

OXFORD

# FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR AND THE HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

---

EDITED BY

MARTIN BAUSPIESS  
CHRISTOF LANDMESSER  
DAVID LINCICUM

TRANSLATED BY

ROBERT F. BROWN  
PETER C. HODGSON



FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR AND THE HISTORY  
OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY



# Ferdinand Christian Baur and the History of Early Christianity

Edited by

MARTIN BAUSPIESS, CHRISTOF LANDMESSER,  
AND DAVID LINCICUM

Translated by

ROBERT F. BROWN  
AND PETER C. HODGSON

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

© First published in German by Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG Tübingen 2014.  
© English edition Oxford University Press 2017

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

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: 2016949495

ISBN 978-0-19-879841-5

Printed in Great Britain by  
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

## *Preface to the English Edition*

The German edition of this book, *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (Tübingen, 2104) contains ten essays written in German and five in English. Robert F. Brown and I have translated the German essays and are pleased to offer this collection in an English edition. Not only is it the first significant publication about Baur to appear in English for many years, but also it introduces a new generation of Baur scholarship to English readers. Just over half a century ago my own book, *The Formation of Historical Theology: A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur*, was published (New York, 1966). In the Anglophone world, Baur is still the most neglected and least appreciated of the major German theologians of the nineteenth century, and this collection makes an important contribution to correcting that deficit. (Emanuel Hirsch regarded Baur as “the greatest and at the same time the most controversial theologian in German Protestant theology since Schleiermacher,” and others have expressed similar judgments.) In recent years I have returned to Baur by issuing translations, with Brown, of Baur’s *History of Christian Dogma* and *Lectures on New Testament Theology* (Oxford University Press). If time and health permit, more translations will follow. In the present volume the translators have added in square brackets clarifying, or supplementary information to existing footnotes (without disturbing the footnote order), as well as a bibliography of works by and about Baur. We appreciate the help provided by the authors themselves. The five chapters written in English (Lincicum, Gerdmar, Morgan, Zachhuber, and Paget) have been reprinted with minor revisions. German personal names using ß in lower case (“Strauß”) are spelled with double-s (“Strauss”) in this translation. The ß is retained when it occurs in common nouns.

Peter C. Hodgson

*Nashville, Tennessee*  
*October 2016*



## *Preface to the German Edition*

Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860) may be regarded as one of the most resolute advocates of the development of historical–critical research in the nineteenth century. Baur’s essential and still relevant contribution to historical theology may be seen in the fact that he worked out a systematically reflective approach to history and was able to transpose this approach into a quite specific *methodology*. From our perspective today, this methodology is the main thing, as opposed to the concrete material results that Baur obtained by his investigations, results for the most part superseded. Baur belongs among those theologians of the nineteenth century who consciously accepted the challenge of viewing Christianity historically, a challenge unavoidable for theology at least since the Enlightenment and one that must be worked through in its own way. Today, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the historical issue has in certain respects been reopened. It has become clear that historical–hermeneutical and methodological questions are indeed to be distinguished from each other, but cannot be kept apart. Baur already had in view precisely this connection between philosophy of history and methodology. Thus it is appropriate, within the horizon of contemporary issues, to inquire into Baur’s contribution.

Closer inspection reveals that a reconstruction of Baur’s thinking cannot proceed simply on the basis of the fundamental explanations he provided in the various “forewords” to his individual publications. For Baur developed his conceptions through his concrete labors on historical details. This way of working can thoroughly complicate access to Baur’s ideas. Whoever wants to track down his thinking must work through lengthy and also frequently long-winded investigations. Up to now there have been a wealth of surveys of Baur’s ideas. In contrast, the contribution of the essays in this volume consists in illuminating Baur’s thinking from diverse aspects and, by doing so, inaugurating, for specific fields of research, quite concrete approaches for the reconstruction of his investigations. We are sometimes reminded, implicitly or explicitly, of contemporary questions, but they are always subordinated to the portrayal of Baur’s view of his material. So this volume of essays offers in its multiplicity various possibilities for becoming engaged with Baur, and from these possibilities readers can themselves ask how Baur might contribute to contemporary discussions.

Even though Baur, from 1827 on, was professionally responsible for church history and history of dogma as a whole, many of his contributions were concentrated in the area of early Christianity and the New Testament. Most of the essays in this volume are focused on this area of study. But the thematic

multiplicity of Baur's work justifies giving voice to systematic and practical theologians, who from their perspective illuminate another aspect of Baur's thinking in addition to that provided by scholars of the New Testament and church history.

Ferdinand Christian Baur developed his thought by connecting it to, and demarcating it from, specific conceptual perspectives. The first part of the volume focuses on three such constellations: *Ulrich Köpf* illuminates once again the many-faceted relationship between Baur and his student from Blaubeuren days, David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74). It is clear that, in addition to substantive differences, the personal relationship between the two was not unproblematic, as becomes evident from the various ways in which Baur undertook to articulate his relationship to Strauss. *Notger Slenczka* recalls Baur's theological controversy with Johann Adam Möhler (1796–1838), against the background of how the Protestant principle was understood at that time, through a thorough exploration of the ecclesiological implications of the Protestant and Catholic positions. *Martin Wendte* presents Baur as ultimately a "historically informed idealist of a distinctive kind" and poses the question about the connections of Baur's thinking to idealism, and in particular to the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831).

The major part of the volume is concerned with the reconstruction of Baur's contributions to specific fields of research. *David Lincicum* investigates Baur's conception of the "Introduction" to the study of the New Testament (*Einleitungswissenschaft*) as a "critique of the canon," and, in dialogue with Baur, offers some reflections on the contemporary state of discussion of New Testament Introductions. *Anders Gerdmar* subjects Baur's controversial reconstruction of the early Christian movement to a thorough examination, by indicating the extent to which his theory depends on an assumed division between Judaism and Hellenism and on a tendentious reading of "Hebrews" and "Hellenists" in the Acts of the Apostles. In his contribution, *Volker Henning Drecoll* turns to Baur's portrayal of Gnosticism and puts it into the context of the philosophy of religion current in Baur's day. Here the philosophical and historical–theoretical implications of Baur's historical labors become clear from his reflections on a concrete phenomenon. *Christof Landmesser* reconstructs Baur's interpretation of Paul against the background of his methodologically reflective historical–critical labors on the New Testament texts. A discernible pattern in these labors is that Baur continually links the historical and exegetical details with interests oriented to his own time. *Martin Bauspiess* provides a survey of Baur's view of the Synoptic Gospels and, in doing so, shows how Baur portrays the process of development of the Synoptic tradition. The claim Baur makes on behalf of his historical work is seen here in his effort, in dealing with the origin of the Synoptic tradition, to trace the "essence of primitive Christianity" to the historical Jesus himself. *Jörg Frey* engages with Baur as a Johannine scholar and presents his contribution to the history of research on the Gospel

of John. Here we are reminded of the question as to the extent to which Baur's systematic thinking does justice to the historical details. *Robert Morgan* sets forth Baur's theology of the New Testament as a historical-critical reconstruction, one having as its basis the ethical imprint of Jesus' religion, and, at the same time intending to express an enduring religious truth that is to be understood against the background of Baur's philosophy of history. *Stefan Alkier* offers "historical-theological remarks on Ferdinand Christian Baur's critique of miracle." In his engagement with Baur, Alkier substantiates his call for a "more complex understanding of reality," as compared to the conceptual systems held by naturalism and supernaturalism. Because he considers Baur in the context of European historicism, *Johannes Zachhuber* proposes a way of reading Baur's *Die christliche Gnosis* that points to the tensions in Baur's thinking between his insistence on the objectivity of history on the one hand, and a covert historical relativism on the other hand.

The final part of the book illuminates some of the effects of Baur's work. *James Carleton Paget* offers an important survey of the history of Baur's reception in Great Britain, in which he shows that indeed Baur sometimes had British sympathizers, but for the most part was received critically, if not always fairly. *Daniel Geese* inquires into the similarities between Baur and Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930), who furthered in his own time the research begun by Baur on the history of dogma. The reconstruction also makes clear how differently Baur and Harnack undertook their quest for an "essence" of Christianity. *Birgit Weyel* brings into play a further facet of his work with her inquiry into Baur's relationship to practical theology. She shows how Baur's way of reconstructing history could have provided the impulse for unearthing "religion lived concretely" in its historical context at a given time.

This volume offers a many-faceted picture of Ferdinand Christian Baur's thinking, which can stimulate in numerous ways the contemporary discussion of issues, and which simultaneously animates an engagement with Baur even today. Contemporary reflections on the historical-critical method and its contribution to the understanding of early Christianity and the texts of the New Testament, which are foundational for the Christian tradition, should not simply ignore Baur's initiatives if they do not wish to fall short of the standard set by his reflections.

The editors express heartfelt thanks to the authors of the volume who have become involved in this project. A special thanks goes to Professor Jörg Frey, who from the beginning supported the idea of a volume of essays on Ferdinand Christian Baur, and recommended its publication in the series "Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament." We also thank Dr. Henning Ziebritzki of Verlag Mohr Siebeck who welcomed the project and guided it; and Mr. Matthias Spitzner, who took care of publishing details and prepared the manuscript for the press. In addition, we thank the research

assistants for the position occupied by Professor Christof Landmesser, who diligently read the proofs: Alexander Beyer, Christina Kuss, Nadine Quattlander, and Nicole Sieber. Friederike Portenhauser also was an energetic supporter. Raphael Zager helped with the preparation of the index. Many thanks! This applies as well to Nicholas Moore for his help in preparing for printing the articles written in English.

Martin Bauspiess  
Christof Landmesser  
David Lincicum

*Tübingen/Oxford*  
*July 2014*

# Contents

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| <i>Abbreviations</i>        | xiii |
| <i>List of Contributors</i> | xvi  |

## PART I: CONNECTIONS AND DEMARCATIONS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Ferdinand Christian Baur and David Friedrich Strauss<br><i>Ulrich Köpf</i>   | 3  |
| 2. Ethical Judgment and Ecclesiastical Self-Understanding: Ferdinand Christian Baur's Interpretation of the Protestant Principle in the Controversy with Johann Adam Möhler<br><i>Notger Slenczka</i> | 45 |
| 3. Ferdinand Christian Baur: A Historically Informed Idealist of a Distinctive Kind<br><i>Martin Wendte</i>   | 67 |

## PART II: HISTORICAL AND EXEGETICAL PERSPECTIVES

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4. Ferdinand Christian Baur and the Theological Task of New Testament Introduction<br><i>David Lincicum</i>                               | 83  |
| 5. Baur and the Creation of the Judaism–Hellenism Dichotomy<br><i>Anders Gerdmar</i>  | 96  |
| 6. Ferdinand Christian Baur's View of Christian Gnosis, and of the Philosophy of Religion in His Own Day<br><i>Volker Henning Drecoll</i> | 116 |
| 7. Ferdinand Christian Baur as Interpreter of Paul: History, the Absolute, and Freedom<br><i>Christof Landmesser</i>                      | 147 |
| 8. The Essence of Early Christianity: On Ferdinand Christian Baur's View of the Synoptic Gospels<br><i>Martin Bauspiess</i>               | 177 |
| 9. Ferdinand Christian Baur and the Interpretation of John<br><i>Jörg Frey</i>  | 206 |
| 10. F. C. Baur's New Testament Theology<br><i>Robert Morgan</i>   | 236 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 11. Belief in Miracles as the Gateway to Atheism:<br>Theological–Historical Remarks about Ferdinand<br>Christian Baur’s Critique of Miracles<br><i>Stefan Alkier</i> | 261 |
| 12. The Absoluteness of Christianity and the Relativity of all History:<br>Two Strands in Ferdinand Christian Baur’s Thought<br><i>Johannes Zachhuber</i>            | 287 |
| PART III: INFLUENCES   |     |
| 13. The Reception of Baur in Britain<br><i>James Carleton Paget</i>  | 307 |
| 14. The Similarity of the Two Masters: Ferdinand Christian Baur<br>and Adolf von Harnack<br><i>Daniel Geese</i>  | 355 |
| 15. Ferdinand Christian Baur and Practical Theology<br><i>Birgit Weyel</i>   | 372 |
| <i>Bibliography of Works by and about Baur</i>   | 391 |
| <i>Index of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Citations</i>  | 403 |
| <i>Index of Authors</i>  | 406 |
| <i>Index of Subjects</i>   | 411 |

## Abbreviations

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| ABG             | <i>Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte</i>  |
| AES             | <i>Archives européennes de sociologie/European Journal of Sociology</i>   |
| AKG             | Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte Berlin   |
| ANF             | <i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325</i> , 10 vols (Edinburgh, 1867–73) |
| APTh            | Arbeiten zur Pastoraltheologie  |
| BETL            | Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium  |
| BHTh            | Beiträge zur historischen Theologie   |
| BJ              | Josephus Bellum Iudaicum  |
| <i>BJRL</i>     | <i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>   |
| <i>BWKG</i>     | <i>Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte</i>   |
| <i>BZ</i>       | <i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>  |
| BZNW            | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft   |
| CBET            | Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology   |
| ConBNT          | Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series  |
| <i>CPJ</i>      | <i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i>  |
| CRINT           | Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum   |
| DS              | H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer, <i>Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum</i>        |
| EKK             | Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament  |
| <i>EKZ</i>      | <i>Evangelische Kirchenzeitung</i>  |
| <i>ET, ExpT</i> | <i>Expository Times</i>   |
| <i>EvTh</i>     | <i>Evangelische Theologie</i>   |
| FGLP            | Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus  |
| FRLANT          | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments   |
| GTA             | Göttingen theologische Arbeiten   |
| HNT             | Handbuch zum Neuen Testament  |
| <i>HThR</i>     | <i>Harvard Theological Review</i>   |
| <i>HUCA</i>     | <i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>  |
| HUTH            | Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie   |
| <i>IDB</i>      | <i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>  |
| <i>JBL</i>      | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>   |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <i>JBW</i>     | <i>Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft</i>                          |
| <i>JDTh</i>    | <i>Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie</i>                               |
| <i>JJS</i>     | <i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>                                       |
| <i>JTL</i>     | <i>Journal für theologische Literatur</i>                              |
| KEH.NT         | Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament                |
| KEK            | Kritische-exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament                |
| <i>KuD</i>     | <i>Kerygma und Dogma</i>   |
| <i>LThK</i>    | <i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i> , 2nd edn                      |
| MThSt          | Marburger theologischen Studien  |
| NET            | Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie                               |
| NovTSup, NT.S  | Novum Testamentum. Supplements   |
| <i>NThJ</i>    | <i>Neues theologisches Journal</i>                                     |
| <i>NTS</i>     | <i>New Testament Studies</i>   |
| ÖTBK           | Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar                                      |
| <i>PKZ</i>     | <i>Protestantische Kirchenzeitung für das evangelische Deutschland</i> |
| <i>PrJ</i>     | <i>Preußische Jahrbücher</i>   |
| <i>RGG</i>     | <i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>                            |
| SBL            | Society of Biblical Literature   |
| SBR            | Studies of the Bible and Its Reception                                 |
| SBS            | Stuttgarter Bibelstudien   |
| <i>SEÅ</i>     | <i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>   |
| SIJD           | Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum                       |
| SJLA           | Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity                                   |
| <i>SJTh</i>    | <i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>                                    |
| SNTSMS         | Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series                     |
| StANT          | Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament                                  |
| <i>STK</i>     | <i>Svensk teologisk kvartalsskrift</i>                                 |
| StNT           | Studien zum Neuen Testament  |
| TBT            | Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann                                      |
| <i>ThB</i>     | <i>Theologische Beiträge</i>   |
| ThHK           | Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament                        |
| <i>ThJb(T)</i> | <i>Theologische Jahrbücher (Tübingen)</i>                              |
| <i>ThLZ</i>    | <i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>                                   |
| <i>TRu</i>     | <i>Theologische Rundschau</i>  |
| <i>ThRv</i>    | <i>Theologische Revue</i>  |
| <i>ThStKr</i>  | <i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>                               |
| ThÜb           | Theologie im Übergang  |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| TRE          | <i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>                                |
| TZTh, TübZTh | <i>Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie</i>                           |
| UTB          | Uni-Taschenbücher   |
| VWGTh        | Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft für Theologie |
| WdF          | Wege der Forschung  |
| WMANT        | Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament        |
| WUNT         | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament                |
| WZ(H)        | <i>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift (Halle)</i>                        |
| ZGB          | Zürcher Grundriße zu Bibel  |
| ZKG          | <i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>                            |
| ZNW          | <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>           |
| ZPhF         | <i>Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung</i>                     |
| ZThK         | <i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>                         |
| ZWT          | <i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>                  |

## *List of Contributors*

**Dr. Stefan Alkier**, Professor of New Testament and Early Church History at the University of Frankfurt am Main

**Dr. Martin Bauspiess**, formerly research associate at the University of Tübingen, since 2014 vicar in Unterhausen and Honau (Reutlingen deaconate)

**Dr. Volker Henning Drecoll**, Professor of Church History at the University of Tübingen, with a specialty in the Ancient Church

**Dr. Jörg Frey**, Professor of New Testament Studies at the University of Zürich, with a specialty in Ancient Judaism and Hermeneutics

**Daniel Geese**, formerly research associate at the University of Tübingen, since 2014 vicar in Schietingen and Vollmaringen (Nagold deaconate)

**Dr. Anders Gerdmar**, Associate Professor in New Testament Exegesis at Uppsala University, and President of the Scandinavian School of Theology, Uppsala, Sweden

**Dr. Ulrich Köpf**, Emeritus Professor of Church History at the University of Tübingen

**Dr. Christof Landmesser**, Professor of New Testament at the University of Tübingen, with a specialty in Paul and the Pauline School, Hermeneutics, and Theology of the New Testament

**Dr. David Lincicum**, Associate Professor of New Testament and Early Christian Literature at the University of Notre Dame

**Rev. Dr. Robert Morgan**, Emeritus Fellow of Linacre College, University of Oxford, and Priest-in-Charge at Sandford-on-Thames

**Dr. James Carleton Paget**, Senior Lecturer in New Testament Studies at the University of Cambridge, and Fellow and Tutor of Peterhouse

**Dr. Notger Slenczka**, Professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Berlin, with a specialty in Dogmatics

**Dr. Martin Wendte**, formerly research associate at the University of Tübingen, since 2013 Assistant for Studies in the Clergy Seminar of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church of Württemberg

**Dr. Birgit Weyel**, Professor of Practical Theology at the University of Tübingen, with a specialty in Pastoral Care and Pastoral Theology

**Dr. Johannes Zachhuber**, Fellow in Theology, Trinity College, and Associate Professor of Modern Theology at the University of Oxford

# Part I

## Connections and Demarcations



# 1

---

## Ferdinand Christian Baur and David Friedrich Strauss

*Ulrich Köpf*

*To Rolf Schäfer, Teacher and Friend*

### INTRODUCTION

Ferdinand Christian Baur long resisted connecting the term “Tübingen School”<sup>1</sup> with his name, as his opponents did in the middle of the fourth decade of the nineteenth century.<sup>2</sup> The contention of the Hanover court preacher Gerhard Uhlhorn that this school was in the process of breaking up<sup>3</sup> gave Baur the occasion finally to accept the school name in a positive sense and to devote a monograph of his own to this school.<sup>4</sup> In the second edition of this monograph, which appeared shortly before his death,<sup>5</sup> he adds a lengthy

<sup>1</sup> Cf. U. Köpf, “Die theologischen Tübinger Schulen,” in *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbe- trachtung. Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler*, ed. U. Köpf, 8th Blaubeurer Symposium, Contubernium 40 (Sigmaringen, 1994), 9–51, esp. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. C. Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Stuttgart, 1845), 2nd edn, ed. Eduard Zeller (Leipzig, 1866–7), preface to the 1st edn, vol. 1, p. vi: “I assume that my method of historical criticism is well known. Recently I have received the dubious honor of being named the founder and master of a new critical school. This is an honor against which—even if I were to take it more seriously than it is intended—I can only protest.” ET: *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, trans. Allan Menzies (London and Edinburgh, 1875–6, 1:vi (our translation).

<sup>3</sup> G. Uhlhorn, “Die älteste Kirchengeschichte in der Darstellung der Tübinger Schule: Eine Übersicht,” in *JDTh* 3 (1858), 280–349, citation from 342–3; reprinted in F. C. Baur, *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, ed. K. Scholder, vol. 5: *Für und wider die Tübinger Schule* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1975), 221–91, at 284–5.

<sup>4</sup> F. C. Baur, *Die Tübinger Schule und ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart* (Tübingen, 1859).

<sup>5</sup> Second revised and enlarged edn (Tübingen, 1860) (reprinted in Baur, *Ausgewählte Werke* [n. 3]), 5:293–465).

footnote in which he himself provides an argument for what Uhlhorn declared to be the school's "dissolution process":

Where are those who in fact still comprise the School? What anguish I must have felt when, from my perspective as the master of the house, I sought to take stock of my chief devotees! Precisely the best, the dearest and truest to me, I found missing from my line of succession.

Then he identifies four persons by name who, in his opinion at that time, form the circle of his close associates: Albert Schweigler (in the meantime deceased), who was the editor of Aristotle's metaphysics and a scholar of Roman history; Eduard Zeller, his son-in-law, who was forced out of theology into philosophy; Karl Christian Planck, who became a secondary school teacher; and Karl Reinhold Köstlin, who was called to the Tübingen chair in aesthetics as the successor to Friedrich Theodor Vischer.<sup>6</sup> This statement stands in curious contrast to a nearly contemporary statement of Eduard Zeller about the "Tübingen Historical School" and the "investigations into the history of the Christian Church and especially its early history" that are characteristic of that school: "The men who have forged a new path in these investigations for a quarter-century, Baur, Strauss, and their younger contemporaries, are the primary ones their opponents customarily group together under the name of the 'Tübingen School.'"<sup>7</sup>

Even if we take into account that Zeller, who was on good terms with Strauss as well as Baur, sought to reduce the tensions between them, he did not fail to acknowledge the existence of their teacher-student relationship. Above all, however, Baur himself, in his 1849 account of recent faculty history, had already spoken openly of Strauss as a student (*Repentent*) "who was a pupil of Baur at the seminary in Blaubeuren and then later in Tübingen, and at the time [of the appearance of his *Leben Jesu*] had a friendly relationship with him."<sup>8</sup> It is not simply an anachronism that in Baur's enumeration the name of David Friedrich Strauss is omitted, a name that doubtless should have belonged there in terms of Strauss's entire development, in terms of the content and critical orientation of his theological writings, and also in view of his exclusion from academic theology. That the teacher simply passed over him testifies rather to an intense awkwardness in his relationship with his most famous student. This awkwardness had a history of its own. From early on it involved both parties, their friends were aware of it, discussed it at

<sup>6</sup> Baur, *Die Tübinger Schule*, 2nd edn, 58–9 (*Ausgewählte Werke*, 5:352–3), n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> E. Zeller, "Die Tübinger historische Schule," in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 4 (1860): 90–173, at 91. Reprinted in E. Zeller, *Vorträge und Abhandlungen geschichtlichen Inhalts* (Leipzig, 1865), 267–353 (the reprint lacks the introductory pages 90–3).

<sup>8</sup> F. C. Baur, "Die evangelisch-theologische Fakultät vom Jahr 1812 bis 1848," in K. Klüpfel, *Geschichte und Beschreibung der Universität Tübingen* (Tübingen, 1849), 389–428, at 411.

length, and also later repeatedly investigated it.<sup>9</sup> When it is portrayed here yet again, I do so with the intention of viewing it as the history of a very personal teacher-student relationship, one that at the same time reflects the tension between two different ways of proceeding on the basis of the same scientific foundation.<sup>10</sup>

## BAUR AS TEACHER IN BLAUBEUREN AND TÜBINGEN

David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74) became a student of Ferdinand Christian Baur (sixteen years his senior) during his residence at the lower seminary in Blaubeuren from 21 October 1821 to 27 September 1825. In the biography of his friend Christian Märklin, who died at a young age, Strauss depicts the “cloistered life” in what was once a Benedictine monastery; this autobiographical account has repeatedly been used by researchers as a source of the first rank.<sup>11</sup> Strauss characterizes Baur in unambiguously positive terms as compared with his colleague Friedrich Heinrich Kern (1790–1842), who was two years his senior. Baur and Kern had been acquainted since their student days as students in the Tübingen seminary (*Stift*). In 1817 they both became professors at Blaubeuren, and in 1826 they were named professors on the Tübingen theological faculty. At Tübingen, nevertheless, Baur could not be certain about the support of his colleague; when he proposed Märklin, about 1839, for a vacant position on the faculty, Kern did not back him.<sup>12</sup> From a

<sup>9</sup> It plays an important role in what is still the basic biography of Strauss: T. Ziegler, *David Friedrich Strauss*, 2 vols (Strasburg, 1908). Cf. further W. Lang, “Baur und Strauss,” in *Im neuen Reich* 4 (1874), 1:841–61 (reprinted with changes in Lang, *Von und aus Schwaben*, issue 3 [Stuttgart, 1886], 1–31); Lang, “Ferdinand Baur und David Friedrich Strauss,” in *Prj* 160 (1915), 474–504, and 161 (1915), 123–44; A. Rapp, “Baur und Strauss in ihrer Stellung zueinander und zum Christentum,” in *BWKG* 52 (1952), 95–149; Rapp, “Baur und Strauss,” in *BWKG* 54 (1954), 182–6; E. Barnikol, “Das ideengeschichtliche Erbe Hegels bei und seit Strauss und Baur im 19. Jahrhundert,” in *WZ(H)* GS X/1 (1961), 281–328; Barnikol, “Der Briefwechsel zwischen Strauss und Baur: ein quellenmässiger Beitrag zur Strauss-Baur-Forschung,” in *ZKG* 73 (1962), 74–125. For Strauss the following uncritical edition is still indispensable: *Ausgewählte Briefe von David Friedrich Strauss*, ed. and interpreted by Eduard Zeller (Bonn, 1895). A new edition of Baur’s correspondence has thus far not gone beyond the first volume: Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Die frühen Briefe (1814–1835)*, ed. Carl E. Hester, *Contubernium* 38 (Sigmaringen, 1993).

<sup>10</sup> The following presentation rests very extensively on the sources; nevertheless, in view of the time at my disposal and the limited scope of this essay, I do not draw on unpublished sources.

<sup>11</sup> D. F. Strauss, *Christian Märklin. Ein Lebens- und Charakterbild aus der Gegenwart* (Mannheim, 1841), 13–27. [Tr. The “lower seminary” was and still is a boarding school operated by the Evangelical Church of Württemberg.]

<sup>12</sup> For more details, see U. Köpf, “Christian Märklin und der württembergische Pietismus,” in *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung* (n. 1), 165–208.

later perspective, Strauss recalled certain weaknesses, which were already evident at Blaubeuren:

Such a pair of men as our teachers Kern and Baur, each first-rate in his own way and each complementing the other so beautifully, are rarely found together in one institution. Of the two, Baur earned well-deserved praise in a broader circle, as academic teacher and author; Kern proved not to be equal to the higher position to which he was assigned [in Tübingen] along with his former colleague and friend.<sup>13</sup>

To be sure, Kern appeared to Strauss at Blaubeuren to be “an excellent teacher.”<sup>14</sup> But still he emphasized that Baur’s life was “wholly devoted to science; . . . he had scarcely any pleasures outside his studies and remained for us in this regard . . . an ideal.” By contrast, Kern had “a more mellow, more easy-going nature, although this could readily be deceiving, for he was more excitable, often showing favoritism or being heavy-handed, . . . while Baur was always fair and impartial”—although to youthful sensibilities he seemed “a bit too harsh.”<sup>15</sup>

At Blaubeuren Kern handled ancient poetry as well as the Hebrew language, the Psalms and the Prophets; Strauss regards his treatment as “in the best sense tasteful.”<sup>16</sup> Baur taught Greek and Roman prose writings, and to that end ancient history and mythology at Blaubeuren. Along with much else, Strauss learned two things in particular from Baur’s teaching that would prove important for his own later work. First, he mentions that Baur introduced “the problem of Niebuhrian historical criticism, using Livy.” The basis for this was the work in which the Danish financier Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776–1831) published his Berlin lectures on Roman history.<sup>17</sup> In these lectures he offered for the first time a critique of the historiography of early Rome that was not simply a rebuttal of the traditional account but rather had as its goal a new, critically refined picture of the events. These lectures made Baur aware of the distinction between the mere critic and the historian, which later proved to be of fundamental importance for his relationship with Strauss.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 17.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 18–19.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>17</sup> B. G. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1811–12). ET: *The Roman History*, trans. F. A. Walter, 2 vols (London, 1827). [Tr. In 1810 Niebuhr became a professor of history at the University of Berlin.]

<sup>18</sup> Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte*, 1:ix–x (ET, 1:x–xi, trans. ours): “The history of the first four centuries of Rome is recognized to be uncertain and falsified. . . . We must make the effort to separate out poetry and falsification, and to direct our view to the evidences of truth, free of all whitewashing. The critic may be satisfied with the exclusion of fable, the destruction of lies; he only wants to unmask a deceptive history and is satisfied with posing a few suppositions, leaving the greater part of the whole in ruins. The historian, however, requires what is positive: he must, at least with probability, discover coherence and a credible narrative to replace those ruins, a coherence and narrative he can present as convincing.”

Second, according to the Blaubeuren “Diarium,” Baur offered a regular course on mythology in 1824 and 1825, which Strauss attended prior to his graduation.<sup>19</sup> In his biography of Märklin, Strauss reports that Baur introduced “us into the higher mythology through Herodotus,”<sup>20</sup> and the teacher had his students “as it were take part in a voyage of discovery.” “On his mythological journey, which at that time Baur undertook albeit without a proper compass, he touched on many shores indeed—a voyage from which, in an orderly way, he subsequently brought home such rich and enduring fruits for German scholarship.”<sup>21</sup> Clearly the students had an immediate lived experience as Baur’s first major book emerged.<sup>22</sup> We do not know how much of the book was presented in the lectures, and we can only include a few points from it here. It appears that Baur presented Jamshid, a figure from Persian religious history with whom he was familiar from Creuzer’s *Symbolik und Mythologie*,<sup>23</sup> so vividly that the students adopted this name as a nickname for their teacher. Jamshid, along with Mithras (Persian: Mitra), was “the original founder of agriculture,” who “with his golden dagger furrowed the soil.”<sup>24</sup> “According to the Zend Avesta, Jamshid is a true preserver of the law, but according to the Shahnama he already tarnished the purity of the ancient fire-worship.”<sup>25</sup> On the occasion of the third marriage of the Blaubeuren magistrate Jeremias Friedrich Reuss, Strauss wrote, in January and February 1826, a humorous “romantic national tragedy” entitled “Zauberei und Spengler.”<sup>26</sup> In it Baur played the role of the hapless master of ceremonies<sup>27</sup> Jamshid, who can speak only in broken phrases.<sup>28</sup> Ten years later, Friedrich

<sup>19</sup> G. Müller, *Identität und Immanenz. Zur Genese der Theologie von David Friedrich Strauss. Eine theologie- und philosophiegeschichtliche Studie* (Zürich, 1968), 176: “According to information from the ‘Diarium,’ he began on 2 January 1824 with a course of one-hour lectures (later expanded to two-hour lectures) on ‘mythology,’ which he continued through the entire year, right up to graduation day in Blaubeuren, 23 September 1825.”

<sup>20</sup> Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 17. Herodotus’ ethnographic excursions, with their comments on religion, provided the occasion for doing so.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>22</sup> F. C. Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie oder die Naturreligion des Altherthums*, 2 pts in 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1824–25).

<sup>23</sup> G. F. Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker besonders der Griechen*, 4 pts (Leipzig and Darmstadt, 1810–12). On Jamshid see esp. pt 2 (1811), 210, 252–5; pt. 4 (1812), 67–8, 76.

<sup>24</sup> Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie* (n. 22), 1:230.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:324.

<sup>26</sup> Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* (n. 19), 279–310.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 284. At the same time, this is an allusion to the lanky figure of the teacher: “Baur mit die lange Bein / Muß Ceremonienmeister sein.” On p. 291, Jamshid is expressly identified with “Prof. Baur.”

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 290–1, to the queen: “Your royal consort—love—ceremonies—in other respects—I know nothing today. . . . (*Jamshid sits down exhausted, wiping away perspiration, about to faint, on a stone at the tomb, and sighs*): God have mercy on me!”

Theodor Vischer, a fellow student and friend of Strauss,<sup>29</sup> remembered (in his description of his own doctoral defense) Baur's comic role in the play.<sup>30</sup> A further conception from the Persian religion that the students encountered and that obviously made a strong impression on them is that of the *ferver*.<sup>31</sup> They learned from Baur that the third group of spirits in "Ormazd's kingdom of light" consists of "countless *fervers*."<sup>32</sup> We do not know whether Strauss had already read Baur's book as a student; but it belonged to the literature that was in his possession and guided his studies.<sup>33</sup>

While the Blaubeuren students of Baur and Kern had already transferred to the Tübingen *Stift* in the winter semester of 1825–6, in order (as was customary) to pursue "philosophical" studies for the next two years, the two teachers followed in the winter semester of 1826–7. The curriculum for the first two years included mathematics, geography, and astronomy,<sup>34</sup> "and, in addition to philosophy in the stricter sense, philology and history."<sup>35</sup> In Western universities since the thirteenth century, theology dominated the remainder of the studies in the arts curriculum. From the winter semester of 1828–9 until the summer semester of 1830, Strauss attended theological lectures, including those by his former Blaubeuren teachers Baur and Kern.<sup>36</sup> In his Märklin biography, Strauss describes the beginning of his studies in the fall of 1826: "At this time the old Tübingen School emanating from Storr was visibly fading away and later was buried with Steudel, while a new, and in scientific terms incomparably more important, Tübingen School was awakening with Baur and his followers."<sup>37</sup> In looking back on this time, he expressed his considered opinion about this whole period. In the first two theological semesters, Strauss

<sup>29</sup> F. Schlawe, *Friedrich Theodor Vischer* (Stuttgart, 1959). Cf. also U. Köpf, "Friedrich Theodor Vischers Verhältnis zu Theologie und Kirche," in *Friedrich Theodor Vischer. Leben—Werk—Wirkung*, eds B. Potthast and A. Reck (Heidelberg, 2011), 67–78.

<sup>30</sup> Vischer to Strauss, 3 December 1836 (*Briefwechsel zwischen Strauss und Vischer*, ed. A. Rapp, 2 vols [Stuttgart, 1952–53], 1:23): "Baur was splendid, just as he was in 'Zauberei und Spengler.' He had indeed rebutted the opposition to me and, as for the rest, my understanding was that he wanted to make them at least receptive to my work. But he had something else in mind and, not doing so, came dressed in a greatcoat and sat comfortably among the noncombatants far back in the hall, when I suddenly called out to him. He whispered in the ear of his neighbor, 'What did he say?' They set aside a prominent place for him, and, extremely embarrassed, he said, 'Please—forgive me—I—am not—prepared.' etc. etc., in short, pure Jamshid."

<sup>31</sup> "Zauberei und Spengler" (Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* [n. 19], 306): "Das Bild dort ist, ich hab's genau betrachtet, / nichts as der Ferver . . . Denn jedes gute Ding hat seinen Ferver." ("The picture there, I've well observed, is nothing other than a *ferver* . . . For every good thing has its *ferver*.") [Tr. A "ferver" is a light spirit. In Persian the word is *feruer* (Ger. *Feuer*), "fire."]

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie* (n. 22), pt 2/1, 21, 25: "They exist from the beginning, and everything that has been created in time has a *ferver*."

<sup>33</sup> Strauss to Baur, 1 May 1836 (Barnikol, *Briefwechsel* [n. 9], 82).

<sup>34</sup> Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* (n. 19), 266–7.

<sup>35</sup> Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 31.

<sup>36</sup> Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* (n. 19), 266–7.

<sup>37</sup> Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 37.

attended not only Baur's lectures but also, without much enthusiasm, those of Kern, on the Synoptics,<sup>38</sup> and, with downright disapproval, those of Johann Christian Friedrich Steudel on apologetics and Old Testament theology.<sup>39</sup> Only in the final four semesters did he attend Baur's lectures on history of dogma, church history, and confessional theology (*Symbolik*), and on the Acts of the Apostles and the Corinthian Epistles.<sup>40</sup> In addition, however, he had to enroll in morals, homiletics, and catechesis for three semesters<sup>41</sup> with the unpopular Christian Friedrich Schmid.<sup>42</sup> Thus, with Steudel and Schmid, Strauss became familiar with the last representatives of Tübingen supernaturalism. He was disappointed with how unfit Kern was for the task.<sup>43</sup> With Baur, however, Strauss experienced a marvelous teacher generating new knowledge and already "shedding a critical light" for his students, "although just from afar."<sup>44</sup> This was because Baur, who had himself once studied with the representatives of the Old Tübingen School, had not yet fully developed his consistently historical-critical approach and had not yet applied it to the whole of the Christian tradition. Baur's inaugural lecture dealt with Gnosticism,<sup>45</sup> a subject that occupied him until his major monograph of 1835.<sup>46</sup> Along with Gnosticism, he advanced his religio-historical studies,<sup>47</sup> and in 1833-4, in particular, Baur became intensely engaged in disputation with his Catholic colleague Johann Adam Möhler.<sup>48</sup> He turned only gradually to New Testament themes after 1829, chiefly to the Acts of the Apostles<sup>49</sup> and the epistolary literature. The first of the latter essays, which aimed to provide a new overview of the history of early Christianity, focused on the opposition between two factions in early Christendom.<sup>50</sup> Subsequently, over quite a long period, he worked out a critical view of the New Testament. Eduard Zeller,

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 41; Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* (n. 19), 266.

<sup>39</sup> Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 38-9. <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 39-41, 51.

<sup>41</sup> Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* (n. 19), 266.

<sup>42</sup> Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 51-2. <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 17, 41-2. <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>45</sup> F. C. Baur, *Primae Rationalismi et Supranaturalismi historiae capita potiora. Pars I: De Gnosticorum Christianismo ideali* (Tübingen, 1827).

<sup>46</sup> F. C. Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis oder die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen, 1835).

<sup>47</sup> F. C. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwickelt* (Tübingen, 1831), and several essays.

<sup>48</sup> F. C. Baur, *Der Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus nach den Principien und Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Herrn D. Möhler's Symbolik*, first published as an article in *TZTh* (1833), nos. 3-4, 1-438, then separately as a book (Tübingen, 1834). Baur, *Erwiderung auf Herrn Dr. Möhlers neueste Polemik gegen die protestantische Lehre und Kirche* (Tübingen, 1834).

<sup>49</sup> F. C. Baur, *De orationis habitae a Stephano Acta Cap. VII consilio* (Tübingen, 1829).

<sup>50</sup> F. C. Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," in *TZTh* (1831), no. 4, 61-206; reprinted in *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, ed. K. Scholder, vol. 1: *Historisch-kritische Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1963), 1-146.

who studied in Tübingen from the fall of 1831 to the summer of 1836, reported in his old age about an experience that dated from the winter of 1834–5. Then he once sought out Baur and asked him whether “the portrayal of the so-called Apostolic Council in the fifteenth chapter of the Book of Acts appears to be incompatible with that of Paul in Galatians,” to which Baur responded (after looking at the text), “I have not yet thought about that, but it seems plausible.” Zeller ended his account by saying of Baur: “His New Testament criticism was astir even then, still in its beginnings, and first ventured upon its bold flight in the years following the appearance of Strauss’s *Leben Jesu* and the completion of Baur’s major works on the history of dogma.”<sup>51</sup>

### STRAUSS’S SCHOLARLY BEGINNINGS UP TO THE INITIAL FALLING-OUT WITH BAUR (1836)

During his curacy in Kleiningersheim, in the spring of 1831 Strauss composed an essay on a theme proposed by the dean at Besigheim, “Die Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge in ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung” (“The Doctrine of the Restoration of All things in Its Religio-Historical Development”),<sup>52</sup> which, in October of that year, he submitted as a dissertation to the Tübingen philosophical faculty.<sup>53</sup> Baur’s *Symbolik und Mythologie*<sup>54</sup> was an important source for this work. The first volume of Strauss’s *Leben Jesu*, which emerged under Baur’s very eyes, appeared in June 1835, the second volume in November 1835 (and bore the publication date of 1836).<sup>55</sup> Strauss wrote this work of some 1,500 pages in little over a year, starting in the summer of 1833; the remainder of the time was consumed by typesetting and corrections. Here I cannot and must not describe the contents of the work—a critical survey of the depiction of the life of Jesus in the four Gospels in terms of individual narrative units, largely destroying their historical validity by treating them under the concept of myth.

The *Leben Jesu* is indeed a contribution to New Testament scholarship, but it must also be viewed from a wider perspective. Strauss was not a New Testament specialist in today’s sense; systematic questions initially moved him, questions aroused by his experiences in the parish.<sup>56</sup> Based on his study of Hegel’s

<sup>51</sup> E. Zeller, *Erinnerungen eines Neunzigjährigen* (Stuttgart, 1908), 93–4.

<sup>52</sup> In Müller, *Identität und Immanenz* (n. 19), 50–82, on the sources and origin, 83–9.

<sup>53</sup> On his graduation, see *ibid.*, 119–26.

<sup>54</sup> Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie* (n. 22), pt 2/2, 383–454.

<sup>55</sup> D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet* (1st edn, Tübingen, 1835–6). ET: *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, trans. from the 4th German edn (1840) by George Eliot (London, 1846, 2nd edn, 1892); reprint of 2nd edn, ed. P. C. Hodgson (Philadelphia and London, 1972).

<sup>56</sup> Cf. U. Köpf, “Der kritische evangelische Theologe David Friedrich Strauss (1808–1874),” in *ThRv* 104 (2008), 443–54.

philosophy, he set forth a comprehensive plan of treating “each doctrine of Christian dogmatics in three steps,” first by grasping “in rational concepts the New Testament representations of it,” then by exposing its contradictions in a “negatively rational fashion,” and thus ridding it of them, and finally by re-establishing the concepts “through a positive rational procedure.”<sup>57</sup> When he returned from his study trip to Berlin, he already had reduced this ambitious project to the outline of a lecture series on the life of Jesus. A three-part treatment would follow upon a religio-philosophical introduction: an “immediately positive,” traditional part giving the ecclesiastical picture (*Vorstellung*) of the life of Jesus; a negative, critical part; and a dogmatic part that would re-establish what had been destroyed critically.<sup>58</sup> In the published version of 1835–6, the *Leben Jesu* offers, following an introduction, the carefully elaborated critical part of this plan, followed by a brief dogmatic “concluding dissertation.” It is notable how from the beginning Strauss uses the concept of the “negative” dispassionately in outlining his project, while later on he always reacts very sensitively to Baur’s designation of his procedure and results as “negative.”

When he composed this work, it is hard to say to what extent Strauss felt himself to be a student of Baur. Up to now, Baur had neither offered a course on the Gospels, since this material was covered by his colleague Kern, nor published a larger work on them. The only publication of his teacher that Strauss cites (once) in the *Leben Jesu* is Baur’s *Symbolik und Mythologie*.<sup>59</sup> In any event, he does not depend on Baur’s fundamental investigations for his own elaborations on the concept of “myth.”<sup>60</sup> Instead he begins directly with the application of the concept to the Bible as found in the biblical scholars Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, Johann Philipp Gabler, Georg Lorenz Bauer, and others.<sup>61</sup> But the consistent application of the concept of myth to the history of Jesus, going beyond these earlier efforts, was the independent achievement of Strauss. Zeller in his old age explains the indelible impression that Strauss’s procedure had on the first readers:

One had to have lived through it to have a sufficient idea of the impact this work had on its contemporaries, especially the theologians, among whom it exploded like a bombshell. People of all factions, rationalists and supernaturalists, and not least the disciples of Schleiermacher and Hegel, had almost without exception treated the gospel accounts with carelessness and gullibility. We young people,

<sup>57</sup> Strauss to Ludwig Georgii, 1 January 1831 (*Briefe von David Friedrich Strauss an L. Georgii*, ed. H. Maier [Tübingen, 1912], 4).

<sup>58</sup> Strauss to Märklin, 6 February 1832 (ed. J. F. Sandberger, *David Friedrich Strauss als theologischer Hegelianer* [Göttingen, 1972], 195–6).

<sup>59</sup> Strauss, *Leben Jesu* (n. 55), 1:3, n. 2, with reference to Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie* (n. 22), 1:343 ff. [Tr. This reference is omitted from the ET.]

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 1:27–76 (ET 52–87).

<sup>61</sup> On this matter see C. Hartlich and W. Sachs, *Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffs in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft* (Tübingen, 1952).

insofar as we stood on the side of scientific progress, quickly became the faction favoring Strauss.<sup>62</sup>

The immediate consequence of this book was that—before even examining the first volume, and solely on the grounds of a bookseller’s notice in the “Swabian Chronicle” of the *Schwäbische Merkur* on 6 June 1835—the Imperial Council for Studies in Stuttgart brought charges against Strauss on 11 June. Despite a noncommittal and cautious vote of the Inspectorate of the Tübingen *Stift*, Strauss was removed from his tutorial appointment on 28 July. This process need not be described here in more detail.<sup>63</sup> Suffice it to say that for Strauss this was the beginning of the end of his ecclesiastical and academic career.

Thereafter the *Leben Jesu* unleashed a torrent of criticism. Already in July 1835 the Tübingen theology professor Steudel wrote his own introduction to an article on the *Leben Jesu* in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, and at the same time published it separately.<sup>64</sup> In it he aligns himself with “supernaturalism,” which he equates “in form and content with the primitive faith of Christianity.”<sup>65</sup> In the rest of it he argues in a long-winded and very general fashion, which reveals no close familiarity with the *Leben Jesu* beyond the introduction, for the historical accuracy of the picture of Jesus contained in the gospels seen as harmonized, and against the application of the concept of myth.<sup>66</sup> In introductory remarks “on the *state of theology*,” he speaks of “a certain school” that with its rationalist understanding of Christianity has made the supernaturalist understanding of it obsolete.<sup>67</sup> Without mentioning Strauss by name, he speaks of “the student of a new school”<sup>68</sup>—not yet in the full sense that was customary later on in referring to a “new Tübingen School,”<sup>69</sup> but as a general indication of a theological orientation. Although Baur was once “my dearest friend and colleague,”<sup>70</sup> Steudel feels he can now

<sup>62</sup> Zeller, *Erinnerungen* (n. 51), 100.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. the description by Baur, who participated as a nonregular member of the Inspectorate, in “Die evangelisch-theologische Fakultät” (n. 8), 410–14; in more detail, C. Weizsäcker, “David Friedrich Strauss und der Württembergische Kirchendienst,” in *JDTh* 20 (1875), 641–60, incl. 648–53 on Strauss’s response of 12 July to the Council for Studies; Ziegler, *Strauss* (n. 9), 181–2: paraphrase of the response of the Inspectorate on 20 June; 183–90: Strauss’s response of 12 July. Supplementing this is F. Traub, “Die Stiftsakten über David Friedrich Strauss,” in *BWKG* 27 (1923), 48–64; 28 (1924), 15–22.

<sup>64</sup> J. C. F. Steudel, “Vorläufig zu Beherzigendes bei Würdigung der Frage über die historische oder mythische Grundlage des Lebens Jesu, wie die canonische Evangelien dieses darstellen, vorgehalten aus dem Bewußtseyn eines Glaubigen, der den Supranaturalisten beigezählt wird, zur Beruhigung der Gemüther,” *TZTh* (1835), no. 3, 117–99; separately, Tübingen, 1835.

<sup>65</sup> Steudel, *Vorläufig zu Beherzigendes*, 7, cf. 9: “It is *nothing other than the faith itself* that has lived in Christendom from the beginning, only requiring its proper grounding as divinely believed according to the needs of a specific consciousness.”

<sup>66</sup> Compare one of his arguments: “Without Christ no Christianity, therefore no Christianity whose Christ was subsequently formed by myths” (*ibid.*, 45).

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Strauss, *Christian Märklin* (n. 11), 38–9.

<sup>70</sup> Steudel, *Vorläufig zu Beherzigendes* (n. 64), 12n.

speak of him with disapproval. Strauss reacted strongly and reproached Steudel in the preface to the second volume of the *Leben Jesu* (already completed in October 1835): it would be “unseemly to make a moral issue out of scientific discussion, to raise his views about opponents to the level of conscience, and to brand those who are not orthodox as irreligious.”<sup>71</sup>

Shortly after Steudel, the Tübingen philosophy professor Carl August Eschenmayer released a polemical piece under the aggressive title, “The Judas Iscariot of Our Time.”<sup>72</sup> In distinction from Steudel, he takes issue with the exegetical undertakings of Strauss up to the third chapter (out of eight) of the second part. He frequently names the author, for whom he has a self-conscious aversion:

I, as a layperson, have worked on the gospel and have increasingly convinced myself of its factual truth. . . . Strauss on the other hand, as a theologian, works his way out of the gospel and increasingly convinces himself of its mythical character.<sup>73</sup>

He locates the procedure of the young author in the

effort found in all centuries partly to mutilate the historical foundation by critical and dialectical artifices, partly to profane the dignity of the revelation, and partly to regard the person of the founder not as he proclaims himself but by the benchmark of great individuals. All these counterclaims against the clear and literal meaning of the gospel can be summed up by calling him a traitor, a Judas Iscariot.<sup>74</sup>

In concluding, Eschenmayer depicts the shattering effect of this work on theology. “The dialectical stratagems are legion, and the recent critical school has truly mastered them. Schleiermacher is undoubtedly its forerunner, but the students have already surpassed their master.”<sup>75</sup> Strauss described this piece of writing as “the monstrous product of the legitimate marriage of theological ignorance and religious intolerance, consecrated by a somnambulant philosophy.”<sup>76</sup> Baur was not mentioned by Eschenmayer, but he must have felt himself a target of this polemic against the critical orientation.

In his survey of the faculty history (1849), Baur reported that Strauss “had shared with him many times the idea of his work and its construction prior to its appearance.”<sup>77</sup> Apparently Baur had not criticized his student’s plan; Strauss could therefore have rightly expected that his teacher would stand with him against attacks. On the other hand, in June 1835 Baur himself had

<sup>71</sup> Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* (n. 55), 2:vi (ET liv).

<sup>72</sup> C. A. von Eschenmayer, *Der Ischariothismus unserer Tage. Eine Zugabe zu dem jüngst erschienenen Werke: Das Leben Jesu von Strauss, I. Theil* (Tübingen, 1835).

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, vi–vii.      <sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, iii.      <sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 103.

<sup>76</sup> Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* (n. 55), 2:vii (ET liv).

<sup>77</sup> Baur, “Die evangelisch-theologische Fakultät” (n. 8), 410.

completed a new critical essay on the Pastoral Epistles, and he must have been aware of its explosive power.<sup>78</sup> At the beginning of August he sent his work to Cotta's Buchhandlung for publication.<sup>79</sup> The book,<sup>80</sup> which he regarded "partly as a sequel" to his work on Christian Gnosticism, and "partly as a contribution to the as-yet-unfinished critique of the New Testament canon,"<sup>81</sup> may have been delivered at the beginning of November; by 6 November Strauss thanked him for sending a copy and expressed his pleasure about the preface, "since many who are in the know will view it as a timely vote on my behalf."<sup>82</sup> In fact in his preface to this undertaking Baur clearly distanced himself from insistence on the "principle of authority and stability,"<sup>83</sup> and stood up for exegetical-critical study based on scholarly knowledge of antiquity.<sup>84</sup> With the results of his investigation, which showed that the Pastoral Epistles could not be attributed to the Apostle Paul, Baur must have also reckoned on an intense opposition to it, even though his topic was by no means as highly charged emotionally as was the critique of the history of Jesus.

Shortly after the appearance of this work, Baur became involved in an internal dispute. "In Tübingen there was a Protestant Union (*Evangelischer Verein*) whose members were faculty and clergy of the city (including also laypeople)."<sup>85</sup> Toward the end of the year its chairman Steudel posed a question occasioned first and foremost by the *Leben Jesu*:

How should the Protestant Christian react to the present danger to the Christian faith occasioned by recent scholarly phenomena, especially inasmuch as the information people get about these phenomena threatens to disturb people's faith?

Baur responded with a detailed letter that addresses fundamental questions.<sup>86</sup> First he takes up the relationship between scholarship and faith in general, then discusses the effects of scholarly work on the public, and refers to the

<sup>78</sup> Significantly, he mentions both works in the same letter to his brother, Friedrich August Baur, 11 June 1835 (Baur, *Die frühen Briefe* [n. 9], 118): "My essay on the Pastoral Epistles has been ready now for some time, but it causes me to have still other reservations regarding the Pauline epistles. . . . Have you already heard about Strauss's Life of Jesus?"

<sup>79</sup> Baur to Cotta's Buchhandlung, 3–6 August 1835 (ibid., 119).

<sup>80</sup> F. C. Baur, *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostel Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1835).

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., iii–iv.

<sup>82</sup> Strauss to Baur, 6 November 1835 (Baur, *Die frühen Briefe* [n. 9], 123–4).

<sup>83</sup> Baur, *Pastoralbriefe* (n. 80), vii.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., viii: "As long as the fact cannot be denied that the documents of Christianity are products of a far-distant past, it will always be a vain undertaking to want to get things straight about these documents in a different way than that process is facilitated by all those studies, encompassing so much, by which we gain information about antiquity in general, and above all by a criticism from which we should not shrink, a criticism by which the scattered ruins of long-past centuries are laboriously and tediously worked over."

<sup>85</sup> Lang, "Ferdinand Baur und David Friedrich Strauss" (n. 9), 479.

<sup>86</sup> Baur to the *Evangelischer Verein*, 20 December 1835, in Baur, *Die frühen Briefe* (n. 9), 129–44 (Steudel citation from 129).

account of “Christ’s ambassadors” about the *Leben Jesu* in order to turn more extensively to the opponents’ line of argument. Finally he connects the protocols of scholarship with the essential nature of Protestantism:

Protestants distinguish themselves from Catholics, by not only trusting in the Word of God alone, but also by giving an account of the reasons for their faith. This account, however, cannot reiterate the faith, but instead can only impart knowledge, the knowledge of faith.

This knowledge is “a never-ceasing investigation that has no stipulated limits and cannot predetermine its results.”<sup>87</sup> One cannot just go back to scripture

so as to stop utterly with scripture . . . and not also ask about it . . . whether human tradition in it is not to be distinguished from the divine content of scripture. The first principle of Protestantism not only does not forbid this questioning, but even requires it. . . . Thus historical–critical investigations have never ceased in the Protestant Church since its beginning.<sup>88</sup>

There are many examples of this insight. Against the objection that there must be “something that faith cannot allow knowledge to take away,”<sup>89</sup> Baur points to the fact that “none of the more recent philosophers and critics have any intention of depriving historical Christianity of its historical Christ and explaining his historical existence as a mere fable.”<sup>90</sup> He aligns himself with Strauss when he emphasizes: “Even the mythical interpretation leaves the historical individual standing, with an unassailable kernel of his life and work to which faith can hold fast.”<sup>91</sup> Again he rejects the idea that Protestant history may not be subjected to historical criticism as it applies to faith. To the contrary: “The more highly it values a living faith, . . . our church has rightly regarded free research into scripture, and beyond scripture, to be its most precious jewel.”<sup>92</sup> The Apostle Paul already developed “the depths and fullness of Christian faith” without going into details about the life history of Jesus, and correspondingly it is unimportant for faith “whether one regards this or that detail in the gospel history to be less reliable historically and thus traditional,” something that “even the most distinguished theologians . . . acknowledged without a further thought.”<sup>93</sup> Baur criticizes the fact that those who do not believe everything in the history of Jesus “to be of equal value,” and who use concepts such as “tradition” and “myth,” are assumed to be speaking of “fables and fabrications, deceptions and lies.”<sup>94</sup> He defends the effort to see in Christ not merely a human individual but also a principle or idea, and he brings the controversy back to the question “whether the entire content of the Christian faith depends on the mere letter, or whether we are allowed to rise up from the

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 135.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 137–8.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.

letter to the spirit.”<sup>95</sup> Expressing the denial of such a possibility is “the opposition to every scholarly understanding of the faith” (with faith still viewed as “supernaturalistic”), and thus the reduction of the spiritual life “to a level...at which the whole of spiritual activity consists in the simple procedure of putting the simple word of scripture in other terms (which many indeed also take to be a scholarly operation).”<sup>96</sup> Baur exclaims:

What monotony, what deathly silence, must rule when a person chooses to live in such a world; and what reason we have to thank God that we are allowed to live in a world in which God dispatches spiritual riches, and in a church that God builds up through the beautiful harmony of spiritual gifts!<sup>97</sup>

To avoid negative consequences, he introduces three “simple rules” for dealing with science.<sup>98</sup> With these rules in mind, he considers the “gift” he was called upon to judge: the essay by Eschenmayer accepted with appreciation by the chairman of the Union. Baur explains: “Only a few literary phenomena have made such a depressing and repugnant impression on me as this charge of contemporary treachery and heresy (*dieser Ischariotismus unserer Tage*).”

I regard it as completely unChristian and unevangelical...to bring such a damning judgment to bear on Strauss’s book and the author himself. . . . In my view, it is at least equally unChristian and unevangelical that the illustrious author . . . has branded the whole of modern criticism with the same label of heresy.

In this way he makes a connection to his own research.

I too have engaged in criticism and only recently have published a critical investigation relating to the New Testament; and I am of no mind to be deterred from the further exercise of my evangelical freedom to teach and write by this cry of heresy.<sup>99</sup>

As a result of this situation, Baur “can no longer consider himself a member of the Union.”<sup>100</sup> But his letter was not intended for the public and could not therefore offer support for Strauss.

Baur’s explanation reveals the extent to which he felt himself affected by Eschenmayer’s attack on Strauss and the historical criticism Strauss uses. While he was united with his student on the fundamentals, this does not mean that he agreed totally with him. Initially he spoke about this matter only confidentially. He wrote to his friend Ludwig Heyd in February 1836: “I am far from giving him my unconditional support, and I know full well what in his book is to be criticized and what is lacking.” On the “main question,” his “fundamentals,” however, “he should be given his due much more than people

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 139, 140.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 140–1.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 141.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 141–2.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 143.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 144.

have so far been inclined to do.”<sup>101</sup> He emphasizes, as Strauss himself does, that “the work contains nothing actually new, but only brings a lengthy and well-trodden path to its natural conclusion.” Therefore he does not find the book to be “as revolutionary” as his friend Heyd does. But Baur does admonish

in addition to [the book’s] often offensive indifference (*Kälte*) especially in regard to the person of Jesus, its far too negative criticism. I also believe that this critical standpoint allows a wider basis for the historical dimension in the account of Jesus’ life, and that the constructive criticism is far too infrequently expressed alongside the destructive criticism.<sup>102</sup>

At the same time Baur remained in close contact with Strauss and offered him advice on how to improve the work. From Strauss’s response of 1 May 1836, we know that Baur made two primary proposals. One was that Strauss should add “to the introduction an exposition on the relationship of myth to Christianity,” thereby introducing the reader to the literature. The other proposal was that he should examine “the external witnesses to the authenticity and antiquity of the Gospels.” Strauss acknowledges that he “feels insecure” on these points, and because of the lack of a relevant literature “does not know how he could improve his treatment.”<sup>103</sup> Strauss followed Baur’s advice in the second edition of the *Leben Jesu*, above all by adding three new sections to the introduction, on the possibility (on both external and internal grounds) of there being myths in the New Testament, and on the criteria of the mythical in the Gospel story.<sup>104</sup> “With these additions, Strauss undoubtedly provides a better foundation for the mythical standpoint.”<sup>105</sup>

Not only did the writings against Strauss grow in number in the course of 1836, the attacks in the ecclesiastical press against the “more recent theology” proved to be such that Baur could no longer remain silent. Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg’s *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* opened the new publishing year with a “preface” that extended over six issues from 2 to 20 January and dealt with “phenomena of the time.”<sup>106</sup> It presented an apocalyptic picture of “our dark days,”<sup>107</sup> traced the negative developments back to French influence (Napoleon in particular), and interpreted the wars of liberation as the age of John the Baptist, the dark days that have called forth, “right up to today,”

<sup>101</sup> Baur to Ludwig Heyd, 10 February 1836 (Lang, “Ferdinand Baur und David Friedrich Strauss” [n. 9], 483).

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 484. [*Tr.* Strauss famously referred to the *Kaltblütigkeit* of his investigation in the preface to the first edition (see ET lii).]

<sup>103</sup> Strauss to Baur, 1 May 1836 (Barnikol, “Briefwechsel” [n. 9], 82).

<sup>104</sup> The second edition of *Das Leben Jesu* was not available to me; I rely therefore on reports by Ziegler, *Strauss* (n. 9), 1:224–6, and Lang, “Ferdinand Baur und David Friedrich Strauss” (n. 9), 487–8. The expansion of the introduction beyond the twelve paragraphs of the first edition is also found in §§ 13, 14, and 16 of the third edition.

<sup>105</sup> Lang, “Baur und Strauss,” 488.

<sup>106</sup> *EKZ* (1836), 2.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

a “turning to Christ.”<sup>108</sup> It regarded both pietism<sup>109</sup> and supernaturalism<sup>110</sup> as negative signs of the time, but above all the “pantheism” deriving from “the Hegelian school.”<sup>111</sup> In 1830, “the spiritual connection with France, for a while interrupted, to Germany’s benefit, was once again reinstated”: the gateway to all the pernicious influence that continues in effect up to today.<sup>112</sup>

Then the writer turns to theological developments: “The past year has witnessed an undeniable worsening in the field of theology too.”<sup>113</sup> Subsequently one could only find fault with literature about the Old Testament,<sup>114</sup> but the most recent publication in the New Testament evokes utter disgust. Strauss’s *Leben Jesu* is “important not because it provides something absolutely new . . . but because it is simply the consistent application and summation of elements that have been around for quite a while.”<sup>115</sup> Strauss’s explanation in the preface to the first volume of his *Leben Jesu* is already deeply offensive: what his work “fundamentally calls for” is “the inner liberation of feelings and intellect from certain religious and dogmatic presuppositions.”<sup>116</sup> To Hengstenberg this means that the philosophy to which Strauss adheres in this state of liberation celebrates “a triumph here similar to that of Satan when he inhabited Judas.”<sup>117</sup> The author derived this comparison with Judas from Eschenmayer, whom he specifically cites in the next issue.<sup>118</sup>

Baur was unhappy about this “preface,” but he found in it as little occasion to defend Strauss as he did in other articles that mentioned his student or were devoted to very critical literature about the *Leben Jesu*. However, on 4 and 7 May an article appeared on “The Future of Our Theology,”<sup>119</sup> which in its second part also attacked Baur. In a fashion similar to the “preface,” the unknown author<sup>120</sup> refers to the “decisive year of 1830” as evoking Napoleon and the French Revolution. He portrays Strauss’s *Leben Jesu* as “the point of

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 10: “Pietistic impulses are found here and there among the lower classes, i.e., Christian forms not saturated with Christian nature, not directly awakened by the Spirit.”

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 11–12: “Supernaturalism has in important respects the same basis as rationalism, and must therefore also collapse with rationalism.”

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 18. [Tr. Baur discusses the July Revolution of 1830 (which removed the Bourbon monarchy from the throne of France) and its impact on German theology and church in *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, ed. Eduard Zeller (Tübingen, 1862), 232 ff. Conservative theologians attributed liberal ideas in Germany to French influence going back to the time of Napoleon.]

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 28–31, 33–5.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 35.

<sup>116</sup> Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* (n. 55), 1:vi (ET lii).

<sup>117</sup> *EKG* (1836), 36.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 41.

<sup>119</sup> *EKG* (1836), issue 36, 281–5; issue 37, 289–91.

<sup>120</sup> Later (*EKG* (1836), 641 n.), the editor Hengstenberg claims that he was not the author of this article and expresses his “confidence” in how Baur is explained: “In this respect the article provides a very obvious demonstration of the value of his reputedly objective criticism. No one will then so readily find more confusing the confidence with which he deprives the apostles of their rightful place.”

departure for the new shape of things” in Christianity<sup>121</sup> and as “the consummate instrument of the spirit governing our own intelligentsia.”<sup>122</sup> “Strauss gives them the religion admirably suited to their adulterous tribe.”<sup>123</sup> Then the author directs his attack against Professors Christian Hermann Weisse in Leipzig and Ferdinand Christian Baur. Baur “up to now has been known as a very talented and thorough, but also very skeptical, scholar”; in his book on the Pastoral Epistles “an arbitrary skepticism” emerges, “which in fact can only be comparable to that of Strauss.” Through the entire work there resounds “a bitter and agitated attitude toward everything to which skeptical criticism is opposed, and which can only be explained by a connection to the procedure of his compatriot Dr. Strauss.”<sup>124</sup> Baur’s “criticism is arbitrary and audacious,”<sup>125</sup> his argumentation characterized by “incomprehensible formulations,” “entirely frivolous reasons,” and “a single, wholly arbitrary foundation.” One must “believe in fact that Herr Baur has already thrown overboard the historical authority of the Gospel of John, just as Strauss did.” In conclusion, says the author, Baur has surrendered to a “giddy, indeed intoxicated, critical skepticism.”<sup>126</sup>

Baur responded to this attack in a surprisingly thorough way, which shows how seriously he took it.<sup>127</sup> In his response, which goes into fundamental issues and draws in large measure on his aforementioned letter to the Protestant Union, we shall focus above all on what concerns Baur’s relationship to Strauss. First of all, he takes up the accusation that a bitter and irritable attitude toward all the enemies of “skeptical criticism” runs through his entire work, which can only be explained on the basis of his cordial relationship with Strauss.<sup>128</sup> He objects to this because the greater part of his investigation on the Pastoral Epistles was drafted during the fall break of 1834, when neither the first part of the *Leben Jesu* was available nor its consequences for the author foreseeable. The work on the Pastorals grew out of his studies of Gnosticism, begun before 1830, and is not the result of an “attitude,” but simply follows the course of his critical investigations.<sup>129</sup> He did indeed compose the preface to his book under the impact of the “first reports of Eschenmayer’s Judas Iscariot essay” and in anticipation of the polemic in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, the assertions of which, in a “crude and appalling tone,” should not have come “from the mouth of an evangelical Christian and

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., 281–2: “Through the turn of things that Strauss’s work has introduced into theology, we are brought to the point of seeing the abrogation of both the Bible, as the source of faith, and the institution of the church.”

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 284.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 285.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 290.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 291.

<sup>127</sup> F. C. Baur, “Abegenöthigte Erklärung gegen einen Artikel der evangelischen Kirchenzeitung, herausgegeben von Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg, Prof. der Theol. an der Universität zu Berlin,” in *TZTh* (1836), no. 3, 179–232.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 184–8.

theologian.<sup>130</sup> In a second step, Baur turns his line of argument against the disparaging of his critical investigation of the Pastoral Epistles.<sup>131</sup>

In the third step, Baur returns to the purpose of the article, which is “to put him in the same category with Strauss,” indeed “to denounce him before the public as one who shares Strauss’s view of the Gospel of John.”<sup>132</sup> Against such a supposition, he explains that he has never previously “permitted himself any kind of judgment on the historical authority of the Johannine gospel, not only because thus far his critical investigations have not extended to it, but also because he has no desire to question its historical authority and claim something he cannot demonstrate.”<sup>133</sup> He regards the accusation about the Johannine gospel as “not merely untruthful but libelous.”<sup>134</sup> He is even more energetic in rejecting the reproach that the “willful skepticism” in his book about the Pastoral Epistles can only be compared with that of Strauss.<sup>135</sup> “The entire tendency” of the accusation against his book on the Pastorals is “to put his criticism into the same category with Strauss’s criticism.”<sup>136</sup> Baur defends himself against this assertion by distinguishing his critical method from that of his student.<sup>137</sup> While “the distinctive aspect of Strauss’s criticism . . . consists in explaining the facts of the gospel history in terms of myth,” Baur’s own argument in his study of the Pastoral Epistles is entirely different. It is not simply a matter of the difference between the texts under investigation by each of them.<sup>138</sup> More important is the difference in methods. By means of his “critical combinations,” he himself always “proceeds from specific, historically highlighted facts.” “Holding fast to the historically given” is the “distinctive character” of Baur’s criticism, and he emphasizes its “objective standpoint” in always-new formulations.<sup>139</sup> So one must ask: “How then can the entire objective foundation of Christianity be called into question by my investigation in the same way it is by Strauss’s?”<sup>140</sup> Regarding the fear expressed in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* about his alleged “critical skepticism” leading to the denial of “the authenticity of all the Pauline epistles,” he would like to show that behind such a fear “is hidden a woeful lack of faith.”<sup>141</sup>

A rather extended discussion of faith and scholarly science comprises a fourth point, into which Baur has incorporated material from his letter to the Protestant Union.<sup>142</sup> He argues that a criticism that is not allowed to be

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 189 n.      <sup>131</sup> Ibid., 190–200.      <sup>132</sup> Ibid., 200.      <sup>133</sup> Ibid., 201.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., 202.      <sup>135</sup> Ibid.      <sup>136</sup> Ibid., 205.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 205–6: “Concerning my and Strauss’s criticism, almost anyone who is capable of making a judgment about such things, and does not, because of ill will, have a particular interest in denying the truth, will acknowledge the difference between my method and Strauss’s.”

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., 206: He speaks of Strauss’s criticism in the *Leben Jesu*, “in which in other respects too the distinctive nature of the object does not allow any fully adequate comparison with my criticism.”

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 206–7.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 207.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., 208.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 208–20.

skeptical is no criticism.<sup>143</sup> In a fifth step, he returns to speaking briefly about his relationship with Strauss.<sup>144</sup> He acknowledges that he stands “in a cordial relationship with Dr. Strauss,” and certifies that, in the years of their acquaintance, he has never seen in him “the demonic nature” that “the editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* wants to behold in him with the Argus eyes of his Christian love.”<sup>145</sup> While he dismisses the charge of friendship as a basis for condemnation,<sup>146</sup> he reacts with special bitterness to the claim that he stands “under Strauss’s influence.” He regards such a claim as “unproven, malicious, damaging to my theological independence, and thus also injurious to my honor.”<sup>147</sup> Finally in a sixth step he locates the controversy within the contemporary arguments over the influence of Schleiermacher and Hegel on theology and church.<sup>148</sup>

Baur spoke out with clarity in this essay on behalf of historical criticism, but Strauss could not have been satisfied with what he wrote. To be sure, Baur defended him against the charge of demonization brought by the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* and by Eschenmayer, and he acknowledged their friendship. But when it came to concrete issues, he spoke without notable sympathy for his student, indeed distanced himself from him, and claimed for his own part to hold on to the historically given, albeit evaluated critically, whereas he spoke very clearly about how Strauss “calls into question the entire objective foundation of Christianity.” This is the basis for a constantly reiterated distinction between his own critical work and that of his student.

This article brought about a noticeable disruption in the relationship between Strauss and Baur, although their communication remained cordial. Strauss explains why he is disturbed in a letter to Baur on 19 August 1836.<sup>149</sup> He addresses Baur as “Most Honored Friend” and continues by expressing appreciation for various matters. He calls the “Required Explanation” (*Abgenöthigte Erklärung*) “a polemical masterpiece,” but complains that the author took the occasion of Hengstenberg’s argument about his relationship to Strauss to distance himself clearly from his student.<sup>150</sup> He concludes his letter

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., 219 n. “A criticism that is not allowed to be skeptical is no criticism. That is because often only doubt can lead to truth; and a theology based utterly on the principle that one is not at all allowed to doubt and winnow, works best by removing historical criticism entirely from the ranks of theological science.”

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 220–2.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., 221. [*Tr.* The allusion is to the mythological monster Argus, who has a hundred eyes, hence is a very watchful guardian.]

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., 221–2. “This is not the first time that friendship counts as a crime because of theological views, with the teacher persecuted along with the student—not the first time that even the dead are not allowed to lie in peace because of the living.”

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., 220.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 222–32.

<sup>149</sup> Barnikol, “Briefwechsel” (n. 9), 88–90.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 88–9. “It is a polemical masterpiece not only because of the clarity of its exposition and compelling marshalling of evidence, but mainly because of the moral dignity with which you oppose the pious viciousness of these people, in a way I can hardly recall being done

by confessing that, just because he is “inwardly bound to Baur by friendship and gratitude,” he believes he “should not keep these remarks to himself,” nor should he “hide the fact that in this regard your essay is among the most distressing things I have met with in regard to my book.” In matters such as this, one is “hardened . . . against insults from strangers and against indifference, but much more sensitive to injuries from friends, be they ever so slight.”<sup>151</sup> A week later he reported how Baur had wronged him to his friend Ludwig Georgii,<sup>152</sup> and at the end of August he complained about Baur to his friend Ernst Rapp in a letter in which he clearly describes the deficiency in Baur’s comparison of their two methods.<sup>153</sup>

## RELATIONS UNTIL THE BREAK OF 1846

Despite this initially strong disagreement, cordial communication between Baur and Strauss continued for another decade, as can be seen from their

elsewhere. Since in this affair you yourself acknowledge a relationship to me in addition to the purely scientific one, I must say that I am not pleased that you have taken the occasion, because of Hengstenberg’s incompetent confusion of our two works and tendencies, to stress for your part only the differences and disagreements between them as strongly as possible, and to guarantee that view by expressing disapproval of my work and method. I don’t know whether this was necessary in your own case (in mine, which already has gained such notoriety, it certainly was not); and I don’t know whether this disapproval was suitably qualified by the subsequently inserted, not entirely clear remark, that in part also the difference of subject matter makes a comparison of our respective critical methods impossible. I at least believe I am aware of the fact that what you call in your letter my negativity is halfway the result of personal shortcomings, and certainly the rest is the result of the fact that the absence of other controlling historical factors for the time period and events of the life of Jesus differs, for example, from the situation at the time of the Pastoral Epistles.”

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 89.

<sup>152</sup> Strauss to Georgii, 26 August 1836 (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 16): “I note that in his ‘Required Explanation’ Dr. Baur, hitherto my truest friend in the field of criticism, has acted badly toward me because he has responded to Hengstenberg’s charge—that his work on the ‘Pastoral Epistles’ exhibits the same tendency as my ‘Life of Jesus’—by renouncing any commonality with me and clearly admonishing me. Whoever thinks I deserve to be admonished can do so, and I have no objection to it. But when a friend does so at the present moment, in order to placate the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, that puts an end to the friendship.”

<sup>153</sup> Strauss to Rapp, 31 August 1836 (*Briefe*, ed. Zeller [n. 9], 24): “Concerning opponents and literature in general, Baur recently published ‘a Required Explanation to Hengstenberg’ in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*. In response to Hengstenberg’s charge that he occupies the same standpoint that I do because of his ‘Pastoral Epistles,’ he now denies every connection between our situations and even reinforces this by admonishing me for my critical principles. In the present circumstances, a friend should certainly not publicly admonish me, even if the admonition be merited. But that is not how B. sees it. He says that at most I simply deduce the impossibility of the stories [about Jesus] from their inner contradictions with each other, or internally and unreasonably, without also, as he does, drawing upon external witnesses, i.e., conflicting data from otherwise credible history—as though such parallels from other sources exist for the greater part of the gospel history.”

correspondence and other writings.<sup>154</sup> Strauss willingly sought further advice from Baur;<sup>155</sup> he even asked him repeatedly for literature not available from the Stuttgart library, and he received it as a rule through the offices of the Tübingen publisher Osiander. They also saw each other fairly often, mainly in Stuttgart,<sup>156</sup> and in Markgröningen where Baur frequently vacationed with his old friend Friedrich Ludwig Heyd, the town pastor.<sup>157</sup> After a delay of many months, Strauss informed Baur on 2 August 1842 of his engagement and invited him to visit his new home in Sontheim bei Heilbronn soon, or indeed come to the wedding<sup>158</sup> scheduled for 20 August.<sup>159</sup> Baur congratulated Strauss on 12 October with the gift of an image of Saint Cecilia, which was appropriate for the vocation of Strauss's wife, Agnese Schebest, a singer.<sup>160</sup> In repeated invitations to Baur, Strauss referred explicitly to himself as his student and spiritual son.<sup>161</sup> Indeed, after meeting Baur in the autumn of 1837, Strauss wrote how much it had meant to him "after so many adverse interactions once again to feel a friendly, fatherly hand."<sup>162</sup> Soon afterward he wrote Georgii: "That you have cordial relations with our beloved Baur is very comforting for me; on Sunday, a week ago today, he visited me and I had once again the impression that he is a fatherly friend."<sup>163</sup> In April 1843 Baur finally visited the married couple.<sup>164</sup> While Baur turned his thoughts to the professional advancement of his student,<sup>165</sup> Strauss supported his teacher in his efforts to fill a theological chair in Tübingen with Christian Märklin<sup>166</sup> and to

<sup>154</sup> Thus Strauss already writes to Georgii on 4 November 1836 (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 17): "I have mended fences with Baur, partly in writing, partly in conversation, for he visited me during the [university] recess; in fact in his presence I find this honorable man to be irresistible."

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Strauss to Baur, 4 March 1837 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel" [n. 9], 96): "Please excuse my many questions. I'm sorry for the time you need to read and respond to them. There is no one I would rather ask than you."

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Strauss to Baur, 31 March 1837 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 98); Strauss to Vischer, 4 April 1842 (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp [n. 30], 117).

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Strauss to Baur, 9 November 1838 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 107). On 17 March 1838 Strauss indicated to Georgii that he hoped to see Baur during the Easter vacation (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 22).

<sup>158</sup> Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 113. <sup>159</sup> Ziegler, *Strauss* [n. 9], 2:385.

<sup>160</sup> Barnikol, "Briefwechsel" [n. 9], 114–15.

<sup>161</sup> Strauss to Baur, 2 August 1842 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 113): "friend and student"; 29 October 1842 (*ibid.*, 115): "My wife too was pleased to meet you as my spiritual father"; Strauss to Rapp, 20 April 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Zeller [n. 9], 151): when his wife said that "the three of us (Zeller, Märklin, and I) are quite some fellows, I added that Baur is the father of us all."

<sup>162</sup> Strauss to Baur, 12 October 1837 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 101).

<sup>163</sup> Strauss to Georgii, 18 October 1837 (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 21).

<sup>164</sup> Strauss to Rapp, 20 April 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Zeller [n. 9], 151); Strauss to Georgii, 27 April 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 42).

<sup>165</sup> Thus Strauss reported to Vischer on 27 May 1838 (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp [n. 30], 1:59): "Recently Baur mentioned that I should try for a lectureship in philosophy in Heidelberg, and I admitted that I wanted to discuss the matter with him."

<sup>166</sup> Strauss to Baur, 12 October 1837 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel" [n. 9], 114 f.); Strauss to Vischer, 16 March 1839 (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp), 1:86; see U. Köpf, "Christian Märklin und

find a financial supporter.<sup>167</sup> At Baur's request, consideration was given to this matter, but, like his proposal to edit the posthumous work of Friedrich Heinrich Kern on moral theology,<sup>168</sup> it came to naught.<sup>169</sup> As the twenty-five-year celebration of Baur's professorship (starting with his call to the Blaubeuren seminary in 1817) approached, Strauss and Märklin planned to award him a cup, sponsored by his students, in the spring of the following year.<sup>170</sup> This plan, separately undertaken by the students,<sup>171</sup> miscarried because Baur declined to accept the award.<sup>172</sup> There were also numerous contacts between Baur and Strauss, which showed that their personal relationship was not permanently damaged by Baur's "Abgenöthigte Erklärung."

Above all the two sent each other their most recent publications and shared their assessments of them. In this way numerous differences in the understanding of their work had to have been clarified. Since the fall of 1836,<sup>173</sup> Strauss was especially occupied in settling accounts in the broadest sense with various opponents of his *Leben Jesu*. In 1837<sup>174</sup> his *Streitschriften* appeared, in which he not only defended his *Leben Jesu* but also engaged with certain tendencies of contemporary thought.<sup>175</sup> Baur thanked him on 10 April 1837 for the first volume and praised its "title, tone, and contents."<sup>176</sup>

der württembergische Pietismus," in Köpf, ed., *Historische-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung* (n. 1), 165–208, esp. 165–70.

<sup>167</sup> Strauss to Baur, 29 April 1842 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 112 f.).

<sup>168</sup> Strauss to Vischer, 4 April 1842 (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp [n. 9], 1:117); Strauss to Baur, 5 April 1842 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 111).

<sup>169</sup> Strauss to Baur, 29 April 1842 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 113).

<sup>170</sup> Strauss to Vischer, 9 December 1842 (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp [n. 30], 1:122); to Zeller, 20 December 1842 (*Briefe*, ed. Zeller [n. 9], 144); to Rapp, 27 January 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Zeller, 147) with plans for "Baur's celebration at the beginning of June"; to Georgii, 7 February 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 42); to Rapp, 23 February 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Zeller, 148).

<sup>171</sup> Cf. Vischer to Strauss, 12 January 1843, and Strauss to Vischer, 15 March 1843 (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp, 1:123–5).

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, 127. Strauss to Georgii, 27 April 1843 (*Briefe*, ed. Maier [n. 57], 42): "Baur, who was here a week ago, forbade the celebration out of concern that it could be misunderstood."

<sup>173</sup> On 11 November 1836 (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel" [n. 9], 90 f.), he reported to Baur his plan for dealing with Steudel, after explaining his preparations to Vischer already on 28 October (*Briefwechsel*, ed. Rapp, 22): "In case you want to tackle Menzel, allow me to add to this, perchance in Lewald's *Europa* or wherever else one might do so." [Tr. Menzel was one of Strauss's critics. August Lewald, a conservative, edited the journal *Europa: Chronik der gebildeten Welt*, published in Stuttgart starting in 1835.]

<sup>174</sup> On 20 January the first volume was approved by the censor and only awaited publication. Strauss was thinking at the time, as he wrote to Baur, of naming the series "Galerie der Gegner meiner kritischen Bearbeitung des Leben Jesu" (Barnikol, "Briefwechsel," 93).

<sup>175</sup> D. F. Strauss, *Streitschriften zur Vertheidigung meiner Schrift über das Leben Jesu und zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie*. No. 1: *Herr Dr. Steudel oder die Selbsttäuschungen des verständigen Supranaturalismus unsere Tage*. No. 2: *Die Herren Eschenmayer und Menzel*. No. 3: *Die evangelische Kirchenzeitung, Die Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, und Die theologischen Studien und Kritiken in ihrer Stellung zu meiner Kritik des Lebens Jesu* (Tübingen, 1837).

<sup>176</sup> Barnikol, "Briefwechsel" (n. 9), 99: "I have immediately read it *uno tenore* and believe that you are right in title, tone, and contents. As much as I pity my friend Steudel, I can only acknowledge that it is an incomparable masterpiece of a devastating polemic."

In addition to the *Streitschriften*, Strauss worked further on his *Leben Jesu*. After the second, relatively only slightly altered, edition appeared in 1837, he prepared a third edition, “improved with a view to writings of the critics,” which appeared in 1838 and 1839. This new edition revealed, however, by contrast to Baur, how insecure Strauss was in his material convictions and his personal stance. In the foreword to the third edition he explained:

The changes offered by this new edition are all more or less related to the fact that a renewed study of the Fourth Gospel, on the basis of de Wette’s commentary and Neander’s *Leben Jesu Christi*, has made me again doubtful of my earlier doubt concerning the authenticity and credibility of this Gospel. It is not that I have become convinced of its authenticity, merely that I am no longer certain of its inauthenticity.<sup>177</sup>

Noteworthy, too, is that he intended, with this revision of the argument with his opponents in the main work, to “render any further continuation of the *Streitschriften* superfluous,”<sup>178</sup> which was in fact discontinued. When the first volume of the third edition of the *Leben Jesu* appeared, Baur was preparing for the first time to lecture on the Gospel of John.<sup>179</sup> On 29 May 1838 he reported to Strauss that he had still covered only the first chapter of the Gospel, and in doing so confirmed his claim in the “Abgenöthigte Erklärung.”<sup>180</sup> Already engagement with this chapter gave him the impression that historical truth was to be sought not in John but only in the Synoptics, and led to his reticent critique of the new edition of the *Leben Jesu*.<sup>181</sup> Strauss himself acknowledged, in the fourth edition of his work in 1840, that he himself, upon surveying anew the third edition, wondered about the changes he had adopted in it, and he again retracted them.<sup>182</sup> A remarkable sign of his uncertainty!

<sup>177</sup> D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet. Dritte mit Rücksicht auf die Gegenschriften verbesserte Auflage*, vol. 1 (Tübingen, 1838), iv–v (ET, lvii). [Tr. Prefaces to all the editions are included in the 1972 edn of the ET.]

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. [Tr. Only the first volume (three numbers) of the *Streitschriften* was ever published.]

<sup>179</sup> According to information from the Tübingen lecture schedule, Baur lectured on the Gospel of John for the first time in the winter semester of 1838–9, then in the summer semester of 1841, the summer semester of 1843, the summer semester of 1845, and the winter semester 1847–8. In the summer semester of 1847 he lectured for the first time on “Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament,” in which he must have discussed the Synoptic Gospels, hitherto treated in only a single lecture series.

<sup>180</sup> See n. 133.

<sup>181</sup> Baur to Strauss, 29 May 1838 (Barnikol, “Briefwechsel” [n. 9] 104): “This new edition of your work suits me very well since I am just now engaged in special studies in preparation for lectures on the Gospel of John. I have scarcely gotten beyond the first chapter of the Gospel of John but already this little has given me the very decided impression that historical truth, relatively speaking, can be sought only on the side of the Synoptics; and it almost appears to me that you have conceded too much in the new edition.”

<sup>182</sup> D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 4th edn, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1840) (the edition translated by George Eliot, see n. 55. Preface to the 4th edn, 1:x (ET lviii of the 1972 edn): “But that [third] edition also contained too much of compliance. The intermingling voices of opponents, critics, and fellow labourers, to which I held it a duty attentively to listen, had

It was still some time before Baur's investigation of the Gospel of John appeared in 1844 as an essay<sup>183</sup> and three years later as the most extensive part of his book on the Canonical Gospels.<sup>184</sup> Prior to this latter work he published a textbook on the history of dogma,<sup>185</sup> an early copy of which he sent to Strauss in November 1846, and for which Strauss thanked him on 17 November. If Strauss had already been disappointed by Baur's study of the Gospel of John, the history of dogma led—ten years after the “Abgenöthigte Erklärung” essay—to a renewed and strong reaction on the part of the student, who expressed himself most clearly in letters to Märklin on 22 July 1846 and to Baur on 17 November 1846.

To Märklin, Strauss complained about his treatment in Baur's investigation of John, whose merits he acknowledged without reserve, although “personally” it did not “appeal [to him].”<sup>186</sup> Strauss could acknowledge that Baur described Strauss's position on the four Gospels as unsatisfactory, and that Baur regarded the “major task” of his own investigation, “in a way adequate to the material, to bring clarity to the relationship, left so undefined by Strauss, of the Johannine Gospel to the Synoptics.”<sup>187</sup> Yet he was disappointed 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 him and treat him in an uncharitable way.<sup>188</sup> In fact, Baur mentions his student above all

confused the idea of the work in my mind; in the diligent comparison of divergent opinions I had lost sight of the subject itself. Hence on coming with a more collected mind to this last revision, I found alterations at which I could not but wonder, and by which I had evidently done myself injustice. In all these passages the earlier readings are now restored.”

<sup>183</sup> F. C. Baur, “Über die Composition und den Charakter des johanneischen Evangeliums,” *ThJb(T)*, 3 (1844): 1–191, 397–475, 615–700.

<sup>184</sup> F. C. Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältniß zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung* (Tübingen, 1847), 77–389. Baur wrote in the preface (iii–iv) that he had repeatedly examined the whole of his 1844 essay on the Johannine Gospel and had used for this book everything the essay offered for considering its various aspects.

<sup>185</sup> F. C. Baur, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1847). ET: *History of Christian Dogma*, ed. P. C. Hodgson, trans. R. F. Brown and P. C. Hodgson from the 2nd German edn of 1858 (Oxford, 2014).

<sup>186</sup> Strauss to Märklin, 22 July 1846 (Rapp, “Baur und Strauss” [n. 9], 118–20: “I first occupied myself with Baur's John, which I had previously only glanced through. Although personally this work does not appeal to me, I am pleased to be able to praise it honestly and to acknowledge its results in full measure. Now, but only now, the ghost of the would-be John is banished. It had repeatedly mocked me and others, and constantly reappeared, even though we believed we had exorcised it.”

<sup>187</sup> Baur, “Composition” (n. 183), 434; *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 184), 270.

<sup>188</sup> Strauss to Märklin, 22 July 1846 (Rapp, “Baur und Strauss” [n. 9], 119): “In Baur's treatment I am often treated polemically, and my standpoint on the Fourth Gospel is described as unsatisfactory. That's the way it is, and B. is always right when he opposes me. . . . Now however Baur places me with Lücke and others in a group, prominent nowhere, which has me to thank for the criticism of the Evangelists, including the Fourth, and shows in general an uncharitable and unsympathetic attitude toward my work.”

in a critical vein.<sup>189</sup> Thus he admonishes Strauss, along with Bruno Bauer, for passing over John 1:32 “naively”<sup>190</sup>; he criticizes the application of his mythological interpretation to the Johannine Gospel<sup>191</sup>; he rejects Strauss’s argument for the Johannine dating of the first entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem (John 2:12–13)<sup>192</sup>; he shows, in comparison with Lücke and in light of the different editions of the *Leben Jesu*, how indefensible are all investigations into the details of the Gospels without fundamentally establishing how they are related to one another<sup>193</sup>; he emphasizes the extent to which Strauss, in his exegesis of John 12:20–36, misconstrues “the distinctive tendency” of the Gospel,<sup>194</sup> and contradicts his interpretation of the foot-washing scene in John 13.<sup>195</sup> Nonetheless, he grants to Strauss the striking designation of the miracle in Cana as an “extravagant miracle” (*Luxuswunder*),<sup>196</sup> and emphasizes that Strauss was “the first to call attention to the fact that the Fourth Gospel has its own agenda in the way it depicts the relationship of Peter and John.”<sup>197</sup> In retrospect, Strauss indeed writes to Märklin that he could find “nowhere a word of recognition on Baur’s part” for his own works, and he summarizes by saying: “No teacher is pleased when his student makes a name for himself too quickly and, as it were, before he does so himself.” He puts Baur in a lineage that runs, albeit with diminishing rigor, from Steudel to Kern. He characterizes Baur’s conduct toward him in brilliant formulations, but with a great deal of bitterness, especially in comparison with younger fellow students, and somewhat enviously.<sup>198</sup> At the end he must acknowledge: “My personal relationship with

<sup>189</sup> These critical remarks are also found in the book version, as the following citations indicate.

<sup>190</sup> Baur, “Composition” (n. 183), 30; *Kritische Untersuchungen* (n. 184), 104. [Tr. John 1:32: “And John testified, ‘I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it remained on him.’”]

<sup>191</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 52; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 121–2.

<sup>192</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 58; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 127: “These reasons appear to me not to carry much weight.”

<sup>193</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 67–9; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 134–6.

<sup>194</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 142; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 197. [Tr. In John 12:20–36, Jesus says that the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified, and that he himself will be lifted up on a cross.]

<sup>195</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 424; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 261n.

<sup>196</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 49; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 119.

<sup>197</sup> Baur, “Composition,” 627; *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 322. It is only in the latter (319–20n.) that he mentions that Strauss has “clearly shown” the impossibility of a double entry of Jesus into Jerusalem

<sup>198</sup> Strauss to Märklin, 22 July 1846 (Barnikol, “Briefwechsel” [n. 9] 119–20): “In short: no teacher is pleased when his student makes a name for himself too quickly and, as it were, before he does so himself. Say what you will against this, but it is so, and from Steudel through Kern to Baur there is only a descending lineage. With the first [Steudel], the student relationship intensified the hatred, with the second [Kern], his vacillation clinched matters for the other party, and the third [Baur] withholds his recognition. I am the son who has moved too quickly out of the family business to start his own, which from the beginning appears to want to overshadow the family business; at first he could only speak well of the new firm, but now,