

LIBRARY
OF THE
BRITISH
MUSEUM
Natural History

39677

Witnesses to the Historicity

of Jesus.

A. Degree Thesis

by

Georges S. S. Kukhi.

September 1916

225.9

K95-

9

Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus.

In 1872 George Smith noticed that there were points of correspondence between the Babylonian account of the deluge and the account given us in Genesis. Further satisfaction came to him when three years later he ~~again~~ discovered that there existed a striking similarity between the reports about the creation of the world given by the above sources. Subsequent to that date it has been the tendency of biblical scholars to take this fact into consideration and to admit a ^rstain of Babylonian influence on the thought and the literature of the Old Testament, especially on the Epistemological, eth-theories, nological and theological. That these scholars are right in making such an assumption, which is really no longer an assumption but an accomplished truth, is more than verifiable. It would be fruitless, indeed, either to question or gainsay this view that takes its stand on solid historical and etymological grounds. Nevertheless it is equally vain and superfluous to deny all originality and historical setting to the biblical narratives and make them pure adaptations of the Babylonian myths. To accuse the Hebrew people, the one people under the sun most celebrated for their exclusiveness, for their staunch opposition to foreign influence, for their fanaticism and suspicion of everything alien, to accuse them of slavish dependence on foreign literature sounds like an insult. This is especially the case since these accounts were compiled after this people attained a national consciousness. It is preposterous, then, to say that a host of biblical characters are diversified expressions of three original characters; that the widely differing geographical settings are alterations of one locality; and that the long period of time is only the creation of fiction. Such claims are unwarrantable. History has again and again shown us how a novel theory carries people off their feet and makes them lose their balance. The first impulse is to exaggerate and look at everything from the point of view of the newly discovered theory. Precisely this is what happened about the close of the nineteenth century when there came into existence in Germany a new school of Biblical interpretation which set out in a dogmatic fashion by tracing back all the numerous books of the Bible to Babylonian sources and ~~by stripping~~ ^{to} them of historical worth. The appellation, "Pan-Babylonianism" has been given to this circle of biblical students. Having focussed their attention on the literary fragments recently discovered in Mesopotamia on the sites of ancient Babylonia and Assyria, they became slaves to their material and it became everything to them. A visible reaction is witnessed on the part of many, with the exception of a few.

"Pan-Babylonianism."

The leaders in this movement are : Professor Peter Jensen, Marburg; Professor Gunkel and Professor Winckler, Berlin; Professor Zimmern, Leipzig; Pastor Jeremias, Leipzig. These are by no means equally radical but fall into different classes of radicalism. Most of these men began their work on the Old Testament but they have gone on to include the New Testament in the range of their studies? The real criticism of the New Testament begins with the "Christ Myth School" and its antecedents, which is the main theme of this paper.

2

The beginning of the "Pan-Babylonian" school maybe said to date from the publication in 1892 of two articles by Professor Jensen on "Elamite Proper Names", in which he claimed that the characters in the Book of Esther were Babylonian deities. These articles were preceded by another article from the pen of Zimmern whose thesis was that the feast of Purim mentioned in Esther only, is of Babylonian origin. In 1895 appeared a work by Gunkel entitled, "Schoepfung und Chaos, Urzeit und Endzeit", dealing with the influence of the Babylonian creation-myth in the Bible, worked out in great detail. To the passages in the Old Testament where Babylonian influence was already recognized, Gunkel added several others. He pointed out at the same time the Babylonian influence on Jewish Apocalyptic literature and the transmission of this to early Christian Apocalypses. This is a legitimate and true argument and Gunkel is to be congratulated on his work.

Another important contribution was furnished by Stucken's "Astral-Mythen: 1. Abraham, 1896; 2. Lot, 1897. The principles laid down here were developed on somewhat more adequate lines in Winckler's "Geschichte Israels". In these books the astral element is at the basis of the discussion. Moon and sun gods and goddesses, we are told, are the heroes and the heroines of biblical texts dealing with characters beginning with Abraham and ending with Solomon. Jensen, Jeremias and Zimmern share this view. By Jensen it is carried to its greatest extremes. Another name for this group is that of the "Astral School". The forerunner of the Astral School was Stucken. Goldhizer's theory drawn largely from etymology had been long since discredited. But Stucken based his theory on an amazing number of parallels which he accumulated from the literatures of the world. This is an illogical procedure which leaves nothing for psychology to say. The psychological processes behind two incidents may be exactly identical, but this identity need not necessarily send one to the mythological category because it happens to resemble the other. Again it is possible that an actual event corresponds in outline to a myth and yet its actors be unaware of the existence of the latter. Human action antedates mythology and the technique of mythology is dependent on it. Mythology could develop only by borrowing analogies from history and not vice versa. This must not be overlooked. Winckler built less on parallels from remote nations and more upon the recurrence of characteristic numbers, such as four, seven, twelve, and began to make a wide and interesting application of them. Many such applications are highly fanciful. Jensen, on the other hand, follows a path peculiarly his own. His infallible chart is the Gilgamesh Epic, of which he was a student for some time. The Epic is a series of legends and myths coming down from different periods and woven together into a whole. Professor Jensen's dictum is that all the biblical stories are nothing but variations of one or another part of the stories in the Gilgamesh Epic. Taking Israel tribe by tribe, he gathers into one group all the tales belonging to a particular tribe and then seeks to find the points of resemblance between them and the stories about Gilgamesh, Eabani or Parnipishtim. This is a great revelation to Jensen which enables him and others to see that the patriarchs, the prophets, the judges, the kings, John the Baptist, Jesus, and Paul are, when their masks are removed, nothing but one or another of the three heroes of the Gilgamesh Epic. Any attempt to refute such a speculation is so much time wasted.

The theory is selfdestructive. What is puzzling about the dramatis personae in the Gilgamesh Epic is the fact that they do not play their roles consistently. In the same scene they are made to play the part of several biblical characters and swing back and forth from one to the other. As a result we are confused. A good illustration of this is the new version of the Baptism of Jesus. John the Baptist is Eabani when he meets Jesus who is Gilgamesh. Immediately following the baptism comes the temptation. At this point Jesus undergoes a metamorphosis and without explanation becomes Eabani. We are struck with awe as we behold this sudden change. Ours is not to question why? when Jensen says that this must be so. He never stops to ask himself whether these similarities are due to the more or less uniform conditions of life in the Semitic world add to the common pedigree and heritage of the Semites. Life among the Semites in their earlier stages was simple and limited to a small number of experiences. It centered about fountains, springs, oasis, trees, wild animals, clans and few religious ideas. One home, Arabia, bred them. It taught them one language and they made the dialects. It taught them the same manners and customs. In brief, they were children of one family. One economic and social reason in time broke up the family ties and sent them in various directions in search of their bread. The unity however was never wholly and substantially broken up. These things Jensen and his staff should remember if they pretend to be Semitic scholars.

Results of Investigation/

Two questions here confront us: (1) What do the great scholars think of such a rationale, and, (2) To what degree is it true? Two things at least must be conceded to these investigations, first, that the Babylonian civilization exerted a tremendous influence on lesser neighboring and kindred civilizations, and secondly, there are cases where a story has been heightened by the admixture of astral elements. The sin of the astral school has been its forgetfulness of certain principles. These principles are the following: (1) Not all stories are astral. Anthropology tells us that a substratum of terrestrial events lies at the bottom of these stories. People had long inspected terrestrial objects before they turned to the stars. (2) Historical criticism has been set at naught. This school does not bring out the distinction between documents which are approximately contemporary with the events recorded and documents which are removed by centuries from the incidents they purport to describe. Events chronicled in contemporary documents can seldom be mythical. It is this consideration that makes Jensen's treatment of Jesus ludicrous. This brings us to the Christ Myth school and its antecedents. But before we leave the Pan-Babylonian school it will pay us to get a bird's eye view of Assyriology and its uses and abuses in biblical criticism.

Assyriology.

Assyriology is the somewhat inadequate term employed to denote the scientific investigation of the history, literature and art of the Babylonians and the Assyrians, as these have been revealed through excavations on the sites of their ancient cities.

There have never been more surprising discoveries in all human research. The constitutions and external fortunes of great peoples, their religions and morals, their languages and writings, even their personal habits and modes of life have been suddenly disclosed. Centuries wholly unknown have been rescued from the abyss of the past. A new, vast and varied canvas has been added to the panorama of history. The fortunes of those ancient peoples who thus emerged from darkness were fatally intertwined with those of the Hebrew nation. It is therefore, not strange that the eager students of philology and history hailed the new discoveries and plunged with energy into the work of their elucidation. To this number was soon added that group of the critics of Christianity who with little equipment for the task began to make Assyriology serviceable in tearing down the scriptures, doing what the apologists had been doing only for another purpose. These people lacked cool judgment very sadly and the virtue of scholarly patience was unknown to them. This polemical temper which is always on the offensive, always ready for assaults and ready to give the first blow with any new weapon avails little. The votaries of Assyriology will learn caution as the excitement of exploration abates. The extreme radicals have swallowed with unseemly voracity theories not supported and not understood, while the well ascertained results of the literary criticism of the Bible have not appealed to them. More openness of mind to scientific proof and less greedy snatching is badly needed. Experience and maturity alone should be the passports of those who advance new theories. The blameworthy thing has been the inadequate care to guard against mistakes. The most rigid observances of the rules of critical investigation must be enforced. Conclusions must not be jumped at but reached from the weighing of evidence. But what right has anyone to doubt biblical texts and devour the contents of the Babylonian texts as truth? The documents of the twentieth century written by persons of far superior culture and character to those of the writers of the Babylonian texts, can not boast of precision and the absence of prejudice. The Babylonian texts are not infallible/ They contain mistakes and deliberate misstatements. Take the tablets containing the annals of the kings of Assyria, for example those of Tiglathpileser III and Sanherib. In his campaign against the people of the lands of the Nairi, Tiglathpileser would have us believe that the people of the lands of the Nairi acted before him as a mouse before a cat. Sanherib on the other hand tries to conceal the failure of his Palestinian campaign by reversing the order of the customary way of writing. We therefore prefer the account given in II Kings, Chapter 18 to his account. Similar illustrations may be cited from the conflicting reports of the European nations in the present war.

The absurdity of the argument from appeal to Assyriology becomes more apparent the more we examine it. Hebrew history is no more mythical than the history of Western Europe which was a more direct descendant of Rome than Hebrew civilization of Babylonia. Western Europe and the Catholic church inherited Roman institutions, Roman law, Roman names, nearly everything they had was Roman and yet they are historical institutions. Does mere resemblance and mere borrowing exclude from historicity? Our bodies more than anything else we have resemble the bodies of primitive peoples but they are not phantoms. They are substantial.

The Antecedents of the Christ Myth School.

The modern denial of Jesus' historicity is not without its antecedents . As early as the end of the eighteenth century certain French writers classed Christianity among the mythical religions of antiquity, and Jesus' person took on the correspondingly shadowy form. The great precursors of this theory of the Christ Myth were Charles Francois Dupuis, 1742-1809 and Constantin Francois Volney, 1757-1820. Dupuis wrote: *Origine de tous les Cultes*, and Volney wrote: *Les Ruines*. These works are literary monuments but from the point of view of the history of religion they do not amount to much. In Germany Bahrdt and Venturini introduced a sceptical movement in reaction against the prevailing supernaturalism of current interpretation. But they did not deny Jesus' existence. The secret of his career they traced to his connection with the Essenes. The Essenes were believed to have drawn upon Babylonia, Egypt, Greece and India for their secret wisdom? In his youth Jesus had been trained in its secrets and during his public ministry he was closely in touch with the leading men in that brotherhood. Such surmises are the products of fantasy. How could Jesus be an Essene when the Essenes abandoned the Messianic hope which was the crux of Jesus' teachings? Again the Essenes were a sort of a Monastic fraternity with constitutions and rules for their conduct and thought. But Jesus was a man interested in the welfare of society and a man of action. He was not bound by conventions or rules. Certainly a wide gap separates him from the Essenes both in his mode of living and in his thinking . Is there the least remark in either the Christian literature or tradition which leads us to suspect that Jesus had any intercourse with these Essenes? Why are they extraneous to early Christianity? How are we to explain the fact that Jesus selected fishermen and artisans as his colleagues, when he was a member of such a learned class? Granting that Jesus knew the mysteries of the Essenes, yet he made no use of them. When he talks he talks like a Jew who knew little else beside the Old Testament. The Essenes were ascetics but Jesus came eating and drinking, they were vegetarians, ignored the temple cult, renounced marriage, Jesus did none of these. His immediate followers even Paul talk like him.

The one name deserving special consideration here is that of Strauss, a Hegelian. Strauss may be said to have been the first critical scholar with a serious purpose. He is only conditionally a forerunner of the mythical school because he never ceased to believe in the historicity of Jesus and made the Old Testament responsible for the mythical elements in the New. It is to him that we owe the word "myth". His book "*Das Leben Jesu*", 1836, discriminates between the historical and mythical accounts in the New Testament. By myth he meant the clothing in historic form of religious ideas, shaped by the unconsciously inventive power of legend and gathering about historic personality. Some of his predecessors had already applied this explanation to the beginning and end of the life of Jesus.

Another conspicuous figure is Bruno Bauer also a Hegelian through and through. Setting history aside he made Hegel's logic and ideals his starting point. He allowed his wild fancy free play and reached his conclusions in a comparatively short time. He held to the priority of Mark and made it the main source for Matthew and Luke. In this way the united

testimony of the three became in reality the testimony of one witness only. The next step was to treat Mark as a literary fiction and this left the gospels no historical value. A similar result attended Bauer's study of the Pauline Epistles. He pronounced Paul's letters pseudonymous. Naturally Jesus' historicity stood unsupported. In one of his books "Christus und die Caesaren", he gives the second half of the second century as the date of the evangelist who wrote Mark. In presence of such inaccurate readings of history, the arbitrariness of such men need not cause any agitation on our part. We may well recall Pope's words:

"A little knowledge is a dangerous thing,

Drink deeply or taste not the Pierian spring.

Bauer is no final judge in this matter. He undertook to accomplish during his brief period of activity, with almost no material for research work at his disposal, what hundreds of scholars with more accurate and abundant data had been seeking to accomplish for the last seventy years. The Christ Myth writers are noted for their quick insight and are famous for their ability to give a final answer to questions of biblical history. It is surprising what they can do in a short time.

The radicals in Holland began by doubting the authenticity of the Pauline Epistles. They assigned the contents of Romans, Corinthians and Galatians to the middle of the second century. S. Hoekstra and Samuel Adrian Naber did not even believe that the Gospels contained ~~any~~ information regarding Jesus as Messiah. Loman in 1881 essayed to prove that the New Testament literature belonged ^{to} the second century. But when he published his book on the nongenuineness of the Pauline letters he discovered, as Van Manen discovered, that there is a historical kernel in the oldest Gospel document. So far, no disputer of the historicity of Jesus has thought of answering the question, "What is the foundation of the belief in the historical Jesus and the explanation of its rapid spread"? What little attention this question has received has resulted in discordant answers. According to some the Gospels are a composite of principles and ideas created by productive movements, social and religious, which consolidated to form primitive Christianity. By others they are treated as the result of a definite mythological evolution centered around an unhistorical dominant conception. The first theory is symbolic and makes the early Christian community itself, the originator of this history by projecting upon an individual its ideals and aspirations. The other theory is the mythical. The first makes historical happenings to correspond to the religious ideas, the second tells us to seek events in primitive narrative material which was gathered and condensed into a story accomplished in a remote past on Jewish soil.

The Christ Myth School.

The leading men in this group are: Professor A. Drews, Karlsruhe; Professor W. B. Smith, Tulane University; as far as he deals with the problems of the New Testament, Jensen may be included among these. A minor satellite in this constellation is J. M. Robertson. It would be worth our effort and time, if before we make the transition to the examination of the theories elucidated by the above expounders of the Christ Myth dogma, for it is a dogma to its believers, to say a word in regard to the position of Kalthoff. Kalthoff

revived Bauer's views with slight modifications. As an extreme socialist reacting against the individualism of Christianity, Kalthoff pleads for a socialistic version of it. Christianity according to him began as a purely socio-religious movement among the masses and these masses embodied their ideals in a Jesus. But this is too logical and scientific a process for history to follow. It is more appropriate to the laboratory than to the immethodical and irregular flux of human events. When Kalthoff says this, he is thinking of the statement in Acts II: 44 and Acts XIII: 32-35. But these things came to pass after the death of Jesus when his followers had no option except that of congregating for mutual protection and consolation. But Jesus and his Disciples during his lifetime refused even to give an opinion respecting the distribution of money and the settlement of economic questions. The Parable of the talents is a strong argument against the communistic theory. No! the Gospels know nothing about socialism. Moreover, Kalthoff has no right to say that early Christianity was socialistic because a few people in Jerusalem shared their goods among themselves for a time. The Christians in the Gentile lands were no more socialistic than their pagan neighbors except that they had a stronger class/consciousness. This class/consciousness is natural to every new movement and is at first more or less socialistic. It cannot be otherwise. But to say that the early Christians had a socialistic program cannot be backed by evidence. All this time Kalthoff speaks of the masses and we wonder whom he has in mind. Who are these Christian masses and where were they? Everyone knows that their numbers were absurdly small, and yet Kalthoff speaks of the masses. The few Christians that lived in the Apostolic age were expecting the end of the world and did not bother with social reform. Some of them even gave up working and began to watch for the coming of Messiah. Paul uses severe language in writing to these idlers, urging them to go back to their work. The Eschatology of the synoptic Gospels and of the Pauline letters is the best weapon to use against Kalthoff. So this argument from the struggling proletariat who dramatized their experiences by creating a hero belongs to the scholars' cell and not to history. The early Christians practically knew nothing about these lofty and noble ideals of equality, justice and brotherhood apart from their master. When they went to be tried or to die they made no dramatic orations explaining the things for which they were dying. They did not die for the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, nor ~~for~~ ^{for} better government and freedom nor for any principle divorced from personality. They died for Jesus. The story of the forty warriors who as they went to die in the cold sang:

"Forty worriers fighting for thee, O Christ,

Winning for thee the victory, and from thee the crown,"

maybe be equally true of all Christian martyrs. Their last low whispers were burdened with Jesus' name. When Paul speaks of knowing nothing but Jesus and him crucified, he is reiterating the words of those who belong to the same household of faith. We know of no mythical creature who exerted the influence that Jesus exerted, an influence that has been growing in geometrical progression throughout the centuries. It is outrageous, therefore, to suppose that all the schisms and all the prosecutions were over a mythical fabrication. Human nature is above this ignominious and unreserved slavery to fancy?

No two investigators have the same methodology. Each has his peculiar method of approach. Each has a thesis to which he subordinates reasonableness and fact. Professor Jensen adopts the literary method or to be more precise the etymology^{ical} method. He has no idealism, no social passion, he is simply a literary critic. In 1906 he published "Das Gilgamesh-Epos in der Welt Literatur" a work which, as far as size goes, is colossal. The work was controversial and shallow and no time was wasted in replying to it. This embittered Jensen and in 1910 he published a second work entitled, "Moses, Jesus, Paulus" in which he appealed to the laity. He compares great points in the New Testament with trivial points in the epos and vice versa. He also lectured in different places and held public meetings/ He challenged his colleagues in the faculty of the University of Marburg to answer him. Finally Jülicher took it upon himself to reply to him.

Professor Drews on the other hand follows the philosophical method. He is Professor of philosophy at Karlsruhe and is a pantheist and follower of Hartmann. That he has a deep religious feeling is unquestionable. Not only that but also his religion means something to him and he wants to share it with others. He is a philosopher of religion and not a historian. Orthodoxy and Catholicism are regarded by him as the true types of Christianity in proportion to the emphasis on the person of Christ. He combats the liberals who look on Jesus as a man. This is the gnostic idea. The gnostics resolve Jesus into a phantom. Jesus was merely an aeon. This is a misapprehension on Drews' part of the Gospel narratives and their purpose, else he would not indulge in such travesties. He inverts the order of the Gospels to suit his purpose. He goes to the Fourth Gospel for his support. Apparently unaware of the fact that the Fourth Gospel is a product of the second century doctrine of the loges. Drews thesis is that we should get rid of the leadership of prominent historical persons. He would have us get rid of Jesus but the others he leaves unmolested. As a monist an advocate of the God-Man theory, Drews charges liberal people with spiritual atrophy and directs his polemic against them.

Professor W. B. Smith falls in with Drews although they differ in motive and method. Their plea is for the primacy of idea in religion over personality. They forget that idea without personality is worthless. Many people have great ideas but are very repugnant because they possess no personality. Ideas must be embodied else they dissipate and personality is the medium for the embodiment of ideas. Personality turns ideas into a channel of action and makes them effective. Smith does not talk like either a theologian or a historian. He talks as a mathematician who deals with imaginary points, lines, and figures. He forgets that in the realm of experience things cannot be treated mathematically. Smith's method is the critical method.

An inquiry into Mr. Robertson's work will be made along side with the others. We need only mention in this connection that Mr. Robertson is not taken seriously.

Professor Jensen.

In his entertaining treatise already alluded to in other connections, "Das Gilgamesh Epos in der Weltliteratur", Jensen proposes the fabulous origin of most of the biblical characters. The famous Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh is believed to have been in existence at least two thousand years before Christ. It deals with the adventures of Gilgamesh, king of Erech in southern Babylonia and his friend Eabani. The whole text is not preserved as some tablets have not been recovered and therefore this leaves a gap. The account of the Deluge referred to at the opening of this paper, was discovered by George Smith and is an integral part of the story. For Professor Jensen the Gilgamesh epic is the prototype of every literary production belonging to the Semetic race and he extends its influence to other fields of literary activity in all cases and in all times. Scholars suffered Jensen to follow his ideas, themselves remaining unconcerned with them. Had Jensen been less hasty, had he taken time to inquire into the origin and authenticity of the New Testament documents, he would never have committed the blunder he did. The parallels on which his assertions are based are droll to the extreme. He puts in columns the Babylonian sagas and in opposite columns the Bible incidents and goes on to prove the dependants of the Bible narratives on the others. The following are examples of such parallels:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| 1/ Eabani returns home from the wilderness to his dwelling, the home of Gilgamesh. |) | Jesus returns home from the wilderness. |
| 2. A plague of fever, Xisuthros intercedes for suffering humanity, by which the plague is stopped. |) | The mother-in-law of Peter is sick of a fever and Jesus heals her. |
| 3. Xisuthros builds himself a boat and keeps it ready. |) | A boat is kept ready for Jesus. |
| 4. Xisuthros with his family and his immediate friends enter the ship one evening. |) | Jesus and his Disciples enter the boat one evening. |
| 5. A storm arises and falls. |) | A storm arises and falls. |

These are only a few of the specimens presented by Jensen and are some of his strongest instances. The points of resemblance here are much more numerous and more close than is usually the case. But what do they prove? Certainly they do not prove that this is the order of events chronologically arranged in any one of the narratives. Jensen brought them from every part and section of the stories/ There is a literary composition and logical unity to the epic but there are no such things to the Gospels. They do not record things in order, nor do they record the same things. In this case parallels are superfluous. The evangelists take for granted that people know the life of Jesus and they want to tell those who do not believe in Jesus something about him. Of course those who read these parallels are deceived because they are unacquainted with Jensen's method. To be sure events from the lives of other countless individuals can be put in parallels with those from the Gilgamesh epic. Who has never entered a boat? Or who has not visited

the wilderness? There are more important things we do in common and more essential things are said of us in the same language, and yet we retain our individuality. Boats, wildernesses and healings are not confined to the Gilgamesh epic and to the Gospels. Where is the resemblance in number five? "A storm arises and falls". In one case it refers to the deluge sweeping away a sinful race and the other an ordinary storm on the Lake of Galilee. There are accounts of storms in the *Odyssey*. The pilgrim fathers met with storms but they knew nothing of the Gilgamesh epic. Jensen is teaching Assyrian in Marburg, but some day he is going to die and he will be succeeded by another. Should someone write about him and his successor he will say of both that they taught Assyriology in Marburg, which is true but does not prove the mythical nature of either. Jensen unnecessarily narrows the field of experience. Thus we see that the wording of an expression amounts to little. When Xisuthros entered the boat he did so to protect himself from the flood. When Jesus entered he did so for the purpose of instructing the people. But worst of all the series ends abruptly without the slightest reference to the crucial scenes in Jesus' life. To these scenes that make the life of Jesus so unique the Gilgamesh story offers not the faintest resemblance. Jesus was a teacher, a preacher, a friend of the outcast, a fighter against wickedness in high places, a martyr and many other things. What was Gilgamesh? This combination of elements that do not belong together and this separation of elements that are meant to be one is not a literary virtue. It is vicious. Further Jensen does not spare other scholars from his ridicule. We may get an idea of how Jensen is regarded by other scholars from a quotation from F. C. Conybeare. He says: "I cannot but think that my readers will resent any further specimens of Dr. Jensen's system. He has not troubled himself to acquire the merest a. b. c. of textual criticism. He has no sense of the difference of idea and style which divides the Fourth Gospel from the earlier Gospels and he lacks all insight into the development of the Gospel tradition. He takes the Christian documents out of their historical context and ignore their dependence on the Judaism of the period B.C. 100-A.D. 100. He has no understanding of the prophetic, Messianic and Apocalyptic aspects of early Christianity, no sense of its intimate relations with the beliefs and opinions which lie before us in Apocryphas like the Book of Enoch, the Fourth Esdras, the Assent of Isaiah, the Testaments of the Patriarchs. He has never learned that in the four Gospels he has before him successive stages or layers of stratification of Christian tradition and he accordingly treats them as a single literary block of which every part is of the same age and evidential value. Like his Gilgamesh epics, the Gospels, for all he knows about them, might have been dug only yesterday among the sands of Mesopotamia, instead of being the work of a sect, with which, as early as the end of the first century we are fairly well acquainted. Never once does he ask himself how the authors of the New Testament came to have the Gilgamesh epic at the tips of their tongues, exactly in the form in which he translates it from Babylonian tablets incised 2000 years B.C. By what channels did it reach them?"

Mr. Conybeare has once for all refuted Jensen's claims and he is only one of many whose sanity of reason is offended by such claims.

~~Professor Jensen.~~

Prof. Drews.

The most conspicuous figure in this campaign and the one who has attracted most attention is Professor Drews. He published two heavy volumes, the one entitled, "The Christ Myth," 1910 and the other, "Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus," 1912. In the former he traces the origin of the doctrine about the Messiah to Parseeism. He goes on to say the Persian modes of thinking never lost their grip on the mind of the Jews, even after the return to their native land. But, as is often the case, Drews is unaware of the contradictions. In the chapter preceding the one on the "Influence of Parseeism on the Belief in a Messiah" he says that the Messianic hope was universal and grew out of a feeling of the uncertainty of all things human which weighted like a ghastly dream upon most minds. The general distress of the time, the subjugation of all states to the Roman yoke forced men back upon their inner life. The only way their longings could be satisfied was through some divine and miraculous intervention. Whoever was fortunate enough to bring them peace of mind became a savior. This saviour could be Augustus and could be Jesus. Is this true of the Persians? Were the conditions that gave rise to both Jewish and Persian Messiahs identical? The only inference we can draw from the chapter, "The Pre-Christian Jesus", is that Judaism also developed its Messianism during that age of collapse. But in the chapter which follows Drews tells that Messianism was possessed by the Jews centuries before. This is an inconsistency and inconsistencies form a notable ingredient in the work of the Christ Myth school. Drews moves forward and shows that the Greeks had a doctrine of mediation. This doctrine, together with many other forms of Greek thought forced its way into Jewish thought and could not be expelled again. For an example, Philo is cited. Here Drews amply proves how sadly he lacks historical data. It never dawned upon him that although Hellenism influenced the Jews in the dispersion, its influence on Palestinian Judaism was meagre. The Palestinian Jews made a staunch stand against the invasion of foreign thought and checked its advance with some success. In another chapter Professor Drews speaks of the Jesus cult in the creeds of Jewish sects- Essenes, Therapeutae and others- who retired into a life of contemplation and religious exercises. He magnifies the importance of these sects in Jewish history when on the contrary they left a faint impress either on contemporary or on subsequent thought. They are hardly heard of. A passing allusion is made to them in religious history out of an interest in things antique. We have no real knowledge of the innermost tenets of any of these societies. What we know points in a very different direction from what Drews knows. The great aim of such ^{mystics} ~~mystics~~ has always been that their spirits should unite with God and this was to be accomplished by the exclusion of both sacrifice and conscious thought. Does this leave room for a Jesus? But what cannot be supported by any substantial evidence is the dangerous speculation that there existed among the Jews secret polytheistic cults. How could this be? Drews arguments from etymology served as a splendid pastime to many who are poring over serious matters. The rest of the Christ Myth deals with the Jesus of the Gospels and the Pauline Jesus and concludes by a chapter on the "Religious Problems of the Present." It is this last chapter that constitutes the thesis of Drews. To uphold this thesis Drews wrote what he wrote. All the extravagant speculations and all the misreadings of history and the misrendering of language were indulged in regardless of principle,

to support this thesis of doing away with idealized human figures. Mrs/ Annie Besant in her book, "Esoteric Christianity" understood the workings of the psychical being better than Drews and therefore allowed for the feeling of affections which gave birth to the mystic Christ, at the same time retaining her belief in the historical Jesus. Drews' closing words are a plea for the doctrine of the God-Man. History he conceives of as the painful and struggling expression of the deity. But Drews does not leave us where we are. He takes us into the confused literature of the Vedas where he gets into complications out of which he cannot escape. The Vedas he confuses with the Vedantas which were written at a much later date. He is a perfect stranger in these fields but nevertheless he recklessly dabbles with things unknown to him. The name of the fire God Agni, he says, is the basis for the latin title "Agnus dei." But the corresponding latin word for the Sanskrit word "Agni" is "Ignis." What relation has the fire with a lamb? Besides the word lamb occurs in the Old Testament and Isaiah 53:7 applies the figure to the coming Savior. The Hebrew word has no etymological connection with either Agni or Ignis. The expression existed long before Christian phraseology became Latinized. But Agni is a God and holds no dependent position on other Gods. He is not the Agni of somebody else. Why then is all this play with the Latin cases?

Professor Drews has another series of words which he traces to one root: Simon, Shem, Shamash, Sem, Semo, Samens, Samson. Professor Drews can carry his series to infinity if he wants. He can find many Chinese, Japanese, Hottentot and other names which are homonymous with the above. He may add Schumann, Siam, Seaman to the list just as well. He leaves no place for phonetics ^{with} which he is unacquainted apparently. He ought to know about the limitations of sound productions. Another very clever but far fetched argument of Drews is based upon the relation of Peter to Janus. Janus was the God of Doors, he had two faces and looked in opposite directions. So Peter has keys to the Doors of Heaven, he was double minded and unsettled, and the crowning argument is that the cathedral of St/ Peter in Rome has Janus Hill for a site. It is most convincing and Drews congratulates himself over such an argument. Then the Passion of Jesus is nothing but a dramatic version of the Passions and victories of Adonis, Attis, Mithra and Osiris. But which of these had a message the proclamation of which ^{led} ~~led~~ him to persecution? Which of these was accused of blasphemy? Which was tried, reviled, deserted by friend, disgraced, beaten and humbled? Which died between two thieves and was buried? Which was pierced with a lance after death? For the ^{garments} ~~garments~~ of which did the soldiers cast lots? At the execution of which were women present? Every man born into the world dies but the conditions attending death differ with different individuals.

Concerning the sole incentive for the writing of the Gospels documents, namely the Kingdom of God, Drews remains silent. He occupies himself with nonessentials, with later additions and interpolations and leaves the real and historical to take care of itself. No wonder that he does this when his whole purpose is to exalt idea over reality. Having undermined the historical foundations of the Biblical characters one by one and proved them all mythical, he does not tell his readers how to discriminate between the mythical and the historical. Where are we to fix the exact year when the Biblical character

ceased to be myths and became men and women? The next, and this is the most important work of Drews is "The witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus". He classifies his witnesses under four categories: (1) Jewish witnesses; (2) Roman witnesses; (3) Paul as a witness; (4) The Gospels as witnesses. Let us consider each of the above divisions separately.

Jewish Witnesses.

We are struck with astonishment at the project to demonstrate that Jesus never existed. Before a man undertakes such a discussion as to who and what Jesus was, it is only right that we should inquire into that person's knowledge. We are also entitled to ask how much that person knows of the Judaism of the period; how much he accepts as history and how much he rejects as legend. The great argument for Drews and Smith is the argument from silence. They mention three witnesses: Philo, Justus of Tiberias and Josephus and then ask why these had nothing to say about Jesus. Jesus, it must be remembered lived during the rule of Herod and his son Archelaus and of the succeeding Roman prefects. During the administration of these men thousands upon thousands of Jews were slaughtered. Could anyone remember that among the thousands, one, there was whose name was Jesus? Twenty years after Jesus' death the fermentation began among the Jews which led to the combat with the Romans and the consequent annihilation of the Jewish state with the death of hundreds of thousands. Before this was forgotten a frightful war broke out under Trajan which, with the exception of one interruption lasted until the year 135 A.D. It closed with the destruction of almost ^{the} entire Jewish people. For a time it looked as though ^{all} of Palestine was transformed into a battlefield. After this crushing down of the people, began frightful religious persecutions on those who survived. These persecutions were carried on to the reign of Antoninus Pius. Under these circumstances who could remember a Galilean peasant who attracted little notice during his life time.

Flavius Josephus, whose Archealogy was written in the year 80 of the first century, was born in Jerusalem in the year 35 A.D. and lived there til the year 71 A.D. He spoke of Jesus in his book, he also spoke of John the Baptist and of James the brother of Jesus. All attacks on these passages are inexcusable. One of the greatest philologists and historians of the last century Alfred Von Gutschmidt, declared the passage on Jesus to be from Josephus' hands. Of course he admitted certain interpolations at a later date. The passage reads thus: "In that time, (time of Pilate) lived Jesus, a wise man. He performed wonderful works. He brought his following many Jews and many Gentiles. At the request of the Jews Pilate sentenced him to crucifixion. Notwithstanding, those who loved him formerly remained true to him even after his death. Up to this time the followers of Christ did not cease to exist." Antiquities 20:9:3. Remember Josephus is writing forty five years after Jesus' death; that he regarded the execution of Jesus as a painful event for the Jews, one can easily see from the following sentence, "Likewise at that time no other misfortune so confounded the Jews." The chief objection raised by the theologians is that as a Pharisee, Josephus could not speak so sympathetically of Jesus, John the Baptist and James. But the New Testament theologian ought to be able to tell us whether or not a Pharisee could so speak. Certainly as good a Jew and Pharisee as Josephus spoke very tolerantly of the Christians. I mean Gamaliel in Acts 5:38. But what Gamaliel is supposed to have said, is in reality a Greek paraphrasing not entirely accurate, of an anonymous speech in the Mishna/

Tract Abuth, V.,XVII, and a similar passage may be found in Scheetgen Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae T. I, page 423. The passage in Scheetgen is by Rabbi Abraham in the book of the Juchasin, fol. 139, I,

"Illo tempore tres fuerunt sectae, nam praeter Phariseos et Sadducaeos, Jehuda Galilaeus tertiam sectam incepit, quae dicitur Essenorum. -- Opinio Nasiraeorum, qui Esseni dicti sunt, quorumque auctor fuit Judas Galilaeus. Illi vero causam dederunt Judaeis, ut contra Romanos rebellarent, dicentes, Neminem debere aliis hominibus imperare, neque Dominum vocari, nisi solum Deum S?B."

This in a measure corroborates the statement in Acts, which we have just cited. There is, therefore, no reason to reject the passage as entirely unauthentic. After all, there is an early account of Jesus from Jewish hands, the The New Testament theologians have in Josephus a diamond, the nature of which they did not understand, and they cast it away. Josephus could not write any more than he did. He was residing in Rome, as a guest of the State and therefore used discretion by avoiding a subject which was not directly concerned with the general current of political history and was distasteful to Rome. Besides, he was writing for educated people who knew nothing about Jesus. But whatever the character of the passages in Josephus may be, there is left the fact that the interpolator wanted to prove the Messiahship of Jesus through the writings of one who by race at least belonged to the group that rejected Jesus. The interpolator took for granted the earthly life of Jesus and the fact that those who rejected him believed that he lived and so he tries now to prove to them that Jesus was the Messiah. A passage in Antiquities XX, IX, I, speaks of the trial of James, the brother of Jesus, thus making a passing reference to Jesus himself. Josephus cannot be the author of the first passage as we have it. He was much too politic to meddle with Messianism, the stumbling block to the Romans. In his "Bello Judaico" he speaks of Vespasian as the promised Messiah.

There is, however, little ground for doubting the authenticity of the second passage. Origen quotes from it three times in his "Contra Gelsum" II, 13. Jerome corroborates Origen's reading, but Shuerer says that the text Origen used accounted for the fall of Jerusalem as divine displeasure for the killing of James. Shuerer goes on to say that this must be a Christian revision. But what motive was there to prompt the Christians to connect this calamity with the death of James, when they had already before connected it with the life of Jesus? Then do not let us forget that if there was a revision it must have been made by Gentile Christians who were not particularly fond of James. On the other hand, it is not intrinsically improbable that many Jews entertained a good opinion of James because we ^{read} ~~hear~~ of him in the New Testament as one loyal to the law. We also know how displeased the Jews were with Annas, the Sadducean High Priest, for sentencing James, that they even petitioned Albinus to restrain him in his rash conduct. Here public opinion was for James, and his case was in no way a threat to Roman power. Josephus may have thought it very proper to allude to it. Evidently it caused a greater stir and a greater national schism than the case of Jesus.

But it was not till recently that the infallibility and the untainted purity in which the texts of Josephus have been supposed to have been preserved, have been proven false once for all. This task was left to A. Berendts, Derpat. He published, "Die Zeugnisse vom

Christentum im slavischen 'de bello Judaico' des Josephus", 1908. He has also an article in the Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. IX, 1908, pages 47 to 70, entitled "Analacta zum slavischen Josephus". Certainly all the things that Berendts ^{recalls} as having happened to Josephus' works did not happen in the order of the details he enumerates. But something happened, we know not what, that left Josephus' works in the same condition with other books. No more reverence or respect was shown to them than to other books. Berendts starts with Josephus' own statement, which says that he had first written his account of the war in his native tongue, and so infers that the Greek edition which Josephus later made and which has become the standard text, was only a revision of the earlier Aramaic work. Another translation was made of the original text into Greek, but without any revision. This translation became the particular source of the present Slavic rendering. In this original Aramaic edition Josephus spoke of Jesus several times. Later he modified his statements radically and in preparing a version for Roman readers he suppressed these passages. This may be an exaggerated theory which has assumed too much, but its utterances are very suggestive and helpful since we know Josephus. The fact that he was called a traitor is proof of his having been before a good Jew. In the early text he plainly expresses his hatred for Rome. It is different, therefore, from the other text. It is probable that the Slavic version elaborated on Josephus' references to Jesus, but why should it make Josephus the hater of Rome? On the contrary, we should expect the Slavic text to make Josephus hate the Jews, the enemies of Christianity. The tendency, then, was to shift the blame from the Romans over to the Jews, markedly so in the Gentile world. The gospel of Luke is an instance of this tendency.

There is a deviation in the Slavic text from the Greek, especially in chapter 30, 7. But Josephus' lack of clearness accounts in part for this. In Chapter 31, 1, 2, the deviation is not so much from the content as from the form. This theory, at least, has a great deal of truth in germinal form. It is open-minded and counteracts the rash radicalism of those who read Josephus uncritically. Later when Josephus wrote to the Romans he mentioned Judas of Galilee, John the Baptist, Theudas the Egyptian, and others whose movements dwindled and left no impression. But he slurred over this disturbing Galilean peasant, Jesus, whose mission was still living and growing and which was a thorn in the flesh of the Romans and the Jews. Josephus refused to link this Christian superstition with Judaism.

pare we belie history and say that the passage in Josephus about the three above mentioned men owes its origin to Christian hands? If so, what interest did the Christians have in these men? These men were in a way rivals of their master. They took active measures to keep them in the background. The competition between the followers of the Baptist and those of Jesus was so acute that the Evangelists consciously undertook to subordinate John. So the Baptist-Christian controversy is a far stronger, far more adequate proof than many mere suggestions which historians use to prove facts of history. But this proof is one among many. When we remember the conditions in which Jesus and his disciples lived, we will learn how to appreciate the merest allusions. There was nothing spectacular about Jesus and his group/

He made no public claims to Messianism till the day preceding the crucifixion. He moved within a limited circle and worked mainly among personal friends. There was no dramatic event in his career, that stirred any great excitement, in spite of all the dramatization of the evangelists. Healing was a common practice and Jesus did less of it than others. There were more conspicuous preachers and enthusiasts than he. What reason is there then for his occupying a prominent position in Josephus? The Christian movement was more or less secret in Josephus' time and attracted little notice. And finally Josephus does not give an account of the Judaism contemporaneous with early Christianity. Perhaps we would find more references to Jesus if we had access to the literature of contemporary Judaism. The age was unproductive from a literary point of view and what was produced was destroyed by all kinds of calamities. So this again is a point to be considered by those who seem to know the daily ~~chronicles~~^{chronicles} of history by heart. The Gospels furnish us with fragmentary information about the Judaism of Jesus' time which harmonizes with other fragmentary accounts. So this argument from silence applies more to that age than to those who live in it. As Jesus lived then he had his share of inattention.

If Josephus says so little about Jesus, why does not Philo say more? But of what interest to Philo was Jesus? Jesus was not a philosopher, not a theologian, he was not of any value to Philo. Of what value was General Booth to Adolph Harnack? Of none. Neither was Jesus to Philo who was wrapped up in the allegorical interpretation of Jewish literature. As a contemporary of Jesus Philo lived too early to have heard much if anything of Jesus' movement. He lived in Egypt, remote from the movements of the people in Palestine.

As to Justus of Tiberias he was busy compiling a chronicle of Jewish kings. He could not afford to investigate this preaching? Perhaps he never heard anything about it which was not at all surprising to us who know the life led by men of learning. And of still greater importance is the fact that Justus was a contemporary of Josephus and his worst political antagonist. He wrote a good deal of polemical literature which he directed at this opponent whom he described as a traitor. This leaves no room for Jesus or anybody else. The other Jewish witnesses come from three main sources of late date. One may find early historical material embedded in these. These sources are, first, the Christian references to Jewish opponents, second, the Talmudic statements about Jesus and third, the so-called Toldoth Jeshu stories. As early as Paul's day Judaism and Christianity were in conflict with each other. This situation perpetuated itself all through the New Testament period and has continued down to our own day. This ~~controversy~~^{controversy} can be clearly traced in Paul's letters. Indeed some of these letters, at least portions of them were written in the interest of Christian-Jewish polemic. The Gospel of Matthew artlessly betrays the influence of this polemic. Luke holds the Jews responsible for Jesus' death. The composite of all these quarrels is the Gospel of John which always holds up the Jews to ridicule and blame. These controversies and the persecutions resulting therefrom are incontestable facts. But direct accounts are lacking. Not even the New Testament writers are explicit. At no time do they write anything of the nature of a narration about the controversy. All they say is incidental and by im-

plication . The apologists took part in this burning controversy. Justin Martyr is a very prominent figure in it. He died about 168 A.D., so he lived in the early part of the second century. The quarrel was not over nothing, else it would not have lasted all down the centuries. The two parties involved took for granted the historicity of Jesus both elaborating on it. One idealized it to such an extreme that it became almost unreal. The other disparaged it to such a degree that it became commonplace.

The Rabbinical Literature and Jesus.

Before we take up this subject it should be remarked that no contemporary literature exists. The Mishna-Kodex which Schuerer and others speak of as the chief source for conditions in Jesus' time, originated at the end of the second century and represents nothing more than the Rabbinism of that century. No adequate account of the status quo of Jesus' day is in existence. From Jesus' day to the writing of this Kodex revolutions followed one another in an unbroken line. Especially revolutions in Jewish religious thought. The Judaism prior to the Jewish war was different from the Judaism of the Mishna. The Sadducees and their institutions had the preference in the former. The Rabbis first appeared on the scene during the last two decades of the temple A.D. 50-70. Owing to the favorable circumstances they could expand and make an impression, but this success was ephemeral. It is absolutely a grave mistake for anyone to act on the theory that the Mishna is the chief source for information about conditions during Jesus' time. A much better source than this may be the Tosefta. Its elements are older than the Mishna and it contains many historical passages respecting the High Priests of the Sadducees.

The Rabbinical literature of the second century includes a collection of sayings that have come down from the Rabbis of the second and first centuries B.C. and the first century A.D. This material thus brought down contains some two dozens ~~the~~³ moral sayings which altogether fill from two to three pages. They give a definition of religious law and deal with questions of ritual and ceremonies and other kindred subjects. Naturally in such a collection we do not expect to read about Jesus.

In the Talmud proper one finds comparatively many references to Jesus which fall into two classes. Those belonging to the first class are third and fourth century products and have no historical worth whatsoever, except that they echo historical event. The others very few in number are first century and are not important. The earliest invidious legends about the person of Jesus which gradually accumulated in the Talmud date from the third century. The only correct statement they contain is that Jesus was executed the day before the Passover. Unfortunately they err when it comes to the place where the execution occurred which they designate as having been the city of Lydda. Otherwise the accounts are without value. The Talmud so hostile to Christianity would have seized the slightest opportunity to ridicule the Christians as followers of a mythical character. The Talmud ought to be the last authority for appeal. It is more of an encyclopedia of Jewish scholasticism than a history book. It contains some ethical passages. Of what remains those passages which are not directly unedifying are non-moral. The Talmud cannot be relied upon for historical purposes. It is very fortunate for the reputation of the Talmud that most of the offensive passages have been removed, not

by Christian senses but by the Jews themselves. This can be got at from the writings of Agobard, Bishop of Lyons (1820-1830) in his "De Judaicis Superstitionibus", and Hrabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence in his "Contra Judaeos" 847 A.D. However the expurgated passages in the Talmud were published separately and Strack mentions no less than four such editions. The one important fact is that whatever the character of the Talmud may be it accepts without question the earthly life of Jesus. In this Jewish and Christian opinions coincide. The Jesus of history is no subject for debate. It is the Messiah that engaged both parties. Before we leave the Talmud, let us know that it bears witness to the registration of the birth of Jesus in the temple archives. This we hope will satisfy our skeptical friends.

The third source is the Toldoth Jeshu or Origins of Jesus. These stories reached their final form in the ninth century A.D. and were composed from various sources. They are a black spot in the history of literature, the product of low fanaticism, malicious delight in defamation and vulgar imagination. They tell how Jesus was born out of wedlock and take great delight in such recitals which they make so detailed and elaborate that one would blush to read or hear about them. In spite of it all they, too, bear witness to the historical Jesus.

Roman Witnesses.

From Jewish Witnesses we turn to Roman witnesses. Professor Drews mentioned particularly three: Pliny, Suetonius and Tacitus who was the first to mention the Christians incidentally. While these sources are scanty, they furnish a few items of importance. Pliny when governor of Bythinia, wrote to Trajan asking his advice for suggestions as regards the course he ought to follow in dealing with the Christians. The date of this letter is commonly fixed at 112 A.D. The movement was not a new one in Pliny's time. Pliny mentions one person who confessed that he had abandoned it before. Drews raises an objection in which he says that Pliny wrote of hymns that were sung "to a God". As a matter of fact Pliny explicitly says "as if to a God"—"quasi deo"/

In his "Life of Claudius" a part of his "Lives of the Caesars" Suetonius refers to the Christians. Even Professor Drews admits the authenticity of the remark except that he says that Suetonius wrote from hearsay evidence. Unfortunately hearsay evidence is our chiefest evidence for early history. Suetonius also mentions the fact Nero punished the Christians. He fails to distinguish sharply between Jews and Christians which goes to prove that the antecedents of Christianity are Jewish.

For more satisfactory information we repair to Tacitus. He says very definitely that the Christians whom Nero persecuted were named after Christ who was put to death by Pilate in the reign of Tiberius. Tacitus wrote before 115 A.D. and the genuineness of this passage is upheld by the majority of scholars. But those who deny Jesus' historicity resort to Huchart's arguments. This French writer rejects the "Annals" and the "History" as falsifications and forgeries by Poggio Bracciolini an Italian scholar of the Renaissance period. But recent discoveries make it a fact that 400 years before Bracciolini's manuscripts of the last six books of the "Annals" and the first five books

of the "Histories" existed. For a fuller account one should go to C. F. Arnold's *Studien ueber die neronische Christenverfolgung*. Tacitus' testimony is valuable as it is very possible that he had access to official records which make him an independent witness.

The Witness of Paul.

If Jesus of whom Paul knows is the mythical Joshua and if the contents of the belief in Joshua were likewise transferred into the belief in Jesus, then we are entitled to ask the for/date, the mood and the circumstances of the transference. We have a right to ask for evidence to that effect. We doubt very much the fact that of all heroes Joshua alone could live through the centuries. Outside the book of Joshua and Judges, Joshua is hardly known and yet we are told that he was worshipped. The prophets denounce the worship of foreign gods, but make no mention of Joshua. Another proposition is that in the course of time this deity was thought of by his worshippers as the expected Messiah. It is claimed that those who looked for this Messiah conceived later under the influence of writings like Psalms XXII and Isaiah XXIII, the idea of a Messiah who was to suffer death and afterwards rise again for the sake of mankind. But the truth is that Christianity searched the scriptures for such passages in order to find parallelisms between its prophecies and the incidents in the life of Jesus. Scripture passages were strained and the life of Jesus was exploited with a view to making it resemble events described in the Old Testament. These propositions are purely hypothetical. Further, in the passages quoted by Drews a nation and not an individual is meant. The resurrection in the Old Testament stood for national exaltation.

If Paul's writings and other New Testament documents are legendary, then they ought to subscribe to the same belief, but they do not. They contain controversies over historical personalities. They quarrel over questions of law and other schemes of salvation. It was then that pagan influence was beginning to show itself and not before. Is there anything parallel to this in the Gilgamesh epic? Likewise, the heterogeneity of the material is proof enough.

We now come to deal exclusively with the witness of Paul. The extreme views of the Dutch school regarding Paul's epistles are discarded. In his brief book "Der Galater Brief" Steck admits a few Pauline fragments in Romans. The "partition hypothesis" of Völter in his "Die Komposition der Paulinischen Briefe" and R. Scott's "The Pauline Epistles" are not to be treated seriously. The result of patient criticism leaves us Galatians, I and II Corinthians, and Romans as unquestionably Pauline, and adds to the list as very probably coming down from the same pen, Phillipians and I Thessalonians, Colossy, Ephesians and II Thessalonians stand a fairer show than they ever did. Even the Pastorals are thought to contain Pauline elements. Clement of Rome, writing to the Corinthians in the last decade of the first century, A.D., not only calls Paul a "notable pattern of patient endurance", but exalts his readers to peruse again "the epistle of the blessed Paul". Are we to discard Clement and other uncanonical authors as worthless? Clement, chapter 49: 1-5, is a reference to I Corinthians. Marcion, a historical person,

holds tenaciously to the Pauline epistles.

The above is merely external evidence, but the strength of the internal evidence is capable of deciding the genuine character of the documents in question. The first canon of a pseudonymous writer is that the individual impersonated shall take the point of view and think the thoughts of the actual writer and of the age to which he belongs. Such is not the case with Paul's letters. The realistic eschatology of Paul whose active career belongs to the middle of the first century, could hardly have been fabricated at the later date when subsequent history was showing the folly of such expectations, yet eschatology prevades Paul's writings. The Romans are reminded of the coming end, marriage is discouraged among the Corinthians and they are ^{exhorted} ~~exalted~~ to refrain from judging one another in view of the near approach of the final judgment. Phillipians I: 6, 10, speak with confidence of the day of Christ. I Thessalonians, I:10, III:13, IV: 15-18, V:2, 23, speak likewise. Another great weapon against the pseudonymity is the personal references. No Vedas, no Gilgamesh Epic, no Ivestas, contain such personal references. Again the biographical details of Paul which he claims in his letters are unique and ^{disprove} ~~this prove~~ pseudonymity. These details come into the epistles quite naturally and incidentally, and show no inclination on the part of the author to give a full account of their apostle's career. Besides, the passionateness of Paul's language and his zeal for the cause of Christ is pronounced. This could not be the language of an impersonator. Paul, moreover, deals with first century problems. To appreciate the difference between what a man writes and what others write about him one need only contrast Paul's epistles with the book of Acts. The pictures the two give are consistent with one another. Paul is a missionary in both. Acts is only more conventional and gives one phase of Paul's life. We see Paul moving from one place to another. On the other hand, the Epistles reveal the psychological side of Paul's life. His moods change. To illustrate, let us take the account of the journey to Jerusalem. According to Acts, he goes to Jerusalem at the instigation of the church in Antioch to discuss with the brethren in Jerusalem the degree to which the Gentile Christians are responsible to the demands of the Jewish law. In Jerusalem terms are concluded and the decision is in the favor of Paul. Paul returns to Antioch and moves on quietly to further evangelization. Acts says nothing of the anxiety Paul must have felt on this occasion. How different is the account in Galatians. Galatians II shows Paul in Jerusalem in his fidgets. When he returned to Antioch he "resisted Peter to the face because he stood condemned", Gal. II, 11. His relations with Barnabas were severed ^{away} because he "was carried/by their dissimulation", Gal. II, 13. Paul is a human being in Galatians with human passions, emotions, fears, angers. Real and not dramatized life is described. This may be said of all Paul's letters. Paul's emotional temperament displays itself again and again. His indignation is aroused when he hears of the troubles in Galatia and he is voluble when he heaps anathemas on those who preach another gospel. He upbraids the Christians for their fickleness. A minute later he calls them his children. The same interplay of feeling is even more strongly marked in Corinthians, especially in the passage

on the relations that existed between him and the Christians of Corinth. These letters are not spurious. Their fabrication is impossible. Recent excavation in Asia Minor bring to light the cities in which Paul preached. The remains of those churches can be seen. They verify our conclusions and show the great influence that Paul left behind. The result of these excavations can be ^{not} gainsaid. With the establishing of Paul's historicity and the authenticity of recent epistles the historicity of Jesus must necessarily follow. It may be urged that Paul talked little about the earthly Jesus. But how are we to tell? Do the Epistles we have contain everything that Paul ever said or wrote? Any man would have written those Epistles in the space of a month. He could have written about the historical Jesus and those writings have not been preserved to us. When Paul claimed to be preaching a gospel which did not look to a human source for its authentication but which had been received directly from the heavenly Christ, he was under fire from his opponents who denied him the right of apostleship and he said this to justify himself. The theme of this controversy was neither the historical nor the heavenly Jesus but the ^{to} right apostleship. Of course Paul's psychology was such as not to enable him to believe in the earthly Jesus until after he had seen the heavenly Messiah. Paul thought it blasphemous at first to identify the two. But Drews is in the wrong when he says that an unprejudiced reader of Paul would not suspect that the apostle ever thought of an earthly Jesus. Roman 1:3 speaks of Jesus as "born of the seed of David" according to the flesh. Romans 5:12 speaks of the "man", the counter-part of Adam. The whole theology of Paul, his doctrine of redemption, are meaningless if he did not think of the historical Jesus who became a propitiation. The historical Christ is everywhere implied. Jesus could not have suffered for our sins in heaven. How does Drews dispense with the "Crucified Jesus" of Paul. Such proofs may be multiplied when one reads Paul. Paul could not be utterly misinformed on this point. His life touched the life of the early community at too many points to allow him to be ignorant of the historical Jesus. Before he became a follower of Jesus he persecuted the Christians for claiming Messiahship to a mere man. He lived with Peter 15 days in Jerusalem, he traveled with Silas another Jerusalemite. If Paul were a myth-maker we would not fail to discover at least an effort on his part to argue for a historical Jesus. But such efforts are absent.

We conclude this part of the discussion by saying that Paul is a genuine historical character and the historicity of Jesus is a prerequisite to Paul's Christian life and work. The impetus to this work was the ^{resurrection} for the defence of which Paul argues so vehemently. I Corinthians 15 makes Paul say that his preaching would be vain if Christ did not rise, meaning that he died and was buried. Galicians 1:19 speaks of James the Lord's brother. Brother cannot mean a "follower", as Drews says, because it is not applied to Peter or to any other follower. Paul would be a fool to look forward for the second coming of one who never was on earth.

The Gospel Evidence.

The reader may be interested to learn Professor Drews' position of the Gospels. He gives as the reason for writing the Gospels the desire to connect the disciples with this fictitious God-Jesus. The difficulty is that the synoptics have no mysticism and no mystery. They are very matter-of-fact and true to Galilean life. They neither exalt the disciples nor are they literary masterpieces. Take them out of their Palestinian setting and they become meaningless. They are equally meaningless if put at a latter date. They offer a picture of a man, not a heavenly Messiah. They tell of what others said and thought of him and how his family thought that he was lunatic. The synoptists themselves are men of diverse types each with his own predilections and prepossessions. Mark writes a Petrine narrative with a Pauline tinge. Matthew writes a Jew and Luke writes as a Gentile. They give an unmistakably real portrait of a historic personality. When their product has been scrutinized and cross-examined and all non-historical material is dismissed as such, one fact remains, namely that their terminus a quo, is Jesus of Nazareth.

Palestine of today, as Renan said, is a fifth Gospel. The scenery and life there are witnesses to bygone events. There are elements in the Gospel tradition which the worshippers of Jesus would never have preserved unless they had been handed down as facts in the story of Jesus' life. It is impossible for one ^{who} worships a hero to think and speak in such a way as to contradict or essentially modify his own worship. Statements of this nature are nothing less than survivors of the truth. These portions of the Gospel tradition are called by Professor Schmiedel, Zurich, "Foundation-pillars of the life of Jesus". The Gospels cannot be pure sagas when material so intractable is enshrined in them. The following are some of the passages: Luke 2:52 speaks of Jesus as "growing in wisdom", but a worshipper of a deity presents that deity as full-grown. Mark 3:21, Mark 8:12, Luke 11:29-32, Matthew 16:1-4 cannot be understood unless Jesus attached more importance to preaching. Mark 6:5 makes Jesus' power of healing depend upon the faith of the sufferer. In Mark 10:17 Jesus refuses to allow the predicate "good" to be applied to himself. Matthew 12:31, Luke 12:10, and Mark 3:28-30 make Jesus say that blasphemy against himself was pardonable but not so against God. In Mark 13:32 God alone knows the hour of the last judgment, not Jesus. Mark 15:34 echoes the reality of the passion. Jesus cries to his God. Could the religious socialism of the masses be responsible for this?

Questions

Certain pertinent ~~Christians~~ ought to be answered before we come to deal specifically with the Gospel evidence. Such questions relate to date, to sources and other kindred questions. The earliest Gospel we have is ~~the Gospel~~ is the Gospel according to Mark, which in all probability was finished about 70 A.D. Christian tradition, relying upon a written statement of Papias preserved by Eusebius, has ever regarded the author of Mark as a special mouthpiece of Peter. This same statement makes Mark Peter's interpreter and declares that Mark recorded without chronological order some of the events in Jesus's life which Peter happened to recall. This traditional statement gains the more in weight in

the light of Mark's selection of incidents from Jesus' life. Besides, Peter figures very prominently in the Marcan Gospel. Peter first appearances on the scene is in Mark 1:16 and he is almost as prominently as Jesus himself. There is here strong evidence to show that Mark actually embodies an important Petrine tradition. This also explains why the other apostles figure so little. Peter naturally told Mark his experiences with Jesus, what Jesus told him and did to him. Peter does not know much of the contact of the other disciples with Jesus and so he says very little about them. Mark being the chief source for Matthew and Luke gives them the tendency to make Peter conspicuous. But it is hardly possible that Mark would have written down the things he heard from Peter before the latter's death, that is to say, in the year 64 A.D. Hence Mark must have been written between 64 A.D. and 70 A.D. The year 68 A.D. is probably the year of the writing of that Gospel as it fits the facts so very well. When Drews is apt to distrust the accuracy of the orientals and to make so much of their fantasy, he ought to remember what unusually retentive memories they had for narrative.

It is very plain that Mark is writing for the benefit of the Gentile rather than for the Jewish Christian. He is careful to explain the meaning of Jewish customs and names. (Mark 7:3-4, 15:42, 7:11, 10:46). It is very remarkable that this particular Gospel is singularly rich in Jewish details and is characterized by a local coloring which is absent from the other Gospels. Professor Drews says that this is due to conscious efforts on the evangelists part to emphasize the real humanity of Jesus, and thus meet the arguments of gnosticism. But this task should have been left to Luke and Matthew who stood nearer to gnosticism. Mark's Gospel in formation is of the utmost importance from the historical life of Jesus. He sets forth very simply the life of the historical man. He speaks of Jesus' home and connections. Nothing is said about the annunciation or about Bethlehem or about the miraculous birth or about any of these elements so poetically put forth by Matthew and Luke. We should find the truth for ourselves and not take Drews or any person at his word.

The second great source, alongside Mark, is the Logia. Both Matthew and Luke draw from this source what material is more suitable for their purpose. It is now generally known by the name "Q" from the German "Quelle" which means a source. Drews denies "Q" all originality. To the Lord's prayer and most of the parables he does the same. He said that these have their prototypes in the Old Testament. This may be true, but how comes it about that within the comparatively narrow limits which the Gospels devote to the teaching of Jesus, we have brought together moral and religious sayings which form the quintessence of the finest utterances in the greatest religions of the world? How is it that while the sayings of Jesus are a worthy parallel to the best which has been said on thought anywhere, we find ourselves always moving on the same high spiritual level without any of the sudden declensions which so often characterize other bodies of teaching? If we look at the Old Testament law we find that it is an amalgam of ritual and morality. It contains the injunction "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" which is immediately followed by the precept, "a garment of two kinds of stuffs shall ^{it} come upon thee." The law regarded both as equally divine. Is not this tendency in the teaching of Jesus, to dis-

criminate between the ritual and the moral, to the advantage of the latter, therefore, something original? It is requested therefore of those who think that they can disprove the originality of the Gospels by citing parallels from the Rabbinical literature that they remind themselves of the size of the Talmud and Midrashim and also of the question of date.

As one reads the Gospels he gains the impression that they are ingenuous works whose claim to a hearing rests upon the supposed truthfulness and ^{se}vicibility of their content. Not until tradition ^{el}abeled them with apostolic names and invested them with a unique dignity, did the notion of an authoritative gospel arise. We may very well congratulate ourselves that the Gospels are anonymous, because this lack of attestation shows them to have been pioneers in that formative period of Christianity when the things of which they speak were ^{more} or less common property and did not need any artificial recommendation.

Both internal and external evidence yields substantial results regarding the time and origin of the Gospels. Irenaeus' testimony is very valuable on this point. The four Gospels were enumerated in the Muratorian Canon. Tatian incorporated them into his "Diatessaron". The remarks of Papias are of still earlier date. There is more evidence to the history of the Gospels' rise to prominence than to the fact of their existence. Ignatius encountered Christians who were unwilling to accept written authorities except the "Charters" probably meaning by that the Old Testament. These individuals were doubtless acquainted with all the essentials of Gospel tradition as commonly repeated and interpreted in public preaching and teaching. Their hesitation was not a rejection of Gospel tradition but a reluctance in regard to placing any writings on a plane with the Old Testament as Scripture. The scantiness of reference to the Gospels in the early second century is no fair indication of the improbability of their existence. It seems that oral tradition was prized above written records. It contained everything the Gospels contained. It had the advantage too of being more easily adapted to individual needs. The necessity of accepting in good faith the Gospel representation of the historical Life of Jesus is incumbent upon us by his proximity to the community in which his life story first took shape. The early framers of the tradition bring Jesus upon the scene at a time when his contemporaries were still living. It was because his ^{re}surrection, his Messiahship, his superiority to Rabbinical teachers, his place in the line of ^{de}cent from David needed vindication, that the tendency to idealize him was so great. But in spite of the idealization we see a normal person. This person goes as the rest of the people to hear John the Baptist preach; he identifies himself with the movement inaugurated by John; presently he begins preaching on his own account along lines somewhat different from those of John; his activities were ⁱmainly among his fellow Galileans; country people and fisher-folk were his chief associates; in time his work attracts the attention of the authorities by whom he was condemned; from that point on his popularity waned. At the Passover season he was put out of the way. Most of his small group of followers, who deserted him in the last hour, returned disheartened ^{re} to their homes; others tarried in Jerusalem. Such in outline is the life of Jesus. Around these bare threads were intertwined historical and legendary accounts. The foundation is given us and it remains intact while the other parts of the fabric fade and crumble before the light of critical research.

This is certainly not a picture of the Gods of mythology. These are associated with the powers of nature; Their setting is vague and far removed from daily life. They do not associate with people; they never preach or ~~exalt~~ ^{exhort} people; they are always triumphant, never defeated by men.

The character of the teachings of Jesus is very appropriate to an individual who occupied the place and confronted problems assigned by tradition to him. Even the Fourth Gospel agrees with the rest in giving an fair picture of Jesus.

Finally one of the strongest arguments for Jesus existence is the existence of the primitive community of believers. This forceful individual so impressed his own and succeeding generations with his life of loyal service for humanity that he started Christianity on its way, whence it has been flowing like a continuous stream. Jesus is the source. We cannot ignore here the Christian Sunday, Christmas Day and the holy days of the Christian calendar which were not known before the Christian era. Other Gods were born in spring all with the waxing of a heavenly body. Jesus was born in mid-winter.

The Witness of ~~the~~ Heretical Sects.

Ebionism.

Ebionism is the name given certain tendencies of thought which cristalized into sects within the Judaeo-Christian circles during the early Christian generations. Ebionism is the residium of the fierce antagonism of Judaistic Christianity to the universalism of the religion of Jesus. Although the Ebionites had moved out of strict Judaism, still they did not move into the universal community. The Ebionites were like their spirtual ancestors men like Peter and James who endeavored to combine the faith of Jesus with the law and with the national hope. As time went on Jesus began to be less appreciated by the Ebionites who were the radicals and reactionaries. Their movement had an opposite development from that of Paul and the Gentile Christians. But both were connected with Jesus, especiality Ebonism which knew so well the historical Jesus that all idealization was out of the question. After the fall of Jerusalem the Jerusalem church was reconstituted at Pella. There it was recruited from the Essenes. The Ebionite sects are not of any interest except to prove that there existed sects which never became converted to the christology of later years. They held firmly to their Jewish heritage and regarded Jesus as a mere man. They were nearest to Jesus, to his disciples, to the home of the new movement and therefore stood resolute for the first impressi on of him. Although they disappeared they left seeds that have been springing up all through the centuries and blossoming into heresies. Ignorant and fanatical as they were they were heirs to a few precious ideas which are of great help in the fight for the historicity of Jesus. When Mohamedanism came it absorbed them and they were completely lost.

Professor Smith and Mr/ Robertson.

The views of the above two gentlemen are somewhat alike and are similar to those of Professor Drews. Each attributed his share to the discussion and now the group holds every thing in common as the early Christians did. Mr/ Robertson's most significant contribution was that Jesus is equivalent to Joshua and that Joshua was a sun-god in a secret Jewish cult. But what of this? People have always named after gods, as they ~~are~~ ^{been} still are.

For example many Assyrian kings had the word Ashur compounded with another word to make their names. So we have Ashurbanipal and others. Many Arabic names have Allah in them like Abdallah or the servant of God, and Atallah or the gift of God, but persons having these names are historical. What objection is there against the Jews doing a similar thing? This sun-god theory seemed to be so convenient that it was used to explain everything in the pioneer stage of the history of religion. It was used like a master key to unlock all doors and fling them wide open before scholars. The treatment of mythology must be done with great caution. Rash inferences which on the strength of mere superficial resemblance turned historical episodes into mythological fictions must be regarded with mistrust. Myths, of sun, moon, stars, and all natural elements may easily be found wherever sought. No legend, no allegory, is safe from the exegesis of the mythologic theorists, classic examples of whom we have in such men as Drews, Smith and Jensen. The life of Julius Caesar would fit admirably into this mythological framework. Caesar's conquests in new lands are like the sun rising over countries one after the other. His desertion of Cleopatra is as the setting of the sun leaving one country to go to another. Then his ordinance that the solar year should be the basis of the calendar. The wounds he received from his assassins and the shrouding of himself in his cloak to die in darkness, corresponds to the sun's heavy rays before setting and its disappearance. But Julius Caesar is historical and so is Jesus and so are many others who have been denied this privilege. Professor W/ B/ Smith is the author of "Der Vorchristliche Jesus," 1906, and "Ecce Deus" 1912. In both of these he declares the existence of a pre-Christian Jesus. A principal basis for this assertion he finds in Acts 18:24-28. Apollos according to Smith was a sun-myth hero, as his name implies. Ephesus was a center of sun worship. Apollos preached the Lord Joshua and knew of the baptism of Cannes the Greek name for the Babylonian god Ea, to whom John the Baptist was related. First of all there must have been many persons called Apollos, why then single out the New Testament Apollos and call him a myth? Jerusalem was the center of Jahweh worship and kings had Jahweh as part of their name. But Smith here uses his fancy and is not as harmful as when he misleads people but in accuracy of expression and by failing to give examples. In the early pages of this book "Ecce Deus" and under the title "The Dilemma" he says that chief and supreme among a certain sufficiently well ascertained body of literary historical proto-Christian facts is the fact of the worship, the cult of Jesus. He goes on to say that this is all-dominant in the New Testament. This is untrue. Where in Christian literature, the creeds of later councils excepted, is it stated that worship must be made to Jesus? ^{nowhere} ~~Nowhere~~ in the New Testament is worship claimed for him? This is equally true of early Christian literature. To be convinced we want to be referred to New Testament passages, otherwise Smith has no claim on our attention. Smith's logical reasoning is fundamentally wrong. The New Testament speaks of "ὁ Ἰησοῦς" but in Greek the article comes before all proper names and therefore Smith is not justified in translating the expression into "The Jesus" else he ought to do the same with other names. He ought to say "The Socrates" or "The Plato" and so on. The language of the Gospels about Jesus is so intimate and so distinctly the utterance of close friends that it is inconceivable that they should use former language in speaking of him.

acquainted with

Smith, is not ~~acquainted with~~ the history of dogma and the history of sacerdotalism. He knows nothing apparently of the heretical sects to which Christianity owes so much of its historical character. Smith does not know what he is saying when he writes: "that this Jesus is represented in the New Testament and accepted in all following history, as a God, is evident beyond argument. It is made clear on almost every page of the New Testament with all the clearness that can belong to human speech. There is no debating with anyone that denies it"/ It this is true what answers has Smith to give to the following questions? Did the Palestinian Christians share the above belief? Did the gnostics accept it? Did Arius, Origen, Nestor, Paul of Samoseta, the apologists, believe it? Why were the councils convened? Is it written on every page of the New Testament? Where? Is Jesus equated with God in the synoptics or the Fourth Gospel or in Paul or anywhere outside the Athanasian and similar creeds? So it is not clear after all. Smith either sees too much in the New Testament speech or is convinced by too little. Paul, to whose account we lay the blame for the introduction of the mystical language which later gave way to doctrine, on no occasion identifies Jesus with God. Jesus and God are two distinct beings in Paul's mind and he establishes relations between them by using figurative language. Smith does not want any debate with those who disagree with him. On the contrary there ought to be no debating with him and others who make such assertions. No knowledge of New Testament criticism is needed to prove that his propositions are not sound. He also urges that the word "Nazareth" was not originally the name of a town or village, (as in the New Testament), but as Nazarois meant "guardian" of "savior"--- having the same meaning as the word "Jesus" itself. But whatever the decision it remains a fact that even today cities and places get their names as Nazareth got its name according to Smith. We have Cape of Good Hope, we have Providence, we have Buenos Ayres, all of which were given because they meant something. Why could not this be true of Nazareth? Babylonia is the equivalent of Bab-ilu which meant the gate of God, and yet it is a geographical name. All names of persons and places meant something in primitive times. How could it be otherwise? A name stood for a concept---religious, military or something else. Smith's arguments fall flat before the rational mind. If his theories are true we live them in a world of illusion and myth, Smith included. In quoting others, Smith commits the fallacy of accent by singling out passages without reference to the context and infers from them what the author disclaims. He also commits the fallacy of Ignoratio Elenchi or irrelevance by arguing beside the point. Instead of proving that this or that is an historical, he says that it is etymologically constructed and therefore unhistorical. It is exactly as when the lawyer at a lawsuit says that the crime a person is accused of is atrocious and deserves punishment, instead of proving that the accused has actually committed the crime. What most of these radical writers need is something to hold the reins of their unruly imaginations, and logically can do that. They are over credulous and uncritical.

Christian Symbolism/ Its Origin and Use.

In all religious associations of all ages and countries there were objects which were held in common by different faiths. Such objects were psychologically ---universal. As religion is universal, so are its elements, phases, theory, practice and representation.

Most religions developed sacrifice, prayer, priesthood, holy places, holy seasons, independently. They all had more or less one source to draw from, namely the religious consciousness and its environment. The natural phenomena are practically alike everywhere. Consequently the social and spiritual phenomena tend to be more or less alike. There is a unity and uniformity in nature. Here and there are variations but they all form a differentiated and harmonious whole. There is more harmony in the psychical and spiritual worlds than in the natural. While science has been busy unifying nature, and while anthropology, ethnology, psychology and sociology have been revolutionizing our theories of the universal reaction of the mind on its environment, the History of Religions has been proving how much similarity exists between the different religions. If we reduce life to a common denominator, all men, everywhere are the same, do the same things, believe the same things and think on the same things. Of course human life manifests its self in various shades and colors but fundamentally it is one.

So when we come to study symbolism let us keep in mind that the symbols used are always things that are most conspicuous in nature and society. If we take the symbol of the cross, for instance, we will be amazed to see how widespread its usage was among the peoples of antiquity. The question may be raised as to whether all these people received it from one common source or discovered it themselves. Certainly it would be foolish to say that they all received it from one source. Some of them like the Norsemen were shut out from the rest of the world. Then the different forms of the cross did not coincide but were of different shapes. Their associations were not the same either. The Christian cross was associated with the crucified Jesus and stands as the emblem of self-sacrifice. Other crosses stood for other things. Some of them had astral origins from stars and constellations which crossed one another. Others may have arisen as the result of engineering works such as building roads or bridges. Architecture must have exerted a great influence on the development of the cross. Today the Italian cross is nearest to the ancient Roman cross. The German is nearest to the old Teutonic cross. Indeed anything possessing two or three dimensions may be spoken of as a cross. We cannot weave any small piece of cloth without making crosses. So crossing is a mathematical law and it is absurd to limit its operations. It was very natural for the Romans to hang men on objects that roughly corresponded to human form. It may have never occurred to the Romans to connect this cross that served as an instrument for capital punishment with that worn by the vestal virgins. So the Christ-myth school ought before undertaking to prove anything, to ask if these similar symbols, these similar phrases, these similar activities in all religions have the same significance. It ought to ask whether or not the cross as used by other than Christian people is the symbol of the object on which the heroes of those particular people suffered death. Superficial parallelism does not help us any. All men live, all men eat but this does not prove that men in Africa are myths because they resemble some tribes in South America. Great religious leaders have always been in the habit of going to the solitude, to nature, to solve their problems. They have always gathered to themselves disciples to whom they preach and whom they send as missionaries. This is very natural and could not be otherwise. Of course there are many myths and many mythisms but it takes a discriminating eye to separate them

from what is historical.

Christianity borrowed much from Paganism because it had to live and to live it must borrow. What Pagan cult did not borrow from other Pagan cults? Or what great religion was self-sufficient? Mohamedanism is nothing when the borrowed material in it is cast away. The Arabs borrowed from the Greeks science and philosophy and commented on Aristotle, but no one calls them myths. Is knowledge, is feeling, is willing limited to one age or to one people? We adopt what universal things we find even if they have been discovered by others.

Paul who indulged in Pagan terminology most, always distinguished between Christianity and the heathen cults. This is why the early Christians were persecuted because they would not recognize the heathen cults on the same par with Christianity. They exalted Christianity and its Lord above all the rest because the influence of the personal founder was so strong and so near to them. The other cults which had no personal founders like Jesus, recognized one another. They even admitted into their membership persons who had affiliations with other communions. There were men who belonged to more than one cult. But Christianity made no compromise. Jesus alone was Lord. Allegiance to others save to him and to his Father was heresy. Only those who delivered themselves to Jesus unreservedly were admitted into the Christian fellowship. What is the meaning of such exclusiveness, such loyalty to one person only? This is a point for the sceptics to think upon.

Even where Paul indulges in Pagan phraseology his background is Judaism. Christianity and Christ were to Paul the fulfillment of the law. He explains Christianity in the light of Judaism not in that of Paganism. When he speaks of the mystery cults he speaks in denunciatory language. When Paul speaks of the death of Jesus he flavors his talk by quoting the Old Testament prophecies. It is very odd that Christianity disclaims all connections with the religions surrounding it. Its controversies are with Judaism from which it is an offshoot. Judaism had little controversy with the mystery cults because they never had been one before and now stood apart as rivals of each other. Christianity and Judaism, daughter and mother, were enemies and rivals. The difference came through the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah by the former and his rejection of such by the latter. Judaism could not tolerate as Messiah so prosaic a man as Jesus. The fight between Christianity and the Pagan cults was of a different nature altogether. It is not so very easy to put Jesus out of the way, his person was the only asset of the early Christians who renounced all for his sake. His death was a defeat, a disgrace, a stumbling block, a cause for apostasy, but his followers got over this and followed him, though dead. This death needed an apology and this apology led to borrowing from Pagan sources. But the death of Adonis was a periodic event. He could not be Adonis if he did not die. Another difference between Christianity and the mystery cults is the manner of deification. The ethnic cults deify ideas. The Vedic Gods are personified actions like sacrifice and prayer, or personified nature powers like fire or rain. The God Brihaspati was originally the idea and the practice of prayer. Later he became a God. In Christianity the process is reversed. First the person

then the idealization. This practice was common enough, the Roman emperors were deified. Christianity which not many years later dominated on Roman soil very naturally imitated the Romans and retained their institutions. Especially after the Christians have been persecuted for refusing to prostrate themselves before Caesar, they found it necessary to set up another person to honor in place of Caesar. They therefore accorded to Jesus all the honors that were to be bestowed on such a character. Jesus differs from Pagan Gods in that we possess references to his mother, father, sisters, brothers and other relations who are in the least idealized. Later by virtue of his idealization, they rose higher in state. The metamorphosis of Jesus came about very gradually in this way. In the Gospels we hear of Jesus the son of Joseph and Mary. He was a teacher and a healer. In Paul and Acts we read of the risen Christ and the heavenly Messiah more than we do of Jesus of Nazareth. In the early church we read of the Lord/ In the later church we hear of the second person in the Godhead.

When all has been said there is left the supreme and final test of personality which we must apply to check all our speculations. Of all the religious leaders Jesus stands as the spiritual genius possessed of a magnetic personality which has not yet been equal. Of all men, he is the friend of mankind. A more tender and affectionate person has never lived. Were all records to disappear and all testimony to vanish, his life can be reconstructed from the lives of his devoted followers. The impression he left is most definite and concrete and shines with a lustre peculiarly its own. The Buddhist wants deliverance, the Mohamedan knows Allah, the Jew follows the law, the Pagan performs the cult, but the Christian knows Jesus and his Father. Never has a name been more uttered, never a name sweeter or more fragrant, never a name more "hallowed by the centuries" as Schiller puts it. Never a theme dearer to the artists or to the poet, Never a more interesting topic in the history of religion. Never, no never. He captivates our hearts, he stands so vividly and so forcibly on the pages of history that we almost see him with our bodily eyes. The intolerance of his followers was not altogether due to fanaticism but to the superiority and excellence of their master that admitted of no compromise. Today more than ever men and women gladly take their lives to the altar as sacrifices for his sake and in his name. He is still the greatest dynamic force in the world. He checks the brute in his followers. His followers are divided up among themselves on questions that pertain to him. He is the object of devotion and he is the norm of the religious consciousness. He is ever waxing brighter and brighter and to his light there shall be no end. This certainly cannot be a myth for never was a myth so unique, so original, so vital. Never did a myth make our hearts burn within us. This is God's doing and is marvelous in our eyes.

Bibliography.

A. Berebdt's: Analecta zum slavischen Josephus, Zeitschrife fuer die Neutastementliche Wissenschaft.

D. Chwelson: Ueber die Frage ob Jesus Gelebt Hat.

Adolf Juelicher : Hat Jesus Gelebt.

Peter Jensen: Das Gilgamesh Epos in der Weltliteratur:

Johannes Weiss : Jesus in Glauben des Urchristentums.

P. W. Schmiedel: Die person Jesu im Streite der Meinungen der Gegenwart.

Drews: Die Christusmythe.

W. B. Smith's: Ecce deus; Der Verchristliche Jesus/

F. C. Conybears: The Historical Christ.

J. E. Carpenter: The Historical Jesus or The Theological Christ.

Rossington: Did Jesus Really Live?

Arno Neumann: Jesus.

Thorburn: Jesus the Christ, Historical or Mythical?

S. J. Case: The Historicaty of Jesus.

Von Soden: Hat Jesus Gelebt?

Tyler: Primitive Culture.

Bernard Pick: Jesus in the Talmud.

Scoetgen: Horae Talmudicae et Hebraicae.