THE KINDRED OF JESUS AND THE BABYLON OF REVELATION.

BY WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

Once more—alas, how soon!—returned from

"Annihilating all that's made
   To a green thought in a green shade,"

I hasten to pay due meed of attention to the midsummer night's dreams in The Open Court of August. In Mr. Kampmeier's article the tides of battle no longer surge and sway around "James the Brother of the Lord," but rather about "my," "thy," "his brethren." He is quite right in chiding neglect of these personages, and still more in saying, "Dr. Smith has hardly grazed the question of the brotherhood of James, etc." The direct treatment given this matter could hardly be called "grazing" even in Texas. As to the "other brothers of Jesus," it is granted they were not heavily touched. As even historicists in general set little or no store by them, it seemed scarcely worth while. However, "simply to make the story completer," let us to the testimony.

In the beginning a word of amendment. Mr. Kampmeier denies that "brothers of the Lord" is "New Testament phraseology," yet he admits of course that it is "the phraseology of Paul." Well, Paul is held responsible for some 29 percent of the New Testament, and it was Paul's usage concerning James that we were talking about. He adds that the "Gospels speak of the brothers of Jesus." Where? The reader will not find the phrase in the New Testament, though he seek it diligently with tears. True, he will find "my," "thy," "his brethren," where the reference is certainly to Jesus, but here it is a question of "phraseology," and the phrase "brethren of Jesus" is not in the New Testament.

"I know what say the fathers wise,—
   The Book itself before me lies,"

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only Son of the Father."
as well as the books of lexicographers not so wise, who talk learnedly about many things and boldly put down "the brethren of Jesus" in quotation as from the Gospels, but without warrant. None of this has been forgotten, and surely Mr. Kampmeier must recall that I have discussed the words ascribed to Jesus about "my brethren." But it still remains true that "the brethren of Jesus" is not a New Testament phrase. If such a form of speech were found embedded in the oldest strata of the New Testament, it might point back to some primitive conception concerning the Jesus; but no such form is found, and the phrases "my," "thy," "his brethren," though certainly used by the Evangelists about the Jesus, and equivalent in their designation, are not nearly equivalent, in fact have no force at all, in evidencing an early idea concerning Jesus himself. They are all late inventions of the editors of the Gospels.

For consider the passages singly and collectively. Here is the census:

"My brethren"—Matt. xii. 48-50; xxviii. 10; Mark iii. 33-35; Luke viii. 21; John xx. 17.
"Thy brethren"—Matt. xii. 47; Mark iii. 32; Luke viii. 20.
"His brethren"—Matt. xii. 46; xiii. 55; Mark iii. 31; Luke viii. 19; John ii. 12; vii. 3, 5, 10; Acts i. 14.

To these we may add:

"Mother of Jesus"—Matt. i. 18; ii. 11, 13, 14, 20, 21; xii. 46-50; xiii. 55; Mark iii. 31-35; Luke i. 43; ii. 33, 34, 48, 51; viii. 19-21; John ii. 1, 3, 5, 12; vi. 42; xix. 25, 26; Acts i. 14.
"Sisters," my, thy, his, etc.—Matt. xii. 50; xiii. 56; Mark iii. 32, 35; vi. 3; John xix. 25.

The Pauline passages, 1 Cor. ix. 5, Gal. i. 19, have been sufficiently considered.

Now as to Matt. xxviii. 10, John xx. 17, there is no doubt; no one denies that the reference is to the disciples. Here at least is something sure and certain, and withal highly important.

The other references fall readily into groups. In Matt. i and ii, there are six mentions of his "mother," in Luke i and ii there are five. These eleven may all be dismissed at once; they argue not for but against the historicity; for these four chapters are obviously and admittedly late accessions to the Gospels, merely preparing the way for the extravagances of the Gospels of the Infancy, with no claim to authenticity, but extremely valuable only as showing the direction and tendency of the literary development, which was firmly set towards purely imaginative biography.

The like may be said of the passages in John. They are all
late, with no place in the earlier synoptic Gospels, with no reasonable pretension to historic character, but are part and parcel of John's striving for vivid dramatic depiction, and are just as authentic as the "sign" at Cana, at the pool of Beth Hesda, and at the tomb of Lazarus. This is clearly seen in xix. 25, 26, where John assembles three Marys at the foot of the Cross; his mother Mary, his mother's sister Mary, wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. We may be sure that the Magdalene is only the symbol of pagandom saved from the seven demons of idolatry, and the reader may be left to estimate the likelihood that his mother Mary would have a sister Mary.

Similarly as to the reference in Acts i. 14. The whole chapter is notoriously late, and the verse serves only to illustrate the conspicuous fact that "his mother" and "his brethren" are especial favorites of fancy in the third and following generations.

Next comes the celebrated passage Mark iii. 33-35, with its parallels, Matt. xii. 48-50, Luke viii. 19-21, the essence of which is that "his brethren" "stand without" and wish to speak with him, but he looks round on his disciples and says, "Behold my mother and my brethren!" It seems strange that any historicist should call this passage to witness, for it seems especially designed to guard against any such false material interpretations of the phrase in question. "Mother and brethren" are plainly the Jewish polity and people, who "stand without" (from that day to this) and decline to enter into the kingdom. In at least six other New Testament verses this term "without" is used in the same technical sense to denote those not in the new religious society (Mark iv. 11; Luke xiii. 25; 1 Cor. v. 12, 13; Col. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 12; also Rev. xxii. 15). Since the Jesus-cult was largely Jewish in origin and spirit, it was perfectly natural to speak of the Jewish church and people as "his mother" and "his brethren"; this usage, however, the passage is intended to correct and to spiritualize.

We have said enough of the so-called "pre-histories" in the first two chapters of Matthew and of Luke. For these pious imaginations (innocent and even beautiful enough, when properly understood) their authors would be the last to claim any standing before the bar of criticism. Mutually contradictory and exclusive, they form no part of the earlier Gospels to which (in revision) they have been prefixed. We can not then have the least interest in any inferences whether correct or incorrect from the terms "first-born," "first-begotten," found therein. Moreover, these are old and highly respectable gnostic and theosophic epithets of the Logos or other primal emanation of the Deity, and had originally no more reference
to any man of Nazareth than the adjective Theodore (God-given) had to Mr. Roosevelt.

On the fragments of extra-canonical gospels surely Mr. Kampmeier can not mean to lay any stress. The one from that According to Hebrews, “Behold, etc.,” in a thoroughly symbolic connection (“When Jesus was baptized, a fire was seen above the water”), seems evidently a pious fiction to explain or vivify the synoptic account of the baptism. Though this gospel may have contained much old material, as does Matthew, yet this particular passage is no more original than the many universally recognized late accessions to our First Gospel. Similar remarks apply to the fragment from the Ebionitic gospel: it is merely a brief form of the Mark-Matthew statement to be discussed presently. But when Mr. Kampmeier thinks that the evidence from “these apocryphal gospels becomes stronger when we remember that their readers, Jewish Christians, rejected the miraculous birth of Jesus and considered him the son of Joseph and Mary,” at least one of his readers must fail to follow his reasoning: such facts would seem to point directly the other way. As to the general leaning of this Gospel of Hebrews itself, any conclusions based on such meager remains of its 2200 lines might appear to be dubious: however, there is one passage that seems plain and explicit: “Even now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and bore me up unto the great Mount Tabor.” Here “his mother” is unequivocally declared to be the Holy Spirit (Hebrew words for spirit, soul are feminine or only rarely masculine), and the speaker Jesus is represented not as a human but as a divine being. Here also we seem to discover the germ of the whole story of his being cast out into the wilderness by the Spirit and being tempted by the devil.

The story quoted by Eusebius (in the 4th century) as from Hegesippus (in the latter half of the 2d century) appears scarcely worthy of notice. Mr. Kampmeier himself does not seem to credit it, and the dates are quite enough to deprive it of any weight. To descend below the middle of the second century for witnesses to alleged events at the beginning of the first, is far worse than to hunt for spring violets amid the frosts of November.

Thus far, then, the testimony adduced by Mr. Kampmeier, at the first touch and breath of analysis, has

“Slipt into ashes and is found no more.”

There remains, however, one passage, the only one that ever deserved any notice (Mark vi. 1-6; Matt. xiii. 54, 58; Luke iv. 16-30), the
ostensible record of a rejection at Nazareth, and this it is a pleasure to consider carefully.

First, then, let us suppose there was nothing in the passage itself to determine whether the account was primitive, the incident historic, or the account late, the incident invented. What then would be the evidential or logical bearing on this instance of the various other instances already examined? This question is important. Suppose here is a bag containing balls, either black or white, it is not known which nor how many of each. Before the first ball is drawn out, a bystander would say the chances were even. If the first ball happens to be black, he will still think the chances nearly equal. But if the second and third come out also black, he will begin to bet on the black, giving heavier odds as the number of blacks increases. His judgment is instinctive, following the line of least resistance; he could not justify himself logically without invoking the calculus of probabilities. This would tell him that after $b$ black and $w$ white balls have been drawn and laid aside, the chances that the next ball will be black or white are $(b+1)/(b+w+2)$ and $(w+1)/(b+w+2)$ respectively. So that if there have been no whites, the chance of a black is $(b+1)/(b+2)$ and of a white only $1/(b+2)$; the odds in favor of the next ball being black are $b+1$ to 1, and plainly increase as $b$ increases.

Let us apply this common sense (for mathematics is only common sense etherealized) to the case in hand. There are many passages that ascribe kinsfolk to Jesus. Are they early, or late? primary or secondary? We examine a large number and find that they all bear unmistakable marks of being late, many of them even very late. Not one gives any token of being original or primitive. Now comes still another. Before any examination, what is the antecedent probability? The answer is already given. If there are 19 such passages already considered, then the chances are 20 to 1 that the new is of the same kind, that it also is late and invented; and every additional instance of such late passages merely strengthens the probability that all are late.

It has seemed good to dwell on this instance as typical of many. In studying the New Testament we frequently meet with some class of facts, some of which imperatively demand a certain kind of interpretation, while others may apparently be interpreted either that way or some widely different way. It now appears that we are by no means logically free to choose which interpretation we please in these latter cases. The antecedent probability greatly favors the one proved form of interpretation as against the other merely prob-
lematic form. Moreover, we are morally bound to go with this prevailing likelihood and interpret the others as we have already been constrained to interpret some, unless we are compelled to change the mode of interpretation. Such is the exact mathematical meaning and value of Occam’s Razor: *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem.*

Hence in approaching the passage we find the scale already heavily weighted with probability against Mr. Kampmeier’s interpretation. It will require very grave considerations to bring the beam back even to a level. Are there any such? So far as can be seen, there are none whatever. What one touch of nature can you detect in any of these verses to suggest that here we are dealing with undoctored history? Is it the omission of father in the mention of the kinsfolk? Volkmar indeed infers hence that Mary was a widow, but the omission is easily understood from purely dogmatic considerations: the writer had the virginal birth in mind and was not disposed to harm the young dogma. Is it the names of the brethren? But they are merely the commonest Jewish names, as if one should say the brothers of Jim were Tom, Dick and Harry. As such they lay obvious to any fabulist. Confidently, then, one may affirm there is nothing in the text that calls for a literal historical construction. On the contrary, there is much that wars against it and favors a figurative exposition:

1. The word “fatherland” (πατρίδα) is very suspicious. Why did not the writer say city, village, or Nazareth, if such was his meaning? The word is emphatic in this incident, occurring seven times, but elsewhere not in the Gospels, only in Acts xviii. 27, Heb. xi. 14.1 Remember, too, that according to the literal construction Jesus had been scarcely a half-day’s journey away from Nazareth, he had been wandering round among the neighboring towns, along the lake shores of Galilee. If a man should go to visit districts less than 40 miles away, his return would hardly be spoken of anywhere at any time as “coming into his fatherland.”

2. The temper of his fellow-citizens seems strange and unnatural. They reject him for no better reason than that they know him and his family! How unlikely! And because he is a carpenter (or carpenter’s son)! This is almost incredible. In that age and clime the clefts did not yawn between the classes of society as in the Occident now. That a man was a carpenter formed no reason

---

1 The case is indeed much stronger. In Acts πατρίδα is no longer read, but “Achaia” instead, while in Hebrews the reference is to the “better” fatherland, the spiritual, the “heavenly.”
why he should not be a prophet. The greatest of prophets, the greatest of kings, had been called from the humblest stations in life. A man did not need a Ph. D., nor a D. D., nor even a modest A. B., to commend him as teacher or leader. "His art is true who of his nature hath knowledge," thought Pindar, and undoubtedly so thought the Galileans. The objection of the people seems highly inapposite and improbable.

3. But how about the famous proverb, that a prophet is not without honor, etc.? As a matter of fact, it is the exact reverse of the truth. Certainly there is enough and to spare of envy and jealousy among our neighbors, yet history attests unequivocally that it is precisely among these neighbors that reformers and prophets have found their first, their warmest, their most faithful adherents. Witness Mohammed, Luther, Savonarola, Lazzaretti, and whom you will. Even in political conventions it is accounted strange and fatal if the home-delegation does not support the "favorite son" first, last, and all the time. One may affirm, then, with little fear of gainsaying, that any such man as the supposed "historic Jesus" would have found his most ready and ardent followers precisely among his fellows of Nazareth. The arrant swindler may indeed be discovered at home and may wisely cry,

"To-morrow to fresh woods and pastures new;"

but the pure and sterling character does not have to run away to find recognition. The proverb becomes intelligible only when referred to the rejection of the Jesus-cult by the Jews and its acceptance by the Gentiles.

4. The anhistoricity of the incident and of the saying comes clearly into light on comparing the Mark-Matthean with the Lucan account (Luke iv. 16-30). It is vain to imagine (with the harmonists) two essays and two rejections at Nazareth, equally vain to attempt a reconciliation of the two recitals. The truth is that Luke has treated his material with perfect freedom, justly feeling that it was no question of historic fact but of edifying doctrine, and has produced a picture in which the Mark-Matthean original is unmistakable and yet transformed beyond possible identification. Notice, too, the strange phrase with which he closes his recasting: The citizens, enraged about practically nothing; cast him (the Jesus) out of the city and lead him to the brow of the mount on which their city is built, in order to hurl him down headlong; "but he, traversing through the midst of them, marched on!" Is it not clear that this is not history? Does not any open eye see that the people having
“led him up to the brow of the mount” would not let him escape? that the “traversing through the midst of them” is not intelligible as the deed of a man but only as the deed of a God? If this account were found in a “Sacred Book of the East,” or in fact anywhere but in the New Testament, would the judgment of the critic falter? Remember too that the same queer word “traverse” is used in Acts x. 38 to describe the activity of the Jesus, and that it is the pet term of Basilides to denote the outward earthward process of the Jesus (or Sonship) through the enveloping aeons, and consider the discussion in Ecce Deus (pp. 85-87). Furthermore, if Luke had felt that he was dealing with a bit of sacred history, it seems hardly possible that he would have allowed himself such unheard-of liberties.

5. Lastly, consider the term carpenter. Perhaps some one may think to detect herein a trace of local color, an unobtrusive detail, manifestly historical! So must he think who speaks of “the naive recitals of Mark.” But let such a one recall that the word is wanting in the Sinaitic Syriac in Matthew xiii. 55—in the same oldest manuscript alas! the leaf is lost that contained Mark v. 26-vi. 5, but the absence of the word from Matthew shows clearly enough that it was an addition, an afterthought. Moreover, the Aramaic nesar means “to saw,” and the cognate participle or noun would mean “carpenter.” Indeed, according to Buhl, Halévy explains Nazareth as a city named from its inhabitants, “of carpenters” (n'sereth). We need not accept this explanation to perceive that there is a close connection in sound between the Semitic terms. The stems differ only almost imperceptibly in the middle sibilant, n-s-r and n-s-r. In the ordinary Syriac the term both in Mark vi. 3 and Matt. xiii. 55 is nagara, as also in the Sinaitic at Matt. xiii. 55 (which also means artist and savant). The stems differ only in the middle consonant and it may very well be that the n-s-r was used in the original and afterwards changed to n-g-r. In any case, there seems to be here nothing but a play on words, on the similarity of sound in nagar or nasar (carpenter) and nasar (as in Nazaree, Nazareth); much as if one should say of a Parisian, Is not he a parasite (Parisite)? Such puns were favorites with the Semites, even in solemn discourse. So, in Amos viii. 1, 2, we read: “Thus the Lord Jahveh showed me and lo! a basket of figs (kayiz). And he said, What seest thou, Amos? And I said, A basket of figs (kayiz). Then said Jahveh unto me, Come is the end (kez) upon my people Israel.” Here the whole point lies in the play upon the words kayiz (figs) and kez (end)—as if it were in English: “What seest thou? And I said, A basket of clothes. Then Jehovah said unto me, Come is
the close to my people Israel."—Now such punning is very easy to understand as an act of reflection, as the ingenuity of some third party, but it is very hard to understand as proceeding from the citizens of Nazareth.

It is unnecessary to carry this analysis further. It must now be plain that not only is there no special reason for regarding the fatherland incident as historic, but there is a noteworthy combination of marks that indicate the contrary—so many and such various indications that our judgment can no longer hesitate. A conservative calculation would show that there is surely not one chance in a hundred, not to say a thousand, that the incident is to be taken in a literal or historic sense. It appears to be only a variation on the familiar theme of the rejection of the Jesus-cult by the Jews, among whom it originated and should have found (one might have supposed) its most devoted adherents. Concerning the incident of the alleged attempted arrest of Jesus by his kinsmen, sufficient has been said in Ecce Deus (pp. 190-192).

Herewith then the case seems closed against the kinsmen of Jesus, understood as blood-relations. Undoubtedly very many able and learned men will long continue to reject these conclusions, but the rejection will rest on sentimental rather than on logical bases. Similarly even such a scholar as Burkitt now comes valiantly forward to rescue the authenticity of the Josephine testimony (Ant. 18, 3, 3)! The real significance of such daring adventures lies not at all in themselves, but in their clear testimony to the necessity felt by the critics, of maintaining the traditional lines of defense even at these admittedly indefensible points, lest surrender here should ultimately entail surrender everywhere else. It was this feeling that so enraged the lamb-like Weinel at any even the most unavoidable concessions to Der vorchristliche Jesus and betrayed him into the excesses that saner German theologians now publicly regret.

* * *

A theory is tested by its ability to set in order and render intelligible large bodies of facts otherwise hard or impossible to understand and to systematize. In proportion as they are numerous, and especially in proportion as they are various and widely separated, the theory is valuable and the probability of its correctness is high. When there remain no facts within its range that it does not thus ordinate and make comprehensible, the theory may be called at least virtually true; we have no means to distinguish it from a theory really true.
It is by this test that the symbolic theory of Gospel interpretation must be proved, that it has actually been tried in Ecce Deus. The literary-historical facts of the New Testament and of early Christianity are immensely numerous. It is seen at once that this theory explains with perfect and surprising clearness large classes of these facts, and every additional explanation is an additional corroboration of the theory. This is not the place for any extended exhibit of such details, but it may be well to give one further illustration of the explanatory power of the new view, an illustration that might have been used in the Ecce Deus had its great significance been more distinctly recognized.  

In Revelation (xiv. 6, 7) an angel flying in midheaven proclaims with mighty voice unto all the inhabitants of earth, and to every nation and tribe and tongue and people, an Eternal Gospel: "Fear God and give Him glory, . . . and worship Him that made heaven and earth." A child must see that this is monotheism pure and simple, nothing more and nothing less. "The hour of judgment" (crisis) that is come is merely the hour of the final overthrow of all forms of idolatry and of the establishment of the universal worship of the One true God. "And another, a second angel followed, saying to them with mighty voice, Fallen, fallen is Babylon the Great, who hath drenched all the nations with the wrath-wine of her fornication" (xiv. 8). This last word must refer either literally to sexual immorality or figuratively to idolatry. The first is nonsense. No matter what "Babylon" may be, it is absurd to suppose that sexual irregularity was the sin of the old world and that the seer in a vision intensely religious denounces Babylon's destruction for this one vice. It must be then that the word means idolatry, false worship of false gods, as so frequently, even prevailingly in the Old Testament (as is proved in Ecce Deus), and as alone comports with

1 It is encouraging to note that the necessity both of a thoroughgoing symbolic interpretation of the Gospels, synoptic as well as Johannine, and of understanding Protochristianity as an aggressive monotheism is now conceded explicitly and in terms by the most representative and authoritative theological journals in Germany. Witness such pronouncements as the following: "Above all, however, it is the demonstration of the originally esoteric character of Christianity and of the consequent demand for a much more comprehensive symbolic explanation of the Gospels, in which the permanent importance of Smith's great work lies."—Theologischer Jahresbericht, 1912, pp. 339-341.

"This symbolic interpretation of the Gospels serves Smith to demonstrate his view of the essence of Protochristianity: that it was a protest against idolatry, a crusade for monotheism. This is in the first place demonstrated from 'the general movement of thought in the apologists'—beyond doubt correctly."—Theologische Literaturzeitung, August 31, 1912, cols. 553-555.

But when these two focal contentions of Ecce Deus are conceded, what is there left that is worth fighting for?
the first angel's proclamation of the Eternal Gospel of monotheism. 
Hereby, then, "Babylon" is determined in meaning. It is not Rome 
or Romanism. Neither could be said to have drenched all the na-
tions with the wrath-wine of idol-worship. Babylon must mean 
polytheism, the whole system of pagan religion, against which and 
which alone the insurrection of Protochristianity was sharply pointed. 
The "crisis" proclaimed by the first angel, the Eternal Gospel of 
monotheism, must involve the utter ruin of this Babylon of poly-
theism, hence the second angel is a logical necessity. 

In the seventeenth chapter we read much about this same Baby-
lon, figured as a woman richly arrayed and on her forehead her 
name written, declaring her to be the mother of harlots and of the 
abominations of the earth, while she herself sits upon many waters, 
the many peoples of the earth. All of this fits perfectly with the 
interpretation just given, and with no other interpretation of this 
"mystery." It is true that in xvii. 18 "the woman" is said to be 
"the great city that hath kingship over the kings of the earth." But 
this verse sits very loose in its context, fastened neither before nor 
after, and has all the appearance of an insertion. In any case, "the 
great city" need not mean Rome but may very naturally denote the 
whole religious polity dominating the pagan world. 

Of course, this interpretation will not please such as think that 
by "city" the seer must mean a mass of brick and mortar, an assem-
blage of lamp-posts and cobble-stones, and forget that Augustine 
wrote of the City of God, and Coulanges of the ancient religion 
under the title of "The Ancient City," and that the seer himself 
speaks of the new order of things as the new Jerusalem; they fancy 
that the seven mountains on which the woman sitteth are the seven 
hills of Rome! though the seer himself says "they are seven kings," 
that is, the whole government polity of the earth. Our exegesis 
will satisfy none such, neither Catholic nor Protestant, neither liberal 
or conservative, not even Gunkel and Zimmern and Jensen, who 
see in all this powerful yet grotesque imagery a recrudescence of the 
elemental strife of primal Time, as it raged in the imagination of 
Mesopotamia. And it may very well be that the drapery of thought 
was in large measure an heirloom from those distant days and 
regions. What of it? The modern poet frames his ideas in the 
far-descended speech of Homer and Isaiah, but they are none the 
less born of to-day and related to present conditions. It makes no 
difference how far the Apocalyptist may have reached his hand into 
the dark backward and abysm of time to pluck thence his phrases 
and figures; his thought was the thought of his age, and his vision
was filled with the religious and spiritual conditions and tendencies of the early Roman Empire. Very likely he conceived of Rome as the highest expression of polytheism; very likely he conceived of the Jews as pre-eminently the people of God, and the representatives of monotheism; but none of this wars against the obvious fact that his tremendous fancies body forth the overthrow of idolatry and the worldwide establishment of the true worship of the true God.

Neither need we be surprised at occasional or even frequent contradictions: for the visions of such seers, or even of one such seer, would scarcely be self-consistent, and the book itself has undergone both compilation and revision. Indeed, the whole exposition in xvii. 7-18 reads like a rather feeble interpolation.

Minute interpretation of the details of these visions may very well be and remain impossible or at least uncertain. Perhaps the authors themselves attached no definite meaning to many of their images, but used them merely rhetorically, to amplify and vivify descriptions. But of the general idea, and of the significance of the great central figure of Babylon, the woman that sitteth upon seven mounts and many waters, the mother of idolatries and abominations of the earth, there can no longer remain any reasonable doubt: She is the polytheism of the Roman Empire, against which the primitive Christian crusade was so directly aimed.

COMMENTS BY MR. KAMPMEIER.

Dr. Smith has taken so much space with his rhetorical slashes against my "midsummer night's dreams," as he terms my article, with side-thrusts against Burkitt, whose belief in the Josephus passage on Christ I do not share, and against "sentimental bases" (example given "the lamblike Weinel"), while I am devoid of all sentimentalism and a dry logician in the debated question, that I cannot claim much space for comments of my own, especially since he has a long addendum on matter in no connection with the discussed point. I would wish my opponent would restrain himself a little more and follow my example and not jump over to so many other things which have nothing to do with discussed points. But since he has dragged in so much other matter, I will also try to answer that as shortly as I can.

1. I am glad that Dr. Smith admits "that reference is certainly made to Jesus," when speaking of "his brothers" in the Gospel passages I cited. So I was right when saying the Gospels speak of the brothers of Jesus. Of course my opponent means the brothers
of his assumed God "Jesus" and I the brothers of the man Jesus. But in the point of grammatical and logical construction we agree.

2. In regard to the word "without" (ἐκτω) in the passage Mark iii. 33 etc. and parallels, the facts are these. Jesus goes with his disciples (verse 19) into a house. "And again a great crowd came together so that they could not even eat." Then comes the verse telling of the family of Jesus going out to get him (verse 21). Verse 31, after the discussion between the scribes and Jesus, takes up the thread again left in verse 21 and says: "Then came his brothers and mother and standing outside they sent to him [of course a messenger, mentioned in Matt. xii. 48] to call him." The phrase "standing outside" or "without" surely here means "outside the house." Dr. Smith will also admit this. Of course I mean a house in the common sense of the word; what kind of a house my opponent means, I do not know, perhaps some symbol or allegory.

Now comes a medley hard to understand. According to Dr. Smith the mother and brothers of Jesus outside of the house are the Jewish church and people. Jesus inside of the house is the Saviour-Protector God, assumed by my opponent, the God of monotheism, to be preached to the pagan world but already believed in by the Jewish church. At least so have we been taught since our childhood, that the Jews believed in one only God. Nevertheless according to Dr. Smith's view those outside the house are at the same time the mother and brothers of his assumed God and again not, while those inside are the brothers of that God. Perhaps I do not understand all this, because I have become so to say immune against the disease of allegorizing and symbolism, having tasted so much of that of the Jewish and Christian Church Fathers and Philo on the Old Testament, that this new inoculation-method of allegorizing the whole New Testament does not "take" with me. I prefer the historical-critical method of interpreting both the Old and New Testament and do not desire to go back to the allegorizing method practised by the Church Fathers.

3. Although the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke are mythical according to the style of antiquity which told the same story of the conception of Plato as of Jesus, and of Ariston's wife as of Joseph's while Plutarch (Numa, 4) like Luke believed that the spirit of a God can impregnate a woman, the writer of the first chapter of Matthew was not therefore compelled to write of Jesus that he was Mary's firstborn son if this had not been the case. He had good reasons for doing so. By the way, the end of the genealogy in Matthew in the Syrian translation of that Gospel discovered some
years ago by Mrs. Lewis reads: “Joseph, to whom Mary the virgin was betrothed, begat Jesus, called the Messias.”

4. That the Gospel of the Hebrews makes the Holy Spirit (femine in Hebrew) the mother of Jesus I have mentioned in my article “Nazareth, Nazorean and Jesus,” Open Court, May, 1910. But this means according to Semitic expression nothing more than that Jesus was a son of God spiritually only, not physically. Compare the Semitic-agnostic expression, “A son of the spirit.” This is also Paul’s view.

5. If the names of the brothers of Jesus in the Gospels are “merely the commonest Jewish names” (which no one disputes) was not the name “Jesus” just as common among the Jews, as “Tom, Dick and Harry,” to use Dr. Smith’s language? Josephus alone gives a whole row of Jesuses in his works. It is peculiar that the originators of the assumed Jesus-God made use of such a common name in order to spread a pure spiritual monotheism. It seems to me they could have made a better choice, if we meet such exalted ideas of God as in Aratus and Epimenides among the pagans, that Acts xvii does not refrain from citing them.

6. There is nothing suspicious whatever about the word patris, translated in the English version “fatherland.” The word patris is also used in an adjectival way by Greek classical writers in such compositions as patris ge, patris polis as alone like patra. Nor would it be wrong, when speaking of any one’s native town, for instance Chicago, to say: “Chicago is his home.” The same applies to the German Heimat. It does not necessarily imply the whole native country. It can as well refer only to one’s native town.

7. It is new to me that the townsmen of Jesus rejected him simply because he was a carpenter and because they knew his family. —As to reformers not finding any hearing with their nearest relatives, I will only mention Mohammed, whom his uncle Abu Lahab called a fool, while his adoptive father, Abu Talib, though he never ceased to protect him for the honor of his family, never professed any belief in Mohammed’s words. Also other relatives scorned him. And why did he leave Mecca?

8. No one has yet disputed that Christianity opened a crusade against polytheism and idolatry in connection with its gospel of salvation. But if its only object was to spread monotheism and to destroy idolatry, why then did it not pursue a more straightforward path, without veiling this its only purpose in language so symbolical and allegorical, that no one could understand it? The Synoptics in their zeal to show that the non-acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah
by the Jewish people as a whole was due to a divine predestination, have very clumsily imputed to Jesus that he spoke many of his parables in such a way that they could not understand them, in order to be hardened. But if all that the whole New Testament teaches is nothing but symbolism, allegory, parable, veiling the purpose of spreading monotheism, this is a greater riddle still. I cannot comprehend how polytheism could ever have understood what the New Testament writers were driving at with their jargon.

9. Rev. xvii. 9 reads: "The seven heads (i.e., of the scarlet beast carrying the woman) are seven mountains, on which the woman sits." I fear no twistings of Dr. Smith will ever convince any unprejudiced critical student of the Apocalypse, that that book does not point to contemporary history, nor that other things in it must be spiritualized. When St. Augustine wrote his "City of God" the time had long passed when Jews and Jewish Christians believed realistically in a new Jerusalem coming bodily down from heaven. For proofs I can direct any one to strong realistic passages in rabbinical and other Jewish literature. Early Christianity was a strange mixture of spiritualism and realism. It would have been unnatural and unhistorical, had it been otherwise.

By declaring further whole passages interpolations in Revelation, Dr. Smith only follows his old convenient method of declaring everything interpolated in Biblical and profane writers which does not suit his theory.