

LECTURES ON NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Ferdinand Christian Baur



edited by
Peter C. Hodgson

translated by
Robert F. Brown

OXFORD

LECTURES ON NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Lectures on New Testament Theology

Ferdinand Christian Baur

EDITED BY
PETER C. HODGSON

TRANSLATED BY
ROBERT F. BROWN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Peter C. Hodgson and Robert F. Brown 2016

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2016

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015949660

ISBN 978-0-19-875417-6

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

A translation of *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*
by Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860)
edited by Ferdinand Friedrich Baur
Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (L. W. Reiland), 1864

Grateful acknowledgment is made to
the University of Tübingen for the reproduction of the
engraving of Baur found on the front jacket. The original is
in the Tübingen Stift.

Contents

Editorial Introduction	1
Text and Translation	1
Baur's Summary of His New Testament Research	4
Baur and Strauss	8
The Synoptic Problem	13
Baur and Judaism	17
Analytic Summary of the <i>Lectures on New Testament Theology</i>	24
LECTURES ON NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	61
Introduction: The Concept, History, and Organization of New Testament Theology	63
The Concept of Biblical Theology	63
The History of Biblical Theology and New Testament Theology	63
Their Domination by Dogmatic Theology after the Reformation	63
The Challenge of Taking History Seriously, and the Influence of Rationalism	68
New Testament Criticism since Strauss	77
The Portrayal of Jesus' Teaching	78
The Portrayal of the Apostles' Teaching	80
The Most Recent Critics and Critical Results	81
The Organization of New Testament Theology	89
Part One: The Teaching of Jesus	94
Introduction	94
The Relation of Jesus' Teaching to the Old Testament and to the Law	95
The Moral and Religious Teaching of Jesus	105
Jesus' Fundamental Moral Vision: The Beatitudes	105
Righteousness	108
The Kingdom of God	111
Jesus' Person and His Messianic Consciousness	115
Son of Man and Son of God	116
Statements about Jesus' Person and His Messianic Consciousness in the Synoptic Gospels, in Particular in Matthew	123
Jesus' Death and Resurrection; The Institution of the Lord's Supper	130
The Second Coming and the Last Judgment	137
The Father, the Son, and the Children of God	142

Part Two: The Teaching of the Apostles	149
First Period: The Theological Frameworks of the Apostle Paul and the Book of Revelation	149
The Transition from the Teaching of Jesus to the Teaching of the Apostles	149
The Resurrection	152
The Apostle Paul	153
Christianity's Relation to Judaism; The Meaning of Jesus' Death	153
Righteousness as the Essence of Religion	156
The Impossibility of Becoming Righteous by Works of the Law	157
The Empirical Proof	159
The Proof from Religious History	160
The Anthropological Proof: Concepts of the Human Being	164
The Law and Sin	170
Righteousness by Faith	173
The Factual or Juridical Aspect: Christ's Death as Substitution	176
The Anthropological Aspect: Christ's Death and the Flesh	179
The Aspect of Religious History: Law and Promise; Law and Freedom	182
Conclusion and Summary; Faith, Love, and Works	189
Faith and Predestination	195
Christology	198
Baptism into the Body of Christ	209
The Lord's Supper	210
The Second Coming and Eschatology	212
The Teaching about God	213
The Book of Revelation	215
The Coming of the Lord, and Christ's Kingdom	216
The Citizens of the New Jerusalem	219
The Person of Christ: His Messianic Predicates, His Death, and His Resurrection	221
The Relation of Human Beings to God and to Christ	228
God, Heavenly Beings, and Satan	231
Second Period: The Theological Frameworks of Hebrews, The Deutero-Pauline Epistles, James and Peter, The Synoptic Gospels and Acts	235
The Epistle to the Hebrews	235
Christianity and Judaism; The Primacy of the Priesthood	235
How Christianity Supersedes the Priesthood and the Law of the Old Testament; Christ as the Son	236

How Christianity is Continuous with Judaism	241
The Antithesis Overcome by the Development of the Idea	245
The Incarnation and Sacrificial Death of Christ as the True High Priest	246
The World to Come and the Present Age	249
Faith	252
Summary	254
The Deutero-Pauline Epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians)	256
Christ Is the Image of God, and Is the Pleroma	256
The Church as the Body of Christ	258
Christ Fills and Reconciles all Things	259
The Christology of Philippians and Gnostic Thought	263
Works and Moral Perfection	267
Theoretical Knowledge; Christianity as Mystery	269
The Absolute Transcendence of Christianity, Which Unites all Things	270
The Epistles of James and Peter	273
James Versus Paul on Faith, Works, and Justification	273
The Foundation of James: The Moral Law and Freedom	278
Introduction to the Epistles of Peter, in Relation to Pauline Concepts	281
Elements in the Epistles of Peter that Mediate between Paulinism and Judaism	285
The Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles	288
Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels	288
The Earthly Life of Jesus the Messiah, as Portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels	289
Jesus' Death, Resurrection, and Ascension	295
Prophecies about the Destruction of Jerusalem and about Jesus' Parousia	299
The Teaching about the Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts	307
The Pauline-Like Theological Framework of the Gospel of Luke	311
The Paulinism of the Book of Acts	314
Third Period: The Theological Frameworks of the Pastoral Epistles and the Johannine Writings	321
The Pastoral Epistles	321
The Pauline Foundation and Departures from it	321
False and True Teaching; The Nature of the Church	323

Paulinism and Gnosticism	325
Gnosticism and the Teaching about God	326
Christology and Gnosticism	328
The Johannine Theological Framework	331
The Logos in the Prologue to the Gospel of John	331
God's Pure Spirituality and God's Activity	333
The Logos as the Medium of Revelation; His Divine Attributes	336
Light and Darkness in Relation to Gnostic Dualism	338
The Incarnation of the Logos	341
Redemption, Faith, and Jesus' Self-Presentation	345
Jesus' Works and Signs	346
Jesus' Teaching: Life, Light, and Love	349
Jesus' Death and Resurrection	354
The Holy Spirit: The Paraclete, or Advocate	358
The Gospel of John in Relation to the Old Testament, to Judaism, to Jewish Christianity, and to Paulinism	361
Faith and Love	367
The Ideality of the Gospel: Eternal Life and Spiritual Consciousness	371
Eschatology: Resurrection, Judgment, Parousia	374
Summary	375
<i>Bibliography</i>	377
<i>Index of Biblical References</i>	383
<i>General Index</i>	394

Editorial Introduction

Peter C. Hodgson

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Ferdinand Christian Baur's *Lectures on New Testament Theology* were delivered at the University of Tübingen during the period 1852–60. Three and a half years after the author's death on 2 December 1860, the result of a fatal stroke, the lectures were published by his son Ferdinand Friedrich Baur. The publication is based on a carefully prepared manuscript intended for use in the summer semester of 1860.¹ However, on 15 July Baur suffered an initial stroke, from which he partially recovered, but which prevented any further lecturing. In this final manuscript, he incorporated important changes in his presentation of Pauline theology, which were also to be part of a revised edition of his 1845 book, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*.² Baur was working on these revisions to the book when his first stroke occurred. He completed the revisions only for the first part (the life and work of the Apostle) and the beginning of the second part (the Pauline epistles), but not for the third part (the theological framework of Paul). The *Lectures on New Testament Theology* incorporate Baur's latest revisions to his treatment of Pauline theology, and they are the only source for this revised presentation.³ This is one reason why his son wanted to publish them as quickly as possible.

The *Lectures on New Testament Theology* place a capstone on nearly thirty years of innovative research on New Testament literature and the history of

¹ Foreword by F. F. Baur to Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1864), iii–iv.

² Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi: Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre* (Stuttgart: Becher und Müller, 1845).

³ A second edition of *Paulus*, incorporating the available changes, was published by Baur's son-in-law Eduard Zeller in 2 vols (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1866–67). See Zeller's Preface, 1:iii–iv. This is the edition translated by Allan Menzies as *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings*, 2 vols (London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1873–75).

early Christianity. The debates, questions, controversies, and struggles that occurred during these thirty years are for the most part not reflected in them. While peaceful on the surface, the *Lectures* represent epochal shifts in the understanding of the documents that were once regarded as infallibly inspired by the Holy Spirit and certified by the church as authoritative, canonical truth. Baur himself notes that his “results had to be of particular importance for the history of the canon. Despite the resistance they encountered, I believe I am right to assert that by means of these results the old, baseless concept of the canon as a self-contained unity has been destroyed forever.”⁴ Baur essentially deconstructed the canon and reassembled it as a series of early Christian writings displaying distinctive tendencies and interests, conflicts and resolutions. The *Lectures*, following an Introduction that surveys the history of New Testament research, are divided into two major parts and three periods. Part One contains the “teaching of Jesus,” reconstructed from the Synoptic Gospels, principally Matthew. Part Two contains the “teaching of the Apostles,” and is divided into three periods: the first period terminates shortly after 70 AD and is concerned with the “theological framework” of the Apostle Paul (based on the four unquestionably authentic Pauline epistles: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans) and that of the Book of Revelation; the second period runs from 70 to about 130 or 140 AD and includes the theological frameworks of Hebrews, the Deutero-Pauline Epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians), James and Peter, the Synoptic Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles; the third period comprises the latter part of the second century AD, when the Pastoral Epistles and the Johannine writings were composed. Most of the writings contained in the traditional New Testament canon are accounted for,⁵ but they have been rearranged in chronological sequence, and their differences from each other are accentuated. This approach reflects Baur’s respect for the enormous historical significance of the canon and the normative status of these writings for the church at least in prior ages. But the distinction between the New Testament and church history/history of dogma is merely one of convenience, for the history of dogma has already begun with the New Testament writings, and other writings from the second century are of equal importance for the reconstruction of Christian beginnings.

Robert F. Brown has translated these *Lectures*, following principles established for our English edition of Baur’s *History of Christian Dogma* (to which this English translation is intended as a companion volume), and earlier for

⁴ See the passage quoted below from *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (n. 10). See also David Lincicum, “Ferdinand Christian Baur and the Theological Task of New Testament Criticism,” in *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, ed. Martin Bauspiess, Christof Landmesser, and David Lincicum (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 96.

⁵ The exceptions are 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, Jude, and the Johannine epistles. These are very brief writings and presumably do not add anything to an understanding of the major frameworks.

our collaborative work on Hegel's *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* and *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*.⁶ He has provided footnoted translations (based on the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible [NRSV]) of many of the biblical passages cited by Baur, and has added other information as well.⁷

⁶ Brown has produced translations on his own of Hegel's *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* and *Lectures on the Philosophy of Art*; and Hodgson has translated Hegel's *Lectures on the Proofs of the Existence of God*. All of these books are published or re-issued by Oxford University Press.

⁷ Brown's detailed notations on his translation of the text follow:

(1) *Footnotes*. Baur's German text has very few footnotes. Those few footnotes that are Baur's own or his son's are identified by beginning them with [Baur]. In several instances material added by the English editor or translator is incorporated into a Baur footnote. In these instances the Baur material begins with [Baur], and the added material begins with [Ed.]. The many other footnotes created for this volume—to provide background information or otherwise explain points, and to provide the wording of biblical passages Baur cites without quoting them, or even to quote relevant passages Baur does not cite but are pertinent to his discussion—begin without an [Ed.] identifier.

(2) *Greek*. Baur presents a great deal of Greek in his text, most of it as direct quotations of NT passages or phrases, but some of it as his own formulation in Greek of a point where the tense, number, or other feature of the Greek does not correspond exactly to the NT forms. This English translation presents some of Baur's Greek, in each case following the Greek with the English equivalent. When Baur's Greek quotes the NT, the following English equivalent is almost always the NRSV English rendition and as such is placed within quotation marks. Quotation marks are not typically used around the English equivalents of Greek phrases formulated by Baur himself. However, much of Baur's Greek quotation from the NT does not involve fine points regarding the meaning of Greek words. Baur just likes to use a lot of Greek. Since this Greek is not really necessary, much of it is not included in this edition and is replaced with the English equivalents from the NRSV. When Baur repeats a Greek word or phrase in his discussion of issues, after the first instance or two the Greek is just replaced with the English equivalent. One notable exception to this practice is the word *σάρξ*, which has multiple resonances as "body" and "flesh" and so is usually just repeated in Greek.

(3) *Biblical Quotations*. These are in the English of the NRSV, with two exceptions: (a) When Baur's German quotation of a biblical passage, when rendered in English, differs significantly from the NRSV, then the NRSV rendition is not used. These few instances usually involve a substantive difference of opinion on Baur's part as to what the best Greek text of the passage should be. The translator typically adds a footnote explanation concerning this. (b) Very minor adjustments to the NRSV version are made (without comment) in order to make the punctuation harmonious with the surrounding text or, as another example, to replace a pronoun with the proper name it intends (e.g., Jesus, God, Jerusalem).

(4) *Baur's Biblical Citations*. These are modified (without comment) in order to: (a) correct a typesetting error; (b) show the full extent of the relevant passage, when Baur just gives the initial verses of it; (c) add citations, where helpful to the reader, when Baur lacks them but obviously has a specific passage in mind; (d) omit (in a few instances) a citation by Baur that has no obvious relevance to the issue he is discussing. Sometimes Baur's discussion of a biblical passage is enhanced by the translator, by adding a few words (usually within brackets, but not consistently so) to indicate the setting or context more fully. Examples would be indications of the setting or occasion on which Jesus makes a particular statement or carries out a particular act.

(5) *Baur's Text*. It consists of his lecture manuscript, as published by his son. It has few subject headings of its own, even in the published edition, although a table of contents (apparently constructed for the German volume, and correlated with running heads on its pages) indicates a much more detailed breakdown of the contents. In the translator's judgment, this is not always the most helpful way to subdivide its contents. Therefore the subject headings and subheadings in this English translation have been created by the translator and the editor, reflecting their

One translation issue worth highlighting is that the peculiarly German expression *Lehrbegriff* (meaning literally “concept of doctrine”) is rendered as “theological framework.” Quite a few of these theological frameworks are found in the New Testament, and Baur is at pains to distinguish them. Notably he is interested precisely in the theological frameworks of the writings, not simply in their literary structures or their cultural-historical contexts. This is a book of *ideas*—ideas about God, Jesus Christ, human beings, sin and redemption, history and the world. Baur works as a theologian with his own presuppositions about the meaning and purpose of history.⁸ What he offers is a *wissenschaftliche Theologie*, a scientific theology based on a historical analysis of texts, traditions, events, and beliefs. The conditions of possibility for a scientific theology have been questioned ever since his death,⁹ but in Baur’s writings such a theology materializes and offers a splendid legacy. Theology without science becomes dogmatics based on authoritative sources; science without theology becomes value-free religious studies.

BAUR’S SUMMARY OF HIS NEW TESTAMENT RESEARCH

Baur himself provides a remarkable summary of his own contribution to New Testament studies in his lectures on church and theology in the nineteenth century.¹⁰ It is quoted here in full because it serves as a basis for understanding the steps leading up to the *Lectures on New Testament Theology*.

Strauss’s *Leben Jesu* . . . posed for itself the task of investigating critically and grasping historically the early history of Christianity from the life of Jesus. But the results were so overwhelmingly negative that the entire early history of Christianity seems to dissolve into a series of myths and traditions. The response from the critics was as unable to contradict Strauss’s views as it was to further

judgment as to the most helpful way to present the organization of the contents. This translation breaks down many of Baur’s long paragraphs into multiple, shorter paragraphs. Likewise, it breaks down long, complex sentences into multiple, shorter sentences, while attempting to still show the relations among the various elements and subordinate clauses in Baur’s complex sentences. The effort has been to communicate Baur’s points as accurately as possible in direct English.

⁸ On Baur as a historian of theology and theologian of history, see the Editorial Introduction to Ferdinand Christian Baur, *History of Christian Dogma*, ed. Peter C. Hodgson, trans. R. F. Brown and P. C. Hodgson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 1–15.

⁹ See Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

¹⁰ Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, ed. Eduard Zeller (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1862). The following citation is from pp. 416–21 of the 2nd edn (Leipzig: Fues’s Verlag/R. Reisland, 1877).

secure the old views. So both sides faced a dilemma. If one chose to disregard the fact that through Strauss's criticism an irreparable rift had opened up in the previous representation of the gospel history, still the negativity of its results, and the unclear and indeterminate picture that it gave of the early history of Christianity, were so unsatisfying that one could not come to a halt at that point. As a consequence, one could see that the task that had become central to the time, that of grasping early Christianity historically, had not yet been solved. In the nature of the case things had to move on. And since the consequences that critics such as Bruno Bauer drew from Strauss's results only led to a self-annulling extreme,¹¹ one could only hope to approximate a solution to the problem along another path. So the question had to be raised whether the negativity of Strauss's results did not reside in a deficiency of the investigation, of its critical method; and whether one could not from a different point of view penetrate more securely into the inner aspects of the early history of Christianity and bring light to bear on its obscurity.

This is where I may mention my own efforts at research into early Christianity. I started my investigations long before Strauss, and thus began from an entirely different point. My engagement with the two Corinthian epistles first provided the occasion to bring more sharply into focus the relationship of the Apostle Paul to the older apostles. I became convinced that in the letters of the Apostle himself sufficient evidence is available to see that this relationship was something entirely different from what previously had been assumed—that, where people supposed a thorough harmony of all the apostles is to be found, rather an opposition exists, an opposition that, from the Jewish-Christian side, went so far as to call into question the authority of the Apostle Paul. A closer investigation of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, a writing whose importance for the history of the earliest period I had especially noted along with Neander, allowed me to see more deeply into the significance of this opposition in the post-apostolic period. It became increasingly clear to me that the opposition of the two parties, which in the apostolic and post-apostolic periods are to be distinguished much more sharply than hitherto has been the case, the Pauline party and the Petrine or Judaizing party, had a decisive influence not simply on the configuration of the sayings of Peter but also on the composition of the Book of Acts.

I published the first results of my investigation in the fourth issue of the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* of 1831, in the essay, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." My investigations into Gnosticism led me to the Pastoral Epistles, and the results of the latter study published in 1835 led to the conclusion that these letters could not have been composed by the Apostle Paul. Rather their appearance is to be

¹¹ The "young Hegelian" Bruno Bauer, in his *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes* (Bremen, 1840) and *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker* (Leipzig, 1841), concluded that the story of Jesus was a complete fiction invented by the author of Mark, who was, according to the theory of Christian Gottlob Wilke, the earliest Evangelist. He also argued that all the Pauline epistles were forgeries. Baur describes Bauer's and Wilke's views a few pages earlier, on pp. 408–10.

explained from the same partisan tendencies that were the moving principle of the church as it took shape in the second century. Continuing engagement with the Pauline epistles, and deeper penetration into the spirit of the Apostle and of Pauline Christianity, solidified in me the view that a very essential distinction exists between the four major letters of the Apostle and the lesser ones, and the authenticity of most if not all of the latter must become very doubtful. What I subsequently gathered together and further expounded in my book on the Apostle Paul is the result of investigations that placed me in this position totally independently of Strauss's critique. If a period becomes more clearly known the more deeply one sees into its circumstances and its endeavors, into the antitheses operative in it, I believe I have attained a historical comprehension of a period of the most ancient history of Christianity, which hitherto has remained in principle immune from historical examination because, on the basis of a dogmatic assumption, people held that what happened [in the events recorded in the New Testament] was not at all possible in the ordinary course of events. I have shown how deeply antithesis itself penetrated into the heart of apostolic Christianity, and how the differences of a later period have their beginnings already in this first sphere. On this basis one can for the first time form a clearer and more concrete picture of the formation of the ancient church, its oppositions and conflicts and the way they were harmonized into the unity of the Catholic Church. Ebionitism and Paulinism were the factors of the historical movement of that time. These results had to be of particular importance for the history of the canon. Despite the resistance they encountered, I believe I am right to assert that by means of these results the old, baseless concept of the canon as a self-contained unity has been destroyed forever.

My first series of critical works referred to the Pauline epistles and the Book of Acts accompanying them. When Strauss's *Leben Jesu* appeared and evoked its notorious emotional response, I remained a passive observer. The matter represented nothing new for me since I had witnessed the emergence of the work close at hand and had frequently discussed it with the author. However, I could come forward neither for nor against it because at the time I still lacked the fuller studies requisite for doing so. Only after I had made the Gospel of John the subject of lectures did I find myself in a position to adopt a new and independent position in regard to the Synoptic Gospels. The fundamental difference of John from the Synoptics became so compelling for me that I at once formed the view of the character and origin of this Gospel that I set forth in the *Theologische Jahrbücher* of 1844. In this way I attained a new ground for criticism of the gospel history. If the Gospel of John is not a historical gospel like the others, if it itself does not intend to be genuinely historical, and if it undeniably has an idealizing tendency (*ideelle Tendenz*), then it can no longer be taken together with the Synoptics and be juxtaposed to them. Thus it is no longer possible, using the Straussian tactic and *modus operandi*, for the Synoptics to win out over John, or vice versa. Thus the result is that no one any longer knows to which of them one should adhere in the gospel story. To the extent that the historical value of John sinks, that of the Synoptics correspondingly rises. We can no longer have any basis for doubting the credibility of the Synoptics for the sake of John. The disagreement between the two sides is entirely due to John. This is surely not to

say that we have in the Synoptics a purely historical portrayal, but with them we nevertheless have a wholly different historical basis; and the question can only be whether, since now one of the canonical Gospels has been shown to be written with a tendency of a specific type, one or another of the Synoptic Gospels should not also be placed in the same category.

This occasioned my further investigation into the Gospel of Luke in the *Theologische Jahrbücher* of 1846, following which I pulled the whole together and completed it in my second major work on New Testament criticism, the *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien* (1847). The more narrowly in this fashion the circle is drawn within which the original gospel tradition is to be sought, the more the task of criticism is simplified and illumined. The whole question is concentrated on the Gospel of Matthew. Also, because of this, the mythical approach Strauss applies with such a broad brush faces very essential constraints. If it is established that most of our canonical Gospels are to be seen as tendency writings, this raises the question as to whether, where previously it was believed necessary to take the gospel traditions as a myth, this tradition has not been modified in the interest of the author's literary tendency, or even that it is an outright fiction. Since the tendency recognizable as the specific character of several of the Gospels can have its basis only in the distinctive circumstances of the time in which their authors have written, in the partisan stances they embody, then our stance as to gospel criticism can only be taken within the entire sphere in which such phenomena are evident to us, in the way they have to be presupposed in this case. We should not draw our historical horizons too narrowly. From this it is self-evident how important it is, not merely in the apostolic age but also in the post-apostolic age, to survey everything that can serve for more precise information about the different orientations that can be distinguished in this period. My investigations into the Gospels quite naturally are therefore linked with my earlier research into the Pauline epistles. They have their foundation and firm support in that Pauline research. On the other hand these investigations also contribute essentially to allowing the post-apostolic age to appear more clearly and vividly in its concrete shape. Our canonical Gospels are products of the post-apostolic age, with the antitheses and interests that are its moving forces.

In doing this I have also permitted myself to give a brief sketch of my own activity in this area. Talented students, of whom I have been fortunate to have many, have further elaborated my views and principles, and have collaborated in their dissemination and reception. This has provided an occasion to regard me as the founder of a school. The "New Tübingen School" has become the customary label for the most recent critical direction. I make no claims of this kind, and I am content to have contributed what I can, to the best of my ability, to the research into the most important issues that occupy the present age. My critical standpoint is the only one from which Strauss's criticism can be both revised and carried further. My criticism is more methodical than Strauss's because it goes back to the question that Strauss, above all, is said to have posed so clearly. One cannot make the life of Jesus the object of criticism as long as one is not in a position to form a definitive, critical view of the writings that are the source of our knowledge of this life, and of their relations to each other. My criticism is for this reason also more

conservative than Strauss's inasmuch as it knows how, from a specific point of view, to distinguish the historical elements from the non-historical. Whatever may be the future results of investigations undertaken with such great interest, in any event I believe I may with certainty hold that no view will succeed in obtaining more general recognition vis-à-vis mine before mine can be contradicted in its entire extent and on wholly other grounds and proofs than those that have been advanced against it thus far.

BAUR AND STRAUSS

This passage is from a section called "Baur and the Tübingen School." But it is remarkable how much the entire discussion is framed by Baur's relationship to Strauss even though Strauss's *Leben Jesu* had already been treated on its own terms in a previous section of these lectures. The relationship between Baur and Strauss is the subject of a recently published, detailed, and path-breaking essay by Ulrich Köpf.¹² Anyone who wishes to understand Baur's contributions to New Testament research should read this essay and become familiar with the issues involved. Here I will provide only a brief survey of the main circumstances. Baur's critical New Testament studies began with his lengthy article of 1831 on the "Christ party" in the Corinthian church.¹³ Here he engaged several of his predecessors (Gottlob Christian Storr, Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, Johann Ernst Christian Schmidt, and August Neander) on the question as to who the opponents of Paul in Corinth were (cf. 1 Corinthians 1:12), and in particular whether the Christ party represented Jewish Christianity. The question was not an original one for Baur, but he advanced the discussion of it in ways that became foundational for subsequent research. Much of this article was incorporated into his book on Paul in 1845, and the results were summarized in the first volume of his church history.¹⁴ Baur came to regard the conflict between opposing

¹² Ulrich Köpf, "Ferdinand Christian Baur und David Friedrich Strauss," in *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 3–51. This valuable collection contains ten essays written in German and five in English. Brown and I are in process of translating the German essays so that an English edition can be published.

¹³ "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 5:4 (1831), 61–206.

¹⁴ *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1st edn (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1853), 2nd edn (1860), 3rd edn, identical with 2nd, published under the title *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (1863). *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*, trans. from the 3rd edn, ed. Allan Menzies, 2 vols (London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1878–79). See esp. Part Two of this work.

tendencies as the driving force of early Christianity, and indeed of the whole of history.

An engagement with his Catholic colleague Johann Adam Möhler on the nature of Protestantism and Catholicism¹⁵ awakened Baur's interest in studying the effects of Gnosticism on early Christian history and on Protestant philosophies of religion in particular.¹⁶ *Die christliche Gnosis* is the work in which Baur first assimilated the influence of Hegel's philosophy of religion into his own thinking.¹⁷ For present purposes, however, it led also to Baur's study of the Pastoral Epistles (1 and 2 Timothy and Titus)¹⁸ and his conclusion that these could not be authentic epistles of the Apostle Paul because they are motivated by their struggle against and assimilation of Gnostic ideas in the second century. Although Schleiermacher had already questioned the authenticity of First Timothy,¹⁹ he did so on philological rather than historical-critical grounds. Following his *Pastoralbriefe*, Baur wrote several monographs on the history of dogma and did not return to New Testament studies until the mid-1840s.

Strauss's *Life of Jesus*²⁰ was published in the same year as Baur's *Pastoralbriefe*. Strauss had been a student of Baur first at the lower theological seminary in Blaubeuren, and subsequently in Tübingen, where he was a lecturer when his book was published. Although his work contained little essentially new (in Baur's view), but rather gathered together already existing rationalist critiques and supernaturalist defenses of the stories about Jesus found in the canonical Gospels, his book had an immense and immediate impact, because he showed with devastating clarity and great literary skill how the rationalist and supernaturalist interpretations cancelled each other out, leaving the door open for a "mythical" (i.e., non-historical) interpretation of

¹⁵ *Der Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus nach den Principien und Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe* (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1834, 2nd edn 1836). On this controversy, see Notger Slenczka's chapter in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 53–74.

¹⁶ *Die christliche Gnosis, oder die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1835).

¹⁷ See the chapters by Martin Wendte and Volker Henning Drecol in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 75–88 and 129–60.

¹⁸ *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht* (Stuttgart and Tübingen: J. C. Cotta'schen Verlagshandlung, 1835).

¹⁹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an den Timotheos: ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J. C. Gass* (Berlin, 1807).

²⁰ David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1835–36). Osiander was also the publisher of Baur's *Die christliche Gnosis*. Strauss issued subsequent editions, including a third (1838–39), in which he made substantive changes in response to critics, but he returned mostly to the original in the fourth edition (1840), which was translated by George Eliot in 1846 as *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. A second, one-volume edition of her work was published in 1892, which was reprinted with an introduction by P. C. Hodgson in 1972 (Fortress and SCM Presses).

most of the contents of the Gospels. The historical core is reduced to a picture of Jesus as an “enthusiast” (*Schwärmer*) who believed he would return shortly on the clouds of heaven as the glorified Son of Man.²¹ In a “Concluding Dissertation,” Strauss replaced the historical figure with the idea of humanity as the proper subject of the qualities predicated of the God-man by the church, a position, he argues, that is true Hegelianism.²²

Baur seems to have been caught off-guard by the reaction to the *Leben Jesu*, even though he says he was familiar with the work and had discussed its contents with the author. Although he knew generally what he thought was wrong about Strauss’s method, he remained a “passive observer” of the controversy because at the time he lacked “the fuller studies requisite” for coming forward. But Baur could not stay clear of the debate because it was not long before his *Pastoralbriefe* was being compared with the *Leben Jesu* as another example of the negative and anti-Christian effects of radical criticism. Baur spoke out publicly for the first time in 1836 in an essay called “Required Explanation Regarding an Article in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*.”²³ He responds to the attempt to link him to Strauss by arguing that his own investigations, focusing on Pauline and Deutero-Pauline epistles, were completely independent of Strauss and written prior to the appearance of the *Leben Jesu*. He did compose the preface to his book under the impact of reports about an attack on Strauss as a “Judas Iscariot” by C. A. von Eschenmayer in a book already published in 1835, and in anticipation of a polemic directed against both of them in earlier issues of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, which, he says, is written in a “crude and appalling tone” and could not have come “from the mouth of an evangelical Christian and theologian.”²⁴ He continues by pointing out that he has not yet expressed any opinion about the authenticity of the Gospel of John, and that in any event his own method differs from that of his student because he himself always “proceeds from specific, historically highlighted facts.” The fear expressed about his alleged “critical skepticism” leading to the denial of “the authenticity of all the Pauline epistles” simply exhibits a “woeful lack of faith.”²⁵ There follows an extended discourse on the compatibility of faith and science and why each requires the other for Protestant Christians. The Protestant must give an account of the reasons for his faith, but such an account cannot be given by faith itself but only by knowledge (*Wissen*) and science (*Wissenschaft*), a science that does not just stop short at scripture but probes it historically-critically. “A criticism that is not allowed to be skeptical is no criticism. Often only doubt can lead to

²¹ See *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined* (n. 20), §§ 61–9, esp. 66 (p. 296).

²² *Ibid.*, §§ 150–1 (pp. 777–81).

²³ “Abgenöthigte Erklärung gegen einen Artikel der evangelischen Kirchenzeitung, herausgegeben von Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg, Prof. der Theol. an der Universität zu Berlin,” *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 9:3 (1836): 179–232.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 189 n.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 200–8.

truth.”²⁶ Finally, Baur reacts with particular fervor to the claim that he stands “under Strauss’s influence.” He regards such a claim as “unproven, malicious, damaging to my theological independence, and injurious to my honor.”²⁷ This article brought about a “visible disturbance”²⁸ in the relationship between Strauss and Baur. Strauss explains why he was disturbed in a letter to Baur on 19 August 1836. He complains rather bitterly about Baur’s attempt to distance himself from him and to distinguish his own “positive” method from Strauss’s “negative” approach. Even though Baur defended Strauss’s right of free criticism, Strauss thinks he deserved more support from his teacher, especially when he was abruptly dismissed from Tübingen and left without an academic future in theology. These issues between them remained unresolved.

After Baur completed his dogmatic–historical monographs on the doctrines of reconciliation, Trinity, and incarnation in 1843,²⁹ he returned to New Testament studies. Already since 1838–39 he had been lecturing on the Gospel of John, and had become convinced very quickly that historical truth was to be sought not on the side of John but only in the Synoptic Gospels. In fact, when Strauss shifted his own position to one favoring the historical reliability of John in the third edition of the *Leben Jesu*, Baur wrote to say, “it almost appears to me that you have conceded too much in the new edition.”³⁰ Baur’s investigation of the Gospel of John appeared in 1844 as an essay³¹ and three years later as the most extensive part of his book on the Canonical Gospels.³² Prior to this work he published a textbook on the history of dogma,³³ an advanced copy of which he sent to Strauss in November 1846. Baur’s remarks about Strauss in the essay on John and the textbook on the history of dogma triggered an emotional reaction on Strauss’s part and his letter to Baur of 17 November 1846 in which he renounced their relationship.³⁴ First, as to the Fourth Gospel, Strauss expressed disappointment, in a letter to Christian Märklin, “that the teacher never referred to what the criticism of the Gospels, including the Fourth, owed to Strauss, but only cited him in order to challenge

²⁶ Ibid., 208–20.

²⁷ Ibid., 220.

²⁸ Köpf, “Baur und Strauss” (n. 12), 24. See 24–5 on Strauss’s response to Baur on 19 August 1836.

²⁹ *Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung von der ältesten Zeit bis auf die neueste* (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1838); *Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 3 vols (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1841–43).

³⁰ Köpf, “Baur und Strauss” (n. 12), 29 n. 181. Strauss retracted the change in the fourth edition.

³¹ “Über die Composition und den Charakter des johanneïschen Evangeliums,” *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 3 (1844): 1–191, 397–475, 615–700.

³² *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung* (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1847).

³³ *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Stuttgart: Becher’s Verlag, 1847; 2nd edn [Tübingen, L. F. Fues], 1858). For the English translation, see n. 8.

³⁴ For the details, see Köpf, “Baur und Strauss” (n. 12), 29–34.

him and treat him in an uncharitable way.” He summarized his feelings by writing: “No teacher is pleased when his student makes a name for himself too quickly and, as it were, before he does so himself.”³⁵

In the Introduction to the *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, Baur addresses Strauss’s new book, “The Christian Faith Examined in Its Historical Development and in Conflict with Modern Science,”³⁶ intended as a companion volume to “The Life of Jesus Critically Examined” and as a swansong to his theological vocation. Baur connects it with rationalism, which “inherently has, in the nature of the case, no historical sensibility.”

The most brilliant example of this is Strauss’s dogmatics. Although it rests, in a quite different sense than do the usual textbooks, on the elaboration of the view that the history of dogma is also its critique, one nevertheless can also see quite clearly that, simply considered from a dogmatic point of view, the history always comes off badly. The [dogmatic] history as such is not the major concern, but instead the critique; and, since the critique itself is connected not with the positive aspect but with the negative, dogma only serves to build up its structure so that this structure is seen to collapse. To show that there is nothing in it that can be sustained, dogma appears in the final analysis to exist only to be criticized and critically negated.³⁷

These remarks represented a last straw for Strauss. In his letter to Baur he portrays himself as the “fig tree” of the gospel from which “no more fruit . . . should be eaten. . . . Fortunately little was wasted on these fruits since they were for you not sweet historical-critical figs but sour rationalistic grapes.” After remarking that his *Glaubenslehre* was “never intended to provide a history of dogma but only a historically-based dogmatics,” he goes on the attack: “In light of the negative results for which I am reproached, I can calmly ask, in what respects are your results supposed to be more positive?” He points out that Baur’s distinction between “positive” and “negative” makes no real difference in the eyes of the opponents, for whom all forms of scientific theology are a threat to faith. He reminds his teacher that his “negative” criticism has created the presuppositions on the basis of which the questions of concern today “are able to be treated so peacefully from a purely historical standpoint.”³⁸ To the last two points Baur had no real response, and, sadly, history has proven Strauss correct in terms of his own effect on the future of theology and the rejection of Baur’s historical-critical findings by church theologians.

³⁵ Ibid., 30. The first quotation is from Köpf, the second from Strauss.

³⁶ David Friedrich Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und in Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, 2 vols (Tübingen and Stuttgart: C. F. Osiander and F. H. Köhler, 1840–41).

³⁷ Baur, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 42; *History of Christian Dogma* (n. 8), 79.

³⁸ See Köpf, “Baur und Strauss” (n. 12), 33–4.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

In the *Lectures on New Testament Theology*, Baur says very little about the distinctive theological frameworks of the Synoptic Gospels other than Matthew, which he uses as the basis for reconstructing the teaching of Jesus in Part One. When he treats them as literary-theological products of the second century in Part Two, he does so precisely synoptically, that is, by focusing on the common features in their presentation of the story of Jesus: his birth, baptism, temptation, miracles, transfiguration, death, resurrection, ascension, and second coming. His answer to the question of what is distinctive about each of the Gospels, how they are related to each other, and what is their order of composition, is found in his *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien* (1847)³⁹ and related articles (and, in the case of Mark, a separate monograph published in 1851).⁴⁰ The greater part of the *Kritische Untersuchungen* is devoted to the Gospel of John, explaining why it cannot be regarded as a historical source for the life and teaching of Jesus, and how it is motivated by higher theological ideals having to do with the incarnation of the divine Logos.⁴¹ Thus the Straussian tactic of playing John off against the Synoptics, and the Synoptics against John, will not work. Baur's conclusions with respect to the Fourth Gospel are widely accepted today, even if he is regarded as giving it too late a date, but in his own time they were highly controversial, partly because John was the favorite Gospel of many of the great figures of idealism and romanticism, from Lessing and Herder, through Fichte and Schelling, to Schleiermacher and Hegel (although the latter drew his portrayal of Jesus' teaching principally from Matthew).⁴²

In the *Kritische Untersuchungen*, the Gospels are discussed in the inverse order of their composition: John, Mark, Luke, Matthew. When John is removed from the picture, the question becomes one of how the Synoptic Gospels are related to each other and which is to be regarded as conveying the most reliable historical traditions.⁴³ In the late eighteenth century, G. E. Lessing and J. G. Eichhorn advanced the theory of a "Proto-Gospel" that served as a common basis for all three of the Synoptics. Baur regarded this theory as representing an "abstract literary conception," a purely literary invention for which there is no defensible external evidence, a substitute for

³⁹ See n. 32.

⁴⁰ *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter. Nebst einem Anhang über das Evangelium Marcions* (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1851).

⁴¹ *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien* (n. 32) 77–389.

⁴² See Jörg Frey, "Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Johannauslegung," in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 227–58.

⁴³ "To the extent that the historical value of John sinks, that of the Synoptics correspondingly rises." See the quotation from *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, above, n. 10.

the verbal inspiration of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁴ Without the prior assumption of a Proto-Gospel, Markan priority might never have been originally proposed in New Testament scholarship. Since Mark would be closest to the hypothetical contents of a Proto-Gospel, the latter being identified with material common to all three Gospels, the existence of such a Gospel would lead to the assumption of an early date for Mark.⁴⁵ Baur follows rather the hypothesis of J. J. Griesbach, first advanced in 1776, which argues for the literary interdependence of the three Gospels and the dependence of Mark on Luke and Matthew; but he does not believe that the question of the order of the Gospels can be settled by a purely literary consideration of the phenomena of agreement and disagreement among them. On this basis alone, it can be argued that Mark is the earliest or the latest of the Synoptic Gospels.⁴⁶ What is needed, in addition to comparative literary analysis, is a study of the theological tendencies of the Gospels in order to determine the fundamental characteristics of each and the approximate milieu and context in which each was composed.

When Baur's *Kritische Untersuchungen* was published, the discussion about a possible Markan priority had already begun, in two works published in 1838 by Christian Gottlob Wilke and Christian Hermann Weisse; these later became the foundation for the two-source hypothesis (Mark and Q), which is widely accepted today.⁴⁷ We have already observed Baur's wariness about Markan priority, which in his view led to Bruno Bauer's dismissal of the entire Gospel history as a fiction,⁴⁸ possibly because the Jesus depicted in Mark seems from a modern perspective to be an unbelievable, even delusional figure (in Strauss's terms, an "enthusiast"). In any event, Mark provides a very impoverished basis for reconstructing the teaching of Jesus, focusing as Mark does on the gradual disclosure of the messianic secret through stories about miracles, healings, and other supernatural events.

The weakest part of Baur's thesis regarding Mark is the motive he provides to explain why Mark made an abbreviated selection of materials from the much fuller sources found in Matthew and Luke. Mark's motivation, he says, is to withdraw from the principal controversies of his time between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and to find a mean between antitheses. Mark may have had an affinity with later Ebionitism and its exclusion of the birth–infancy stories, but his tendency is his "neutrality."⁴⁹ Evidence that Mark is a purely

⁴⁴ *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 32), 23–7.

⁴⁵ Cf. William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 11–14, 40–1, 43.

⁴⁶ *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 32), 36, 68–71.

⁴⁷ See Martin Bauspiess, "Das Wesen des Urchristentums: Zu Ferdinand Christian Baur's Sicht der synoptischen Evangelien," in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 195–225; on Mark, 213–17.

⁴⁸ See above, n. 11.

⁴⁹ *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 32), 535–67, esp. 561–7; see also Bauspiess (n. 47), 217.

secondary writer can be seen from the fact that whenever he expands his selected sources, he clearly does so from his own imagination, providing the narratives with color and detail and the apparent vividness of an eyewitness account.⁵⁰ However, as modern critics have pointed out, Mark appears to be “neutral” and “impoverished” only when viewed from the perspective of Matthew and Luke. It is only on the assumption of Matthean priority that Mark exhibits this aspect.⁵¹ Viewed on his own terms, Mark has a logic and dramatic thesis of his own. It seems intrinsically more plausible that a shorter writing would have been expanded and supplemented by longer ones, than that the reverse would have occurred. Of course Markan priority also requires the purely literary hypothesis of a sayings source Q, which serves as the basis for material common to Matthew and Luke. There is no external evidence for such a source.

External evidence is found, however, of an earlier source for the Gospel of Matthew, the so-called “Hebrew Gospel” to which Papias, Hegesippus, and other church fathers testified (some using different names for it). According to the tradition, this Gospel was written in Hebrew by the Apostle Matthew for use primarily by the Palestinian Jewish Christians. Baur finds no compelling reason to deny this authorship. This Gospel was at an early date translated into Greek, as Papias also indicates. The translation went through various recensions and modifications, until finally it was given its present form by an unknown author writing in Greek probably in the second or third decade of the second century. It can clearly be shown that canonical Matthew is not identical with the Hebrew Gospel: citations from “Matthew” in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Justin Martyr differ significantly from our Matthew; some of the citations from the Old Testament in canonical Matthew are drawn from the Septuagint, others, with a messianic reference, are translated directly from the Hebrew text; there are theological inconsistencies in our Matthew that indicate a composite origin. However, we are not to assume that the more universal, less legalistic elements in the teaching of Jesus are introduced by the later author if the Hebrew Gospel is indeed “the oldest documentary source for our knowledge of the teaching of Jesus”; these more universal elements are found in the teaching of Jesus itself and are faithfully preserved in the earliest source. Most notably, the Hebrew Gospel is essentially a collection of *λόγια*, of sayings of Jesus, as Papias indicates, while canonical Matthew includes a great deal more narrative material, derived from other sources. “By *λόγια* is to be understood the teaching content, the expressions and speeches of Jesus, which from the beginning have been regarded as the essential and substantial content of the evangelical history.” These *λόγια* are preserved very exactly by our

⁵⁰ *Das Markusevangelium* (n. 40), 138–52. A good example of such expansion is the story of the healing of Jairus’ daughter and the woman with a hemorrhage in Mark 5:21–43.

⁵¹ Bauspiess, “Das Wesen des Urchristentums” (n. 47), 215–16.

Greek Gospel, but they have been arranged into groupings such as the Sermon on the Mount.⁵² On this basis Baur goes on to assert the “historical character” of the Gospel of Matthew,⁵³ and he uses it almost exclusively for his reconstruction of the teaching of Jesus.

As for the Gospel of Luke, Baur’s basic thesis is that an original form of the Gospel, no longer extant, was written in Greek by a Paulinist prior to Marcion’s edition of the Gospel. In some instances Marcion preserved the original more faithfully than canonical Luke. The latter was the product of an editor who worked shortly after Marcion’s Gospel and just before the middle of the second century. On the one hand, he attempted to correct the Marcionite interpretation of the Gospel, and hence there is an anti-Gnostic polemic in canonical Luke. On the other hand, he attempted to mediate between the Paulinism of the original author and the Judaizing spirit of Matthew. He worked in an irenic spirit; he was especially responsible for introducing the birth and infancy narratives (not found in the original), which bring Jesus into line with Old Testament expectations of the Messiah; and he restored some of Jesus’ teaching concerning the validity of the law as found in Matthew. The prologue to the Gospel shows that he was working at a late stage in the development of the Synoptic tradition; and he had access to some sources of that tradition independently of Matthew.⁵⁴

Since I am not a New Testament scholar, I feel free to offer a thought experiment. Let us assume that Mark was composed prior to Matthew and Luke and was the source of narrative materials common to all three Gospels. Let us also assume that Baur is correct about a Hebrew Gospel that served as the source of the sayings materials found in Matthew. Let us assume finally that a Lukan proto-Gospel existed and was the source of materials unique to Luke, and that Luke also drew upon the sayings in Matthew, often revising them in a Paulinizing direction. In this way we can revise the weakest link in Baur’s reconstruction without seriously disturbing his hypotheses about Matthew and the locus of the most historically authentic materials. We can also dispense with the construct of a sayings source Q, containing material common to Matthew and Luke; rather Matthew had his own sayings source; and Luke drew upon Matthew as well as Mark and the pre-Marcionite version of his Gospel. Baur’s theories about Matthew do not really depend on whether Mark is an early or a late Gospel; and by granting it an early status we do not read it from

⁵² *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 32), 571–82, quotation from 581. Bauspiess notes (220–1) the striking fact that Baur constructs a *Logienquelle*, a sayings source, on the basis of Matthean priority.

⁵³ *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 32), 600–21. Baur makes it clear that canonical Matthew is not an eyewitness account and cannot be regarded as a purely historical source; rather it has its own theological tendency and agenda, which is to prove the actualization of the Old Testament idea of the Messiah in the person of Jesus (606–9, 617–20).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 424–523; *Das Christenthum*, 2nd edn (see n. 14), 73–7 (ET 1:77–82).

the perspective of Matthew but recognize its own integrity and theological argument, which is to show how Jesus' identity (announced to the reader in the first verse, that Jesus is the Son of God, but kept hidden as a "messianic secret") is gradually disclosed to his followers through his healings, transfiguration, and his own predictions of his suffering, death, and second coming as the glorified Son of Man on the clouds of heaven. This is the version of the story that Strauss's reconstruction in the *Leben Jesu* most closely approximates, and Baur was understandably leery of its being accorded historical primacy. With this story, God's entering into history causes an "irruption" of history; in this sense Markan christology tends toward docetism and an apocalyptic, history-ending finale. With Matthew, on the other hand, Jesus is a plausible human being with a radically new self-understanding, and God's appearing in history brings about a transformation within history itself. Just how God "appears" in the figure of Jesus and his teaching and its effects is a topic for theological discussion; it is not addressed in the *Lectures on New Testament Theology*.⁵⁵

BAUR AND JUDAISM

In the Introduction to his *Lectures*, Baur emphasizes the differences that distinguish the authors of the individual New Testament writings from each other. The greatest difference bears upon "Christianity's relationship to

⁵⁵ See my discussion of this matter in the Editorial Introduction to the *History of Christian Dogma*, 2–7. I would like to correct one misimpression caused by what I wrote there. In attempting to clarify the relationship between Baur and Hegel, I said that Hegel too attends to the ministry and teaching of Jesus, and that he stresses the *congruence* between a historical perspective on Jesus and a faith perspective. But I was wrong to suggest that "Baur's depiction of the teaching, person, and redemptive work of Christ follows Hegel's very closely, although Baur's christology is set forth in greater detail and on the basis of historical-critical study of the Gospels" (p. 5). It is clearly not the case that Baur is following Hegel very closely here. For one thing, he does not seem to be especially familiar with Hegel's discussion of the teaching and ministry of Jesus, which is somewhat constricted in the *Werke* edition (1832) of the *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* to which Baur had access; in the modern edition, ed. and trans. R. F. Brown, P. C. Hodgson, and J. M. Stewart (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), it is found on 3:110–22, 216–18, 310–21. For another, and more importantly, Baur's conclusions are based on his own critical analysis of the Gospel of Matthew, and he stresses the moral-religious character of these teachings, comparing them more to Kant's categorical imperative than to Hegel's speculative interpretation of the God-man. I agree with Martin Wendte that Baur is "a historically informed idealist of a distinctive kind," but I do not agree that Hegel's influence is massively de-emphasized in the 1850s after Baur's first summation of the teaching of Jesus at the beginning of his church history—see Wendte, "Ferdinand Christian Baur: ein historisch informierte Idealist eigener Art," in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 75–88. Rather he introduces the category of the "Christian idea" (the idea of divine-human and inter-human reconciliation, first instantiated in the teaching of Jesus), which enters into a non-identical union with historical appearances to construct the history of the Christian church. This is a deeply Hegelian insight.

Judaism,” along with “all that bears upon the person of Jesus” and on how the “Christian principle” is grasped.⁵⁶ Baur’s identification of the Jewish question as front and center for New Testament research explains why a renewed interest in the study of Jewish Christianity on the part of contemporary scholars finds itself engaged, positively or negatively, with Baur.⁵⁷

My concern at the outset is with the negative engagement from the perspective of “Orientalism,” which criticizes Western stereotypes about the East. It is well-represented by Shawn Kelley.⁵⁸ He says that Hegel’s “racialized views” of history are transferred into the arena of biblical scholarship especially under the influence of Baur, who takes over Hegel’s “fundamental antithesis between the Western (free) Greeks and the nonWestern (servile) Orientals and interjects it into the very heart of his analysis of emerging Christianity.” Much as I would like to defend Hegel against such an assertion,⁵⁹ my focus must remain solely on Baur. Of Baur, Kelley writes:

... He combined the antiJudaism of Christian theology (where the Jew, the repudiator of Jesus, comes to symbolize the antithesis to all that is good and honorable) with the racialized Orientalism of his day. He interjected this narrative into early Christianity by arguing that the fundamental divide within early Christianity was between the (despotic, fleshly, backwards, Eastern) Jewish Christianity and the (free, spiritual, dynamic, Western) Hellenistic Christians. Early Christianity, for Baur, is fueled by a conflict between Hebrew and Hellenist, which means between a slave and a free consciousness. The conflict of earliest Christianity eventually gives way to compromise, as the Western spirit of freedom makes its peace with the despotic spirit of the East and transforms itself in early Catholicism. It becomes the task of radical biblical scholars to strip away the Eastern and Catholic debris that impedes access to the authentic Western core of the New Testament.

In this summary form, such a critique is a gross caricature. But there is a valid issue at stake. For our early-twenty-first century sensibilities, Baur’s mid-nineteenth century interpretation of Judaism is problematic on at least two

⁵⁶ See below, p. 77. This section is based on an essay I have written for *Is There a Judeo-Christian Tradition? A European Perspective*, edited by Anya Topolski and Emmanuel Nathan, and part of a series of “Perspectives on Jewish Texts and Context,” edited by Vivian Liska and published by De Gruyter. The title of my essay is “F. C. Baur’s Interpretation of Christianity’s Relationship to Judaism.” Used by permission.

⁵⁷ See James Carleton Paget, “The Reception of Baur in Britain,” in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 380–6.

⁵⁸ Shawn Kelley, *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), quotations in this paragraph from 6–7.

⁵⁹ It could be pointed out, for example, that Hegel favorably compares the “breadth,” “infinitude,” and “free universality” of the Orient with the “abstract rigidity or finitude” of the West. Thus when Christianity first appears, in the Roman world, its highest ideals and deepest spirituality come from the East, specifically from Judaism. Greece is seen to have a mediating role between East and West and becomes a factor only later in the history of Christianity. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. Robert F. Brown and Peter C. Hodgson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 451–2.

counts. First, the characteristic mark of Judaism is often described as “particularistic,” by which Baur means that the God of Israel is understood to be the God of the Jewish people alone (the “chosen people”) rather than the God of human beings as such, including Gentiles. Second, Baur understands Christianity to be the “consummate” or “absolute” religion, which supersedes not only Jewish religion but other religions too, absorbing them into itself and transforming them. If particularism and supersession are markers of “Orientalism,” so be it. But Baur’s views are not racialist or crypto-racist.⁶⁰ He is not motivated by racial prejudice or religious antagonism, but by the attempt to understand how Christianity emerged as a religion distinct from Judaism, while at the same time Jewish factors remained an essential component of it. This is a legitimate historical question. How does historical novelty occur within the ongoing continuum of history? It does so (and here Baur acknowledges his indebtedness to Hegel) not through a supernatural incursion of the divine but through the process by which history changes—the interplay of powers, interpretations, and goals—or in logical terms the process of identity, difference, and mediation. Because history is unending, so also this process repeats itself in endless configurations. The unity of logic and history indicates (for Baur as well as Hegel) that the ideal and the real are inextricably intertwined. Logic is historicized, and reason is introduced into history.⁶¹

Today we are inclined to think in terms of “identity” rather than “particularity,” and we affirm the equivalent validity of the major world religions rather than the superiority of one over the others. The language of “identity,” while neutral, leaves the question open as to, for example, how the identity of Christianity differs from the identity of Judaism—a question that contemporary scholarship rather prefers to avoid. But arguments about the superiority or inferiority of religions have proven to be fruitless and harmful, and most serious religious scholars today embrace some form of pluralism. In this respect, Baur’s approach is no longer acceptable. He views the religions in a progressive scheme, and indeed seems to make negative generalized remarks about Judaism, exaggerated perhaps by his dialectical oppositions. But if we look below the surface and at detailed analyses, we get a different picture.

The following summary of Baur’s thesis about the interaction between Jewish and Pauline Christianity in the formation of the early church is based on the first volume of his church history.⁶² Baur begins by claiming that the two parties—the Jewish Christians and the Pauline Christians—both have their origin in the figure of Jesus, one side focusing more on his moral-religious teaching and

⁶⁰ The term “race” is introduced into the translation of Baur’s church history at points where it is not found in the German text. See n. 77.

⁶¹ See my book, *Shapes of Freedom: Hegel’s Philosophy of World History in Theological Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

⁶² See n. 14 for the German text and English translation. Subsequent citations are abbreviated as *KG* and *CH* (all the *CH* citations are from the first volume of the English translation).

the other on his messianic person. In Antioch, fourteen years after Paul's conversion, the issue was whether Gentiles could become Christians without circumcision. We may deduce from the Corinthian epistles that a heated confrontation occurred between Peter and Paul, with Peter insisting that Gentile Christians cannot be on the same level with Jewish Christians, and Paul holding that all Christians are of equal status.⁶³

Paul attacks the foundations of the argument that salvation must include observance of the law and circumcision in his earliest epistle, Galatians.⁶⁴ Even within the sphere of Jewish history the law is not the primary and original element. Above it stands the promise to Abraham, which points toward the time when righteousness will become the blessing of all nations. This promise can be fulfilled only when the law gives way to faith. The purpose of the law is a transitional one, to expose sin and prepare humanity to be set free from it. Judaism holds promise and fulfillment apart until the fullness of time has arrived. In the new community of Christ, there are no differences between Jew and Greek, circumcision and uncircumcision, rather all are one in faith manifesting itself as love. One should keep in mind that these ideas are expressed by Paul, a Jew by birth who argues for Christianity on the basis of his knowledge of the Hebrew scriptures (from his rabbinic training) and his conversion and missionary experience. The conflict here is between two ways of interpreting Judaism in relationship to Christianity, not between Judaism and Hellenism.⁶⁵ Paul too could be regarded as a Jewish Christian, but with a radically new interpretation, one emphasizing the presence of the fulfillment in Christ.

To advance such a bold claim, Paul also had to claim an apostolic authority equal to or greater than that of the older apostles, who had known Jesus in the flesh. This is the issue that came up in Corinth and surfaces in the Corinthian epistles.⁶⁶ Here the topics of law and circumcision have completely disappeared. Rather the question concerns the apostolic authority of Paul. Is Paul a true and genuine apostle at all? Paul has no empirical proof, apart from the results of his missionary labor, but only his subjective experience of seeing the Lord and being called by him. Here conflicting principles of authority oppose each other; the principle of Paulinism, writes Baur, is the emancipation of consciousness from every external authority and the elevation of the human spirit to freedom and light.⁶⁷

⁶³ *KG* 44–53, *CH* 51–5.

⁶⁴ *KG* 53–7, *CH* 56–60.

⁶⁵ Anders Gerdmar argues that Baur is in fact the creator of the “the Judaism–Hellenism dichotomy,” in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 107–28. For a Jewish reading of Paul, see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 4th edn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980). Rabbinic elements are clearly evident in Baur's Paul.

⁶⁶ *KG* 57–62, *CH* 60–5.

⁶⁷ See Christof Landmesser's view of Baur as a modern interpreter of the Pauline idea of freedom, in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 161–94.

The height of the conflict between Jewish and Pauline Christianity occurs after the death of Paul and continues into the second century.⁶⁸ The Pauline side is expressed in the Gospel of Luke and the Deutero-Pauline Epistles; the Jewish side in Revelation and Hebrews, Papias and Hegesippus, the Ebionites and Simon Magus. The virulent attacks on Paul found in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies have Gnostic associations. The Ebionites consider Paul an apostate and false teacher, reject all his epistles, slander his memory, and claim that he was a Gentile by birth, not a Jew. In the Homilies and Recognitions, Paul appears in the character of Simon Magus, preaching a lawless doctrine. The Magus is nothing other than a caricature of Paul and becomes the great father of heretics, representing the views with which Paul is associated by his opponents.

But a reconciliation or mediation (*Vermittlung*) must also have occurred, otherwise a Catholic Church could never have arisen, a church that “cut off from itself everything extreme and united opposites within itself.”⁶⁹ Baur hypothesizes that there must have been steps of reconciliation, from both sides but in different ways. The two parties sense that they belong together, act upon each other in the living process of development, each modifying and being modified by the other. The first step occurs when baptism comes to replace circumcision as the outward sign of initiation into the saving community. With increasing numbers of Gentiles converting without circumcision, the issue is resolved, as it were, on the ground. A second step occurs when Pauline universalism is transferred from Paul to Peter. According to the Clementine writings, Peter (not Paul) is the apostle to the Gentiles, and his mission ends with his alleged martyrdom in Rome.

Baur appreciates the contribution of Jewish Christianity to the formation of the Catholic Church.⁷⁰ Without its hierarchical organization, which derives from Jewish theocracy, the church could never have survived against hostile forces and become a viable historical institution. Thus Jewish Christianity remains a permanent and essential feature of Christianity, and the tension between it and Paulinism furnishes the dynamic by which the church exists in the world. They are “the two factors of its historical movement,”⁷¹ the ideal factor and the real factor. When one factor threatens to submerge the other, resistance occurs and a new balance is established, for the church is and remains an ideal-real community, even after the Reformation when it assumes a new ecclesial form.

Baur summarizes his ecclesiology at the beginning of the third part of the church history, where he addresses the antithesis between Gnosticism and the Catholic Church.

⁶⁸ *KG* 71–93, *CH* 76–98.

⁷⁰ *KG* 106–9, *CH* 112–14.

⁶⁹ *KG* 94–106, *CH* 99–111.

⁷¹ *KG* 130, *CH* 137.

The very idea of the Catholic Church is that it should seek to rise above everything particular and merge it in the universality of the Christian principle; but on the other hand it is a no less essential part of its task to maintain and hold fast the positive elements of Christianity. In fact, what constitutes it a Catholic Church is that it stands in the middle to harmonize all tendencies and reject the one extreme as much as the other. Had not the idea that developed itself out of Christianity, the idea of the Catholic Church, overcome the particularism of Judaism, Christianity itself would have been a mere sect of Judaism. But on the other side, where it came into contact with paganism, it was threatened by a danger no less serious, namely the generalization and evaporation (*Verallgemeinerung und Verflüchtigung*) of its content by ideas through which Christian consciousness, spreading out in limitless expansion, would entirely lose its specific historical character. Now this was the tendency of Gnosticism.⁷²

Gnosticism introduces speculative and philosophical considerations into Christian theology and stimulates its development in many ways, positive and negative. For example, the major Christian doctrines are first formulated in opposition to Gnostic heresies. Baur remains alert to the fact that *γνώσις* is a powerful but dangerous tool, and that a balance has to be found between faith and thought, history and reason.⁷³

Regarding the entrance of Christianity into the world as simply and absolutely a miracle requires stepping at once outside all historical connection, and the same interruption of the historical process is then equally possible at later stages as well. From Baur's historical-critical perspective, such a view is unacceptable,⁷⁴ so the historian must view the so-called absolute beginning as itself "a link of the chain of history," and resolve it insofar as possible into its "natural elements."⁷⁵ These natural elements include the political universalism of the Roman Empire into which Christianity was born and the pre-Christian religions from which Christianity evolved. Baur discusses Christianity's anticipation in Greek philosophy and culture, but no direct influence from Greece occurs until the second century.⁷⁶ Its true antecedent is Judaism:

Christianity arose on Jewish soil, and is connected with Judaism far more closely and directly. It professes to be nothing other than spiritualized Judaism: it strikes its deepest roots in the soil of the Old Testament religion. . . . The special superiority that distinguishes Judaism from all the religions of the pagan

⁷² *KG* 175–6, *CH* 185.

⁷³ On Baur's view of Christian Gnosticism and contemporary philosophy of religion, see Volker Henning Drecoll's article in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 129–60.

⁷⁴ On Baur's critique of miracle, see Stefan Alkier's essay, "Wunderglaube als Tor zum Atheismus," in *Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (n. 4), 285–311.

⁷⁵ *KG* 1, *CH* 1–2.

⁷⁶ *KG* 3–16, *CH* 3–16.

world is its pure and refined monotheistic idea of God. . . . In its consciousness of God, therefore, Christianity knows itself to be at one with Judaism. The God of the Old Testament is the God of the New, and all the teaching of the Old Testament concerning the essential distinctness of God from the world, and the absolute sublimity and holiness of God's nature, is also an essential part of Christian teaching. But on the other hand the Old Testament concept of God has so much a national stamp that the particularism connected with and ensuing from it stands in the most decisive antithesis to Christianity.⁷⁷

My purpose in quoting this passage is to emphasize not (in this instance) Baur's critique of Jewish particularism—which is certainly present in his writings along with the view that Christianity as the consummate religion supersedes previous religions—but rather his insistence that Christianity, not being miraculous in origin, does indeed arise on Jewish soil and is deeply connected with it. In other words, it is precisely Baur's historical-critical approach that drives him to a serious engagement with Judaism.

Another consideration that leads Baur to Judaism is his exclusion of the Gospel of John as a historical source for recovering the teaching of Jesus, and his prioritizing of Matthew among the Synoptic Gospels. The sayings source that Baur discovers in the Hebrew Gospel (as the basis for canonical Matthew) presents a more Jewish Jesus than the sayings source Q or Mark. From it Baur draws his portrait of Christianity's "founder." This portrait does not, in my view, reflect a shift on Baur's part late in his career, as argued in some recent scholarly literature,⁷⁸ from a Hegelian/speculative to a Kantian/ethical perspective. For one thing, Baur had long interpreted the teaching of Jesus in moral-religious categories in his sermons; for another he already recognized in *Die christliche Gnosis* that the teaching of Jesus assumed quite a different form than that found in subsequent theology and philosophy.⁷⁹ Baur is very clear that New Testament theology does not displace speculative or constructive theology but supplements it, and this is evidenced by his continuing interest in the history of Christian dogma and his engagement with the theologians and philosophers of the nineteenth century until the end of his career.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ KG 16–17, CH 17–18. The English translation introduces extraneous language, including the category of "race," which is not found in the German text.

⁷⁸ This argument has been advanced principally by Wolfgang Geiger. See Bauspiess's discussion of the issue, *Baur und die Geschichte* (n. 4), 221–3; also Martin Wendte in *Baur und die Geschichte* (n. 4), 84–5.

⁷⁹ *Die christliche Gnosis* (n. 16), 718. On Baur's sermons and their significance for practical theology, see Birgit Weyel in *Baur und die Geschichte* (n. 4) 405–24.

⁸⁰ Baur continued to lecture on the history of dogma until the end of his life and published a second edition of his *Lehrbuch* in 1858. He remained engaged with Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Hegel even as he sought a more independent stance.

ANALYTIC SUMMARY OF THE *LECTURES ON*
NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

The follow summary covers the entire work but provides the fullest details for Baur's treatment of the teaching of Jesus and the theology of Paul, stressing the connection of both Jesus and Paul to Judaism.⁸¹ But the Jewish connection continues throughout the New Testament writings, manifesting very different tendencies.

Introduction

The Concept of Biblical Theology

Baur explains that the term "theology" is used in a "general and nonspecific" way to distinguish biblical theology (of which New Testament theology is a part) from "dogmatics" as systematic theology. "Biblical theology was supposed to be a purely historical science. In it the unvarnished teaching of scripture has disengaged itself, and increasingly emancipated itself, from the bonds of the dependency into which it had fallen; it has become disengaged from its subordination to the church's dogmatic system." We might legitimately wonder why it should not be called "biblical history." The answer seems to be that its principal concern is with the *teaching* of scripture, that is, with theological ideas and arguments, not just with literary structures and cultural-historical facts; and, moreover, theological judgments are expressed about these teachings in Baur's work.

The History of Biblical Theology and New Testament Theology

The dogmatics of the Protestant church intended to be nothing other than the presentation of the teaching contained in scripture: scripture is foundational, normative, definitive; dogmatics is derived from it and grounded by it. But after the first generation of Reformers, the relationship reversed itself, and dogmatic formalism, based on dogmatic antitheses, became dominant. Scripture was now utilized for the construction of the dogmatic system, for its proof and defense.

Biblical theology arose as a reaction to this tendency at the end of the seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth century. The term "biblical theology" was used in the title of books by authors such as G. T. Zachariä,

⁸¹ These sections on Jesus and Paul continue to draw on the essay cited in n. 56. The summary duplicates the headings found in the table of contents so that readers can locate materials relatively easily.

and Baur is simply continuing that convention. But these scholars still believed that a basic harmony existed between biblical theology and the dogmatic-ecclesiastical system, and that the task of biblical theology was to demonstrate that harmony rationally. Baur says that the rationalism of the following stage in this development “lacks any full-blooded conception of history”; it lacks the capacity to cross over from its own subjective rationality to concrete historical actuality. The mediation between universal and particular, or the insight that the rational is actual and the actual is rational, came only later in the form of speculative philosophy.

D. F. Strauss perpetuated this rationalist perspective, but he represented a watershed moment in the history of the discipline. His *Leben Jesu* “called into question the credibility of the gospel story as a whole, chiefly by directing attention to the lack of agreement and the many contradictions that can be identified in the different presentations of the gospel story. We can only conclude from this that our gospel writings do not originate from eyewitness accounts of the Apostles who are said to be their authors.”⁸² This conclusion caused an enormous disturbance in biblical studies and church theology. But neither Strauss nor anyone else at the time recognized the only way forward, which was to engage in a critique of the writings that lie at the basis of the stories, disclosing their conflicts and interests, and providing a basis for historical judgments about the most authentic testimonies to the teaching of Jesus and Paul.

A life of Jesus cannot be reconstructed from the available sources—the three Synoptic Gospels—but the teaching of Jesus is accessible through a critical reading of the Gospel of Matthew in particular, keeping in mind that we can only determine approximately what its true content may have been, because “that content is always presented to us as mediated simply by the writer’s subjective reflection of it.” We must also distinguish between epistles genuinely by Paul and others wrongly attributed to him by the tradition. The apostolic period is not a time in which unity and harmony prevailed. “The very process of a historical development of Christian dogma already begins on the soil of the canonical scriptures. The history of Christian dogma is thus the direct continuation of this process. . . . Yet until now there has always been a very influential dogmatic bias, affirming not only that Jesus’ teaching and the Apostles’ teaching form an utterly self-consistent whole, but also that the theological frameworks of the various Apostles are in complete agreement with one another.”

⁸² Strauss’s *Glaubenslehre*, as we have seen, did not demonstrate the harmony between biblical ideas and dogmatic-ecclesiastical systems, but precisely the disharmony between the doctrines of faith and modern science. Here rationalism is being used for destructive rather than constructive purposes.

The remainder of Baur's survey of the history of the discipline simply shows how firmly entrenched that dogmatic bias favoring harmony proved to be, and how much resistance his own New Testament theology encountered, right through the 1850s.

The Organization of New Testament Theology

We must not only distinguish among several theological frameworks but also demonstrate New Testament theology's progressive development, over a longer time period than usually has been supposed. The greater the time period, the greater too will be the distinctions and antitheses to which it is subject.

Following the teaching of Jesus, which is the presupposition of all that follows, Baur distinguishes three periods with disparate theological frameworks: the First Period (AD 30–70) contains the authentic Epistles of the Apostle Paul (Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans, the oldest writings of the New Testament canon) and the Book of Revelation; the Second Period (AD 70–c. 140) includes Hebrews, the Deutero-Pauline Epistles, the Epistles of Peter and James, the Synoptic Gospels (from which the teaching of Jesus is reconstructed), and the Book of Acts; the Third Period (after c. AD 140) comprises the Pastoral Epistles, the Gospel of John, and the three Johannine Epistles.

Part One: The Teaching of Jesus

The teaching of Jesus, writes Baur, "is the foundation and presupposition for all that belongs to the history of the development of Christian consciousness. That is precisely why his teaching is what stands above and beyond all such development, what is immediate to it, is its origin. As such, Jesus' teaching is not theology but is instead religion. Jesus is the founder of a new religion." For this reason Baur treats only Jesus in Part One of his *Lectures on New Testament Theology*.⁸³ Theology starts in Part Two of the *Lectures* with the interpretation of Jesus on the part of the New Testament authors. As the founder, Jesus does not stand above history as such but constitutes one of its decisive turning points, the emergence of a new possibility (a *kairos* in Paul Tillich's sense⁸⁴). This new possibility appears not simply out of the blue but only in relation to the existing form of religion.

⁸³ The *Lectures* contain by far Baur's most extended treatment of the teaching of Jesus, which, as we have pointed out, is not intended as a "life" of Jesus.

⁸⁴ Paul Tillich, "Kairos," in *The Protestant Era*, trans. James Luther Adams (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 32–51.

Baur analyzes the teaching of Jesus under three major topics.⁸⁵ He himself warns that we do not know for certain what Jesus actually taught and said, as distinct from what the tendencies and interests of the writers of the Gospels convey to us. We have no direct access to the teaching but only to its mediation through tradition—for Baur a written more than an oral tradition. Yet he is more confident about the results of his findings than are many New Testament scholars today.

The Relation of Jesus' Teaching to the Old Testament and to the Law

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus announces that he has come not to abolish the law and the prophets but to fulfill them. The Sermon makes it clear that Jesus stands wholly on the soil of the Old Testament, and that his relationship to it is not destructive but constructive. The law cannot be abolished until it has become actual truth and reality, and it does so when people adhere to it and abide by it. This in turn involves their becoming members of the kingdom of God, which in Matthew Jesus calls the kingdom of heaven. With his radical demands in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus insists on a pure and sincere conscience (*Gesinnung*), a morality (*Sittlichkeit*) not made up of outward acts but one subsisting in the inner recesses of conscience. Such conduct gives human beings absolute moral worth in the eyes of God, or what Jesus calls "righteousness." This is not merely a quantitative extension of the law but a qualitative antithesis. The essential principle of Christianity involves setting "the inner element over against the outer one, conscience over against the act, the spirit of the law over against the letter of the law." Thus on the one hand Jesus does not acknowledge the Mosaic law as having absolutely binding authority, but on the other hand he never speaks of abolishing the law as a whole, and he does not deny its validity for those who trust it. He stops short of an open break with the law and leaves further development to the spirit of his teaching. "Since new wine belongs in new wineskins, the spirit of the new teaching cannot be put into a vessel for the old teaching. On its own, the new spirit will burst that old vessel and create a new form for itself." With this simple, familiar image, drawn directly from Jewish practice, Jesus positions himself in relation to Judaism.

The Moral and Religious Teaching of Jesus

Jesus' Fundamental Moral Vision: The Beatitudes. What gives human beings their moral-religious worth is conscience alone, conscience directed to God as its *own* absolute content. The summary of the law is that one should love God

⁸⁵ The designation of the topics is the work of the translators based on clues in the text.

and one's neighbor as oneself. "The universal element is the action's formal aspect in virtue of which one treats others the same way that one wants to be treated by them. . . . This is the formal principle of action that essentially coincides with the Kantian imperative so to act that the maxim of your own action can be the universal law of action." The Christian principle elevates itself to what is universal, unconditional, intrinsically subsistent. The purest expression of the principle is found in the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount.

As an affirmation of the Old Testament law, and as the antithesis to Pharisaic legalism, Christianity appeared foremost as a strengthening of moral consciousness, as a moral power that sought to arouse in human beings the awareness of their moral self-determination, the energy of their own moral freedom and autonomy. This moral element . . . is the substantial core of Christianity, and all else, howsoever great its significance may be, stands in a more or less secondary and incidental relationship to this moral element. It is the foundation on which everything else first can be built. Even though it hardly has the form and the complexion of what Christianity became historically, it nevertheless already is implicitly the whole of Christianity. All too soon it was able to be suppressed by the dogmatism developing from Christian consciousness, to be set in its shadow, to be overlaid and stifled. Yet this moral element ever remained the firmly unshakable point to which people always had to return again—to turn back from all the aberrations in dogma and life and return to that in which authentic Christian consciousness expresses itself in its most direct, original form and its simplest truth, infinitely exalted above all the self-deceptions of dogmatism.

Baur's critique of the aberrations of dogmatism is noteworthy for one who also devoted a large portion of his scholarly attention to the development of the Christian principle in the history of dogma. Such a development was essential, and dogma gradually acquired a critical consciousness. The greatest thinkers always recognized their dependence on the original gospel, a gospel that stood in the closest proximity to Judaism.

Righteousness. In righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*), the moral element receives a *religious* content. Righteousness involves not merely one's relationship to oneself (moral self-consciousness) but also one's relationship to God, without which there is no religious consciousness. Indeed, such righteousness is the very completion and fulfillment of the law that Jesus claims is at hand. It is the state of adequacy in which one is subjectively what the kingdom of God is objectively. Baur argues that Christianity sublates (annuls and preserves⁸⁶) the Old Testament's separation of the divine and the human. The two sides

⁸⁶ The German term *Aufhebung* has this double meaning. The distinction between the divine and the human is not collapsed into an identity; rather the two are understood to be inwardly related.

coincide inasmuch as the subjective possibility of the consummate fulfilling of the law is also given together with this completion. "The subjective possibility of *δικαιοσύνη*, the power of reconciliation with God, which consciousness, when further developed, calls 'grace,' is simply included in the other aspect, the objective carrying-out of the consummated law." Jesus speaks only of fulfilling the law perfectly, although he is in fact revealing a new and universal power of reconciliation. His consciousness still stands within the Old Testament perspective insofar as it sticks with the countervailing objectivity of God's law. Pauline theology is the first to make righteousness, as a new principle, into the object of Christian consciousness and to understand it as grace.

Righteousness or grace is the objective divine power working within and as human subjectivity, and it is the category that links the teaching of Jesus and the thought of Paul. Paul simply expresses for consciousness what was posited implicitly and factually in the teaching of Jesus.

The Kingdom of God. The concept of the kingdom of God is taken over wholly from the Old Testament's religious and political system. For Jesus it is simply the *moral-religious community* of those who make up the people of God. He has so spiritualized the concept of the messianic kingdom that in his sense it is just a community resting on moral-religious qualifications, with its ultimate goal not in the sensible but in the supersensible world. "What takes place in heaven is the paradigm for what ought to take place on earth. So . . . when the will of God is also fulfilled on earth, the kingdom of God is made actual on earth; it comes unto us, unfolding and spreading itself more and more in humankind. . . . This purely moral-religious concept of the kingdom of God contrasts with the Jews' customary representations of it." Be like children, says Jesus; do not claim the kingdom for it grows on its own, it has "its own inner motive power and endlessly produces its widespread effect" (as seen in the parables of the kingdom). The kingdom of God is simply "the divine principle instilled into humankind and working, as the substantial element in it, with an overarching power." The only real question is whether, for Jesus, it extends to the Gentiles or merely includes Jews.

When Baur says that Jesus' concept of the kingdom of God contrasts with the Jews' customary representations of it, he probably is thinking more of its theocratic aspect than its apocalyptic-eschatological aspect (its supernatural, cataclysmic arrival). In any event, eschatology is not a prominent feature of Baur's Jesus. He allows that apocalyptic motifs come later, for example in the Book of Revelation, and that they provide a backdrop to other New Testament writings as well. But Jesus himself is not—in contrast to Strauss's claim—an apocalyptic figure. Baur's moral-religious interpretation aligns more with the existential interpretation of Rudolf Bultmann than with the eschatological interpretation still favored by many New Testament scholars today.

Jesus' Person and His Messianic Self-Consciousness

Baur provides an extensive discussion of Jesus' conception of his person and his messianic self-consciousness. He acknowledges that much is found in the Synoptic Gospels on this subject that was first formed subsequent to the death of Jesus and in light of the messianic beliefs of the apostles, so a critical winnowing is required with only approximate results. But Baur allows for a messianic consciousness far more liberally than many New Testament scholars do today.

Son of Man and Son of God. Jesus chooses for himself the expression "son of man" taken from Daniel 7:13–14, not with the intention of saying directly that he is the Messiah, but only to refer to himself as a human being sharing in everything human. Being son of man does not involve coming in glory on the clouds of heaven, but rather only involves the fullness of human suffering and lowliness. The so-called earthly son of man sayings are the ones that Baur regards as being an authentic self-reference of Jesus. Likewise, Jesus is a "son of God" in the sense of belonging among the "children of God" as those who, by their moral conduct, make themselves worthy of the divine favor.

Statements about Jesus' Person and His Messianic Consciousness. Baur infers from the Matthean tradition that Jesus becomes aware of his messianic identity only gradually. He acknowledges and discloses it for the first time in Matthew 16:13–20, when he asks his disciples who they say that he is and affirms Peter's avowal that he is the Messiah, the Son of God. Baur's explanation is as follows. Jesus can only have discerned his messianic calling in the process of actualizing the idea of the kingdom of heaven in the sense of all the moral and religious demands he lays upon his followers. He is at odds with his nation or people in that he wants to be its Messiah solely in the spiritual sense in which he grasps the Messiah-idea. The nation's belief in the Messiah is the necessary medium by which alone he can hope for the realization of his spiritual idea of the kingdom of heaven. Since he does not wish to be a Messiah in the people's sense, he can decisively express the messianic consciousness that at first develops in him gradually only after he has provided the requisite foundation for it. He spiritualizes the Messiah-idea in accord with the moral-religious concept he links to the kingdom of heaven.

Jesus' Death and Resurrection; the Second Coming and the Last Judgment. Jesus may have had intimations that he would be the sacrificial victim of his messianic vocation, but he does not possess a higher, supernatural knowledge that enables him to foresee the future. He has a presentiment of his death, but not of its significance. He just assumes that all who acknowledge their sins and repent of them with true humility may be assured of their forgiveness. His vocation is that of a teacher; the substance is his teaching, not his fate.

With respect to his alleged pronouncements about his resurrection, his second coming, and last judgment, as found in the Synoptic tradition, all we

can say is that Jesus' person belongs essentially together with his teaching. He is himself "the concrete demonstration of the absolute truth of his teaching." He internalizes his awareness of his role by applying to himself the popular views of the Messiah current at his time. But he does not predict any of the events following upon his death, and he does not use the vivid and sensible eschatological imagery found in the Gospels. These are products of the writers who were articulating the interests and convictions of their own time.

The Father, the Son, and the Children of God. One of Jesus' most original ideas is that of God as "Father" (anticipations are found in the Psalms, Isaiah, and Jeremiah). This term expresses the direct relationship in which a human being stands to God. From God's side it entails love and goodness; from the human side, trust and dependence, freely resting on the awareness of one's need. This relationship is not only immediate but also universal. No one is excluded from the relationship to God the Father; it transcends every national limitation. God, as the universal Father of everyone, "makes his sun rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous" (Matthew 5:45).

Here Jesus draws out the moral consequences of the idea of God as Father, the consequences of the universality of God's relationship to human beings: that we ought also to love our enemy and do good to those who hate us, certainly inasmuch as God too treats everyone, good and evil, righteous and unrighteous, in the same way. So this moral bond linking human beings with God is, as such, a further element of the idea of God as Father in Jesus' sense. If God is the Father of human beings, then they are God's children, as God's sons [and daughters].

If God the Father is the moral idea in itself, then the Son is the idea realizing itself in God's children. This moral concept of the Son of God must be distinguished from both the metaphysical concept of the Gospel of John and the Jewish national concept.

Thus Jesus does not limit his messianic plan to a particular nation. He does not refuse or exclude Gentiles. Even so, he may have considered it his distinctive task to make the lost sheep of the house of Israel the focus of his personal activity, for they need his care first and foremost. As to the Canaanite woman, he affirms that even Gentiles ought not to be excluded from the messianic kingdom, if only their faith is great enough. He praises faith wherever it is found. "The prophets of old"—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Malachi—"had already raised the hope that in the messianic age the Gentiles will turn to the true religion." Universalism is implicit in their message, just as it is explicit in that of Jesus. "But it cannot be determined precisely in what way he sought to expand Jewish particularism to Christian universalism" because we are left in doubt as to whether Jesus anticipated replacing Jewish circumcision with the Christian rite of baptism.