interrupted by foolish objections of secondary persons" (denied by Wrede, affirmed by Reitzenstein with reference to the Hermetic writings), see Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 276 f.

727 Cf. the threefold passion prediction of Christ and in particular the treasury of related themes which follows the last.

728 To be excepted only is 1 Cor. 14 2, where with μυστήρια the religious sounds of feeling produced by the impulse of the Spirit in speaking in tongues are designated as mysterious in the sense of *unintelligible*, and Eph. 5 32, where the significance, according to the author of the letter, contained in Gen. 2 24 (the saying concerning the marital love-relation) referring to the relationship of Christ to his church, is called a hidden and richly meaningful *great mystery* (cf. v. Soden ad loc.: "The interpretation with reference to the Parousia contradicts the entire context").

729 1 Cor. 4 1 ("God's mysteries"); 13 2 ("all mysteries"); Col. 2 2 ("the mystery of God"); 4 3 ("the mystery of Christ"); Eph. 6 19 ("the mystery of the Gospel"); 1 Tim. 3 9 ("the mystery of the faith": of evangelical truth); 3 16 ("the mystery of godliness"; cf. 4 8: it has the promise of the present and the future life).

730 Rom. 11 25 (the hardening of a part of Israel until the entry of the fullness of the Gentiles); 1 Cor. 15 51 f. (the peculiar transformation of those still living at the Parousia); 2 Thess. 2 7 (the providential presuppositions of the Parousia of Christ, especially the appearance of the ἄνομος); Rev. 1 20 (the significance of the seven stars, i.e. angels of the seven eschatological churches); 10 7 (the prophecy of salvation which will have come to fulfillment when the seventh angel is about to blow the trumpet); 17 5. 7 (the significance of the name of the great Babylon).

731 Rom. 16 25 f.; 1 Cor. 2 7; Col. 1 26 f.; Eph. 1 9; cf. 10–14; 3 3. 4. 9.

732 Mark τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ; Matthew τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν; Luke τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

733 Holtzm. *Syn.* 73.

734 Cf. on Paul Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* 39. 43 f.; 58 f.

735 As a more exact examination shows, it cannot in this connection throughout be a matter of assuming that foreign elements are taken over unchanged; fundamentally rather what is involved is their transformation into the purely spiritual and ethical, a process which elsewhere, in different ways and to different degrees, has a parallel in the Old- and New-Testament reshaping of mythical materials that arose from natural religion. Instead of a "borrowing," therefore, it will in most cases be more appropriate to speak of an allusion on the part of the New Testament writers, possibly or probably present, now more, now less consciously. From this it may already be concluded that completeness cannot be achieved or guaranteed in determining the exegetical comparative material in question. An attempt going beyond this would also burst the framework of our main task in scarcely tolerable fashion. We shall therefore, with all the more justification, confine ourselves to a brief illumination of those New Testament passages which have found the greatest attention, since the total yield to be expected, alongside what has already been set forth in the preceding sections concerning the historical relationship between early Christianity and Greek religion in general, is of fairly subordinate significance. For the literature and the state of the controversy one may in general

refer especially to H. Holtzmann, *Sakramentliches im Neuen Testamente* (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1904, pp. 58–63), and to Clemen, *Mysterienreligionen und ältestes Christentum* in Wünsche-Deubner, *RVV.* 1913, pp. 1–88.

736 H. Holtzmann apparently (together with his predecessors) holds the allusion to mystery-language to be “quite certain” in *N. Th.* II 186; but one should note the formulation in II 208, 2.

737 Cf. Clemen, *a. a. O.* 26 f.
738 S. Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* p. 167.
739 Cf. on the former antithesis Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* p. 157.
740 Cf. on the mysteries Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 25. 99; against the questionable combination Clemen, *a. a. O.* 31.

741 The same argument also asserts itself against Reitzenstein’s generalizing concluding consideration (*a. a. O.* 60): “However infinitely much may have remained Jewish in his feeling and thinking, he owes to Hellenism his faith in his apostleship and his freedom. Herein lies the greatest and, for world history, the most significant effect of the ancient mystery religions.” Hellenism offered the man the specific equipment for the calling of the apostle to the Gentiles. Faith in his apostleship, however, arose for the Hellenistic Jew solely out of the wondrous experience before Damascus, which in its manner approached the Old Testament vocational visions of the prophets (Isa. 6, etc.) and bore no mystical character whatsoever. God, according to the explicit testimony of the apostle, was pleased to let Jesus confront him in wondrous fashion (visionary: ἀποκαλύψει Gal. 1 16, and insofar inwardly: ἐν ἐμοί) and reveal himself to him as his Son (the true Messiah). It is to be noted that this proof of the apostle does not yet contain the conception of Χριστὸς ἐν ἐμοί (Gal. 2 20), that is, of the entering of the one person into the other. Just as this does not point to a contact with the mysticism of religious-Hellenistic pneumatology, so the absence of any preparatory processes of consciousness for the conversion of Paul also does not allow any real analogy to arise specifically with the concluding initiations of the mysteries. Under these circumstances, then, the unconditional apostolic sense of independence and authority of the converted Paul (cf. on this Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 164) will also not have been brought by him into comparison with the “absolute knowledge (πάντα γινώσκειν)” of the Hellenistic pneumatics and mystagogues (cf. on these Reitzenstein 165).

742 Cf. Schmiedel, *z. St.*
743 Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 26. 105. 179.
744 Cf. Clemen, *a. a. O.* 24. The alien character of the expression in the New Testament passage has been emphasized by Reitzenstein himself, “since it does not quite fit δόξα (transfiguration); not in a change of form, but of essence, respectively of the degree of transfiguration, consists the μεταμόρφωσις.” He speaks of a deliberate artificiality on the part of Paul. Decisive, however, would not be the questionable objection. One will not be able to close oneself off from the perception that precisely in the kind of allusions standing here in question there generally accrues to the mode of expression a measure of freedom that does not everywhere permit the presupposition of a stricter logic of the parallel.

745 The Messiah Zerubbabel is presented by Yahweh to the high priest in Zechariah at the point in time when (speaking figuratively) the gemstone of the ring is to receive its inscription engraved (Zerubbabel is to be shown before the world as Messiah).

746 Cf. Clemen, *a. a. O.* 27.

747 Prel.-Robert 750 f.

748 Cf. Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 162. 167.

749 Cf. on the mystery parallels of the two passages Clemen, *a. a. O.* 25 f.

750 Reitzenstein has shown this with finesse (p. 81 f.).

751 On its dissemination in Syria and the Greek world cf. Clemen, *a. a. O.* 8 f.

752 The calling of Paul to be an apostle, to which Clemen's objection reverts, comes, as one easily sees, just as little into consideration as a divine calling preceding the course of initiation of the mystēs (cf. in this connection with the Isis mysteries Apuleius, *met.* XI 19, and on this Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 25. 99; Clemen, *a. a. O.* 31). Reitzenstein aptly remarks (p. 82): "If we assume that Paul knows the language of the mysteries, the passage acquires a wonderful ethos. Old Paul feels himself and in his imprisonment shortly before that mystery which brings union with the Lord and the new life. He would gladly have held this last, beloved child of his preaching back in his κατοχή, so that it might serve him. Do not the κάτοχοι, precisely because they are at least hindered in freedom of movement, take to themselves a διάκονος—thus Ptolemaios and the twins; cf. e.g. Pap. Par. 22, 25 προσλαβέσθαι τὸν ἐκείνης υἱὸν διακονεῖν ἡμῖν; 23, 23 δέξασθαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς Παχρήτην, ἵνα διακονεῖ ἡμῖν. Spoiled is the gripping image that arose from a momentary mood already in 2 Tim. 1 8, pressed down to a formula in Eph. 4 1. The richness and the fineness of Paul's images the imitators were no longer able to sense."

753 Cf. on this Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 27. 33.

754 Cf. John 12 24 and Holtzmann-Bauer, *z. St.*: "reminiscent of the language of the Demeter mysteries"; Loisy: *peut être une hypothèse risquée*.

755 Schmiedel, *z. St.*

756 Clemen, *a. a. O.* 30; cf. Anrich, *Ant. Myst.* p. 11. 146, 1.

757 Cf. the overview in Clemen, *a. a. O.* 28 f.

758 Further details see Clemen, *a. a. O.* 63 f. 65.

759 Against the assumption of the reversed relationship of dependence cf. Grill, *Die persische Mysterienreligion* p. 50 f.; otherwise Clemen p. 64 f.

760 Cf. Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 269; *Mysterienreligionen* 68.

761 *Der Primat des Petrus. Eine Untersuchung.* 1904. pp. 59–79.

762 He has found emphatic assent from the scholarly side.

763 *A. a. O.* p. 61 f. The conception, underlying the above, based on the saying Mt. 16 18. 19, of Jesus as possessor of the keys of the kingdom of heaven presents itself as a complementary variant of the image of Rev. 1 18, according to which Jesus has command over the keys of death and of Hades. That here, in some form of mediation, contact is made with Greek mythology (Aeacus, one of the wisest and most just kings, through Attic poetry having become a principal figure of the underworld, appearing now as gatekeeper with the keys, now as judge over the godless and executor of the subterranean punishments: Prel.-Robert 804, 4. 825 f.) can scarcely be denied (cf. *Primat des Petrus* 14).

764 Clemen: “One may be permitted to assume that both conversion narratives are worked according to a fixed schema” (*a. a. O.* 66).

765 Cf. on the taurobolia Rapp in Roscher II 1, 1670 f.; II 1, 725; on the interrelation of the two points of view Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* 31 f.; on the whole: Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä* p. 34 f.: “It is, however, questionable whether here [1 Pet. 1 2] there is at all a clear and conscious allusion to Old Testament rites and expiatory practices. Further: even if the author is well acquainted with Old Testament and, what is still more important, with contemporary Jewish conceptions concerning sacrifice, blood, and expiation, the Hellenistic, Gentile-Christian readers of the letter need not have been acquainted with these conceptions. And yet they will have correctly sensed the meaning and the tone of the present passage.”

766 Knopf: “The expression is taken from the language of the mysteries and designates the one initiated into the last and highest degree of the mysteries.”

767 If in Mt. 19 28 παλιγγενεσία signifies “not the rebirth of the individual human being, but the new creation and renewal of the entire world” (Knopf p. 41), then it may further be pointed out that already the Avesta quite generally designates the transition of world-beings into the future life as the “future birth” (aipizanthəm — cf. ἐπιγίγνομαι: thereafter be born, ἐπιγέννημα; thus more precisely: the additional begetting or birth that comes as a second), Yasna 48, 5.

768 Further details see the thorough and illuminating presentation by Knopf, *a. a. O.* pp. 41–43.

769 Whether Hebr. 5 12 f. is to be brought into connection with this passage remains questionable. Knopf rightly emphasizes that in 1 Pet. 2 2 “in connection with the circle of ideas of new birth and rebirth, milk is spoken of as the nourishment of those who have been reborn.” This context, however, is lacking in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it is to be recalled that here “no longer, as with Paul, does faith open up a mystical community of life with Christ, the one who died and rose again, and thus that entire series of ideas also falls away which is bound up

with a life of the Exalted One in his believers, with a dwelling in his community." — In particular, there is also lacking "the Pauline new creation through the Spirit" (Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 306 f. 347). On 1 Cor. 3 2 a position had already been taken above.

770 Cf. moreover Knopf's discussion pp. 84–87.

771 Cf. Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 25 f. If in the mystery the meaning of *salus* fluctuates between "preservation of earthly life" and "bestowal of a new, higher one," then what was noted above concerning the logical freedom of allusions also applies here (note 744).

772 Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 33.

773 One and the same person (cf. Wendland, Σωτήρ in *ZntW* 1904, p. 353).

774 Cf. on σωτήρ Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 25 f. 213. In 2 Tim. 1 10 and perhaps also 4 8 the outwardly striking word ἐπιφάνεια designates the first and the second appearance at the same time, whereas in 1 Tim. 6 14; 2 Tim. 4 1; Tit. 2 13 it denotes the still-to-be-expected ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας (2 Thess. 2 8) — and otherwise is absent from the New Testament.

775 Rohde, *Ps.* II 127, 4.

776 To see in the ἀρχιποίμην of 1 Pet. 5 4 merely the image of the head of a shepherds' guild or something of that sort (cf. Knopf *z. St.*) is not satisfactory.

777 See on this Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 165 ff.; *Mysterienreligionen* 16 f.

778 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* I 378; II 448 f.

779 The human spirit here does not receive God in personal immediacy together with the divine Spirit, but only in the mediation through a power sent forth by him (Ezek. 36 26 f.; 39 29). Nor does it come, even in Ps. 73 25 f., to a truly *mystical* conception of the relationship between Yahweh and the person of the pious man, to a conceptually incomprehensible kind of mutual indwelling of the two I's, at a passage which not without justification has been designated as the most religious word of the Old Testament (Schmiedel). Whether one should think, in a manner analogous to the pagan mysteries though in substance of a different kind, of a Pharisaic doctrine of immortality, Duhm considers in connection with Ps. 73 17 (בְּמִקְדְּשֵׁי־אֵל). Cf. moreover Rohde, *Ps.* II 62: "That the human soul is not denied the power truly and without delusion to live with the life of the deity—this belief is the source-point of all mysticism."

780 Cf. Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 178 f.; *Mysterienreligionen* 47.

781 Cf. Rohde, *Ps.* II 127 f. (on Orphism!).

782 Schmiedel *z. St.*: "The custom could have arisen by analogy with the valuation for future blessedness that was attributed to the initiates of the mysteries. — Paul could properly neither

approve it nor use it without disapproval as evidence." Schm. possibly thinks of inauthenticity at 1 Cor. 15 29 (except for ἔπε) and of (καὶ?) ἡμεῖς 30.

783 From this point of view the repeated adjective πνευματικός in v. 3 f. is also to be understood. The text-critical objection (Joh. Weiß) is to be rejected. The πνευματικὸν βρῶμα thus does not mean something supernaturally produced (Schmiedel et al.), but rather that food which, typologically (interpreted into the spiritual; cf. Rev. 11 8 πνευματικῶς = allegorical), corresponded to the New Testament Lord's Supper food; the Old Testament rock is conceived pneumatically, i.e. typologically: Christ, who repeatedly presented himself as such to Israel. See also Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* 146 f.

784 See Schmiedel *z. St.*

785 Cf. Rohde, *Ps.* II 71 ff. (on mystery katharsis).

786 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 457; Clemen, *Mysterienreligionen* 36.

787 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 180. 2198.

788 Cf. especially Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum* 1911: "In doing so we note that the lines of thought of justification and forgiveness of sins are rarely connected with baptism, only at one place, 1 Cor. 6 11, and that the emphasis rests entirely on Christ-mysticism" (p. 18). "Thus baptism brings about the washing away of sin. It makes the unrighteous righteous; we shall scarcely be permitted here to think of Paul's proper doctrine of justification; the word simply means that they are now regarded as righteous. And finally baptism 'sanctifies,' i.e. it makes one the property of God; according to Pauline conception this takes place through the Spirit of God or of Christ" (p. 15).

789 Reitzenstein considers the influence of the "Hellenistic usage" (determined by the language of the mysteries) at least to be probable (*a. a. O.* 104).

789 Reitzenstein considers the influence of the "Hellenistic usage" (determined by the language of the mysteries) at least to be probable (*a. a. O.* 104).

790 The significance of the fundamentally essential, positive moment of baptism presupposed in Rom. 6 4 ff. according to 1 Cor. 12 13—the re-ensoulment, or re-spiritualization—is brought to the fore only in the related section Rom. 8 1–17.

791 Nor is this altered by the concomitant conception, alongside what has been shown, of the life-connection between the baptized person and Christ effected by the Spirit of Christ. It is customary to call this mystical. The justification for doing so, however, lies, strictly speaking, not so much in the actual nature of the matter as rather in the apostle's mode of feeling and expression. Just as his self-designation as ἄνθρωπος ἐν Χριστῷ (2 Cor. 12 2) is to be understood *cum grano salis* (Schmiedel: "P. intentionally says it as colourlessly as possible: a Christian, but at the same time does indicate close fellowship (ἐν) with Christ"), so also his statements concerning the Christ living in him (Gal. 2 20) and speaking in him (2 Cor. 13 3): the

mediation through the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8 9 f.; cf. Eph. 3 16 f.) is always included. In this connection, moreover, cf. what has already been noted (note 779) concerning Old Testament pneumatology.

792 Cf. Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* 34, and (with reference to Dieterich, Wobbermin, Cumont, Lietzmann) Clemen, *Rel. Erkl.* 178 f.; in addition the illuminating remark in Reitzenstein 39 f. On the Isis mysteries of Kenchreai see Apul. *met.* XI 21 and Clemen *a. a. O.*

793 Cf. Clemen, *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde* 1897, p. 208.

794 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 179 f.; II 196.

796 Cf. Reitzenstein *a. a. O.* 29 ff.

797 Cf. on the more recent conjectures Clemen, *Mysterienreligionen* 44 ff.

798 Dillmann: "Putting on a quality as a garment means above all to arm and adorn oneself with it, e.g. Isa. 11 5; 59 17." Attention was rightly drawn to the Job passage already by Weinei and Clemen.

799 Eph. 5 25 f. ("just as Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for her, ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι"), in which baptism is clearly grounded on the sacrificial death of Christ, is explicable only from the unmistakable dependence of the author on Pauline statements: cf. on ἁγιάζειν 1 Cor. 6 11; on τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι Rom. 6 3 ff. Baptism is now characterized, in the shortest conceivable formulation and precisely for that reason not immediately intelligible, as the (well-known: τῷ) water-bath which (in substance) is a bath in the word (ἐν ῥήματι) (cf. *sensu stricto* as "word–water bath"). That this word cannot be the baptismal formula, to which some have among other things resorted, is obvious enough. The last-mentioned passage, however, provides the correct interpretation. From it it follows that the author of the Ephesian passage, in the cleansing effected by Christ which sanctifies the church, had in mind the spiritual βάπτισμα εἰς τὸν θάνατον Christi, brought about by the evangelical proclamation of the cross (of forgiveness and of the break with sin) (1 Cor. 1 17 f.; cf. 1 Pet. 3 21 and see above p. 140 on John 15 3) and brought to solemn attestation and confirmation in water baptism. With this, the conception found here by Holtzmann (*N. Th.* I 383 f.; *454 f.*), with regard to the mystery-religions, to which the author *ad Ephesios* so frequently recalls, "which is perhaps the most characteristic for the gradual transformation of early Christian figurative language into mysterious theurgy," falls away. Clemen was on a not entirely incorrect track when he thought that "since the Epistle to the Ephesians stands in close contact with the First Epistle of Peter, the cleansing through the water-bath in the word here as well (5 26) will probably not have been intended to take place through baptism, but rather through the word itself" (*Rel. Erkl.* 175). 1 Pet. 3 21 likewise "traces salvation in baptism back to something inward." It is "not a submerging of the body in water, not an outward washing away of dirt of sin, but a prayer for a good conscience — . The presupposition for this way of defining the content of baptism is that the act was accompanied by a prayer for forgiveness of sins (= good conscience). And this prayer, which the author may assume as self-evident to find a hearing

with God, appears to him as the most important element in baptism, or at least as something so important that he defines the content of the act accordingly" (Knopf *z. St.* p. 158. He adds further: "Very fine is the way in which the sacramental-mystical character of baptism recedes in the wording, without any reduction of the religious to the 'merely ethical' taking place.")

800 Heitmüller, *T. u. A.* p. 17.

801 Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 27.

802 Reitzenstein: "The begetter is God's will." Cf. on this Jas. 1 18: βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς.

803 Reitzenstein, *a. a. O.* 33.

804 Reitzenstein p. 20. Cf. what was set out above (note 653) concerning the actualization of rebirth in the Sabazios mysteries. In general, with regard to "sexual union with God," reference is to be made to Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* 1903 and 1910, p. 123 f.; Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* 142. 221. 226; *Hellen. Myster.* 12. 20 ff. 76. 88. 99. 130; and, with regard to "rebirth," to the latter's *Poimandres* 215. 219 (it is the conclusion and goal of all revelation, makes the recipient of grace one with God or rather into God), 226 ff. 341; *Hellen. Myster.* 9. 26. 31–35. 42. 44. 49. 57 f. 77. 97 f. 101. 105. 207. 214.

805 Reitzenstein p. 12. 87 f.: "The initiation itself probably points to the Orient, which is celebrated as sexual union with the god — . A ten-day asceticism is followed first by baptism, then by the introduction into the *sacrarium*."

806 This ἀνακαίνωσις cannot mean the lifelong moral–religious "process" effected by the Holy Spirit, but only the change in basic orientation that conditions and stimulates it, which occurs at baptism and comes to expression in confession and divine recognition.

807 From engaging in a history and critique of the modern discussions concerning the question of the origin of the Lord's Supper (see on this the most recent exchange by K. G. Goetz: *Das Abendmahl eine Diatheke Jesu oder sein letztes Gleichnis?* 1920, in H. Windisch, *Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, fasc. 8), in particular also concerning the significance of the relevant texts of Justin (on the latter see Harnack's exposition in *Texte und Untersuchungen* VII 2, 117–141 and the controversy thereby occasioned), one can and must refrain here.

808 On the post-apostolic course of development cf. especially Knopf, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter* 1905, pp. 253–271 ("the meal assembly").

809 The ἀνάμνησις (1 Cor. 11 24 f.; Luke 22 19) is originally remembrance of what one has oneself experienced.

810 The sense of 1 Cor. 11 20 is not: When you come together, then your entire eating and drinking is not the proper "Lord's Supper" (cf. Knopf, *a. a. O.* p. 256), but rather: thus there does not come about any Lord's Supper at all (cf. Weizsäcker, *Übers.*), because your ordinary

feasting, in which one thinks only of oneself and not of Christ and the (needy) brothers, renders your appended supposed and alleged celebration of the Lord's Supper null and void. Moreover, it could of course not fail to occur that the expression κυριακὸν δεῖπνον was then also applied jointly to the Lord's Supper and the brotherly meal associated with it.

811 The name occurs in the New Testament only in Jude 12. Cf. otherwise Knopf, *a. a. O.* 257.

812 According to the *Didache* (ch. 14) one is to come together on the Lord's Day to break bread and give thanks; "but first confess your transgressions, so that your sacrifice may be pure. But everyone who is at odds with his companion shall not take part in your assembly until they have been reconciled, so that your sacrifice may not be defiled" (Knopf, *a. a. O.* 254).

813 With regard to the questionable consideration of Jewish Passover custom in the later celebration of the Lord's Supper one should compare Knopf (*a. a. O.*): "It is striking that according to the clear wording of ch. 9 (of the *Didache*) the cup precedes the bread. It is Jewish custom, at Passover and at other meals, to let the cup go around first. This Jewish custom caused the insertion of the first cup in Luke 22 17, and the same sequence—cup–bread—which is to be established in the *Didache* also seems to be present in 1 Cor. 10 16. 21 (despite 11 23 ff.)" (pp. 255 f.).

814 Here the older name ἀνδρεία (sc. συσσίτια) persisted into late times.

815 Ed. Meyer, *GA.* II § 57. In Rome, where the curiae were the "counterpart of the phratries," "the ancient food-community lived on as a religious custom in the meals at the curial tables into the latest period. Similar conditions to those in Rome will originally have existed everywhere in Italy, however little we know of them. Food-communities which were evidently at the same time warrior-communities, such as the Cretan and Spartan syssitia, still existed in full vitality in southern Italy in the 5th century; they are traced back to the primal king Italos" (ibid. § 326).

816 Westermann in Pauly *RE* VI, 2, 1551. In Crete, where it was the state that had to provide nourishment for the citizens and their dependents, of all produce in fruits and herds one half was used for cult and state administration, the other for the syssitia.

817 "The form of the word, which varies throughout the manuscripts, is uncertain, the etymology unknown" (Westermann, *a. a. O.* 1550).

818 Cf. also the echo in the Easter angel-choir (*Faust* I).

819 Schürer, *Gesch.*[4] II 663. 658.

820 The image, evidently already current and capable of multiple interpretations, is used by Paul only here and indeed without reference to the Lord's Supper. Paul's thought—Christ our Passover lamb—was carried through by the Fourth Evangelist in the passion narrative, although he no longer allows Jesus to celebrate the Passover meal. Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on John 18 28.

821 Cf. with regard to the *καινὴ διαθήκη* in the blood of Jesus the (not expressly stated, but parallel in sense) one in the water (of baptism) in 1 John 5 6.

822 Cf. Baentsch (*Exodus–Leviticus*) on Ex. 24 8: “In that the people also are sprinkled with the sacrificial blood, the covenant fellowship between Yahweh and the people is established and the obligations assumed by both sides are given the character of absolute binding force. The blood comes into consideration solely as a binding agent; of an expiatory or sanctifying power there is no talk here. In v. 6 it is expressly designated as ‘covenant blood.’” Just as, with the image of Jesus as the Passover lamb, at least indirectly the notion of the activity of the host (bestower of salvation) could attach itself, so also with the comparison of the covenant sacrifice, insofar as it was a peace-meal sacrifice on the basis of the covenant foundation.

823 Schmiedel on 1 Cor. 11 23—26 (p. 164).

824 As regards the diversity of the components, which contain a mixture of mythical and again legendary materials (characterized by historically sounding names—vv. 1. 9), and the “unhistorical character of the chapter,” reference may be made to Holzinger and Gunkel in their Genesis commentaries and to (Stade–)Bertholet, *Bibl. Theol. des A. T.* II p. 4.

825 One thinks of a “conclusion *ex silentio scripturae*, according to Philonic hermeneutics” (v. Soden in the *Hand-Comm. z. N. T.* III 28 p. 57). Matters are not so simple.

826 On immortality in the sense of an inseparable union of body and soul see note 621. Melchizedek too shows, in what he gives and receives, that he is of bodily nature.

827 Why I cannot concur with the Assyriological interpretation of צדק and שלם in Gen. 14 18 in the sense of a “designation of God” (Zimmern–Winckler, *Die Keilinschriften und das A. T.* 1903, pp. 224. 473) will become clear from what follows.

828 See the apt demonstration by Stade (*Lehrb. d. hebr. Gramm.* 1879, § 343 b).

829 Thus in Manu’s Lawbook 7, 7; alongside this *Dharmarāja* in the *Mahābhārata* and elsewhere.

830 Thus, for example, the sun is called *dharmadhvaja*, because it has *dharma* as its banner (*Mahābhārata* 3, 149). In Greek the concept corresponds to θεσμός in the name of the underworld goddess Demeter θεσμοφόρος, whose festival was properly a sowing festival (Prel.-Robert 777).

831 As such he also bears the name *Dharma* (*Mahābhārata* 1, 4759 ff., among others).

832 Cf. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben* 1879, pp. 421 f.

833 Cf. in general especially *Rigveda* X 14 (and incidentally, on eschatological drinking: Mark 14 25 = Matt. 26 29 = Luke 22 18). Further details in Zimmer’s illuminating exposition, pp. 408—422.

834 Yama is the son of Vivasvant (the latter word being a “name of the morning sun; later, of the sun,” *Petersb. Wörterb.*).

835 On the name see Roscher I 2, 1786 (Scherer); III 2, 2569 (Höfer).

836 Prel.-Robert 803.

837 Prel.-Robert 804.

838 Whereas according to some (already Homer, *Od.* 4, 564) Rhadamanthys, like outstanding heroes, is translated into the Elysian Fields without dying (according to Pindar, to the Isles of the Blessed as πάρεδρος of Kronos), according to others he dies and in the underworld exercises the office of judge alongside his double Minos and others, either in a manner similar to that on earth (Plato, *Apol.* 32 p. 41 A; cf. *Od.* 11, 568), or as judge of the dead who decides over blessedness or damnation (Plato, *Gorg.* 523 E—526). Further details see Jessen in Roscher IV 80 ff., where it is found “in itself already probable” “that Rhadamanthys was originally only one of the many names under which the god of the hereafter was invoked” (p. 85).

839 Cf. the names traditionally likewise referred to the site of Jerusalem, Moriah (Gen. 22 2; 2 Chr. 3 1) and Ariel (Isa. 29 1. 2. 7), and on this Gunkel in the Genesis commentary³ pp. 237. 240 f.

840 Cf., as a counterpart, the participation of the inhabitants of the underworld stirred up *in malam partem*, as the vivid poetic imagination of the prophet sees it occur at the fall of the Babylonian king in Isa. 14 3—23.

841 Cf. the messianic conjunction of צדק and שלום, Isa. 9 6; 32 17; Ps. 72 1—3.

842 Cf. Rohde, *Ps.* I 76 f., and Enoch’s rapture Gen. 5 24 (“the old tradition means: to God, into God’s dwelling,” Gunkel).

843 מִכָּל־יִשָּׂר points to the wondrous field-commander skill of Abram (Gen. 14 14—16). The expression אֵל עֶלְיוֹן becomes sufficiently intelligible in Abram’s achievement with his 318 men. אֵין־אַבְי is not to be drawn to the preceding (strike out the *maqqeph*!); like שַׂר שָׁלֵם it plays upon the characteristic of Melchizedek and, with the conceptual moment of eternity (עַד), receives light as much from Hebr. 7 (see above) as from the (probably belonging to the first half of the fifth century) messianic prophecy Mic. 5 1. As to the name-form (a “fine poetic personification”: my father—אָבִי—is eternity) cf. those discussed by Olshausen, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.* p. 616. According to Stade (*Zeitschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch.* 1906, p. 99), in Isa. 9 5 f. not only “the equipment of the son of David for his messianic calling, as in 11 1 ff., appears as a gift from on high,” but he himself (אֵל גִּבּוֹר). The messianic kingdom moves back into the heavenly sphere. He infers from this a very late origin of the “messianic jubilee song.”

844 From a further elaboration one must here refrain.

845 The later Melchizedek tradition certainly thought, at Salem (Σαλήμ), of the old Jebusite fortress, the later seat of Yahweh, the “θεὸς ὕψιστος.” Cf. moreover Gunkel.

846 δίφυος; *geminus* Ovid, *Metam.* 2, 555; *biformis* Justin II 6, 7; cf. the double nature of Yama (see above).

847 He “has no father,”—which is why it also remains doubtful whether at the earth-birth the goddess Gaia was thought of as mother. Kekrops originally begets no lineage either. His wife Agraulos is certainly inferred only from the daughter of the same name. The daughters themselves are hypostases of Athena and originally cannot belong to him either—Erichthonios even less so. “Nor does any noble lineage derive from Kekrops” (Immisch in Roscher II 1, 1014—1024; 1513. Prel.-Robert 52. 130. 388).

848 Prel.-Robert 130. 202. What light, after what has been shown, falls from Melchizedek upon the king of Sodom cannot be set forth here.

849 Cf. v. Soden on 2 10. 5 9.

850 On the history and significance of the conception see Knopf (on the last-mentioned passage) pp. 147—154.

851 Cf. with respect to the אֵל־עֶלְיוֹן of Melchizedek (Gen. 14 18) the אֵל־עֶלְיוֹן of the earth (Gen. 1 12). On Melchizedek as a priestly image of the divine wine-gift Logos in Philo see above p. 81.

852 “Without in any way indicating that the letter derives from Paul or indeed from any apostolic authority, but out of the consciousness of communicating to the Corinthians a piece of gnosis hitherto peculiar to his community, Clement often introduces and expounds the letter to the Romans (at 47 passages, especially 36 1—5 = Hebr. 1 3—5. 7. 13). Immediately thereafter he also seems to presuppose Hermas” (Holtzmann, *Einl.* 293).

853 On the non-consideration of the Lord’s Supper (cf. especially 6 2, where there is talk only of the παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχή, and that as something elementary in Christian religious instruction, v. 1) cf. Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 306 f. 347: “If, accordingly, here faith no longer, as with Paul, opens up a mystical community of life with Christ the one who died and rose again, then that entire series of ideas also falls away which is bound up with a life of the Exalted One in his believers, with a dwelling in his community.” Cf. also v. Soden on Hebr. 10 29: “an influence of the Lord’s Supper formula must remain all the more doubtful, since the ἁγιάζειν is not bound specifically to the Lord’s Supper celebration, but rather to the once-for-all sacrifice itself, 10 10.”

854 For further details see Hilgenfeld, *Ketzer-gesch.* p. 611 f.; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*³ I 671 ff.; 713 ff.

855 Cf. the clear and emphatic expression of this feeling in 1 Thess. 5 23. The inability, strongly evident in antiquity and thus especially also in the Old Testament, sharply to distinguish between body and soul, between the physical and the spiritual being, is to be kept in view (cf. Heitmüller, *T. u. A.* p. 21).

856 “That is, the holy food is, like all nourishment, completely transformed into our flesh; but Justin too has here most probably had in mind the resurrection body” (Harnack, *a. a. O.* I 202 f.; 234).

857 We think of what, through the “transformation” (cf. Phil. 3 21; 2 Cor. 5 4), has become of the earthly σῶμα and αἷμα Christi. Just as certainly as the blood belongs in the full sense to this body, it is also not to be eliminated in Paul’s conception of the glorification of Christ (cf. the curious argument on the basis of 1 Cor. 15 50 in Clemen, *Mysterienrel.* p. 48).

858 Cf. Clemen *a. a. O.* pp. 56 f.; 73; 78; Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myster.* 98; Knopf on 1 Pet. 2 3 and 2.—On the “pre-stages of eschatological ‘glorification’” according to Paul, to which not only ethical but also physical transformation of the human being through the πνεῦμα coming into him belongs, whereby he receives an “earnest of the resurrection,” cf. Schmiedel in the *Hand-Comm.*² II 1 p. 233 and 201 f.; Reitzenstein *a. a. O.* 32 f. 48 (“σῶμα ἀσώματον, as Hellenistic mysticism calls this mirror-image of the heavenly in the earthly”). 179.

859 Not a revelation (cf. Reitzenstein: “directly from the Lord,” *Hellen. Myster.* p. 50), but an “indirect reception from oral tradition” (Schmiedel p. 162) is to be assumed. Ed. Meyer points to the three years of the apostle’s period of instruction in Damascus, which is then supplemented by intercourse with Peter and James in Jerusalem (Gal. 1 18 f.) (*U. A.* I 175). One would do well not to think of something memorized and repeated in a school-like fashion.

860 On the uniting of the two see above p. 271 f.

861 Cf. also the relevant determination of the so-called apostolic decree (Acts 15.20.29; 21.25) — and, as a parallel to the consumption of swine’s flesh, 2 Macc. 6.18—31, chap. 7.

862 See above, n. 673. It could thus also be connected with this, what must strike one over against the not infrequent entering of the apostle upon baptism, that he comes to speak of the Lord’s Supper only in 1 Cor. 10 and 11. — The synagogue remained entirely foreign to sacramental ideas (on “non-official Judaism” see Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*² 1906, p. 230 ff.; cf. H. Holtzmann in *Th. LZ.* 1903, col. 370).

863 There revealed itself therein the extraordinary strength of the mystico-cultic need of the age of the Hellenistic world (see above, pp. 90 f., 221 f.). Cf. O. Holtzmann in *ZntW.* 1904, p. 106 f.: “One may dispute whether Paul formed this conception in recollection of specific pagan mysteries; undoubtedly here a piece of paganism has penetrated into the world of ideas of Christianity,” and the not wholly inapposite remark of Reinach in *Orpheus* 1910, p. 20, cited by Clemen (*Mysterienrel.* 78) in a rejecting sense.

864 See Schmiedel *z. St.*

865 One has remarked, with regard to the questionable effect of unworthy participation in the Lord’s Supper, that it has no parallel in the mystery religions (Clemen a. a. O. 58). But are we sufficiently instructed — and on both sides? One will also have to keep the many-sidedness of the total question in view if 1 Cor. 10.16 ff. (concerning the κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος and τοῦ

σώματος of Christ), already on account of its extraordinary logical obscurity (see the commentary literature!), is to be declared a passage not suitable as the basis of a demonstration. It may be asked whether already here one is not to think of a mysterious, real influence proceeding from the exalted Christ, which does not accord with the analogous influence of demonic powers upon their worshippers and table-companions. Moreover, the perishable physical consequences of the abusive consumption of the Lord's Supper, which according to Paul are to be assumed, recall the effect which the Fourth Evangelist ascribes to the "morsel" handed by Jesus (before his glorification: cf. 12.23, 28; 13.31 f.) to Judas at the last meal: the seizure of possession (13.27) of the unmasked disciple. The unmistakably outstanding interest of the evangelist precisely in this trait of his narrative (13.2, 21—32; 18.2—6) is explained, according to what was already discussed in the first section, from the fact that in the person of Judas Iscariot the incorporated (13.27; cf. Lk. 22.3) Satan himself was to be presented as the betrayer of the incarnate Logos (cf. above, pp. 44—48). According to Lk. 22.3—6 Judas had already (for some time) before the Passover taken the "Satan" into himself (εἰσῆλθεν Σατανᾶς). Both in Luke and in John the betrayal of Judas appears as something to which he was incited and driven by Satan. In Mark (14.10 f.) and Matthew (26.14—16) the betrayal, as with Luke, precedes the Passover day, but in both cases there is no mention of Satan.

866 Cf. Nestle in *ZntW.* 1906, p. 256 (the passage fused from two sources, whether through Luke or through a glossator). See further on Lk. 22.19 f., in which (according to Blass and Wellhausen) most recently Ed. Meyer (*U. A.* I 178) discerns a "late interpolation," as also for the whole section vv. 15—20, especially Holtzmann, *Syn.* pp. 408—410.

867 The expressly formulaic character of the words of institution in Mark and Matthew explains itself from the increased frequency of their cultic use and the corresponding need for the briefest formulation. Cf. in general also Reitzenstein (*Hellen. Myster.* 50): "The mystery naturally demands the formula." On the basis of Mark–Matthew Luke, who in both goes back to Paul himself, would certainly not have obtained the consistent report vv. 14—20 (Passover meal, Lord's Supper). On the question of sources see Ed. Meyer 177, 248 ff.

868 From Zech. 9.11 one must refrain (cf. Marti *z. St.*).

869 Cf. Ed. Meyer, *U. A.* I 179. The question whether Jesus at the traditional institution of the δεῖπνον κυριακόν (not at the Passover meal, Lk. 22.15—18) himself also ate bread and drank wine, whereby a strong lack of clarity enters in, may at least be touched upon. As certainly as he is in the holy meal in some way represented as the one offering his own body and his own blood, so certainly can he therein only be the host of his own and not their table-companion (see above, p. 283 f. on the Pauline conception and p. 267 f. on the original Lord's Supper). The δεῖπνον of 1 Cor. 11.25 and Lk. 22.20 can scarcely be anything other than the breaking of bread of the Lord's Supper taking place in the midst of the Passover meal, to which the parallel of the drinking of wine on both sides attaches itself. In the former passage this is less intelligible because the preceding special reference to the Passover is lacking there. Cf. Schmiedel p. 161. On the "un-Pauline formulation" of the addition εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in Matthew see Schmiedel p. 164.

870 If the bread handed by Jesus at the farewell meal in the reporting of Paul and of the Synoptics is not designated more precisely as ἄζυμον (unleavened bread), but simply as ἄρτος, this cannot be surprising, for it was in fact unleavened bread (מצה; cf. ἄρτος ἄζυμος Exod. 29.2), and moreover, in the typological consideration of the feast, as shown, already with the emergence of the "Lord's Supper" the Passover parallel had elsewhere (above all that of the "bread and wine" of Gen. 14.18) given way.

871 Hebr. 13.9 is also not to be taken into account (cf. Clemen a. a. O. 69). That 1 Cor. 10.3 f. drops out for the mystery question has already been shown (p. 258 f.).

872 "Certainly one originally also among the Greeks thought that one could eat the deity and thereby appropriate its powers" (Clemen a. a. O. 56).

873 "Indeed, in the meals which we find in the Demeter, Kab(e)iroi, Attis, Sabazios, Isis and Mithras mysteries, nothing points to this; only the eating of raw flesh (and ivy) in the Dionysus cult may originally have had this sense" (Clemen a. a. O.). From the mysteries of Lykosura (see ibid.) and others one may in any case refrain.

874 Cf. the scholion note on Clem. Alex., *Protr.* I p. 433 Dind.
(ὠμὰ ἴσθιον κρέα οἱ μυούμενοι Διονύσῳ· δεῖγμα τοῦτο τελουμένου τοῦ σπαραγμοῦ ὃν ὑπέστη Διόνυσος ὑπὸ Τιτάνων), which is to be explained from the entire corresponding complex of ideas of the mysteries (as Dieterich — *Mithrasliturgie* 106 — has already done). Prel.-Robert 693, 695. Rohde, *Ps.* II 15, 1; 118, 2; 103 f.

875 Then the main explanation of 4.2 lies in the fact that Jesus let only his disciples baptize: their baptism was not yet baptism of the Spirit, but rather stood on the level of John's baptism. On 1.33 cf. *Unters.* I 336.

876 *Unters.* I 342—344.

877 "Eternal life" appears most frequently in the two sacrament chapters: 3.15 f., 36 and 6.27, 40, 47, 54, 68. Cf. moreover *Unters.* I 294, 292.

878 Holtzmann-Bauer: "According to 3.36, ἰδεῖν τὴν ζωήν would have been more Johannine." But it deserves notice that the concept of life is not introduced in 3.3 and 5, although precisely it is most closely related to the concept of begetting and birth. The synoptic conception of the kingdom of God (kingdom of heaven), which includes within itself the oppositions of this world and the other world, of present and future, is to come fully into its own (cf. Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 516; ²578 f.).

879 Rohde, *Ps.* I 289 f. Evidence for Pindar, Sophocles, Isocrates, Krinagoras, Cicero, Aristides see in Lobeck, *Agl.* 69 ff.; Rohde p. 290, 1; see above, n. 604.

880 Lobeck 67 ff.

881 Preller in Pauly, *REccl.* V 325. We shall return later to a corresponding significant piece of evidence in our Gospel itself (the name John).

882 Cf. Rohde, *Ps.* I 288 f. Besides the “dramatic action,” probably especially “the sacred formulas to be spoken by the hierophant” were of importance.

883 From the “life of Jesus” his self-testimony in word and sign is, in this general consideration, to be taken together with the incarnation. On the conception of the process of the becoming-flesh of the Logos itself see *Unters.* I 334 ff. With regard to the designation of the Logos as μονογενής, it has been recalled that it is also used of mystery gods (Wobbermin, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* 1896, 114 ff.; cf. Clemen, *Entst.* 57). More important, however, is the clarification which the evangelist gives us concerning the nature of his Logos in 1.14, when he ascribes to the one who appeared in the flesh a glory such as that of an only-begotten who has come from the Father (παρὰ 6.46; 7.29), full of grace and truth. If μονογενούς referred to the incarnation, it would have to read: δόξαν τοῦ μονογενοῦς. The particle ὡς (instead of τοῦ) signifies that the begetting-concept is to be understood figuratively, thus referring to the Logos ἄσαρκος, who from the incarnation onward presents himself as πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. Already the specifically “Johannine” depth and fullness of these concepts makes it impossible to interpret μονογενούς and πατρός as referring to any arbitrary only-begotten and any arbitrary father (cf., e.g., B. Weiß). With fine tact the evangelist speaks of the sonship of the Logos only at the moment when he introduces the God-man, and in such a way that he at the same time allows the figurative character of the expression μονογενής and the uniqueness of the inner-divine relation to be seen through (cf. *Unters.* I 77 f., 102). With the divine creation time began: the divine begetting, conceived as self-objectification in a person-like highest and most general principle of revelation, is pre-temporal and supra-temporal. Humanity has recognized this archetypal divine begetting in its full δόξα only from the incarnation in the person of Jesus Christ onward — through the inference resulting from this appearance. Accordingly, also in 1.18, with the μονογενὴς θεός (υἱός), who nestles against the Father (is cherished by him as his alter ego), the Logos of 1.1 ff., who in Jesus has become personally known to the world as the perfect “exegete” of God, is designated according to his unchanging nature. The “being in the bosom of God” is an eternal one (cf. moreover, on the question of the prehistory of the concept and expression μονογενής, *Unters.* I 362 f.). The expression ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, however, makes the almost unavoidable impression that an allusion is here interwoven which again recalls the conceptual and linguistic mode of the mysteries. We have come to know, in connection with the passage which compares the exalted Jesus with the exalted serpent of Moses (3.14), the (Dionysian-)Sabazios worshipped under the symbol of the serpent as a god to whom, in his mysteries, the begetting of a new human being in the mystes (his rebirth) was ascribed, and who, in reference to this, was called the ὑποκόλπιος (the word unites in itself the two meanings: hidden in the mother’s womb and dearly loved) (see above, n. 653). In this connection one should note how in the Prologue 1.11 ff. it is said of the Logos presented as the light of the world: He came into his own, and his own did not receive him. “But as many as received him, to them he gave the power to become children of God — to those who believe in his name — who were begotten not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God.” If, then, according to what has been shown, we are dealing christologically in the Prologue with the mystery of a pre-temporal and a temporal “begetting,” then for the evangelist’s

comparative consideration, given his whole character, already at the outset the religionsgeschichtlich-mythological parallel of the double birth of Dionysos lay ready. However strange this myth may appear to us, the natural process which it originally describes is nevertheless simple and intelligible. The Semele beloved by Zeus (personification “of the earth swelling with fertility under the breath of spring,” Prel.-Robert 660), induced by Hera, demands an appearance of the god with thunder and lightning and, seized by the flames, gives birth while dying to the unripe fruit, which is saved from the earth by cooling ivy. Thereupon Zeus takes the child and “sews it into his thigh and begets it anew from this, after the hour of its maturity has come.” Thus Dionysos poetically (according to Nonnus of Panopolis) bears the epithet διισσότοκος (among the Orphics διμήτωρ). The meaning of the myth is the successive operation of winter soil-moisture and spring thunderstorms, of the motherly earth and the fatherly heaven, whereby the life of nature, summarized and personified in Dionysos (see nn. 327, 453), is conditioned. In both cases Dionysos is son of heaven, but spatially his story leads from the earth into the atmosphere (the thigh of Zeus, i.e. “his generative power signifies the cooling and moistening cloud”). “The legend is very often repeated and has also been frequently expressed in works of art” (Prel.-Robert 661 f.). That the evangelist was acquainted with this myth is, after all that we have seen, beyond doubt. That it hovered before him already at the beginning of his written work is an all the more well-grounded assumption, since the second chapter at once opens with the most astonishing portrayal of Jesus in his antitypically Dionysian role (see above, pp. 95 f., 107 ff.), and the third chapter immediately follows with the rebirth-theme of the baptismal mystery. Whoever, in such cases — and they are numerous in the Fourth Gospel — makes his literary and factual criticism dependent upon a modern standard of taste and uniformly heightened logical demands upon the ancient writer will often enough go seriously astray: *exempla sunt odiosa*.

884 Resurrection, exaltation, and return are included typologically and antitypologically. On the detailed demonstration of the mystery-idea in the “Johannine” presentation of the passion narrative of Jesus see especially above, pp. 204 ff.; on the suffering death of Dionysos p. 193 f. The resurrection with the subsequent appearances of the risen one corresponds to the highest grade of initiation of the (Eleusinian) mysteries: the epopteia. Cf. on this Preller in Pauly, *REccl.* III 104 f.; Prel.-Robert 795. In heretical Christian Gnosticism it could not fail that, over against the passion mystery of the Logos who became flesh in the Jesus of our Fourth Gospel, real and permanently humanized, a cross- or suffering-mystery of the docetic Logos-Christ was set. Cf. in the *Acts of John* chs. 94—96; 47; 101 (Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 427 f., 453 f.; II 508, 534; and on this C. Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache aus dem Codex Brucianus* in v. Gebhardt and Harnack, *Texte u. Unters.* (1892) VIII 1 f., p. 187 ff.).

885 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 6.

886 It may perhaps be appropriate here to cast another glance at the peculiar report of the foot-washing (13.1—20), already discussed in another connection (see above, pp. 140 f.), which is clearly conceived, according to vv. 2—4, as temporally coinciding with and essentially connected to Jesus’ farewell meal and the associated institution of the “Lord’s Supper” (see above, pp. 267 ff.), which the evangelist passes over in silence. The symbolic action of Jesus is evidently intended, together with the farewell discourses contained in ch. 14 ff., to prepare the

disciples in an initiatory manner for the beholding and experiencing of the great passion mystery of the Logos-Christ (15.12—14). But there is the greatest probability that the evangelist here again followed a classical mystery motif. The characterization of the illumination of Jesus' suffering death by our evangelist has already led us to compare the "lesser" Eleusinian mysteries, falling in the same season of the year (month Anthesterion: February to March) (p. 206), which were regarded as προκάθαρσις καὶ προάγνωσις τῶν μεγάλων and took place in the southeastern suburb of Athens, Agrai. The southeast of Athens resembles in several remarkable respects the east of Jerusalem geographically. Just as opposite the Acropolis rose the Ardettos, at which Agrai lay, so opposite the Temple Mount and Zion stood the Mount of Olives. Corresponding to the Ilissos, flowing southward and separating Athens from the eastern chain of hills, was in Jerusalem the Kidron, likewise coming from the north, the one as the other a constricted mountain stream; the present Ilissos "is rarely more than a step wide and even in antiquity stood far behind the Kephisos in volume of water; in summer it dries up entirely, but can occasionally swell like a torrent" (Baedeker, *Griechenland*[8] 1908, p. 28). The Kidron also does not flow continuously through its southward-narrowing valley, but appears only after heavy, prolonged rainstorms as a turbid, dirty "black stream" (J. Frohnmeyer, *Bibl. Geographie* 1892, p. 117). The Athenian spring Kallirrhoe, which "wells forth from the rock at the edge of the Ilissos bed," recalls the Gihon (Mary's Spring) and the Rogel (Job's Well) of the Kidron valley. Did not the evangelist himself think of this parallel when he strikingly reports that Jesus, departing from the last meal (13.2; 14.31), went with his disciples across the winter-torrent (χειμάρρους) Kidron (read τοῦ Κεδρών) to a place where there was a garden (κήπος), into which he entered with his disciples, and that this locality was also known to his betrayer Judas, because Jesus often assembled there with his disciples? The circumstantiality of the entire remark alone betrays that the evangelist ascribed particular weight to the seemingly incidental detail. It should be recalled that the Synoptics do not mention the crossing of the Kidron at all (Mark and Matthew designate as the destination a plot of land (χωρίον) named Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives — Luke names only the Mount of Olives). Along the Ilissos — here on the city side itself — already before the Persian Wars there extended garden land (κήποι); but eastward opposite, opening toward the Ilissos, lay at the Ardettos the stadium of the Panathenaic athletic contests, laid out by the Athenian rhetor and statesman Lycurgus around 330 B.C. Plato also places the scene of his dialogue *Phaedrus* in the same river region, "where Socrates reclines in the shade of the plane trees for conversation, the river at his feet, the scent of blossoms from above, wafted by cooling air and the song of cicadas" (Baedeker, *Griechenland* a. a. O.). We evidently come to know in John 18.1 ff., as scarcely anywhere else, the author of our Gospel — who knew Jerusalem as well as Athens from personal observation — also as a poet. In view of Jesus' final path of suffering and his struggle of soul in Gethsemane, which latter, as corresponding mysteriously to the idea of the Logos-Christ and at the same time as belonging to the Holy of Holies of the passion mystery (see above), is passed over in silence, he is involuntarily transported to the place where once the most celebrated classical herald of truth had fulfilled, in the circle of his disciples, the inner calling that led him to martyrdom. We can only surmise how powerfully the contrast between the athletic contests in the Athenian stadium and that wrestling of the "Son" with the "Father" in Gethsemane, which was directed toward the salvation of the "world" (3.17), may have impressed itself upon him. Thus, for the reflective reader of the Fourth

Gospel, at an inconspicuous point and unexpectedly, a beam of light falls upon the passion narrative that shows it illuminated by the radiance of the sun of ancient Greece.

***** Dmitri Merezhkovsky, *Leonardo da Vinci* (German trans. by Dr. El*iasberg 1911), Book 15.*

---

pp 298-411

887 Cf. the argumentation of Loofs: “If Peter was only a short time in Rome, and if it is contested with noteworthy reasons that the First Epistle of Peter was originally a letter of Peter, the Papias tradition can be a construction that grew out of the mention of Mark in the First Epistle of Peter and out of the remembrance of relations between the Gospel of Mark and Italy. And this construction can have arisen from the inclination already operative in the 2nd century of the later ‘Christendom’ to attach the Gospels that bore no apostolic name to apostles. All the more would this not be improbable if the not unambiguous words of Papias are supposed to say that Mark, as author of the Gospel, was the interpreter of Peter, i.e. the transmitter of his proclamation of Jesus” (*Wer war Jesus Christus?* 1916, p. 71). For Mark as “interpreter of Peter” there has most recently again stepped forward (with special rejection of Wellhausen and Bousset) emphatically and confidently: Ed. Meyer (UA I 157–160).

888 Jerome *Ep.* 120, *ad Hedib.* 11 (*Petro narrante et illo scribente*). Cf. on this and on the intermediate links (Irenaeus, Clement Alex., Origen, Eusebius) Holtzmann, *Einl.* 384.

The first secure report is that it was read as holy scripture by Syrian Docetists**889** in the district of Antioch at the end of the 2nd century, but was rejected by the episcopal representative of the great church [Serapion], to whom it had been unknown until then” (Stülcken in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 29). St. dates the composition of the writing to about the middle of the 2nd century. Along with the Synoptics, the Fourth Gospel has already also been used.

890 As also here the evangelist gradually disappeared behind the apostle (according to Chrysostom one can also ascribe the work of Luke to Paul, *Homil. in Act.* I), see Holtzmann, *a. a. O.* 387.

891 Cf. Grill, *Der Primat des Petrus*, p. 34.

892 On the details see Holtzmann, *a. a. O.* 388 f.

893 At John 15:1 one might think of Matt. 4:11; 26:53. Cf. however *Unters.* I 128 (Philo).

894 Holtzmann, *a. a. O.* 380. Cf. Jülicher, *Einl.* § 25, 3.

895 It could in no way have concerned James (Gal. 1:19; 2:9, 12).

896 As this is also expressed in the mysterious designation “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (see above).

897 Note equally “the Gospel” and “issued,” also the quite indeterminate διατριβών. The naming of the (apostle) John as author of the Fourth Gospel (ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει ἐν ἀρχῇ κ. τ. λ.) in Theophilus (*ad Autol.* 2, 22) is the first example of a named citation of an evangelist, in any case not before 180 (cf. Bleek, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 276; Holtzmann, *Einl.*, p. 109). The dependence of Irenaeus on the books *ad Autolycum* is very probable (Harnack, *Chron.* I 319 f.).

898 For details and the history of the criticism reference may be made especially to Holtzmann, *Einl.* pp. 470–475 (the tradition about the Ephesian John).

899 Hase, *Kirchengeschichte* I 178. “To communities in which the Ephesian apostle must have stood in the highest esteem, Ignatius writes. — As little as Ignatius, writing to the Smyrnaeans or to their bishop, mentions an apostle John, so little does Polycarp himself in the letter to the Philippians (instead 3:2; 9:1; 11:3 Paul) or his martyrdom. Justin too still does not know an apostolic evangelist John. — As the last watchman on the frontier [between the apostolic age and the times of the emerging Gnosis] Polycrates [of Ephesus] and Irenaeus would certainly have named John. But also the Muratorian Canon [200+?], in which the Fourth Gospel appears to us as it were in the first freshness of attained canonicity, imagines Jerusalem as the place of composition and the period when the apostles were still united as the time of composition, so that the Johannine writings precede the Pauline letters. — One quibbles with each of these witnesses individually. — But overwhelming is nevertheless their common silence, all the more since among the silent there comes a speaker, namely that Papias who knows nothing to say of the apostle John except perhaps for the confirmation of the *λόγιον κυριακόν* Mark 10:39 = Matt. 20:23: ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη” (Holtzmann, *a. a. O.* 470). On Papias see below, note 906.

900 I let Holtzmann speak once more (*a. a. O.*, p. 196).

901 The narrator of the wine miracle of Cana!

902 As allegedly the guarantors of Irenaeus, the disciples of the apostle, the “presbyters,” and their fellow witness Papias, the hearer of John, wish to know, to the eschatological saying of Jesus the betrayer Judas, confessing his doubt, is said to have been dismissed by the Lord himself with the word: *Videbunt qui venient in illa!* The anecdote seemed to Irenaeus (or to a later one?) particularly in need of authentication by the “old Papias.” Cf. otherwise Harnack, *Chron.* I 335 f.; Clemen, *Entst.* 377 f.

903 With the whole series of supports for the legend of the Asia Minor apostle John, ascertained through interpretation of the silence of all the earliest writers who could or should have spoken (cf. Clemen, *Entst.* 415 ff.; Loofs 99 ff.), one does not in a positive direction get beyond a more or less forced assumption of conjectural possibilities. It remains with the impression already attested by H. Holtzmann that “their common silence is overwhelming” (see above). How much right there is to expect in the Ignatians a “mention of John,” Clemen himself notes (p. 418), and Loofs too (p. 100) concedes: “In Ignatius indeed—this should not be denied—the non-mention of John, especially in the Epistle to the Ephesians, is at first glance striking.” That the designation of the Ephesians as Παύλου συμμύσται in 12:2 demands no comparison with John in the same context must be granted. Nevertheless Schwartz is completely right when he does

not understand how Ignatius, in addition, in his long letter to the Ephesians should have thought with no word of the glorious memory of the long life of John in Ephesus concluded only a few years before (Noch einmal der Tod der Söhne Zebedäi in *ZntW.* 1910, p. 90; cf. Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II 413 ff.). If, however, Clemen (p. 419) remarks with regard to Papias that he may possibly, just as little as Peter and James, who had long been dead when Papias presented his investigations, have seen John, this at the same time would be invoked against the Ephesian residence of the latter altogether; this conclusion would be compelling only for the lifetime of Papias, or more precisely the later lifetime in which he interested himself in these matters; during this time John could hardly have lived in Ephesus, for otherwise Papias would probably have sought him there; but before that he could quite well have been there—then he will hardly have concealed from himself the questionable nature of this reasoning. On the occasional intrusion of the *παράδοσις ἄγραφος* with Papias in general, which challenges criticism, cf. Euseb. *h. e.* III 39, 11. I conclude the discussion with Harnack's remark: "One may here still make the following consideration: if John the apostle was for decades in Asia and the author of the writings standing under his name, how could a contradiction arise at all in Asia? Have the Pauline letters ever been doubted, with the exception of the truly doubtful Pastoral Epistles?" (*Chron.* I 671).

904 Schürer in *Theol. Liter. Zeit.* 1904, col. 708. Cf. Loofs p. 19 and, over against this, already the exposition of E. Schwartz in *ZntW.* 1910, p. 91 ff.

905 Apart from Wellhausen's position on Mark 10:35 ff. (in the commentary; cf. *Das Evangelium Johannis* 1908: "There is now no longer any shaking the fact that John Zebedee followed his master into death long before Peter and was executed in Jerusalem together with his brother James," pp. 100, 119 f.), one should chiefly recall the investigation of E. Schwartz: *Noch einmal der Tod der Söhne Zebedäi* (in *ZntW.* 1910), according to which the martyrdom of the sons of Zebedee is with the greatest probability to be set in the year 43/44—shortly after the meeting of Paul with the "pillars" in Jerusalem. "It is the first secure date of church history, from which all preceding events must be determined" (p. 100). The said meeting probably shortly before occasioned the persecution under Agrippa I. Cf. also Wendland (on Ad. Bauer, *Vom Griechentum zum Christentum* 1910, ch. VI): "Papias' testimony about the joint martyrdom of the two Zebedees is rightly found confirmed by the *vaticinium ex eventu* of Mark 10:35 ff., which cannot be explained away" (*Theol. Lit.-Z.* 1911, col. 9), and Heitmüller, *Zur Johannes-Tradition* (in *ZntW.* 1914, p. 189 f.).

906 Thus especially by Clemen (*Entst.* pp. 434–448) and Loofs (pp. 87–93). Both have deployed everything to remove the fortunately not lost testimony of Papias (see above, note 899), confirming the prophecy of Mark 10:39 (Matt. 20:23) and standing opposed to the Asia Minor Johannine tradition. I am unable to recognize a decisive counterproof even in what is here adduced, although it is presented as "undoubted" "that Papias cannot have written as the 'report' now reads" (Loofs 92). As is well known, this is found both in the collection of ecclesiastical-historical excerpts produced between 600 and 800 (probably traceable back to Philippus of Side [around 430]) as offered by the medieval *codex Baroccianus* 142 (for the text [ed. de Boor in *Texte u. Unters.* 1888, V, 2] see Preuschen, *Antilegomena* 1901, p. 58; 1905, p. 94; Funk, *Die apostolischen Väter* 1901, p. 132 f.), "and also in the chronicle of Georgios

Hamartolos belonging to the 9th century according to the text of *cod. Coislinianus* 305 (ed. Nolte in *Theol. Quartalschrift* 1862, p. 466 f.; see Preuschen *a. a. O.*; Funk 133; and on the textual form of all the other chronicle manuscripts Clemen p. 434 f.). The epitome of the Baroccianus gives the wording: Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λέγει, ὅτι Ἰωάννης [ὁ θεολόγος—certainly did not stand in the original text; see Bousset in *Theol. Rundschau* 1905, p. 227] καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθησαν. The chronicle of the Coislinianus reports: Μετὰ δὲ Δομετιανὸν ἐβασίλευσε Νερουᾶς ἔτος ἕν, ὃς ἀνακαλεσάμενος Ἰωάννην ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἀπέλυσεν οἰκεῖν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, μόνος τότε περιὼν τῷ βίῳ ἐκ τῶν ιβ´ μαθητῶν καὶ συγγραψάμενος τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον μαρτυρίου κατηξίωται. Παπίας γὰρ ὁ Ἱεραπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος αὐτόπτης τούτου γενόμενος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων φάσκει, ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη—πληρώσας δηλαδή μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν πρόρρησιν καὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ὁμολογίαν περὶ τούτου καὶ συγκατάθεσιν. — Among other things, one has sought to help oneself by assuming that these statements have suffered multiple, partly accidental, partly arbitrary distortion on one side and the other, and has sought to guess the original Papias text (thus, following Lightfoot, Harnack—experimentally and "meant hypothetically" in *Chron.* I 666 ff.). But that with such means pretty much anything can be made out of everything should be evident; Loofs too remarks nothing further than: "That is possible, but not provable." He in turn (with Harnack) argues against the assumption of the authenticity of the "alleged Papias report" that Irenaeus, Eusebius, and many others could not have read it in the work of Papias and all have kept silent. "But against that it holds that at all times one has had means and ways to pass over unusable and contradictory traditions. And the Papias tradition was unusable for the Fathers in view of the tradition about the apostle John in Asia Minor that was fixed by the end of the 2nd century. Our critics themselves show how one can *bona fide* come to eliminate this clear Papias testimony as irrelevant or not pertaining to the matter" (Bousset in *Theol. Rundschau* 1905, p. 228). The doubly attested statement demands attention instead of principled doubting and discounting (Loofs too speaks of presumably quite convoluted paths of manuscript transmission and perhaps essential alteration of Papias' wording), already because one asks oneself in vain what could have induced the copyists involved in one or the other period of the Middle Ages (if not already previously Philippus of Side) to bring Papias, by distortion of his text, into such striking contradiction with the Church (Gutjahr's explanation also appears to Clemen, despite all sympathy, "probably too bold," *a. a. O.* p. 442; on the misleading appeal of Georgios to the agreement of Origen with Papias see Holtzmann, *Einl.* 471). On the basis of this consideration we have in fact initially to reckon with the circumstance that Papias still represented the historical tradition, in agreement with Mark 10:39, of the martyr's death of the two sons of Zebedee (on the Old Syriac translation of the Mark passage, which already disregards the martyr-death of John—*Syr*^{m} and *Syr*^{our}—see J. Weiss in *ZntW.* 1910, p. 167, where—against Merx—the originality of the Greek text is maintained). Against this it does not avail to appeal to the fact that Papias knew the Fourth Gospel and the attestation of the peaceful death of John in the appendix to it (ch. 21), and that therefore a word of early martyr-death of the evangelist would be unthinkable with him (Loofs 78 n. 1; 93); cf. against this also Ed. Meyer: "I consider it excluded that Papias knew the Gospel of John" (UA I 247). Least of all can this alleged knowledge of Papias be proven by the curiosity of that note of unknown origin which reports him as the "favorite pupil" of John, that the Gospel of John was issued by him "still during his lifetime" and gifted to the churches, and adds that John dictated it to Papias

(on the text see Funk *a. a. O.* 133 f.; Clemen, *Entst.* 375; and on the criticism—against E. Schwartz—Bousset, who rightly speaks of a bogus citation, in *Theol. Rundschau* 1905, p. 284 f.). Nor is anything accomplished with the assertion that Papias, in his statement based on the "presbyter" about the origin of the Gospel of Mark (Euseb. *h. e.* III 39, 15), measured this by the Gospel of John (Loofs 72—appealing to E. Schwartz): it is unprovable; and if one sets the wording of Papias: Μᾶρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ ὡς ἔφην Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων (λογίων) beside the statement of the same Church Father about the Gospel according to Matthew: Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο (συνετάξατο? Eus. III 39, 16), then rather the comparison of the Gospel of Mark with that of Matthew appears as the given one with Papias, as indeed this assumption has also found substantial critical support (cf. Holtzmann, *Einl.* 383, 377). To speak of a correct order (*τάξις*) in the Fourth Gospel would hardly have occurred even to a Papias, already in view of chs. 1 and 2 themselves. Finally, misguided, in light of the foregoing, is the attempt by means of combination of what is attested on the one hand by Papias and on the other allegedly by the presbyters of Irenaeus to gain a proof that Papias knew of a historical existence and activity of the apostle John in Asia Minor. For even with this "very small mind" (Euseb. *h. e.* III 39, 13) it is incomprehensible how he, if in accordance with reality he lets the Zebedean John suffer martyr's death by the Jews, should already also have made use of the "formulas" with which Irenaeus repeatedly (adv. haer. II 22, 5; V 30, 1; 33, 3 f.) introduces his presbyters as such who themselves saw the "disciple of the Lord John," i.e. the apostle (as a very aged old man in Asia Minor). On a separate engagement with the views recently put forward concerning the guarantors of Papias and Irenaeus one cannot enter here in particular (reference may be made especially to Harnack, *Chron.* I 333 ff.; Corssen, *Die Presbyter des Irenäus* in *ZntW.* 1901, pp. 202–227; Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedäi* 1904, pp. 7, 13, and *Noch einmal der Tod der Söhne Zebedäi* in *ZntW.* 1910, pp. 89–104; Bousset, *Der Verfasser des Johannesevangeliums* in *Theol. Rundschau* 1905, pp. 236–244, 274–295; Bacon, *Date and Habitat of the Elders of Papias* in *ZntW.* 1911, pp. 176–187; Clemen *a. a. O.* 376–379). In the following brief, partly only allusive summary of what I myself find clearly expressed in the present texts, or at least believe I can derive from them with sufficient certainty, I find myself in the widest agreement with the results of the investigation of the "tradition about the Ephesian John," which we owe to H. Holtzmann (*Einl.* 470–475). The "presbyters" in question of Irenaeus are evidently in his own conception an indeterminate many, generally also already unknown to him himself by name, churchmen of the period reaching up into the last decades of the first century, immediately preceding the literary activity of Papias, to which, according to Papias, pre-eminently Aristion and the likewise unnamed by Irenaeus—by all indications (see what follows) identical with the author of the Apocalypse (but not the author of I or II and III John—cf. on the question already Jerome *de vir. inl.* 18 and Philippus of Side in *cod. Baroccianus* 142 [Preuschen *a. a. O.* 58 f.])—"Presbyter John" (or simply "the presbyter") belong. It is to be noted that the tradition ascribed to that indeterminate plurality of presbyters in Iren. V 33, 4 is expressly characterized as an oral testimony (cf. on this Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutest. Kanons* VI, 1900, p. 89; also Clemen *a. a. O.* 377 f.), in distinction from the written (*ἐγγράφως*) of Papias, to which there occurs an appeal there for confirmation of the

oral. Now Papias himself, however (according to Euseb. III 39, 2–4, 7), clearly distinguishes the apostle John and the presbyter John as persons of different periods, and indeed in such a way that he presents himself as a contemporary and fellow-student of the latter. Eusebius therefore corrects there the assertion of Irenaeus in V 33, 4 that Papias still heard John (namely the apostle), to the effect that Papias himself does not present it thus in the preface to his work, as though he were a hearer and eyewitness of the holy apostles; rather he teaches that he received the knowledge of the facts of faith from the acquaintances (*γνώριμοι*) of the apostles, thus indirectly, when he says: “I will not hesitate to weave into the explanations what I once learned (*ἔμαθον*—through repeated personal instruction??) securely (*καλῶς*) from the presbyters [the *γνώριμοι*, i.e. immediate pupils of the apostles] and kept well in memory, while I guarantee their truthfulness. For I did not take pleasure, like the multitude, in those who talk much, but in those who teach the truth.—But if someone came [a mediate pupil of the apostles] who had also [like myself] followed the presbyters [the immediate apostolic pupils] (one already senses from the expression *παρηκολουθηκώς* the unclear background of the overall conception), I inquired [with his help] from the sayings of the presbyters [the immediate apostolic pupils] what Andrew or what Peter had said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James or John [the apostle] or Matthew or [otherwise] one of the disciples of the Lord, and [our older contemporaries—cf. Harnack, *Chron.* I 660 f.] Aristion and the presbyter John [the only named mediate pupils of the apostles beside Papias (and Polycarp)] say” (*οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί* is a textually incorrect insertion based on misunderstanding; cf. Preuschen, *Antilegomena* pp. 55, 146). To this quotation Eusebius still adds the remark about the two bearers of the name John, that it is probable that the second—or, if one prefers, the first—saw the revelation standing under the name of John. He concludes with the words: “The Papias just mentioned now confesses that he received the teachings of the apostles from those who had followed them (as immediate pupils), while he himself heard Aristion and the presbyter John (the two mediate apostolic pupils). For he mentions them by name frequently in his books and adduces teachings from them. I did not wish to say this in vain” (Preuschen *a. a. O.* 55 f., 146). One sees clearly: the instance of the “presbyters” of Irenaeus stamped as witnesses—partly leading back to the end of the apostolic age and thus allegedly specially made acquainted with the apostle John—whose historical reality he scarcely illuminates and substantiates by even a single name, is a nebulous magnitude, a phantasmagoria. Irenaeus speaks of Polycarp only twice, of Papias only once. Entirely correctly Holtzmann already remarked (*a. a. O.* 472): “This senate of Nestors, which the apostolic and post-apostolic age would have to show, would probably reduce in advance to the two or three around 100 (the Jerusalem Simeon, Aristion, and the Ephesian John, who again is not to be split into two homonymous persons) and the two around 150 (the Hierapolitan Papias and the Smyrnaean Polycarp) [cf. on the martyr Simeon: Knopf, *Das nachapost. Zeitalter* 1905, pp. 20, 22, 26 ff.]. But the interest of Irenaeus, to bring the catholic church grown up with himself into as immediate a connection as possible with the apostolic age, lets him scarcely still distinguish the various rows of *πρεσβύτεροι* lying between, just as for him also the age of Domitian, despite the fact that this one died 40 years before the birth of Irenaeus, almost coincides with his own age. A presbyter, *qui audierat ab his, qui apostolos viderant et ab his, qui didicerant* (IV 27, 1—double designation of the same persons) soon thereafter (IV 32, 1) becomes *senior apostolorum discipulus*, just as Clement of Rome, against his own testimony, is called *ὁ καὶ ἑωρακὼς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους καὶ συμβεβληκὼς αὐτοῖς*

(III 3, 3).” Cf. on this also Harnack’s remark concerning the “presbyter-preacher” of Irenaeus (IV 27, 1—32, 1): “There is no demonstrable connection between the reminiscences in our section and the other presbyter notices in Irenaeus” (*Philotesia* for Kleinert’s 70th birthday, 1907, p. 22). Is it too much to say if one applies to such a church writer, insofar as he wishes to be a historical guarantor (cf. also Holtzmann *Einl.* 196; Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II 403; Heitmüller in *ZntW.* 1914, p. 190 f.), *mutatis mutandis* the Horatian: *hunc tu Romane caveto!* That moreover the fog had already begun to form some decades before the intervention of the authority of Irenaeus in the ecclesiastical sphere of Papias himself is, after what has been shown, to be emphasized especially. Under these circumstances we will finally not have to wonder that the tradition of the Asia Minor apostle John also does not become more credible if one appeals to the statement of Irenaeus that Polycarp, the companion of Papias, had seen the apostle in Asia. Corssen has declared the testimony in question of Polycarp’s intercourse with the apostle to be “a brazen forgery” (*ZntW.* 1904, p. 302). With an extensive investigation of the relevant evidentiary material, which leads Clemen to the assumption “that Irenaeus only heard Polycarp as a boy in his earliest age” (cf. Irenaeus’ letter to Florinus 5 ff. and *adv. haer.* III 3, 4; Euseb. *h. e.* IV 14, 3 ff.; V 20, 1, 4 ff.), he too does not get further here (*Entst.* 447–456) than to the declaration that he “firmly believes” Irenaeus did not err in this case (that he consciously lied would in any case only have been assumed as long as one did not understand the purpose of the letter to Florinus). According to this, however, “by the testimony of Irenaeus is proven what was already the most probable after the Gospel of John itself, that John really later lived in Asia Minor” (p. 456). Are we really to ascribe serious probative force, when Irenaeus after all “also otherwise liked to move some nearer to the apostles than they stood to them,” to Clemen’s appeal to “the precise memory of the man of the sermons and lectures of Polycarp heard in his earliest age”? Has no disposition yet shown itself in this reporter at an immature boyhood (cf. Harnack, *Chron.* I 326, 328: not in that of a pupil) toward the emotional vagueness proper to the presbyter and bishop in weighty historical questions? Is one really to believe unconditionally in the correctness of his apprehension and the fidelity of his memory in this case—to assume the same memorial value in this direction as where it concerns the *τόπος ἐν ᾧ καθέζόμενος διελέγετο ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος καὶ τὰς προόδους καὶ τὰς εἰσόδους καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ σώματος ἰδέαν*? If, however, Clemen alongside this also argues that if Irenaeus had mistakenly taken the John meant by the *ἀποστολικὸς πρεσβύτερος* Polycarp for the apostle, Florinus would “surely have thrown this in his face and Irenaeus would have answered it in his later writing against him,” we likewise do not get beyond a quite questionable conjecture, which—even strengthened by a side glance at the stance of the reporter Eusebius toward the two Johns in the question of the composition of the Apocalypse (see above)—by no means suffices where a decisive proof is to come about. We can indeed, as regards the memory of Irenaeus, insofar as it “stood under the influence of a growing enrichment of his theological consciousness,” not avoid reckoning with an expansion beyond the original content of youthful memories (Holtzmann, *Einl.* 472).

After all this, the assertion of Irenaeus that the presbyters in question themselves saw and heard the “disciple of the Lord John,” the apostle (see above), in reality proves only that in the homeland of Aristion and the presbyter John (Asia Minor) at the time of Irenaeus (at the latest in the penultimate decade of the 2nd century) the tradition was widespread and had found ecclesiastical belief that the Zebedean John, who (contrary to the solemn agreement of the pillar

apostles with Paul and Barnabas, Gal. 2:9) had become from Jewish apostle the apostle to the Gentiles, had concluded his apostolic activity and his life there in the highest old age. The path to the explanation of this strange legend, which with Irenaeus has become the proper legend, cannot in any case, as one easily sees, leave aside the named "presbyter John." If this one was in fact the author of the Apocalypse, although the apocalyptist does not call himself presbyter but deliberately only John simply, then we have precisely in him a personality who, through his name as well as through his literary work, came in a quite peculiar way to meet the formation of the Johannine apostle legend corresponding to a churchly need of the time (already present in its beginnings). To the sameness of name of the presbyter and the apostle, which in itself already favored a later confusion, there came the pressing comparison of the character of the two. Why does the writer in question call himself only John, not presbyter? Because what he has to say as apocalyptist he wants at the same time to say as a particularly graced bearer of the New-Testamentally significant Johannine name (cf. on John the Baptist Luke 1:13, 17: *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἠλεία*) in the spirit and, as it were, in representation of the apostle John. His book is a revealed "book of destiny" (Holtzmann, *Einl.* 411). The place where the future is revealed to him perhaps symbolically bears the name Patmos because it resonates with *πότμος*—all the more so as the revealed content (however the question of unity, in which I side with Jülicher, *Einl.* § 22, conclusion, may stand) lets a long chain of most severe judgments (the seven "harbingers," the seven trumpets, the three woes, the war of the dragon with the community of God on earth, the seven bowls of wrath, the battle with Gog and Magog, and the judgment of God on the world) precede the renewal of the world and eternal blessedness in the new Jerusalem. Which other apostle's traits, however, fit better the title image of this future drama than those of the *υἱὸς βροντῆς* John (Mark 3:17)? It may also be pointed out that the apocalyptist's self-designation as *συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ* (1:9) strikingly recalls the admonitory characterization of the two Zebedees in Mark 10:32–45: the *θλῖψις* precedes their position of honor in the future *βασιλεία* (on the connecting *ὑπομονή*, the patient expectation of Jesus, cf. Apoc. 22:17, 20); ambitious claims to preference are to be rejected. The apocalyptist also in this respect steps into the footsteps of his humbled apostolic predecessor: the royal distinction he expects is a common one. Not to be overlooked further is also the concealment, achieved in our case without the otherwise usual means of free choice of a writer's name, of the literary activity of the presbyter John as author of the Apocalypse. The remaining in darkness of the author appears, precisely with a work of this kind, already in general to be appropriate to the matter (cf. Weinei, *Apokalypsen* in Hennecke, *A. Apokr.* I 199 f.), as demanded by the dangerous situation of the times (and so in any case if it was composed in Domitian's time, perhaps around 95; cf. Holtzmann, *Einl.* 419; Jülicher *a. a. O.*; Knopf, *Das nachapostol. Zeitalter* 1905, p. 89 ff.). That the concealment succeeded is shown not merely already by Justin, when he (as the first) expressly assumes the authorship of the apostle John (Dial. 81), but in later times in particular also in his way by Eusebius through the remarkable vacillation, the "transitional position" of the judgment, with all inclination toward a decision for the presbyter (see above and for details Holtzmann, *Einl.* 425 ff.). If one duly considers all these moments, one will not be too much surprised if relatively soon the legend of the Asia Minor activity of the apostle John, supported by the erroneous transfer of the composition of the Apocalypse to the apostle John, arose against the tradition still reproduced by Papias of the martyr's death of the apostle. This course of events appears all the more understandable when

one considers that that misleading shift in favor of the apostle and the literary displacement of the presbyter John thereby accomplished—who at least retained the honor of the *πρεσβύτερος κατ' ἐξοχήν*—could from the spread of the Apocalypse onward occur in a wide circle at the most various points and in individual cases quite independently. It would only be surprising if it had gone otherwise precisely with such a sensational phenomenon. For from the beginning also precisely in the explanation of the basic passage for our whole question, Mark 10:37 ff., the exegetical art of the ancients was offered the possibility of deriving from the prophecy of Christ for the one of the two Zebedees the indeterminate length of life required for an Asia Minor concluding period: one could (as already the author of Acts 12:3? see above) ascribe to the Lord's word Mark 10:39 (Matt. 22:23) a double sense misinterpreting the doubled image of cup and baptism, and thereby assign to the one Zebedee the suffering martyrdom, to the other the martyr's death (cf. the repetition of this embarrassment exegesis down to the present). One also understands only from here what church-historical interest embodied itself in the narrative of the suffering testimony of John (at Peter's side!) according to Acts 4:3, 18–21 and 5:17–42 (in the latter passage John is not named, but is thought of in the first place alongside Peter). Yes, after all it could almost be asked whether not, from quite another side, something also slipped in by the hand in the origin and spread of the Asia Minor legend: a popular superstition already attested by the Synoptics in another case (Mark 6:14 ff.; Matt. 14:1 f.; Luke 9:7 ff.)? We again come upon the name John. It was the Baptist, held by his disciples to be an "incarnation of Elijah" (Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des 4. Evangeliums* 1898, p. 84), of whom once the rumor went that he (according to others Elijah or some other old prophet) had risen again in Jesus (his spirit prophetically working wonders had entered Jesus); here too Luke is especially to be considered. Did one perhaps here and there secretly see in the Asia Minor apocalyptist the apostolic *Joannes redivivus*? Still in the 15th century, for example, the pupils of the Platonist Georgius Gemisthus Pletho believed that the soul of Plato had embodied itself anew in him. The Acts of John even let the Ephesian apostle raise two dead persons! The testimony, on the one hand contained in statements of the Valentinian Heracleon (Clem. Alex. *strom.* IV 9, 73), of the author of the writing *De rebaptismate* (*Corp. script. eccl. lat.* III 3, 86), of Aphraates (from the year 343/4) in Homily XXI (*Texte u. Unters.* III 347), etc., and on the other hand in the martyrologies, for the fact of the martyr's death of the two sons of Zebedee, is, in view of the partly not entirely sufficient definiteness of the wording or of the contradiction of the tradition of one and the same land, finally to remain at least not unmentioned (cf. on the details Clemen, *Entst.* 442–444). A side glance presses itself almost involuntarily from the long-lived apostle. How in antiquity conversely the one who in fact had become an old man in a foreign land could, according to legend, have already died in his best years (as punishment), whether murdered or by suicide, shows the well-known example of Coriolanus (cf. Mommsen, *Die Erzählung von Cn. Marcius Cor.* in *Hermes* IV, 1870).

907 In responding on this side (cf. e.g. Loofs *a. a. O.* pp. 75 f.; 87) one would in particular also have to point to the well-known application of the concept of "forgery," demonstrably inappropriate both to the religious and to the profane mode of thought of antiquity.

908 Cf. Bousset in *Theol. Rundschau* 1905, p. 225 f. That, moreover, one can get by without necessity with the assumption of a *vaticinium ex eventu* in New Testament exegesis just as little as in Old Testament exegesis, will scarcely need to be recalled incidentally.

909 E. Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedäi* 1904, p. 48.

910 The testimonies do not compel us to assume a simultaneous martyrdom of both brothers (Bousset *a. a. O.* p. 226, n. 1).

911 On the relationship to Mark 3:17 (Boanerges) cf. above, n. 73: the passage already takes into account the apostolic rank relationship in the sense of the later period!

912 E. Schwartz thinks that the reasons for the absence of the oracle concerning the sons of Zebedee in Luke can no longer be guessed (*ZntW.* 1910, p. 100). We shall return to this. For the moment it must not be overlooked that according to Mark the sons of Zebedee themselves are presented to Jesus, whereas according to Matthew the mother intercedes for them—with a mitigating effect in favor of the sons (cf. Holtzmann).

913 With regard to the section 8:5–25, which challenges source criticism, reference must be made to the investigations of Waitz (*Die Pseudoklementinen* in *Texte u. Unters.* XXV, 4, 1904, p. 225 ff.; and: *Die Quelle der Philippusgeschichten* in *ZntW.* 1906, pp. 340–355); Ed. Schwartz (*Zur Chronologie des Paulus* in *Nachr. d. Ges. d. Wiss. Gött.* 1907, pp. 263–299); Wellhausen (in *Abhandl. d. Ges. d. Wiss. Gött.* 1914, p. 14 f.); Bousset (in *ZntW.* 1914, p. 146 f.); on the Catholic side: Pieper (*Die Simon-Magus-Perikope* in *Neutestl. Abhandlungen* ed. Meinertz III, 5, 1911). For our question, the entire ecclesiastically transmitted textual corpus comes into consideration, however it may be judged in detail from the standpoint of literary history.

914 Clemen, who (following Köstlin, Overbeck [Pfleiderer], Harnack) considers the origin of Acts in Ephesus the most probable (*Entst.* 396–399), thinks in this connection of the year 94 or 95, whereas otherwise more recent criticism often brings the date down into the time of Trajan and Hadrian; he assumes the same place of origin for the Gospel of Luke, “since between the two Lukan writings and the fourth Gospel the well-known points of contact exist” (p. 399).

915 On the renewed appearance of Peter in Acts 15:7, 14 cf. E. Schwartz *a. a. O.*: “It has been demonstrated that the section 15:1–16:4 refers to the same events that are narrated in 11:27–30, and that the missionary journeys of Paul, of which chs. 13 and 14 report, can fall not before, but only after the meeting [of Paul with the ‘pillars’ in Jerusalem].”

916 On the question of the point in time of the final redaction of Acts and correspondingly of the time of Papias cf. the concession of E. Schwartz in *ZntW.* 1910, p. 90.

917 Cf. Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.* 467: “Now it is also further, quite apart from tendentious fabrications of the later period, entirely conceivable that later, without historical foundation, the notion arose that the apostles raised above all others in a tradition such as the Gospel of Matthew presents must also have lived in the community which soon became the center of Christendom and must have founded their decisive prestige.”

918 “In fact, the situation with Peter in Rome and with John in Asia Minor is quite similar” (Holtzmann, *Einl.* 474). What kind of relationship the tradition drawn upon by Weizsäcker from Matt. 16:16–19 has, I have shown in my work *Der Primat des Petrus* (1904); to the result that vv.

18 f. are an interpolation of later origin, H. Holtzmann, Ficker, and other scholars have emphatically assented. In this situation, it is of course all the more important to attach weight to what we may derive from the statement of the letter of the Roman “bishop” (presbyter) Clement, already soon after 150 (cf. Hegesippus and Dionysius of Corinth), probably composed around the middle of the nineties of the first century, thus approximately contemporaneous with the Johannine Apocalypse, sent by the Roman community to the Corinthian community, in ch. V. The passage makes a highly surprising impression already on first reading through the disproportion in what is said about Peter and about Paul. The author expressly wishes to present to the Corinthians—among whom serious disturbances of communal life had arisen through ecclesiastically ambitious intrigues and insubordination—the greatest and most justly constituted (δικαιότατοι) supports (“pillars”) of the Church, in particular the apostles Peter and Paul, as the most outstanding exemplars of a humility and self-denial prepared to sacrifice itself to the utmost in the face of misrecognition and injury. The more, however, he strives and is able to provide, in the case of Paul, a vivid and weighty factual proof for this, the more it must stand out that what he is prompted or able to report concerning Peter turns out to be exceedingly scanty, indefinite, and insignificant. What Peter “endured” were not one or two, but several “πόνους,” i.e. the unlawful and tormenting hardships of the apostolic vocation arising from jealousy (διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον). What is that supposed to mean in comparison with what is asserted of Paul? Had more been said—and as known to the Corinthians presupposed—it would certainly not have remained unmentioned by the Roman church leader. That, however, this does not occur more forcefully explains itself readily if he bases his statement immediately and exclusively on the reporting of Acts, or at least on the tradition history belonging to it (cf. with regard to the latter the phrase ἐπτὰκις δεσμὰ φορέσας and 2 Cor. 11:23). For this speaks unmistakably the agreement with regard to the alleged facts, the language, and the motivation. For the multiple sufferings of Peter cf. Acts 4:3, 17 f., 21; 5:40 (imprisonment; threatening warning not to be deterred from his boldness; scourging—of which among the “apostles” Peter is to be thought of in the first place—cf. 4:35; 5:2 f.); for those of Paul Acts 9:25; 13:50 (συρρασθεῖς); 14:19 (λιθασθείς); for the faith of the latter and his doctrine of righteousness Acts 17:30 f.; for the enemies of Peter themselves the tormenting jealousy Acts 4:2 (διαπονούμενοι); 5:17 (ζήλου). There still remains the question: what, according to Clement, did the two apostles achieve for their own person through their exemplary professional conduct during their persecution (ἐδιώχθησαν)? In the case of Paul a double gain is stated: first the genuine (i.e. well-earned) renown (κλέος) of his faith; then, finally—and after a reference to the (Rom. 15:24, 28 announced, by Clement not doubted) activity in the farthest West (Spain) and the (death-defying) confession before the supreme court—his deliverance from the world and his entry (ἐπορεύθη) into the (heavenly) sanctuary. He thereby became “the greatest example of patience.” Over against all this, with regard to Peter it is stated only in advance: καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας (after those repeatedly endured witness-sufferings—πόνοι) ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. The more precise determination of this place of glory is the most difficult and most important task of the interpretation of our passage. It can be solved only if it is recognized that in ch. V ff. only two of the μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιότατοι στῦλοι (Peter and Paul as an especially outstanding pair, which lies closer to the interest of the communities of Corinth and Rome) are named and held up for imitation, without thereby excluding the thought of the apostolic brother-pair of the sons of Zebedee, one of whom (James) according to the tradition

decisive for Clement fought ἕως θανάτου (Acts 12:2) and indeed as the first blood-witness of the apostolic circle altogether. That the same Acts says nothing of a martyr's death of the other, John, who was already known to Paul as a στῦλος (despite Mark 10:39; Matt. 20:22), has already been discussed (he disappears with 12:2). Since now, as likewise shown, in precisely this historical work the situation with Peter is quite similar, insofar as we learn in 12:17 only that he soon after the execution of James departed from Jerusalem elsewhere (ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον), the statement of Clement that he went to the "place of glory" due to him (on grounds of God and justice) enters into a peculiar, highly noteworthy light. One can scarcely resist the impression that the Roman author, in his deliberate and carefully chosen mode of expression unmistakably alluding to Acts 12:17, wishes to let the same shine through in the case of Peter as the author *ad Theophilum* (see above p. 316 f.). He achieves this by designating the final goal of the apostle's vocational activity in a double sense as τόπος τῆς δόξης, and in these words comprehending not merely the idea of heavenly glory corresponding to the otherworldly ἅγιος τόπος of the completed Paul, but also—parallel to the κλέος τῆς πίστεως of the latter—the conception, pertaining to the earthly course, of the most eminent ecclesiastical place of honor, such as is due precisely to the most outstanding original apostle and subsequent "pillar apostle." It is precisely in this connection that it will also relate that a named reference to John has been avoided: the thought of a rivalry of the two colleagues is thereby for the time being kept at a distance. If, however, the supposition is justified that Clement under the τόπος τῆς δόξης had Rome in mind, then one still cannot further draw from this the conclusion that he also attests the martyrdom of Peter in the Roman capital (as H. Lietzmann has most recently sought to demonstrate: *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* 1915, pp. 167–170). Against this speaks the fact that the martyrdom of Paul, although Acts even strikingly enough is silent about it, is expressly mentioned by Clement with praise, whereas with Peter there is no indication whatsoever: the ἕως θανάτου ἤθλησαν (V, 2) evidently applies to the two apostolic pairs James–John and Peter–Paul in such a way that it came to death only in the case of the witness-suffering of the one in each pair (cf. the exposition above—n. 906, conclusion—concerning the later misinterpretation of Mark 10:39). Only the newly arisen posthumous rivalry of the two pillar apostles Peter and John was inclined to ascribe to Peter, in fact already relatively soon, alongside Paul, the halo of the blood-witness. This can fortunately still be shown subsequently from John 13:36 through the appendix chapter John 21 in vv. 15–23, wherein, over against Peter—solemnly rehabilitated by the Risen One after his severe offense (the denial of Christ of the Passion) and appointed as chief shepherd of the Christian community (cf. e.g. B. Weiß, Schanz, Holtzmann-Bauer)—under emphasis on his future blood-witness dignity, there is emphatically granted to the beloved disciple John, despite the lack of this distinction, a special apostolic legal and honorary status.

That in this connection a martyrdom of Peter in Rome is intended can (incidentally) scarcely be doubtful. And thus in the end the prestige of a blood-witness of Christ has in reality been transferred from the actual bearer of this character, John, onto Peter of the Roman legend! Indeed, it even gains the appearance as though now the "son of John" Peter (1:42; 21:15–17; not "son of Jonah"!) were to step into a position like that of the "disciple whom Jesus loved" himself (21:15–17), if not displacing the (Asia Minor) John, yet subordinated to him as one holding a complementary supreme authority of the Church (cf. above p. 35 f.). In the whole of

ch. 21 it is in fact merely a matter of a concession, difficult in view of the state of affairs, to the Petrine cause from the Johannine standpoint. The threefold address: “Simon, son of John!” seems intended to indicate that Peter, in his final apostolic role, through his calling also toward the Gentile world, toward the tenderly beloved “lambs” (new converts) and “sheep” of the Lord, will show himself spiritually akin to his colleague John and precisely thereby prove in deed the perfect love of Jesus to which he confesses himself. Viewed from here, as one readily notes, in the martyrdom of Peter the point of view of distinction recedes behind that of the, in his case unavoidable, most severe test of sacrifice. At the same time this explains why in Peter’s case the crueler form of death of crucifixion is to replace beheading (21:18 f.), which in later legend appears further intensified by Peter being crucified upside down at his own request (cf. *Actus Vercellenses* ch. 37; Origen in Euseb. *h. e.* III 1; Jerome, *de script. eccl.* ch. 1; *Acta Petri et Pauli* ch. 81). Under these circumstances one can finally seriously ask whether not the very obvious and materially appropriate combination of Matt. 26:51 f. and John 18:10 f. in the formation of the tradition that Peter suffered martyrdom has substantially contributed, although here initially only beheading was thought of.

In brief, the result of the investigation may be summarized approximately as follows: From the letter of 1 Clement there emerges, in agreement with Acts—intentionally veiled—so much that, with regard to the end of the life of the apostle Paul, already during the last decades of the first century both the legend of the conclusion of Peter’s life in Rome and, in connection with it, the Asia Minor Johannine legend (from Ephesus) had been put into circulation. The martyrdom of Peter (in Rome) is not yet signaled. That, however, the thought of it was from the outset not far off may already be inferred from the linking of John 18:10 f. with Matt. 26:51 f., and the supposition is confirmed already around the middle of the second century through John 21 (with the intensifying variant of the crucifixion corresponding to the grave sin).

With regard to the overall literary-historical question concerning the end of Peter, reference should also be made to the noteworthy study of Erbes in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* XXII, 1901 (“Peter did not die in Rome, but in Jerusalem,” pp. 1–47; 161–224). To the result of Schmiedel’s investigation in *Encyclop. biblica* ed. Cheyne-Black IV, col. 4601, 4607 (art. Simon Peter) I have already referred in my work *Der Primat des Petrus* (p. 63): “All that can be deduced from him—it is Clement Romanus—is (not indeed as anything certainly attested, but yet as something which need not be gainsaid) only Peter’s martyrdom, but outside of Rome and away from the western world altogether.” It is rightly emphasized that Justin (c. 152) knows nothing of the Roman sojourn of Peter. “This circumstance ought also to induce caution in finding a testimony for such a sojourn in Clement of Rome.” On the alleged tomb of Peter in Rome cf. (as against Lietzmann) Karl Holl (who incidentally likewise maintains the Petrine martyrdom in Rome) in *Sitzungsberichte d. preuß. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1921, p. 945.

That text-critically the question can arise whether not the section John 13:36–14:31 was secondarily placed before chs. 15, 16 in the sense of the appendix (21:15–23), in order to allow the essential contrast between the “son of John” (see above) Simon Peter and the “son of Simon” Judas the Iscariot (John 13:26; 12:4; 14:22), between the later denier and the betrayer of Jesus, to emerge more strongly (see n. 13), should finally likewise still be noted.

919 One should already also note the reference of the **Gospel of Mark** to the ranking order of the apostles in 3:16 ff. (Simon Peter and Andrew separated from James and John).

920 After what has been shown, one cannot speak in Mark 10:35–41 of a conversation that is "very old, even if not authentic" (E. Schwartz in *Abh. d. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Gött.* N. F. 1904, VII 5, 4; cf. *ZntW.* 1910, p. 100 and the modification by Clemen in *Entst.* 430 f.). In its deeper sense, what is narrated places us in a time when the opposition of the double slogan: *Here Peter! Here John!* had already begun to take shape in its first beginnings. **Pro Petro**, Mark first of all emphatically restricts, vis-à-vis James and John, the eschatologically decisive significance of death-martyrdom. **Pro Joanne**, on the other hand, the Gospel of Matthew subsequently mitigates the reproach of ambition directed at the sons of Zebedee, and the Lukan Gospel then goes so far as to conceal this offensive feature through its silence.

921 The right and dignity of Peter could in the period in question appear all the more in need of confirmation, the more dangerous (from an originally extremely Pauline side?) a criticism of Peter threatened to become, which brought the apostle into comparison with the traitor Judas Iscariot by reference to the denial of Jesus in the Passion narrative (Mark 3:19)! For quite some time already, on the basis of the results of a comprehensive investigation—which did not leave the Iscariot problem out of consideration and cannot be reproduced here—I have entertained the strongest objections against the assumption of the historicity of the relevant Petrine narrative of our four canonical Gospels, and must maintain these even against the position taken by Brandt (*Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums* 1893, p. 29 f.; cf. p. 159 f.) and by Ed. Meyer (UA I 148 ff.). In all likelihood the denial report in Mark 14:29b–31 and vv. 54, 66–72 did not yet belong to the oldest Markan text. One should already note the unusually strong textual variation in v. 30 and vv. 66–72; materially, however, the striking escalation of the individual features: the miraculous foreknowledge of Jesus and the magnitude of the apostle's fall (indicated by the particularly characteristic, not text-critically eliminable, twice-crowing of the cock)! The passage is entirely dispensable in the base narrative: Peter also denies Jesus here, but only as the other disciples do, by fleeing—despite the prior protestation. The addition seems to have entered the text only after the emergence of a differently structured evangelical narrative **type**. Hardly need one be reminded of a parallel to this insertion, such as confronts us in the appendix of the Gospel of Mark (16:9–20), which is even "entirely alien to the manner and linguistic coloring of Mark, and scarcely intelligible in itself as an excerpt from Matthew, Luke, and John" (Holtzm.-Syn.). It should also be evident that, assuming close personal relations of Mark to Peter (see above p. 299), it would be doubly difficult, in view of the peculiar sharpening of the criticism, to maintain the assumption of the authenticity of the text component in question. Moreover, the (Asia Minor?) Acts of Peter (*Actus Vercellenses* 35; cf. Ficker in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 390, 420; II 473 ff.) still show, toward the end of the 2nd century, in the legend of the encounter of Peter fleeing from Rome with the Lord ("*Domine, quo vadis?*") and his drastic reprimand by Christ, the after-effect of that same hypercriticism which was to be definitively disposed of around this very time by the incomparable glorification of the apostle in Matthew 16:18–19 (cf. my work: *Der Primat des Petrus*). As its basis, the regrettable lasting vilification of the later "prince of the apostles" certainly has the deserved rebuke that Paul directed against the weak character of Peter's conduct in Antioch according to Gal. 2:11 ff. (cf. *a. a. O.* p. 41 f.). From the entire course of

events there also results a backward inference to the powerful and enduring impression of the Pauline action, as well as to the extraordinary sensation that this humiliation of the original apostle must have caused in the widest ecclesiastical circles. The tone which the apostle to the Gentiles strikes toward his Galatians, when he portrays Cephas—esteemed alongside James and John as one of the "pillars" of the Christian mother community—as wavering, does not conceal the irony which the painful memory extorts from him. And thus, finally, from this side as well, an explanatory light seems to fall on the origin of the grotesque parallel discussed above (n. 612) to the mysterious ancient Hellenic cult legend (with its strange transition from tragedy to comedy).

922 That the "apostle Peter" of the First Epistle of Peter—probably written in Asia Minor—which could have been composed around 100 (in the ninth decade of the first century? Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä* 1912, p. 24 f.), is meant to be the Roman one, the author himself does not fail to indicate (5:13). To him there is then joined the (likewise imagined in Rome? 2 Peter 1:13 f.; cf. John 21:18 f.) "apostle Peter," to whom probably not much less than a century later the Second Epistle of Peter was attributed by its author (cf. on the most recent investigations especially Knopf *a. a. O.* pp. 249–257).

923 It could not fail to happen—and apparently it did so very soon—that to the Asia Minor (Ephesian) apostle of ecclesiastical legend, John, of whom it was said: "that disciple does not die" (John 21:23), instead of the role of guarantor for the fourth Evangelist, the composition of the fourth Gospel itself was ascribed (21:24); cf. Ed. Meyer, *UA.* I 312. That "the appendix chapter of the Gospel of John," from which we derive this fact, originated in Asia Minor "is as good as certain" (Loofs *a. a. O.* p. 99).

924 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer p. 6: "The word κόσμος occurs in the entire Synoptic tradition only 15 times, in John 78 times, because here the immediate relationship of Christ to the world is continually emphasized (Osk. Holtzmann 50, 88)," and p. 178 on 8:26: "Before him (Jesus), however, the audience is not, for example, the historical surroundings of Jesus in Jerusalem, but in accordance with the universal significance of the Logos, Christ stands before δ κόσμος, into which he calls his word of revelation received from the heavenly Father."

925 Holtzmann-Bauer on the passage (following O. Holtzmann).

926 In accordance with the "holy law" (Bartholomä, Wolff).

927 "The *Ahū* (from the warrior estate; cf. *Yas.* 29:9) compares himself to the Βασιλεύς, who held the office of δικάζειν, in contrast to the office of διαγνῶναι of the judges, to whom in Iran there stood opposite the one *Ratav* (who will have belonged to the priestly estate)." Barthol. *A. W.* col. 282.

928 See Bartholomä *a. a. O.* col. 281 f., 702 f. How fundamental for the Zoroastrian work of salvation precisely the viewpoint is that justice is brought about is shown also by the name of the third of the three sons of Zarathustra, who will complete his father's work and thus, as the Saosyant κ. ε. (Yas. 110, 13), is called *Astvat-ereta* ("the embodied justice") (*Yas.* 26:10; *Yasht*

19:92 and others; for the explanation of the name see Bartholomä *a. a. O.* col. 215 and Tiele-Gehr. II 308).

929 Cf., with δικαιοσύνη John 16:10 and the δικαία κρίσις 5:30, the πατήρ δίκαιε 17:25 and the demand: δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε 7:24.

930 They are children of the devil as the arch-liar (v. 44).

931 So also Holtzmann-Bauer (with the remark: "*for the time being*—it does not say '*finally*'").

932 As regards the justification, reference must here be made to the commentaries—B. Weiß, Calmes, Heitmüller, Zahn, Holtzmann-Bauer.

933 Cf. 8:53: τίνα σεαυτόν ποιεῖς, "what do you make yourself out to be?" What is meant here is the quality and characteristic activity of the person. The same is the case in v. 25, where λαλεῖν τι, as in Attic usage, means "to speak about something or chatter," and probably the expression τὴν ἀρχήν at the same time is intended to recall 1:1 (ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος) and to point back to the Logos-revelation in the person of the speaker as the ultimate ground (cf. 858). It is in fact characteristic precisely of the fourth Gospel that Jesus, from the beginning of his appearance, lets the Logos-glory shine through in his teaching discourse (see above p. 241 f.).

934 Cf. concerning *Vohu manah* what is noted below (under 4).

935 See Barthol. *Gath.* pp. 55, 51. On the contrast between truth and lie cf. John 8:13 f., 16 f., 26, 31 f., 40, 44–46, 55.

936 On the Evangelist's preference for multiplicity of meaning see above p. 204.

937 See above p. 219 f.

938 On the divergent modern interpretation of 16:7–11, which understands ἐλέγχειν in a substantially different way (see Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapost. Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus* 1899, pp. 183–190), cf. Holtzmann-Bauer p. 262. The generality decisive for v. 9 of the thought in the statement about the world in v. 8 does not readily permit thinking in vv. 7–11 of certain special pneumatic matters in Christian congregational life (unmasking of present sinners).

939 Cf. Tiele-Gehr. II 142: "In fact he (*Vohu manah*) comes closest to what we understand by the Holy Spirit." He appears in *Yas.* 46:7 alongside the "fire" as an organ of judgment instead of the Holy Spirit (3:13; 47:6); on the other hand also as mediator of intercourse between Mazdā and Zarathustra (*Yas.* 43:7, 8).

940 Cf. Barthol. *A. W.* col. 1139.

941 The saving activity of Zarathustra (his priestly intercession) continues even when he himself will be in the enjoyment of the deserved eternal life (*Yas.* 50:9; cf. Barthol., *Gath.* 105).

942 *Yas.* 28:6 ff.; 31:22; 32:1, 2, 9 ff., 16; 33:2; 49:3; 51:10 f.

943 *Yas.* 28:5; 30:9; 46:5–8, 14–17; 48:2, 5, 10–12; 49:7 ff.; 50:3; 51:16–19; 53:4 f.

944 *Yas.* 30; 47:5; *Yasht* 19:46, 96; *Videvdad* 19:4; *Yas.* 32:5; 45:2. Particular attention deserves *Yas.* 49:11, according to which the fate of the individual is decided immediately after death (Barthol., *a. a. O.* 99). One is reminded of the "self-judgment" that takes place with the "decision against the light," "which in the Johannine worldview takes the place of the world-judgment" (Holtzmann-Bauer on 3:20), thus already receiving in the oldest Avesta a corrective to the notion of the world-judgment and of eschatological demonology. That, moreover, even according to ancient Zoroastrian teaching, the final judgment and the beginning of the "second life" are thought of as close at hand is shown by *Yas.* 43:12 (cf. Barthol. p. 57; Lehmann in Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrb. d. Religionsgeschichte*² II 203; ³II 223). Whether the Evangelist truly did not reflect on where the "prince of this world" comes from, "how it is at all possible that the world created by God through the Logos displays a being hostile to God" (Holtzmann-Bauer [following Pfleiderer] p. 37), must remain an open question.

945 Barthol., *a. a. O.*: "In accordance with the desire for paradise one is to receive paradise through your caring most holy spirit, O Mazdā." Cf. the abstract *frāxšnan* in 43:4: "Caring support, such as one who knows, if he is able, should grant to a friend," is the concern of Mazdā.

946 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer p. 126.

947 Zarathustra too fundamentally only establishes the decision of the supreme court (Mazdā's and that of the respective Amesha Spentas).

948 Barthol.: "In the last things Zarathustra, who is appointed as judge for this purpose, will finally decide who, as adherents of *Aša*, has deserved the eternal reward, and who, as adherents of the *Drug*, the eternal punishment; and he will also determine the 'mixed ones'" (*Gath.* p. 39).

949 Cf. Barthol., *a. a. O.* p. 74; *A. W.* col. 666.

950 14:16, 26 (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου: in accordance with my personal request and petition).

951 It should further be noted that in the Avesta the adjective *zaoya* (= to be invoked for assistance of whatever kind, capable of and ready for that purpose) is applied to the gods in general and to the *Fravašis* (the guardian spirits of every being, even of the gods!). The word is etymologically identical with the Vedic *havya* (particularly frequently predicated of Indra). That, however, the Greek παράκλητος, in the sense of the farewell discourses of Jesus, could easily become current and customary from the time of the Synoptic Gospels onward should be evident in view of Mark 13:11. Cf. moreover, on the word and the matter under the Hellenistic point of view, Deissmann, *L. O.* 252.

952 *mairyō*: not murderer (Tiele-Gehr.), but deceiver, scoundrel (cf. Barthol., *A. W.* col. 1151).

953 Cf. the characterization of *Angra mainyu* in the temptation narrative of Zarathustra (*Vend.* 19), and on the question of the dependence of the Zarathustra legend on the temptation narrative of Buddha: Garbe (*Ind. Christ.* pp. 50–56), to whom this dependence is "by no means improbable."

954 Cf. my rectorial address on the Persian mystery religion in the Roman Empire and Christianity (1903) pp. 31, 45.

955 Cf. *a. a. O.* p. 30. How the situation of things and the task could, from another standpoint, present themselves differently depending on circumstances, see above p. 253 f.

956 *Unters.* I 74; 344–353. Whether in India the man Krishna, in whom Vishnu is thought to be incarnate, originally belonged to actual history (cf. Garbe, *Ind. Christ.* pp. 210–214) or not is, as is easily seen, irrelevant for our question.

957 With good reason—it has been said, with reference to the state of affairs set forth by me *a. a. O.*—that the progress from Paul to John manifests itself christologically, among other things, essentially also in this, that "Paul represents the apotheosis closer to Greek thinking, the fourth Evangelist the incarnation belonging to the Oriental religious systems [this would need to be more precisely formulated]." "What is distinctive and unique about the person of Jesus no longer consists, for him, in the fact that he is the Messiah of the Jews, nor even in the fact that he is the archetype of humanity, but in the fact that he directly represents the deity on earth in the flesh" (Holtzmann-Bauer p. 58; cf. Holtzm., *Syn.* p. 38).

958 *Unters.* I 352; 353, 1.

959 Cf. *Unters.* I 357, where the possibility is also considered of a polemical interest on the part of the Evangelist over against the gnostic-mystery belief in the *Ophis* Son of Man.

960 Wolff, *Avesta* p. 62. A tasteless elaboration of the passage is offered by *Yasht* 15.

961 See Holtzmann, *Syn.* p. 57, and (against Wellhausen, Joh. Weiß, et al.; cf. Schleiermacher) Ed. Meyer, *UA.* I 296–299. Holtzmann remarks incidentally: "That, however, even in the meantime and then later again it should always have been precisely these Twelve—no more and no fewer—who were around him and followed him on all his journeys like a privileged circle, at the same time also like a closed, numerically delimited company, is neither credible in itself nor, in view of the wider circle of disciples (Luke 10:1; Acts 1:21–23), the opinion of the evangelical tradition; cf. Mark 4:10. Their fixed numbers therefore also appear in the apostolic catalogues only with Peter in first place and Judas in last."

962 According to Seufert (*Über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung des Zwölfapostolats* 1903) and Brückner (*ZntW.* 1906, p. 115), the tradition in question was formed only in the primitive community, and indeed in opposition to the apostleship of Paul. Its presence in Paul shows how far removed the real, historical life of Jesus was from him. See also Brückner, *Der Apostel Paulus als Zeuge wider das Christusbild der Evangelien* (*Prot. Monatshefte* 1906, p. 360). On the most recent discussion of the question of the "historicity of the choosing of the Twelve" (Ed.

Meyer against Wellhausen and Ed. Schwartz), reference should further be made to K. Holl *a. a. O.* p. 931. With regard to the number seven of the disciples in the miraculous catch of fish in John 21, and to the "fish-meal of the seven disciples" in the sacramental chapels of the catacombs, by analogy with the second feeding narrative with its seven baskets (Matt. 15:37 = Mark 8:8), see Holtzmann-Bauer on John 21:2 and 13.

963 On the very questionable equation vắc–λόγος attempted by Albr. Weber, cf. *Unters.* I 206, and Garbe, *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie. Eine Darstellung des indischen Rationalismus nach den Quellen*², 1917, p. 134 f.

964 Cf. on the content and the position of the concept ἀλήθεια in the fourth Gospel *Unters.* I 201–206.

965 For further details see *Unters.* I 349–351.

966 See especially Garbe *a. a. O.* pp. 386, 245, 388.

967 The language of the ancient Sāṃkhya literature did not use this word (it is found very late with the Sāṃkhyasūtra commentator Vedāntin Mahādeva, as colleague Garbe informed me; cf. his *Sāṃkhya-Philosophie* pp. 104, 108).

968 One should note the convergence of both kinds of religion-historical relationships in John 8. On the other hand, one should also recall the mythically elementary typology in Διόνυσος Ἐλευθερεύς already discussed above, pp. 145 f.

969 Cf. on the systems Garbe *a. a. O.* pp. 195, 200.

970 *Unters.* I 203, 2.

971 For further details see Garbe (*Ind. Christ.* p. 34 f.), who perhaps rightly remarks: "Here, however, the character of the entire narrative seems indeed to speak for Buddhist originality; but the youth of the sources nevertheless suggests the thought that it is rather a matter of an assimilation of the originally Christian narrative to Indian conditions."

972 Garbe: "In both cases the differences are too great to allow a historical connection to appear credible" (*a. a. O.* p. 40).

973 Garbe *a. a. O.* p. 59 f.

974 Garbe p. 60 (especially in connection with Edmunds, *Buddhist and Christian Gospels*⁴ II 256).

975 Garbe *a. a. O.*: "sufficient in my judgment." The much later recension of the Buddhist material in the "history of the present" (from the 5th century CE) does not come into consideration. By way of comparison, one may briefly recall the Buddhist legend of the Sinhalese chronicle *Mahāvaṃsa* (composed toward the end of the 5th century CE) concerning

the hero-king Dutu Gameni (150 BCE) and his miracle of the rice-grain, which he distributed as alms and which could still be distributed by the priests on the summit of Samanella (Adam's Peak) among 900 other priests (cf. Häckel, *Indische Reisebriefe*³ p. 299).

976 For further details and justification see Garbe pp. 35–38. In general he appeals, for the assumption that Indian materials could have found entry into the fourth Gospel, especially to its emergence "at the same time and within the same circles of belief and imagination" as those of the Physiologus ("in the first quarter of the second century"), pp. 67, 61. With regard to the conclusion about the dependence of John 8:56–58 on the Buddhist legend (O. Franke in *Deutsch. Lit. Zeit.* 1901, col. 2766), however, one should heed Garbe's critical remark (p. 79): "If the author of an apocryphal Gospel [in this case Pseudo-Matthew XXX] attaches himself to passages in the canonical Gospels, embellishes them further, and does so under the influence of Buddhist ideas or narratives, it by no means follows that precisely these influences have already affected the corresponding passages of the canonical Gospels."

977 See further Garbe pp. 70–80 ("Buddhist influences on the apocryphal Gospels").

978 Edv. Lehmann, *Der Buddhismus als indische Sekte, als Weltreligion* 1911, p. 267. Cf. Garbe p. 72.

979 See there especially pp. 91, 94 f., 183–201, 221–223, 353–357, 363, 371 f., 374–379, 380–383.

980 On the positive, irenic, approximating approach cf. *Unters.* I 94 f., 221–223, 353–357, and Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 4 f.; on the question of the use of a gnostically formulated mode of expression in the fourth Gospel, Wetter in *ZntW.* 1917/18, pp. 49–63.

981 We shall return to the latter. Here it should only be mentioned in passing, for the characterization of the present phase of the Johannine question, that the "Odes of Solomon" newly drawn into the argument are to be considered, with which the Gospel of John is said to be "closely related," and according to which it is supposed to have been patterned (see Bert. Georg, *Das Evangelium des Johannes. Versuch einer Lösung seines Grundproblems* 1922; Bestmann, *Johannes. Zur Geschichte des ntl. Kanons* 1922). The work in question has also been attributed, among others, precisely to Gnosticism on substantial grounds (cf. Gunkel in *ZntW.* 1910, pp. 291–328, and in the *Deutsche Rundschau* 1913, I, pp. 25–47, according to which its composition would have taken place around 150). We gladly recognize the sweep and the pathos of deep religious seriousness that addresses us from these songs, would even overlook the not infrequent cases of a degeneration of style into the formulaic, confused, and tasteless (after Ode 19:2 ff., God the Father is "milked" by the Holy Spirit!), were it not that, in addition, the striking, primarily peculiar interweaving and jumbling of religion-historically heterogeneous elements of thought (cf. especially Gunkel *a. a. O.*) would remind the German reader, for better or worse, of the words of the German poet:

> Sit there always, glue things together,
> Brew a ragout out of other people's fare,

And blow the wretched flames
Out of your little heap of ashes!

The disputed question concerning the unity and integrity of the songs could under these circumstances all the less fail to arise.

982 A critical sifting of the entire material of the relevant scholarly discussions is not feasible here, nor necessary. Reference may be made to Clemen, *Entst.* pp. 3–344 and 344–348 (summary), and to the orienting brief overview of the principal individual questions and controversies in Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 23–25 (“Symptoms of unhistoricity”) and 25–28 (“Value as a historical source”).

983 Cf. note 717.

984 The story of the healing of the royal military official’s son in Capernaum, John 4:43–54, is most probably only a variant of the miracle performed on the servant of the local centurion (Matt. 8:5–13; Luke 7:1–10). On which side, however, the greater originality lies is difficult to discern. It has been rightly judged that the intensification of the remote healing that drives the concept of miracle to its extreme—so that even days later the very hour at which the “miraculous telegram” departed and arrived is painfully precisely checked—corresponds at the same time also to all the consequences of Johannine Christology (Holtzmann-Bauer p. 116—following Hilgenfeld, Keim, Strauß, O. Holtzmann). As for the feeding of the 5000 and the sea miracle of Jesus (John 6:5–13; 14–21), it has been shown (p. 116 f.) that the incorporation of both ancient narrative units finds its explanation in the religion-historical typological mode of interpretation of our Evangelist, and that the incorporation of the feeding miracle lies in the intended allusion to the mystery of the Lord’s Supper (vv. 51–58). The later form of transmission already betrays the fourth Gospel in the feeding narrative by the fact that the occasion of the miracle is less intelligible than in the Synoptics (J. Réville, Holtzmann-Bauer).

985 Even the total number of individual signs presented by the Evangelist—seven—is significant.

986 By contrast, even the strong realism of John 9:6 f. proves nothing (cf. above p. 136).

987 Cf. the summarizing elucidation of the symbolic individual features of ch. 9 in Holtzmann-Bauer p. 193 f.

988 With good reason Loisy (p. 398) asks regarding 5:1–16 whether the author does not obviously *opère avec des idées, des vues générales, non avec des détails d’histoire*. “The narrative can be completely explained on the assumption of its unhistorical character,” remarks Clemen concerning the healing of the man born blind (*Entst.* p. 194).

989 Cf. in general on the New Testament conception and treatment of demoniacal possession Holtzmann, *Syn.* pp. 49–51.

990 By way of example, for the revival of Germanic mythology one need only recall the appearance of Odin (Wodan) as leader of the “wild host” and of the “wild hunt,” of the bestowing storm- and thunder-god, in the person of the returning Emperor Charles V or Frederick Barbarossa or Charles V. “The most recent representatives of Wodan are old Schlippenbach and General Sparr from the age of the Great Elector, to whom in the end even Old Fritz attached himself” (Simrock, *Handbuch der deutschen Mythologie*³ pp. 189, 195; cf. p. 144). From the Oriental side, the “prophet” al-Khiḍr (originally an old Arabian god of spring vegetation, “the Green One”), who is supposed to have reappeared in Elijah and others, is an analogous mythical figure (cf. Baiḍāwī on Sura 18:64; Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad* 1869, II 466 ff.; Hartmann, *Chidher in der arabischen Überlieferung und im Volksglauben des Orients* in *Preuß. Jahrbücher* 1911, pp. 87–98).

991 On the parallel emergence of mythological legend in the Orphic cult associations see Roscher III 1, 1107 (Gruppe).

992 See above pp. 185 (Lazarus); 164, 171 f. (Martha and Mary); 185 ff. (Bethany); 73–82, 115 (Cana).

993 See above p. 176 f. (Joseph of Arimathea); 178 f. (Mary Magdalene; with 19:25, apart from this Mary nothing is to be made of—see the commentaries!).

994 Cf. on vowel change, e.g. שִׁכָּר → Συχάρ. Whether the name of the village Askar neighboring Shechem (Nablus) may be connected with “Sychar,” and how, may remain undecided.

995 Cf. Voigt in Roscher I 1, 1048 f.

996 Holtzmann-Bauer p. 111 (on 4:1–42).

997 Aenon and Salim have in more recent times repeatedly been interpreted as symbolic names (Pfleiderer, Kreyenbühl, E. A. Abbott; cf. on this Holtzmann-Bauer).

998 In 1:28 the critical condition of the text is already very doubtful.

999 Nicodemus (note the Greek name!) is an allegorical personification (perhaps created by the Evangelist himself?) which moreover has a mythic background (see above p. 176 ff.).

1000 See above p. 35.

1001 Justin. *Front. histor.* libri XLIV 18, 7. Pauly, *RE* cl. IV 1461.

1002 Nathanael is therefore also not, without further ado, to be equated with Nicodemus (Jülicher).

1003 I suspect, as already noted (note 87), that Nathanael is in reality only a name-variant used or created by the Evangelist; he certainly did not think, in connection with Μαθθαῖος, of אֶפֶת or וְאֶמֶת) אֶמֶת), but rather of Mattanja (Theodor).

1004 *Unters.* I 42 ff.; 46–49; 128 f.

1005 Cf. Jülicher, *Einl.*³ I: “In John, tendency has gained an infinitely greater influence over the evangelical material than in the Synoptics” (p. 306; 5·6 p. 346), and specifically, with regard to the discourses of Jesus, the exposition pp. 333 f.; 5·6 pp. 379 ff.

1006 See above pp. 133 f. (on 3:14); note 384 (on 7:37); pp. 105 f. (on 15 ff.); pp. 148 ff. (on 10:1–18); pp. 327–337 f. (on 18:37; 8:25; ch. 14–16; 8:44; 3:13). Whether under these circumstances it can specifically be said of the Johannine “Logos” that it is evidently rooted far more in Jewish conceptions of the word of God abiding with God and manifesting him in the world than in the concepts of Greek philosophy, from which the one-sided and therefore misguided modern mode of interpretation would derive it (Ed. Meyer, *UA.* I 318), is something one may indeed be allowed to question. “Of the conception encountered in the Targums (of the *Memerā*) we do not even know how far it was developed in New Testament times, and whether it did not itself owe its existence only to Alexandrian influences” (Holtzmann-Bauer p. 53).

1007 “Jesus presents himself as independent both of Mosaic and of patriarchal authority” (Holtzmann-Bauer on 7:22). Cf. the revelation-historical opposition into which Paul brings the two authorities.

1008 “The minimum of Gospel contained in the Law” (Holtzmann-Bauer). Abraham and Moses appear only as authorities of limited significance, to whom the opponents of Jesus, in their blindness, falsely appeal; it is as though one heard Jesus say: “your Moses!” “your Abraham!” Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 7:22.

1009 Moses is indeed designated in Acts 7:35 as a messenger of God; in the fourth Gospel, however, where the same predicate is applied forty times to Jesus, three times each to the Holy Spirit and the “disciples” (the critically contested passage 13:20 should be disregarded), this character is ascribed only to John the Baptist (1:6, 33). Nor are we reminded of the Christ-types of the Synoptics—David, Solomon, Jonah (Mark 12:35 ff.; Matt. 22:42 ff.; Luke 20:41 ff.; Matt. 12:41 f.; Luke 11:29 ff.)—nor of those of the Epistle to the Hebrews: Melchizedek (5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10 f., 15, 17); Moses (3:2, 3, 5; 10:28 f.; 11:25 f.); Aaron (5:4; 7:11; 9:4 [Joshua 4:8]).

1010 *Unters.* I 128 f.

1011 The latter is in any case the case in 15:25, where Jesus presents the Psalms (cf. 69:5; 35:19; 119:161?) as a constituent part of the Old Testament Law (which forms the absolute norm for the secularized, hardened Jewish people). The same applies to the Christ-types of messianically understood scriptural passages indicated and not named outside the discourses: 19:24 (“they divided my garments,” Ps. 22:19); 19:37 (“they shall look on him whom they pierced,” Zech. 12:10; cf. Matt. 24:30; Rev. 1:7).

1012 The situation is the same when the Evangelist in 19:36 (“not a bone of him shall be broken,” Exod. 12:46; Num. 9:12) presents Jesus as the Passover lamb (cf. above, note 820); in more recent times, an allusion to Ps. 34:21 has repeatedly been suggested (cf. on this Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 298 f.).

1013 With this retreat of Old Testament typology there is unmistakably connected the fact that the fourth Evangelist adduces only about twenty Old Testament quotations, in contrast to the very large number in the Synoptics, of whom even Mark has fifty to sixty. The absence of the Transfiguration narrative (Mark 9:2–13; Matt. 17:1–13; Luke 9:28–36) from the fourth Gospel might also—inasmuch as not already the questionable character of the event as such, and especially the difference between the idea of the Logos-Christ and that of the Messiah-Christ, recommended the mysterious silence—be connected with the elimination of a typological relationship between the lawgiver Moses and the coordinated Old Testament prophet Elijah and the Transfigured One. That in John 12:28 at least an allusion to the Synoptic pericope occurs can hardly be doubted. Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer p. 227.

1014 "The entire mode of presentation, insofar as it offers content of thought in the form of discourse, allows a school-tone to be recognized that lies far removed from the Synoptics and is occasionally acknowledged by the fourth Evangelist himself (see on 7:15)." "And indeed, what characterizes the Johannine Christ in contrast to Mark 1:22 is the theological stamp of his argumentation, the rabbinic training which he displays (e.g. already 7:22–23)" (Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 24, 160). Most probably, moreover, what hovers before the Evangelist in this respect is the all-surpassing, revelation-perfect counter-image not merely of the rabbinic, but also of the Hellenistic-philosophical teacher and head of a school.

1015 The Johannine discourses of Jesus, which "spread out a world of conceptions that stem solely from within, do not leave these higher regions even when attacks in word and deed urgently challenge one to combat on the ground of general comprehensibility, so that, for example, only rarely does an answer correspond directly to the question that prompted it; see on 1:25; 8:23, 25; 12:35; 14:6" (Holtzmann-Bauer p. 24).

1016 The mutually cancelling statements of Jesus (and thereby more or less referring back to the dialectic of the mystery of the Logos) concern himself and the Father as judges of the world (3:17; 12:47; 9:39; 5:22; 15:2), the truth of Christ's self-testimony (5:31; 8:14), the beginning of his glorification (7:39; 18:31), the signaling of the betrayer (13:18 f.; 6:70), the goal of Jesus' departure (13:36; 14:5; 16:5), the necessity of Jesus' intercession (14:16; 16:26).—Involuntarily one is reminded, by way of comparison, of Ed. Meyer's pointed remark on the concluding chapter of Amos: "One usually forgets that contradictions in a writer's thoughts can often get along very well with one another, and all the more so in the case of a prophet, who must never be judged according to the rules of logic at all" (*Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* 1906, p. 453).

1017 Cf. especially Jülicher, *Einl.*³ IV p. 310; 6·6 p. 350.

1018 For further details see Holtzmann-Bauer *a. a. O.* and Holtzmann, *Einl.* p. 450: "The discourses are in any case, formally considered, the property of the author, as is already evident from the fact that, together with the Evangelist's own expositions, they form a compact mass in terms of linguistic coloring and content. Hence also the transition of the discourse 3:10 f. into a reflection 3:16–21, and of the reflection 12:37 f. into a discourse 12:44–50, which itself is only a series of already existing sayings, an unspoken monologue." One may properly dispense with

an appeal to “the psychological impossibility of literal retention on the part of the still immature disciple” (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer *a. a. O.*).

1019 O. Holtzmann, *Das Johannesevangelium* 1887, p. 78.

1020 Note especially 12:19.

1021 With regard to the Spirit of truth as the possession of the disciples, alongside 14:17 (μένει—ἐστίν), 20:22 also comes into consideration.

1022 See Holtzmann-Bauer p. 4 and the relevant discussions in the commentary on the passages cited. A repeated discussion of the individual details can and must be avoided here. That, however, “in general the entire world of thought represented in the Gospel corresponds to such an advanced development of the Church and its theology” had already been demonstrated in my *Unters.* I.

1023 Holtzmann-Bauer (p. 24) recalls the remark of Frz. Delitzsch (in Johannsson, *Die hl. Schrift und die negative Kritik* p. 234): “In the Gospel of John it occurs extraordinarily frequently that what is affirmed in one place is denied in another.”

1024 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 9:29: “πόθεν ἐστίν” does not have its parallel at 7:27, but rather, for example, at Matt. 21:25 “πόθεν ἦν”; on the whole it nevertheless leaves the predominant impression that we are dealing here with the … [sentence continues in the main text].

1025 The excommunication of believers in Christ “n’existait pas encore dans les premières années de la prédication chrétienne” (Loisy p. 595).

1026 It has been thought that it was originally intended to omit the anointing narrative entirely (Keim); or that the author wished to supplement the readers’ recollection of Mark 14:3–9 by naming Mary (Zahn); or that John 11:2 should be deleted (Blass, Wellhausen). Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer *ad loc.*

1027 Loisy remarks on 16:32, with regard to the Synoptic tradition (of the flight of the disciples, Mark 14:50; Matt. 26:56), which “actually fits the Johannine scheme rather poorly” (Holtzmann-Bauer), quite bluntly: “L’évangéliste ne s’est pas inquiété de ces contradictions.”

1028 Holtzmann-Bauer p. 27.

1029 Are—incidentally asked—these details certainly historical? With regard to Simon of Cyrene, who according to Mark 15:21 (Matt. 27:32; Luke 23:26) appears at the execution of Jesus coming from the field, the question arises whether the chief interest lies in the closer specification of the man by homeland and kinship, or in his name. In the former case, a historical notice might be reckoned with. In the latter, it would be conceivable that here, over against the bearer of the name Simon who became the denier of Jesus, there appears a Simon to whom the honor of carrying Jesus’ cross was granted—whereby what was noted above (note 921) should be recalled. It is in any case noteworthy that Simon of Cyrene is absent from the

fourth Gospel, and that the names of Simon's two sons are given only by Mark, and his coming from the field only by Mark and Luke. One is also involuntarily struck by the subsidiary circumstance that for Mark 15:27 the minuscule codex Colbertinus (and the Arabic *Evangelium infantiae*) even supplies the names of the two criminals—the same codex which (together with D and the Sahidic translation) for Luke 23:64 offers the "addition derived from a recollection of Homer, *Od.* 9.240, or more probably from Josephus, *Bell.* VI 5, 3," namely that Joseph of Arimathea laid upon the tomb of Jesus a stone that scarcely twenty men could roll (cf. Holtzmann, *Syn. ad loc.*). All this scarcely encourages the assumption of a historical substratum. In Mark 15:42 the closer determination of the burial day as "pre-Sabbath," and thus preparation day (παρασκευή) for the Sabbath celebration—setting aside the coincidence of the day of death with the festival day of the 15th of Nisan!—is intended to explain the performance of the burial rites reported in v. 46. Light is also cast on this (cf. the case of Simon) historical self-contradiction by the intrusion, already demonstrated above (pp. 176–178), of alien, originally mythical traits into the evangelical picture of the *passio magna* of Jesus. The same holds with regard to the pre-Sabbath activity of the Galilean women followers of Jesus, which Luke (23:55) connects with Joseph's act of piety.

1030 See above p. 271 note 820.

1031 Holtzmann-Bauer p. 285. It has also not without reason been emphasized that our Evangelist, even more than his Synoptic predecessors, shapes the historical material with the intention of exonerating the procurator from guilt in the death of Jesus and placing it upon the Jews; if, therefore, the Jews are to act primarily, it must not be a high festival day as according to the Synoptics (Holtzmann-Bauer p. 292). As for the argument, however, that an anti-Judaist such as our narrator could not have allowed Jesus to celebrate the Jewish festival according to the Law, it must not be overlooked that despite all opposition, in this same fourth Evangelist Jesus is not merely vaguely designated as the Lamb that takes away the sin of the world, but is also expressly identified as the antitype of the Passover lamb, and that already at his first public appearance before the Passover festival (2:13 ff.) he intervenes zealously for worthy worship in the temple, which he calls his Father's house.

1032 Jülicher, *Einl.*[6],6 p. 379. That this finding is not incompatible with the assumption of Ed. Meyer (*UA.* I 332–340), according to which our Evangelist, alongside oral traditions, made use of a "written special source" that was drawn upon to supplement the threefold Synoptic tradition, is obvious. It also lacks no considerable degree of probability that this source "must have been a complete Gospel like those which Luke mentions in the Prologue, in general similar to the numerous apocryphal Gospels." The pair of miracle stories from Cana and Bethany alone, drawn from this source according to Meyer, could already speak both for the completeness of the writing aimed at by its author (attention is rightly drawn to 2:11) and for its apocryphal character at the same time. If, however, Meyer sees in that transformation of water a "crass" miracle narrative and in the raising of Lazarus a "crass" intensification of the older resurrection narratives, and in both cases allows them to be symbolically interpreted by the fourth Evangelist, he thereby stamps two of the most significant components of the work in question with a mark that is not suited to inspire the belief that it "nevertheless still contained valuable notices in isolated cases." What the real nature of these and the other pieces of tradition derived

from the “special source” actually is can be determined only by comparative religion-historical investigation and has been set forth in the foregoing studies in each corresponding substantive context. It is not possible here to enter into all the details. Reference may be made in particular: to the multi-year activity of Jesus and his three journeys to Jerusalem, as well as to the striking relegation of Galilee behind Judea (Meyer p. 333), on pp. 112 f., 159 ff.; to the dating of the crucifixion to the day before the Passover and to Mary of Clopas (Meyer p. 334), on pp. 363 ff., 183 f.; to the figure of Nicodemus (Meyer p. 334), on pp. 177 f. and note 999; to the appearance of Greek proselytes—“real Hellenes, though proselytes” (Weizsäcker)—through Philip and Andrew (Meyer pp. 334–336), on p. 209; to the wedding at Cana and the raising of Lazarus (Meyer pp. 336 ff.), on pp. 349–351; to the cohabitation of Jesus with mother and brothers in Cana (Meyer pp. 77, 337), on p. 115 and note 351. The other half of the pieces adduced by Meyer as evidence for the influence of the “special source” may be disregarded here already for the reason that he himself notes that they amount only to possibilities and conjectures.

1033 Holtzmann, *Einl.* p. 441.

1034 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer p. 28.

1035 On what follows, and especially on the controversy (Baidensperger, Wrede, J. Réville, Loisy, Pfleiderer, E. F. Scott, Heitmüller, Jülicher), see Holtzmann-Bauer p. 29.

1036 Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 29 f.

1037 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer on 3:36.

1038 On the symptoms of the “temporal proximity of Gnosis,” see especially Holtzmann, *Einl.* pp. 457 f.; on the more recent discussions of the question of the relationship of the fourth Gospel to heretical Gnosis, Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 28 f.

1039 Holtzmann-Bauer on v. 31 (following Zahn, *Einl. in das N. T.*³ 1900, II 469. 478. 530; *Komm.* 1908, p. 677).

1040 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer pp. 11 f.

1041 Cf. the revelation-historically analogous conception of the real power of messianic prophecy that unfailingly takes effect in John 12:37 ff.

1042 Cf. Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* IV 23, 2, where the Ethiopian eunuch baptized by Philip is called *praecatechizatus*.

1043 On the “Logos-Christus here presenting himself,” cf. Holtzmann-Bauer and my *Unters.* I 46–50. 71 f.

1044 On the state and development of the faith and knowledge of the Twelve in general, see above pp. 48–50. 67–73. 242–245.

1045 Holtzmann-Bauer *ad loc.*

1046 All indications suggest that for the fourth Evangelist the two first introduced together and designated as former disciples of the Baptist (1:35 ff.), the firstfruits of Jesus' discipleship, John (see above pp. 27–32) and Andrew, do not count exclusively as recipients of the water baptism that prepares for the appearance of the Messiah and entry into his kingdom of glory. The statements in 3:22.26. 41 f. can even quite naturally have only the sense that Jesus did not wish to give rise to the misleading appearance of a rivalry between himself and John the Baptist, sent by God (1:6–8), but rather saw the path ordained by the Father in this, that he initially allowed his own disciples, alongside the disciples of John, his unique forerunner, to support him through participation in his messianic preaching of repentance (cf. Mark 6:7–30; Luke 9:1–10; Matt. 10:1–11:19!) and baptismal activity. For even according to our Evangelist the disciples of Jesus themselves betray long enough that their understanding of salvation and their Christology are governed by the messianic idea (cf., besides 1:41–49, after everything that had previously occurred in word and sign in Jesus, still the confession of Peter in 6:69 and the wide distance between this and the confession of Thomas in 20:28). In particular, the scene of jealousy between the two groups of disciples hinted at in 3:26 f., together with the appended statement of the Baptist about his revelation-historical relationship to Jesus, accords with this: it is not the Baptist—who indeed has recognized Jesus as Messiah and as the eternal Son of God (1:30.34)—who is jealous; it is his disciples who are (tels du maître petit maître). From all this it follows that it was the baptism of the messianic **consecration of repentance**, whether performed by the Baptist himself or by his disciples, or whether performed by disciples of Jesus, which the Evangelist regarded as the complement of the baptism of the Spirit by the glorified Jesus, and which in this combination for the first time represented the Christian sacrament of baptism.

1047 To the tremendous advance of the Roman Catholic conception of the apostolate legalized in Matt. 16:18–19, a comparative glance may be directed only in passing. Cf. my work: *Der Primat des Petrus* (1904).

1048 See above pp. 94. 140 f.; cf. the fixed concept of mortal sin in 1 John 5:16 f.

1049 At the preceding appearance of the not yet glorified (20:17) risen one, Mary Magdalene significantly does not address him, like the first two disciples, as *rabbi* (1:38), but with the intensifying *rabbuni* (Aram. *rabban*, *ribbon*): in accordance with the higher insight attained. This element is lost in the Greek translation.

1050 Note that the Evangelist already does not report the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist, but merely alludes to it (1:32).

1051 Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 247. 282; cf. 253. 288: "The Christ of these letters [Col. and Eph.] is, in a single word, the central being of the universe; his relation to God is none other than that of the Johannine Logos-Christ."

1052 Already from 1:17 it can be gathered that, according to the Evangelist, prophecy has a fundamentally different affinity to Old Testament revelation than does the Mosaic religion of the Law, and indeed precisely from the standpoint of Logos-revelation (cf. also p. 356 f.). Prophecy can be regarded as an effect of the Logos itself that anticipates the New Testament stage of revelation; from here the emphasis with which the fourth Evangelist also highlights the fulfillment of the—prophetically conceived—scriptural words receives still further illumination.

1053 On the Iranian (Avesta) and Indian (Veda) religion and on Indian philosophy of religion see above pp. 327–344.

1054 See above p. 96 and Eisele in Roscher IV 1, 259. Cf. on the corresponding phenomenon in Judaism Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie* 1903, p. 302 f.

1055 That the intended effect did not fail to materialize is shown not only by the eloquent example of the typological reference by the interpolator of John 7:53–8 to the Eleusinian mysteries (see above p. 127 f. and note 381), but is indirectly betrayed even as late as the fifth century by the literary activity of the poet Nonnos of Panopolis (Akhmim in Upper Egypt): to one and the same epic poet who, in the 48 books of his *Dionysiaca*, glorified the march of Dionysos to India by drawing on myths of Alexandrian poetry, we owe a poetic reworking (*μεταβολή*) of the fourth Gospel! How many questions regarding this remarkable convergence would we wish to be able to answer! One might also think of Apollinaris the Younger, a classically educated Alexandrian and Christian lector in Syrian Laodicea (4th century), who is said to have been temporarily excluded from the local church community by Bishop Theodorus because he attended the solemn recitation of a hymn to Dionysos, which traditionally began by calling upon all the uninitiated to withdraw (Moeller, *Kirchengesch.* I 412)—if it concerned a proven fact. At any rate, the story itself is already noteworthy.

1056 Even in 4:22 a divine irony intrudes. Synoptically this name appears as the Evangelist's own mode of expression only in Mark 7:3; Matt. 28:15; Luke 7:3; 23:51; nowhere habitually (see above p. 10).

1057 For the first third of the second century one may recall the example of Aquila, the convert to Judaism, thorough connoisseur and translator of the Old Testament, who according to Epiphanius had become a Christian and was excluded as an astrologer, a relative of Hadrian (?) from Pontus (?), cf. Schürer, *Gesch.* III 318 f.

1058 Cf. on this Deißmann, *L. O.* p. 424: "The New Testament as a whole is a monument of late Greek colloquial language; in its overwhelmingly predominant parts it is a monument of more or less popular colloquial language. The most popular are the Synoptic Gospels—" (Luke here and there strives after elegance). "In the Epistle of James we hear a loud echo of this evangelical popular language." "The Johannine writings, including the Apocalypse, are also linguistically deeply rooted in popular colloquial language." P. 91: "The popular character of the Johannine style is not imitated, but for the most part has grown wild." "John is popular both where he narrates or reflects and where he gives Christ's discourse. For both—for the popular narrative style with its short paratactic sentences and its *and—and*, as well as for the lapidary I-style of

the deity speaking to cult-members and outsiders precisely through its popular simplicity—we can easily find examples." P. 89 f.: "Parataxis (*and—and* instead of the use of particles) is the primordial form also of Greek discourse, has always lived on in the language of the people, and has also come into literary currency where popular speech was imitated." This latter point is asserted against those who present the Johannine style as especially Semitizing, such as v. Dobschütz in *ZntW* 1907, p. 7, and Heitmüller in the *Gegenwartsbibel* (*The Writings of the New Testament*, ed. Johannes Weiß) II 1907, part 3, p. 175, where from it a Jewish origin of the Evangelist is inferred.

1059 The miracles of chapters 5 and 9 are excluded from consideration because of their allegorical character.

1060 On the one hand, the Synoptics allow the death of Jairus' daughter to be treated by Jesus himself even apparently as a death-like sleep, and likewise in the case of the youth of Nain (Luke) no burial has yet taken place; on the other hand, in Luke the raising of the youth occurs before that of the girl, whereas Mark and Matthew place the raising of the latter before that of the youth; Luke allows an indeterminately large number of miracles to precede the raising of the youth (on the resurrection miracles see Mark 5:22–24, 35–43; Matt. 9:18 f., 23–26; Luke 7:11–17; 8:40–42, 49–56). The contrast in the significance of the raising of Lazarus could not be expressed more strongly than by the τετραήμερος of John 11:39.

1061 Cf. what is set forth toward the end of note 906.

1062 The honorific title ὁ θεολόγος, ascribed by the ancient Church to the allegedly apostolic Evangelist, is, as is well known, to be interpreted specifically with reference to the statement 1:1: θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, because the author θεολογεῖ τὸν Χριστόν. On the already discussed Papias passage in which ὁ θεολόγος is inserted, see above note 906 and Preuschen, *Antilegomena* 1901, pp. 54. 145.

1063 Holtzmann-Bauer 13. 53 f. Subsequently mention may also be made here of the indication, inferred from the identification of the apostle and the deacon Philip in the fourth Evangelist, pointing to Asia Minor as the land of origin of his Gospel (Ed. Meyer, *ÜA.* I 338).

1064 The conclusions to be drawn from the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ of the Apocalypse (19:13), as well as from the passages concerning the disciples of John (John 3:22–36), Philip (12:22), and the long-lived disciple (21:23) in the Gospel (and its appendix chapter), may be passed over here (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 13. 50. 53. 99 f. 223. 314).

1065 Cf. especially Schürer, *Gesch.*³ III 323 f., and Holtzmann-Bauer ad loc.

1066 Schürer³ III 322. 324.

1067 O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* pp. 115. 164. 191. Holtzmann-Bauer 13.

1068 About 165? "At least simultaneous with the first traces of the canonization of the Gospel" (Holtzmann-Bauer 14; cf. on the matter and literature Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*⁴ I 707 f.).

1069 Commentary on the *Diatessaron*, ed. Aucher–Mösinger 1876, p. 285 f.

1070 On the doubts and conjectures concerning the place of origin held by older scholarship ("already Schwegler had thought of Antioch": *Theol. Jahrb.* 1842, pp. 300. 305) and by more recent scholarship, see further Holtzmann-Bauer, *a. a. O.*; Clemen, *Entst.* 386–403; Clemen himself allows the work to have been written "in or near Ephesus" "in its basic core" (p. 482).

1071 E.g. in Harnack, Jülicher, Knopf.

1072 Knopf, *Na. Z.* p. 269. The same remarks on σάρξ in John 6 (61 ff.): "Ignatius and Justin also speak of the flesh, not of the body. This is a usage and a conception that must very soon have established itself on Asiatic soil: 1. σάρξ, not σῶμα, forms the correct antithesis to αἷμα; 2. one also otherwise spoke much of the σάρξ of Christ, of his appearance, existence, suffering κατὰ σάρκα; 3. especially in anti-gnostic polemic the σάρξ of Christ came strongly to the fore" (p. 268). If Knopf (pp. 266 f.) wished to perceive in the words of the *Didache* 10:3: πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον a "decidedly Johannine sound," then what is thereby achieved is all the less significant, since "nothing more specific about the manner in which life is bound to the spiritual food and the spiritual drink can be read out of these few words of the prayer," and the dating of the writing (c. 90–c. 140? p. 42) remains very uncertain.

1073 One may indeed, as Knopf has also done, suspect in these chapters "the term, if only indirectly, attested through the accumulated use of the words ἀγαπᾶν and ἀγάπη" (p. 257). Special attention should also be drawn, alongside ἀγαπήσας — ἠγάπησεν — δείπνου γενομένου (13:1–2), to εἰς τὸ τέλος (up to the Τετέλεσται 19:30, compared with vv. 26 f.—see already Düsterdieck in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1871, p. 178 f.) (see above p. 204 ff.).

1074 It is striking that in the literature of the post-apostolic period only the very late canonical Epistle of Jude (v. 12) still speaks of ἀγάπαι in the sense in question.

1075 On the several most recent attempts at proof tending in this direction see Clemen (*Entst.* 364 f.), who likewise assumes a "direct dependence" of Ignatius. Krüger too had seemed here—and here alone—"the assumption of an acquaintance with the fourth Gospel unavoidable" (Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II 198). He remarked, however: "Nevertheless the question would have to be considered whether the word was coined by the Evangelist himself or taken up by him. In the latter case no literary dependence would need to be present at our passage either."

1076 Pfleiderer (*Urchr.* II 413) will be right when, following v. d. Goltz (*Ignazius von Antiochien* pp. 118–144), he explains: "The truth is that in all the genuine Ignatian letters not a single sentence is to be found that would point to a dependence on the Gospel or the letters." He also correctly remarks regarding the similar case of the assumption of a quotation from 1 Tim. 6:7 in Polycarp *Phil.* 4 that it is entirely arbitrary: "The same thought is found with almost the same words also in Seneca *ep.* 102, 25, and was therefore a popular proverb that everyone knew from his surroundings" (*a. a. O.* 281).

1077 Cf. the remark of H. Holtzmann on ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί (2 John 7): "confessional designation instead of 'having come' (1 John 4:2)."

1078 The Epistle of Barnabas says (like 1 Tim.) ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθῆναι (φανεροῦσθαι) 5:6. 6:7. 9:14; alongside this ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί 5:10. This latter manner of expression also underlies the ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός in Ignatius (*Eph.* 7); cf. γίγνεσθαι ἐν ἑαυτῷ, "to come to be within oneself."

1079 Cf. Pfleiderer *a. a. O.* II 392. 441. 446 f.: "The so-called first Johannine epistle is a polemical writing, written against Gnosis by a church teacher who indeed walks in the footsteps of the Evangelist and, like him, has appropriated much from Gnosis, but in principle stands much farther from it than the Evangelist and therefore adapts his formulas more closely to the church's faith and carries out the break with heretical Gnosis more decisively than he." Special reference should also be made here to the concept of κόσμος. The universally far-sighted and broad-hearted Hellenic Christian, from whose Gospel we take the Jesus sayings John 3:16 f. and 12:47, would certainly not have written the sentence ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται (1 John 5:19), however much John 15:18 f. (cf. 7:7). 16:33. 17:9. 14. 16:25 illuminate the "world" exclusively from its soteriologically negative side, since in the "high-priestly prayer" he uses the same term κόσμος not merely to denote humanity still to be converted and promising success (17:21. 23), but also to encompass the religiously from the ground up diametrically opposed components of the human race (17:6. 11–13. 15. 18). From this conceptual situation that of 1 John stands out so strikingly (in the Gospel the number of negative passages scarcely amounts to a third of the total, in 1 John 13 negative stand over against only 4 positive) that one can scarcely resist the impression of an advanced narrowing of Christian world-consciousness. From this precisely the **κόσμος ὅλος** of 1 John 5:19 is to be understood. In comparison with the later conception and teaching one involuntarily recalls Origen's idea, expressed in the John commentary VI 38, of the Church as the **κόσμος τοῦ κόσμου** (cf. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*³ I 378. 441⁴ f.).

1080 *Unters.* I 100, 1. 303–306. Cf. in the main Weizsäcker, *Apost. Z.* 539 f. (Pfleiderer *a. a. O.* II 441–450 lets 2 and 3 John precede the Gospel by about a decade, around 125). As a parallel there presses itself upon one the relationship of James 2:24 and Rom. 3:28. "It is certain that James made no distinction between the distorted doctrine of faith of his Pauline opponents and that of Paul himself. — And if both appeal for their thesis to the example of Abraham, it is clear that this cannot be a chance coincidence, but that James intends to wrest from Paul or his school their distinctive scriptural proof" (Pfleiderer II 548). We thus stand by all indications in the middle of the second century (cf. on the association of James and the *Pastor Hermae* Pfleiderer II 539. 542; on the latter Weinei in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 222). How in a still later period (probably "quite deep into the second half of the second century") the same most highly acknowledged apostolic scriptural authority could undergo a contemporarily appearing, at least formal, censure is shown by 2 Peter 3:15 f., where the author places the teaching activity that "our beloved brother Paul has unfolded in all the letters according to the wisdom given to him" in a problematic light as one that is liable to multiple heretical misinterpretations. By contrast one should recall how a Polycarp in *Phil.* 3:2 rather celebrates the "blessed and famous Paul" as a teacher unattainable for himself and his peers (in the second decade of the second century).

1081 *Unters.* I 300. Cf. above pp. 280 f.

1082 Cf. Pfleiderer *a. a. O.* II 424 f.

1083 Neither in the Epistle of Barnabas (between 70 and c. 100: Knopf, *Na. Z.* p. 38; within 80—137: Funk, *Ap. V.* XVI. XVIII; about between 117 and 125: Veil in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 149. II 235; 120—125: Lipsius in Schenkel's *Bibellexikon* p. 1371 f.; about 130: Harnack, *Chron.* I 427; Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II 559), nor in the Teaching of the Apostles (approximately between 90 and 140: Knopf p. 42; between 100 and 160: Drews in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 187), nor in the Shepherd of Hermas (about 130—140; cf. Weinei in Hennecke I 221 f.; Knopf p. 40), nor in II Clement (ca. 140: v. Schubert in Hennecke I 172), nor in Papias (ca. 135—150: Knopf p. 47; on the "acquaintance of Papias with the Gospel of John" conjecturally assumed by Clemen in *Entst.* pp. 380—382 see above n. 906), can knowledge of the fourth Gospel (and its influence) be demonstrated.

The same holds with regard to the Gnostics Basilides (in Alexandria), Valentinus and Marcion (in Rome), who appear in the thirties of the second century; cf. Holtzmann, *Einl.* 469 f.; Clemen 369—374.

1084 Cf. Knopf 47.

1085 Still by Pliny Jerusalem is designated as *longe clarissima urbium orientis non Judaeae modo* (*Hist. nat.* V 14, 70), and in the Jewish revolt of the period in question, "to which restless elements of another kind joined themselves," according to Dio Cassius (69, 13) "so to speak the whole world was in motion" (Schürer, *Gesch.*[34] I 681 f. 687). John 11:48 ("the Romans will come and take away our place and our people") may possibly, as has been done several times in recent times, also be drawn in here. Concerning 16:2 (cf. Pfleiderer *a. a. O.* II 440), Holtzmann-Bauer has rightly remarked: "That at first Jewish, not heathen persecutions are mentioned (O. Holtzmann 278 f.) corresponds to the course of history and scarcely requires for its explanation a reference to the fresh experience of the second Jewish war (Hilgenfeld, *Einl.* 739; against him Loisy 776)."

1086 According to Dio Cassius (68, 32), the number of non-Jewish fellow citizens murdered by the Jews in their revolt in Cyrene is said to have amounted to 220,000, and the number of non-Jewish inhabitants of the island killed in the subsequent bloodbath in Cyprus even to 240,000. "As certainly as the most extravagant imagination guided the pen here, so clearly does the extent and significance of this revolt nevertheless emerge from it" (Schürer, *Gesch.*[34] I 665 f.).

1087 Schürer 679.

1088 Knopf *a. a. O.* 5.

1089 John 4:21—24 reveals clearly enough that in v. 21 one of the popular and characteristic ambiguities of the fourth Evangelist is present. The double ἔρχεται ὥρα in vv. 21. 23 points to a doubled moment: "the one hour" belongs purely to the future, the other to the future and yet already also to the present of the speaker. The corresponding double sense laid down in vv. 21 ff. is accordingly this: there comes a time when you will be able to worship neither in the manner

of the fathers on this mountain nor (insofar as you have meanwhile attained true knowledge of salvation) in Jerusalem, because the Jewish temple as well as the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim will have been destroyed (v. 21); but then you will no more wish to continue your old, locally conditioned cult than will the Jews who have come to faith (1:7) continue theirs (even though revelation-historically justified, v. 22), because you will have recognized what is already now (in the present of Jesus) a fact, namely that the conditions of the right worship of God the Father are of a purely inward kind (on the history of the Samaritan temple see Schürer, *Gesch.*[4] II 20 ff.). This same Jesus, however, who in 4:21—26 presents himself expressly as Messiah to the representative of the salvation-seeking Samaritans (vv. 39—42), with foresight and announcement of the second Jewish war and its consequences (vv. 25 f.), repels in 5:43 the unbelieving Jewish people—despite the universal testimony to his divine sonship and divine dignity—with prophetic reference to their behavior toward the pseudo-messiah of that same future war, in a tone of final condemnation (cf. Holtzmann-Bauer).

1090 Cf. especially Ed. Meyer, *ÜA.* I 331: "The revolt falls in the years 132—135, thus in a time to which the other points of reference for the composition of the Gospel of John also lead." It is not possible to refer 5:43 to the catastrophe of the year 70: "Of arts of deception by false prophets, such as are foretold in Mark 13:22 = Matt. 24:24, the historical account of the last days of Jerusalem knows nothing. Such prophecies have been fulfilled at most in religious demagogues such as those mentioned in Acts 5:36. 8:9—11. 21:38; cf. also Rev. 13:11—17. As an avowed Messiah it is only Bar Kochba who appeared in 131—135" (Holtzm. *Syn.* pp. 32. 169).

1091 Cf. Holtzmann, *N. Th.* II 511 ff.; *Syn.* 96 f.

1092 Thus rightly Lipsius *a. a. O.*; Schürer *a. a. O.* 672 f.; Harnack, *Chron.* I 424 ff.; Pfleiderer *a. a. O.* II 559, and others.

1093 Cf. Schürer[34] I 701: "On the coins the deities of the city appearing, besides Jupiter, are: Bacchus, Serapis, Astarte, the Dioscuri." Already under Antiochus Epiphanes not only was a pagan altar erected on the great altar of burnt offering of the Jerusalem temple (Dan. 11:31. 12:11) and sacrifices offered on it to Olympian Zeus (1 Macc. 1:41—64; 2 Macc. 6:1—11; Joseph. *Ant.* XII 5, 4), but the Jews had even been forced to march in bacchantic procession at the festival of the Dionysia, crowned with ivy (Schürer[2] I 155).

1094 Why Papias does not come into consideration is to be seen from the above (n. 906).

1095 Cf. the correct observation of Clemen, *Entst.* 383.

1096 In general, cf. on Justin Holtzmann, *Einl.* 467: passages in *Apol.* 1:61 = John 3:3. 5; *Dial.* 88 = John 1:20. 23; *Dial.* 8 = John 1:31; *Apol.* 1:22; *Dial.* 69 = John 9 ff.; *Dial.* 63 = John 1:13; *Apol.* 1:6 = John 4:24; *Dial.* 123 = 1 John 3:1 — that is all. Nowhere a quotation, nowhere an explicit derivation from apostolic source. The mystical depth of the Johannine writings is as foreign to him as the core point of the Pauline world of thought. — The fourth Gospel too is for him a writing among many, toward which he relates in equal measure as a moralizing eclectic,

most positively indeed where he combines the pre-worldly pre-existence of the Son of God (according to John) with the (synoptic) virgin birth (*Apol.* 1:32; *Dial.* 48. 105).

1097 For further details on the characterization of the writing and the answer to the chronological question see Stülcken in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II 74. 79. Pfleiderer (*Urchr.* II 157) had assumed a “middle position between the Synoptics and the Gospel of John.”

1098 According to the verse division of Harnack in his first edition (1893).

1099 It is better to refrain from deriving from vv. 23 and 48 that they “are to recall 15:— and 60” (Stülcken); perhaps also from v. 56, where the words: “He has gone there from where he was sent,” could be Johannine expression in place of the concrete synoptic: “he goes before you into Galilee.”

1100 Stülcken p. 87. The same will also have seen rightly when he further remarks that it may at first appear striking that the author should have named precisely those apostles who remain nameless in John; but precisely this is most easily explained: what John did not know, this “Peter” of course knew.
In any case “everything is explained almost without gaps if one assumes with v. Schubert that the author saw the hints of Mark 16:7, which suited his Petrine interest, best fulfilled in John 21, accordingly omitted the Jerusalem appearances and adhered to John 21 for what was lacking in his Mark copy (or there replaced in contradiction to 16:7)” (p. 87 f.).

1101 “Nowhere in the 2nd century was the religious imagination more stimulated than in Asia Minor” (Ficker in Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 390). The Acts of Paul (ca. 170) and the Acts of Peter (toward the end of the century) also arose there.

1102 Hennecke in *N. Apokr.* I 423 f.

1103 Hennecke *a. a. O.* 427. 431.

1104 Zahn, *Forschungen* VI 195 n. 2.

1105 For the critical objections raised by Hilgenfeld and Corssen see Hennecke *a. a. O.* II 523.

1106 For further details see Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* II 531. The confusion of the multiple designations of Christ corresponding in various ways to the Fourth Gospel (Christ beheld in the mystical light-cross) in *c.* 98 (cf. 109) is discussed by Hennecke II 532 f.

1107 Cf. on the negative side (following Corssen and Hilgenfeld) Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* II 439; on the positive side Hennecke (and Schimmelpfeng) *a. a. O.* I 432. II 493.

1108 Hennecke (-Schimmelpfeng) I 428. II 529 f.

1109 Cf. Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 220 f. 5–6 241 f.

1110 Cf. with regard to Clement of Alexandria and Origen Holtzmann, *Einl.* 139.

1111 On the epistolary form of the expressly declaredly didactic and edifying writing that from the outset attaches itself to the Fourth Gospel and proclaims its abiding validity, cf. Holtzmann *a. a. O.* 479 f.

1112 Holtzmann *a. a. O.* 483 (with reference to Jerome *Ep.* 123,12 or 11 *ad Ageruchiam* and more recent authors).

1113 Cf. regarding the seven churches of the Apocalypse and their angels (bishops?) Knopf, *Na. Z.* 207 ff.

1114 As is well known, "the author — apart from II John — aligns himself, by the self-designation as πρεσβύτερος, with the συμπρεσβύτερος of I Pet. 5[1], and by the ἐκλεκτή with the ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή of I Pet. 5[13]" (Holtzmann *a. a. O.* 483); but that in the Babylon of the latter passage there is likewise an allegorically veiled designation of Rome has long since been recognized (cf. the τροπικώτερον of Euseb. *h. e.* II 15, 2) and repeatedly convincingly demonstrated. Aptly v. Soden remarks (*Einleitung* to I Peter, in the *Hand-Comm.*[*3] p. 122): "This allegory can of course be explained only in a time of formal persecutions, and indeed those emanating from Rome. That such persecutions are in view (he thought, as most recently again Knopf, of the time of Domitian) is made certain by the letter. Not occasional harassments, but only systematic persecutions make it intelligible that a letter addressed to the communities of all Asia Minor should take them as its occasion. The indications of the letter itself concerning the nature and extent of the sufferings imposed on the readers show the same." To this only one thing needs to be added: what the "Presbyter" of III John has to suffer is of a different kind; it is not political but ecclesiastical, but for him in his official position and responsibility it is no less painful and agitating, as vv. 9–11 clearly enough allow to be seen.

1115 I Cor. 11[4]. Rom. 16[23]: ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

1116 He cannot be identical with the "Presbyter" of II and III John, who in III 12 rather betrays his identity with the writer of John 21[24] f. I John is likewise to be set aside (see what follows).

1117 Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 308 f.

1118 "Ἔγραψά τι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ" (v. 9) can, according to the context, only mean: I have written something to the church (in this sense also, i.e. concerning walking in truth and love vv. 1–8). The word ἐκκλησία, which elsewhere in Johannine literature occurs nowhere except III John 6. 9. 10, here consistently denotes the entire church; neither in the attestation of the love of Gaius toward the "brothers and strangers," nor in the excommunication of disobedient church members by Diotrephes does anything occur that concerns only a single local congregation. In the latter case "there naturally develops [from the very beginning], with the close consolidation of the communities into the church, the expulsion from the community into one from the church; proceeding from the community, it is conceived as exclusion from the community of Christ and delivery over to Satan" (Moeller, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengeschichte* I[2] 270. II[1] 279). Under these circumstances it lies nearest at hand and has most in its favor to recognize in the letter in

question the “catholic” epistle I John. The τι is in reality something of significance: the letter-writer employs a meiosis (litotes).

1119 In the years 140–155 (Harnack, *Chron.* I 720).

1120 Harnack *a. a. O.* I 290 f. 720.

1121 Tertullian: *sub Pio impius* (cf. Harnack I 298, 4).

1122 Harnack *a. a. O.* I 303. 306 f. 310.

1123 Harnack I 721.

1124 There is hardly any need still to recall the Roman presbyter Florinus (cf. above n. 906), who even in the time of Victor (ca. 190) fell away to Valentinianism (Euseb. *h. e.* V 15: πρεσβυτερίου τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποπεσών), whose writings also disturbed the communities of the Rhône region (cf. Zahn in Herzog, *REccl.*² VII 130. IX 402).

1125 What must have been the nature of the post-apostolic pneumatikian excesses, the prelude to Montanism, has recently been shown in detail by Knopf: “The wandering brothers, who travel ‘for the sake of the name [of God],’ come from outside into the community, wish to be honorably received as pneumatikoi, and wish, even if only temporarily, to work in the community, to edify it, to inform themselves of its condition. But the wandering pneumatikoi had already become quite suspect at that time. The figure of the wandering teacher or prophet coincided with that of the heretic. And even if this extreme danger was not present, itinerant preaching was in any case an element of unrest. The consolidating community with its office at the head could not tolerate that wandering preachers should travel into the community from outside and appear in it with the highest claims, to which possession of the Spirit gave entitlement. The emerging episcopate set itself against this pneumatikism and either did not tolerate it at all in the community or at least demanded control over it. To brusquely turn away the wandering preachers seems to have been the practice of Diotrephes; bad experiences may have driven him to his rejecting attitude. His community seems on the whole to have agreed with him” (*Na. Z.* 207). Unfortunately Knopf, in this depiction, had in mind the conditions of church organization at the time of the composition of the Apocalypse (100+), and thus has set the date too high by roughly half a century. One should note especially also — apart from everything else — that the critic of the community leaders (community angels — to speak with the apocalyptist) in III John is not Christ, but an episcopal colleague.

1126 That Gaius in his community is not indeterminate as one of the “notables,” and that III John is not a “private letter” (Holtzmann, *Hand-Comm.* to the N. T. ¹IV 244 f. ³IV 369. 372), follows from the foregoing.

1127 A real Demetrius later (simultaneously with Victor in Rome) becomes bishop of Alexandria (Harnack *a. a. O.* 723). The question arises whether in III John a code-name is not also present here. It could be that Ephesus, the famous cult-site of the “great Artemis” (Acts 19 23—41), is intentionally indirectly alluded to (the well-known Ephesian name Artemidor was for various

reasons not suitable). Ephesus, like Miletus and other cities of the Ionian colonies, had the Eleusinia and Thesmophoria of the Demeter cult (Prel.-Robert 754). Demeter, however, was regarded in Eleusis as the mother of Artemis (Prel.-Robert 322, 2) and was also connected with Artemis in Arcadia (Prel.-Robert 306. 749, 4). One should moreover note the **contrast** of the Demetrius of III John 12 with the Ephesian Demetrius of Acts 19, as it results if our conjecture is correct.

1128 One has adduced the expression of Papias: *ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγενομένας τῆς ἀληθείας* (Euseb. *h. e.* III 39, 3).

1129 *ἡμεῖς* is the plural of official language: possibly the letter-writer includes himself, vis-à-vis Demetrius and his community, together with the other members of the presbyterium.

1130 Already in the Antiochene Ignatius (Eph. 8, 1) this church is the one famous "for all eternity" (*ἡ διαβόητος τοῖς αἰῶσιν*).

1131 v. 10: *ἐὰν ἔλθω* — via **Corinth** to Rome? Compare the mentioned visit of Polycarp in Rome.

1132 See above n. 918. One may compare here also Knopf's exposition: "The only thing that can still be conjectured concerning the nature of the opposition in Corinth is this: It is easily possible that those opponents of the presbyters relied on their special gifts of the Spirit, that they were Pneumatics (prophets, teachers, ascetics come above all into consideration) who provided the backbone of the resistance of the community against the presbyters. When we see how almost everywhere in the first and second centuries, where a fundamental struggle breaks out in the communities, this struggle reflects the great confrontation between Spirit and office, free charisma and institution, or at least is connected with this confrontation, then we must from the outset designate it as possible that this contrast also played a role in the internal struggles of the Corinthian communities" (Hennecke, *N. Apokr.* I 85).

1133 Compare concerning provenance: Knopf, *Na. Z.* 43 f.; concerning date: v. Schubert in Hennecke I 172 (Lightfoot and Knopf: between 120 and 140); otherwise see Harnack, *Chron.* I 445.

1134 One should compare, for the most recent literary criticism of John (20 and 21) and the viewpoints decisive for it in the "Johannine question," especially the discussion by Ed. Schwartz in *ZntW.* 1914, pp. 210—219 (*Johannes und Kerinthos*), to whose details no position can be taken here, and Ed. Meyer, *UA.* I 30, where John 20 2—10 is ascribed to the author of ch. 21 and chs. 15 to 17.

1135 Connected with this is the fact that likewise in the first as in the second and third Johannine letter the author conceals his proper name. In the case of the Gospel, which already because of its analogy with the synoptic writings remains out of consideration, the mystery-character of the writing would come into play in any case. Concerning the Apocalypse see above n. 906.

1136 He could hardly have allowed it to shine through more clearly in I John than by the in 1 1—3, e.g., tangible parallel to the Evangelist's Prologue, although (as shown n. 1079) the modification that had meanwhile entered in a way appropriate to the time is already recognizable. For a certain coherence of John and I—III John with the Apocalypse see Jülicher, *Einl.* §22, 6 (following Bousset).

1137 I also avoid here the expression "pseudonymity," since for the religious **ancient** author, insofar as he wishes to let his own person disappear behind the name of the once-again-to-be-asserted preeminent authority (compare especially Dillmann on the pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* ²XII 342 ff.), a question concerning the truthfulness of this procedure does not arise in principle (compare the comprehensive discussion in Holtzmann, *Einl.* 191 ff. and 200 ff.). How far this goes is shown, within the New Testament canon apart from the post-apostolic Pauline and Petrine letter-writing (II Thess. [?]; Eph. [?]; I II Tim.; Tit.; I II Petr.), by the writings likewise presenting themselves indirectly as apostolic under the names of James (compare Gal. 1 19) and of Jude ("brother of James"). We must come to terms with this fact despite our essentially altered concepts of literary *fides* and the corresponding demands upon it, and will be all the more ready to do so the less doubtful it appears that the designated New Testament letters, in various ways, nevertheless also sprang from the impulses of the same *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* as the authentic ones (compare, concerning the "questionable means of distinguishing Pauline letters" and the correct evaluation of it — especially with the Pastoral Letters — the relevant exposition in Jülicher, *Einl.* pp. 153. 155 f. §§168 f. 171 f.). That, in the questionable application of the appearance of foreign authorship for the purpose of securing and strengthening authority — an "art that earned its successes because it did not seek its own" (Jülicher) — precisely the authors of the "Johannine" literature give evidence to a preeminent degree of tact and delicacy, emerges from the foregoing and should still be especially emphasized. That, however, also the (notably in the accumulation of the Pauline closing persons in II Tim. 4 10—21 emerging) very far-reaching literary freedom of the author of the Pastoral Letters, which partly pressed toward the assumption of a use of "billets or fragments of letters of the apostle," partly led one to think of "free invention," quite as soon thereafter in the "Acts of Paul" (compare Jülicher 155 f. §§171 f.), alongside perhaps having its good, might under certain circumstances be seen from Tit. 3 12. What, indeed, may have prompted the letter-writer here to let the free city and Roman colony at the southwest corner of Epirus, founded by Augustus, Nicopolis, appear as a winter station envisaged by the apostle, which was doubtless intended as a place of work? The strange notice would be intelligible if, at the time and place of the composition of the Pastoral Letters (in Rome or Asia Minor? in the first quarter of the 2nd century?), there existed a (legendary) tradition that brought Paul into personal relation with his younger contemporary, the Phrygian **Epictetus**, the highly celebrated Stoic who came closest to Christianity in teaching and life, although the latter had only resettled from Rome to Nicopolis in a. 94. Epictetus "opened a school in Nicopolis, but worked much more through free conversations and discussions entirely in the manner and spirit of Socrates, who was his great model; hence the youth streamed in from all sides" (Pauly, *REccl.* III 178. Compare von Arnim in Pauly–Wissowa VI 126 ff.). Precisely the author of the Letter to Titus, however, is also the one who (following the procedure of Acts 17 28) lets his Paul appeal to the authority of the (likewise unnamed) Cretan "prophet" **Epimenides** (1 12)! Of an

occasionally intentional, for us of course uncontrollable, allusion by the author of the Pastoral Letters to personalities and events of his own present, Jülicher also speaks (*a. a. O.*).

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

———————

pp 412-416

1139 Already with regard to the significant hint in Lk. 18 13 f.

1140 Compare moreover the correct exposition of Holtzmann-Bauer on John 14 13.

1141 Worth noting is Ed. Meyer's conclusion from Mk. 11 25 that Mark already knows the basic formula from which the Lord's Prayer developed, but knows nothing yet of a tracing back of its wording to Jesus (UA. I 116, I).

1142 They were certainly inserted editorially into the original of the Gospel of Matthew at an early stage.

1143 Luther went so far that in the German translation "Und verlasse uns unsere Schuld, als wir verlassen unsern Schuldigern" (Catech. maj. and min.) he suppressed the καί of καὶ ἡμεῖς, which still further emphasizes the comparability of the divine and the human action.

1144 Through the viewpoint of the *conditio sine qua non* and of the experiential difficulty and rarity of its fulfillment.

1145 In reality, in the full Christian sense of this petition there lies at its basis a conclusion *a minore ad majus*, the thought: if the selfishly sinful human being is capable of this, how much more God with his great moral power (πᾶ, ἰσχύς Num. 14 17)! The ὡς of Mt. 6 12 corresponds to the καθάπερ of Ps. 33 (LXX 32) 22. Compare also the syllogism of Lk. 11 13.

1146 Does the thought of a cultic (liturgical) determination enter here? That from the beginning it was a community prayer is not to be denied.

1147 Tiele (Gehr.) II 153.

1148 Corresponding to the Aryan-Indian word and concept *ṛta*.

1149 See Bartholomä, *A. W. Sp.* 521. 237.

1150 Compare Bartholomä, *A. W. Sp.* 1360 ff.

1151 Inserted is also a second register, comprising roughly half a hundred such Mazda-names.

1152 According to the usage of the younger Avesta (Bartholomä, *A. W. Sp.* 1137).

1153 Naturally not in the Old Testament-prophetic and New Testament sense, but only as it was conceivable within a religion that was only in the process of acquiring an ethical basic character and possibly monotheistic traits. Compare Tiele (-Gehr.) *a. a. O.*

1154 Bartholomä, *A. W. Sp.* 1139 and *Gathas* 125.

1155 Compare Yasna 43, 2 (*per tuum sanctissimum spiritum o Mazdä*) and Bartholomä Sp. 1138.

1156 This understandably does not prevent that in the archaic conception and representation the spirit of Ahura and the Amesha Spenta Vohu Manah initially also proceed alongside one another (Yasna 33, 12. 43, 6. 51, 7). On the whole question Yasna 43 of the Gathas is particularly instructive. In the revelation that Zarathustra according to 43, 7. 8 received through Vohu Manah, the latter passes immediately into Mazdä. The entire chapter teaches how Zarathustra recognized God as the Holy One.

1157 “Before the angel Israel is to have exactly the same respect as before Yahweh himself, for in essence there is no difference between the two, since the name of Yahweh, that is, his self-revealing essence, is in him; compare v. 22 and 3 2. 16. The angel himself forgives sins” (Baentsch, *Exodus-Leviticus* 1900 *z. St.*). In more recent times the Amesha Spenta have repeatedly been combined with the archangels of Jewish belief (see on the one hand, for example, W. Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn, *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie* 1896—1904. II 633 ff., and to this Bartholomä, *A. W. Sp.* 146 — with question marks; on the other hand [Stade-]Bertholet II 374 f.).

1158 In the same Gospel the words: ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου [ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς] καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς, according to Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus Confessor, and two minuscules, rather form the second petition (compare Holtzm. *Syn.* on Lk. 11 2 and Bauer, *Leb. J.* p. 402): “The Spirit sufficed for a later time, and the Parousia was dispensable for it” (Wellhausen, *Evang. Lukas* 56). It will be asked whether this reading rests on a displacement from the beginning of the petitions into the second position (Marcion and Gregory belong to northeastern Asia Minor). According to more recent scholars (compare Klein, *Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers* in *ZntW.* 1906, pp. 34—50), the petition for the Holy Spirit in Marcion and others came into the Lord’s Prayer from a baptismal prayer of the baptismal movement of John in place of the first petition.

1159 “The divine order of things that enters from heaven into present reality, becoming this-worldly” (Holtzm. *Syn.* 49).

1160 That in this one is to see downright a characteristic of the Gospel of Matthew emerges from the connection of βασιλεία and δικαιοσύνη in 5 10. 20 (fundamental thoughts of the Sermon on the Mount), 21 31. 32 (compare 11 11—13; 3 2. 4 17). Lk. 12 31 (the parallel passage to Mt. 6 33) characteristically omits δικαιοσύνη. The word occurs in Luke only in 1 75 (in Mark not at all).

1161 This element, too, is elsewhere emphasized precisely in Matthew: 7 21. 11 12.

1162 Compare Yasna 31, 22. 43, 16. 51, 21.

1163 The ζητεῖν of the Matthean passage gives the intensified concept, like the Avestan *var* (see on this Barthol., *A. W. Sp.* 1360 ff.).

1164 Compare Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* 1898, p. 113.

1165 It makes the human being holy (compare Yasna 51, 21).

1166 See above p. 170 (n. 511).

1167 It is not to be forgotten that the Mazdä faith is the most strongly developed agrarian religion. On the details it is not possible to enter here.

1168 Compare Barthol., *Gath* 127.

1169 What is meant is the *frašōkereti* (renewal of humanity; compare παλιγγενεσία Mt. 19 28) at the end of things.

1170 Compare Barthol., *Gath.* on Yasna 44, 6 and 46, 2.

1171 What is meant is that suffered through injustice.

1172 Forgiveness of the unjustly inflicted suffering of the other.

1173 Yasna 33, 11.

1174 The number of the Amesha Spenta is given as 7 in Yast 2, 1—3; 13, 82 f.; “but one must not press the number seven even here. Most often six appear (see above); thus Yast 1, 25; 4, 1; but on the other hand see Yasna 1, 2; 70, 2; 57, 12” (Barthol., *A. W. Sp.* 146).

1175 Fully reproduced only by Matthew. Luke shortens the heptadic prayer into a pentadic one. Why, one wonders?

1176 Compare Barthol., *A. W. Sp.* 104 f.; Wolff, *Avesta* 452; Tiele (-Gehr.) II 282 ff.

.**1177** Barthol., *A. W.* s. v. *frasōkeretay-* and *Gāthās* 127. Tiele(-Gehr.) II 306 ff. Böcklen, *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen und der parsischen Eschatologie* 1902, pp. 69 ff. 102 ff.

1178 Barthol., *Gāth.* p. 68, 4. 87 (2).

1179 Barthol., *A. W.* Sp. 513: “perhaps also to be regarded as a particularly holy space within Paradise.” The more often (in contrast to Mark and Luke) Matthew designates God as the heavenly Father, the less justification there is for explaining the words ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in 6 9 as a (liturgical) addition.

1180 Bartholomä, *Die Gāthās und heiligen Gebete des altiranischen Volkes* 1879, p. 1. 65 f.

1181 Barthol., *A. W.* Sp. 283 f. It belongs to the “four-times-to-be-spoken” Gāthā-strophes.

1182 Wolff, *Avesta* 66. Barthol., *A. W.* Sp. 282. 702. 778. On the Shepherd cf. above p. 327.

1183 *yazamaide* Wolff: “we venerate”; Barthol.: *yaz* = to perform prayers in honor of a deity and acts of worship (*A. W.* Sp. 282. 1274).

1184 Barthol., *A. W.* Sp. 922.

1185 But after the creation of the *Ameša spenta* (Yas. 19, 8).

1186 S. Wolff, *Avesta* 51.

1187 The name reproduces in abbreviated form the beginning of the prayer: *yathā ahū vairyo*.

1188 One may in this connection recall the archangels compared with the *Ameša spenta* (4? 6? 7?): they not only bear the prayers up to God, but also themselves enter in as intercessors for human beings ([Stade-]Bertholet II 374 f. 378).

1189 When once already Rhode, Richter, Seyffarth, Herder (“Explanations from a newly opened oriental source,” Herzog, *REncl.* V 793) allowed the Lord’s Prayer through Christ to be derived from the “Zend-Avesta” (cf. Ebrard in Herzog, *REncl.*² IV 768), then they had, after what has been said above, at least a dark presentiment of the actual state of affairs.

1190 I suspect an Asia-Minor origin of the prayer. It would allow itself to be understood without strain from conditions and circumstances such as may be inferred especially for the earliest Christianity in Cappadocia (cf. I Pet. 1 1) — because of the particularly strong confrontation and intermixture there, also drawing in the popular strata, of Jewish, Hellenistic, and Iranian-Persian religion (cf. on this Harnack, *Miss.*¹ pp. 468–470. *St.* II 195–199). A more definite result can only be hoped for in connection with answering the question of the place of origin of the Gospel of Matthew in the totality that lies before us, from which we must here refrain. The Gospel would still have to be examined more precisely and coherently in the direction indicated. Here attention is only to be drawn to the remarkable similarity of Mt. 6 33 and Yasna 27, 14. When in the latter passage it is said: *ašem vohū vahistem astrī, uštā astrī uštā ahmāi, hyat ašāi vahistāi ašem*, i.e.: “*aša* is the best good; according to desire it is, according to desire it comes to us, *aša* for the best *aša*” (so Bartholomä, *A. W.* Sp. 233; others, because of the difficulty of the conclusion, otherwise), with the sense: the most valuable thing, which serves the fulfillment of the wishes of the pious, is the quality of justice corresponding to the order of right in the realm of Ahuramazda, and the “thereby acquired claim to the eternal good (Paradise) and this itself,” briefly speaking, the highest salvific good rightfully due to the best righteousness — then the biblical: “Seek first his (your heavenly Father’s) kingdom and (his) righteousness (Weizsäcker: his kingdom and justice), and all this will be added to you” sounds almost like a free Christian transposition in the form of a commandment (cf. on the polyvalent word *aša* and on the passage in question Barthol. *a. a. O.* Sp. 230. 232 f.: “our passage shows an intentional play with the meanings”). *Aša* is therefore praised with the greatest emphasis, because for the pious believer it has the greatest “usefulness,” and indeed in an eschatological sense (cf. Barthol., *Gāth.* 128

and the New Testament: “godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come,” I Tim. 4 8); the kingdom of Mazda is the “kingdom of usefulness” (Yasna 28, 9), that which is better than good (Yas. 51, 6), the good kingdom, the most precious, the most pious share for the one who with zeal practices the best in his works (51, 1). For the conception of the kingdom of God of the heavenly Father as gift (cf. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* 1898, p. 113), with which the Sermon on the Mount immediately opens (Mt. 5 3), Yasna 51, 21 (“through Vohu manah Mazda will bestow the kingdom [upon the one devoted to piety]. After this good praise I bear desire”) presents itself. The desire, the striving after the highest good is equally strongly emphasized in Mt. 5 6. 10. 6 33 and in the Avesta passages. It is further noteworthy that the most holy Avesta saying Yasna 27, 14, the second principal prayer of the Mazda religion, follows immediately upon the *Ahuna vairya* (Yasna 27, 13), the first principal prayer and in this capacity the Iranian parallel to the Lord’s Prayer (see above). From here a light may also fall on the fact that Mt. 6 33 likewise follows the Lord’s Prayer, even if not immediately: the supposition lies close that the verse was taken into the text by the same hand or authority as the Lord’s Prayer. One readily notices that the required striving after the divine and highest good leads back beyond the immediate context (of anxious cares) to the standpoint of 6 20 (of gathering treasures). It may be expedient also to recall the striking uncertainty of the wording of Mt. 6 33. Reference may once more be made to the peculiar text-historical interventions of the Asia-Minor Marcion and Gregory of Nyssa in the Lukan Lord’s Prayer (see above, note 1158).

1191 Klein *a. a. O.* (see note 1158).

1192 On the other hand, a relation to the *Shema* and the *Qaddish* may likewise be dispensed with.

1193 The Lord’s Prayer of the two Synoptists presents Jesus as the petitioner; the prayer of John 17 as the intercessor. According to Ed. Meyer, in John 17 15 the Lord’s Prayer is used (by the “editor of the Gospel of John”) (UA. I 116, 1); cf. above note 1141. Too far goes the assumption that in the high-priestly prayer “the individual petitions of the Lord’s Prayer are paraphrased and interpreted in the sense of Johannine theology.” Cf. Holtzmann-Bauer 277 (with reference to E. A. Abbott, *Encycl. bibl.* II 1777; Loisy 817).

1194 A mysterious elder, “one of the noblest representatives of the chosen race of Abraham,” Friedrich von Rougemont lets prophesy — he calls him “the stranger” — that the Petrine and the Pauline church would one day yet be replaced by the Johannine. The end of God’s ways, however, would be the church of Israel grafted back onto its own stock (Rom. 11) (*Christ et ses témoins*, translated by Fabarius 1859, p. 405). The saying John 19 27 seems to hover before the “elder.” How Peter and Paul would have positioned themselves toward this prophecy, one asks oneself involuntarily.

—----------