

THE REAL QUESTION OF THE ANCESTRY OF JESUS.

IN FURTHER COMMENT ON PROF. PAUL HAUPT'S ARTICLE
"THE ARYAN ANCESTRY OF JESUS."

BY WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

HAD we confined ourselves to the strict requisitions of logic, our discussion of the Aryan ancestry of Jesus, as thus far conceived, would have ended with the December number of *The Open Court*. But there are many other matters of interest in the pregnant paper of Professor Haupt. Powerfully he has struck, as with hammer of Thor, at a single point the broad urn of Oriental science, and the strong vibration runs round and round the sonorous rim.

As already observed, the combined authority of Cheyne and Gardner assures us that Jesus was in all likelihood born in Nazareth, and this judgment seems plainly confirmed by Professor Haupt. A threefold cord holds strongest, but what is the evidence in point? So far as I can see, absolutely none at all. Certainly none worthy of the name has yet been produced.

True, it is reported that Jesus was invoked as the Galilean by the dying Julian,¹ and Epictetus (IV, 7) designates certain obdurates, who are presumably Christians, as Galileans. But there are many ways to account for all that. A Galilean residence would suffice, Galilean birth is by no means necessary. Matthew has his own theory of birth in Bethlehem and residence in Nazareth, Luke holds another quite contradictory. It is the fashion in certain quarters to prefer Luke's account to Matthew's, but the preference is entirely unreasonable. In every respect Matthew's story is superior in plausibility, simplicity, naturalness. It contents itself with one star and two dreams as its supernatural machinery, not an ex-

¹ *γενέκηναι, Γαλιλαίε!*—Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.*, III, 21. The sole basis for the report seems to be the fact to which Gregory Nazianzen repeatedly adverts in both his invectives against the Emperor, that he preferred the term Galilean and would even make it the legal substitute for Christian.

tensive outfit surely; while Luke fairly riots in prodigies and miracles. Any even proximate analysis, such as the tyro may make, must expose the romantic, artistic, and thoroughly fictive nature of the Lucan narrative and relegate it to a position far below Matthew's in all but literary respects, with which the historical critic has no concern. In view of these facts, we must repeat that any preference for Luke's account is entirely unwarranted.

Professor Haupt rightly rejects the Lucan device, so zealously championed by Ramsay, of sending Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, to be enrolled for taxation. As if Missourians should go back to Kentucky or Virginia every census-year!

Recently the discovery and publication of an edict issued by Gaius Vibius Maximus, eparch of Egypt, A. D. 104, on occasion of a census (taken every 14 years), sets this matter in clear light. All are required to go back *home*, "each to his own hearthstone,"² to attend to their ordinary daily tasks of husbandry (*Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, III, 125, 1907). This is the plainest common sense. On census day every one should be "at his own hearth," surely not in some distant ancestral city. Deissmann, whom the student of the New Testament has to thank for so much "Light from the East," but whose syllogisms are sometimes fearfully and wonderfully made, fancies that he finds in this edict at least a partial parallel to the deliverance in Luke! "*Die Aehnlichkeit ist doch sehr gross*" (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 201, n. 6). But parallels may run in exactly opposite directions!

But Jesus is also called the Nazaree,³ and does not this fix his birth at Nazareth? Assuredly not. *Nazaraïos* is not derivable from Nazareth, and Keim's preference for Nazara is not sustained by the manuscripts. Moreover there is no evidence whatever in favor of the existence of any such town "called Nazareth" B. C. 4, and much silent but eloquent testimony against it.

Neither Josephus, nor the Old Testament, nor the Talmud (for nearly a thousand years after Christ) knows anything of such a town. Yet Professor Haupt assures us that Nazareth = Hethlon = Hittalon = Hannathon = Hinnathon = Hinnatûn = Protection. Granted. But why the change of name? and when? Professor Haupt is silent. Where is the shred of evidence that the change of name was made before 4 B. C.? There seems to be none. Such

² ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἐαυτῶν ἐφέστια.

³ ναζωραῖος. The several forms, *Νασαραῖος*, *Ναζαραῖος*, *Ναζωραῖος*, *Ναζαρηνός*, are all used. The first, which we may transliterate into *Nazaree*, seems to be primitive and to reproduce most nearly the Syriac *Nazaryā'* and the Hebrew. N-3-R.

a change could not have taken place without some reason. Eastern conservatism would certainly retain the many-century-old name but for some compelling motive. Hethlon, Hittalon, Hinnathon, all these are fair- and rich-sounding words. Nazareth is inferior in sound and barely equal in sense. Why then the change, and when? The answer is that we do not hear of "a city called Nazareth" till it suddenly appears in Matt. ii. 23, to explain the epithet Nazaree. Admittedly the etymology is unsound. But there must be some explanation. What is it?

Fortunately we know something about Nazarees (or Nazorees). In the early days of the Propaganda they appear as a well-known sect, one of whose leaders was Paul; so at least says Tertullus (Acts xxiv. 5). I say well-known, for Tertullus deigns no word of explanation to Felix concerning this "Heresy of the Nazarees."

We turn to Epiphanius. Of all the ancients none knew more about sects or heresies. The study of them was his life-work, the discussion of them his *magnum opus*. No one has yet questioned his diligence, his painstaking, his minute and extended information. His orthodoxy shines conspicuous. His eagerness to bring down the dates of the heresies to the very latest is manifest. He holds a brief for Catholicism. His thesis is that every Christian heterodoxy is an aberration from a primitive unital orthodoxy. To establish this contention, he strains every nerve and not a few facts. What then is his witness? "The heresy of the Nazarees was before Christ and knew not Christ" (*Haer.* XXIX, 6). There! The cat is out of the bag. It is vain to say that this careful and erudite heresiograph did not know what he was talking about. If he did not, as the result of a life's study, pray, who did? It is vain to say that he is often confused and inaccurate. How could he be other when defending an indefensible thesis? The facts were dead against him. He could not jostle them into accord with his postulates. Hence his confusion and contradictions. But this merely strengthens his testimony quoted. We may justly question the asseverations of a witness that are made in his own interest and that serve his own purposes. But the admissions of the witness against himself, which overturn his own position and throw his own case out of court, these no judge of evidence thinks of questioning or of discounting; they are accepted not at par but above par, at a high premium. Until counter-testimony is adduced, and that will be a long time, we must hold firmly then to the unwilling witness of Epiphanius that "the sect of the Nazarees was before Christ and knew not Christ."

Was then the name derived from Nazareth? Certainly not! Such derivation was both philologically and topologically impossible. The Nazarees are located by Epiphanius on the other side of Jordan and the sea of Galilee. Why should such an important sect take its name from an unknown and contemptible hamlet? What other sect of that day took its name from an insignificant village or even a flourishing city? Call the roll, the answer is, None. We may be confident then that the party of the Nazarees had no more to do with the city of Nazareth than the party of the Tories with the city of Troy.

Common sense may raise its voice at this point. A sect might readily take its name from a person, or from an idea. Examples abound. The Nazarees might be so called from a person Nazarya' or from the idea of Nazar, that is, Protection, Guarding. Nazarees might be something like Conservatives. Apparently they worshiped God as Guardian, under the special aspect of Servator or Protector. Nazar-Ya' itself would appear to mean simply Guardian-Yah. The word seems nearly equivalent to Jesus, or *Soter*, or Saviour, and Jesus-Nasarya' looks like the most natural of combinations.

Accuracy of detail is perhaps not attainable at this point, but the general situation seems clear: The Nazarees were a pre-Christian sect worshiping God as Protector, Defender. They were close akin to the Iessaioi (or Jessees), who adored the same God as Saviour or Jesus, who were themselves nearly related to the more Hellenic Gnostics, who worshiped the same God as *Soter* or Saviour.

The term *Soter* was not regarded with favor by Old Catholics like Irenæus. It would appear to have smacked too unmistakably of pre-Christian Gnosticism. Hence it has been nearly quite displaced by its Hebrew translation, Jesus. It occurs in the New Testament only 24 times, and of these, 10 times in the Pastoral Letters, 5 times in 2 Peter; in fact, it is practically absent from all contexts but such as are more or less Gnostic. Irenæus substitutes Lord (*Kurios*) for it and speaks to the Gnostics ill-temperedly of "Your *Soter*."

The fusion of the Nazarees with the Jessees would appear natural and inevitable and even indicated in the combination Jesus-Nazarya. The fusion of both with the Messianists, the Christ-Servants or Christians, seems to lie just as plain before us in the immortal juxtaposition Jesus-Christ.

Not having a clear-cut subjunctive at command, I have tried hard in the foregoing to distinguish the facts from my interpretation of the facts, by the use of verbal auxiliaries, *seem*, *appear*, etc.

The facts indeed are few, but they are profoundly significant. We *must construct* them, *interrelate* them rationally. In *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (the writer may be allowed to say) will be found a conscientious attempt to utilize in such construction a maximum of facts with a minimum of hypothesis, though only about one-fourth of the material already assembled has been collocated in that volume.

It is notorious that all attempts, no matter how learned and ingenious, hitherto made to deduce the phenomena of primitive Christianity from a single personal focus, a unique and exaggerated man, whether Jew or Aryan, have issued in total and absolute failure. We may and we do entertain the highest reverence for the essayists, but their essays are all tissues of assumptions and even of contradictions. No matter how unanimous they may now be on their standpoint, that standpoint is untenable and must be definitely and permanently abandoned. "E'en in their glory comes the changing shade." This all-victorious school of criticism has passed its climacteric. Not only have all such past efforts aborted, but all future ones must abort also. A history, a movement of thought, feeling, action cannot be deduced from a character, a Human Being, when the clearest of all attestations of that history is to the total absence of any such character or Humanity as a factor in that history, as a component in that movement. The proof of this absence cannot of course be attempted in this paper, it must be reserved for at least one large volume; but the assertion is made on the basis of minute and registered examination.

To return from this conscious but apparently justifiable digression, we repeat the question, Whence the name Nazareth?

Professor Haupt assures us it was a new name for an old thing, the venerable city of Hethlon = Hittalon = Hinnathon = Hinnatûn = Protection = Nazareth. If this be true, and it is perilous to controvert the editor of the Polychrome Bible, then we may readily believe that it was named Nazareth from the Nazarees, who were "before Christ and knew not Christ." The relations have been exactly reversed in Matt. ii. 23, as so often in case of city-names. The evangelist cast his eye round over Galilee and saw Hinnaton = Defense, and ingeniously translated it into Nazareth = Protection, wherewith he had a firm enough hook on which to hang his innocent etymology, by which he effectually drew the fangs from the *fact* of pre-Christian Nazareeism. Similarly in Mark vi. 3, the question is put, "Is not this the Carpenter?" Turning it back into Syriac we get, "Is not this the N-S-R?" where the scarcely perceptible difference in sound between the two sibilants

allows the beautiful pun on N-Ḫ-R and N-S-R. It seems plain that the Jesus is here called the Carpenter (N-S-R) because he was the Defender (N-Ḫ-R).*

The identification of Nazareth with Hinnatûni is very near lying, extremely plausible and highly probable; it is moreover very welcome, as solving the queer riddle of the "city called Nazareth," which suddenly appears on the map as if it had fallen from the sky. The reader may naturally ask for the evidence of this identity. The answer is that in the El-Amarna Letters (11: 16-17) in the letter of Burrahuriash, King of Karduniash, to Napkhururia, King of Egypt, we read, according to Winckler, "After Akhi-ṭâbu went on his way to my brother, in the city of kHinatôn in Kinakhkhi etc." (*â lu*) *kHi-in-na-tu-ni ša (mâtu) Ki-na-akh-khi* etc.), where (*mâtu*) *Ki-na-akh-khi* is (land) *Canaan*. Again (196: 24-32), in the continuation of a letter, "But Surata took Lapaja out of Makida, and said to me, 'Upon a ship I will bring him to the King.' But Surata took him and sent him from (city) kHinatuni home" (*u-ji-tar-šir-šu-iš-tu (a lu) kHi-na-tu-na â-na biti-šu*). *Magid-da* seems to be the well-known Megiddo of the plain of Jezreel, and appears here as not far from kHinatuna.

Again, in the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III, as edited by Paul Rost, at line 232 we read:

"... [*šal-lat*] (*â lu*) *kHi-na-tu-na* 650 *šal-lat* (*â lu*) *Kana*..."

"... [captives] (city) *kHi-na-tu-na* 650 captives (city) *Kana*"

Here *Hi-na-tu-na* appears in close relation with "*Kana*..." apparently the *Cana* of Galilee, six miles north of the present Nazareth. To be sure, the reading "*Kana*..." is not quite certain. Layard gave instead "*Ku*(?)." Moreover, since the end of the line is lost, we are not sure of the name even if thus far correctly read. If one should find a piece of writing illegible after the letters *Adria*, one would not be sure, in the absence of other indications, whether *Adria* in Italy was meant, or perhaps *Adrianople* in Turkey. However, the *Cana* of Galilee has a strong presumption in its favor. There is in fact no other claimant for the honor of this mention.

* The Greek is *τέκτων*, strictly *wood-worker*, as opposed to *metal-worker*, though also used in the latter sense. The Syriac of the passage actually presents *n-g-r*, which denotes *workman* in wood, metal, or stone, whereas the participle *M-n-s-r* is the exact term for *carpenter*, *sawyer*. It should perhaps be mentioned in passing that in the old Sinaitic Syriac palimpsest the Marcan passage is wanting (from v. 26 to vi. 5) and in the parallel passage (Matt. xiii. 55) we read simply, "Is this not the son of Joseph?" The word *carpenter* would thus appear to be a later conceit.

The identification of Hethlon or Hittalon with Hinnaton (the Hannathon of Zebulon, Josh. xix. 14), seems hardly so likely. The linguistic obstacles are not indeed insuperable, but this Hethlon is an extremely elusive and uncertain quantity. "The way of Hethlon" we come upon in the Old Testament only in Ez. xlvi. 15, and xlviii. 1, as bounding the ideal Canaan on the north and apparently starting from the Mediterranean (in neither case is Hethlon recognized as a proper name in the Septuagint, which attempts to translate it).⁴ Hence the plausible conjecture of Schwarz (*Das heilige Land*, 171) and of Van Kasteren (*Revue biblique*, 1895, p. 24), which has found so much favor, identifying it with the modern 'Adlûn (Ornithopolis), a few miles north of the mouth of the Nahr-el-Qasîmiye, in latitude 33° 23' 30", whereas Nazareth lies in latitude 32° 42' 30", nearly 50 miles further south. Furrer would find this Hethlon in the present Heitla, still much further north, beyond Tripoli, and it would seem likely that Ezekiel would push the northern boundary of his ideal Canaan as far toward the pole as seemed possible.

Professor Haupt's extremely daring and ingenious reconstruction of this frontier depresses it much toward the south, starting it from Carmel and carrying it across to and up the Sea of Tiberias or Lake Gennesaret. It is perilous for any one to question Professor Haupt in such matters; for the most it would be temerarious; with Pindar, "I hold aloof." But one would at least be glad to see Professor Haupt's proofs in minuter detail than given in his article in Peiser's *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* and in the *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford, 1908). The taste is not instantly reconciled to the new wine of the doctrine that the *Way of Hammath* is the rather modest *Wady el-Hammâm*, and that the northern boundary of Palestine ran (along the western shore of the sea of Galilee?) to Bethsaida at the northeastern end of Gennesaret. It is very hard to imagine a patriotic idealist contenting himself with a border drooping so far to the south. Far more likely that he would retire it unduly to the north. Furthermore, if the northern boundary passed through Bethsaida, at the northeast end of Gennesareth (or Chinnereth), then since the eastern border "shall descend and shall reach unto the side of the Sea of Chinnereth eastward," the northern and eastern borders would seem to meet at or near Bethsaida; where then is there room left for that large part of the border, northern

⁴ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης τῆς μεγάλης τῆς καταβαινούσης καὶ περισχιζούσης, and κατὰ τὸ μέρος τῆς καταβάσεως τοῦ περισχιζόντος.

and eastern, defined by Ziphron, Hazar-enan, Shepham, Riblah, Ain (Numbers xxxiv. 8-11)? Passing by the well-known text-uncertainties in connection with this northern boundary, one is nevertheless embarrassed by multiplied difficulties in contracting the bounds of Palestine so far to the south.

Another most interesting identification by Professor Haupt is that of Sepphoris (modern Saffūriye) with the Arbatta, Arbacta, or Arbana of 1 Macc. v. 23. Here again the philologic possibility certainly lies open, but the probability of such a series of transformations does not seem to be high. Perhaps Professor Haupt has evidence of the actual disappearance here of the initial S into a guttural. In any case it will seem curious that Ziphron, which he equates with Sepphoris, should be mentioned (Num. xxxiv. 9) *after* Zedad (or Bethsaida) as on the northern border of Palestine. On this point we may hope for further light. That Sepphoris, the *Çipporin* of the Talmud, is the "city set on a hill," seems uncertain when one reflects that there were many cities so set in ancient times, even in Palestine; moreover, the sentiment of the verse is not new nor startling, though the phraseology, as so often in Matthew, is particularly pleasing.

In passing it should be noticed that Professor Haupt seems to attribute to the Angel (of Luke ii. 9-12) a geographic confusion that would ill become such an accredited messenger. He says, "The shepherds were told by the angels, 'Ye will find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger,' just as Nazareth is *swathed* in a basin with a girdle of hills." But the Angel could hardly have been glancing in his phraseology at Nazareth, for he declares explicitly, "There is born to you to-day a Saviour, who is Christ-Lord, in David's city," "which is called Bethlehem." Of course, it is possible to hold that these words are not authentic, that they were added to the veridical declaration of the Angel concerning the swathing and manger. However, this does not mend matters much; for the incident of the swaddling is of itself too commonplace for record, and the sole distinguishing detail of the manger loses point and credibility except in connection with the census and the crowded state of the hotels in Bethlehem. We can hardly believe that the Child, even though a carpenter and the son of a carpenter, would have been swathed in a manger at home in Nazareth, however insistently the engirdling hills may have suggested it.

Inasmuch as H. S. Chamberlain has discussed the question, Was Jesus a Jew? with so much learning (of course, not nearly equal to Professor Haupt's) and vigor and earnestness, it would

be unjust not to notice his arguments. However, there is little to add. The general complexity of racial relations in Galilee, on which he justly insists, is not disputed. The race-Babel of the Assyrian monarchy, on which Winckler lays so much stress (*Die Völker Vorderasiens*, 1900), was even intensified in Galilee, which was a veritable witches' caldron bubbling over with varied and violent contents. Assuming for the moment the standpoint of Chamberlain, we must approve his judgment: "To what race did He belong? No answer at all can be given." But if Chamberlain rightly declines to make any affirmation, he is none the less positive in his negation. He also quotes the Maccabean passage with the added emphasis of spread-print, which however does not strengthen the argument which we have already seen collapse completely. Chamberlain thinks the Jews would not return to Galilee; but his only reason is that they refused to people Tiberias at the behest of Herod Antipas. That however was for a very specific reason, which Chamberlain forgets to state, namely, Tiberias was built on an old cemetery, as Professor Haupt remarks. This particular site therefore was "unclean" for the Jews, hence their recalcitrance; nothing is implied as to the rest of Galilee. Later, however, Tiberias became the seat of Jewish learning.

It is curious to note at this point a queer psychologic phenomenon. As must now be evident, neither Chamberlain nor any one else has any cogent reason to allege against the Jewish ancestry of Jesus. The most they can urge is that a man chosen at random from among a populace prevailing non-Jewish would be probably a non-Jew—a reason whose irrelevance has already been pointed out.⁵ Chamberlain seems to have felt the uncertainty of his position at the outset, and hence his first statement (p. 211) is comparatively mild and innocent. "In religion and education He was undoubtedly a Jew; in race—in the narrower and proper sense of the word Jew,—He was most (*höchst*) probably not." After discussing the matter, however, he assures us (p. 214) there is "not the slightest occasion" (*nicht die geringste Veranlassung*) to assume His parents were Jews. This confidence grows with his manuscript, and on page 218 he declares that he who makes the assertion that Christ was a Jew is "either ignorant or untrue" (*entweder unwissend oder unwahr*). "The probability that Christ was no Jew, that he had not a drop of pure Jewish blood in his veins, is so great that it almost amounts to a certainty." Lastly, on page 219, it reaches this limit: "That Jesus Christ did *not* belong to it (the Jewish race) may be

⁵ See "The Jewish Element in Galilee," *Open Court* for December.

considered as certain. Every other assertion is hypothetic." Now on page 211 Chamberlain knew all that he knew on page 219. No scintilla of new evidence, none we have not already examined. But by eight pages of eloquent declamation Chamberlain has convinced himself and doubtless many of his readers. So illusory is often the artificial illumination of rhetoric!

Chamberlain indeed, whose merit I would not for a moment underestimate, holds as is well known, a brief for the Aryan *vs.* the Jew. He will not even admit that Renan was quite honest in (*Vie de Jésus*, 1863, chapter II) declaring it impossible even to conjecture the race of Jesus, and later (1891) affirming "He was a Jew"* (*Histoire du peuple d'Israël*) and violently attacking the gainsayers. He thinks he detects in this change of front the fine hand of the *Alliance Israélite!*

On one point, however, we must agree with Chamberlain heartily. The importance he ascribes to race and blood is not fictitious. It is genuine and abiding. A. Réville (who has been followed by Harnack) erred mightily in declaring (*Jésus de Nazareth*, I, 47) the question of the Aryan descent of Christ to be not only inadjudicable but also idle (*oiseuse*). The disposition so common among ethnologists and other "liberal" writers to disregard questions of race and to treat the substance of humanity as practically homogeneous, as a uniform dough out of which everywhen and everywhere equally good individual units may be made, is altogether deplorable. Jean Finot writes a big book on *Race Prejudice*; Anatole France re-echoes him and scoffs at the alleged superiority of any race; H. G. Wells swells the chorus; Prof. Thomas (says the press) calls out for miscegenation and seems to believe the millennium awaits the day when black spirits and white, blue spirits and gray, mingle, mingle, mingle, they that mingle may. We may think the Hottentots uncivilized, uncultured, disgusting, but it's only a matter of taste; they think the same of us, and apparently with equal reason! The African rice- and butter-fattened houri, who cannot rise from a sitting posture without assistance, is really just as beautiful as the Melonian Venus, her royal admirers prefer her! Jacobi's deduction of the triaxial ellipsoid of equilibrium is hardly more admirable than the Australian's calculation of his own kinship! All he needs is a little training, and the Bushman will every way equal the Anglo-Saxon! Says Réville (*loc. cit.*), "A man belongs to the nation in whose bosom he has grown up." Is the mild Mongolian

* "Nothing but the folly of men of the world could ever have raised any doubts on this point."

grown up in New York a genuine good American?! By his earnest and vehement and well-reasoned protest against sickly sentimentality in high places, Chamberlain has earned the thanks of right-thinking men.*

Not only are race and blood important in themselves, but in understanding a religion or a literature it makes a big difference whence it proceeds. The incapacity of the Aryan rightly to appreciate the Semite, the Hittite, and their compound the Jew, has profoundly influenced nearly 2000 years of history. The thick-strewn but thin-veiled allusions of the Song of Songs passed with Herder for the tenderest blossoms of virginal innocence, modesty, and delicacy. The English clergyman quotes Matt. v. 30 without a blush, without an inkling of what is aimed at; he regards Rom. i. 18-32 as directed against vice in general, and when he reads that Jesus went up into the Mountain he may possibly think of Tabor or Lebanon or Olivet, but hardly of Sinai, the Mount of the Law.

Once more resuming the thread of discourse, we affirm that the question of the racial ancestry of Jesus is not unimportant for such as Chamberlain and the "liberal" critics, Bousset, Wernle, Schmiedel, Haupt and the rest, who deduce Christianity from a unique human personality. But for such the question is entirely unanswerable, as Renan rightly perceived. In Galilee (*Gelil hag-gôyim*, district of the nations) was to be found unending variety of parentage. Once cut loose from the Bethlehem story of Matthew, conjecture drifts rudderless on a sea of possibilities.⁶ For neither is there anything in any other tradition, whether of word or of deed, to give us the slightest clew. Plainly, in case of a character of whom nothing is known, nothing that he said, nothing that he did, it is absurd to talk of internal evidence. We never can tell a man's race from his birth-place, much less from his dwelling place. The greatest of Roman emperors may be a Spaniard; the most illustrious of German philosophers, a canny Scot; the profoundest of French analysts, "*la haute pyramide des sciences mathé-*

* The great egalitarian apostle of opportunity "predicates" "intellectual equality" in "each" race "taken by itself." Ward's *Applied Sociology*, p. 110.

⁶ Professor Haupt will not indeed by any means allow that David was of Bethlehem. In a most interesting and ingenious paper in Peiser's *Or. Litztg.*, February, 1909, he dissipates the tradition of David's connection with Bethlehem as formed of misconceptions, and refers him to Hebron, as Winckler had already referred him to the Negeb. But Winckler despairs of separating "actuality from genealogic-mythologic constructions" (*Geschichte Israels*, II, 226) and footing on Stucken's *Astralmythen*, he translates so much of the Davidic legend to the skies that it becomes almost indifferent where the minstrel king was born or whether he was born at all.

matiques," an Italian; the chief of Russian poets may proudly boast descent from an African Arab.

Nevertheless, although, as the matter shapes itself in my mind, the question of the Aryan ancestry of Jesus Nasarya' aligns itself with that of the Semitic lineage of Zeus Xenios, the Hittite descent of Jupiter Stator, or even the Turanian genealogy of Yahveh Zebaoth, there yet remains a kindred sense in which the question may be put and may be answered with reasonable precision: The doctrine, the worship, the cult of Jesus—the *only thing in the premises that we really know anything about*—was it Jewish? was it Aryan? was it Greek? was it Semitic? was it Babylonian? was it pamphylic, a synthesis of all tribes and tongues and worships? This Way (of the Lord), which the mighty Apollos had learned orally,⁷ which he was "accustomed to preach and to teach accurately," which he was proclaiming as an ardent missionary all round the Mediterranean, and that in utter ignorance of the Gospel story, having learned only the Baptism of John (Acts xviii. 24, 25), this cult of the Jesus,⁸ which Paul too taught (Acts xxviii. 31), though he knew practically nothing of a "Christ fleshwise" (2 Cor. v. 16), this *Religionsanschauung* is the broadest, deepest, and highest fact of modern civilization, culture, and history, nor can we evade the question as to its genesis. The answer thus far rendered and almost universally accepted has been that this cult was Jewish, the legitimate, prophesied, inevitable fruit of the slow-flowering century-plant of Israel's history.

"Christianity," says Renan in an outburst of enthusiasm, in 1891 (*Hist. du p. d'Is.*, v. 415, ii. 539), when his style had begun to do its worst for his judgment, "Christianity is the masterwork of Judaism, its glory, the résumé of its evolution. . . . Jesus is all and entire in Isaiah." Against this prodigious error Chamberlain has done well to protest, though his critical arguments hit far wide of the mark, and Jensen's Pan-Babylonism may render some service. But however much the Gilgamesh-Epos may have unconsciously infiltrated the mythologizing of the Evangelists, whatever echoes Zimmern or Gunkel may hear of Assyria in Epistles or Apocalypse, the proximate sources of the Jesus-Cult lie much nearer at hand in time, in space, in race. For it can be proved by "minutely accurate exegesis" that the cult was at least half-Greek, whatever foreign admixtures may have been and actually were present. Born in the Diaspora, in the blending twilight of Greek philosophy and Jewish

⁷ *κατηχημένος.*

⁸ *τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.*

theology, it was itself a *theosophy* taught primarily in secret and by mystery, even as is distinctly said (1 Cor. ii. 7): "But we speak divine wisdom in mystery."⁹ The primitive secrecy of this cult is revealed on many pages of the New Testament, from Mark to the Pastorals (O Timothy, guard the deposit, 1 Tim. vi. 20). That the cult was largely non-Jewish is evident from a score of considerations. "Jesus came into Judea," and even "into Galilee" according to a variant of Mark i. 9, which to me appears older than our Receptus. The doctrine bloomed out almost simultaneously all around the Mediterranean. Ananias was evidently a citizen of Damascus, not a refugee from Jerusalem, yet before there had been any mission to Damascus he was a worshiper of Jesus, who appeared to him in a dream and gave him weighty instructions (Acts. ix. 10-19). Aquila and Priscilla knew it in Rome before we hear of any mission thither. Apollos knew it in Alexandria. The Twelve knew it in Ephesus before Paul preached it to them (Acts. xix. 1-7). Elymas Son-of-Jesus (most probably Disciple of Jesus) in Cyprus was a "false prophet" (that is, a more or less heterodox teacher of Christianity—the word never means anything else in the New Testament) before Paul and Barnabas came thither, and apparently long before (Acts xiii. 6-12). Moreover, when we come to examine the cult itself we find Greek elements abounding, not without some Roman. We have no space for detailed proof, which must of course be minute and painstaking. In fact, the notion of the Jesus is only an Hebraization of the Greek *Sōter*, whom¹⁰ without any specification, though the reference is to Zeus, Socrates invokes in the *Philebus*, 66, D; "Zeus Soter and victory!" shouted the Greeks at Cunaxa, as their eager front rank billowed forward against the Persians.

This brings us to the part played by Judaism in the Jesus-Cult. That part has been largely misunderstood. Baur recognized a certain conflict, but quite mistook its nature, origin, and significance. With him it was a struggle between Petrine and Pauline, and he scented these two forces everywhere in early Christianity. This conflict seems to have been mainly imaginary. The supposed basis in Gal. ii. 11 ff., a mere passing incident at most, seems quite insufficient. In Acts Peter appears as liberal as Paul, and the Epistles ascribed to him are Pauline enough for the most exacting. In the Clementines Peter is not fighting Paul, but much rather his ancient self, Simon before his *conversion* (Luke xxii. 32).¹¹

⁹ ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ.

¹⁰ τῷ σωτῆρι.

¹¹ The Revisers have here allowed their prejudices to impair their trans-

What then did Judaism for the Jesus-Cult? Precisely what by its racial nature it was bound to do: *It historized the Doctrine*, just as the Jew has always historized whatever he touched. This was not his fault, hardly even his misfortune. Equally averse to generalizations and to abstractions, he threw the cult of the Jesus into a narrative form, he gave the "new teaching" (Mark i. 27) historic form and setting, he turned a body of ideas into a body of facts; he wrote or inspired the Gospels! Such was the rôle he played, principal, poetic, dramatic, fateful, ruinous! A little leaven that has leavened the whole lump. It is the mission of criticism to disclose and identify this tremendous part played by the Jew in Greek-Christian religion. He has given that originally highly spiritual, philosophic and even theosophic religion its historical material form, a terrific investiture, a shirt of Nessus. This religion he has recognized from the start as not his own, as alien and absolutely unassimilable to his nature. Hence he has never accepted, he has steadfastly and necessarily rejected it—a fact of itself sufficient to show that this religion was not born of him, that in its origin and essence it is foreign to his being.

Doth not the ox know his owner, and the ass its master's crib? If Christianity had been the fructification of Judaism, the Jews would have adopted it with an impulse as irresistible as the rush of a planet. Herewith is said nothing against the Jew, whom all men must, at least in many regards, most reverentially admire. When we say that he is not now and never was and can never be a Greek, we institute no comparison but merely state a fact, by no means discreditable to the Jew.

It is in this sense and only in this sense that we can attach importance or even meaning to the question of the ancestry of Jesus. The paths pursued by criticism thus far in its treatment of the whole question of Christian origins are smooth and well-beaten and conduct through beautiful and interesting scenery; but they lead no whither, they are blind alleys, they are *culs-de-sac*. He who would attain to the light must turn his back resolutely upon them all. Even though he may have known the Christ fleshwise, henceforth he must know Him so no longer. That way lies hope, lies progress, lies truth.

"Wunsch um Wünsche zu erlangen,
Schaue nach dem Glanze dort."

lation: "When once thou hast turned again"—but the word *again* is gratuitous, unrepresented in the original, which is simply *ἐπιστρέψας*—turned round.