

Anders Gerdmar

Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism

German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews,
from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann

STUDIES IN JEWISH HISTORY AND CULTURE

Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism

Studies in Jewish History and Culture

Edited by

Hava Tirosh-Samuelson
(Arizona State University)

and

Giuseppe Veltri
(Leopold-Zunz-Centre for Jewish Studies,
University of Halle-Wittenberg)

VOLUME 20

Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism

German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews,
from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann

by

Anders Gerdmar



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gerdmar, Anders.

Roots of theological anti-Semitism : German biblical interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann / by Anders Gerdmar.

p. cm.—(Studies in Jewish history and culture, ISSN 1568-5004 ; v. 20)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-16851-0 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Judaism (Christian theology)—History of doctrines. 2. Christianity and antisemitism—Germany—History. 3. Bible—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—Germany—History. 4. Christianity and other religions—Judaism—History. 5. Judaism—Relations—Christianity—History. 6. Theology, Doctrinal—Germany—History. 7. Antisemitism—Germany—History. I. Title. II. Series.

BT93.G47 2008

261.2'60943—dc22

ISSN 1568-5004

ISBN 978 90 04 16851 0

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To the memory of my beloved parents,
Ingvar and Margareta Gerdmar.

1 Cor. 13:4–13

CONTENTS

Foreword	xiii
Introduction: Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism	1
Defining Anti-Semitism	5
The Analysis	9
Who are the Exegetes? On the Choice and Delimitation of Materials	12
Research Traditions versus the Scholars' Own Contextual Theology	18
What This Study Does and Does Not Do	19

PART I ENLIGHTENMENT EXEGESIS AND THE JEWS

Introduction	23
The Jews in Enlightenment Exegesis From Deism to de Wette	29
An English Prelude: Enlightened Prejudice against the Jews	29
The Moral Philosopher: Judaism as an ' <i>Egyptianiz'd</i> ' Degeneration	31
Christian is Good, Jewish is Evil	35
Conclusion	36
Johann Salomo Semler: Dejudaising Christianity	39
Semler's View on the Jews and Judaism	40
Idealistic Historiography	41
The Moral Element	43
Universalism and Particularism	44
View of the Old Testament	45
Semler on Tolerance	46
Conclusion	48

Johann Gottfried Herder: The <i>Volk</i> Concept and the Jews	51
Herder on the Jews	52
Degeneration Hypothesis	54
Herder and the Emancipation of the Jews	57
The <i>Volk</i> Concept and the Jews	58
Conclusion	59
 F. D. E. Schleiermacher: Enlightenment Religion and	
Judaism	61
Schleiermacher and Judaism	64
Schleiermacher and the Old Testament	69
Schleiermacher on the Concrete Situation of the Jews	70
The Influence of Schleiermacher	74
Conclusion	74
 W. M. L. de Wette: Judaism as Degenerated Hebraism	77
The Picture of the Jews: <i>Hebraismus</i> , <i>Judenthum</i> and	
Christianity	79
View of the Old Testament	83
Early Christianity and Jesus	84
de Wette and Contemporary Judaism	86
Conclusion	91
 The Jews in Enlightenment Exegesis from Baur to Ritschl	95
 Ferdinand Christian Baur: Judaism as an Historical Antipode	
of Christianity	97
A Dialectical Movement from Paganism and Judaism to	
Early Christianity	98
From the Jerusalem Church to World Religion	102
Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ	103
Dialectical Opposition in Corinth	105
The Letter to the Romans: Written to “Cut Jewish	
Particularism at its Root”	107
Jesus and Judaism	109
Judaism: A Pawn in the Game	111
Contextualising Baur’s Philosophical Theology	113
Conclusion	118

David Friedrich Strauss: Judaism in Continuity and	
Discontinuity with Christianity	121
Reconstructing Jewish Past	122
Continuity and Discontinuity	123
Dialectics and the Emergence of Christianity	124
Strauss on the Jews	126
Jewish-Christian Past and German Present	127
Conclusion	129
Albrecht Ritschl: <i>Kulturprotestantismus</i> and the Jews	133
Ritschl on the Jews and Judaism	136
Jewish Christianity	138
Conclusion	141
The History of Religions School and the Jews—	
An Historical Turn?	143
Bousset and Weiss on the Jews	145
The Preaching of Jesus: Two Opposing Views	146
Wilhelm Bousset: The Religion of Judaism in the	
New Testament Age	150
Bousset's Overarching Historiography of Religions	152
Late Jewish Degeneration	154
Palestinian versus Diaspora Judaism	156
Controversial Use of Intertestamental Sources	161
Hugo Gressmann, <i>Die Religion des Judentums</i> , and the	
Berlin Institutum Judaicum	163
Gressmann's Revision of Bousset's <i>Religion der Judentum</i>	167
Johannes Weiss: The Jews in <i>Das Urchristentum</i>	171
Contextualising the History of Religions School and the	
Jews	175
Bousset's Philosophical Background	181
Conclusion	183

PART II
SALVATION-HISTORICAL EXEGESIS AND
THE JEWS: FROM THOLUCK TO SCHLATTER

Introduction	191
Philo-Semitism	193
Friedrich August Tholuck: “Salvation Comes from the Jews” ..	195
Conclusion	199
Johann Tobias Beck: Organic Continuity Between Judaism and	
Christianity	203
An Organic View	204
Romans and Judaism	206
Abraham the Common Root	208
Romans 9–11	209
Conclusion	210
Franz Delitzsch: Pioneering Scholarship in Judaism	213
Organic Salvation History and the Jews	218
Hebrew Philology and Literary Criticism	221
Describing the Jewish Background of Jesus	223
Opposing Anti-Semitism	225
Confronting Jews and Judaism	226
Conclusion	234
Hermann Leberecht Strack: Missions to and Defence of Jews	239
Conclusion	247
Excursus: Defenders and Detractors? Alan Levenson on	
Strack and Delitzsch	248
Adolf Schlatter and Judaism: Great Erudition and Fierce	
Opposition	253
The Jews in Schlatter’s Main Works	256
Faith in the New Testament	256
A Commentary on Romans	262
Schlatter’s Works on Jewish History and Topography	264
Schlatter on Jews and Judaism in Contemporary	
Germany	272

Schlatter and the Jews during National Socialism	275
Schlatter's General View on National Socialism	279
Schlatter and the "Bethel Confession"	281
Schlatter's Dialogue with <i>Völkisch</i> Ideology	292
The Righteousness of God: Commentary on Romans	301
Will the Jew Prevail over Us?	305
Conclusion	318

PART III THE FORM CRITICS AND THE JEWS

Introduction	329
Karl Ludwig Schmidt: A Chosen People and a 'Jewish Problem'	331
Schmidt on New Testament Judaism	334
Dialogue with Martin Buber on the Church, State, People and Judaism, 1933	335
The Jewish Problem in the Light of Romans 9–11	339
Conclusion	343
Martin Dibelius: Ambivalence to Jews and Judaism	347
The Jews in Dibelius's Exegetical Production	351
<i>Jesus</i> —Dibelius's Bestseller	353
<i>Wozu Theologie?</i> (<i>Why Theology?</i>)	359
Dibelius on Judaism and Christianity after National Socialism	364
<i>Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen</i> (<i>Self-Reflection of the German</i>)	367
Conclusion	368
Rudolf Bultmann: Liberal and Anti-Jewish	373
Bultmann's Scholarly Background	375
Bultmann and the Judaism of Antiquity	377
The Jesus Book	382
Bultmann on the Law in Judaism	385
The Commentary on John's Gospel and the Jews	391
Bultmann, Politics and the Jews	395
Bultmann and Heidegger	401
Conclusion	406

PART IV NAZI EXEGESIS AND THE JEWS

Introduction	415
Gerhard Kittel: Jewish <i>Unheil</i> Theologically Founded	417
From the Lutheran Professor's Home to Service under National Socialism	418
Kittel, New Testament Studies and Judaism 1913–1932	419
Jesus and the Rabbis	420
Kittel's Main Monograph: <i>Die Probleme des Palästinischen Spätjudentums</i>	423
Was Jesus an Aryan?	435
Positive Evaluation of Judaism at its Peak: <i>Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum</i>	437
Kittel and the Jews during National Socialism	440
Kittel and the National Socialist Party	446
Kittel's Production During National Socialism	452
Conservative Standpoints and Criticism of Popular Anti-Semitic Legends	473
Kittel's Work on Judaism in TDNT	474
Kittel's Race-Historical Works at Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage	478
The Emergence of Judaism as the Emergence of the 'Jewish Problem'	478
Kittel's Last Speeches	496
Kittel's Defence Evaluated	499
The Scholarly Evaluation of Kittel	517
Conclusion	521
Walter Grundmann: Towards a Non-Jewish Jesus	531
The Eisenach Institute	536
Grundmann's Overall Theology and Ideology	538
Grundmann 1933–1934: <i>Völkisch</i> Renewal of Lutheran Theology	543
Grundmann 1938: <i>Germanentum</i> and Christianity against the Jewish Myth	549
Dejudaisation as a Task of German Theology and Church	553
Grundmann's Exegetical Work and the Jews, 1938–1945	555

On the Jews in John: “The Struggle Against the Jews is Everywhere”	556
The Jews and the Sermon on the Mount	559
Dichotomising Judaism and Hellenism as Ideological Strategy	562
Grundmann’s Magnum Opus: <i>Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum</i>	565
Conclusion	572
Concluding Analysis	577
The Description of Jews and Judaism in New Testament Exegesis	578
The Characterisation of Jews and Judaism	578
Constructing Jewish Past	581
Christianity and Judaism: Connected or Disconnected? ...	584
The ‘Jew’ in the Symbolic World	588
Exegesis and Legitimation of Anti-Semitism	593
Anti-Judaism as <i>Praeparatio Antisemitica</i>	594
Legitimation and Delegitimation of the Social Oppression of Jews	594
Exegesis in Cultural-Political Context	601
Exegesis after Auschwitz	609
Archive Materials	615
Abbreviations	617
Bibliography	619
Name Index	653
Subject Index	661
New Testament Texts	677

FOREWORD

Writing a book on *the* roots of theological anti-Semitism is hardly a feasible task. There are too many possible factors, spanning from hostility towards Jews in antiquity to a theologically legitimised enmity towards Jews in various modern societies. What this study seeks to investigate, therefore, is *roots*, in indefinite form, of theological anti-Semitism—and more specifically, root causes of the theological anti-Semitism that is undisputedly found among a number of scholars during National Socialism.¹

The idea for this book came about when I realised that certain thought patterns, which I had seen in overtly National Socialist exegetes, were also present in the writings of earlier, nineteenth-century scholars. Instead of creating a brand new road, the personalities of the 1930s seemed to be merely taking more radical steps on a path that had existed for a long time. This observation led me to study how Jews and Judaism were constructed, not only by individual scholars but in entire research traditions. The result of that study, this book attempts to describe and explain the views on Jews and Judaism held by German exegetes of the New Testament in the formative period of modern exegesis, 1750–1950.

A work such as this does not come about in isolation. Many are the people who, in various ways, have made the writing of this book possible. The main funding came from a project grant from the Swedish Research Council (then the Humanistisk-Samhällsvetenskapliga Forskningsrådet), 2001–2007, the host institution being the Department of Theology at Uppsala University. My partner in the research project was Dr Håkan Bengtsson, now director of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem. Dr Bengtsson focused on the Swedish scene, writing about two professors in early twentieth-century Sweden, Anton Fridrichsen, Uppsala, and Hugo Odeberg, Lund, and their stance towards Jews and Judaism, whereas my focus was German exegesis.

Several colleagues have been of great help in reading parts of or all of the manuscript, and chapters were presented at an early stage at the

¹ Below I define terms such as ‘anti-Semitism’ and ‘anti-Judaism’.

post-doctoral seminar in New Testament exegesis at the Department of Theology, Uppsala University. Since the material is German, my contacts with German experts on anti-Semitism, exegesis and research history, especially those with an interest in Jews, Judaism and exegesis, have been of particular importance. In connection with several trips to Germany as well as England, I have had the privilege of discussing parts of my manuscript with Professor Peter von der Osten-Sacken of the Institut Kirche und Judentum, the centre for Christian-Jewish studies at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. He kindly received me on two occasions, offering several valuable viewpoints on the manuscript and opening up the institute's eminent library to me. Similarly, Professor Werner Bergmann of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in Berlin read and commented on part of the manuscript and gave me the opportunity to consult their extensive library on anti-Semitism and National Socialism. A symposium at the centre put me in touch with leading experts on *völkisch* ideology, especially Dr Uwe Puschner of the Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut at Freie Universität Berlin, who kindly read and commented on an earlier draft of the book. Professor Dr Rainer Kampling of the Seminar für Katholische Theologie at Freie Universität Berlin met with me and discussed early proposals as well as final conclusions, providing important input for the work. I am also indebted to the archives of the Auswärtiges Amt, Bundesarchiv, and the Evangelical Central Archive (EZA), all in Berlin. Through the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in Berlin, I came into contact with Professor Christhard Hoffmann, Institut für arkeologi, historie, kultur- og religionsvitenskap at the University of Bergen, who kindly read a draft and provided valuable input. So did Professor Hermann Lichtenberger at the Institut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte of the Eberhard Karls Universität, Tübingen, who moreover let me use his unpublished article on Adolf Schlatter, referred to in these pages, as well as some Kitteliana not usually found in libraries. Furthermore, I am grateful to Dr Werner Neuer for e-mail correspondence about Adolf Schlatter, and Dr Roland Deines, Associate Professor and Reader in New Testament at the University of Nottingham, who has dealt with several of 'my' scholars in his large study *Die Pharisäer: Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, and who kindly commented on part of my manuscript. I would also like to thank Professor Susannah Heschel, Dartmouth College, USA, for her encouragement during my work with the book. Dr Carl Johan Gardell, Uppsala, offered important remarks on the manuscript on

the basis of his profound historical knowledge, and Professor Matti Myllykoski, Helsinki University, also read and commented on part of the text. Finally, Professor Birger Olsson, Lund University, examined an earlier draft of the manuscript, providing important input. I am greatly indebted to all these scholars for their suggestions and critical viewpoints. At the same time, I must add that I alone am responsible for the final shape of the book.

In addition to the generous grants from the Swedish Research Council, a few smaller grants have facilitated travelling and concentrated study periods. Harald och Louise Ekmans Forskningsstiftelse at the Sigtuna Foundation have on several occasions enabled me to work on the manuscript in a friendly and creative environment, while contributions from Gunvor och Josef Anérs Stiftelse and the Western Europe Scholarships of The Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities in Sweden have made my research trips possible. Livets Ord University, too, gave me the opportunity to carry out part of this research.

At my home base in Uppsala, the friendly and helpful staff of the Carolina Rediviva University Library, especially those handling the transfer loans, have been an invaluable help, often acquiring obscure texts from German libraries. In this connection, I would also like to thank my older colleague Professor Thure Stenström for numerous talks over cups of coffee at the Carolina Rediviva Library, often touching on issues relevant to this study.

The preparation of the final manuscript of a large book is a big and time-consuming process. It is no exaggeration to say that without the help of my student Ms Irina Schiau, this book would probably never have been completed. With persistence and accuracy, Ms Schiau has heroically helped check all footnotes, as well as literature references and indices, a help for which I am immensely grateful. Translator Eva Aasebø, MA, has thoroughly, thoughtfully and patiently checked my English, and Markus Häßlein, MDiv, Hannover, the German quotes, for which I am thankful. My daughter Sofia Gerdmar showed both care and professionalism as she helped with the Subject Index. I also want to thank my brother Lars Gerdmar for his encouragement during this long period, when each of us was working to finish a large book project, as well as Elsa Antonsson, Hans Gabre and other friends for their support.

Last but not least, my gratitude goes to my dearest Else-Marie and my greater family, especially Elin, Anna and Sofia, for their patience in putting up with this book as an extra, very demanding, family

member during these years. Thank you for your love, encouragement and patience! The book is dedicated to the memory of my mother, Margareta, and father, Revd Ingvar Gerdmar, examples of faith and unfailing love.

Uppsala, 9 August 2008, sixty-six years to the day after Edith Stein, a leading Jewish-European intellectual and spiritual personality, was barbarously gassed to death in Auschwitz

Anders Gerdmar

INTRODUCTION: ROOTS OF THEOLOGICAL ANTI-SEMITISM

If there exists a cure for Judeophobia, the age-old malady of Christendom, it lies not in the suppression of symptoms but in their exposure to the light.

Frank E. Manuel¹

As Adolf Hitler strategised his way to power, he knew that his anti-Semitic agenda needed to gain the support of theology and the Church. Hitler himself looked up to the anti-Semitic *Hofprediger* Adolf Stoecker, admiring his success in making anti-Semitism a popular movement in the 1880s.² Just a few months after the new Reich Chancellor came

¹ Frank E. Manuel, *The Broken Staff. Judaism through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1992), 1.

² Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Nationalsozialismus und Kirchen. Religionspolitik von Partei und Staat bis 1935*, vol. 5, Tübinger Schriften zur Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1974), 44–46; see also Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, “Der Widerstand der Kirche im Dritten Reich”, *Lutherische Monatshefte* 1, no. 8 (1962), 366, on Hitler’s strategic propaganda to win the Christians, although in principle, Hitler himself was at enmity with Christianity and the Church, which was kept secret during most of the Nazi period, Eike Wolgast, “Nationalsozialistische Hochschulpolitik und die evangelisch-theologischen Fakultäten”, in *Theologische Fakultäten im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Carsten Nicolaisen, *Arbeiten zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Darstellungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 49. Hitler went to the trouble of reading the biography on Stoecker before publication; moreover, in the preface to his 1936 edition, the Nazi historiographer Walter Frank stresses the affinity between Stoecker and Hitler, Walter Frank, *Hofprediger Adolf Stoecker und die christlichsoziale Bewegung*, Zweite durchgesehene Auflage ed. (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1935), 9–10. Stoecker wanted to rid the press, literature, culture and banking of Jewish influence and exclude Jews from certain professions, Günther Brakelmann, “Stoecker, Adolf (1835–1909)”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. Gerhard Müller (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001). See also Massimo Ferrari Zumbini, *Die Wurzeln des Bösen. Gründerjahre des Antisemitismus: Von der Bismarckzeit zu Hitler* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2003), 151–165, for an overview of Stoecker’s role in the anti-Semitic movement.

Literature on anti-Semitism is vast, with bibliographies available in published form as well as on the Internet. In book form, Susan Sarah Cohen, ed. *Antisemitism: An Annotated Bibliography*, vol. 1–19 (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1984–2007) seems to be the most complete, at the time of writing comprising nineteen of the planned twenty-one volumes. This material is also available on the Internet, see Hebrew University of Jerusalem, “SICSA The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism”, <http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/bibsear.html>. See also Herbert A. Strauss, ed. *Bibliographie zum Antisemitismus: die Bestände der Bibliothek des Zentrums für Antisemitismusforschung der Technischen Universität*

to power in January 1933, the respected New Testament professor at Tübingen and international expert on Judaism, Gerhard Kittel, published his book *Die Judenfrage*. In it, he suggested an apartheid policy against the German Jews, based on his exegesis of the New Testament. Walter Grundmann, too, became a key figure in the Deutsche Christen, using his exegetical skills to construct a dejudaised, Aryan Jesus. Other more moderate exegetes in the 1930s and 40s, such as Adolf Schlatter, Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann, each took their stand on Jews, Judaism and anti-Semitism.³ Their stories are examples of the ways in which Church and theology deal with Jews and Judaism in a racial state.⁴

This book begins two hundred years earlier, however, searching for the roots of theological anti-Semitism, how various positions on Jews and Judaism were theologically justified, and how Jews and Judaism were constructed in the biblical interpretation of German Protestantism, from the dawn of modernity to the years after the Holocaust. This study deals both with the prelude to theological anti-Semitism and with views that opposed anti-Semitism.⁵ Although it is true that National Socialism brought attitudes regarding Jews and Judaism to a head, the positions of the exegetes are rooted in their respective theological systems, cultural and political views, and often long research traditions. Protestant New Testament exegesis and the Jews being a large enough project, I leave aside exegesis in Roman-Catholic and Anglo-Saxon environments, although such a study would be of importance.⁶

Berlin/ herausgegeben von Herbert A. Strauss; bearbeitet von Lydia Bressemer [Katalog] und Antje Gerlach [Sachregister] = A Bibliography on Antisemitism: the Library of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at the Technical University of Berlin/ edited by Herbert A. Strauss; compiled by Lydia Bressemer [Catalogue] and Antje Gerlach [Subject index], vol. 1–4 (München: Saur, 1989–1993), which describes the holdings of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, Technische Universität, Berlin.

³ For all scholars mentioned, see their separate chapters below.

⁴ For Germany under National Socialism as a racial state, see Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Ippermann, *The Racial State: Germany 1933–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

⁵ See below for a definition of theological anti-Semitism.

⁶ For the Roman-Catholic Church and anti-Semitism, see e.g. Olaf Blaschke, *Katholizismus und Antisemitismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, ed. Helmut Berding, et al., vol. 122, *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997); Wolfgang Altgeld, *Katholizismus, Protestantismus, Judentum. Über religiös begründete Gegensätze und nationalreligiöse Ideen in der Geschichte des deutschen Nationalismus*, ed. Konrad Repgen, vol. 59, *Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte Reihe B: Forschungen* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, 1992) (discussing Catholicism, Protestantism

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a period that was formative for modern biblical interpretation, the place of Jews and Judaism in society and theology was a perennial question. Biblical interpretation and the view on Jews were related because the Bible played a leading role in shaping the world-view of individuals and society. The focus here is not what the ordinary Bible user thought, but the attitudes of theological professors, who in turn taught the pastors, who influenced the people. The ideology and values conveyed in exegesis are thus critical for the situation of Jews and Judaism in a Christian society.

When dealing with anti-Semitism, it is neither possible nor desirable to be neutral, since the horrific results speak for themselves. As is well documented, Christian theology has traditionally been more biased than not regarding Jews and Judaism.⁷ Theological views on Jews and Judaism have been an important legitimating force, resulting in the discrimination and oppression of Jews in Christian societies ever since Christian antiquity. Abhorring anti-Semitism is not enough, however; it is also necessary to *understand* what it is in ideology and theology that makes it possible. Holocaust scholar Helen Fein suggests that where anti-Semitic views existed in pre-Second World War countries, there

and Judaism); and a discussion of the moral responsibility of the church in Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *A Moral Reckoning. The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003).

⁷ See Alex Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems*, vol. I (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980); Alex Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems. Band II: Anmerkungen, Exkurse, Register*, vol. II (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980), George Foot Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism", *Harvard Theological Review* 14, no. 3 (1921), Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide. The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1974), John G. Gager, *The Origins of Antisemitism. Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (New York: Oxford U.P., 1983), James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A study in the origins of antisemitism* (London: Soncino Press, 1934); James Parkes, "Jews and Christians in the Constantinian Empire", in *Studies in Church History. Papers read at the first winter and summer meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. C. W. Dugmore and Charles Duggan (London: Thomas Nelson, 1964), Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1980), Eleonore Sterling, *Judenhass. Die Anfänge des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815–1850)* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1969), Uriel Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*, trans. Noah Jonathan Jacobs (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975). For the Jews in the Roman Empire, see Ernst Baltrusch, *Die Juden und das Römische Reich: Geschichte einer konfliktreichen Beziehung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002).

were more Jewish victims in the Holocaust.⁸ Thus neither scholarship at large nor exegesis is ‘innocent’ or detached from social life. This study therefore explores *how exegetes from the beginning of modernity to the aftermath of the Holocaust describe and theologise about Jews and Judaism, and examines the mechanisms between biblical interpretation and anti-Semitism.*

Especially after the Holocaust, New Testament studies have shown a growing interest in Jews and Judaism, and there is now a wealth of studies on early Christianity and contemporary Judaism. Less attention has been given to the role of ideological and theological views on Jews and Judaism in exegesis, and how such views have affected interpretation—and, in turn, theology.⁹ The focus of this study, therefore, is the overarching paradigms, thought structures and models used in exegesis,¹⁰ such as characterisations of Jews and Judaism, historiographical models used to describe the relationship between Judaism and early Christianity, and the place of Jews and Judaism in the respective world-views or symbolic worlds. My focus is thus on the scholarly paradigms and how they relate to Jews and Judaism, not on the detailed exegesis of certain texts. There are already several studies available that deal with how research traditions have treated certain issues in New Testament exegesis, such as the Pharisees¹¹ and the Old Testa-

⁸ See Helen Fein, *Accounting for Genocide. National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust* (New York and London: The Free Press and Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1979), 36.

⁹ In a footnote in E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977), Sanders notes that earlier scholarship has caricatured the views on Judaism, mentioning names such as Wilhelm Bousset and Emil Schürer, and referring to George Foot Moore’s pathbreaking article, Moore, “Christian Writers on Judaism”. More recently, Jewish historian Susannah Heschel has devoted an article to the image of Judaism in New Testament exegetical scholarship, but rightly calls for a more thorough investigation of the period, Susannah Heschel, “The Image of Judaism in Nineteenth-Century Christian New Testament Scholarship in Germany”, in *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries*, ed. Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, *American University Studies Series IX: History* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), and Kurt Nowak gives an overview of Protestantism and Judaism in the Weimar Republic, Kurt Nowak, “Protestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik”, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 113, no. 8 (1988). However, several important studies dealing with various aspects of anti-Judaism, anti-Semitism and different scholars have been published, with the ones relevant to this study quoted under each author.

¹⁰ In this context, the term ‘model’ has no exclusive connection with sociological models but means a mode of description or explanation.

¹¹ See the exhaustive investigation in Roland Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, vol. 101, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) and Hans-Günther Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft des 19.*

ment,¹² and which look at how scholars describe Jewish past. There are articles that discuss certain exegetes and their relationship to Jews and Judaism,¹³ as well as National Socialist theology and exegesis, which are included below.¹⁴ A comprehensive and systematic study of how the dominant research traditions in modern New Testament exegesis relate to Jews and Judaism has been lacking, however.

Defining Anti-Semitism

The term ‘anti-Semitism’ is ambiguous and used with a variety of meanings, making it difficult to employ without qualification,¹⁵ although

Jahrhunderts, ed. Johannes Wallmann, vol. 107, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

¹² On views on the Old Testament among German Protestant scholars in the 19th c., see Klaus Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel. Altes Testament und Judentum in der evangelischen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Adolf Martin Ritter and Thomas Kaufmann, vol. 85, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), and specialising on this in *Völkisch* theology, Cornelia Weber, *Altes Testament und völkische Frage. Der biblische Volksbegriff in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft der nationalsozialistischen Zeit, dargestellt am Beispiel von Johannes Hempel*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Hermann Spieckermann, vol. 28, Forschungen zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

¹³ On historiography of Jews and Judaism spanning from de Wette to Neusner, see James Pasto, “Who Owns the Jewish Past? Judaism, Judaisms, and the Writing of Jewish History” (Ph. D. Thesis, Cornell University, 1999). Heschel, “The Image of Judaism in Nineteenth-Century Christian New Testament Scholarship in Germany” discusses the topic of this book, albeit with the obvious limitations of the article format. Shawn Kelley, *Racializing Jesus. Race, ideology and the formation of modern biblical scholarship*, ed. David Gunn and Gary A. Phillips, Biblical Limits (London: Routledge, 2002) discusses several of the scholars in this study, e.g. Baur and Bultmann.

¹⁴ This discussion has parallels in other fields as well. On German historians and the Jews, see Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum in Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Jacob Neusner, vol. 9, Studies in Judaism in Modern Times (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988), and for an overview of research on anti-Semitism in various scholarly disciplines in a German context, see the volume Werner Bergmann and Mona Körte, eds., *Antisemitismusforschung in den Wissenschaften* (Berlin: Metropol, 2004).

¹⁵ The definition of anti-Semitism is a major field in itself. Langmuir’s extensive discussion can be mentioned as one of the more prominent ones, suggesting three possible understandings of anti-Semitism: realistic hostility, xenophobia and chimerical anti-Semitism, Gavin I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 340. From the perspective of antiquity, Peter Schäfer opposes Langmuir, suggesting that ‘fear of Jews’ is a more fitting term, covering both fear and hatred of Jews, Peter Schäfer, *Judeophobia. Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997), 210. As Said has pointed out, the concept of ‘anti-Semitism’, if properly used, ought to include Arabs, Edward W. Said, *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient* (London: Penguin Books, 1991),

it is hardly possible to replace. Most authors retain the term but add various attributes.¹⁶ The least ambiguous use of anti-Semitism is that of a distinct political movement beginning in Germany in the late nineteenth century.¹⁷ Sometimes ‘anti-Judaism’ is used, but unfortunately this term, too, is blurred and must be defined.¹⁸ Moreover, in modern discussion, ‘anti-Judaism’ and ‘anti-Semitism’ are sometimes

although that would be ambiguous. Said also rightly points to the use of ‘Semitic’ as part of Eurocentric, Orientalist geopolitics. As true as this is, the focus of this discussion is anti-Semitism as prejudice against Jews and Judaism. Moreover, neither ‘Jew’ nor ‘Judaism’ is unambiguous in meaning. For the definition of Jews and Judaism in antiquity, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness. Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, ed. Anthony W. Bulloch, et al., vol. 21, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), where he distinguishes between ethno-geographic and religious-cultural definitions. For a brief history of anti-Semitism, see Werner Bergmann, *Geschichte des Antisemitismus*, 3 ed., C. H. Beck Wissen (München: C. H. Beck, 2006).

¹⁶ Several attributes are used to qualify anti-Semitism. Saul Friedländer talks of ‘redemptive anti-Semitism’ for Hitler’s variant: the “synthesis of a murderous rage and an ‘idealistic’ goal [...] led to Hitler’s ultimate decision to exterminate the Jews”. Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews. Volume I: The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1997), 3. The ‘eliminationist anti-Semitism’ that Goldhagen has suggested is the “belief that the Jews had to be *eliminated* from Germany” due to the threat that they were thought to pose, Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler’s Willing Executioners. Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1996), 72. Steven Katz, too, singles out Nazi anti-Semitism as having unique features; see Steven Theodore Katz, *Kontinuität und Diskontinuität zwischen christlichem und nationalsozialistischem Antisemitismus*, ed. by Volker Drehsen, trans. Alexandra Riebe (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 59–75 for a succinct description of ‘Nazi anti-Semitism’, which brings to light its highly peculiar characteristics. Zumbini, *Die Wurzeln Des Bösen*, 9, speaks of ‘racial-ideological anti-Semitism’.

¹⁷ This is what Zumbini calls “the organised anti-Semitism of the Wilhelminian Empire”, Zumbini, *Die Wurzeln Des Bösen*, 9.

¹⁸ See Amy-Jill Levine, “Anti-Judaism and the Gospel of Matthew”, in *Antijudaism and the Gospels*, ed. William R. Farmer (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 13–14. It is not always clear what anti-Judaism includes: a religion, a people, a geographically or otherwise limited part of the people—or all of this. Within New Testament studies, attempts have been made to specify kinds of anti-Judaism that might be found in the New Testament: prophetic anti-Judaism, Jewish-Christian anti-Judaism, Gentilizing anti-Judaism (Douglas R. A. Hare, “The Rejection of the Jews in the synoptic Gospels and Acts”, in *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity. Twelve theologians explore the development and dynamics of antisemitism within the Christian tradition*, ed. Alan T. Davies (New York: The Paulist Press, 1979), 29–32), or (refining Hare’s categories): ‘prophetic polemic’, ‘subordinating polemic’ and ‘abrogating anti-Judaism’ (George M. Smiga, *Pain and Polemic. Anti-Judaism in the Gospels*, ed. Helga Croner, Stimulus Books (New York: Paulist Press, 1992) For the difficulty in using the established terms in an exegetical context, and suggestions towards more functional definitions, see Anders Gerdmar, “Polemiken mot judar i Nya testamentet och dess reception. Utkast till en analytisk typologi”, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 69 (2004).

used to indicate ‘degrees’ of enmity towards Jews, anti-Judaism being the more harmless form, a way to be critical of Judaism without being anti-Semitic.¹⁹ In general usage, anti-Judaism indicates a polemic against Judaism as a religious system, whereas anti-Semitism indicates a racist polemic, and sometimes action against Jews. However, this can blur the fact that there is often a link between theological polemics against Judaism and anti-Semitic views. Although it is true that there are natural polemics between religious systems, polemics against Jews and Judaism are complicated by the fact that Judaism may involve ethnicity and culture as well as religion. It is therefore necessary to be alert to theological polemics that drift into polemics against Jews as an *ethnos*, or that begin to discriminate against Jews, regarding them as inferior, or even as an inferior race.²⁰ In this study, ‘anti-Semitism’ is racist discrimination against Jews for the simple reason that they are Jews. To describe this type of anti-Semitism, I have adapted Fredrickson’s definition of ‘race’:

Anti-Semitism is then where it is thought that the Jews are inferior in a permanent and ineradicable way, and where this is used to dominate, exclude, or (legitimate people to) eliminate Jews because they are Jews.²¹

In other words, anti-Semitism involves ideology, and speech and/or action. ‘Theological anti-Semitism’ is anti-Semitism that is theologically motivated; furthermore, I sometimes qualify anti-Semitism and talk about ‘cultural anti-Semitism’ (in analogy to cultural racism), as

¹⁹ In an historical perspective, anti-Judaism is at times a no less hostile term, and is occasionally used synonymously with anti-Semitism, e.g. in Anti-jüdische Aktion, Joseph Goebbels’s group, which published strongly racist texts, see Gerhard Kittel, “Die Behandlung des Nichtjuden nach dem Talmud”, *Archiv für Judenfragen. Schriften zur geistigen Überwindung des Judentums*. Herausgeber Anti-jüdische Aktion 1, Gruppe A 1 (1943), discussed below.

²⁰ ‘Race’ is admittedly difficult to separate from ethnicity. As Jenkins suggests, “ethnicity is more ubiquitous than those situations we describe as ‘race relations’”, Richard Jenkins, “Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization, and Power”, in *Race and Ethnicity: Comparative and Theoretical Approaches*, ed. John Stone and Rutledge Dennis (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003), 66, and whereas ethnic relations need not be oppressive, race relations may be—and racist views and actions are discriminating. For the concepts of race and racism, see Imanuel Geiss, *Geschichte des Rassismus*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Neue Historische Bibliothek (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988), Ivan Hanaford, *Race. The History of an Idea in the West* (Washington: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1996) and George M. Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

²¹ See Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History*, 170.

an anti-Semitism that describes Jews by means of cultural stereotypes, giving them essential, inferior traits, or ‘biological anti-Semitism’ (in analogy to biological racism), as an anti-Semitism that stresses the racial, biological inferiority of Jews. Anti-Judaism, then, is polemics against Jewish faith, although this study indicates that often, even if not always, anti-Judaism works as a *praeparatio antisemitica*, with a clear link between theological polemics and overt anti-Semitism. It appears that when racist thoughts exist and there is a political situation in which Jews can be made the scapegoat, anti-Judaism may be ‘fertilised’ and develop into anti-Semitism. The purpose of this study is to explore the link between different attitudes to Jews and Judaism, and anti-Semitism in New Testament interpretation.²² Occasionally I also use the term ‘essentialism’, where character traits of individuals are suggested to be ontologically connected to the essence of the group.²³ Such essentialism considers character traits of Jews to be unalterable. Typically it regards all Jews as the same, for example believing that a modern Jew and a New Testament Jew are essentially the same. Finally, when using the term ‘Jewish problem’ for *die Judenfrage*, this is to show that those who employ it on the whole do not regard this as an academic question, but as a problem that calls for a solution.²⁴

²² In addition to anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, some other terms are also suggested: ‘Judeophobia’, Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, and ‘hatred of Jews’ (*Judenhaß*), Sterling, *Judenhass. Die Anfänge*.

²³ “Essentialism is a naive ontology positing that categories have a deep and unobservable reality, that this reality or ‘essence’ gives rise to the surface features of category members (i.e. ‘dispositionism’), that it is unchanging and unchangeable by human intervention, and that it has a ‘natural’ basis,” Nick Haslam et al., “Psychological Essentialism, Implicit Theories, and Intergroup Relations”, *Intergroup Processes & Relations Group* 9, no. 1 (2006), 64.

²⁴ The term ‘Jewish problem’ (*die Judenfrage*) seems to have been introduced in Germany in the 1840s, Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems*, 1. The term was coined by enemies of the Jews and was later adapted also by Jews discussing the relationship between Jews and Judaism and cultures that tried to marginalise or oppress Jews. The notion of ‘Jewish problem’ is thus chosen as an alternative translation to ‘Jewish question’ for *Judenfrage*, since, where it is used, it mostly pertains to the Jewish question as a social problem. Kurt Nowak, *Kulturprotestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Claus Ritterhoff, vol. 4, *Kleine Schriften zur Aufklärung* (Wolfenbüttel, Göttingen: Lessing-Akademie, Wallstein Verlag, 1993) also uses the notion of ‘das jüdische Problem’. On the ‘Jewish problem’, see Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems*.

The Analysis

The analysis aims to describe the ideological and theological factors behind each scholar's view on Jews and Judaism by looking at his description of Jews and Judaism in antiquity. As in every scholarly analysis of texts or historical processes, the Jewish past is perceived through modern spectacles, coloured by a variety of thoughts, at the same time as the scholar's perception of the New Testament texts influences his contemporary views and actions. This means that each statement on Jews and Judaism needs to be contextualised; a saying that might appear modest in a certain context in 1850 may seem racist in a new environment. What we are studying, therefore, is the *reception* of biblical and traditional depictions of Jews and Judaism in new contexts, where different ideological factors are at play.²⁵

My analysis looks at three issues in particular. Firstly, it *documents* each scholar's view on Jews and Judaism, looking at the characterisation and historiography of Jews and Judaism, and how the problem of continuity–discontinuity is regarded in this connection. Secondly, it attempts to understand views of Jews and Judaism within the scholar's *symbolic world*—the world of thoughts, values and ideologies. Thirdly, it discusses the social dimensions of the respective views, that is, whether the descriptions and ideology pertaining to Jews and Judaism meant a *legitimation or delegitimation* of discrimination and oppression of Jews. I will now explain the analytical steps in greater detail.

The picture of Jews and Judaism begins with the way in which the exegetes *characterise* Jews and Judaism. Although this characterisation may consist of their own observations, established stereotypes are often used. Such stereotypes generalise what are regarded as common denominators of a certain group. I then go on to study the *historiography* of Jews and Judaism in New Testament times and its prehistory. History, then, is much less an attempt to interpret historical empirical data of *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, than an ideological construct that expresses the author's overall view on Jews and Judaism in relation to early Christianity, by

²⁵ For the theory behind a reception analysis, see the classic article, Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, ed. Wlad Godzich and Jochen Schulte-Sasse, trans. Timothy Bahti, vol. 2, *Theory and History of Literature* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982). Although it deals with aesthetic reception, the dynamics are the same: the text or the work is received in new situations, and the reception is governed by the present situation as well as ideological factors.

telling the story in a certain way. I therefore consciously use the term *historio-graphy*, to stress that the writing of history is the writing of a story that is an expression of the author's viewpoints, as much as it is a mere description of the object described.²⁶ History has a social and ideological context, and it is also written from a certain 'place' and serves certain interests.²⁷ Both these points are evident in most of the historiographies presented below, where idealistic and other ideologically motivated descriptions dominate. Finally, I look at how the exegetes regard the *continuity or discontinuity* between Jews and Judaism on the one hand, and Christianity on the other. The scholars' descriptions of this relationship range from a strong continuity, where early Christianity is organically connected to Judaism, to complete discontinuity, where Jews and Judaism are of no consequence to early Christianity. Taken together, these three aspects of the characterisation of Jews and Judaism give a picture of each scholar's ideological construction of Jews and Judaism.

My second interest is the place of Jews and Judaism in the *symbolic world* of the authors. Here I purpose to understand the characterisations of Jews and Judaism within the overarching symbolic world of each author. A symbolic world is constituted by the ideas, values, faiths, convictions, ideologies, cultural codes, etc. of a group or an individual. Where Christian religion provides the fundamental perspectives, the symbolic world is often constituted by Scripture being seen as authoritative, including certain views of God and man, time and space, good and evil, and so on, as well as by political ideology, cultural traditions, etc. For my analysis of theology and anti-Semitism, this combination of 'religious' and 'non-religious' symbols is helpful, since religion, politics and culture are closely intertwined. The notion of 'symbolic world' basically accords with Peter Berger's understanding of symbolic universe. A symbolic universe is made up of a "body of theoretical traditions that integrate different provinces of meaning and encompass the institutional order in a symbolic totality".²⁸ Used in the analysis of early Christianity,

²⁶ This observation is fundamental to Hayden White, *Metahistory* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973), who is, however, too sceptical regarding the possibility of approximating an historical process in historical analysis.

²⁷ As noted by Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley, *European Perspectives* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

²⁸ Hummingfield Charles Nkosinathi Ndwandwe, "Reading 1 John in a Zulu context: hermeneutical issues" (Doctoral Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2000), quoting Berger 1966:95.

the notion of symbolic world often refers to that of the ancients.²⁹ However, it is also possible to describe the symbolic world of modern scholars. This consists of two poles: the object studied, here the Jews and Judaism of the New Testament, and the modern scholarly views of the object. In the act of interpretation, the horizon of the interpreter and that of the interpreted merge. This basic hermeneutical insight is first and foremost applicable to the interpretation of texts, but also to interpretation in general. Therefore, in order to evaluate the results of the interpreters, it is necessary to understand the horizon of the interpreter as well as that of what is interpreted. Thus the object of study is the horizons and the symbolic worlds of the *scholars*. Moreover, although each scholar has his own symbolic world, to a great extent it is held in common with the research tradition in which the scholar stands. And since Jews and Judaism are an important part of the symbolic worlds of these scholars, either as positive or negative entities, I observe how they construct Jews and Judaism. I call this ideological construction of Jews the 'symbolic Jew', which is an ideological entity with a particular role in the total ideological structure. Sometimes this is a positive, almost suprahistorical figure, as when certain salvation-historical theologians regard the 'Jew' as an important factor in God's plans; other times the figure is negative, constructed as an antipode of what the author considers valuable and good. This 'symbolic Jew' has hardly any relation to the 'real Jew'. In fact, the study indicates that it is possible to hold elevated views of the 'symbolic Jew', yet regard the 'real Jew' next door as a nuisance, or speak of 'that Jew' in a pejorative manner.

The third step in the analysis is to study the link between a certain symbolic world, with its ideology and theology, and the *legitimation versus delegitimation* of discrimination against and oppression of Jews and Judaism. According to Berger, religious legitimation "legitimizes social institutions by bestowing upon them an ultimately valid ontological status, that is, by *locating* them within a sacred and cosmic frame of reference".³⁰ As other forms of legitimation, this may "serve to explain

²⁹ For this concept in the analysis of early Christianity, see Gerd Theissen, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1999) and Kari Syreeni, "A Single Eye: Aspects of the Symbolic World of Matt 6:22–23 53/2", *Studia Theologica* 53, no. 2 (1999).

³⁰ Peter L. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy. Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (New York: Doubleday, 1967), 33.

and justify social order".³¹ Hence the way in which Jews and Judaism are perceived in the symbolic world of a society or church and theology will have a direct bearing on the situation of the Jews in the social system. Since religious legitimization even justifies certain social action, it is extremely powerful: *the order is regarded as divinely justified*. There is a subtle transferring back and forth between theology and social construction, which may serve as legitimization. Thus theology and ideology can serve to legitimise or delegitimise social order, and the statements of biblical interpreters may be used to legitimise or delegitimise policies pertaining to Jews. Legitimation and delegitimation may be either *general* or *direct*. In the first case, a picture of Jews and Judaism is painted that affects their status in society and the Church. This type of legitimization/delegitimation should not be underestimated, even if the purpose is not to oppress Jews, as the step from stereotypical generalisations to actual acts of discrimination may be a small one. Direct legitimization/delegitimation pertains to actual social policies and actions. It must be noted at the outset that it is not possible to ascertain how the texts of a certain theologian were received, and whether they did or did not legitimise oppression of Jews and Judaism, but only to study this link from theology to social thought regarding Jews and Judaism in the texts, and to try to understand, in a general sense, the role of theological legitimization.

Who are the Exegetes? On the Choice and Delimitation of Materials

The exegetes discussed are scholars who have had a decisive influence on the picture of Jews and Judaism in New Testament exegesis, beginning at the dawn of modern exegesis and ending where the relationship between exegesis and anti-Semitism is brought to a head: exegesis under National Socialism. I have limited the study to German Protestant exegetes from around 1750 to 1950. The reason for this starting point is that new approaches to New Testament studies began to develop from the mid-eighteenth century, marking a natural beginning of the investigation. The Second World War and the Holocaust with its immediate aftermath is a natural end point, the horrors of the Shoah and the situation in Germany after the war bringing about a new

³¹ Ibid., 29.

set of circumstances for German Protestant exegesis.³² In the wake of the Holocaust, a new picture of Jews and Judaism in New Testament exegesis seems to slowly emerge, presenting a more Jewish Jesus and early Christianity. The reasons for, and outcome of, this Jewish turn in exegesis deserves another study.

It is in Protestant Germany that the cradle of modern New Testament exegesis is found, which is one reason for the focus on German Protestants. Furthermore, German exegesis of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had a formative role for all exegesis, even the Roman Catholic one,³³ and not only for exegesis, but for Protestant theology at large. The study of exegetes and the Jews is therefore a strategic one. The term ‘New Testament exegete’ is used in an inclusive way. Two hundred years ago, the academic roles were less precise than today; to some extent, Christian theologians were exegetes. The included scholars have a great deal of production in the area of New Testament exegesis, irrespective of whether they held a New Testament chair. Church historian F. C. Baur in Tübingen, for example, was truly an exegete, teaching and publishing extensively on exegesis, but also on ethics and systematic theology. The same is true of Old Testament scholars W. M. L. de Wette and A. Tholuck, and the systematic theologian F. D. E. Schleiermacher. Only in the late 1800s were the Old and New Testament chairs separated, at least at some universities,³⁴ although Old Testament professors could still teach the New Testament and publish New Testament commentaries, and vice versa. Hence, in this study, New Testament exegetes are scholars who have impacted New Testament exegesis, ‘exegete’ describing a function, not a profession.

The scholars included are Johann Salomo Semler (1725–1791), Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768–1834), Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck (1799–1877),

³² For an informative description of the Holocaust, see Wolfgang Benz, *Der Holocaust*, 6 ed., C. H. Beck Wissen (München: C. H. Beck, 2005).

³³ For works focusing on Roman Catholic positions to Jews and Judaism, see e.g. Blaschke, *Katholizismus und Antisemitismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, which concentrates on the German *Kaiserreich*, and the more general overview James Carrol, *Constantine's Sword. The Church and the Jews* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2001). On Catholic theological scholarship during National Socialism, see Georg Denzler, “Katholisch-Theologische Wissenschaft im Dritten Reich”, in *Theologische Wissenschaft im “Dritten Reich”*, ed. Georg Denzler, Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, and Vicco von Bülow, *Arnoldshainer Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 2000).

³⁴ See Wolfgang Wiefel, “Franz Delitzschs Stellung in der Geschichte der Auslegung des Neuen Testaments”, *Judaica* 49 (1993), 101, on the situation in Leipzig.

Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849), Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860), Johann Tobias Beck (1804–1878), David Friedrich Strauss (1808–1874), Franz Delitzsch (1813–1890), Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1889), Hermann L. Strack (1848–1922), Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938), Johannes Weiss (1863–1914), Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920), Gerhard Kittel (1868–1948), Martin Dibelius (1883–1947), Rudolf Bultmann (1884–1976), Karl Ludwig Schmidt (1891–1956), and Walter Grundmann (1906–1976); in order to give a background to Enlightenment exegesis, the English deist Thomas Morgan is also covered. Other scholars could have been included, such as Julius Wellhausen and Emil Schürer, but for the sake of limiting what is already a large book, for Wellhausen I refer to James Pasto's substantial study from 1999, in which Wellhausen is closely related to de Wette.³⁵ As for Emil Schürer's great work *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, which meticulously describes all historical details pertaining to the Jews, I merely refer to Schürer's brief but most influential text "Life Under the Law" (*Das Leben unter dem Gesetz*), his § 28.I,³⁶ although I do not discuss it in detail. For the reasons given above, I restrict myself to German scholars. This does not mean that I side with the idea that German exegetes were worse than others, nor that anti-Semitism is intrinsic to Germans or the like.³⁷ Elsewhere I have discussed how Swedish scholars participated in and significantly contributed to efforts to dejudaise German Christianity in Eisenach during the Second World War, for example the famous New Testament professor Hugo Odeberg, Lund University.³⁸

³⁵ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*; see also Ulrich Kusche, *Die unterlegene Religion. Das Judentum im Urteil deutscher Alttestamentler*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, vol. 12, Studien zu Kirche und Israel (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1991).

³⁶ E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986); Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3 and 4 ed. (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1901–1909).

³⁷ See e.g. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners. Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, and for the ensuing debate, Geoff Eley, ed. *The "Goldhagen effect": History, Memory, Nazism—Facing the German Past*, Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000).

³⁸ Anders Gerdmar, "Ein germanischer Jesus auf schwedischem Boden: schwedisch-deutsche Forschungszusammenarbeit mit rassistischen Vorzeichen 1941–1945", in *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, ed. Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007).

It is in order to understand roots of theological anti-Semitism that I have chosen to study this broad spectrum of scholars from diametrically opposed research traditions. In selecting the scholars, I have taken into consideration their influence but not their stance towards Jews and Judaism. Moreover, since German Protestantism has been very heterogeneous, it is not possible to speak of one single research tradition.³⁹ For the most part, scholars identify two main streams or traditions, although there are mediating streams and variations within each one. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, for instance, talks about

the deep inner division of German Protestantism in a liberal-bourgeois cultural Protestantism, relatively open to modernity, and a conservative, neo-Pietist or Lutheran confessional church Protestantism, mostly borne by old elites and by the petty bourgeois.⁴⁰

Elsewhere he describes the latter as a conservative Protestantism that is critical of the Enlightenment and the former as a liberal Protestantism.⁴¹ The classic work of Emanuel Hirsch talks of ‘theological rationalism’ and its opposite, ‘supranaturalism’, which was revived through neo-Pietism,⁴² but also of a third movement, ‘mediating theology’ (*Vermittlungstheologie*).⁴³ The first two movements are also described with the terms ‘Protestant liberalism’ and its opposing ‘Lutheran orthodoxy’,⁴⁴ or as the basic opposition of conservative and liberal Protestantism.⁴⁵

³⁹ As is noted in Nowak, “Protestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik”, 564.

⁴⁰ Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, *Der Protestantismus. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, C. H. Beck Wissen (München: C. H. Beck, 2006), 11–12.

⁴¹ Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “Die Spaltung des Protestantismus. Zum Verhältnis von evangelischer Kirche, Staat und ‘Gesellschaft’ im frühen 19. Jahrhundert”, in *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Wolfgang Scheider, *Industrielle Welt* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993), 158.

⁴² Emanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuen evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949–54), part V, 70–71.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, part V, 364. Due to his main focus on Old Testament exegesis, I do not discuss the Erlangen theology of J. Chr. K. von Hofmann beyond a certain connection with Franz Delitzsch. Salvation history, which is rightly linked to von Hofmann, is also represented in the work of other scholars.

⁴⁴ Kenneth C. Barnes, *Nazism, Liberalism, & Christianity: Protestant Social Thought in Germany & Great Britain 1925–1937* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1991), 23.

⁴⁵ Wolfgang Heinrichs, *Das Judenbild im Protestantismus des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. Ein Beitrag zur Mentalitätsgeschichte des deutschen Bürgertums in der Krise der Moderne*, ed. S. Flesch, et al., 1 ed., vol. 145, Schriftenreihe des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte (Köln: Rheinland-Verlag, 2000), 685. Describing attitudes to Jews and Judaism in

This study confirms that research traditions in general, and these two streams in German Protestantism in particular, do play a great role in exegesis, and I have chosen to concentrate on these two, only touching upon mediating theology. The rationalist-Protestant liberal stream received significant impulses from the Enlightenment, although there is variation in this group, too, whereas the salvation-historical stream included revivalists, and the variant studied here is part of a renewed breakthrough of Pietism,⁴⁶ characterised by a national awareness, piety centred on Jesus as a friend, a strong consciousness of sin, and Biblicism. Neither of these two main traditions is unaffected by the other; on the contrary, they are shaped in intense interaction with, or rather opposition to, one another. However, although it is possible to follow how certain topoi are furthered in these traditions in the course of two hundred years, there are scholars who are less committed to the traditions, and it would be an oversimplification to range all scholars within them.

Due to their obvious links to the respective traditions, however, I discuss Semler and Herder, de Wette, Schleiermacher, Baur, Strauss, Ritschl, Bousset and Weiss in Part I on Enlightenment theology, my term for the theological rationalist-Protestant liberal stream. Then, in Part II on the salvation-historical research tradition,⁴⁷ I discuss Tholuck, Beck, Delitzsch, Strack and Schlatter.⁴⁸ Part III deals with the form-

various journals, Heinrichs notes the obvious fact that there were diverse currents within these two streams.

⁴⁶ Ferdinand Kattenbusch, *Die deutsche evangelische Theologie. Erster Teil: Das Jahrhundert von Schleiermacher bis nach dem Weltkrieg*, vol. 1 (Giessen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann in Giessen, 1934), 43.

⁴⁷ A general overview of salvation history is found in Wollhart Pannenberg, "Geschichte/Geschichtsschreibung/Geschichtsphilosophie VIII", in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 660–661. For prominent examples in exegesis, see Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament theology. Vol. 1, The theology of Israel's historical traditions*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979), 121 ff; Oscar Cullmann, *Heil als Geschichte. Heilsgeschichtliche Existenz im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1965). A monograph on salvation history, with a great deal of information but also a rather polemical standpoint, is Gustav Weth, *Die Heilsgeschichte: Ihr universeller und ihr individueller Sinn in der offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*, vol. Reihe 4; 2., Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus (München, 1931). Weth points to the roots in J. A. Bengel (1687–1752), Fr. Chr. Oetinger (1702–1782) and their Swabian Pietist followers, 18, but also to the Hegelian influence on J. T. Beck, who combined the Pietist inheritance with Hegelian organic-dialectical thought, 45.

⁴⁸ Kattenbusch rightly ranges Schlatter among other 'biblical theologians' and stresses their common roots in the theology of Beck, Kattenbusch, *Die Deutsche Evangelische Theologie*, 67. The list of exegetes could of course have looked different. E.g. I did not

historical exegetes, which is not a theological but a methodological classification. Although difficult to define, Martin Dibelius is considered part of the Enlightenment research tradition.⁴⁹ In this section, I have also included Karl Ludwig Schmidt, who stood fairly close to the Confessing Church⁵⁰ and whose theology takes him closer to the salvation-historical tradition, and Rudolf Bultmann, who is at home in the Enlightenment research tradition in many respects, but when relating to Jews in the ‘Third Reich’ also argues in line with the Confessing Church, to which he belonged.

The final two exegetes discussed in Part IV, Gerhard Kittel and Walter Grundmann, were members of the National Socialist party and engaged in the racial issues of the ‘new Germany’ through their scholarly work. These are treated separately from their contemporaries, not because they are unrelated to the earlier research traditions—both of them stand on the shoulders of earlier scholars, and Kittel must be regarded as one of the most internationally respected German exegetes of his time. However, in a basically unprecedented way, they perform exegesis and implement models from their research traditions to fit National Socialist political purposes. It is also with them that a theological anti-Semitism is most evident.

Since my interest is how the scholars in this study impacted academia, Church and society, the material consists mostly of the published works or lecture manuscripts of the authors. Other materials, for example letters, have been used in a few cases. I have attempted to analyse all writings by the author that I have deemed suitable for the study—that

include the Old Testament exegete Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (1802–1869), due to his main focus on the Old Testament as predicting Jesus in the New Testament. I hope that my discussion of Tholuck’s view of the Jews will mirror common positions in the Berlin circles to which both Tholuck and Hengstenberg belonged, even though there were differences among them. For the latter, see William Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume One. From Deism to Tübingen* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 279–282, and for his view of Jews and Judaism, see Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 268. Hirsch, *Geschichte Der Neuern Evangelischen Theologie*, V, counts Tholuck and Beck to ‘supranaturalism’, 103–115; 130–140. Similarly, Goppelt counts von Hofmann, Beck, Th. Zahn and A. Schlatter to the *heilsgeschichtlich-kirchliche* research line, Leonhard Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert*, ed. Paul Althaus, Hermann Dörries, and Joachim Jeremias, vol. 2. Reihe: 55, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954). It should be noted, however, that Schlatter himself had a mixture of positive and critical views on Beck.

⁴⁹ Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “Nachwort des Herausgebers”, in *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm Graf* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

⁵⁰ See the discussion of Schmidt below.

is, I have considered works that are relevant for the author's attitude to Jews and Judaism in, or in relation to, the New Testament, as well as materials that reveal their attitudes to contemporary Jews. If a work by a certain scholar is not mentioned, this does not mean that it has not been considered, only that I have deemed it less important for this specific study. Especially where prolific writers such as F. C. Baur and Adolf Schlatter are concerned—the latter whose bibliography encompasses four hundred works⁵¹—I have been unable to discuss each one and have deemed it unnecessary to list all the works initially reviewed. In order to make the material available to a broader public, and since I consider it necessary to thoroughly substantiate my analyses, a fairly comprehensive view of the works is given.

Research Traditions versus the Scholars' Own Contextual Theology

This study amply demonstrates that thought structures exist, which are furthered to new generations of scholars through research traditions, and that these can be traced from the early eighteenth century to the 1950s—and probably beyond.⁵² Larry Laudan notes that a research tradition exhibits certain metaphysical and methodological commitments. It has a long history, the tradition outliving single theories,⁵³ and it consists of some new ideas and some time-honoured ones. Moreover, in a discipline, research traditions have a vital role in determining problems, and a heuristic role in posing certain questions. Laudan also notes the justificatory role of the research traditions: the researcher within a certain tradition does not need to defend what is assumed by that tradition to its members.⁵⁴ These characteristics are also applicable to research traditions within exegesis, and to exegetes' views on Jews and Judaism in relation to the New Testament. There are

⁵¹ Ernst Bock, *Adolf-Schlatter-Archiv. Inventar. Als Manuskript gedruckt* (Stuttgart: Landeskirchliches Archiv Stuttgart, 1988).

⁵² As was successfully pointed out even in 1962 by Thomas S. Kuhn, ed. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Second edition, enlarged ed., vol. 2, 2, International Encyclopedia of Unified Science (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), the basic observations of which are still applicable to all scholarly work.

⁵³ Laudan's 'research traditions' are different from Thomas Kuhn's 'paradigm' and Imre Lakatos's 'research programmes', see Larry Laudan, *Progress and its Problems. Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 73–76.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 78–93.

certain metaphysical and methodological commitments that are fundamental, and certain historiographical patterns that do not need empirical justification. Furthermore, just as Laudan observes, the research traditions bring with them certain heuristics. In order to evaluate depictions of Jews and Judaism, we need to understand these traditions and their central ideas. Thus, in dealing with theology and anti-Semitism, we cannot merely study individual scholars but must discuss research traditions as well.

The influence of research traditions is not enough to explain the various positions, however. A scholar's view on Jews and Judaism is not only a reproduction of a research tradition—instead, out of his own concrete context, personal ethos and symbolic world, each scholar forms his ideas and actions in the complex interaction between research tradition, theological and philosophical views, and responses to existing cultural and political systems. This means that factors other than the research tradition or theological system may come into play. For example, when new political winds sweep the land or the cultural climate changes, this might influence how scholars see Jews and Judaism. In searching for roots of the exegetes' views on Jews and Judaism, one must therefore try to contextualise the ideas within this interplay of factors.

Finally, a study of research traditions obviously runs the risk of oversimplification, since in reality the scholars are on a continuum even within a tradition to which they belong. There are scholars who hardly fit into any research tradition, or who otherwise blur the boundaries. There are also anomalies who say and do things that are not expected in that tradition, as well as people like August Wünsche or Paul Kahle, who carry out important work in Judaica and the New Testament, seemingly without any obvious ideological bias. One result of the study is that, although there is ample support for the existence of these traditions, in the end they often overlap. Having shown these factors, complicating the picture and guarding against oversimplification, the investigation clearly shows that the study of these two major lines in German Protestantism helps to put the views on Jews and Judaism in German New Testament exegesis into perspective.

What This Study Does and Does Not Do

The study attempts to understand how theological and ideological structures in biblical interpretation yield themselves to different views

on Jews and Judaism, and to explain the link between biblical interpretation regarding Jews and Judaism, and anti-Semitism.

Thus my purpose is not to judge or taint anyone or any of the research traditions with anti-Semitism, but to understand the underlying structures. In fact, one result of the investigation is that none of the research traditions is innocent of legitimising anti-Semitism; rather, there are positive and negative factors in each. Representatives of various traditions come in for their share, and since other factors are at least as important as the research tradition, underlying thought structures and *ressentiments* seem to surface in seemingly contradictory systems. As noted below, there are representatives of the Enlightenment tradition, such as Toland and Locke—Toland who wanted to see Christianity and Judaism existing side by side—and Biblicists, such as Beck, who strongly emphasised the unity between Judaism and Christianity, whereas others in their camp viewed Jews and Judaism differently. The picture is too complicated to allow a tainting of any tradition with anti-Semitism, or to exempt any tradition from it.

The perspective that I am writing from is that of a Christian exegete, with a pathos to counter anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism as the dark companions of Christianity from the time of the Letter to the Romans until today—an anti-Semitism that has not ceased but is evident in old and new forms. The same old stereotypes and libels are revived in these movements. Uncovering structures behind anti-Semitism is not a merely academic task therefore, but one that can affect the circumstances of its present-day victims. As an exegete, I welcome the post-Holocaust re-evaluation of the Jewish roots of Christianity, seeing the value and necessity of a sound historical description of Judaism in antiquity—in relation to New Testament studies in particular—as a prerequisite for a proper understanding of the New Testament in its original environment.

In many ways, the results of this investigation have been surprising, causing reconsideration of preconceived ideas and challenging my own convictions. If the following pages can cause the reader to experience a similar thing, bringing about a deeper reflection of how Jews and Judaism are constructed in exegesis and theology, the work will not have been in vain.

PART I
ENLIGHTENMENT EXEGESIS AND THE JEWS

INTRODUCTION

Just as its political history, Germany's history of theology during the Old Reich, the *Kaiserreich* and National Socialism is marked by constant conflict and great change—not forgetting the turmoil during the Weimar Republic. Perhaps more than in any other modern country, the nation's destiny was intertwined with the destiny of Christianity.¹ In contrast to what most modern scholars experience, living their lives on academic islands, German professors of theology and exegesis were no unimportant figures in the life of the nation. In fact, German Protestant theology often saw itself as part of, and key to, the development of Germany. At times it was successful in exerting its influence,² not only on theology but also on politics and cultural life. However, at the same time, the so-called Jewish problem hung as a dark shadow over the theological and political life,³ throughout the period between the Enlightenment and the Holocaust. In the great project of shaping the German nation-state, a project that several leading theologians were involved in, the Jewish minority, whether assimilated or maintaining its integrity, was often regarded as a disturbing phenomenon.

Studying the Jews in European Enlightenment discourse, it is apparent that theology, culture and politics are part of the same fabric. The discussions on the Bible had a direct bearing on the fate of the Jews, as was natural in a culture that had the Bible as one of its components. Not merely philosophical or cultural, the Enlightenment project truly caused a shift of paradigms, even world-views, having spiritual, sociopolitical and

¹ For an overview of German Protestant theology of the period, see Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, ed. *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, vol. 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990), 11–54, and Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, ed. *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, vol. 2. Kaiserreich. Teil 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992), 12–118.

² Graf, ed. *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, 12–16.

³ For the term, see the Introduction. Even if Joseph II's edict meant important abolitions and relaxed restrictions, it was a torso, and in effect much remained the same, Calvin Goldschneider and Alan S. Zuckerman, *The Transformation of the Jews*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984), 34–35; Alfred D. Low, *Jews in the Eyes of the Germans. From the Enlightenment to Imperial Germany* (Philadelphia: Institute for Human Issues, 1979), 17–23.

material aspects. During this process of change, no single group was perhaps more in focus than the Jews. The emancipation envisioned was one of the individual from the rule of Church and Bible, to a new rational and universal religion, but this also had political dimensions for those who welcomed the political modernisation envisaged in the French Revolution. In Germany, national unity was part of such political modernisation. As noted by Goldschneider and Zuckerman:

State builders sought to apply their rule uniformly for all individuals in their societies. Special taxes, statuses, and privileges had to be eliminated. Hence, policies toward Jews had to be revised and their place as a special group had to be addressed. The Jewish question illustrates the general policy problem.⁴

Not only was the Jewish group in focus, but due to the link between the political situation and religion—the Jews’ and that of the states in which they lived—the ‘Jewish problem’ came to the fore, the European states discussing the place of the Jews in society from Emperor Joseph II’s Edict of Tolerance in 1781 to after the Holocaust. At the same time, the theologians strove to define an Enlightenment-oriented religion. No wonder the theological question of the Jews occupied a prominent position in this reflection. Since the inception of the Jesus movement, Judaism had been regarded as Christianity’s older twin (Rom. 9:11–12), and Enlightenment theology and philosophy defined itself in relation to Judaism. This is for instance evident in one of the main figures of Enlightenment redefinition of religion and ethics, Immanuel Kant, from whom the fundamental views of Enlightenment theologians, of religion as well as of Judaism, often seem to emanate.⁵

⁴ Goldschneider and Zuckerman, *The Transformation of the Jews*, 33.

⁵ See Nathan Rotenstreich, *Jews and German Philosophy. The Polemics of Emancipation* (New York: Schocken Books, 1984), 3–5. Kant’s structures and concepts seem to reoccur in Enlightenment-oriented theologians, e.g. the idea that Judaism is legalistic (*statutorisch*) and a worldly state within the state, Kant’s criticism of Messianism, etc. *Statutorisch* denotes the opposite of moral, that is, lacking inner substance and emanating only from external authority. These thought structures sometimes remain, even when later thinkers at times dissociate themselves from Kant. For Kant’s view of race, see Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, *Race and the Enlightenment. A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997). This does not mean that Kant was always opposed to Jews; on the contrary, he befriended the Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelsohn, Micha Brumlik, “Laudatio auf die Preisschrift von Frau Dr. Bettina Stangneth ‘Antisemitische und Antijüdische Motive bei Immanuel Kant’”, in *Antisemitische und antijudaistische Motive bei Denkern der Aufklärung*, ed. Horst Gronke, Thomas Meyer, and Barbara Neißer, *PPA-Schriften* (Münster: LIT, 2001), 33–35.

The new religious paradigm affected the ‘place’ of the Jews. Religion in an Enlightenment perspective was no longer dependent on, or bound to, historical events, but became supra-historical. Since religion was ‘natural’, it was intrinsic to all humans. Religion thus became integrated into the individual’s self-understanding: “each individual [can] attain truth by the free exercise of his private judgment”.⁶ At the same time, no particular religion was true, and part and parcel of this outlook was that the hegemony of revelation had to be broken. Jews and Judaism were linked to that precise biblical revelation that the Enlightenment wanted to free itself of, and the ethnic and religious particularity that was typical of the Abrahamic covenant and Judaism—and then Christianity—went out of fashion. Rationality being the ruling principle of this changing intellectual condition, theology and philosophy began to express profound criticism of the miraculous, or ‘mysterious’, element of religion, and thus of the Bible. This was pioneered by English deists. Descartes’s principle that truth is what is evident to reason had signified a decisive break with tradition, replacing the unchallenged primacy of theology with that of philosophy.⁷ As a result, the Enlightenment meant not least, to use Scholder’s formulation, an “Emanzipation der Vernunft gegenüber der Bibel” (an emancipation of reason in relation to the Bible).⁸ As my discussion will show, this process of the emancipation of reason from the Bible at times runs parallel to the emancipation of Christianity from the Jews.

This shift of paradigms profoundly changed theology, exegesis in particular. Although it was in Germany that Enlightenment theology grew into the force that would transform the world of theology, modern theology—and modern exegesis—was born in England.⁹ English deism, the ‘Enlightenment philosophy of religion’ (McGrath) and the deistic controversy brought the decisive blow to pre-critical faith in biblical revelation.¹⁰ Thus it was English rationalism that reformed German

⁶ Vassilis Lambropoulos, *The Rise of Eurocentrism. Anatomy of Interpretation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 46.

⁷ Klaus Scholder, *Ursprünge und Probleme der Bibelkritik im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der historisch-kritischen Theologie*, ed. Ernst Wolf, vol. 33, *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966), 134.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 131.

⁹ Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative. A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 51.

¹⁰ Lambropoulos, *The Rise of Eurocentrism*, 45.

university philosophy,¹¹ although initially the result was different from that seen in England or France. The dominant German Christian philosopher Christian Wolff united rationalism with dogmatic conservatism, using his logic to defend orthodoxy.¹² But when Wolff's disciple, the German theology professor in Halle, Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten, introduced English deism to Germany, critical rationalism made its inroad into theology.¹³ This is true even though Baumgarten was by no means uncritical of deism.¹⁴

Halle having long been the stronghold of Pietism, Baumgarten now opened up for students to take an historical approach to the Bible, which would turn the tide of exegesis.¹⁵ Quite differently from the deists, however, Baumgarten sought to unite Wolff's philosophy with Pietism, "against his own will" pioneering historical-critical scholarship in Germany,¹⁶ his roots being in German Protestantism. Nevertheless, his approach to the Bible resulted in a growing division between the Scriptures and the 'Word of God'.¹⁷ His dual foci on the experience and rational Christianity also seem typical of much later German theology (for instance Schleiermacher). These changes affected the Protestant view on the Jews, too.

Baumgarten's main influence, however, came through his student Johann Salomo Semler, whose impact on Enlightenment theology and exegesis can scarcely be overstated.¹⁸ Fascinated by Baumgarten's way

¹¹ Leopold Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie* (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1905), 26.

¹² *Ibid.*, 26.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁴ Baumgarten criticises Morgan's *The Moral Philosopher* in a review and in summaries of English literature that debate Morgan's theses, Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten, "Review of *The Moral Philosopher*", in *Nachrichten von einer hallischen Bibliothek*, ed. Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten (Halle: Johann Justinus Gebauer, 1750), 330–358 (including a few shorter notes on other literature).

¹⁵ Martin Schloemann, *Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten. System und Geschichte in der Theologie des Überganges zum Neuprotestantismus*, vol. 26, *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 242.

¹⁶ Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume One*, 117; Otto Merk, "Baumgarten, Siegmund Jacob", in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. Walter Kasper (Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 93.

¹⁷ Schloemann, *Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten*, 216, 242.

¹⁸ On Baumgarten's influence on Semler, see Gottfried Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler. Studien zu Leben und Werk des Hallenser Aufklärungstheologen*, ed. Hans Joachim Kertscher and Fabienne Molin, vol. 2, *Hallesche Beiträge zur Europäischen Aufklärung* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1996), *passim*.

of criticising the dominant theology without destroying the Christian religion, Semler would himself attempt the same.¹⁹

With the deistic ideas followed thoughts on Christianity and the Jews, and so there is a direct link between English deistic depictions of the Jews and those found among the pioneers of modern New Testament exegesis. The following discussion of German Protestant views on the Jews thus begins with an English prelude. I will first discuss an English predecessor of Semler, Thomas Morgan (1680?–1743), followed by Semler and Herder, Schleiermacher and de Wette. As will be demonstrated, although there are considerable differences between English and German Enlightenment, there are also close connections.²⁰ As rationalism lost influence, Romanticism took over, German Romanticism being partly a continuation and partly a break with the Enlightenment tradition. This continuity despite the discontinuity is also evident in the theologians discussed below, including their view on the Jews. On the link between Enlightenment and Romanticism, Dyson writes:

after the demise of the Wolffian philosophy, the *Aufklärung* developed, mainly from intrinsic resources, a standpoint which in important respects anticipates and is in continuity with the subsequent Romantic and Idealist movements.²¹

Hence it seems correct to treat these theologians as part of the same research tradition: the thought develops from a more rationalistic to a more Romantic position, although the latter often involves rationalism.

How, then, are the Jews and Judaism described in the deliberations of Enlightenment theology and exegesis? Did the Enlightenment, with its emancipatory ambitions, deliver the final blow to theological anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, as one might expect? Against such an idealised view, I suggest that the picture of the Jews and Judaism found in the exegesis of this research tradition is coloured by classic anti-Jewish stereotypes, and that Jews and Judaism are constructed as the main antipode to Christianity, despite the tradition's lip service to emancipation.

¹⁹ Ibid., 6.

²⁰ See John W. Rogerson, "Philosophy and the Rise of Biblical Criticism: England and Germany", in *England and Germany: studies in theological diplomacy*, ed. S. W. Sykes, *Studien zur interkulturellen Geschichte des Christentums* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982); A. O. Dyson, "Theological legacies of the Enlightenment: England and Germany", in *England and Germany: studies in theological diplomacy*, ed. S. W. Sykes, *Studien zur interkulturellen Geschichte des Christentums* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982).

²¹ Dyson, "Theological Legacies of the Enlightenment", 54, emphasis mine.

THE JEWS IN ENLIGHTENMENT EXEGESIS FROM DEISM TO DE WETTE

An English Prelude: Enlightened Prejudice against the Jews

Thomas Morgan's dangerous theological views caused his superior to dismiss him from the Presbyterian ministry.¹ The main work of this advocate of deism, *The Moral Philosopher* (1738–1740), takes the form of a dialogue between a deist (Philaethes) and a Christian Jew (Theophanes) on this new faith. The Old Testament history of the Jews is the warp of the discussion, although Morgan does not reflect historically on Jews and Judaism. He believes that the religion of the Hebrews degenerated into legalism with Moses, after which it was restored into a natural religion with Christ, who was not, however, a Jewish Messiah.²

Morgan was not alone in regarding the opposition between Judaism and Christianity as fundamental; this dichotomy would become an influential heuristic tool in New Testament exegesis. The Irish deist theologian John Toland (1670–1722), however, who also saw an opposition between a Jewish Christianity that kept to the Jewish law, and Pauline Gentile Christianity, considered the former to be the original and genuine expression of Christianity.³ Thus Toland interpreted the dichotomy rather differently from other deists and, in their wake, Enlightenment theologians. To Toland, Jesus, the apostles and the 'Nazarenes' represented true Christianity, where law was nothing negative. In a polemic against Luther, Toland states that man is made righteous not by faith but by works!⁴ A strong advocate of Jewish emancipation,

¹ Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume One*, 52.

² *Ibid.*, 52–54.

³ Werner Georg Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament. Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme*, ed. Fritz Wagner and Richard Brodführer, 2 ed., Orbis Academicus. Problemgeschichten der Wissenschaft in Dokumenten und Darstellungen (Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 1970), 59.

⁴ Max Wiener, "John Toland and Judaism", *Hebrew Union College Annual*, no. 16 (1941), 221.

as was John Locke,⁵ Toland wanted Judaism and Christianity to be able to live side by side.⁶

Many deists advocated Jewish emancipation, even if this does not mean that all advocates of Jewish political emancipation were tolerant of the faith of the Jews. Rather, the question of emancipation is at times dealt with independently of the theological discussion. Thus, despite their tolerance with regard to politics, the strong polemics of deists and others against Judaism as a theological position may have opened up for racist action. Manuel concludes, "When Judaism was no longer necessary for a rational religion in Europe, the Jews lost their place in the order of things and soon stood as naked aliens in a secular society."⁷ Once they were deleted from the Bible, i.e. a Bible without the Old Testament, the Jews lost the protection they so needed, even in an 'enlightened' Europe.

Deists influenced Voltaire, as well as German theologians such as Reimarus and Semler. "Through them [...] the animosity towards the Jews was transmitted to most educated free-thinking Europeans of that century and their influence can be discerned even in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."⁸ Thus, to Ettinger, *the deist's conception of Jews and Judaism formed the link between ancient and classic anti-Judaism and modern Jew-hatred*.⁹ Inspired by the deists after his stay in London in the 1720s, Voltaire, in his war against what he regarded as superstition and prejudice, rejected any idea of the Jewish people as having a special, divinely appointed role in history—later in Voltaire's thought, the Jews were replaced by the Catholic Church.¹⁰ To him, the Jews were inferior in every way: culturally, religiously, ethically, socially and politically.¹¹ Voltaire's position is interesting, since he was well versed in biblical exegesis and had a direct link to Baumgarten and Semler in Halle, which became the most important matrix of Enlightenment

⁵ David S. Katz, *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 175, 234.

⁶ Wiener, "John Toland and Judaism", 230, 235. So also Katz, *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850*, 235, describing how Toland, addressing bishops and archbishops, fought forcefully for the emancipation of the Jews.

⁷ Manuel, *The Broken Staff. Judaism through Christian Eyes*, 191.

⁸ S. Ettinger, "Jews and Judaism as Seen by the English Deists of the 18th Century (Hebrew)", *Zion* 29 (1964), II.

⁹ Ibid.; Katz, *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850*, 234 n. 164.

¹⁰ Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 37.

¹¹ Ibid., 41.

theology in Germany. Halle was also influenced by Thomas Morgan's translated and published writings.

The Moral Philosopher: Judaism as an 'Egyptianiz'd' Degeneration

The central theme of Morgan's great three-volume work *The Moral Philosopher* is the contrast between Judaism and Christianity, paired with other parallel dichotomies.¹² The main opposition is presented even in the preface to the first volume, "moral Truth, Reason, and fitness of Things" versus "Things merely positive, ritual and ceremonial, as necessary parts of Religion".¹³ Another parallel opposition is 'reveal'd Religion' and 'natural Religion'. Morgan's own Christianity is basically moral, restoring "the eternal, immutable Rule of moral Rectitude, or the Religion of God and Nature". Moral truth and righteousness are at the centre of his teaching, whereas his enemy is "systematical Orthodoxy and Church authority",¹⁴ "Church Power, priestly Absolutions, the spiritual Regeneration of Baptism, and the seal'd Pardons of the other Sacrament from authoriz'd Hands".¹⁵ In this presentation of basic oppositions, Judaism and 'Church' form the negative part.

Central to Morgan's thinking—as to that of other deists—is his conception of religion as *one* natural religion. From this standpoint, he criticises the fact that religion that is expressed in doctrines instead becomes many *different* religions. It is strange, he says, that God would reveal a religion that was not clear to all men.¹⁶ The Jewish religion becomes an example of this downfall. Throughout the work, Morgan presents Paul and Moses as antipodes, putting forward a degeneration hypothesis to describe the history of the high-standing Hebrews' degeneration into Jews. He acknowledges the faith of the early 'Hebrews' Noah, Abraham and Enoch, but holds that the faith degenerated in

¹² I concentrate on the first volume. The subsequent volumes, Thomas Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher. Being a farther vindication of Moral Truth and Reason*, vol. II (London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1739), Thomas Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher. Superstition and Tyranny inconsistent with Theocracy*, vol. III (London: n.p., 1740) are occasioned by criticisms against Morgan. The subject matter and his positions are the same as in volume one.

¹³ Thomas Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and Theophanes a Christian Jew*, vol. I (London: n.p., 1738), v.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vii.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 248.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

Egypt.¹⁷ Similar degeneration hypotheses are found in most of the Enlightenment-oriented scholars that will be discussed here.

Morgan's quarrels are with the Law. Moses had learned rituals in Egypt, which became the ceremonial and moral law,¹⁸ and these outward sacrifices replaced what Morgan regards as true religion, the "inner sincerity of the Person", transferring it from a "*personal* to a vicarious Acceptableness".¹⁹ Thus the doctrine of the Atonement is Egyptian and Jewish, marking a degeneration. According to Morgan, the people had been "perfectly *Egyptianiz'd*" and might more appropriately have been called Egyptians than Israelites, since they were Egyptians in every respect. Moses and the prophets are therefore of no consequence to Morgan's religion, although he "can admire them as Politicians, Historians, Orators, and Poets".²⁰ Neither did the Old Testament have any positive function in religion; instead, according to Jacob Katz's description of the deist position, the addition of the Old Testament to the New Testament "is a distortion of Christian teaching which diverts Christianity from its original purity", and the link between them ought to be broken.²¹ "I am a Christian on the foot of the New Testament," Morgan confesses. Although this view of the Old Testament would become another feature of much of Enlightenment theology, Morgan was probably the first to take such a radical stand against the Old Testament in England.²²

Thus, to Morgan, the period in Egypt brought a permanent and irrevocable change to the national character of the Jews:

from this Time, neither Moses, nor any of their other Prophets, could ever deliver them from this *Egyptian* Darkness, Blindness of Mind, and Slavery of Conscience, to priestly Power and Absolution. For, having lost all inward Sincerity, and Integrity of Heart, and all true Notions of God, Religion and Providence, they had nothing to depend on but Miracles [...] nor could any Dispensation of Providence towards them ever cure them of this constitutional, natural Blindness [...] under which they still remain abandoned and forsaken of God to this Day.²³

¹⁷ Parkes, "Jews and Christians in the Constantinian Empire", 71–72.

¹⁸ Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume One*, 52.

¹⁹ Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and Theophanes a Christian Jew*, 243.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 394.

²¹ Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 30.

²² Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie*, 113.

²³ Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and*

The criticism of the Jewish people focuses on their character or essence, which to Morgan remains the same throughout history: “this Blindness, Bigotry and Enthusiasm being the incurable Distemper of that wretched people”. Elsewhere he calls the Jews “grossly stupid, superstitious and *Egyptianiz’d*”:²⁴

It is true, that St. *Paul*, as well as all the Prophets before him, found himself obliged to treat the *Jews* in a very grave and solemn Manner; for that People being naturally reserv’d, sullen, morose and severe, could not bear any Thing of Wit and Humour, and would certainly have return’d a Jest or a piece of Wit upon them, with a Dart or a Javelin.²⁵

It is remarkable that Judaism is judged here for not suiting Morgan’s sense of humour. To Morgan, the Jews are an eternally negative example: the Jewish nation is “set up by Providence, as an Example to the World in all future Ages, of the natural Effects and Consequences of Ignorance, Superstition, Presumption and Immorality”.²⁶

Hence Judaism and Christianity are starkly contrasted—“no two Religions in the World can be more inconsistent and irreconcilable, than Judaism and Christianity”²⁷—as are Gentile and Jewish Christianity. Gentile Christianity is positive, Paul being its most important representative, whereas Jewish Christianity has quite a different theology. Jews are mere Jews even if they convert, indicating that for Morgan the criticism is not academic or theological but racist: Jews qua Jews are hopelessly degenerated. He can therefore state, “No Christian *Jew* ever believ’d in Jesus as the common Saviour of the World, without distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile*,” which was Peter’s gospel in contrast to Paul’s.

Morgan often stresses that Paul was the apostle of the Gentiles, but although he concedes that Paul was a Jew, he seems to be the exception to all other Jews. Paul received an immediate revelation from Christ, independently of all jurisdiction and authority, thus providing an example to the deists.²⁸ The Jews, however, were not able to receive the gospel, Morgan writes:

Theophanes a Christian Jew, 247–248; see also p. 254. Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 28, says: “The Deists tended to see the Jews as students of other peoples.”

²⁴ Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and Theophanes a Christian Jew*, 248, 254; cf. 291.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 21.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 255.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 441.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 376–377.

The Jews could receive nothing contrary to their old Superstition and national, *Egyptian* Prejudices. And, therefore, when St. Paul came to preach Christ as the common Saviour of the World, there was not one *Jew* that could ever give into his Scheme. [...] therefore, *Peter* who had the Keys, shut the Gates of the Kingdom against the whole *Gentile* World, who would not submit to the Law of Proselytism, or *Jewish* Naturalization.²⁹

Morgan's picture of the Jews does not seem to comment on 'New Testament Jews' but reveals his general sentiment towards them, which often surfaces in his discussion, for instance when talking of damnation: "A most horrid and diabolical Notion, which they took from the wicked, revengeful *Jews*".³⁰

Thomas Morgan chose Jews as the dark backdrop to Christianity, that is, the 'free' Christianity of his interpretation, and this backdrop is very present in his writing. Although he does not explicitly reflect on his English ethnicity in contrast to the Jewish one, the Jews are portrayed in essentialist terms, being incorrigible and hopelessly given to superstition. This is done without any distinction between Jews past and present.

Morgan's text only contains slight evidence of his views regarding racist policy. In England at that time, there was a discussion concerning the rights of English Jewry, who would only be granted entrance to the country in 1753 through the so-called Jew Bill. However, due to public resistance, the bill was withdrawn that same year,³¹ and it would be another hundred years before the policy against Jewish emancipation was revoked in England—this was done completely only in 1890. The defamation of the Jews by Morgan and other deists was probably instrumental in forming public opinion against Jewish emancipation and thus for the exclusion of the Jews.

According to Morgan, Jewish Christians share the negative traits of Jews. The Jewish Christians confined salvation to themselves, Morgan states, and Jewish Christianity is the same old Egyptian superstition with external, "useless" rites and ceremonies.³² In an aetiology on the emergence of the "Catholick Christian church", Morgan explains

²⁹ Ibid., 361.

³⁰ Ibid., 400.

³¹ Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems. Band II: Anmerkungen, Exkurse, Register*, 108–109.

³² Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and Theophanes a Christian Jew*, 367, 374.

how this came about. Separated at first, during the persecutions the two Christianities united, and the negative Jewish heritage began to influence the church, establishing a hierarchy in it, an external, visible “Authority and Jurisdiction over Conscience in Matters of Religion and eternal Salvation”.³³ However, there were also “truly primitive Christians, who maintained Liberty of Conscience, and the Right of private Judgment [...] called in Derision by the general Name of *Gnosticks*”, being the dissenters and Protestants of this time.³⁴ The last statement reveals Morgan’s own preferences: the primitive as opposed to late developments, freedom as opposed to legalism, private religion as opposed to Church, and the Protestant dissenter as the model of sound religion, which is very much a self-description of Morgan. The idea of Gnostics being forerunners of Morgan’s type of religion would return in for example F. C. Baur.

Christian is Good, Jewish is Evil

As already noted, Morgan heralds themes and makes analyses that would recur in Enlightenment theology and exegesis throughout the two centuries that followed. The stark opposition between Judaism and Christianity, and the strong prejudice against Jews and Judaism, although perhaps surprising, belong to the fundamental structures of his theology. In his presentation of the deist, natural religion, Judaism and the Old Testament form the black backdrop. Not based on any historical analysis, his construct is prejudiced, portraying Judaism, together with Catholicism and other established religion, as the negative side. Jacob Katz rightly describes a position such as Morgan’s as follows: “All that is good and beautiful is attributed to Christian origins and whatever is evil or ugly is attributed to Jewish origins.”³⁵ The opposite side is rooted in ‘true’ Christianity as envisioned by Morgan, the ‘law-free’ Christianity of Paul, who is regarded as the first person of the Enlightenment. Similarly, Jewish and Gentile Christianity are starkly contrasted, with the former being a degenerated form.

³³ Ibid., 378.

³⁴ Ibid., 381, 387.

³⁵ Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 31.

However, Morgan's views are not all new. The criticism of the Catholic Church is parallel to that of the Hebrews and Jews, and when Morgan talks about Jewish Christianity, he means Christians who keep to dogma, hierarchy and sacraments. Seemingly, a 'church person' is a Christian Jew, regardless of ethnic descent. *Thus 'Jewish' is basically a pejorative term and does not describe an historical entity.*

Conclusion

Morgan's description of the Jews is important as a background to the later German development, showing that the negative, stereotypical *characterisation* of Jews is not a German phenomenon per se. His picture of the Jews is strongly negative in that the characteristics of the Jews are inalterable, them having a "constitutional, natural Blindness [...] under which they still remain abandoned and forsaken of God to this Day", the "Blindness, Bigotry and Enthusiasm being the incurable Distemper of that wretched people".³⁶ These are traits of Jews qua Jews, irrespective of personality or whether they are Christian or not. Thus Morgan's prejudice against Jews is an essentialist and racist one: because they are Jews, they cannot change.³⁷

In his *historiography* of the Jewish people, Morgan differentiates between the early, happy period of the 'Hebrews' Noah, Abraham and Enoch, and the time after Moses's arrival in Egypt, when the religion of the Hebrews degenerated into something else, and the Jews became thoroughly 'Egyptianised'. In comparison to many later scholars who share Morgan's basic views, Egypt and Alexandria do not stand for anything positive. Whereas others see Alexandria as the place where Judaism would be elevated through Greek influence, this is not the case with Morgan. He also argues for an early depravation of Israel, interpreting Moses and his time in Egypt negatively, whereas scholars such as de Wette and Baur consider Judaism's encounter with Hellenism in the time after Alexander to be something positive. Furthermore, in contrast to these scholars, Morgan has no thought of a *praeparatio evan-*

³⁶ Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and Theophanes a Christian Jew*, 248, 254.

³⁷ On race and Enlightenment, see Eze, *Race and the Enlightenment. A Reader*. See also Kelley, *Racializing Jesus. Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship*, 16–17, 34–39.

gelica. After Moses's depravation, which was also the depravation of his people, Judaism entered a new, inalterable and negative state.

Accordingly, there is *no continuity* between the Old and New Testaments, and Morgan draws a sharp dichotomy between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. The unbridgeable break between Judaism and Christianity exists between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, too. The Jews are the degenerated Israel of the Old Testament, and the Old Testament has no relevance for Morgan's own theology, which like much of Enlightenment theology has a negative view of the Old Testament. Enlightenment theology, on the other hand, is positive, representing Pauline Christianity. In other words, Paul somehow managed to be a Jew without having any of their inalterable characteristics. This is a blatant inconsistency in Morgan's discussion.

Morgan's *symbolic world* is a deist one, presenting a new rational and universal natural religion, centred on reason and with a strong moral focus. The opposition being between 'reveal'd Religion' and 'natural Religion', Paul is the proponent of a Christianity that can be associated with the latter, a Christianity independent of all jurisdiction, church authority and "systematic orthodoxy". Paul received an *immediate* revelation from Christ, and thus became the deists' example of a private, true religion, where 'the inner sincerity of the Person' is central. Hence Morgan places Paul, free and natural religion, as well as sincerity, integrity and high morals, on the positive side of the symbolic world, whereas he places church, authority, jurisdiction, but also ignorance, superstition, presumption and immorality, on the negative side.

To illustrate the negative side, Morgan constructs a 'symbolic Jew' as an entity in his symbolic world. This entity is not described using scholarly empirical arguments, but is ideologically constructed. The 'symbolic Jew' is useful to Morgan, forming the dark backdrop that is necessary for his continued argument. He is given all kinds of negative traits, even those that Morgan lists as characteristics of the 'church-kind of Christianity', which he argues against.

In Morgan, the Jews of past and present melt together into one. Since he describes Jews in essentialist terms, seeing them as forever depraved and inalterably negative, his descriptions of them become immediately relevant for how Jews are viewed in society and politics, thus indirectly *legitimising* the prevailing oppression of the Jews in England in 1738. It is important to remember that Morgan's was not the only position on the Jews, as the example of Toland shows, although deists who in principle had a tolerant view of Jews could still utter statements similar

to those of Morgan. This dominant deist confession of emancipation combined with a deeply prejudiced view on Jews and Judaism is an example of “the Janus face of the Enlightenment”, to use Habermas’s famous expression.³⁸

³⁸ For the expression, see Jürgen Habermas, “The Entwinement of Myth and Enlightenment: Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno”, in *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987), 109.

JOHANN SALOMO SEMLER: DEJUDAISING CHRISTIANITY

The first Protestant writer to call for a dejudaizing of Christian theology for theological reasons was Johann Salomo Semler.¹ As noted, the English deistic and anti-deistic literature, the former including Thomas Morgan's writings, had been introduced to the German academy by Semler's teacher Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten.² Semler's stance towards the Jews is comprehensible against this background.

Semler has been called "the incontestable leader of German Neology" and is known as the person who turned old Protestantism into new Protestantism.³ Although the latter epithet may be applied to later figures as well, for example Schleiermacher, Semler is certainly one of the architects of modern exegesis, due to his new approach to biblical studies. Furthermore, his work strongly influenced that of Schleiermacher, a connection that will be discussed below. Semler's own literary production is vast. The Halle theologian is depicted as a union of opposites: Lutheran Pietism and rational historical-critical theology.⁴ However, Semler's picture of Christianity is in effect quite different to Pietism: his religion is one of reason and virtue, where Christianity is primarily a *moral* order, furthering all good works,⁵ and instead of

¹ This is argued in Heinrich Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie zum Judentum am Ausgang der Aufklärung" (Doctoral thesis, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität, 1953), 55.

² Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie*, IV:7; Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie*, 32.

³ Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie*, IV:48–49. See also Dyson, "Theological Legacies of the Enlightenment: England and Germany", 54–62, where he shows similarities and differences between the British Enlightenment and the German *Aufklärung*.

⁴ Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 40. For Semler's position on the authority of the Scriptures, see Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler. Studien zu Leben und Werk des hallenser Aufklärungstheologen*, 237–239. Semler's distinction between the text of the Holy Scriptures and the Word of God enabled him to work critically with the Bible while believing in the authority of the Word of God, Johann Salomo Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon; nebst Antwort auf die tübingische Vertheidigung des Apocalypsis* (Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1771), 75; Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*, 255. The theory of accommodation and criticism of "mythical elements" in the Bible were part of his critical work with the Bible.

⁵ Johann Salomo Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, ed. Hans Scheible,

being the Crucified One, the Redeemer, Christ is seen as the founder of a higher moral religion.⁶ This theological basis also explains his view on the Jews.

Semler's View on the Jews and Judaism

Semler's picture of the Old Testament, and related to this, of Jews and Judaism, was fundamental to his theology; Jews and Judaism became the prime, dark backdrop to his own interpretation of Christianity. Here, too, we encounter the Janus face of the Enlightenment. As a person of the Enlightenment, Semler took a clear stand against any discrimination of Jews and other minorities, for instance rejecting the traditional Jewish blood libel.⁷ At the same time, however, his theological view on Jews and Judaism is strongly negative.

Whereas Judaism in itself is nationally limited, and Yahweh is only a national God (*Nationalgott*), Semler holds that religion must be universal and cosmopolitan.⁸ Christianity, therefore, is something new and different, and is in essence no continuation of Judaism. Instead, Semler sees Christianity as a new religion that is revealed by God but not confined to a certain people or group. Being a universal religion, it supersedes both Jewish and Gentile religion.⁹ The Old Testament, too, has a Jewish-national character, an idea that Semler's writings seem to be the first evidence of on German soil, although it was not an entirely new thought, as we have already seen in Thomas Morgan.¹⁰

Thus to Semler, there is a breach between Judaism and Christianity:

The Christian religion is for all people, the Jewish is only *particular* [...]; therefore it had to be annulled (*aufgehoben*), to give space to the Christian general (*allgemeinen*) religion, which has completely different books as its

Texte zur Kirchen- und Theologischesgeschichte (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1967 (1771–1776)), 68.

⁶ Rothe, Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 56–57.

⁷ Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*, 49, 296.

⁸ Jewish Enlightenment thinkers, e.g. Moses Mendelsohn, claimed that their religion also genuinely expresses natural religion. For Mendelsohn, see Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 14. Similar thoughts are common among Christian Enlightenment writers.

⁹ Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*, 59.

¹⁰ Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie*, 113.

sources and evidence and promises an entirely new covenant and a more perfected order of religion to all men.¹¹

Universal, natural religion supersedes particular, national religion, and the expression ‘annul’ (*aufheben*), used in the above quotation, is central, recurring to describe the relationship between Christianity and Judaism: the redemption of Christ annuls Judaism.¹²

Idealistic Historiography

Describing Jewish history around the turn of the era, Semler places Diaspora Jews and Palestinian Jews in opposition to each other. He states that there are two kinds of peoples—cultivated and uncultivated—and although he does not discuss the matter systematically, it is clear that the Jews belong to the latter.¹³ As long as the Jews are left to themselves, they will not gain the right understanding, having a “non-cultivated way of thinking”.¹⁴ However, when they, in the period before the coming of Christ, found themselves among “peoples of rational culture”, they began to acquire understanding.¹⁵ Semler’s example of such peoples is Alexandria/Egypt, and he also notes that Pythagorean and Platonic thought had influenced peoples that surrounded the Jews. Furthermore, Semler states that the Christian religion could only develop if removed from Jewish soil. He reflects on whether the so-called Therapeuts could be regarded as Christian, as he sees similarities between these, the Essenes and Johannine Christianity—this is interesting, since the idea often recurs in Enlightenment research tradition.¹⁶ Semler’s historiography is idealistic, not based on empirical facts but constructed from an aetiology of how Judaism was ‘elevated’ into something that could become the seedbed of Christianity.

¹¹ Ibid., 112–113, quoted from Semler.

¹² Johann Salomo Semler, “Vorwort”, in *Kürzer Begriff der theologischen Streitigkeiten, zum academischen Gebrauch von neuem mit einer Vorrede von der heutigen Polemik herausgeben von D. Johann Salomo Semler* (Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1759), “von der Erlösung Jesus [...] wodurch das Judentum aufgehoben [...] worden”.

¹³ Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, 44–45.

¹⁴ “uncultivierte Denkart”, Ibid., 44–45.

¹⁵ “Völker die Cultur des Verstandes annehmen”, Ibid., 41.

¹⁶ See Johann Salomo Semler, “Untersuchung ob die Therapeuten zu den Christen des ersten Jahrhunderts gehören”, *Wöchentliche Hallische Anzeigen* 28–31 (1769).

To Semler, the adherence of the Palestinian Jews to Jerusalem and the Land was inspired by the Pharisees and the rabbis, and being negative to this, he considers the Jews to have benefited from being dispersed among other peoples.¹⁷ Alexandrian Jews, or non-Palestinian Jews, were acquainted with Greek texts and Greek philosophy, leading to a certain way of thinking among the Christians.¹⁸ This contact was a result of the dispersion, and it enhanced the ability of the Palestinian Jews to understand “the best foundations of religion”, which also made it easier to convert from the Jewish to the Christian religion. In fact, Semler contends that the earliest Christians and followers of Jesus were especially from the Greek Jews. This group, which lived in the Diaspora, concentrated on the morals of the texts and read the Old Testament allegorically, just as the Jews in Alexandria.¹⁹ It was also closer to the Pauline teaching, which is marked by greater freedom.²⁰ The other group, the people from the lower classes, had a more traditional, literal understanding of the Old Testament. They interpreted it politically, and this group of early Christians was confined to Palestine. Thus Semler models early Christianity on Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism, stressing a sharp tension between the legalistic Jewish-Christian (Palestinian) group and the Pauline Diaspora group. Again, Judaism left on its own was limited but could be enhanced by extra-Jewish contacts.

In Semler’s mind, Christian religion was perfected through leaving this Jewish-Christian legalism for freedom from the Law.²¹ According to his logic, the opposites are represented as Pharisees and Essenes, where the latter is closer to Greek Judaism and to Jesus and his moral teaching.²² Jesus’ attitude was seen in his dealings with the finery and wrong practices of the Pharisees; they had failed to relate the Law to the right purpose of religion. The Essenes, on the other hand, had succeeded in this, and Semler sees in them a predecessor of his envisioned modern religion.²³ Focusing on the moral content, this religion lives in

¹⁷ Johann Salomo Semler, *Versuch einer freiern theologischen Lehrart zur Bestätigung und Erläuterung seines lateinischen Buchs* (Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1777), 121.

¹⁸ Ibid., 123, 126.

¹⁹ Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, 76.

²⁰ Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*, 198.

²¹ Ibid., 134.

²² Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 328.

²³ For this, see also Semler, “Untersuchung ob die Therapeuten zu den Christen des ersten Jahrhunderts gehören”.

freedom, outside the structures of and in contrast to the established Jewish religion.²⁴

The Moral Element

Semler's yardstick in evaluating religion and religious documents is what is 'ethically developed'. Judaism lacks the moral element, being a merely ceremonial religion, Semler contends,²⁵ and morally the Jews are 'minors' in comparison with Christians,²⁶ their Scriptures containing an "insignificant and imperfect religion". This "lowly, uncultivated way of thinking of so many eager Jews" must be explained as an inability to freely use the powers of their soul.²⁷ Whereas the Jews in earlier theology were seen as the people that carried the revelation of God, this motif of the Jews as an ethically 'coarse' people, less literate and refined than other peoples, is common in Enlightenment theology.²⁸ Reimarus, for example, called the Jews "primitive, raw and immoral (*unsittlich*)". Earlier Enlightenment theologians had regarded the Jews as above other peoples because of their "morals and monotheism".²⁹ Semler, however, does not see the Jews as having any particular role. Old Testament Judaism is not a sole carrier of the truth, but other peoples, their poets, philosophers and legislators, can also be used by God as mediators of revelation.³⁰ Moral understanding and behaviour can be developed, Semler argues, although some are more capable than others of grasping moral truths, that is, of having moral discernment. In fact, anyone can do this better than Jews and early Christians. Semler's point here is not that Jews are bad; instead, his idea is one of growth and development,³¹ and of the "free, universal religion" as the highest

²⁴ For Semler's dream of a non-confessional, natural Christian religion with an ethical focus, see Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*.

²⁵ Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 111–112.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 111.

²⁷ Vernachlässigung alles [jetzigen] freien Gebrauchs der Seelenkräfte, Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, 41.

²⁸ Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 24, 26.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 29.

³⁰ Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon; nebst Antwort auf die tübingsche Vertheidigung des Apocalypsis*, 54; Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 48.

³¹ Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon; nebst Antwort auf die tübingsche Vertheidigung des Apocalypsis*, 21–23.

form of religion.³² To him, the overall criterion for true religion is its moral content, and no specific revelation is better than other revelation. In his description of the ethos of the Jews, however, they once again play the negative part.

Universalism and Particularism

Semler dichotomises universalism and particularism, where the negative, particularism, is characteristic of the Jews. Overall, Semler takes a negative view on historical religions with their specific forms and expressions—they are particularist, provincial, local and preliminary, whereas his religious ideal is the abstract, the general and universal. Christianity, to him, is a universal religion.³³ Judaism had an outward worship and outward promises, waiting for a national deliverer. Even the religion of Jesus was clothed in Jewish garb, and the New Testament represented an ‘incomplete’ form of Christian religion. Fortunately the Christian can separate the content from the Oriental-Jewish language and world-view.³⁴ This is important to Semler, since he believes that ‘thinking people’ consider the ‘revelation’ of the Jews and Christians to be irritating (*irgerlich*).³⁵ Although he sees some Old Testament scriptures as having moral value, he believes that much of the Bible of the Jews contains ‘idiotism’ (*Idiotismus*), clothing the message in circumstances that pertain only to one people in one land at certain times.³⁶ He rejects its mixing of civil society and religion, and holds that the moral benefit of the text would be much greater without the tabernacle, the feasts, the sacrifices and the laws of Moses.³⁷ This outward religion is Jewish, local and pertains only to its own Jewish society, which opposes all that Semler values: the ambition of becoming “an inwardly perfected person, like God and rich in virtue”.³⁸ The problem is particularism, which hampers a proper understanding:

³² Rothe, “Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie”, 49.

³³ Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie*, IV:62.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, IV:66.

³⁵ Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, 48.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 49.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 49.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 50.

All such *individual* and merely *particular* concepts, descriptions and stories must and may by a thoughtful reader of the books be singled out as passing and temporal clothes or vehicles, as he seeks to apply the general concepts and truths to himself and then to assess himself *morally*, but he should not be and become such a Jew.³⁹

Thus, to Semler, the ‘Jewish garb’ of Christianity is a burden to Christianity, a general thinking that also governs his view on the Old Testament.

View of the Old Testament

In Semler’s analysis of the canon, the questions of whether the Old Testament is useful from a moral point of view and whether it is in accordance with the universal character of religion are decisive. Semler regards the Old Testament as having little moral value; therefore, the Old Testament is of little importance to Christian religion.⁴⁰ There is no new revelation in the Old Testament,⁴¹ and the Old Testament is foreign (*ausländisch*), not suiting our taste.⁴² Semler’s interest lies in how people can develop their morals, culture and mind through the Bible, and he does not see how the Old Testament historical books could be useful in that respect: “These are partly provincial, partly family stories”, of little value to people other than Jews. His views on the Jews, their particularity and their adherence to the ‘Jewish’ books of canon are a vital issue here. S. J. Baumgarten, just as the church and research tradition to which Semler originally belonged, had treated the Old Testament in a traditional Christian way, as featuring Christological interpretation and prophecy fulfilment. Semler, however, in the same vein as Morgan but even more explicitly, would move away from this dependence on the Old Testament as an important source for religion. According to Semler, the Old Testament ought to be regarded as belonging to a past

³⁹ “Alle solche *einzelne* und bloß *particuläre* Begriffe, Beschreibungen, Erzählungen muß und darf ein nachdenkender Leser dieser Bücher [als vergängliche und veränderliche Einkleidungen oder vehicular] absondern, indem er allgemeine Begriffe und Wahrheiten auf sich anzuwenden und darnach *moralisch* sich selbst zu beurteilen sucht, nicht aber ein [solcher] Jude sein und werden soll”, Ibid., 50. Italics in text.

⁴⁰ Rothe, “Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie”, 47–48; Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 111.

⁴¹ Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 111.

⁴² Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, 57.

national religion, and the New Testament ought to be cleansed from Jewish ideas and the Jewish ‘clothes’ that Jesus and the early Christians had dressed the truths in. Then the kernel would become visible.⁴³

Semler also goes further than his Neologian colleague Michaelis, who equates Old Testament morals with New Testament ones.⁴⁴ The latter even criticises Semler for his contempt for the Jews, although he too airs strong prejudices. Despite his positive attitude regarding the emancipation of the Jews,⁴⁵ Michaelis deems it impossible for them to be integrated in a nation in the same way as other ethnic and religious groups.⁴⁶

Evaluating their moral utility, Semler sifts out the Old Testament books. The historical books of the Bible have limited value, being “the religious books of the Jews”.⁴⁷ These books contain only the Jews’ own history, teaching them nothing of the political and moral history and character of other peoples. The exceptions are certain texts that contain divine value, such as Psalms, parts of Proverbs, Qohelet, Job and the Prophets,⁴⁸ the latter which he also refers to as “extraordinary teachers” (*außerordentliche Lehrer*). Although these contain things of value, this does not include their Messianic ideas.⁴⁹

In sum, when discussing the canon, Semler is often preoccupied with the Jews, writing them off as uncultivated and incapable of understanding true religion.

Semler on Tolerance

Along with these strong positions against Jews and Judaism, Semler held views that seem rather contrary. Tolerance and freedom of conscience and thought were central to Semler and rooted in his view of man. The State or Church attempting to force people into a certain faith was

⁴³ Rothe, “Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie”, 52.

⁴⁴ Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 111.

⁴⁵ Rothe, “Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie”, 39, 42–44.

⁴⁶ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past? Judaism, Judaisms, and the Writing of Jewish History*, 131.

⁴⁷ Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*, 273.

⁴⁸ Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, 42.

⁴⁹ Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler*, 112.

intolerable,⁵⁰ and a consequence of this was his political stance regarding the Jews, which caused him to publicly defend Jews against blood libels and argue extensively against prejudice towards Jews. To Semler, all persecution of Jews was wrong.⁵¹ At the same time, his description of the Jews as “the poor Jewish people” remains.⁵² This dual position seems to follow the pattern set by S. J. Baumgarten, who defends tolerance, while supporting the right of the Christian state to interfere with the business of the Jewish synagogue and to attempt to convert Jews.⁵³ At the same time, the rift between Judaism and Christianity is total: an “enmity and hate” for God’s sake is not only allowed but also an obligation and a necessity.⁵⁴

Semler’s tone towards the Jews is somewhat friendlier than that of Morgan or Baumgarten, but the Janus face of Enlightenment is present once again. His dejudaising of the Bible and downgrading of the Old Testament and its role in Christianity would later influence Enlightenment Protestantism, his approach coming to full fruition first of all with Schleiermacher. Hirsch holds that Semler only developed half a thought, which Schleiermacher carried through, and that Schleiermacher is ‘unthinkable’ without Semler, building on a foundation laid by him.⁵⁵ Despite his programmatic tolerance towards Jews, Semler’s criticism of Palestinian Jews and Judaism reveals his prejudice. Palestinian Judaism is narrow, national, particularistic and culturally uncultivated; Jews are morally inferior and actually immoral. But when Jews come into contact with Greek culture, they are elevated, and such Jews are apt to receive Christianity. In Semler’s overall view, Jews and Judaism represent an inferior state, not only in a religious sense but in general: Jews qua Jews are inferior to Greek, ‘Western’, cultivated people. Nevertheless, compared to Morgan’s radically essentialist view, which concludes that Jews cannot change even through conversion, Semler is more moderate.

⁵⁰ Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler*, 292–297.

⁵¹ Udo Arnold, *Pro Iudaeis. Die Gutachten der hallischen Theologen im 18. Jahrhundert zu Fragen der Judentoleranz*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, vol. 14, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1993), 201–220; 216–217.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 219.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 140, 151.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁵⁵ Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie*, IV:89.

Conclusion

Semler's *characterisation* of Jews is full of negative stereotypes. He believes that, in a moral sense, the Jews are 'minors' compared to Christians, and Palestinian Jews cannot acquire the right understanding when left to themselves. They have a "lowly, uncultivated way of thinking", due to an inability to freely use the powers of their soul. Although he also considers Jews to be immoral, 'minor' is a keyword in Semler: Jews have the possibility to develop, but this would probably mean them developing into Christians, since Christianity is the expression of a "free, universal religion". Evaluating Jews and Judaism on the basis of his own idealistic pattern, Semler's characterisation is highly prejudiced and stereotypes Jews as a collective. In his writings, 'Jew', 'Judaism' and 'Jewish' are consistently negative terms.

Semler's *historiography* of the Jews in the New Testament is also idealistic; that is, his description does not build on empirical data but merely places Jews and Judaism within his own idealistic framework. Semler believes that the Christian religion could only develop if removed from Jewish soil. Whereas the Jews' adherence to the Land was negative, Jews grew in understanding when they encountered Pythagorean and Platonic thought and Greek texts in Alexandria and Egypt. Hence Palestinian Jews profited from the dispersion, which became a *praeparatio evangelica*. Semler argues that the first Christians were Greek Jews. They focused on morals, read the Old Testament allegorically and were closer to the Pauline teaching, which is characterised by greater freedom. The Jews of the lower classes, on the other hand, had a more traditional, literal understanding of the Old Testament. Thus the transition of Jews from the Land to the Diaspora was a lucky throw. The opposition between the Land and the Diaspora could also be compared to the Pharisees and Essenes, where the latter are seen as foreshadowing the modern religion envisioned by Semler. This historiography inevitably becomes Orientalist, however. What is Jewish, limited to the Land and related to the Pharisees is Oriental and of less value, whereas what is Greek, enlightened, European and rooted in Plato and the Pythagoreans becomes a tutor to the Jewish minors. This thinking also borders on racism, since Palestinian Jews, representing mere Jews, are regarded as minors, and without Greek cultural education, they are seen as inferior. In effect, Semler's idealistic historiographical pattern serves ideological rather than scholarly purposes and portrays Jews and Judaism in a strongly prejudiced manner.

The relationship between Christianity and Judaism is best described in terms of *discontinuity*: Christianity is a new religion without continuity with Judaism. This builds on Semler's ideas that Judaism is nationally limited, that Yahweh is only a national God and that the Old Testament has a Jewish-national character. Christianity, on the other hand, is not confined to a certain people or group but is a universal religion, superseding, even 'annulling' both Jewish and Gentile religion. Christianity, Jewish Christianity included, must free itself from 'Jewish garb'. In describing this discontinuity, Semler thus severs Christianity from everything Jewish. This is exemplified by his rejection of the Old Testament, which he sees as having little moral value and as being of little importance to Christian religion. The Old Testament historical books are of no use for enhancing morals.

Semler's programmatic disconnection of Christianity and Judaism, the Old and New Testaments, seems rooted in his overall perspective on religion, his *symbolic world*, in which universalism and particularism are central. The overarching value is universalism: the abstract, inward, general and universal, which is not limited to culture, time or nation. This is manifested in Semler's interpretation of Christianity. Universalism's opposite, particularism, is seen in historical religions, with their specific forms and expressions: limited, outward, provincial, national, local. Without building on empirical data, Semler portrays his 'symbolic Jew' as personifying negative characteristics: particularism, limitedness, legalistic orientation, concentration on outward things, such as promises, worship and the expectation of a national Messiah. Hence Semler's 'symbolic Jew' is always on the negative side.

As for *legitimation* or *delegitimation* of the Jews' status in society, Semler took a public stand against persecution of Jews, which was in line with his Enlightenment tolerance. Nevertheless, although his characterisation of Jews as minors is perhaps not as irrevocably negative as Morgan's, his theology regarding Judaism and his characterisation of Jews as inferior are consistently negative. No doubt Semler's thoughts greatly influenced society and Christian theology, and his notion of Jews as minors is likely to have countered the ideas of emancipation. Although he personally fought discrimination of Jews, Semler would influence generations of scholars with his dark picture of Jews and Judaism.

JOHANN GOTTFRIED HERDER: THE *VOLK* CONCEPT AND THE JEWS

The idea of the ‘national spirit’ of a people is more than anything else the contribution of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803). This thought would prove both positive and negative to the view on Jews and Judaism. In the same vein as the deists, Enlightenment theology used morals as the yardstick for examining different religions. Universalism, monotheism and unity of faith across borders of time and space all belonged to the basic religious values, and Jews and Judaism were examined accordingly. Thus, as noted earlier, Enlightenment theologians often defended emancipation of the Jews, despite their often prejudiced view of them.

With Romanticism came a new interest in nation and nationality, the other side of this coin being a growing German national chauvinism. The ideological ferment of such political movements can be traced back to early Romanticism,¹ when the struggle for a united nation became a matter of urgency for the intelligentsia. Thus central notions that were used in Germany’s national struggle, such as particularism and universalism, were transferred to the evaluation of the Jews in the New Testament and in general. Jews represented particularism, whereas Western Christian people stood for universalism.

Herder is often considered one of the most important fathers of both Romanticism and liberal or Enlightenment theology.² His Romanticism is seen as a counter-rationalistic reaction to the Enlightenment, although this reaction only concerned *rationalistic* Enlightenment. Taking on board and developing the Enlightenment ideas of his time, Herder added important new aspects, strongly fighting mere rationalism and creating his own synthesis. The components stem from the rational,

¹ See George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964), 1–30. Mosse primarily discusses the *Kaiserreich*, but points to the beginnings of a fully developed *völkisch* thinking in early Romanticism.

² Hans-Wolf Jäger, “Herder, Johann Gottfried”, in *Neue deutsche Bibliographie, herausgegeben von der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1969), 602.

humanistic Enlightenment and from Romanticism,³ with key concepts being reason, humanity, freedom and a theological stance far removed from the old Protestantism of his country.⁴

As a result of his historiographical studies on the world's national cultures, Herder pioneered the view of the peoples as being organic, each having their own life and spirit. In his *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 1787, he discusses all known peoples, developing the idea of a national spirit.⁵ Such a spirit expresses itself in culture, philosophy, religion and social life. Using concepts like 'national spirit' (*Nationalgeist*), 'genius of the people' (*Genius des Volkes*), etc.,⁶ Herder portrays a national *Volk* with a mentality, language and mission that is peculiar to that people, i.e. the German people. However, it is important to note that 'nationalism' at the time of Herder was radical rather than chauvinistic. Herder himself cherished the French Revolution, being a cosmopolitan and not holding one nation to be better than another.⁷

Herder on the Jews

Herder's new nationalism would prove both positive and negative to his view on the Jews. The word *Volk* ('people'), which referred to the geographical circumstances as well as inner characteristics of a people, became an ideologically loaded concept. Herder believed that this national spirit was given by God during creation and that it was a great crime to rob a nation of its national character, language and peculiarity of spirit.⁸ The spirit of a nation shaped its history and governed its ethos, and so Herder did not approve of outside interference in a

³ See Matthias Schmitz, "Herder, Johann Gottfried", in *Metzler-Philosophen-Lexikon. Dreihundert biographisch-werkgeschichtliche Porträts von den Vorsokratikern bis zu den Neuen Philosophen*, ed. Bernd Lutz (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1989). Through listening to Rousseau and through his friendship with J. G. Hamann, Herder encountered liberal ideas and literature that would become important to his development, Jäger, "Herder, Johann Gottfried".

⁴ Jäger, "Herder, Johann Gottfried", 602.

⁵ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, vol. 3 (Riga und Leipzig: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1787).

⁶ Wolfgang Tilgner, *Volksnomostheologie und Schöpfungsglaube. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes*, ed. Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, vol. 16, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 18–19.

⁷ Jäger, "Herder, Johann Gottfried", 602.

⁸ Tilgner, *Volksnomostheologie und Schöpfungsglaube*, 21–22.

nation. Judaism, for example, rightly had its national character, spirit and national law, leading Herder to be sceptical of missionary work among Jews.⁹

All nations had their own place, with the term *Volk* including more than 'people': it was a certain transcendental essence, nature of soul, which was also determined by the natural landscape. Thus Jews, due to the barrenness of their landscape, were a barren, shallow, even spiritually shallow, people compared to Germans, who, living in the deep forests, were mysterious and profound.¹⁰

This emphasis on the national is different from Semler's. Whereas Semler contrasted Judaism with universal, natural religion, Herder relates it to Germany and its people: "a community united by a shared history and the common language of its members, a cultural family".¹¹ What transcends nationality, however, is Christianity, which is always in the leading position. Furthermore, Christianity has the task of cleansing pagan national law and elevating it to the higher common moral law. At this point, Herder manages to link one nation to the elevated common law: Germany and a national, 'Germanised' Christianity. Nevertheless, charging Herder with a full-fledged racial ideology would be anachronistic.¹²

Herder is not critical of everything Jewish. Whereas rationalist theologians belittled the Old Testament and the Jews, Herder considered the Jews to be the original carriers of divine revelation. The Jews had the pure "religion of the fathers", the patriarchal religion, which was a universally minded religion,¹³ even "the religion of humanity",¹⁴ the bud that would flourish in Christianity.¹⁵ Thus the Old Testament is the ethical norm and *Urbild* for other national religions, including Jewish-Israelite religion: "Wonderfully conceived are all the laws of Moses."¹⁶ The Hebrews gave the Scriptures to mankind, as Herder often notes, although he also contends that Christianity could understand them in

⁹ Ibid., 23–24.

¹⁰ Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, 4–5.

¹¹ Maurice Cranston, *The Romantic Movement* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 23.

¹² Tilgner, *Völkernomothologie und Schöpfungsglaube*, 26.

¹³ Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 137–138.

¹⁴ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Herders Sämtliche Werke herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1877–1899), Band 20: 234.

¹⁵ Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 139.

¹⁶ Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 87.

a 'freer way' than the Jewish spirit could.¹⁷ Up to the time of Moses, the Jews, the priesthood of the patriarchs, gave wisdom, revelation and religion, a monotheism without images, to the world.¹⁸

Moreover, in his *Vom Geist der hebräischen Poesie* ("The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry"), 1782, Herder enthused about Hebrew poetry, its profundity and originality, and unlike many Enlightenment contemporaries, he set the Hebrew above the Greek and Roman.¹⁹ All this made Herder, in contrast to theologians such as Semler or Morgan, a strong defender of the Old Testament and of the deep affinity between the Old Testament Judaism and Christianity.

Degeneration Hypothesis

Nevertheless, Herder also has a degeneration hypothesis, arguing that there is no continuity between Old Testament Judaism and the Judaism of Jesus' day. Judaism degenerated after the death of Moses;²⁰ the Jews adopted foreign customs in Canaan, and there was no new legislator after Moses. Compared to Semler, the difference is not the degeneration but where it occurred: in Canaan instead of Egypt!²¹ Another difference is that whereas several other Enlightenment theologians demean the Law, Herder shows appreciation for the Law. In Canaan, however, Jewish religion began to degenerate into patriotism, slavish misinterpretation of the Law and particularism, and thus the Jews hampered, rather than furthered, the development of humanity.²²

After the Exile, the degeneration accelerated: the Jewish religiosity became Pharisaic, their scholarship a meticulous "gnawing" (*nagen*)

¹⁷ Ibid., 86.

¹⁸ Herder, *Herders Sämmtliche Werke herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan*, Bd 14, 62. For a more extensive discussion of the Hebrews by Herder, see Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 85–98. See also Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 141.

¹⁹ Low, *Jews in the Eyes of the Germans. From the Enlightenment to Imperial Germany*, 56.

²⁰ This thought recurs in later exegesis, e.g. in de Wette: "Das Judenthum ist entartet, erstarrter Hebraismus" (Judaism is degenerated, petrified Hebraism), Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik, in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt. Erster Theil: Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813), 114; see Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past? Judaism, Judaisms, and the Writing of Jewish History*, 95.

²¹ Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 89–90.

²² Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 136.

on one book, and dreams of world rulership were born.²³ The Jews viewed themselves as the chosen people, and Herder speaks of a more legalistically rigid Judaism, a national religion, where the hope lay in a carnal kingdom, all in contrast to the religion of their fathers.²⁴ Through his death, however, Jesus set the original religion free so that it could develop: "His death on the cross made him Christ for all nations," disconnecting religion and religious nationalism once again.

In this historiographical reflection, Herder follows the 'original religion—degenerated religion—restored religion' scheme, although he sees it in a universalist perspective. Thus he shows a certain continuity with the Enlightenment: Christ restores religion to something like natural religion, but in Herder's case, this religion is not 'free from' but closely linked to Old Testament monotheism. As in Semler's thinking, there is a dichotomy between the Judaism of Judaea and that of Egypt. Jerusalem is the cradle, Alexandria the school of earliest Christianity.²⁵ The inhabitants of the former adhered to the nationally interpreted eschatology, whereas in Egypt, where ideas were influenced by Greek thinking, old Messianic dreams came to an end.²⁶

Hellenism, too, played an important role, being a freer way of thinking among Jews than Palestinian thinking. It was already mixed with the thinking of other peoples, a "wonderful spirit" of syncretised ideas from India, Persia, Judaea, Ethiopia, Egypt, Greece, Rome and the barbarian rule under the Ptolemies, especially in Alexandria, having become "the school of the nations".²⁷ The philosophers of these kingdoms "brought their ideas to the great mass of concepts," and the drop of Christianity fell into this ocean.²⁸ Hence, according to Herder, Christianity seems to have needed this new Hellenistic matrix in order to develop. The cradle could stand in Jerusalem, but the development of Christianity required a transfer to Alexandria and Greek thinking. Thus Herder foreshadows the aetiology that soon became part of the Enlightenment exegetical research tradition that stated that 'Palestinian Judaism' could hardly have developed into the 'free' universal religion

²³ Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 91.

²⁴ Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 137–138.

²⁵ Herder, *Herders Sämtliche Werke herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan*, Band 14:319.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Band 14:293.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Band 14:319.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, Band 14:319–320.

that Christianity is, pinpointing the emergence of ‘free’ Christianity to Alexandria.

In contrast to scholars like Morgan or Semler, Herder argues that Judaism is the mother of Christian religion and that Christianity has a close relationship with Old Testament Judaism. This is not the whole truth, however: Herder holds that Judaism, like other religions, is situated in another era and culture, with another national spirit, and that such national characteristics should not be mixed. With Judaism, a “culture specific to the East” (*morgenländische Idiotismus*) entered Christianity: Jewish language became part of the worship, manners and orders. The spirit of Christianity must now be lifted out of these Jewish clothes, a point on which Herder resembles Semler. However, Herder differentiates between the Jewish element in the Old and New Testaments; it was the Jewish element in the latter that affected Christian cultural life negatively. With reference to Luther, Herder contends that Christianity must be ‘Germanised’; Christianity must be presented using our expressions and imagination.²⁹

In its degenerated form, Judaism is the most obvious opposite of Christianity, Herder argues. It had become like a “hard darkness”, covering the light. Yet even out of this hard Judaism, the purest anti-Judaism broke forth, according to Herder—the religion of the nations.³⁰ The Old Testament is fulfilled in Christ in every way, which is why Herder often criticises earthly dreams, such as the Messianic dream or the dream of the Jewish people being eschatologically superior.³¹ Jewish dreams of national restoration were rendered obsolete by the work of Christ. Jesus saw Judaism as “a decrepit corpse”, Herder argues, and after the destruction of the temple and Judaea—considered to be an act of Providence—the so-called only people of God were dispersed, and their worship, “full of pride and superstition”, ended.³² This “ex-Judaism of Christianity” was difficult for the apostles to accept, and Paul needed to employ all his skill in Jewish dialectics to make it comprehensible even to Christian Jews outside of Judaea.³³

²⁹ Rothe, “Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie”, 144–145, Tilgner, *Volksnomos-theologie und Schöpfungsglaube*, 26.

³⁰ Herder, *Herders Sämtliche Werke herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan*, Band 20:235.

³¹ Rothe, “Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie”, 147.

³² Herder, *Herders Sämtliche Werke herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan*, 294.

³³ *Ibid.*, 294.

Thus on the one hand, Herder wants to retain continuity with Old Testament religion, especially its monotheism but also the Law, but on the other hand, he argues that Judaism after Moses is a decrepit corpse, and that its influence on Christian religion should be uprooted to make room for a more German Christianity, just as other nations ought to develop their Christianity. Herder comes across as more ambivalent than Morgan and Semler, although his view on Judaism after Moses is in line with theirs.

Herder and the Emancipation of the Jews

Politically, too, Herder is ambivalent. Positioned in the middle of 'political Romanticism', he defended the freedom to preserve what was regarded as 'natural orders' against the totalitarian project of reform absolutism,³⁴ and with Rousseau he cherished the dream of liberal national states living in unity.³⁵ As a man of the Enlightenment, Herder held that all laws that discriminated against the Jews must be removed, considering it barbaric of the state to treat Jews "like cattle",³⁶ and speaking favourably of the Jews in many other ways.³⁷ Nevertheless, as noted above, he differentiates radically between Mosaic Judaism and post-Christian Judaism, and his view on nationality led him to consider contemporary Jews alien to Germany and Europe. The passage treating the Hebrews in Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, includes sections where Herder waxes lyrical about the Mosaic law as well as sections where he airs heavy prejudice against the Jews. He concludes that the Jews' lifestyle and law are foreign plants on European soil. For thousands of years, the people of God have been

a people that was ruined during its formation, since it never reached the maturity of a political culture on its own soil, and therefore did not attain a true sense of honour and freedom. The sciences that their most excellent minds pursue show more of a legalistic devotion and order than a fruitful freedom of spirit, and their situation has almost always stripped them of the virtue of a patriot. For thousands of years, yes, almost since

³⁴ Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte. Erster Band. Vom Feudalismus des Alten Reiches bis zur Defensiven Modernisierung der Reformära 1700–1815* (München: C. H. Beck, 1987), 235.

³⁵ Ibid., 511.

³⁶ Low, *Jews in the Eyes of the Germans*, 56.

³⁷ Ibid., 60–63.

its inception, God's people [...] has been a *parasitic plant on the trunks of other nations*—a race of shrewd negotiators, almost all over the world, which despite all oppression never longs for its own honour and abode, never for a homeland.³⁸

Thus Herder could simultaneously cherish Mosaic religion and consider Jews and Judaism alien to and a highly negative element in German cultural life. These thoughts corresponded to traditional prejudices, such as that of Jews as parasites and “money Jews”.

The Volk Concept and the Jews

Herder's role in the formation of German Enlightenment and Romanticism can hardly be overstated, a fact that was taken advantage of by figures such as the chief ideologist of race, Houston Steward Chamberlain.³⁹ Seen as a whole, Herder's view on the Jews is truly ambivalent: firstly, differentiating between Mosaic Judaism and later, degenerated Judaism, the latter is made out to be as dark as the former is bright; secondly, distinguishing between Judaism as a religion and Jews in society, Herder defends the Jews against persecution, yet produces ideology to support their exclusion.

Herder did not support national chauvinism or racial ideology in the same vein as later racial nationalism, but his thoughts could be used as an important building block in such ideology. Viewing all nations as standing side by side, each one existing in its own right, Herder also dreamt of a *Germanien*: Prussia and Austria ought to be one nation, one

³⁸ “Kurz, es ist ein Volk, das in der Erziehung verdarb, weil es nie zur Reife einer politischer Cultur auf eigenem Boden, mithin auch nicht zum wahren Gefühl der Ehre und Freiheit gelangte. In den Wissenschaften, die ihre vortrefflichsten Köpfe trieben, hat sich jederzeit mehr eine gesetzliche Anhänglichkeit und Ordnung, als eine fruchtbare Freiheit des Geistes gezeigt und der Tugenden eines Patrioten hat sie ihr Zustand fast von jeher beraubt. Das Volk Gottes, dem einst der Himmel selbst sein Vaterland schenkte, ist Jahrtausende her, ja fast seit seiner Entstehung eine parasitische Pflanze auf den Stämmen anderer Nationen; ein Geschlecht schlauer Unterhändler, beinahe auf der ganzen Erde, das trotz aller Unterdrückung nirgend sich nach eigener Ehre und Wohnung, nirgend nach einem Vaterlande sehnet.” Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 98, my emphasis; see also Erika Weinzierl, “Antisemitismus VII. 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 157.

³⁹ Herder, along with Stoecker, is also mentioned as an inspirer of the Deutsche Christen, pioneering the idea of a national church, which the Deutsche Christen later realised, Schmidt, “Der Widerstand der Kirche im Dritten Reich”, 366.

people, one state⁴⁰—ideas that recur, during National Socialism, for example. Hence, although his respect for different nations was partly advantageous for the Jews, Herder's nationalism would mainly prove to be negative.

Conclusion

Herder laid the ideological foundations of a new nationalism, including ideas that favoured the right to national particularity. It was God-given and comprised national character, language and ways that were peculiar to different peoples. Although this could involve an appreciation of the national character of Jews and Judaism, the same thoughts would make the Jews hopelessly foreign on German soil. A *Volk* was at home only in its own country, with its specific characteristics, nature and other factors.

Characterising Jews, Herder focuses on their national essence, which has its basis in the country that they originally came from. Their nature of soul is determined by the natural landscape, and so, due to the barrenness of their landscape, Jews are barren and shallow, even spiritually shallow. Herder goes even further, however: Judaism is “a decrepit corpse”, and Jews are full of pride and superstition, which is manifested in their worship. Furthermore, Jews harbour dreams of superiority—a thought that recurs later in the concept of *Weltjudentum*, in which Jews aspire to rule the world. Thus, whereas the idea of nationality acknowledged that Jews had the right to a certain space—a right that they did not have in Morgan's or Semler's thinking—this space was outside of German and European culture. Finally, Herder claims that Jews lack a sense of honour, intellectual creativity and patriotism. Using established stereotypes, he contends that they are instead “shrewd negotiators”, “a parasitic plant on the trunks of other nations”.

Describing the *historical* relationship between Judaism and Christianity, Herder follows a similar scheme to that of other Enlightenment scholars: ‘Original religion—degenerated religion—restored religion’. Specific to Herder is his high regard for everything Hebrew; Herder cherished Hebrew poetry and the law of the Hebrews as the model for all national religion. The Hebrews had the religion of the fathers,

⁴⁰ Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 515–516.

which was a universal religion (*sic*); after Moses, however, due to influences in Canaan, the faith degenerated. This happened in two stages, with the depravation growing worse after the Exile. But Hellenistic Greek thought elevated Judaism, resulting in a syncretism of ideas and a *praeparatio evangelica*.

In Herder's *symbolic world*, therefore, things Hebrew are given an honourable place, but depraved Judaism is not. Although Herder's thought is developed under the auspices of Enlightenment thinking, Romantic ideas of nationality also emerge. In theory, the 'symbolic Jew' has a different place in Herder's system than in Morgan's, since it allows room for national characteristics. But whereas the 'symbolic Hebrew' is a positive figure, the 'symbolic Jew', due to the degeneration, is not. Once again, this constructed figure attracts all the negative traits in Herder's symbolic world. Ironically, while the 'symbolic Jew' is at the bottom of Herder's symbolic world, the 'symbolic Hebrew' is at the top, even representing and personifying universal religion.

Herder's words about Jews being "a parasitic plant on the trunks of other nations" do not belong in a theological context, but to a political one. His claims about shrewd "money Jews" (*Geldjuden*, cf. Shylock), etc. fall back on and further old anti-Semitic tradition in Europe. Thus, in effect, Herder's pathbreaking theory of national identity affected the Jews negatively, adding a powerful argument that *delegitimised* their emancipation in Europe and Germany, despite Herder's criticism of the ill-treatment of Jews.

F. D. E. SCHLEIERMACHER:
ENLIGHTENMENT RELIGION AND JUDAISM

Schleiermacher's contribution to the picture of Jews and Judaism cannot be overestimated. Although several leading theologians had already stressed what they regarded as a problematic relationship between Judaism and the Old Testament on the one hand and Christianity on the other, it was Schleiermacher's dominant role that brought such ideas to prominence in German Protestantism.¹ Besides his doctrinal and hermeneutical teaching, Schleiermacher taught on the New Testament, ethics and church history. After his death, his works on philosophy and hermeneutics became highly influential, as did his views on Judaism. His writings also included a widespread New Testament Introduction.

Schleiermacher is likely to have become acquainted with Herder's theology during his studies,² and he encountered Semler's theology in Halle.³ Although he has sometimes been described as an autodidact *Neutestamentler*, Schleiermacher was probably dependent on Semler as well as J. D. Michaelis for his overall perspective regarding New Testament exegesis and theology. Schleiermacher's background was in Herrnhut circles, and he was originally destined to become a preacher within this movement. The Pietism of Zinzendorf included a philosemitic stance,⁴ expecting the fulfilment of Paul's words that "the whole of Israel shall

¹ The texts by Schleiermacher used below are normally quoted from Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Hans-Joachim Birkner, et al., *Quellenschriften zur Protestantismus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984–). For a fresh introduction to Schleiermacher and his relationship to Judaism, see Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 31–135, where Schleiermacher and his view of the Old Testament and the Jews are discussed at length. I am greatly indebted to Beckmann's work for this presentation, which is limited to Schleiermacher's view of the Jews. For an introduction to Schleiermacher at large, see Terence Tice, *The Schleiermacher Bibliography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

² Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 45. Beckmann notes a number of affinities and similar formulations in Herder and Schleiermacher, 45–47.

³ Gottfried Hornig, "Schleiermacher und Semler. Beobachtungen zur Erforschung ihres Beziehungsverhältnisses", in *Internationaler Schleiermacherkongreß Berlin 1984*, ed. K.-V. Selge (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1985), 880–881.

⁴ For the term 'philo-Semitism', see Wolfram Kinzig, "Philosemitismus. Teil II: Zur historiographischen Verwendung des Begriffs", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105, no. 3 (1994); Wolfram Kinzig, "Philosemitismus. Teil I: Zur Geschichte des Begriffs", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105, no. 2 (1994).

be saved" (Rom. 11:26). However, Schleiermacher would break with this, just as he definitely broke with his Herrnhut past in Halle.⁵

Having read Semler on Judaism, the study of Schleiermacher often gives a sense of *dèjà vu*, even as Schleiermacher develops his own theology. The overall approach is familiar, including freedom from the dogmatic system of the Church, the critical approach to classic theology and the canon, the focus on 'private religion', and the tension between universalism and particularism. Although a genetic connection between Schleiermacher's and Semler's thinking has been disputed, more so in the past than today,⁶ it seems clear that Schleiermacher takes up, and furthers, insights from the same research tradition and religio-philosophical tradition.⁷ This also concerns the place of Jews and Judaism in his thinking. Like Semler, it is important for Schleiermacher to draw a line between Christianity on the one hand, and Judaism and paganism on the other, and in the work of both authors, Judaism is marked by its narrow particularism.⁸

Nevertheless, Schleiermacher sketched a universal perspective of religion that had quite a different scope to those of earlier theologians. Schleiermacher's works *Über die Religion: Reden an die gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern* ("Speeches on Religion"), *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* and *Glaubenslehre* came at a time that is said to have revolutionised religion, his studies coinciding with the French Revolution, to which he was sympathetic,⁹ and with the Napoleonic aggression in Prussia, against which Schleiermacher was an ardent preacher.¹⁰

⁵ Thomas Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität. Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768–1834)", in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus. Band 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990), 176; Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 47. This need not mean that he did so in every respect; the 'psychologising' piety of his background found a new expression in his Romanticism, Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 41.

⁶ See Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 48 with extensive literature.

⁷ For this discussion, see Hornig, "Schleiermacher und Semler. Beobachtungen zur Erforschung ihres Beziehungsverhältnisses", which convincingly shows the affinity between the two. My interest, however, does not lie in the genesis of certain ideas, but in studying the research tradition.

⁸ Ibid., 892. See also Rudolf Smend, "Die Kritik am Alten Testament", in *Friedrich Schleiermacher 1768–1834. Theologe—Philosoph—Pädagoge*, ed. Dietz Lange (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 112–113.

⁹ Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität", 178.

¹⁰ Koppel S. Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), 194–195.

To understand his view on the Jews, one must look at Schleiermacher's overall perspective. A new idea regarding the political, intellectual and religious 'Subject' had emerged through the Enlightenment and the political metamorphoses of the time, which also resulted in religious individualism: the individual—not a collective, as in the Church—relates to the universe.¹¹ Schleiermacher's approach, however, was neither rationalistic nor merely experiential, but rather aesthetic. Founded on the new awareness of the aesthetic subject's autonomy,¹² his thinking is a synthesis of rationalism and German Romanticism,¹³ the latter having been inspired by Herder. Schleiermacher himself was trained under Johann August Eberhard, a disciple of Christian Wolff, who had developed a critical stance towards Kant.¹⁴

Moving into other dimensions than earlier theology, Schleiermacher sees the spirit of religion as neither thought nor deed, but as feeling (*Gefühl*), with an openness for the infinite.¹⁵ Instead of the empty thought of the "mere speculative idealist", Schleiermacher, in his highly suggestive meditation, sees the Poet, the Seer, the Artist or the Orator as a mediator of the experience of the infinite. This individual is a "true priest of the Most High, whose soul approaches the Divine and brings the divine things closer to people who are not used to dealing with such things".¹⁶ Thus God is not known through the intellect but through religious feeling.¹⁷ This mediating of the religious Self (*religiöse Selbstmitteilung*) is central to Schleiermacher.¹⁸

However, this religion of Schleiermacher's, his religious individualism, is seen as replacing an old, crumbling religion that Schleiermacher describes with constant reference to Judaism. Judaism is equated with the Church that Schleiermacher despises. He talks, for instance, of "the fallen walls of their Jewish Zion with its gothic pillars [*sic*]", where the latter seems to be referring to the Church.¹⁹ To Schleiermacher, the

¹¹ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 35.

¹² Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität", 174.

¹³ Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 145.

¹⁴ Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität", 176.

¹⁵ Schleiermacher, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* I.2, 211; Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität", 181.

¹⁶ Schleiermacher, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* I.2, 193.

¹⁷ Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität", 193.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 185.

¹⁹ Schleiermacher, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* I.2, 190: "[...] ich habe nichts zu schaffen mit den altgläubigen und barbarischen Wehklagen, wodurch sie die eingestürzten Mauern ihres jüdischen Zions und seiner gothischen Pfeiler wieder emporschreien möchten".

history of Judaism is the prime example of a religion's decline.²⁰ Later on, Harnack would popularise Schleiermacher's negative view of the Old Testament, which both regarded as having little importance for their interpretation of Christianity. Harnack became the most renowned proponent of Marcion's views, but a similar position can be found in Schleiermacher's work almost a century earlier;²¹ in fact, F. C. Baur contends that none since Marcion had shown such antipathy towards Judaism as Schleiermacher.²²

Schleiermacher and Judaism

Schleiermacher's view of Judaism—and of the Old Testament—is deeply rooted in his transcendental understanding of religion. The tension between universal religion/Christianity and Judaism is described in terms of inward and outward, living and dead, mature and immature, universalist and particularist, free and nomistic.²³ A main source for Schleiermacher, as well as for his view on Judaism, is his “Speeches on Religion”. In this work, Schleiermacher presents a grand view of natural religion, ‘true religion’, dichotomising between this sublime and fairly abstract religion on the one hand, and historical religions on the other. The latter are limited to time, meaning that their relevance is also limited, and Judaism becomes his main example of such a limited and therefore base religion. In the same vein, he sees the physical, historical, *sinnliche* reading of the Bible as a hindrance to proper understanding.²⁴ It is clear that Schleiermacher's view on Judaism and what he calls the ‘Jewish Codex’,²⁵ the Old Testament, are parallel.

For the most part, Schleiermacher's lengthy discourse on religion elaborates on philosophical questions regarding the nature of religion. Only seldom does he cover religions other than Christianity in any

²⁰ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 36.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 133.

²² Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis oder die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen: Verlag von C. F. Oslander, 1835), 660. See also Hans Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967), 96–98.

²³ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 49.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 134.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 55.

detail. Judaism is the main exception, revealing Schleiermacher's pointed and strongly negative opinion of *Judaismos*:

for Judaism has long been a dead religion, and those who still wear its livery only sit lamenting at the imperishable mummy, bewailing its departure and the mournful state of being left behind. But I do not talk about it as were it in some way a predecessor of Christianity: I hate such historical connections in religion; its necessity is one that is far higher and eternal, and every beginning in it is original [...] the whole thing [is] such a strange example of the corruption and total disappearance of the religion.²⁶

As noted, in Schleiermacher's vast work, Christianity and Judaism are the only religions that are explicitly discussed. Establishing a sharp dichotomy between the two, Judaism becomes a dark backdrop that is of no consequence to Christianity. *Judaism is the example of what religion is not or should not be. Judaism is dead, Schleiermacher's imagery of a mummy being vivid enough.* It is also interesting to note that historical connections are unimportant to Schleiermacher. Similarly, in contrast to Semler, for instance, Schleiermacher sees no connection between the Essenes and Jesus,²⁷ or between other schools and him. To Schleiermacher, the work and life of Jesus emanate only from his 'self-consciousness', whereas historical context and religious backgrounds are of lesser or no importance.²⁸

Religion proper is different from Judaism, however: it is sublime (*erhaben*) and eternal—and from Schleiermacher's larger discourse, it becomes clear that this religion is identified as Christianity. In his perhaps most popular work, *Die Weihnachtsfeier*, Schleiermacher describes his theological programme in a few sentences: the essence of Christianity is Christ embodying the divine principle as human nature.²⁹ This

²⁶ [...] denn der Judaismus ist schon lange eine todte Religion, und diejenigen, welche jetzt noch seine Farbe tragen, sitzen eigentlich klagend bei der unverweslichen Mumie, und weinen über sein Hinscheiden und seine traurige Verlassenschaft. Auch rede ich nicht deswegen von ihm, weil er etwa der Vorläufer des Christenthums wäre: ich haße in der Religion diese Art von historischen Beziehungen, ihre Nothwendigkeit ist eine weit höhere und ewige, und jedes Anfangen in ihr ist ursprünglich [...] das Ganze [ist] ein so merkwürdiges Beispiel von der Corruption und vom gänzlichen Verschwinden der Religion [...], Schleiermacher, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* I:2, 314–315.

²⁷ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Friedrich Schleiermacher's sämtliche Werke. Erste Abtheilung zur Theologie*, vol. 1:6 (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1864), 124–125.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 130.

²⁹ Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher, *Die Weihnachtsfeier. Ein Gespräch* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig und Kompagnie, 1806), 125–126.

universal human is basically detached from the historical roots of Jesus and Christianity, and thus from Judaism. Jesus as an outstanding Jew has no relevance for his role as redeemer; Schleiermacher contends, but the latter is based on Jesus as the model of religious experience.³⁰

Schleiermacher stresses that he does not talk of Judaism because it is a predecessor of Christianity. On the contrary, in his own words, Schleiermacher “hates” such historical connections regarding religion.³¹ The historical and particular has little value. What Schleiermacher considers important in Christianity is neither the historical nor even the teaching of Jesus, but the fact that Christianity is the eternal religion that is the model for eternal humanity.

What then is the dominant idea of the universe in Judaism, Schleiermacher asks, answering: “None other than that of a general and immediate retribution (*Vergeltung*).”³² Judaism is corrupt; it is a religion of retribution; it is like a monastic order;³³ and it is childish and immature compared to the mature Christianity.

The expectation of an earthly Messiah as found in early Christianity also belongs to this ‘childish’ religion. Schleiermacher often criticises such limited thinking, which is the ‘last fruit’ of Judaism, brought forth with the greatest effort. This Jewish religion is like a shrivelled fruit that has lost its life because of its limitations on the people and nation. Instead, it has become something merely outward:

[*Jewish religion*] died when its holy books were closed; then Jehovah’s conversation with his *Volk* was regarded as finished. The political connection that was linked to it dragged on for longer with a shallow existence, and its outward appearance has kept up until much later, the unpleasant appearance of a mechanical movement long after life and spirit have departed.³⁴

³⁰ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 63.

³¹ Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:2, 314.

³² *Ibid.* 1:2, 315.

³³ He does not use the term ‘monastic’, but this seems to be what he is implying, quite frequently forming a negative link between Catholicism and Judaism. This parallel was not seldom used in anti-Jewish polemic, as even Moore pointed out, Moore, “Christian Writers on Judaism”.

³⁴ [*Jewish religion*] starb, als ihre heiligen Bücher geschlossen wurden, da wurde das Gespräch des Jehova mit seinem Volk als beendet angesehen, die politische Verbindung, welche an sie geknüpft war, schleppte noch länger ein sieches Dasein, und ihr Äußeres hat sich noch weit später erhalten, die unangenehme Erscheinung einer mechanischen Bewegung nachdem Leben und Geist längst gewichen ist. Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:2, 316, emphasis mine.

In the quotation above, Schleiermacher expresses disgust at Judaism: it is “outward”, “mechanical”, *unangenehm*, the imagery being a dead body that continues to make movements without life. Schleiermacher also reacts against the political dimension of Judaism and its Messianic hope; Judaism is a ‘dead religion’ as a consequence of the affinity between the political and the moral in Judaism.³⁵ Elsewhere Schleiermacher says that Judaism is a religion of punishment and recompense, instead of being a religion that challenges and educates people.³⁶ He strongly stresses that Christianity has no specific relationship with Judaism and should not be seen as a continuation of Judaism:

Notwithstanding its historical connection with Judaism, Christianity should not be regarded as a continuation or renewal of it; rather, as for its peculiarity, its relationship with Judaism is no different from its relationship with paganism (*Heidenthum*).³⁷

In his *Einleitung ins Neue Testament*, Schleiermacher returns to stating that Christianity is not a modified Judaism. Even the most “spiritual” and “idealistic” of Jewish texts, such as certain Apocrypha, remain within particularism, whereas Christianity “stands out”.³⁸ Judaism, Schleiermacher argues, had changed during the Babylonian exile through mixing with the Gentiles. A ‘paganisation’ had occurred, and there was no great difference between Jews and Gentiles.³⁹ In the Bible, he contends, the texts that are most decisively Jewish are the least valuable.⁴⁰

Schleiermacher then proceeds to describe the antipode: ‘early Christianity’, although this does not correspond to what is meant by ‘early Christianity’ today, that is, a picture reconstructed from early Christian sources. Instead of being an historical Christianity, it is interpreted as universal religion, the ultimate example of a religion that corresponds to the religious sensibilities of mature humanity:

³⁵ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 37.

³⁶ Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:7,1, 57–58.

³⁷ “Das Christenthum ist ohnerachtet seines geschichtlichen Zusammenhanges mit dem Judenthum doch nicht als eine Fortsetzung oder Erneuerung desselben anzusehen; vielmehr steht es, was seine Eigenthümlichkeit betrifft, mit dem Judenthum in keinem anderen Verhältniß als mit dem Heidenthum.” Ibid. 1:7, 1, 88.

³⁸ “hebt ihn selbst ab”, Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Friedrich Schleiermachers sämtliche Werke*, vol. 1:8 (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1845), 481.

³⁹ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 69.

⁴⁰ Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:7,1, 89.

More glorious, more elevated, more worthy of mature humanity, penetrating deeper into the spirit of systematic religion, and more seminal throughout the universe is the original outlook of Christianity. It is simply the common yearning of everything finite towards the unity of the whole.⁴¹

Here Schleiermacher, without using the term, talks of the ‘true religion’ (*die wahre Religion*) or ‘natural religion’, which he elsewhere compares to ‘positive religions’,⁴² the latter being described as “certain existing religious expressions” (*vorhandenen bestimmten religiösen Erscheinungen*). Arguing in favour of this natural religion is a main topos of Schleiermacher’s discussion, and in the later “Speeches on Religion”, which has already been discussed here, Schleiermacher uses Judaism as his main example of such religions. Christ is portrayed as an eternal and divine person who represents the Infinite, but his teachings and specifics are not Schleiermacher’s focus. Instead, Christ represents a universal, eternal Idea that is at the centre of religion:

But the truly Divine is the glorious clarity, to which the great idea, which he came to represent, developed in his soul—the idea that All Finite things need higher mediations in order to be connected with Divinity.⁴³

Thus, *to Schleiermacher, the historical Jesus and his Jewish background is of no consequence, and his philosophical universal Christ becomes an antipode of Judaism, instead of someone who emerges from it.*⁴⁴

Schleiermacher describes early Christianity in terms of Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, the former being divided into a Diaspora and a Palestinian variant: Hellenistic Jews, and those who related to [merely, A.G.] Jewish.⁴⁵ This is in line with Semler and Herder. Again, the point that Schleiermacher makes when discussing the historical roots of Christianity is that they are of little importance

⁴¹ “Herrlicher, erhabener, der erwachsenen Menschheit würdiger, tiefer eindringend in den Geist der systematischen Religion, weiter sich verbreitend über das ganze Universum ist die ursprüngliche Anschauung des Christenthums,” Ibid. 1:2, 316.

⁴² Ibid. 1:2, 296. See also Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft*, 145.

⁴³ “[...] aber das wahrhaft Göttliche ist die herrliche Klarheit, zu welcher die große Idee, welche darzustellen er gekommen war, die Idee daß Alles Endliche höherer Vermittlungen bedarf um mit der Gottheit zusammenzuhängen, sich in seiner Seele ausbildete.” Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:2, 321.

⁴⁴ See Schleiermacher’s *Leben Jesu*, Schleiermacher, *Friedrich Schleiermacher’s sämtliche Werke. Erste Abtheilung. Zur Theologie*.

⁴⁵ Schleiermacher, *Friedrich Schleiermacher’s sämtliche Werke*, 31; 474–475.

to Christianity. Hellenistic Judaism, however, is regarded as being as radically different from 'Judaism'. From a national point of view, the New Testament is part of Jewish literature, but Schleiermacher notes the lack of literature among Christians who adhered to Hellenistic Judaism. Their literature was "completely Hellenised" at the time of Jesus.⁴⁶ Seeing no connection between New Testament theology and Alexandrian literature, Schleiermacher holds a position that is contrary to earlier as well as later scholars. Having made the point that there are no Hellenistic Jewish sources that are relevant to Christianity, the sources that remain are Palestinian. However, since Jesus and the apostles were not educated in the common school, Christianity cannot be explained merely on the basis of prevalent thought.⁴⁷ Schleiermacher's interests are evident: from this long argument, he establishes that Christianity does not emanate from anything but the remarkable spirit of Christ's person.⁴⁸ In his view, "it [Christianity, A.G.] emanates from him and has no connection with Jewish literature", or else Christianity would be nothing but "modified Judaism".

This discussion of the New Testament makes Schleiermacher's position regarding the Jewish background of the Gospels abundantly clear. The central thought is the unmediated, supra-historical character of Christianity, being independent of certain sources, especially Jewish ones. His second point is that this independence from Palestinian traditions keeps Christianity from being a modified Judaism, dependent on the kind of historical connection between faith and history that Schleiermacher explicitly despised.

Schleiermacher and the Old Testament

Schleiermacher's view of the Old Testament, which would exert a long influence on church life and Protestant tradition, is linked to his view on Judaism. As indicated above, Schleiermacher sees the Old Testament as a 'Jewish codex', a document of a foreign religion. Christianity is new and different from any other religion, but even if the content of the Old Testament has nothing to offer, Old Testament scholarship helps

⁴⁶ Ibid., 476.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 479.

⁴⁸ "seines eigenthümlichen Wesens in der Person Christi", Ibid., 481.

to create a background and an understanding of the outer factors that shaped Christianity.⁴⁹ Judaism and paganism (*Heidenthum*) play an equal role in the background of Christianity, although both are depicted as obsolete predecessors of it. Despite conceding to the Old Testament being used in the Church, Schleiermacher sees no 'inner' relationship between the New and Old Testaments; the link to the Old Testament is "without meaning". His general view of holy scriptures is lucidly expressed in the following statement:

Every holy scripture is only a monument of the religion, a memorial that a great spirit was there, which is not there any longer. [...] It is not he who believes in a holy scripture who has religion, but he who does not need one and could himself produce one.⁵⁰

Schleiermacher also maintains that the Old and New Testaments being contained in the same 'Jewish codex' is against the idea of a canon and in no way means that Christianity should be regarded as a continuation of Judaism.⁵¹ Schleiermacher's view of the Old Testament thus signifies a complete break with any Hebrew or Jewish background to Christianity. In this sense, Schleiermacher goes further than earlier tradition, with the exception of Morgan. Other Enlightenment exegetes, although they heavily criticised it, try to maintain a certain connection with the Hebrew or Jewish past.

Schleiermacher on the Concrete Situation of the Jews

According to Beckmann, Schleiermacher's commitment to the emancipation of Jews needs to be considered when evaluating him: he would by no means support any racist policy.⁵² Instead, Schleiermacher speaks very positively of the fellowship he enjoyed in the 'open houses' of

⁴⁹ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 56.

⁵⁰ "Jede heilige Schrift ist nur ein Mausoleum der Religion, ein Denkmal, daß ein großer Geist da war, der nicht mehr da ist; [...] Nicht der hat Religion, der an eine heilige Schrift glaubt, sondern welcher keiner bedarf, und wohl selbst eine machen könnte," Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* I:2, 242.

⁵¹ Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher, *Schleiermachers Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums. Kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Register von Heinrich Scholz*, ed. Carl Stange, vol. 10, *Quellenschriften zur Protestantismus* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh., 1910 (1811)), 47 n. 2.

⁵² Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 110.

the Jewish upper class in Berlin. The most important of these was the *salon* of the medical doctor and philosopher Marcus Herz and his wife, Henrietta, the latter with whom Schleiermacher developed a deep friendship.⁵³ In these circles, the question of the emancipation of the Jews was a significant one, and the rational Enlightenment religion, which went beyond Judaism or traditional Christianity, could often be seen as a 'religious common ground'. This group of 'enlightened' Jews in Berlin belonged to the intellectual, cultural and, to a certain extent, economic elite, but their legal position was weak, since they were discriminated against through specific legislation, for example the law forbidding Jews to be craftsmen. At the same time, the Jews who were willing to assimilate came into confrontation with the Jewish orthodoxy, being more prone to conversion.⁵⁴

Various ways of becoming integrated in society were considered in the enlightened circles. Moses Mendelsohn's disciple David Friedländer (1750–1834) suggested in an open letter that the enlightened Jews should be integrated into the Protestant church, but without demanding a full Protestant confession. This suggestion came only after his request that the authorities grant Jews equality was rejected. As long as the Jewish nation "formed a special state within the state, so to speak, by dint of its internal constitution and hierarchy", the authorities would not abolish the special laws.⁵⁵ Friedländer believed that Judaism and Christianity in their enlightened form could coexist under one roof.⁵⁶ But Schleiermacher's reaction to Friedländer's concrete solution was negative, although he, too, was critical of the oppressive Christian state. Instead, Schleiermacher suggested that the Jews who were willing to renounce radical observance of the Law and—especially—Messianic expectation, should create a confession of their own, on a par with the Christian Church. In other words, Schleiermacher wanted to favour only those Jews who fitted his own ideal picture of religious expression. This Jewish confession was to be fully subordinated to the demands of the state, but free to retain a certain form of ceremonial law, although

⁵³ Henrietta Herz later converted to Christianity, Emil L. Fackenheim, *The God Within. Kant, Schelling, and Historicity*. Edited by John Burbridge (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), xx–xxi.

⁵⁴ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 104–105.

⁵⁵ Mordechai Breuer and Michael Graetz, *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Tradition and Enlightenment 1600–1780*, ed. Michael A. Meyer, vol. 1, German-Jewish History in Modern Times (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 344–345.

⁵⁶ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 108–110.

unlimited ceremonial law was a hindrance to the emancipation of the Jews. It was important to Schleiermacher that this Jewish confession remained ‘enlightened’. Even here, Schleiermacher’s criticism of Judaism is clear, as the author is not willing to give up his Judaism as Schleiermacher would wish:

You should recall that perceptible throughout is a profound attachment to the original pristine Abrahamite Judaism and to a Judaism that still awaits renewal, that does not yet really exist. And [you should recall] that Judaism, properly so, is set in opposition to Christianity; moreover, that the author derives the fundamental truths of his religion from Judaism—and it is precisely for this reason that he has objections to Christianity. [...] You will certainly have as few doubts as I do about the author’s sincere hatred for it.⁵⁷

Thus it would be wrong to try to make Schleiermacher an emancipator in the modern sense of the word, even though he socialised with Jews. His position is directly linked to his view of religion. In the spirit of Herder, Schleiermacher regarded conversion resulting from a lack of integrity. The rift that he sees between Jewish–Oriental and Christian–European also becomes evident as Schleiermacher airs his irritation at enlightened Jews who do not understand Christianity and who have a taste for Chaldean wisdom and beauty “which is so contrary to our European spirit”.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, his involvement with the enlightened Jews of Berlin shows that, for his time, he was liberal; indeed, his close association with Jews was sometimes criticised.⁵⁹ His position regarding Judaism is consistent, however: Judaism and Christianity are irrelevant to each other.

Schleiermacher’s German patriotism is another important factor as regards his view on the Jews. Pinson called Schleiermacher “the first great political preacher of Germany” and the “greatest patriotic preacher”.⁶⁰ As the troops fought on the battlefield, so Schleiermacher fought in the pulpit,⁶¹ although interestingly he was also trained in the local militia.⁶² The emphasis on nationality was not only based on

⁵⁷ Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:2, 341; translation in Breuer and Graetz, *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, 345–346.

⁵⁸ Schleiermacher, *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 1:2, 342.

⁵⁹ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 135.

⁶⁰ Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor*, 98; 11.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 194. See also Lehnerer, “Religiöse Individualität”, 183–184 for Schleiermacher’s involvement in the Prussian government.

⁶² Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 139.

theoretical–theological convictions but was also the result of ardent patriotism. If Herder had laid a foundation with his theories of nationality, predominantly from a cultural perspective, it was Schleiermacher who transformed those thoughts from a political perspective, making them directly applicable to the Prussian political reality and, after the *Befreiungskriege*, to the German nationalistic project.⁶³

For Schleiermacher, the borders and destiny of the nations were rooted in God's will and creation; each people had been given its calling (*Beruf*) on earth and its specific spirit, whereby its specific glory would be attained.⁶⁴ In political terms, this meant a theological legitimisation of the idea of Germany as a nation with a God-given calling, where nationality was linked to the order of creation: only a person who is one with his nation can live as a citizen in God's kingdom. The law of the nation is also directly rooted in this divine calling, giving divine authorisation to the legislation of the state.⁶⁵

This thinking also has consequences for the Jews. Schleiermacher could not see any way to bridge the gap between Judaism and German Christianity, which seems to be the reason why he did not encourage Jews to convert. It is also clear that, despite his concrete suggestion of creating an enlightened Jewish 'church', Schleiermacher's views on Judaism remained highly negative.⁶⁶ Although this does not make Schleiermacher a racist theologian, the *Wirkungsgeschichte* shows how his approach could be seen as pre-empting a later, more developed *völkisch* ideology and could be used for quite different purposes than he himself had imagined. Even in his lifetime, Schleiermacher was truly influential. His funeral was attended by people from all strata of society—a total of 30,000 people, in Ranke's estimation.⁶⁷

⁶³ Tilgner, *Volksnomostheologie und Schöpfungsglaube*, 36–37.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 37–38.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁶⁶ Theologically, his position on Judaism and the Old Testament was consistently negative. These views of the great theologian were exploited by Nazi theologians within the framework of the Institut zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben, as noted by Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 32. See Heinz Erich Eisenhuth, "Idealismus, Christentum und Judentum", in *Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses. Sitzungsberichte der ersten Arbeitstagung des Institutes zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben vom 1. bis 3. März 1940 in Wittenberg*, ed. Walter Grundmann, *Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben* (Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1940), 143–144.

⁶⁷ Lehnerer, "Religiöse Individualität", 186.

The Influence of Schleiermacher

It is said that the theology of the eighteenth century may be understood as a theology *post* Schleiermacher, with Morgan and Barton stating that Schleiermacher's reorientation provides the key to modern theology.⁶⁸ Schleiermacher's pathbreaking theorising in the *Reden* became a Magna Charta of modern religion and a basis for later development, as he put his own imprint on the ideas of Semler, Herder and others.

Hence it is no wonder that later generations were affected by Schleiermacher's views of the Jews, although there were also criticisms. In addition to Baur and Bultmann,⁶⁹ Schleiermacher influenced perhaps the most significant historian of Judaism within the History of Religions school, Emil Schürer, as well as Ernst Troeltsch and Adolf von Harnack.⁷⁰ The description of Judaism as being founded solely on law and retribution may have received its first breakthrough through Schleiermacher's work.⁷¹ Schürer wrote his dissertation on Schleiermacher's concept of religion and was affected by his view on Judaism, in his turn influencing generations of scholars and churchmen.⁷²

Conclusion

Schleiermacher's is the most conceptual and complete view of an unmediated Enlightenment religion, centred on a universal humanity and represented by Christ. Its ahistorical or suprahistorical character lifts religion above particularist religions and their scriptures, rendering all nationally limited religion unimportant. Schleiermacher sees his universal form of Christianity as the sole religion, and within his overall logic, Jews and Judaism have a specific place.

⁶⁸ Robert Morgan and John Barton, *Biblical Interpretation*, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and G. N. Stanton, Oxford Bible Series (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 32.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁷⁰ Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft*, 13–14. For Harnack and Schleiermacher's speeches on religion, see Kurt Nowak, "Theologie, Philologie und Geschichte. Adolf von Harnack als Kirchenhistoriker", in *Adolf von Harnack. Theologe, Historiker, Wissenschaftspolitiker*, ed. Kurt Nowak and Gerhard Oexle, *Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 213.

⁷¹ Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft*, 43.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 226; 245.

Schleiermacher does not *characterise* Jews as much as he does Judaism. Judaism is marked by narrow particularism, a point that must be understood on the basis of Schleiermacher's programmatic universalism. Most graphically, he describes Judaism as a dead religion and a mummy. To him, Judaism is an outward and "mechanical" religion that has retribution as its dominating idea. In Schleiermacher's discourse on religion, the epithet 'Jewish' is thoroughly negative.

Schleiermacher's *historiography* of Christianity's development in relation to Judaism is reminiscent of Semler's, yet different. Schleiermacher argues that Judaism changed when Jews mixed with Gentiles during the Babylonian exile. Thus even he has a hypothesis of degeneration. After the 'paganisation' during the Exile, there was no great difference between Jews and Gentiles. Agreeing with Semler's view of a Jewish and a Gentile Christianity, Schleiermacher believes that Jewish Christianity is divided into a Diaspora and a Palestinian-Jewish Christianity. But he breaks with research tradition when he denies early Christianity's dependence on Alexandrian literature—this is a sound position from an historical point of view. His reason for this is not problems with the thought of Alexandrian influence, however, but that Christianity to him is *sui generis*, something that emanates from within, from Christ's spirit. This is part of his *dehistoricising strategy*: neither Christ nor Christian religion is dependent on external sources, and so Schleiermacher despises any connection between faith and history. At the same time, this is a radically universalistic approach, in which the national and cultural play no role at all.

Judaism is dead, Schleiermacher contends, and there is *no continuity* whatsoever between Judaism (or paganism) and the new, universalistic Christ-religion, all earlier religions having become obsolete. Christianity is no more a continuation of Judaism than of paganism—this despite Schleiermacher's view that Christianity *has* an historical bond to Judaism. Furthermore, Schleiermacher's dichotomic descriptions are paradigmatic: there is a fundamental tension between universal religion (Christianity) and Judaism, inward and outward, living and dead, mature and immature, universalist and particularist, free and nomistic. Even his view of history severs Christianity from Judaism, Judaism being of no consequence to Christianity. A further example of the discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity in Schleiermacher's thought is his view of the 'Jewish codex', the Old Testament. Although it may be used for traditional reasons, there is no spiritual connection between the testaments. With this radical break from Judaism, and the reduction

of the Old Testament to just another religious book, Schleiermacher laid the foundation both for Enlightenment religion and for certain German academic attitudes to Judaism.

The *symbolic world* of Schleiermacher centres on the individual subject and Christ as the prime manifestation of this free, spiritual and universal humanity. The individual relates to the universe in the same way, whereas church and other collective, outward forms are foreign to this symbolic world. For Schleiermacher, however, this is not a rationalistic thought: religion is centred around feeling, and this feeling is understood in aesthetic terms. Schleiermacher's religion is one that approaches the Divine in a new way: God can be 'felt'. His 'symbolic Jew' is constructed as being the opposite of this free, spiritual religion and of his 'symbolic Christ'. The 'symbolic Jew' stands for the old and immature, the backdrop against which Schleiermacher develops his theories, representing particularism, legalism, the outward and, ultimately, death. Nevertheless, the dead corpse is still trying to move, within the limitations set by *rigor mortis*. Hence Schleiermacher sees no connection between the symbolic world of Judaism and that of Christianity.

Like other Enlightenment theologians discussed here, Schleiermacher is programmatically tolerant, resisting discrimination of Jews and having many Jewish friends. Thus Schleiermacher *delegitimises* negative treatment of Jews—but the tolerance has its limits. Reacting to Friedländer's suggestions, Schleiermacher calls for a certain level of 'enlightenment'. In addition to stating that the Jews ought to abstain from orthodoxy, Schleiermacher comments on the kind of ceremonial law that could be retained. Moreover, the new formation was to be fully subordinated to the requirements of the state. The insistence on assimilation as a prerequisite accords with the general picture of Enlightenment tolerance. Apart from this, Schleiermacher regarded Jewishness as foreign to the European spirit, revealing his patriotism. Summing up, in the spirit of the Enlightenment, Schleiermacher's stance towards Jews was ambivalent, consisting of heavy criticism of Judaism as an ideology, paired with a tolerant attitude towards Jews, even though the latter was a tolerance conditioned by Christian superiority and a demand for assimilation into the Christian state.

W. M. L. DE WETTE:
JUDAISM AS DEGENERATED HEBRAISM

The Old Testament scholar W. M. L. de Wette established a view of Jewish history that would gain enormous influence. Referred to by Julius Wellhausen as an “epoch-making founder of Old Testament Criticism”,¹ he is said to have “laid the foundation and much of the superstructure”, upon which later scholars would build.² de Wette was also a New Testament exegete—a division between the two exegeses would not become commonplace until long afterwards. He therefore wrote books on both the New and the Old Testaments, with works including commentaries on the New Testament as well as scholarly writings on themes ranging from textual criticism to ethics.³ Apart from his influence during his lifetime, de Wette’s view on Jews and Judaism would continue to exert influence on later research.

De Wette belongs to the so-called *Frühromantik* (early Romanticism) that was inspired by for example F. W. J. Schelling (1775–1854),⁴ who developed a theory of nature and aestheticism—a theory that received its specific application in relation to the Jews. Emphasising the continuity of all things, the underlying structure in Schelling’s thinking is a history of the Spirit. The ultimate point of development in this history is the history of humanity, the highest manifestation of which is human expression in the arts. In the theological thought of this period, the two competing perspectives were the ethical and the rational, the latter largely being Kant’s philosophical approach to all sciences, including religion.⁵ However, none of the ethical or rational approaches was fully acceptable to de Wette, although Kant’s thinking remained one of his

¹ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 149.

² *Ibid.*, 79.

³ For de Wette’s scholarship on both testaments, see Rudolf Smend, *Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Arbeit am Alten und am Neuen Testament* (Basel: Verlag Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1958).

⁴ Jan Rohls, “Liberale Romantik. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette”, in *Profil des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus. Band 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990), 235.

⁵ John W. Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, vol. 126, JSOTSup (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 27–31.

fundaments.⁶ But de Wette found another model in Schelling's thinking: "Religion was no longer a set of moral precepts; it was the contemplation of the origin of all being, which was manifested in nature, history and art."⁷ Schelling criticised Kant for one-sidedness, making rationality the judge of everything. To de Wette, this was the answer, and in an idealistic fashion, he saw God as the Absolute and human reason as a part of this Absolute. Combining the impulses from Schelling and Kant, de Wette searched for a synthesis of the two, finding it through the philosophy of J. F. Fries, which facilitated a combination of "faith as a supernatural awareness" that was not "troubled by" empirical historical reality.⁸ In this way, he harmonised two previously opposing dimensions into a synthesis:⁹

religion consists not primarily of dogma or speculative knowledge about God and eternity, but of virtuous action inspired and warmed by feeling, and informed by self-knowledge of all that is most noble and beautiful.¹⁰

Fries agrees with Schleiermacher that the basis of religion is feeling, *Gefühl*, and Fries's definition of feeling directly influenced de Wette, who uses his three-step analysis in his *Dogmatik*. Feeling is the conduit between the individual and the universe: "Feeling and history teach us that religion consists of *inexpressible feeling* (*unaussprechbarem Gefühl*); and the latter [history] shows that all peoples have the same feeling but differ from one another in their *expression* (*Aussprechen*)."¹¹ The forms of religion are aesthetical, de Wette believes, consisting of speculation, ethics and *Gefühl*.¹² In a way that is scarcely comprehensible to modern theology, aesthetics take a central place here.

⁶ Ibid., 27–32.

⁷ Ibid., 33.

⁸ Ibid., 78. Fries's relationship to Kant, which may be characterised by critical adherence, is treated in his Jakob Friedrich Fries, *Von deutscher Philosophie Art und Kunst. Ein Votum für Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi gegen F. W. J. Schelling* (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1812), 31–37.

⁹ These suggestions of how de Wette developed his thinking are based on de Wette's semi-autobiographical novel *Theodor*. Since de Wette uses this piece of fiction to give a detailed account of his pedigree, this seems to be an unusually rich and accurate story for ascertaining how he arrived at his theological and philosophical positions.

¹⁰ Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, 95.

¹¹ de Wette, *Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmatik, in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt*, vii.

¹² Ibid., 17.

This thinking and de Wette's philosophical foundation create a backdrop for his views on Jews and Judaism. Comparing Jewish to Greek, de Wette is able to criticise Judaism for having destroyed the aesthetic dimension of religion. The outward, physical and superstitious, and the adherence to a book, were not acceptable to this aestheticism.¹³ Jacob Friedrich Fries himself was in fact strongly anti-Jewish, a stance that was linked to his German nationalism.¹⁴

The Picture of the Jews: Hebraismus, Judenthum and Christianity

In his pioneering work, *Dissertatio critica qua a prioribus Deuteronomium Pentateuchi libris diversum aliud cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur*, 1804, de Wette discusses the historical development that led to the five books of Moses, that is, what he calls 'rabbinic' Judaism.¹⁵ Once again, the idea of degeneration reappears. Whereas the other parts of the Pentateuch represent an early, original, simple and spontaneous religion, Deuteronomy, with its focus on cultic centralisation and ritual action, represents a degeneration of Israelite religion, being a postexilic development, "a gathering of later laws, ascribed to Moses through historical fiction".¹⁶ It is an outer religion—self-conscious and reflexive—that is separated from inner religion.¹⁷ These views on the religion of Israel foreshadow de Wette's later historiography of Hebrews

¹³ Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, 84.

¹⁴ See below. Gerald Hubmann, "Sittlichkeit und Recht. Die jüdische Emancipationsfrage bei Jakob Friedrich Fries und anderen Staatsdenkern des Deutschen Idealismus", in *Antisemitische und antijudaistische Motive bei Denkern der Aufklärung*, eds. Horst Gronke, Thomas Meyer, and Barbara Neißer, *PPA-Schriften* (Münster: LIT, 2001), 59–69 explains Fries's anti-Jewish views on account of his *völkisch* thinking. See also Gerald Hubmann, "Völkischer Nationalismus und Antisemitismus im frühen 19. Jahrhundert: Die Schriften von Rühs und Fries zur Judenfrage", in *Antisemitismus—Zionismus—Antizionismus 1850–1940*, ed. Renate Heuer and Ralph-Rainer Wuthenow, *Campus Judaica* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1997), 10–34.

¹⁵ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 86.

¹⁶ W. M. L. de Wette, *Kritik der Israelitischen Geschichte. Erster Theil. Kritik der Mosesaischen Geschichte*, vol. 2, Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1807), 385–395. In this book, de Wette devotes only ten pages to Deuteronomy, whereas the other books of the Pentateuch receive much greater attention. This marks his attitude to Deuteronomy as a degeneration of the religion represented in the earlier works.

¹⁷ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 91.

and Jews. Even at this point, he holds that “Judaism is the misfortune, and Christianity is its consolation”.¹⁸

In his “Biblical Dogmatic of the Old and New Testament or Critical Representation of the Religious Doctrine of Hebraism, Judaism and Early Christianity”, 1813, de Wette further explicates his views,¹⁹ with even the three-part division of the title inferring his historiography. The Hebraism is described in four phases: pre-Mosaic polytheistic *Hebraismus*; Mosaic *Hebraismus*; degenerated polytheistic-Mosaic *Hebraismus*; and the ideal *Hebraismus* of the Prophets and Poets.²⁰ The first and third are negative, but the other two are valuable, forming the foundation of de Wette’s dogmatic of *Hebraismus*. The inner content of *Hebraismus* is “the practical idea of one God, as one holy Will, symbolized by the theocracy, delivered from myth”—de Wette’s preferences for law and against myth are evident. In practice, *Hebraismus* is love for the truth and moral seriousness,²¹ a rejection of all mythology,²² as well as spontaneity—a thought that only refers to its inner convictions and consciousness. Thus *Hebraismus* becomes the intellectual source of life,

from which Christianity, and after the killing of it in Catholicism, true Christian Protestantism has come forth, and with Christianity and Protestantism, the scholarly spirit of the new European culture.²³

In this quotation, de Wette sees a parallelism of *Hebraismus*–Protestantism–European scholarly spirit standing in opposition to Judaism–Catholicism. This symbiosis between the Hebrew religion before its depravation, Christianity and European scholarly thinking is surprising, but it is

¹⁸ “Das Judentum ist das Unglück, das Christenthum der Trost dafür”. In *Beytrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus*, *ibid.*, 91.

¹⁹ *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums*, de Wette, *Kritik der Israelitischen Geschichte. Erster Theil. Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte*.

²⁰ W. M. L. de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, vol. 1, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813), 47.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 59, “Wahrheitsliebe und sittlicher Ernst”.

²² By mythology, de Wette means apocalyptic thought, faith in the Messiah, angels and demons, etc.

²³ de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 59–60: “Und das ist jener geistige Lebensquell, aus welchem das Christenthum, und nach Erödötung desselben im Katholizismus, der ächt christliche Protestantismus hervorgegangen ist, und mit Christenthum und Protestantismus, der Forschungsgeist der neu-europäischen Bildung.”

quite natural to de Wette, with his deep roots in Schelling and Fries. Furthermore, it expresses a fundamentally Orientalist approach, where Judaism is Oriental and thus downgraded, whereas Christianity is European and natural to identify with. This reflects the frontiers of debate at the time of writing.²⁴

De Wette proceeds to describe *Hebraismus* in terms of universalism (monotheism) and particularism (theocracy). He holds that a false particularism ensued when the Hebrews combined this with universalism and, figuring a worldwide mission of the Hebrews, liked their theocracy to a future rule of the world.²⁵ Here de Wette sees the negative aspect of the Hebrews' religion: a moral of retribution and requital, affecting *Hebraismus* with the tragic mentality of Qohelet or Job. (Note that 'tragic affection' is a technical term within de Wette's aestheticism, denoting something negative.) Moreover, the Messianism of the Hebrews—another negative feature—is the patriotic-religious hope of a future realisation of the theocracy, although this hope was not manifested in its 'fanatical' form until *Judenthum* was a fact.²⁶

"Judaism is degenerated, petrified *Hebraismus*" (*Das Judenthum ist entartet, erstarrter Hebraismus*), de Wette begins his discussion on the doctrine of Judaism.²⁷ Judaism is back in mythology, bound by a written, authoritative scripture, lacks its own productivity and is oriented around the letter. Seeing a definite rupture between *Hebraismus* and Judaism, de Wette pinpoints this breach to the Exile. The trauma of the country's destruction, and life as foreigners in Babylon, impacted the Hebrew religion:²⁸

This influence was so powerful that we must consider the nation after the Exile as another, with a different thinking and religion. We call them in this period *Jews*, before that *Hebrews*; we call what pertains to the postexilic cultural formation *Judaism*, and what pertains to the pre-exilic cultural formation *Hebraismus*.²⁹

²⁴ See Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism".

²⁵ de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 101.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 108.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 114. See also Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 95.

²⁸ de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 48.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 48.

This quotation clarifies de Wette's distinction between Hebrews and Jews: they are two different nations, with different cultures and mentalities. During the Exile, the Jews adopted foreign religious beliefs: 'Oriental philosophy', in close affinity with Zoroastrism, including demonology; and belief in a Messiah and the resurrection. Religion became characterised more by study and pondering (*Forschung und Grübele*), less by faith and life. Characterised by the letter, by the written law, as opposed to the 'spirit of Moses', Judaism is "the unsuccessful restoration of Hebraism", where metaphysical reflection has replaced ethical direction, where concept and letter has replaced life and enthusiasm, and where a written source of religion has been established.³⁰ de Wette's thoughts bring to mind the Romantic craze for the primordial, natural and simple.

Later in Jewish history, however, de Wette saw a positive turn. Encountering Greek philosophy in Egypt and having learned the philosophy of Plato and Pythagoras, the Jews combined this with 'Mosaism' and Parsism. The Essene and Therapeut ascetic sects thus emerged as syntheses of Greek formation, *Mosaismus* and Oriental wisdom, creating a new, "finer, more spiritual doctrine of religion".³¹ Hence this history of Judaism ends in something more promising, but—just as in Semler and Herder—it required the elevation of Judaism through Greek thought, since the development could not have occurred within Judaism alone. The Pharisees' interpretation of the Scriptures, however, results in a tradition that kills both spirit and heart.³²

De Wette finds what he sees as typical Jewish particularism even in Philo³³ and Josephus,³⁴ with 'mythology' often reappearing in the dogma of Judaism. He mentions angels, demons and Satan, which entered under influence from Zoroastrism, though less in Philo than in Josephus.³⁵ Jewish eschatology and Messianic views are also included, de Wette giving evidence of these doctrines in Jewish literature. And

³⁰ Smend, *Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Arbeit am Alten und am Neuen Testament*, 103.

³¹ de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 56.

³² *Ibid.*, 118.

³³ *Ibid.*, 139.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 142.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 146–147.

so, whereas Hebraism and Christianity are positive concepts, Judaism represents depravity and a negatively influenced apocalypticism.

View of the Old Testament

De Wette differs from for instance Schleiermacher in his view of the Old Testament, although he too maintains a certain discontinuity. Noting that Jesus and the apostles were Jews raised within Judaism, he also states that the Jews' holy books may have made more sense to Jews. From a religious point of view, "the truth of Christianity" can stand without the Old Testament,³⁶ de Wette writes, but he polemicalises against those who believe that religions emerge 'of themselves', without historical roots, and criticises their lack of historical understanding. There is a dogmatic but also a spiritual relationship between Judaism and Christianity, for example the common monotheistic faith, and de Wette talks of Christianity as being ethereal and in need of an earthly cover, which is Judaism. Logically, de Wette thinks of the Old Testament as preparatory revelation, without which there can be no proper understanding of Christianity or Protestant conviction.³⁷ Therefore, it is neither right to understand Christianity in material terms nor as 'empty abstractions' in a philosophical theology, without regard for history. Statements such as these may very well be criticisms of Schleiermacher's view of the Old Testament.³⁸ To de Wette, the Old Testament, especially Psalms, has great poetic value, and he praises "the old, solid Mosaism" and the people of that time, who contrast sharply with paganism.³⁹

However, this does not mean that de Wette accepts Judaism. Even if he respects the spirit of 'original Mosaism', in his view it had almost disappeared by the time of Jesus, when Christianity managed to break through the narrow limits of Judaism. Thus, even as de Wette praises Hebraism, he uses Judaism as an example of degeneration, comparing

³⁶ Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Ueber Religion und Theologie. Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815), 184.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 186–187.

³⁸ Smend, *Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Arbeit am Alten und am Neuen Testament*, 122.

³⁹ de Wette, *Ueber Religion und Theologie. Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 191; see also 84–85.

it to Catholicism, which he describes as “Christianity sunken down into Judaism”.⁴⁰

Early Christianity and Jesus

A keyword in de Wette’s thought is ‘spiritual’. In his conception of Christianity, Jesus is a ‘spiritual Messiah’ (*ein geistiger Messias*), giving ‘spiritual’ legislation and elevating the Mosaic law into moral reflection. Jesus is true to the Mosaic spirit, and like Moses, he stays away from metaphysics and theory, de Wette contends:

The way Jesus presented things was pure of anything didactic, methodical and systematic; it was not teaching but merely reviving, directed at common sense and unspoilt feeling.⁴¹

Again, in the spirit of Romanticism, de Wette envisions Jesus’ listeners as being simple and unsophisticated in a positive sense, and Jesus as being a person with direct access to the most profound dimensions of human beings but standing above human effort: didactics, methods, systems and teaching. Jesus gives no dogma and rejects faith based on authority (*Autoritätsglauben*).⁴² He represents the idea, the inward, the spirit of what is rightly there in Moses, himself being “spiritually reborn Prophetism”. Similarly, the Prophets represented a stance that was closer to true Mosaic religion than others.⁴³ Thus Jesus is placed in sharp opposition to the Pharisees, who represent Mosaic formalism, and when relating to Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, he opposes anything ‘not spiritual’, e.g. ceremonies and tradition.⁴⁴ Jesus’ disciples themselves were stuck in Jewish particularism, but Paul’s education and culture broke that limitation and delivered Christianity. Paul is not only

⁴⁰ Ibid., 99.

⁴¹ “Jesu Vortrag war rein von allem Schulmässigen, Methodischen und Systematischen, nicht unterrichtend, sondern bloss erweckend, auf den gesunden Menschenverstand und das unverdorbene Gefühl berechnet,” de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 213.

⁴² Ibid., 198.

⁴³ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 96.

⁴⁴ de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 199–200.

a positive figure, however, as the “free teaching of Jesus” was also put in dogmatic chains through him.⁴⁵

Interestingly, to de Wette, the doctrine of Jesus himself contains superstitious, mythological views, although if he believed in demonology, this was done unconsciously and did not belong to Christianity⁴⁶—here de Wette quotes Schlegel, who holds that the demonology of Jesus does not belong to the religion (*die eigentliche Religion*). Likewise, Jesus’ view of resurrection was more ‘spiritual’ than that of the Pharisees, and if he spoke of hell, this was in an inner sense.⁴⁷ In this way, de Wette is able to ‘deliver’ Jesus from superstition.

Arguing on the basis of idealist philosophy, de Wette concludes that the teaching of Jesus rests on the purest and most elevated ideas. In his analysis, he consciously constructs an anthropology in which *the opposition between the outward and inward is central*, the latter being founded on self-consciousness (*Selbstbewußtsein*). The outward things as perceived by man are mere images, but by being raised up into the idea of the Divine—the idea of the eternally real—this limitation is dissolved.⁴⁸

The view on Judaism as degenerated and petrified must be understood from this perspective. Whereas Judaism is a degeneration into something outward, including obedience to laws, limitedness or particularism and ‘mythological’ views, de Wette establishes a link between Mosaic religion and the religion of Jesus. Jesus is the ideal human, and the kingdom of God is an ideal human kingdom, where God’s will is accomplished.

The Jews also stand for national limitation. de Wette’s negative evaluation of Judaism comes as a surprise when reading his *Dogmatik*, although it is clear from other texts that he sees the Jews as representing something highly negative. As Pasto notes, de Wette describes Jewish history from a Christian perspective rather than from a Jewish one: “his main concern is the Christian—and not the Jewish—past and present”.⁴⁹ Although de Wette does proceed to study the biblical texts, his argument is governed by his philosophical perspectives: the tension

⁴⁵ de Wette, *Kritik der Israelitischen Geschichte. Erster Theil. Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte*, 220, “durch ihn wurde aber zugleich die freye Lehre Jesu in dogmatische Fesseln gelegt.”

⁴⁶ de Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 236.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 250.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 1–2, 9–10.

⁴⁹ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 92; 103.

between universalism and particularism, legalism versus the theology of the Prophets, the outward versus the inward, “feeling versus reason, and freedom versus constraint”.⁵⁰ This is fully in line with his time. In the contemporary philosophical debate, the original and natural was highly esteemed, and ancient Greece was the ideal for the philhellenic German intelligentsia, just as ancient Germania was the ideal for Teutonic revivalists.

De Wette’s view of the rupture between *Hebraismus* and Judaism is similar to that of several previously discussed scholars, even if some hold that the rupture took place in Egypt, while others pinpointed it to Babylon. Pasto discusses whether de Wette might be influenced by Eusebius, although he does not believe that to be the case. De Wette never cites Eusebius (whereas elsewhere he seems to consistently give credit to his sources, both classical and modern).⁵¹ He does, however, show a clear continuity with much earlier theologians, which indicates a long tradition regarding the attitude towards Judaism. A thought that comes up is that Abraham’s gods corresponded to Greek ones: Jehovah–Jupiter (Jovis), Jubal (Apollo), Thubalkain (Vulcanus), Noah–Bacchus.⁵² He does not dwell on this, however, but only uses it to explain that Jehovah may have had a ‘monotheistic’ role as the supreme God.

De Wette and Contemporary Judaism

De Wette’s view on the Jews was probably directly related to his political position, the ‘Jewish problem’ being on the tapis in Prussia, much due to the influence of French politics. Theologians were more often than not involved in politics: “At no time since the Reformation had theological and political agendas been so closely intertwined in German intellectual life.”⁵³ This was eminently true of de Wette too. In

⁵⁰ Adapted from *ibid.*, 103.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 104. On Eusebius and the Jews, see Jörg Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden. Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, ed. H. C. Brennecke and E. Mühlenberg, vol. 49, *Patristische Texte und Studien* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999).

⁵² de Wette, *Kritik der Israelitischen Geschichte. Erster Theil. Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte*, 36–36.

⁵³ Thomas Albert Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism. W. M. L. de Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 72.

1810 de Wette's colleague Schleiermacher had helped him acquire a position at the newly founded University of Berlin, the crown of von Humboldt's educational enterprise.⁵⁴ That Schleiermacher had political interests is clear, but de Wette's history would be even more influenced by coeval politics.

Labelling himself theologically as a 'Freisinnige Christ' ('liberal' or, more directly, 'freethinking' Christian), politically de Wette belonged to 'early liberalism' (*Frühliberalismus*).⁵⁵ This movement adhered to the ideals of the French Revolution—human rights, national sovereignty, etc.—as well as to Kant's ideas regarding the rights of the individual. The specifically German aspect of the movement was its nationalism: the desire for national independence and the dream of a unified Germany. Whereas in present-day politics, nationalism often has a conservative ring to it, in early nineteenth-century Germany, it was a matter near to the hearts of liberals. The alternative was the old fragmented, particularistic and partly feudal German-speaking sphere with hundreds of political entities—from territorial states (*Länder*), principalities and free cities, to abbeys and bishoprics.⁵⁶ This particularistic structure hindered national unity and obstructed national liberal reforms. The terminology of particularism and universalism so often used in de Wette's (and others') discussions of the Hebrews and Jews directly corresponds to this discussion. German Jews as a particularistic entity, paralleled by postexilic Judaism, threatened to disturb the universalistic-nationalistic project, the search for national unity and the cultural cohesion, with which the liberals identified themselves.⁵⁷ For a long time, this frustrated passion for a united and great German *Volk* meant a growing threat to the freedom of the Jews.

Living in Jena, de Wette was personally affected by the plundering after Napoleon's defeat of Prussia there in 1806.⁵⁸ Emperor Franz II had laid down his crown the same year,⁵⁹ marking the end of the first Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. A period of deep national humiliation followed. However, in 1815 Napoleon was defeated

⁵⁴ Ibid., 56. On Humboldt's reform, see Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 474.

⁵⁵ Rohls, "Liberale Romantik. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette", 237.

⁵⁶ Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 47.

⁵⁷ Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, 2–3.

⁵⁸ Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, 61–63.

⁵⁹ Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 43.

at Waterloo, and the confederation called the *Bund* was formed.⁶⁰ Throughout this time, de Wette was deeply involved in the struggle for the nation.

But nationalism was also linked with strong anti-Jewishness. The avant-garde of these ideas was the rapidly growing so-called *Burschenschaften* (student leagues), which de Wette grew acquainted with even during his time at Jena University.⁶¹ The *Burschenschaften* were devoted to nationalism and to fighting for the unity of their country and democracy,⁶² the latter which cannot have been popular with the Prussian leadership. Fries, the Jena philosopher and close friend of de Wette mentioned above, exerted great influence on the *Burschenschaften* and played a major role at the infamous burning of books at the 1817 Wartburg festival,⁶³ where the students wanted to rid their country of foreign influences and see a nationalistic leadership.⁶⁴

As already indicated, Fries greatly impacted de Wette's thinking, although we do not know whether he exerted any influence on de Wette during the latter's years in Jena.⁶⁵ They did socialise in Heidelberg, however, maintaining their relationship even after de Wette moved to Berlin. Fries, with his 1816 pamphlet *Über die Gefährdung des Wohlstandes und Charakters der Deutschen durch die Juden* ("On the Menace to the Wellbeing and Character of the German People Through the Jews"), positioned himself among leading anti-Semites, arguing that the only solution to the menace was eradication of Judaism. Although the text is thoroughly racist, in this case he meant nothing more violent than baptism.⁶⁶ Whereas others could add that if this spiritual eradication was unsuccessful, the only thing that remained was "to eradicate them by force",⁶⁷ Fries contends that his war is not against the Jews but

⁶⁰ Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 71.

⁶¹ Ibid., 71. On the so-called *Urburschenschaften*, see Günther Steiger, *Aufbruch. Urburschenschaft und Wartburgfest* (Leipzig: Urania-Verlag, 1967).

⁶² Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, 5; Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 71–72.

⁶³ For parts of de Wette's letters to Fries, see Ernst Staehlin, *Dewethiana. Forschungen und Texte zu Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Leben und Werk*, vol. 2, Studien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Basel (Basel: Verlag von Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1956).

⁶⁴ Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, 191.

⁶⁵ Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, 26–27, 92.

⁶⁶ Ismar Elbogen and Eleonore Sterling, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, vol. 111, Athenäums Taschenbücher (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988), 188–189.

⁶⁷ Sterling, *Judenhass*, 114.

against Judaism.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the pamphlets of Fries and his colleague Friedrich Rühs waged a direct war against political emancipation of the Jews, with arguments that foreshadowed later racial anti-Semitism. This includes much of the rhetoric used during the Nazi era, causing the modern reader to be horrified at their treatment of the Jews.⁶⁹ But even in the time of Fries and de Wette, the *Burschenschaften* had a clearly anti-Semitic agenda, with Fries arguing that Jewish students should be expelled from the *Burschenschaften*.⁷⁰

De Wette also explicitly addressed the so-called Jewish problem, which was vigorously discussed in Europe after the French Revolution. Just as Rühs and subsequently Fries wrote pamphlets against the emancipation of the Jews, de Wette airs his prejudice in his novel *Theodor*, expressing his own views through the mouth of the hero:

I would tolerate the Jews, but not allow them any civil rights, because their religion is not merely a religion, but it is also a national union, and consequently dangerous to the state. If full privileges were granted them, they would form a state within a state. Let the government tolerate them, but restrain their growth, so far as it can be done without oppressing them. Let it encourage them to educate their children in Christian customs, and favor every movement among them toward freeing themselves from the service of the letter, and the rabbinical hierarchy.⁷¹

De Wette's argument is as political as it is theological, and he uses the expression "state within a state" in the exact same way as Rühs and Fries in their anti-Semitic pamphlets.⁷² Obviously, de Wette related the situation of the Jews to the national cause, which in turn was part of Romantic nationalism.⁷³ Rühs expressed the nationalist vision as follows:

A people cannot become a single whole except through the internal coalescence of all the traits of its character, by a uniform manner of their manifestations: by thought, language, faith, by devotion to its constitution.⁷⁴

⁶⁸ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 136–137.

⁶⁹ Sterling, *Judenhass*, 122, 125, 128–129.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 149–150.

⁷¹ From *Theodor*, quoted after Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 148.

⁷² Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 81.

⁷³ On Romanticism and nationalism, see Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, 13–30.

⁷⁴ Quoted in Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 77.

For Rühs, this meant that the Jews needed to accept Christianity in order to become eligible for citizenship; for Fries, that they needed to abolish their Jewish particularity—the difference between the two being that Rühs supported a Christian state, whereas Fries did not.⁷⁵ As a ‘state within the state’, the Jews, according to Rühs, were more loyal to their compatriots than to any nation in which they lived, and they had a law of their own in addition to national law, i.e. German law. He suggested a reimposition of medieval customs, such as a Jewish sign on their clothes and Jewish tax to the German confederation. Just as de Wette would later, Fries described the Jews as a separate people that was hostile to the environment,⁷⁶ and went even further in his absolute rejection of Jewish particularity. If the Jews did not abolish their peculiar practices, their expulsion from the country ought to be considered.⁷⁷

The ‘Jewish problem’ was one of the issues at the Congress of Vienna in 1814–15 and even before that, in 1806–1808, in the German *Länder*.⁷⁸ In the German nationalistic project, the problem discussed was “how to integrate a minority population into the new nation-state”,⁷⁹ and in that sense the ‘Jewish problem’ was parallel to the ‘Polish problem’. But, as Pasto notes, due to the religious dimension and the fear that the Jews wished to create a state within the state, the situation of the Jews was different from that of the Poles. Support for the emancipation of the Jews came with C. W. von Dohm’s pathbreaking book *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (“On the Civic Betterment of the Jews”), 1781. This was granted in France in 1792, and finally, after much discussion, in Prussia in 1812,⁸⁰ albeit with gross limitations, especially in the political respect.⁸¹ However, although Dohm’s discussion belonged to the most emancipatory of this era, his view on the Jews as “ethically destroyed” corresponded to the contemporary prejudiced picture of the Jews.⁸²

⁷⁵ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 136–137; Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 82.

⁷⁶ Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 81.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁷⁸ See Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems*, 195–216, 201–202. For the situation of the Jews in Germany, see Elbogen and Sterling, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* and Breuer and Graetz, *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. I.

⁷⁹ Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*, 121.

⁸⁰ Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 53–54.

⁸¹ Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 407–409.

⁸² Manuel, *The Broken Staff: Judaism through Christian Eyes*, 276–277.

Deeply committed to the nationalist cause, de Wette's academic life ended tragically and abruptly due to his political commitments, as de Wette cast in his lot with the *Burschenschaften* and their ideas. Although theological criticism of de Wette in the royal Prussian court and administration had been increasing, his actual fall was caused by his political involvement, seeing as the court was dominated by Pietist nobility.⁸³ de Wette had been introduced by Fries to his student, the young *Burschenschaft* activist Karl Sand, who for political and nationalist reasons murdered the well-known playwright and publicist August von Kotzebue in 1819. Having become acquainted with Sand's family, de Wette wrote a letter of condolence to his mother, in which he, while clearly condemning his action, intimated that Karl had done it out of his integrity of conviction and that passion is "sanctified by the good source from which it flows".⁸⁴ Praising the young man as "a beautiful sign of the times", de Wette referred to a passage on the political murders of Charlotte Corday and Brutus. Sand was executed for his crime, and de Wette was dismissed from his professorship in Berlin for what the authorities regarded as a sanction of Sand's action. de Wette's fate indicates his deep political involvement. It is no wonder that his picture of Jews was so negative, especially considering Fries's influence and his association with the student leagues.

Conclusion

The study of de Wette reveals a view on the Jews that pervades his entire thinking, from theology to politics. When *characterising* Judaism, de Wette uses time-honoured stereotypes: Judaism is degenerated (*entarteter*) Hebraism; it is bound by mythology and written, authoritative Scripture; it is a letter-oriented religion; and the written law of Judaism is opposed to the 'spirit of Moses'. In the same vein as Semler thirty years earlier, de Wette talks of Judaism as having degenerated into something

⁸³ For this, see Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, 147–159.

⁸⁴ The letter without the (disputed) note on Jean Paul is printed in Stachlin, *Dewettiana*, 85–87. For the whole text in English translation, see Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*, 153–154 (the discussion of Jean Paul's essay on p. 155); see also Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 75–76.

outward: obedience to laws, limitedness and particularism—a criticism that is fully in line with the picture painted above.

Most significant for de Wette's *historiography* is his idea of a rupture between *Hebraismus* and Judaism during the Exile. Distinguishing between Hebrews before and Jews after the Exile, de Wette regards Judaism as an entirely postexilic cultural formation. The idea of depravation was of course not a new one, but scholars saw it as having happened for different reasons, in different places and at different times. De Wette pinpointed the depravation of Hebraism to the Exile. Babylon, with its philosophy, demonology, the idea of a Messiah, etc., influenced the simple religion of the patriarchs. Deuteronomy represents this depravation, and the simple old religion is now destroyed by reflection and pondering. De Wette defines the process in greater detail than his colleagues: pre-Mosaic polytheistic *Hebraismus*; Mosaic *Hebraismus*; degenerated polytheistic-Mosaic *Hebraismus*; and the ideal *Hebraismus* of the Prophets and Poets. To de Wette, *Hebraismus* stands for monotheism and moral integrity, springing spontaneously from the innermost part of man, as well as a theocracy without the mythology that later entered the religion. His argument, however, is not founded on evidence but on a theological tension between outer, reflective religion and inner, spontaneous religion. In the background lies his aesthetic theology, with naturalness and spontaneity being keywords. The focus is on the primordial, natural and simple; it is a religion of ethical action, stemming from feeling and a personality elevated by what is noble and beautiful. And in all this, there is a relationship with the Divine. Everything was lost with the degeneration, the turnaround only coming once a later Judaism had been informed by Platonism and the Pythagoreans, and could combine this with 'Mosaism' and Parsism. The synthesis of these things by the Essenes and Therapeuts again brought about a "finer, more spiritual doctrine of religion" that accorded with de Wette's overall thinking. Thus, in de Wette, as in several other authors in the Enlightenment research tradition, the solution to the crisis of Judaism comes through the encounter with the Greek, European spirit.

This historiography in turn involves an interesting combination of *continuity and discontinuity* between Judaism and Christianity. On the one hand, Hebrews and Jews are two different nations, with quite different cultures and mentalities, and de Wette sees no other solution than the synthesis between 'Mosaism' and Greek philosophy. 'The truth of Christianity' can stand without the Old Testament, he contends. But

on the other hand, de Wette talks of Christianity as something ethereal and in need of an earthly cover, which is Judaism, and so Judaism does have a certain role. In this way, de Wette acknowledges a dogmatic and spiritual relationship between Judaism and Christianity, which is exemplified by the common monotheistic faith. Jesus and the apostles were Jews, who were raised within Judaism, and de Wette polemicises against those who think that religions emerge 'of themselves', without any historical roots. Whereas Schleiermacher radically disconnected the Old Testament from Christianity, de Wette sees the Old Testament as a preparatory revelation that is necessary in order to understand Christianity. Interestingly, de Wette describes a continuity between Hebraism, Protestantism and the European scholarly spirit (!), placed in opposition to Judaism and Catholicism.

de Wette's symbolic world does not radically differ from those of other theologians who operated under the Enlightenment umbrella, and his aesthetic theology is quite close to Schleiermacher's. As for the place of the 'symbolic Jew', de Wette contends that Judaism has destroyed the aesthetic dimension of religion, representing the outward, physical and superstitious, as well as the adherence to a book. 'Jewish' stands for the opposite of what Christianity stands for, being 'spiritual', with a 'spiritual Messiah' and a 'spiritual law'. Thus, in the symbolic world, the 'symbolic Jew' is a negative figure, representing all the outward things in the world of religion: dogmatic chains, methods, systems, faith in authority, ceremonies, tradition, Jewish particularism, limitation and superstition. In contrast, Jesus is the ideal 'symbolic human'.

It would be a mistake to describe de Wette's symbolic world and neglect his political preferences; theological and political convictions coexist in his symbolic world, supporting one another. Insofar as de Wette supports a certain tolerance towards Jews and Judaism, he is an Enlightenment thinker, but his nationalism forbids him to allow the Jews to grow and retain their place in the nation. His theological and political works speak the same language, and no doubt his fundamental theological ideas helped to *legitimise* his political stance. 'Spiritual' universalism and particularism had a political counterpart. In de Wette's interpretation, Jesus and Christianity coincide with liberal ideals, and just as particularism was an enemy in the universalist theological project, so it was an enemy in the political sphere. de Wette's strong nationalism seems to correspond to that of the *Burschenschaften*, who wished to rid Germany of foreign influences. Here he expresses a 'split tolerance',

wanting to tolerate the Jews without allowing them any civil rights. As a threat to the uniformism of the state, de Wette wants the State to reform the Jews into adopting German customs and Christian values.

With his dichotomy of Hebrews and Jews, de Wette would exert great influence on his own time as well as on German Protestant theology in the nineteenth century. His views on Hebraism, Judaism and Christianity were developed and popularised especially by Julius Wellhausen, who describes de Wette as the “epoch-making opener of historical criticism” in the field of the history of Israel.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ Smend, *Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Arbeit am Alten und am Neuen Testament*, 105; Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6 ed. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1905).

THE JEWS IN ENLIGHTENMENT EXEGESIS FROM BAUR TO RITSCHL

As is amply evidenced above, the views of exegetes on Jews and Judaism in Enlightenment theology were influenced by philosophical and political conditions, Judaism having a specific place in the world-views of leading philosophers. Kant had considered the gulf between Judaism and Christianity impossible to bridge, modelling his dichotomy of autonomous versus externally regulated (*statutorisch*) ethics on the dichotomy of Christianity and Judaism.¹ But whereas Kant did not place Judaism in a dialectical position in relation to Christianity, Hegel did.² Instead of seeing Judaism and Christianity as a dichotomy, Hegel described their relationship in his historical dialectics. He appreciates the religious and ethical character of Judaism, regarding it as a sublime (*erhaben*) religion. Nevertheless, in Hegel's reconstruction of the moves of the World Spirit, Judaism represents a lower stage of religion, which will be 'dissolved' (*aufgehoben*) into Christianity,³ Judaism being external, legalistic, ritualistic and ceremonial, rather than meeting Hegel's ideals of freedom and independence.⁴ Hegel is capable of sharp characterisations. The 'Absolute Spirit' is "an expressly Greek Being", whereas Judaism is "the demon of hate"—a fierce depiction indeed.⁵ Nevertheless, despite this lingering critical stance towards Judaism,⁶ his new approach, with the Spirit moving to ever higher developments of

¹ *Statutorisch* means something that is motivated by external statutes or regulations.

² On Kant and Judaism, see Low, *Jews in the Eyes of the Germans*, 93–95. For Hegel's view on Judaism, see Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 56–59.

³ Rotenstreich, *Jews and German Philosophy*, 7. Rotenstreich uses the term 'sublate' for *aufheben*. The latter is technical in early 18th-c. dialectical discourse and is often used to describe how Christianity includes and dissolves Judaism.

⁴ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 58.

⁵ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, 2 ed. (Neukirchen-Fluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 189–190.

⁶ See e.g. Hegel's mention of the Jewish people and its rejectedness in his *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, G. W. F. Hegel, *Phänomenologie Des Geistes*, ed. Johannes Hoffmeister, 6 ed., vol. 114, Der Philosophischen Bibliothek (Hamburg: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1952 (1807)), 250. Hegel showed development in his attitude to Judaism, Low, *Jews in the Eyes of the Germans*, 274–276, and he opposed anti-Semitism in the spirit of the Prussian Edict of Emancipation, 279.

religion and culture, to a certain extent bridged the gap between Judaism and Christianity, allowing for greater continuity between (certain) Judaism and Christianity. As Susannah Heschel writes, comparing Baur's [Hegel-inspired, A.G.] conception of Judaism to that of Schleiermacher: "There is no discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity, as there is for Schleiermacher, but the relationship between the two religions is one of negation and transformation."⁷ And Rotenstreich notes that the systems of Kant and Hegel, as the main philosophical systems of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, are "foci of different scenarios of the encounter between Judaism and modern philosophy".⁸ The same seems true of theology and exegesis. The Kantian paradigm was dominant in providing structures for thinking up to the first decades of the nineteenth century, after which the Hegelian model also gained influence within exegesis. Views similar to Hegel's regarding Jews, Judaism and their historical relation to Christianity are evident in some of these works from then onwards.

It was in E. C. Baur's Tübingen that Hegelian idealism and dialectics according to Baur's adaptation became influential, largely due to Hegel's grand narrative, which explained the development from a nationally limited Palestinian Judaism to a religion of world-historical importance. Baur's followers, such as David Friedrich Strauss, elaborated in various ways on the scheme that Baur had provided. The same is true of Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1889) who, having started out as Baur's disciple, took a strongly critical stance towards his teacher. In fact, so did the History of Religions school, which is the last example of theology under the auspices of the Enlightenment to be discussed here. Disciples of Ritschl, they nevertheless developed their ideas in opposition to his concept of the kingdom of God. Certain contributions from the History of Religions school, however, marked the beginning of an historical turn with regard to the study of Jews and Judaism in New Testament exegesis.

⁷ Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 112.

⁸ Rotenstreich, *Jews and German Philosophy*, 7.

FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR:
JUDAISM AS AN HISTORICAL ANTIPODE OF
CHRISTIANITY

Although the scope and date of Ferdinand Christian Baur's more direct involvement with Hegelian ideas is disputed, Baur undoubtedly operated with an idealistic dialectical model of history. He did this in a similar vein to Hegel, regardless of whether it was initially the result of direct inspiration from Schelling or from Hegel himself.¹ In any case, with Baur as the founder of what is known as the (New) Tübingen school,² idealistic dialectical history in Baur's specific conception became the vogue in the discussion of early Christian history, conditioning much of it for the rest of the century. Hence—and because the structures of his thought remain in New Testament research tradition—Baur stands as one of the founding fathers of New Testament exegesis.³ The study of

¹ The dependence on Hegel is too evident to be disputed; according to Baur's own confession from 1833, he was a Hegelian, W. Geiger, *Spekulation und Kritik. Die Geschichtstheologie Ferdinand Christian Baur's*, vol. XXVIII, *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus* (München: Chr. Kaiser-Verlag, 1962), 39. On Baur and the Tübingen school, see Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), and on Baur and Hegel, Peter C. Hodgson, *The Formation of Historical Theology. A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, *Makers of Modern Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), 1–4, 265, with a nuanced view of Baur's dependence on Hegel. Carl E. Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", in *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler. 8. Blauberger Symposium*, ed. Ulrich Köpf (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994), *passim*, also notes the influence from Schelling.

² This concept is by no means unambiguous, see Ulrich Köpf, "Die theologischen Tübingen Schulen", in *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler. 8. Blauberger Symposium*, ed. Ulrich Köpf (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994). The Tübingen school here is to be distinguished from the old Tübingen school, as well as from the Catholic one, all with very different views, Köpf, 15. Baur himself was trained in the old Tübingen school.

³ Baur truly is an exegete, although the scope of his writings may primarily be designated as church history. His influence on exegesis has been immense, Käsemann in Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, vol. I–V (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1963–1975 (1831–)), I:8. The basic material used for the analysis of Baur is the texts published in Baur, Ferdinand Christian, ed. Klaus Scholder, I–V, Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, but also Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums*, 2., nach dem Tode des Verfassers besorgt von Eduard Zeller ed., vol. 1 (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (L. W.

Morgan, Semler, Herder, Schleiermacher and de Wette indicates that Baur may not have produced the original sketches of Jews and Judaism in early Christianity.⁴ It is well known that Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre* led to a breakthrough in Baur's thinking—"without Schleiermacher, Baur's entire research is unthinkable".⁵ However, Baur combined this and other influences into a new synthesis, through his extensive writing but also through his influence on students and followers, constructing a building in which generations of scholars would dwell.

A Dialectical Movement from Paganism and Judaism to Early Christianity

Baur's is a history of great sweeps, and since he is first and foremost an historian, the place of Christianity in world history is of interest to him. Throughout his production runs a coherent narrative about the dialectical movement from two religious worlds on the verge of dissolution, and how this is followed by a new synthesis, Christianity. Baur notes that the rise of Christianity and the apex of the Roman Empire coincide in time:

It is a genuinely world-historical viewpoint that at the same time as the Roman Empire united all the peoples of that time into a universal monarchy, the religion, too, began its course through the world, dissolving (*aufhob*) all religious particularism into universalism.⁶

This describes a moment in time when the national, the particular and the individual unite into two great bodies, the Roman Empire

Riesland), 1866). On Baur, see e.g. Roy A. Harrisville and Walter Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture. Theology and Historical-Critical Method from Spinoza to Käsemann* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 111–130, Klaus Scholder, "Baur, Ferdinand Christian (1792–1860)", in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (1980). Modern scholars who build expressly on Baur's description of New Testament history include Goulder, see Michael D. Goulder, *Paul and the competing mission in Corinth*, ed. S. E. Porter, Library of Pauline Studies (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001), 7–8.

⁴ Baur himself quotes J. E. C. Schmidt for the basic analysis of two competing parties in Corinth, Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* I:16, and both Semler and F. von Schelling influenced Baur; Goulder, *Paul and the competing mission in Corinth*, 1.

⁵ Peter Friedrich, *Ferdinand Christian Baur als Symboliker*, vol. 12, Studien zur Theologie und Geistesgeschichte des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 37–38, quotation from an unpublished dissertation by Eberhard Hermann Pältz, "F. Chr. Baur's Verhältnis zu Schleiermacher" (Diss. Jena), 1955.

⁶ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III: 2. For Baur on particularism and universalism, see Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 113.

and Christianity, moving from particularism to universalism. In broad outline, the pattern of Christianity as the end point of a development involving Judaism and paganism had long been part of New Testament historiography. Using his dialectics, Baur now expanded on and refined it.

Jews and Judaism are the example of this particularism. Due to the peculiarity of their national character, the Jews maintained their obstinate dissimilarity from other peoples from the start, Baur contends. However, dispersed into the kingdoms where Alexander's Hellenism had been a shaping factor, this Hellenistic Judaism became the seedbed of Christianity. Christianity emerged when the two factors, *Heidenthum* and *Judenthum* (paganism and Judaism) had reached their end. The competing sects of Judaism showed that Judaism as a national religion was ready for dissolution,⁷ and a parallel development was evident in pagan religion. The two antipodes, paganism, representing unbelief, and Judaism, representing superstition (*Aberglaube*), were ripe for change.⁸

It is evident that Baur constructs the course of events in a dialectical manner, reminiscent of Hegel's dialectics: paganism is the thesis and Judaism the antithesis, Christianity being the synthesis into which both are 'dissolved'. The absolute religion in relation to its predecessors,⁹ Christianity represents a progress (*Fortschritt*).¹⁰ The movement towards Christianity following the disintegration of the religious antipodes does not happen by chance but is predetermined:

The forms, in which religious life functioned up to this time, disintegrate more and more; finally they become totally empty forms, void of the content that used to fill them, but only because they have become too narrow and confining to the Spirit that employed them for the mediation (*Vermittlung*) of its religious consciousness. When something old disintegrates, something new is always already there to take its place.¹¹

⁷ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:6.

⁸ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:7.

⁹ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, II:232.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II:142.

¹¹ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:9–10: "Die Formen, in welchen bisher das religiöse Leben sich bewegte, zerfallen mehr und mehr, sie werden zuletzt völlig leere, des sie erfüllenden Inhalts entäusserte Formen, aber nur aus dem Grunde, weil sie dem Geiste, welchem sie zur Vermittlung seines religiösen Bewusstseins dienten, zu eng und beschränkt geworden sind. Wo etwas Altes zerfällt, ist immer auch schon etwas Neues da, das an die Stelle desselben tritt."

As in Hegelian dialectic, Baur sees the way of the Spirit through history as moving to ever higher manifestations. This trajectory of the Spirit cannot be broken, and the Spirit waits until it brings forth a new creation to be manifested in.

Paganism is not only a negative pole, however. Having abandoned the Greek folk religion as an adequate form for its manifestation, the Spirit elevated itself (*erheben*) into Greek philosophy. This was the most 'spiritual' point of contact between Christianity and the pre-Christian history of mankind.¹² But this description pertains only to Platonism, not to Epicureanism or Stoicism; Platonism to Baur contains embryos of significant themes that resemble Christian ideas, especially within the important area of ethics.

Hence, through this course of events, Judaism is abandoned and the Spirit moves on into a new manifestation, Christianity. Yet Baur has a somewhat more conciliatory stance to Judaism than certain earlier exegetes, probably due to the continuity with Judaism that is inherent in his dialectics: "God has not totally rejected his people."¹³ In describing Judaism, therefore, Baur clearly states that Christianity grew in the soil of Judaism and has a natural relation to it: Christianity is "only the spiritualised Judaism".¹⁴ The advantage of Judaism over all forms of religion is its monotheism, the New Testament sharing its conception of God with the Old Testament and Judaism.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Baur also stresses the disadvantages of Judaism: its conception of God bears the stamp of nationalism and particularism, which is in strong opposition to Christianity. The Jewish conception of God had to therefore be liberated and purified (*geläutert*). This occurred as the Jews were forced to live in the Diaspora, particularly in Alexandria. Here Judaism was remoulded. It moved out of its national and political isolation (*Abgeschlossenheit*), and a fusion took place, in which Judaism and Greek customs and cultivation (*Sitte und Bildung*) merged into one.

¹² Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:10.

¹³ Ferdinand Christian Baur, "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit zusammenhängende Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung", in *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, ed. Klaus Scholder (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1963 (1836)), 159: "Demungeachtet bleiben die dem jüdischen Volk von Gottes gegebenen Verheissungen an ihm nicht absolut unerfüllt, und Gott hat sein Volk nicht absolut verstoßen."

¹⁴ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:16. "Es will selbst nur das vergeistigte Judenthum sein [...]"

¹⁵ For this and the following, see Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:17 f.

The result was *Hellenismus*, out of which something new emerged: the Greek-Jewish or Alexandrian Philosophy of Religion. A condition for this development was that Judaism went beyond itself:

The deeper they [the Jews], through their ongoing study of Greek philosophy, became involved in it, the more intense did the conflict with their national religious consciousness have to become.¹⁶

Baur describes the process of change that he saw the Diaspora Jews as undergoing, with a productive tension between the national religious consciousness and Greek philosophy, the intermediary between their heritage and Greek philosophy becoming allegorical exegesis. In this process, a totally new form of Judaism arose.

A new interpretation of Old Testament scriptures was an important step in this change, although these scriptures now became merely the form for a new content, that of a spiritualised Judaism, which had broken through and dissolved (*aufgehoben*) the old Jewish particularism, without fully relinquishing Old Testament religion.¹⁷ This happened in the writings of Philo, which were Jewish exegeses of the Old Testament as well as philosophical tractates. Although Baur's historical reconstruction would not hold up under modern historical scrutiny, it served his agenda well. With this aetiology, Baur managed to construct a viable, 'more spiritual' Judaism, which was ready to become the seedbed of Christianity, the highest philosophical form of Greek paganism in fusion with the Jewish Holy Scriptures. In this construction, Baur builds on and develops concepts that had already become quite established in exegesis.

Baur's next move is to explain how this 'spiritual Judaism' found its way back to Palestine; as in de Wette and Semler, the Therapeutae and Essenes offer an explanation—although to Qumran scholarship, it is a surprising thought that Essenes would represent a freer alternative than other contemporary Jewish groups. Baur argues that the Essene view of life is closer to Christianity than Pharisaism and Sadduceeism, being more spiritual and ardent, and he sees it as one of the most spiritual points of contact between Judaism and Christianity.¹⁸ The role

¹⁶ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:18. "[...] je tiefer sie aber durch die fortgehende Beschäftigung mit der griechischen Philosophie in sie hineingezogen wurden, um so grosser musste mehr und mehr der Conflict werden, in welchen sie mit ihrem national religiösen Bewusstsein kamen."

¹⁷ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:19.

¹⁸ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:20–21.

of the Egyptian Therapeutae is that of intermediary between Greek Alexandrian Judaism and the Palestinian Essenes, Baur assuming that there was a connection between Essenes and Therapeutae.

Thus, in this idealistic historiographical construct, Baur paints a picture of a Judaism that was itself particularistic and limited, but which was promoted, through the encounter with Platonism in the Alexandrian philosophy of religion, to being viable as a seedbed for early Christianity. In contrast, 'Palestinian Judaism', apart from the Essenes, is not regarded by Baur as a possible environment for earliest Christianity.

From the Jerusalem Church to World Religion

At this point, Baur is ready to describe how Christianity, now a possible candidate for becoming a world religion through Hellenistic Judaism, could enter into this role. Fundamental to Baur's history of early Christianity are the events in, and emanating from, the Jerusalem church according to Acts chapters 6–8 and 20. The Jerusalem church had a Hebrew leadership, the apostles, but there was also a 'Hellenistic' group of Diaspora Jews, led by Stephen. Described as a Hellenist, Baur considers it no accident that Stephen stands for another kind of freedom than the Hebrew apostles. To Baur, it was only through influence from the Hellenistic Judaism of Alexandria that this Greek element of freedom was infused into early Christianity. Thus Stephen represents a 'more spiritual' worship of God, opposing the temple cult in Jerusalem.¹⁹ The 'Hellenists' left the church, whereas the Hebrews stayed behind, and an opposition to 'freer Hellenistic Christianity' developed within this strongly Judaizing group.²⁰ After Stephen was martyred for his message of freedom and a more spiritual religion, the Hellenistic element in the Jerusalem church was dispersed.²¹ Out

¹⁹ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* III:42 ff.

²⁰ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, I:47.

²¹ That this is no necessary reading of Acts 8:1 has been conclusively argued by Larsson, "Hellenisterna och urförsamlingen", in *Judendom och kristendom under de första århundradena*, ed. S. Hidal, et al. (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1986) and Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992). See also Anders Gerdmar, "Hebreer och hellenister i urförsamlingen—ett receptionskritiskt perspektiv", *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 67 (2002).

of the church in Antioch, which was founded as a result of Stephen and the ‘Hellenists’ who were dispersed from Jerusalem, came Gentile Christianity. The Jerusalem church now consisted only of Hebrews, whereas the Hellenists were dispersed.

Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ

The above is a brief overview of Baur’s narrative of how Christianity became a world religion. In *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, Baur develops these ideas further. Most important to this discussion is how Baur sees ‘national Judaism’ as the main hindrance on Christianity’s path to becoming a world-historical reality—and how this hindrance is removed through the work of Paul.²²

Stephen, as Paul’s forerunner, is the first to explicate the *opposition* between Judaism and Christianity, speaking against the Law and the holy place. To Baur, the reason for the riot against Stephen is his criticism of the Jewish national cult, when he stated that true religion cannot be bound to a temple in a certain place.²³ This marks the point of breakthrough:

Stephen had become aware of this necessary tearing away (*Losreissung*) of Christianity from Judaism, through which *Judaism as absolute religion was negated and its final destruction was brought about*: the high, free position to which he saw himself elevated through this, aroused in him the energetic zeal with which he worked for the cause of Jesus (*die Sache Jesu*), but all the more serious was the opposition that he caused against himself.²⁴

Hence Stephen, or the process that he represents, brings about the destruction of Judaism, and his own position is elevated and free compared to that of the apostles who kept to the temple cult. Following the persecution of Stephen’s own Hellenistic churches in Judaea, these became the starting point for evangelising the Gentiles, the earliest

²² Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, I:5.

²³ *Ibid.*, I:66.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, I:66–67, “Diese nothwendige Losreissung des Christenthums vom Judenthum, wodurch das Judenthum als absolute Religion negirt und sein endlicher Untergang herbeigeführt wurde, war in Stephanus zum Bewusstsein gekommen: der hohe-freie Standpunkt, auf welchen er sich dadurch erhoben sah, erweckte in ihm den energischen Eifer, mit welchem er für die Sache Jesu wirkte, aber um so ernstlicher war auch die Opposition, die er gegen sich hervorrief,” emphasis mine.

impulses for which must have come from the Hellenistic *Ideenkreis*. To Baur, the ideas initiated by Stephen were what transformed Saul into Paul. Although Stephen represents what was least acceptable to a Jew, i.e. Jewish particularism lifted into universalism, this thought contained the seed of the basic ideas of Pauline Christianity:²⁵ the breaking away from the Mosaic law, which was already present in Stephen and which made him the forerunner of Paul.

In Baur's narrative, however, Paul is the leading figure. A similar scheme to that of the way from antitheses to synthesis in the Alexandrian philosophy of religion emerges, with Stephen, uniting Jewish and Greek, becoming the necessary precedent to Paul. For unlike Hellenistic Judaism, Palestinian Judaism and the Palestinian Hebrews of the Jerusalem church were not viable as a seedbed of Christianity. Stephen and Paul, however, were 'converted Hellenists' and thus had a different openness.²⁶

According to Baur, there is a fundamental conflict between Pauline Christianity and Jewish-Christian Christianity, since the latter had not worked out (*hinausgedacht*) its relationship to Judaism.²⁷ Similarly, there is a true and fundamental opposition to Judaism in Paul, although Baur argues that the story in Acts harmonises and conceals it. At this point, and throughout his historical work, Baur employs his 'tendency criticism'.²⁸ The opposition—again interpreted in dialectical terms—had to be dissolved in the later history of the Church, Baur contends. Whereas the 'older apostles' maintained that the only way for Gentiles to receive the Messianic salvation was through circumcision,²⁹ the Hellenists, described as only 'outwardly' (*auswärtige*) Jewish-Christian,

²⁵ Ibid., I:68.

²⁶ Ibid., I:127.

²⁷ Ibid., I:137.

²⁸ Ibid., I:233; 271.

²⁹ In fact, the concession of the Apostolic Council need not mean that the Gentile converts were not seen as part of Judaism, which may be indicated by the affinity between the Noahidic laws and the decision in the council, Alan F. Segal, "Conversion and Universalism: Opposites that Attract", in *Origins and Method. Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Bradley H. McLean, *JNTSS* (Sheffield: 1993); Marc Shapiro, "Noahic Laws", in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Anders Runesson, "Particularistic Judaism and Universalistic Christianity? Some Critical Remarks on Terminology and Theology", *Studia Theologica* 54, no. 1 (2000); Anders Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*, ed. Birger Olsson and Kari Syreeni, vol. 36, *Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 250–251.

became intermediaries between Judaism and paganism. Their thinking was freer than that of the Palestinian-Jewish Christians, who would not give up the Mosaic law.³⁰ The opposition was fierce. To Baur it is evident that Paul is regarded as an enemy by James and the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem: “all who came from James were described as the pronounced opponents and enemies of Paul”,³¹ who was hated by the Jews because of his polemics against the Law.³² In fact, Baur sees Jews and Jewish Christians as birds of a feather, both opposing the more elevated and freer religious consciousness of Paul.³³

Dialectical Opposition in Corinth

The same perspective of dialectical conflict could be applied to any New Testament context. Among Baur's most important works is the one on the party of Christ in Corinth.³⁴ Here, too, the picture of the Jews and Jewish Christians is pertinent. Although beginning with the four ‘parties’ of 1 Cor. 1:12—“but I say that each of you is saying: I belong to Paul, I belong to Apollos, I belong to Cephas, I belong to Christ”³⁵—Baur constructs *two* parties. These are the Pauline-Apollonian and the Petrine-Christ parties: “There is no doubt that the Gentile-Christian part of the church preferably joined Paul and Apollos, whereas to such people who had been true to Judaism even as Christians, the name of Peter was at the centre of a closer group.”³⁶ In his introduction to Baur's *Ausgewählte Werke*, Ernst Käsemann calls 1 Cor. 1:12 “the Archimedean point from

³⁰ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, I:163, 188.

³¹ “[...] alle, die von Jakobus kamen, als erklärte Gegner und Feinde desselben [Paulus] beschrieben werden”, *ibid.*, I:229.

³² *Ibid.*, I:190; 234; 239.

³³ *Ibid.*, I:282–283.

³⁴ Ferdinand Christian Baur, “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom”, in *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, ed. Klaus Scholder (1963 (1831)).

³⁵ λέγω δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ.

³⁶ Baur, “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom”, 2 (my pagination follows that of the Baur, *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* edition); Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, I:295–296.

which the history of earliest Christianity opened up to Baur”.³⁷ The Christ party and the Petrine party refer to the same entity.³⁸ According to Baur, the two form a main opposition (*Hauptgegensatz*), although he has to harmonise the quite evident opposition of Paul and Apollos in 1 Corinthians with this position.³⁹ One of the main points for Baur is that Paul had Jewish-Christian opponents, who adhered to the Mosaic law, and by attacking his apostolate, sought to gain influence for their Judaism.⁴⁰ Baur’s identification of the Petrine–Christ party with these is founded on 2 Cor. 11:22, saying that the opponents were born Jews and that these were against Paul: “Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I.”⁴¹ Baur compares the two “completely contrary systems” that stem from Pauline Christianity and Judaism as follows:⁴²

Judaism, Jewish Christianity	Pauline Christianity
Outward information about revelation, only unveiling what is already present	Revelation as a new creation, a higher life principle, given through the divine Spirit
Christ is only a teacher	Christ is the Redeemer in the highest sense
All religious value: observance of the Law	Faith in the death of the Redeemer
ἔργα (deeds)	πίστις (faith)

³⁷ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, I:IX.

³⁸ Baur, “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom”, 24.

³⁹ Ibid., 16–17.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 23. Baur belittles the will of Peter and the so-called *Judenapostel* in opening the church to Gentiles—this decisive breakthrough could only be brought by Paul, 49. However, according to Acts, Peter was the first one to see the eschatological Spirit filling Gentiles, Acts 10:35, which was accepted by “those of the circumcision”, Acts 10:45, Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Dietrich-Alex Koch, 17 ed., vol. 3, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) *ad loc*, suggests that this pertains to God-fearers and not to Gentiles, which is, however, contradicted by the use of τὰ ἔθνη.

⁴¹ Ἑβραῖοί εἰσιν; καγώ. Ἰσραηλιταί εἰσιν; καγώ. σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσιν; καγώ, Baur, “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom”, 44.

⁴² See *ibid.*, 75–76.

This table shows a few of the points of opposition that Baur sees between Pauline and Petrine Christianity: “[I have shown] how deeply the opposition penetrates into the heart of apostolic Christianity.”⁴³ Again, Baur sharply contrasts a winning Pauline Christianity with a less developed Jewish one. He writes interchangeably of Petrine Christianity and Jewish Christianity, often using the latter term,⁴⁴ preferably in the dichotomy between Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian.⁴⁵ Kümmel considers Semler to have introduced this idea,⁴⁶ which is both true and untrue. We have seen embryos of it in each of the Enlightenment exegetes discussed, the fundamental idea being that of Hebraism degenerating into Judaism and then being restored into something close to the Greek. But Baur was the one who systematised this dichotomy, quite naturally as a result of his constant need for dualisms in his dialectics and tendency criticism.

The Letter to the Romans: Written to “Cut Jewish Particularism at its Root”

The purpose and cause of the Letter to the Romans also relates to the basic opposition between Gentile and Jewish Christians, Baur argues.⁴⁷ And, as in the Corinthian correspondence, the main opposition between Gentile and Jewish Christians is vital to the understanding of the letter.⁴⁸ Although this is no controversial position, Baur’s argument runs contrary to that of most interpreters. Again, the question is whether Christian salvation is particular or universal, whether the grace of the gospel rests on a national or a ‘generally human’ precedence.⁴⁹ In Baur’s argument, the theological discussion of chapters 1–8 is related to the problem of chapters 9–11. Jews and Gentiles alike are unable to fulfil the righteous requirements of God, but the righteousness from

⁴³ Baur, *Auserwählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* IV:396.

⁴⁴ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, I:15, 97, 128.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, I:141, 145, 155.

⁴⁶ Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament*.

⁴⁷ Baur, “Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit zusammenhängende Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung”.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 163–165.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 167.

God is without the Law. Baur interprets the tension between Jews and Gentiles in terms of universalism and particularism:

all that the apostle develops in the first eight chapters is the necessary condition for being able to cut the Jewish particularism that opposed the universalism of the apostle, not in Judaism in general, but in the Christian church itself, in a Jewish-Christian church, at its root.⁵⁰

Thus, to Baur, *the purpose of Romans pertains to the relationship between Jewish Christianity and Pauline Christianity, the object being to cut the roots of Jewish particularism.*⁵¹ Therefore, although Romans 1–8 has a dogmatic value in itself, it is to be regarded as an introduction to 9–11.⁵² Baur summarises that “there is no doubt that the main content of this letter is directed against Jewish-Christian principles and prejudices, which are very closely connected with Judaism”.⁵³ Paul must have regarded these opponents as highly dangerous to have written this long discourse dealing with them, Baur contends. The Jewish Christians, for their part, thought that Paul in his universalism had unjustly given the Gentiles precedence over the Jews.⁵⁴ Baur depicts the situation in the Roman church as follows. The expulsion of the Jews by Claudius (Suet. *Claud.* 25.4), “for constantly rioting at the instigation of Chrestus”, was caused by Christianity.⁵⁵ In this church, there was an anti-Pauline current from an early stage, opposing Paul’s universalism.⁵⁶ The Jewish-Christian party being dominant, the letter is largely *a justification of Paul’s apostolic ministry, provoked by the Jewish-Christian opposition*,⁵⁷ although Paul also admonishes the Gentile Christians not to boast over the Jewish Christians, 11:18. Baur differentiates between the opponents of Galatians and those of

⁵⁰ Ibid., 174–175.

⁵¹ It is more natural to interpret Romans in the exact opposite manner, its purpose being to cut the roots of Gentile-Christian boasting, showing them that they are in fact grafted into the root of Israel to obtain salvation, Rom. 11:17.

⁵² I am inclined to agree with Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), but our interpretation is diametrically opposed to Baur’s.

⁵³ Baur, “Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit zusammenhängende Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung”, 180, emphasis mine: “kein Zweifel darüber seyn, daß dieser Brief seinem Hauptinhalt nach gegen judenchristliche, mit dem Judenthum sehr eng zusammenhängende Grundsätze und Vorurtheile gerichtet ist”.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 188.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 198; see also Acts 18:2.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 200, 202.

⁵⁷ Romans can be read in the opposite way, to indicate that the Jewish-Christian group was a minority in the church.

Romans. The latter were considered brethren by Paul, but he and this group were in opposition to each other because they had different opinions regarding righteousness by the Law versus righteousness by faith.⁵⁸ Drawing parallels to Ebionitism, Baur submits that what was fully developed in this movement was already present among the Roman Jewish Christians, e.g. a dualism, in which the powers that be (Rom. 13:1) were regarded as part of the unclean, demonic realm.⁵⁹ Moreover, “the death of Christ had no principle importance for all Jewish Christians”, Baur states.⁶⁰ Thus the polemic against the Jewish Christians runs throughout Romans. When Paul states that he does not want to build on another’s foundation, Rom. 15:20, Baur interprets this as pertaining to the conflict between Pauline Christianity and Jewish Christianity, not to his Spanish mission, as the context indicates. This peculiar interpretation of Romans shows how dominant the criticism of Jewish Christianity is in Baur’s thinking, and that Jews and Judaism again belong to the negative side of his symbolic world.

Jesus and Judaism

The gist of Paul’s theology is thus the breaking away from the Law and Judaism.⁶¹ Discussing Jesus, on the one hand he acknowledges that Jesus stands on the ground of the Old Testament,⁶² but to Baur such a position could involve difficulties. Baur constantly depicts Christianity in contrast to Jewish legalism, and Jesus says that not an *iota* shall disappear.⁶³ In Baur’s interpretation, Jesus, in contrast to ‘Mosaic-Pharisaic’ religiosity and ethos, represents an inner, consciousness-oriented and universal religion, whereas ‘Mosaismus’ stands for a particularistic and narrowing ethos.⁶⁴ Hence when Jesus sharpens the Law, it is only to counter the Pharisees and their limited interpretation of it. Jesus and

⁵⁸ Baur, “Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit zusammenhängende Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung”, 209.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 223.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 231.

⁶¹ Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*, ed. Ferdinand Friedrich Baur (Leipzig: Fues Verlag, 1864), 128.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 49.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 48.

Christianity do not dissolve the Law but are an *Idealisirung* (idealisation) of it. 'Quality', the inner, the implicit, the attitude (*Gesinnung*),⁶⁵ the Spirit, are placed in contrast to 'quantity', the outward, the deed, the letter. "This is the essential principle of Christianity, and in this insistence on the attitude (*Gesinnung*) as the one thing that the absolute ethical value of a human being consists of, it is substantially new."⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Baur is able to accept the commandments, since he idealises them as referring to a general ethical outlook.⁶⁷ To Baur, this ethos is the kernel of Christianity:

all that can be brought out as the original content of the Christian consciousness of Jesus' Sermon of the Mount is a purely ethical (*rein sittliches*) element. Christianity, as it is found in its original form in the teaching of Jesus, is a religion that breathes the purest ethical Spirit. [The ethical element] as it is, appears as the purest and unadulterated content of Jesus' teaching, as the true substantial kernel of Christianity, to which everything else [...] is related, the foundation on which everything else may be built.⁶⁸

Jesus, therefore, is the true forerunner of spiritualised ethical religion: "Baur's Jesus spiritualizes, and therefore elevates, Judaism in a rather familiar manner. He turns morality inward, elevating inner disposition over Jewish legalism."⁶⁹ This view on Jesus and his teaching becomes the starting point even for Pauline Christianity. Although Paulinism is the real break with Judaism, Paul only stands for what is implicit and fundamental in the teaching of Jesus, but then takes this further: the "essential element of his doctrinal view (*Lehrbegriff*) is the antithesis against Judaism [...] Judaism stands in an absolutely negative relation to Christianity",⁷⁰ Baur contends.

⁶⁵ *Gesinnung* is somewhat difficult to translate into English, but the word covers attitude, posture, mind-set, temperament. I interpret *Gesinnung* as referring to inner attitude in contrast to outward behaviour.

⁶⁶ "Diess ist das wesentliche Princip des Christenthums, und in diesem Dringen auf die *Gesinnung* als das Eine, worin der absolute sittliche Werth des Menschen besteht, ist es ein wesentlich neues," Baur, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*, 51.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 64–65.

⁶⁹ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 72.

⁷⁰ Baur, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*, 132.

Judaism: A Pawn in the Game

To summarise his view of Judaism, Baur understands history on the basis of German idealism,⁷¹ and beneath his description of Jews and Judaism lies his primary agenda of creating an aetiology of early Christianity. Baur's historical heuristics being thoroughly dialectical,⁷² his definition of the Jews is directly dependent on these heuristics. History consists of antipodes and intermediaries, and the interplay or antagonism between these adds momentum to his broadly outlined history. Inspired by Schelling's *System of Transcendental Idealism*, an attempt to reconstruct a history of the development of self-consciousness, and Hegel's dialectical philosophy of history, Baur combines such an idealistic philosophy of history with reflection on human and historical consciousness, as well as epistemology. Although he only admits to his dependence on Hegel later on, even his first imposing work, *Symbolik und Mythologie*, 1824–1825, applies dialectics to the overall understanding of the history of religions.⁷³ His application of idealism is done in an independent way but nevertheless uses a dialectical method.⁷⁴

Rather than being an historical description in a modern sense, Baur depicts Jews and Judaism more as a pawn in the grand spiritual-historical game. Instead of relating something concretely historical, Baur depersonalises and stylises the Jews into an idea or symbol—here the notion 'symbolic Jew' seems appropriate.⁷⁵ However, Baur betrays neither positive nor negative reactions to 'real' Jews, either in the past or present, which is perhaps a consequence of his depersonalising of the Jews. Although Judaism is a higher form of religion than paganism, and especially with its monotheism being the precursor of Christianity, his characterisation of Judaism is almost consistently negative. Judaism is first and foremost the antipode of Christianity. It is superstition; it is abandoned; and the World Spirit has moved into a new phase with

⁷¹ Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume One*, 259.

⁷² This seems evident whenever one reads Baur. For an overarching discussion, see Geiger, *Spekulation und Kritik*.

⁷³ See Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie oder die Naturreligion des Alterthums*, vol. 1–2 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924–25), a work that shows the imposing scope of his knowledge.

⁷⁴ Geiger, *Spekulation und Kritik*, 43; Scholder, "Baur, Ferdinand Christian (1792–1860)", 354.

⁷⁵ Hodgson, *The Formation of Historical Theology*, 221, notes Baur's positive estimation of Judaism, but less so his generally negative depiction of Judaism.

Christianity. A manifestation of this new phase is the Gospel of John, which Baur regarded as an example of a kind of universal Christianity that could never have been produced by a narrow-minded Jew.⁷⁶

The antipodes Christianity and Judaism are linked to a set of other similar oppositions, roughly shaped to fit the scheme: Spirit-Gospel-Freedom versus Law, spiritual versus limited, higher, free ethics versus legalism, faith versus works, universalism versus particularism, elevated versus its opposite in terms of culture and erudition, but also Greek versus Palestinian, Pauline versus Petrine, and Hellenistic versus Hebrew. Characterising the alternatives, Baur uses the terms *Gesetzesreligion-Geistesreligion* (religion of the Law-religion of the Spirit)⁷⁷ to clarify the opposition. The frontier against Judaism was an important one: “opposition to Judaism is the main perspective (*Hauptgesichtspunkt*) from which the apostle looked at Christianity”.⁷⁸

These oppositions describe the fundamentals of Baur’s symbolic world. The *negative antipode* in Baur’s description is fairly well defined by Baur’s frequent references to the Law and Judaism as narrow, as *Mosaismus*, as legalistic and particularistic—we recognise all these terms from earlier Enlightenment exegetes. The *positive antipode* less evidently refers to biblical things, that is, the definitions of words such as ‘Spirit’ and ‘freedom’ should not necessarily be interpreted on the basis of their usage in Pauline texts. In Paul, Spirit or the human spirit, entities that are sometimes difficult to differentiate, refer to the Holy Spirit and a kind of human ‘centre’ that is connected with the Holy Spirit, analogous to ‘inner man’.⁷⁹ Baur refers to a philosophical concept of the Spirit, where the Spirit in a macro-perspective drives history forward, but also to a higher order for human life. Similarly, Christ is more an idea than an historical person—the ideal Christ, “the consciousness of the redemption as a phase in human consciousness”.⁸⁰ This movement from the concrete historical to the idea is typical of Baur. Christianity is a *spiritual* power, the absolute Principle through which

⁷⁶ Harris, *The Tübingen School*, 194.

⁷⁷ F. C. Baur, *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. Zweite, neu durchgearbeitete Ausgabe* (Tübingen: L. Fr. Fues, 1860), 55.

⁷⁸ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, II:198.

⁷⁹ See e.g. Galatians 3–5.

⁸⁰ Friedrich, *Ferdinand Christian Baur als Symboliker*, 49.

the self-consciousness of the Spirit is carried on,⁸¹ where spiritual is understood as inward in contrast to outward. The universalism so often discussed by Baur presupposes and is exemplified by a *spiritualisation* of Judaism, the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy of religion, one example of a departure from particularism. Christianity is the purest universalism.⁸² Through this, Baur strengthens his negative view on Judaism as narrow and historically limited, whereas Christianity is open and actually fulfils history.

Freedom is another keyword in Baur's understanding of Christianity, and is used as an antipode of Judaism. The inner freedom of the Subject as the governing principle of Christianity is an important part of Baur's ethical thinking. To him, ethics (*Sittlichkeit*) are crucial to Christianity, or even *are* Christianity. The Christian faith is accomplished in the spontaneity of the ethical, through the free willpower of man and his innate consciousness.⁸³ This inner freedom of Christianity is contrary to the supposed closedness of Judaism. This also accords with an Orient–Occident dichotomy: the Orient to Baur represents closed, nationalistic systems, whereas the Occident, Europe, especially Greece, is the origin of freedom. The former represents blind obedience, but Greece and Rome put an end to the fetters of old.⁸⁴

This presentation of the fundamental symbols in Baur's symbolic world makes clear that Jews and Judaism symbolise most of the negative antipodes to Baur's core values.

Contextualising Baur's Philosophical Theology

Baur did not live in a vacuum, and his writings must be read with the overarching ideas in mind. From his early years in Blaubeuren, Baur's philosophy, theology and political ideas seem to form a synthesis of the ideals of freedom found in Athens and classical Greek culture. The German political situation also played an important role. Baur cherished dreams of a republican Germany founded on the emancipatory ideas

⁸¹ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 4.

⁸² Geiger, *Spekulation und Kritik*, 74. In dealing with universalism, Baur uses the terminology of Hegel but gives another interpretation.

⁸³ Friedrich, *Ferdinand Christian Baur als Symboliker*, 45.

⁸⁴ Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 69.

of the French Revolution, which were revived once the despotism of Napoleon was thrown off.⁸⁵

Already operating with dichotomic oppositions in his interpretation of the past and present, Baur's historical sweeps pertained not only to a time gone by, but also to an idealistic interpretation of his own time. In a typically Orientalist way, Baur used the analogy of the transition from the Orient to the West, Greece, which he saw as the victory of freedom over an Oriental despotism that was characterised by blind obedience and force. This had a direct bearing on the Greek–Turk conflict in 1821–1830, a liberation war that resembled the ones recently won in Germany, and which could be readily interpreted in terms of the enlightened West in its struggle against the despotic East.⁸⁶ Hegelian-type historiography merged with Philhellene interests both in Greek antiquity and the political present, and university people such as Baur were typical representatives of this kind of liberalism.

The ongoing process in some of the German *Länder* could be interpreted in similar terms. Baur's own Württemberg had moved towards a new, modern constitution,⁸⁷ which included freedom of discussion, political parties and the right to vote for all citizens, irrespective of estate. This was interpreted as a movement from (Oriental-type) despotism to (Greek-type) democracy, although it was hardly conceived of in terms of modern democratic ideals. "The wars of liberation, the foundation of the *Burschenschaft* [nationalistic student league, A.G.], the *Wartburgfest*, Jahn's gymnastic societies and the fight over the constitution of Württemberg: all had melted patriotic and emancipatory hopes together," Hester writes.⁸⁸ This synthesis included a national liberalism with emancipatory dreams and patriotism with a frontier against existing particularism, which meant that the German sphere

⁸⁵ Ernst Rudolf Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789. Band I. Reform und Restauration 1789 bis 1830* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1957), 698. For the mentality of the period, which Baur also seems to represent, see Huber pp. 696–732.

⁸⁶ Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 72–73, 78. On German Philhellenism, which was the strongest in Europe due to the massive classical tradition in Germany, see William St. Clair, *That Greece might still be free. The Philhellenes in the War of Dependence* (London: Oxford U.P., 1972), 60–65.

⁸⁷ B. Gebhardt, "Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte" (Stuttgart: Union Verlag, 1970), 101; Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 70.

⁸⁸ Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 70. On Jahn, see also Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789*, 704–705. The student leagues were committed to the freedom and unity of Germany, being against particularism but for a Christian ethos, Huber, 708.

was fragmented into more than 1800 political units.⁸⁹ When Emperor Franz II laid down his crown in 1806, the empire dissolved into several independent states.⁹⁰ Universalism was the vision of a unification of all these into a viable political unit—here Baur is in agreement with de Wette. Moreover, many liberals, including Baur and those in his circles, were republicans with democratic ideals. This conglomeration of ideas is quite specific to Germany at this time, partly due to the political particularism, but also because the shaking off of the Napoleonic yoke had reignited a spark of hope for a united Germany. In addition to the nationalist and emancipatory ideas, this movement harboured dreams of German greatness and, on the flip side, negative views concerning Jewish influence on Germany. Against this background, it is easy to see the link between politics and theology with regard to the Jews.

The constitution of Württemberg was the most radical in Germany at the time, and Baur was himself an enthusiastic supporter of it. Baur's relative silence with regard to politics probably has to do with a prohibition against academics commenting on political matters, which was issued by the royal government department.⁹¹ Nevertheless, Baur spoke openly against the conservative Austrian policy and warmly of patriotic and emancipatory feelings after the wars of liberation. Here he uses another opposition: Catholic and southern Austria representing the aristocratic-monarchic Sparta, Baur hoped that the Protestant north and Prussia, representing Athens, would guarantee democracy—a remarkable combination of nationalism, Protestantism and democratic ideals.⁹² Langewiesche emphasises precisely this social and political role of the Tübingen theologians: "Religious interpretations of the world pervaded politics and society in the first half of the nineteenth century."⁹³ Although Baur, to his exasperation, was hindered from speaking politically, he often drew parallels between history and the contemporary situation, and he comments on the years after 1815 in his church history.⁹⁴

⁸⁹ Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 47.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

⁹¹ Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 71.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 72.

⁹³ Dieter Langewiesche, "Bildungsbürgertum und Protestantismus in Gesellschaft und Politik: Württemberg in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts", in *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler. 8. Blauberger Symposium*, ed. Ulrich Köpf (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994), 59.

⁹⁴ Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, ed. Klaus

This overview of Baur's highly integrated thinking can help in understanding his view of the Jews. Firstly, Baur frequently refers to the dichotomy of universalism and particularism, a usage that may well have had a political bearing, the Jews in Baur's theology being the *typos* of particularists. In Baur's idealistic-political project, this was the negative counterpart to the desired universalism, and so the rhetoric disfavoured the Jews. Secondly, Baur uses 'Jewish-Christian' as a negative metaphor for aristocratic, theocratic and Roman Catholic,⁹⁵ and what he saw as an essential opposition between Protestant and Roman Catholic had its analogy in the relationship between Christianity and other religions. Roman Catholicism, then, is analogous to the 'bad' side, i.e. primitive religion (*Naturreligion*), Judaism and Islam, whereas Protestantism is analogous to Christianity.⁹⁶ Hester has rightly classified Baur's view as Orientalist,⁹⁷ something that Baur has in common with broad strata of the German philhellenic intelligentsia. Regarding the situation of the Jews in Württemberg, in 1828 the *Land* added a specific law about the 'Israelite adherents', the purpose of which was the education of the Jews. This also gave them citizenship without the right to vote, although a church official was appointed to control their actions.⁹⁸

Baur's symbolic world is thus constructed with a set of dichotomic oppositions that represent fields as different as early Christian historiography, ancient and modern Greek history in Orientalist perspective and contemporary German politics interpreted on the basis of Baur's idealistic ideology. The Jews, not having been influenced by Greek culture, are positioned on the negative side of this opposition, as the symbol of limitedness and narrowness, legalism, particularism and aristocracy/theocracy:

Scholder, vol. 4, *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* (Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1970 (1862)), 113–118.

⁹⁵ Ferdinand Christian Baur, "Die Tübinger Schule und ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart", in *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben. Für und wider die Tübinger Schule*, ed. Klaus Scholder (Tübingen: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1975 (1859)), 75.

⁹⁶ Friedrich, *Ferdinand Christian Baur als Symboliker*, 122.

⁹⁷ Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 74, 78, 80.

⁹⁸ Elbogen and Sterling, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, 195.

Old	New
Orient	Occident
Particularism	Universalism
Palestinian Jewish	Alexandrian Jewish
Peter	Paul
Roman Catholic	Protestant
Southern	Northern
Sparta	Athens
Aristocracy/Monarchy	Democracy/Republic
Austria	Germany
Turks	Greek
etc.	

Here the basic structures of Baur's thinking are given, where the Jews are grouped together with what is negative. This is not surprising: Baur is in accord with feelings that were common in circles close to the *Burschenschaften*, where the Jews held a negative place despite a broad Enlightenment tradition.

To a great extent, this corresponds to Shawn Kelley's description of Baur as furthering a Hegelian, thoroughly racialised view of East and West in modern Protestantism.⁹⁹ A detailed discussion of Hegel and his historical philosophy does not belong here, but Baur's construction of history shares Hegel's (and for that matter, Droysen's)¹⁰⁰ general dialectical aetiology of the emergence of Christianity or the Roman Empire. Despite being influenced as much by popular general ideas as he was by Hegel's specific thought, Hegel, Droysen and Baur share fundamental Orientalist ideas that are inherently racist, presupposing that Jews or Jewish Christians must be influenced by Greek thinking in order to attain 'freedom'. As one of the main architects of such Orientalist thinking in New Testament exegesis, Baur constructed a dialectic where Jews would continue to be the antithesis of everything that Christian theology regarded as valuable. Thus, in spite of his general emancipatory ideas, Baur's historiography resulted in a systematic marginalisation of Jews and Judaism within Enlightenment theology.

⁹⁹ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 33–88.

¹⁰⁰ J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, vol. 1 (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1843); on this see Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*, 245–248.

The Jews (and Jewish Christians) were black pawns in the historical game between opposites, which would lead to German Protestant religion, a new and enlightened ethical religion, pervaded by classical ideals, and with Socrates and Christ as its teachers. In Baur's totally integrated philosophical and political theology, the particularistic Jews were more an obstacle than an asset.

Conclusion

F. C. Baur's thinking is highly integrated, using dialectics both as an overall method and as a heuristic tool. It is no wonder that everything in his intellectual and spiritual world appears as dichotomies. In this dichotomising of reality, Jews and Judaism always end up on the negative side. Nonetheless, this allows for Jews, Judaism and Jewish Christianity to be *included* as a factor, even though they are considered obsolete, which means that Baur's dialectics is different to and more inclusive than Kantian dialectics.

Baur is quite restrictive in his *characterisation* of Jews, and he speaks of Judaism rather than of the Jews. However, he does state that the national character of the Jews is peculiar, having maintained their "obstinate dissimilarity from other peoples" from the beginning. Thus Baur seems to view the Jews as having an unalterable essence and as staying the same throughout history. He also talks about Judaism as being superstition.

As already noted, the *historiography* is a major part of Baur's writing on Jews, largely because he interprets most things in terms of history, and theology is almost identified with history. Baur develops and stereotypes patterns found among earlier scholars, interpreting the development of the prehistory of early Christianity, as well as the development of early Christianity itself, in dialectical terms. Two opposing theses are dissolved into a third. The Alexandrian synthesis formed the seedbed of Christianity, but a similar synthesis reoccurs in early Christianity. The synthesis that came out of the constant opposition between Pauline and Petrine, Hellenism and Hebraism was Christianity, which had been able to elevate itself to higher levels and which prevailed. Similarly to the Enlightenment research tradition in which he stands, Baur sees the Greek enlightenment as taking place in Alexandria, but more than other scholars, he harmonises his ideal figures with each other: Socrates or Plato, and Jesus. As in his research tradition, the historiography is ideal-

istic, and there seems to be a prejudice towards Jews and Judaism at the root of the explanatory models. Once again, the Palestinian Jews had to be lifted out of their narrowness into Alexandria, where purification occurred. Not only is this perfectly unhistorical, but it also mirrors an Orientalist thought: the Greeks, in other words, the Europeans, are the Jews' tutors, teaching them good customs and cultivation. In line with his research tradition, Baur lets the Therapeutae and Essenes plant the purified Judaism in Palestinian soil, and he constructs New Testament history in a similar way.

However, because of the dialectical model, Baur is able to allow for a certain, though not total, *continuity* with Judaism. Having grown in the soil of Judaism, Christianity has a natural relation to Judaism—it is spiritualised Judaism. An important link backwards is monotheism, but there is also a hermeneutical bridge, Philo's way of interpreting the Old Testament. At the same time, however, a *disconnection* of Christianity from Judaism had to occur, through which *Judaism as absolute religion was rejected and its destruction was brought about*. That is, Judaism left on its own had no chance of surviving, which is why all those who truly brought Christianity into its destiny as a world religion were 'converted Hellenists'. The same sharp dissension with Judaism lives on in Paul's dissension with Jewish Christianity, the Petrine type of early Christianity. Thus Baur's dialectics opens for continuity, yet there had to be an abrupt break with the Jewish. Only when fertilised with Greek thought in Pauline Christianity does Jewish Christianity become viable.

Baur's *symbolic world* is a universe of Enlightenment theology, Platonic philosophy and ethics, and world-historical meditations in which the World Spirit takes development to higher spheres, intertwined with political dreams of a united and free Germany. Built on opposites, the stars on his idealistic canopy are: Christian, Platonic, spiritual, freedom, inward, universal, ethical, European, Protestant, democratic, republican, German, a replica of Athens, etc. The 'symbolic Jew' in this projection brings together a range of characteristics on the opposite side: Jewish—being a negative term—Oriental, physical, outward, particularist, nationalist in a narrow sense. Judaism is a pawn in this dialectical game, in which the non-winning side can often be labelled as Jewish.

To my knowledge, Baur did not speak out or act socially or politically against the Jews, which is why we cannot reckon with any direct *legitimation* of negative policies against Jews beyond his theological and ideological statements about the character of Jews and what that involved. However, the Jews being the types of particularism also

has a political bearing, since when Baur wants a pejorative for his dislikes—aristocratic, theocratic, Roman Catholic—he uses ‘Jewish-Christian’. Hence the consistently negative characterisation and its social and political dimensions, even if it does not directly legitimise negative actions, probably supported the continued existence of Jews as second-class citizens, foreigners in a united and free Germany.

DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS:
JUDAISM IN CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY
WITH CHRISTIANITY

Although F. C. Baur was the founder of the modern Tübingen school, its beginning should perhaps be dated from the publication of *Das Leben Jesu* ("Life of Jesus"), written by Baur's 27-year-old student David Friedrich Strauss, in 1835.¹ This book marks a definite break with the old, conservative Tübingen school. Nonetheless, the intellectual foundations of the new Tübingen school were laid by Baur.²

Strauss's book caused not a debate but an earthquake, bold as it was in challenging fundamental Christian convictions. Baur did not support his student Strauss in the midst of the vehement criticism that he faced following the publication of the book, a fact that deeply affected the relationship between Baur and Strauss.³ Nevertheless, they had many basic perspectives in common.

If the role of Hegel in Baur's construct is sometimes disputed, it certainly cannot be in the work of David Friedrich Strauss.⁴ Strauss brought Hegelian method to Tübingen and probably inspired his teacher. In the introduction to his *Glaubenslehre*, Strauss discusses Hegel's religious philosophy extensively, giving his consent,⁵ and *Das Leben Jesu* starts out by describing the development of religions to ever higher stages of maturity and literacy, in a way that is reminiscent of the historical philosophy of Hegel.⁶ The inspiration from Hegel is also

¹ For Baur and his relationship with his students, among them Strauss, see Hester, "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren", 67–68.

² Harris, *The Tübingen School*, 2. Harris's book is devoted both to the various figures of the Tübingen school and to Baur's theology. For the Tübingen school as seen through the eyes of Jewish scholar Abraham Geiger, see Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 106–126.

³ For a background to their relationship and their correspondence, see Horton Harris, *David Friedrich Strauss and his theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 85–116.

⁴ For Hegel's view of Judaism, see Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild*, 24–42.

⁵ David Friedrich Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, vol. I (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1840), 1–24.

⁶ David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 ed., vol. 1 (Tübingen:

evident as Strauss, summarising his two volumes, discusses ‘speculative Christology’.⁷ In *Die Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge in ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Strauss uses a Hegelian scheme:⁸ “opposition between human and divine, and dissolution into something higher”.⁹ This discussion is about Christianity as something spiritual and inward, and his argument has a direct bearing on his view of Judaism, which also seems to have been influenced by the Hegelian approach.

Reconstructing Jewish Past

Reconstructing Jewish past, Strauss places Hebraism and postexilic Judaism in opposition to each other, but as a process of slow degeneration. The opposites do not pertain to the Law as with other theologians, but to the people’s relation to immanence and transcendence. Hebraism at first only concentrated on the immanent world, which Strauss regards as positive.¹⁰ However, the Hebrews did not remain content with the immanent, but yielded to an interest in the transcendent, and this had far-reaching consequences. After the Exile, the people and their religion came under Chaldean and Persian influences: the belief in the angelic and demonic world, and the expectation of a Messiah and a resurrection of the dead.¹¹ Here Strauss falls back on de Wette’s kind of division, where the primordial Hebrew lifestyle is contrasted to what would later be called ‘Late Judaism’, with its Messianism and apocalypticism.

C. F. Osiander, 1837), 1. For this discussion, see Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel* and its discussion of Baur.

⁷ David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 ed., vol. 2 (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1837), 734–737, see also note 2 on p. 734.

⁸ Reprinted in Gotthold Müller, *Identität und Immanenz. Zur Genese der Theologie von David Friedrich Strauss. Eine theologie- und philosophiegeschichtliche Studie. (Including Strauß, D.F.: Die Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge in ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung)*, ed. Max Geiger, vol. 10, Basler Studien zur Historischen und Systematischen Theologie (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1968).

⁹ Beginning *Die Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge in ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*, in Gotthold Müller, *Identität und Immanenz*, 50, and then used as a yardstick to evaluate the religions, *passim*.

¹⁰ Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, 31.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 32.

Continuity and Discontinuity

Strauss's aim in *Das Leben Jesu* is to show what a spiritualised Christianity is like. While Baur's focus is on Paul and the other apostles, Strauss's is on Jesus. Evaluating Jesus' position in relation to the Mosaic religion and the Old Testament, on the one hand he says that the 'Mosaic religious constitution' met its end in the church ordained by Christ, and that Jesus said and did things to support such a view.¹² On the other hand, there are indications that Jesus did not set his mind on overthrowing this religious order.¹³ Strauss enumerates how Jesus observed the Law of the fathers—the Sabbath, pilgrimages, Pesach—stating that his alleged digressions from the Law were only from the coercion of rabbinic interpretations of the Law.¹⁴ Jesus came to fulfil the Law and did not speak against sacrifices, Strauss contends. According to Strauss, some had tried to argue that Jesus had done so out of an ambition to accommodate his people, whereas others maintained that Jesus only expected the moral regulations to be kept, not the ceremonial ones. But he refutes the latter argument with Jesus' words that all of the Law and the Prophets had validity.¹⁵

Instead, Strauss stresses the difference between Mosaic regulation and traditional 'rabbinical' additions,¹⁶ a duality analogous to that between the original 'Hebrew' and the degenerated postexilic religion. This "Pharisaic system of statutes" was mostly concerned with outward things under which "the noble ethical kernel of the Mosaic law was lost". That was the kernel that Jesus valued, and Strauss did not regard Jesus as repudiating the part of the Mosaic law that dealt with morality (*Sittlichkeit*). To Strauss, however, the only essential thing in religion was spiritual worship of God, whereas the ritual was a thing of the past.¹⁷

Here Strauss is clearly different to e.g. Schleiermacher, whose more Kantian dichotomy of Judaism and Christianity could see only discontinuity between Christianity and its Jewish past. Hegelian and Baurian dialectic, on the other hand, regarded Judaism as a preliminary stage

¹² Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 554–556.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 556.

¹⁴ "gezwungene rabbinische Folgerung", *ibid.*, 557.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 559.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 559.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 560–561.

to Christianity; that is, there was a certain continuity between Jesus and the Old Testament. In later editions of *Das Leben Jesu*, Strauss used precisely the Jewish roots of Jesus as an argument for his demythologisation programme, which saw both the Old and the New Testament as being in need of demythologisation.¹⁸ Nevertheless, the fact that Strauss insisted on continuity between Judaism and Christianity marked an important break with part of the Enlightenment theological tradition. This is natural in Hegelian dialectic, which implies that although the thesis and anti-thesis are abandoned, a 'purified form' of them is included in the synthesis.¹⁹

The relationship between Judaism and Christianity being a dialectical one, however, Strauss's standpoint did not mean a rehabilitation of Judaism as such. Instead, discussing Christianity, Strauss works with dialectical opposites and ends with their dissolution into something new. The basic idea of Christianity is a reconciliation (*Versöhnung*) between the intellectual (*sic*) and the visible worlds into a Hegelian monism. That is, Strauss sees man as spiritual, although this should be understood in rational rather than in immaterial terms. The opposite standpoint, Strauss argues, stresses the dualism of transcendence and immanence. Using Hegel's own discussion of these problems, Strauss concludes that Christianity unites the two aspects in the God-Man, Christianity being a religion of unity between the divine and the human.²⁰ As Chalcedonian as this sounds, Strauss views must be interpreted in an idealistic sense, where Jesus is a spiritualised symbol of true universal humanity rather than a God-Man in the classic theological sense. It is this spiritualisation that on the one hand implies an abandonment of everything historical in Judaism except Mosaic ethics, but on the other hand allows Strauss to maintain continuity with the old Hebrews.

Dialectics and the Emergence of Christianity

Strauss tells a similar narrative to Baur about the emergence of Christianity. Observing the tensions in early Christianity, he contends that this dualism originated in that of Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism,²¹

¹⁸ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 213.

¹⁹ So also *ibid.*, 237.

²⁰ Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, 28–29.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 29–30.

although it did not lead to any further development. Within this dualism, there was no power for a religious ‘regeneration’ (*Wiedergeburt*) of the world, and its fruits were nothing but hopelessness and an overstrung state. Only the *connection* between the two Judaisms bred new spiritual life.²² Here Strauss uses the well-established dichotomy of Jewish and Greek, pointing to the historical encounter between Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism as the beginning of something new.

The Hebrew people kept rigidly to the ‘supra-naturalist’ standpoint,²³ but in this Alexandrian encounter between Palestinian and Greek, preparation took place for a new synthesis. Key to this development was a new hermeneutics, at which point Strauss refers to Philo, whose hermeneutics was developed in Alexandria but then used in Palestine. This new way of reading could deal with offensive and difficult things in the Old Testament. It in turn paved the way for a synthesis—a result of Jewish formation having come into contact with Greek culture. However, due to their ‘supra-naturalist’ outlook, the Jews still held on to their history when interpreting the Bible. Only the early Christian church fully adopted allegorical hermeneutics, Strauss maintains.²⁴ Moreover, whereas there is a legalistically motivated disharmony between God and man in the abstract Jewish-Hebrew thinking, the Greek perceives another unity between human and divine.²⁵

Strauss also sees this process in the greater perspective of religious and cultural world history. At this point, the Jewish world-view was ripe for marriage (*Vermählung*) with the Pythagorean-Platonic world-view, amalgamating the Jewish heaven with the Platonic ideal world. The ‘philosophising’ Jews of Alexandria, which were also present in Palestine as Essenes, incarnated both this dualism and the longing for the soul’s deliverance from the material.²⁶ Strauss does not sympathise with this phase, however, nor does he identify Jesus and the apostles with this “sickly spiritualism”. Instead, he portrays a state where the opposition between the Palestinian Jewish and the Alexandrian had been resolved and neutralised. Jesus and the apostles had not “forgotten the sound realism of the old Hebrew religion and ethos”, Strauss contends. Hence, in Strauss’s description, old Hebrew religion stands

²² Ibid., 31.

²³ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 4.

²⁴ Ibid., 6–7.

²⁵ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 202–203.

²⁶ On the Essenes, see also David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 2 ed. (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1864), 178–179.

for something positive, whereas the synthesis in Alexandrian thinking does not. Interestingly, here Strauss differs from Baur, who sees the Alexandrian milieu positively, as the seedbed of Christianity.

In his new popular edition of *Das Leben Jesu*, published in 1864, Strauss vividly describes Judaism as a precondition of Christianity, yet still obsolete—a position not too unlike de Wette's. At this point, Strauss seems to have adopted a more positive view of the encounter in Alexandria. Strauss maintains that Christianity grew in Jewish soil, but the decisive change came when the Greek-Roman spirit came over Judaism. "Judaism had to first be ground in the dreadful mortar of history," be scattered among the peoples and bring home pieces of foreign knowledge, before it could give birth to Christianity. A marriage between Orient and Occident had to take place, and the marriage bed was Alexandria. "If Alexander had not gone before, Christ would not have come after," Strauss states.²⁷ Although Judaism is a precondition of Christianity, it is "not without Alexander", that is, the Greek element lifts narrow Palestinian Judaism to a level where Christianity has the possibility of developing. A parallel to this is when Strauss speaks of Stephen as a Jew who must have been born in a Greek country, who "seems to have understood the meaning of Jesus better than the Palestinian apostles, the *Judenapostel* of Palestine".²⁸ Similar statements can be found *passim* in Strauss's work, indicating a view where Palestinian Judaism is inferior but was "fecundated" by Greek-Roman, foreign thinking.²⁹

Strauss on the Jews

Despite his positive description of Mosaic ethics, Strauss approvingly quotes Baur's description of Judaism as a double Judaism. There is one higher, one lower; spirit and letter; content and form; soul and body. Strauss also uses this dichotomy as an analogy to Christianity's present

²⁷ Ibid., 167–168.

²⁸ Ibid., 217.

²⁹ For a contemporary criticism of *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, see the Jewish scholar Abraham Geiger's review in Abraham Geiger, "Christliche Gelehrsamkeit in Beziehung auf Judenthum", *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 2 (1863). See also Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 109–110, and Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume One*, 244–269. The fecundation motif is also present in Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*.

condition.³⁰ This makes clear that Strauss regards Judaism as a lower, outward religion of the letter, having mere form without content. In his later book *Der alte und der neue Glaube*, Strauss talks of the “hard Jewish tendency to exclude” and places Jewish and Pauline Christianity in sharp opposition to each other,³¹ believing that there was a bitter feud between the two parties: that of the old apostles, who regarded salvation as limited to the descendants of Abraham and insisted on keeping the Law, and that of Paul, who believed that the Law was annulled. The greater Paul’s success was in the Gentile world, the more Jewish “national egotism” (*Nationalegoismus*) grew. It seems as though Strauss, in the years from 1835 to the early 1870s, sharpened his view both of the opposition in early Christianity, and of the Jews.

What by this time is a standard depiction of Judaism as particularistic is present in Strauss as well.³² Christianity purifies the Old Testament with its “mixture of political elements, ceremonial ‘outwardness’ and national particularity”, and Jesus is the representative of such purified religion. To Strauss, only a few Jewish personalities have lifted themselves into a freer, more intimate religion, similar to Christianity.³³ Even in his dissertation, he had pointed to the difference between the Greek religion, which succeeded in solving its fundamental oppositions, and the Jewish, which awaits a future reconciliation of them.³⁴ ‘Judaism proper’, however, represents a constant and irreconcilable opposite of the more spiritual Christianity.

Jewish-Christian Past and German Present

Strauss draws parallels between Jewish-Christian past and German present. German Protestant Christianity has nothing better to offer than “old Jewish ceremonies”:

³⁰ Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, 72 n. 3.

³¹ “mit der äußersten Härte die jüdische Ausschließlichkeit”, David Friedrich Strauss, *Der alte und der neue Glaube. Ein Bekenntnis*, 6 ed. (Bonn: Verlag von Emil Strauß, 1873), 54.

³² Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*, 37, 82.

³³ *Ibid.*, 222.

³⁴ Müller, Gotthold, *Identität und Immanenz*, 55–57.

As long as Christianity views something as given from outside, this spirit-religion (*Geistesreligion*) is itself non-spiritual, *understood in a Jewish way*, seeing Christ as coming from heaven, his Church as the place for removing the sins of man by his blood.³⁵

Judaism is depicted as the opposite of the Christianity in the ongoing reformation that Strauss envisions, and he talks of a law religion equal to Jewish law religion, which is in need of reformation.³⁶ With such statements about Judaism as the constant opposite of true Christianity, Strauss helped preserve the caricature of Judaism.

Strauss's picture of Judaism, as well as the whole scholarly approach, is similar to Hegel's.³⁷ However, whereas Hegel takes a clear stand in favour of the emancipation of the Jews,³⁸ Strauss speaks against it.³⁹ He notes that there is persecution of Jews but finds it quite natural because of how Jews treat the farmers in particular.⁴⁰ Strauss contends that the Jews were separated from all other peoples not only by descent, but also because they regard themselves as being above other peoples.⁴¹ Such a "people within the people", such a "separate organism", cannot be accepted, and the Jews cannot without great difficulties be incorporated into the "modern state"⁴²—they float as oil on water. Moreover, the Jews have certain weaknesses, he claims, airing traditional anti-Semitic prejudice: they avoid hard manual labour, they haggle, they have no feeling of honour, etc., even if these things are the result of mistreatment by Christians.⁴³ Such faults could only be cured through freedom to intermarry, the *Kon nubium*: "only a *mixing of races* [*sic*] would be capable of" eliminating such negative tribal peculiarities of the Jews.⁴⁴ Only when Christians intermarry with Jews will such patterns change. Strauss thus argues for a change in existing confessional legislation to allow such mixed marriages.⁴⁵ By thinning out Jewish blood with Christian blood, Strauss hopes that Jews will change. In this discussion, Strauss

³⁵ *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, xviii, emphasis added.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, xvii–xviii.

³⁷ See Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild*, 24–42.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 41–42.

³⁹ David Friedrich Strauss, "Judenverfolgung und Judenemanzipation", *Jahrbücher der Gegenwart* 30, no. April (1848).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 118.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 118.

⁴² *Ibid.*, also discussed in Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 224–229.

⁴³ Strauss, "Judenverfolgung und Judenemanzipation", 119.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 119.

⁴⁵ Beckmann, *Die fremde Wurzel*, 225–228.

touches upon the mid-eighteenth-century racist doctrines of German racial unity (*germanische Blutseinheit*), where Jewish blood was regarded as foreign, although most anti-Semitic ideologists would resist Strauss's idea of blood mixing.⁴⁶ The above statement is the most overtly racist statement of this entire discussion, prior to the exegetes of National Socialism.⁴⁷

Conclusion

Although Strauss's depiction of Jews and Judaism changed in the course of his long scholarly production, some structures seem to have prevailed. In line with his Hegelian dialectic, he sees a movement from lower to higher, whereas in the synthesis of opposites, some of these opposites remain. Thus Strauss does not see a strict dichotomy between Judaism and Christianity, or Old and New Testament, but he holds that the value of Mosaic ethics remains. On the other hand, and perhaps due to a changed mind over time, Strauss is able to combine this relatively high degree of continuity between Judaism and Christianity with overtly racist statements.

Strauss's *characterisation* of Jews follows the lines of Enlightenment exegesis first of all: Christianity is higher, Judaism lower; Judaism is disharmony between God and man; legalism; letter, form, body and outward religion; and there is a national Jewish egotism. Entering modern political discourse, Strauss also talks of Jews having negative tribal peculiarities and foreign blood. Strauss seems to have hardened his attitude towards Jews over the years.

The *historiography* of Jewish past offers some new perspectives. Although Strauss does put Hebraism and postexilic Judaism in opposition, the tension is not about the Law but between immanence and transcendence. He also has the idea of an Alexandrian synthesis, focusing on Philo's new hermeneutics, which was used in Palestine and in fact came to fruition in Christianity. Looking at Strauss's entire

⁴⁶ Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners. Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, 66. See also Sterling, *Judenhass*, 101–102, regarding Strauss's ideas of the Jews having Asiatic-Jewish blood, whereas the Christian 'principle' had gone over into European blood. To the Left Hegelians, Strauss included, the emancipation of humanity requires "a self-elimination of the 'Jewish essence'", 104.

⁴⁷ On Strauss (and Schleiermacher), see also Halvor Moxnes, "Den historiske Jesus i nasjonalismens tidsalder", *Norsk teologisk tidsskrift* 3 (2000).

production, however, he wavers on the role of Alexandria in the development of Christianity. It is clear that Alexandria always plays a role and that Palestinian Judaism needs to be elevated by Greek influence, but Strauss is more willing than others to situate a viable Christianity in Palestine. Likewise, he is able to speak positively of Jesus as a Jewish person. Thus, Judaism is a precondition of Christianity, but “not without Alexander”. A general tendency in Strauss, however, is his opposition to transcendentalism and “sickly spiritualism”, which he also finds in the Alexandrian milieu.

Strauss stresses *continuity* rather than *discontinuity* between Judaism and Christianity. Jesus is Jewish, observes the Law, the Sabbath, pilgrimages and Pesach, and he came to fulfil the Law. On the other hand, Strauss contends that the “Mosaic religious constitution” became obsolete after the appearance of the church of Christ, although he then regards it as something similar to postexilic religion. There was still a certain continuity between Jesus and the Old Testament. However, to Strauss, the Old Testament had to be purified of other, later amalgamations, and due to a process of degeneration, Judaism emerged as something different from the religion of the Hebrews. It is here that Strauss criticises a negative longing for transcendence in Judaism, adding foreign apocalyptic and Messianic ideas. He then speaks of double Judaism, a traditional picture of Judaism as a low and legalistic religion, and of Jews as hagglers who avoid hard labour, even of Jews as a foreign organism. Nevertheless, even though he seems ambiguous with regard to Jews and Judaism, Strauss’s insistence on a continuity between Judaism and Christianity marked an important break with part of the Enlightenment theological tradition.

Hegelian philosophy being prominent in Strauss’s *symbolic world*, he stresses the “opposition between human and divine, and dissolution into something higher”. Christianity is spiritual and inward, but Strauss does not appreciate an unchecked spiritualism. It is in this context that he talks of the sound realism of the old Hebrew religion and ethos, in general seeing this religion as representing something positive. He regards Jesus as a spiritualised symbol of humanity, however. Strauss’s frontier against the transcendent has to do with his disgust at such things as the angelic and demonic world, and the expectation of a Messiah. The ‘symbolic Jew’ is not all that easy to place in his symbolic world. On the one hand, the Hebrew and Jewish stand for positive things, even if Judaism is a kind of depraved form of Hebraism. Jesus and the apostles are presented as Jewish, and Strauss very surprisingly ‘allows’ Jesus to

retain his Jewish customs, thus constructing the 'symbolic Jew' as fairly positive. The Law seen as 'high' Mosaic ethics are also a necessary part of his symbolic world. It is the transcendent and apocalyptic Judaism that Strauss regards as a degeneration. Seen as a whole, Strauss's picture of Jews and Judaism is thus fairly ambiguous.

The negative part of Strauss's picture of Jews and Judaism probably accounts for his severity towards contemporary 'real Jews' and his racist remarks. Strauss also uses Judaism as a pejorative category when criticising legalism in contemporary Protestantism. Since his positive 'symbolic Jew' belongs to a bygone time, it is possible to treat contemporary Jews harshly, desiring their Jewish blood to be purified by German blood. Late in his production, therefore, Strauss *legitimises* racist policies, taking a strong stand against the emancipation of the Jews. They are a "people within the people", a "separate organism", who avoid hard manual labour, haggle, have no feeling of honour, etc.—and only the thinning out of Jewish blood can eliminate these negative tribal peculiarities. Strauss's views in this context are surprisingly callous and in some ways contradict his other views, which are rather more favourable towards Jews than those held by many of his exegetical colleagues.

ALBRECHT RITSCHL:
KULTURPROTESTANTISMUS AND THE JEWS

An apostate of the Tübingen school, Albrecht Ritschl would become a predominant ideologist of *Kulturprotestantismus* (cultural Protestantism),¹ which grew to be a leading cultural and religious force in the *Kaiserreich*. Theology was adapted to this project, among other things, and the Jews, even at the beginning of the empire a group of second-class citizens, would by the end of the 1870s become the target of fierce and programmatic anti-Semitism.

The eagerly awaited nation-state was established in 1870/71, Kaiser Wilhelm I being its monarch and the founder of the empire, and Otto von Bismarck being the national hero of a 'political Protestantism'.² The empire's foundation was interpreted as a completion of the Reformation and an achievement by Protestant Prussia.³ Because this religion was the main 'interpretive culture' of the empire, and Protestantism was regarded as the cement that could keep the various classes and groups of the newborn nation-state together, leading Protestants had a unique role, and none more so than Albrecht Ritschl.⁴

Ritschl's programme was opportune enough to bring about a conciliation of (liberal) Protestant tradition and the ideals of the cultural bourgeoisie.⁵ The main achievement of the liberal theology that thrived at the end of the nineteenth century was the successful synthesis between rationalism, religion and renewed nationalism, which served the national project of the *Kaiserreich* well.⁶ Although the liberals opposed the idea of a Christian state in the sense of conservative confessional circles or the ultramontane Catholics, their dream was a *Kaiserreich* that was

¹ The term was coined by its opponents, Manuel Zelger, "Modernisierte Gemeinde-theologie. Albrecht Ritschl 1822–1889", in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992), 183.

² Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "Protestantische Theologie in der Gesellschaft des Kaiserreichs", in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992), 12.

³ Ibid., 20–21.

⁴ Ibid., 14–15.

⁵ Ibid., 84.

⁶ Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany*, 161.

dominated by Christian ethics, without being ruled by an organisational church.⁷ In Richard Rothe's words, "The ecclesiastical stage in the historical development of Christianity has passed and gone, and the Christian spirit has entered its ethical, that is, its political stage."⁸ Christianity was to rule as a spiritual power in the state.

The place of the Jews, however, was basically the same in the liberal as in the confessional or Catholic vision. For Jews, a Christian state meant relinquishing their religion if they wanted to be assimilated,⁹ or living as second-class citizens, for example, not being admitted to public posts, army training or the field of education.¹⁰ This was the policy supported by Bismarck himself, as well as by liberal Protestants.¹¹ This group had as little understanding for Jewish particularity as anyone else. Their flagship journal, the *Christliche Welt*, demanded that Jews—not orthodox or Zionist, but liberal Jews—give up their singularity and become fully part of Christian society. Their failure to do so was met with a complete lack of understanding on the part of Christian liberals.¹² The reason was that national liberalism required assimilation. From early on, liberal Christianity had been a twin to this national liberal project, dreaming of a united Germany, where particularistic groups had been assimilated into the body of the people. The refusal of even liberal Jewish groups to assimilate was a thorn in the flesh to liberal Christianity.

Such particularistic behaviour was in direct opposition to theologians like Ritschl, who argued that Christianity was called to spiritual dominion in the world, for instance ruling over "Judaism with its national segregation and confining ceremonialism dating from the Pharisees at the time of Jesus".¹³ This Christian rule in all areas of life meant that Jews were marginalised, even if the rule was not through any outward power but through indirect Christian influence.¹⁴ Protestant liberals, for instance, hindered 'particularist' schools such as the Jewish ones.¹⁵ In

⁷ Ibid., 167.

⁸ Ibid., 167.

⁹ Ibid., 156.

¹⁰ Ibid., 135.

¹¹ Ibid., 141, 221.

¹² Ibid., 163.

¹³ Ibid., 169.

¹⁴ Ibid., 170–172.

¹⁵ Ibid., 176.

sum, liberal Protestantism in a state where this was the fundamental ideology, with its exclusive Christian and authoritarian approach, became an oppressive force against Judaism in the last decades of the nineteenth century, at the same time as anti-Semitism flourished and Jewish identity was placed within narrow limits. Jews felt what they called “levelling without freedom”, in a situation where “German liberalism tended to suppress [socially and religiously particularistic, A.G.] groups”.¹⁶

Ritschl's vision was for Protestantism to gain spiritual dominion in a state where Christianity and culture were identical, and the state was an immanent kingdom of God governed by Christian ethical ideals. Such a view also explains his neo-Kantian theology, which seems to marginalise Jews in a more radical way than had the dialectical thinking of his former teacher Baur. After his training in Bonn and Halle, and promotion in Heidelberg and Tübingen, Ritschl taught New Testament in Bonn. In Tübingen he had become part of the Tübingen school, which led to the first edition of his groundbreaking book *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (“The Origin of the Old Catholic Church”), in 1850. However, as early as in the second edition of 1857, he took a stand against Baur and his school,¹⁷ his criticism being that the Tübingen approach was more committed to Hegel's philosophy than to unbiased work with the sources.¹⁸ Ritschl's interest was in the text and the church as the New Testament's context, and he wanted a less idealistic view of history than the Tübingen school.

To some extent, this also pertained to his treatment of Christianity and the Jews. Ritschl's views became generally influential. In addition to the scholars of the ‘Ritschlian school’, several of the leading figures

¹⁶ Ibid., 294–295.

¹⁷ Albrecht Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*, Zweite, durchgängig neu ausgearbeitete Auflage ed. (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1857), v.

¹⁸ Hermann Timm, *Theorie und Praxis in der Theologie Albrecht Ritschls und Wilhelm Herrmanns. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Kulturprotestantismus*, ed. Heinz Eduard Tödt and Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, vol. 1, Studien zur evangelischen Ethik (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1967), 31. According to Rolf Schäfer, “Ritschl, Albrecht 1822–1889/Ritschlsche Schule”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 222, the reason for the conflict between Baur and Ritschl was that Baur refused to let Ritschl write about the newly found letters of Ignatius of Antioch, since Baur feared that Ritschl would be too conservative in his evaluation of them. This caused Ritschl to break with Baur and the whole school.

in the History of Religions school had been his students,¹⁹ although the latter group would protest against the theology of their teacher. The immanentist understanding of Christianity that he developed under the auspices of the bourgeois state would in fact encourage later theologians to develop a more transcendentalist understanding—‘consistent eschatology’ could perhaps be regarded as one such reaction.

Ritschl on the Jews and Judaism

According to Susannah Heschel, Ritschl’s contribution meant that “a new and radical exclusion of the Jewish from early Christianity began to grow in New Testament scholarship”.²⁰ Although it seems difficult to evidence in clear terms, this is the general tendency of his view on Judaism.

In comparison to how the Baurian school described Judaism—in dialectical terms, which implies that the thesis and antithesis are at least present in the synthesis—Ritschl’s approach is more black-and-white. The result is a view where Judaism is of no consequence to the development of the church, even if the Old Testament is important.²¹ Ritschl’s historical work *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, begins with an exegetical study of apostolic times, discussing Jesus’ view of the Mosaic law as the main problem of the apostolic era.²² Firstly, Ritschl looks at how Mark describes Jesus’ dealings with the Law, where he defends the breaking of the Sabbath by the disciples, thereby demonstrating that the Law is no longer binding for them as part of the kingdom of God.²³ But in Ritschl’s view, Jesus has a double strategy. On the one hand, he acknowledges the Law before the people, but on the other hand, he regards the Mosaic law as obsolete for the kingdom of God, although he only reveals this to his disciples, not wanting to

¹⁹ Graf, “Protestantische Theologie in der Gesellschaft des Kaiserreichs”, 84–85, 90; Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft*, 258; Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 97.

²⁰ Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 123.

²¹ Schäfer, “Ritschl, Albrecht 1822–1889/Ritschlsche Schule”, 225.

²² Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 27. I regard this as the main source for Ritschl’s view of the New Testament, since his other work concentrates on later church history and systematic theology. This discussion pertains only to the second edition.

²³ *Ibid.*, 29.

instigate a revolution. Jesus only saw what deals with the highest goals of humanity as binding—the twofold commandment of love—whereas he was indifferent to the laws concerning the Sabbath and sacrifices, and regarded regulations on purity as futile.²⁴ Thus Jesus did not abrogate the Law but abolished everything that did not accord with the ‘higher principle’ of the kingdom.²⁵ Secondly, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus says that no part of the Law will perish, including the ceremonial law. However, Ritschl interprets the command as pertaining to the Law as “*developed and interpreted by the prophets* for the sake of righteousness”, thus avoiding a binding ceremonial law.²⁶ Although he does maintain that the disciples were part of Israel, Ritschl sees the kingdom of God as a higher order, where the Law is abrogated due to the fulfilling of the Law through Jesus.²⁷ In practice, Ritschl lets his Pauline understanding of the relationship between law and faith govern his interpretation of Jesus here.

Ritschl differed strongly from the Tübingen school in his view on the relationship between Paul and the other apostles. Whereas Baur contended that there was a fundamental opposition between the Pauline and the Jewish-Christian, Petrine parties, Ritschl argues that there was no such opposition.²⁸ Although the disciples of Jesus were aware of the universality of Christianity, just like Paul they see the absoluteness of the revelation in Jesus.²⁹ Ritschl does not accept the idea that Paul differentiates between the ceremonial and ethical dimensions of the Law—neither of them is able to achieve righteousness.³⁰ Moreover, the Old Testament is not only acknowledged by Ritschl, but he strongly emphasises the connection between the Old and New Testaments:³¹ Paul pointed the Gentile Christians to this as the document of all divine revelation.³²

²⁴ Ibid., 32–33.

²⁵ Ibid., 47.

²⁶ Ibid., 36–37.

²⁷ Ibid., 51.

²⁸ Ibid., 51.

²⁹ Ibid., 48.

³⁰ Ibid., 75.

³¹ Alf Özen, “Die Göttinger Wurzeln der ‘Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule’”, in *Die ‘Religionsgeschichtliche Schule’. Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*, ed. Gerd Lüdemann, *Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), 32.

³² Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 103.

Jewish Christianity

Ritschl reinterprets Jewish Christianity as something outside the heart of apostolic Christianity. The depiction of the Jewish Christians in the Tübingen school is unfounded, he argues, criticising the use of 'Ebionitism' for Jewish Christianity, and also questioning the connection with the Essenes.³³ To Ritschl, Jewish Christianity is something different than to e.g. Semler and Schleiermacher: it is not to be found within the circle of the apostles, but only outside of it.³⁴ In his discussion of what Jewish Christianity is and is not, Ritschl begins by pointing out the terminological difficulties of 'Jewish Christianity', questioning the views of the Tübingen school.³⁵ Whereas (Adolph) Schliemann wanted to define Jewish Christianity as that which brought foreign (*unbehörige*) elements into Christianity, Ritschl contends that with the definitions used, Paul or Barnabas could be called Jewish-Christian. These definitions do not consider the kind of Jewish influence that was deemed to be illegitimate.³⁶

To Ritschl, Jewish Christianity is what the letter of Barnabas describes: those who claim that "their covenant is also ours" (*Ep. Barn.* 4:6), or in Ritschl's words, who argue, "The Law that God has given through Moses is also the spirit of Christianity (*das Wesen des Christentums*)". Ritschl warns against identifying the Old Testament too strongly with Judaism, since Paul recognises "a point of identity between the Old and the New Testaments". However, the continuity that Paul sees with Christianity is with the divine promises but in opposition to the Mosaic law.³⁷ Methodically, Ritschl contends that Protestant historical research can only find its description of Jewish Christianity in canonical sources. He then proceeds to describe the Christianity of the Letter of James, the first Petrine letter and the Apocalypse. James, he argues, is not a document of Jewish Christianity but sees the perfect law in contradiction to the Mosaic law. Although his letter has the imprint of the Old Testament, it is not Judaistic.³⁸ Ritschl also differentiates between classic Old Testament religion before and after Ezra, calling the latter

³³ Ibid., 104–105.

³⁴ Ibid., 107.

³⁵ Ibid., 104.

³⁶ Ibid., 106.

³⁷ Ibid., 106–107.

³⁸ Ibid., 115.

Epigonenthum, a poor imitation of the original, which James's letter is not affected by. First Peter is not Jewish-Christian either—when Peter preaches Christian conduct, this is the lifestyle of the old covenant people, but without any observation of the Law.³⁹ The same is true for the Apocalypse of John, despite its Judaistic colouring, and Ritschl mentions its agreement with Paul. In this way, Ritschl manages to 'free' the entire first apostolate from the charge of being Jewish-Christian, as well as remove this conflict from the apostolic heart of early Christianity. Fundamental to his analysis is his firm resolve to keep anything Jewish and 'legalistic' at a distance.

Ritschl acknowledges that the apostles and their church in Jerusalem were 'born Israelites' and observed the Law, but as a matter of principle, they, like Jesus, were indifferent to the Law.⁴⁰ He distinguishes between the Jerusalem apostles and the rigorous (*streng*) Jewish Christians, however; James, Peter and John did not subscribe to the demand that Gentiles be circumcised, and the Council of the Apostles led the apostles, including Paul, to assume a common frontier against the Jewish-Christian positions.⁴¹ In short, Ritschl seems intent on demonstrating that although they kept the Jewish custom, to the *Urapostel* it had a different meaning than to the Jewish Christians.⁴² The former regarded faith in Christ as the only condition for entering into the new covenant, while keeping the view that the promises were given to the people. If they went to the temple, it was to teach.⁴³ In contrast, the Jewish Christians wrongly exploited the name of the apostles by demanding that there be no Christianity outside of the Jewish people. Ritschl then goes on to describe his view of the later development of Jewish Christianity in its opposition to Gentile Christianity. In his thinking, the latter is not Paulinism, as had been suggested by the Tübingen school;⁴⁴ instead, Gentile Christianity stood in opposition to the teaching of Paul and the apostles, exemplified by the Letters of Clement.

Thus, with a different manoeuvre from Baur, Ritschl manages to maintain a unity between Paul and the other apostles, in Baur being stern opponents, but in Ritschl being almost fully united. From an

³⁹ Ibid., 119.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 124–125.

⁴¹ Ibid., 127–128, 133.

⁴² Ibid., 147.

⁴³ Ibid., 124.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 273.

historical point of view, this position may of course be easily criticised as a construction based on certain theological interests, to which end he had to maintain that James, Peter and their groups kept the Mosaic law in a somewhat more 'spiritual' manner than what he describes as the rigorous Jewish-Christian group. Ritschl makes the latter the typical Jewish group—legalistic, narrow, nationally limited—whereas all the apostles were able to grasp the gospel of salvation through faith. In sum, although Ritschl did renew biblical studies with a more historical outlook than his more philosophical Tübingen colleagues, his own theological perspective shines through.

Baur's comment on Ritschl's first edition of *Die Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche* is enlightening, Baur regarding it as a deviation from his own view on Judaism. Ritschl's position is too hard, Baur writes: "he in fact completely denies that Judaism is capable of developing".⁴⁵ Thus where Baur sees a continuity with Judaism, despite considering it an abandoned stage, Ritschl sees only oppositions. From the outset, Ritschl displaces the Jewish-Christian force in early Christianity with which earlier scholars had reckoned, thus marginalising so-called Jewish Christianity in earliest church history and rendering the Jews and Judaism of little or no consequence to the subsequent development of Christianity. This is done in a subtle way, however: Jesus never publicly abrogated the Law,⁴⁶ and although it was not heartfelt, the apostles kept an outward observance of the Law. To use Deines's description, Judaism was insignificant to Christianity because the New Testament was the direct and legitimate continuation of the Old Testament.⁴⁷ This displacing of Jewish Christianity is parallel to the de facto rejection of e.g. the Sabbath and purity regulations, which Ritschl finds in Mark. Jewish Christianity and therefore Judaism are in effect radically marginalised in a way that is quite different from Baur's thinking: Jesus and the apostles in fact abrogated everything Jewish, whereas the Jewish-Christian sect continued to strive for obedience to the Law for Jewish and Gentile Christians alike. Heschel summarises:

⁴⁵ Letter to Zeller, quoted after Harris, *The Tübingen School*, 220.

⁴⁶ Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 125.

⁴⁷ Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 98.

Ritschl created a picture of an early Jesus movement united in a goal of eliminating Jewish elements; these were viewed by all the apostles, he contended, as influences to be combatted.⁴⁸

One of Ritschl's lasting contributions is his more historical approach to theology, which began to break away from the idealistic and Hegelian *historical-philosophical* models. This approach resulted in a whole new exegetical school, even though it grew into something quite different to that of its master. Out of one group of *Ritschlianer* came what is known as the 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule', the History of Religions school.⁴⁹ However, Ritschl's, and the cultural Protestant, view on the Jews is perhaps evidenced more in the work of his protégé Adolf von Harnack, who became more well-known than his teacher.⁵⁰

Conclusion

Albrecht Ritschl's scholarly work impresses with its consistency and innovative character. *Characterising* the Jews and Judaism, he maintains a strong and clear frontier against anything Jewish, which is seen in his efforts to keep Jewish Christianity out of the apostolic circle. Judaism is characterised by national segregation, confining ceremonialism and legalism. To Ritschl, Jewish Christianity is typically Jewish: rigorous, legalistic, narrow and nationally limited. And the Jewish-Christian sect continued to demand obedience from Jewish as well as Gentile Christians. In other words, Ritschl furthers time-honoured stereotypes and also seems to regard these traits as being essential to Jews. The pre-Christian *historiography* of the Jews is no great feature in Ritschl, but he seems to accept the traditional idea of a classic Old Testament religion, which after Ezra develops into a poor imitation of the former (*Epigonenium*). In his description of early Christianity, Ritschl breaks the

⁴⁸ Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 123.

⁴⁹ Having been won for theology, especially Ritschl's own kind, these scholars later turned from Ritschl, developing understandings of Christianity that were quite different in many ways, Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 25.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of Harnack's dispute with Jewish scholarship, especially Leo Baeck, sparked by his *Das Wesen des Christentums*, see Christian Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, vol. 61, *Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 131–139.

tradition of e.g. Baur, seeing a split in the apostolic group, although he abstains from other historical speculations. In Baur's view, he was too hard on Judaism when he denied its capacity to develop.

Ritschl maintains *continuity* with the Old Testament and even Judaism, although in reality he abrogates the latter. The Old Testament is important to Ritschl and he stresses the relationship between the testaments, but he is unwilling to identify the Old Testament with Judaism, which he sees as being different. He explains the fact that Jesus and the apostles were Jews who observed Jewish customs, and that Jesus never publicly abrogated the Law, by stating that this was an outward observance and that they were actually indifferent to the Law. In this way, Ritschl disregards the actual evidence of Jesus and his apostles' adherence to Jewish customs and is able to render Judaism obsolete.

Baur regarded Ritschl as fairly conservative, and in Ritschl's *symbolic world* the Old and New Testaments were important factors. However, Christianity had a political dimension, and being a dominant voice in guaranteeing the ethical voice of Christianity in the new German Reich was also important. The 'symbolic Jew' in Ritschl's thinking is quite similar to the one found in earlier research tradition: legalistic, narrow, rigorous, ceremonial. But the neo-Kantian theology, which involved a sharper dualism than Baur's dialectical approach, may perhaps have allowed the Jews less space. Keeping the 'Jew' out of Christianity—and its core, consisting of Jesus and the apostles—and limiting his influence in the national state was a necessity.

Hence, when Ritschl talks about Judaism "with its national segregation and confining ceremonialism, dating from the Pharisees at the time of Jesus", his analysis, although rooted in the apostolic time, is one of how the Jews' essential character is again manifested in cultural-Protestant Germany. Ritschl's liberal Protestant state had no place for Jews who upheld their cultural and religious integrity. Their systematic marginalisation in his theology probably helped to preserve oppressive social structures that marginalised Jews at a time when the questions of 'Jew' and 'Judaism' became increasingly heated in German public life.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS SCHOOL AND THE JEWS—AN HISTORICAL TURN?

The History of Religions school (Religionsgeschichtliche Schule) both was and was not an historical turn with regard to the picture of the Jews. While some of its proponents more or less furthered the idealistic historiography found as early as in Semler into the twentieth century, new approaches and findings paved the way for new ways of doing exegesis. The school marked—or wished to mark—an historical turn in the understanding of Christianity: “Religion is history” was the slogan, formulated by one of its fathers, Bernhard Duhm (1847–1928).¹ And if religion was history, Christianity could not be understood apart from the religious matrix in which it developed. This pertained not least to Judaism. The confession of the History of Religions school was that New Testament studies were part of the historical sciences;² this approach meant that instead of only seeing the New Testament and earliest Christianity in relation to the Old Testament, *all* contemporary literary material should be taken into consideration. And new materials changed the picture of Judaism, especially the findings and publishing of Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The first translation of the *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* by Kautsch, for example, was only published in 1898.

The name ‘Religionsgeschichtliche Schule’ may imply more of a unified school, as well as more about what the various ‘members’ stood for, than what is the case.³ The majority of these people were

¹ Özen, “Die Göttinger Wurzeln der ‘Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule’”, 32–33.

² Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 141 n. 38 quoting Bousset.

³ On the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, see Gerd Lüdemann, “Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule”, in *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Moeller, *Göttinger Universitätschriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), Lüdemann and Schröder, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, Gerd Lüdemann, “Die ‘Religionsgeschichtliche Schule’ und die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft”, in *Die “Religionsgeschichtliche Schule”. Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*, ed. Gerd Lüdemann, *Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), Gert Lüdemann and Alf Özen, “Religionsgeschichtliche Schule”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997). Lüdemann notes that it is not easy to place their exegetical principles under one common denominator, Lüdemann, “Die ‘Religionsgeschichtliche

also part of the 'kleine Göttinger Fakultät' (small Göttingen faculty), a group that was more or less influenced by Albrecht Ritschl.⁴ At the outset, the History of Religions school was predominantly a movement within New Testament studies.⁵ It became influential through its many publications in particular,⁶ with many important religious texts being edited and published. The ideas of the school also became influential through some of the second-generation scholars that were indebted to the school. Although Rudolf Bultmann would later break with 'liberal theology' and the History of Religions school, the structures of his work are to a great extent based on its approach and fundamentals.

Two representatives of the school deserve special attention due to their work on Jews and Judaism in relation to the New Testament: Wilhelm Bousset for his book on the religion of the Jews, and Johannes Weiss for his attempt to place Jesus in his religio-historical background.

Schule' und die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", 9. See also Carsten Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösmythos*, vol. 78, *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), with his profound insider criticism of the school and its methods. On the origin of the name, see Lüdemann, "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule", 335–336.

⁴ The names most often included in the school are Wilhelm Bousset, Albert Eichhorn, Hermann Gunkel, Ernst Troeltsch, Johannes Weiss, William Wrede, Heinrich Hackmann, and later also Rudolf Otto and Wilhelm Heitmüller; earlier Alfred Rahlfs, too, is included, see Lüdemann, "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule", 325. Özen, "Die Göttinger Wurzeln der 'Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule'", 23–24. Rahlfs's main interest would, however, become the Septuagint studies, Lüdemann, "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule", 330 n. 32.

⁵ Apart from the church historian Eichhorn, all members of the school, including Gunkel, were New Testament scholars, and the dominant issue was how to understand the New Testament against the background of neighbouring religions. The high linguistic and historical competence of the school and its teachers, e.g. Paul de Lagarde (1827–1891), Julius Wellhausen and Ulrich Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, contributed to its success. See A. F. Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Ton Bolland, 1973), 306.

⁶ E.g. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (RGG), the *Göttinger Bibelwerk* commentary series, the *Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbücher*, published for the purpose of addressing vital questions pertaining to religion in an uncompromising manner. The scholarly series *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (FRLANT), as well as the journals *Theologische Rundschau* and *Christliche Welt*, also belonged to the publications that emanated from the school. See Nittert Janssen, "Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung. Breitenwirkung durch Vorträge und 'gemeinverständliche' Veröffentlichungen", in *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, ed. Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987). These publications could be vehemently criticised, Klaus Berger, "Nationalsoziale Religionsgeschichte. Wilhelm Bousset 1865–1920", in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1993), 281.

As will be demonstrated, these two influential scholars had much in common, but there are fundamental oppositions in their approach—a fact that in one way relativises the thought of a school. Interestingly, it is precisely their different historiographical approaches that meant that Bousset's picture of the Jews remained predominantly in line with the research tradition described above, whereas Weiss's approach envisioned and implemented a methodological shift. In fact, this comparison of the two scholars points to one of the most important shifts in methodology within New Testament exegesis and in ways of dealing with Jews and Judaism.

Bousset and Weiss on the Jews

The study of Israel, the Jews and Judaism was fundamental to the History of Religions school, and the leading work of Julius Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, was highly esteemed by its members.⁷ Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920) would write the textbook on Judaism that prevailed for a long time, although his inspiration also came from Emil Schürer,⁸ Bernhard Duhm, Paul de Lagarde and William Wrede⁹—according to Ernst Troeltsch, de Lagarde in particular strongly impacted the group.¹⁰ Johannes Weiss (1863–1914) shared much of Bousset's background and general theological outlook, and belonged to the same political circles. Their rather opposite perspectives of Jews and Judaism were the result of different methodological and philosophical perspectives.

Both scholars received theological training in Göttingen under Albrecht Ritschl, and Bousset in particular was inspired by Ritschl to

⁷ Özen, “Die Göttinger Wurzeln der ‘Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule’”, 38.

⁸ Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (several editions, partly revised).

⁹ On de Lagarde, see e.g. Otto Merk, “Paul Anton de Lagarde und die Theologie in den ersten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jahrhunderts”, in Walter Grundmann, *Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, ed. Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007), which, however, tones down de Lagarde's influence, 29–30.

¹⁰ Karsten Lehmkuhler, *Kultus und Theologie. Dogmatik und Exegese in der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule*, ed. Wolfhart Pannenberg and Reinhard Slenczka, vol. 76, *Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 24.

pursue New Testament studies.¹¹ He had befriended Ernst Troeltsch even in Erlangen, where the two studied Fichte and Carlyle.¹² But in Göttingen they joined the group that would become the core of the History of Religions school. It was led by William Wrede and included Weiss, who had also ended up in Göttingen. The latter not only had close contact with Ritschl himself, but also married his daughter Auguste.

The Preaching of Jesus: Two Opposing Views

It was the view on Judaism that would place the two friends and colleagues in opposite camps—especially their interpretation of Jews and Judaism. Publishing his *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (“The Preaching of Jesus on the Kingdom of God”) in 1892, Weiss emphasised the apocalyptic and eschatological dimension of earliest Christianity and of Jesus’ own religion, which Weiss understood as being Jewish religion at the time of Jesus.¹³ With this, Weiss challenged the prevailing picture of early Christianity that had been living under the hegemony of a cultural Protestantism. Its view of eschatology was shaped by Schleiermacher’s silence on the subject, with Wilhelminian cultural Protestantism seeing the kingdom as “a progressive churchification of the world” with no transcendent dreams.¹⁴

In Weiss’s study of Jesus in his Jewish context, Jesus stood out as quite foreign to the theology that Weiss and his father-in-law represented—a theology purged of any eschatological dimensions.¹⁵ Requiring a re-evaluation of the concept of the kingdom of God,¹⁶ Weiss asked what Jesus had meant by it. Contrary to Ritschl and Wendt, he stated that to Jesus, the kingdom was by no means immanent or present, but something eschatological.¹⁷ “Thus we understand [...] that the kingdom of God according to Jesus is a superworldly entity, which stands in

¹¹ Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset*, 11.

¹² *Ibid.*, 8.

¹³ Johannes Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht’s Verlag, 1892); Berthold Lannert, *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiss*, ed. Klaus Berger, et al., vol. 2, *Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 1989), 215–216.

¹⁴ Lannert, *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiss*, 3–11.

¹⁵ Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 67.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 14–17.

opposition to this world.”¹⁸ Hence the kingdom could not be anything inner-worldly, a statement that challenged contemporary theology.

For the picture of Judaism, Weiss’s approach truly meant an historical turn as well as a turn towards the History of Religions, i.e. to an historical picture of Second Temple Judaism. To Weiss, Jesus stood in the tradition of his contemporary Judaism, sharing a Jewish apocalyptic understanding of the future, a dualistic world-view, and a Messiah and Son-of-Man consciousness. He believed in an eschatological *parousia*, a judgment, with Palestine as the centre of the new kingdom, where Jesus and his faithful ones would rule over a people of twelve tribes, to which the Gentiles would be appended.¹⁹ The outcome of Weiss’s study was a far-reaching continuity between Jesus and his contemporary Judaism, in which Jesus shared most of the dreams of his time. If Wellhausen was an important inspirer of the History of Religions school, Weiss’s analysis was nevertheless quite independent from the prevailing picture of a degenerated Judaism to which Jesus was a bright contrast.

Bousset in no way sided with Weiss, however. Instead, the name of his pamphlet—*Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum* (“The Preaching of Jesus in Its Opposition to Judaism”)²⁰—was formulated as a counterpart to Weiss’s book, Bousset wanting to make a comparison between Jesus and his contemporary Judaism.²¹ At the outset, Bousset denies any continuity between Jesus and ‘Late Judaism’,²² the latter which is painted in glaring colours, even more so than in the later *Die Religion des Judentums*, to which I will return. Bousset’s main target being Weiss’s book, he clearly motivates his methodological choice: the results will differ if one sets out to understand Jesus on the basis of continuity with his Jewish background, or on the basis of discontinuity.²³ ‘Late Judaism’, Bousset argues, was a degenerated form of the religion of the prophets of Israel,²⁴ the result being a legalistic, particularistic and apocalyptic ‘theology of accounts’ (*Zahlentheologie*),²⁵ a religion characterised by the

¹⁸ Ibid., 49.

¹⁹ Ibid., 62–63.

²⁰ Wilhelm Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht’s Verlag, 1892).

²¹ Ibid., 6.

²² On this, see Lannert, *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiss*, 215–219.

²³ Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*, 40.

²⁴ Ibid., 16–17.

²⁵ Ibid., 25. Bousset presents ‘Late Judaism’ on pp. 10–41.

‘genius of hatred’ (*Genialitet des Hasses*).²⁶ The very negative picture of ‘Late Judaism’ is contrasted with Jesus, who restores the preaching of the prophets. This, he contends, is different from *Judentum*,²⁷ the breach between Jesus and Judaism being deep,²⁸ since he shares a universalism with the prophets.²⁹ Hence Jesus does by no means stand under the “spell of Judaism (*im Bannkreis des Judentums*), but the total figure of Jesus unites old and new into a quite original picture”.³⁰ Bousset ends his discussion programmatically:

Knowledge of contemporary Judaism is to the highest degree necessary for understanding the deepest meaning and historical importance of the figure of Jesus. But out of Judaism and its world-view one will never reach the figure of Jesus; here there are absolute opposites (*vollständige Gegensätze*). The verdict remains: “The gospel develops hidden shoots from the Old Testament, but it protests against the dominating movement in Judaism.”³¹

The last quotation was probably so proverbial to the readers that Bousset did not need to give the source, Julius Wellhausen’s *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Judas*.³² Bousset thus comes across as a true representative of Wellhausen’s tradition.³³

Weiss, however, took up the gauntlet in a second edition of *Die Predigt Jesu*, now openly confessing that he sees a major discrepancy between Ritschl’s view on the kingdom and Jesus’ perception of it.³⁴ Weiss’s ambition is to produce an historical work that disregards any systematic theological presuppositions and only appreciates what the kingdom of God is in the New Testament, with its background in the Old Testament and Judaism. On several occasions, he debates Wellhausen’s positions

²⁶ Ibid., 46 n. 2; 59.

²⁷ Ibid., 50, 65.

²⁸ Ibid., 84.

²⁹ Ibid., 85. To Bousset, these are the most eminent bearers of religion, and he opens the book with a quote from the Scottish philosopher Thomas Carlyle, whose idealistic-romantic views of great heroes, and especially great German leaders, were deeply cherished by Bousset.

³⁰ Ibid., 70.

³¹ Ibid., 130.

³² Julius Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. 1. Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Judas im Umriss*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1884), 98.

³³ For an analysis of Wellhausen as an inheritor of de Wette, see Pasto, *Who Owns the Jewish Past?*.

³⁴ Johannes Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), v.

outright as being affected by contemporary ideas and not appreciating the sources,³⁵ criticising him and Bousset for being influenced by Thomas Carlyle's views of history, i.e. his hero cult.³⁶

This methodological rift also marks the main difference between Weiss and Bousset. Weiss sharply confronts what he regards as "scholarship with a purpose to preach to the present", which "uses biography in order to undergird the cult of a hero", in contrast to the scholar who cherishes *Akribi* (accuracy) as the highest virtue.³⁷ He methodically works his way through the Old Testament as well as intertestamental literature, e.g. the literature of Enoch, Ezra, Baruch, *Assumptio Mosis* and Rabbinnica, also including material from Iranian religion.³⁸ In the conclusion to his background presentation, he finds probable roots to the dualism of "the foreign religion".³⁹ The general impression of Weiss's second edition, which includes a more elaborate discussion on the kingdom of God, is that Weiss attempts to read the sources on their own terms, bringing in all the texts that he regards as relevant through solid linguistic and historical scholarship. In practical terms, this means that Weiss presents Jesus within his Jewish setting and thereby upgrades the importance of the Jewish background, interpreted on its own terms.

The basic positions of Bousset and Weiss are established in these early books, and although details would change, on the whole they seem to keep these positions throughout their scholarship, thus representing two rather different approaches within the History of Religions school. Whereas Bousset openly referred to idealistic views, such as Carlyle's on the role of heroes in history, Weiss just as clearly took a stand against such methods, criticising Wellhausen and Bousset's approach for lacking the "full historical objectivity" that must be the goal of any historian.⁴⁰

³⁵ Ibid., 23, 53, 88.

³⁶ Bousset shared his passion for Carlyle with William Wrede as well as other members of the History of Religions school, Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*, 1; Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiesgeschichtlicher Versuch*, 12.

³⁷ Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 56.

³⁸ Ibid., 19–28; 30–35.

³⁹ Ibid., 34.

⁴⁰ Lannert, *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiss*, 217.

This attitude is also seen in the discussion of Weiss's last book, *Das Urchristentum* ("Early Christianity"), published posthumously in 1917, which represented a quite different outlook to that of Bousset. However, first I will discuss Bousset's main work on Judaism, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, a standard work that impacted generations of scholars in Germany and other countries where German exegesis was influential.

Wilhelm Bousset: The Religion of Judaism in the New Testament Age

The most well-known and comprehensive work on the Jews in connection with the History of Religions school, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, was written by Bousset and in a later edition completed by his disciple Hugo Gressmann. Bousset was a prominent member of the History of Religions school, and this book became the standard work on Judaism in the German language until the 1950s,⁴¹ its basic views influencing scholars and ministers even beyond that.

Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter is devoted to the religion of Judaism, in contrast to Schürer's standard work, which spans all dimensions of Jewish life, and—with its comprehensive treatment of the cultural and political circumstances, as well as Jewish literature—has less to say about Jewish religion.⁴² Bousset's interest is a different one: to give an overarching interpretation of the development of Judaism from the Maccabees to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, or to describe 'Late Judaism' as a preliminary stage to Christianity. As Bousset puts it, "On this foundation of 'Late Judaism', the gospel emerged."⁴³ Having discussed the sources in part one—a discussion that would be much debated—Bousset proceeds to deal with "The development of Jewish piety into church", "The national dependence of the Jewish religion", "Individual faith and theology", "Specific forms of Jewish piety" and "The religious-historical problem".

⁴¹ Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1903). Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, notes that the work gained the status of a standard work, 141. See Wiese's discussion of Bousset's book and its reception by Jewish scholarship, 140–172.

⁴² Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*.

⁴³ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1.

The mark of the History of Religions school is evident even at the outset. Describing the main branches of religion, Bousset divides them in two: 'Palestinian–(Babylonian)–Pharisaic Judaism' and '(Alexandrian) Diaspora Judaism'. In the concluding chapter, he pioneers a description of Judaism as a 'syncretistic' religion.⁴⁴ Bousset also considers his history to be different from that of earlier scholars. Undertaking to "keep an eye on the whole",⁴⁵ an organic approach to the development of the whole of humanity runs through his thinking. Elsewhere he describes this organic idea of the emergence of religions by using the imagery of a tree of human religious life. The religions of humanity are somehow related, but the development occurs through "free spiritual personalities", beginning with the prophets and followed by Zarathustra, the great Greek tragic dramatists, then Buddha and Plato. Different branches begin to grow simultaneously,⁴⁶ the imagery vividly portraying a new vision of religion, unlike that of earlier theologians. However, Bousset probably took inspiration from two of his philosophical forerunners, Carlyle and Fries.⁴⁷ Fries writes in Bousset's edition of his novel *Julius und Evagoras*:

You will [in history] find a clear, regular progress from old Asia, with its religions, fostering (*bildende*) and ruling priests, to the freedom and beauty of the Greek, to the world rulership of the Romans, to Christianity, to the new Europe. It is the tree of knowledge, which you see germinating, growing up and spreading its branches further and further.⁴⁸

This beautiful and graphic description of how the history of religions grows and develops as something organic is typical of idealist historiography, albeit in a non-dialectical form.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Ibid., 2.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 2.

⁴⁶ Wilhelm Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion dargestellt an ihrer Geschichte* (Halle: Gebauer-Schwetschke Druckerei und Verlag, 1906), 84–85.

⁴⁷ For Carlyle, see Heinrich Kahlert, *Der Held und seine Gemeinde. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Stifterpersönlichkeit und Verehrgemeinschaft in der Theologie des freien Protestantismus*, vol. 238, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII, Theologie (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1984), 187.

⁴⁸ Jakob Friedrich Fries, *Julius und Evagoras. Ein philosophischer Roman von Jakob Friedrich Fries* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 226–227.

⁴⁹ As is well known, Fries opposed Hegel, see Bousset's comments in his foreword to Jakob Friedrich Fries, *Julius und Evagoras*, xxii–xxiv.

Bousset's Overarching Historiography of Religions

This concept of organic growth, with continuity between the Judeo-Christian religion and other religions, seems new, although universalistic ideas during the Enlightenment may have paved the way. The idea is fundamental to Bousset. In *Das Wesen der Religion* ("The Essence of Religion"), published the same year as *Die Religion des Judentums*, Bousset describes the religions in a similar evolutionary perspective. Religion has different stages and is constantly moving to higher levels: from the religion of the savages to national religions, prophets and prophetic religions, law religions, such as Judaism, Parsism and Islam, and the redemptive religions of Buddha and Plato, with the end point being the spirit of Christianity. This development is a divine work, culminating in the biblical religions:

the entire great history of human religious life is to us as a work of God [...] the religion of the Old and New Testaments represents [...] the line of the purest expression (*Ausprägung*) of religion, and the gospel the, to say the least, hitherto highest and most perfect embodiment of religion.⁵⁰

The driving force in this history of religions is the tendency towards universalism. Such tendencies can also be traced in Jewish religion, e.g. in its "world propaganda", "world missions", and in Judaism becoming a "world church". Other religions of the same period moved in the same direction; according to Bousset, it was time for a universal monotheism,⁵¹ and even "Late Judaism' stood on the verge of transformation from a national, cultic religion to a universal, spiritual one".⁵² As this took place, spiritual oppositions replaced physical ones; the opposition between pious and godless replaced that between "born Jew" and "born Gentile", at the same time as Judaism developed into a more spiritual religion, that is, into the *Kirche*, church.⁵³ However, due to its hopeless limitations as a folk religion, Judaism became the stumbling block in this entire development. This also caused hatred towards the Jews, Bousset contends, not as a religion but as a *Rasse* (race) and *Volk* (people).⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion dargestellt an ihrer Geschichte*, 7.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 109.

⁵² Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, "dass das Spätjudentum sich auf der Stufe des Übergangs von einer nationalen, kultischen Religion zur universalen, geistigen befindet", 3.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁵⁴ Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion dargestellt an ihrer Geschichte*, 110.

The result of Bousset's analysis is that Judaism was a dead end. Being delivered from its connection to the nation and the national sacrificial cult did not help; despite the evident universalistic tendencies, Judaism never lifted itself out of its background, but "sank down" into the letter of the Law.⁵⁵ Jesus, however, came to deliver the Jewish religion from the national, the ceremonial, the letter, into a freedom that has its strongest representative in Paul.⁵⁶ Hence "Christianity is the peak of the whole development, and in [Christianity] all earlier lines seem to converge," Bousset summarises. Having overcome every specific national element of religion, Christianity is a simple, spiritual faith that is freer from outward things, such as cult or ceremonies, than any other religion, liberating the individual. Christianity, Bousset contends, is a moral religion, combining the ethical dimension and redemption into an "ethical redemptive religion" (*ethische Erlösungsreligion*). Finally, Christianity advances human life and culture, the Christian peoples being the ones who have furthered culture, in Bousset's view.⁵⁷ Thus, in his overarching presentation of the history of religion, Bousset identifies Christianity as the end point of all religions, making it the superior one.

The more popular *Das Wesen der Religion* gives a clearer presentation of Bousset's overarching ideas, but he follows the same lines in *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, describing the process as *Verkirchlichung*, churchification of Judaism, the end result being 'the Jewish church'.⁵⁸ Unfortunately he provides no definition of the concept, but he does give three characteristics: firstly, piety is released from the national and political life; secondly, this does not result in an individualism, but the former religions are transformed into other expressions; thirdly, this religion begins to cross national borders, not only religiously, but Judaism also gains a position of power, Bousset says, following Strabo and Josephus.⁵⁹ Here Bousset airs a series of prejudiced ideas, discussing attitudes towards Judaism in the nations where it was dispersed: Judaism was a spiritual superpower (*Weltmacht*) with great self-esteem and pride;⁶⁰ anti-Semitism emerged from the first century BCE because Judaism had become a problem, being a foreign

⁵⁵ Ibid., 163–164.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 180–181.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 203.

⁵⁸ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 62.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 55; 66–68.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 75–76.

body in society; Judaism's stiffness and customs, and the Jews enclosing themselves within their own group, aroused bitter controversy; the Jews' wealth, superiority in trade and ability to exploit different circumstances and gain the favour of the influential awakened the hate of the mob.⁶¹ "Judaism was a world power (*Weltmacht*), and the opposition and rage of the entire world around it showed that this was so," Bousset concludes,⁶² also stating that Judaism hates all and is hated by all.⁶³ Although Bousset refers to Tacitus here, he himself describes the Jewish people in clear terms: Jewish morals have an inhuman quality; the Jews are characterised by their exclusiveness (*ἀμικσία*); and the Jewish people have an inhuman, barbarian character.⁶⁴ However, the reasons for this anti-Semitism is not mere racial hatred (*Rassenhass*), but was caused by the Jews themselves.⁶⁵ This characterisation of Jews is a prime example of the prejudice that prevailed in anti-Semitic discourse.

Late Jewish Degeneration

The duality of particularism and universalism crops up in Bousset,⁶⁶ along with national religion versus universal religion, and folk religion versus individual religion.⁶⁷ In this respect, Bousset stands solidly in the Enlightenment tradition. Universalism represents positive development, synonymous with *Verkirklichung*,⁶⁸ whereas particularism is the Jewish confinement to nationalism. This particularism ended the promising universalist course of Judaism, and the play between universalist and particularist tendencies ended in the negative. According to Bousset, "Judaism remains a religion chained to a single people,"⁶⁹ a development that he regrets. As Judaism in 70 CE lost its universal role, the religion became mere legalism, which to Bousset was manifested in the Pharisees.⁷⁰ What began as the naïve consciousness of the Jews having a special relationship with God turned into "a repugnant and offensive

⁶¹ Ibid., 76.

⁶² Ibid., 78.

⁶³ Ibid., 86.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 115.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 115.

⁶⁶ Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*, 99.

⁶⁷ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 371–372.

⁶⁸ Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*, 99.

⁶⁹ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 86.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 371.

particularism" (*hässliche und verletzte Particularismus*), and national elation (*Hochgefühl*) became the pride of the sect.⁷¹ Here Bousset reveals his preferences, articulating strong prejudice against the Jews in 'Late Judaism' terms.

Bousset caricatures 'Late Judaism' as "aping and unproductive" (*epigonenhaft und unschöpferisch*). In this phase of Judaism, there are no "original spirits" or any power for development,⁷² nor is there any direct connection between human and divine spirit. It was different in the time of the prophets. These strong personalities were driven by the Holy Spirit and are themselves examples of great spirits, representing the creative role of the great individual. In a situation where Israel was confined to a religion that was merely national, focusing on the cultic, the prophets stood up and spearheaded a new beginning.⁷³ But in 'Late Judaism' the canon was formed instead, turning the religion of Israel into a religion of the book, and ending the free rule of the Spirit. This led to a time of epigons (*Epigonenzeit*), in which revelation is bound to the Scriptures.⁷⁴

The ethics of 'Late Judaism' are another example of degeneration. Whereas the prophetic preaching was popular and social, 'Late Judaism' disregards social questions;⁷⁵ the commandments to the people pertain only to the cult and include no moral obligations.⁷⁶ The Jewish law, Bousset contends, is about nit-picking, trying to lead a life that meets God's requirements for righteousness, where life becomes a matter of calculation (*Rechenexempel*). In contrast, the Gospels are spirited by a "heroic atmosphere, ready for any sacrifice, superior to the world, having turned from the world".⁷⁷ Thus the ethics of this degenerated Judaism are negative, saying what not to do instead of the opposite, what to do.⁷⁸ Throughout the book, Bousset returns to the contrast between 'Late Judaism' on the one hand, and the religion of the prophets on the other, and similarly of 'Late Judaism' versus Christianity.

⁷¹ Ibid., 372.

⁷² Ibid., 449.

⁷³ Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion dargestellt an ihrer Geschichte*, 84–85.

⁷⁴ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 374.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 397.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 395.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 395.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 399.

The characterisation of 'Late Judaism' and the stereotypes that Bousset uses when discussing contemporary anti-Semitism go hand in hand. Jews and their religion are limited, legalistic, casuistic; Jews focus only on duty, striving for reward,⁷⁹ with narrow hearts, conceit, pride and censoriousness. Other characteristics of the Jewish people are falsity and hypocrisy, the lack of truthfulness being the main threat to Jewish ethics. Here Bousset holds a clearly essentialist view: Jews are the same in the time of Jesus as they are in Bousset's.⁸⁰

Palestinian versus Diaspora Judaism

Bousset's description of how Judaism became a viable background to Christianity is similar to that of earlier liberal Protestant exegetes. Palestinian Judaism is centripetal (directed inwards), he argues, whereas Diaspora Judaism is centrifugal (directed outwards)—at the same time as there is a unity between the two.⁸¹ The difference is by degrees and should not be overstated, Bousset writes,⁸² showing insight into the historical state of things. However, in the Alexandrian era, Judaism changes, despite the narrowness of Palestinian Judaism that Bousset often speaks of. Although Palestinian Judaism wishes to remain separate, the encounter with new religions and cultures brings a change:

A foreign spirit (*Wesen*) penetrated every pore of its existence; Greek language, Greek knowledge and thinking, Babylonian astronomy, Babylonian (Egyptian) magic and many other things penetrated it.⁸³

Bousset describes the time of Alexander and the Diadochi as one of general *Verschmelzung* (fusion, amalgamation). Borders between peoples disappear, and a common language is spoken, both in a concrete and in a spiritual sense. In this period, the centrifugal power tends to overcome the other, and Diaspora Judaism is on its way to becoming a world religion: "Through thousands of channels, the foreign rushes in; together with the atmosphere in which it lives, Judaism breathes it in."⁸⁴ The influences that affect Judaism come from two directions:

⁷⁹ Ibid., 396.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 118.

⁸¹ Ibid., 450.

⁸² Ibid., 109–110.

⁸³ Ibid., 450–451.

⁸⁴ "In tausendfachen Kanälen strömt das fremde hinzu, mit der Atmosphäre, in der es lebt, athmet das Judentum es ein", Ibid., 451.

the Greek and the Babylonian, meaning the Stoic, Cynic and Platonic philosophers and the Jewish Alexandrian theologians on the one hand, and the mystery religions on the other.

Alexandrian Judaism is of utmost importance to Bousset's historiography, and it is easy to recognise ideas already presented in Enlightenment exegetical research tradition. It is Alexandrian Judaism that "built the bridge on which the gospel could enter the world",⁸⁵ the reason being that Old Testament monotheism and Greek philosophy are able to synthesise; here the forms are created that enable the gospel to become comprehensible to the world. Alexandrian theology is different: "the theology developed here [in the Diaspora, A.G.] does not as the Palestinian bear the mark of jurisprudence, it emerges in a pure way" (*sie tritt rein heraus*).⁸⁶ The reason why Judaism could develop better in the Diaspora is that it was not hindered by the focus on the Law, Bousset argues, making it viable for further development. Bousset stands in a long tradition regarding this: just as earlier theologians, including Baur, he holds that life from the Greek and pagan environment has to enter Judaism for it to expand and become the seedbed of Christianity. This Alexandrian Judaism develops in its Hellenistic environment, which to Bousset seems the ideal milieu for it. Here theology, theologians and theological literature experience growth. Moreover, just as Hellenistic popular philosophy, it is private, having no relation to church and practical application. The eminent example of all of this is Philo, Bousset writes.⁸⁷

No doubt Bousset sees his own ideal religion in this construction, one that is 'free' from the outward forms of church life. In effect, he constructs Alexandrian Judaism from his own point of view, rather than appreciating the historical circumstances. As already indicated, this is something that he has in common with earlier Enlightenment exegetes.⁸⁸ Again, we see the pattern of this long research tradition: how Alexandrian Judaism 'enlightened' Judaism through Greek influence, making it the seedbed of universalist Christianity. And this step in the prehistory of Christianity is necessary for it to attain its role as *the*

⁸⁵ Ibid., 410.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 148.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 148–149.

⁸⁸ See e.g. Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), which demonstrates that the basic elements of Shabbat, *kashrut*, circumcision and strong opposition to intermarriage were widely observed in the Jewish Diaspora.

religion, superseding all other religions. Bousset's verdict on a Judaism uninfluenced by Greek thought is that it lacks freedom and vitality.

Nevertheless, on two points Bousset's description of Judaism and the emergence of Christianity differs from that of the Tübingen school and Schleiermacher, for instance, before that. Prior to the History of Religions school, the universalism of religions was described more in 'Hellenistic' terms, i.e. as a synthesis between Greek and Jewish, perhaps with a trace of Oriental. New religious findings had made it possible to name other redemptive religions among the stars on the universalistic religious canopy. The role of Judaism remains, being a barren preliminary stage to the development into a free Christianity, and there is an optimism for religion to evolve to its highest form.

Secondly, Bousset sees more parallel developments in neighbouring religions, which influence 'Late Judaism' in various ways. In Bousset, too, there is a Jewish 'church', with the synagogue, scribes, confession, canon and national Messianic expectations. But his picture becomes charged with apocalyptic dimensions in neighbouring religions and intertestamental literature. The late Jewish religion had been subjected to certain influences, especially Iranian religion, which Bousset calls apocalypticism.⁸⁹ This was an apocalyptic world-view that included ideas about the roots of Evil, saw the future of the world in terms of different aeons, had a new dualistic dimension and believed in the devil and demons, as well as in the spectacular judgment and destruction of the world. To Bousset, these ideas "cripple the freshness and confidence of faith, and weigh down the soul of the people of Israel".⁹⁰ The view of God becomes transcendent and blurred, mediatory beings get between God and man, and belief in individual retribution gains ground. This signifies a break, Bousset argues, being no natural development of the religion of the Prophets and Psalms.⁹¹ In his mind, three or four religions have made an inroad into Judaism: in addition to the "iranisch-zarathustrischen Religion" (Iranian-Zoroastrian religion) already mentioned, they were the Assyrian-Babylonian, the Hellenic and in part the Egyptian religion. Bousset sees a movement into spiritualisation of faith in God, transcendence and individualisation, regarding this as a general development, found in several religions. Thus the new picture

⁸⁹ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 460–492; 491: "We have more and more focused on Iranian religion."

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 448.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 449.

of 'Late Judaism' as a more syncretistic religion marks a shift in the understanding of Judaism, but it is a shift that distances Judaism from Bousset's own religious ideals.

The end result of Judaism's encounter with these other religious influences is a religion fraught with contradiction. Despite opposition, the refractory Judaism was drawn into the general development of human life and religion, "which moves like a mighty stream",⁹² and foreign influences and ideas (the ones mentioned for 'Late Judaism' above) reached into the innermost part of the Jewish religion. This happened to both Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism, affecting not only an elite, but also the people, forming a piety of the masses. Yet not even these foreign influences or faith in the transcendent could break through the "fanatic, national, particularistically limited future ideas of the Israelite religion", Bousset contends. The end product of this development, the religion of Judaism, contains massive contradictions. As foreign influences manifested as bizarre, grotesque forms of Judaism, the result was wild, confused fantasies.⁹³ Summarizing the book on the religion of Judaism, Bousset talks of Judaism in strongly negative terms on two occasions. He calls the situation before Christ a "seething chaos" (*gärendes Chaos*), which neither apocalypics nor rabbinic theologians could handle. Only the gospel could create the necessary conditions for change.⁹⁴ During 'Late Judaism' this seething chaos was present among the masses, *but then the hero, the leading individual, Jesus, came to create peace*. As Berger notes, Bousset envisions this situation at the cost of an accurate historical description of Judaism at the time of Jesus.⁹⁵

Describing the seething chaos, Bousset speaks in romantic terms:

The new thoughts have come alive, the seed dreams under the surface, waiting for the divine "Let there be!". The elements that are necessary for the great process of recovery and life lie next to each other. The contact between them only needs to be established, and the process will begin.⁹⁶

⁹² Ibid., 492.

⁹³ Ibid., 493: "Es sind zunächst freilich höchst bizarre, groteske Formen, in denen jener fremde Einfluss zur Erscheinung kommt, wilde, ungeklärte Phantasien."

⁹⁴ According to Berger, Bousset shows a dependence on Carlyle here, Klaus Berger, *Exegese und Philosophie*, ed. Helmut Merklein and Erich Zenger, vol. 123/124, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986), 94–95.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 112.

⁹⁶ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 493: "Aber lebendig

Judaism had done the preparatory work, even by integrating essential elements from foreign religions and then adapting them to a certain extent, says Bousset. Therefore, one religion alone had not contributed to the emergence of Christianity, “but the contact between the religions of the Western cultural work, the Hellenistic cultural period”:

Alexander the Great had to come and build the Hellenistic kingdom, the flowing together of the national cultures from the Euphrates and Tigris to Alexandria and Rome had to begin, in order to create the preconditions for the gospel. Judaism was the retort, in which the different elements were gathered. Then, through a creative miracle, the new creation of the gospel occurred.⁹⁷

In these last sentences of *Die Religion des Judentums*, Bousset summarises his view of Judaism. Bousset’s idealistic historiography does not describe a series of events in terms of empirical scholarship. It draws upon and refines an already established aetiological historiography that gives the end result, Christianity, and demands certain preliminary stages. Judaism is overtly presented as a mere *praeparatio evangelica* and is thus caricatured negatively as a contrary force, reluctantly playing its role as the historical prerequisite for the emergence of Christianity. It is a ‘retort’, Bousset says, choosing a remarkable word that is defined as a vessel or receptacle, used in chemical processes to collect a substance, and brewing or heating it to extract something.⁹⁸ Gressmann retains the passage in his updated 1926 edition, but clarifies the meaning as follows: “Judaism was the retort, in which the different elements were collected *and brewed*.”⁹⁹

As this presentation indicates, this product by a member of the History of Religions school is more a theological interpretation of Jewish

geworden sind die neuen Gedanken, die Keime träumen unter der Oberfläche und harren des göttlichen Werde! Die Elemente, die notwendig sind für den grossen Gesundheits- und Lebensprozess, liegen nebeneinander. Es muss nur der Kontakt hergestellt werden, und der Prozess beginnt.”

⁹⁷ Ibid., 493.

⁹⁸ Felix Perles, *Bousset’s Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht* (Berlin: Wolf Peiser Verlag, 1903), 31, reacts negatively to the choice of words, which render Judaism a mere vessel, whereas Bousset overestimates paganism.

⁹⁹ Wilhelm Bousset and Hugo Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann*, ed. Hans Lietzmann, vol. 21, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926), 524. Gressmann completes the *Religionsgeschichtliche* chapter of Bousset’s book in particular, but the main perspective seems intact twenty-three years after the first edition.

history than a critical writing of history. In some respects, the History of Religions school truly marks an historical turning point, both in its use of new source materials and in its interest in popular religion, sociology and the religious and cultural matrix of early Christianity. As for the Jews, however, history is still modelled on an idealistic framework, similar to that of de Wette or the Tübingen school. The historical understanding of Jews and Judaism has a very limited value. Interwoven in Bousset's historiography is an openly and frequently aired prejudice towards Jews and Judaism, which reflects the spirit of his age and his own view of Judaism. *Wissenschaft des Judentums* judged it harshly, to a great extent for good reason.

Controversial Use of Intertestamental Sources

The History of Religions school had introduced new sources to the analysis of Judaism, but Bousset's use of sources would cause intense debate. Whereas other scholars used rabbinic literature to describe the Judaism of the period, Bousset laid these aside and concentrated on apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha.¹⁰⁰ This was a strategy motivated by ideology. To Bousset, 'apocryphal Judaism' represented the real Judaism at the time of Jesus and a preliminary stage to the gospel. Seen in a longer perspective, the introduction of pseudepigraphical material is a point where Bousset and the History of Religions school methodologically took exegesis a step forwards. Yet in this heyday of finding and using new texts, their role for understanding Second Temple Judaism may have been overstated, leaving rabbinic literature behind.¹⁰¹ Bousset's approach caused bitter debate.¹⁰² To the Jewish

¹⁰⁰ Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*, 92.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 95.

¹⁰² For this debate and the discussion between *Wissenschaft des Judentums* and German Protestant theologians, see Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*. For the discussion between Bousset and Perles, see 141–157. Other Jewish scholars engaged in the debate were Elbogen with his Ismar Elbogen, "Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer mit besondere Rücksichtigung der Begriffe Gott und Mensch", *BHwJ* 22 (1904); Güdemann, Moritz Güdemann, *Jüdische Apologetik, Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums*. Schriften, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Wissenschaft des Judentums (Glogau: Flemming, 1906); and Eschelbacher, Joseph Eschelbacher, *Das Judentum im Urteile der modernen protestantischen Theologie*, Schriften, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Wissenschaft des Judentums (Leipzig: Buchhandlung Gustav Fock, 1907).

scholar Felix Perles, “a thorough, independent knowledge of the *rabbinic* literature” is the necessary prerequisite for dealing with Judaism in the New Testament era.¹⁰³ Bousset, he complains, allows the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha too much room, and the Judaism of the rabbinic literature too little.¹⁰⁴ The intertestamental literature is interesting for the purpose of the history of religions, Perles contends, but not for creating a picture of Judaism at that time.¹⁰⁵

In his apology to Perles’s book, *Volksfrömmigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum* (“Popular Piety and Scribal Scholarship”),¹⁰⁶ Bousset says that he had focused on sources contemporary with the New Testament that could be dated, and also criticises Perles for confusing the piety of the scholars with that of the people.¹⁰⁷ Other Jewish scholars entered the debate. Ismar Elbogen notes that even the name ‘Late Judaism’ indicates a view of history in which Judaism is only a preliminary stage to Christianity,¹⁰⁸ and historian Joseph Eschelbacher’s criticism of Bousset is also heavy: “In reality, Bousset has not clearly appreciated any of the religious phenomena of the era of Jesus.”¹⁰⁹ Moreover, Perles complains about Bousset’s reliance on secondary literature by Protestant authors when describing Judaism, all of which Perles regards as of questionable quality, e.g. that of Ferdinand Weber,¹¹⁰ Emil Schürer—whose competence in this area is questioned, despite his other merits¹¹¹—and Adolf Schlatter.¹¹² At the same time, Bousset had failed to consult a range of

¹⁰³ Perles, *Bousset’s Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht*, Preface.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 22.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹⁰⁶ Wilhelm Bousset, *Volksfrömmigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum. Antwort auf Herrn Perles’ Kritik meiner “Religion des Judentums im N.T. Zeitalter”* (Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1903).

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 4–5.

¹⁰⁸ Elbogen, “Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer mit besondere Rücksichtigung der Begriffe Gott und Mensch”, IV, quoted in Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*.

¹⁰⁹ Eschelbacher, *Das Judentum im Urteile der modernen protestantischen Theologie*, 42.

¹¹⁰ Perles, *Bousset’s Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht*, 5; Ferdinand Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften/gemeinverständlich dargestellt von Ferdinand Weber; herausgegeben von Franz Delitzsch und Georg Schnedermann* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897).

¹¹¹ Perles, *Bousset’s Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht*, 8; Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*.

¹¹² Perles, *Bousset’s Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht*, 7, n. 3, 15.

important Jewish scholarly works on the issue, although some of them are mentioned in his overview of literature.¹¹³

Bousset's critics were both right and wrong. On the one hand, the intertestamental literature at the centre of interest at this time was important material for Judaism and complemented other material. On the other hand, Bousset had probably neglected rabbinical literature, and his own competence in this area may also have been limited. Bousset cherished Ferdinand Weber's *Jüdische Theologie* as an excellent work,¹¹⁴ for example, and he used it, not interpreting all the source materials himself, as his critics had rightly noted. Reading the sources from a Christian viewpoint, he had not stood by his claim of historical scholarship. Moreover, although Bousset had stated that the works of the Jewish academics should be "used with caution", he himself studied Judaism with a Christian bias.¹¹⁵ Bousset's hypotheses would later also earn him criticism from the Protestant expert in Judaism, Gerhard Kittel.¹¹⁶

Hugo Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums, and the Berlin Institutum Judaicum

As indicated above, Bousset's student Hugo Gressmann revised Bousset's *Die Religion des Judentums*¹¹⁷ in its third edition. This was published in the influential series *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, influencing the view on Jews and Judaism of several generations of scholars and pastors. The question here is whether the revision altered Bousset's picture of the Jewish religion.

The Old Testament scholar Hugo Gressmann was born in 1877 and died in Chicago in 1927. He obtained his doctorate in Göttingen,

¹¹³ Ibid., 6–7; cf. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 49–53.

¹¹⁴ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 52.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 50.

¹¹⁶ Gerhard Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, ed. Rudolf Kittel, vol. 3:1, BWANT (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926), 5. The American Protestant scholar George Foot Moore, in his insightful article, Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism", also criticised Bousset, 241 ff.

¹¹⁷ Henry Wassermann, "Prof. Dr. Hugo Gressmann: '...Ich bitte endlich, diese Gastvorlesungen auch als eine Anerkennung der jüdischen Wissenschaft zu betrachten'", in *Reuchlin und seine Erben. Forscher, Denker, Ideologien und Spinner*, ed. Peter Schäfer and Irina Wandrey, *Pforzheimer Forschunschriften* (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 286, calls Bousset his mentor.

became a professor in Berlin in 1920 and was an important figure in the second generation of the History of Religions school. In 1925, he became director of the Institutum Judaicum in Berlin.¹¹⁸ Presenting the purposes of the institute, he stressed that these were only scholarly: “missionary intention was totally irrelevant for the institute”.¹¹⁹ Now part of the University of Berlin, the original vision of being a tool for missions to Jews was no longer of any consequence to the work.

In 1924, Gressmann had also taken over the editorship of the “Journal of Old Testament Study” (*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*), adding “and the Study of Post-Biblical Judaism”,¹²⁰ wanting to create an international research community that included Christian and Jewish scholars.¹²¹ In his programmatic article “Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums” (“The Objects of the Study of Post-Biblical Judaism”), he describes his view on Judaism from ancient Israel to Hadrian,¹²² even though he writes from a Christian perspective, stating that “we as Christian theologians” are as interested in what Jewish scholars write about Jesus as in what can be learnt from a secular historian such as Eduard Meyer.¹²³ Earlier, Gressmann also established that the religion of Jesus was Jewish, referring to those who “count a couple of drops of Aryan blood that may have run in the veins of Jesus” as “amateurs” (*Dilettanten*).¹²⁴ Gressmann’s article envisions a scholarship of post-biblical Judaism, spanning from rabbinic literature to what Gressmann calls “half-Jewish” currents, syncretistic Judaism.¹²⁵ He acknowledges that Christian scholars are weak as regards rabbinic literature, and requests that Jewish scholarship provide critical editions and translations of the key texts. That this weakness is Gressmann’s own is clear from the fact that he spends one page on the topic, only indicating the lack of knowledge, whereas he discusses syncretistic Judaism on the following twenty-two pages. Here he continues the tradition from Bousset, supplementing it with the new findings of the History

¹¹⁸ On the history of the institute, see the chapter on Strack.

¹¹⁹ Hugo Gressman, “Einführung”, in *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion, Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann Verlag, 1927), 1.

¹²⁰ Kuschke, *Die unterlegene Religion. Das Judentum im Urteil deutscher Alttestamentler*, 141.

¹²¹ Hugo Gressman, “Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums”, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43 (1925).

¹²² *Ibid.*, 1–4.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 1–2.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 10–32.

of Religions school. Gressmann describes ‘post-biblical Judaism’ as a “new type of religion”, a transformation into an otherworldly religion, containing the synagogue, canon, resurrection and retaliation, supernaturalism and apocalypticism.¹²⁶ Perles’s earlier criticism of Bousset’s work thus applies to Gressmann, too, as was pointed out even by Rudolf Bultmann and Gerhard Kittel in reference to Gressmann’s edition of Bousset’s book.¹²⁷ His own scholarly approach to Judaism has not developed much from Bousset’s “The Religion of Judaism”, but what is new is his ambition to work together with Jewish scholarship.

This is in line with another initiative of the institute. In 1925, Gressmann invited a group of Jewish scholars from the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums to give guest lectures at the institute,¹²⁸ lectures that were published in the volume *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion* (“Development Stages of the Jewish Religion”).¹²⁹ Through these lectures, Gressmann wanted to let Jewish scholars speak for themselves—Gressmann also supported Jewish theology having a faculty at the university.¹³⁰ Describing the purpose of the event, he states that in a time of strong anti-Semitic hatred with a distorted picture of Judaism, there can be a positive scholarly view of Judaism, and such an evaluation of Judaism is best made by Jewish scholars. Gressmann also wishes to acknowledge Jewish scholarship through these lectures.¹³¹ For his time, Gressmann’s view is tolerant, the initiative of these lectures countering what he perceived as an anti-Semitic atmosphere in society. Perhaps this was what brought him an invitation to guest lecture at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, a trip during which he unexpectedly died.¹³²

¹²⁶ Ibid., 3–4.

¹²⁷ See below.

¹²⁸ Gressman, “Einführung”, in *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion, Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin*, 3.

¹²⁹ Leo Baeck et al., *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion*, vol. Erster Jahrgang 1925–1926, Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann Verlag, 1927).

¹³⁰ Kusche, *Die unterlegene Religion. Das Judentum im Urteil deutscher Alttestamentler*, 143.

¹³¹ Gressman, “Einführung”, in *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion, Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin*, 2–3. See also Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 357. On Gressmann’s reluctance to enter into politics in the area of Judaism and anti-Semitism, see Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 339, 131.

¹³² Wassermann, “Prof. Dr. Hugo Gressmann: ‘...Ich bitte endlich, diese Gastvorlesungen auch als eine Anerkennung der jüdischen Wissenschaft zu betrachten’”, 290.

However, in a longer perspective, Gressmann's relationship to Jews and Judaism was complex. In the earlier, heated debate between his friend Bousset and Perles, mentioned above, Gressmann had wanted to be even harder than Bousset, and he writes on 3 July 1903, "I am glad that you gave this Jew a real punch in the face, as he deserves."¹³³ This is indeed severe, revealing what private communication between the two could be like. In a letter from 1920, when Martin Rade challenged him and Hermann Gunkel to take a stand against anti-Semitism, Gressmann answered, "I cannot deal with the topic of Judaism and anti-Semitism, since it only interests me historically, and since I wish to stay away from the big politics of the day."¹³⁴ A few years later, however, in the context of the *Institutum Judaicum*, Gressmann was keen to show respect for his Jewish colleagues, stressing the continuity between Judaism and Christianity, as well as acknowledging the right of Jewish believers to maintain that their religion is the absolute one: "None would blame me as a Protestant Christian for holding Christianity in its Lutheran form to be the absolute religion. For this reason, I fully appreciate that the Jew claims the same regarding the Jewish religion."¹³⁵

Although these few biographical notes show a somewhat ambivalent Gressmann, his initiative in 1925 to acknowledge Jewish scholarship was brave, especially considering the long and heated debate about giving Jewish scholarship a place in German scholarly life.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, Henry Wassermann discusses Gressmann's contribution to the question of Jews and Judaism critically. His first point is what he sees as ignorance, for instance noting that Gressmann seems uninformed about basic Jewish things, such as the mezuzah. Commenting on an interpretation of rabbinical material, but also on Gressmann's rude comment on Perles, Wassermann writes that Gressmann's "ignorance could [...] well support prejudice".¹³⁷ He gives an example from a

¹³³ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 155: "Ich freue mich, daß Du diesem Juden eins auf die Schnauze gegeben hast, wie er es verdient."

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 339.

¹³⁵ Gressmann, "Einführung", in *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion, Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin*, 11–12.

¹³⁶ For this, see Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 335–360.

¹³⁷ Wassermann, "Prof. Dr. Hugo Gressmann: '...Ich bitte endlich, diese Gastvorlesungen auch als eine Anerkennung der jüdischen Wissenschaft zu betrachten'", 286–287.

text in which Gressmann discusses how historians of Judaism should describe “Hellenistic or rabbinical Judaism”. Here Gressmann describes the role of Hellenistic Judaism as that which contained the seed of a “new, great development” (*einer neuen gewaltigen Entwicklung*), Christianity, which is dependent on Hellenistic Judaism. He has a high appreciation for the circles that read the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha—this is where the living Judaism from which the progression started is found, which Gressmann contrasts with “dead or [...] gradually dying Judaism”.¹³⁸ Gressmann’s position here can hardly be regarded as based on serious scholarship, but rather as reflecting his own views of Hellenistic Judaism as a *praeparatio evangelica* and of Judaism at large as dead or dying. Wassermann’s verdict is that Gressmann’s positive efforts with, for instance, the symposium that became the *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion*, is to be seen as minor episodes, especially since Gressmann discredited the rabbinical literature, which according to Wassermann, the study of early Christianity had much to gain from. As noted, not unlike Perles a hundred years earlier, Wassermann’s criticism is first of all aimed at Gressmann’s disregard for rabbinic sources. There is no reason to believe that Wassermann is wrong regarding this; Gressmann takes the same position here as his mentor Bousset in the early debate following the publication of *Die Religion des Judentums*. Wassermann is also correct in stating that Gressmann, as an historian of Judaism, operated on the basis of his belief in Christian superiority.¹³⁹ Even so, in his rare interaction with Jewish *Wissenschaft*, Gressmann showed a more tolerant attitude towards his Jewish colleagues than most of his contemporaries, and the fact that he combined this with his own views of Christian superiority is no surprise. A similar initiative would be taken in January 1933, when K. L. Schmidt invited Martin Buber to engage in a dialogue.¹⁴⁰

Gressmann’s Revision of Bousset’s Religion der Judentum

What may be more important than isolated examples of Gressmann’s attitudes is his revision of Bousset’s *Religion der Judentum*. The following analysis shows that Gressmann did not make any substantial changes

¹³⁸ Ibid., 287, my emphasis.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 287.

¹⁴⁰ This event is discussed in the chapter on K. L. Schmidt below.

to Bousset's text and therefore largely supports Bousset's views. Gressmann's edition of the book merely furthers and emphasises Bousset's own, highly prejudiced picture of Judaism and Jews in general. Bousset's work is regarded by Gressmann as unsurpassed in its treatment of details as well as the whole: "with the sure *eye of the historian*, and with understanding and perception, he successfully pointed to the driving forces of the development and penetrated into the innermost meaning of the process".¹⁴¹ Adding new literature, Gressmann only made considerable changes to the introduction and end. Even in the final chapter, "The religio-historical problem", Gressmann only changed the direction slightly, to pick up on the contemporary research development. Gressmann thus stands for the positions of Bousset.¹⁴²

The picture of Jews and Judaism follows the same patterns as Bousset's in all important respects, although Gressmann adds certain aspects. *Spätjudentum* becomes *späthellenistischen Judentum*;¹⁴³ the notion '*jüdische Kirche*' has in Gressmann lost its quotations marks; and occasionally longer sections have been inserted. But the picture of Jews and Judaism remains intact:

The fundamental character of Late Hellenistic Judaism (Bousset: *Spätjudentum*) is absolutely imitative and uncreative. Original spirits are lacking, by whom the new bodies of thought could have been set in motion.

The new truths are not personally gained and battled through: the new things that they know and believe, they have received by way of mysterious revelation.¹⁴⁴

Here Gressmann is simply quoting Bousset, agreeing with his picture of Judaism of the Second Temple period. Using the same formulation

¹⁴¹ Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann, v.

¹⁴² Ibid., v.

¹⁴³ Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 448; Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann, 469.

¹⁴⁴ Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann, 472: "Der Grundcharakter des späthellenistischen Judentums ist durchaus epigonenhaft und unschöpferisch. Originale Geister fehlen, von denen die neuen Gedankenmassen hätten in Bewegung gesetzt werden können." "Die neuen Wahrheiten werden nicht persönlich errungen und durchgekämpft: was sie neues wissen und glauben, ist ihnen auf dem Wege geheimnisvolle Offenbarung zuteil geworden." The original is found in Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 449.

as Bousset, Gressmann sees the inconsistency and abstruseness of Judaism's world-view:

The purpose here is to study the general spirit of the religion, and one of its fundamental traits is the disharmony. Everywhere stands old and new, provisionally connected to one another. The new does not forcefully make its way, proclaimed and carried by powerful personalities, growing out of the old, blasting the shell and the kernel. Everywhere we have new patches on an old dress, new skins but no new wine, new beginnings without any effect, embryos that are not developing.¹⁴⁵

Merely upholding Bousset's analyses from twenty-three years earlier, Gressmann hardly carries out a proper historical analysis. Instead, his text is determined by an attempt to construct Judaism as a dark background to Christianity, much in the same way as Bousset and the Enlightenment research tradition. Word by word, Gressmann retains Bousset's description of how Greek influence, beginning with Plato, the neo-Pythagoreans, the Orphics, etc., became a powerful leaven for the religions in the Orient and Occident.¹⁴⁶ He then argues that Hellenism showed a remarkable ability to exert a deep influence, and that to him the amalgamation of the Greek and Jewish spirit is eminently seen in Paul.¹⁴⁷ Although he adds new material, demonstrating the exploits of religio-historical research after Bousset, Gressmann's picture of Judaism is essentially the same. The conclusion of his book, which almost entirely resembles Bousset's, clearly expresses the common programme of Bousset and Gressmann:

One needed to come, who was greater than the apocalyptics and rabbinic theologians, a restructuring had to take place in the gospel, before the unity and vitality of genuine and true piety could emerge from the seething chaos once more. But the new thoughts were already alive, the seed was dreaming under the surface, awaiting the divine "Let there be!". The elements that were necessary for the great process of recovery and life were lying side by side. The contact only had to be made, and the process began. There had been a preparation [...] for all that Judaism did, and as

¹⁴⁵ Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann, 473; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 450.

¹⁴⁶ Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann, 483; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 458.

¹⁴⁷ Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann, 483.

we must not forget, it made this preparation in that it absorbed, and to a certain degree elaborated, essential thoughts from foreign religion. In the end, not only *one* religion contributed to the emergence of Christianity, but a confluence (*Zusammenfluß*) of the religions of the Oriental cultural world, the Hellenistic cultural period. Alexander the Great had to come and prepare the Hellenistic kingdoms, the confluence of the national cultures from Euphrates and Tigris to Alexandria and Rome, the triumphal procession of the Chaldean-Iranian religious amalgamation (*Mischreligion*) had to take place, so that the preconditions for the emergence of the gospel would be created. Judaism was the retort, in which the different elements were collected and brewed. Then, through a creative miracle, the new creation of the gospel took place.¹⁴⁸

This, the closing passage of the revised edition, which again is almost identical to Bousset's own wording, sums up Gressmann's own position. Overall, Gressmann's contribution to Bousset's book is sparse and does not considerably change the previous positions. *Thus Gressmann is liable to the same criticism as Bousset, despite the twenty-three years that had passed between the first and third editions, as scholars such as Bultmann and Kittel critically pointed out.*¹⁴⁹ Gressmann's weak point is especially the bias against rabbinic material, hotly debated even after the first edition. Moreover, as demonstrated above, Gressmann does not take less prejudiced positions than Bousset towards Jews and Judaism, and both share the description of Judaism's religious history as a *praeformatio evangelica*. In this regard, too, the picture of Judaism is a negative construction, rather than one that is based on the sources.

Taken as a whole, Gressmann's picture of Jews and Judaism is ambiguous. In scholarly terms, he continues in the tradition of Bousset, reinforcing a traditional Enlightenment-oriented picture of so-called Late Judaism. Early reports reveal a prejudiced position towards Jews, as does his unwillingness to take a stand in the raging debate on anti-Semitism. The exceptions are his invitation to Jewish scholars to lecture at the institute in 1925 and his attempts to bring about international cooperation between Jewish and Christian scholars. In this, he takes a practical stand against anti-Semitism, demonstrating respect for his Jew-

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 525; compare Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 493.

¹⁴⁹ Rudolf Bultmann, "Review of Bousset, Wilhelm: *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. In 3., verb. Aufl. hrsg. v. H. Greßmann", *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, no. 11 (1928); Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*.

ish colleagues. Nonetheless, the prejudiced views on Jews and Judaism furthered in his edition of Bousset's book, and his refusal to listen to the largely justified criticisms of Bousset's biased depictions, to a great extent confirm Wassermann's view that his attempts in 1924–1925 were more of an episode than an indication that his Enlightenment Christian conception of Jews and Judaism had changed in any major way. Gressmann's combination of a certain, but limited openness to Jewish colleagues, an anti-anti-Semitic confession and a deeply prejudiced view on Jews and Judaism is another instance of what has earlier been called the Janus face of the Enlightenment picture of the Jews.¹⁵⁰

Johannes Weiss: The Jews in Das Urchristentum

Weiss's 670-page volume was still in process when he died in August 1914, the final seventy pages being finished by Rudolf Knopf on the basis of Weiss's material. In the same vein as his 1892 book, this work marks a break with the Enlightenment and liberal research tradition before Weiss, and could perhaps be counted among the first 'modern exegetical books'. Methodologically, it is considerably different from Bousset and the literature before him. As already indicated, Bousset and precursors such as de Wette, Baur, Strauss and Ritschl all worked with a more or less unvarnished idealist and/or theological agenda. Not that Weiss was free from this: even in *Der Predigt Jesu*, he discusses his exegesis from an openly liberal-Protestant standpoint.¹⁵¹ But as noted above, Weiss professes to be an historian with a clear purpose to render the New Testament teaching on its own terms, and on the whole, his first

¹⁵⁰ Unfortunately, Gressmann's description of Jews and Judaism in his revision of Bousset does not justify Kusche's view that it is the first decisive attempt at giving a comprehensive understanding of Judaism and that Gressmann moved beyond the limits of one confession or religion, pioneering a modern, more open attitude, Kusche, *Die unterlegene Religion. Das Judentum im Urteil deutscher Alttestamentler*, 145. Even though Gressmann made certain attempts in such a direction, he does not seem to have given up Christian superiority. However, in his attempts to dialogue, he was admittedly ahead of his contemporaries.

¹⁵¹ Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 67. However, see also Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906), which regards Weiss's book as a mere rehabilitation of all the ideas of Reimarus, 23.

book confirms that he was able to do so, letting his findings challenge his own theology.¹⁵² *Das Urchristentum* has the same characteristics.

In turn, Weiss discusses “The original church”, “The gentile mission and Paul the missionary”, “Paul the Christian and theologian”, “The mission churches and the beginning of the church” and “The different areas”, the latter partly written by Knopf.

As in 1892, Weiss still sees a continuity between Jesus and his Palestinian-Jewish background. The traditions behind the Gospels were of Palestinian origin, which is evidenced linguistically as well as by the content.¹⁵³ Jesus is Jewish, and the words of Jesus pertain to contemporary, inner-Jewish conflicts. Weiss thus positions Jesus in his historical soil in a way that earlier scholars had not, although the dichotomy between the prophets and later Judaism is still there. He says:

the ethical demands of Jesus do not contain any nationally or locally rootless ethics of humanity (*Menschheitsethik*), but show a development in the spirit of the religion of the old prophets, which disconnects it from the vulgar Jewish one.¹⁵⁴

Holding that the stories cannot be understood apart from this environment, however, Weiss upgrades the Palestinian background to Jesus’ own. Without second thought, he places Jesus within Judaism,¹⁵⁵ which marks a new phase compared to Baur and Bousset. This does not mean that Jesus is merely Jewish—the new faith in the Messiah meant a “formidable step above [the Messianic hope, A.G.] of Judaism”.¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, although Weiss reflects on what the divinity of the man Jesus would have meant to *Jewish* men, he does not ridicule or criticise Jewish faith.¹⁵⁷ Continuity with Jewish customs is no problem: Jerusalem is the obvious centre of the new faith, the twelve apostles follow the twelve tribes, the church organises itself as the synagogue had, etc.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵² On Weiss’s integrity as an historian, see Lannert, *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiss*, 214.

¹⁵³ Johannes Weiss, *Das Urchristentum. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von D. Rudolf Knopf* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), 8.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁵⁵ It is interesting to compare this discussion to the early publication of his student Rudolf Bultmann, Rudolf Bultmann, “Urgemeinde”, in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1913), where a similar picture is presented.

¹⁵⁶ Weiss, *Das Urchristentum. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von D. Rudolf Knopf*, 25.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 32–38.

At the same time, Weiss retains notions that may be regarded as less historically founded but are part of the research tradition in which he stands. Examples are ideas related to the Alexandrian or Hellenistic hypothesis: that “a freer Greek element” would become influential in the Jerusalem church, an idea that he shares with many modern exegetes;¹⁵⁹ that Stephen was a representative of a Jewish-Hellenistic enlightenment;¹⁶⁰ and that there was a division between Hebrews and Hellenists.¹⁶¹ But in presenting Paul, Weiss stresses his Palestinian-Jewish background, and his solid Pharisaic-Jewish background, with rabbinical hermeneutics: Paul, as the disciple of Gamaliel, “according to formation and education a real Jew in every respect”.¹⁶²

Weiss also has quarrels with Baur (without mentioning the name—the book has very few references) regarding the Christ party in Corinth,¹⁶³ at times using the concept of ‘Late Judaism’, but never the types of descriptions of Jews and Judaism found in Schürer, Wellhausen or Bousset. When dealing with Paul and Judaism, Weiss notes that Paul, because of his background, is more critical of Judaism than of paganism, but also that he oscillates between a warm affection for his people and deep pain at the position that he sees them in. Paul acknowledges that the Jews are favoured and that God stands by his calling and grace, believing in their final salvation.¹⁶⁴ As for 1 Thess. 2:15f, often considered one of the most ‘anti-Semitic’ statements of the New Testament, Weiss interprets it in an immanent sense, rather than seeing Paul’s statement as describing a negative Jewish essence. To him, it expresses Paul’s reaction to his constant encounter with Jews being “enemies to the gospel”, nothing more. Again, Weiss chooses not to take a stand against Jews and Judaism.

Discussing Romans, Weiss reinforces a coming in of the Jews in the end time, but he does not focus on the image of the root and the tree

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 38. See the criticism of the various hypotheses pertaining to the ‘Hellenists’, ‘Hellenism’, etc. in Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*.

¹⁶⁰ Weiss, *Das Urchristentum. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von D Rudolf Knopf*, 121.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 125. For a critical discussion, see Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*; Gerdmar, “Hebreer och hellenister i urförsamlingen—ett receptions-kritiskt perspektiv”.

¹⁶² Weiss, *Das Urchristentum. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von D Rudolf Knopf*, 130–135.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 257–258.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 480–481.

in Rom. 11:17–21. Instead, his interpretation accords with the idea of the third race, which Weiss thinks that Paul holds.¹⁶⁵ Although he admits that Paul believes in a remnant from Israel,¹⁶⁶ and notes the vision in Ephesians of Jews and Gentiles having been made one in Christ, “on the whole, the notion that the Jews stand wholly outside the church of God dominates, and that the third race, which has appeared alongside Gentiles and Jews, has taken the place of the Jews in a salvation-historical sense”.¹⁶⁷ Together with his earlier discussion of Paul and the Jews, Weiss gives an ambivalent picture here: on the one hand, there will be a final salvation; on the other hand, the third race has replaced Israel. Nevertheless, Weiss contends that Paul does not believe in a complete rejection of Israel.¹⁶⁸ Matthew, Mark and Luke–Acts present salvation as having escaped the Jews and come to the Gentiles.¹⁶⁹ But Weiss sees a stronger ‘anti-Judaism’ in 1 Peter, Revelation and the Gospel of John, the latter depicting the Jews as “the sons of the devil”, whereas anti-Judaism is mitigated through Paul’s sympathies and hopes for his people.¹⁷⁰ The “burning hate” with which the Jews persecuted Paul and the mission, however, shows that the synagogue felt the competition that the Christian propaganda represented.¹⁷¹ To Weiss, Matthew’s gospel has a similar ambivalence to Paul, having been written by a man grieving over the gospel’s transfer from Jewish to Gentile ground. On the one hand, he emphasises the Jewish roots, and on the other, that the Jews rejected salvation in unbelief and even wanted to murder the prophets.¹⁷²

Weiss discusses the exegetical problems relating to early Christianity in a way that is very similar to more modern exegesis, although most present-day scholars would judge him as being too optimistic regarding the historicity of the New Testament source material. Throughout his vast discussion on early Christianity, Weiss’s tone is calm and to the point. More than the research tradition in which he stands, he sees a continuity between Christianity and Judaism, despite stressing the ambivalence of Paul and the Gospel of Matthew. The spell of

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 517.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 481, 517.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 517.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 518.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 519.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 520.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 521–523.

¹⁷² Ibid., 587–588.

idealistic exegesis thus seems broken, with Weiss providing a thoughtful rendering of the source material instead of an ideological product. Although he talks of ‘Late Judaism’, the paradigms often linked to this in earlier research tradition are absent, as is a coarse dichotomising of Jewish and Greek, Palestine and Diaspora, or two ‘church theologies’, as found in the recent works of his History of Religions school colleagues.¹⁷³ Weiss’s ambition of letting the texts speak on their own terms also affects his view on the Jews, moving from the glaring ‘Late Judaism’ hypotheses heeded in much of his environment, to a realistic understanding of the environment of Jesus. Although Weiss in many ways differed from his teacher and father-in-law Albrecht Ritschl, the focus on the historical pathos and the New Testament text itself was probably part of the inheritance from him. Discussing the kingdom of God, his own findings in the New Testament become anomalous to contemporary systematic theology, including his own.¹⁷⁴ By letting responsible and historically informed exegesis be corrective to dogmatic theology, Weiss refuses to harmonise history with any overarching ideology. This approach seems to have favoured an historical picture of Jews and Judaism in New Testament exegesis.

Contextualising the History of Religions School and the Jews

The force of Bousset’s negative depiction of Jews and Judaism may cause surprise. I will therefore give a background to the intellectual climate in which ideas such as these were formed, comparing Bousset and Weiss, whose historical and ideological backgrounds may help us understand how their views relate to contemporary approaches to Jews and Judaism. Bousset and Weiss were also politically conscious and active, writing at a time when anti-Semitism in German discourse had moved from being a latent force to becoming part of politics and party platforms. Despite their similar political and theological backgrounds,

¹⁷³ See e.g. his colleague Wilhelm Heitmüller or Bousset’s hypotheses, W. Heitmüller, “Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus”, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 13 (1912) and W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*, vol. Neue Folge 4, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).

¹⁷⁴ Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 63–67.

however, Weiss seems to have adopted a very different position to that of Bousset.

Political questions were in no way foreign to the circles of the History of Religions school,¹⁷⁵ and as demonstrated in the chapter on Ritschl, since the 'Jewish problem' was part of politics, it was also part of theology. Although Weiss and Bousset were chiefly exegetes, many 'liberal' theologians regarded politics simply as the other side of the coin, and this included the 'Jewish problem'. Bousset had long been part of Christian social groups and parties that wanted to provide workers with an alternative to socialism. These were both monarchist and social, envisioning "ein soziales Kaisertum".¹⁷⁶ Several people in the circles of the History of Religions school became members of parliament, and both Weiss and Bousset were friends with the leading figure in these circles, Friedrich Naumann, who later became a legendary liberal personage. Both were also founding members of Naumann's Nationalsozialer Verein.¹⁷⁷ In Weiss, Bousset and Naumann's circles, Jews and Judaism were often viewed negatively. Some of the descriptions mentioned in Bousset's history of the Jewish religion above resemble these ideas.

The anti-Semitic preacher Adolf Stoecker (1835–1909) inspired many theologians at the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁷⁸ Before 1896, Naumann, Bousset and Weiss were associated with the court chaplain's Evangelisch-Soziales Kongress and were therefore aware of how Jews were constructed in the link between theology and politics. Although they left the cooperation with Stoecker with the founding of the Nationalsozialer Verein in 1896, this type of anti-Semitic environment may

¹⁷⁵ See e.g. Berthold Lannert, "Die Bedeutung der religionsgeschichtlichen Forschungen zur Geschichte des Urchristentums", in *Ernst Troeltschs Soziallehren: Studie zu ihrer Interpretation*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, *Troeltsch-Studien* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1993); see also Nagel's view: "The 'political professor' [...] was in the Wilhelminian era rather an exception than the rule," Anne Christine Nagel, *Martin Rade—Theologe und Politiker des Sozialen Liberalismus. Eine politische Biographie von Anne Christine Nagel*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Gangolf Hübinger, vol. 4, *Religiöse Kulturen der Moderne* (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1996), 9.

¹⁷⁶ Brockhaus²⁰, s.v. Nationalsozialer Verein.

¹⁷⁷ Lannert, "Die Bedeutung der religionsgeschichtlichen Forschungen zur Geschichte des Urchristentums", 39–40.

¹⁷⁸ In addition to those mentioned here, Adolf Schlatter spoke warmly of Stoecker, see Theodor Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1952), 187.

have played a role in their respective positions to Jews and Judaism, despite being theologically very different from Stoecker.

Stoecker came from a Pietist environment,¹⁷⁹ entering the higher levels of Prussian society in the last decades of the nineteenth century. His Christlich-Soziale Arbeiterpartei was founded in 1878 as an alternative to the Social Democratic Party,¹⁸⁰ but Stoecker became best known for popularising anti-Semitism. His new party was overtly anti-Semitic, and Stoecker owed some of his success among the lower middle class to this anti-Semitic stance,¹⁸¹ with people like Stoecker seeing the influence of Jews in media and finance as a negative factor in Germany.¹⁸² Stoecker clothed his racist ideas in Pietist language:

I want to deal with the Jewish problem (*die Judenfrage*) in full Christian love, but also in full social truth [...] We do not hate anyone, not the Jews either; we regard them as our co-citizens and love them as the people of the prophets and the apostles, from which our Redeemer has come forth; but this cannot hold us back, when Jewish papers discredit our faith and the Jewish spirit of Mammon destroys our people [...] In practice, modern Judaism is in my eyes a great danger to the life of the German people.¹⁸³

[...] Even in 1816, Benzenburg wrote, "Perhaps the glory of Germany will perish because of the Jews." When Christians continue to give in to the influences of the Jewish spirit that de-Germanises it, this prophecy will truly be fulfilled. [...] We must be a nation without honour if we do not break these chains of a foreign spirit, but in fact become Judaised (*verjudeten*).¹⁸⁴

¹⁷⁹ Zumbini, *Die Wurzeln Des Bösen*, 161–162, notes that Stoecker was directly inspired by Pietist missionary to the Jews Johannes de le Roi. For Stoecker, see Hans Engelmann, *Kirche am Abgrund. Adolf Stoecker und seine antijüdische Bewegung*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, vol. 5, Studien zu jüdischem Volk und christlicher Gemeinde (Berlin: Selbstverlag Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1984).

¹⁸⁰ Philip G. Dwyer, "The changing concerns of Prussian conservatism, 1830–1914", in *Modern Prussian History 1830–1947*, ed. Philip G. Dwyer (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 100.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 101.

¹⁸² Grit Koch, *Adolf Stoecker 1835–1909. Ein Leben zwischen Politik und Kirche*, ed. Detlef Leistner-Opfermann and Dietmar Peschel-Rentsch, vol. 101, Erlanger Studien (Erlangen und Jena: Verlag Palm & Enke, 1993), 85.

¹⁸³ Adolf Stoecker, *Christlich-Sozial. Reden und Aufsätze* (Berlin: Verlag der Buchhandlung der Berliner Stadtmission, 1890), 359–360. See also Koch, *Adolf Stoecker 1835–1909. Ein Leben zwischen Politik und Kirche*, 85.

¹⁸⁴ Stoecker, *Christlich-Sozial. Reden und Aufsätze*, 366–367.

The Jews are “a people within the people, a state within the state, a tribe on its own among a foreign race”,¹⁸⁵ who are to blame for the spiritual and economic impoverishment, Stoecker writes. He proceeds to talk about their legalism, and states that gold and finances, as well as the press and higher education, are in the hands of the Jews. But in reality, the Jews are idle, he claims.¹⁸⁶ And if Jewry continue to rule through the press and its capital, disaster is inevitable. “Israel must give up the claim of becoming the lord over Germany,”¹⁸⁷ he writes, for only by removing Jewish influence from key areas of German life can the nation be saved from greater problems.¹⁸⁸ Stoecker also warns that an anti-Semitism is beginning to blaze up, which the gospel opposes.¹⁸⁹ Such rhetoric naturally attempts to disguise that this very anti-Semitism is being popularised by Stoecker himself! Stoecker’s criticism is directed at “modern Judaism”,¹⁹⁰ a pattern that would recur in for example Schlatter and Kittel, who see modern Judaism as the main reason for degeneration during the Weimar years.¹⁹¹ The sum of Stoecker’s 150 pages on the ‘Jewish problem’ is that the Jews are an economic, spiritual and moral danger to Germany, and are charged with unchecked capitalism.¹⁹² This double confession of loving the Jews as heirs of the prophets, while warning against them as a primary social threat is also seen in National Socialist exegetical discourse.¹⁹³

The above statements by Stoecker were made when Friedrich Naumann was a leading figure in Stoecker’s Christlich-Soziale Kongress,¹⁹⁴ and ideas such as these belonged to the social circles of Bousset and Weiss. Even after leaving Stoecker’s group, attitudes to Jews in Naumann’s circles ranged from negative bias to overt racism. When Naumann, who aired anti-Semitic ideas in his early writings,¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁵ Qtd. from Koch, *Adolf Stoecker 1835–1909*, 87.

¹⁸⁶ Stoecker, *Christlich-Sozial. Reden und Aufsätze*, 367.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 368.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 369.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 368.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 360.

¹⁹¹ See the respective chapters.

¹⁹² Stoecker, *Christlich-Sozial. Reden und Aufsätze*, 359–494.

¹⁹³ See e.g. the discussion about Gerhard Kittel below.

¹⁹⁴ Dieter Düding, *Der Nationalsoziale Verein 1896–1903. Die gescheiterte Versuch einer parteipolitischen Synthese von Nationalismus, Sozialismus und Liberalismus*, vol. 6, Studien zur Geschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Abhandlung der Forschungsabteilung des historischen Seminars der Universität Köln (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1972), 23–24.

¹⁹⁵ Koch, *Adolf Stoecker 1835–1909*, 2 n. 2; 166.

wrote the article "What we owe Stoecker" in 1895, he identified with Stoecker,¹⁹⁶ despite having an excellent opportunity to take a stand against his anti-Semitism. However, in the debate on the programme of the Nationalsoziale Verein in 1896, Naumann, as a political principle, rejected racial anti-Semitism,¹⁹⁷ wishing to limit opposition between Jew and non-Jew to an individual level, and arguing that the local party groups should decide whether or not to allow 'Israelites' in their associations. In addition to Bousset and Weiss,¹⁹⁸ Wilhelm Ruprecht, another Göttingen personality and a relation of the two professors, was also active within the Nationalsoziale Verein.¹⁹⁹ According to Ruprecht, the Jews in Germany played a negative role:

We have quite specific damages in mind, which the Jews have the main responsibility for, one could say, as far as the history of all peoples and ages goes, and therefore we also, in our fatherland, fight the great power of Judaism out of national interest. [...] there is something legitimate in political and social anti-Semitism.²⁰⁰

In liberal Protestantism, the environment of all the persons mentioned here except Stoecker, the stand towards Jews and Judaism was often ambivalent. Another key figure in these circles, Martin Rade, long-standing editor of the liberal theological flagship journal *Die Christliche Welt*, as well as brother-in-law of Friedrich Naumann, has a partly parallel story. Here is a curious intertwining of negative attitudes towards Jews, together with a clear stand against both anti-Semitism and prejudiced attitudes towards Jews. Rade, too, came into early contact with, and held a fascination for, Stoecker,²⁰¹ although he was somewhat guarded against a too radical anti-Semitism of certain circles in Stoecker's Evangelisch-Sozialen Kongress. Nevertheless, he shows a certain understanding for anti-Semitism: "Anti-Semitism is a reaction of natural men against evils that undoubtedly exist. However, we as Christians cannot simply go along with it (*es mitmachen*)."²⁰² Despite his clear stand against racism

¹⁹⁶ Friedrich Naumann, *Was heißt Christlich-Sozial? Gesammelte Aufsätze von Fr. Naumann. Zweites Heft* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1896), 33.

¹⁹⁷ Düding, *Der Nationalsoziale Verein 1896–1903*, 60.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 137, 141.

¹⁹⁹ Lannert, "Die Bedeutung der religionsgeschichtlichen Forschungen zur Geschichte des Urchristentums", 46.

²⁰⁰ Düding, *Der Nationalsoziale Verein 1896–1903*, 61.

²⁰¹ Nagel, *Martin Rade—Theologe und Politiker des Sozialen Liberalismus*, 34.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 39 n. 63.

and National Socialism, Rade was still able to advocate special laws for Jews in the early 1930s.²⁰³

The famous Paul de Lagarde was another leading theologians in the intellectual environment of Göttingen, where Bousset and Weiss forged their scholarly tools.²⁰⁴ Admittedly, de Lagarde's role in the History of Religions school is disputed—even Gunkel and Troeltsch argued about it—but Bousset's biographer Verheule concludes that there is an affinity of "spiritual climate" between Bousset and de Lagarde.²⁰⁵ de Lagarde is renowned for his German chauvinism and strong polemic against Jews and Judaism. He related his view on Jews to his nationalism, stating that religion and other things had to adjust to German nationalism; they needed to be Germanised.²⁰⁶ Bousset evidently uses de Lagarde's *Deutsche Schriften*,²⁰⁷ quoting him on the absolute opposition (*gerade Gegensatz*) between Jesus and Judaism.²⁰⁸ As for Second Temple Judaism, de Lagarde differentiates sharply between *Israelitismus*, which was a positive preparation for Jesus of Nazareth, and *Judentum*, which was a negative one,²⁰⁹ thus agreeing with scholars such as de Wette, where *Judentum* would be synonymous with 'Late Judaism'. Jesus adopts no nationality, least of all a Jewish one,²¹⁰ and to de Lagarde, the ardent spirit of Jesus came about "in opposition to the Judaism of his time".²¹¹ On this point, Bousset and de Lagarde's opinions are the same.

²⁰³ Ibid., 243–244. For this and the attitude to Jews, Judaism and anti-Semitism in liberal Protestantism, see also the chapter on Rudolf Bultmann below.

²⁰⁴ Also known as Paul Anton Bötticher, but took the name of his adoptive mother in 1854, Robert Hanhart, "Paul Anton de Lagarde und seine Kritik an der Theologie", in *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Moeller, *Göttinger Universitätschriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 270; Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*, 298; Hanhart, 273.

²⁰⁵ Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*, 230. Hanhart stresses the difference between de Lagarde and the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, Hanhart, "Paul Anton de Lagarde und seine Kritik an der Theologie", 301–302.

²⁰⁶ Verheule, *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*, 299.

²⁰⁷ Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*, 41, 75, but not always with consent, 21 n. 3.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 41, quoting Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften* (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1878), 229–230 (faulty reference in Bousset's text: 292).

²⁰⁹ de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften*, 235.

²¹⁰ On de Lagarde as a forerunner to anti-Semitism, see Ina Ulrike Paul, "Paul Anton de Lagarde", in *Handbuch zur "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871–1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht (München: K. G. Saur, 1999).

²¹¹ de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften*, 229.

This discussion shows that in the circles of the History of Religions school, certain ideas were in vogue that can explain statements about Jews and Judaism in Bousset's production, and may also provide a background to Weiss's statements about Jesus being a Jewish person, which could be interpreted as a reaction to that.

Bousset's Philosophical Background

Johannes Weiss and Wilhelm Bousset shared certain political interests, but their philosophical preferences differed. In Bousset's philosophical background, several leading names are tainted with anti-Semitism. Bousset showed an early dependence on Carlyle,²¹² an appreciation shared with several members of the History of Religions school,²¹³ although he also pointed to weaknesses in Carlyle's focus on the personal in history.²¹⁴ As already noted, Weiss criticised the influence of Carlyle on Bousset's work as early as in 1892. Weiss's criticism, however, was matched by an equally great enthusiasm on Bousset's part. In a series of articles in *Die Christliche Welt*, Bousset writes about "Thomas Carlyle. A Prophet of the Nineteenth Century (1795–1881)", deeming the influence of Carlyle one of the most important reasons for the positive trends that he sees in German spiritual life. Although Carlyle was Scottish, his writing with reference to Germany and German thought was deeply cherished by many German intellectuals, especially his writings about Frederick the Great as the heroic king who mastered the masses.²¹⁵ Carlyle himself bore witness to great liberation through German idealistic philosophy and literature. At the centre of his ideology was the one strong leader, the Hero, who stood in relation to the masses.²¹⁶ According to Bousset,

²¹² Berger, *Exegese und Philosophie*, 87.

²¹³ Kahlert, *Der Held und seine Gemeinde. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Stifterpersönlichkeit und Verehrergemeinschaft in der Theologie des freien Protestantismus*, 138–139.

²¹⁴ Wilhelm Bousset, "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts", *Die Christliche Welt* 11 (1897), 251, as noted in Kahlert, *Der Held und seine Gemeinde. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Stifterpersönlichkeit und Verehrergemeinschaft in der Theologie des freien Protestantismus*, 171.

²¹⁵ Bousset, "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts", 249–251.

²¹⁶ Wilhelm Bousset, "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 3–", *Die Christliche Welt* 12 (1897), 268; Wilhelm Bousset, "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 5", *Die Christliche Welt* 13 (1897), 299. See the widespread work on heroes by Carlyle, Thomas Carlyle, *On heroes, hero-worship and the heroic in history* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1889).

Carlyle combines hero worship, nationalism and defence of the poor. To him, Carlyle's faith does not entail weakness or emotionalism but is the faith of the strong, courageous, free and confident man, for whom work and duty are constitutive.²¹⁷

It is quite clear that Carlyle was anti-Semitic.²¹⁸ In his criticism of 'Late Judaism', Bousset at times seems inspired by Carlyle, for example when he somewhat surprisingly focuses on the role of work in 'Late Judaism', holding that it had no meaning to the masses: "it [the Messianic piety, A.G.] strengthened the conviction more and more that all earthly work is useless".²¹⁹ According to Berger, this should be seen against the background of Carlyle's discussion on the role of work,²²⁰ but Bousset also refers to Wellhausen at this point, making it unclear whether Bousset was directly influenced by Carlyle in his view on the Jews. However, given that Bousset deeply cherished Carlyle, his influence should not be disregarded. Moreover, from 1909, Bousset was deeply influenced by the Kantian philosopher and well-known anti-Semite J. E. Fries through what is called *Neufriesianismus*, a movement that also had an impact on Bousset's colleague Rudolf Otto.²²¹

Against this political and philosophical background, Bousset's statements regarding Jews become more comprehensible. These strongly resemble views such as those of Stoecker or anti-Semitic discourse at large. Jews and their religion are limited, legalistic, casuistic; Jews only focus on duty, only strive for reward; Jews have narrow hearts, conceit, pride and censoriousness; Jews are false and hypocritical, their ethics lacking truthfulness; Jews possess a "repugnant and offensive particularism" and "national elation"; Judaism is a superpower, a world power, a foreign body in society, exclusive, superior in trade, exploiting different circumstances, influencing the influential, provoking the surrounding peoples through its customs and power. No such attitudes can be traced in Weiss, however. On the contrary, he argues for a more far-reaching continuity with Judaism than had previously been done in Enlighten-

²¹⁷ Bousset, "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 5", 297–298.

²¹⁸ See T. Peter Park, "Thomas Carlyle and the Jews", *Journal of European Studies* 20 (1990). Carlyle also inspired Hitler, with his strong emphasis on the great leader, Alan Steinweis, "Hitler and Carlyle's 'Historical Greatness'", *History Today*, June (1995).

²¹⁹ Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*, 30–31.

²²⁰ Berger, *Exegese und Philosophie*, 106–107.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 114.

ment research tradition. This may have prevented a more prejudiced approach, since Bousset's and Weiss's writings on Jews and Judaism hardly lacked political relevance.

Conclusion

The History of Religions school and its most prominent historians on Judaism, Wilhelm Bousset and Johannes Weiss, came out of the cultural-Protestant theology of Albrecht Ritschl. Although both scholars would remain within this liberal Protestantism, Weiss re-evaluated Jesus in such a way that Jesus became an anomaly within his own paradigm, whereas Bousset basically reinforced the picture of Judaism that prevailed within his tradition, sharpening it through a strongly negative depiction of 'Late Judaism'.

Despite their common background, the *characterisation* of Jews and Judaism differed greatly in Bousset and Weiss. In Bousset's work, Jews and Judaism are depicted in terms of 'Late Judaism', a degeneration of the earlier Israelite religion. Legalistic, particularistic, proud, with a "theology of accounts", and formed out of a "genius of hatred", Judaism is hopelessly restricted to being an ethnic religion, national, ceremonial, limited and sinking down into the 'letter'. Moreover, Judaism is casuistic, censorious, false and hypocritical, and in its apocalypticism, fanatic, bizarre, wild and confused. At this point, however, stereotypes from the anti-Semitic discourse of the late nineteenth century are added: Judaism is a superpower and world power, a foreign body in society, exclusive and superior in trade; it exploits different circumstances, influences the influential and provokes the surrounding peoples through its customs and power; furthermore, the Jews themselves provoke racial hatred. Bousset has an essentialist view on Jews and Judaism in never-changing negative roles here, and so, instead of giving an historical account of Judaism in relation to the New Testament, he constructs a caricature of the Jews and Judaism in New Testament times. While he perpetuates much of the research tradition from Semler, de Wette and others, he also mixes this with political and philosophical ideas that included racist views of Jews and Judaism.

Weiss's characterisation of Judaism is rather different, painting a picture that is basically independent from the prevalent 'Late Judaism' hypothesis. Where Bousset perpetuates such positions, Weiss questions them. He upgrades the Palestinian-Jewish background of Jesus, making

it his genuine background. Instead of seeing this as a disadvantage and trying to distance Jesus from it, for example, he understands Jesus' ethics as being a development from those of the old prophets, rooted in his Jewish nation. Weiss does not describe Jewish faith in negative terms but presents Paul on the basis of his Palestinian-Jewish background; using rabbinical hermeneutics, he was "according to formation and education a real Jew in every respect". This was seventy years before the so-called 'new perspective on Paul' was conceived. Weiss holds that Paul does not believe in an outright rejection of Israel—although he sees an anti-Judaism in John—and his usage of the 'Late Judaism' concept lacks the traditional negative notions of Bousset. Nowhere does Weiss employ stereotypes of Jews and Judaism, either in his description of New Testament Judaism or with reference to modern Jews.

Bousset uses two established *historiographical* thought patterns: a more general idea of the progress of religions from Asian religions to Christianity, and that of Alexandrian Judaism as the place where Judaism was 'elevated' to new dimensions. The historiography of both is aetiological. By reconstructing Christianity's prehistory, they endeavour to explain how it became the world religion. Bousset's imagery of an organic development of the world religions is also one where the progression goes from the religion of savages, to national, prophetic and law religions, to redemptive religions such as Buddhism and Platonism, before finally reaching the end point: Christianity. Here the second pattern comes in handy. Palestinian Judaism is centripetal, whereas Diaspora Judaism is centrifugal, which to Bousset means that Diaspora Judaism is more outwardly directed. Although he does not subscribe to a total dichotomy between the two Judaisms, he does hold that the time of Alexander was one of spiritual fusion. It had primarily Greek elements but also included the mystery religions—here Bousset introduces an element into the traditional pattern of the History of Religions school. While Judaism did not break through into the freedom offered by the Greek and pagan influences, Alexandrian Judaism "built the bridge on which the gospel could enter the world". Introducing the idea of a syncretism of Judaism and paganism, Bousset's historiography is nevertheless modelled on the skeleton of the Enlightenment research tradition. It does not build on historical empiricism, however, and the ideas that the author wishes to present are primary to historical circumstances.

Here, too, Weiss differs from Bousset. Whereas Bousset works actio-logically, Weiss tries to reconstruct the historical situation of early Christianity in a modern sense, and he plants Jesus in his historical soil.

When talking of the ‘Hellenists’ in the Jerusalem church representing a “freer Greek element”, he falls back on the same research tradition as Bousset. Nevertheless, on the whole, if Bousset’s work was largely a perpetuation of idealist historiography, Weiss’s approach was a true attempt to write history *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, breaking the idealistic spell over New Testament history.

The theme of *continuity-discontinuity* between Jesus and Judaism is evident in both Bousset and Weiss. Having constructed his picture of ‘Late Judaism’, Bousset negates any continuity between it and Jesus. Jesus is the contrast, who restores the preaching of the prophets—in no way does he stand “under the spell of Judaism”. Instead, Jesus and Judaism are absolute opposites! The continuity that Bousset does acknowledge passes over ‘Late Judaism’ to the prophets, with Bousset regarding Old and New Testament religion as the hitherto highest form of religion. To him, the opposition between particularism and universalism (see below), between folk religion and universal religion, runs deep. This dichotomy is also parallel to that between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism. For the absolute opposition between Judaism and Christianity, Bousset was able to fall back on Paul de Lagarde, one of the fathers of the History of Religions school: the dichotomy between *Israelitismus* (the positive preparation for Jesus) and *Judentum* (the negative). This is, moreover, in line with a long research tradition.

If Bousset does what he can to disconnect Judaism and Christianity, Weiss stresses the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, and wishes to present Jesus in his Jewish setting. This is Weiss’s overall approach, and both Bousset and Weiss acknowledge that the attitude to continuity-discontinuity governs the outcome of any study on Jesus. Following his programme, Weiss reconstructs Jesus’ background using Old Testament, rabbinic and intertestamental literature, as the Gospel stories cannot be understood apart from their Jewish environment. Whereas Bousset regards the conflict as one between Christianity and Judaism, Weiss sees inner-Jewish conflicts. He considers Jerusalem to be the centre of the new faith, the twelve apostles to be the continuation of the twelve tribes, etc. Nevertheless, to Weiss, the new faith is a big step above Judaism, and there is no such thing as two parallel ways to salvation for Jews and Christians. Weiss finds a way in Paul’s ideas of a third race that replaces Israel, even if not entirely. Consequently, in Weiss’s strategy of continuity, a dichotomising between Judaism and Christianity becomes less important, and both the Old Testament and Jewish literature are of value.

In Bousset's *symbolic world*, certain notions stand for positive values, others for negative ones.²²² Recurring positive notions are e.g. universalism, progress into higher spiritual forms of religion, and the 'hero'. Reality is organic, described with a tree model, and progress occurs through free spiritual personalities, 'heroes'. The peak of history is universal monotheism and Christianity as a world religion, since Christianity liberates the individual, and the Gospels are spirited by a 'heroic atmosphere'. Moreover, progress represents a transcendence and spiritualisation of faith in God. Jesus, the Hero, comes with peace in the chaos that prevailed before him. But freedom and redemption are also linked to Greece and Plato. There is a certain connection between this vision of progress and Bousset's Carlyle-inspired German nationalism, where Germany has a key role to play in history. In this symbolic world, Jews and Judaism play the negative role. Jews stand for particularism, rather than Bousset's vision of universalism; they are not heroes as the prophets and Jesus are; Judaism is the opposite of spiritualised or transcendent religion; furthermore, it is characterised by limitedness, as opposed to freedom. And so it continues. Hence Jews play a role in Bousset's symbolic world, but it is a consistently negative one. In this symbolic world, values and roles are essential: the 'symbolic Jew' is essentially negative, and Jesus and 'his side' are essentially positive.

Constructing Weiss's symbolic world is more intricate. He confesses outright that although Jesus is Jewish and has a far-reaching continuity with Judaism, his apocalyptic theology does not fill the needs of Weiss or modern man. Weiss maintains his own liberal Protestant theology and ethos, and points out that the kingdom (immanent in the world and society) that was such an important tenet in the theology of Ritschl, out of which Weiss came, is something entirely different to Jesus—eschatological, superworldly, in opposition to bourgeois society! Thus Weiss lets the kingdom of God as Jesus renders it become a corrective to his own theology. In Weiss symbolic world, however, Jesus is a positive factor, and through the continuity figured between Jesus and his contemporary Judaism, Jews and Judaism also take on a positive role. The ethics of Jesus as a perpetuation of the prophets' definitely holds a prominent place.

²²² The symbolic world of an authorship is of course much more comprehensive than this, and I concentrate on the place that Jews and Judaism hold in the symbolic world.

Neither of the authors expressly discusses the societal status of the Jews in the texts considered, nor do they attempt a direct *legitimation* or *delegitimation* of the existing societal status of Jews and Judaism. However, following the Berlin Anti-Semitism Dispute (*Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*) in 1879–1880, when Adolf Stoecker and Heinrich von Treitschke questioned the relative freedom of Jews in German society, the ‘Jewish problem’ was a hot topic, and anti-Semitism was included in the programmes of political parties. In this context, the statements that Protestant exegetes made regarding Jews could help legitimise or delegitimise their status. Pulzer notes that “the term *Christian* in a political context explicitly came to have more and more of a national—even racial—connotation”,²²³ and in the climate that Weiss and Bousset wrote in, the word ‘Jew’ was even more charged.

Bousset and Weiss were both well aware of the discussion regarding the Jews. Weiss’s insistence on the continuity between Jesus and Judaism would be an indirect but powerful legitimisation of Jews as acceptable and even positive, and a delegitimation of racist policies. But whereas Weiss does not refer to the cultural and political discourse regarding the Jews, Bousset does. Firstly, his stereotypical descriptions of Jews and Judaism, which are not unlike Stoecker’s, would indirectly legitimise a demeaning of Jews qua Jews, the thought being that if Jews were essentially what Bousset said they were, this would also apply to modern Jews. Secondly, Bousset uses a range of expressions that are hardly motivated by his source material but seem to belong to contemporary anti-Semitic discourse: Judaism as a world power and a foreign body in society, exclusive, superior in trade; Jews exploit whatever might be exploited, striving for influence and provoking the surrounding peoples through their customs and power; the Jews themselves provoke racial hatred, since they “hate all and are hated by all”. Similarly, Bousset argues that anti-Semitism is not racial hatred but is caused by the Jews. Of course, Bousset cannot be judged for his interest in anti-Semitic writers such as Carlyle, Fries and de Lagarde, but this philosophical background makes sense given the evidence of anti-Semitic stereotypes. Although Bousset would most probably take a stand against anti-Semitic policy—he continued to side with Friedrich Naumann, who in

²²³ Peter Pulzer, “The Return of Old Hatreds”, in *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Integration in Dispute 1871–1918*, ed. Michael A. Meyer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 222.

1903 abandoned anti-Semitism²²⁴—statements that would be labelled anti-Semitic today were acceptable then. It did not matter that these stereotypes concerned Jewish past—Bousset's descriptions of Jews come across as timeless descriptions of Jewish character. Despite there being no evidence that Bousset's statements had direct influence on the political debate, his stereotypes have influenced generations of theologians and ministers through one of the main handbooks on the religion of Judaism in Protestant scholarship. This indirect legitimization of social strategies against Jews should not be underestimated.

²²⁴ Ibid., 224.

PART II
SALVATION-HISTORICAL EXEGESIS AND THE JEWS:
FROM THOLUCK TO SCHLATTER

INTRODUCTION

Running parallel with Enlightenment-oriented theology and exegesis was a confessional current that in some ways related differently to Jews and Judaism. This current was well represented in academia, exerting great influence on scholars and contemporary church life. In the nineteenth century, it was also widespread within the influential aristocracy, where Pietist revival had gained a strong hold. Among these ‘perfumed Pietists’, there was a special interest in the Jews.¹ As Pietism became part and parcel of the reconstructed Prussian state, so did the question of the Jews, but with another angle than ‘emancipation’: missions.

In this tradition, the Jews encountered something entirely different from what they had met in Enlightenment theology. As earlier chapters have shown, although the Enlightenment theologians often professed emancipation, in reality the picture was far more complex,² and the Jews’ political situation was still precarious. After the Napoleonic Wars, discussions were held on the rights of Jews, leading to various degrees of blessing or curse for the Jews, depending on the German *Land* in which they lived.³ In some places, Jews enjoyed a certain freedom of worship and trade, despite it being dependent on goodwill, such as a one-year permission, granted by an elector or prince.⁴ In Prussia, however, after the disaster in 1806, when Napoleon had humiliated the nation at Jena and Auerstädt, the privileged Jews became eligible for citizens’ rights relatively quickly. In 1812, the “edict concerning the civil status of Jews within the Prussian state” was passed, on the condition that they acquired German family names and used German or another living language in their business and other doings.⁵

¹ The phrase ‘perfumed Pietists’ comes from a 19th-c. biography about Tholuck, Christopher M. Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 124.

² See Schmuel Ettinger, “Foreword to Tal, Uriel, Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914”, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975); Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, 147–158.

³ See Elbogen and Sterling, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* for the situation in different *Länder*.

⁴ Breuer and Graetz, *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, vol. I, 142–143.

⁵ Michael Brenner, Stefi Jersch-Wenzel, and Michael A. Meyer, *German-Jewish History*

However, along with the task of reshaping central Europe after the Napoleonic Wars, the Congress of Vienna in 1815 was also urged by various cities to deal with the 'Jewish problem', reversing the Jewish legislation implemented by the French.⁶ In effect, the cities that complained about the emancipation of the Jews had their way, and the Congress meant a backlash for Jews almost everywhere.⁷ Once again, the relationship was one between a Christian state and a socio-religious minority without a very strong position. This is the background of the Jews in Prussia, against which the attempts to conduct missionary work among Jews—as well as the theology and social action that were connected to it—must be seen.⁸

The 1800–1850 period was one of awakening as well as one of missions to Jews, this being strongly promoted by the confessional Pietist aristocracy. In Prussia alone, around 5,000 Jews converted to Christianity between 1800 and 1848. The conversions happened for various reasons, ranging from "sheer cynicism to genuine conviction", Michael Meyer suggests, baptism being the ticket into German and European society.⁹ Clark calls Prussia "a missionary state", especially with regard to the Jews.¹⁰ Between the Congress of Vienna and the revolution in 1848, the Pietist awakening was the dominant spiritual power in Prussia—and thanks to its deep influence in the circles of the royal court, its influence also extended beyond that. The Pietists struggled, on the one hand, against what they regarded as the onslaught of Enlightenment ideas.¹¹ On the other hand, they fought an intense battle for souls, especially Jewish ones. In the course of these chapters, it will become clear that although this meant that Jews were seen as objects of conversionist activities, the strongest defenders of the Jews often came from among these missionaries.

in *Modern Times. Emancipation and Acculturation*, ed. Michael A. Meyer, vol. 2, *German-Jewish History in Modern Times* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 24–27.

⁶ Ibid., 27–28.

⁷ See *ibid.*, 27–30.

⁸ For this, see Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*.

⁹ Brenner, Jersch-Wenzel, and Meyer, *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Emancipation and Acculturation*, 177–178.

¹⁰ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 92.

¹¹ For the Enlightenment-oriented tradition, see e.g. Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, *Protestantisches Christentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, ed. Helmut Thieckle and Hans Thimme, vol. 5/6, *Evangelische Enzyklopädie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965).

Philo-Semitism

It is sometimes suggested that there is generally a ‘philo-Semitism’ in Pietist circles, due to the place that Jews are given in salvation history.¹² However, apart from the problematic nature of the concept of philo-Semitism as such, the fact that Jews of a heroic, biblical history are given a prominent place does not guarantee a positive attitude to contemporary Jews.¹³ The founder of the Pietist movement, Philipp Jakob Spener (1635–1705) believed in the salvation-historical role of the Jews, who would come into the kingdom in the end times, holding the deterministic view that this would happen whatever the Church could accomplish through its missionary activities. He also said that the conduct of Christians was a main obstacle to Jews being converted,¹⁴ objecting to the idea that Jews were corrupt or insincere. Although it is true that he could talk of Jews in negative terms, Spener’s tone was more favourable than what was common at the time.¹⁵ Spener was probably instrumental in introducing a new, more positive Christian attitude towards Jews, as well as an interest in using Jewish source materials.¹⁶ On the other hand, he supported forcing Jews to listen to Christian sermons, and there was no doubt about Christian superiority. Nikolaus Graf von Zinzendorf (1700–1760) later integrated Judaism as part of Christian tradition, opening up for dialogue with Judaism in a new way.¹⁷

The Jewish legislation of 1812 meant opportunity for some, but it did not change much. In most contemporary reports, conversion was regarded as the sole solution to the ‘Jewish problem’:¹⁸ “Prussian Jewish

¹² For the definition and historiographical use of this concept, fraught with the same ambiguity as its antithesis anti-Semitism, see Kinzig, “Philosemitismus. Teil I: Zur Geschichte des Begriffs”; Kinzig, “Philosemitismus. Teil II: Zur historiographischen Verwendung des Begriffs”.

¹³ Kinzig, “Philosemitismus. Teil I: Zur Geschichte des Begriffs”, 204–205, referring to Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems. Band II: Anmerkungen, Exkurse, Register*, 109.

¹⁴ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 25–27.

¹⁵ Ibid., 27–28.

¹⁶ Ibid., 30–31.

¹⁷ Christiane Dithmar, *Zinzendorfs nonkonformistische Haltung zum Judentum*, ed. Michael Graetz, vol. 1, *Schriften der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2000). See also Gustaf Dalman, “Graf Zinzendorf und die Juden”, *Saat auf Hoffnung* 26 (1889); Gustaf Dalman, “Graf Zinzendorf und die Juden”, *Saat auf Hoffnung* 27 (1890).

¹⁸ Ibid., 97.

policy [...] abandoned the secular solutions of the Enlightenment in favour of a religious solution founded on conversion as the only authentic variety of emancipation.”¹⁹ Even after they were converted, however, Jews often continued to face legal limitations and the resistance of non-Jewish Christians.²⁰ Callenberg, the leader of the mission to the Jews in Halle, for example, spoke of a “deceitful Jewish spirit” and made the classic distinction between Old Testament and contemporary Jews, suggesting that Christians were the true heirs of the Old Testament Jews.²¹

The leading figures of Biblicist exegesis—and missions to the Jews—were linked to confessional Pietist circles, from Friedrich August Tholuck, whose main opponents were men such as Schleiermacher and de Wette, to Hermann L. Strack and Adolf Schlatter. In this academic environment, an alternative view on the Jews and Judaism developed, which, among other things, was based on the notion of salvation history. As we will see, in the long term, this approach would prove both a blessing and a curse to the Jews of Germany.

¹⁹ Ibid., 131.

²⁰ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 63.

²¹ Ibid., 67–68. See also the ridiculing attitude of Stefan Schultz, 69.

FRIEDRICH AUGUST THOLUCK:
“SALVATION COMES FROM THE JEWS”

Professor Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck (1799–1877) became a central figure in three areas: the neo-Pietist awakening, the defence against the emerging Bible criticism, and missions to the Jews, a triad that was representative of this research tradition. As noted, the Pietist awakening had its roots in Philipp Jakob Spener’s Pietism, and he constructed his theology in such a way that an appreciation of the Jews is intrinsic to Pietist theology after him. To Spener, the conversion of the Jews was an urgent matter, and so he urged the German universities to put greater effort into teaching Oriental languages.¹ In Halle especially, intensive missionary work was carried out among the Jews.² As this revival grew cold, however, so did its missions, leading to the closing of the main base, Institutum Judaicum in Halle, in 1792.³ The new Pietist awakening in early nineteenth-century Prussia meant not only the reappearance of revivalist Christianity but also a renewed interest in the Jews.

Tholuck was a product of this revival. A man of exceptional linguistic ability—by the age of seventeen, he knew nineteen languages—Tholuck arrived in Berlin to study Oriental languages and, through the Orientalist von Diez, came into contact with the neo-Pietist movement.⁴ Here he met Baron von Kottwitz,⁵ the ‘patriarch’ of this movement, who became Tholuck’s spiritual father and later also a fellow worker.⁶ Through him,

¹ Ibid., 27.

² Ibid., 57–71.

³ Ibid., 81.

⁴ Günther Wenz, “Erweckte Theologie”, in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus. Band 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990), 254–255; Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 127–128.

⁵ On von Kottwitz, see Peter Maser, *Hans Ernst von Kottwitz. Studien zur Erweckungsbewegung des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Schlesien und Berlin*, ed. Peter Hauptmann, vol. 21, *Kirche im Osten. Studien zur osteuropäischen Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), who also uses the term ‘patriarch’, 124. The revival had roots in e.g. the Moravian Brethren, but the igniting spark probably came from the revival in Bavaria, Maser, 144.

⁶ Wenz, “Erweckte Theologie”, 255. For the close relationship between the baron and Tholuck, see Maser, *Hans Ernst von Kottwitz. Studien zur Erweckungsbewegung des frühen*

Tholuck got involved in work among Jews,⁷ for example becoming the founding editor of the missionary paper *Der Freund Israels*.⁸

With his learned Bible expositions and polemic against Schleiermacher, among others, Tholuck became the leading theologian of the awakening. None of his texts was more influential than *Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner, oder: die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers* ("Guido and Julius; or Sin and the Propitiator Exhibited in the True Consecration of the Skeptic"). As Clark puts it, this text was "as important for the awakening in Prussia as Spener's *Pia Desideria* had been for the pietist movement 150 years earlier".⁹ A novel, it contains letters between the two heroes Guido and Julius, revolving around repentance and faith. Numerous references to the works of classical literature and theology, including documents of other religions, as well as of modern philosophy and theology, show a man of great learning. It was thus well suited to his audience, which probably consisted mainly of educated Prussians—yet with a very clear agenda to present the gospel of the awakening. The novel was also directly aimed at countering the message of de Wette's famous theological novel, *Theodor oder des Zweiflers Weihe* ("Theodore, or the Skeptic's Conversion"). Published anonymously until the third edition, Tholuck's book was printed in nine editions in the course of the century and was translated into five languages.

Although Judaism is not a major motif in the book, a few references may intimate some of Tholuck's thinking. According to him, Israel—in its stubbornness constantly refractory to the loving God until it is humiliated by the irate God—is an image of proud humanity. The Law is a means through which God impresses on people the consciousness of standing under a Lord,¹⁰ and Judaism and Christianity are regarded by Tholuck as having revelation in common.¹¹ Returning to the idea of divine economy, he suggests that the destiny of the Eskimos, the devastation of Palestine and the fact that "Japheth lives in the tents of

19. *Jahrhunderts in Schlesien und Berlin passim*. On the frequent meetings of the conventicles, see Maser, 151.

⁷ Ibid., 166–169.

⁸ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 127–128.

⁹ Ibid., 129.

¹⁰ A. Tholuck, *Läran om Synden och Försonaren eller Tviflarens sanna Inwigning* (Göteborg: Samuel Norberg, 1829), 38–39.

¹¹ Ibid., 69.

Shem" are part of God's economy.¹² "If paganism is the starry night-side of religion, and Judaism is the sweet moonlit night, the moon and all the stars borrow the light from the sun," Christ, who is the light, Tholuck writes poetically,¹³ pointing to the beauty of Judaism but the superiority of Christianity.

Tholuck describes the role of Israel in the context of salvation history, beginning just after the fall of man. A "pious seed" (probably from Abel) continues even through dark ages, he contends, with the patriarch being found in Abraham. From him the seed grows into a people that receives the "ladder to heaven" as its possession, the ladder on which men of God can ascend and the message of God, descend.¹⁴ In this context, he also says that the salvation of the Jews is part of God's economy, referring to Romans 11.¹⁵ Thus, seeing the role of the Jews within a salvation-historical perspective, Tholuck does not paint Judaism or the Jews in dark colours, but regards physical Israel as a carrier of the seed of faith. He presents God's plan within a coherent scheme, although there is also a deterministic trace in his idea of God's economy. The destiny of peoples and cultures, including the desolation of Palestine, is governed by God's hand.

Tholuck's commentaries were his most influential scholarly works.¹⁶ Exegeting the texts, he conducts a critical dialogue with the leading representatives of Enlightenment theology. His description of the Jews contains both similarities and differences to e.g. Semler or de Wette. In Tholuck's discussion on the Sermon on the Mount and the kingdom of God, Jewish theocracy is painted positively, as the background to Jesus' teaching on the kingdom. Although he uses terms such as particularism and 'national limitedness', he stresses, in a positive way and in contrast to Semler or de Wette, that God elected this people from among the peoples of the earth, making it his own peculiar people. To Tholuck, the Jews have a specific role in relation to the peoples of the world, the Jewish people functioning as priest to the lay people, that is, the other nations.¹⁷

¹² Ibid., 73.

¹³ Ibid., 85.

¹⁴ Ibid., 152.

¹⁵ Ibid., 154.

¹⁶ Günther Wenz, "'Gehe Du in Dich, mein Guido'. August Tholuck als Theologe der Erweckungsbewegung", *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 27 (2001), 75.

¹⁷ A. Tholuck, *Ausführliche Auslegung der Bergpredigt Christi nach Matthäus*, 3 ed. (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1845), 82–83.

The Jews had realised this general role, Tholuck states, but for an interplay to become reality, the spirit of this principle was absolved from the Old Testament kingdom of God and its 'symbolic' and local forms. The fulfilment took place in the Messiah, through whom the kingdom of God became the kingdom of the world. Nevertheless, Tholuck sees a continuity between Israel and the new kingdom, and in contrast to F. C. Baur's history of early Christianity, it is through the Messiah that Christianity becomes universal, not through the encounter between Judaism and the 'Greek spirit' in the Diaspora. Tholuck's description of Palestinian Judaism is similar to Baur's, however: "the particular-national limits fell, the civil life was released from the spiritual; in place of the symbol came truth, in place of the Law, grace".¹⁸ Thus Tholuck basically agrees with the depiction of nationally limited Judaism as found in Baur, but he criticises Semler for turning the important biblical idea of the kingdom of God into a "small, Jewish local idea", accommodating it to Jewish thought—in this way, reducing it to a doctrine for the spreading of moral betterment.¹⁹ Although the Pharisees are painted negatively in Tholuck—the Pharisaic perversions [of the Law] missed its deeper inner intention²⁰—"the Redeemer" did not abrogate the Law but carried it out, thus retaining it, and both Jesus and Paul followed the Law in most cases, Tholuck contends.²¹ This is another instance where Tholuck points to continuity between Judaism and Christianity.

In addition to his ambitious work on the Sermon on the Mount, Tholuck's commentaries included John's gospel, Hebrews and Romans. In John, he does not interpret 'Jews' as Jews at large, but as the Jewish leadership, and he abstains from using John 5:18, 7:11, etc. against the Jews. Discussing the role of the Jews in the commentary on Romans, he stresses that "so much depends upon the salvation of the Jews".²² They are a covenant people according to a decision that will not change from God's point of view.²³ Tholuck refutes Baur's idea that Romans was written to repudiate the Judaism of the Roman church, arguing that Baur's rare opinion is linked to his hypothesis of the Paulines and

¹⁸ Ibid., 85.

¹⁹ Ibid., 87.

²⁰ Ibid., 161.

²¹ Ibid., 141–142.

²² A. Tholuck, *Kommentar zum Briefe Pauli an die Römer*, 2 ed. (Halle: Eduard Anton, 1842), 593.

²³ Ibid., 474.

Petrines. He also polemicises against other attempts at making Romans an argument against Judaism,²⁴ although he regards *Das Leben Jesu* by Baur's student Strauss as having been "financed by Jews and friends of Jews" to "carry on Jewish propaganda"!²⁵ This conspiratory joining of Jews propagating Judaism and liberal Christianity reveals that Tholuck is able to see Jews as a threat, and that he is well aware of the closeness between the Christian and Jewish theologies that share the Enlightenment as a base. Finally, Tholuck contends that Romans 9–11 purposes to show that God's promises to his peculiar people have failed, although from the beginning, only those who believed as Abraham did were the "real children of Abraham". Israel's exclusion is only temporal, however, and all of Israel will be saved.²⁶ Thus Tholuck maintains the thought of Israel's election.

Conclusion

Tholuck's *characterisation* of the Jews has a fundamentally positive tendency. Judaism is not anything negative—it is the beautiful moon, although it is outshone by Christ. The use of terms such as 'particularism' and 'national limitedness' for Jews and Judaism certainly contains a critical dimension, but Tholuck interprets particularism in a good way: the election of Israel is fundamental and the way to blessing for all peoples. Israel is not seen through rose-coloured spectacles, however: the people stubbornly resisted God, and it takes Christ to change this. The particular-national is not anything valuable in itself, and to Tholuck it was a positive development that national limits fell, grace replaced law, etc.

Tholuck contains no meditations on a *historiography* in which Hebraism degenerated into Judaism, or Judaism got rid of its national limits outside Palestine and was elevated by Greek thinking. Debating Baur's view that Christianity became universal through the encounter with the 'Greek spirit' in the Diaspora, Tholuck believes that Christianity became universal with the Messiah. His historiography has another, biblical logic. Where the Enlightenment scholars, with whom Tholuck

²⁴ Ibid., 19, 22–23.

²⁵ Sterling, *Judenhass*, 96.

²⁶ Tholuck, *Kommentar zum Briefe Pauli and die Römer*, 24.

interacts critically, draw a religio-philosophical trajectory with obligatory stops in Alexandria, and perhaps Iran, Tholuck's Pietist salvation history draws an arch from Abraham to the Messiah. If holy history to Baur is the encounter between Socrates and Christ, to Tholuck it is a comprehensive biblical narrative from Adam to Christ.

In Tholuck's thinking, there is an unbreakable *continuity*, a 'revelatory continuity' between the Old and New Testaments, and the continuity lies in the salvation-historical idea, where the new is merely a more or less predetermined continuation of the old. This thinking guaranteed the Jews an important role in God's plan. Regarding the Law, too, there is continuity: 'the Redeemer' did not abrogate the Law, and both Jesus and Paul followed the Law in most cases, thus retaining it. Similarly, the Messianic kingdom was nothing new, but it developed out of the Jewish theocracy.

The role of the Jews must be seen in the context of Tholuck's *symbolic world*. Here, as in the Enlightenment exegetical research tradition, there is a construct, a 'symbolic Jew', which fits into his symbolic world. Tholuck's overarching value system is biblical, and philosophy is of no consequence to his construction—at least not intentionally. Pietist theology, however, is: Spener's salvation-historical approach, where the Jews have a given role, is evident in Tholuck. This post-Reformation, economic theology, with roots in Pauline thought,²⁷ sees spiritual and material history as God's history and as an organic whole. In Tholuck's theology, the physical Israel retains its role as a carrier of the seed of faith. At the same time, his theology is Christocentric, which is the main foundation of his salvation history. The salvation of God's people is just as fundamental: "so much depends upon the salvation of the Jews". In Tholuck's world, 'Jew' is a positive word, and the 'symbolic Jew' is thus a positive figure—as opposed to only the 'Hebrew' in much of Enlightenment exegesis. The 'symbolic Jew' carries the seed of faith, Jesus and Paul are Jews, and they do not abrogate the Law. The Jews are and will continue to be a covenant people, in accordance with a divine decision. Thus the 'symbolic Jew' is a necessary player in God's salvation plan, which is why it is essential for Tholuck and his fellow Pietists to win the Jews for Christ.

²⁷ See R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996) on economic theology and how the biblical pattern was substituted by what Soulen calls the 'standard narrative', with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus as the main representatives.

It is important to realise that this 'symbolic Jew' is not the 'real Jew' next door. In terms of *legitimation* or delegitimation of policies that were negative for the Jews, the role of the Jews as part of God's salvation plan was probably favourable to the Jews; with the Jews at least potentially being highly significant figures in the working out of this salvation plan, it was important to defend and support Jews socially. This should not be regarded as unconditional support, however. Jews were not always viewed positively: to Tholuck, Jews and friends of Jews financed (!) Jewish propaganda, which was regarded as a threat to the missionary agenda of his circle. This motif will often return when dealing with this research tradition: the liberal Jews as a main threat to, in this case, Christianity, and in other cases, the nation.

JOHANN TOBIAS BECK:
ORGANIC CONTINUITY BETWEEN
JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Judaism and Christianity had a strong organic relationship in the theology of Johann Tobias Beck (1804–1878). Having spent part of his theological life countering tendencies like those of de Wette, by the time of his death, he was regarded as the leading ‘Biblicist’.¹ It was F. C. Baur who invited Beck to work in Tübingen,² where he became a pioneer of biblical theology and ‘captivated’ Adolf Schlatter among others, at least for a time.³ The reason for Beck’s connection with Baur was a common appreciation for dialectical theology, but he did not share Baur’s fundamental ideas and was instead one of the leading figures within Swabian Pietism. A systematic theologian, Beck wrote several exegetical works, the most important of which is his commentary on Romans.⁴ He is thus another example of theological ‘general practitioners’, such as de Wette and F. C. Baur.⁵ As Beck is regarded as one of the architects of ‘biblical theology’, it is important to look at the place of Jews in his conception. His contribution is all the more interesting because he interacts critically with both de Wette and Baur—even if not always explicitly. Despite differences of opinion, Beck was also friendly with de Wette in Basel.⁶ Holding two ‘heterodox’ views in

¹ Hanns-Martin Wolf, “Beck, Johan Tobias (1804–1878)”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980).

² For a brief biography, see Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, “Beck, Johan Tobias”, Verlag Traugott Bautz, Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon, Bd IV. Much separated Baur and Beck, and at first sight, the fact that Baur favoured Beck seems peculiar. However, to a certain degree, both shared an idealistic view of history in the vein of Schelling and Hegel, see above for Baur; for Beck, see Karl Gerhard Steck, *Die Idee des Heilsgeschichte. Hofmann-Schlatter-Cullmann*, ed. Karl Barth and Max Geiger, vol. 56, Theologische Studien (Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1959), 16–17, and below in this book.

³ William Baird, *History of New Testament Research. Volume Two: From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 374.

⁴ Johann Tobias Beck, *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer*, ed. Jul. Lindenmeyer, vol. 1–2 (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1884).

⁵ Th. Mazer, *Johan Tobias Beck. En lifsbild ur den kristna kyrkans historia* (Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrrelsens Bokförlag, 1916), 33.

⁶ Wolf, “Beck, Johan Tobias (1804–1878)”, Mazer, *Johan Tobias Beck. En lifsbild ur den kristna kyrkans historia*, 30, 33, 35.

Lutheran theology, that of justification as a non-forensic act and that of a coming Millennium, Beck was not fully accepted by confessional Lutheran theology either.⁷

An Organic View

Presenting the faithfulness of God, Beck uses a vivid seed-tree imagery, making Abraham the point where God enters in to show his faithfulness; this “decisive point” was chosen from among humanity as the place where the “seed of salvation” would attach itself.⁸ After a process of division into tribes and peoples, God began to prepare an “instrument and ground” (*Organ und Boden*) for the seed of blessing, the beginning seed of a kingdom of God among the nations of the world. Like a mustard seed, it reaches down into a specific individual and the family that grows around him. To start with, this takes shape in a popular (*Völkstümlich*) constitution, later in a vast tree that extends its branches all over the world, spreading until it finally joins into One Crown. The core tribes of the Semites maintained their faith in the name of Yahweh. They did not enter “the ethnic process of transformation”, since they continued their life as shepherds. Only by maintaining patriarchalism (*Vater-Regiment*) and sticking together as families could they survive.⁹

God has elected this people, Beck writes, a people wandering among other peoples and developing “greatness of soul and humility of spirit”. Abraham is the rock, out of which a house would be built, and God made a covenant with the patriarchs, starting a development where they, walking the “way of Jehovah”, would go from the mere order of nature into a life of increasing blessing.¹⁰ Using the tree imagery, Beck demonstrates that the history from Abraham to Christ is an organic unity. The individual’s relation to faith is emphasised, analogous to the work that took place through that special individual, Abraham. As a “pedagogical middle stage”, between the period of minority and the

⁷ Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie*, V, 139–140.

⁸ Johann Tobias Beck, *Die Christliche Lehr-Wissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden. Ein Versuch von J. T. Beck*, vol. 1. Die Logik der christlichen Lehre (Stuttgart: Verlag der Chr. Belser’schen Buchhandlung, 1841), 335–336.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 337.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 339–340.

inheritance of the person who is of age, comes the Law.¹¹ At this point, the “uncultivated, obstinate people” receives the discipline of the Law, revealing Beck’s view of a disciplinary problem in early Jewish history, as there may be when there are minors in the family.

Through Moses, schooled in the life of faith, God establishes a national and law-governed order in which individuals and life circumstances are shaped by a priestly state organism (*Staats-Organismus*), “under the redemptive and sanctifying grace and truth of Jehovah and his legislative-judicial rule”.¹² This indicates that Beck interprets the priestly rule and order following Moses positively, in contrast to much of Enlightenment research tradition, although he is probably also alluding to contemporary problems. In the background is an *ordo salutis*-oriented dimension—that God deals with an individual in a certain order when working out salvation—and God’s history with Israel is analogous to this. It includes both the work of the Law and the work of grace. Under the Law, force is still required, since the time of inner power and life has not yet come, Beck says. Here the severity—and long-suffering—of God is stressed. In the Torah, the whole organisation of the kingdom is set in writing, becoming a testimony to the people’s unique relationship with God. The Torah also provides a foundation for the people, which is superior to anything that is known among the neighbouring peoples: its ethics, social-legal system and liturgical regulations harmoniously weave individual and social life together under the rulership of Jehovah.¹³

Beck’s picture of the people’s lives under the strict but benevolent rule of Jehovah is quite different from the ‘Late Judaism’ imagery. It portrays a harmonious, monarchical-constitutional state, in which the citizens are fostered to obedience. The people are God’s peculiar people, chosen by him to help fulfil his plans for mankind, which to Beck continues with the statement in John 4:22.¹⁴ Following a nomadic period, the people receive a new sociopolitical form and a divinely granted nationality with the possession of a land set apart for them. Beck thus describes the Jewish people, their land and nationality in positive terms. His description

¹¹ Ibid., 344.

¹² Ibid., 347.

¹³ Ibid., 347.

¹⁴ Ibid., 348.

of the Law is also entirely positive: it is holy, regulates the lives of the people and shapes them in their relationship to God.¹⁵

To Beck, all events in the history of Israel are part of the whole ‘God economy’, a frequently recurring term that describes Beck’s salvation-history, which progresses through the history of Israel and ends in one individual: Christ. The prophetic predictions “converge in the universal idea of an individuality that mediates the godly blessing of the new ‘life economy’ (*Lebens-Ökonomie*) for Israel and all peoples”.¹⁶ Here the universalism is linked to a particular history, that of Israel, and ends in one individual, Christ, who has an Israelite genealogy and appears in a certain place, Bethlehem, Zion. At the same time, the appearance of the Saviour-King occurs in an *organic* relationship with human history. Once again, the harmonious, organic connection between humanity and Israel is evident: Christ is the “original organic head of the world system”.¹⁷ Everything in the history of Israel, and about Christ as the fulfilment of the promises, is portrayed as good and blessed, and there is no thought of a depravation of Israel, nor of any postexilic degeneration of Israel in its preparation for the coming of Christ.¹⁸ These positions are especially interesting in light of the fact that Beck was well aware of the rather different views of his friend de Wette.

Romans and Judaism

This generally harmonious view of God’s history prevails in Beck’s interpretation of Romans. The book has the classic verse-by-verse commentary format, but since the question of Jews and Gentiles is so important to Beck’s argument, he deals with it especially in the introduction—it is evident that talking about the Jews is part of his agenda. Despite having been favoured by Baur for a Tübingen professorship, Beck’s and Baur’s theological positions—and their views on New Testament Jews and Judaism—differed considerably. To Beck, the

¹⁵ Beck, J. T. *Die Christliche Lehr-Wissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden. Ein Versuch von J. T. Beck*. Vol. 1. *Die Logik der christlichen Lehre*. Stuttgart: Verlag der Chr. Belser’schen Buchhandlung, 1841, 350, 376.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 360; see also 407–409.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 584–585.

¹⁸ This organic thinking, and the whole *salvation-historical* thought, is inspired by the philosophical idealism of Hegel, which Beck also expresses, quoted in Steck, *Die Idee des Heilsgeschichte*. Hofmann-Schlatter-Cullmann, 16–17.

argument of Romans revolves around Judaism and the Law: against a syncretism with a Law-centred Judaism, and against an exclusiveness towards the same.¹⁹ As Tholuck, Beck polemicalises against the view in Baur's commentary on Romans that it opposed the Jewish Christians of Rome.²⁰ If Baur's commentary tends to be critical of Jews or Jewish Christians, Beck's standpoint is just the reverse, rejecting that Jewish Christianity is at all an issue in Romans. The letter is not polemical in that sense, Beck contends, and there is nothing that is directed against Jewish Christians or Judaism in the Roman church.²¹ On the contrary, in Romans the gospel is seen in relation to Old Testament revelation, and this warrants the national Jewish position, with regard to both the Law and the promises. Beck does not approve of the idea that Romans specifically opposes Jewish particularism either; when it opposes Jewish particularism, he points out, it also opposes Gentile particularism.²²

This is typical of Beck's discussion: Jews and Gentiles are put on a par with each other, Christianity standing as the opposite of both the lawless *Heidenthum* and the legalistic Judaism. This is a fundamental idea of Romans, Beck argues. Christianity is a purified people, consisting of purified Jews and purified Gentiles;²³ however, Judaism is by no means to be compared with other religions where its part in God's plan is concerned. Beck talks of "the more richly endowed Jew and Christian through covenantal grace"; the Jew has received more from God than the Gentile.²⁴ The fulfilment of Gentiles and Jews alike will be brought into God's overarching economy of grace, but the difference is that paganism is ungodly, and Christians are spiritually relieved of this pagan ungodliness. Through the Old Testament, Christians were "*spiritually connected* (verbunden) *to Judaism*", and Christianity was enveloped in Judaism to such an extent that people could mistake them for Jews, when Christianity in fact needed to uphold its distinctive character.²⁵

Beck has an interesting idea, supported by ancient sources, that the Romans tended towards Judaism: "*Judaism and Christianity encounter each other in Rome on ground in a state of ferment, and the entire situation was primarily*

¹⁹ Beck, *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer*, I: 17.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, I: 5–6.

²¹ *Ibid.*, I: 5.

²² *Ibid.*, I: 6–7.

²³ *Ibid.*, I: 9, 11, 12.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, I: 211–213.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I: 13–14. Italics are Beck's unless otherwise indicated.

in favour of Judaism,” Beck contends.²⁶ As for the general analysis of the Christians in Rome, Beck seems quite modern.²⁷ In Beck’s mind, the Roman *Volkgeist* (national spirit) went well with the search for righteousness among the Jews, and it is in the attitude to righteousness that the issue of Romans lies. On the one hand, Roman and Jewish views of the Law may coincide; on the other hand, the Gentile Romans may boast of their law, seeing it in opposition to Judaism, which might lead to a disregard for the Jewish-Christian *λεῖμμα* (remnant) (11:5).²⁸

Abraham the Common Root

Beck’s organic view is also evident when he describes Abraham as the common root of Jews and Gentiles. The overall principle of faith is grounded in the *Gentile* Abraham, and thus his faith can grasp a grace of salvation “encompassing the peoples’ world”. Faith is introduced in this function before an opposition between circumcision and uncircumcision exists. Being part of the original layout for the divine covenantal relationship, faith is the “*original principle uniting Jews and Gentiles*”.²⁹ This does not mean that Beck diminishes the role of the Jewish people. The “faith principle” ensures that Christianity or the church do not end up under the Jewish national “law principle”; both principles go back to the “Old Testament covenantal economy”, with which Christianity and the church are fundamentally joined. The effect is a safeguard against the “proud expelling of the Old Testament covenant people”.³⁰

Hence, although he describes the Jews as seekers of the righteousness that comes from the Law in the same spirit as Paul,³¹ Beck defends the role of the Jews in God’s covenantal economy. The picture he gives of Judaism is thus more positive than that of Baur, and he repeatedly extends arguments to disprove Baur’s. For example, Beck does not attach

²⁶ Ibid., I: 15.

²⁷ See Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: the Jewish context of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), although Beck would not go as far as Nanos.

²⁸ Beck, *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer*, I: 16–17.

²⁹ Ibid., I: 18.

³⁰ Ibid., I: 19.

³¹ As Paul writes in Rom. 9:31, “Israel, which intensely sought the law, did not attain righteousness with regard to the law” (Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν).

the pejorative epithet ‘particularist’ to Jews (as Baur often does): Jews are on a par with Gentiles because faith is the fundamental principle, and saying “the Jew first” is not founded on particularism, but on monotheism.³² As noted above, Romans opposes *two particularisms*: the Jewish and the Gentile.³³ Beck does not side with the common description of the Jews being more particularistic than others. Jewish “national pride”, he contends, is not negative but “is the pride in being God’s people, and rests primarily on their *objective precedence*”.³⁴ Although he seems to regard pride as a characteristic of Jews, where other scholars major on the negative character of the Jews’ ‘national pride’, Beck seems to acclaim it. His view of the Law is not negative either: it is the Torah in its entirety, not merely a collection of commandments.³⁵ The essence (*Wesen*) of Judaism being inner Judaism, “Christianity is no contradiction to true Judaism, to the essence of the Law or the circumcision, but is its *πλήρωσις*,” its full development.³⁶ Beck stresses the inner dimension, but he does not reject Judaism, maintaining a far-reaching continuity between Judaism and Christianity.

Romans 9–11

In Romans 9–11, Beck returns to the divine economy—“the objective, *historical course of salvation’s development in the world of the nations*”—when the development of salvation is brought to fulfilment, linking the original limitation of Israel’s salvation to the uniting of Jews and Gentiles in a common salvation.³⁷ Jews who did not believe in Christ may have kept to the stubborn principle of deeds as opposed to grace, but from a covenant point of view, salvation is linked to the people, and God’s Holy Spirit did not reject them.³⁸ The people are chosen, the root being the fathers. Though it is not the physical descent or the physical connection that saves, but the sap that flows within the olive tree, an inner

³² Beck, *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer*, I: 76.

³³ *Ibid.*, I: 7.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I: 243.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, I: 243.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, I: 253.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, II: 95–96.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, II: 164–165.

connection,³⁹ Israel is the physical carrier of the stem of grace—a fact that Paul uses to correct the boasting of the Gentiles.⁴⁰ Beck ends this discussion with the fulfilment of God's "economy of grace".

Conclusion

Beck's *characterisation* of the Jews is very positive, and he often counters base arguments that single out the Jews in a negative way. They are God's elected people; dwelling among other peoples, they develop "greatness of soul and humility of spirit"; and God's relationship with Israel is a covenantal one. Not even the Jewish 'national pride', a constant target in Enlightenment exegetical research tradition, is negative. Instead, it "is the pride in being God's people", which is what they are, Beck contends. The Law is positive as well, the Torah, with its ethics, social-legal system and liturgical regulations, making the Jews superior—a picture that is quite unlike the 'Late Judaism' imagery. Nationality is thus not negative but divinely granted, and Beck's description of the Law is entirely positive. It is clear that Beck's picture is very different to the stereotypes studied above, e.g. Baur's, which Beck was certainly well aware of, and against which he may have formed his own characterisation.

Beck's *historiography* moves within a biblical-theological and salvation-historical concept: the entire Bible testifies to God's evolving salvation history. His view of history is like a reversed idealistic one: it is not a scholarly history built on empirical data, but an ideologically constructed thought that accommodates biblical history. The history from Abraham to Christ is an organic unity; to Beck, it is not only a 'spiritual' history but God's history, which encompasses all mankind. As for the historical course of events, there is an early nomadic stage, but then the people settle in the nation and take on a new political form through a popular constitution. After Moses, a priestly state organism is put in place, where God invests his grace and truth through legislation. Beck is also able to talk about theocracy in positive terms, in contrast to de Wette, for example, who abhors what is priestly. Yet all is not

³⁹ Ibid., II: 175–176.

⁴⁰ Ibid., II: 179.

always well with God's people; there is a period in its history, between childhood and maturity, when the Law had to step in. At this point, the "uncultivated, obstinate people" received the discipline of the Law, although this is seen within a family-discipline imagery and accords with Beck's harmonious view. In Beck's concept there is no thought of any depravation of Israel.

If there is anyone in this entire study who stands for *continuity* between the people of the patriarchs, Jews and Christians, it is Beck, with the organic-harmonious view of God's salvation history that pervades his writing. Graphically illustrated by the tree, Israel is the physical carrier of the stem of grace, and through the Old Testament, Christianity is spiritually connected to Judaism and Old Testament covenantal economy. Beck talks of a 'God economy', but this does not only encompass Jews: Abraham is the common root of Jews and Gentiles alike, of Israel and all families of the peoples, since faith unites Jews and Gentiles. Beck chooses the most effective imagery to underline continuity, with no reservations: in God's history, God's people will finish the course in due time; this will affect all peoples, and the Messiah will be the crown of the tree that is God's entire humanity, which has Abraham as its root.

Beck's *symbolic world* incorporates various elements. His entire theology is Biblicist, which in this case means that the building blocks used in constructing the salvation-historical view are biblical. However, although it is not immediately evident in his texts when making a comparison with e.g. Baur, it cannot be excluded that Beck is inspired by Hegelian thought. There is, therefore, an apparatus of dialectical philosophy, although in his description of biblical history, his own ideals of a monar-chic, harmonious state organism, a society with law and jurisdiction, shine through. In this biblical, predominantly Old Testament-based view, the 'symbolic Jew' has a key role, as an Abraham figure, around which history evolves. The 'symbolic Jew' is an individual with only positive traits, who is an instrument of God to accomplish his plans, and this calling is irrevocable. Consequently, Jews and Judaism are positive terms, and the 'Jew' personifies everything that is right and positive.

When he talks about the risk of expelling God's people, Beck may be reacting against what he saw in society, but this is only an intimation. Nevertheless, saying that Christianity and Church are fundamentally joined to "Old Testament covenantal economy" *delegitimises* any oppressive activities against Jews, and it is probable that Beck envisioned this

effect. He seems to be striking back against theology that wishes to cut off the Jews: his theology is a safeguard against the “proud expelling of the Old Testament covenant people”, as Beck himself puts it. His vivid and consistent organic theology would influence generations of salvation-historical scholars and churchmen.

FRANZ DELITZSCH: PIONEERING SCHOLARSHIP IN JUDAISM

From the 1870s, salvation-historical Protestant interest in exegesis and the Jews entered a new phase, in which the triad scholarship in Judaism—a rather conservative-Protestant-Biblicist standpoint¹—and missions to Jews were part of the same parcel.² This new focus on research within Judaism meant a decisive new step in a research tradition that would first inspire a range of exegetes of a conservative Lutheran or Biblicist brand, and later New Testament scholarship at large when occupied with Jewish studies.³ The triad can be found in Adolf Schlatter—who, although sometimes regarded as a scholarly outsider, is nevertheless a scholar with much in common with Delitzsch and Strack⁴—as well as in Rudolf and Gerhard Kittel.⁵ The base was the Institutum Judaicum in Leipzig, founded in 1886 by Franz Delitzsch, as the continuation of a work started as early as in the 1870s,⁶ and a main propagator of

¹ The point that Delitzsch invested the most interest and prestige in was the question of the Pentateuch, where Delitzsch's position satisfied neither the conservatives nor the historical-critical camp, Siegfried Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, Monographien und Studienbücher (Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1991), 209–225; Siegfried Wagner and Arnulf Baumann, “Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary”, *Mishkan* 1 (1991), 49.

² Wagner and Baumann, “Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary”; Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 60.

³ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 305, notes that the influence of Delitzsch and Strack eventually resulted in a new course of scholarship in relation to *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, e.g. with Gerhard Kittel and Strack's disciple Paul Fiebig. Delitzsch's conversion took place in 1832, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 120, according to whom Delitzsch had a strong Lutheran profile, 122.

⁴ Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 39 n. 94; “wissenschaftliche Außenseiter”, 405.

⁵ Gerhard Kittel studied under Johannes Leipoldt in Leipzig, in Berlin where Strack was the leading Christian scholar of Judaism, in Greifswald (Dalman), and with Schlatter in Tübingen, *Ibid.*, 412.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 242–243. See Deines 242–262 for the Instituta Judaica, Delitzsch, Strack and Paul Billerbeck. On Delitzsch, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, Eckhard Plümacher, “Delitzsch, Franz Julius”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981), and for Delitzsch and the Jews, Wolfgang Heinrichs, “Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von ‘Saat auf Hoffnung. Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche und Israel’”, *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Zeitgeschichte* 44 (1992), and Alan Levenson, “Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz

its ideas was the journal *Saat auf Hoffnung*.⁷ This was only three years after the creation of the Institutum Judaicum in Berlin by H. L. Strack. After Delitzsch's death, the Leipzig institute was renamed Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum.

Delitzsch and Hermann Strack", *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 92, no. 3–4 (2002). A brief overview of his work as a scholar and missionary is found in Wagner and Baumann, "Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary". The Leipzig Institutum Judaicum was a re-establishment of the 1728 institute of the same name in Halle, founded by Johann Heinrich Callenberg, a professor of Philosophy and an expert in Semitic languages, and Jewish history and theology, Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 47–48, whose scholarly and Pietist theological tradition Delitzsch wished to revive, Heinz-Hermann Völker, "Franz Delitzsch als Förderer der Wissenschaft vom Judentum. Zur Vorgeschichte des Institutum Judaicum zu Leipzig und zur Debatte um die Errichtung eines Lehrstuhl für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur an einer deutschen Universität", *Judaica* 49 (1993), 90. On the history of the Berlin Institutum Judaicum, see Golling's presentation in Ralf Golling and Peter von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, vol. 17, Studien zu Kirche und Israel (SKI) (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1996), 70–122, which also tells the tragic story of how the institute under Johannes Hempel was put in the service of National Socialist anti-Semitism, in fierce opposition to its founder, H. L. Strack, 117–121. During and after his lifetime, it was rumoured that Delitzsch's Jewish benefactor Levy Hirsch was his biological father, and although Delitzsch himself denied this, it was used in the anti-Semitic propaganda against him, Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 16–26. In any case, Levy Hirsch undeniably seems to have meant a great deal to Delitzsch during his upbringing and studies, Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 25. Delitzsch was also highly involved in the early Messianic Jewish work in Kishinev in Russia, Wagner and Baumann, "Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary", 52–53. For this, see especially the biography about Josef Rabinowitsch, Kai Kjær-Hansen, *Josef Rabinowitsch og den messianske bevægelse* (Århus: Forlaget OKAY-BOG, Den danske Israelsmission, Forlaget Savanne, 1988), and *passim* for Delitzsch's part in the work. On the history of the institute, see also Hermann Lichtenberger, "Christlich-jüdische Beziehungen dargestellt an der Geschichte des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum", in *Brücke zwischen Kulturen und Völkern. Ein Bild für unsere Universität*, ed. Rudolf Hausner (Münster: Coppenrath, 1993).

⁷ Heinrichs, "Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von 'Saat auf Hoffnung. Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche und Israel'", 200. The prehistory of the institute is longer, Delitzsch having started to teach in 1871 at what was called the Institutum Judaicum. However, this was basically Delitzsch's private enterprise, since the Centralverein für die Mission unter Israel—the base for the work, which was located on the premises where the institute started out and had its first library—had not been able to recruit another teacher, Völker, "Franz Delitzsch als Förderer der Wissenschaft vom Judentum", 96. From 1880 onwards, interest in the work grew, and in 1886 Delitzsch's vision was realised in an institute with five teachers and an ambitious programme of lectures in languages, the Talmud and Midrash, and the New Testament read in the light of this literature, as well as Jewish polemics and missions to Jews, Völker, "Franz Delitzsch als Förderer der Wissenschaft vom Judentum", 97.

Deines notes that the scholarly work of people such as Delitzsch and Strack initiated something new in New Testament scholarship that was only fully manifested in the 1920s:

The picture is no longer only determined by the authors stemming from the missions to the Jews, such as Franz Delitzsch and Gustaf Dalman, or the scholarly outsider Adolf Schlatter, but to a growing number of exegetes, the work with rabbinical literature is a necessary precondition for the exposition of the New Testament and the investigation of *Urchristentum*.⁸

Thus the *Instituta Judaica* paved the way for a new consideration of the Jewish origins of Christianity. Apart from a few important contributions, such as that of Johannes Weiss, the historical turn towards the Jewish origins in New Testament exegesis did not get its breakthrough with the History of Religions school, but rather with a movement that ran parallel to it, through scholars such as Delitzsch, Strack, Schlatter and Gerhard Kittel. Ironically, the latter was one of the first exegetes to publicly and in writing advocate a racist strategy against the Jews, despite being one of the most distinguished scholars on the Jewish religion and holy scriptures.⁹ This raises questions as to how passion for Jewish studies and friendship with Jews on the one hand relates to racist attitudes towards them on the other hand—but Kittel's case will be discussed later in this book.

From 1867, Delitzsch was ordinary professor of the Old Testament at the University of Leipzig; although he also taught New Testament, the first chair in New Testament was only created in 1878.¹⁰ His production in the area of New Testament is substantial; apart from his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, including prolegomena, he published commentaries on Hebrews and Romans.¹¹ The former has little to offer this investigation—its context was the debate regarding

⁸ Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 405.

⁹ This will be dealt with in a later chapter.

¹⁰ Wiefel, “Franz Delitzschs Stellung in der Geschichte der Auslegung des Neuen Testaments”, 101; Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 309.

¹¹ Franz Delitzsch, *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer mit archäologischen und dogmatischen Excursen über das Opfer und die Versöhnung* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1857); Franz Delitzsch, *Paulus des Apostels Brief an die Römer aus dem griechischen Urtext auf Grund des Sinai-Codex in das hebräische übersetzt und aus Talmud und Midrasch erläutert* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1870). On this, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 167–180.

J. Chr. K. von Hofmann's doctrine of redemption¹²—but I will return to the commentary on Romans. Delitzsch regarded himself as a biblical theologian, and his salvation-historical theology with its unity of both testaments was the rationale for dealing with both.¹³

Both Delitzsch and Strack—and their Jewish institutes—combined qualified Semitic and historical scholarship with an ambition to further knowledge of Judaism among Christians, and of Christianity among Jews. But it did not stop with information; both institutes were Protestant bases for missionary work among Jews. According to Delitzsch, the background was the failure of Protestant Christianity to understand and reach Jews and the fact that the emerging *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, characterised by the ideals of Enlightenment and emancipation, posed a threat to Protestant missions to Jews—the furthering of which was in the interest of the Christian state.¹⁴ With Reform Judaism seen as a threat, and Delitzsch also regarding its creativity and claims to represent a world religion as a danger, he felt that such tendencies could be countered by a professorial chair in Jewish literature.¹⁵ Thus the relationship between Delitzsch and the Jews is not merely scholarly, and ultimately his work is founded on a missionary interest. This does not mean that everything he did was missionary related or that it was perceived as such, however; Delitzsch won great acclaim for his scholarship and defence of Jews among Jews who did not sympathise with his missionary ambition. Yet Delitzsch also wished that the Jews would remain Jews, believing that their identity was endangered by assimilation and liberalisation.¹⁶ An identical statement could in fact have been made by Adolf Stoecker or Gerhard Kittel, for example, and is representative of conservative Christian criticism of liberal Judaism.¹⁷

Delitzsch saw a need for academically trained Christian authors who could defend Christianity, construct a scholarly-based criticism of Judaism and “bring the message of Jesus Christ to the Jews”.¹⁸ His great appreciation for the Jews having been largely inspired by

¹² Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 313.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 334–335. Wagner states that Delitzsch pursued his Old Testament theological work using a salvation-historical concept.

¹⁴ Völker, “Franz Delitzsch als Förderer der Wissenschaft vom Judentum”, 91.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 93.

¹⁶ Wagner and Baumann, “Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary”, 52.

¹⁷ See below, and Gerhard Kittel, “Die Judenfrage” (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933).

¹⁸ Völker, “Franz Delitzsch als Förderer der Wissenschaft vom Judentum”, 91, 94.

the two missionaries Goldberg and Becker,¹⁹ Delitzsch purposed to be “a Jew to the Jews”,²⁰ regarding his own studies as preparation for his missionary work among them. In his biography on Delitzsch, Siegfried Wagner establishes that in the nineteenth century, Delitzsch was the most prominent figure within Jewish missions in Germany, if not Europe.²¹ The institute actively supported missionary activities in for example Russia,²² and published materials for the missions. One of the less successful scholarly productions is Ferdinand Weber’s ambitious but highly tendentious *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, which systematises rabbinical material according to a principle that Weber perceives as the centre of Judaism, *Nomismus*. From this he is able to build a whole system, not unlike a systematic theological work in the Lutheran and Reformed traditions.²³ After Delitzsch’s death, Gustaf Dalman (1855–1941) became the leader of the Leipzig institute.²⁴

These scholars had a genuine dual interest in contemporary Judaism and the Judaism of New Testament times. The period in which the institutes were founded was also one of growing political anti-Semitism, which the institute was involved in countering in various ways, adding another aspect to these scholars’ dealings with Jews and Judaism. The somewhat intriguing combination of scholarship in Judaica, missions to Jews and defence against anti-Semitism put the relationship between Protestant theology and Judaism to an exceptional test. This was especially true when, as in the case of Delitzsch, there were controversies with the Jewish scholarly interpretation of Jesus, e.g. in the debate with Abraham Geiger.²⁵ At the same time, Delitzsch was highly respected in rabbinic circles for his Jewish scholarship, and he maintained extensive

¹⁹ Wagner and Baumann, “Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary”, 47.

²⁰ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 150.

²¹ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 149.

²² See note above.

²³ Ferdinand Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1880).

²⁴ On Gustaf Dalman, see Julia Männchen, “Gustav Dalman and Jewish Missions”, *Mishkan* 1 (1991).

²⁵ On this, see also Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 195–197; Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*.

Jewish contacts throughout his life.²⁶ It would certainly be a mistake to see missions to Jews as the sole rationale for his interest in Judaism.²⁷

Delitzsch's theological outlook is to be placed within salvation-historical theology,²⁸ with roots in Lutheran confessionalism and Pietist revival.²⁹ Delitzsch was indebted to this Pietist background throughout his life, and as already mentioned, the salvation-historical approach is part and parcel of the Pietist world-view. His academic background was in Semitic philology and theology in Leipzig. Through the acquaintance with Hebrew manuscripts and rabbinical literature, he came into contact with prominent Jewish scholars, such as Leopold Zunz (1794–1886) and the rabbi and Orientalist Julius Fürst (1805–1873). His position to modern theology was conservative, and he saw no possibility of bridging the “deep rift between the old and the new theology”, the latter representing the theology of Semler and Schleiermacher.³⁰

Organic Salvation History and the Jews

As noted, Tholuck and Beck's salvation history included Jews and Judaism, and the same is true of Delitzsch. The discussion of salvation history being in vogue at this time, Delitzsch's contribution demonstrates

²⁶ Levenson, “Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack”, 385. See also Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 33, 54, 165 and *passim*. The *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (24, 1891, column 53) writes that numerous Jewish men were drawn to his erudition and warm relationship with Israel, and that he often disputed with Jews with a combination of sharp argumentation and meekness.

²⁷ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 148; Delitzsch also tells of his acquaintances with Jewish families, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 401.

²⁸ Hans-Joachim Barkenings, “Die Stimme der Anderen. Der ‘heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels’ in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts”, “Die Stimme der Anderen. Der ‘heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels’ in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts”, in *Christen und Juden. Ihr Gegenüber vom Apostelkonzil bis heute*, ed. Wolf-Dieter Marsch and Karl Thieme (Mainz/Göttingen: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 213.

²⁹ Delitzsch was inspired by Martin Stephan, a Bohemian Brethren-Lutheran preacher who emigrated to the USA in 1838, leading a group of several hundred people, including pastors, to the new continent. Delitzsch was thus ‘born’ in a radical revivalist environment, Albert Hauck, “Nordamerika, Vereinigten Staaten”, in *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. This group was the beginning of the conservative Lutheran Missouri Synod, and Delitzsch adhered to the same persuasions as this group throughout his Christian life, Wagner and Baumann, “Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary”, 47.

³⁰ Franz Delitzsch, *Der tiefe Graben zwischen alter und moderner Theologie. Ein Bekenntnis* (Leipzig: Centralbureau der Instituta Judaica (W. Faber), 1888).

his view of the Jews in God's economy. As well as being a friend of the main proponent of salvation-historical theology, J. Chr. K. von Hofmann, Delitzsch would succeed him as ordinary professor in Old and New Testament exegesis in Rostock, and later in another exegetical position in Erlangen, where he would also lecture in both Old and New Testament exegesis.³¹ Nevertheless, he stood in a "positive-critical" relation to von Hofmann's version of salvation history (see below),³² partly because he regarded Hofmann as indebted to Schleiermacher. Instead, Delitzsch developed his own salvation-historical thinking in dialogue with the Leipzig theologian and philosopher Chr. A. Crusius and, especially, von Hofmann.³³

The theology of these scholars is discussed in Delitzsch's early work *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwicklung*, published in 1845.³⁴ The history of Judaism and Christianity is arranged according to God's overall salvation plan, "the positive-historical revelation of Crusius", seen from the perspective of an ongoing development from one level to the next.³⁵ To Delitzsch, there is a 'history of preparation' that equals the Old Testament salvation history, and one of 'fulfilment' that equals the New Testament. Using typology, characters in the history of preparation prefigure those that will appear in the New Testament history of fulfilment—salvation history flows "out of eternity and back into eternity".³⁶ The Church, too, belongs to the history of fulfilment, being where salvation history is currently present.³⁷

Continuity with the Old Testament is emphasised. It not only contains prophecy regarding Christ and his kingdom, but the kingdom is already taking shape. Its beginning is present, and the future of Christ is prepared through an "increasingly specific family line", so that David's kingdom and Christ's are one and the same.³⁸ But not everything is

³¹ Wagner and Baumann, "Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary", 48.

³² So also Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 335.

³³ Barkenings, "Die Stimme der Anderen. Der 'heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels' in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts", 214.

³⁴ Franz Delitzsch, *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwicklung seit der Christologie Hengstenbergs*, ed. Franz Delitzsch and Carl Paul Caspari, vol. 1, *Biblisch-theologische und apologetisch-kritische Studien* (Leipzig: Gebauersche Buchhandlung, 1845).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 115.

³⁶ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 336–337.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 341.

³⁸ Delitzsch, *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwicklung seit der Christologie Hengstenbergs*, 116.

painted in positive colours. The “Old Testament theocracy did not produce anything more glorious than the Sinaitic legislation”, and to Delitzsch, the appearance of Christ was preceded, not by a ‘Late Judaism’ type of Judaism (although Delitzsch does not employ the term) as in many other authors, but by a time when the kingdom of darkness, representing the influence of demonic forces, had reached its peak.³⁹ Nevertheless, the relationship between the Old Testament Israel and the New Testament church is “an organic and causal one”.⁴⁰ The beginning of the church is the believers of Israel according to the flesh, “as the original branches of the holy stem”, into which the Gentiles *παρὰ φύσιν* are grafted in. There is, between Old Testament Judaism and Christianity,

[quite a] different relationship to that between pattern and realisation (*Vorbild und Gegenbild*). The theocracy under Israel does not relate to the conversion of the peoples outside Israel as the shadow to the body, as the picture to the object, but Israel is the foundation and body of the very Church, which is to continually expand and grow.⁴¹

Once again, the *organic* relationship is reinforced. The believing part of Israel according to the flesh is the foundation, which “also takes the rest of the degenerated (*entartete*) part to its bosom”.⁴² This means the Christ believers of Israel, as opposed to the “enemies of the cross of Christ”. The true Christians are counted to Israel, not the other way around, whereas the Gentiles are the degenerated ones—here the contrast to the ideas of the ‘Late Judaism’ hypothesis is stark indeed. Thus Delitzsch, referring to Crusius, presents an explanatory model where the unity of Old and New Testament is central, and where there is no breach between the prehistory and history of Christ. The Gentile Christians are dependent on Israel, not vice versa. Hence the fundamental role that salvation history plays to Delitzsch is evident.⁴³ He firmly believes in the organic salvation-historical view of history, but reserves the leading role for a sovereign God. This does not imply a negative view of Israel and the Jews: in God’s overall salvation plan to develop his church of salvation (*Heilsgemeinde*) as a bearer of the

³⁹ Ibid., 123–125.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 131.

⁴¹ Ibid., 132.

⁴² Ibid., 133: “[...] wird auch einst den Rest des entarteten Theils in seinen Schoss aufnehmen”.

⁴³ Ibid., chapter 5.

kingdom of God, Israel or the Jewish people play a key role, being a tool for the realisation of the divine plan.⁴⁴ From the above, it is evident that Delitzsch had a thoroughly developed salvation-historical theology, reminiscent of Beck's, and with certain important modifications, he would keep this perspective throughout his life.

Hebrew Philology and Literary Criticism

Delitzsch's linguistic and literary-critical work was highly esteemed in Jewish circles. His scholarship spanned from Semitic philology and literature to New Testament exegesis, Christian psychology and dogmatics.⁴⁵ Delitzsch's first book was a pioneering work on Jewish literature, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poësie* ("To the History of Jewish Poetry"), where he, following profound research into a vast material, presents Jewish poetry from the Hebrew Bible to his own day.⁴⁶ The work demonstrates Delitzsch's genuine interest in Jewish literature, and it is difficult to see any apologetic agenda behind the project. Interestingly, however, the work is dedicated to the Lutheran pastor Martin Stephan. Also, when talking about Jewish poetry in Herodian times, Delitzsch maintains the continuity between New Testament poetry and the old, prophetic literature on the one hand, but on the other hand states that the synagogue entered an inimical conflict with the church.⁴⁷ Little in the book betrays Delitzsch's theological view on Jews and Judaism, however, and he received much praise from Jewish quarters both for his scholarship in Jewish poetry and for his text editions.⁴⁸

Delitzsch is famous primarily for his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew. The high scholarly quality of his translation work is exemplified in his *Paulus des Apostels Brief an die Römer*, which is carried out with rigorous linguistic scholarship.⁴⁹ But it also contains an anti-anti-Semitic pungency, as Delitzsch hopes that a Jewish readership will

⁴⁴ Rothe, "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie", 108–109, 111.

⁴⁵ For the most comprehensive presentation of his production, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 209–320.

⁴⁶ Franz Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poësie vom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften Alten Bundes bis auf die neueste Zeit* (Leipzig: Karl Tauchnitz, 1836).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁴⁸ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 404–405.

⁴⁹ Delitzsch, *Paulus des Apostels Brief an die Römer aus dem griechischen Urtext auf Grund des Sinai-Codex in das hebräische übersetzt und aus Talmud und Midrasch erläutert*.

welcome a Christian book in a better spirit than Eisenmenger's.⁵⁰ The main part of the book consists of prolegomena to the translation and then the translation, the commentary being sparse and predominantly containing rabbinical parallels to passages in Romans. However, it also includes statements that would be most provoking to Jewish readers and betray the missionary purpose, e.g. that Jesus is "Yahweh our righteousness".⁵¹ Delitzsch's conclusion as to the meaning of the words in Rom. 11:23, that "God has the power to graft them in again", is that Israel,

sighing for redemption, through depths of suffering in which it seems lost, finally breaks forth, purified and strengthened, a graft (*Edelreis*) for the wild vine, into which it is engrafted, a balm for the natural world (*Naturwelt*), which up to now was mourning as a mother, bereaved of its children, [becomes, A.G.] a leader of the peoples to fertile pastures.⁵²

In this poetic passage, Delitzsch clearly envisions a bright future for Israel, even obtaining a role of leadership among the nations, a position that is not so clear in his later writings. Worth noting is that Delitzsch makes the olive tree a vine, but also that in contrast to Paul's imagery, the Gentiles, the wild tree, are the base, into which the graft is engrafted.⁵³ This shifts Paul's emphasis on Jewish precedence to the Gentiles, a position that accords with Delitzsch's emphasis on Christ ending Old Testament history. However, what is explicitly said here is that there is an eschatological re-entry of Israel into its salvation-historical calling. Yet Delitzsch, with his Lutheran background, and the Lutheran Jewish mission, saw an eschatological entry of Israel as a pure act of God, rejecting a millenarian thought (*Chiliasmerei*) among English colleagues,⁵⁴ and facing criticisms from the Lutheran camp for being millenarian, took a clear stand against this.⁵⁵ This may help explain Delitzsch's rather puzzling reluctance to emphasise Rom. 11:24–25.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 7.

⁵¹ Ibid., 89.

⁵² Ibid., 92.

⁵³ Delitzsch is horticulturally correct, and Paul is not, probably for a reason: the graft is engrafted into a wild root, not as Paul figures in Rom. 11:17.

⁵⁴ Heinrichs, "Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von 'Saat auf Hoffnung. Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche und Israel'", 217. Millenarian ideas were also represented among Lutheran Pietists, among them J. A. Bengel.

⁵⁵ Barkenings, "Die Stimme der Anderen. Der 'heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels' in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts", 217.

Wiefel concludes that Delitzsch in this work “is a Lutheran theologian while Rabbinist”,⁵⁶ and it is probable that Delitzsch’s Lutheran position may have held back too speculative eschatological theories. While maintaining his theological position in theological matters, Delitzsch nurtures an attitude of dialogue towards his educated Jewish readership, at least at this point in time.

Describing the Jewish Background of Jesus

The idea of ‘Late Judaism’ was basically foreign to Delitzsch, his historiography describing an unbroken continuity between Jesus and Judaism, rather than a breach between them—although in certain respects, this would later change. His picture of Jesus in relation to contemporary Judaism was painted in warm colours.⁵⁷ One example is his little book on Jewish handicraft at the time of Jesus, which attempts to give an historical picture of Jerusalem at that time.⁵⁸ Delitzsch’s general purpose of bridging the gap between the synagogue and the church shines through, his depiction of Judaism at the time of Jesus strongly diverging from the popular and scholarly ones. This applies to the spiritual as well as social life in Palestine.

The cult and prayer life are portrayed without any criticism of Jewish spiritual life. On the contrary, Delitzsch describes the temple cult as objectively as he can, based on his sources. The Levites prepare for the morning sacrifice and call the priests and Israelites in for service; people hasten to the temple or one of the hundreds of synagogues. Everywhere, there is prayer:

[The Pharisee stops his walk to observe the prayer hour, putting the tefillin over his head and arm; the fruit picker stops working to, A.G.] conduct his morning service in his natural temple among the branches. Prayer

⁵⁶ Wiefel, “Franz Delitzschs Stellung in der Geschichte der Auslegung des Neuen Testaments”, 105.

⁵⁷ As also noted by Levenson, “Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack”, who renders Delitzsch’s account of the Capernaum synagogue service, 392–393, where Jesus is a Jew among Jews, praying the *Schmone Esre*.

⁵⁸ See also *ibid.*, 391–392.

goes on everywhere [...] The people are praying, and wherever they pray, they connect their spoken prayers to the prayer in their thoughts.⁵⁹

The same thing happens at three o'clock, when a *Bikkurim* (first fruits) procession goes up to the temple,⁶⁰ and prayer takes place even in the small room at home and in a nook in a synagogue. The prayer is for the Messiah to come and purify the atmosphere from voluptuousness, the sacrifices of "unrighteous righteousness", as well as the heavy scent of the offerings.⁶¹ Of course there is a critical dimension here, but it is presented in a very pleasant way. Delitzsch ends by hinting at Jesus, the Cross and "the hour of redemption". In his charming, nineteenth-century style popular account, Delitzsch demonstrates an appreciation for Jewish spiritual life as something genuine. The people—the Pharisees, too—are praying, and their prayer is not merely words but also an inward prayer. The cult is authentic, with life in Jerusalem seen through rose-coloured spectacles. This stands in glaring contrast to the picture presented through the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis, where Judaism in Jesus' day was seen as a degenerated religion, prayer was without inner qualities, and Jews and Judaism were generally portrayed negatively. Although the booklet was part of the missionary activities aimed at 'educated' Jews, references to Jesus and evangelistic traits are restrained, even if not absent.

Delitzsch's main purpose was to give a positive picture of Jews as handicrafters, i.e. as people who engaged in ordinary and serious work. In nineteenth-century Germany, the Jews were thought of as pedlars and people in low-level trades, and there was a widespread prejudice, even among people who were involved in missions to Jews, that Jews were unwilling to do physical work or produce handicraft.⁶² In order to "bring the person of Jesus closer to the Jewish people", Delitzsch writes to defend the Jews as handicrafters, describing Jerusalem and Israel as a veritable beehive of work.⁶³ Showing Delitzsch's intimate knowledge of the rabbinical literature and Josephus, albeit without the methodological awareness (especially regarding dating of sources) of

⁵⁹ Franz Delitzsch, *Handwerkerlif på Jesu tid. Ett bidrag till den nytestamentliga tidens historia* (Örebro: Abr. Bohlin, 1874), 52–55, quotation p. 55.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 67.

⁶¹ Ibid., 70–71.

⁶² Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 259–261.

⁶³ Delitzsch, *Handwerkerlif på Jesu tid. Ett bidrag till den nytestamentliga tidens historia*.

modern scholarship, this booklet was also part of the social programme of Delitzsch's Institutum Judaicum and other similar institutes.

Opposing Anti-Semitism

The key role of Jews and Judaism in the overall system of people such as Delitzsch may in fact have provided a natural protection for the Jews in the tumultuous 1880s, as Jews were seen as a divinely appointed part of the Christian faith that was fundamental to German society. The Jews needed all the friends they could get as a new anti-Semitism flared up. Delitzsch considered it a disgrace for Christians to call themselves anti-Semites and took a strong stand against anti-Semitism.⁶⁴ His response to the anti-Semitic claims in *Der Talmudjude* ("The Talmud Jew"), written by the ultramontane Roman Catholic priest August Rohling,⁶⁵ won Delitzsch public acclaim. In his pamphlet "Rohling's Talmud Jew Elucidated", he proved that Rohling had plagiarized Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judentum*,⁶⁶ to which Rohling replied with a 152-page book, *Franz Delitzsch und die Judenfrage*,⁶⁷ where he writes that "the celebrated Lutheran theologian [...] Franz Delitzsch belongs to those I honour, and what is more, love".⁶⁸ His answer to how "a man of intelligence" such as Delitzsch could defend the Jews is Delitzsch's purported Jewish descent.⁶⁹ In response to Rohling's book, Delitzsch wrote another, and then a third,⁷⁰ the context being the blood libels, where Rohling and others had accused Jews of ritual murder. Nevertheless, Rohling's

⁶⁴ Franz Delitzsch, *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk? Ein Beitrag zur Lichtung der Judenfrage*, vol. 22, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum zu Leipzig (Leipzig: Centralbureau der Instituta Judaica (W. Faber), 1889), 4.

⁶⁵ August Rohling, *Der Talmudjude. Zu Beherzigung für Juden und Christen aller Stände*, 6 ed. (Münster: Adolph Russel's Verlag, 1877). On his debate with Rohling, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 409–413.

⁶⁶ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 273.

⁶⁷ August Rohling, *Franz Delitzsch und die Judenfrage. Antwortlich beantwortet von Prof. Dr. Aug. Rohling* (Prag: Verlag von Joh. B. Reinitzer & Co., 1881).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 154. For this matter, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 16–28.

⁷⁰ Franz Delitzsch, *Was D. Aug. Rohling beschworen hat und beschwören will. Zweite Streitschrift in Sachen des Antisemitismus*, 2 ed. (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1883); Franz Delitzsch, *Schachmatt den Blutlügen Rohling & Justus*, 2 ed. (Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1883).

book gained enormous influence.⁷¹ These books by Delitzsch precede his colleague Hermann Strack's many writings on the issue.

Confronting Jews and Judaism

The strength with which Delitzsch defended Jews against anti-Semitism was matched by his sharpness in theological dispute. In 1866 Delitzsch published the widely distributed pamphlet *Jesus and Hillel*, which was translated into several languages.⁷² In it, he criticises the French author and Orientalist Ernest Renan (1823–1892), who had written about Jesus' relation to Hillel in his *Vie de Jésus*, which caused a great stir in 1863. He was also upset by the views on Jesus of the German-Jewish Reform scholar and rabbi Abraham Geiger (1810–1874).⁷³ Delitzsch argues that Renan put Hillel on a par with Jesus,⁷⁴ whereas Geiger placed Hillel far above him, for instance saying, "Jesus was a Pharisee who walked in the footsteps of Hillel. *He did not utter a new thought.*"⁷⁵ But to Delitzsch, Hillel is not a reformer in the way indicated by Geiger. He has no creative spirit to reform the "sunken and distorted folk religion". Moreover, Hillel reduces the Law to a mere ethical rule, saying nothing about its religious foundations. Hillel is "judicial and casuistic", moving on the surface of the Law, whereas Jesus is religious and lives according to the spirit of the Law.⁷⁶ Delitzsch argues, summarising, "Here is more than Hillel."⁷⁷ To Delitzsch, Jesus is the sun, and as wax candles melt, and the moon fades, facing the rising sun, so does Hillel's teaching and the Law itself, facing Jesus. Delitzsch regarded Geiger and others as major threats to Christianity, playing into the hands of secularisation. It especially vexed Delitzsch that Jewish scholars could benefit from the ideas of Baur's Tübingen school, the latter whom he regarded as

⁷¹ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 411.

⁷² Franz Delitzsch, *Jesus och Hillel med afseende på Renan och Geiger* (Stockholm: A. L. Norman, 1867).

⁷³ On the discussion between Delitzsch and Geiger, see Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 407–409; Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 195–196, and Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack", 394.

⁷⁴ Delitzsch, *Jesus och Hillel med afseende på Renan och Geiger*, 11.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 14, 19, 23.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

traitors of true Christianity.⁷⁸ In the debate with Geiger, it is obvious that Delitzsch had an apologetic agenda, as did Geiger, and Delitzsch's tone is sharper than otherwise.

He also adopts a sharper tone against Judaism in the pamphlet *Ernste Fragen an die Gebildeten jüdischer Religion* ("Serious Questions to the Educated of Jewish Religion"), from 1888.⁷⁹ Delitzsch begins by stressing the shared monotheistic belief of Jews and Christians, stating that this is part of New Testament faith, and emphasising that they have the patriarchs in common.⁸⁰ On the subject of the Panthera (Pandera) myth and other Talmudic examples of "hatred of Jesus", however, the presentation becomes confrontational at times.⁸¹ Delitzsch also asks whether the Jews had any part in the crucifixion of Jesus. To begin with, he states that the time when every single Jew was held responsible for the killing of Jesus should be over. There were Jews in the world who did not know about Jesus at all, Delitzsch argues, and he rejects blaming Israelites who lived later than or were not involved in that "judicial murder".⁸² But Delitzsch then goes on to say that "we cannot evade the conclusion that the handing over of Jesus to the Romans, as a criminal worthy of death, is a national debt that weighs on the Jewish people". Repudiating the idea that the Gentiles killed Jesus, Delitzsch writes that "in the Book of Isaiah, we hear that the innocent servant of God was persecuted by his own people". He regards the killing of Jesus as the "national sin of the Jewish people"⁸³—a sin for which the temple was burned down a few decades later, and the Jewish state was dissolved.⁸⁴ The spell of this unconfessed sin, Delitzsch contends, hinders the people from being delivered from their 1800-year exile.⁸⁵ Hence Delitzsch first rejects the idea that the Jews have a collective guilt, but then reinforces this same idea in another form. Instead of basing his argument on historical evidence, Delitzsch mixes discussions of legal circumstances with prophetic sayings. The sum is clear: the Jewish

⁷⁸ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 409.

⁷⁹ Franz Delitzsch, *Ernste Fragen an die Gebildeten jüdischer Religion*, vol. 18 und 19, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum zu Leipzig (Leipzig: Centralbureau der Instituta Judaica (W. Faber), 1888).

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 1–7.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 9–11.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 11, 13.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 13: "eine auf dem jüdischen Volke lastende Nationalschuld [...]".

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 14, 15, 16.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

people are collectively guilty of having killed Jesus and are now paying the penalty through their exile. Despite his anti-anti-Semitic battle in other areas, here Delitzsch expresses an anti-Semitic view with a long Christian tradition.

In this book, Delitzsch also presents a classic supersessionist understanding of Israel. In place of the temple stands a spiritual temple, being the church of the new covenant, a people gathered from Israel but breaking through all national limitations. In God's salvation plan, the limitation to the people of Israel was a step on the way; instead of lasting, it was to create an example that would educate mankind and then be withdrawn.⁸⁶ Delitzsch reasons that the old covenant has been annulled, the national privilege has ended and the law of Israel is merely a national law (*Volksgesetz*), and is thus unable to serve as the law of a church of all nations. Israel's era was a preliminary stage; after Christ, it is a thing of the past, and Delitzsch emphasises to his Jewish audience that a future annulment of the Law, i.e. the ceremonial law, was foreseen in both the Prophets and the Midrashim.⁸⁷ Delitzsch's description of the Law comes close to the purported characteristics of 'Late Judaism': the consequences of life within the national limitation were such that they conflicted with moral ideals, and the national law cannot be exempted from a particularism characterised by nationality and state. The Law hides an eternal kernel in a shell, bound to that time,⁸⁸ and the statutes of the Law are "cruel in an antiquated way, national and particularistic".⁸⁹ In the discussion of the Law, Delitzsch explicitly sides with Reform Judaism, seeing this movement as having evolved out of Christianity, although he does not approve of its faith: "Reform Judaism is Christianity without Christ." Wanting to prove that Reform Judaism does what Christianity did "a thousand years" ago,⁹⁰ Delitzsch then goes on to oscillate between demonstrating the continuity between Judaism and Christianity, and exploiting passages in Talmudic literature to prove Christianity, consistently pointing to the superiority of Christianity but showing little respect for Jewish "religious sense". Interpretations that are evident to Delitzsch "go beyond

⁸⁶ Ibid., 35.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 24, 26–27.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 35–36.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 55.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 38.

the Jewish intellectual ability" (*gehen über jüdische Fassungskraft hinaus*).⁹¹ Delitzsch ends with the call: "Brethren of Israel, break through the spell of unbelief, so that the cycle of mercy will be fulfilled!"⁹² Thus, in this text, Delitzsch stands for a classic supersessionism as well as employs some of the same negative characteristics of Jews and Judaism as did those who talked of Second Temple Judaism as 'Late Judaism'.

At the end of his life, Delitzsch goes even further in his critical attitude and comes closer to scholars who operate with the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis, still without leaving his salvation-historical foundation. Although he continues to give Israel a specific place in God's salvation plan, he assigns it only to the Old Testament people of Israel. He discusses this hot issue in his 1889 pamphlet *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk?* ("Are the Jews Really the Chosen People?"),⁹³ which was written at a time when political anti-Semitism was established in Germany. In a somewhat harsh tone, Delitzsch says that Jews are accused of regarding themselves as higher and better than other people, and he concedes that this Jewish "national aristocratic pride" (*nationale Adelsstoltz*) is the most prominent and "seemingly justified" accusation against the Jews.⁹⁴ He then gives a surprisingly critical description of Judaism: the Jews oppose the grace of God with enmity, blindness, worldly-mindedness, national pride, nationalism, liberalism and falsely conceived emancipation.⁹⁵ Moreover, the basis for this lies in their identity as God's elect and covenant people.⁹⁶

Delitzsch does not question this election, however. There is only one people that has succeeded in keeping to monotheism, and that is the Jews, he says, reasoning that this is due to the soul of Abraham,⁹⁷ and then also arguing for the historicity of Abraham.⁹⁸ The election of Abraham is synonymous with the election of Israel. God's elected nation, and Jesus—the one through whom the blessing upon the peoples would become reality—are the seed of Abraham, Delitzsch contends.⁹⁹

⁹¹ Ibid., 62.

⁹² Ibid., 72.

⁹³ Delitzsch, *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk? Ein Beitrag zur Lichtung der Judenfrage*.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 3.

⁹⁵ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 152.

⁹⁶ Delitzsch, *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk? Ein Beitrag zur Lichtung der Judenfrage*, 4.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 6–7.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 6, 12–13.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 8–9.

Thus he retains a particularism that is concentrated in Abraham, but the religion of Israel is not particularistic in the same sense as in de Wette or Baur, for instance. Throughout its history, Israel has encompassed more than ethnic Israel, and Delitzsch shows that the concept of 'people' in this context encompasses more than ethnic Jews. The seed of Abraham is not ethnically united: different nationalities (*am*) can belong to a people (*goy*), as happened with the people in the Old Testament. However, only one people among the peoples is God's people, and all those who wish to belong to God's people must leave their own national association and enter into Israel's. God, then, is a "world God", not a national God "in the particular sense that Kemosh is the Moabites' national God and Jupiter Capitolinus, the Romans'".¹⁰⁰ Delitzsch thus firmly believes in the election of Israel, and he states that the soul of Moses was the workshop of that election.¹⁰¹ The kernel of this people would be used for God's kingdom purposes.¹⁰²

Nevertheless, the Old Testament revelation is only a preparatory step for the New Testament one, Delitzsch contends.¹⁰³ In later Judaism (*spätere Judentum*), Judaism closed itself to New Testament revelation and hardened itself, developing a nationalist and particularist view of God.¹⁰⁴ At this point, Delitzsch talks about the narrow Judaism of the Pharisees and the people having become fanaticised (*fanatisiertes Volk*), which led to Jesus' death, to his grave.¹⁰⁵ This does not refer to 'Late Judaism' proper; Delitzsch is merely describing post-New Testament Judaism in this way.¹⁰⁶ But without Christ, the pre-Christian development had ended up, like the Jordan, in the Dead Sea.¹⁰⁷ Again, Delitzsch taps into the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis: since the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, "postexilic Judaism had increasingly degenerated into ceremonial legalism with a righteousness that comes by works" and a political-national idea of the Messiah instead of an ethical one.¹⁰⁸

In this discussion, too, Delitzsch expresses supersessionist views and seems to have reconsidered Judaism. The election is still a given, but

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 13–14.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 9.

¹⁰² Ibid., 11–12.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 4.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 16–17.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 46.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 60.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 27.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 59.

in various ways, he points to discontinuity instead of continuity. The concept ‘people of God’ is reinterpreted to mean all believers, and the description of later Judaism is identical with ‘Late Judaism’. The watershed seems to be salvation through Christ, and perhaps the recognition that there were enemies to his faith in Christ among the Jews, in addition to the fact that fewer than hoped were converting. This is also what Delitzsch describes. Encountering the Christ, the Jewish people was divided in two: the great mass that rejected him and the Christ-believers of Israel, who received him. By rejecting Christ, the mass fell out of the calling of God’s elect people, just as Abraham’s and Isaac’s sons were not all elected.¹⁰⁹ As a result of their own decision, the people of Israel, the mass, were elected as a vessel of wrath. God’s people is now “the Christ-believers of Israel and of the Gentile world”, and the believers of Israel are the remnant, the kernel, for whom “the election of Israel as a salvation-historical people” took place. Salvation is prepared in the periphery of this people, but when Jesus says, “Salvation comes from the Jews,” it is referring to the kernel.¹¹⁰ Thus to Delitzsch, *physical Israel ceases to corporately be the people of God*, and this role is transferred to the believers from Israel and the Gentiles. In other words, Delitzsch holds a supersessionist view, at least a *temporally conditioned supersessionism*.¹¹¹ That is, this pertains to the period up to the eschatological events, for although the mass of the people have degenerated, this cannot stop the future plans for Israel. In effect, the individual Jew is no more elected than a Gentile.¹¹² Hence Delitzsch finds the designation “true Israel” correct for the church, which is still built on “Israelite fundamentals”: the apostles, the first church, the first bishops.¹¹³ At the same time, Delitzsch acknowledges both the Jewish foundation of Israel and that the church is a supranational people, held together not by blood but only by the spirit. This is typical of Delitzsch’s balancing act between maintaining the salvation-historical role of the Jews and arguing for their replacement by the church.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 18.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 20–21; 27.

¹¹¹ A similar idea is found in Schlatter and Kittel, see the respective discussions.

¹¹² Heinrichs, “Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von ‘Saat auf Hoffnung. Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche and Israel’”, 215.

¹¹³ Delitzsch, *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk? Ein Beitrag zur Lichtung der Judenfrage*, 22–23.

Despite everything, Delitzsch wishes to defend contemporary Jews as faithful citizens, something that the anti-Semites negate.¹¹⁴ He disagrees with their claims that the Jews are a curse among the peoples, seeing it as blind unbelief and racial hatred.¹¹⁵ He also holds that there must be interaction between the church and synagogue, since the prophetic promise speaks of a final unity¹¹⁶—here Delitzsch is probably referring to Rom. 11:24 *ff.* However, he does not envision Christianity, Islam and Judaism, for instance, melting down into one ethical cosmopolitan theism, but sees an Israel that repents, believes in the Christ and becomes instrumental in taking the gospel to the world.¹¹⁷

As this lengthy discussion shows, Delitzsch acknowledges the role of Israel in God's salvation plan but sees a decisive break when only a smaller part of Israel accepts the Messiah, whereas the 'mass' falls away, becoming a vessel of wrath. Here he majors on ideas from Romans 9, retaining the idea of a final rehabilitation of Israel, though not very forcefully. He does not refer to the Pauline teaching on the olive tree, however, nor to the statement that all of Israel shall be saved, and he seems ambivalent as to the final inclusion of Israel.¹¹⁸ The answer to his question in the book title "Are the Jews Really the Chosen People?" is thus a fairly quiet 'yes' and, as Barkenings notes, *Delitzsch does not interpret the salvation-historical role of Israel as being as dogmatically important as did other theologians to whose camp he fundamentally belonged.* In Delitzsch's theology, it is *the holy remnant* of Israel that is given a role, not the mass.¹¹⁹ Thus there is no longer a prerogative of Israel at large, and the time of the Law is over. The calling of Israel was fulfilled in the Old Testament prehistory to the New Testament. As a result, compared to some other adherents of salvation-historical theology, Delitzsch tones down eschatology and also makes it his business to take a stand against chiliastic ideas.¹²⁰ This is probably due to his Lutheran background.

In this discussion, Delitzsch also accepts some descriptions of Jews and Judaism that are similar to those of the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis. The optimistic view on Judaism seen in his early work seems to have waned,

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 24–25.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 28.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 60.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 60–61.

¹¹⁸ Barkenings, "Die Stimme der Anderen. Der 'heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels' in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts", 216.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 214.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 217.

and Delitzsch is in fact not so far from the views of colleagues such as Bousset or Schürer. His opening statement about Jewish national pride clearly betrays an attitude of superiority and prejudice that is part of a greater whole. Delitzsch never gave up the vision of a Christian state, and in such a state, Jewry would never exist on an equal footing with Christians. Neither could he accept a Jewish emancipation, “which could tear down the Christian state”, or to use Clark’s term, “the missionary state”.¹²¹ This view was typical in Delitzsch’s circles.¹²² To a prominent ideologist of the missions to the Jews, Johannes de le Roi, who cooperated closely with both Delitzsch and Strack (and on whom Stoecker was very dependent),¹²³ Jews were still enemies of the “empire of Christ”, although they had ceased to be enemies of Christ.¹²⁴ This illustrates the context in which Christian scholarship on Judaism and missions to the Jews developed. The goal was the incorporation of the Jews, not only ‘into Christ’ but also into the Christian state. If Jews gained too much influence, however, the result would be de-Christianisation and de-nationalisation, de le Roi contends.

Nevertheless, Delitzsch’s commitment to defending the Jews against anti-Semitic assaults rendered him great appreciation and esteem in Jewish circles. For his seventieth birthday, various tokens of honour were planned, but he requested that there be no ovations, fearing that this would cause his critics to say that he had made his stand in order to gain Jewish sympathy.¹²⁵ Even so, his biographer Wagner notes that Delitzsch’s attitude was one of appreciation *and* criticism of things Jewish, both animated by his passionate longing to see the Jewish people acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah.¹²⁶ At the same time as he defended the Jews against the blood libels, he also aired thoughts about Jews and Judaism being narrow, legalistic and opponents of Christianity.

¹²¹ *Saat auf Hoffnung* 19, 1882, 243 ff. Quoted from Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 129 n. 137. For Clark’s expression, see Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 92.

¹²² Heinrichs, “Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von ‘Saat auf Hoffnung. Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche and Israel’”, 203.

¹²³ Zumbini, *Die Wurzeln des Bösen*, 162 n. 32.

¹²⁴ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 267. Strack praised de le Roi’s theory of missions to the Jews, 253.

¹²⁵ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 414.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 414.

Conclusion

Delitzsch studied and wrote about Jews and Judaism in the course of a long life, seemingly reconsidering certain things along the way. In the concluding analysis, therefore, I am obliged to describe his views in two steps, early and late, since the strongly negative views of Judaism are only formulated in his last years. However, this need not imply that his views were not all anchored in his theological centre, which they probably were.

The *characterisation* of Jews and Judaism, then, is ambivalent. Israel, or the Jewish people, has a key role as a tool for the fulfilment of God's plan, and it has an ideal future with a leadership role among the nations. Paired with this type of high estimation of Israel and its calling is a warm and tender depiction of pious Jews in New Testament times, countering views that were all too widespread. To Delitzsch, the Jewish spiritual life was genuine: the people pray, and their prayer is also an inward one—here Delitzsch stands in the sharpest possible contrast to the picture presented through the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis, of a Judaism without inner qualities. This is all placed within a salvation-historical framework in which Israel and the Jews hold a position of honour. However, *in his later writings*, Delitzsch has another tone. He blames the death of Jesus on the Jews, and sees it as a national debt that weighs on the Jewish *people*: the Jews were the ones who pierced Jesus. His description of Judaism can be negative, especially in polemical situations. This is seen in his portrayal of Hillel as "judicial and casuistic", whereas Jesus lived according to the spirit of the Law. And Jews are described with phrases that are no nicer than in e.g. de Wette or Bousset. Delitzsch talks of the "national aristocratic pride" of the Jews, who oppose the grace of God with enmity, blindness and worldly-mindedness. Furthermore, they are characterised by liberalism and falsely conceived emancipation. All these seem to be essential traits, pertaining to historical as well as contemporary Jews. He even talks pejoratively of things going beyond the Jewish intellectual ability.

Delitzsch's *historiography* follows a salvation-historical pattern with a clear Christological tendency, at least at the outset. Christ and what was to come were prepared in the Old Testament, and Abraham is the root of it all. Nevertheless, strains of a degeneration idea are included in way that is quite different to Beck. The Old Testament is merely a preparation for the appearance of Christ, and its theocracy produced nothing greater than the Sinaitic legislation. However, according to

Delitzsch, the appearance of Christ was preceded by a time when the kingdom of darkness, representing the influence of demonic forces, had reached its peak. Thus there is a degeneration stage: since the time of Ezra–Nehemiah, postexilic Judaism had increasingly degenerated into ceremonialism, legalism, works–righteousness and a political-national idea of a Messiah, rather than an ethical one. Here Delitzsch comes close to the traditional ‘Late Judaism’ hypothesis, whereas earlier he was able to state that the Gentiles are the ones who are degenerated. Nevertheless, in the future, Delitzsch sees a possible eschatological re-entry of Israel into its salvation-historical calling. The focus on Christ and salvation makes Delitzsch’s views more Christ-centred than Tholuck’s and especially Beck’s, with Jewish history having less value in its own right.

The same is true of his view on *continuity and discontinuity*. There is a “history of preparation” that equals the Old Testament salvation history, which is fulfilled in the New Testament. Early on, Delitzsch writes that in the Old Testament, the kingdom is something that is already ‘becoming’, thus stressing continuity. David’s kingdom and Christ’s are one and the same; there is an organic and causal connection. Between Old Testament Judaism and Christianity, there is a relationship between pattern and realisation: “Israel is the foundation and body of the very church, which is to continually expand and grow.” Thus in Delitzsch, there is always a real organic relationship between historical Israel and Christianity, and he sees an unbroken continuity between Jesus and Judaism, at least in his early writings.

In *later writings*, discontinuity takes the upper hand: the old covenant has been annulled, the national privilege has ended, the law of Israel is merely a national law, unable to serve as the law of a church of all nations. Supersessionism takes over. Israel’s time is a preliminary stage, which after the coming of Christ, is a thing of the past. The physical Israel becomes history, and the *believers of Israel* [that is, believers in the Messiah, A.G.] are the remnant, the kernel. When Jesus says, “Salvation comes from the Jews,” he is referring merely to this kernel. I believe this is a key to understanding Delitzsch: it is the Christ-believing minority of Jews that represents continuity with ancient Israel, a position that fits well with Delitzsch’s missionary focus. Delitzsch thus moves the sceptre from physical Israel to the believers of Israel and the Gentiles. However, the supersessionism is temporal—which may sound like a *contradictio in adiecto*—that is, he maintains the fundamental idea of Israel as a peculiar nation, although it now consists of those who

believe in Christ. These are still a tool for God's purposes, whereas the prerogative of Israel at large is a thing of the past, since the Jews rejected Christ. Delitzsch's theology is thus a markedly Christological one. Before Christ, the chosen people prepare for his coming, but since they do not corporately receive him, their prerogative is transferred to a spiritual Israel. Nevertheless, and this is the motor in all of Delitzsch's work, the Jews do have a special calling, and winning them for Christ is instrumental to God's plans. This is how he can say with prophetic zeal, "Brethren of Israel, break through the spell of unbelief, so that the cycle of mercy will be fulfilled!"¹²⁷ Yet when Jews refuse to listen, they are the only ones to blame.

The *symbolic world* of Delitzsch is Lutheran Pietist. His expertise in Jewish theology was not acquired as a result of spiritual hunger but for a missionary purpose, his salvation-historical approach being soteriological. Clearly Delitzsch also internalised some of the ideas of the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis. Early on, Delitzsch's 'symbolic Jew' was a key figure, instrumental to the realisation of the divine plan. This 'symbolic Jew' shifts over time, however. Having lost the salvation-historical task, the 'Jew' now personifies negative things instead. This shift is not surprising, considering how Christ and salvation are at the centre of Delitzsch's symbolic world. Delitzsch seems to have started out with optimistic dreams of a believing Judaism, but later in life raged over their unbelief. Moreover, Delitzsch envisioned Christian Jews in a Christian church and state, and when Jews and Judaism retained their own identity and could not be incorporated, Delitzsch's vision had failed. Just as in Schlatter and Gerhard Kittel after him, the liberal 'Jew' became a negative factor of an increasingly demonic kind, and if this was the 'symbolic Jew', he belonged to the underworld, rather than on the sacred canopy of salvation-historical theology.

In spite of all the negative things said, in the midst of negative characterisations of Jews, Delitzsch strongly objected to everything that he regarded as anti-Semitic, and he was regarded by the Jews themselves as a defender in word and deed. Thus, through his scholarship, he *delegitimised* oppression of Jews. The key role given to Jews in his overall theological system may have provided a natural protection for them in the tumultuous 1880s—although when he spoke in prejudiced terms about Jews, this may have worked in the other direction. Regarding it

¹²⁷ Delitzsch, *Ernste Fragen an die Gebildeten jüdischer Religion*, 72.

as a disgrace for Christians to call themselves anti-Semites, Delitzsch publicly countered anti-Semitic assertions and also wished to change prejudiced views: when Jews were seen as lazy, he wanted to convey a picture of them as good handicrafters, etc. However, Delitzsch did not support unconditional emancipation. The Christian state was his only alternative, and Jews who wanted to fully enter it had one option: conversion. Thus Delitzsch adopted quite a complex position:¹²⁸ *theologically* passionate about the salvation of the Jewish remnant so that God's plans could be fulfilled, *scholarly* eager to understand and explore the Jewish world, both for academic and missionary reasons, *politically* convinced that Jews could not be fully emancipated but must convert to fit into the Christian state, *humanly* certain that the assaults from anti-Semites—typically the blood libels and the like—had to be countered at any cost, *personally* probably feeling a kind of frustrated love towards the Jews, given the lack of success in seeing Jews converted. Contemporary Jews nevertheless respected this life as a blessing to the suppressed German-Jewish minority.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ For an insightful description of the dilemma felt by people like Delitzsch, see Barkenings, "Die Stimme der Anderen. Der 'heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels' in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts", 203–204.

¹²⁹ In the next chapter about Strack, I will comment on Levenson's article, which deals with Delitzsch and Strack, Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack". He also discusses the complex relationship that the two theologians had to Jews and Judaism.

HERMANN LEBERECHELT STRACK: MISSIONS TO AND DEFENCE OF JEWS

Throughout his scholarly career, H. L. Strack was deeply involved with Jews and Judaism. An eminent Orientalist, specialised in Hebrew, the Old Testament and Judaism of Tannaitic and Amoraic times, he, just as Delitzsch, combined a scholarly interest with a passion for missions to Jews. This was also his main impetus for studying Judaism.¹ Having founded the Berlin Institutum Judaicum in 1883, leading it from 1886, he wrote a Hebrew grammar and an introduction to the Old Testament, among other things, and edited Mishna tractates.² A student of Delitzsch's, Strack in many ways continued what the former had begun,³ Delitzsch meaning a great deal to the young Strack, both privately and as a teacher.⁴ His reputation in Jewish circles was predominantly positive, being recognized as leading among non-Jewish scholars in the Bible and Talmud, Semitic linguistics and Jewish history of literature, as well as being esteemed for a book on Yiddish grammar.⁵ A major contribution to Jewish scholarship was his photographic edition of the complete manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud, published in 1912.

Strack was appreciated for defending Judaism against anti-Semitism but was also criticised for his missions to Jews,⁶ or at least it is noted that his main motive for studying Judaism was missions to Jews.⁷ This rendered him the description "a wolf in sheep's clothing" by Paulus

¹ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, 26.

² For Strack's biography, see Christof Dahm, "Strack, Hermann Leberecht", in *Biografisches-Bibliografisches Kirchenlexikon* (1996). The most comprehensive discussion of Strack is Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, and see this work *passim* for biographical notes.

³ Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 255.

⁴ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 21.

⁵ Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack", 415–416.

⁶ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 15.

⁷ *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. Strack, Hermann Leberecht; *Jüdisches Lexikon*, s.v. Strack, Hermann Leberecht.

Meyer, a converted Jew, who himself accused Jews of ritual murder. It is true that Strack was at home in conservative Protestantism and missions to Jews; however, he also engaged in serious scholarly work, which was often motivated by his defence against anti-Semitism.⁸ With his extensive network of Jewish scholars, “there was scarcely any of the Jewish scholars, with whom he did not stand in connection”.⁹ The institute of Strack’s creation taught theoretical subjects from Hebrew to the history of synagogue worship, but also how to take care of proselytes,¹⁰ the latter aspect meeting with suspicion from both Jewish and Christian quarters.¹¹

Strack is best-known for two handbooks that are directly linked to Judaism, for generations regarded as indispensable to exegetes, his “Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash” and the monumental rabbinical commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Midrash, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, the latter published together with Paul Billerbeck.¹² Strack was only around for the publication of the first volume in 1922, dying the same year, by which time he was professor and *Konsistorialrat*. The preface to the first part states that Strack’s contribution was to outline the project and gather the materials. Billerbeck processed this material into its existing form, which was then inspected by Strack before publication. In the preface from 1928, however, Billerbeck clarifies that Strack was not involved in the actual writing of the work, and he explicitly calls it “my commentary”.¹³ These circumstances make it difficult to ascertain which contributions are Strack’s and which are Billerbeck’s, and as for my interest in Strack’s attitudes towards the Jews, to what extent

⁸ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 51. Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 112.

⁹ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 16, quoting Wohlgemuth.

¹⁰ Clark, *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*, 245, 253.

¹¹ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 16–17.

¹² Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C. H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922–1961).

¹³ Preface to Volume 4 of *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Discussing the authorship of the work, Gerhard Kittel stresses that “the only author is Paul Billerbeck”, Gerhard Kittel, “Grundsätzliches und Methodisches zu den Übersetzungen rabbinischer Texte”, *Aggelos. Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde* 1, no. 1/2 (1925), 61 n. 1.

the text reflects Strack's views. The imposing work has also met with criticism regarding the handling of the rabbinic sources, as well as the interpretation of central concepts. The Jewish critic Samuel Sandmel points to what he saw as a constant demonstration of the superiority of Jesus, a position he shared with C. G. Montefiore, H. Heinemann and J. Krengel.¹⁴ Later New Testament scholars, such as E. P. Sanders, shared their critical position.¹⁵

"Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash" is undoubtedly Strack's work and lasting contribution, however, with its first edition in 1887, as well as several newer editions and revisions, now living on in Stemberger's radically revised form.¹⁶ The last edition by Strack himself is the fifth, from 1920.¹⁷ In his 1887 preface, Strack directs his work both at the people who are unconditionally hostile to the Talmud and at those who are overly zealous for it—Levenson rightly remarks that the latter group was a smaller problem in Strack's Germany.¹⁸ In the preface to the fourth edition of 1908, Strack shows that one important context for the information about the Jewish sources is to counter the disinformation to German Christians that Judaism wanted to keep the Talmud secret. This is something that Strack strongly contradicts,

¹⁴ For Krengel, see Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, 32.

¹⁵ See the critical discussion of the concept of reward in H. Heinemann, "The Conception of Reward in Mat. XX.1–16", *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 1, no. 2 (1948–1949); generally about methodological problems with Strack-Billerbeck in Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962). Montefiore acknowledges his indebtedness to Strack-Billerbeck and refers to it *passim*, although he often has quarrels with their Christian interpretation of the rabbinic material. As an example, Strack-Billerbeck, having discussed the *Amme ha-Aretz*: "The big mournful class of pessimists [*Amme ha-Aretz*, A.G.]—religious outcasts, despairing of their own salvation, despised by the learned and more or less despising themselves—appears to be a figment of S.B.'s [Strack-Billerbeck's, A.G.] and other Christian theologians' vivid imagination," C. G. Montefiore, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1930), 7. Montefiore sometimes opposes Billerbeck's positions in more important matters, e.g. the view of the Law, 196–201. For Sanders's criticism of the caricature of Judaism that prevailed for much of the 20th c., see Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*.

¹⁶ Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. Markus Bockmuehl, 2 ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996). For the history of the Introduction, see Stemberger's discussion in Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, 53–69.

¹⁷ Hermann L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midras*, 5 ed. (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920).

¹⁸ Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack", 397.

assuring that the Talmud does not include any hidden part that is unavailable to Christian scholarship.¹⁹ The Jews neither wish nor are able to hide anything. The revised edition from 1920 is produced in close cooperation with Jewish scholars, among whom Strack's work received growing acclaim, with many Jewish scholars expressing their appreciation for Strack's work, both during and after his lifetime.²⁰ His work, however, was perhaps more that of a most erudite collector and teacher, than that of a particularly creative researcher.²¹

The other line of publication that Strack was noted for during his lifetime was anti-anti-Semitic writings, where Strack stood as a constant scholarly defender against anti-Semitism.²² For thirty years, he sided actively with Jews and Judaism against anti-Semitism, which by this time was a political force, thereby making a unique and historical achievement.²³ As a (or *the*) leading Christian professor in the area of Judaism and the Talmud, Strack was a natural authority in the many controversies caused by anti-Semitism, which often pertained to questions of Jewish literature. Early on, he took action against an alleged "Excerpt from Talmud", which was distributed as a handbill,²⁴ and against the anti-Semitic blood libel. One prominent part of the anti-Semitic propaganda that was linked to the pseudo-scholarly caricature of Judaism in Eisenmenger's book *Entdecktes Judentum* was the concise halakhic synopsis *Shulchan Aruch* ("The Prepared Table"), originally printed in Venice in 1565. Excerpts from this, taken out of context, and misinterpretations of it gave rise to the idea, for example, that Jews are to hate, lie to or even kill Christians.²⁵

¹⁹ Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midras*, iii–iv.

²⁰ Ibid., v. See Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 121–123, and for Jewish views on Christian Talmudic scholarship, 305–335; and Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack", 398.

²¹ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 19.

²² Bruno Kirschner, "Strack, Hermann Leberecht", in *Jüdisches Lexikon*, ed. Georg Herlitz and Bruno Kirschner (1987).

²³ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 20; Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 126.

²⁴ The text is published in Wiese, 89–90, and Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*, 312 includes a facsimile.

²⁵ *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. Shulhan Arukh; *Jüdisches Lexikon*, s.v. Schulchan Aruch. See also Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*, 40–41.

The blood libel was discussed by Strack in the pamphlet “The Blood Superstitions of Mankind, Blood Murders and Blood Rites”, later published in book form,²⁶ and Strack would continue to publish pamphlets countering anti-Semitic prejudice and lies about Jews, using his expertise to disprove false accusations and further accurate information about Judaism.²⁷ In *Jüdische Geheimgesetze?* (“Secret Jewish Laws?”), Strack summarises much of the defence against the “pseudo-scholarship of anti-Semitism”.²⁸ He also publishes patristic and Talmudic sayings about Jesus—not to hide what is there but to offer correct information—in the volume *Jesus die Häretiker und die Christen*.²⁹ In another pamphlet, from 1900, he defends the Jews against accusations of keeping secret scriptures and polluting meat before selling it to Christians. The text also includes declarations by rabbis of Jewish ethics.³⁰

Theologically, however, Strack does not regard Judaism and Christianity as equals: Judaism is a preliminary stage to Christianity, missionary work among Jews is a duty, and acting righteously in relation to Jews and Judaism gives Jews a positive testimony of being a Christian. The commandment to love your neighbour eminently pertains to Jews, Strack reasons.³¹ Nevertheless, Strack’s defence of the Jews was highly appreciated by his Jewish colleagues and was not generally interpreted as

²⁶ Hermann L. Strack, *Der Blutaberglaube in der Menschheit, Blutmorde und Blutritus*, 4 ed., vol. 14, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1892). On ritual murder, see also Johannes T. Groß, *Ritualmordbeschuldigungen gegen Juden im Deutschen Kaiserreich (1871–1914)*, vol. 47, Reihe Dokumente, Texte, Materialien / Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung der Technischen Universität Berlin (Berlin: Metropol, 2002).

²⁷ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland*, 113–116.

²⁸ Hermann L. Strack, *Jüdische Geheimgesetze? Mit drei Anhängen.*, 6 ed. (Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921). See also Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, 41–42.

²⁹ Hermann L. Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben*, ed. Hermann L. Strack, vol. 37, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1910); in the introduction to his comprehensive and valuable investigation of references to Jesus in the Talmudic tradition, Johann Maier notes that Strack represents a new and positive trend in the way that scholars treated the Jews, Johann Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*, vol. 82, Erträge der Forschung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliches Buchgesellschaft, 1978), 20–22.

³⁰ Hermann L. Strack, *Sind die Juden Verbrecher von Religionswegen?*, vol. 28, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1900).

³¹ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland*, 117.

motivated by his missionary enterprise.³² Part of the reason why Strack stood up against anti-Semitism was that it destroyed Jewish confidence in Christianity.³³ Seeing anti-Semitism as the main hindrance to Jewish missions, his struggle against anti-Semitism would be at least partly linked to this, but he also regarded Christians as obliged to defend the Jews, a view rooted in his salvation-historical thought.³⁴ As many other theologians and churchmen, especially confessional ones, Strack initially appreciated Adolf Stöcker's Christian Social movement; however, as it grew overtly anti-Semitic, Strack took a strong stand against Stöcker's ideas in his 1885 pamphlet *Herr Adolf Stöcker, christliche Liebe und Wahrhaftigkeit*.³⁵ It documents dealings between Strack on the one hand, and Stöcker and his anti-Semitic colleagues on the other, strongly attacking Stöcker for untruthful attacks on Jews, wrongly polemical interpretation of the Talmud, etc. Strack admits that he initially supported Stöcker, not knowing where the movement was going, and that he had defended Stöcker as late as in 1884.³⁶ Socialising in the same circles and sharing a similar Pietist background, including a common frontier against modern Judaism, Strack had been attracted by Stöcker's message at first. But when Strack saw the unworthy ways of Stöcker, he reacted, and the text reveals that there was a complete break between the two. The booklet is thus a sharp attack on Stöcker and his "unchristian, unrighteous *degeneration (Entartung) of anti-Semitism*, which sowed not love but hatred".³⁷

Although Strack defended Judaism against unjust attacks, his view of Christian superiority was unshakeable, and there is no doubt that Strack's overarching perspective is his confessional salvation-historical theology. Within this paradigm, he does place the Old Testament and rabbinical Judaism in the same system as the New Testament; there is a certain continuity, Jews and Christians having the Old Testament in common. But to Strack, a salvation-historical interpretation of the latter naturally represents a discontinuity with the Jews.³⁸ Thus, from a

³² Ibid., 118–119.

³³ Ralf Golling, "Strack und die Judenmission", *Judaica* 38 (1982), 73.

³⁴ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, 27–29.

³⁵ Hermann L. Strack, *Herr Adolf Stöcker, christliche Liebe und Wahrhaftigkeit* (Karlsruhe und Leipzig: Verlag von H. Reuther, 1885).

³⁶ Ibid., 2.

³⁷ Ibid., 75.

³⁸ Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*, 35.

religious perspective, there is no place for a Jewish religious self-confidence; the Jews are merely the receiving part in the religious dialogue.³⁹ As few others in his position, however, Strack maintains that righteousness dictates appreciation of positive sides of Jews, such as their family values, industry and thrift.

Theologically, Christianity is historically indebted to Judaism, from which Jesus comes—but Christianity is *not* dependent on Jewish doctrines, nor is it a daughter of Judaism. Old Testament Israel is the chosen people, but a pre-stage to Christianity. The covenant is still effective, however, and Strack hopes for a future when “Israel’s knee will bow in the name of Jesus Christ”.⁴⁰ To Strack, Christianity is the perfection of the true Israel’s religion of the prophets, and rabbinic Judaism is a shoot on the side, but Reform Judaism is no longer Judaism.⁴¹ Paying a certain respect to Orthodox Jewry, although theologically he regards them as lacking understanding, he polemicises against the Reform Jewish emphasis on monotheism, and points critically to the dependence of Jews on the Law—he even welcomes a certain historical-critical work on the Pentateuch as a means of taking away the foundation for such a faith among orthodox Jews.⁴²

In 1906, Strack enters the debate on the essence of Christianity and Judaism, which was started by Adolf von Harnack with *Das Wesen des Christentums*, his famous 1899/1900 lectures published in numerous editions,⁴³ and answered by the liberal rabbi and leading Jewish theologian Leo Baeck with *Das Wesen des Judentums* in 1901.⁴⁴ Whereas these scholars lectured and wrote on their own religions, Strack wrote *Das Wesen des Judentums*, himself being a Christian.⁴⁵ Although he refers to Harnack, the debate caused by his lecture and the numerous Jewish books published in response, the context of Strack’s writing is a

³⁹ Golling, “Strack und die Judenmission”, 70.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 74–75.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 80.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 79.

⁴³ Adolf von Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums. Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Fakultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität Berlin*, vol. 72. Tausend (Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1929), E. T. Adolf von Harnack, *What is Christianity (E. T. 1901)* (London: G. P. Putnam’s sons, 1900).

⁴⁴ Leo Baeck, *Das Wesen des Judentums* (Berlin: Rathausen & Lamm, 1905). On the debate, see Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland*, 131–139.

⁴⁵ Hermann L. Strack, *Das Wesen des Judentums. Vortrag gehalten auf der internationalen Konferenz für Judenmission zu Amsterdam*, vol. 36, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1906).

mission conference, the basic purpose being to inform about Judaism, “trying to draw the spirit of Judaism”. Alan Levenson calls the text “a strange animal with a philosemitic body and an anti-Semitic tail”. Strack informs about Judaism objectively, presenting Jewish life “with a verisimilitude rarely present in Christian descriptions of Judaism”,⁴⁶ noting that Jewry are not only united by their blood, but even more so through their common memory and hope. However, he protests against what he regards as Jewish *Adelsstolz* (aristocratic pride), a pride in being the chosen ones with a monopoly on the absolute truth, which causes them to not want to include even proselytes in their midst,⁴⁷ and which holds that all that is good in Christianity is of Jewish origin. Judaism’s pride in having created monotheism is unwarranted; God maintained it despite Israel’s polytheistic tendencies, Strack says. Through God’s election of Israel, it became God’s vessel, keeping faith long enough for it to reach humanity at large. This does not give Israel any reason for pride, however, since the vessel is “often defective” (*schadhaft*).⁴⁸ Nevertheless, Israel has a fancied merit and prides itself unjustifiably on the merit of its fathers, Strack contends—here Strack finds a parallel to Roman Catholic doctrine—and as a result, Israel lacks a proper consciousness of sin. It rejects the doctrine of original sin, which stands in the way of missions to the Jews.⁴⁹ In conclusion, Strack holds that the memory of God’s deeds in history and the Jews’ future expectations create a pride that hinders them from seeing their depravation and need of salvation—and the enmity felt from Christians hinders them from accepting the Christian message. But Strack believes that the “heart of Israel having grown stiff” will soften, and the knee of Israel will bow in the name of Jesus.⁵⁰ Here Strack echoes attitudes common in Lutheran tradition—the self-criticism of Christians included.⁵¹ In this discussion, Strack’s approach differs greatly from when he defends Judaism. The singling out of Israel as a stiff and obdurate people with

⁴⁶ Levenson, “Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack”, 416–417.

⁴⁷ Strack, *Das Wesen des Judentums. Vortrag gehalten auf der internationalen Konferenz für Judenmission zu Amsterdam*, 18, 21.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 21–22.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 22–23.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵¹ Heinrichs, “Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von ‘Saat auf Hoffnung. Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche und Israel’”, 206.

an “aristocratic pride” is reminiscent of popular sentiments of “Jewish pride” and suggests a certain bitterness.⁵² As Heinrichs notes, there is a gap between the theoretical salvation-historical view of the Jewish people and the view of the Jews in person.⁵³

Strack never gave up his view of Christian superiority, a fact that became evident in the debate surrounding the possibility of a Jewish scholarly assistant working with Strack at the University of Berlin. In this context, Strack maintained the view that scholarly work on Judaism had to be done under Christian auspices, in order to further a *Christian* scholarship of Judaism, thus not acknowledging an autonomous Jewish scholarship.⁵⁴

Conclusion

Strack’s view on Judaism is marked by his intense, long-term involvement with the Jews, as their public advocate and a zealous missionary. The former fostered a willingness to help and relate to Jews, which he probably did as no other Christian personality at the time. The latter built on a theological analysis, where Jews were in need of Christian salvation, and where the love of the missionary could be frustrated. At the same time, in this context, the enemies were those who opposed the salvation of Jews. Despite this, Strack succeeded so well in his defence of the Jews that he became a highly respected Christian personality in the circles that he wanted to reach with the gospel.

Characterising Jews and Judaism, Strack, despite his massive anti-anti-Semitism, surprisingly talks of the Jews as having an aristocratic pride in being the elected with a monopoly on the absolute truth, and as overstating their election and holding that all that is good in Christianity emanates from Judaism. However, when God installed monotheism, Israel went polytheistic. Strack never places Judaism on an equal footing with Christianity, seeing it as a preliminary stage to Christianity. Discussing modern Jews, he is able to respect Orthodox

⁵² The idea of Jewish pride and obduracy was traditional, and a topos in the discourse of the *Kaiserreich*, *ibid.*, 205.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁵⁴ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland*, 330–332.

Jewry, although they lack understanding and are too dependent on the Law. His quarrels with Reform Judaism are greater.

Strack does not major on *historiography* but keeps a salvation-historical approach, although he sometimes interprets this in supersessionist terms. As for continuity or discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity, there is a certain continuity, since the Jews and Christians have the Old Testament in common. Old Testament Israel is the chosen people but a pre-stage to Christianity, and theologically and historically, Christianity is indebted to Judaism. Moreover, Israel's time is not over, the covenant is still effective, and Strack hopes for a future when "Israel's knee will bow in the name of Jesus Christ".

Strack's *symbolic world* brings nothing new in relation to his teacher Delitzsch's. The two share the view of Christian superiority and the Christian state as the only option, and here, too, the 'symbolic Jew' is ambivalent. The 'Jew' has an historical role, but everything depends on salvation. Although Israel is God's vessel according to its election, to Strack the vessel is often defective. There is no doubt that Strack's 'Jew' is essentially the same whether he is historical or contemporary.

Strack's greatest human legacy is his incorruptible *delegitimation* of anti-Semitic propaganda, for thirty years using his expertise and professorial authority with unremitting zeal to counter new accusations. While it is true that part of the reason for this was that he saw anti-Semitism as a hindrance to Jewish missions, in Strack's mind Christians were obliged to defend the Jews—a position that is a consequence of his salvation-historical theology.

Excursus: Defenders and Detractors? Alan Levenson on Strack and Delitzsch

This duality of a strong defence of Jews, both contemporary Judaism and Jews as God's elected people, and at the same time, critical views of Jews raises questions. In his evaluation of the missionary movement and its relationship to the Jews and Judaism, Levenson calls scholars such as Delitzsch and Strack "defenders and detractors":⁵⁵

I argue that despite a theological starting-point inimical to Judaism, their Judaica scholarship, their contacts with Jewish scholars and their

⁵⁵ In the title of the article, Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack".

opposition to prevailing trends in German Christianity consistently led them in pro-Jewish directions. The resulting tension between anti-Semitic and philosemitic tendencies produced a view of Judaism that was highly compartmentalized in a way that left both their philosemitism and their Christian triumphalism intact.⁵⁶

Levenson also notes that scholarship has not enough noted “the anti-Jewish elements of their thought”,⁵⁷ asking, “How can we come to terms with the apparent contradiction that the most determined defenders of Judaism publicly and its most sympathetic interpreters theologically were the same people who actively strove for the Jews’ disappearance?”⁵⁸ He goes on to discuss terminology: philo-Semitism, anti-Semitism and ‘allosemitism’, which to Levenson means “an individual who assigns both intensely positive and intensely negative judgments to different aspects of Jewry/Judaism”.⁵⁹ This Levenson sees in the remarkable fact that Strack and Delitzsch were ardent defenders against the anti-Semitic assaults on contemporary Judaism, while maintaining an uncompromising view of Christian superiority.⁶⁰ Combining serious scholarship of Judaism and missions to Jews—both inherent to the *Instituta Judaica*—with Jewish friendships, at the same time they regard Judaism as a threat to the German Christian state.⁶¹

Levenson also gives examples of how the mission institutes played a very positive role against political anti-Semitism from the very beginning: Delitzsch and Strack “opposed the new movement [anti-Semitism, A.G.] more stridently than any other group in Germany in the 1880s”, Strack’s anti-anti-Semitic action making him the best-known missionary in Germany. These scholars had the competence to counterattack anti-Semitic statements, e.g. those dealing with rabbinic literature, and since they were Christians, they were not compromised when doing so. The fact that the literature and magazines that were distributed by the institutes mostly displayed an objective or favourable view of Jews, Jewish scholars and Judaism meant support for German Jewry—it is

⁵⁶ Ibid., 384–385.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 384, mentioning Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, and Golling and von der Osten-Sacken, eds., *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin*.

⁵⁸ Levenson, “Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack”, 387.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 387–388.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Heinrichs, “Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs”, 220.

important to remember that as university professors, Delitzsch and Strack were held in high esteem in society. Finally, Levenson notes as positive that these scholars befriended Jews, contrasting their efforts with the liberals⁶²—not until the 1890s did the liberals take up anti-Semitism as part of their cause.⁶³ He describes the quarrels that German missionary Christians had with liberal Jewry in particular, but also how Strack, due to his activities as an anti-anti-Semite became the best-known missionary in Germany. People of his kind were the first to resist the Berlin anti-Semitic movement, were the most competent defenders of Jews because of their knowledge of Judaica, painted a positive picture of Jews when everyone else was caricaturing them, interacted with Jewish scholars and befriended Jews.⁶⁴

In his elucidating article, Levenson rightly points to the complex and seemingly contradictory way in which scholars like Strack and Delitzsch relate to Jews and Judaism. Interestingly, similarly contradictory views, with a rather different content, were noted in the discussion of the History of Religions school and liberal Protestantism. However, talking of anti-Semitism and philo-Semitism when describing the same person only shows that the terms are not properly defined.⁶⁵ As noted regarding Delitzsch, his Christology and soteriology are at the centre of his dealings with Jews and Judaism. Perhaps their attitudes can be analysed by using the concepts of 'race', 'ethnos' and 'religion'.⁶⁶ There is no doubt that both Delitzsch and Strack were strongly opposed to *racist* views of Jews and Judaism, including the anti-Semitic stereotypical lies about Jews. As Levenson notes, these circles, more often than others in contemporary Germany, also defend Jews as *ethnos*, presenting Jewish culture and literature on their own terms and depicting Jews as studious, industrious, etc.—although it must be admitted that there are highly pejorative statements here, too, such as the talk of a Jewish *Adelsstolz*. However, the pervasive problem for these scholars is *religious*, and more specifically, the stance on Jesus and the gospel. It is here that they feel threatened by Jewish attacks on the Virgin Birth,

⁶² Levenson, "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack", 404–407.

⁶³ Ibid., 403–404, though noting a few exceptions.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 404–406.

⁶⁵ For literature on the definition of the terms, see the Introduction.

⁶⁶ For a discussion of these terms as fundamental to a functional typology of polemic against Jews and Judaism, see Gerdmar, "Polemiken mot judar i Nya testamentet och dess reception. Utkast till en analytisk typologi".

purported Jewish modernist ideas on morals and the Jewry becoming an emancipated part of the German Christian state. This is admittedly an ethno-religious tension, a mixture of the ethnic and religious commitment to a Christian Germany. But the heart of the matter is the soteriology—only when understanding the role of their Lutheran Pietist soteriology, it is possible to understand their irredeemable position regarding the claims of Jesus as Saviour. Sometimes in these circles, fierce opposition to Judaism regarding the soteriological issue may also be an aspect of an anti-Judaism that paves the way for anti-Semitism in its racist sense.⁶⁷ Strack and Delitzsch, however, did not go so far as to be rightly described as racist anti-Semites.

⁶⁷ This discussion is also elucidating for the following discussions about Adolf Schlatter and Gerhard Kittel.

ADOLF SCHLATTER AND JUDAISM: GREAT ERUDITION AND FIERCE OPPOSITION

Adolf Schlatter's Jewish erudition is unparalleled among New Testament scholars of Second Temple Judaism, Hermann Lichtenberger states.¹ However, it is not only his learning that makes a study of Schlatter a must in this book; through his vast literary production, Schlatter exerted great influence both on the broad German Christian public and on Christian leaders. As the teacher of generations of pastors, and a widely read author of Christian literature in Germany, in a way rarely seen for a New Testament exegete who passed away seventy years ago, his books are being republished, especially in the United States,² and Schlatter's importance for 'biblical theology' is often stressed.³ During his lifetime,

¹ Hermann Lichtenberger, "Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum" (Bonn 2003), 20. Professor Lichtenberger has kindly allowed me to use this unpublished lecture manuscript from the SNTS 2003. For Schlatter's biography, I am indebted to Werner Neuer's comprehensive book Werner Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1996), a much shorter version being Werner Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: A Biography of Germany's Premier Biblical Theologian* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1996). Within the scope of this investigation, I cannot discuss more than Schlatter's attitude to Jews and Judaism. For the sections of his book relevant to this study, Neuer relies on his reading of Schlatter's abundant correspondence with his son, Theodor Schlatter, whereas my discussion deals primarily with the public aspect of his work, that is, what might have affected the public. Therefore, if Schlatter seems to be saying something else in the correspondence, I will still consider what is on the printed page. Moreover, as the reader will notice, my reading of Schlatter sometimes differs from Neuer's, which tends to downplay some of Schlatter's negative sides. Lichtenberger, too, notes that Neuer at times treats Schlatter in a somewhat 'friendly' manner, Lichtenberger, "Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum". Schlatter and his relationship to the Jews has lately attracted the interest of other scholars, besides Lichtenberger, also James McNutt, James E. McNutt, "Adolf Schlatter and the Jews", *German Studies Review* 26, no. 2 (2003), James E. McNutt, "Vessels of Wrath, Prepared to Perish. Adolf Schlatter and the Spiritual Extermination of the Jews", *Theology Today* 63, no. 2 (2006). See also Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, "Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums", in *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Arnoldshainer Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994).

² On this, see McNutt, "Vessels of Wrath, Prepared to Perish. Adolf Schlatter and the Spiritual Extermination of the Jews", 182.

³ See e.g. Peter Stuhlmacher, "Adolf Schlatter als Bibelausleger", *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* Beiheft 4 (1978), Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Schlatter Reception Then: His New Testament Theology", *Southern Baptist Journal* 3, no. 1 (1999) and Robert

his influence was also felt abroad, for example in Sweden, where his four-volume work “The New Testament Interpreted and Explained” was widespread.⁴ In this context, Schlatter is especially important because he was a teacher and mentor to several scholars who were influential during National Socialism—Gerhard Kittel, Walter Grundmann and Paul Althaus—and because his own position during the ‘Third Reich’ is in fact complex. However, Schlatter had a long scholarly life prior to this, and so I will discuss Schlatter’s work in two parts, before and during National Socialism.

According to Schlatter, his interest in Judaism began in the context of Jewish missions. His older friend Johannes Schnell, an historian of jurisprudence, had introduced Schlatter to the missions to Jews in Basel, where he spoke at an annual meeting of *Die Freunde Israels* in 1882.⁵ Recognising in the course of this day “that we do not at all know the Jews”, Schlatter decided to gain knowledge of the Jews, telling himself:

You must go into the Jewish literature; Philo and the apocalypics (whom I knew) are not enough; Judaism, to which the New Testament stood in fruitful fellowship and heated struggle, was the Palestinian one, Pharisaism, which you must get to know on the basis of its own testimonies.⁶

Schlatter notes that in this he stood alone, since it was common to only describe Judaism on the basis of the text available in Greek, “even though Judaism itself had rejected this literature”.⁷ Finding the rabbinical literature aesthetically unattractive and challenging to the logical capacities of the reader, Schlatter nevertheless believed that the New Testament historian needed first-hand knowledge of it, since

Yarbrough, “Schlatter Reception Now: His New Testament Theology”, *Southern Baptist Journal* 3, no. 1 (1999).

⁴ Adolf Schlatter, *Nya testamentet utlagdt och förklaradt: Bemynd. öfvers. under öfverinseende af Karl Ohman [& C. Silwer]. Med förord jämte öfversikt öfver Jesu lif i tidsföljd enligt de fyra evangelierne (synoptisk-kronologisk tafla) af W. Rudin*, vols. 1–4 (Stockholm: Schedins, 1906–1910).

⁵ Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 76–77 (on Schnell); 120; Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 179–180; 201–202. See also Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 262. Deines gives an overview of Schlatter’s work in connection with his discussion of Schlatter’s view of the Pharisees, 262–299. Neuer’s biography is reviewed by Fritz Neugebauer, Fritz Neugebauer, “Wer war Adolf Schlatter?”, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 122, no. 9 (1997).

⁶ Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 120.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 120.

Jesus lived in this environment. Schlatter also expresses his reverence for the religious earnestness of the Pharisees.

These personal remarks convey some fundamental aspects of his thinking regarding the role of Judaism in New Testament studies: the study must be based on the sources in the Semitic languages, and the Judaism that was contemporary with the New Testament stood in an important relation to Christianity. According to Schlatter, however, this Judaism was also its fiercest opponent—then and now. Throughout his life, Schlatter's relationship with Judaism would be characterised by this dual relationship of deep interest and fierce opposition.

Schlatter came from a large Swiss Christian family with many well-known personalities, among them his grandmother Anna Schlatter and the New Testament scholar in Erlangen, Theodor Zahn.⁸ Schlatter combined Biblicism and a salvation-historical approach inspired by J. T. Beck⁹—though without accepting Beck's doctrine of righteousness¹⁰—with Bern Pietism, with which he had a “constructive-critical relationship” (Neuer). Together with the Greifswald professor H. Cremer, Schlatter wanted to provide an alternative to the liberal theology of the Ritschlian school.¹¹ He saw no alternative in Karl Barth's theology or dialectical theology at large,¹² sharing this with the Tübingen Protestant theological faculty. In many ways, Schlatter was an outsider;¹³ his views did not fully fit into the existing camps, and he

⁸ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 5–9; Werner Neuer, “Schlatter, Adolf”, in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. Gerhard Müller (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 135.

⁹ On the *salvation-historical* approach, see Steck, *Die Idee des Heilsgeschichte. Hofmann-Schlatter-Cullmann*, 37, whose discussion, however, seems overly polemical. See also Weth, *Die Heilsgeschichte: Ihr universeller und ihr individueller Sinn in der offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*.

¹⁰ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 237. See, however, his respectful presentation of Beck in Adolf Schlatter, *Christus und Christentum. J. T. Beck's theologische Arbeit*, ed. Adolf Schlatter and Wilhelm Lütgert, vol. 8:4, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1904).

¹¹ See Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 229; Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 212; Neuer, “Schlatter, Adolf”, 137.

¹² Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “Geschichtsverständnis angesichts des Nationalsozialismus. Der Tübinger Kirchenhistoriker Hanns Rückert in der Auseinandersetzung mit Karl Barth”, in *Theologische Fakultäten im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Carsten Nicolaisen, *Arbeiten zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Darstellungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 134.

¹³ “wissenschaftliche Außenseiter”, Deines, *Die Phariseer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 405.

was more ecumenical than many contemporaries.¹⁴ Egg does not want to place Schlatter in either the historical-critical or the ‘positive’ camp, arguing that he is *sui generis*.¹⁵

Schlatter immediately began to study along Jewish lines, and in the following, I will examine the part of his production that is relevant for this discussion, spanning from 1885 to his death in 1938. Schlatter’s historical work on the New Testament met with fierce criticism, especially from the influential Emil Schürer (from 1893),¹⁶ and not until the 1920s did Schlatter win wider scholarly acclaim.¹⁷ However, even before that, due to his immense production in biblical theology, Schlatter reached far beyond the scholarly guild. His *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament* in particular, which encompassed all the New Testament texts, was used by lay people and pastors alike. Through the scholarly series *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, which he initiated and continued to edit throughout his lifetime, Schlatter created a platform not only for his own research, but also for many scholars who could identify with the title of the series.¹⁸

*The Jews in Schlatter’s Main Works*¹⁹

Faith in the New Testament

Schlatter’s resolve in 1882 to concentrate on Jewish literature had immediate consequences for his research, as is seen even in his “Faith

¹⁴ Neugebauer, “Wer war Adolf Schlatter?”, 770.

¹⁵ Gottfried Egg, *Adolf Schlatters kritische Position gezeigt an seiner Matthäusinterpretation*, ed. Alfred Jepsen, Otto Michel, and Theodor Schlatter, vol. 2/14, *Arbeiten zur Theologie* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1968), 241–242.

¹⁶ See below.

¹⁷ Egg, *Adolf Schlatters kritische Position gezeigt an seiner Matthäusinterpretation*, 11–13.

¹⁸ Paul Althaus, “Zum Gedächtnis der abgerufenen Herausgeber der ‘Beiträge’”, in *Adolf Schlatter und Wilhelm Lütgert zum Gedächtnis*, ed. Paul Althaus, *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939), 13.

¹⁹ Within the scope of this investigation, it is neither possible nor desirable to discuss all 400 works in his bibliography, and I have selected the ones that seem most relevant. Schlatter’s extensive bibliography is published in Bock, *Adolf-Schlatter-Archiv*, and partly in Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 832–841. An early list is found in Rudolf Brezger, *Das Schrifttum von Professor D. A. Schlatter. Zusammengestellt von Rudolf Brezger*, ed. Paul Althaus, vol. 40: 2, *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939).

in the New Testament" (*Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*) from 1885.²⁰ Describing the New Testament idea of faith, he contends that there is a natural continuity between Israel and the teaching of Jesus:

The entire teaching of Jesus, and therefore also the whole thought of the church, is built from materials that had been developed in Israel, which is why there is no New Testament concept without a model (*Vorbildung*) in the theology of the synagogue. This spiritual mediator (*Medium*), in which the work of Jesus and the life of the church took place, becomes more obvious, the more completely the linguistic and conceptual property that precedes it is described.²¹

Schlatter depicts Old Testament Jews in a harmonious relationship to God. He opens by stressing the continuity between Jesus and the church on the one hand, and Israel and the synagogue on the other, beginning with faith in the Palestinian and Greek synagogues. Israel and God stood in a personal relationship to each other, Schlatter states, and in his almighty goodness, "the people's own God" enacted the people's history through a continuous series of deeds. As God did this, faith was generated.

Evaluating Judaism, Schlatter sees faith as the natural touchstone. Although this can be regarded as anachronistic and as read with Pauline or Reformation glasses, Schlatter finds more faith in pre-Christian Judaism than most Christian theologians. To start with, Schlatter perceives a difference between the synagogal congregation and the pre-exilic one, a contrast that grows clearer when comparing the faith of the Targums to that of the Old Testament. Faith is fundamental to the pre-exilic congregation (*Gemeinde*), which leaves a rich treasure of faith to the postexilic successors, but even more so to the synagogue, Schlatter believes. In principle, Schlatter distinguishes between Israel before and after the Exile here, though not in the spirit of e.g. de Wette. The fact that Israel keeps to its God, its Abrahamic descent, its belonging to the congregation of Israel, the Land and its future and circumcision is evidence of the power of its faith.²² After the Exile, the

²⁰ Adolf Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*, 2 ed. (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1896). This was published in 1885 as *Preisausgabe der Haager Gesellschaft zur Verteidigung der christlichen Religion*. The society in Haag had launched a competition for a book on faith in the New Testament, which Schlatter won, thus beginning his career as an author of books, Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 99–101.

²¹ Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*, 7–8.

²² *Ibid.*, 15.

situation changed: there was neither king, nor prophets, nor any outward organisation, and the people were left with the Word. Thus, during this period, Schlatter does not see a degeneration, but the Word enabled the Jews to keep to the prophetic promises. At this time, Schlatter sees several important accomplishments: the canonisation and elevation of the prophetic books, and the creation of the school of rabbis in order to teach every member of the congregation that gathered on the Sabbath to study the Bible.²³ The Bible, he contends, was regarded as inspired by the Spirit.

Schlatter, as many other critics, maintains that the Exile represents a turning point. After the Exile, the main concern became to ensure that the Law was put into practice, and faithfulness to God became faithfulness to the Law. However, in contrast to many other scholars, Schlatter does not describe the Law and the relationship to the Law in negative terms. The New Testament, he contends, does not criticise people for keeping the Law but for not obeying the Law enough; unconditional adherence to the Law results in a stronger development of faith.²⁴ Discussing faithfulness and retribution in Sirach, he does so in no negative terms. Thus faith is the decisive factor in Old Testament religion, but Schlatter differentiates between various types of faith, where the Targums, for example, represent a later development.²⁵ At this point, Schlatter in effect develops a kind of degeneration hypothesis. In the synagogue (which to Schlatter stands for postexilic Israel), faith starts to more and more despise the natural and look for the extraordinary: "the submission to the course of nature under the government of God is no longer enough".²⁶

It is here that a tension can be found between Schlatter's own ideal and what he sees in history. In the synagogue, human will is emphasised, since the choice to live according to the Law requires an effort of will. However, to Schlatter, this also produces "a highly tensed self-esteem" that is exemplified by the Pharisee in the temple. Schlatter summarises the synagogue view of human effort in salvation as "works and faith". Moreover, the relationship between God and man is measured by the works of man. Thus the faith in postexilic Israel borders on works, and both faith and unbelief get their retaliation from God. The blessing

²³ Ibid., 16–17.

²⁴ Ibid., 18–19.

²⁵ Ibid., 23.

²⁶ Ibid., 27.

of Abraham is a reward for his faith; even in faith, man stands before God contributing something, not only receiving: "In this, that in faith is destroyed, which makes it faith."²⁷

The change also affects the picture of God. He now becomes the judge, and the relationship between man and God is regulated through the Law. As a result, the people fluctuate between confidence and despondent insecurity before God and when faced with their eternal destiny, Schlatter contends. In the Palestinian synagogue, the result is "a dying off of faith" (*Absterben des Glaubens*), since God had become so elevated and distant. There is no longer a relationship between the Judge and the people under judgment, and when the latter praise God, they praise their own achievement: "it [the worship, A.G.] is not love for Him [the Judge, God, A.G.]."²⁸ In Schlatter's argument, the contrast between the Old Testament wording and that of the Targums comes to a climax here, when the Targums 'translate' the faith of the prophet into various deeds:

The prophet says: seeking God, the translator: seeking the doctrine from God; the prophet: turn back to God, the translator: turn back to the Law or the veneration of God; the prophet: knowing the Lord, the translator: knowing the fear of the Lord; the prophet: turning away from God; the translator: distancing oneself from the fear of God.²⁹

Thus, according to Schlatter, in postexilic Jewish faith, there is a widening gulf between God and man. In the place of God, there is piety, whereas there is self-confidence and earnestness for the law of Israel among the people. God dwelling in unreachable isolation and separation from man, this divine absence, in its turn, paves the way for the law interpreters of the synagogue to handle the Scriptures arbitrarily and avoid obeying the overarching principles of the Law. Consequently, the people focus on petty but visible achievements. "*The pride and the anxiety of the Jews* is in harmony with the move towards precision, which overstated every outward and measurable result of faithfulness to the Law."³⁰ Although grace does exist in the synagogue's picture

²⁷ Ibid., 28–30.

²⁸ Ibid., 32. As Lichtenberger notes, this description is the same in the 4th edition of 1927, Adolf Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament. Vierte Bearbeitung*, 4 ed. (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927), 35.

²⁹ Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*, 33. Similarly Lichtenberger, "Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum", 3.

³⁰ Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*, 34, my emphasis.

of God, it has a secondary place, resulting in the withering away of faith. Schlatter concludes that faith in the Palestinian synagogue was full of contradictions; it was not a firm faith that could create peace, but wavered between guilt and fear on the one hand, and confidence in one's own ability on the other.³¹

Seen as a whole, therefore, Schlatter's description of the Palestinian synagogue is not too far from that of scholars such as de Wette, although the tone is milder and acknowledges a continuity between the old and the new. When Schlatter portrays 'the Jew' as proud and anxious, having a faith that is defective and mixed with works, and being unable to relate to God with genuine faith, he comes close to the 'Late Judaism' description. As Lichtenberger rightly notes, Schlatter stresses "the opposition between the prophetic and the later 'legalistic' preaching, after the manner of Wellhausen".³²

This is also basically true of his description of the Greek synagogue. The Pharisaic way of handling the Law was the same here, Schlatter contends, a point that he unfortunately does not substantiate with references to the sources. He majors on Philo's view of faith, although he admits that he is not representative of the Greek synagogue.³³ Faith and faithfulness (*Glaube und Treue*) are closely related in Philo; faith 'glues' the person to God, it is a knowledge of having received from God, and so the person is also thankful.³⁴ Here faith speaks to God as to a friend, but combines confidence with awe, as for Abraham, leading to inner peace.³⁵

Summarising that the example of Philo indicates that Greek Jewry had understood that God is our support in life, Schlatter argues that this paved the way for the apostles to address the Greek synagogue: "Believe in Christ."³⁶ Schlatter does not find this potential in the Palestinian synagogue, regarding this as a crucial difference. Again, the resemblances to Enlightenment research tradition, according to which the Alexandrian synagogue was better prepared than the Palestinian to receive the gospel, are clear. Yet Schlatter maintains that there are differences between Paul and Philo: "Philo's faith is the righteousness

³¹ Ibid., 36–37.

³² Lichtenberger, "Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum", 3.

³³ Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*, 38.

³⁴ Ibid., 41–43.

³⁵ Ibid., 46, 49.

³⁶ Ibid., 50.

of the righteous, that of Paul is the righteousness of the godless.”³⁷ The good works found in Palestinian Judaism are not discussed in Philo, Schlatter maintains, although he does not exclude that Philo had similar thoughts. In Philo, faith is something inward and more ardent, but even though the Law is Graecised and intellectualised, the adherence to the Law is no different to that of the Palestinian synagogue.³⁸ Nevertheless, Schlatter is critical of Philo’s exegesis: using his exegesis to state whatever he wished, and hiding the Scriptures under his doctrine, his Greek synagogue is similar to the Palestinian one. Scripture sank down under tradition, Schlatter argues, and so in Philo’s faith, just as in Palestinian Judaism, there were contradictions.

The sum of Schlatter’s discussion on faith in Judaism—both Palestinian and ‘Greek’—is that it is full of contradiction, with faith being compromised by works and an illegitimate self-confidence. The time has thus come for John the Baptist to prepare the way for Jesus. In the same vein as in the ‘Late Judaism’ research tradition, Schlatter presents a dark backdrop against which the gospel can shine, rather than reconstructs Jewish history.

In later editions, Schlatter would reconsider some of his wordings, but he does not change perspective.³⁹ A new chapter on Akiba’s faith in the fourth edition displays the same attitude as his discussion on Jochanan ben Zakkai. Akiba’s faith is turned towards God; he rejects all complaints against God’s sovereign acts and all doubts in God’s salvation, but his faith is “righteousness and merit”.⁴⁰ Similarly, Schlatter emphasises the earnestness of Akiba’s religion and faith, but his literalist hermeneutics of Scripture distorted (*verkrümmte*) his faith, and he believed in the works of man for attaining forgiveness and righteousness. Akiba “remained firmly on the ground of a theology of merit”, which in turn created a strong self-consciousness and made his ethical judgment harsh.⁴¹ Schlatter concludes that, despite Akiba’s moral and religious stature, his faith still belonged to the sphere of merit: “it is *he* who teaches and considers the Scripture, and it is *he* who does it.”⁴² Although Schlatter portrays Akiba with great sympathy, he does so using his anachronistic

³⁷ Ibid., 52.

³⁸ Ibid., 53.

³⁹ Lichtenberger, “Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum”, 5.

⁴⁰ Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament. Vierte Bearbeitung*, 43, 46–47.

⁴¹ Ibid., 52, 54–55.

⁴² Ibid., 60.

Reformation-oriented analysis. In effect, Schlatter explains away the faith that rabbinical literature in fact contains, as if the existence of genuine faith was no option before Christ and Paul. In Deines' words, Schlatter's work contains a tension between "respect and theologically motivated rejection" of Judaism in apostolic times,⁴³ and this is also true of his attempt to describe faith in the Jewish background to the New Testament. Today's scholarship would also question Schlatter's argument, due to greater caution in dating Targums, Mishnayot, Midrash and Talmudim.⁴⁴

A Commentary on Romans

Schlatter wrote two commentaries on Romans, one in 1887 and the other as late as in 1935.⁴⁵ The first of the two was later included in the great work *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*. This early commentary on Romans is an example of Schlatter's popular commentaries, originating in a Bible study for men.⁴⁶ Although the Jews are clearly central in Schlatter's theological conception, if it can be argued that part of Paul's purpose with the letter is to grant the Jews a place in the church and in God's salvation plan, this is not what comes across in Schlatter's commentary. Commenting on Rom. 1:1–17, Schlatter opens the discussion on the Jews in Romans: "the eye is directed to the fall of the Jews, which Paul, together with the church, regrets in the deepest possible way", asking why Israel faces the wrath of God. Thus, from the outset, God's displeasure with Israel is a central thought in Schlatter, which does not necessarily accord with what Paul expresses in Romans 1, where the Jews are not more displeasing to God than the Gentiles are. Nevertheless, God has called a remnant of the people to himself, Schlatter writes, and Israel will finally be brought to God.⁴⁷

The expressive heading to Romans 9–11, "God's right to reject Israel", again intimates the drift of Schlatter's analysis. He differentiates

⁴³ Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 269.

⁴⁴ For these questions, see Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*.

⁴⁵ Adolf Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1935).

⁴⁶ Adolf Schlatter, *Der Römerbrief. Ein Hilfsbüchlein für Bibelleser* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1887), 3; Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 123.

⁴⁷ Schlatter, *Der Römerbrief. Ein Hilfsbüchlein für Bibelleser*, 17.

between Israel and the Jewish believers, their destiny clearly being of special interest to Schlatter. Although it is true that there is no people like Israel, he argues, the Jewish believers had to separate themselves from their own people and were expelled from Israel.⁴⁸ Just as Israel was elected only as a result of God's free choice, Jesus was now withdrawn from the Jews, also through God's choice, and so the kingdom was closed to them. God is not bound to the Jews, nor can their fathers create any special position before God.⁴⁹ In fact, their opposition to the gospel, similar to that of Pharaoh, only led to the name of God being preached in all nations. Thus Schlatter argues with pairs of events, where the Jews stand for something negative, which God counters with something positive: the Jews crucified Jesus, but God resurrected him; the Jews suppressed the gospel in Jerusalem, but it broke through in the whole world. Through their own choice, the Jewish people became the vessel of God's wrath: "the wrath prepares for destruction and destroys".⁵⁰

"The unbelief of Israel causes the downfall of Israel" is the heading of the following section (9:30–10:21), which describes how Israel's intensely pious life was of no avail, because they failed to believe. "In their worship, they only had one thought: works, works! Faith—that displeased them," Schlatter writes, constantly treating the Jews as a collective.⁵¹ He concludes his description of the "fall of Israel" by stating that their answer to the gospel was: we do not want you.⁵² Finally, Schlatter discusses chapter 11 in "God's grace over Israel", stating several times that Israel is and remains God's people: "So Israel not only once was holy, but is, and will be"; "The Gentiles are called, but not in such a way that he repels Israel; Israel remains God's holy people, but not in such a way that he forgets the Gentiles."⁵³ Schlatter follows Paul's argument closely: God has not rejected his people; Paul is an Israelite, and God never intended the destruction of Israel. The fall of Israel is "in the days of Jesus, as they rejected and crucified him", but through this, the Jews threw the grain of wheat into the earth.⁵⁴ The people are holy: as the lump, so the dough; as the root, so the

⁴⁸ Ibid., 148.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 151–152.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 155–157. The Jews crucifying Jesus recurs in Schlatter's discussion, 171.

⁵¹ Ibid., 160–161.

⁵² Ibid., 167.

⁵³ Ibid., 172, 177.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 167–168, 171.

branches. At this point, Schlatter states that the fathers of Israel were made holy by God, who gave them the covenant and promises, and even if they turn away, the seal of God's act remains. Hence the Gentiles should not show off their precedence (of faith), and both Jews and Gentiles ought to rejoice that God by his grace grafted them into the olive tree—which Schlatter does not present as the people of Israel, but rather as Christ.⁵⁵ Finally, Schlatter states that when the work among the Gentiles is finished, God will fulfil all that is prophesied over Israel, making the Jews and the Gentiles complete before himself. God will show his mercy towards Jews and Gentiles alike.

Schlatter's account has two seemingly conflicting parts. He begins by stressing God's wrath upon Israel and the Jews, choosing the heading "God's right to reject Israel". But he also very clearly states the salvation-historical place of Israel in the same vein as Paul. Israel is holy, Israel is chosen, and this election is eternal, but for a time, Israel was rejected. Thus the picture is somewhat ambivalent, and his commentary on Romans as a whole leaves the impression that, on the one hand, Schlatter wants to stress the rejection of the Israel that did not believe—and even crucified Christ—whereas on the other hand, Schlatter regards Paul's teaching as leaving no room for an eternal rejection. He also downplays Israel's role by identifying the olive tree with Christ instead of with Israel, the latter which would make the Gentiles dependent on Israel. In comparison with his teacher Beck, therefore, Schlatter takes a far more moderate view on the role of Israel, his argument being very much in line with the old Delitzsch. The focus here is salvation, the touchstone being the Jews' relationship to this salvation.

Schlatter's Works on Jewish History and Topography

It is no overstatement to say that Schlatter's work on Jewish history in and around New Testament times are studies in a *praeparatio evangelica*. Just as the pioneers of the *Instituta Judaica*, Schlatter had initially recognised that reaching Jews with the gospel required knowledge of Judaism. He went on to study and publish widely on explicitly Jewish themes with a connection to the New Testament, e.g. *Jason von Kyrene* and *Eupolemos als Chronolog und seine Beziehungen zu Josephus und Manetho* ("Eupolemos as Chronologist and His Connections with Josephus and

⁵⁵ Ibid., 174–175.

Manetho”), products of his work with Josephus and 2 Maccabees, both of which were written during his time in Greifswald. The rationale behind these studies was to know the “contemporaries of Jesus”.⁵⁶ During the autumn of 1890, Schlatter prepared for a research trip to Palestine, which he made in 1891, and in 1893, the product of this, *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas* (“On the Topography and History of Palestine”), was published. The work testifies to the great learning that Schlatter had acquired since his decision in 1882 to research Judaism. But because he concentrates on topographical and historical issues, the material for studying Schlatter’s attitudes towards Jews and Judaism is sparse. If anything, the statements on Jews are neutral or positive; for example, when talking of the time of Judith, Schlatter notes that Jews had an ideal of chastity in a world full of lewdness.⁵⁷ Schlatter undoubtedly opened up a very valuable genre within Jewish studies, which Gustaf Dalman then developed in several volumes of the *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* series. However, it is here that Schlatter meets with fierce criticism from the very influential scholar of Jewish history in Kiel, Emil Schürer. In a devastating review in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* in 1893, Schürer attempts to pick all of Schlatter’s above-mentioned work to pieces, critically discussing most of Schlatter’s twenty-six studies in the volume. He concludes that despite extensive knowledge, Schlatter lacks proper method and fails to consider the work done by others before him (probably also thinking of his own work): “Everything seems to be a revelation of Schlatter’s,” Schürer states.⁵⁸ As devastating as this was to Schlatter—and he admits that the work was written quickly and early in his Judaica scholarship—the criticism made a profound impression on him.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, this event may also indicate that an alternative line of scholarship in Judaica had been established by this time, something that was not immediately welcomed by Schürer, who belonged to the Enlightenment research tradition. Reading Schlatter’s material, Schürer’s criticism is understandable, even

⁵⁶ Adolf Schlatter, *Erlebtes. Erzählt von D. Adolf Schlatter*, 3 ed. (Berlin: Furche Verlag, 1924), 89.

⁵⁷ Adolf Schlatter, *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas* (Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1893), 284.

⁵⁸ Emil Schürer, “Review of Schlatter, Prof. D. A. *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas*”, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 18, no. 13 (1893).

⁵⁹ Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 151.

if unfair—Schlatter did not major on footnotes and scholarly apparatus that stood in his way.

Jochanan ben Zakkai and First-Century Piety

Continuing his Jewish scholarship, in 1899 Schlatter published his pioneering study *Jochanan Ben Zakkai, der Zeitgenosse der Apostel* (“Jochanan ben Zakkai, the Contemporary of the Apostles”), by Lichtenberger characterised as one of the most beautiful and literarily perfected works by Schlatter’s hand.⁶⁰ In this work, which left its mark on the study of Judaism, Schlatter criticises some of his contemporary biographers of Jochanan—several of them Jewish scholars—for being panegyric, resulting in a neglect of history. For example, “Schürer’s assiduity in amassing [evidence, A.G.] completely fails” to help provide background work for New Testament theology, Schlatter writes.⁶¹ At first sight, the purpose of Schlatter’s biography seems to be mere history, but he also has a clear theological purpose in attempting to understand the situation of the Jewish people in New Testament times.

Schlatter respectfully describes the gravity of Jochanan, his untiring zeal in learning and teaching, his honest quest for an inner life before God, and his yearning for sanctification.⁶² The ‘works’ of Jochanan and his disciples were not a proud collecting of merit, but grew out of their earnest effort to attain confidence in the face of death, Schlatter says.⁶³ Jochanan’s theological thinking was casuistic, however, with a zeal for perfection in the deed, but also with an emphasis on the overarching ethical dimensions of the Law⁶⁴—on this point Schlatter differs from those who describe rabbinic theology as mere casuistry with no ethical dimension. In describing Jochanan’s theology, Schlatter notes Greek influences, thereby providing an argument against a simple dichotomy between Jewish and Greek in Palestinian Judaism.⁶⁵ According to

⁶⁰ Lichtenberger, “Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum”, 11. On this work by Schlatter, see also Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 294–295.

⁶¹ Adolf Schlatter, *Jochanan ben Zakkai, der Zeitgenosse der Apostel*, ed. Adolf Schlatter and Hermann Cremer, vol. 3:4, *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1899), 7 n. 1.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 11–13.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 30–39.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 35, *passim*.

Jochanan's thinking, the destruction of the temple was a deep but not devastating trauma, and after the catastrophe, he substituted charity for sacrifice, directing his activity to the poor.⁶⁶ Regarding purity, Jochanan thought exactly as Jesus did, Schlatter contends, and the observation of such regulations was only motivated as acts of obedience to God. Schlatter sees Jochanan's view as an example of *γράμμα* in a Pauline sense: read and obey what he has commanded, and do not ask why!⁶⁷ Jochanan also awaited the coming of the Messiah, and his theology included a twofold end after death: paradise or Gehinnom.⁶⁸

Schlatter takes a special interest in the fascinating account of Jochanan's own deathbed, regarding it as an example of the spiritual condition of Israel in New Testament times. In a long quotation from the Babylonian Talmud tractate *Berachot*, Jochanan expresses his fear of facing the King of kings, whose eternal wrath might fall upon him; he does not know whether the King will take him to paradise or Gehinnom, and instructs his disciples to fear God as they fear men.⁶⁹ Schlatter believes that Jochanan expresses a Messianic expectation in the moment of the Rab's death:

The deep, sharp dissonances that run through the rendering do not stem from the corruption of the sources, nor from Jochanan's individual weaknesses: these fissures (*Risse*) reach down into the fundament of his theology, becoming the predicament of his entire system. At one point, a life "without sin" is proudly spoken about; then Jochanan stumbles over trifles (*Kleinigkeiten*) with painstaking anxiety: I fear that it is sin. At one point, he appears as the "Father of Wisdom"; then we hear the lament: the wisdom that he has received from his teachers is as nothing. [...] At one point, he stands as the bold praying person, with God's benignity immediately at his service; then he despairs in uncertainty of whether paradise or hell is allotted to him (*ihm beschieden sei*).⁷⁰

This vivid, existential and moving description of Jochanan's death, where Jochanan, the "Light of Israel", lies helpless, is central to Schlatter's book. He sees it as summarising his analysis of the religious situation at the time of the apostles. The faith of Judaism, even the faith

⁶⁶ Ibid., 39–41.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 43–44.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 44–47.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 72–73.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 74–75.

of the “Light of Israel”, was defective and unable to give Jochanan a peaceful death:

The end that a human life will have, is known by none; neither did the Light of Israel know it. Uncertainty remained until the end. The confidence put in effort (*das Werk*) did not reach certainty, and fear kept the victory from faith.⁷¹

Thus, to Schlatter, Jochanan’s death throws light on how faith and works functioned in apostolic times. Schlatter saw the fissures, not only in Jochanan’s theology, but also in his existential life, and he regards this as typical of the situation at the end of the first century:

These sharp, painful curves and swayings belong essentially to what Paul called “the fulfilment of the time”. Through the Law, Israel learned fear and remorse, and this pervades their whole service to God.⁷²

Schlatter states that Israel swayed between pride and remorse, and, honest to the very end, Jochanan had experienced this conflict. *In this moment of crisis, he and all of Israel experienced the situation into which God gave Jesus, showing that the foundation of faith is not in ourselves but in Jesus.*

Schlatter paints a sympathetic portrait of Jochanan and shows appreciation for things that people such as Bousset consider of little importance for understanding the background to the New Testament: the ethics of ‘Late Judaism’, the yearning for a close relationship with God, a picture of God as more than just a judge. Thus, appreciating his honourable sincerity, Schlatter is able to understand Jochanan’s petty casuistry, the conclusion being that what is typically Jewish is not bad or to be denigrated—it simply does not work, for want of a Saviour. Schlatter’s description of Jochanan is clearly modelled on a post-Reformation, even Pietist, Christian pattern, with Jochanan’s last moment lending itself well to this. His picture is like a message of awakening: the strivings of the individual, the options of heaven and hell, the remorse and the hope of a Messiah. As the title may indicate, Jochanan is interesting precisely because he is a contemporary of the apostles. As much as he is writing an historical account on Jochanan ben Zakkai, Schlatter is adding another chapter to a *praeparatio evangelica*, at the same time reinforcing his picture of Judaism.

⁷¹ Ibid., 73.

⁷² Ibid., 75.

The History of Israel

It was with the same drive to understand the background to the New Testament that Schlatter published his *Israels Geschichte von Alexander dem Großen bis Hadrian* ("The History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Hadrian"), as a piece of the history of New Testament times, "[describing] the soil, on which Jesus and those who belonged to him completed their service to God".⁷³ Schlatter describes Judaism under Greek rule, however pointing to the difference between Judaism in the Land of Israel and the Diaspora, the latter creating less favourable circumstances for keeping the faith pure. In the Judaism of Judaea, there was a faith in the one God, and people submitted to the one Law, this being connected to a universalism that saw God as the only God of the whole world.⁷⁴ Schlatter holds that this Jewish vision of a *Großjudäa* was inspired by the Greek idea of a *Großhellas*; the "idea of world state and world power" was awakened in the Jews because the Greek cherished and employed it, having created a synthesis between citizenship and politics, which, according to Schlatter, the Jews also adopted.⁷⁵

Universalism in Schlatter's interpretation is different from the universalism often found in Enlightenment exegesis; in fact, it is quite contrary to it. Whereas the latter is a universalism of certain common values, beyond and opposed to national limitations, Schlatter's universalism describes one nation with a universal mission, although Schlatter's idea of a parallel development between universalist 'Hellenism' and Jewish ideas of universal expansion is scarcely substantiated.⁷⁶ Schlatter holds that the land was scrupulously protected against foreign cults but its spiritual situation was not satisfactory, and "since the worship of the congregation was limited to the Law, it brought no new experience of God's goodness, but directed its attention with serious exertion on what man was to accomplish for God".⁷⁷ Here Schlatter, in more measured terms than for instance Wellhausen, agrees with the analysis of the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis. In the Diaspora, Judaism was apt to change; the Jews gave up Aramaic for Greek, and they accepted the

⁷³ Adolf Schlatter, *Israels Geschichte von Alexander dem Großen bis Hadrian*, vol. 3, Reiche der Alten Welt (Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1901), 4.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 7, 26.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁷⁶ On Hellenism in modern historical discussion, see Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*, with literature.

⁷⁷ Schlatter, *Israels Geschichte von Alexander dem Großen bis Hadrian*, 8.

norms of the new countries, including visiting the baths and theatre.⁷⁸ What united the Jews with the Greek was the rational dimension of Hellenism; in the enlightened Greek, the Jew found a comrade, where truth, beauty and ability to conduct life (*Tüchtigkeit der Lebensführung*) were the uniting factors. However, the encounter with “the highest standing people of the earth”, the self-assured Greeks, aroused the vanity and haughty arrogance of the Jews, Schlatter contends. Here Schlatter falls into the tradition of describing Jews as haughty and proud, but even his emphasis on the importance of the connection between Jews and Greek in the Diaspora is probably overstated and reminiscent of the aetiology found in the Enlightenment research tradition. Moreover, he sees the theological work after Ezra as a spiritual preparation of the Jews, “which furthered the receptivity to the gift of the Greek”.⁷⁹ What this gift means is not spelled out.

Generally, in contrast to what is found in the Enlightenment research tradition, Schlatter’s history is centred around Palestinian Judaism, which is a comparatively positive entity. Compared to Baur, for example, Schlatter takes a far more modest view of Jewish thought being enlightened by Greek ideas in Alexandria, and on the whole, Schlatter’s history, although based in and motivated out of a Protestant theological paradigm, seems more modern. Yet, despite his distance to Schürer and Wellhausen, Schlatter also has much of a ‘Late Judaism’ hypothesis, albeit in a milder form.

A late but major work on Jewish theology in apostolic times is *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus* (“The Theology of Judaism According to the Account of Josephus”), in which Schlatter systematically describes Josephus’ theology, working with the hypothesis that it has a continuity with “the old Catholic Church”.⁸⁰ In other

⁷⁸ Ibid., 19–21. However, here Schlatter makes the common mistake of using Philo as the norm for the Diaspora. On the Jews in the Diaspora, see e.g. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and interactions from Alexander to Justinian*; L. V. Rutgers, *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*, ed. Tj. Baarda, A. van der Kooij, and A. S. van der Woude, vol. 20, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology (Leuven: Peeters, 1998); Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus On the Jews. Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*, ed. Anthony W. Bulloch, et al., vol. 21, Hellenistic Culture and Society (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).

⁷⁹ Schlatter, *Israels Geschichte von Alexander dem Großen bis Hadrian*, 28–30.

⁸⁰ Adolf Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, ed. Adolf Schlatter and Wilhelm Lütgert, vol. 26, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. 2. Reihe Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932), V.

areas, too, Schlatter carries out important scholarly work on Josephus, describing his theology systematically and with great and impressive detail. In doing this, Schlatter makes only a few personal comments, but when they do appear, they are in line with the picture of Jews found elsewhere in his production. For instance, there is a difference in the conception of faith in the synagogue compared to the church, not being a work of God but coming close to an ὀρθὴ δόξα about God, pressuring the young church to equate faith with orthodoxy.⁸¹ Moreover, Josephus shows the “double face that characterises the piety that arose through the Law”. Although regarded as hypocrisy by the church, Josephus is full of boasting about the Law and his people.⁸² In the same vein, Schlatter interprets the Jewish view that he believes was formulated even in Persian times: “God does nothing, we humans must act according to our judgment,” with a pride in the human ability that makes man alone responsible for what he experiences.⁸³

In his two-volume *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,⁸⁴ Schlatter has a chapter called “Paul in struggle against the Jews”,⁸⁵ followed by a section on his struggle against the Greeks. In this section, it seems fundamental to Schlatter that there was a conflict with Judaism, and in contrast to the commentary on Romans, he does not acknowledge an election of Israel. The struggle between Judaism and Christianity was well under way when Paul was converted, and Paul finds the “guilt of the Jews, not primarily in their rejection of Jesus, but even in their Jewish piety”. Here Schlatter sees the Jews as a unit, and neither their opposition to Jesus nor that against Paul is an individual matter. The Jews as a people resist God’s call to repentance, and the fact that there is knowledge of both God and ‘evil’ (*Bosheit*) among the Jews is what brings them under judgment. According to Schlatter, here there is a division between faith and deed. It is what ‘the Jew’ does that damages Jewish piety.⁸⁶ The Jews are thus treated as a collective here, and Schlatter voices criticism against them, stressing their puffed-up self-image and contending that

⁸¹ Ibid., 105.

⁸² Ibid., 136.

⁸³ Ibid., 191.

⁸⁴ Adolf Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Erster Teil: Das Wort Jesu* (Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1909); Adolf Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Zweiter Teil: Die Lehre der Apostel* (Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1910).

⁸⁵ Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Zweiter Teil: Die Lehre der Apostel*, 236–250.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 236–237, 241.

this also results in mercilessness towards others: “the hollow pride of the synagogue”.⁸⁷

Contrary to Paul, Schlatter portrays Jews as hardened, more so than Gentiles. When Paul in Rom. 2:1–11 says that all of humanity, Jews and Gentiles included, are hard and impenitent, Schlatter reads this as pertaining only to Jews (to Rom. 2:4). Schlatter does not criticise the Jewish adherence to the Law per se, nor their national organisation or worship, and thus he deviates from the traditional ‘Late Judaism’ pattern. Nevertheless, in his interpretation of Pauline texts, he seems to read Paul’s view of the Jews more negatively than Paul, and he fails to follow Paul when he acknowledges the place of the Jews in God’s plan. A general “struggle against the synagogue” or against the Jews in Schlatter’s sense seems overstated and difficult to substantiate from the pages of the New Testament, but Schlatter sets Christianity against Judaism in an anachronistic way. This “struggle with Judaism” also recurs elsewhere.⁸⁸

Schlatter on Jews and Judaism in Contemporary Germany

Schlatter was not only interested in Jewish history but also commented on Jews and Judaism in contemporary Germany. In two published lectures from 1929 and 1930, Schlatter reveals his views on Jews and Judaism before the National Socialist seizure of power.

Wir Christen und die Juden

In 1930, Schlatter participated in an international conference organised by the Protestant-Lutheran Zentralverein für Mission unter Israel, “5. Tagung über die Judenfrage”, aiming not only at missions to Jews but also at furthering understanding between Christians and Jews. One of the contributors was Martin Buber. The event was regarded as rather unique, which it probably was—with its dialogue between Christians and Jews, it was among the first modern ones of its kind. As will be

⁸⁷ Ibid., 239, 242.

⁸⁸ Adolf Schlatter, *Die Gemeinde in der apostolischen Zeit und im Missionsgebiet*, ed. Adolf Schlatter and Wilhelm Lütgert, vol. 16:5, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912), 9, 11, 18.

seen below, a similar encounter between the same Martin Buber and K. L. Schmidt would take place in 1933.⁸⁹

Although he does not give up his confessional standpoint, Schlatter's lecture sets a relatively conciliatory tone,⁹⁰ and Neuer summarises that it was "free from the anti-Semitic racial thinking that was then gaining ground through National Socialism".⁹¹ Schlatter opens on a friendly note: "It must be a concern of ours, that we just like Jesus seek company with the Jews," admitting that the Church also has an interest in seeing Jews become members.⁹² By the same token, he stresses that there is a risk of adjusting to one's counterpart in a missionary situation, a mistake that even the Apologetes of the second century made, although a large part of the New Testament shows Jesus' struggle with Judaism, and Christians and Jews cannot discuss on equal terms.⁹³

Nevertheless, Schlatter also emphasises the *continuity* between Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries. Jesus did not create a new Talmud but said to the Jews, "The Light is with you; walk in the Light, believe in the Light, as long as you have got it."⁹⁴ In Schlatter's version, Jesus did not confront the rabbis: "Because of his unity with the Father, Jesus [...] also saw God's hand in earlier history and also heard God's Word in the mouth of the rabbi."⁹⁵ Thus Schlatter again stresses the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, even though he says that Jesus did not receive everything from the House of Learning. Moreover, Schlatter acknowledges the Matthean words of Jesus, that one should believe what the rabbis taught. In orthodoxy, the rabbinate was right, Schlatter says, and what the Christians have to offer the Jews is not that, but a Christian Word. In fact, again underlining the continuity, Schlatter goes so far as to say that the central quest of the New Testament is

⁸⁹ Note also the symposium in 1925, when Hugo Gressmann invited Jewish scholars in Berlin.

⁹⁰ Adolf Schlatter, *Wir Christen und die Juden*, vol. 7, Freizeit-Blätter (Velbert: Freizeit-Verlag zu Velbert im Rheinland, 1930).

⁹¹ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 705. However, the question is what is meant by "anti-Semitic racial thinking". Although it is true that Schlatter's views are far from biological racism, they nevertheless reinforce age-old prejudice against Jews, as will be demonstrated.

⁹² Schlatter, *Wir Christen und die Juden*, 5.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

the same as that of Judaism: “not that for knowledge, nor for [eternal, A.G.] bliss (*Seligkeit*), but that for righteousness”.⁹⁶

Judaism and Jesus are not identical, however. The Law is given through Moses, not through Jesus, who comes with grace and truth, God working in our inner life to carry out his will.⁹⁷ The question to Schlatter is not whether Christianity is morally better than Judaism. Jesus is thoroughly Jewish,⁹⁸ but what is unique is that he knows the Father. Schlatter proceeds to discuss how to evangelise to Jews, warning against merely using the methods of the reformers, with their focus on sin. If the Church does this, the Jews who come will find only what is Jewish, Schlatter argues. The Jews need to see what is new, that it is possible to be a child of God.⁹⁹

In this lecture, Schlatter’s description of Judaism—predominantly Judaism of apostolic times—so far emphasises the harmonious, and he makes an effort to stress the continuity between Christianity and Judaism, although the differences are clear. When describing modern Judaism, however, his picture darkens. The tendencies that Schlatter perceives even in the time of Jesus are intensified through our world-view and technologies.¹⁰⁰ Modern consciousness, as seen in Spinozism and Marxism, has influenced Judaism negatively, and Schlatter talks of the ‘Jewish type’ and its self-glorification in the religious as well as the worldly realm. This, he thinks, is paralleled by the Jewish banker and the rabbi, which are the pillars of Judaism. Hence, from an analysis of Second Temple Judaism that stresses continuity, Schlatter begins to air heavy classic prejudice against Jews and Judaism, bringing up Jewish pride, Jews and money, and a reference to Spinoza, a major enemy to a Christian like Schlatter. Schlatter does not believe that the negative traits that he finds in Jews are due to race, but he nevertheless talks about them as essential to Jews: “the embarrassing features of the ‘Jewish soul’, which are not a product of race, but of the fellowship and history”.¹⁰¹ He continues to state that the Jewish fellowship is one of coercion, which promotes sin, where truth is lacking and where there is religious theatrical acting, double standards of morality and pliant

⁹⁶ Ibid., 9.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 9–11.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 12.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 13–14.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 14–15.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 21.

conformity. Finally, Schlatter stresses the importance of Jesus and faith in Jesus, and until 'the Jew' understands this, he remains a Jew. The task of Schlatter's audience is to lead the Jews to Jesus, Schlatter concludes.

In this lecture, Schlatter perhaps sees more of a continuity with Judaism of apostolic times than with contemporary Judaism. But although he stresses the Jewishness of Jesus, he very clearly says that Judaism and Christianity are never on an equal footing. When describing contemporary Jews and Judaism, bridging Judaism in antiquity to his contemporary situation in an essentialist way, Schlatter expresses classic prejudice and makes a list of negative features, such as greed, double standards, pride, cunningness, etc.¹⁰²—remarks that must have been quite painful for the Jews who were present, such as Martin Buber. Schlatter's sharp polemic is part of his criticism that modern Judaism was the cause of much evil, not least during the Weimar years, a view that would in time become even sharper. What is expressed here is on a par with what we saw in Bousset's writings, the difference being that Bousset does not as readily refer to modern Jews and Judaism.

Schlatter and the Jews during National Socialism

The above examination of Schlatter's depiction of Jews and Judaism indicates that Schlatter combines a great passion for Jewish studies—with a knowledge of Jewish sources—with a theological criticism of Judaism in apostolic times and a generally critical stance towards contemporary Judaism. Moreover, although he sympathises with the earnestness of Jochanan ben Zakkai and Akiba, he finds their faith defective and uses them to paint a dark backdrop to New Testament faith.

His lecture from 1930 contained some comments on contemporary Judaism, but it is only after 1933 that Schlatter enters into more topical issues, i.e. Judaism, racial issues and the relationship between Church and State. Scholars have accused Schlatter's work under National

¹⁰² According to Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 706, Schlatter stressed the Jewishness of Jesus, that the Jewish soul is no product of race, but of society and history, and later expressed admiration for Buber's contribution. Neuer omits that Schlatter lists many negative characteristics of Jews here.

Socialism of containing “anti-Semitism” (Charlotte Klein)¹⁰³ and “theological anti-Judaism” (Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz),¹⁰⁴ and of being “bluntly anti-Semitic” (Marikje Smid on Schlatter’s book *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*).¹⁰⁵ Neuer, however, generally gives a more positive description of Schlatter. This complex picture makes it pertinent to examine how Schlatter, sometimes regarded as the doyen of German New Testament exegesis, related to the Jews, past and present, and what the relationship was between his theological position and social issues. What is more, two of Schlatter’s students, Walter Grundmann and Gerhard Kittel, became leading figures in National Socialist exegesis, and a third, the systematic theologian Paul Althaus, was also supportive of National Socialism, at least initially,¹⁰⁶ making it even more important to evaluate Schlatter’s own positions.¹⁰⁷

Compared to his statements in *Wir Christen und die Juden*, the lecture held at the Zentralverein für Mission unter Israel in 1930, Schlatter would take a sharper position towards the Jews after 1933. After Hitler’s seizure of power in January 1933, various factions of the Protestant churches began their opposition to the regime. At the same time, a National Socialist church movement arose, the Deutsche Christen,

¹⁰³ Charlotte Klein, *Theologie und Anti-Judaismus. Eine Studie zur deutschen theologischen Literatur der Gegenwart*, ed. Helmut Gollwitzer, *Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1975), 63, 87; see also 117–118.

¹⁰⁴ Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums”.

¹⁰⁵ Marikje Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, ed. Heinz Eduard Tödt, vol. 2, *Heidelberger Untersuchungen zu Widerstand, Judenverfolgung und Kirchenkampf im Dritten Reich* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1990), 259.

¹⁰⁶ For this, see R. P. Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), and Gotthard Jasper, “Theologiestudium in Tübingen vor 100 Jahren—im Spiegel der Briefe des Studienanfängers Paul Althaus an seine Eltern”, *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte* 13, no. 2 (2006), the latter who stresses that Althaus’s time as a supporter of the new regime was short. Jasper’s article testifies to Althaus’s great appreciation of Schlatter, as does the memorial article after Schlatter’s death, Paul Althaus, “Adolf Schlatters Gabe an die systematische Theologie”, in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, ed. Paul Althaus (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1938).

¹⁰⁷ Bock, *Adolf-Schlatter-Archiv*, 236, notes to the publication of *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*, “Unfortunately many, even eager Confessing [Church, A.G.] Christians, to the extent that they have limited themselves to the reading of the provocative title, have felt themselves strengthened in the absurd verdict over Schlatter as a ‘Grandfather of Deutsche Christen’, which is rampant until this day among certain theologians.” The remark shows that there has been such an assessment of Schlatter, but the question is whether this is justified.

which later split into different factions itself.¹⁰⁸ In this context, Neuer argues that Schlatter refused to take a stand for the National Socialist party and that he spoke strongly against *Neuheidentum* (neo-paganism), *völkisch* thinking and a Führer cult. Nor could he accept the use of the 'Aryan' concept.¹⁰⁹ However, although this is basically correct, Schlatter's stand during his five years under the swastika is more complicated than that, and the picture seems more blurred and ambivalent than anything else. It is true that Schlatter refused to take a stand for the National Socialist party and that he criticised the cult of the Führer and neo-paganism, but that is not the whole truth. A thorough reading of his printed production and public statements during the period indicates that he also took steps in the opposite direction. It is important to point out that my discussion is restricted to Schlatter's printed production and public statements, and does not include his correspondence, such as the letters to his son Theodor, which play a very important role in Neuer's argument. As significant as this correspondence is, Schlatter's public statements were what influenced the public and are therefore the focus here. A fresh study of Schlatter, the Jews and the 'Third Reich', evaluating all of the material, printed sources as well as correspondence, is still lacking.¹¹⁰

Although Neuer seems basically correct in that Schlatter was critical of National Socialism¹¹¹ and never supported the National Socialist party, several things indicate that Schlatter, at least initially, also officially welcomed the new regime, despite not being an organised party member. Schlatter did support the so-called *Tübinger Sätze*, which was formulated in early May 1933, only one month after the boycott of the Jews.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ On Deutsche Christen, see Doris L. Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Doris L. Bergen, "Storm Troopers of Christ. The German Christian Movement and the Ecclesiastical Final Solution", in *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*, ed. Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999).

¹⁰⁹ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 728–729, 732, 747–748.

¹¹⁰ This is all the more pertinent because several scholars partly disagree with Neuer on Schlatter's view on Jews and Judaism, Lichtenberger, "Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum", McNutt, "Adolf Schlatter and the Jews"; McNutt, "Vessels of Wrath, Prepared to Perish. Adolf Schlatter and the Spiritual Extermination of the Jews", in addition to the present study.

¹¹¹ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 725–729.

¹¹² On April 1, 1933, the Nazis began a well-organised, national boycott of Jewish stores, doctors' offices, etc., preventing the general public from entering. The event marked a new era for the German Jews.

His signing of it must therefore be interpreted with the social situation of the Jews in mind. The *Tübinger Sätze* was phrased as a confessional statement and aimed at preserving the unity of the Church by meeting the Deutsche Christen halfway. In no uncertain terms, it declared it a duty to pay obedient service to the people, greeting Adolf Hitler as a divine gift:

We are full of gratitude to God, that he as the Lord of history has given our people in Adolf Hitler the Führer and deliverer (*Führer und Retter*) from deep trouble. We know that we are connected and obligated to the German state and its Führer with life and limb. For us as Protestant Christians, this connection and obligation has its deepest and holiest responsibility in that it is obedience to the commandment of God.¹¹³

The declaration lifts up the question of Adolf Hitler and the German state to a divine dimension, making God, the Lord of history, responsible for installing Hitler, the latter who is described with the almost theological term *Retter*. Moreover, it expresses an obligation to the worldly regime, according to the “commandment of God”. The “motives and goals” of the final statements, a contemporary document says, were “joyfully acclaimed” by Schlatter and other Tübingen professors.¹¹⁴ The *Tübinger Sätze* uses the strongest possible arguments to legitimise the leader and policies of the new regime, which included strategies against Jews, the fruit of which was already visible. Schlatter’s signing of the declaration may have been caused by a wish to bridge the gap within Protestant circles, but on the other hand, Schlatter would have been able to see the political and theological implications of such a statement. Other similar documents were also signed, but Schlatter was not among the Tübingen professors who, as early as in March 1933 (!), signed the declaration of three hundred German university and col-

¹¹³ “Wir sind voll Dank gegen Gott, daß er als der Herr der Geschichte unserem Volk in Adolf Hitler den Führer und Retter aus schwerer Not geschenkt hat. Wir wissen uns mit Leib und Leben dem deutschen Staat und diesem seinem Führer verbunden und verpflichtet. Diese Verbundenheit und Verpflichtung hat für uns als evangelische Christen ihre tiefste und heiligste Verantwortung darin, daß sie Gehorsam gegen das Gebot Gottes ist,” quoted from Gerhard Schäfer, *Die evangelische Landeskirche in Württemberg und der Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation zum Kirchenkampf. Band 3: der Einbruch des Reichsbischofs in die württ. Landeskirche 1934* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974), 335. This was noted by Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums”, 96.

¹¹⁴ Schäfer, *Die evangelische Landeskirche in Württemberg und der Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation zum Kirchenkampf. Band 3: der Einbruch des Reichsbischofs in die württ. Landeskirche 1934*, 335.

lege teachers, “Faithful and firm behind the Führer”.¹¹⁵ However, it is not clear whether Schlatter was invited—but refused—to sign the declaration. Since he taught in Tübingen only until 1930, he was by this time no longer an ordinary professor.¹¹⁶ Unfortunately, Neuer completely overlooks the *Tübinger Sätze* and the fact that Schlatter did sign it, whereas when discussing “Faithful and firm behind the Führer”, he notes that Schlatter did not sign it, but does not prove that he actively refused to do so.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, it is clear that Schlatter did sign a declaration in favour of Hitler, making him no different from those of his colleagues who did the same.¹¹⁸

Schlatter's General View on National Socialism

Schlatter was undoubtedly negative towards the National Socialist seizure of power and the neo-pagan elements of the new German ideology, and he did express criticism of Hitler and the new regime.¹¹⁹ Sympathising with the Christian conservative party Christlich-soziale Volksdienst,¹²⁰ he—along with Karl Heim—was an important factor for its success in Tübingen in the government elections of 1930. This indicates that Schlatter was not non-political but was politically aware and active.¹²¹ The confession quoted above may well fit in with the picture of Schlatter, being an expression of obligation to the state and the Führer, but not to everything National Socialist. However, this does not make it harmless or irrelevant, but shows Schlatter's complexity.

¹¹⁵ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 729.

¹¹⁶ Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 255.

¹¹⁷ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 729–730. Schlatter's discussion with his colleagues in Tübingen who had joined the National Socialist party is beyond my power to judge, since it is only evidenced in the correspondence with his son Theodor, Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 729 n. 221.

¹¹⁸ Contra Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 729.

¹¹⁹ This is evident from his abundant correspondence with his son Theodor. I base this general observation on Neuer's biography, 725–736.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 725.

¹²¹ Benigna Schönhagen, *Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz. Eine Universitätsstadt in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, vol. 4, Beiträge zur Tübinger Geschichte (Stuttgart: Theiss, 1991), 46. Schönhagen writes that the CSVD did not come into conflict with the NSDAP but indirectly supported it. According to Neuer, Schlatter was against the idea that the NSDAP could replace the CSVD, Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 725–726.

That Schlatter did not bow to all aspects of the new empire is clear from a lecture held in July 1933 and later published as *Die zehn Gebote der Träger unseres Volkstums* ("The Ten Commandments of the Carriers of Our National Traditions").¹²² He begins, "A people is a community (*Gemeinschaft*), and community does not come by force,"¹²³ taking a stand against the use of force that had become important in Germany. He also criticises the too strong emphasis on race: we Germans are not a product of race, but of history, above which stands God. In the course of the argument, Schlatter vindicates the Ten Commandments against what he regards as threats to it: there is one God, and there is no picture of a prince (*Fürst*) in the temple. To the fourth commandment, he states that "the SA man who does not honour his father and mother makes his swastika a lie".¹²⁴ Schlatter stresses that communities superior to the family should not destroy the family.¹²⁵ Moreover, he states that a "people is no slave house", and the *völkisch* community does not grow strong by depriving its members of legal rights and impoverishing them. This could be directed against Aryan policy, but surprisingly, there is no explicit mention of the oppression of Jews.¹²⁶

Thus Schlatter pursues a Christian criticism of a culture without Christian values, becoming provocative when addressing the question of a Führer: there is nothing about a Führer in the commandments, and Schlatter talks ironically of caesars. When a caesar forgets that he is there to serve and turns his power into an end in itself, he destroys the foundation of the *völkisch* community.¹²⁷ Schlatter ends by stating that what creates true national character is the power that comes from the Ten Commandments.¹²⁸ In this pamphlet, therefore, Schlatter maintains that a nation needs a Christian foundation to guard against the religious, ethical and political risks of the new state; in doing this, Schlatter often uses strong words about things that "destroy the Church".

¹²² Adolf Schlatter, "Die zehn Gebote der Träger unseres Volkstums", in *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, ed. Theodor Schlatter (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1933).

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹²⁴ SA, Sturmabteilung, was a popular uniformed militia, which at the time organised about four million people, and which from the 1920s was involved in terror action, street violence, etc.

¹²⁵ Schlatter, "Die zehn Gebote der Träger unseres Volkstums", 25.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

For the most part, Schlatter intimates rather than explicates his critical points, but he is clear when criticising ‘Caesarism’ and vindicating freedom: a mass of slaves is not a people, he says. His criticism of the Führer ideology, in particular, ought to have created strong reactions in the ‘Total State’, but we do not know about the reactions.¹²⁹ Constructing a coherent picture of his view of the Führer from this and the *Tübinger Sätze*, we see that Schlatter acknowledges the present order as divinely ordained but warns against excesses that jeopardise the foundations of the Christian state. The only thing that can be extracted from this concerning Jews, however, is when he talks of the deprivation of rights, although this is in unclear terms. It is surprising that Schlatter could not criticise the Aryan legislation at this point (13 July 1933), given that he was otherwise bold in his criticism of the political system.¹³⁰

Schlatter and the “Bethel Confession”

This silence may have been due to a general attitude towards the Jews. In the autumn of 1933, Schlatter was instrumental in disarming a confession document that was critical of the new political system. The background to this document was the church struggle, *Kirchenkampf*, which was waged from February to July 1933. Hitler had purposed to take over the Church, and the new office of Reichsbischof was earmarked for Hitler’s religious specialist, Ludwig Müller. When the leader of the Bethel seminary, Friedrich von Bodelschwingh (the younger)—a close friend of Schlatter’s—was elected bishop by the leaders of the *Landeskirchen* on 26 May 1933, the National Socialist party intervened, resulting in the forced resignation of the newly elected bishop. These events ignited the *Kirchenkampf*, Schlatter being among those who could not accept a political theology such as that of the Deutsche Christen.¹³¹ The government

¹²⁹ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 733.

¹³⁰ It would be valuable to study Schlatter’s correspondence on the situation of the Jews from the beginning of the Jewish boycott, but this is not possible within the scope of this discussion.

¹³¹ For Schlatter and the *Kirchenkampf*, see Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 736–780. Schlatter’s daughter Hedwig Schlatter was among the deputies of the Deutsche Christen at the church election of 1933 in Tübingen, *Schönhagen, Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz*, 414 n. 492. This need not mean that Schlatter was of the same opinion, but it shows that there was open sympathy for the National Socialist Christian movement in Schlatter’s proximity. This accords with Schlatter’s fairly positive view of *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche*, see below.

organised new church elections on 23 July—another intrusion into German church life—and with the help of massive propaganda and a radio speech in which Hitler personally endorsed them, the Deutsche Christen won an overwhelming victory. One of their aims was to introduce the ‘Aryan paragraph’ in the Church,¹³² which succeeded at the Brown Synod of the Altpreuussische Union on 5–6 September 1933.¹³³ It was in reaction to this that the Pfarrernotbund (Pastors’ Emergency League), led by Martin Niemöller, was founded.¹³⁴

Through his relationship with people such as Friedrich von Bodelschwingh and Dietrich Bonhoeffer—a student of Schlatter’s¹³⁵—Schlatter was closely connected to the leaders of the Confessing Church. In August 1933, Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Hermann Sasse, assisted by Gerhard Stratenwerth and Georg Merz, attempted to formulate a confession with the purpose of uniting as many of the confessional groups in Germany as possible in their resistance against the Deutsche Christen: the so-called *Betheler Bekenntnis*.¹³⁶ It included a paragraph on the Church and the Jews, necessary because of the boycott against the Jews that was launched on 1 April 1933 and the Aryan legislation of

¹³² This suggested church legislation followed the “Gesetz über die Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums” of April 7 1933, which prevented non-Aryans from filling a public position, see Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 336.

¹³³ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 743; Christoph Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus. Der Weg Dietrich Bonhoeffers mit den Juristen Hans von Dohnanyi und Gerhard Leibholz in den Widerstand*, ed. Heinz Eduard Tödt, vol. 1, *Heidelberger Untersuchungen zu Widerstand, Judenverfolgung und Kirchenkampf im Dritten Reich* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1989), 193. The wording of § 1, 2 of the synod’s decision was: “Anyone not of Aryan descent or married to a person of non-Aryan descent, may not be called as minister (*Geistlicher*) or official of the general church administration. Ministers or officials of Aryan descent, who enter into wedlock with a person of non-Aryan descent, are to be discharged. Who is to be regarded as a person of non-Aryan descent is decided by the regulations of the laws of the Reich.” (Lichtenberger, “Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum”, 16).

¹³⁴ See Pfarrer Niemöller’s statement on the Aryan question in Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, *Die Bekenntnisse und grundsätzlichen Äusserungen zur Kirchenfrage des Jahres 1933*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1934), 96–98.

¹³⁵ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 598–599.

¹³⁶ Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 205. For a full discussion of the complex history of the confession, see Strohm, 202–228. The first draft was accompanied by a covering letter written by Friedrich von Bodelschwingh on 26 August 1933, which makes clear that the purpose was to open a dialogue with the Deutsche Christen, HA 2/39–209 (7). See also Klaus Scholder, *Die Kirchen und das dritte Reich. Vorgeschichte und Zeit der Illusionen*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Ullstein, 1977), 582.

7 April.¹³⁷ The paragraph was formulated by Wilhelm Vischer.¹³⁸ Overall, the draft uses uncompromising language to strongly defend the freedom of the Church, attacking statements by the Deutsche Christen.

Schlatter, however, turned sharply against the text of the first draft, commenting it in a covering letter to Friedrich von Bodelschwingh:

I agree with your opinion that the new world-view that is now being made a property of our people calls in the strongest possible way for theological reflection. However, I would regret it if this dogmatic draft were published. It is not at all natural, so foreign to the *people*, and so far removed from the New Testament [...] that I cannot hope that an SA man could have an ear for it. [...] The sentences about the relationship of the Church to the *people* could only seem crippling and dishonouring to his designs.¹³⁹

Schlatter means that if the document is written for the purpose of dialogue with the National Socialist theologians, one must speak to them as to an SA man, which emerges from the covering letter.¹⁴⁰ The SA movement being a broad popular movement by this time, Schlatter seems to want to keep a door open to it. However, he identifies with the interests of the SA and Deutsche Christen movements rather than with the Jews. Later in the same document, Schlatter clarifies his view: "At this time, fellowship with the compatriots (*Volksgenossen*) is more important than fellowship with the Jewish Christians."¹⁴¹ What he is referring to here is not just Jews in general but Christian Jews.

¹³⁷ Wolfgang Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, vol. 10, Studien zu Kirche und Israel (Berlin: Selbstverlag Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1987), 57; Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 749; Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 257–258.

¹³⁸ Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 211.

¹³⁹ "Ich bin mit Ihnen der Meinung, daß die neue Weltanschauung, die nun zum Besitz unseres Volkes gemacht wird, die theologische Besinnung in stärkstem Maß aufruft. Aber ich würde es bedauern, wenn dieser dogmatische Abriss veröffentlicht würde. Er ist fern von der Natur, so volksfremd, auch so weit vom Neuen Testament entfernt, ... daß ich nicht hoffen kann, daß ein SA-Mann dafür ein Ohr haben könne ... Die Sätze über das Verhältnis der Kirche zum Volk kann er nur als Lähmung und Entehrung seines Wollens empfinden." HA 2/39–96, f. 30 (Hauptarchiv der v. Bodelschwinghsten Anstalten Bethel).

¹⁴⁰ HA 2/39–96.

¹⁴¹ HA 2/39–209 (7), 23, Schlatter's commentary in the margin. See also Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 257. Below I will return to this statement and Werner Neuer's discussion of it.

A major issue for the Confessing Church—where a Lutheran two-kingdom teaching was important—was the attitude of the Church to the State. This question had now become urgent with regard to the National Socialist state and Aryan legislation in particular. A crucial point was whether or not the orders of society belonged to creation, because if they did, this would legitimise the existing state and its policies. The first draft of the “Bethel Confession” stated that the orders were not part of the original creation. Schlatter protested, however, changing the original formulation—“These orders are not the orders of the original creation”—so it *reinforced* that the orders of the present state were divinely sanctioned: “These orders are not the orders of the coming world and perfected humanity.”¹⁴² Furthermore, Schlatter omits the words, “These orders have no value in themselves,” adding that they have an “absolute value of a divine regulation (*Satzung*)” and that the violation of these orders “makes us adversaries of God and closes the access to Christ”.¹⁴³ Thus Schlatter even makes obedience to the prevailing power a condition for salvation. He continues, “With each of these orders all men should agree with all of their will.”

Discussing the paragraph in which the authors of the draft point to the lack of biblical support for the concept of race, Schlatter objects that the modern concept of race, meaning the connection between the inner life and the physical life, equals what Paul says about the flesh. He thus renders racial ideology harmless, and through other statements, he supports the role of the State in creating a legal system, saying that it belongs to the State’s mandate.¹⁴⁴ To this, Lichtenberger notes that Schlatter, in a frightening way, both misjudges the National Socialist concept of race and the Pauline understanding of the flesh.¹⁴⁵ Schlatter believes in a radical division between the two kingdoms, to the extent that the ‘prophetic’ calling of the Church to speak to the authorities is removed and the divine legitimation of the existing system is reinforced. He thus moves the mandate of the powers that be from “the sphere of death” (first draft) to “the sphere of natural life”, and his formulations seem to relate to *völkisch* thought. The word of the Church “equips the

¹⁴² HA 2/39–209 (7), 8, with Schlatter’s comments in the margin.

¹⁴³ HA 2/39–209 (7), 8, with Schlatter’s commentary in the margin. See also Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 215.

¹⁴⁴ See *ibid.*, 215.

¹⁴⁵ Lichtenberger, “Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum”, 15.

people for active and fruitful participation in *völkisch* action".¹⁴⁶ Moreover, Schlatter again underlines that the Church ought to support the State: "The Church knows that it should not hinder the leading of the people (*Führung des Volkes*) but support it."¹⁴⁷ *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche* ("The New German Kind in the Church", for this see below) also confirms this special interpretation of the two-kingdom doctrine.¹⁴⁸

Schlatter's comments to the draft caused Dietrich Bonhoeffer to range Schlatter among theologians like Althaus—another of Schlatter's students—and Hirsch, both of whom were positive to National Socialism and the Aryan legislation at this point.¹⁴⁹ The comments were successful and significantly influenced the final text of the *Bekenntnis*, which said that Scripture, with its statements about the flesh, confirms the true character of "modern racial thinking" and the link between inner and physical life—words that lent strong support to contemporary racial ideology.¹⁵⁰ Schlatter also influenced the final text, painting quite a harmonious picture of the relationship between Church and State. Service to the Church and the worldly powers that be

pertains to the person who in the same *völkisch* or state order receives the fellowship of the physical life with everything that fills it. [...] In their office (*Amt*) both claim the whole man.¹⁵¹

Strohm notes that this and other statements made the *Bekenntnis* a document that was supportive of the regime and its policies. Hence the *Betheler Bekenntnis* failed to resist racial ideology, Schlatter being the ideologist with the red pen behind this development. However, the *Bekenntnis* did oppose every attempt at making the German Protestant Church a Reichskirche for Christians of the Aryan race,¹⁵² which these groups regarded as going too far. The crux of the matter, to Schlatter as well as to the Bekennende Kirche, was the freedom of the Church.

¹⁴⁶ Quoted from Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 218.

¹⁴⁷ Quoted from *ibid.*, 218.

¹⁴⁸ Adolf Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, ed. Theodor Schlatter, vol. 14, Sonderdrucke des Monatsblattes "Beth-El" (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1933), 21, see also 16.

¹⁴⁹ Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 218 n. 134. For Althaus's theology of the *Schöpfungsordnungen* in relation to National Socialist politics, see Erickson, *Theologians under Hitler*, 100–107, a thinking with many parallels to Schlatter's reactions to the first draft of the "Bethel Confession".

¹⁵⁰ Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 226–227.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 227.

¹⁵² Neuner, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 750.

The way in which Schlatter dealt with the Jews and racial legislation in this context is important. As well as being evidence of Schlatter's theological views, the confession document shows that he had authority to change the wording—and used it. My own reading of the material confirms Strohm's observations, although the document would certainly be worth a broader treatment. Neuer, however, contends that Schlatter could not support the Aryan paragraph but that he for a time had a “peculiarly reserved position” regarding the consequences of this rejection.¹⁵³ While Neuer is probably right about Schlatter's general attitude, when the first draft of the confession stated that unity between Gentile and Jewish Christians was so important that the Church should accept persecution rather than give this up, Schlatter disagrees: “At this time, fellowship with the compatriots (*Volksgenossen*) is more important than fellowship with the Jewish Christians.”¹⁵⁴ Neuer argues that this statement “lacks any plausibility”, since Schlatter sharply criticises the *Deutsche Christen* as mere Nazis: “This statement is even less comprehensible, since Schlatter in his response letter to Pastor Stratenwerth once more emphasises his distance to the *Deutsche Christen*: ‘I for my part say “Nazi”, not “Deutscher Christ”.’”¹⁵⁵ However, the source material is indisputable, and other statements by Schlatter, as well as the tendency in *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, use the same language. Thus Schlatter's criticism of Nazis and the *Deutsche Christen* does not exclude a harshness towards Jews. Schlatter is able to combine a religiously motivated criticism of National Socialism and the *Deutsche Christen* with patriotism, subordination to the authorities and a failure to stand up for Jews, Christian Jews included.

Neuer holds that Schlatter had a seemingly inconsistent stance because his theology of the State tended to emphasise the powers that be. Schlatter had not, Neuer contends, expressed such thinking in his *Dogmatik* or *Ethik*, nor had he shown such a submissive view of the State. Nevertheless, Schlatter's comments to the *Betheler Bekenntnis* are firm statements that divinely legitimise the obedience of the German people to the State, lest they disobey Christ, and similar attitudes will be referred to below. Hence, although Schlatter's statement may “lack plausibility”, it is still there, and he is not “inconsistent” when he, three

¹⁵³ Ibid., 749.

¹⁵⁴ HA 2/39–209 (7), 23, with Schlatter's commentary in the margin.

¹⁵⁵ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 750.

times in a row, takes the same stand on the Aryan paragraph. It is quite clear that Schlatter carried out the dialogue with the Deutsche Christen in mind and that he let this dialogue govern his statements. Although it might be an explanation that Schlatter makes certain statements for dialogue purposes, such an ambition does not justify the statements. Later on, however, facing growing oppression of the Church, Schlatter would clearly express that the State has no right to intervene in questions pertaining to ordination in the Church.¹⁵⁶

That same autumn, Schlatter took a similar position to that of the "Bethel Confession". On 14–18 October 1933, at the Freudenstädter Tagung für christliche Akademiker, he was asked to give his opinion on the Aryan paragraph, which prevented non-Aryans from holding offices in the Church, and theology students from completing their studies. In a way that is surprisingly complaisant to the new laws, Schlatter says:

The Aryan paragraph has for understandable reasons unfortunately been placed at the centre of the discussion. Symptoms usually arouse greater attention than the occurrence itself. *Of course we all have compassion on the students whom we must drop. But demanding to be accepted at all costs is unwarranted. The community will not be governed by selfish ambitions for power. No one can claim the right of being elevated to an office.* That is determined by what the state orders are and how the church legislation is constructed. Nevertheless, as a symptom, the question is serious, because it shows the mixing of ecclesiastical and political interests. The inability to understand that Church is different from a national organisation—the pastor in a brown shirt, who no longer knows why he is a pastor, who no longer receives his authority from the Church but from the State—these are symptoms that call for battle. However, in itself the question of how we limit the access to office is no matter of life and death to the Church.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 756.

¹⁵⁷ Adolf Schlatter, "Menschengemeinschaft-Gottesgemeinschaft" (paper presented at the 16. Freudenstädter Tagung, (Christlicher Akademikertagung für Württemberg und Baden). "Ich glaube an den Heiligen Geist", Kurhaus Palmenwald in Freudenstadt, 14–18 Oktober 1933), 26. "Der Arierparagraph ist leider in die Mitte der Erörterung gestellt worden aus verständlichen Gründen. Symptome pflegen die Aufmerksamkeit heftiger zu erwecken als der Vorgang selbst. Selbstverständlich haben wir alle Mitleid mit den Studenten, die wir streichen müssen. Aber der Anspruch, unter allen Umständen zugelassen zu werden, ist schlecht begründet. Die Gemeinschaft wird nicht vom selbstischen Machtwillen bestimmt. Niemand hat Anspruch darauf, in ein Amt erhöht zu werden. Das hängt davon ab, wie die staatlichen Ordnungen sind und das kirchliche Recht sich formt. Als Symptom ist die Frage dennoch schwerwiegend, weil sie die Vermengung von kirchlichem und politischem Interesse sichtbar macht. Die Unfähigkeit, zu verstehen, daß Kirche etwas anderes als eine nationale Organisation ist,—der Pfarrer im braunen Hemd, der nicht mehr weiß, wozu er Pfarrer ist, der

The passage clarifies Schlatter's position: he criticises State interference in the Church and National Socialist pastors but is complacent when it comes to discrimination of Jews. What disturbs Schlatter is not the situation of the Jews but the intrusion by the government into church matters. The Aryan paragraph as such is not a big problem; the main problem is that the boundaries between the two kingdoms of Church and State are not being upheld. Jewish university students and Jewish Protestant pastors are no longer accepted because they are Jews, but Schlatter argues that no one can claim the right of being accepted as a student or into the ministry! In this context, Schlatter also refers to selfish ambitions for power as the motive of these people, a thought that seems to belong to the racist characterisation of Jews as hungry for power.

Schlatter repeats his criticism of pastors who are more inclined to follow the political agenda than be pastors of the Church. Here he may also be referring to Jews:

Keep to the distinction between Church and Party! Away with the pastors in brown shirts! It is merciless to all the thousands who have a lonely, overpowered, hopeless and faithless existence. The Church has its own calling, stands beyond any political goals. Only by clearly maintaining this, can we keep a way to those who have been stripped of their rights, who stand resentfully next to the German destiny.¹⁵⁸

Schlatter thus once again emphasises the two kingdoms, saying that it is not the calling of the Church to enter into politics, and therefore criticising the pastors in brown shirts. Through this policy, which is amply

seine Autorität nicht mehr von der Kirche, sondern vom Staat bekommt, das sind Symptome, die zum Kampf aufrufen. An und für sich aber ist die Frage, wie wir die Zulassung zum Amt begrenzen, keine Lebensfrage für die Kirche." My emphasis. See also Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 751, where unfortunately the quotation is shortened in such a way that Schlatter's true tendency is not perceived. As already noted, Neuer tends to omit aggravating traits in Schlatter.

¹⁵⁸ "Haltet die Unterscheidung von Kirche und Partei fest! Fort mit den Pfarrern im braunen Hemd! Das ist unbarmherzig gegen alle diese Tausende, die vereinsamt, überwältigt, hoffnungs- und glaubenlos existieren. Die Kirche hat ihren eigenen Beruf, steht jenseits jeder politischen Zielsetzung. Nur dadurch, daß das klar festgehalten wird, behalten wir einen *Weg zu den Entrechteten*, die grollend neben dem deutschen Schicksal stehen," Schlatter, "Menschengemeinschaft-Gottesgemeinschaft", 53. The part "Haltet die Unterscheidung von Kirche und Partei fest! Fort mit den Pfarrern im braunen Hemd!" is quoted in Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 740 to show Schlatter's negative attitude to the pastors in brown shirts, but he does not mention the context, which elucidates Schlatter's view of Jews and Judaism.

described in Gerlach's research on the *Bekennende Kirche*,¹⁵⁹ Schlatter joins those who believed that the Church should mind its own business, seeing no *political* way or calling of standing up for those without rights. Schlatter may well be referring to Jews in this context: they are persecuted, hopeless and faithless, and he wishes to retain a way from the Church to these people. This may be motivated by humanitarian and/or evangelistic concerns. At the same time, however, Schlatter firstly does not speak up against the oppression of Jews, which accords with Gerlach's picture of much of the Confessing Church. What is more, he describes this group as resentful and does not question that they stand next to the German destiny but appears to take this alienation for granted. Hence the two-kingdom doctrine stops Schlatter from getting into politics, but he does take a stand against a church phenomenon, the *Deutsche Christen*; he shows empathy with those without rights, but also describes them as resentful.

It is also clear from the document that Schlatter welcomes the thought of a Führer, although he has reservations: the Führer must follow the laws,¹⁶⁰ and he must not be elevated above everyone else.¹⁶¹ However, he reacts when someone uses the notion 'myth' for *Blut*, *Boden* and *Gemeinschaft* (blood, soil, community):

But to begin with they are serious *realities*. We undoubtedly have the possibility before us that people cling to *one* branch of the tree of life and do not see anything else. But for this we are together, people and church, SA and pastor, to help one another when our thoughts become encrusted and we do not see more than the process that affects us.¹⁶²

Schlatter does point out the risk inherent in the nationalist cause, but he also acknowledges the blood and soil imagery as talking about indisputable realities. He does not distance himself from the SA, the member of the *Sturmabteilung*, but holds that we are all birds of a feather, once more stressing fellowship with contemporary political movements. This is in line with the entire document, where Schlatter distances himself from National Socialist *ideology* but also acknowledges some of the new policies, recommending a low profile, even in the Aryan question, and

¹⁵⁹ Wolfgang Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 2 ed., vol. 10, Studien zu Kirche und Israel (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1993).

¹⁶⁰ Schlatter, "Menschengemeinschaft-Gottesgemeinschaft", 27.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 52.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 52.

seeing Church and politics in a relationship of dialogue rather than confrontation.

The audience at Freudenstadt understood that Schlatter accepted that Jewish people were not matriculated at or employed by the universities, but one participant, Dürr, asked whether Schlatter considered it important to use the Aryan paragraph retroactively in the Church.¹⁶³ Schlatter answered:

If it is necessary that we get a legislation, according to which the nature of the blood of the grandfather and the grandmother must be investigated (I regard it as very unnecessary!), then we must do so.¹⁶⁴

Again, although he regards it as unnecessary, Schlatter does not protest against the racial discrimination *in principle* and holds that the Church must follow such a law. His doubts do not concern the Aryan paragraph but the ideas of Germanic supremacy:

To the racially conscious Germanic person one must say: "God's hand will find you once more," to the reviled Jew: "Your bloodline be as it may, you live by the grace of God just as the Germanic person with his blond hair; come to us, Christ is calling; we are celebrating Holy Communion; come to us, let your child be baptised, brother in the Lord." Race to, race fro (*Rasse hin, Rasse her*)—but I would not fight any battle with our people based on regulations for pastors.¹⁶⁵

Schlatter has no problem welcoming Jews into the Church, nor does he support any racial discrimination when Jews wish to come; to him race is not an important question. Obviously the main threat for Schlatter is getting into a conflict with the State and people over "the wrong thing", i.e. racial legislation and the situation of the Jews, when the real issue to him is the survival of Christianity in Germany.

This is yet another indication that Schlatter sees no problem with laws that exclude Christian Jews from Christian ministry and Jewish students from universities—a position that corresponds to his statement

¹⁶³ Ibid., 27.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 27.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 28, see also Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 751. Unfortunately, Neuer downplays what Schlatter says here as well, maintaining that Schlatter's view is that Christians do not have the right to claim an office in the Church, when the fact is that Schlatter at this point fails to support the groups affected by the Aryan legislation.

regarding the “Bethel Confession”. Firstly, in this discussion,¹⁶⁶ Schlatter, in contrast to most leaders in the Confessing Church, does not uphold the separation between the mandate of the State and the mandate of the Church—the State has the right to intervene in Church matters with its legislation. Secondly, Schlatter goes far in accepting the discrimination of Jews, allowing for rejection of their matriculation at universities and acceptance to ministry, as well as for a retroactive investigation into the blood of Jewish ministers, even if he finds it “unnecessary”. In November that same year, Schlatter states that the Aryan paragraph is not enough to motivate resistance: “A fight with God’s Word because of the expulsion of the Jews from the ministry only arises when this decree is connected with the superstition that the Germanic race is privileged before God.”¹⁶⁷ To Schlatter, the treatment of the Jews is not reason enough to resist the Aryan paragraph; rather, his interest is the purity of the faith from Germanic ideology.

From these statements, it is clear that the situation of the Jews in the Church was not very important to Schlatter, and that Schlatter bowed to racist legislation without any real protest. Neuer’s interpretation of these statements as “inconsistent”¹⁶⁸ is benevolent; he fails to mention Schlatter’s aggravating statements,¹⁶⁹ even though he refers not only to the booklet *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, but also to the report from the discussion.¹⁷⁰ But it is clear that this was Schlatter’s position during the autumn of 1933 at any rate—Neuer believes that he had changed his view on the Aryan paragraph by 1936.¹⁷¹ At this time, Schlatter did not regard the racist legislation as a major problem, either in the State or Church, but he quietly supported the policies by refraining from taking a stand against them, even when asked for an opinion by the participants, who no doubt considered Schlatter an authority.

Summing up, the fact that Schlatter does not take issue over the rights of the Jewish Christians is surprising, as is the extent to which he expresses a willingness to understand and engage in a dialogue with the ‘new German kind’; instead, his main criticism concerns intrusions

¹⁶⁶ This does not exclude another position in other texts, see Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 736–780.

¹⁶⁷ Adolf Schlatter, *Rasse und Bruderschaft* [*Adolf Schlatter-Archiv Nr 169/11*] (1933), discussed in Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 752.

¹⁶⁸ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 752.

¹⁶⁹ See *ibid.*, 733–735.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 735.

¹⁷¹ See *ibid.*, 753, 756.

into church life. Smid suggests that Schlatter goes further here than Gerhard Kittel, who was a member of the NSDAP.¹⁷² He certainly gives the authorities greater freedom than was the general tendency in the Confessing Church.

Schlatter's Dialogue with Völkisch Ideology

Schlatter was indeed deeply worried about the freedom of the Church and theology.¹⁷³ It is therefore surprising that he did not take a *consistent* stand against the Deutsche Christen, when it is clear that he was fundamentally opposed to this National Socialist church movement.¹⁷⁴ According to Schäfer, as early as in 1933, Schlatter stated that "he could not comprehend why the well-known twenty-eight statements of the Deutsche Christen could not be used as a foundation for the work of the Church".¹⁷⁵ He also expressed that the twenty-eight theses of the Saxon church were fairly moderate; although theologically questionable, this was not reason enough "to withhold Christian fellowship from a church that confesses this".¹⁷⁶ Here Schlatter reflects on the possibility of retaining the fellowship with the Deutsche Christen, despite their theological aberrations. He concludes that "it is true that the theses obviously 'were written for Nazis by a Nazi' and contained problematic statements, but they 'earnestly' tried 'to keep to the Christian character of the Church'".¹⁷⁷ The confession, however, was an overtly National Socialist one (explicitly referring to the programme of the NSDAP), which merged Lutheranism with an ideology of blood and race, a critical attitude towards the Old Testament, etc. It is true that Schlatter takes a clear stand against theological tendencies in the Deutsche Christen that he cannot support, and that his concern was keeping

¹⁷² He fails to mention Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 257–258.

¹⁷³ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 741.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 763.

¹⁷⁵ Schäfer, *Die evangelische Landeskirche in Württemberg und der Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation zum Kirchenkampf. Band 3: der Einbruch des Reichsbischofs in die württ. Landeskirche 1934*, 448.

¹⁷⁶ "einer Kirche, die das bekennt, die christliche Gemeinschaft zu versagen", quoted after Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 763.

¹⁷⁷ As reported and quoted in *Ibid.*, 763; see the theses in Schmidt, *Die Bekenntnisse und grundsätzlichen Äusserungen zur Kirchenfrage des Jahres 1933*, 98–102. They were also expounded by their author, Walter Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, Schriften der Deutschen Christen (Dresden: Deutsch-christlicher Verlag, 1934), a student of Schlatter's.

a Christian unity with the *Deutsche Christen*. Nevertheless, when reading the theses, it is difficult to understand how Schlatter, with his theological background, could call them moderate, especially in view of the fact that its statements on racial issues had a direct bearing on the treatment of Jews. This picture is supported by Grundmann's comment that Schlatter had defended him during the *Kirchenkampf*, where the "Twenty-Eight Theses" was a main contribution and Grundmann was a key figure:

Much has linked me to him [Adolf Schlatter, A.G.], and one of the great joys of my life is that his son, Theodor Schlatter, told me that his father thought highly of me and had stood up for me at the time of the *Kirchenkampf*, when I frequently faced hostility. I owe much to Adolf Schlatter; more than anyone else he opened up the Bible to me, and my own exegetical work is again and again greatly influenced by him.¹⁷⁸

The quotation is taken from Grundmann's partly apologetic autobiography *Erkenntnis und Wahrheit*, an unpublished manuscript that nevertheless gives us no reason to doubt Grundmann's information. It supports the picture that although Schlatter in principle was against any political theology and definitely did not identify with the *Deutsche Christen*, he had a relatively conciliatory view of the *Deutsche Christen* during the church struggle. The reason for this was not theological, however, but had to do with his concern about severing the relationship with the *Deutsche Christen* and ultimately his desire to reach Germans with the gospel even in this new situation.

¹⁷⁸ "Mich hat viel mit ihm verbunden, und es gehört zu den großen Freuden meines Lebens, daß mir sein Sohn, Theodor Schlatter, erzählte, daß sein Vater große Stücke auf mich gehalten habe und für mich in der Zeit des Kirchenkampfes eingetreten sei, als ich vielfach angefeindet wurde. Ich verdanke Adolf Schlatter viel, vor allen anderen hat er mir die Bibel aufgeschlossen, und meine eigene exegetische Arbeit geht immer wieder zu ihm in die Schule," Walter Grundmann, "Erkenntnis und Wahrheit" (Eisenach 1969), 21, not referred to by Neuer, although Neuer refers to Grundmann's document elsewhere: 605, where Neuer quotes Grundmann's p. 20, and 658, where Neuer quotes Grundmann's p. 23 f. On p. 729, Neuer disputes Siegele-Wenschkewitz's view that there was regular correspondence between Grundmann and Schlatter, with the argument that among the thousand letters from colleagues to Schlatter, there is not one from Grundmann. In fact, neither is there a single letter to or from Schlatter in Grundmann's files in the Landeskirchenarchiv der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Thüringen, Hannelore Schneider, E-mail communication, Thu, 04 Oct. 2007. The absence of letters is also confirmed by the fact that Grundmann refers to Theodor Schlatter's statement regarding Adolf Schlatter's support of Grundmann during the *Kirchenkampf*.

Additional examples of dialogue with the new German ideology can be found in other writings by Schlatter. As already noted, in 1933 Schlatter published *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche* ("The New German Kind in the Church"), originally a speech given to the German Christian Students' Association. In it he challenges his listeners to tell the new, young Germans what church is all about.¹⁷⁹ The document is characterised by a desire to reach the 'new German', acknowledging as much as possible in the 'new German way', while defending the Church and the integrity of the Christian message. Nevertheless, in this conversational manner of writing, Schlatter does maintain a Christian perspective and criticises a biological *völkisch* position as fleshly. When the 'new German' says that German nationhood is the greatest, Schlatter protests that human things never can be, although he assures that, with all that we are, we are united with our people.¹⁸⁰ Schlatter begins on a positive note:

We eagerly and joyfully strengthen and perfect our *völkisch* community—community of people [...] Total State—Total Church. This is the problem of the hour. Is it a call to war? Yes. Is it a message of peace? Yes. Whether it is this or that, it is always a message of joy.¹⁸¹

Here, as in several other publications during National Socialism, Schlatter relates to the existing political discourse, for example bringing up the word *völkisch*, stressing the fellowship with the *völkisch* community and even using the motif of 'Total State'.¹⁸² This usage need not imply a commitment to the existing political vision and probably has apologetic reasons, but in any case it seems to indicate that Schlatter is keen to be in dialogue with the new power. Although *völkisch* can be used as a synonym of 'national',¹⁸³ in the 1910s and 1920s, its usage changed into a concept linked to a *Weltanschauung*,¹⁸⁴ and during National Socialism

¹⁷⁹ Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, 6.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁸² The concept 'Total State' was first formulated by the jurist Carl Schmitt in 1932, and it is also used by the government expert Ernst Forsthoff. See also the book by Walter Grundmann, where the same terminology is employed: Walter Grundmann, *Totale Kirche im Totalen Staat. Mit einem Geleitwort von Landesbischof F. Coch* (Dresden: Oskar Günther Verlag, 1934).

¹⁸³ Uwe Puschner, *Die völkische Bewegung im wilhelminischen Kaiserreich. Sprache—Rasse—Religion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001), 27. The first use of it in 1909 was as a purist German word for 'national'.

¹⁸⁴ See *ibid.*, 27–42 and Uwe Puschner, "Völkisch. Plädoyer für einen 'engen' Begriff", in "Erziehung zum deutschen Menschen". *Völkische und nationalkonservative Erwachsenenbildung*

it was often synonymous with 'National Socialist'.¹⁸⁵ The context has to determine the value of the word; nevertheless, when discussing the relationship to National Socialism, it is difficult to escape that Schlatter is also influenced by the new ideological meaning of the word, although this did not mean that he accepted it in its entirety, as has already been noted. Schlatter challenges his listeners to pursue this dialogue as well, pointing to a range of things held in common, as well as to areas where he regards the new ideology as incompatible with his theology. At the same time, he clearly expresses sharp criticisms against the regime's totalitarian tendencies and argues against racial ideology.

Schlatter holds that he and the group he is addressing have much in common with the "revived German" (*der erwachte Deutsche*):¹⁸⁶ disgust at the intellectuals and bureaucrats, and an urge to not only say, but also to will and to do. He contends that they do not oppose the Spirit with their attitudes in these areas. Schlatter understands the criticism of young Germans, that they see a discrepancy between knowing and acting. This self-critical formulation, which is hardly ironical, is difficult to understand in any other way than that Schlatter is agreeing with the regime—at least this is probably what the listener's interpretation would have been:

We know nature and do not believe in it, stand in the *völkisch* fellowship and do not live for it, and have a Führer and do not trust and obey him [...]. If the Total State creates the willing German, it brings great blessing to the Church.¹⁸⁷

Schlatter goes on to criticise the bureaucracy: "The new German will not be an enemy of the Spirit when he puts the Führer in the place of the jurist."¹⁸⁸ But he welcomes the willpower and energy of the *völkisch* fellowship:

When the young Germans rejoice: we make the destiny of our people great and worthy, organise our economy so that no one is without food,

in *der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Paul Ciupke, et al., *Geschichte und Erwachsenenbildung* (Essen: Klartext, 2007).

¹⁸⁵ Uwe Puschner, E-mail communication, 31 Mar. 2008, personal communication.

¹⁸⁶ Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, 8.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 8. "Wir kennen die Natur und glauben nicht an sie, stehen in der völkischen Gemeinschaft und leben nicht für sie, und haben einen Führer und vertrauen und gehorchen ihm nicht [...]. Schafft der totale Staat den wollenden Deutschen, so bringt sein Wirken der Kirche einen großen Segen."

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

and overcome the discord that destroyed our society—we are from now on a people!—the Church is relieved of a pressing burden.¹⁸⁹

Schlatter identifies with a people who have been ashamed—people hungering, etc. probably refers to the situation during the Weimar Republic. Elsewhere, although he also warns against pride in the human, the heroic, the German, the Nordic, honour and power, and so on, he states that “we are united with our people with all we are, with our natural abilities as well as our spiritual goods”.¹⁹⁰ Fully uniting with the people, at the same time as he takes a stand against certain ideas, Schlatter firmly vows loyalty to the Total State:

We live in the *völkisch* community, with the same upright, undivided will that wholly believes, wholly obeys and wholly loves, and we wholly give what it needs. This is the wholesome power in the cry of “Total State!”, which fights against all selfish reservations that cause us to withdraw from the fellowship, and impresses on us, that we owe our people an honest love that does not only consist of words, but in that we make all that we have and know fruitful to the *völkisch* fellowship.¹⁹¹

It is important for this commitment to be motivated from within: “From those who are dead inside, you cannot create a living fellowship. *From withered fig trees, no Führer will make a German paradise.*”¹⁹² The irony here is directed against the people rather than against the thought of a Führer. Thus, in Schlatter’s view, there is a symbiosis—even if not unconditional—between the *völkisch* project and the Church; for the Church to be a resource to the nation, it must stay alive and wholehearted.

Hence, as long as this commitment does not infringe on the total life of the Church, Schlatter considers it necessary for people to live fully for the State. His variant of two-kingdom teaching is summarised in the words, “We must live totally in the Church in order to live totally in the State, and live totally in the State in order to live totally in the Church.”¹⁹³ But rather than guarding the division between two kingdoms, Schlatter seems to be suggesting a symbiosis: the vision of the Führer requires Christians who fully identify with the cause! The ideas expressed here accord with Schlatter’s revisions to the “Bethel Confession”, where he says that obedience to the orders are divinely

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 9.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 11.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 16.

¹⁹² Ibid., 17, my emphasis.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 16.

ordained.¹⁹⁴ This can scarcely be interpreted otherwise than that Christians are called to support the existing regime, and to do it wholeheartedly. According to Schlatter, the State is the Church's battle companion in its struggle against the works of the flesh:¹⁹⁵

Therefore our State takes up *the fight against the works of the flesh* in a more valiant way than the former orthodox or enlightened princely state (*Fürstenstaat*). It must do so, since it wants to rescue the people. Hence it must stand against what destroys the people. It [the State, A.G.] is thus the comrade-in-arms (*Kampfgenosse*) of the Church.¹⁹⁶

However, at the same time, and in line with his two-kingdom thinking, Schlatter says that if the State declared itself to be the only thing that was real and valuable, or that there was nothing but the State, this would be an absurdity.¹⁹⁷ Thus Schlatter maintains the rights of the Church but undeniably sees a far-reaching unity of interests between the Church and the National Socialist State, people living totally in the Church and totally in the State.¹⁹⁸ Yet this does not mean that Schlatter accepted National Socialism as such.

Having devoted most of the article to emphasising commitment to the Total State, Schlatter explains where he has quarrels with the National Socialist project: the *freedom of the Church*. He forcefully enters into the *Kirchenkampf*, the discussion about the freedom of the Church to govern itself and, in this particular case, to decide who can be a church leader: as the Church, "we are no longer slaves of men".¹⁹⁹ Describing the Church as the closest fellowship there is, Schlatter regards its freedom as a necessity and argues against the inversion of unity into conformity.²⁰⁰ At this point, Schlatter admits that the new German offers resistance as well as support.²⁰¹ The SA man declares it impossible to make the Jew a German; why should he not understand that it is impossible to make the Church a state institution? If he wants to reach this goal through pressure and violence, he will destroy the Christians and the Church,

¹⁹⁴ See above.

¹⁹⁵ Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, 15.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 15.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 16.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 16.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 17.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 17–19.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 19.

Schlatter contends.²⁰² “Will then the new State become our enemy, since we, on top of the *völkisch* fellowship, also have our own Church, which has its own office (*Amt*)?” Here Schlatter once again broaches the heated question of church offices and criticises the idea of a national leader of the Protestant church, whose urge for power is “reminiscent of a Jesuit general”.²⁰³ Does the end of the party state bring us the beginning of a church state, whose dogma is the *Weltanschauung* of the Reichskanzler, Schlatter asks.²⁰⁴ Finally he asks whether “we will be strong enough to oppose untruth and defend against the disaster that will follow through the use of state methods for Christian ends”.²⁰⁵ Here Schlatter launches a vehement attack on the attempts of the State to govern matters of the Church, without mincing matters or trying to please the authorities. The main issue does not seem to be the situation of the Jews, however, but the freedom of the Church.

Schlatter also points to the limits of *völkisch* thinking. The focus on blood among the new Germans is a focus on the flesh, and here he

²⁰² Ibid., 19. In this context, Neuer restricts himself to this quote from Schlatter’s pamphlet, Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 745–746, stressing Schlatter’s resistance to the National Socialist regime: “In his speech at the *Freudenstädter Tagung* for Christian academics in October 1933, he took the opportunity to subject not only the power politics (*Gevaltspolitik*) of the National Socialist state to sharp criticism, but also the church government of the Reich and the Synod of Wittenberg.” (745) It is true that Schlatter criticises the restrictions of the Church’s freedom here, but Neuer overlooks the main drift of the speech, where Schlatter acknowledges the demands of the Total State as long as they do not intrude on the freedom of the Church. As demonstrated in this study of the booklet *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche* and the ensuing discussion (Schlatter, “Menschengemeinschaft-Gottesgemeinschaft”, see Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 746), while maintaining a classic two-kingdom argumentation for the freedom of the Church, Schlatter expresses understanding for the idea of a Führer, the new state and the implementation of the Aryan legislation for students and pastors. He also has an optimistic view of the cooperation between Total Church and Total State. Neuer’s failure to render the whole picture puts Schlatter in quite a different light to what the written sources support, and gives a distorted view of Schlatter’s attitudes. Neuer describes Schlatter’s wish to publish this speech as an urge to give “his critical view of National Socialism and the Deutsche Christen broad publicity”. However, Neuer should have clarified that these documents do not air a *general* criticism of these entities—rather the contrary—but of National Socialist and Deutsche Christen *church politics*. The examples that Neuer gives of Schlatter’s Jewish acquaintances are both *baptised* Jews, which does in itself not imply a general support of Jews and Judaism, Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 748–749. Interestingly, Neuer mentions Schlatter’s friendship with the Jewish wallpaper shopkeeper Löwenstein, as does Kittel, Gerhard Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, in *Universitätsarchiv Tübingen 162/31, I* (Tübingen 1946), 63.

²⁰³ Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, 20.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 21.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 21.

becomes sharp indeed: those who see themselves as descendants of a Nordic human animal (*Menschentier*) are no better than the Germans who gave up reason for oracles.²⁰⁶ He turns strongly against the idea that the heroic, Germanic, Nordic man is the holiest and best.²⁰⁷ Nevertheless, Schlatter also sees the 'new German kind in the Church' as an opportunity to purify the Church of more Roman influence than the Reformation was able to do, saying this in a context where he assents to the search for the German heritage: "Back to the Nordic and the 'Ostische', the race that forms us."²⁰⁸ Schlatter clearly wishes to put limits on racial thinking, but he also opens a door to certain racial thought, walking a fine line in his attempt to accept the new thoughts without accepting the neo-pagan and undue racial views.

Although Schlatter does not say much about Jews and Judaism, much of his reasoning would be negative for the Jews in his contemporary Germany. The identification with the Total State is problematic, as is the urge to obey its orders in the physical realm, since the 'Jewish problem' was regarded as a social issue. The German Total State *was* already a racial state—and would become even more so²⁰⁹—and Schlatter shows little distance to the prevailing racial thinking. At one point in his discussion, the adjective *jüdisch* even represents walking according to the flesh, referring to the moral agenda of the new German to stand against everything fleshly, everything Jewish. This is something that Schlatter welcomes. Jewish stand for "parties, cowardly weaklings, bloodsuckers of the workers and the state, the women with make-up, the puffed-up intellectuals, the hollow officialese speaker".²¹⁰ Behind all these is the same master, "the selfish craving of the man who has sunk into himself. What the young German calls 'Jewish' is all living according to the flesh," Schlatter says.²¹¹ Here 'Jewish' denotes several things that were commonly used in polemic against Jews, and by using it without saying that all of it is indeed human, Schlatter seems to agree with the rhetoric of the 'young German', rather than refute it. This criticism of the Jews was not foreign to Schlatter. As already noted,

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 14.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 11.

²⁰⁸ 'Ostisch' is a racial term for a European type of human that is supposed to have lived especially in the western European mountains, *Brockhaus Wörterbuch*, s.v. ostisch.

²⁰⁹ See Burleigh and Wippermann, *The Racial State*.

²¹⁰ Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, 12.

²¹¹ Ibid., 12.

Schlatter had a very critical view of assimilated Judaism as linked to immorality, cold intellectualism and greed.²¹²

In conclusion, this document shows how Schlatter on the one hand accepts policies of the new regime, and on the other hand takes a stand against things that he regards as incompatible with Christian faith. Through his language and certain statements that tap into the public racial discourse, Schlatter seems to be flirting with the ‘young German’ and his claims to the totality of man. By using the two-kingdom doctrine to demand obedience to the powers that be, Schlatter also assents to their racial policies, and at times he reinforces racist descriptions of Jews. Nevertheless, Schlatter, in line with the Confessing Church at large, fights forcefully for the freedom of the Church. *This instance shows that it was possible to criticise the State for its intrusion in the Church without addressing its Jewish policy,*²¹³ which is precisely what Schlatter does. In the context of the “Bethel Confession”, we noted that Schlatter saw its implications for Jews. Unfortunately Neuer, in his account of the pamphlet, disregards some of his statements, failing to see that Schlatter’s primary criticism of the regime concerns its Church policy and by no means its Jewish policy.²¹⁴

Moreover, discussing the boundaries of the Christian fellowship in an article from 1935, Schlatter opposes the ambitions of the *völkisch* movement to eliminate any confessional differences in the Church.²¹⁵ Here Schlatter stands for a two-kingdom doctrine, suggesting that the *völkisch* movement and the Church have their respective legitimacy. However, he also believes in, and regards as healthy, a sharp and mutual opposition between the State and Church. Furthermore, he maintains that the liberal State had its definite shortcomings.²¹⁶ As for the question of race and the Jews, Schlatter criticises that the unity of race and the state has become the condition for everything, even for church fellowship. This is irrelevant to church life, since it is not founded on the work of Jesus. Here Schlatter forcefully establishes that the State has no right to impose its ideology on the Church. His example is a Jew who has come to faith in Christ, who must be respected for and

²¹² See e.g. Gerhard Kittel, Schlatter’s student and close acquaintance, who speaks of ‘decadency Judaism’, *Dekadenzjudentum*, Kittel, “Die Judenfrage”, 25–27.

²¹³ Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekenkende Kirche und die Juden*, 387–388.

²¹⁴ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 733–735.

²¹⁵ Adolf Schlatter, “Die Grenzen der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft”, *Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1935).

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 182–183.

cannot be prevented from accepting the faith.²¹⁷ Schlatter holds that Jews can still face problems in their Christian fellowship, but this is due to the “disrespect that is attached to him because of the tradition of his people, which shapes him”.²¹⁸ Again Schlatter expresses thoughts that we saw in 1930, not of the Jews’ racial inferiority, but of their essential social inferiority. In this article, however, Schlatter purposes to defend Jewish Christians against *völkisch* assaults. This is in line with one of the two following writings from 1935.

The Righteousness of God: Commentary on Romans

In 1935, Schlatter published two works of particular relevance to his stance towards Jews: *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (“The Righteousness of God. A Commentary on Romans”) and *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit* (“Will the Jew Prevail over Us? A Word for the Christmas Season”).²¹⁹ Schlatter’s production during his final years was impressive: commentaries on Mark (1935), Romans (1935, first draft written between February and July 1934), the letters to the Corinthians (1934), the Pastoral Letters (1936), and 1 Peter (1937)—a total of 2,000 printed pages,²²⁰ of a quality that was no lower than his earlier production. Hence it is scarcely justifiable to regard him as an 80-year-old with diminished capacity or judgment.

Schlatter’s new commentary on Romans is just as valuable as his previous one from 1887. Although he himself hesitated to call it a commentary, as it was “devoid of all erudition”,²²¹ *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* allows us to see whether Schlatter’s exegesis had been adjusted to the new political circumstances, since any talk about Jews at this point in time would have had a political bearing. My impression of the commentary is that, rather than adjusting to the hardening climate for Jews, Schlatter takes a stand against the downgrading of Jews in places, but in some instances his tone still is harsh against Jews and Judaism. Schlatter talks of Jews and Judaism in two dimensions, however—the first

²¹⁷ Ibid., 183.

²¹⁸ Ibid., 183.

²¹⁹ Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*; Adolf Schlatter, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*, vol. 8, Freizeit-Blätter (Essen an der Ruhr: Freizeiten-Verlag zu Velbert im Rheinland, 1935).

²²⁰ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 781.

²²¹ Ibid., 786.

salvation-historical and eschatological, the second contemporary—and his view on Jews and Judaism differs radically between the two.

Compared to his earlier commentary, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* includes some terminological changes; I concentrate my analysis on chapters 9–11. Again, Schlatter has adopted the vocabulary of the time, e.g. *Rasse* ('race') and *völkisch*.²²² Moreover, the general tone when talking about Jews is somewhat sharper, and through his choice of words, he contemporises the commentary to include modern-day Jewry. He goes from the 'fall' of Israel,²²³ to the *Sturz*, "die Offenbarung Gottes im Sturz Israels" ("God's revelation in the downfall of Israel").²²⁴ Schlatter also changes some of the headings in the new commentary, thus bringing the discussion even closer to contemporary Jewry: "The guilt of the *Jews*" (1887, "The unbelief of Israel causes the fall of Israel"), "The work of grace within *Jewry*" (1887, "God's grace upon Israel"), and rather than talking about 'Israel', the terms 'Jews' and 'Jewry', so highly charged in 1935, are used.²²⁵ As we have seen, the adjustment to National Socialist usage is in line with his other texts from the period; however, this goes both ways: there is a guilt of Jews, but God's grace also works among Jews.

The general drift of the commentary corresponds to his earlier one. Schlatter takes a strong stand against the theology of Judaism, and at the same time vindicates the place of the Jews in God's salvation plan. He begins by painting the dilemma of Romans 9–11 in clear colours: on the one hand, there is a "new church", since the old was removed or eliminated (*beseitigt*)—quite a rough term in the 1935 context—through the fall of the Jews.²²⁶ But the problem that Schlatter puts forward is that the church must explain its clear connection to the Jewish confession, even though Paul separates the believers from the Jews. In other words, in Schlatter's thinking, there is a coincidence of continuity and discontinuity with Jews and Judaism. Schlatter says: "a total fissure now divided the two communities from one another. The Jews want to eliminate the church, and Christianity reproaches them for their apostasy from God." Schlatter chooses strong words for the mutual

²²² Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 15, 293, 297. For references to the commentary in the following discussion, see *ad loc.*

²²³ Schlatter, *Der Römerbrief. Ein Hilfsbüchlein für Bibelleser*, 159 *et passim*.

²²⁴ Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 291.

²²⁵ My emphasis.

²²⁶ Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 291.

rejection here: “total fissure”, “eliminate the church”, emphasising the rift between church and synagogue.²²⁷

At this point, Schlatter takes a stand against racism, emphasising Jewish nationality as nothing negative per se. To Rom. 9:3–5, he stresses Paul’s *völkisch* Jewishness (!) and the treasures given to Israel, as well as Jesus being a Jew. He makes much of Rom. 9:5, “Christ is God over all”, with reference to the thought that Jesus is Jewish, and not only Jewish but “a Jew, who is God”.²²⁸ Thus Schlatter stresses the Jewishness of Jesus in an exceptionally strong way, especially in view of the suggestions that Jesus was Aryan.²²⁹ Politically, such a statement must have been a provocation against the public policy, in the year that the Nuremberg racial laws were passed. Even in the pamphlet *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*, Schlatter is consistent on this point, and his comment probably meant a strong support for the right of Jews to exist.

Theologically, however, Schlatter divides Israel in two: the spiritual and the carnal. The one that belongs to God and the *völkisch* Israel are not identical; among the children of Abraham are those who follow in the train of his faith and those who have only the circumcision.²³⁰ Abraham’s children of the flesh are not automatically the children of God, an idea that Schlatter parallels with Ishmael. In the bearing of Ishmael, only natural powers were at work, whereas in Isaac’s, the promise was productive.²³¹ Yet Schlatter admits that there is an ambivalence in Paul: he can speak of the *völkisch* Jewry as a work of God on the one hand, and denounce it as a product of the flesh on the other hand. The same ambivalence is Schlatter’s own. However, Schlatter chooses the spiritual line, and proceeds to discuss election (to 9:7–14).

²²⁷ Similar thoughts about unbelieving Jews are found in Schlatter’s second work from 1935, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*, see below.

²²⁸ Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 294–296; see also 309. I leave his text-critical motivation to Rom. 9:5 aside.

²²⁹ As suggested by Houston Steward Chamberlain, *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 3 ed., vol. 1 (München: Verlagsanstalt F. Bruckmann A.-G., 1901) and several authors in the wake of his book. For this, see Alan T. Davies, “The Aryan Christ: A Motif in Christian Anti-Semitism”, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 12 (2004), and for a more general discussion, Léon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth. A history of racist and nationalist ideas in Europe*, The Columbus Centre series (London: Chatto, Heinemann for Sussex University Press, 1974).

²³⁰ Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 297.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 298.

In Schlatter's view, Christianity is made up of everyone who believes, not only Jews.²³² In his relationship to Jesus, "the Jew demonstrated that he was not capable of believing (*zum Glauben nicht fähig*)".²³³ Yet Jews—albeit without any precedence over Gentiles—can call upon the name of Christ.²³⁴ The argument turns when Schlatter returns to the salvation-historical calling of Israel. God has not rejected his people, and Paul is an example of that.²³⁵ Israel is God's elect, and out of Israel, God elects some to faith. Paul honours the *völkisch* community, and Schlatter states that their remnant, *λειμμα*, will become their fullness, *πλήρωμα*—the promise is not only for spiritual Israel but for its *völkisch* community!²³⁶

Thus, in the midst of heavy oppression of Jews, Schlatter supports a salvation-historical understanding of the role of Israel. This is stressed by his discussion of the eternal election of carnal Israel. It is the lump of the dough and the root of the olive tree. Some of the branches are taken off the tree, and others are grafted in, but "it is not the branch, but the root, which has the power to carry"—once again an emphasis on the importance of physical Israel.²³⁷ "If God gives his grace even to the Greek, he gives it to the Jew even more. With this *πόσῳ μᾶλλον*, Paul says once again what he said with *πρῶτον*, 1:16; 2:10."²³⁸ Here it is the Gentiles who are told off, but Schlatter also speaks into the existing German situation:

Through the arrogance that boasts of being Christian and holds the Jews in contempt, the bonds that tie it to what is good are untied, and its exclusion (*Ausscheidung*) from the people of God sets in. The attitude of the Christian Church towards the Jews is a deeply serious question. If it denies its fellowship with the fallen, it threatens its own existence.²³⁹

Again, this must be read not only as an exegesis of a passage in Romans, but as a comment on how Christianity should relate to the Jews, particularly in the contemporary German situation. According to Schlatter, the Gentile Church is truly dependent on physical Israel,

²³² Ibid., 305.

²³³ Ibid., 309.

²³⁴ Ibid., 315.

²³⁵ Ibid., 319.

²³⁶ Ibid., 323.

²³⁷ Ibid., 324–325.

²³⁸ Ibid., 326.

²³⁹ Ibid., 325–326.

and this must be taken into account when understanding his position to the Jews. "The Jew stands in an insoluble connection with the holy community," Schlatter contends.

However, the argument is complex indeed, since Schlatter always differentiates between the salvation-historical people of Israel and individual Jews. The Jew who now "is called by Christ must untie himself from Israel. *He steps out of the Jewish fellowship and ceases to be a Jew.* When salvation is given to 'the whole of Israel', the message of Jesus does not destroy the *völkisch* fellowship but makes it subservient to it."²⁴⁰

Schlatter uses two perspectives of time. This means that the individual Jews who convert *before* eschatological times cease to be Jews during the present time, but the *völkisch* Israel will not cease to exist eschatologically. Reading the commentary on Romans with a political dimension in mind, it becomes a strong defence of the 'symbolic Jew', the eternal and eschatological Jews, at the same time as the individual Jew now must convert, leave his Jewish fellowship and become Christian. Schlatter sees the embryo of this duality even in Paul, in Romans 9–11. God is faithful to the people in an eschatological perspective, but Paul rebukes his contemporary fellow Jews for not believing in Christ. Thus, by operating with two time perspectives, one for the eschatological 'symbolic Jew', another for the 'real Jew', Schlatter can retain the role of Abraham's physical seed, and still rebuke 'fallen' contemporary Jews. A similar duality but with a different twist is found in Gerhard Kittel's exegesis of the same passage. Nevertheless, Schlatter's statements on the Jewishness of Jesus and the divine calling for *völkisch* Judaism must be interpreted as a defence of German Jewry during National Socialism.

Will the Jew Prevail over Us?

The booklet *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?* ("Will the Jew Prevail over Us?") was published on 18 November 1935 by a small Pietist publishing house, but it sold 40,000 copies. This was two months after the passing of the Nuremberg Laws, which according to Neuer, Schlatter reacted strongly against.²⁴¹ The existence of the laws are probably reflected in his text; for instance, he writes that some people fear the

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 327, my emphasis.

²⁴¹ The laws were passed on 15 September 1935: the *Reichsbürgergesetz* (The Reich Citizenship Law) stated that only people of German or Aryan blood could be citizens of the country, and *Gesetz zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes und der deutschen Ehre* (The Law

destruction of the race through mixing with Jews.²⁴² But the readings of *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?* vary widely from scholar to scholar. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz regards it as fraught with anti-Jewish stereotypes,²⁴³ Marikje Smid evaluates it critically,²⁴⁴ Lichtenberger states that Schlatter was blind to the situation in Germany in 1935 and really seems to mean what the title says,²⁴⁵ and Saul Friedländer talks about “Schlatter’s antiregime hatred of the Jews”,²⁴⁶ whereas Werner Neuer sees it as a word against racism.²⁴⁷ According to Neuer, in the weeks following the Nuremberg Laws, Schlatter had seen himself “more and more compelled to publicly resist the racism that was gaining ground and the neo-paganism that built upon it”.²⁴⁸ Also, the negative reactions to the pamphlet from National Socialist circles would prove that it did as intended, despite its title being “liable to be misunderstood” and “misleading”.²⁴⁹ Neuer notes that the booklet was criticised in National Socialist publications, and that it was forbidden by the Gestapo in places, but he deplores that Schlatter could not take a clear stand against the discrimination of the Jews.²⁵⁰ It seems obvious that the pamphlet was provoking to National Socialist interests; once again, Schlatter vehemently attacks Germanic and Nordic ideas that he thinks threaten the Christian Christmas. However, being anti-Nazi does not mean that a person is not anti-Semitic, and in this pamphlet, Schlatter’s criticism of Nordic ideology, Jews and Judaism are forged into one in a remarkable way.

The context is the approaching Christmas in Germany in 1935, and as the subtitle indicates, it is “A Word for the Christmas Season”. Regarding the Christian celebration of Christmas and the faith in Jesus that this expresses as seriously threatened, Schlatter’s overall argument is that two forces, although they are as fire and water, have joined forces to destroy the Christian celebration of the birth of Jesus. These joint

for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour) regulated which marriages were allowed from a racial point of view.

²⁴² Schlatter, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*, 21.

²⁴³ Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums”.

²⁴⁴ Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 259.

²⁴⁵ Lichtenberger, “Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum”, 19.

²⁴⁶ Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews. Volume I: The Years of Persecution*, 165–166.

²⁴⁷ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 759. Unfortunately, Neuer’s view is not convincing after a reading of Schlatter’s text.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 757.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 759.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 761.

forces are the Jews and the Germanic-Nordic National Socialists who wish to replace Christmas with the Nordic *Sonnenwendfeier*, midwinter celebrations—a Germanic celebration on 21 December with magic ingredients, also called *Sonnenwendfeuer*, as the rites included burning fires on the mountaintops. The adherents of this Germanic celebration did not want to celebrate Christmas because it did not originate in Germany.²⁵¹ This being the actual context, Schlatter develops a fantastic conspiracy theory of ‘the Jew’ being behind it. His analysis does not build on any known connection between the two, nor does he refer to any concrete event or statement by either of the parties, who by this time were as opposed as could be. Instead, his thinking builds on the essential opposition between Jesus/Christianity and Judaism, which is so fundamental to Schlatter that he sees Jews behind every enemy. The goal of Judaism is to “rob us of Christmas”,²⁵² i.e. of Christ, just as Jews in the days of early Christianity succeeded in getting the authorities to prevent their celebration of Christmas.²⁵³ Thus, to Schlatter, anyone opposing Christmas and faith in Christ automatically becomes an ally of the Jews, and since the groups pursuing the *Sonnenwendfeier* are against the Christian Christmas, the two are allies! A widespread *Sonnenwendfeier* at the expense of the Christian Christmas would be a victory for ‘the Jew’—i.e. contemporary Jews—who is against Jesus. Moreover, Schlatter once again asserts that the Jews crucified Jesus!²⁵⁴

The pamphlet begins as follows:

During the Christmas season, Germany looks strange. Now numerous and persuaded Germans are all of a sudden marching arm in arm with the Jews. *We have ousted them from the Reichstag and university, from the office, theatre and press.* But now we support them in their most important concern. In the past, there was never such a complete and public rejection of the Jews by our people as during the Christmas season. It is true that on Good Friday, when the Crucified One was shown to all the people, it was also made plain to the Jews what separates us from them. But on Good Friday, the Christians have also always sincerely attested their fellowship with the Jews [...] Because it was precisely Christ’s coming that

²⁵¹ Schlatter, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*, 11.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 3.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 17. This recurs several times, also p. 14.

the Jews guarded themselves against; that was unbearable; against that they directed their attack with united resolve.²⁵⁵

Here Schlatter starts out by depicting Germany of November 1935, mixing modern political observations with his historical remarks regarding traditional popular rejection of the Jews in the context of Good Friday.

Together with the book title, this introduction can scarcely be understood otherwise than as a consent to the racist policies of Germany: "We have ousted them from the Reichstag and the university, from the office, theatre and press. But now we support them in their most important concern." First of all, Schlatter talks about the status of Jews on the *sociopolitical* scene in the racial state of Germany, two months after the passing of the racial legislation and over two and a half years after the introduction of the Aryan paragraph. Schlatter's description of how the Jews have been forced out of society is laconic and without regret,²⁵⁶ and by using the pronoun 'we', Schlatter identifies with the cause. In the rest of the text, he does not mince matters when criticising different phenomena, and he could easily have spoken up against the racial legislation here. Instead, the reader must have seen this as endorsement of the contemporary situation, where Jews were presented as the disaster of Germany on a daily basis. All this because Schlatter is upset about the backing given to the 'Jewish destruction' of Christmas: "But now we support them in their most important concern," meaning

²⁵⁵ "Während der Weihnachtszeit sieht Deutschland seltsam aus. Nun marschieren zahlreiche und überzeugte Deutsche auf einmal Arm in Arm mit der Judenschaft. Aus dem Reichstag und der Universität, aus Amtsstube, Theater und Zeitung haben wir die Juden verdrängt. Nun aber gewähren wir ihnen für ihr wichtigstes Anliegen unsere Unterstützung. Früher wurde die Absage an die Judenschaft von unserem Volke nie so vollständig und so öffentlich vollzogen wie während der Weihnachtszeit. Zwar wurde auch am Karfreitag, wenn allem Volk der Gekreuzigte gezeigt wurde, dem Juden deutlich gemacht, was uns von ihm trennt. Aber am Karfreitag hat die Christenheit immer aufrichtig auch ihre Gemeinschaft mit den Juden bezeugt [...] Denn eben dagegen, daß der Christus gekommen sei, setzte sich die Judenschaft zur Wehr; das hieß sie unerträglich; dagegen richtete sich ihr Angriff mit einträchtiger Entschlossenheit," *ibid.*, 3, emphasis mine.

²⁵⁶ Hence Neuer's presentation of the pamphlet is questionable: "In the weeks that followed [the Nuremberg Party Congress], Schlatter saw himself more and more compelled to lodge a public protest against the racism that was spreading and the neo-paganism (*Neuheidentum*) that built upon this. He did this in a writing with the mistakable title *Wird der Jude über uns stegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*." As is demonstrated here, it is difficult not to read the pamphlet as a racist one, especially given the background of the new Nuremberg Laws. However, it is true that Schlatter opposes neo-paganism here. For a more extensive discussion, see below.

that their anti-Christian agenda is supported. The conspiracy theory continues with Schlatter's argument that the Jews are using the new German racial state as their servant, just as they used the State before, even in the first decades of the Church.²⁵⁷

As mentioned above, the heading with the introduction gives the impression that Schlatter indeed supports the racist policies. In a most unrealistic manner, he now states that "the situation for his [the Jew's] world-view has never been more favourable than now", describing the triumph of the rabbi:

But today a rabbi can say with pride: "Look how the situation in Germany has changed; indeed we are despised, but only because of our race. But until now we were alone in trying to erase from the public consciousness the mad message preached at Christmas that Christ has come; but now we have as allies in our fight those who are responsible for the education of the German people, whom the German is also obliged to obey" [...] *the situation for his [the Jew's] world-view has never been more favourable than now.*²⁵⁸

Schlatter's description of the situation as the heyday of the Jewish world-view is utterly unrealistic and can only be understood in such a way that he was completely occupied with the situation of Christianity in Germany and disregarded the actual political situation of the Jews. Schlatter feared that a pagan feast would take the place of Christmas.

It is clear that Schlatter's quarrels are with assimilated Judaism. In liberal times, he contends, Jews had tried to push back Jesus, striving to make Christianity a private religion only²⁵⁹—here Schlatter attacks modern assimilated Jews, who "did not take their Judaism seriously anymore and did not believe".²⁶⁰ As noted earlier, these are the Jews whom Schlatter regards as his main enemies, since they have no understanding of what faith in the Messiah is. Thus Schlatter's contemporary Jewish enemies have joined the Nordic people in a "battle of extermination against the Church (*Vernichtungskampf*)",²⁶¹ the two having a common enemy, Christianity: it is firmly evidenced that "the agreement with

²⁵⁷ Schlatter, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*, 3.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 4. Translation: Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews. Volume I: The Years of Persecution*, 165–166. My emphasis.

²⁵⁹ Schlatter, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*, 5.

²⁶⁰ Ibid., 5.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 6, similarly 14–15.

the Jewish judgment on Jesus could be linked to violent enmity against Jewry",²⁶²

At the same time, although Jews are often paralleled with the Nordic people, Schlatter takes a clear stand against certain Nordic ideas. The latter are not against Jesus as a powerful figure, believing that "Judaism never had a fiercer adversary than [Jesus, A.G.]".²⁶³ Because Jesus is different from the Jews, he must be Aryan, they reason. But Schlatter considers it wrong to 'cleanse' the gospel of what is Jewish, since the entire story of Jesus is that of a Jew; Jesus is "a part of his people".²⁶⁴ Yet Schlatter sees the Jews even behind the idea of Jesus as an Aryan, because a rabbi stands behind the Panthera myth. Through this, the "Jewish hatred" has produced a "drop of poison".²⁶⁵ As elsewhere, however, Schlatter strongly rejects the idea that Jesus was Aryan.²⁶⁶ Instead, he emphasises the solidarity that Jesus had with the Jews, that he was very keen to win them over and show them that the answer to their Messianic expectation had come, and that he "did not want to give up the fellowship with them".²⁶⁷ Nevertheless, Schlatter also criticises 'the Jew' for having introduced the lie that Jesus performed his miracles through witchcraft, which he learned in Egypt.²⁶⁸ He philosophises about Jews being liars due to their 'racial soul' (*Rassenseele*), but he does not accept the idea—this itself becomes a lie through generalisation. To Schlatter, the Jews lie, and he does not question that they do this, as a result of their hatred. Hate does not care about the truth: "however, this is true, that the Jew lies when his hatred of Jesus and Christianity speaks".²⁶⁹ Having taken a stand against a more general, essentialist view that Jews are liars due to race, Schlatter states that they are essentially liars due to religion.

To qualify the picture given above, it is true that Schlatter argues against racial ideology, especially regarding the idea that Jesus was Aryan, and he addresses both racial ideology and theological arguments of the *Deutsche Christen*, that a Jewish Jesus would not be attractive to the Nordic people. Jesus is free, though bound to his people, Schlatter

²⁶² Ibid., 19.

²⁶³ Ibid., 6.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 10.

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 7.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 8.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 9.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 7–8.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 8.

contends.²⁷⁰ He also talks ironically about “the omnipotence (*Allmacht*) of race”,²⁷¹ and similarly of the effort that the Germans made to deliver the Gospels of the Jewish elements that his disciples had put into it. However, purifying the gospel of what is Jewish is impossible “because the whole story of Jesus is that of a Jew, not only individual stories or sayings”,²⁷² and Schlatter gives a number of examples: “the way in which he ordered the fellowship for them [the church, A.G.] was not Aryan, but Jewish”, ending, “Jesus was a Jew.”²⁷³

Moreover, Schlatter clearly argues against a mere biologism, shutting a person into his body and making him dependent on his blood alone. In the context of the Nuremberg racial laws that had recently been passed, Schlatter confronts such ideology. Schlatter’s writing does not contain any biological racism, and he criticises “[people, who] fear that the mixing with Jews means the destruction of the race”.²⁷⁴ It is no wonder that many in the National Socialist party reacted strongly against the famous Schlatter’s clear opposition to the foundations of the racial laws. But even though we do not find any biologically racist views in Schlatter, there is still a ‘culturally’ essentialist idea that Jews are inclined to do certain things.

With sharp criticisms, Schlatter also returns to the theme of the ‘Nordic racial’ ideology.²⁷⁵ In reaction to these ideas, Schlatter wishes to prove that there is no such thing as a racial soul, and the example he gives is why the Jews hate (!). “The Jew hates; and because he hates, he lies [...] The Jew claims dominion over the world, his temple should be eternal and his election irrevocable.”²⁷⁶ Jesus being Jewish countered all this, however, and so, since both lies and truth can emanate from the Jewish soul, there is no such thing as a racial soul. Still, Schlatter upholds a negative essentialist view on the Jews, returning to classic stereotypes that were also widespread in the ‘Third Reich’: that Jews were liars, full of hate and claimed world dominion. Thus, although he criticises National Socialist racial ideology and the anti-Semitic gospel research of the *Deutsche Christen*, Schlatter nevertheless maintains racial prejudice towards ‘the Jew’ and seemingly uncritically uses the

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 9.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 8.

²⁷² Ibid., 10.

²⁷³ Ibid., 10.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 21.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 14.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 10–11.

terminology of the racial state, e.g. “racial soul” (*Rassenseele*) and “after their kind” (*artgemäß*).²⁷⁷

The Jew is seen as a negative figure. Describing the Nordic people with their myths and nationalist dreams of supremacy, Schlatter taints them with resembling the Jews (!), thus revealing his own view of the Jews. The Jews wanted Jesus to “fulfil their craving for greatness, for victory, for the perfection of their national egotism. What else do these want, who know nothing greater than their racial soul (*Rassenseele*)? They think in a completely Jewish way.”²⁷⁸ Schlatter moves between his two targets, the Jews and the Nordic people, holding that they share the same racial ideals and that both want to give their *Rassenseele* full freedom to manifest. He repeats that the Jews dream of victory in contemporary Germany.²⁷⁹ This again shows Schlatter’s essentialist ideas of Jews aspiring to world dominion. In view of the recently passed Nuremberg Laws, and the Aryan paragraph and systematic persecution of the past two and half years, the statement, as well as the overall depiction of the Jews, is cruel indeed.

Schlatter continues comparing the Jews to the Nordic people. The Jews had also begun to honour their national traditions, their soil and succession of blood [*Boden* and *Blut*—note that Schlatter a line earlier refers to *Blut und Boden* in National Socialist ideology, A.G.]. “Through this came the elevation of the land and their race into something holy,” Schlatter says, although he notes that race is not meant in scientific but religious terms²⁸⁰—he never supports biological racism. It was secularisation that stopped the Jew from being the Wandering Jew, who was able to live only in the Holy Land. As Jews disappeared into the other peoples, Judaism disintegrated. At the same time, it grew empty, and the victory of this assimilated Judaism opened the way for the ‘German faith’.²⁸¹ At this point, Schlatter airs age-old prejudice against Jews, e.g. talking about the Wandering Jew.

Schlatter repeats similar prejudice against Jews in a few more instances. The Jews are homeless by divine will, through the words of Jesus: “The judgment of Jesus that the temple would be destroyed,

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 12.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., 15.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 19.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 20.

²⁸¹ Ibid., 20.

through which the Jews have become the always Wandering, was spoken with royal authority.”²⁸² Jesus made this judgment, Schlatter adds, in his office as king and with his mandate to judge and punish. Although the concept of the Wandering Jew is not present in the Matthean and Lukan accounts (Matt. 23:38; Luke 13:35), Schlatter uses them to reinforce that Jews are divinely judged to a status of foreigners, thus mixing the biblical account with a racist stereotype.

Finally, Schlatter compares the situation of Jews and Christians in contemporary Germany, contending that the Jews are better off than Christians (!). Unlike Christians, the Jews enjoy special protection due to their status as a foreign body (*Fremdkörper*), with their own school, press and art.²⁸³ Their children are not taken away to be indoctrinated with the German *Weltanschauung* (world-view), as the Christian children are.²⁸⁴ Thus, because the Church can neither enjoy this protection, nor assimilate into the people as the Jews can, it is worse off, Schlatter argues.²⁸⁵ The Jews would benefit from remaining public, whereas Christians would benefit from hiding. At the end of his discussion, Schlatter states that it is possible that ‘the Jew’ will “win a powerful victory over us” for a time:

It is true that the Jews may first win a powerful victory over us, but this victory will not be final. For the Jew has not brought the faith in God into the world, and just as little can the Jews and companions of Jews (*Judengenossen*) destroy it. They cannot do it, since they cannot undo that Christ has come into the world.²⁸⁶

Hence Schlatter at the end reinforces his view of the situation: although the Jews clearly represent a threat to Christianity and Germany, the Jews and their companions, the Nordic-Germanic National Socialists, will not be able to prevail over the Christians in the long run, only for a time! Despite clearly provoking the ‘Nordic’ National Socialists here by calling them *Judengenossen*, it is just as true that Schlatter is agreeing with the State’s view that Jews and Judaism mean problems for Germany.

²⁸² Ibid., 19.

²⁸³ Ibid., 21–22.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 22.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 21.

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 25.

Discussion

Since the true message of *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*²⁸⁷ is disputed, I have dealt with it at some length. I will first briefly summarise the findings and then return to Neuer's analysis.

Even the title shows that Schlatter regards the Jews as the main enemy of the German people, who will "win over us". Although on the surface the racist 'Aryan-Nordic' people play the leading part in the attack on Christian Germany, the 'eternal' enemy, the Jews, are the hidden force behind the political power. Using the common idea of a Jewish conspiracy (to Schlatter consisting mainly of assimilated Jews),²⁸⁷ Schlatter writes that the Jews, together with the National Socialists, now stand behind the de-Christianisation of Germany. I have considered whether the introduction might be read as irony, but that is most improbable. The title and the view on the Jews are consistently negative throughout the text, and rather than urging the German public to reverse the process whereby the Jews have been ousted from other areas, Schlatter warns that it has not yet extended to the religious scene.

At the same time, Schlatter sharply confronts the ideas and agenda of the Nordic people, whose attack on German Christianity is the reason for his pamphlet. This is a typical example of the range of possible positions regarding Jews and Judaism, as well as National Socialism, during the 'Third Reich'. As Schlatter exemplifies, it is possible to hold strongly negative views on Jews and Judaism, while being negative to National Socialism and/or the pagan Nordic ideas held by part of the National Socialist movement. *Therefore, it is never a valid argument that if someone is anti-National Socialist, he is also friend of the Jews.* The picture is more complex than that. Schlatter airs negative essentialist prejudice against Jews, at the same time as he confronts another ideological front, pagan Nordic ideology. In a remarkable way, he then fuses the two archenemies into one, since to Schlatter they oppose the same thing.

Schlatter has an ambivalent attitude to racial discourse. On the one hand, he strongly criticises a merely biologicistic German or Nordic thinking: it shuts people up in their bodies, or blood. He also criticises boasting about one's own *Rassenseele*,²⁸⁸ making it no wonder that National Socialist and Germanic-Nordic interests were deeply irritated by Schlatter's pamphlet. While basically accepting that there is a

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 4–5.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 10–12, 14, 16.

fundamental *völkisch* fellowship, he opposes things that move Christianity out of this national culture and replace it with pagan Nordic ideas. On the other hand, Schlatter positively states that there is a certain affinity between Jesus and the Nordic soul: it has something of his greatness, while it detests cowardice, effeminacy and endeavours that are only for one's own wellbeing.²⁸⁹ By talking about the affinity between Jesus and the Nordic soul, Schlatter strikes a chord in contemporary Germanic-Nordic ideology, probably wanting to once again show the relevance of Christianity and Jesus to this group. However, Schlatter by no means goes as far as those who thought Jesus was an Aryan.

As already noted, Neuer argues that, despite the title being liable to misunderstanding, Schlatter's intention was to counter neo-pagan assault; however, he regrets that Schlatter made the mistake of equaling the oppressing National Socialist groups with the Jews. Moreover, pointing to certain freedoms of the Jews, he underestimated the oppression they faced.²⁹⁰ Nevertheless, Neuer reads the pamphlet as an "outright, passionate rejection of a glorification of the Aryan-Nordic race, and of a disregard for the Jewish race".²⁹¹ The latter is exemplified by Schlatter's statement that Jews have no disposition for lying,²⁹² and his rejection of the idea that Jesus was Aryan. Neuer accounts for Schlatter's description of how Jews in Germany seemed to have got the upper hand over the Christians, the former having retained rights that were withdrawn from Christians. However, he has revised his earlier verdict that it was "a courageous pamphlet".²⁹³

Despite several correct observations in Neuer's analysis, he presents Schlatter's book in too favourable terms. Neuer does not describe the polemic against the Jews as carefully as he does Schlatter's criticism of neo-pagan racism, nor does he explicate the negative depiction of Jews and Judaism, or consider the many expressions of prejudice against Jews; hence he puts the pamphlet in a more sympathetic light than is justifiable.²⁹⁴ Lichtenberger rightly states that the title of the booklet

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 6.

²⁹⁰ See Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 759–761. So also Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: A Biography of Germany's Premier Biblical Theologian*, 151.

²⁹¹ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 757.

²⁹² Neuer on Schlatter, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*, 8.

²⁹³ As pointed out in Siegle-Wenschkewitz, "Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums", 97, 99 ("a courageous pamphlet [...] against the National Socialist racial delusion (*Rassenwahn*)").

²⁹⁴ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 757–761.

cannot be misunderstood, “but precisely renders Schlatter’s course of argument from the first page to the last”.²⁹⁵

Following his depiction of Jews and Judaism in the argument, it is first of all clear that *in this text* Schlatter welcomes the apartheid policy that had ousted the Jews from public life since the seizure of power in 1933.²⁹⁶ Secondly, subscribing to conspiratorial theories prevalent in anti-Semitic discourse, he believes that the Jews are secretly behind the attack on German Christianity, depicting another negative stereotype, the rabbi, as beaming at the great success of anti-Christian interests. Thirdly, the text includes a range of age-old essentialist prejudices about Jews: they crucified Christ; they were judged by him to the state of the Wandering Jew, doomed to live as foreigners in the nations; they lie, not because of their blood, but because of their religion, hating Christianity.²⁹⁷ According to Schlatter, the Jews cherish a dream of world dominion, have a craving for greatness and victory, and want to perfect their national egotism. They, too, have a *Blut und Boden* ideology; the land and their race are holy, he contends.

As Neuer rightly points out, National Socialist circles reacted against the book, which is no wonder since it includes strong criticisms of neopaganism and racial myth. Even the frequent association of ‘Nordic’ with Jewish people must have seemed degrading to a National Socialist mind. However, as noted, criticism of National Socialist ideas does not imply an absence of racist views or polemic against Jews, and in this text, the absolute opposition between Judaism and Jesus/Christianity is even more fundamental than that between Christianity and neopaganism, the latter becoming a contemporary tool of the timeless anti-Christian Judaism. The whole pamphlet airs the perennial idea of an overarching Jewish conspiracy against humankind, the German in particular. Hence it is not the Nordic person who is stigmatised as the ontological opponent, but ‘the Jew’.

In Schlatter’s book, the blame placed on the Jews is irrational, and his conspiratorial theories are nowhere empirically substantiated. Written two months after the Nuremberg racial laws, the greater readership may well have taken Schlatter’s pamphlet as in fact siding with the racial policy against Jews, although he does take a stand against biological

²⁹⁵ Lichtenberger, “Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum”, 19.

²⁹⁶ I underline that this pertains to this text, but it is possible that other statements have another tendency.

²⁹⁷ Against Neuer’s analysis, which fails to see that Schlatter still argues that Jews lie.

racism. By no means politically unaware, Schlatter had been able to follow the situation of the Jews for almost three years, but he still accepts this much, even if not everything, in anti-Semitic discourse. Although Schlatter does not believe in more than a temporal victory for ‘the Jew’, the Jewish victory—the fall of Christianity—which Schlatter envisions in the last weeks of 1935, is nevertheless a national catastrophe, and the pamphlet serves as a call to war against such a development.

Without any mention of Schlatter, in an insightful posthumous essay, Uriel Tal gives a background to Schlatter’s joint attack on *völkisch* National Socialists and Jews. Beginning in the 1920s, Tal points to a range of German theologians who link German Jewry with the *völkisch* movement. Having a political religion, both these deify nationality—flesh, blood and soil—and impede the fulfilment of salvation history by hindering the Church’s most sacred mission: leading people to baptism and faith, and seeing God’s plans accomplished.²⁹⁸ Similar ideas are expressed even by personalities such as Eduard Lamparter, a liberal defender of Jews. He states that the Jews and the *völkisch* movement interpret salvation history in a similar way, nationalist Jews envisioning an earthly Messianic kingdom and the *völkisch* dreaming of an eschatological and political Thousand-Year Reich. In Lamparter’s view, both groups need to be converted.²⁹⁹ During National Socialism, the motif becomes common primarily in the Confessing Church, which equates the *völkisch* with the new pagans. Nazis worshipped the Führer as a Messiah, whereas the Jews were materialistic and vulgarly this-worldly, and enlightened Jews were liberal and revolutionary. Jews “contributed to the relativisation of values, to the integration of binding norms”.³⁰⁰ Tal’s description shows that there was a broad tradition, developed during the Weimar years and accentuated during National Socialism, of seeing Jews and *völkisch* groups as common threats to a Christian Germany—and Schlatter fell into this. “It was these traditions which, in the historical reality of the era between the two world wars, motivated leading Lutherans to compare and to equate their two adversaries, antithetical as they were.”³⁰¹ Schlatter’s version of this became all the

²⁹⁸ Uriel Tal, “On Modern Lutheranism and the Jews”, in *Religion, Politics and Ideology in the Third Reich. Selected Essays*, ed. Michael Burleigh (London: Routledge, 2004), 192–194.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 194.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 197.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 200.

more grotesque, considering that it was delivered just a few weeks after the Nuremberg Laws were passed.

Enjoying great esteem in Germany, Schlatter and his opinion of Jews in the existing situation, with aggressively racist legislation and growing persecution, was highly sought after, as is confirmed by the large print run. One contemporary reaction was that Schlatter “mocks, ridicules and defames” Jews through the pamphlet, and the question was asked whether this defender of the Confessing Church against National Socialism believed he could reach these goals by libelling the Jews.³⁰² Although Schlatter’s rationale is a Christian evangelistic one, he drifts partly with the racist current, to a certain extent welcoming racist policies, and he reinforces a traditional defamation of Jews, reiterating racist stereotypes. Thus *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?* probably contributed to the discrimination of Jews rather than the reverse, with its view of the Jews as being behind the worst possible assaults on Christian Germany.

Conclusion

A key to understanding Schlatter’s view of Jews and Judaism is that he deals with the Jews in two temporal and qualitative dimensions: a salvation-historical one, marked by continuity, and a temporal one, marked by discontinuity. *This hiatus in the salvation-historical role of the Jews, from their rejection of Jesus to the eschatological entrance of Israel, enables Schlatter to hold two parallel views of Jews.* The focus of the first is the ideal or ‘symbolic Jew’, who is represented in biblical and Jewish history before Christ, and is identical with the eschatological ‘Jew’, who will be part of the fulfilment of God’s plans for mankind. The other dimension is the ‘real Jew’, contemporary Jews and Judaism, be it contemporary with Paul or with Schlatter. The calling upon Israel as a people remains important, but in reality, Jews and Judaism are fundamentally opposed to Christianity. The watershed is soteriological, that is, whether or not the Jews accept Jesus Christ and have faith in him. Thus the Jews who did not accept Christ in Paul’s time caused a hiatus in God’s dealings with his peculiar people, and similarly Schlatter’s contemporary Jews represent

³⁰² The weekly journal *Gerechtigkeit* (Vienna), 27 February 1936, quoted in Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden*, 167.

degeneration and resistance to core German and Christian values, and seem to have nothing in common with the ‘symbolic Jew’.

Hence Schlatter’s view of Judaism turns with the relationship to Jesus: he regards Judaism before Christ with greater understanding than he does Judaism after Christ. When the Jews, who as a people had distinguished themselves through earnestness and piety, did not accept the Messiah, Schlatter’s picture of them changes into the negative. His *characterisation* of the ‘real Jew’ is therefore a negative figure, described in essentialist terms with fixed negative properties. In fact, the generic notion of ‘the Jew’ itself has an essentialist foundation. To Schlatter, this same essence can be found in a first-century Roman Jew or a modern German Jew—always an enemy of Christ and always wanting to dominate society,³⁰³ “claiming dominion over the world”. Schlatter also talks about the ‘Wandering Jew’, and of ‘the Jew’ as proud and anxious. The ahistorical idea that “the Jews crucified Jesus” is another thought with essentialist consequences, which applies this guilt collectively, not only to all Jews at the time of crucifixion, but to ancient and modern Jews alike.

This is the broad outline, but there are refinements to be made. Describing Jewish history, Schlatter finds more faith, one of his positive key ideas, in pre-Christian Judaism than did most Christian theologians of his time, although he argues that faith becomes more and more mixed with works in the centuries before Christ. Moreover, while Schlatter does not mock or criticise faithfulness to the Law or Jewish worship, in contrast to some ‘Late Judaism’ descriptions, he holds that Judaism before Christ increasingly overstates the outward and what could be measured as faithfulness to the Law. Jewish piety degenerates, its faith mixes with works, and an illegitimate self-confidence arises. Yet Schlatter respects sincere Jewish piety, his example being Jochanan ben Zakkai. At least initially, he does not characterise such piety as legalism, nor caricature it as mere casuistry, even though the picture of Jewish legalism grows increasingly negative as it approaches the time of Jesus. Earnest Jewish piety gained Schlatter’s respect even in modern times. Hence the picture of historical Jews and Judaism is ambivalent, but generally more positive than that of most of his contemporary scholars.

³⁰³ Regarding Rome, this is probably a tall tale that was used in anti-Semitic propaganda and existed in New Testament scholarship at the time, Carl Schneider, “μέτωπον”, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942), 639.

However, during National Socialism, Schlatter changes his tone, not only adopting terms such as *Rasse* and *völkisch*, but also to a certain extent playing the game of the 'new Germans', even if he does not accept biological racism. The tone when talking about Jews is also generally sharper, as is amply demonstrated in his 1935 pamphlet. Yet the characterisation of the 'symbolic Jew' is intact, and facing overt racism, which he disliked, Schlatter stresses that God's Israel is Jewish from a *völkisch* point of view, and Jesus is *a Jew, who is God* (!). These are points where Schlatter maintains a strong resistance to the dejudaisation of Christianity. Nevertheless, a Jew without faith in Christ has no precedence over the Gentiles. And it is during this period that Schlatter bluntly states that Judaism never had a fiercer adversary than Jesus. Thus, even though there is a continuity between Schlatter's positive and negative views on Jews and Judaism before and after the 'Third Reich', his descriptions of Jews and Judaism are often fiercer.

Schlatter's *historiography* is reminiscent of both the Enlightenment and salvation-historical research traditions, but the contrasts between how Jews and Judaism develop through history are softer than in for example Bousset. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that, just as the Enlightenment research tradition, Schlatter has a pattern of degeneration. Seeing a difference between an increasing degeneration of Israel before and after the Exile, Schlatter still describes the change as successive. However, in contrast to the Enlightenment research tradition, Palestine stands for something that is fundamentally positive to Schlatter, a place where the development of Christianity could occur. Moreover, Schlatter reassesses developments that the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis regards as negative: canonisation, elevation of prophetic books, creation of the school of the rabbis, the Sabbath congregation studying the Bible, the adherence to the Law. But faith, being alive in Old Testament religion, does more or less die off in the Palestinian synagogue, and God becomes distant. This analysis is not unlike that of de Wette, only the change comes later, outside the Old Testament, and Schlatter's tone is more conciliatory. Schlatter also makes a similar analysis to Baur's of the Greek influence on the emergence of early Christianity, but this, too, is more moderate. To Schlatter, the theological work done after Ezra is a preparation of the Jews for the gift that would come through the Greek contacts, and the Alexandrian synagogue is a preparation for the gospel. Like Baur, Schlatter sees the value of a Greek influence, but he has nothing of Baur's more advanced ideas in this direction, nor would he incorporate the craze for Socrates and Plato as parallel

to Christ. In this regard, the situation during National Socialism meant no change in Schlatter's theology.

In Schlatter's thinking, there are several important factors of *continuity* between Judaism and Christianity. The New Testament is based on the Old, and the teaching of Jesus as well as the Church builds on this foundation: "there is no New Testament concept without a model in the theology of the synagogue". Schlatter often returns to this continuity. His salvation-historical foundation also spans history, from Abraham to an eschatological entrance of Israel. Yet once again, this salvation-historical arch and continuity is broken for a time, from the point when Jews did not accept Christ, to the eschatological time when the πλήρωμα of Israel enters in. Israel is holy and chosen, and its election is eternal, but for a time, Israel is rejected. The Church has a clear connection with Judaism, but at the same time, the believers in Christ are clearly separated from the Jews. What is written during National Socialism regarding this does not differ from what was said before. The change is in Schlatter's tone, when he talks of a "total fissure", that Judaism wanted to "eliminate the Church", and strongly emphasises the rift between the Church and the synagogue. His model of salvation-historical continuity and temporal discontinuity makes this duality possible.

Schlatter's symbolic world is made up of elements from his Protestant, Pietist revivalist and Biblicist background—he fought theological liberalism throughout his life—and not least structured by the idea of salvation history, probably inspired by Beck. Neuer describes him as "eclectic in his ecclesial ties".³⁰⁴ In all this, Schlatter is a fairly free soul, characterised by a strong urge to reach out with the gospel of Jesus Christ. Salvation through Jesus seems to be at the centre of his theology, at the same time as he, more than his contemporaries, emphasises the first article of faith, creation and nature in his symbolic world. The dual emphasis on creation and redemption was perhaps the most important heritage from his home,³⁰⁵ with great consequences for his theology. At the same time, Schlatter, a Swiss, cherished the German nation and identified with the German people, e.g. in facing the consequences of the war.³⁰⁶ Thus, even in the deep personal loss of his son Paul, Schlatter stood by his belief in the nation.

³⁰⁴ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: A Biography of Germany's Premier Biblical Theologian*, 87.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 26–28.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 129.

The political situation during National Socialism made the question of the relationship between Church and State an urgent one. The Confessing Church applied the doctrine of two kingdoms to the new political situation, and this study shows that Schlatter frequently used the two-kingdom doctrine to analyse the situation. However, Schlatter does not only use it as a tool for taking a stand against the political powers, but he moves the mandate of the powers that be from “the sphere of death” to “the sphere of natural life”. This accords with his theology’s strong emphasis on the creation, sometimes referred to as ‘ecological’.³⁰⁷ The two-kingdom doctrine is strong in Schlatter, and his emphasis on the State and its autonomy, race, *Volk* and Führer—which goes further than many other theologians in the Confessing Church—may be rooted in this theological approach, which is also found in the theology of Schlatter’s student Paul Althaus.³⁰⁸ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, for example, ranged Schlatter’s comments to the “Bethel Confession” among thoughts of people such as Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch. Schlatter accordingly says that “the word of the Church equips the people for active and fruitful participation in *völkisch* action”.

This, an evangelistic zeal and a burden for the survival of Christianity in the new Germany seem to lie behind Schlatter’s purpose of maintaining a dialogue with the ‘SA man’. Although there is no doubt that he rejects every kind of neo-paganism, he basically welcomes the ‘new German kind in the Church’, which can purify it of the Roman influence, just as long as it does not jeopardise the freedom and faith of the Church. He flaunts the words *völkisch* and *Rasse*, to the extent that they at times seem to have become his own, even after having taken his stand against neo-paganism and other oversteps. But it is important to seek the German heritage, Schlatter says, “back to the Nordic and the ‘Ostische’, the race that forms us”. There is also a certain affinity between Jesus and the Nordic soul, something of his greatness, while detesting cowardice, effeminacy, etc. At the same time, Schlatter definitely rejects ideas of an Aryan Christ.

When Schlatter is keen on having a dialogue with the ‘new Germans’, he is so also for an apologetic reason, although this does not justify his prejudice against or failure to stand up for the Jews. A mature theologian and a leading authority in German theological and church

³⁰⁷ J. Jürgen Seidel, “Schlatter, Adolf”, in *Biografisch-Bibliografisches Kirchenlexikon* (Herzberg: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1995).

³⁰⁸ See Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler*.

life, Schlatter's was an important voice from the Confessing Church, and his words acted as guidance for the generations of leaders whom he had taught.

The 'Jew' in Schlatter's symbolic world has different roles. As already noted, in his salvation-historical thought, the 'symbolic Jew' is a positive actor with a key role in a salvation-historical perspective and in the eschatological scenario. However, as regards contemporary Jews and Judaism, the 'symbolic Jew' takes the opposite role, which in fact holds true even for New Testament times, i.e. the Judaism that did not accept Jesus as the Messiah, and the 'Jew' who after the judgment of Jesus became the 'Wandering Jew'. Thus the 'Jew' can at the same time be an essentially negative figure with a suprahistorical ambition to dominate the world, and at this point the German Christian state. This is often thought of as assimilated Judaism, but not only—the rabbi, too, seeks the destruction of Christianity. Decadent Judaism is depicted in glaring colours as exemplifying "cowardly weaklings, bloodsuckers of the workers and the State, the women with make-up, the puffed-up intellectuals, the hollow officialese speaker". In *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*, Schlatter describes Jews as the main enemy of Germany and Christianity. At first, Schlatter's positive evaluation of Adolf Stoecker is surprising,³⁰⁹ and there is no evidence that his anti-Semitism affected Schlatter, but they do have in common the combination of theological profile, patriotism and prejudice against Jews. Hence in Schlatter, 'Jew' and 'Judaism' have negative connotations with regard to the present, but the opposite is true in the salvation-historical and eschatological context. Thus, if contemporary Jews are essentially negative figures because of their rejection of Jesus, the 'symbolic Jew' has some positive connotations—and when Jesus and Paul are very consciously depicted as Jews, they have a continuity with this 'symbolic Jew'. Schlatter even says that Jesus is "a Jew, who is God", taking a stand against racial anti-Semitism.

When discussing how Schlatter may have helped to *delegitimise or legitimise* policies against Jews in his time, one must firstly discern between his

³⁰⁹ Schlatter, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*, 187: "The acquaintance with Stoecker was the greatest that Berlin had brought me [...] Among the Berlin people, he nevertheless then stood in unique greatness with his eye on the whole of the people and with a manifold love, which not only thought, but acted." Without going into details, Schlatter mentions a misstep (which may have related to anti-Semitism), but his appreciation of Stoecker is strong indeed.

overarching salvation-historical thought and his view of ‘contemporary Judaism’, past and present. No doubt his insistence on the Jewishness of Jesus and early Christianity contributed to the delegitimising of policies against Jews. This is evident in his commentary on Romans from 1935, even though such a scholarly commentary would have had far less influence on public life than his pamphlet “Will the Jew Prevail over Us?”. Because of his hiatus in salvation history, Schlatter is able to maintain a positive place for the ‘symbolic Jew’, while holding a negative view of the ‘real Jew’. Secondly, it seems to have been possible for Schlatter, at least initially, to be loyal in many respects to the State and Führer, regarding this as a divine order, yet still criticise National Socialism and especially neo-paganism and racial ideology. However, Schlatter’s support for the Führer, which is not uncritical, cannot be seen as a wholesale acceptance of the National Socialist state with its ideology, but as an outcome of his faith in the divine legitimacy of the powers that be. This is also true of his tendency to ‘allow’ the State to carry out its policies without interference from the Church, whereby he quietly legitimises inhuman policies. Examples of this are when Schlatter makes light of the fact that Jewish students were not allowed to study, and that Jewish officials and clergy were barred from their work. In this Schlatter stood closer to the National Socialists than other Confessing Church theologians.

The table below attempts to grasp the various facets of Schlatter’s relationship to the Jews and the State. The left column shows different stances to the political system, and the top row shows different positions to Jews and Judaism:

Political attitude	Anti-Judaism	Escha-tological role of Israel	Defence of Jewish Christians	Cultural Anti-Semitism	Racial Anti-Semitism	Anti-racist Anti-Semitism
Pro NSDAP state						
Anti NSDAP state	•	•	Weak/no	•		•
Pro State mandate	•	•	Weak/no	•		•
Anti State mandate						

The table shows the range of possible positions during National Socialism, and then indicates Schlatter's positions. In reality, attitudes are even more complex, of course, and would best be described on a continuum. In other words: one can support the State mandate as divinely legitimised without being ideologically pro-National Socialist; one can oppose things National Socialist without denying the divine mandate of its Führer; one can believe in an eschatological restoration of Israel, yet strongly oppose Jews in the present and represent a fierce anti-Judaism. Schlatter is able to link anti-Judaism to a cultural anti-Semitism, regarding Jews as having certain essential, negative characteristics, and still resist racist and biological anti-Semitism. He seems to accommodate all these aspects in his system: a salvation-historical view on the Jews, a strong and essentialist criticism of Judaism and Jews, a loyalty to the State, even its social policy, resistance to racial anti-Semitism, and a criticism of National Socialist ideological positions, while he subordinates himself to the State and Führer. Although it is possible that he changed regarding the Aryan paragraph in 1936, that is fairly late. In sum, his being anti-NSDAP does not imply that he was against all its policies regarding Jews and Judaism.

It is impossible to say to what extent Schlatter's writings worked to legitimise or delegitimise policies against Jews and Judaism. McNutt graphically describes his influence and its possible effect in contemporary Germany:

if thousands of pastors over multiple generations were trained at his feet, through the milieu of lectures, biblical commentaries, devotional literature, and essays, Schlatter provided a potentially inspirational source and justification for thousands of readers to regard the Jews as spiritually dangerous and absent of repentance.³¹⁰

Firstly, the general legitimation of the State and its Führer also legitimised the anti-Jewish policies. Together with the other Tübingen theologians, Schlatter expressed support of the new National Socialist leadership. In the initial phase of the 'new Germany', the *Tübinger Sätze* effectively legitimised the policies of the new regime, and Schlatter repeats similar positions in other documents. Secondly, in the texts discussed here, Schlatter explicitly refused to take issue with the Aryan

³¹⁰ McNutt, "Vessels of Wrath, Prepared to Perish. Adolf Schlatter and the Spiritual Extermination of the Jews", 179.

paragraph, which was one of the Church's greatest confessional issues during National Socialism, and he also suggested that policies regarding this should not be opposed. Moreover, his involvement contributed to the disarming of the "Bethel Confession", averting a protest against discrimination. Schlatter's comments on the draft of the Confession prioritise unity with the SA man and Deutsche Christen over the Jewish Christians. Since Schlatter referred to obligations to the State as divine regulations, breaking them "makes us adversaries of God and closes the access to Christ".³¹¹ Schlatter's adoption of the new regime's concepts and terminology also gave them legitimacy, e.g. in "The New German Kind in the Church". This is true even though he also draws the line at biological racism. Thirdly, one must ask what role his theological anti-Judaism had in legitimising anti-Semitism. Statements such as "the Jews crucified Jesus", Jesus is Judaism's fiercest opponent, Jews represent sin, degeneration and stubborn resistance to God's will, the 'Jew' is a 'Wandering Jew' with no German home, as well as other essentialist notions, underline that Jews are doomed to their current rootlessness in Germany. Fourthly, *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*² makes Jews the authors of a conspiracy against the heart of Christian Germany. Fifthly, when Grundmann states that from a theological point of view Schlatter paved the way for them to National Socialism, he might also be referring to the views described above.³¹²

Thus, despite his criticism of things National Socialist and neo-pagan, Schlatter indirectly and directly legitimises oppression of Jews. It is beyond our power to judge whether he understood it or not, but this study of the texts makes it difficult to reach another conclusion. The Confessing Church more often than not took issue with the State over the freedom of the Church to have Jewish-Christian clergy, to teach non-Aryan Christian school children Christianity, etc.³¹³ Its guilt lay in that most of its representatives took issue with the State on the Jewish-Christian question, but not on the social situation of the Jews. Schlatter gives even less support to the Jews, prioritising the advancement into the 'new Germany' above his Jewish-Christian brethren. In this, Schlatter stands to the right of the Confessing Church at large.³¹⁴

³¹¹ Strohm, *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, 215.

³¹² Deutsche Frömmigkeit 8, 1937, 11. See also page 539 note 34.

³¹³ For this, see the excellent presentation, Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekenkende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*.

³¹⁴ This is also supported by Schlatter's surprisingly positive view of the twenty-eight theses of the Deutsche Christen.

PART III
THE FORM CRITICS AND THE JEWS

INTRODUCTION

If theological outlook was the common denominator of the aforementioned groups of scholars, the form critics are united by methodology. Born immediately after the First World War, this school's main proponents would develop their ideas about Jews—as well as their sociopolitical questions at large—against the backdrop of Weimar and National Socialist ideologies and politics. While the History of Religions school and Enlightenment theology had been dominant players in New Testament scholarship in Germany prior to the First World War, the war brought a decisive change of perspectives. According to Kümmel, the catastrophe meant the end of cultural optimism and faith in rational thinking.¹ To some extent, this also affected the historicist outlook; having failed to provide hope in the midst of crisis, New Testament scholarship returned to theological questions. However, this does not mean that everything changed—Rudolf Bultmann, for example, contended that the war had not changed his theology,² and the continuity between his New Testament historiography and that of earlier members of the History of Religions school is evident.

Form criticism became the dominant school in post-war New Testament scholarship, and in this section I will discuss how its most prominent representatives related to Jews and Judaism. Although other scholars were involved in the form critical debate (e.g. Martin Albertz), the leading trio became Karl Ludwig Schmidt (1891–1956) for his literary groundwork, Martin Dibelius (1883–1947) for his sociohistorical analysis and study of the *Sitz im Leben* of different literary forms, and Rudolf Bultmann (1884–1976), who revolutionised Gospel research through his classification of the forms.

Since form criticism was not a theological school, a unified picture of Jews and Judaism is not to be expected. However, Schmidt, Dibelius and Bultmann, being among the leading exegetes of their day, certainly influenced their students and readers, and the analyses of their writings, together with the discussions of Schlatter, Gerhard Kittel and

¹ Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament*, 417.

² *Ibid.*, 559 n. 378.

Grundmann, give a good picture of exegesis and the Jews during the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. What is more, in various ways all three scholars were involved in the debate regarding Jews and Judaism, in addition to being noted critics of the racist policies of National Socialism. The latter will be examined in the following three analyses.

KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT:
A CHOSEN PEOPLE AND A 'JEWISH PROBLEM'

Karl Ludwig Schmidt was one of few exegetes who addressed the 'Jewish problem' (*die Judenfrage*) in a book,³ written at the end of the Nazi rule. However, Schmidt is primarily known as the scholar who pioneered form criticism with his *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesus* in 1919, at which time he was a professor in Berlin. In this book, he asks about the setting, in place and time, of the gospel stories, introducing the idea that although the sayings of Jesus are often similar in the Gospels, the framework stories were not originally connected with the sayings. The authors of the Gospels were frequently unaware of the historical background to the sayings, Schmidt finding the chronological information particularly problematic.⁴ Instead, he seizes upon the idea—which had won increasing acceptance in the preceding years—that the context of the sayings was the cult,⁵ and his programme thus becomes an analysis of the chronological and topographic reports in the Gospels.⁶ Schmidt's general theological position contained several facets. His teacher Adolf von Harnack influenced his theological direction throughout his life,⁷ as did Adolf Deissmann, who also testifies to his nationalist zeal when volunteering as a soldier in Russia during the First World War.⁸ During his time in Giessen (1921–1925), Schmidt met Karl Barth and was influenced by his dialectical theology,⁹ although he would always stress the need of historical-critical exegesis to balance the dogmatic Christological emphasis of his friend and colleague Barth.

³ Others were Kittel, "Die Judenfrage" and Karl Georg Kuhn, *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem*, Schriften des Reichsinstitutes für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939), both supportive of National Socialist politics.

⁴ Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919), 1–9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vi.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 13, 17.

⁷ Andreas Mühlhling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "Und Wissenschaft ist Leben"*, ed. Christoph Marksches, Joachim Mehlhausen, and Gerhard Müller, vol. 66, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 12.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 48.

Schmidt was not only a New Testament scholar, however. The other focal point of his work was his editorship of the *Theologische Blätter*, through which he actively participated in the German debate. Considering political involvement important, he criticised Barth for “retreating into theology”.¹⁰ Schmidt himself, for many years politically active in the Deutsche Demokratische Partei and later in the SPD, openly opposed the Nazi regime, not least through numerous articles in *Theologische Blätter*, until he was forced to leave the editorship in 1935.¹¹ On 14 January 1933, two weeks before Hitler’s appointment as Reichskanzler on 30 January, he met the Jewish scholar Martin Buber in a dialogue (*Zwiesgespräch*) at the Stuttgarter Jüdischen Lehrhaus—a conscious political act, which at this point in time was a radical step indeed.¹² Schmidt’s clear and public political stand against National Socialism led to his dismissal from the position of New Testament professor at Bonn in 1933,¹³ and his subsequent emigration to Switzerland in October 1933.¹⁴

Even so, Schmidt’s relationship to Judaism was a complicated matter throughout his life.¹⁵ On the one hand, he has a strong persuasion that Israel is still the chosen people of God;¹⁶ on the other hand, there is a latent anti-Semitism. His book on the ‘Jewish problem’ in Romans 9–11 (*Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*)—to which I will return in detail—is itself a testimony to these conflicting tendencies. Schlatter took a strong theological stand in favour of the salvation-historical place of the Jews, and he was in fact one of the earliest and strongest opponents of a racist or supersessionist view on the Jews;¹⁷ yet, at the same time, he was able to air prejudice against Jews.¹⁸ In two

¹⁰ Andreas Mühling, “‘Es hat diese Aussprache nun doch ihren Sinn’. Anmerkungen zu Karl Ludwig Schmidt und der Neutestamentler-Erklärung des Jahres 1933”, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 49, no. 1 (1993), 354–355.

¹¹ Marshall D. Johnson, “Power Politics and New Testament Scholarship in the National Socialist Period”, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23, no. 1 (1986), 21.

¹² Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. “Und Wissenschaft ist Leben”*, 135. See also Philipp Vielhauer, “Karl Ludwig Schmidt”, in *Neues Testament Judentum Kirche. Kleine Schriften*, ed. Gerhard Sauter, *Theologische Bücherei* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1981 (1968)), 32.

¹³ Johnson, “Power Politics and New Testament Scholarship in the National Socialist Period”, 21.

¹⁴ For Schmidt’s biography and political involvement, see Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. “Und Wissenschaft ist Leben”*. For the 1933 events, see his detailed account, 134–163.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁶ Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*, ed. Karl Barth, vol. 13, *Theologische Studien* (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1943), 47.

¹⁷ Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. “Und Wissenschaft ist Leben”*, 202.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 9.

letters to his co-editor of *Theologischen Blätter*, Hermann Strathmann, in 1936, he speaks of the young New Testament scholar Werner Georg Kümmel's Jewish descent in negative terms.¹⁹

Now the Swiss reformers are [...] most proud of their clever and intelligently speaking Kümmel (I think of his type as clearly Jewish, something I have to note from time to time, without therefore being an anti-Semite).²⁰

Before this, Schmidt notes that "Kümmel, who by the way falls under the Aryan paragraph, so that he never could have become a lecturer in Germany" had been called to a position in Zürich. Schmidt's note indicates that he is well aware of Kümmel's exclusion from German academic life, and still he expresses these negative and ironic thoughts about Kümmel being Jewish. Pointing out that he does not regard his view as anti-Semitic, Schmidt seems to understand that he is close to it. In modern thinking, the talk of Kümmel being a 'Jewish type' would probably be regarded as bordering on racism, but if Schmidt by 'anti-Semitic' means someone who supported the German racial legislation, that description did not apply to Schmidt. The comment could of course merely be expressing a negative personal attitude, but there is no mistaking the racial overtones. Later that year, in another letter from Schmidt to Strathmann, Schmidt returns to Kümmel's Jewishness:

Mr Kümmel – Zürich [...] is more and more turning out to be a young man who is quite intelligent, but not exactly particularly equipped with theological substance, whose Jewish descent, which does not always turn out well, must also be taken into account.²¹

Again Schmidt speaks pejoratively about Kümmel, and in even clearer racial terms: his Jewish descent has negative consequences and must be taken into account. It is with astonishment that Kümmel later comments that Schmidt, despite being a Social Democrat who had emigrated from

¹⁹ Ibid., 9.

²⁰ Letter from Schmidt to Hermann Strathmann, 24 June 1936, LKA Nürnberg, Personen XXVII (Strathmann) 2: "Nun sind die Schweizer Reformer [...] sehr stolz auf ihren flott und klug redenden Kümmel (ich empfinde seinen Typ als recht jüdisch, was ich öfters feststellen muß, ohne deshalb Anti-Semite zu sein)."

²¹ Letter from Schmidt to Hermann Strathmann, 3 October 1936, LKA Nürnberg, Personen XXVII (Strathmann) 2: "Herr Kümmel – Zürich, dem ich ja wohl etwas dringlich gekommen bin, entpuppt sich immer mehr als ein ganz gescheiter, aber gerade nicht mit theologischer Substanz sonderlich ausgestatteter Jüngling, dessen jüdische Abstammung, die eben nicht immer gut ausgeht, wohl auch zu verrechnen ist."

the National Socialist Germany, has “a purely racist National Socialist anti-Semitism, even if he denies it”.²²

Although Schmidt reveals a clearly prejudiced attitude towards Küm-mel here, these statements are included to exemplify attitudes to Jews by people in academic and theological circles, in this case a person with a high estimation of the Jews’ salvation-historical role. The following discussion suggests that Schmidt’s comments were based on a more generally prejudiced view of Jews.

Schmidt often addressed the political situation, as for example in his introductory lecture to the professoriate in Basel in 1936, *Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments* (“The Opposition between Church and State in the New Testament Church”),²³ although this speech has no immediate bearing on the Jews and Judaism.

Schmidt on New Testament Judaism

There is little material in Schmidt’s magnum opus *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* that can be used to trace his attitude to the Jews. In contrast to Bultmann in his *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Schmidt does not include any history of religions analysis as fundamental to the discussion, and only a few passages reveal his own views. Discussing the Canaanite woman (Mark 7:24–30), he says that it shows “Jesus himself as caught in particularistic views”, here agreeing with the long research tradition of using ‘particularism’ negatively when talking about Jews.²⁴ When dealing with Paul’s place in early Christianity, however, Schmidt does not agree with Bousset and Bultmann’s dichotomising of the Palestinian and Hellenistic church traditions, and would rather see a shift of emphasis between the theology of the two than a sheer contrast.²⁵

²² Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. “Und Wissenschaft ist Leben”*, 9, n. 24.

²³ Karl Ludwig Schmidt, “Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments”, in *Neues Testament Judentum Kirche. Kleine Schriften*, ed. Gerhard Sauter, *Theologische Bücherei* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1981 (1936)). That the discussion is related to the German political situation is evident from his remarks on Kittel and Stauffer, 191.

²⁴ Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*, 214.

²⁵ Schmidt, “Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments”, 139.

But he agrees that 'Hellenists' were more apt to receive the universalist content of the teaching of Jesus than were the Palestinian Jews.²⁶

Investigating the biblical terms for church and early ecclesiology in *Die Kirche des Urchristentums*, Schmidt distances himself from the sharp dichotomy between Palestinian and Gentile Christianity, found in a long tradition from Semler and Baur, through Heitmüller and Bousset.²⁷ Instead, Palestinian and Gentile Christianity agreed in their view of the church.²⁸ Schmidt also stresses the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, and has no problems with the Jewishness of Jesus.²⁹ Throughout these discussions, as a general rule Schmidt does not aim at denigrating Palestinian Judaism, as has often been the case in New Testament research tradition, but he puts the two on a par with each other and acknowledges that Palestinian Judaism had a leading role. In doing this, he stands out as different in a long tradition of scholars who caricatured Palestinian Judaism as narrow and legalistic.

Dialogue with Martin Buber on the Church, State, People and Judaism, 1933

The dialogue, prepared through a correspondence between Schmidt and Buber, was written down in shorthand and published in *Theologische Blätter*.³⁰ To understand the climate of the time, just the fact that a Jew and a Christian were at all pursuing dialogue made the event extraordinary. The kinds of argument seem typical of Schmidt's relation to the Jews, however: salvation-historical, racial and theological. I concentrate here on Schmidt's part of the dialogue.

²⁶ Ibid., 141.

²⁷ See above and Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus".

²⁸ Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "Die Kirche des Urchristentums. Eine lexikographische und biblisch-theologische Studie", in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, 7. November 1926, ed. Karl Ludwig Schmidt (Tübingen: J. C. B Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927), 310.

²⁹ Ibid., 274, 279.

³⁰ Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Martin Buber, "Kirche, Staat, Volk, Judentum. Zwiegespräch im Jüdischen Lehrhaus in Stuttgart am 14. Januar 1933", *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 9, September 1933 (1933). In Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*, 69 n. 46, Schmidt tells about the event and the stenography. The text with an introduction is published in Peter von der Osten-Sacken, ed. *Leben als Begegnung. Ein Jahrhundert Martin Buber (1878–1978). Vorträge und Aufsätze*, vol. 7, Veröffentlichungen aus dem Institut Kirche und Judentum (Berlin: Selbstverlag Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1978), 116–144.

Schmidt's overarching theological view on the Jews sees them as part of God's salvation plan—a view that he would develop further in his *Die Judenfrage*, published in 1943. Schmidt believes that the Jewish people have a special place in 'God's history', and that Israel's salvation-historical role is based on God's calling³¹ and God's covenant with his people.³² The Church, he argues, is dependent on Israel. A Church that does not want anything to do with Israel is an empty shell (*eine leere Hülse*), and the Church has much in common with Judaism as the "carnal Israel" (*fleischlichem Israel*).³³

To Schmidt, Israel is not an entity that is merely spiritual, but the Jews as a people have a place in God's plan for world history: "Martin Buber and I are agreed that world history, seen from the Bible, depends upon Israel,"³⁴ Schmidt says, even though he and Buber differ on how this is worked out. Schmidt by no means puts the Jews on a par with the Church, however. Even if Israel holds this key position, it is incomplete without Christ, and its future is interpreted in deterministic terms, Israel being "on its way to Church":

World history as God's history, salvation history must be understood from this caesura. The Church of Jesus Christ [...] sees Judaism not as fundamentally dangerous (*gefährlich*) from an ethnic or state perspective, since Israel with absolute necessity (*zwangsläufig*) is on its way to Church.³⁵

Schmidt holds that according to God's overarching plan, the Jews cannot but accept Jesus as the Messiah, because the only people of God is the Church, into which the Jews will be incorporated.³⁶ The Church as Israel cares for Jews and Gentiles alike.³⁷ Whereas the Israel of the Jews is "Israel not fulfilled", the Jew who becomes a Christian enters into the spiritual Israel, which is fulfilled.³⁸ So while Buber holds that the gates of God are open to all, and that neither Jew nor Christian needs to go through the other religion to get to God,³⁹ Schmidt sees only one way. Likewise, Judaism's claim of being the people of God

³¹ Schmidt and Buber, "Kirche, Staat, Volk, Judentum. Zwiegespräch im Jüdischen Lehrhaus in Stuttgart am 14. Januar 1933", 263.

³² *Ibid.*, 272.

³³ *Ibid.*, 264.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 271.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 263.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 264.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 263.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 264.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 274.

in an exclusive sense (*ausgezeichneten Sinne*) cannot be accepted by the Church.⁴⁰

Schmidt's openness to seeing Israel in 'God's history' does not mean that he thinks the Church and Israel agree. Instead, he submits that there is an 'Israel connectedness' and an 'Israel antagonism' that has been established by Jews and Christians.⁴¹ The more vital the Church, the sharper the confrontation with Israel. He notes that there is no conflict between liberal Jews and so-called liberal Christians, since both agree that Jesus was nothing but a pious Jewish human being,⁴² although he does believe that conflict would be unavoidable if the two parties took their positions at face value. Therefore, to Schmidt, the only fruitful question is whether or not the Jews had hardened themselves against the Messiah sent by God. Schmidt holds that Jesus of Nazareth himself fought against the then Jewish church for the true Church.⁴³ To him, "the fellowship with the Jews is only temporal. If the Church would be more Christian than she is, the controversy with Judaism would be sharper."⁴⁴ In the early days of the Church, there was such a conflict, the cross of Christ and the suffering body of Christ being a manifestation of it. World history with all its pain continued because Judaism did not enter the Church, Schmidt contends; had it done so, the end would already have come.⁴⁵ At this point, Schmidt makes clear that he sees no opportunity for dialogue between Christians and Jews, and he defends the mission of the Church to the Jews.⁴⁶ In other words, the place of the Jews in God's plan is only a future one and relates to the Jews accepting Jesus as the Messiah. Upon this, Jews and Gentiles will unite into one Church.

Discussing the supposed racial differences, while he repudiates a "frenetic, confused anti-Semitism" (*ein ungebändigter, wirrer Antisemitismus*), Schmidt does not radically reject the phenomenon. He strongly opposes German-Aryan racial ideology,⁴⁷ and the idea that Jesus is Aryan does not deserve any refutation. Still, Schmidt seems to operate out of a

⁴⁰ Ibid., 259.

⁴¹ Ibid., 264.

⁴² Ibid., 260.

⁴³ Ibid., 261.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 272.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 272.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 258.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 258.

basically racial thought, not refusing racial categories, but several times presupposing them instead:

Jews and Christians live together in the same state, forced together (*zusammengezwungen*) into a fellowship where Judaism not only differs confessionally as Mosaic synagogue from a Christian church, but also ethnically-racially from citizens of other ethnicity (*andersstämmig*). And the more the latter governs the whole situation, the less Christians feel themselves to be Christians, as a Church in the common state. Almost exclusively, the Jewish problem is treated as a racial problem.⁴⁸

Schmidt regrets this overemphasis on the racial dimension but seems to agree that the Jews living among the German people are non-Germans. Since the Jews make up only one per cent and Indo-Germans make up ninety-nine per cent, stressing the racial is not favourable to the Jews. He also argues that the 'Jewish problem' is not only a racial question, and treating it as such is to make light of it.⁴⁹ Only when the theological question of the place of the Jews is settled can the burning issues of today be dealt with and the decision be made whether to choose anti-Semitism, philo-Semitism or another position, socially, economically, politically and spiritually.⁵⁰ Here Schmidt wants to lift the 'Jewish problem' to a theological, spiritual level, without burying the racial questions:

It would be ostrich-like policy (*Vogel-Strauss-Politik*) to deny racial-biological and racial-hygienic questions, as they present themselves with Jews living among other peoples. The theologian must be on guard when the struggle against Judaism is fought on the basis of an ethnic and state ideology, through which Judaism is dissociated from the Israel of the old and new covenants, through which the struggle against Judaism becomes a struggle against the substance of the Church.⁵¹

Schmidt's concern is not whether or not there should be a struggle against Judaism, but that it should not be fought in the secular arena. Thus Schmidt does not reject racial categories altogether but wants to downplay their place. Ten years later, he would speak up much more clearly against racial anti-Semitism.

Seen as a whole, on the one hand, Schmidt's contribution to the dialogue reinforces that Judaism *as Israel*, that is, in its salvation-historical

⁴⁸ Ibid., 258.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 259.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 259.

⁵¹ Ibid., 264.

role, has a place in God's history and hence a role in world history. On the other hand, Schmidt comes across as rather harsh on the Jews, especially considering the context of the Jüdisches Lehrhaus, where this was uttered. Schmidt assumes racial categories, although he plays down their relevance for solving the 'Jewish problem', and he talks candidly about the theological struggle against Judaism. Thus Schmidt's position is ambiguous, indicating an ingrained racial thinking but also that he was more willing than most Christian leaders to interact with Jewish colleagues. What made it impossible for him to continue in Germany was his strong stand against National Socialism, not necessarily his view of the Jews, which acknowledges a 'Jewish problem'.

The Jewish Problem in the Light of Romans 9–11

The early days of Schmidt's exile involved continued editorial work and writing, but during his Swiss period, there were few books by his hand, partly due to ill health.⁵² In 1942 and 1943, however, Schmidt published a study on Galatians⁵³ and his booklet *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes* ("The Jewish Problem in the Light of Romans 9–11"). Compared to Schmidt's position in 1933, this book gives a deeper and sharper view of the salvation-historical and even world-historical relevance of the 'Jewish problem'. It also turned out to be a strong protest against anti-Semitic action against both Jews and Jewish Christians, although it still contains strains of racist views.

The 'Jewish problem' is in a very limited sense a political or historical question, but to Schmidt it is a question of the highest importance, being a question of God working out his historical plan:⁵⁴ "The question of God, the question of the future, the Jewish problem, are one and the same question," he exclaims rhetorically.⁵⁵ The persecution of Jews and Jewish Christians by the anti-Semites casts a glaring light on the 'Jewish problem'—although such a question always existed, according to Schmidt—and this ought to make Christians pull themselves together

⁵² Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "Und Wissenschaft ist Leben"*, 198–199.

⁵³ Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Ein Gang durch den Galaterbrief*, ed. Karl Barth, vol. 11/12, Theologische Studien (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1942).

⁵⁴ Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*, 49.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 37.

and take the 'Jewish problem' seriously.⁵⁶ Through this awakening of the Christians, Schmidt hopes that the light from Romans 9–11 may remove non-biblical, non-Christian and non-churchly anti-Semitism.⁵⁷ His perspective is quite different from that of e.g. Gerhard Kittel—which I will return to—in the book *Die Judenfrage*, where the 'Jewish problem' is 'serious' and needs to be seen 'religiously', but the theological argument is there to legitimise a racist political agenda.⁵⁸

To Schmidt, it is obvious that anti-Semitism must be rejected. Jewish and Gentile Christians belong to the same people of God and the same body of Christ. A recurrent example is Paul: he was not an apostate⁵⁹ but a Jewish Christian, who was always, even as a Christian, conscious of his connection to Judaism.⁶⁰ Schmidt's central thought is the role of Israel in God's plan. In this discussion, more than in his dialogue with Buber in 1933, he states that there is an identity between the Jews and Israel, although he reserves the expression 'Israel of God' (Gal. 6:16) for the Church of Jesus Christ, consisting of Jews and Gentiles alike.⁶¹ 'Israel' is a term of dignity, and Schmidt talks of 'Israel dignity' (*Israel-Würde*); Paul never took that away from the Jews, not even the hardened or unfaithful Jews!⁶² Siding against Karl Barth,⁶³ Schmidt does not regard Israel as being identical with the Church, stressing two verses that speak of the unique place of the Jews: Rom. 11:18, "the root [the Jews] supports you [the Gentile Christians]", and John 4:22, "salvation comes from the Jews".⁶⁴ The promise in Rom. 11:26 that "all Israel will be saved" is the peak of Paul's "response to the Jewish problem".⁶⁵ This means, Schmidt contends, that all of Israel—hardened, assimilated, Zionists—will be converted.⁶⁶ Israel's role, in the sense of the role of Judaism (*fleischliche Israel*), in God's history is a permanent

⁵⁶ Ibid., 49.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 49.

⁵⁸ Bauernfeind, "ἀρετή", in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), 7–9.

⁵⁹ Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*, 37, 48.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 4.

⁶¹ Ibid., 10–11.

⁶² Ibid., 10, 11, 27; Israel a title of dignity, 12.

⁶³ Ibid., 67 n. 40.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 5. For the latter, he criticises Bultmann's suggestion that this is a gloss, 66 n. 40, commenting on Bultmann's then fresh commentary on John, Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 10 ed., vol. Zweite Abteilung, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1941), 139.

⁶⁵ Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*, 5.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 31, 34 f.

one with a lasting importance,⁶⁷ but its divine appointment means both dignity and responsibility (*Würde und Bürde*). Israel and the Church belong together especially in the eschatological perspective, and there needs to be a solidarity between them.⁶⁸

However, even in this book, Schmidt combines an anti-anti-Semitic agenda and a salvation-historical view of the key importance of Israel with racist thoughts. His rejection of a racist anti-Semitism that persecutes the Jews is fundamental to the book; *völkisch* racial thinking is far from a man such as Paul, Schmidt says.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, Mühling is correct in that Schmidt is ambivalent in his relationship to the Jews: on the one hand, he accommodates a high salvation-historical estimation of the Jews as Israel; on the other hand, his private (see above) and scholarly communications contain views that verge on what Mühling calls "'racial' anti-Semitism".⁷⁰ More lenient towards the Jews in this book than in some formulations from 1933, he still accepts racial categories. He writes, "From a racial point of view, [Judaism] stands next to the Greek"⁷¹ and admits to "grave depravation" among present-day Judaism.⁷² Yet Schmidt has a general agenda: to downplay a racial view of the Jews and emphasise both social and religious elements.⁷³ Schmidt exemplifies this:

[...] the Jewish peculiarities that we all to various degrees know and often do not like, and which we do not need to like; peculiarities in the soulish, but also bodily, structure of our Jewish fellow beings, whether they belong to the synagogue or not. Our fellow Christians from Israel, the so-called Jewish Christians, may also have something to do with the Semitic race, which in any case the forefathers of Israel as well as the Arabs should be included in, but [they may] also in certain circumstances have nothing to do with this racial basis, when this is demonstrably not there. These *Jewish peculiarities* have something, yes, very much, to do with the Jewish Talmud and ghetto, the peculiar (*besonderen*) institutions that have shaped the Jewish human being in an excellently positive but also negative way.⁷⁴

⁶⁷ Ibid., 13, 41, 48.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 35.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 13.

⁷⁰ Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "Und Wissenschaft ist Leben"*, 8–9.

⁷¹ Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*, 8.

⁷² Ibid., 43.

⁷³ See *ibid.*, 55 n. 24.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 15–16.

This passage is complex. On the one hand, Schmidt advocates the view that the ‘peculiarities’ of the Jews are conditioned by environment rather than by biological factors. Schmidt reflects on his *Frankfurter* upbringing: some of his Jewish acquaintances and friends are reminiscent of Arabs, but most are reminiscent of the Polish masses of Jews, and he believes that in the study of races one becomes quite unsure of the descent of the ethnically varied Eastern Mediterraneans.⁷⁵ The analysis of racial mixing that follows is one that Schmidt shares with contemporary racial research on the Jews, with which he is very familiar.⁷⁶ However, he attacks an anti-Semitism that claims that the Jews, due to the mixing with other peoples, have negative traits that people of pure race do not have. Schmidt actually ridicules those who cherish the racial pedigree of the Germans, saying that their breed, mixed with Celtic and Slavic elements, is less Germanic than e.g. Norwegian or Swedish!⁷⁷ There are Jewish characteristics that we encounter, Schmidt admits, but the Jewish peculiarity is caused by something else.⁷⁸ Still, Schmidt believes that there *are* problems in the relationship between Jewish Christians and the Church, and Jewish Christians tend to minimise people’s [in Schmidt’s view rightful, A.G.] racial apprehensions.⁷⁹ Here Schmidt takes a middle way. He does not accept the National Socialist biological racism, with its speculations about racial mixing, nor *völkisch* ideas, but he does not break with a racist depreciation of Jews either. To Schmidt, Jews are still peculiar and different, not because of blood, but because the culture of the ghettos and Talmud brought it about. The combination of attitudes comes close to Schlatter’s, but Schmidt is much stronger in his outright rejection of political anti-Semitism.

By way of conclusion, Schmidt’s position to carnal Israel developed between 1933 and 1943. Stronger than before, he now stresses the role of Israel in God’s history, strongly opposing the political and theological agendas that discriminate against the Jews. At the same time, he keeps to—and shows interest in the research of—the basic racial analysis of

⁷⁵ Ibid., 16.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 16 and 52, note 15. Schmidt says that he—critically, but appreciative of the expert knowledge contained—has studied the six volumes produced by the Jewish racial investigation enterprise *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, in which Kittel played no unimportant role.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 17.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 17.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 23.

the day. Here it is evident that Schmidt accommodates both a high estimation of the place of the Jews and racial prejudice against Jews.

Conclusion

Schmidt's theological production does not include many *characterisations* of Jews, although, apart from the theological argument, he does refer to Jewish racial peculiarities in his booklet on the 'Jewish problem'. While Schmidt sides with a rather broad research tradition in that he uses Jewish particularism negatively, he insists that the Jewish people have a special place in 'God's history' and makes a strong stand for Israel's eternal role, which is related to physical Israel and not only a suprahistorical entity. At the same time, he talks candidly about the struggle against Judaism. These views are not unlike those of Schlatter, even if Schmidt does more to defend contemporary Judaism.

Although he does not major on it, Schmidt agrees with the dominant Hebrew-Hellenistic *historiography*, where 'Hellenists' were more apt than the Palestinian Jews to receive the universalist content of Jesus' teaching. However, he does not denigrate Palestinian Jews, but generally puts them on a par with Gentiles and even retains a leadership role for Palestinian-Jewish Christianity. Israel has an eschatological function, and Judaism even has a key role in world history, Schmidt argues. The place of the Jews in God's future plans is related to their accepting Jesus as the Messiah—if the Jews had joined the Church, the end would already have come. But to Schmidt the future is clear: all of Israel—hardened, assimilated, Zionists—will be converted.

Schmidt repeatedly emphasises the *continuity* between Judaism and Christianity. Thus, by putting Palestinian and Gentile Christianity on the same level, he disagrees with Bousset and Bultmann's dichotomising of the Palestinian and Hellenistic church traditions. Instead, he stresses the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, and maintains that Jesus is Jewish—anything else is not even worth considering. Israel's salvation-historical role begins with God's calling and in God's covenant with his people, and the Church is dependent on Israel: "A Church that does not want to have anything to do with Israel is an empty shell." There must be a solidarity between Israel and Church, both existing parallel to each other—compare Schlatter, where the Church seems to eliminate Judaism for a time, but Judaism also wants to eliminate the Church. The continuity with temporal Judaism, however, is quite a different matter:

the more vital the Church, the sharper the confrontation with Israel, Schmidt argues, believing that Jesus himself fought against the Jewish fellowship and for the true Church! The model he uses to accommodate the two perspectives of salvation-historical Israel and contemporary Israel is similar to Schlatter's, but Schmidt has a much friendlier tone when talking of Jews and Judaism.

The overarching theological perspective in Schmidt's *symbolic world* is emphatically salvation-historical, with a focus on conversion. Influences from the Enlightenment research tradition are negligible. Schmidt's association in other matters with Karl Barth is perhaps not seen here, where he deviates from Barth's view of the future Israel. Nor is there any trace in these texts of his national zeal for Germany; rather, he takes a clear stand against the new policy. Schmidt's theology contains a clear tension between the 'symbolic Jew' and 'real Jews'. Physical Judaism has a constant role in God's plan, and high ideas of a future role in God's divine plan are attached to the 'symbolic Jew', even though Judaism as a faith is an opponent of Christianity. Nevertheless, this view of the 'symbolic Jew' does not stop Schmidt from speaking in a pejorative and prejudiced manner about Jews in general and his colleague Kümmel in particular.

Karl Ludwig Schmidt's role in the *legitimation* or delegitimation of Jews and Judaism is contradictory: there is an open and clear stand against anti-Semitism combined with a salvation-historical inclusion of the Jews as key, even to world history, at the same time as a streak of racial prejudice runs through his thought. In view of the time—January 1933—Schmidt made an important political statement when he invited Martin Buber to a dialogue, and together with his early and fearless stand against the National Socialist rule, Schmidt's position differs from that of most contemporary colleagues. Although his insistence on the role of Jews and Judaism in God's salvation plan also seems to legitimise the place of Jews and Judaism in German and European history, the total picture is full of contradictions. His prejudice against Jews is documented in his theological and private discourse, even if the dialogue with Buber was a positive initiative, his message at the meeting included thoughts that may have reinforced the racial ideology in Germany. Then again, Schmidt is ideologically opposed to anti-Semitism, in the 1940s taking a strong stand against anti-Semitism that is built on a racial analysis where Judaism is regarded as a race of lower standing. In today's terms, some of his statements would nevertheless be categorised as racist and anti-Semitic, since he classifies Jews as negative

simply because they are Jews. But because his stand is rather against the biological anti-Semitism that discriminates against Jews due to their blood, or 'blood mixing', Schmidt's racist views could be called 'cultural anti-Semitism'. Moreover, Schmidt agrees that Gentile Christians have apprehensions about Jewish Christians. In this ambiguous picture, we see a product of the time, a person who simultaneously harbours elevated ideas of the place of the Jews in God's salvation history and expresses overtly racist thoughts regarding Jews.

MARTIN DIBELIUS: AMBIVALENCE TO JEWS AND JUDAISM

Martin Dibelius (1883–1947) was a pathbreaking scholar. With two doctorates from Germany and an honorary doctorate from St Andrews in Scotland, he was held in great esteem both in and outside Germany,¹ being active internationally even during the National Socialist era.² Like Schmidt, Dibelius was spurred to historical study by Adolf von Harnack,³ and was influenced by—though not uncritical of—the History of Religions school, especially Gunkel and Reitzenstein.⁴ And like Schmidt, he trained under Adolf Deissmann, where he received the impetus to study the history of early Christian literature.⁵ It was this interest that led to Dibelius’s main scholarly achievement, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*.⁶

As many of the exegetes discussed above, Dibelius was politically active. Although his cherished teacher Harnack also inspired political commitments, the foundation was laid by Dibelius’s father.⁷ In his circles,

¹ For a description of Dibelius’s position in Heidelberg, see Wolfgang U. Eckart, Volker Sellin, and Eike Wolgast, eds., *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus* (Heidelberg: Springer, 2006), 174.

² A biography is now available, Stefan Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld. Studien zu Martin Dibelius*, ed. Theodor Ahrens, et al., vol. 20, *Hamburger Theologische Studien* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2001), and the edition Martin Dibelius, *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm Graf* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), includes a biographical essay, Graf, “Nachwort des Herausgebers”.

³ Martin Dibelius, “Zeit und Arbeit”, in *Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, ed. Erich Stange (Leipzig: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1929), 9; Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 4.

⁴ Dibelius, “Zeit und Arbeit”, 12–17. See also Karl-Heinz Fix, *Universitätstheologie und Politik. Die Heidelberger theologische Fakultät in der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Hermann Jakobs, et al., vol. N.F. 7, *Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1994), 93 and Graf, “Nachwort des Herausgebers”, 52–53.

⁵ Dibelius, “Zeit und Arbeit”, 22.

⁶ Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 2 ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933). For Dibelius’s bibliography, see Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 310–345.

⁷ Matthias Wolfes, “Schuld und Verantwortung. Die Auseinandersetzung des Heidelberger Theologen Martin Dibelius mit dem Dritten Reich”, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 111, no. 2 (2000), 189; Dibelius, “Zeit und Arbeit”, 26.

it was common to think *großdeutsch* ('great German'),⁸ making it natural for Dibelius to join the nationalistic Verein deutscher Studenten. This involvement gave Dibelius lifelong contacts with people with future political influence.⁹ As many others, Dibelius had a short period in the circles of the leading anti-Semitic figure Adolf Stoecker. Brought there through a strong interest in social problems,¹⁰ he found Stoecker's 'patriarchalism' a hindrance. But even though the students' association was tainted by anti-Semitism, Dibelius's 1929 presentation of his life makes no mention of anti-Semitism as the reason for leaving the association. Instead, he does this in his *Lebensbeschreibung* from 1946:

As a student, I went straight through the Verein deutscher Studenten and there made the personal acquaintance of some politicians-to-be. Later I freed myself from the union, since I came into open conflict with the anti-Semitism that they devoted themselves to there.¹¹

In this post-Holocaust statement, Dibelius stresses his anti-anti-Semitic stance on several occasions, as well as his acquaintance with Jews.¹² In 1903, he joined Naumann's Nationalsozialer Verein, attracted by his combination of national and social thinking.¹³ Dibelius compares the vital role that Naumann played in his life to that of Harnack.¹⁴ After a period in the German Democratic Party (DDP), from 1919 onwards, he left this group in 1930, partly because of its cooperation with the Deutsche Staatspartei, which included anti-Semitic groups.¹⁵ In 1919, together with Max Weber and others, Dibelius pleaded for an end to the defamation of Jews for the sake of peace within the nation and Germany's international reputation.¹⁶

⁸ The 'great Germans' figured a united Germany containing all the peoples with "German language and culture", that is, today's Germany plus the German parts of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, whereas the 'small Germans' envisioned a northern German, Protestant and Germanic country.

⁹ Dibelius, "Zeit und Arbeit", 26.

¹⁰ Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 5–6.

¹¹ Martin Dibelius, "Lebensbeschreibung", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 111, no. 2 (2000 (1946)), 207.

¹² Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 5; Wolfes, "Schuld und Verantwortung", 189. Geiser and Wolfes do not contrast the 1946 statement with the one from 1929. Dibelius, "Lebensbeschreibung", 205, 207.

¹³ Dibelius, "Lebensbeschreibung", 208; Dibelius, "Zeit und Arbeit", 28.

¹⁴ Dibelius, "Zeit und Arbeit", 28.

¹⁵ Graf, "Nachwort des Herausgebers", 61. For a description of Dibelius's political history, see Fix, *Universitätstheologie und Politik. Die Heidelberger theologische Fakultät in der Weimarer Republik*, 93–106.

¹⁶ Nowak, *Kulturprotestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik*, 7, 35 n. 5.

During the Nazi regime, Dibelius experienced the SA searching his house on several occasions.¹⁷ His passport was suspended in 1938,¹⁸ although he regained the favour of the authorities the following year. When abroad, Dibelius could also speak critically of the regime and the treatment of the Jews.¹⁹ In 1937 he travelled to Britain and the USA, lecturing successfully at several universities.²⁰ As a notable international scholar, Dibelius was appointed leader of the German group of exegetes who travelled to the first SNTS meeting,²¹ which was deemed valuable by the German authorities.²² The decision was taken at the highest possible level—even the Führer's deputy was informed—and would hardly have happened had the German authorities been unsure of his loyalty. The principal of Heidelberg University, for instance, had stated that “there was no doubt about the political reliability of Herr Professor Dibelius”.²³ The fact that Dibelius was regarded as reliable by the authorities at this time should not be neglected, even if the local National Socialist press and the *Landeskirche* would have liked to see him suspended on several occasions.²⁴ Despite notably being the only prominent German New Testament professor to not sign the statement against the racial laws, *Neues Testament und Rassenfrage*, in 1933, Dibelius did help Jewish citizens flee persecution and protested against the deportations in 1940.²⁵ In his *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen* from 1946,²⁶ he grieves over the crimes of the nation—something that I will return to later.²⁷ Among many other things, Dibelius notes that the persecution of the Jews had been legitimised by theologians long before National

¹⁷ Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 99; Eckart, Sellin, and Wolgast, *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, 60. In 1933–1934, Dibelius was attacked several times from circles close to the Deutsche Christen, see Eckart, Sellin, and Wolgast, 215.

¹⁸ Graf, “Nachwort des Herausgebers”, 62.

¹⁹ Eckart, Sellin, and Wolgast, *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, 207.

²⁰ Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 97. On the reception, see the Yale professor Carl Krachlin's foreword to Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon of the Mount* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940).

²¹ SNTS stands for Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, an association of New Testament scholars, formed in 1938 at Carey Hall, Birmingham.

²² Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 133–134.

²³ *Ibid.*, 133.

²⁴ Fix, *Universitätstheologie und Politik. Die Heidelberger theologische Fakultät in der Weimarer Republik*, 113; see also Graf, “Nachwort des Herausgebers”, 62.

²⁵ Graf, “Nachwort des Herausgebers”, 64–65.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 81.

²⁷ Dibelius, *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen*, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm Graf.

Socialism;²⁸ the fact that the Jews had been made into ideological outcasts was a precondition for the persecution.

As for Dibelius's political stance during the Nazi regime, some data are necessary to balance what is said above. It seems as though 1939, when Dibelius was entrusted with the leadership of the German SNTS delegation to England, is a turning point. In 1940, Dibelius participated in a propaganda project run by the Deutsche Institut für Außenpolitische Forschung, which published a series called *Das britische Reich in der Weltpolitik* ("The British Empire in World Politics"). This included thirty-six booklets, written on a variety of topics, such as England's propaganda of lies during the world war and today; England and freemasonry; and England—land without love. Dibelius's *Britisches Christentum und britische Weltmacht* ("British Christianity and British World Power") was the first theological book in the series.²⁹ It discusses history as well as modern characteristics of Britain, which is painted in dark colours.

The magnitude of the contradiction between thought and action in England is explained by a fault in the basic conception, by its *tremendously insular Puritan Old Testament illusion*, which rests on the placement of the English people and God's people on equal footing.³⁰

Even so, Dibelius contends, this nation acts in a non-Christian way.³¹ Little is said regarding Jews and Judaism, only that Gladstone opposed the opportunism of a liberal Jew [Disraeli, A.G.].³² In a later commentary on his scholarly work during the Nazi regime, Dibelius does not regret his text, but stresses that he wrote it so that nothing less reliable would be written about England, and that he succeeded in getting it off the press in unchanged form.³³ Geiser, in defence of Dibelius, discusses how to evaluate the existence and content of the book, arguing that it is not a libel and that, between the lines, there is disguised criticism of the German regime. Although it is true that it contained examples of real libels, Dibelius's argumentation is nevertheless strongly coloured by the existing German political attitude towards England, and when

²⁸ Ibid., 43.

²⁹ Martin Dibelius, *Britisches Christentum und britische Weltmacht*, vol. 36, *Das Britische Reich in der Weltpolitik*. Schriften des Deutschen Instituts für Außenpolitische Forschung (Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1940).

³⁰ Ibid., 43.

³¹ Ibid., 43, 45.

³² Ibid., 58.

³³ Dibelius quoted in Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 160.

comparing the English and the Germans, the latter are superior in character.³⁴ No doubt Dibelius played into the hands of the National Socialist authorities through this publication.³⁵

Dibelius also gave speeches and wrote articles with the same content, although in one lecture, he dared to say that the Lutheran doctrine of the two regiments had worked negatively in the case of Germany, giving the State a license to do whatever it wished.³⁶ Nevertheless, the aforementioned work would later be sharply criticised as “a biased book of the worst kind”.³⁷ After the Second World War, Dibelius became chairman of the committee for the reconstruction of Heidelberg University, thanks to his favour with the Allied forces.³⁸ However, as will be demonstrated, publications between 1939 and 1943 indicate that the book on England was not his only compliance with the National Socialist regime or its racist policies.

The Jews in Dibelius's Exegetical Production

Dibelius's exegetical treatment of the Jews and Israel in his main book, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, is sparse.³⁹ He mentions the Jewish background to the Gospels as a matter of fact, and uses it as one explanatory model for the literary forms in the gospel. Discussing Paul and early Christianity, Dibelius contends that a Hellenistic Christianity had grown out of Jewish churches in the Diaspora, which was different from the Pauline churches and had not broken with Judaism.⁴⁰ Using Bousset's words, Dibelius calls this “unfettered Diaspora Judaism” (*entschränkte Diasporajudentum*). The churches that came out of this Judaism stressed the role of the Jewish people; salvation is limited to this people, Christianity is a fulfilled Judaism.⁴¹ When Dibelius talks

³⁴ Dibelius, *Britisches Christentum und britische Weltmacht*, 66.

³⁵ So also Eckart, Sellin, and Wolgast, *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, 208.

³⁶ Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 179.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 182–188.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 225.

³⁹ This is also true of Dibelius's long essay “Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind”, Martin Dibelius, “Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburts-geschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium”, in *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuch-handlung, 1932).

⁴⁰ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 26–27.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

about the death of Jesus and how the curtain of the temple was torn in two (Matt. 27:51), he says that "whereas the Jews only had scorn for the dying one, the holy place of the Jews testifies that something of vital importance happened here".⁴² This view on the Jews is schematic; instead of appreciating that it was not the Jews as a whole who scorned Jesus, Dibelius's comment is reminiscent of classic Christian polemic against Jews.

In 1925, Dibelius writes his *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum*.⁴³ His first mention of Judaism in the book is in the context of Judaism being influenced by Iranian religion during the Exile. After this, the outward cultic religion continued, at the same time as a popular piety developed, which was centred around the Law and synagogue. Politically rootless, and eventually left without the cultic centre in Jerusalem, it was still able to prevail. Since they were not bound to their country, the Jews became the people of obedience to the Law: homeless, doomed to a rootless existence as a people among the peoples, expelled from a professional life that generates value and forced into one that acts as an intermediary of value, and in religion cut off from the productive powers of "primitive piety" and left with one that merely tries to express the correct behaviour in different historical circumstances.⁴⁴ Here Dibelius reiterates ideas like those about the 'Wandering Jew' and the Diaspora experience of Judaism, which goes far beyond what happened during the Exile, and rather describes as a fact the situation of European Jewry in modern times.

However, to Dibelius there is also a continuity between Jewish prayer and the Lord's Prayer,⁴⁵ and there is no strong antagonism between Jesus and Judaism, for instance. Dibelius's *The Sermon on the Mount* adds little to the picture of the Jews,⁴⁶ but his books in Sammlung Göschel, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*,⁴⁷ discuss the various New Testament

⁴² Ibid., 196.

⁴³ Martin Dibelius, *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925).

⁴⁴ Ibid., 18–19. See also 99–100, on Judaism as a constant competitor and a type that Christianity defines itself in contrast to. However, the competition from Judaism is no dangerous threat.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 68–69.

⁴⁶ Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount*.

⁴⁷ Martin Dibelius, *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur I. Evangelien und Apokalypsen*, vol. 934, Sammlung Göschel (Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1926); Martin Dibelius, *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur II. Apostolisches und Nachapostolisches*, vol. 935, Sammlung Göschel (Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1926).

texts as well as some post-apostolic ones. In these books, the attitude towards Judaism in apostolic times is modest and informative. Even the section on John's gospel contains nothing that is negative towards Jews. Instead, Dibelius argues that Paul uses Jewish hermeneutics⁴⁸ and that there is a continuity between Jewish and Christian paraenesis,⁴⁹ as well as between Jewish and Christian prayer traditions.⁵⁰ Yet Dibelius sees only the Jewish people in Romans as the "first called, but then hardened people".⁵¹ In an article in *Der Jude* from 1926, on the theme "Man and God" (*Mensch und Gott*), although Dibelius admittedly states that Judaism and Christianity stand in absolute opposition, the common roots in Old Testament religion are emphasised, and on the whole Dibelius describes Judaism in its relation to Christianity respectfully.⁵² As I will show, his later descriptions of Judaism are considerably more negative.

Jesus—Dibelius's Bestseller

Dibelius perhaps most influential book, apart from his *Formgeschichte*, is the small book *Jesus* in Sammlung Göschen, published in 1939.⁵³ It is not unlike Bultmann's book with the same title, in that it presents Jesus in a contemporary exegetical perspective but in popular form. *Jesus* was probably Dibelius's largest print run. Giving an overview of the kingdom of God and the life and teaching of Jesus, on the whole, Judaism is presented in a neutral way. However, there are two passages that deserve special attention: the discussion on the racial background of Jesus in the section "People, land, descent" and the chapter called "The enemies", which speaks about the Jews.

According to Dibelius, it is important that Jesus was raised in and worked in Galilee. There the population was "strongly mixed, in no

⁴⁸ Dibelius, *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur II. Apostolisches und Nachapostolisches*, 12.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁵² Martin Dibelius, "Mensch und Gott", *Der Jude. Sonderheft "Judentum und Christentum"* 4 (1926).

⁵³ Martin Dibelius, *Jesus*, vol. 1130, Sammlung Göschen (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1939). The book was published in several editions: 2nd in 1947, 1949; 3rd revised by W. G. Kümmel in 1960, 1964.

way purely Jewish”,⁵⁴ Dibelius argues, noting that the question of Jesus’ origin is hotly debated in and outside Germany,

because behind it lies the problem of Jesus’ racial belonging, and because linked to this problem is the question of whether Christianity should be regarded as a product of the Jewish race and therefore be rejected by other races. Since Houston Steward Chamberlain’s famous book *Die Grundlagen des 19. Jahrhunderts* (1899), the question has never been laid to rest. The earnestness with which it is raised by the new *völkisch* consciousness, calls for a fundamental discussion.⁵⁵

To Dibelius, a Christian does not regard the words and works of Jesus as a message with the spirit of only one race or people. This means that relating to Christianity does not depend on Jesus’ *völkisch* origin, but on whether it is possible to hear and comprehend God in this setting. Moreover, Dibelius does not accept the argument that Jesus was not Jewish because his words and deeds have proven important to the West. No, Dibelius contends, the question of Jesus’ origin must be answered by means of thorough investigation, using historical evidence.⁵⁶

Obviously, Dibelius’s discussion is apologetic. He has noticed people in the *völkisch* movement turning against Christianity as something Jewish. Consequently, Dibelius conforms to the prevailing tendency of downplaying the Jewishness of Jesus, which we also see in Grundmann’s book on Jesus from the same time. Jesus is called the Son of David, but this is less a family designation than a common Messianic title, Dibelius argues, and the Church and Jesus’ family use this name more than Jesus, who seems to place little value in the designation. And even if he really was of Davidic descent, “that neither makes Jesus’ pure Jewish origin certain, nor excludes the Galilean pedigree”.⁵⁷ Although

⁵⁴ Ibid., 31.

⁵⁵ “[...] weil hinter ihr das Problem der Rassenzugehörigkeit Jesu steht, und weil sich mit diesem Problem die Frage verbindet, ob das Christentum als Erzeugnis der jüdischen Rasse anzusehen und darum von anderen Rassen abzulehnen sei. Seit Houston Steward Chamberlains berühmten Buch ‘Die Grundlagen des 19. Jahrhunderts’ (1899) ist diese Frage nie zur Ruhe gekommen. Der Ernst, mit dem sie von dem neuen völkischen Bewußtsein gestellt wird, verlangt eine grundsätzliche Überlegung,” Ibid., 32. For a background to the motif of Jesus as Galilean, see Roland Deines, “Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann”, in *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, ed. Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007), 45–85.

⁵⁶ Dibelius, *Jesus*, 33.

⁵⁷ “Aber auch wenn Jesus wirklich aus Davids Geschlecht gewesen sein und wenn Mark. 12:37 nichts gegen die Verwandtschaft mit David besagen wolle, so ist damit

Dibelius confirms that Jesus was from Galilee, due to the designation 'the Nazarene', even if his family would have been of Davidic origin, he writes:

if they had been living in Galilee for generations, *it is reasonable to doubt their pure Jewish nature*. A doubt—no more than that—and no complete certainty could be reached regarding the origin of the non-Jewish element in their family. The possibility of non-Jewish ancestry must be acknowledged—however, this is also all that thorough investigation of the tradition regarding Jesus' lineage can accomplish.⁵⁸

Here Dibelius opens the door to a non-Jewish pedigree of Jesus, an issue that had been hotly debated in the first decades of the twentieth century,⁵⁹ even though he does not speculate about what descent Jesus might have. To the careful scholar Dibelius, this was as far as he could go, and in fact he more complies with the racially motivated ideas of his time than develops a scholarly argument. Anything can be doubted, so why doubt the Jewish pedigree of Jesus precisely in Germany in 1939?

Dibelius continues that Jesus nonetheless counted himself as belonging to the Jewish 'church', but he does not want to identify Jesus too strongly with Judaism. His faith and message go beyond that religion, Dibelius says, and he preaches something that is greater than its cultic and legal disguise. This seems to be the main apologetic purpose: to show that Christianity is not all that Jewish and can retain its place in Germany.

Dibelius returns to racial terminology once more in the book, stating that although Jesus' audience had a Jewish faith and were members of the synagogue, "that they, however, were Jews of pure race (*rassereine Juden*) cannot be asserted in Galilee, as demonstrated".⁶⁰ Here a racial analysis has crept into the investigation of the great exegete.

weder Jesu reine jüdische Abstammung gesichert, noch die Herkunft aus Galiläa ausgeschlossen." Ibid., 34.

⁵⁸ "[...] seit Generationen in Galiläa beheimatet gewesen sein, so wäre ein Zweifel an ihrer rein jüdischen Art erlaubt. Ein Zweifel—nicht mehr; und vollends wäre keine Gewißheit darüber zu erlangen, von welcher Herkunft dann der nichtjüdische Einschlag in ihrer Sippe gewesen sei. Die Möglichkeit nichtjüdischer Ahnen muß anerkannt werden—das ist aber auch alles, was gewissenhafte Prüfung der Überlieferung über die Herkunft Jesu ausmachen kann." Ibid., 34, my emphasis.

⁵⁹ Davies, "The Aryan Christ: A Motif in Christian Anti-Semitism". See also Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth*.

⁶⁰ Dibelius, *Jesus*, 50.

In the discussion above, Dibelius refers to H. S. Chamberlain's work, which was highly regarded in Germany. Thanks to Chamberlain, but also Friedrich Delitzsch (the son of Franz), who had argued for the influx of Aryan elements in Galilee,⁶¹ the debate on the racial origin of Jesus was ongoing, and Dibelius seeks to give an exegetical response. In doing so, he uncritically uses prevailing racial categories, even if he does not express that Jesus was Aryan and there is no reason to believe that he held this idea. Dibelius's arguments are thus not unlike those of outspoken National Socialist theologians, although these went further. The very year that Dibelius wrote his book, Emanuel Hirsch published his *Wesen des Christentums*, which included a discussion on the descent of Jesus, where he states that Jesus must be of non-Jewish blood.⁶² Walter Grundmann's book came out in 1940, with quite similar arguments on this point: it cannot be proven, but it is not impossible that Jesus had a non-Jewish pedigree due to the Galilean racial mixing.⁶³ Unlike Grundmann,⁶⁴ Dibelius takes care not to argue that Jesus is non-Jewish on the basis of his theology, and he is also more careful not to explicitly state *as a fact* that Jesus was non-Jewish. Nevertheless, when the leading exegete Martin Dibelius opens up for the possibility that Jesus was non-Jewish in a popular book, written to give the views of scholarship on one of the hottest exegetical issues, he plays into the hands of the racist theologians, and in effect race politics, rather than drawing a line between racist theology and scholarly exegesis. Even if his reasons are apologetic, i.e. countering those who criticise Christianity for racial

⁶¹ Friedrich Delitzsch, *Die große Täuschung. Fortgesetzte kritische Betrachtungen zum Alten Testament, vornehmlich den Prophetenschriften und Psalmen, nebst Schlußfolgerungen*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart und Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1921), 58–69; according to Chamberlain, due to the racially mixed population of Galilee, there is no reason to believe that Jesus was racially a Jew, Chamberlain, 210–220: “that Jesus did *not* belong to this [the Jewish race, A.G.] may be regarded as sure”, 219. Before that, e.g. Paul de Lagarde had depicted Jesus as non-Jewish.

⁶² Emanuel Hirsch, *Das Wesen des Christentums. Neu herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Arnulf von Scheliha*, ed. Hans Martin Müller, vol. 19, *Gesammelte Werke* (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2004 (1939)), 181–188. See also Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler*, 164.

⁶³ Walter Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben (Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1940). On racial ideas and Scripture, see Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races. Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600–2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); on the Aryan Christ, see 168–202; on Grundmann, Hitler and the Aryan Christ, see 50–51.

⁶⁴ I will return to Grundmann's argument below.

reasons, his exegesis could still be regarded as supportive of a racist theology—apologetics is the mother of many theological mistakes.

In his description of Judaism after Alexander the Great, Dibelius follows the research tradition of e.g. Wellhausen and Bousset, although he does not use the word ‘Late Judaism’. Between Alexander the Great and Jesus, the view of God “had narrowed enormously. The Lord of the people had become the party leader (*Parteioberhaupt*) of the legalists; the obedience to the one who governs history had become a widely ramified technique of piety,” Dibelius describes. The people no longer had an ear for the Lord. The choice of words is peculiar, but Charlotte Klein’s point that Dibelius is influenced by Nazi language here seems overstated;⁶⁵ *Parteioberhaupt* in this case is negative, which means that Dibelius is ironic, rather than fawning on the Nazis. The description of Judaism at the time of Jesus is stereotyped and in line with the Enlightenment research tradition.

Under the heading “The enemies” (*Die Feinde*) Dibelius discusses the relationship between Jesus and the Jews:

The message of Jesus kept within the framework of Judaism. And yet out of this Judaism grew an enmity towards him, which led to his death. However, with this death sentence, Judaism made a ruling for itself. For in the long run, it was not the Roman campaign that made it homeless, but the enmity of the Christians. The opposition between Jesus and the Jews had such consequences.⁶⁶

Here the Jews are described as the enemies of Jesus, and Jesus is depicted as opposing the Jews, a great breach existing between the two.⁶⁷ Moreover, the Jews rendered themselves homeless through their death sentence on Jesus. In other words, Dibelius makes the Jewish people responsible for the death sentence, although he later states that Pilate issued the sentence.⁶⁸ In effect, the Jews have themselves to blame for their homelessness and destiny. The heading “The enemies” works powerfully to establish the sharp dichotomy between Christians and Jews, which is a reality to Dibelius, even if he does not prove that there is such antagonism between Jews qua Jews and Christians.

⁶⁵ Klein, *Theologie und Anti-Judaismus*, 35–36.

⁶⁶ Dibelius, *Jesus*, 106.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 107.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 116.

The Jewish theme stays with Dibelius to the end of the book: "The story of Jesus determined in an instant the destiny of Judaism."⁶⁹ Even if Jesus and the Jews is only a subplot in the book, the relationship with Judaism is described in fateful terms. And instead of taking the opportunity to say that the opposition between Jesus/Christians and Judaism is an historical episode that both parties should regret, Dibelius seems to add fuel to an ongoing antagonism. In the same spirit as some contemporary exegetes, Dibelius paints the relationship between Jesus and Judaism in black and white, a point that Grundmann would carry to excess in his *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*.⁷⁰ However, in comparison with Grundmann's positions, Dibelius comes across as very moderate, even though the two topoi of the Galilean Jesus and the enmity between Jesus and Judaism are there. One point where Dibelius's insistence on the accurate use of sources forbids him to agree with some *völkisch* theologians, is the idea that Jesus' thinking made it unlikely that he was Jewish.⁷¹ In 1936, Dibelius also lectured on the theme "Paul (The separation [*Scheidung*] of Christianity from Judaism)".⁷²

Dibelius's treatment of Jews and Judaism must be read against the background of contemporary treatment of the Jews.⁷³ In his book on Jesus, he does not seem to attempt to draw a line between scholarship and political ideologies, and even if he does not express this, his statements about Jews and Judaism have a political bearing. The nationwide pogroms that took place on 9–10 November 1938, when many Jews were killed, synagogues were burnt down, and after which 20,000 Jews were deported, are part of the backdrop to this book. From this point, no one could be unaware of the dimensions that the war against Judaism had taken on. In Dibelius's Heidelberg, the synagogues were burnt down on 10 November, and 150 Jews were deported to Dachau.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ "An der Geschichte Jesu entschied sich eins das Schicksal des Judentums," *ibid.*, 126.

⁷⁰ Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*.

⁷¹ Dibelius, *Jesus*, 126; Martin Dibelius, "Christentum und Judentum", in *Heid.Hs.* 3814, II.K.3 (Heidelberg, 1945).

⁷² Eckart, Sellin, and Wolgast, *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, 235.

⁷³ Unfortunately, Geiser does not comment on the passages where Dibelius discusses the racial background of Jesus, even though the book is referred to in several other instances.

⁷⁴ *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. Heidelberg.

Wozu Theologie? (Why Theology?)

The last book that Dibelius wrote during National Socialism is *Wozu Theologie?* ("Why Theology?"). This should be seen as an apologia for theological scholarship under a regime that gave increasingly less space to university theology. In 1939, the vice chancellor Schmitthenner had considered it necessary to inquire about the future of the Heidelberg theological faculty at the Reichserziehungsministerium (Department of Education), arguing that the faculty and the National Socialist movement had a common interest in defending it.⁷⁵ In 1941, the same year that he wrote *Wozu Theologie?*, Dibelius invited colleagues from Würzburg to discuss "the future of our theological faculties and our conduct in case of emergency (*Ernstfall*)". This event and the book both express the need felt by a professor under threat of seeing his faculty closed down.⁷⁶

This perspective provides the key to Dibelius's discussion. In an unconventional introduction, Dibelius lets three non-theologians hold a conversation on theology, *Wozu noch Theologie?* ("Why still theology?"):⁷⁷ the young man, representing a Nazi perspective; his friend, representing a middle position, defending theology; and the old man, who is conservative, but critical of theology as science. It seems clear that Dibelius is closest to the friend's position,⁷⁸ which is unsympathetic towards the old man but wants to win the ear of the young man. The young man sees theology as knowledge of a "foreign faith" that contributes little to "the German person". But the friend argues that the theology rejected by the German mind (here represented by Goethe) was the unfruitful Middle Age theology, surmising that there is a more modern theology. When the young man wants to see a Germanised theology that does not seem to be found among theologians, the friend replies that Luther did much for a Germanisation of theology, and further contends that since theologians are suspected by the Church, they are more than mediators of tradition. The young man states that theology must let itself be measured against the framework of the new German life and

⁷⁵ Wolgast, *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, 73.

⁷⁶ So also *ibid.*, 73. The wording is taken from a letter to Hans Lietzmann on 7 October 1941, letter no. 1199, p. 1033 in Kurt Aland, ed. *Glanz und Niedergang der deutschen Universität. 50 Jahre deutscher Wissenschaftsgeschichte in Briefen an und von Hans Lietzmann (1892–1942)* (Berlin und New York: de Gruyter, 1979).

⁷⁷ Martin Dibelius, *Wozu Theologie? Von Arbeit und Aufgabe theologischer Wissenschaft* (Leipzig: Leopold Klotz Verlag/J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1941), 5–10.

⁷⁸ Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 26.

existence, and it must ask what services it can offer the people. The old man holds that theologians only accept the Bible as their standard. At this point, the friend—and, I believe, Dibelius—presents his solution: theology is to build on the Bible but fit into the present society. The friend ends by inviting the young man into theology, to see what it really is.⁷⁹

Dibelius wants to allow room for theology by making it relevant to the present situation. Again he discusses Judaism, first differentiating between the Israel of history and contemporary 'Ostjuden' (Eastern Jews), or European–American emancipatory Jews. In this way, he disconnects biblical Israel from two of the unpopular Jewish categories, playing the game of the Jews' enemies. The *völkisch* purity had disappeared long ago, Dibelius contends, and after the destruction of Jerusalem, Judaism pushed its way (*hineinstossen*) into the world.⁸⁰ It withdrew into itself, retired into its shell and made the Law the yardstick of life. The scribes' strict observance became the way of rabbinic Judaism, which has retained its peculiarity, according to Dibelius.⁸¹ Describing this development as strange and fatally unhealthy, he parallels it to a major theological change: the development from the religion of the Old Testament major prophets, which tells of a relationship between a great, merciful God and man, who is completely dependent on him and his forgiveness, to a religion where the relationship between God and man is one of reward and recompense, so that man can live a life that is sufficient before God.⁸² A relationship between God and *Volk* becomes a private religion, this new religion taking shape after the Exile, and even in some later Old Testament texts and the literature around the birth of Jesus:

This is the Judaism that Jesus fights (*bekämpft*), since it treats God as a man; this is the Judaism from which Paul separates himself and his churches, since God through the death of Christ has revealed that his leading of history does not equal the Jewish-human scheme.⁸³

Here Dibelius reiterates a traditional research tradition concerning Judaism, separating the religion before the Exile, which is valuable and

⁷⁹ Dibelius, *Wozu Theologie? Von Arbeit und Aufgabe theologischer Wissenschaft*, 10.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 33–34.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 34.

in fact equals Dibelius's own ideals, from postexilic Judaism. Only the latter is called Judaism, and here the word has nothing but negative connotations. The quarrel that Jesus has with Judaism is serious: he fights it! Dibelius's depiction of Jesus' relationship with Judaism was no doubt sharpened during the Nazi years, compared to his conciliatory and strictly scholarly views of the 1920s.

However, Dibelius also says that Germans need to take care not to fall into the "national Jewish consciousness of being the elect"; all peoples have a relationship to God.⁸⁴ He thus rejects a far-reaching *völkisch* theology, but at the same time caricatures Jewish thinking. Even the conversation contains the thought of *Eindeutschung* (Germanisation). Dibelius argues that theology needs to study three religions that are relevant to the emergence of Christianity: Persian religion, having influenced Judaism and therefore Christianity; late Greek religion; and Germanic religion. A Germanisation of religion can only be considered if one has an understanding of Nordic-German religion, Dibelius says.⁸⁵ It is clear that Dibelius's message is addressed to the National Socialist regime, and he mentions National Socialism several times. National Socialism was more apt than Christian social ethics to solve the social problems after the First World War, he reasons,⁸⁶ and the Nazis turned against "scholarship detached from life". Discussing Nazi politics of education, Dibelius recommends that scholarly education should "favour the scholarly discoveries that are according to the purposes" of the duty to the people, and the university should not live a separate life but be the highest level of the *völkisch* educational edifice.⁸⁷ Through these statements, Dibelius is definitely playing the game of the political power, but he has his reservations. Theology cannot fit into the *völkisch* education just like that, since Christianity points beyond one separate people. Asking about the place of theology within the *völkisch* university, Dibelius holds that out of theology that belongs to the National Socialist university grows an obligation to stand in the people and for the people, ready for service and sacrifice, "without which no *völkisch* standpoint is possible".⁸⁸ He argues that in the National Socialist Total State, it is no longer justifiable for theologians to be exempt from the

⁸⁴ Ibid., 72.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 47–48.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 45.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 68.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 69.

obligations that other academic positions are to obey, but at the same time, it is in the interest of a state that does not desire theologians to be alien to the *Volk*, to not let them be educated in a corner.⁸⁹ *Theology takes part, Dibelius contends, in the national struggle, investigating what it means that a Christian stands in orders such as family, people and race, and also spreading the ideas of these nature-given orders internationally, creating an understanding for the new Germany outside the country.*⁹⁰ Moreover, he argues that theology has fought a faulty Biblicism regarding Romans 13 and made way for a stronger loyalty to the own people and state, which is based on nature, rather than the cool (*kühl*) loyalty to Rome that Paul discusses. In this passage, it is evident that Dibelius puts the theological university under the authority of the National Socialist State, seeing the work of the university as a function of it. Naturally, this also has a bearing on Jews and Judaism, since the system was thoroughly racist.

As a whole, Dibelius's book is important for understanding the context of the crisis of German theology in general and the Heidelberg faculty in particular. Dibelius does not entirely capitulate to the political pressure, in that he vindicates the need and place of both theology and the Church, and opposes a merely German Christian theology. But the pressure has led to a fairly extensive accommodation to the existing situation and ideology. Theologically, this is seen in his description of the Jews, which is basically a reiteration of research tradition, with its denigration of Second Temple Judaism. However, here it is expressed in a sharper tone, probably in order to show that theology *can* in fact adjust to contemporary views on Jews and Judaism, Jesus' battle with Judaism, etc. Here Dibelius is at home with concepts such as race, racial purity, *völkisch* ideology and theology, and natural orders as constitutive. There is no doubt that Dibelius's apology is directed at the young man, the National Socialist, and on several occasions he argues to demonstrate the readiness of theology to adjust to National Socialist demands. It is remarkable that this work by Dibelius with its overt compliance with the state, has not received more attention when painting the picture of Dibelius during the 'Third Reich'. Here university theology is largely made into an *ancilla politici*. Unfortunately Geiser fails to account for this aspect of Dibelius's book.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Ibid., 69.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 76, emphasis mine.

⁹¹ In his section on *Wozu Theologie?*, Geiser refers to none of these rather aggravating passages, overlooking the compliance with National Socialist interests. He does not

However, if this is politics, Dibelius's reservations are somewhat stronger regarding scholarly matters, i.e. hypotheses about Jesus and Judaism, and here Dibelius's pathos for sound scholarship is evident. In a review of several new books on Jesus and the Gospels that same year, 1941, he discusses Grundmann's Jesus book. Conceding to Grundmann's basic approach that Jesus was in radical opposition to Judaism, he nevertheless thinks that Grundmann goes too far, and he proceeds to refer to facts rather than the theological opposition between Judaism and Christianity. Dibelius cannot accept Grundmann's arguments for Jesus' non-Jewish descent.⁹² "What justifies doubts about the pure Jewish descent of Jesus is only the possibility that he stems from a Galilee inhabited by a mixed population," Dibelius writes, criticising Grundmann for not using purely historical evidence, although as already noted, Dibelius himself is on thin ice here and could have rejected this idea altogether. Further, Dibelius holds that Grundmann has turned the New Testament Jesus from "the speaker of God within a people that drags God down to itself", that is, a people that is proud enough to treat God as an equal, into "the enemy of the Jews in a contemporary sense".⁹³ This is not something that Dibelius can subscribe to. He adds, "However, the enmity towards Jews to which we are accustomed is against a people, rootless among the peoples, which despite being alien among the peoples asks to play an essential role." This kind of enmity cannot have been Jesus' position, however, since the Judaism that Jesus refers to is one that lives in its own country. At this point, Dibelius airs racist sentiments regarding contemporary Judaism but does not want to equate contemporary Jews with the Jews at the time of Jesus, deeming

state his reasons for not including these passages, which seem necessary for a proper evaluation of the book. Instead, he concludes, "In the end it must be emphasised that in the argumentative passages, there is no trace of an otherwise so widespread National Socialist language habitus" ("Es muß aber am Ende auch hervorgehoben werden, daß in den erörternden Teilen jeden Spur eines sonst so verbreiteten NS-Sprachhabitus fehlt"), 38. To this one might ask why Geiser has overlooked such passages where they do exist. Geiser fails to see where Dibelius complies with the National Socialist interests, see Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, 35, commenting on Dibelius, *Wozu Theologie? Von Arbeit und Aufgabe theologischer Wissenschaft*, 69, which he calls an "argumentative device". The comparison with the far rougher Grundmann does not take away the fact that Dibelius adjusts his view of theology to fit into the existing situation. A more correct description of Dibelius's standpoint in *Wozu Theologie?* is found in Graf, "Nachwort des Herausgebers", 665–668.

⁹² Martin Dibelius, "Neue Deutungen und Umdeutungen des Evangeliums", *Die Christliche Welt* 55 (1941), 5–6.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 6.

Grundmann's argument concerning them as anachronistic. The sum of Dibelius's criticism is that Grundmann is right when he says that Jesus opposed Judaism, but this does not mean that Jesus opposes contemporary Judaism; moreover, Grundmann's argument for Jesus being non-Jewish is invalid, although Dibelius accepts that there are doubts regarding his Jewish descent.

In his *Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert*, 1943, Dibelius touches upon the Jews but never in such a way that he discusses them.⁹⁴ It is difficult to ascertain exactly how Dibelius refers to the existing political situation, but the sum of his study is that Christians could be persecuted without becoming enemies of the state. This was due to a "fixed tradition", found for instance in Romans 13, which placed the Christians under an obligation to obey the powers that be.⁹⁵ It is unlikely that this can be read as mere theory, and in effect the study should probably be understood as support for the state order at the beginning of the war.⁹⁶

Dibelius on Judaism and Christianity after National Socialism

Only a few days after the American occupation of Heidelberg (30 March 1945), the Americans made Dibelius chairman of the group that would reopen the university. This was a result of Dibelius's American contacts, his high esteem in the Anglo-Saxon academic world and his prominent place within the university.⁹⁷ He played an important role in the early days of the reopened university, and was most active despite his tuberculosis, an illness that he had contracted by the time the war ended, and which led to his death on 11 November 1947.

Probably due to his role after the war, Dibelius was not subjected to interrogations about his wartime production. This is surprising given the texts analysed in the previous section. Moreover, it seems clear that Dibelius persisted in his negative evaluation of the Jews even after the war. Two texts describe Dibelius's standpoint: the first is a typescript

⁹⁴ Martin Dibelius, "Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert", in *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1943).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁹⁶ The year of the volume is 1941/42, which may mean that the paper was given in 1942 at the latest.

⁹⁷ Graf, "Nachwort des Herausgebers", 68.

for lectures to war-merited (*kriegsapprobierter*) medical students, held in September 1945, and the second is his *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen*, a text about the guilt of the German people, probably written in the first months of 1946.⁹⁸

The typescript used for the lectures contains four brief points for each lecture. The documents reveal that Dibelius held the same view of Judaism after the war as in his Jesus book, published in 1939; hence these views were not only formulated to please the regime, nor written under pressure. On 8 and 15 September 1945, Dibelius taught a group of medical students a course on Christianity and Judaism.⁹⁹ Here he treats the two as antagonistic systems. In the first lecture, he tells the story of how the old people of Israel became what we know as Judaism, from a nation to a stateless religion, even in Palestine. Here it seems as though Dibelius does not regard Israel as a nation after the Exile. The path goes from the Diaspora to the European Jewry of the Middle Ages, the ghetto, and then Jewish emancipation. Dibelius also defends Old Testament Israel against the National Socialist propaganda that there were “typical Jewish traits” in the Old Testament.¹⁰⁰ Dibelius thus has a positive attitude to old pre-exilic Israel and the Old Testament, but back in Palestine it develops its casuistry, and religion becomes mere technique. He then stresses that European Judaism stems from Diaspora Judaism and “is in every way something other than the old people of Israel”,¹⁰¹ as well as from the agrarian Palestinian Judaism. Diaspora Judaism is different from Palestinian Judaism “according to occupation, race, literacy”. It is interesting that Dibelius sees a racial difference; this is probably because he, along with Kittel, for instance, believes in a racial mixing in the Diaspora. In his dichotomy between Israel and Judaism, Dibelius falls back on a long tradition of disconnecting the two. Judaism has pervaded the old world of learning, connecting to it in a certain way, thus creating the preconditions for the “confrontation between Judaism and Christianity”.¹⁰² The outcome of this presentation is that Judaism is disconnected from Israel, and that this Judaism stands in opposition to Christianity.

⁹⁸ For the dating, see *ibid.*, 81.

⁹⁹ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3.

¹⁰⁰ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 1.

¹⁰¹ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 2.

¹⁰² Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 2.

As for the relationship of Judaism to Christianity, Dibelius again stresses the opposition between the two.¹⁰³ Jesus confronts Pharisaism, and the conflict is between Judaism as a legalistic religion on the one hand, and Christianity as a redemptive religion on the other. Written after the collapse of the racial state, Dibelius's interest in racial matters is indeed surprising. In his brief discussion, he deals with the racial descent of both Jesus and Paul:

Now, was Jesus himself a Jew? The famous intuitive proof—the speaker of the Sermon on the Mount could not be a Jew—has no scholarly power. There remains only the weak possibility that he descended from a Galilean family, and that all kinds of racial mixing had occurred in Galilee.¹⁰⁴

Again Dibelius holds the same position as in the 1939 edition of *Jesus*. He still talks in terms of what could be a non-Jewish descent, and instead of taking as clear a stand against the racial hypothesis as he had done with the intuitive proof—which would have been a sound scholarly position—he leaves the door open to the possibility of Jesus being non-Jewish. The same ambiguity goes for Paul: Barnabas and Paul are Diaspora Jews. Dibelius continues, “Neither can we say much about the racial descent of Paul; he descends from Tarsus in Cilicia, but according to later information from an originally Galilean family. If so, the question would stand as for Jesus.”¹⁰⁵ It seems as though Dibelius is keen to include doubt regarding the Jewish descent of the main figures in Christianity, Jesus and Paul. This makes sense, considering that Dibelius often stresses the deep disassociation between Judaism and Christianity. Finally, Dibelius mentions that the Jewish future is uncertain, since Judaism has undergone severe persecution.¹⁰⁶ But the gist of his presentation is that Judaism and Christianity are disconnected.

It is astonishing that an exegete on such a high international level as Martin Dibelius even after National Socialism persists in airing these

¹⁰³ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 3.

¹⁰⁴ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 3: “War Jesus nun selbst Jude? Der berühmte intuitive Beweis—der Redner der Bergpredigt könne nicht Jude sein—hat keine wissenschaftliche Kraft. Es bleibt nur die schwache Möglichkeit, dass er aus einer galiläischen Familie stammte und dass in Galiläa mancherlei Rassenmischung vorgekommen war.”

¹⁰⁵ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 4: “Auch bei Paulus lässt sich über die rassische Herkunft nicht viel sagen; er stammt aus Tarsus in Kilikien, aber nach einer späteren Nachricht aus einer ursprünglich galiläischen Familie. Dann stünde die Frage wie bei Jesus.”

¹⁰⁶ Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3, p. 4.

‘possibilities’ that neither Jesus nor Paul were full Jews, and that he still argues from a racial point of view. Dibelius must have been able to expose the racist dimension of Aryan theories about Jesus and Paul. He could simply have dismissed these hypotheses as highly improbable and by no means proven.

The picture of the Jews in Dibelius’s works changes considerably over time. In 1925, Judaism was no threat, and Dibelius sees a far-reaching continuity between Christian and Jewish, but in 1939, Judaism stands in sharp contrast to Christianity, just as in late 1945. This may in part reflect Dibelius’s adjustment to the changed political and scholarly atmosphere, but also that he, during and after National Socialism, has deep convictions about the opposition between Judaism and Christianity.

Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen (Self-Reflection of the German)

As already noted, Dibelius wrote a long essay reflecting on the historical reasons for Germany’s catastrophe during National Socialism. “Egregious things have happened,”¹⁰⁷ it begins, and then brings up various factors, predominantly political ones, that became a hotbed for the political development. As for Jews and anti-Semitism, Dibelius is not very detailed. He mentions the *Kristallnacht* and the deportation of Jews among other crimes,¹⁰⁸ undoubtedly condemning these things as crimes, but also stating:

The public discussion has more and more turned its attention to the crimes against the foreign peoples, the inhabitants of the occupied areas, led thereto by the Nuremberg indictments. However, one should never forget that numerous Germans also perished in the camps, that Germans also were tortured and executed.¹⁰⁹

Later in the text, however, Dibelius states that the crimes against the Jews were

the most terrible deeds of these decades [...], the persecutions of the Jews! No one in our civilisation in around 1900 would have thought it possible that such a thing could happen in our gifted, good-natured people, blessed

¹⁰⁷ Dibelius, *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen*, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 1.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 2–3; similarly 44.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 3.

with the most noble traditions. It was only possible because anti-Semitism had already ideologically declared the Jews to be outcasts.¹¹⁰

In the document, this insightful comment is the strongest one pertaining to the Holocaust. However, it is striking that despite such a statement, the treatment of the Jews is given little attention in the text as a whole. The Aryan paragraph and the racial laws are not explicitly mentioned, the persecution of the Jews is mentioned in a series of other crimes, and Dibelius wants to balance the emphasis on crimes against foreigners with those against Germans. Even though an argument from silence seldom is very reliable, a modern reader may at least find that the absence is telling. Dibelius's defence of Gerhard Kittel's writings during National Socialism speaks the same language.¹¹¹

Conclusion

This study shows a development in Dibelius's depiction of Jews and Judaism, even though his basic theological position seems to have followed him throughout his active period. During his Weimar years, Second Temple Judaism seems of little interest, and Dibelius emphasises the continuity between Judaism and Christianity. During the Nazi era, he generally maintains his role as a serious scholar, defending scholarly quality and the need for evidence. However, his Jesus book from 1939 shows a considerable tendency to denigrate Judaism in apostolic times, and Dibelius partly adjusts to racial discourse, stating that Jesus may not have been Jewish and that he fought against Judaism—statements that do not hold water in an exegetical study.

Dibelius *characterises* Jews and Judaism differently in the 1920s and during National Socialism. Describing Judaism after the Exile, he points to the role of the Law, but describes the destiny of the Jews in a way that is not unlike the Enlightenment research tradition: homeless, doomed to a rootless existence among other peoples, expelled

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 43. "*Die Intoleranz gegenüber dem Andersdenkenden, wie sie bei uns in Kirche, Schule und Haus gepflegt worden ist, hat es ermöglicht, daß in Deutschland die furchtbarsten Taten dieser Jahrzehnte geschehen konnten, die Judenverfolgungen! Kein Mensch unserer Zivilisation um 1900 hätte es für möglich gehalten, daß in unserem begabten, gutartigen und mit edelsten Überlieferungen begnadeten Volk dergleichen vorkommen würde. Es war auch nur möglich, weil der Antisemitismus den Juden bereits ideell zum outcast erklärt hatte.*"

¹¹¹ See the discussion below in connection with Kittel's apology.

from professional life, in religion cut off from the productive powers of “primitive piety”, etc. This interprets the Diaspora as God’s judgment. Agreeing with what by this time is a broad research tradition, Dibelius holds that the religion before the Exile is valuable, whereas postexilic Judaism is negative. He describes the Judaism of apostolic times in a modest and informative way: Paul uses Jewish hermeneutics, there is a continuity between Jewish and Christian paraenesis, and between Jewish and Christian prayer traditions, and Judaism and Christianity have common roots in Old Testament religion. On the whole, Dibelius describes Judaism in its relation to Christianity respectfully. During National Socialism, new motifs enter the debate. Dibelius opens up for ideas of racial mixing, writing that the *völkisch* purity of Judaism had disappeared long ago, that Judaism pushed its way into the world, that the picture of God was narrowed, etc. In various ways, Dibelius’s characterisation now seems influenced by the new climate, but the turns of phrase can be found in the Enlightenment research tradition, e.g. in Bousset’s description of ‘Late Judaism’.

The movement in Dibelius’s description of Jews and Judaism also goes *from continuity to discontinuity*. Dibelius holds that there is a continuity between Jewish prayer and the Lord’s Prayer, in 1925 saying that there is no strong antagonism between Jesus and Judaism; in 1926, however, he is able to state that Judaism and Christianity stand in absolute opposition, which shows that this opposition is not politically conditioned. In his book on Jesus in 1939, he makes the Jewish people responsible for the death sentence against Jesus, saying that the Jews rendered themselves homeless through it, having themselves to blame for their homelessness and destiny. The dichotomy between Christians and Jews becomes sharper during National Socialism: Jesus fights Judaism! Yet if we are to take Dibelius’s criticism of Grundmann at face value, the fact that Jesus criticised Judaism has no bearing on the modern situation. Nevertheless, the depiction of Jesus’ relationship with Judaism was sharpened during the Nazi years, at least in comparison with what was found in earlier research tradition.

Dibelius’s production contains elements from both of the research traditions described here, and perhaps this is symptomatic, hard as he is to place in any one camp. More than for example Schmidt or Schlatter, Dibelius moves in a merely scholarly discourse, and there are no salvation-historical perspectives present. However, the influence from the History of Religions school and Dibelius’s teacher Adolf von Harnack is perhaps predominant. Dibelius’s exegetical position is generally quite

moderate. As for the role of the Jews and Judaism in his *symbolic world*, he is ambivalent. Whereas in the 1920s Judaism is a natural background to Christianity, during National Socialism it diminishes in importance. There is no eschatological Israel or larger theological system into which Judaism can be incorporated, but in Dibelius's basic analysis, there are two players: Jesus and Judaism, and the 'symbolic Jew' becomes the negative part. The sharper tone and heavier emphasis on the opposition between Jesus/Christianity and Judaism is there even in 1926, however, when Dibelius states that there was total opposition between Jesus and Judaism—here sounding exactly like Schlatter.

From 1939, Dibelius enters more into racial discourse, adopting part of its language, but more than in a dialogic way. Here he goes quite far in complying with the National Socialists in power. Being the skilled scholar that he is, Dibelius mostly takes small steps, as is the general picture of him during the 1920s. However, facing the risk of seeing Christianity and theology end up on the margins of German life, Dibelius adjusts his arguments and vocabulary to the racist discourse. Opening up for the possibility that Jesus was not Jewish, and stating that Jesus fought the Jews fitted well into this context. Intentionally or not, Dibelius's depiction of Jews and Judaism probably indirectly support a negative picture of Jews and Judaism, e.g. his statement that "theology takes part in the national struggle, investigating what it means that a Christian stands in orders like family, people, race"; this, again, is said in the racial state of Germany.¹¹² It is likely that Dibelius's thought of a fierce opposition between Jesus and Judaism helps pave the way for a negative view on Jews and Judaism; this is said after the pogroms of 9 November 1938, in a Germany where the Nuremberg Laws had been in force since 1935. Thus, in his attempt to rescue university theology under National Socialism, Dibelius adjusts heavily to what is politically correct. From 1939, he appears to be considered a good representative of Germany in international contexts, and his theological production points in the same direction. The fact that he, after the fall of the Nazi regime, retains his descriptions of Judaism, Christianity and the pedigree of Jesus shows that these ideas were rooted in his own thinking and not produced under pressure. When painting the complete picture of Dibelius, National Socialism and the Jews, one must accept that it is quite complex: after the war, Dibelius expresses grief over

¹¹² Burleigh and Wippermann, *The Racial State*.

the crimes against Jews, but he complied with the regime both in his exegesis of Jesus' Galilean pedigree and in the role of theology in the racial state. Dibelius was deemed politically correct in 1939, when he led a German delegation to the SNTS, and he continues to stand for his rather negative picture of Jews and Judaism even after the war, but at the same time, he did help Jews during the 'Third Reich' and was sometimes regarded as a negative figure by the National Socialist press. Only such a complex picture of the famous exegete, containing both light and dark elements, comes close to describing Martin Dibelius between 1933 and 1947.

RUDOLF BULTMANN: LIBERAL AND ANTI-JEWISH

Rudolf Bultmann is known as a prominent figure in the academic theological resistance to the National Socialist regime.¹ Even in his opening lecture of the semester on 2 May 1933, Bultmann spoke up against the existing political evils under the heading “The Task of Theology in the Present Situation”.² The boycott of the Jews that had been implemented on 1–4 April 1933, and the anti-Semitic laws that had been in force in the State realm since 7 April also involved a threat to the churches.³ In his lecture, Bultmann criticises the slandering of the Jews as well as *völkisch* theology, vindicating freedom of speech. Not long afterwards, he also initiated the famous declaration of New Testament scholars, “The New Testament and the Racial Question”.⁴ Moreover, Bultmann became instrumental in the writing of the expert verdict on the freedom of the Church and the Aryan paragraph, issued by the Marburg theological faculty in October 1933.⁵ The Marburg Declaration stirred up the discussion and led to a debate between Bultmann and the Psychology of Religion professor at Göttingen, Georg Wobbermin. As part

¹ For some biographical notes, see the articles in Kulturdezernat Der Stadt Oldenburg, *Gedenkfeier für Rudolf Bultmann. 1884–1976* (Oldenburg: Heinz Holzberg Verlag, 1985) and Bultmann’s autobiographical notes, Rudolf Bultmann, “Autobiographische Bemerkungen Rudolf Bultmanns”, in *Karl Barth—Rudolf Bultmann. Briefwechsel 1911–1966*, ed. Bernd Jaspert, *Karl Barth. Gesamtausgabe* (Zürich: Theologisches Verlag, 1994 (1956)).

² Rudolf Bultmann, “Die Aufgabe der Theologie in der gegenwärtigen Situation”, *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 6, Juni 1933.

³ There was a State as well as a Church Aryan paragraph. The struggle regarding the latter raged from the summer to early autumn of 1933, with the Aryan legislation coming into force in the Church of the Altpreuussische Union on 6 September 1933, Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 291, 295. See also Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekenkende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*, which discusses the Confessing Church’s stand on the Jews in great detail.

⁴ Bauer et al., “Neues Testament und Rassenfrage”, *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 10, Oktober 1933 (1933). Bultmann is not presented as the author, but the twenty-one scholars jointly signed the statement, see Jack Forstman, *Christian Faith in Dark Times. Theological Conflicts in the Shadow of Hitler* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 230.

⁵ Die Theologische Fakultät der Universität Marburg, “Gutachten der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Marburg zum Kirchengesetz über die Religionsverhältnisse der Geistlichen und Kirchenbeamten”, *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 10 (1933).

of this debate, Bultmann wrote another notable article, "The Aryan Paragraph in the Context of the Church", in which he defends the freedom of the Church to employ non-Aryan ministers and workers.⁶ Thus there are no doubts concerning his strong stand against attempts to limit freedom by means of Aryan legislation in the Church.

Bultmann's position to Jews and Judaism is debated, however,⁷ and again it is necessary to distinguish between the view on the State and National Socialism on the one hand, and the view on Jews and Judaism on the other; in earlier cases, we have seen that it is quite possible to be anti-National Socialist, yet have racist prejudice. Wolfgang Stegemann writes that anti-Jewish sentiments are not to be expected in Bultmann, due to his personal integrity during the Nazi regime, but he continues, "However, the personal integrity of Bultmann's behaviour does not exclude that his theology includes what we determinedly and without compromises must regard as and call anti-Jewish."⁸ Shawn Kelley describes Bultmann's theology as 'racialized', due to its relation to Heidegger's philosophy,⁹ and Peter von der Osten-Sacken finds anti-Jewish thoughts in Bultmann's (as well as in Adolf von Harnack's) writings.¹⁰ But Erich Grässer argues that anti-Judaism is only read into the Bultmannian texts, reminding of Bultmann's resistance to the racial laws of 1933.¹¹ Focusing on Bultmann's 'insights' and 'problems' in relation to the Old Testament and the Jews, Paul-Gerhard Müller raises substantial criticism against Bultmann. He notes that Bultmann in fact

⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, "Der Arier-Paragraph im Raume der Kirche", *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 12, Dezember 1933 (1933).

⁷ For Bultmann's activities during National Socialism, see e.g. Andreas Lindemann, "Neutestamentler in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. Hans von Soden und Rudolf Bultmann in Marburg", *Wort und Dienst. Jahrbuch der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel* Neue Folge 20 (1989), Johnson, "Power Politics and New Testament Scholarship in the National Socialist Period", Wolfgang Dietrich, "Es gilt: Entweder—oder!" *Marburger Theologen zum christlich-jüdischen Verhältnis (I): Rudolf Bultmann*, *Lutherische Monatshefte* 10 (1996).

⁸ Wolfgang Stegemann, "Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum. Ein Beitrag zur Pathologie des strukturellen theologischen Antijudaismus", *Kirche und Israel* 5 (1990), 26.

⁹ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 141. Kelley does not mean that Bultmann himself was a racist but that his work, like much of biblical scholarship, is embedded in a "racialized discourse", 211.

¹⁰ Peter von der Osten-Sacken, "Rückzug ins Wesen und aus der Geschichte. Antijudaismus bei Adolf von Harnack und Rudolf Bultmann", *Wissenschaft und Praxis in Kirche und Gesellschaft* 67, no. 1 (1978).

¹¹ Erich Grässer, "Antijudaismus bei Bultmann? Eine Erwiderung", *Wissenschaft und Praxis in Kirche und Gesellschaft* 67 (1978), 424–425.

reckons with the Old Testament as relevant to Christian faith, but at the same time, he talks of the total failure of the Old Testament religion.¹² Hans Hübner, on the other hand, devotes an article to reinforcing the point that Bultmann saw the Old Testament as essential for the New Testament as well as theology.¹³

This debate raises the question of whether there is an anti-Jewish stance in Bultmann's production, and if so, how to explain this in view of his indubitable concern regarding the Aryan paragraph. As already noted, criticism of National Socialism does not always imply taking a stand against racial policies. Moreover, there were many different positions to Jews and Judaism, making it possible to be anti-Jewish, support racial legislation and still oppose street violence against Jews, for instance.

Bultmann's Scholarly Background

Bultmann's views on Jews and Judaism were influenced by leading figures of the History of Religions school. His career as a scholarly writer extends from 1908 to the 1970s, and he studied in Tübingen, Berlin and Marburg.¹⁴ His *Doktorvater* Johannes Weiss left for Heidelberg before Bultmann was finished with his doctorate, however; Weiss was succeeded by Wilhelm Heitmüller, and Bultmann wrote his postdoctoral qualification (*Habilitation*) thesis under Adolf Jülicher. The connection with Weiss and Heitmüller established a link with the History of Religions school, which would become important in Bultmann's work, also with regard to the Jews.¹⁵ Moreover, the History of Religions approach affected his understanding of early Christian history, which he describes in the same way as his teacher Heitmüller,¹⁶ drawing a sharp line

¹² Paul-Gerhard Müller, "Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns", in *Kontinuität und Einheit. Für Franz Mußner*, ed. Paul-Gerhard Müller and Werner Stenger (Herder: Freiburg, 1981).

¹³ Hans Hübner, "Rudolf Bultmann und das Alte Testament", *Kerygma und Dogma* 30 (1984).

¹⁴ Dieter Lührmann, "Rudolf Bultmann and the History of Religions School", in *Text and Logos. The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament*, ed. Theodore W. Jennings, *Homage Series* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 4–5.

¹⁵ Lührmann argues that it is correct to see Bultmann as an inheritor of the History of Religions school, due to his indebtedness to Hermann Gunkel in his form critical work, *ibid.*, 5.

¹⁶ See the programmatic Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus".

between Palestinian and Hellenistic early Christianity. This fundamental historiography became a model for his *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (dedicated to the memory of Heitmüller), as well as his *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*.¹⁷ Bultmann's earliest production contains traces of Weiss's analysis of Judaism and early Christianity, but the dichotomous views of Heitmüller seem to have prevailed. Whereas Weiss had argued for a continuity between Jesus and Judaism, early Christianity and Judaism, Heitmüller and other History of Religions scholars instead saw a distance between Judaism and early Christianity. The school also furthered an interest in parallels to Christianity in religions other than Judaism. This affected Bultmann, one example being his statement that the history behind the Buddhist Jataka documents offers an interesting parallel to the history of the Synoptic tradition.¹⁸ In his interest in Gnosticism, he falls back on scholars such as Reitzenstein and Bousset; the eminent role of Gnosticism for Bultmann is evident in his "New Testament Theology".¹⁹ From the outset, Bultmann also falls back on F. C. Baur's history of early Christianity.

It is rather surprising that, after the First World War, Bultmann would side with Karl Barth and the dialectical theology, though never without a critical distance.²⁰ Bultmann originally counted himself as part of liberal theology, but his famous essay from 1924, "Liberal Theology and the Latest Theological Movement",²¹ shows his radical showdown with central thoughts in the theology, apostrophising Ernst Troeltsch, Wilhelm Herrmann and Adolf von Harnack, but also his teachers Johannes Weiss and Wilhelm Heitmüller. In several ways, Bultmann

¹⁷ Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 2 ed., vol. 12, *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Neue Folge (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931) and Rudolf Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1948–1953).

¹⁸ Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 8 with note 1.

¹⁹ See Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 162–182 and the following discussion on Johannine and Pauline theology. One of many examples of the importance of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule to Bultmann is Rudolf Bultmann, "Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte", *Theologische Rundschau* NF 4 (1932), 3, 4, 21; the fundamental work of Bousset, Heitmüller and Reitzenstein plays a very important role for Bultmann's understanding of early Christianity.

²⁰ For the history of Bultmann and dialectical theology, see Forstman, *Christian Faith in Dark Times*, 133–147.

²¹ Rudolf Bultmann, "Die liberale Theologie und die jüngste theologische Bewegung", in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Rudolf Bultmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933 (1924)). On this, see also Forstman, *Christian Faith in Dark Times*, 139–143.

took the opposite position to that of liberal theologians.²² It is difficult to say how dialectical theology affected Bultmann's view on the Jews and Judaism, but the connection with Barth may have supported his stand against the Aryan paragraph in the Church.²³

Politically, Bultmann was liberal, seemingly not too different from other leading figures, such as Bousset or his friend Martin Rade (the brother-in-law of Friedrich Naumann),²⁴ although in this context, 'liberal' could include anything from national monarchist liberalism—combined with a strong social programme—to liberal in a more modern sense. But Bultmann had a nationalist side. When the First World War began, Bultmann said of Germany that "our cause is God's cause", and after the war, he, as several other theologians, was involved in the new liberal Deutsche Demokratische Partei (German Democratic Party). This party, which Friedrich Naumann helped found, was liberal, democratic and republican. Bultmann explicitly expressed his support for the republic and was bold enough to speak out against monarchy.²⁵ However, being liberal was no guarantee against anti-Jewish ideas, as the example of Martin Rade shows.²⁶

Bultmann and the Judaism of Antiquity

Bultmann's interest in Judaism is predominantly related to early Christianity, and his original research has no main focus on Judaism as such. It seems as though Bultmann maintained the picture of Judaism that he drew during his early period throughout his scholarly life.²⁷ In the first

²² See Bultmann's comments on this in Bultmann, "Autobiographische Bemerkungen Rudolf Bultmanns", 308–309.

²³ Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*, 63.

²⁴ Bultmann, "Autobiographische Bemerkungen Rudolf Bultmanns", 304.

²⁵ Heinz Eduard Tödt, "Glauben und politischen Einstellung bei Rudolf Bultmann. Anmerkungen zum Beitrag Walter Rebells", *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* 31, no. 2 (1987), 183; Walter Rebell, "Glaube und politisches Handeln bei Rudolf Bultmann", *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* 31, no. 2 (1987), 165.

²⁶ See below, and Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "'Wir konnten den Rad nicht in die Speichen fallen'. Liberaler Protestantismus und 'Judenfrage' nach 1933", in *Der Holocaust und die Protestanten*, ed. Jochen-Christoph Kaiser and Martin Greschat, *Konfession und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988).

²⁷ For the following discussion, the contributions of Stegemann, "Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum" and Müller, "Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns", have been important.

edition of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, RGG, Bultmann writes an article on the early church (*Urgemeinde*).²⁸ Here he stresses its continuity with Israel and the change that came about when the church went into the Diaspora. The early church regarded itself as the Israel of the last days; it did not separate itself from Judaism nor form a new religious fellowship, but kept to the people of Israel. In this analysis, Bultmann is quite close to his teacher Weiss. But to Bultmann, there was still a deep rift between the early church and Israel, although the early church was faithful to the Law and cultic form of Judaism, including circumcision, keeping to the synagogue and temple cult.²⁹ However, the Gentile church is no continuation of the early church, which came to nothing. Referring to F. C. Baur, Bultmann submits that the early church is of no consequence to apostolic Christianity as it developed later; that is, Bultmann sees a gap between the early church and Gentile Christianity. Jesus, Baur said, represents the idea of Christianity, but the early church is in no way a factor in this process, and this new principle had no impact on the early church, in which there was no freedom from the Law, no overcoming of national limitations, no understanding of Christianity as an ethical religion of redemption (*sittliche Erlösungsreligion*).³⁰ The only trace of the “new principle” is that the “picture of Jesus” is alive, enclosed within limits of the time—faith in eschatology, in the Messiah—as the husk encloses the grain, which is the spirit of Jesus. The historical aspects are thus rendered less important, whereas Jesus’ spirit pervades human existence.³¹ This spirit gives rise to the church, the gospel tradition and such an inner quality that the early church is expelled from Judaism. Historically, however, the role of the early church is simply that it mediated the gospel tradition. Bultmann also stresses that the true picture of Jesus never manifested in the early church but lived in individuals.³²

Here Bultmann lays the foundation for his analysis of the history of early Christianity, with the description of the early church as being centred around the Law, limited to the nation and void of the full revelation of the ethical redemptive religion. This notion is reminiscent

²⁸ Bultmann, “Urgemeinde”.

²⁹ Ibid., 1520–1521.

³⁰ Ibid., 1523.

³¹ The question is if Bultmann understands this spirit in terms of the Holy Spirit or if there is an element of the idea of a ‘world spirit’, as often referred to in 19th-c. philosophy and theology; however, this text does not give enough evidence to establish that.

³² Bultmann, “Urgemeinde”, 1523.

of Bousset's *ethische Erlösungsreligion*, and here Bultmann gives his theological construction of what proper Christianity is in relation to early Christianity. The discontinuity between the early church and Gentile church is clear, with the reference to Baur also being noteworthy. Bultmann treats his historiography as axiomatic and falls back on this research tradition, including patterns from the History of Religions school. Although he does not mention the article from the previous year, Bultmann may have been influenced by his teacher Heitmüller in the emphasis on the rift between the early church and Gentile church.³³ Since this article portrays the early church as Jewish and of no consequence to the further development of Christianity, it has a bearing on Bultmann's view of Judaism, representing a dead end, whereas the Gentile church is able to carry Christianity to victory.

Bultmann's interaction with contemporary literature on Judaism and early Christianity contributes to the picture of his own thoughts on Judaism. In an eighty-page literature presentation on the theme of early Christian religion (*Urchristliche religion*), Bultmann covers ten years of research, 1915–1925, and also gives a backward glance.³⁴ The section on the history of early Christian religion shows Bultmann's view of the Jewish background to Christianity. Baur's work is regarded as still providing the basic scheme for the history of early Christianity, while Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* is considered to be the most important work since Baur's, which is why Bultmann gives it considerably more space than other works.³⁵ He is pleased with Bousset's fundamental distinction between Palestinian and Gentile early Christianity, as well as the breaking up of the straight line from Jesus to Paul. The role of Jesus is played down, and the cult of Christ leads to the religion of the early church, which is to be regarded as a new religion.³⁶ Through this, Bultmann (with Bousset) distances the early confession of Christ from Jewish Christianity. By the same token, there is a sharp dichotomy between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity throughout Bultmann's discussion.

³³ Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus".

³⁴ Rudolf Bultmann, "Urchristliche Religion (1915–1925)", in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, ed. Otto Weinreich and M. P. Nilsson (Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1926).

³⁵ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*; Bultmann refers to the second edition, Bultmann, "Urchristliche Religion (1915–1925)", 88–91.

³⁶ Bultmann, "Urchristliche Religion (1915–1925)", 86.

Moreover, evaluating Gustaf Dalman's book *Orte und Wege Jesu*, Bultmann holds that Jesus and the eschatological church had little relation to the people of Palestine and their day-to-day lives, a view that fits in with Bultmann's depiction of Jesus in the RGG article above. Jesus is more like the spirit, working out his plans, than an historical—and Jewish—person.³⁷ Here Jesus and early Christianity seem unrelated to their historical Jewish pedigree. Bultmann contends that the work of members of the History of Religions school has contributed much regarding the religion of Judaism, pointing to Reitzenstein's *Poimandres*, 1904, and Bousset's *Hauptproblemen der Gnosis*, 1907. At this point, he shows his interest in hypotheses that point to a syncretistic background of Christianity, which is typical of the History of Religions school.³⁸ However, little interest is shown in research into Judaism, parallels to other religions being more important. In a review of Gressmann's revised edition of Bousset's *Religion des Judentums*, Bultmann calls it "indispensable".³⁹ Nevertheless, he criticises that F. Weber's *Jüdische Theologie* is still used by Bousset, and agrees with the criticism that Bousset's description of Judaism has a preponderance for apocryphal and pseudepigraphical material, to the detriment of rabbinic material.⁴⁰ According to Bultmann, Gressmann could have repaired this weakness, since rabbinic texts that were not available to Bousset now were. In this criticism, Bultmann sides with Gerhard Kittel.⁴¹ Bultmann expects a more updated scholarship of Bousset–Gressmann, criticising that Wellhausen's outdated views of Pharisees and Sadducees live on, and that Gressmann's use of 'Hellenistic Judaism' for Diaspora as well as Palestinian Judaism blurs the boundaries between the two, failing to do justice to the specific "contact of Judaism with the Greek spirit in the Diaspora".⁴² This is reminiscent of e.g. Baur's idealistic depiction discussed above, describing how Judaism is lifted up through its encounter with the Greek spirit. Whereas Bousset sees a spiritualisation

³⁷ Ibid., 100.

³⁸ Ibid., 100–104, 110.

³⁹ Bultmann, "Review of Bousset, Wilhelm: Die Religion des Judentums in spät-hellenistischen Zeitalter".

⁴⁰ Ibid., 252. There is no reference to this, but Bultmann must have been well acquainted with the debate following Perles's critical book, Perles, *Bousset's Religion des Judentums*, as well as Moore's criticisms, Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism."

⁴¹ Bultmann refers to Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*.

⁴² Bultmann, "Review of Bousset, Wilhelm: Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter", 252.

of the Jewish faith in the Diaspora, Bultmann diverges from Bousset's standpoint here, stating that the Palestinian development towards universalism is motivated from the Old Testament and also criticising Bousset's description of the Palestinian "legalistic ethics" as distorted. These ethics, Bultmann says, are a combination of ὑπακοή (obedience) and παρησία (confidence).⁴³ This review shows a somewhat ambiguous Bultmann. He is aware of the shortcomings of Bousset and the earlier tradition—although he has great admiration for Baur—and takes a stand against a wry depiction of Palestinian Judaism, for instance. However, this does not imply that Bultmann sees Palestinian Judaism as the birthplace of the Christianity that prevailed—this happens in the Diaspora.

Similarly, criticising Holl's account of *Urchristentum*, Bultmann complains about his defective description of Judaism.⁴⁴ Here Bultmann states that Jesus was Jewish and that his faith, ethics and view of God were those of Judaism; that is, Bultmann does not separate Jesus from Judaism. Furthermore, Bultmann's description of the Jewish understanding of the Law is far from the caricatures of for instance Bousset, his position being more reminiscent of that of his teacher Johannes Weiss. He states that the Law grows out of grace, *is* grace,⁴⁵ and he outlines the view of God from the Old Testament in a correct manner, contending that this view is held also by Jesus and Paul.⁴⁶ Paul, for example, never understood the Law as a burden; the Law was good, but it had an end—a Jewish idea, according to Bultmann. Nevertheless, he believes that there was a false understanding of the Law in Judaism, where it was seen as a means of attaining one's own righteousness before God.⁴⁷ Even though he sees a considerable continuity between Jesus and Paul, Bultmann argues that the difference between them is that between Judaism and Christianity (!), the reason being primarily the eschatology: to Jesus the kingdom is future, to Paul it is present.⁴⁸ In sum, the discussion with Holl demonstrates that Bultmann does not merely reiterate topoi of a long Protestant research tradition of Jewish legalism and a caricatured picture of God—although the opposition

⁴³ Ibid., 253.

⁴⁴ Bultmann, "Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte".

⁴⁵ Ibid., 12.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 13–15.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 16–17.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 19.

between Jesus and Paul is reminiscent of for instance Baur's opposition between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism—but at times he presents Judaism in a more correct way, again in the same vein as Weiss. So far, there are no pejorative statements about Jews and Judaism in Bultmann's discussions.

If Bousset and the History of Religions school majored on the 'syncretistic' environment of early Christianity and the 'apocryphal' Judaism, underrating the rabbinic material, Gerhard Kittel, in his book *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum* ("The Problems of Palestinian Late Judaism and Early Christianity"), instead wishes to investigate the Palestinian Jewish background.⁴⁹ In his long review of the book, Bultmann welcomes Kittel's criticisms of Bousset and agrees with Kittel in the critique of Gressmann's neglect of the rabbinic material.⁵⁰ He also agrees that there are pre-70 CE sayings in later rabbinic texts, but he differs radically from Kittel in his historiography. Bultmann does not concur that the basic traits of early Christianity grew out of Palestinian Judaism, a tenet that is directly opposite to Bultmann's emphasis on the Christ cult in the Hellenistic Diaspora.⁵¹ In other words, whereas Kittel wishes to stress the continuity between later Christianity and its Palestinian beginnings, Bultmann does the opposite, in line with his earlier toning down of the Palestinian historical background of Christianity. This seems to be due to his constant attempts to 'remove' the cradle of the early Christianity that prevailed from Palestine to the Diaspora. In this, he appears to make a negative evaluation of the Jewish environment.

The Jesus Book

Bultmann continues to discuss positive and negative traits in Judaism of apostolic times. Describing "the Jewish religion" in his popular book

⁴⁹ For this, see the discussion on Gerhard Kittel below.

⁵⁰ Rudolf Bultmann, "Review of Gerhard Kittel: *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*", *Gnomon* 4 (1928), 297–298. ET: Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, trans. Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntress Lantero (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

⁵¹ Bultmann, "Review of Gerhard Kittel: *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*", 301.

Jesus, 1926,⁵² Bultmann stresses the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, at least “true Judaism”. He initially states that the Jews are a strange (*seltsam*) people, and he strongly schematises Jews and Judaism, but he also has positive things to say. The people differ from others in that they do not only live an “inner life” through cultural things, such as science, art and justice—Bultmann acknowledges the strength, powerful instincts, highest moral energy and intellectual abilities of the people—but their life is governed by law and promise.⁵³ This law is not primarily an ethical one, but its purpose is to get the people to bow before God, and it makes them God’s chosen people.⁵⁴ Post-Christian scribal Judaism concentrated fully on the Law. For apostolic times, Bultmann stresses the Messianism, but does not major on any legalism.⁵⁵ Moreover, Bultmann notes that it is not clear what role the Jewish leadership played in the execution of Jesus.⁵⁶ Jesus himself is described as a rabbi, and in practice he worked as a rabbi, although he was less bound by the forms of a Jewish rabbi.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, Bultmann sees great differences between Jesus and the rabbis, especially that he did not agree with the Jewish “piety of the Law” (*Gesetzesfrömmigkeit*).⁵⁸ The outcome is a contrast between the Old Testament ethical Law and Prophets on the one hand, and a legalistic later Judaism in Palestinian Judaism on the other. At this point, Bultmann enters into polemics. Palestinian Judaism observed a great many unintelligible and useless commandments, and according to Bultmann it did not reinterpret these morally as the “Hellenistic Judaism under the influence of Greek thinking did”.⁵⁹ Instead, it complied with the commandments as mere commandments, that is, Bultmann depicts this as a blind obedience. Jewish ethics are ethics of obedience, and Bultmann critically remarks that they lack a concept of virtue, such as the one that Philo, influenced by Greek philosophy, was able to establish. Here Bultmann falls back on the idealistic depiction of Judaism as only being elevated to a meaningful religion after an

⁵² Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus*, vol. 1, *Die Unsterblichen. Die geistlichen Heroen der Menschheit in ihrem Leben und Wirken* (Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1929).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 21–22.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 53, 55.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 60.

encounter with the 'Greek spirit', and he caricatures Jewish ethics as a merely superficial ethics of obedience without further reflection or motivation.⁶⁰ Bultmann argues that even if there was a reflection with regard to the interpretation of conflicting commandments, rabbinic casuistry was governed by "blind" obedience. The pious could gain merit before God, thinking that they were entitled to a reward, and are described as standing in a "legal relationship" before God. However, Bultmann does not want to carry this idea of reward too far: the main thrust of Judaism is an unselfish obedience. Jesus' ethics are also ethics of obedience, but to written rules.

In this book, Bultmann develops his ideas along existentialist lines,⁶¹ but the thrust of his thinking accords with fairly traditional patterns of Jewish legalism, prevalent in Protestant research tradition. Reminiscent of earlier historiographical tradition, and part and parcel of the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis, is the idea of a degeneration after the Exile. After the Exile, Israel degenerates into legalism, and the 'Late Judaism' product becomes the backdrop of early Christianity. The complex Exile history of the tribes of Israel and Judah is in Bultmann's version reconstructed to fit this traditional historiographical model. After the Exile, Israel is no longer a state, a people, but it is reshaped into *Kirche* (church), a "mere religious community", with an increasing legalism, where circumcision and the Sabbath grow in importance, and the isolation increases, i.e. particularism.⁶² This description by Bultmann is idealistic rather than historical. Interestingly, the basically anachronistic imagery of Judaism having become a church is reminiscent of e.g. Wellhausen and Bousset.⁶³

Bultmann often stresses the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, but not without qualifications. Discussing Jesus' view of God, Jesus stands within the framework of "true Judaism", and his distinctiveness lies in that he has understood the idea of God in Judaism in all its purity.⁶⁴ When Jesus teaches on prayer, there are considerable parallels to the

⁶⁰ Ibid., 61.

⁶¹ Ibid., 75–76.

⁶² See Müller, "Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns", 31.

⁶³ See Bousset, *Volksfrömmigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum. Antwort auf Herrn Perles' Kritik meiner "Religion des Judentums im N.T. Zeitalter"*, 3 and Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter passim* for the term *Kirche* for postexilic Judaism, and the latter work for Bousset's fundamental analysis; see also Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. 1. Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's im Umriss*, 90–93.

⁶⁴ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 131.

Jewish Eighteen prayer,⁶⁵ but Jesus is more radical than Judaism in his view of sin and man's choice (*Entscheidung*).⁶⁶ Thus, in his *Jesus* book, Bultmann generally stresses the continuity between Judaism and Jesus, although he depicts 'Late Judaism' in the same way as the research tradition in which he stands. 'Late Judaism' is the legalistic, casuistic and shallow religion to which Jesus offered an alternative, "true Judaism". But the main thrust of Bultmann's description is that Jesus is a Jew, and that Christianity, as far as Jesus is concerned, has a far-reaching continuity with Judaism at the time of Jesus, although Bultmann does not demonstrate great historical expertise on Judaism in apostolic times. On the other hand, Bultmann retains much of the darker picture of Judaism found in his research tradition. In my reading, Bultmann does not air any prejudice against contemporary Judaism in this book; however, it is worth noting that Bultmann's evaluation of Judaism fluctuates somewhat between different works. Compared to Bousset and Weiss, Bultmann stands between the two: in stressing the continuity between Jesus and Judaism, he is closer to Weiss, while in his basically idealistic depiction of Jesus and the 'Late Judaism' background, he is closer to Bousset.

Bultmann on the Law in Judaism

As noted above, Bultmann connects the Law with Judaism in a special way, but he also stresses that "the Law is good". The conclusion is that Bultmann's presentation of the Jews in relation to the Law has quite a positive tone, with a description that is fairly close to the actual situation in apostolic times. However, in certain works from the 1940s, Bultmann sharpens his tone against what he calls 'legalism' (*Gesetzlichkeit*), and this becomes a topos in his presentation of Judaism. In *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* ("Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting"), 1949, he even presents Judaism under the heading *Das jüdische Gesetzlichkeit* ("Jewish legalism").⁶⁷

Bultmann returns to the question of the Law, and he seems to increasingly fall back into caricatures of Judaism in the spirit of, for example,

⁶⁵ Ibid., 153.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 166.

⁶⁷ R. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949); ET: Rudolf Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (London: Thames & Hudson, 1956).

Bousset's *Religion des Judentums*. In the essay *Christus ist das Gesetzes Ende* ("Christ is the End of the Law") from 1940,⁶⁸ Bultmann discusses the Law at length. He begins by stating that the Law is no burden according to Paul, and also points out that Paul cannot be read with Luther's glasses: the pious Jew rejoices in the Law.⁶⁹ Paul does not talk of an "inner burden of the Law" either, which would be to major on guilt, and Bultmann sees μετάνοια (repentance) as playing no important role in Paul.⁷⁰ However, Jesus' fight (*Kampf*) against the Law, Bultmann contends, focused on the idea that fulfilling the letter was enough before God, and that one must let ethical rules precede the cultic.⁷¹ Paul's criticism of the Jews is that they want to win salvation by fulfilling the Law. They have an urge to assert themselves (*Geltungsbedürfnis*) through their performance, their deed.⁷² And this urge causes a peculiar lack of relevance in their deed, Bultmann contends:

Since it is all the same for the Jew if he fulfils ritual or moral demands, if he demonstrates his obedience to the Law through meaningful and useful or through absurd and ridiculous deeds, everywhere an unrestrained urge to assert himself can lead to absurd performance.⁷³

Here Bultmann airs similar prejudice against Jews and Judaism as was found in for example Bousset. True, the Jews become the example of something found in all of humanity, but the comparison begins by defaming the Jews. But in Christ, Bultmann writes, Judaism is overcome (*überwunden*) and the Law is done away with.⁷⁴

In the end of the 1940s, such descriptions are sharpened. Describing Judaism in *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1948, the theme is Jewish legalism.⁷⁵ The very structure of the book builds on the description of early Christian history given by Bultmann's teacher Heitmüller (and Bousset in his *Kyrios Christos*), where two almost entirely different church traditions are presented: that of the Palestinian *Urgemeinde* and

⁶⁸ Rudolf Bultmann, "Christus des Gesetzes Ende", in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1968 (1940)); Rudolf Bultmann, *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, trans. J. C. G. Greig (London: Macmillan and Co., 1955).

⁶⁹ Bultmann, "Christus des Gesetzes Ende", 32–33.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 36 n. 3.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 38–39.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 39.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 52–53.

⁷⁵ See von der Osten-Sacken, "Rückzug ins Wesen und aus der Geschichte. Antijudaismus bei Adolf von Harnack und Rudolf Bultmann", 116.

that of the Hellenistic church.⁷⁶ The former is back under the Law, whereas Gentile Christianity is “law-free”.⁷⁷ Jesus’ preaching on God’s demand is a

great protest against the Jewish legalism, that is, against a piety that sees the will of God expressed in the written Law and in the tradition that makes an exposition of this, and strives to win the favour of God through the meticulous fulfilment of the instructions of the Law.⁷⁸

This description allows no room for a Jewish rejoicing in the Law, but depicts Judaism as a religion of effort. Bultmann goes on to describe Jewish legalism in strongly negative terms. It does not distinguish between religion and ethics, religion and civil law; religion is regulated by law, and civil legislation and criminal law are divine law. Many cultic rules are regarded as God’s will, whereas the real demands of God are overshadowed, Bultmann contends. “The motive for ethical action is destroyed,” the retaliation motive comes into the foreground and—as is typical of Judaism, Bultmann says—the obedience that man is supposed to give God and man is understood in an entirely formal way. However, the faults of Jewish legalism are seen in that the Law can never cover all situations, and that it demands an overscrupulous obedience.⁷⁹ This also has consequences for the picture of God: in Jewish piety, God has withdrawn and become distant, whereas to Jesus, God is once again the God of closeness.⁸⁰

A new motif in the description of Judaism is introduced in Bultmann’s essay *Weissagung und Erfüllung* (“Prophecy and Fulfilment”), 1949,⁸¹ where he contends that Judaism had contradictory tendencies, wanting to be God’s people and a national entity at the same time. Bultmann discusses whether the “Jewish ‘church’ of Persian and Roman times” can be regarded as the realisation of the people of God. Here Bultmann also uses the term ‘Late Judaism’, in contrast to the Judaism of the

⁷⁶ Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*; ET: Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel, vol. I–II (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1951–1955); Heitmüller, “Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus”; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*.

⁷⁷ Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 107.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 11; see also 55–56.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁸¹ Rudolf Bultmann, “Weissagung und Erfüllung”, in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1968 (1949)), ET: in Bultmann, *Essays Philosophical and Theological*.

prophets, which to Bultmann represents an early stage, unaffected by the later decadence.⁸² These are united only by the laws of a “theoretically devised cult and rite”, which is increasingly losing its meaning to the people, Bultmann contends,⁸³ and at the same time, it is bound to the nation.

Bultmann concludes that in the New Testament, the *ekklesia* alone is the people of God, and this is no longer an empirical-historical people: “As God’s people, the *ekklesia* is the Israel of God, [...] and the Jews can even be chided as the ‘synagogue of Satan’.”⁸⁴ Bultmann thus subscribes to a supersessionist view here, and without reflection mixes Pauline statements and as odd a verse as Rev. 2:9, on the synagogue of Satan. Supersessionism is found elsewhere, too: “If early Christianity understands itself as the eschatological people of God, as the end of a salvation history directed by God, it no longer identifies salvation history with the empirical history of the Israelite-Jewish people.”⁸⁵ By the same token, Bultmann describes the Old Testament prophecy as being fulfilled in the New Testament “in its inner contradiction, in its failure (*Scheitern*)”.⁸⁶ Here the whole Old Testament is seen from Bultmann’s modern Protestant position, and a gross schematisation is given of the Scriptures.⁸⁷ The same message is found in his book *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (“Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting”), 1949. Unlike Hellenistic Judaism, Palestinian Judaism is isolated;⁸⁸ its law is solely negative,⁸⁹ filled with the thought of retaliation.⁹⁰ And Jesus’ teaching is—as in Bultmann’s “New Testament Theology”—a grand protest against Jewish legalism.⁹¹ However, in the

⁸² Müller, “Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns”, 448.

⁸³ Bultmann, “Weissagung und Erfüllung”, 181.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁸⁵ Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*, 208.

⁸⁶ Bultmann, “Weissagung und Erfüllung”, 183–186.

⁸⁷ I generally agree with Paul-Gerhard Müller that Bultmann does not consequently reject the Old Testament. On the contrary, he says that the Old Testament has an existential value, Müller, “Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns”, 446–447, but sometimes the Old Testament and the principle of the Law are confused, as when he talks of the Old Testament as the principle of failure. See Müller, “Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns”, 451–457.

⁸⁸ Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*, 65.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 78.

encounter between Judaism and the Diaspora, *Hellenistic* Judaism was able to discern monotheism and morals parallel to what is found in the Old Testament.⁹² Only when the church “took the step across from the borders of Palestinian Judaism”, so that the Christian churches in the Greek–Roman world came into existence, did it take the step towards becoming a world religion, he contends, a description that accords with the Enlightenment-oriented research tradition.⁹³ In F. C. Baur and scholars up to the year 1900, this referred to Alexandrian Judaism, but with Bousset’s publication of *Kyrios Christos*, and the influence of the History of Religions school, the description changes. Now Greek philosophy and ethos are replaced by cult in a syncretistic environment, although according to Bultmann, there is a “philosophical enlightenment” in the Hellenistic synagogue.⁹⁴

In summary, Bultmann’s production on Judaism harbours some slightly divergent views of the Jews and the Law. In contrast to much of earlier scholarship, Bultmann at times stresses that the Law was not seen as a heavy burden to the Jews, and despite some attempts to spiritualise Jesus, thus placing him “above history”, Bultmann nevertheless positions him within Palestinian Judaism. In this, he accords with for instance Gerhard Kittel and Johannes Weiss. However, his descriptions of ‘Jewish legalism’, especially in his later production, are not too far from what was found in the schematic and much disputed view on Judaism in antiquity, held by for example Bousset and the Enlightenment research tradition. This respect for and at the same time caricature of the Law seems contradictory,⁹⁵ and Bultmann does not succeed in harmonising the tension. The tendency to elevate Jesus out of ‘Late Judaism’ was also age-old. However, over time Bultmann seems to sharpen his criticism. During the second half of National Socialism and in the early post-war texts, the picture of Judaism is almost consistently negative, with Judaism standing for the ‘negative principle’.⁹⁶ And in Bultmann’s overall argument, Jewish ‘legalism’ plays the role of a negative antipode, especially to Paul’s theology. In Paul-Gerhard

⁹² Ibid., 104–105.

⁹³ Ibid., 195.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 197–199.

⁹⁵ See Stegemann, “Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum”, 35.

⁹⁶ von der Osten-Sacken, “Rückzug ins Wesen und aus der Geschichte. Antijudaismus bei Adolf von Harnack und Rudolf Bultmann”, 107.

Müller's words: to Bultmann, Paul is the *criterium veritatis*,⁹⁷ and what Bultmann regards as Paul's view of the Law is the standard. Moreover, the level reached by early Christianity is the highest point ever in the development of religions, and the yardstick for all later generations.⁹⁸ In Bultmann's theology, especially in the latter part of our period, a caricatured Judaism is a pawn in the game where Bultmann's Pauline interpretation shows its superiority. Judaism's only role is to be the opposite of Christianity—law as the backdrop to grace, legalism as the backdrop to freedom—just as in generations of exegesis before Bultmann, especially the Enlightenment-oriented one. Despite Paul's crucial role to Bultmann, the role of the Jews in God's salvation plan as described in Romans 9–11 is not included in Bultmann's supersessionist theology. Thus Judaism is of less importance in Bultmann's theology than in Paul's. Even if Bultmann explicitly rejects reading Paul and the question of the Law with Lutheran glasses, this seems to be what he is doing. Jewish *Gesetzlichkeit* is almost as meticulous, as meaningless, as in a Lutheran caricature of 'Catholic' legalism. In this connection, Moore's or Perles's criticisms of Christian caricatures of Judaism, which Bultmann must have known about, are of no significance.⁹⁹ Instead, Bultmann's exegesis includes the old pictures from Wellhausen, Schürer and Bousset. Judaism at the time of Jesus is legalism, literalism, faith in reward and retribution, particularism, ritualism, casuistry—the whole package included in the notion of 'Late Judaism'. There seems to be one exception: the Law is, at least to Jesus, Paul and circles of their time, not a burden but a joy, although here, too, there is an ambivalence. In *Judaism*, the observance of the Law is mostly described in negative terms, but in Jesus and Paul, the Law can be something positive. At this point, the view of the research tradition and the more positive evaluation that Bultmann at times returns to seem to not be fully integrated in Bultmann's thinking.

⁹⁷ Müller, "Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns", 466.

⁹⁸ Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für den christlichen Glauben", in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Rudolf Bultmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933), 314.

⁹⁹ See Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism".

The Commentary on John's Gospel and the Jews

One of the most influential books by Bultmann is his extensive commentary on John's gospel;¹⁰⁰ published in 1941, his treatment of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is all the more intriguing. The way that Bultmann related to the Jews was certainly observed with great interest, since John's gospel was even used in propaganda against the Jews.¹⁰¹

In Bultmann's commentary, there is a fundamental conflict between Jesus and the Jews; in fact, to him, the gospel paints this conflict as one in which the Jews, as 'the world', bring Jesus to trial.¹⁰² The Jews in John are presented not as the peculiar people of God, but as representing what opposes the gospel and faith, 'the world', and are thus placed on the dark side in the Johannine dualism. Bultmann states that the thought of the election of the people of Israel, and God's covenant with them, is missing in the prologue, as in the whole gospel, "and that here as well as there, the situation of the Israelite-Jewish people is not presented as one that in principle is brought out of the rest of the world".¹⁰³ In a footnote, Bultmann notes that his view is valid despite certain Johannine texts, pointing to his argument for omitting John 4:22: "to the Gospel [of John, A.G.] the Jews are absolutely the representatives of 'the world' anyway".¹⁰⁴ 'The world' is in Johannine dualism and in Bultmann's interpretation here the dark side of reality,¹⁰⁵ the opposite of the Word, the Light, etc. Hence when Bultmann invalidates the positive statements regarding Jews and Judaism (see below), this affects the whole interpretation of John. Jews are *the* representatives of the world. However, Bultmann disagrees with Adalbert Merx that John is the book on earth that is most inimical to Jews.¹⁰⁶

Later in his commentary, Bultmann discusses οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in greater detail. Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι stands for Jews in their entirety, but sometimes for the Jewish officials, Bultmann states. As noted, they are also viewed as

¹⁰⁰ Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*.

¹⁰¹ The—edited—Johannine statement "the father of the Jews is the devil" was even used for propaganda posters along a road, see Robert P. Erickson and Susannah Heschel, eds., *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999), photo no. 6.

¹⁰² Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 58, 87–88, 500.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 7 n. 5.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 33–34.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 35.

representatives of the unbelieving world, i.e. 'the world'. Moreover, *Jesus stands in opposition to the Jews, even though he was a Jew himself*:¹⁰⁷

the conflict (*Streit*) that runs through the whole of Jesus' life is also here, a conflict between the Christian faith and the world, which is represented by the Jews, which is constantly visible through the imagery of a court case, and indeed also that the Jews live under the delusion that they are the judges, whereas they in reality are the prosecuted before God's court (*Forum*).¹⁰⁸

Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is not the empirical Jewish people, but stands for a Jewish essence. The Jews are regarded as a foreign people that is opposed to Jesus—even John the Baptist is not presented as Jewish—and in his analysis, Bultmann identifies Jews with unbelief. However, in generalising the role of the Jews in John, Bultmann disregards positive statements on οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, a word that he sometimes places within quotation marks to show that it represents Jews in the more symbolic meaning. He sees consistent opposition to the Jews; the cleansing of the temple, for example, was an attack on the 'Jews' and their temple.¹⁰⁹ However, Bultmann may be taking a tacit stand against the contemporary thought that Jesus was Aryan, when he says that Jesus is ὁ Ἰουδαῖος even as a Galilean, since he is part of the Jewish *Volks- und Kultusgemeinschaft*, the Jewish community in an ethnic as well as religious sense.¹¹⁰ Against the background of the German discussion at the time, this may have been taken as a stand against ideas that Jesus being Galilean was an argument for him not being Jewish. In sum, Bultmann's depiction of the Jews is one that is not racist, but strongly anti-Jewish, stressing the opposition between Jesus and the Jews, overemphasising the conflict, while identifying the Jews with the world.

Key to Bultmann's view on the Jews in John is John 4:22, to which I have already referred. Bultmann simply omits the verse, arguing in a footnote that it is partly or in its entirety a redactional gloss.¹¹¹ To John 1:11 Bultmann had said that οἱ ἴδιοι, 'the own', can impossibly mean that it is God's peculiar people,¹¹² and he contends that Jesus cannot have uttered what is said in 4:22:

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 59; 84 n. 2.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 59.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 91.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 130 n. 7.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 139.

¹¹² Ibid., 34 n. 7.

That ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν [for the salvation is from the Jews] is impossible in John, not only in view of 8:41 *ff*; even 1:11 showed that the evangelist did not see the Jews as a peculiar and salvation people, and it is despite 4:9 hard to understand that the Johannine Jesus, who constantly dissociates himself from the Jews (8:17; 10:34; 13:33), would have spoken this phrase (see also W. Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, 1940, 229 *ff*).¹¹³

When Bultmann omits the text that together with the beginning of chapter 4 gives the Jews the role of God's peculiar people, he does this without thorough argumentation for why he considers it a gloss, simply stating, "Jesus could not have said this."¹¹⁴ It is also interesting that he refers to Grundmann's book, with its radical and racist dissociation of Jesus from Judaism. It seems important to Bultmann to sever the Johannine Jesus from Jews and Judaism. Of course, the statement that "salvation comes from the Jews" was highly controversial in the political situation.

Under the heading "The Jews as children of the devil" (*Die Teufelskindschaft der Juden*),¹¹⁵ Bultmann discusses portions of John 8, the statement being a counterpart to having God as a father, which Bultmann also discusses in the commentary. The heading itself is provoking, and it is surprising that Bultmann uses this formulation, since the Johannine text can scarcely be interpreted as meaning that Jews qua Jews were children of the devil. In fact, a few verses earlier, the gospel places Jews on the 'good side' in the Johannine dualism, as believers: the "Jews who believed in him" (πεπιστευκότας Ἰουδαίους),¹¹⁶ John 8:31. This is the context in all scholarly text editions, but in his own seemingly arbitrary literary criticism, Bultmann displaces this saying so that it comes after 12:32. *Having thus removed the saying where Jews are actually on the positive side, Bultmann interprets his pericope 8:41–47, 51 as overtly talking about Jews as children of the devil*, which is true, since they are unbelievers, but in Bultmann's interpretation, this unbelief, or unwillingness to hear and

¹¹³ Ibid., 139 n. 6. In the 11th and 12th editions, Bultmann refers to this book by Grundmann, which vehemently dissociates Jesus from Judaism (see discussion below).

¹¹⁴ For a fuller discussion, see Gerdmar, "Polemiken mot judar i Nya testamentet och dess reception. Utkast till en analytisk typologi", and Raimo Hakola, "Identity matters. John, the Jews and Jewishness" (Doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki, 2003), 105, 113.

¹¹⁵ See Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 238–244.

¹¹⁶ The perfect form πεπιστευκότας may also denote the permanency of the faith; from the context in v. 30, πιστεύσαντες would rather have been expected.

believe, is intrinsic to the Jews.¹¹⁷ Here Bultmann goes against the very context which states that the Jews believed. This heading and the following discussion helps taint Jews in the Johannine discourse as children of the devil, as well as those who were willing to kill Jesus.¹¹⁸

Does this imply that Bultmann saw Jews as children of the devil? Although this is difficult to ascertain, it is what the heading indicates. Hence Bultmann's exegesis tends to omit anything positive about the Jews, while emphasising the negative. Nor does Bultmann discern between a varied usage of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, which includes positive as well as negative statements. Where the Johannine Jesus expresses criticism of unbelief among Jews, Bultmann interprets this as a negative view of Jews qua Jews, not unbelieving Jews as unbelievers. His influential commentary thus probably contributed to the thought that (the Johannine) Jesus talks of Jews as being intrinsically negative, even children of the devil.

Even results by exegetes with regard to New Testament Jews and Judaism could be a hot issue in Germany in 1941, not least concerning John 4:22, and Bultmann's statements can scarcely be regarded as politically innocent. The consistent conflict perspective that Bultmann sees in John's gospel seems stronger than the material would allow if for example John 4:22 and other more positive descriptions in John were included in the characterisation of the Jews. However, in the existing situation, it would have been radical to present a positive picture of Jews and Judaism. Walter Grundmann in his article "Salvation Comes from the Jews" in fact reflects that the interpretation of this text was topical. Although Bultmann's commentary was not yet published, in quoting it, Grundmann dates it to 1938, and so must have been able to read page proofs.¹¹⁹ Building on Bultmann, Grundmann omits 4:22, which indicates that Bultmann's omission could serve National Socialist interests. This does not imply that Bultmann's interpretation of the Johannine Jews was motivated by National Socialist ideology, but it is clear that in a situation where racial discrimination was established in

¹¹⁷ Bultmann sees their conversion as something that immediately came to naught, Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 332.

¹¹⁸ See *ibid.*, 242–243.

¹¹⁹ Walter Grundmann, "Das Heil kommt von den Juden?" Eine Schicksalsfrage an die Christen deutscher Nation", *Deutsche Frömmigkeit* 6, no. 9, September (1938), 2 n. 5; 5 n. 12. In the aforementioned Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, 225 n. 5, and 230 n. 12, Walter Grundmann also builds on Bultmann.

Germany, Bultmann's choice of words and exegetical practice may have contributed to a negative picture of the Jews.

Bultmann, Politics and the Jews

As already noted, Bultmann was deeply involved in the discussion of the Aryan question and the Church. It concerned the freedom of the Church in general, and specifically the question of 'Jewish-Christian' ministers and whether they had to be removed from their positions, just as Jewish officials in the State. As already noted, the Deutsche Christen wanted the racial legislation to be applied to the Church, whereas the Confessing Church wanted to protect against State interference in the Church. As said in the discussion on Schlatter above, the theologians of the Confessing Church often argued on the basis of Lutheran two-kingdom theology; this doctrine was an important part of the Confessing Church and was written into the Barmen Declaration.¹²⁰

Bultmann's public resistance to the regime was predominantly related to church politics; Bultmann and Karl Barth both took a stand against National Socialist church policy, and the Barmen Declaration is mainly associated with Barth's name, as it should be.¹²¹ However, Bultmann and Barth took different stands regarding the loyalty oath to Hitler, an oath that all civil servants were to sign. Whereas Barth refused to take the oath unless it included a clause stating obedience to the Führer "insofar as I responsibly can as a Protestant Christian", Bultmann

¹²⁰ Karl Barth, *Gottes Wille und unsere Wünsche*, ed. Karl Barth and Ed. Thurneysen, vol. 7, *Theologische Existenz heute* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1934), article 4, p. 14, where lines are drawn between the mandates of the State and Church. In the existing situation, the statement regarding the freedom of the Church was of course bold. See also Kenneth C. Barnes, "Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Hitler's persecution of the Jews", in *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust*, ed. R. P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 115, on Bonhoeffer's two-kingdom theology.

¹²¹ The declaration and Barth's presentation of it is found in Barth, Barth, *Gottes Wille Und Unsere Wünsche*, the declaration on pp. 9–15. On this, see Forstman, *Christian Faith in Dark Times*, 204–205, and Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barths Lebenslauf*, 5 ed. (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1993), 248–261. See also Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekenkende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*, 127–130, which discusses the declaration critically. The Barmen Declaration explicitly rejects a legislation where people are locked out from ministry due to race, Barth, Barth, *Gottes Wille Und Unsere Wünsche*, 14. For Barth and the 'Jewish problem', see Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*, 289–301. Karl Ludwig Schmidt criticised Barth's unwillingness to take stronger political action and his sole focus on church and theological issues, Mühling, *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "Und Wissenschaft ist Leben"*, 135–136.

chose a more pragmatic line and advised Barth to sign it, perhaps in order to protect the Confessing Church.¹²² Bultmann's membership of the Confessing Church is a token of his resistance to the Nazi ideology and the Deutsche Christen, but as already demonstrated, the Confessing Church had a higher profile in ecclesio-political questions than in race-political matters where the State was concerned.¹²³ Despite this, Bultmann's friendship and solidarity with Jews is a fact, and he could not tolerate anti-Jewish comments.¹²⁴ The way in which the frontiers were drawn up between 'liberals' and more conservative scholars is exemplified by the famous episode when Karl Barth presupposed that Bultmann would side with the Deutsche Christen since he was 'liberal', which hurt Bultmann deeply.¹²⁵

Just as the Confessing Church and the leader Dietrich Bonhoeffer, with his strong resistance to the government,¹²⁶ Bultmann reasons

¹²² Forstman, *Christian Faith in Dark Times*, 205–209.

¹²³ See, however, the critical discussion of the role of the Confessing Church, Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge* and Shelley Baranowski, "The Confessing Church and Antisemitism: Protestant Identity, German Nationhood, and the Exclusion of Jews", in *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust*, ed. R. P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999).

¹²⁴ Stegemann, "Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum", 27.

¹²⁵ Forstman, *Christian Faith in Dark Times*, 203.

¹²⁶ On Dietrich Bonhoeffer's stance, see Barnes, "Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Hitler's persecution of the Jews". He was defensive of Christian Jews, but on the basis of a Lutheran two-kingdom theology, accepted the authority's right to deal with the Jews: "Bonhoeffer conceded that the 'Jewish problem' was a real historical problem that came under the domain of the state to solve," 115. However, he also discussed how the Church should act faced with the Aryan paragraph. Bonhoeffer's speech in April 1933 (Dietrich Bonhoeffer, "Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage", in *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Eberhard Bethge (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1959 (1933))) clearly states the different mandates of Church and State and thus reinforces the political right to govern the human sphere, although it discusses strategies for church action if the stately policies are such that they deprive citizens of their rights. Bonhoeffer suggests that, at the present moment, there was no cause to intrude into the stately mandate, and that such action must be decided by a 'Protestant' council; for the time being, the Church should confine itself to asking the State about the stately legitimacy of their actions, and caring for the victims. As for the 'Jewish problem' (the existence of which he does not question), Bonhoeffer argues that the Jews have a history of suffering due to the curse that came upon them when they "nailed the redeemer of the world to the cross", and Bonhoeffer awaits the future conversion of this people, 49–50. 'Judaism' to the Church is not a racial but a religious concept, and Bonhoeffer is straightforward in his insistence that the Church knows no racial differences within its confines. The same position is found in the first draft of the "Bethel Confession", 1933, Bonhoeffer, "Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage", 115–117. On Bonhoeffer's later positions, see e.g. Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*, 414–423, with literature.

on the basis of a two-kingdom theology during the ‘Third Reich’.¹²⁷ Hence, in his article “The Aryan Paragraph in the Context of the Church”, 1933, Bultmann strongly advocates the right of the Church to be governed by biblical principles, *whereas he leaves ‘social questions’ to the State realm—and the Jewish problem’ is a social question.* The realm of the Church is different, however: “The Neutestamentler declaration states that the Church according to Paul is the body of Christ and that *in its sphere (Raum)* there are no differences, referring to texts such as 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:28.”¹²⁸ Here Bultmann refers to the Church sphere, where biblical ‘laws’ must rule, but he also acknowledges a State sphere, where the Church cannot intervene. Bultmann writes:

Within the Church, biological factors cannot grant greater or smaller rights. [...] But do not the differences of the human sphere, and with these the biological differences, count at all before God? Indeed, in the widest sense, they do not count at all before God, since “standing before God” simply means to stand as an individual under God’s claim, under God’s judgment, under God’s grace. [...] Where does that leave the significance of belonging to a race [...]? But does not the statement from Erlangen¹²⁹ also say that the fact that all Christians are children of God does not abolish the biological and social differences, but rather binds each Christian to the estate (*Stand*) into which he is called? Yes, quite rightly so. [...] Paul [...] in 1 Cor. 7:17–24 turns against such fools who want to make the principles of the church fellowship into laws of the world, against emancipatory desires of slaves and women. Are we now to commit the opposite folly and make the laws of the world into the laws of the Church?¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Stegemann, “Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum”, 29. Stegemann’s article has given me important impulses when working with the political stance of Bultmann.

¹²⁸ Bultmann, “Der Arier-Paragraph im Raume der Kirche”, 361, emphasis mine.

¹²⁹ Bultmann here, in addition to the dialogue with Wobbermin, critically discusses a statement on the Aryan paragraph given by the University of Erlangen. This was formulated by the systematic theologians Paul Althaus and Werner Elert and stressed that the mandate of the Church is limited to the gospel and that the Church cannot decide whether the Jews are a guest people (*Gastvolk*) or not, in practice supporting the Aryan paragraph. The statement is published in *Theologische Blätter*, Paul Althaus and Werner Elert, “Theologische Gutachten über die Zulassung von Christen jüdischer Herkunft zu den Ämtern der deutschen evangelischen Kirche”, *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 11 (1933). See also Kurt Meier, *Die theologischen Fakultäten im Dritten Reich* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 125–126. On Althaus and his view of two kingdoms, the *Zweireichenlehre* of Lutheran tradition, see Erickson, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 104–107, and on the Erlanger statement, 108.

¹³⁰ Bultmann, “Der Arier-Paragraph im Raume der Kirche”, 362–363: “Innerhalb der Kirche können biologische Merkmale nicht größere oder geringere Rechte verleihen.

The basis for this reasoning is the Lutheran two-kingdom doctrine, which in addition to the traditional concepts includes the contemporary one of race being placed into different estates. At this point, Bultmann is in line with the Erlangen statement and the theology of Paul Althaus.¹³¹ To the question of whether the fellowship with God means that biological differences are nullified for Christians, Bultmann responds with a clear no. He does not oppose the basic analysis of the Erlangen statement, that racial differences *are* relevant outside the Church; however, he goes on to criticise that the Erlangen theologians apply this *to the Church*. Basically, Bultmann seems to acknowledge the existence of racial differences, although the ‘natural orders’ are dependent on historical circumstances:

The belonging to a race as a mere fact implies no unambiguous instruction for action [...] It is wholly possible that in certain situations the significance of the factor of race was wrongly overlooked. The question involved must be kept alive; however, the answer is never unequivocally given.¹³²

One must reckon with Bultmann making some concessions in order to convey his point, which pertains to the sphere of the Church. Nevertheless, his concessions are far-reaching, allowing for racial politics as a relevant issue in social life, i.e. in the sphere of the State. However, Bultmann continues to take a stand against a race-based *theology*: Paul did not speak of biological differences in 1 Corinthians 7, and he regarded “what we call *völkisch*” as an order put into the hands of man; to the Church it makes no difference.¹³³ Bultmann reinstates the fundamental

[...] Aber gelten die Unterschiede der menschlichen Sphäre und mit ihnen die biologischen Unterschiede vor Gott überhaupt nichts? Sie gelten in der Tat insofern vor Gott—im weitesten Sinne genommen—überhaupt nichts, als ‘vor Gott stehen’ heißt: schlechthin als Einzelnor vor Gott stehen unter Gottes Anspruch, unter Gottes Gericht, unter Gottes Gnade. [...] Wo bleibt da die Bedeutung der Rassenzugehörigkeit [...]? Aber sagt nicht auch das Erlanger Gutachten, daß die allen Christen gemeinsame Gotteskindschaft die biologischen und gesellschaftlichen Unterschiede nicht aufhebt, vielmehr jeden Christen an der Stand bindet, in dem er berufen ist? Ja, mit vollem Recht. [...] Paulus ... wendet sich I Kor 7,17–24 gegen solche Toren, die die Grundsätze der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft zu Gesetzen der Welt machen wollen, gegen Emanzipationsgelüste der Sklaven und Frauen. Und *wir* sollen nun die umgekehrte Torheit begehen und Gesetze der Welt zu Gesetzen der Kirche machen?”

¹³¹ Erickson, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 108–109.

¹³² Bultmann, “Der Arier-Paragraph im Raume der Kirche”, 364.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 365.

indifference to racial issues *within the Church realm*. What then about the human sphere, the realm of the State? Bultmann says:

Let then the State decide if the Jews resident in Germany belong to the German people in a full sense or are a guest people. "The Church as such cannot settle this"—thus says the Erlangen statement (paragraph 4), and rightly so. But it does not exactly speak for the power of its logic or the consequence of its ecclesiology, when afterwards it is concluded from the concept of *Volkskirche* that the decision that the State has taken for its officials will be adopted by the Church. It is, however, clear: if the Church cannot settle this question, the question is insignificant for its sphere (*Raum*).¹³⁴

This statement closely echoes the Erlanger statement: the Church cannot decide "whether the Jews living among us in a full sense belong to the German people or to their own nationality and thus are guest people. *The Church cannot settle this.*"¹³⁵ Bultmann continues to say that the Church relates to people confessionally: Jews are Jews in the meaning of people who do not acknowledge Jesus as God's Christ, whereas Jewish Christians are simply Christians. Thus Bultmann draws the consequences of his two-kingdom theology both for the church sphere—here Gal. 3:28 is in force—and the human sphere. *In the latter, the political power should decide how to administer the racial question, and this question is irrelevant to the Church.* The Church can only fulfil its peculiar task when it is aware that its critical task keeps it in constant tension with the conscience of the people, Bultmann contends.¹³⁶ Bultmann's agenda, therefore, is the freedom of the Church to form its own law, thereby building on the biblical equality of the races, rather than the questioning of racial legislation. The sharp division between the two spheres functions as a defence of the freedom of the Church, *but is also a concession for the*

¹³⁴ Ibid., 366: "Mag also der Staat entscheiden, ob die in Deutschland ansässigen Juden im vollen Sinne dem deutschen Volke angehören oder ein Gastvolk sind. 'Die Kirche als solche kann das nicht entscheiden'—so sagt mit Recht das Erlanger Gutachten (Abs. 4). Aber für die Kraft seiner Logik oder die Konsequenz seines Kirchengedankens spricht es nicht gerade, wenn nachher aus dem Begriffe der Volkskirche gefolgert wird, daß die vom Staate für seine Ämter getroffene Entscheidung von der Kirche übernommen wird. Es ist doch klar: wenn die Kirche jene Frage nicht entscheiden kann, so ist die Frage für ihren Raum bedeutungslos."

¹³⁵ Kurt Meier, *Kirche und Judentum. Die Haltung der evangelischen Kirche zur Judenpolitik des Dritten Reiches* (Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag: 1968), 126; Althaus and Elert, "Theologische Gutachten über die Zulassung von Christen jüdischer Herkunft zu den Ämtern der deutschen evangelischen Kirche", 323.

¹³⁶ Bultmann, "Der Arier-Paragraph im Raume der Kirche", 369.

existing government to define the status of the Jewish people. Hence the price of the freedom of the Church was the freedom of the State to pursue its racial policy.¹³⁷ Stegemann writes, “[One may establish] that with a stroke of the pen this formulation abolishes the history of the emancipation of German Jewry and surrenders the civil and human rights of the Jews to the discretion of the State.”¹³⁸

This position did not stop Bultmann from protesting against National Socialist ideology—it is important to remember that being anti-Jewish need not mean being pro-National Socialist. In an article on “The Meaning of the Christian Faith in Creation” (*Der Sinn des christlichen Schöpfungsglaubens*), Bultmann clarifies what is and is not a Christian view of the ‘orders of creation’.¹³⁹ He acknowledges as an order of creation that the State has power to uphold law and authority, and that there are estates, but the existence of these estates have no specific consequences. Rather, Bultmann stresses the responsibility of man to answer to the present circumstances. Neither a lawless utopia, a *humanitas* governed by eternal principles, nor a divinely constituted people based on blood and soil (*Blut und Boden*) can be accepted.¹⁴⁰ Thus Bultmann vindicates the Christian state in view of the existing alternatives, and this is explicitly directed against National Socialist ideology. He also relativises the concept of ‘people’: a people is an historical entity and not based on its blood. Any divinisation of state authority is out of the question, and the servant of the State is a servant of man, and thus of God. This latter statement is written in a situation where the oppression of the Nazi rule had escalated, with Bultmann taking a stand against pretensions of the State that he could not accept.

Even after 1945, Bultmann could air negative thoughts about Jews and their fate during National Socialism. Having acknowledged a collective guilt on behalf of the Germans in a reply to the leading Jewish scholar Leo Baeck, Bultmann nevertheless wonders if the Jews should not ask themselves to what extent they share a responsibility for what happened. Distinguishing between a proper, pure Judaism and its opposite, Bultmann intimates that many Germans see the negative

¹³⁷ Cf. Stegemann, “Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum”, 29.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹³⁹ Rudolf Bultmann, “Der Sinn des christlichen Schöpfungsglaubens”, *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft* 51 (1936).

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 18.

Judaism,¹⁴¹ and along theological lines that for a long time were his own, Bultmann blames German Jewry for the persecutions and the Holocaust: “both of us, the Jew and the German, fared on the same wrong way”. In addition to the dichotomising between Jews and Germans, as if one could not be Jew and German at the same time, it is astonishing to a modern reader that Bultmann could intimate a partly Jewish guilt for the Holocaust.

Bultmann and Heidegger

Martin Heidegger being a confessing National Socialist, Bultmann’s friendship with the great philosopher has sometimes been used to taint Bultmann with the same ideology. This is not proven, however, and as for the political stance, Bultmann opposed Heidegger. It is true that Bultmann and Heidegger were close friends and colleagues in Marburg,¹⁴² a friendship that lasted until their deaths in 1976, but the friendship was interrupted during National Socialism, due to Heidegger’s National Socialism and Bultmann’s strong opposition to it. The question that remains is whether Bultmann, who shared many philosophical beliefs with Heidegger, was influenced by this, given that Heidegger’s philosophical beliefs were in turn conditioned by fascist ideas.¹⁴³

In his book *Racializing Jesus*,¹⁴⁴ Shawn Kelley asks to what extent “biblical Heideggerians [are] influenced by the disastrous ideological and political values embedded in Heidegger’s thought”, focusing on Bultmann.¹⁴⁵ Having restricted myself to literature that deals explicitly with Judaism, I will not discuss the possible Heideggerian influence

¹⁴¹ Rudolf Bultmann, “Das deutsche Volk und Israel”, in *Glauben und Verstehen* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960 (1952)), 57.

¹⁴² On the relationship between Heidegger and Bultmann before the war, see Hans Jonas, “A Retrospective View”, in *Proceedings of the International Colloquium On Gnosticism Stockholm August 20–25, 1973*, *Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademins Handlingar Filologisk-filosofiska serien* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1977), 3–4.

¹⁴³ Within the scope of this study, it is not possible to discuss Heidegger’s philosophy in relation to his political ideology.

¹⁴⁴ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*.

¹⁴⁵ For Heidegger’s biography focusing on his Nazi involvement, see Victor Fariás, *Heidegger and Nazism* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), which caused a heated debate, and Hugo Ott, *Martin Heidegger. Unterwegs zu seiner Biographie* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1988), both of which testify to a thoroughly Nazi Heidegger during the war.

on Bultmann's demythologisation programme. However, Kelley rightly points out the dependence of Bultmann on for example Baur and the Tübingen school.¹⁴⁶ I would put it somewhat differently. Bultmann is dependent on the Enlightenment theological research tradition, inherited from English deism, developed from Herder and Semler, through de Wette and Schleiermacher, Baur, and the subsequent research tradition, popularised and somewhat broadened by the new perspectives of the History of Religions school, but in certain respects also by Lutheran theological tradition. When Bultmann—as demonstrated—repeats the tale of the Jewish past using almost the same formulations as a Schürer or a Wellhausen, he does this as a child of this research tradition. Kelley notes, talking of Heidegger and Barth—both in different ways inspirers of Bultmann—that they “shared a similar *narrative* of origin, fall, crisis, and revival; a narrative which would prove to provide Bultmann's thought with its essential structure”.¹⁴⁷ I would add that Barth also shared that ‘narrative’ with a long and broad Christian tradition. But since this plot (origin–fall–crisis–renewal) is fairly universal and probably could be evidenced in a range of ‘narratives’ from different traditions, it is difficult to unambiguously connect it to any specific background. Thus furthering this tale is not *specifically* Heideggerian; Heidegger himself seems to stand in such a tradition. However, the interesting question is the relation of this narrative to Heideggerian philosophy in Bultmann's interpretation, and whether the dependence on Heidegger, who was a National Socialist and anti-Semite, affects Bultmann's theology. As for Heidegger's ideological stand and position to the ‘Jewish problem’, Berel Lang convincingly depicts Heidegger as a confessing National Socialist,¹⁴⁸ with a nefariously cynical view of man—e.g. in his 1949 Bremen lectures, when he without comment draws analogies between the food industry and extermination camps.¹⁴⁹ Lang argues that Heidegger's silence on the ‘Jewish problem’ speaks of his anti-Semitism, from this and anti-Semitic statements, demonstrating that Heidegger was anti-Semitic.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 141.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 135.

¹⁴⁸ Berel Lang, *Heidegger's Silence* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996). The book is an elucidating discussion of Heidegger's programmatic silence on the ‘Jewish problem’, and at the same time a fascinating memento to anyone who—like myself—tends to reject arguments *e silentio*.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 16–17.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, silence: ch. 2 and 3; anti-Semitic statements: 38, 69–71.

Kelley also argues that Bultmann uses the Heideggerian ‘care-structure’ and that this has implications for the reading of Bultmann,¹⁵¹ concentrating on Heidegger’s concept of authenticity–inauthenticity (*Eigentlichkeit*). Kelley interprets this in terms of race, and especially the Jews. However, in Bultmann, inauthenticity rather represents sin, whereas authenticity represents faith. In Heidegger’s thought, man has either an authentic or an inauthentic existence;¹⁵² these are the two modes of existence (*Seinsmodi*).¹⁵³ When man ‘is himself’, he is *authentic*, but the human existence (*Dasein*) always falls away from itself and into the ‘world’, which is linked to the ‘they’ (*das Man*), representing ‘everydayness’ and the human as part of, and voluntarily submitting to, the public. This is an *inauthentic* state, and Heidegger talks of ‘lostness’ or “fallenness into *das Man* (the ‘they’)”. According to Schmithals, Bultmann applies this to the New Testament and the concepts of sin, arguing that authenticity is, if not identical with, then related to, faith. “Martin Heidegger’s existentialist analysis of human existence seems to be only a profane philosophical presentation of the New Testament view of who we are,” Bultmann writes.¹⁵⁴ Whereas Schmithals argues that faith and sin are the ‘equivalents’ of authenticity and inauthenticity, to Kelley they also represent, in turn, Hellenistic Judaism and Palestinian Judaism. Lang also discusses how categories from *Sein und Zeit* are used to philosophise about the *Volk* and its role, with the central term ‘authenticity’ being related to the *Volk*.¹⁵⁵ In one instance, Heidegger talks of ‘authentic’ values that were there to counteract the “growing Jewification”. Given Heidegger’s dual *Seinsmodi*, Jews then represent the inauthentic.¹⁵⁶ This is a clue to how Heidegger may have related Jews and Germans to his otherwise overly abstract rhetoric, and it seems reasonable to assume that Heidegger could interpret the negative dimension in his existential structures in terms of Judaism.

¹⁵¹ Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 138. For Kelley’s presentation of Heidegger’s thought, see 89–128.

¹⁵² For this, see Walter Schmithals, *An Introduction to the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann* (London: SCM Press, 1968), 72–73.

¹⁵³ Thure Stenström, *Existentialismen. Studier i dess idétradition och litterära yttringar*, 3 ed. (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1984), 101.

¹⁵⁴ Rudolf Bultmann, *New Testament Mythology and Other Basic Writings*, trans. S. Ogden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1994), 23.

¹⁵⁵ Lang, *Heidegger’s Silence*, 53.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 70–71.

Applying these possibilities to Bultmann, there is no doubt that the discussion in Bultmann's *Das Urchristentum* from 1949, for example, has a ring of Heidegger's categories¹⁵⁷—as noted, the inauthentic sides of man can very well be paralleled with Palestinian Judaism, and the authentic with Hellenistic Judaism and Paul. Nevertheless, to Bultmann the most authentic man, Jesus, is part of Palestinian Judaism. Thus such parallels are drawn, and in the often dichotomizing thinking of Bultmann, it seems meaningful to create such series of opposing characteristics as shown by Kelley. Judaism is Eastern, backward-looking, alienated, static, decayed, apocalyptic, inauthentic, servile; Christianity is Hellenistic, Western, forward-looking, dynamic, eschatological, authentic, free. Since Bultmann's thinking centres around law and faith, and the misuse of the former is identified with 'Late Judaism', the step between the history and the interpretation of modern Christian existence is not a long one, but the combination of tradition and existentialist categories gives old texts a new and powerful existential dimension.

However, it seems as though Bultmann through the Heideggerian influence does not change much of the traditional narrative of the Jewish past, but that *this tale is only reinterpreted in some Heideggerian terms*: authenticity and alienation. If, as Kelley suggests, Heidegger's influence racialises Bultmann's discourse, this only converges with the tale that in fact provides the structure to his whole rendering of 'Late Judaism' and early Christianity.¹⁵⁸ But it is problematic to conclude that racism was instilled through the use of Heidegger's philosophy, or to believe that Heidegger's influence was decisive for a 'racialised' discourse in New Testament research tradition. As demonstrated in the section about Bultmann's ecclesio-political statements, he complies with racial categories without any link to Heidegger. Firstly, even if Heidegger's philosophy were connected with National Socialism in his own thinking,¹⁵⁹ it does not follow that the same ideology is influenced by National Socialist thought when other people use it. Due to their abstract character, Heidegger's categories can be interpreted in very different

¹⁵⁷ Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*, e.g. in the sections "Der Mensch und sein Verhältnis zur Zeit" and "Die Situation der Mensch in der Welt", 200–218.

¹⁵⁸ In this, I basically agree with Kelley, who rightly points out that "Bultmann's major contribution to this common view [the research tradition on 'Late Judaism', A.G.] was to give a Heideggerian structure to it" (144), but it seems as though Bultmann is quite traditional and gives the tradition new clothes rather than restructures it.

¹⁵⁹ Lang, *Heidegger's Silence*, 38, the dialogue with Löwith.

ways. Secondly, in Bultmann's usage of the categories from *Sein und Zeit*, there seems to be no *völkisch* thinking, and basically the categories are used to speak of less historical matters than may have been the case for Heidegger. Thirdly, as for the racial dimension, when seeing Jews and Judaism as inauthentic and as a model for such an existence, Heidegger's and Bultmann's thinking may concur, but Heidegger's categories add little more than mere analytical language to the rather consistent rendering of Jews as the dark background of Christianity that is found in Enlightenment Christian historiography, and before that in the long *Adversus Ioudaios* tradition.¹⁶⁰ Hence the racialisation of New Testament research tradition does not come with Heidegger's thinking, but though the long tradition of Christian interpretation and the Enlightenment research tradition outlined in this study.¹⁶¹ This is not to take Heidegger's fascism lightly, which Bultmann does not seem to have done. After the war, Bultmann urged Heidegger to recant his National Socialist sympathies, but he did not even respond to the suggestion. In his correspondence with Herbert Marcuse, Heidegger regretted certain things, but he would not admit to the German guilt for the extermination of the Jews. Instead, he referred to Allied bombings of the East Germans.¹⁶² Nevertheless, Bultmann and Heidegger remained in contact with one another until the year of their deaths, 1976.

That Bultmann had warm relationships with Jews is amply demonstrated by the case of Hans Jonas, who was forced to leave Germany during the war, but who highly cherished Bultmann's support of his research. This indicates that despite some surprising statements, Bultmann maintained such relationships on a personal level.¹⁶³ Moreover, in 1938, Bultmann stood up for the Jewish philologist Paul Friedländer when he was arrested.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ For the latter, see Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide. The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 154–160. The influence from Heidegger to Bultmann, and then to his followers, seems more complex than this; Heidegger's influence may be overstated, and for a balanced evaluation, the interaction between the research tradition and Heidegger needs to be clarified.

¹⁶² Farias, *Heidegger and Nazism*, 282–287.

¹⁶³ Jonas, "A Retrospective View", 11.

¹⁶⁴ Werner Raupp, "Bultmann, Rudolf (Karl)", in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* (Nordhausen: Bautz, 2003).

Conclusion

The study of Bultmann's scholarly reflection on the Judaism of antiquity and in relation to early Christianity, as well as his political involvement in opposition to Aryan legislation in the Church, makes up a complex picture. Bultmann stands solidly and consciously in the research tradition from F. C. Baur, and he often agrees with the results of the History of Religions school. The research tradition provides the hermeneutical framework, which he uses to understand early Christianity in relation to Judaism, roughly furthering the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis. Bultmann does not present any deeper research into Judaism as such, but basically relies on other scholars, although he does share Kittel's opposition to Bousset–Gressmann's picture of Judaism, and especially their neglect of rabbinic material. However, the basic structures of the Enlightenment research tradition on the Jews are there: the Christianity that prevailed was not the Palestinian one, with its 'Late Judaism' characteristics. Instead, its seedbed is in the Diaspora—although in line with Heitmüller and Bousset, and against the Baurian historiography, Bultmann places the meeting with the Greek spirit in Antioch, rather than in Alexandria.

At first sight, Bultmann's relationship to Judaism and the Jewish *Urgemeinde* seems somewhat ambiguous, but it is in fact consistent. He operates with the entities of Judaism, the early (Jewish) church and the Gentile church. Only the Gentile church survived, and only in this church is the spirit of Jesus fully manifested, although the early church, due to its inner quality and the spirit of Jesus at work in it, was also expelled from Judaism. The early (Jewish) church has the traditional limitations of Judaism: it is centred around the Law, limited to the nation and void of the full revelation of the ethical redemptive religion, the religion that Jesus introduces. When Jesus is described as a rabbi, Bultmann nevertheless sees big differences between Jesus and the rabbis. Rather than support the legalistic 'Late Judaism', he reinforced the ethical law of the Old Testament and the Prophets. Thus, even though Bultmann again talks about Jesus' Jewish pedigree, Jesus is un-Jewish. Only the influence of the Greek thinking in Hellenistic Judaism brought a change. A change may perhaps be seen in Bultmann over time. In the 1920s, he sometimes describes Judaism and the early (Jewish) church more favourably. However, this positive picture fades, especially in the production of the 1940s; instead there is a more negative evaluation of the Judaism of antiquity and Bultmann's time. Bultmann's review of

Holl's book paints his most favourable picture of Palestinian Judaism: Jesus was Jewish; his faith, his view of God and his ethics were Jewish; "the Law grows out of grace, is grace". Although he also states that there was a false understanding of the Law, in the overall picture this is an exception.

Thus there is *no continuity* between Palestinian early Christianity and Gentile Christianity. The continuity is only with Jesus, and in practice, the Jewish church means nothing, and the Gentile church everything. The gist of Bultmann's thinking is that the *spirit of Jesus*, the grain within the husk (which, then, would be Palestinian Judaism), provides the essence of Christianity. *Therefore, Jesus is dehistoricised and is more an idea than a real Jewish person. This strategy makes it possible for Bultmann to acknowledge the pedigree of Jesus but still detach him from his Jewish background.* In the symbolic world of Bultmann, Jews and Judaism never have a positive place in their own right; Jesus does, but he is then reinterpreted and disconnected from his Jewish background.

Bultmann's *symbolic world* has several elements. On the one hand, Bultmann is an inheritor of Baur and the Enlightenment research tradition; constructing Jews and Judaism, he repeats its descriptions of Jews and Judaism as legalistic, casuistic, shallow. Jesus is a Jew, but by dehistoricising him, Bultmann can make him suprahistorical. Bultmann's 'symbolic Jew' is a negative figure, an opponent to Jesus and faith, a person of no consequence to Christianity; the Palestinian church theology withered away, whereas the Hellenistic rose to become true Christianity. The peak of his negative description of Jews is his commentary on John's gospel, where he uses the heavily pejorative notion of the Jews' *Teufelskindschaft* (being children of the devil) and their willingness to kill Jesus.

As for the *legitimation versus delegitimation* of oppression against Jews and Judaism, there is nothing to indicate that Bultmann accepts *völkisch* theology. Instead, he resists it, boldly and early in the 'Third Reich', standing up against Aryan legislation within the Church. At the same time, however, he complies with National Socialist racial policy in the State realm. Race is a biological factor and an estate that is part of the jurisdiction of the State. Thus he leaves to the racist German authorities to implement whatever laws they see fit to solve the 'Jewish problem'. This was not only an attitude that Bultmann adopted under pressure. In a dialogue with the leading Jewish Rabbi Leo Baeck in the early 1950s, he asks Jews to examine themselves for any responsibility they might have for the tragic events during National Socialism. Bultmann

could not have been unaware of Jewish persecution and pogroms; in Bultmann's Marburg, too, the synagogue was burnt down on 9 November 1938, and it is remarkable that such a statement could be made after the horrors of the National Socialist rule.¹⁶⁵

Thus, in Bultmann, there is a combination of liberal criticism of National Socialism, a will to protect Jewish-Christian ministers in the Church and an acceptance of the racial legislation of April 1933 in the State realm. "Let then the State decide if the Jews resident in Germany belong to the German people in a full sense or are a guest people," Bultmann writes,¹⁶⁶ at the same time as he is able to stand up for Jewish friends. Nevertheless, Bultmann's appalling statement that German Jews needed to be self-critical indicates a generally critical attitude to Judaism.

As puzzling as the combination of a certain liberalism and this view on Jews and Judaism is to a modern spectator, as common was it in the circles that Bultmann spent his entire life in: cultural Protestantism. Writing mainly on Martin Rade and the circles of *Die Christliche Welt*, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf notes a similar combination of the attitudes that we find in Bultmann. National liberalism, with an 'enlightened liberal' doctrine of justice,¹⁶⁷ is combined with protests against Aryan legislation in the Church, helping Jews to emigrate—even 'Mosaic Jews'—and theological criticism of a blood and soil theology (even if they might confirm that Christianity is part of German identity). At the same time, there is a notion of Jews being a guest people, an acceptance of certain racial terminology, legislation, etc., and thus a de facto support of racial policies. Graf explains this with the tradition of cultural Protestants maintaining a religious personalism, concentrating on the religious autonomy of the individual, whereas the judicial protection of this freedom is neglected.¹⁶⁸ This thinking favours a cultural homogeneity at the cost of a pluralism of faiths and philosophies. It can, for example, accept Jews, but at the price of their particularity: "they are caught in ideas of a homogeneous cultural substance, which hinders a cultural equality of the Jews".¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁵ Dietrich, "‘Es gilt: Entweder—oder!’", 31.

¹⁶⁶ Quoted above.

¹⁶⁷ Graf, "‘Wir konnten den Rad nicht in die Speichen fallen’. Liberaler Protestantismus und ‘Judenfrage’ nach 1933", 155.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 174.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 155. For evidence of this in Wilhelminian Germany, see Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*.

Linked to this is an adherence to the State as the main agent in society, and a State with religious legitimacy. The loyalty to the State—exemplified by even the Confessing Church interpreting the Nazi state as a legitimate superior under certain premises—and the focus on the freedom of the Church, neutralised much of the critical potential of the Church. How far this could go is evidenced in Martin Rade's article "On German Legislation for Jews", published in *Die Christliche Welt* in 1935, which comments on the newly passed Nuremberg legislation:

*Through the Nuremberg Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour of 15 September, the solution to the Jewish problem is placed on a firm foundation. Marriages between Jews and Germans are hereafter forbidden in Germany. Thus racial purity is guaranteed for those families that have an undisputed Aryan character.*¹⁷⁰

Although Rade goes on to show the difficulties in handling issues pertaining to the 'half-Aryans', mainly from a church perspective—ensuring that baptised Jewish children are not forced to attend a confessional Jewish school, noting that baptism of Jews is not prohibited by the State, and suggesting emigration as the only solution for this group¹⁷¹—it is surprising that he takes the racial legislation as a *lex lata*, the law that is given, and does not criticise it. Even if this does not mean that Rade wholeheartedly supports it, his introductory statement that the 'Jewish problem' has been placed on a firm foundation is hardly ironic but a mere statement of fact. At the end of the article, however, Rade opposes a prohibition against Aryans and non-Aryans keeping company, arguing that it is unethical from a Christian point of view.¹⁷² The Jews are a 'foreign people' but should be regarded and treated as a 'guest people', Rade suggests, and he cannot accept that interaction with such people should be considered racial defilement (*Rassenschande*). Rade also interprets the Führer's words on 15 September positively, stating that the legislation gives the Jews better possibilities of developing a life of their own than in any other country.¹⁷³ Thus, in this text, commenting

¹⁷⁰ "Durch das Nürnberger Gesetz zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes und der deutschen Ehre vom 15. September ist die Lösung der Judenfrage auf eine feste Grundlage gestellt. Eheschließungen zwischen Juden und Deutschen sind fürder in Deutschland verboten. Damit ist für die Geschlechter, deren arischer Character unangefochten dasteht, die Reinerhaltung ihrer Rasse garantiert." Martin Rade, "Zur deutschen Judengesetzgebung", *Die Christliche Welt* 21 (1935), 995, emphasis mine.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 995–996.

¹⁷² Ibid., 997.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 997.

on the thoroughly racist legislation of Nuremberg, Rade seems to basically accept the right of the State to pass these laws. He suggests implementations that are in the interest of the church, and wants this guest people to be treated as humanly as possible, but he refuses to criticise the inhuman legislation as such, only stating that the laws placed the 'Jewish problem' on a firm foundation. This is an example of the environment in which Bultmann lived and worked.

As Kurt Nowak summarises in his discussion on cultural Protestantism and Judaism, "It could be difficult, in the Protestant landscape of the 1920s, to find a group that defended the marked, legitimate place of the Jewish citizen in the modern development of German society with a humane and political unambiguity such as that of the constitution-loyal cultural Protestants."¹⁷⁴ Nowak also points to the involvement of several Protestant figures in the Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus (Association for Defence Against Anti-Semitism).¹⁷⁵ In the case of Bultmann, Nowak's description seems true for his general political outlook, especially during the Weimar Republic, but the evidence put forth here shows that his application of the two-kingdom doctrine to the situation of the Jews under National Socialism, and the apparent acceptance of the idea of the Jews as a guest people, as well as other statements, even after the Holocaust, indicate a surprisingly negative attitude to Jews.¹⁷⁶ In a note to Nowak, Wiese also points to the complexity of the liberal Protestant position: "Against an idealisation of the position of liberal Protestantism, which certainly took the most positive approach within Protestant theology, one must ask whether its theological picture of Judaism did not work counterproductively to its humanitarian intentions."¹⁷⁷ In sum, these notes to liberal Protestantism

¹⁷⁴ Nowak, *Kulturprotestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik*, 35.

¹⁷⁵ For this society, see Barbara Suchy, "The Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus (I). From its Beginnings to the First World War", in *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, ed. Arnold Paucker (London: Secker & Warburg, 1983); Barbara Suchy, "The Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus (II). From the First World War to its Dissolution in 1933", in *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, ed. Arnold Paucker (London: Secker & Warburg, 1985).

¹⁷⁶ Nowak's description shows that e.g. Ernst Troeltsch holds views that are typical of the Enlightenment research tradition discussed in this volume, of the 'original' Hebrews as a positive entity, and Judaism as a degeneration, and also that Troeltsch had a certain German-Nordic ideal, Nowak, *Kulturprotestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik*, 28–30.

¹⁷⁷ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland*, 15–16 n. 25. It may be questioned whether this is not a simplification; there are friends and foes of Jews and Judaism in the two main streams of German Protestantism, and the results of this study make it difficult to pinpoint the more positive one.

show quite an ambiguous stand towards Jews and Judaism, where partly contradictory interests and ideas compete, and the same ambiguity is also present in Bultmann.

The crucial point to this discussion is what part the theology of Bultmann played in the *legitimation* or *delegitimation* of actions against Jews. The principal disconnection between Judaism and Christianity is evident, and the dehistoricising of Jesus lifts him above his Palestinian Jewish pedigree. Bultmann's Christianity thus basically lacks any essential connection with Jews and Judaism. They are predominantly a negative factor in his overall theology, and this probably made it easier for Bultmann to leave the destiny of the Jews to the National Socialist state. His heart beat for the *Christian* Jews, however—to him, Jewish Christians were simply Christians. Bultmann's cultural-Protestant thought in combination with a religious symbolic world, where Judaism was the 'negative principle', probably made it possible to protest against Aryan legislation in the Church and to oppose National Socialist policy and blood and soil ideology, without taking a stand for Jews in general. In sum, Bultmann's predominantly negative theological view on Jews and Judaism seems to have favoured his reluctance to take a stand for the Jews as a social group in National Socialist Germany.

PART IV
NAZI EXEGESIS AND THE JEWS

INTRODUCTION*

The Protestant theological professor was a highly revered figure in early twentieth-century Germany, uniting the two powers of the academia and the Protestant church. Planning his political conquest, Hitler knew that the National Socialist party (NSDAP) had to connect with the churches in order to succeed with anti-Semitic strategy, and he admired the Christian conservative *Hofprediger* Adolf Stoecker, who had made anti-Semitism a popular movement.¹ As Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz puts it:

With the connection of Christian conservative thought and radical anti-Semitism, the NSDAP stands in a tradition that goes back to the early nineteenth century, to the Prussian Pietist and the Bavarian ultramontane conservatives, just as to Adolf Stoecker's Christian Social Workers' Party or the anti-Semitic *Deutschsoziale Partei* of the past century.²

The tactical concept of the NSDAP was to envision State and Church as one entity (Article 24 of the party programme), in contrast to the situation during the Weimar Republic—a concept that was attractive to many church people and theologians.³ It is then no wonder that the National Socialists were eager to count theological professors among their members, even though their later politics were hostile to the traditional values of Christianity. The young exegete Walter Grundmann became an early member of the National Socialist party on 1 December 1930 in Tübingen, and his teacher, the prominent New Testament exegete and expert in Judaism, Gerhard Kittel, became a member on 1 May 1933, one month after the Jewish Boycott.

* I define Nazi exegetes as exegetes who were organised National Socialists. The presentation will show whether their political stance affected their exegetical practice.

¹ Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Nationalsozialismus und Kirchen. Religionspolitik von Partei und Staat bis 1935*, 46. As noted, Hitler took such great interest in Stoecker that he personally went through Walter Frank's biography of Stoecker before the publication of its second edition, Frank, *Hofprediger Adolf Stoecker und die christlichsoziale Bewegung*.

² Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Nationalsozialismus und Kirchen. Religionspolitik von Partei und Staat bis 1935*, 44.

³ Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, vol. 208, Theologische Existenz heute (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1980), 89–90.

Below I will discuss the view on Judaism of these two scholars: Kittel, a second-generation theological professor with great prestige and deep roots in the conservative Pietist circles, and Grundmann, a scholar with an ordinary lower-class background. The choice is quite natural: both of them were National Socialists, who had the same theological outlook to begin with, although they represent fairly different positions politically and theologically.

GERHARD KITTEL:
JEWISH *UNHEIL* THEOLOGICALLY FOUNDED¹

At first sight, Gerhard Kittel appears to be an enigma. In his time, Kittel was no doubt one of the most competent and respected New Testament experts in the Judaism of the Second Temple and Tannaitic to Talmudic times.² Kittel's publications after 1913 were primarily in the area of Judaism and Christianity, including the 1922 edition of *Sifre to Deuteronomy*, and he was editor of the great rabbinic text edition from 1932, *Rabbinische Texte*.³ His professorship at Tübingen and the editorship of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* crowned his scholarly career. Yet, during National Socialism, Kittel was a party member with a programmatic and strongly negative stance towards Judaism, resulting in a racist apartheid policy against the Jews.⁴ During most of the National Socialist period, he was involved in the

¹ Central to Kittel's argument in his 1933 reflection on the fate of the Jews is his theologising of contemporary events in terms of *Heilsgeschichte* and *Unheilsgeschichte*, see discussion below. Since the otherwise proper translation 'disaster' for *Unheil* lacks the negation of salvation (*Heil*) so important in Kittel's argument, below I use the term *Unheil* instead of disaster.

² For Kittel's biography, see Gerhard Friedrich and Johannes Friedrich, "Kittel, Gerhard, 1888–1948", in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (1990), Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 47–50, and Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 28–31. Unfortunately, TRE's article on Kittel—written by his successor as editor of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, "Theological Dictionary of the New Testament" (henceforth TDNT), Georg Friedrich—makes surprisingly little of Kittel's National Socialist involvement, as pointed out also by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, "'Meine Verteidigung' von Gerhard Kittel und eine Denkschrift von Walter Grundmann", in Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit*, ed. Hermann Düringer and Karin Weintz, *Arnoldshainer Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 2000), 139. Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 413–421, also includes valuable biographical information, as does Wayne A. Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

³ Kittel discussed the pertinent methodological problems in connection with the translation of rabbinic texts, see Kittel, "Grundsätzliches und Methodisches zu den Übersetzungen rabbinischer Texte".

⁴ So also Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*.

Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage (Research Department for the Jewish Question) at the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands (Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany), an institute that directly served the National Socialist purposes.⁵ And here, Kittel did not conceal his view on the Jews. For instance, in the first paper at the 1937 conference of the institute, Kittel says of the 'Jewish problem' and its roots in the essence of Judaism:

What is important for this history of emergence [of Judaism, A.G.] and for the judging of the present-day questions is this: it shows irrefutably how the 'Jewish problem' is not a coincidence, but how the determining factors [...] lie in the essence of Judaism (*das Wesen des Judentums*), as it has developed historically from the first millennium of its existence. This means that all those remain bunglers, who think that they can render this problem harmless, which has been given to the peoples, that it can be ignored without harm or against which small measures can be taken; and this [implies, A.G.] that it was not arbitrary brutality and barbarity when the Führer of the new Germany put the Jewish problem on a completely new foundation in a radical resolution for the German people as the first people of the present day, but it was honest political action, born out of historical sobriety.⁶

Thus Kittel's attitudes to Jews and Judaism present an enigma: the combination of great interest and expertise in Judaism, as well as instances of personal defence of certain Jews, and a strong and programmatic deprecation of Judaism, suggesting racist measures against German Jewry. The question discussed here is how these attitudes and actions can be related to his overarching ideology and theology.

From the Lutheran Professor's Home to Service under National Socialism

Gerhard Kittel was born in 1888 as the son of the famous Old Testament scholar Rudolf Kittel (1853–1929) and his wife Emilie. Born in

⁵ Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 516.

⁶ Gerhard Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Ersten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 19. bis 21. November 1936, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937), 63. Kittel tries to reinterpret this message, which clearly supports and historically establishes the 'Jewish problem', Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 40, but the words cannot be understood other than as strong support for Hitler's policies.

Breslau, at the age of ten he moved to Leipzig, where his father was called to the Old Testament professor's chair and was also active in the leadership of the Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum. Gerhard Kittel describes himself as a Lutheran, both with regard to church affiliation and theological stance,⁷ more specifically a Saxon Lutheran and Pietist.⁸ This seems to be true also of his father. Siegele-Wenschkewitz notes the extent to which the son was influenced by his father, in his choice of the area of study, as well as and in his entire development. Gerhard Kittel studied theology and *Orientalistik* in Leipzig, Tübingen and Berlin, but took his doctorate and postdoctoral qualification (*Habilitation*) with Johannes Leipoldt in Kiel in 1912, with the dissertation *Die Oden Salomos, überarbeitet oder einheitlich*. He became a lecturer at the University of Kiel at the young age of twenty-five, and would later complete a second postdoctoral qualification with Leipoldt, by this time New Testament professor at Leipzig. Kittel was successful. Shortly after his appointment as New Testament professor at Leipzig, he was called to the same position in Greifswald. In 1926, he became New Testament professor in Tübingen, taking up Adolf Schlatter's chair, for which his closest competitor was Rudolf Bultmann. Kittel would keep this position until his suspension by the French military authorities on 25 October 1945. He died in July 1948, shortly after his return to Tübingen from the internment camp, an important reason for his detention having been his involvement in the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage.

Kittel, New Testament Studies and Judaism 1913–1932

Kittel's introduction to Jewish studies was quite different, however. His background and development gave him a unique opportunity for understanding the Judaism of New Testament times, and provided the tools with which he could pioneer a renewed view on this Judaism. The main centres for Jewish and rabbinic scholarship in Christian circles in Germany were the Instituta Judaica, and as noted Gerhard's father was a member of the board of the Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum in

⁷ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 3. Otto Michel describes him as "fundamentally conservative, and a Lutheran" in RGG³ III, 1626, and states that he connected the *völkisch* renewal and 'Christian' anti-Semitism of Adolf Stoecker's type.

⁸ Friedrich and Friedrich, "Kittel, Gerhard, 1888–1948".

Leipzig.⁹ Professor Leipoldt at Leipzig, stating that rabbinic literature was necessary for a proper understanding of the New Testament, initiated a translation of and commentary to the Tosefta, and was in the 1920s also active on the board of the Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum.¹⁰ In addition to Leipzig, Kittel studied in Berlin, where Strack was the leading Christian scholar of Judaism, in Greifswald with Gustaf Dalman, and with Schlatter in Tübingen, all of whom were highly respected by Kittel.¹¹ His parental home and these studies gave him a unique opportunity to become a leading scholar in the New Testament and Judaism, and in part provide an alternative to the picture of Jews and Judaism mediated by the History of Religions school. Kittel's contribution on Palestinian 'Late Judaism', in particular, meant a step forward for the field.

Jesus and the Rabbis

Having finished his doctorate on the Odes of Solomon, in 1914 Kittel wrote his *Jesus und die Rabbinen* ("Jesus and the Rabbis").¹² He begins with a sharp contrast:

"Jesus and the Rabbis"—these words represent a problem. Not just a problem of the past—it is clear that what we call the rabbis were the circles that the Lord had been in conflict with during his life. The opposition to them had brought him death. But also for the present, there lies a problem for our historical understanding (*Erkennen*).¹³

It is clear from Kittel's complete production that he sees a fundamental and essential opposition between Jesus and the rabbis, or Jesus and Judaism, the two pairs seeming synonymous.¹⁴ Kittel does not explicate what he means by the rabbis, but the above quotation seems to indicate that he sees an essential oneness between 'the rabbis' of apostolic times

⁹ Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 418 n. 33.

¹⁰ Ibid., 407.

¹¹ Ibid., 412.

¹² Gerhard Kittel, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, ed. Kropatchek, vol. IX, Serie 7, Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen (Berlin-Lichterfelde: Verlag von Edwin Runge, 1912). Neither the dissertation nor Gerhard Kittel, "Jesus bei Paulus", in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1912) are of particular relevance to this investigation. For this book, see also Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 422–424.

¹³ Kittel, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, 3.

¹⁴ This is also evident from his defence, Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung".

and his present time. There is no doubt that the 26-year-old Kittel is well read in rabbinic literature, and he frequently relates to scholars who represent such knowledge, e.g. Franz Delitzsch, H. L. Strack, Paul Fiebig, Adolf Schlatter and Gustaf Dalman, the latter whom Kittel presents as an example of serious rabbinic scholarship.¹⁵ It is worth noting that all these were part of the Pietist circles around the *Instituta Judaica* to which Kittel himself belonged. Kittel regards Schlatter as the most balanced among them, however, and later formed a very close relationship with him.¹⁶ The context of the study is the debate regarding the originality of the Gospels, raised by German-Jewish scholars, and Kittel mentions some works pertaining to this.¹⁷

The first problem discussed by Kittel deals with the purported similarities in *content* between Jesus and the rabbis, i.e. the affinities between the Talmud and the words of Jesus. Talmudic statements express similar things as the Sermon on the Mount: "Given this, one might for a moment understand that the Jewish scholars triumphed: the Talmud includes the Gospel; this is the source from which Jesus had drawn." But Kittel argues that the Talmudic sources discussed are all later than Jesus and the Gospels.¹⁸

Kittel rather sees an influence in the other direction. He makes this argument even stronger in the area of prayer. Concerning the Lord's Prayer and ways of prayer, one can with "absolute peace and confidence believe in the originality of the words of Jesus in relation to the rabbinic words".¹⁹ In rabbinic literature, "dead study of the Law and scholarship has taken the place of the living kingdom of God-work".²⁰ Kittel notes that the rabbis give a morally solid teaching, but whereas they deal with the moral question by weighing and accounting (*Abwägen und Abrechnen*), Jesus settles the whole ethical question with a few clean, clear statements. Moreover, the Talmud has no consistent message about love, and if there are statements that are in line with Jesus, these are singular. Kittel concludes that Jesus is nowhere dependent on the rabbis, but that he may have heard a rabbinic statement, adapted it, and on

¹⁵ Kittel, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, 29–32.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 25, 26.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 29. For this debate, see Donald A. Hagner, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus. An Analysis and Critique of Modern Study of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*.

¹⁸ Kittel, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, 4–8.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 10.

the basis of this, formulated his own statement. This, however, is an exception. On the other hand, individual rabbis may have expressed Christian thoughts in history, and may at some point have been able to “break the shackles of traditionalism and ceremonialism, and force their way to pure humanity”.²¹ The words we like in the Talmud, Kittel contends, are essentially foreign to it: “one could almost say that they are the words that do not belong to the Talmud”.²² Here Kittel intimates his negative view on the rabbis, which is similar to that of e.g. Wellhausen or Bousset. To maintain his negative picture of the Talmud, he omits the statements with which he sympathises, since they equal the ones in the Gospels.

The second issue is linguistic, pertaining to the language of Jesus, where Kittel’s position is nearer to Wellhausen than to Dalman. He states that Jesus was closer to the Jewish people than to the rabbis and gives linguistic examples.²³ This indicates that Kittel has no general criticism of the Jewish people, only of the rabbis.

The third area discussed is formal affinities between rabbinic texts and sayings of Jesus. Kittel is ready to accept affinities in this area: between the Eighteen prayer and the Lord’s Prayer, and between rabbinic parables and those of Jesus. Other scholars had suggested that Jesus was similar to the rabbis in outward lifestyle, for example that they could have been miracle workers; however, Kittel denies this, contending that Jesus was radically different from anyone else in the way that he performed miracles.²⁴ He concludes, “Also here it is clear that the statement ‘Jesus and the rabbis’ does not give harmony (*Zusammenklang*) but provides an opposition.” In fact, Kittel seems inclined to construct the opposition, whereas others prefer the harmony.²⁵ To conclude, Kittel emphasises the opposition, contending that the rabbis offer no useful analogies to Jesus. Such are to be found among prophets, enthusiasts, holy ones and the expected Jewish Messiah.²⁶

The keyword in this presentation by Kittel is opposition: Jesus stands in sharp opposition to the rabbis. With this, Kittel argues against a

²¹ Ibid., 14–15.

²² Ibid., 15.

²³ Ibid., 16–17.

²⁴ Ibid., 24–28.

²⁵ See e.g. Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew. A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981); Geza Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1983).

²⁶ Kittel, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, 28–29.

dominant line in the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, and at the same time, he draws a fairly traditional picture of rabbinic Judaism as narrow traditionalism and legalism. His eminent rabbinic knowledge is used to paint a black and white opposition, rather than to see continuity. In this, Kittel's contribution is almost the reversed picture of post-war scholarship, which has instead used the same areas of study to reinforce the Jewishness of Jesus. The few 'positive' findings in the rabbinic corpus are explained away. Nevertheless, Jews may not be essentially negative; in the background an *am-ha-aretz* is seen (however, without the term being used), which Jesus related to rather than to the rabbis, but in the light of the discussion of *am-ha-aretz* and its ethnicity, this may not pertain to Jews.

In *Rabbinica*, 1920,²⁷ Kittel once again demonstrates his knack for rabbinic sources and Semitic languages, wanting to remind his readers that it is important not only to interpret early Christianity in terms of Judaism and Hellenism, but also to study rabbinic literature.²⁸ The content does not say much about Kittel's view on Jews and Judaism, but his genuine interest in rabbinic material as key to the understanding of the New Testament is evident. Kittel's study *Die γενεαλογίαι der Pastoralbriefe* shows his great rabbinic erudition.²⁹

Kittel's Main Monograph: *Die Probleme des Palästinischen Spätjudentums*

Apart from the editorship of rabbinic texts and the "Theological Dictionary of the New Testament", Kittel's literary production is not overwhelming in scope. However, with this monograph, Kittel places himself on the front line of contemporary New Testament research on Judaism, in critical discussion primarily with Bousset's *Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* and Hugo Gressmann's revision of it. The 140-page monograph is dedicated to Kittel's Jewish teacher Israel I. Kahan, and includes discussions on historical, linguistic and theological aspects of the problem. Kittel states that Jesus is a Palestinian

²⁷ Gerhard Kittel, *Rabbinica. Paulus im Talmud, Die "Macht" auf dem Haupte. Runde Zahlen*, ed. Johannes Leipoldt, vol. 1, 3. Heft, Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1920).

²⁸ Ibid., preface.

²⁹ Gerhard Kittel, "Die γενεαλογίαι der Pastoralbriefe", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 20, no. 1/2 (1921).

Jew and that he and his disciples belonged to Palestinian Judaism, but he also establishes the fundamental opposition. The main frontier of Jesus and the apostles was, according to Kittel, the one against Palestinian rabbinism and Palestinian scribes.³⁰

However, Kittel clearly states that Palestinian Judaism is the main root of early Christianity.³¹ With this, he departs from the idea of a basic dichotomy between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism, which had been dominant since Semler and Baur. Advocating the idea that the mother is Palestinian Judaism, he criticises Gressmann for his undue emphasis on the Hellenistic-Jewish literature for understanding early Christianity, and for methodological weaknesses linked to this.³² Initially, Kittel deals with questions of sources, polemicising against Bousset and Gressmann, who had contended that rabbinic literature is of little use for New Testament studies, due to it being later than the New Testament.³³ Kittel argues that, as long as proper consideration is given to the dating of the traditions in rabbinic sources, these can be used.³⁴ He also contends that the scribes did not change much in the first four centuries after the time of Jesus: “the fundamental character and piety of ‘Late Judaism’ did not change during these centuries”.³⁵

Kittel’s second quarrel with Bousset is his dichotomy between scribal and popular Judaism, i.e. his thesis that rabbinism in its entirety was scribal, belonging to a theological elite, whereas early Christianity was at home in a popular piety, characterised by apocalypticism. Kittel cannot accept this simplification: there was an apocalypticism, but one must not neglect the rabbinic literature. The Talmud is not only

³⁰ Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 3.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

³² *Ibid.*, 4 n. 3.

³³ On this, see also Meeks, “A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel”, 519–521.

³⁴ Kittel’s discussion forestalls the later discussion, for instance on Birger Gerhardsson’s use of rabbinic sources in Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, ed. Astrid B. Beck and David Noel Freedman, The Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998); Birger Gerhardsson, *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Foreword by Jacob Neusner*, ed. Astrid B. Beck and David Noel Freedman, The Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), which was sharply criticised by Morton Smith and Jacob Neusner, Morton Smith, “A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963). However, see now Neusner’s preface to the 3rd edition of Gerhardsson’s dissertation, Gerhardsson, *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Foreword by Jacob Neusner*.

³⁵ Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 11.

a theological work, and halakhic questions were not detached from the people, who earnestly desired to follow the Law. They appreciated the Pharisees, because behind the legalism there was life. Moreover, Kittel contends that Bousset is wrong in trying to reconstruct Judaism from sectarian material, neglecting the “‘inescapable foundation’ of the Law”.³⁶ However, Kittel also wants to consider apocalypticism as one of the factors.

Thirdly, Kittel complains about the low standard of linguistic capabilities among Christian students of rabbinic literature, which forces them to rely on secondary sources. Handbooks such as Lightfoot's commentaries, Bacher's *Aggadah*, or Weber's *Jüdische Theologie* are not acceptable to Kittel, nor does he recommend Billerbeck's commentary, since it invites understanding without sources.

In sum, Kittel's verdict on the scholarship of his colleagues is very negative. Instead, he strongly emphasises the necessity, but also the extreme difficulty, of mastering the rabbinic material. Kittel explicitly sides with Bousset's strongest critic, the Jewish scholar Felix Perles.³⁷ He also stresses the need for cooperation with Jewish scholars, “the hand-in-hand work of the Christian with Jewish scholars”, whose advice and collaboration is indispensable—here Kittel means those who have grown up in the Jewish scholarly culture.³⁸ Kittel argues that well-informed Jewish scholars may have correction or information to give the serious Christian scholar, and that it is foolish to deprive oneself of such help due to pride. Christian scholars can also help the Jewish ones, especially in the area of method, although Kittel is on his guard against proud aspirations of knowing more than the Jewish scholars.³⁹

In a spirit that is quite different from that of Bousset in his discussion with Perles, Kittel here stresses openness, humility and dependence on the help of Jewish scholars, expressing the deepest respect for the kind of learning in the Jewish material that these represent. These statements are important to bear in mind when dealing with Kittel's attitude during National Socialism. In this book, Kittel seems to open a new avenue for cooperation with Jews in mutual respect, even though there

³⁶ Ibid., 12–14.

³⁷ This was Perles's criticism of Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Perles, *Bousset's Religion des Judentums*. Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 14–17.

³⁸ Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 19.

³⁹ Ibid., 19–20.

are antecedents in the relationship between the representatives of the *Instituta Judaica* and Jewish scholars, the institutes being Kittel's milieu during his formative period. Kittel still does not discuss the notion of 'Late Judaism' critically, although he partly reinterprets what it stands for in Bousset's work.

The book's overview of previous research helps to place Kittel in the existing debate. Kittel first dissociates himself from Lightfoot and Wettstein, since the standards of scholarship have superseded them, but also because their tone is apologetic and polemical, whereas to Kittel, modern work stands under historical principles. He also criticises that earlier scholarship aims at glorifying Christianity at the cost of Judaism. This pertains first of all to Wagenseil and Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judentum*,⁴⁰ which many anti-Semitic writers have since taken their inspiration from.⁴¹ Kittel also sees problems where Jewish missions have been the inspiration, mentioning Franz Delitzsch—and Ferdinand Weber, who stood under his influence—as well as Hermann L. Strack. Weber attempted to construct a system of rabbinism, even though there never was such a thing, and shaped Jewish theology according to a Lutheran system. All of it was for missionary purposes, Kittel contends. The other wing, too, receives its share of critique: Bousset's "The Religion of Judaism" is criticised for its insufficient methodological dealing with the sources, as is Gfrörer's by this time 90-year-old Jewish theology, which to Kittel overstates Philo's influence, but nevertheless gets a fairly decent verdict. Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, however, is regarded by Kittel as a history with a different historical sensitivity to Weber, which did not despise rabbinic sources as did Bousset. The disadvantage was that Schürer did not deal with the religion and piety of 'Late Judaism'. Finally, Strack is not presented as a great scholar, but Kittel emphasises his apologetics and defence against anti-Semitism.⁴² Positive contributions had been given by George Foot Moore, and Kittel also mentions Gustaf Dalman, Adolf Schlatter and Paul Billerbeck, concluding that they, although

⁴⁰ Johann Andreas Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum. Das ist: Wortgetreue Verdeutschung der wichtigsten Stellen des Talmuds und der sonstigen, den Christen zu einem grossen Teile noch ganz unbekannten, hebräisch-rabbinischen Literatur, welche einen sicheren Einblick in die jüdische Religions- und Sittenlehre gewähren*, trans. Franz Xaver Schiefler (Dresden: Verlag von Otto Brandner, 1893 (1700)).

⁴¹ Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 22–25.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 27.

they emanated from Jewish missions, dealt with 'Late Judaism' and rabbinism in a groundbreaking way.⁴³

Kittel then attempts to place the New Testament in a Palestinian setting. With reference to John's gospel,⁴⁴ and surprisingly even Luke's, he argues that both have a strong Palestinian character, which is also true of Acts.⁴⁵ He also argues for a Palestinian origin of the Epistle of James, and goes on to discuss and strongly argue for Palestinian and rabbinic parallels to the Synoptics and the 'forms' used in these. This pertains to prayers, parables, the "I am" sayings, the formulas used to define tradition (*παραλαμβάνειν, παραδίδωμι*) and the ways of keeping and developing such oral tradition. Here Kittel gives a fair sample of all the issues that have appeared in later arguments regarding the Jewish background of Jesus and the New Testament, i.e. literary forms, methods of tradition, Palestinian Jewish character of early Christianity, and similarities in prayer, ethics and theology—although in the theological area, the balance would ultimately be negative.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, there is an urge to study Palestinian Judaism: to understand literary forms in the New Testament, one must study rabbinism and its forms.⁴⁷ The sum of Kittel's discussion is that there is a very strong connection between early Christianity and Palestinian Judaism.

When Kittel situates early Christianity in its religious matrix, he concludes that this question is first and foremost a question of the religious matrix of 'Late Judaism'.⁴⁸ In the contemporary debate about whether Christianity took its influence from the Old Testament and Judaism, or from other religions, Kittel thus takes a clear stand. He complains that the historiography of early Christianity leans more towards its secondary Hellenistic Asia Minor background, even though this background lacks useful parallels. Palestinian 'Late Judaism', in contrast, offers extensive materials.⁴⁹ Whereas other religions are in a melting pot during late antiquity, Judaism, Kittel contends, strives to distinguish itself from others and consolidate its own character. This includes the orientation towards the Torah, concentration on its own people and defence of its originality, even though postexilic Judaism was never

⁴³ Ibid., 27–30.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 45–51.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 56, 58.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 53–70.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 70.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 71, 87.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 72.

a separate island. As for the meeting with other religions in the East, Kittel accepts Iranian influences in demonology—but not in the belief in the resurrection—and Persian influence in Jewish apocalypticism.⁵⁰ Generally speaking, Kittel sees a variety of influences on the New Testament, although he is basically reluctant to acknowledge them; they include the mysteries, faith in the Messiah and Greek philosophy, all of which are mediated through ‘Late Judaism’. However, Kittel’s religious history of ‘Late Judaism’ has nothing of the basic dichotomy of, for instance, F. C. Baur, where Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism are two equal forces in struggling opposition. In Kittel’s conception, all influences merge in the melting pot of Palestinian ‘Late Judaism’, to him the matrix of early Christianity.

However, if the introductory chapters resulted in an unusual insistence on the continuity between Palestinian Judaism and early Christianity, the last and main chapter has a different tenor. Having made a comparative analysis of Judaism and early Christianity, majoring on the specific characteristics of each religion, he nevertheless ends up with a strong opposition between the two:

Where Judaism wants to remain Judaism, it can do nothing but declare a fight regarding the claim of Jesus (*dem Anspruch Jesu den Kampf ansagen*). But where the ἐξουσία of Jesus is accepted as reality and truth, there Judaism has found its end.⁵¹

According to Kittel, it is precisely because the claim of Jesus pertains to Judaism’s inheritance that Jesus becomes an offence to the Jews.⁵² At the beginning of the chapter, Kittel devotes himself to a “discussion without judging which religion is superior to the other, without any derogatory passion”,⁵³ concentrating on ethics.⁵⁴ The Israelite-Jewish religion is unique, Kittel contends, in that ethics and religion are completely united: “this religion is a morality totally rooted in God [...] Here in the deep unity of religion and morals, the religion of Israel stands

⁵⁰ Ibid., 75–81.

⁵¹ Ibid., 140.

⁵² Ibid., 140.

⁵³ Ibid., 88.

⁵⁴ In 1925, Kittel published part of the book in a separate article, which does not contain any new material on Jews and Judaism, Gerhard Kittel, “Die Bergpredigt und die Ethik des Judentums”, *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* 2, no. 4 (1925).

alone.”⁵⁵ At this point, Kittel refers to the Old Testament prophets, but after their time, decadence comes:

It is the strange tragedy of later Judaism, that in its elemental, powerful originality (*Ursprünglichkeit*), it did not always have the power to keep to this welding into unity [of ethics and religion, A.G.], but allowed the moral line to increasingly become an end in itself.⁵⁶

The latter can happen in two ways: Judaism going via Hellenistic Judaism and then medieval philosophy of religion to moral philosophy, or Judaism falling into ritualism. Kittel gives two examples of the former, which he regards as liberal Judaism: Nathan the Wise, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's Jewish figure, who stands for philanthropy, and Walther Rathenau (1867–1922), the minister for foreign affairs of the Weimar Republic, who was murdered in 1922. Jewish, a leftist democrat and, to right-wing circles in Germany, a symbol of the Weimar Republic, Kittel considers Rathenau an example of moralism without religion, and with this example, he unveils his own preferences. (In his ‘Third Reich’ writings, Kittel clearly despises modern liberal Judaism,⁵⁷ whereas he respects Orthodox Jews, as is evident when he talks about “true Israelites”).⁵⁸ The ritualistic way is sophistic-moralistic Talmud scholarship, which to Kittel is characterised by technical ritualism, ending up as the opposite of the ethical giving of norms.⁵⁹ Kittel's concludes that the living moral religion of the old prophetism, which was far from both moral philosophy and ritualism, has disappeared.

Nevertheless, Judaism is the religion that attempted to unite ethics and religion, and this characteristic remains. Even in its worst forms, Judaism retains the earnest desire to fulfil God's demands. Kittel presents Jesus as reviving the demand of the prophets and being in line with his people. Still, Jesus initiates a new movement, which is not Judaism, and is himself a Jew, a pious Jew, who ceased to be a Jew.⁶⁰ In Kittel's argument, two themes are recurring: the criticism of ritualism and halakhic dialectics, and the idea that within this Judaism, “the wholly genuine tones of a pure moral striving and thought still carry the spirit of the old ethical prophetism, from which ‘Late Judaism’ also has its origin”.

⁵⁵ Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 90.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁵⁷ Gerhard Kittel, “Die Judenfrage” (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934), 25–27.

⁵⁸ Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 94.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 93.

That is, Kittel defends the continuity of 'Late Judaism' with Old Testament religion, reinforcing that whatever Jesus teaches can be found in wider Judaism. He mentions that since the publication of "Jesus and the Rabbis" in 1912, when he has tried to show the superiority of one religion over the other, he has found that it is not possible.⁶¹ With this, Kittel diverges from the dominating 'Late Judaism' research tradition, which denigrates the ethical standard of 'Late Judaism'.

Kittel goes on to study areas where he demonstrates similarities between Jesus and 'Late Judaism': taking oaths, moral purity, to some extent divorce, polemics against hypocrites, and that also in 'rabbinism', mercy could be superior to ritual laws. The golden rule is found in these sources as well, and even though there are negative statements on how to treat enemies, there are also positive ones.⁶² All this allows Kittel to contend that "there is no single ethical demand of Jesus [...] that is singular",⁶³ and the specific thing about Christianity is by no means that it has higher ethics than other religions. Instead, Kittel stresses that it is possible to put Jewish ethical statements on the same level as Christian ones! The reason why early Christianity and 'Late Judaism' are so similar is that both emanate from Old Testament piety. One is not dependent on the other, but if that were the case, the rabbis would be influenced by Christianity, rather than the other way around.⁶⁴

But what is the specific Christian kernel? With Jesus, there is first of all a *concentration* on the religious-ethical aspects, which is different from the varying ethical level of Judaism and even from the Old Testament:

However, with Jesus all interest is concentrated on the religious-ethical. The whole sea of ritualism has disappeared, as has all joy in dialectics. Every trace of ethics tied to nationalism has been overcome. The orientation of ethics towards practical worldly wisdom, so cherished in rabbinism, has been eliminated. Finally, the supremacy of morality, humanity and wisdom has disappeared.⁶⁵

The demand of Jesus is a purely religious one, and now Kittel reaches the central argument of his book:

⁶¹ Ibid., 95–96.

⁶² Ibid., 97–120.

⁶³ Ibid., 120.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 124.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 124–125.

This force of concentration on the *religious* demand, on the demand as God's demand, is the first great peculiarity of Jesus' demand, compared to which even all analogies of pious Judaism fade in importance.⁶⁶

At this point, Kittel compares Jesus and rabbinism: for Jesus all of this is a complete pattern of life (*Lebenszusammenhang*), whereas in rabbinism the connection is purely formal, without any inner coherence—a piece of tradition, something inherited, mere scribal and exegetical products, and therefore ossified, parched. It is inherited and not acquired, a thick, arid layer of traditionalism, Kittel contends. The imagery used is a tree, which a drop of life trickles out of now and again, but in Jesus life breaks through, not as drops, but

as the full living stream of the prophetic demand in all its force. There never was a Jew with whom the original tone of Old Testament piety, the morality rooted in God and only in God, has come into such full and single harmony as with him who says he would come to fulfil the Law and the Prophets.⁶⁷

Kittel's argument takes on a new dimension compared to that of de Wette, Wellhausen, Schürer and Bousset: the trickling drops of life and the streams that Jesus provides both come from the tree of Palestinian 'Late Judaism', although it is caricatured in much the same way as by the majority of scholars—dry, barren, ossified. On the one hand, there is an organic connection between Palestinian Judaism and Jesus here; on the other hand, Kittel's picture is in effect not so different from that of the aforementioned scholars, even if the Palestinian background, rabbinism and the Old Testament take the place of the Diaspora background, apocalypticism and philosophical thought.

The second great difference is that Jesus puts an absolute ethical demand on people—your love and purity shall be total—whereas Judaism rejects such radical ethics, as it is too demanding. The example Kittel gives is divorce according to Jesus versus Judaism. The spirit of Jesus' demand is absoluteness (*Absolutheit*), knowing no compromise, no letter of divorce, no reference to σκληροκαρδία (a hardened heart) or other things. Instead, the standard comes from Jesus' consciousness of the kingdom of God that is present in him—and thus in the demand of God, given in his person.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Ibid., 125.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 125.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 129–130.

Concluding his entire argument so far, Kittel sees two elements in Jesus: his reception of the values present in the development of the Israelite-Jewish history of religion, and his consciousness of absoluteness and of himself being the fulfilment of the kingdom of God, αὐτοβασιλεία,

as the last and crowning part of Israelite-Jewish history of religion, and out of this comes also a new religion, and new ethics. *There, where Jesus' consciousness of mission stands with its claim of providing the fulfilment, he ceases to be a Jew, and his proclamation ceases to be a member of Judaism.*⁶⁹

In other words, according to Kittel, Jesus has deep roots in the Israelite-Jewish background, but the fulfilment of his self-consciousness *means the end of his ethnic and religious Judaism*. The example from ethics is supplemented by analogies in the areas of sin, forgiveness and miracles.

Despite his strong insistence on the continuity between Jesus and his Israelite-Jewish background, Kittel contends that:

At the end of all comparison between the two entities Christianity and Judaism stands not the synthesis of the two, but the stark contrast. Where Judaism remains Judaism, the claim of Jesus can be nothing but mockery and insanity; for the Jew who wants to remain a Jew, to think something else would be sin and in itself a mockery.⁷⁰

As noted, Kittel ends his book by saying that where someone acknowledges Jesus' ἐξουσία (authority), *this is the end of Judaism*.

To sum up, Kittel ultimately constructs a stark opposition between Palestinian Judaism on the one hand and Jesus on the other, although his argument gives more credit to Jewish ethics, exegesis, hermeneutics, faith in God, and so on, than most exegetes before him. In this respect, Kittel is a renewer of scholarly work on Judaism. *However, it is Jesus' exclusive claim of being the actualisation of the kingdom of God that is the breaking point*, and thus there is no way of rescuing the continuity between the old and the new. In his person, Jesus has assimilated all that is good in Judaism, whereas this has disappeared from the Jewish tradition. As a result, there is a very strong opposition between Jewish and Christian. This opposition—which is evident from the beginning of Kittel's production—would be a fundamental theme in Kittel's dealings with Jews and Judaism, academically as well as politically, during

⁶⁹ Ibid., 131, emphasis mine.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 137.

the 'Third Reich'. Yet something of reverence for 'original Judaism' remains, as indicated by his dedication of the book to his teacher Israel Kahan, whom he describes with the scripture from John 1:47: "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" In his methodological discussion on the translation of rabbinic texts, Kittel talks of his "friend who has gone home", I. I. Kahan,⁷¹ and he returns to Kahan once again in *Die Judenfrage*.⁷²

When Kittel declares his scholarly programme in his introductory lecture as full New Testament professor in the *evangelisch*-theological faculty of Tübingen that same year, 1926, he begins by discussing early Christianity, 'Late Judaism' and Hellenism.⁷³ More clearly than in the book discussed above, he stresses that Christianity is a religion of two cultures. Its home is Palestine, and it spread through Asia Minor, Greece, Egypt, Italy, "the world of Hellenism".⁷⁴ This dichotomy must be heeded, Kittel contends. Hence, Paul is Jewish, has a partly Palestinian upbringing and a largely Palestinian way of thinking,⁷⁵ and yet he is also a man of Hellenistic culture.⁷⁶ Speaking of contemporary research in 'Late Judaism', Kittel regrets that Hugo Gressmann's third edition of Bousset's *Religion des Judentums* was published without revision, since this preserves the much-criticised dominance of the apocalyptic material in Bousset's analysis.⁷⁷ Kittel's verdict is that one cannot describe 'Late Judaism' while neglecting apocalypticism, just as one cannot do so while neglecting Josephus. Nor can one neglect the rabbinic literature in all its breadth.⁷⁸ Kittel notes that Gressmann reacted strongly against Kittel's

⁷¹ Kittel, "Grundsätzliches und Methodisches zu den Übersetzungen rabbinischer Texte", 60.

⁷² Gerhard Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe" (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933), 92. As noted by Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 57.

⁷³ Gerhard Kittel, *Urchristentum, Spätjudentum, Hellenismus. Akademische Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 28. Oktober 1926*. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁷⁵ Kittel is thus an early voice, suggesting what Krister Stendahl and especially E. P. Sanders would work out much later, Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and other essays*; Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*.

⁷⁶ Kittel, *Urchristentum, Spätjudentum, Hellenismus. Akademische Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 28. Oktober 1926*, 6.

⁷⁷ Gressmann was equally critical of Kittel, Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 62, but Joseph Klausner held the opposite view, 67.

⁷⁸ Kittel, *Urchristentum, Spätjudentum, Hellenismus. Akademische Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 28. Oktober 1926*, 9.

book on 'Late Judaism', and adds a defence at the end of his published lecture.⁷⁹ These pages verify that Kittel represents a new dimension in New Testament studies, where rabbinics is given an entirely different place than in Bousset–Gressmann. The specific contribution that Kittel brings is the emphasis on rabbinics, which is in line with his book on Palestinian 'Late Judaism', at just about the same time as Kittel's colleague and friend Hugo Odeberg, in his inauguration lecture as New Testament professor at Lund, said that one cannot regard Palestinian Judaism as unaffected by Hellenism.⁸⁰ It is affected by it, just as the opposite is true, Kittel contends.

Nevertheless, Kittel emphasises the role of Judaism, which had a much greater structural impact on early Christianity than did Hellenism, and he repeatedly points out that Palestine is the Christian homeland.⁸¹ Christianity is a "daughter religion" of Judaism, Jesus was a Jew, as were the apostles, and what the new religion offers is not something new, but the fulfilment of the old. "At no point has the New Testament religion denied its home in Old Testament piety," Kittel says. 'Late Judaism', then, is not merely a cultural background, but the carrier of the tradition that represents the "innermost sanctuary" of Christianity.⁸² Kittel repeats his idea that Jesus' religion makes the ethical demand of the Old Testament and 'Late Judaism' absolute, but also that the religion is what offers forgiveness of sins to the poor in spirit. In this soteriology, Christianity is an heir of Judaism and Old Testament Messianism.⁸³ However, Judaism crucified Jesus because he claimed to be the Messiah, and it has continued to blaspheme him in its tradition.⁸⁴

Here, at the end and peak of Kittel's discussion, the alternatives are presented once more, and his opposition between Christianity as a religion of forgiveness and 'Late Judaism' as a religion of human achievement becomes clear. Judaism has no assurance of salvation, he contends; there is only effort and uncertainty as to whether their achievements will be enough. Just as Schlatter, Kittel points to Jochanan ben Zakkai on his deathbed, uncertain of whether he is bound for Eden or Gehenna

⁷⁹ Ibid., 29–32.

⁸⁰ See Hugo Odeberg, "Några synpunkter på den judiska litteraturens betydelse för den nytestamentliga exegetiken", *Svensk Teologisk Kvärtalsskrift* 10, no. 2 (1934).

⁸¹ Kittel, *Urchristentum, Spätjudentum, Hellenismus. Akademische Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 28. Oktober 1926*, 12–13, 14.

⁸² Ibid., 17.

⁸³ Ibid., 23.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 24.

because of his fear of God. “That is a religion of achievement,” Kittel argues.⁸⁵ The concepts of ethical demand, forgiveness unto salvation and assurance of salvation are central to the discussion, and in fact to the whole evaluation of ‘Late Judaism’. In contrast, early Christianity is absolutely and utterly free from this fear, due to its faith in forgiveness.⁸⁶ Obviously, with this yardstick, i.e. early Christianity interpreted from the perspective of Lutheran Pietist religion, ‘Late Judaism’ falls short on the vital point: faith. In conclusion, Kittel’s evaluation of ‘Late Judaism’—despite his unusual insistence on ‘Late Judaism’ being the pedigree of early Christianity—is the same as in the broad German research tradition: it is a legalistic religion, where the focus is on one’s own achievement. What stands out as different from earlier scholars is Kittel’s strong insistence on Palestinian Judaism as the only essential background to early Christianity, and therefore an unusually positive evaluation of it.

Was Jesus an Aryan?

Even at this time, the racial origin of Jesus was an issue:⁸⁷ “A book title including the word ‘Judaism’ has a piece of sensation in it,” Kittel writes, referring to the existing political struggles over racial antagonisms.⁸⁸ In the booklet *Jesus und die Juden* (“Jesus and the Jews”), 1926,⁸⁹ Kittel reveals his position to the debate and the racial question:

Certain *racial questions* have recently been applied to the relationship of ‘Jesus and Judaism’. It really is not worth the effort of wasting very many words on this. The fundamental, very serious problem of “right and wrong of the racial conflicts” does not need to be touched upon at all. But when it comes to whether Jesus himself by descent and race was an Aryan or a Jew, one must certainly establish as a simple historical fact, which cannot

⁸⁵ Ibid., 26.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 27.

⁸⁷ According to Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth*, Fichte was the first one to question Jesus’ Jewish origin, 101, and Chamberlain argued the case most thoroughly, 318, in his *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. See also Wolfgang Fenske, *Wie Jesus zum “Arier” wurde: Auswirkungen der Entjudaisierung Christi im 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005).

⁸⁸ Gerhard Kittel, *Jesus und die Juden*, vol. 42, *Stimmen aus der deutschen christlichen Studentenbewegung* (Berlin: Furche Verlag, 1926), 3.

⁸⁹ This introduces a third version of what is basically the same text as *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum* and the article in *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* mentioned above.

be explained away, that it is conceivable that Jesus, if he was a Galilean, had a couple of drops of non-Jewish blood in his veins—I wonder: it is *conceivable*, not wholly impossible; but it is absolutely *certain* that he in any case had very many drops of genuine Semitic blood in him.⁹⁰

The passage reveals two things. Firstly, Kittel does not side with those who, following H. S. Chamberlain and Friedrich Delitzsch, among others, propose that Jesus' Galilean descent intimates that he was not Jewish, or that he was of mixed blood.⁹¹ Kittel would never assent to the idea that Jesus was Aryan, which became popular in Deutsche Christen theology during the war years in particular. Secondly, although Kittel does not deem the first question worthy of consideration, he regards the general racial issues, "right and wrong of the racial conflicts", to be both a fundamental and a most serious problem. However, "Judaism is not only race, and the racial question is only one side of the Jewish problem," Kittel continues, instead setting out to discuss Judaism as a religious question. In this discussion, Kittel describes Jews as two types, 'the religious-philosophical Jew' and the 'Talmud Jew'. He also knows a

type of the modern Jew—besides, exactly the same type existed even in old times—who, in terms of his spiritual life and the structure of his world-view, is nothing but the representative of a certain average enlightenment (*Durchschnittsaufklärung*); who generally is very shallow and superficial (*flach und seicht*); who, the duller he gets, the more vain he becomes (*je platter*

⁹⁰ Kittel, *Jesus und die Juden*, 3. "Man hat freilich in neuerer Zeit auch gewisse *Ras-sefragen* auf das Verhältnis 'Jesus und das Judentum' angewendet. Es ist wirklich nicht der Mühe wert, darüber sehr viele Wörter zu verlieren. Man braucht dazu das grundsätzliche, sehr ernste Problem: 'Recht und Unrecht der Rassengegensätze' gar nicht anzurühren. Aber wenn es sich darum handelt, ob Jesus selbst seinem Geschlecht und seiner Rasse nach ein Arier oder ein Jude war, dann muß man allerdings als einfachen historischen Tatbestand, an dem gar nicht zu deuteln ist, feststellen: es ist denkbar, daß Jesus, wenn er Galiläer war, ein paar Tropfen nichtjüdisches Blut in seinem Adern hatte—ich frage: das ist *denkbar*, ist nicht ganz ausgeschlossen; aber absolut *sicher* ist, daß er auf alle Fälle sehr viele Tropfen echt semitischen Blutes in sich getragen hat."

⁹¹ Such ideas were found in Chamberlain, *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Delitzsch, *Die große Täuschung Fortgesetzte kritische Betrachtungen zum Alten Testament, vornehmlich den Prophetenschriften und Psalmen, nebst Schlußfolgerungen*, part 2, 58–63, and during National Socialism in Emanuel Hirsch's *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1939, and Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*; see also the overview in Davies, "The Aryan Christ: A Motif in Christian Anti-Semitism", and for the thought in Deutsche Christen circles, Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich*, 155. See further Johannes Leipoldt, *War Jesus Jude?* (Leipzig, Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh., 1923), where the discussion presents a background to the debate, and a general discussion in Davies, "The Aryan Christ: A Motif in Christian Anti-Semitism".

sie wird, desto eitler wird); who only too often enjoys himself in frivolity and lasciviousness [...] It is hardly an accident that this type of Jew seems to us others to be the most foreign and disagreeable. These Jews without religion have something rootless.⁹²

Kittel's construction of types of 'Jew' has in itself a racist dimension, and he links them to certain strongly negative characteristics. Although he lists two additional 'Jews', who are described in more positive terms, the thinking stereotypes a wide variety of people into three groups, which he can easily handle and denigrate. Kittel also uses the terminology of the contemporary debate on race uncritically. On the other hand, Kittel criticises "anti-Semitic polemicists" for schematising, taking one Talmudic word to represent the whole of the Talmud. In sum, Kittel's view oscillates between positive statements for part of the Jewish tradition, and a highly stereotypical thinking—which a few years later would manifest in his suggestion of an apartheid programme for German Jews.⁹³

Positive Evaluation of Judaism at its Peak: *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum*

In order to understand the religious matrix of early Christianity, Kittel increasingly directed his interest to other areas of the history of religions than the rabbinic Jewish one, which was his specialty. This was the topic of his Uppsala lectures in 1931.⁹⁴ Kittel describes Judaism in the syncretistic world of the Second Temple. On the one hand, Judaism was different from the other religions in that it was not syncretistic. In this, too, Kittel sided against the History of Religions school.⁹⁵ On the other hand, Kittel believes that since Jews lived among other peoples in the Diaspora, and since the Diaspora had intense contact with Jerusalem, Judaism was not unaffected by foreign culture. That is, Greeks such as Strabo were fascinated by the Jewish monotheism, whereas Jews could

⁹² Kittel, *Jesus und die Juden*, 4.

⁹³ See below the discussion of Kittel's *Die Judenfrage*, published in 1933.

⁹⁴ Gerhard Kittel, *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum*, Vorlesungen der Olaus-Petri-Stiftung, gehalten in der Universität Upsala 26.–29. Oktober 1931. (Gütersloh: Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1932), Swedish: Gerhard Kittel, *Religionshistorien och urkristendomen*, Olaus Petriföreläsningar vid Uppsala Universitet 26–29 oktober 1931 (Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1933).

⁹⁵ As noted by Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of 'Gerhard Kittel'", 522.

be attracted to for example Greek philosophy. However, Jewish writers often tried to show that the good that they found in Greek philosophy had its roots in Judaism, e.g. Artapanos.⁹⁶ The encounter between “Greek-Hellenistic concepts” and Old Testament religious tradition resulted in both a deepening and a superficiality.

Kittel also sees Oriental influences, e.g. from the Sabazios cult, and mentions the magical papyri, Philo’s “mystical gnosis”, and astrology, the latter even having made its way into the Jerusalem temple.⁹⁷ Another example is the dualist eschatology, emanating from Iranian religion and influencing the whole of Jewish apocalyptic. The idea of redemption has roots in Old Testament thought, but the consciousness of this comes from the “astrological world-view”, Kittel contends.⁹⁸ For the picture of God, the Greek influence results in the Old Testament view of God—a spiritual God, who is close and holy—as well as anthropomorphisms, being replaced by a transcendentalised and more distant God, and a similar tendency is there in apocalypticism, Kittel says, holding that a consequence of this is the encroachment into, or even dissolution of, monotheism.⁹⁹

Kittel continues to reserve a certain profile for Judaism even in the ethical realm, only there was a change from Old Testament thinking. There sin meant acting against God’s will, and human life was understood in terms of obedience and disobedience, but in the new development, sin comes because man is “embedded in the evil principle”. By the same token, redemption is now related to the cosmic-metaphysical eschatological struggle that rages in the realm of nature. This redemption was understood on the basis of a relationship with a merciful God, who judges the disobedient. In the new thinking, redemption means salvation from the world of material things: “redemption is an ascetic and ecstatic exercise or cosmic drama; it is no longer in the first room, of which the prophets spoke: transformation of the ethical will, repentance and penance”.¹⁰⁰ Kittel’s conclusion is that Judaism during this period can by no means be understood apart from contemporary syncretistic movements: “the change of tone (*Tönung*) is perceptible”.

⁹⁶ Kittel, *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum*, 42–49.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 60–61.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 64–65.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 66.

However, it has *not* become a syncretistic religion, “but has in principle remained something different”, he says.¹⁰¹

The aforesaid is a clarification of Kittel’s position in his discussion with Hugo Gressmann,¹⁰² the latter who majored on the foreign influences in Second Temple Judaism. Kittel holds that contemporary sources describe Jews as the ones who did not worship the local deities, as everyone else did. What causes Judaism to remain Judaism is the Old Testament revelation, Kittel argues; it is a religion of the Word.¹⁰³ He describes the Oriental-dualistic ideas and the Greek Enlightenment as threats to Judaism, the former undermining the confession to the God of creation and history, the latter weakening the ethical religion.

Faith prevails in Judaism, in that Judaism was able to withstand foreign influences. As a religion of the Word, it is firstly a return to the ethical concept of the God of the prophetic religion.¹⁰⁴ Opposing Bousset, Kittel argues that Judaism was not a religion that had lost its closeness to God, despite its emphasis on God’s transcendence.¹⁰⁵ Here he quotes the tractate *Berachot* from the Jerusalem Talmud: “the idols seem close, but are nothing but distant [...] But the Holy One, blessed be He, seems distant, and nothing is closer than He.”¹⁰⁶ Kittel emphasises the faith seen among Jews, who in the midst of crisis hold on to their faith, e.g. Rabbi Akiba, trusting God’s promise of a new temple, even when the jackal makes a den in the ground of the Holy of Holies. In other words, faith prevails over the distress of the people. Pointing to this continuity with the Old Testament picture of God and faith, Kittel provides an alternative to the traditional ‘Late Judaism’ hypotheses.

Secondly, Judaism is a religion of the Torah, a law religion, which seeks the will of God as laid down in the Scriptures and tradition. Kittel admits that this becomes a religion of sophistry and casuistry, but he also points to the motive: the will to obey God and take his demand seriously. Hence, this religion also becomes one of achievement (*Leistung*).¹⁰⁷ But instead of caricaturing this as legalism in line with Schürer

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 65–66.

¹⁰² Ibid., 143 n. 138.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 66, 68, 73.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 73–75.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 144 n. 158.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 74.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 75–76.

and Wellhausen—and in contrast to some earlier statements—Kittel defends such religion:

Perhaps we are a bit quick to despise it all and call it hypocrisy. Jesus, too, knew of the *earnestness of the rabbi*, to whom he could say that he is not far from God's kingdom. This whole thing of being serious about doing God's will is first and foremost something very great.¹⁰⁸

Here Kittel differs from the long Enlightenment research tradition, although he contends that there is a casuistry that ordinary people cannot handle, where the people are left on the outside.

Lastly, Kittel describes Judaism as a religion of “expectation” and eschatology. Kittel's portrayal of Judaism is thus very positive, comparatively speaking, only mentioning circumstances that were traditionally regarded as negative to the Jews, and providing an alternative to a traditional ‘Late Judaism’, which majored on legalism, viewing postexilic Judaism as a degeneration. Instead, Kittel sees the predominantly positive Judaism, which is true to the Word, as reinforcing Old Testament prophetism.¹⁰⁹ For his time and the state of research, Kittel gives an unusually favourable picture of so-called Late Judaism. Compared to his other works referred to here, *Religionsgeschichte und Urchristentum* is the peak of Kittel's positive evaluation of Second Temple Judaism, contrasting sharply with the picture provided by for instance Bousset of the History of Religions school.

Kittel and the Jews during National Socialism

Kittel's biography describes the path from a professor's home in Lutheran Pietist circles to a position as a leading National Socialist scholar during the “Third Reich”.¹¹⁰ Kittel joined the National Socialist party on 1 May 1933, with membership number 3,243,036.¹¹¹ He

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 76, my emphasis.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 77–78.

¹¹⁰ This study is no complete biography of Kittel; for this I refer to Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*.

¹¹¹ Kittel's membership card, in Bundesarchiv, NSDAP-Zentralkartei, Pk Kittel, Gerhard *23.9.1888. The register card shows that he was also a contact man at the university for the National Socialist press. On Kittel during National Socialism, see Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 204 n. 6; Friedrich and Friedrich, “Kittel, Gerhard, 1888–1948”, 223, suggests that he entered the party on 1 August 1933, but Kittel himself states that it was 1 May, Kittel,

seems to have been impressed by Hitler; in 1937 he approvingly told an audience in Cambridge that Hitler carried a New Testament in his vest pocket and read from it daily—the date of this shows that Kittel's support for Hitler was not just a passing fancy.¹¹² In early June 1933, Kittel published his book *Die Judenfrage*,¹¹³ a pamphlet that advocated treating Jews as a 'guest people', stripped of the rights of ordinary German citizens, which within a year was distributed in three editions.¹¹⁴ That same year, he defended this position in famous debates with Martin Buber (included in the second edition of *Die Judenfrage*) and Karl Barth.¹¹⁵ Kittel was an ordinary New Testament professor at Tübingen until the end of the Second World War, including a period when he was also a professor in Vienna.

"Meine Verteidigung", 11. The main treatments of Kittel are Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, Martin Rese, "Antisemitismus und neutestamentliche Forschung. Anmerkungen zu dem Thema 'Gerhard Kittel und die Judenfrage'", *Evangelische Theologie* 39, no. 6 (1979), Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", and Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz's discussion of Kittel's *Meine Verteidigung* (Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung"), in Hermann Düringer and Karin Weintz, eds., *Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore. Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit*, vol. 112, Arnoldshainer Texte (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 2000), 134–170 (including a discussion of Walter Grundmann), but also Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People* (New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, YIVO, 1946), 41–43, included Kittel. In R. P. Ericksen, "Genocide, Religion, and Gerhard Kittel. Protestant Theologians Face the Third Reich", in *In God's Name. Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Omer Bartov (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001), the author 'returns' to his early work on Kittel and others. Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 517, suggests that Kittel was a liberal during the Weimar Republic, a statement that seems hard to prove. See below, for example his criticism of Rathenau, and the fact that he was member of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur.

¹¹² Robert P. Ericksen, "Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel", in *Remembering for the future. Working papers and addenda*, ed. Yehuda Bauer, et al. (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989), 2403.

¹¹³ See discussion below. Reviewed in *Neues Tübingen Tageblatt* already on 16 June 1933, Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 112. On the so-called *Judenfrage*, see the exhaustive work Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems*; Bein, *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems. Band II: Anmerkungen, Exkurse, Register*.

¹¹⁴ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage" which will be discussed below. In the second edition, two new appendices were included: "Answer to Martin Buber", who had written an open letter to Kittel in *Theologische Blätter* 12, 1933, and a section on "The Church and the Jewish Christians". The third edition of 1934 took the print run to 9,000. In it Kittel made some changes to the text and footnotes, adding eighteen new ones, Kittel, "Die Judenfrage", 3 ed.

¹¹⁵ Also published as Karl Barth and Gerhard Kittel, *Ein theologischer Briefwechsel* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934).

The quotation quoted at the beginning of this chapter shows that Kittel welcomed Hitler's racist policies. Joining the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage was an important step in his support of the National Socialist racist project. Of Hitler, he was able to state that:

it was not arbitrary brutality and barbarity when the Führer of the new Germany put the Jewish problem on a completely new foundation in a radical resolution for the German people as the first people of the present day, but it was honest political action, born out of historical sobriety.¹¹⁶

Kittel says this having given a survey of the Jewish Diaspora and the development of the "Jewish spirit" and its claim of power and domination over the peoples of the earth. For the German regime, these words in 1937 from a leading scholar and churchman provided a welcome legitimization of its racist policies, including the Nuremberg racial laws of 1935.¹¹⁷ At the National Socialist Teachers' Association in 1937, Kittel greeted these laws as a deed of world-historical magnitude:

The Jewish problem arises always and everywhere with Judaism; it is thus an essential phenomenon (*Erscheinung*) of Judaism; only sentimental effeminacy can disregard that today. What the National Socialist Germany has done through the Jewish legislation is not barbarism, but the cold consequence of a sober historical insight, for which the world will have Adolf Hitler to thank.¹¹⁸

Kittel, in "My Defence", tries to downplay his involvement in National Socialist circles, for instance stating that he only spoke at such a teachers' meeting once. There is, however, no doubt about what he said in this meeting, and that it was a clear support of National Socialist racism.¹¹⁹ Kittel was also involved in the writing of the twelve *Tübinger Sätze*, a confessional statement that aimed at preserving the unity of

¹¹⁶ Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage", 63.

¹¹⁷ The laws were passed on 15 September 1935: the *Reichsbürgergesetz* (The Reich Citizenship Law), which stated that only people of German or Aryan blood could be citizens of the country, and *Gesetz zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes und der deutsche Ehre* (The Law for Protection of the German Blood and the German Honour), regulating which marriages were allowed from a racial point of view.

¹¹⁸ Schönhagen, *Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz*, 289: "Mit dem Judentum entsteht immer und überall die Judenfrage, die also eine wesentliche Erscheinung am Judentum ist; nur sentimentale Weichlichkeit kann das heute übersehen. Was das nationalsozialistische Deutschland mit der Judengesetzgebung getan hat, ist nicht Barbarei, sondern die kühle Folgerung einer nüchternen geschichtlichen Erkenntnis, und die die Welt Adolf Hitler zu danken haben wird."

¹¹⁹ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 45.

the Church by meeting the Deutsche Christen halfway, declaring the duty of obedient service to the people, and stating that Adolf Hitler was a divine gift:

We are full of gratitude to God, that he as the Lord of history has given our people in Adolf Hitler the Führer and deliverer (*Führer und Retter*) from deep trouble. We know that we are connected and obligated to the German state and its Führer with life and limb. For us as Protestant Christians, this connection and obligation has its deepest and holiest responsibility in that it is obedience to the commandment of God.¹²⁰

Moreover, Kittel was “among the Tübingen members of faculty indisputably [regarded, A.G.] as the true promoter of a National Socialist scholarship of Judaism”.¹²¹ It is with satisfaction that Kittel notes that as early as in the spring of 1933, there was no ‘Jewish problem’ among the Tübingen University teachers and students,¹²² a result of a several-year silent policy of keeping Jews at a discreet distance.¹²³ In addition, Kittel belonged to the group chosen by Hitler from among Tübingen University’s Great Senate, and given the prestigious task of creating the legislative framework for university life in the new Germany.¹²⁴ He also acquired other positions for which National Socialist loyalty was a prerequisite.¹²⁵ Around 80 per cent of the 160 university teachers were considered to be National Socialists, but Kittel was one of the five

¹²⁰ “Wir sind voll Dank gegen Gott, daß er als der Herr der Geschichte unserem Volk in Adolf Hitler den Führer und Retter aus schwerer Not geschenkt hat. Wir wissen uns mit Leib und Leben dem deutschen Staat und diesem seinem Führer verbunden und verpflichtet. Diese Verbundenheit und Verpflichtung hat für uns als evangelische Christen ihre tiefste und heiligste Verantwortung darin, daß sie Gehorsam gegen das Gebot Gottes ist,” quoted from Schäfer, *Die evangelische Landeskirche in Württemberg und der Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation zum Kirchenkampf. Band 3: der Einbruch des Reichsbischofs in die württ. Landeskirche 1934*, 334–335. This was noted by Siegle-Wenschkewitz, “Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums”, 96. That Adolf Schlatter also did this is noted above in the chapter on Schlatter.

¹²¹ Uwe Dietrich Adam, *Hochschule und Nationalsozialismus. Die Universität Tübingen im Dritten Reich. Mit einem Anhang von Wilfried Setzler “Die Tübinger Studentenfrequenz im Dritten Reich”*, ed. Hansmartin Decker-Hauff, vol. 23, Contubernium (Tübingen 1977), 177. Adam bases this on testimonies from the Tübingen vice chancellor Walter Erbe.

¹²² Kittel, “Die Judenfrage”, 35, as Schönhagen, *Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz*, 141, notes.

¹²³ Schönhagen, *Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz*, 120.

¹²⁴ Adam, *Hochschule und Nationalsozialismus*, 41, note 65.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 52. As the only faculty member except Fezer, Kittel did not support the joined sympathy declaration for Bishop Wurm of the Confessing Church, who had refused to take the loyalty oath demanded by Reichsbischof Ludwig Müller, 61–62.

who were chosen by Hitler.¹²⁶ To summarise all these instances, Kittel reinforces racist policies and legislation, venturing his scholarly power and reputation in support of it. This is done with a prestige that both he and Germany's scholarly community were well aware of.¹²⁷

Kittel was active in the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage from 1936 to the end of National Socialism, during this time focusing his scholarship on the 'Jewish problem'. His research within the Reichsinstitut was clearly linked to the modern solutions to the 'Jewish problem', welcoming the Jewish policies of Hitler, even though he knew that they would be brutal.

Kittel had greater ambitions in the new Reich than to simply remain in Tübingen. From 1939, he held the position of New Testament professor at the University of Vienna, but without formally leaving Tübingen, to which he later returned. In Vienna, he replaced Professor Rudolf A. Hofmann, who was discharged from his office for political reasons. Greeted as "the man of the hour",¹²⁸ Kittel was successful in Vienna, contributing to the university's claim to a leading position in the southern part of a Greater Germany, now expanded through the *Anschluß* of Austria as a province of Germany on 13 March 1938. The New Testament professor was even the Führer's guest of honour at the party convention (*Parteitag*) for the Greater Germany.¹²⁹ By no means passive in National Socialist academic politics, Kittel authored a document that he himself presented to the authorities, which emphasised the close connection between Protestantism and National Socialism, and which was written to further the position of the Theological Faculty at the University of Vienna. In his memoirs, the dean of the faculty, Gustav Entz, describes Kittel as a great scholar of international reputation, who had an unobjectionable "national outlook" and was held in esteem because of his personal relationship with the National Socialist rulers.¹³⁰ As Erickson notes, Kittel may have been spurred to

¹²⁶ Ibid., 153. Kittel belonged to a group of six professors, against whom the heaviest charges were pressed.

¹²⁷ See his, Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 5–6.

¹²⁸ Karl W. Schwarz, "'Grenzburg' und 'Bollwerk'. Ein Bericht über die Wiener Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät in den Jahren 1938–1945", in *Theologische Fakultäten im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Carsten Nicolaisen, *Arbeiten zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte. Reihe B: Darstellungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 375.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 375.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 377.

aspire to a greatness that was comparable to that of his famous father, Rudolf Kittel.¹³¹

In his defence after the war, however, Kittel emphasises his Jewish acquaintances. As noted, his book *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Christentum* was dedicated to the Jewish scholar Issar Israel Kahan, Kittel's Hebrew teacher. In his famous reply to Martin Buber in 1934, Kittel says, "As I once learned Hebrew from Issar Israel Kahan (the memory of whom, as a man after John 1:47, for ever keeps me from a general 'calumny against Judaism')." ¹³² Kahan belonged to the circles around the Leipzig Institutum Judaicum and seems to have been close to Christianity. Siegfried Wagner suggests that, in contrast to his other Jewish colleague there, J. Lichtenstein, he did not dare to take the final step to Christianity.¹³³ Kittel also mentions that he on 1 April 1933, the first day of the Jewish boycott, had protected the shop of the Jewish-Christian wallpaper dealer Löwenstein from sabotage by "walking for a long time back and forth together with Löwenstein in front of the store on Wilhelmstraße in Tübingen".¹³⁴ It should be noted that most of Kittel's examples of this kind concern *Christians* of Jewish descent. However, he did also cooperate with the English Jewish scholar A. Marmorstein and mentions a few other Jewish acquaintances.¹³⁵ Nevertheless, having Jewish acquaintances hardly implies that a person does not hold prejudiced views regarding Jews, Kittel himself being an example of the opposite.

Adding to his defence, Kittel points out that his book *Die Judenfrage* was negatively received in the most militant National Socialist circles.¹³⁶ It is important to bear in mind that there were a range of positions

¹³¹ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 213, 237.

¹³² Kittel, "Die Judenfrage", 92. The reply was published from the second edition of his *Die Judenfrage*.

¹³³ Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, 161.

¹³⁴ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 63. Hengel gives a personal picture of his experience with Jews in Swabia during the war and shows that there were few Jews in the area, Martin Hengel, "A Gentile in the Wilderness: My Encounter with Jews and Judaism", in *Overcoming Fear Between Jews and Christians*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Fran X. Blisard, and Jerry L. Gorham (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992).

¹³⁵ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 63.

¹³⁶ The lecture on which the book was based was regarded as scandalous and antagonistic to the strivings of those who wanted a 'pure' German people, Schönhagen, *Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz*, 163. It should be noted, however, that although certain Nazis considered Kittel too soft on the Jews, he was perceived as a faithful member of the party as well as a valuable member of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage; see below.

within National Socialism; Kittel belonged to those who, for example, were against street violence and similar activities. He had taken a stand in favour of the Deutsche Christen Reichsbischof Ludwig Müller during the *Kirchenkampf* of 1933,¹³⁷ but he was among those who left the movement after the so-called Sports Palace Rally on 13 November 1933, due to the fierce attacks on the Old Testament and Paul from representatives of the Deutsche Christen. Even Ludwig Müller left at this time, but in contrast to Kittel, he would later return.¹³⁸

We do not know how much Kittel knew about the extermination of Jews. Any German would have been aware of pogroms and deportations, at least after November 1938. In his defence, Kittel relates that at the beginning of 1943, he knew of “systematic persecutions and murders of Jews on a large scale in Poland and Russia”.¹³⁹ After the war, the main thing to Kittel’s discredit was his involvement in the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage. His contributions in this context will be discussed below.

Kittel and the National Socialist Party

Ericksen writes that “outside his membership in the party and the Reichsinstitut, there is no dramatic evidence of Kittel’s support for the regime”.¹⁴⁰ However, his involvement in the institute and his writings there should not be underestimated,¹⁴¹ having been carried out with full dedication to the racist cause. Moreover, as the following discussion will indicate, Erickson’s description also overlooks Kittel’s faithful and long-term involvement in the party and for the National Socialist cause. As already indicated, Kittel became a party member on 1 May 1933. He states himself that he had never before belonged to a political party but had only been influenced by Friedrich Naumann’s Christian Social

¹³⁷ Ibid., 169.

¹³⁸ Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich*, 17.

¹³⁹ Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, 43. As also pointed out by Ericksen, “Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel”, 2411.

¹⁴⁰ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 47.

¹⁴¹ Which Ericksen himself shows in later research, Ericksen, “Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel”; Robert P. Ericksen, “Assessing the Heritage: German Protestant Theologians, Nazis, and the ‘Jewish Question’”, in *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*, ed. Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999).

movement.¹⁴² The question of Kittel's National Socialism cannot be isolated from his position to the Jews, since the National Socialist ideology was a racist ideology and the National Socialist state was a racial state.¹⁴³ In his defence, Kittel says that he was enchanted by Hitler's promises of a *völkisch* community built on Christianity and Christian culture, and that he had not understood that under the surface was a "counterfeit imperialistic and megalomaniac policy of brutality". He regrets having built his life on this deception.¹⁴⁴ Kittel underlines that his involvement in the party was only dutiful, that he was never engaged in the National Socialist University Teachers' Association (*NS Dozentenbund*), and that he "during his time in Vienna never had a word with the leader of the district".¹⁴⁵ Instead of leaving the NSDAP, which he would not have feared doing, he stayed in order to be "a thorn in the flesh" until they threw him out, Kittel purports. Thus he wanted to force the party to take a stand on his person. He also contends to have publicly torn off his party badge because theologians were not accepted in the Volkssturm.¹⁴⁶

However, there are documents to indicate that Kittel's version is doctored. A hitherto overlooked document from the head of the German Security Police (Sipo) and the Security Service (Chef der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD), describing Kittel's relationship to the National Socialist party and dated 1 September 1943, contains several *observations that make Kittel's assertions regarding his stand to the party unlikely*.¹⁴⁷ It is true, as Kittel asserts, that he had never before belonged to a political party, but it is not true that the only political movement that had influenced him was Naumann's *Christlich-Soziale* movement.

According to Sipo, Kittel was a member of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (KfdK, Combat League for German Culture) *before*

¹⁴² Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 11.

¹⁴³ Burleigh and Wippermann, *The Racial State*.

¹⁴⁴ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 11–12.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 12–13.

¹⁴⁶ On 25 September 1944, all men between the ages of 16 and 60 were mobilised into the Volkssturm.

¹⁴⁷ Letter from Chef der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD to the Auswärtiges Amt (IV B 2–686/43-E), 1 September 1943, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes Inland I-D, R98821. As far as I have gathered, the document has not been treated elsewhere, and I found it by accident in the Auswärtiges Amt. The reason for the report was an investigation by the Security Police into Professor Wilhelm Michaelis, Bern. The latter was also a party member (no. 1782742) and a frequent contributor to the TDNT. For this, see also act R98821.

1933, and prior to that, a member of several other organisations with a nationalist and/or anti-Semitic stance: the Kyffhäuser-Verband of the Vereine deutscher Studenten and Deutsche Vaterlandspartei.¹⁴⁸ The membership of the KfdK may provide a valuable key to Kittel's stance during National Socialism, as this was a deliberate undertaking by the National Socialist movement to attract people like Kittel. KfdK was projected as a National Socialist scholarly society, following an initiative from the NSDAP *Parteitag* in 1927. The society was formed as the KfdK in 1929, led by Alfred Rosenberg, and was originally called the Nationalsozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur (National Socialist Society for German Culture).¹⁴⁹ With the aim of attracting those in the educated elite who were not reached through the party's mass meetings and who would not accept the image of vulgar street riots with hooligans, the strategy was to appeal to the intelligentsia through cultural politics. The goal was not merely academic. At this point, the National Socialist party was known as a "hooligan and riot party", an image that severely hampered a breakthrough for National Socialism.

In the 1926 and 1927 elections, the NSDAP received only two to three per cent of the vote, and a mission to make the party socially acceptable was launched.¹⁵⁰ In this process, much weight was put on the academic occupational groups. Rosenberg purposed to tie leading figures to the association, "somehow nationally noted personages".¹⁵¹ The association was deliberately not presented as part of the National Socialist party,¹⁵² but was to attract "personalities in German cultural life who, at least initially, refuse a tie to any party".¹⁵³ This was success-

¹⁴⁸ For the latter, see Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage*. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte, 79.

¹⁴⁹ Rolf Düsterberg, "Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (KfdK)", Datenbank Schrift und Bild, <http://www.polunbi.de/pers/index.html>. The main work on the KfdK is Jürgen Gimmel, *Die politische Organisation kulturellen Ressentiments. Der "Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur" und das bildungsbürgerliche Unbehagen an der Moderne*, ed. Klaus-Jürgen Scherer, Adalbert Schlag, and Burkard Thiele, vol. 10, Schriftenreihe der Stipendiatinnen und Stipendiaten der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2001); see also Reinhard Bollmus, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner. Zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystem*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte. Herausgegeben vom Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1970), especially 27–39, where the KfdK is presented as the background to Rosenberg's influential centre for National Socialist cultural politics, Das Amt Rosenberg.

¹⁵⁰ Gimmel, *Die politische Organisation kulturellen Ressentiments*, 16.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 15.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 274–275, quoted from a KfdK document. That it attracted people who did not join the National Socialists is evident from other cases, Thomas Rösner, "Adolf

ful; the KfdK could at an early stage count great scholarly personalities who were not National Socialists among its ranks, for example the great Germanist Andreas Heusler,¹⁵⁴ but also Eva Chamberlain.¹⁵⁵ The KfdK considered German cultural values to be in danger, and there was a strong front against the values of the Weimar Republic, which were seen as cultural degeneration. It was concerned with “*the whole problem of the German culture, the substance of which is threatened*”,¹⁵⁶ and it criticised a growing materialism.¹⁵⁷ Instead, the KfdK wanted “to form a community of the people (*Völksgemeinschaft*) that, having grown out of the deepest sources of the *Volkstum*, rests on a well-ordered world-view (*Weltanschauung*) in morality, philosophy, education and art”.¹⁵⁸ In other words, *Bildung*, education and formation, is a central concept, but so is blood, race and *Volk*.¹⁵⁹ A useful description of the enemy was *Kulturbolschewismus*, cultural Bolshevism.¹⁶⁰

Kittel's cultural and moral view fitted very well in the KfdK. In these circles, there was also a strong anti-Jewish stance. In the manifesto at its foundation, KfdK talks about racially alienated literature, the “international” that threatens the *Arteigene* (that which is characteristic of the Germanic race)—all referring to Jewish influence as the threat.¹⁶¹ *Thus Kittel was a member of KfdK before the National Socialist assumption of power*,¹⁶² when the group had only a few thousand members, compared to 1933 when membership grew by thousands each month; in October 1933, it had 38,000 members. It is not possible to know the extent of Kittel's involvement with the KfdK, or the degree to which he shared the views stated in its pamphlets and manifestos. We do know that Kittel in “My

Bartels”, in *Handbuch zur “Völkischen Bewegung” 1871–1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht (München: K. G. Saur, 1999), 891.

¹⁵⁴ Heusler's *Germanentum* became an important book during National Socialism, Andreas Heusler, *Germanentum. Vom Lebens- und Formgefühl der alten Germanen*, Kultur und Sprache (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934).

¹⁵⁵ Bollmus, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner. Zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystem*, 28.

¹⁵⁶ Gimmel, *Die politische Organisation kulturellen Ressentiments*, 202, my emphasis.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 202–204.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 226.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 273.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 360.

¹⁶¹ Bollmus, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner. Zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystem*, 27.

¹⁶² Letter from Chef der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD to the Auswärtige Amt (IV B 2–686/43-E), 1 September 1943, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts Inland I-D, R98821.

Defence” often takes a stand against Rosenberg, and it is clear that Rosenberg’s anti-Christian stance was completely alien to Kittel’s own Lutheran Pietist view. Nevertheless, the fact that he joined the KfdK when it was still small—we do not know exactly when he joined it, only that it was before January 1933—shows that he shared the *ressentiments* on which the association was built, and this fits in with Kittel’s deeply rooted opposition to ‘threats’ to German culture.

Thus, although Kittel disguises this membership in his defence, we have no reason to doubt the information that Kittel was a member of the KfdK, which came from the Tübingen NSDAP to Sipo. This means that Kittel, who truly belonged to the target group of the KfdK, had been won over to the cause of the National Socialist leadership even before these ideas became *comme il faut*. It also shows how skilful the NSDAP ideologists were in winning the cultural elite over to their purposes. *This new material forces us to re-evaluate Kittel: his ressentiments had deeper roots and were not only a result of his being enchanted by Hitler in the ecstasy of the early months of 1933.* That these ideas were rooted in Kittel before he became a party member is also evidenced by his book *Die Judenfrage*. This extensive and ‘mature’ material hardly emanates from the spring of 1933 but seem to be rooted in long-term reflection.

Secondly, Kittel says in his defence that his involvement with the party was only dutiful, and that he was only a thorn in the flesh to it. However, the Sipo report has nothing detrimental to say about Kittel in political and ecclesio-political respects—the thorn was at any rate not felt on the National Socialist side. Kittel was registered with the NSDAP in Vienna and took an active part in the party work in Tübingen: “he has frequently visited the party arrangements [...] he has always kept close contact with the party”, the report states. Kittel defends himself by saying that he was very seldom engaged to speak, never for the anti-Jewish radio propaganda, etc.,¹⁶³ but the general verdict of Sipo and SD, as well as his involvement in the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage, show that the reason was hardly suspiciousness against him. On the contrary, it is with appreciation that the Sipo report states, “Party member Kittel has a special area of work, the research of Jews. He works for the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland. Through this work, he has made himself a name far beyond the German borders.”

¹⁶³ Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, 51.

The report also mentions his essay about the non-Jews and Talmud.¹⁶⁴ Kittel's work was without a doubt appreciated among the National Socialist leadership. This need not mean that he was as appreciated in all circles, however. It is impossible to settle whether Kittel was disliked in Alfred Rosenberg's circles and office—which Kittel himself makes much of. Kittel may have been disliked by Rosenberg, for example, due to his Christian world-view or his attachment to Walter Frank.¹⁶⁵ The Sipo report, however, tells of a loyal and active party member.

Kittel's ecclesio-political stance, too, has the approval of the Security Police. Sipo's representative has spoken to him several times, sees him as loyal to the National Socialist party, but notes that he tries to combine his Christian dogmatic views with the National Socialist *Weltanschauung* in a free way. Kittel is a “dogged proponent of ecclesiastical Christianity” and has therefore entered into certain “spiritual conflicts”. The informant notes that a theologian will always come into conflict with this ideology, expressing as his own conviction that a true National Socialist must break with the Christian dogma. He also observes that Kittel has recently stayed away from church politics. Nonetheless, he believes that their communications have brought theology and the National Socialist world-view closer to one another for Kittel. The informant ends:

To conclude, the following can be said: party member Kittel has taken an active part in the church struggle of the Protestant church front for a church of the Reich as desired by the Führer. He has always maintained close contact with the party. In a political respect, nothing detrimental has become known.¹⁶⁶

The document shows more clearly than before that Kittel *was involved in National Socialist groups for cultural politics* before 1933, and that he, at least until late 1943, was considered *a loyal and active party member in close contact with the party*, although the party people saw him as somewhat ‘unenlightened’ when it came to the relationship between the National

¹⁶⁴ Letter from Chef der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD to Auswärtige Amt (IV B 2–686/43-E) 1 September 1943, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes Inland I-D, R98821. The article mentioned, Kittel, “Die Behandlung des Nichtjuden nach dem Talmud”, is discussed below.

¹⁶⁵ Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, 46, 55–56, 60. It is well known that Rosenberg had quarrels with Walter Frank and his work, see Helmut Heiber, *Walter Frank und sein Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland*, vol. 13, *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1966), *passim*.

¹⁶⁶ So far the letter from Sipo, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes Inland I-D, R98821.

Socialist world-view and Kittel's piety and theology. Even so, the document is undoubtedly positive towards Kittel, who was by no means regarded as a "thorn in the flesh" by the party. I see no reason for the Sipo or SD to have favoured Kittel in a report such as this, since Kittel was still too 'pious' for the National Socialist taste, but was nevertheless appreciated as a good party member. Against his claim that he had little to do with the party and the National Socialist Teachers' Association, and that he had not written for NSDAP publications, Kittel's faithfulness to the party and involvement in the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage speaks for itself.

In April 1933, the NSDAP authorities in Stuttgart offered Kittel the position of vice chancellor at the University of Tübingen, which he refused—he does not state why. Kittel says that he was astonished, since he was neither a member of the party nor known as a National Socialist.¹⁶⁷ Kittel's membership of KfdK must have been regarded as favourable to National Socialism, however, and it is difficult to explain this offer in any other way than that Kittel was considered a reliable person.

In church politics, Kittel, according to his own version, left the Deutsche Christen because he deemed it impossible to change the movement, as he had set out to do together with some colleagues. In the defence, he also takes a clear stand against the Eisenach institute (see below), instead presenting himself as a supporter of the Confessing Church. It seems clear that Kittel was closer to the theology of the Confessing Church in many respects; however, as indicated above, his clear stand for National Socialist politics also made him different from this group.

Kittel's Production During National Socialism

Apart from the editorial work with the "Theological Dictionary of the New Testament", which certainly was a demanding task, Kittel did not publish more than a few scholarly articles within New Testament studies during National Socialism. Instead, his production almost entirely revolves around the 'Jewish problem', beginning with *Die Judenfrage* and continuing with a range of historical articles about Jews and Judaism.

¹⁶⁷ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 14.

Die Judenfrage (*The Jewish Problem*)

Kittel was quick to publish a theological book on the 'Jewish problem', taking a stand for the new apartheid policies, which must have been greeted with appreciation by the new regime, although in some circles Kittel's position towards the Jews was seen as too liberal, as noted above.¹⁶⁸ The book emanated from Kittel's keynote address at Verein deutscher Studenten on its fiftieth anniversary on 1 June 1933, and sold 9,000 copies in three editions.¹⁶⁹ Kittel dedicates the books to "my covenant brethren" (*meinen Bundebrüdern*) in the association, which had a long tradition of anti-Semitism, as was common in much of the German student movement.¹⁷⁰ He notes in his book that the association had traditions of opposing Jewish assimilation,¹⁷¹ which Kittel sees as the main danger, one that should be resisted.

The immediate context of Kittel's discussion is the Aryan legislation, which he refers to in the first sentence. In the book, Kittel sets out to advise those unsure of which way to turn¹⁷²—advice that was in great demand, as is evidenced by the large print runs of the three editions. He continues to say that people had been wondering if the situation of the Jews in Germany had to have such radical consequences as the new laws, and if such legislation could be legitimised from an ethical and Christian point of view, or if it was "barbarian brutality"—what does love require, he asks. He also notes that many Christians could not accept the anti-Semitic attacks on the Old Testament. The reason for his discussion, Kittel states, is that people were looking for a conciliation (*Ausgleich*) between *völkisch*-national and Christian-ethical ideals.¹⁷³

Kittel's ambition is to make the struggle against Judaism one that rests on a Christian theological basis. To him, it is necessary for the "young *völkisch* German state" to see such a conciliation, and he refers to the party programme of the NSDAP being written from the standpoint of

¹⁶⁸ Adam, *Hochschule und Nationalsozialismus*, 49.

¹⁶⁹ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 32, 54.

¹⁷⁰ Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 528–9; Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 79.

¹⁷¹ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 32. As noted in Rese, "Antisemitismus und neutestamentliche Forschung", 564.

¹⁷² Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 7.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 8.

a “positive Christianity”. Therefore, “also the struggle against Judaism must be carried on, on the basis of a conscious and clear Christianity”. Kittel complains that anti-Semitism is often based on feelings or slogans, and that there is more sentimentality than clear understanding. Instead, Kittel wants to see facts, on the basis of which proper actions can be taken. For the first time in this text, Kittel also speaks about a “struggle against Judaism”; in order to understand it fully, he contends that it is imperative to view the ‘Jewish problem’ as a religious question. Then it is possible to be German and Christian at the same time: even this course of events [dealing with the ‘Jewish problem’, A.G.] must be put before God, he thinks.¹⁷⁴

The facts that Kittel considers important are, firstly, that the Jews following the destruction of Jerusalem and Hadrian’s destruction are a people who are dispersed over the earth. They have lost their home and live as foreigners among other peoples, having a different religion and belonging to “a completely foreign race, the home of which is in another part of the world”. The Jewish people are and will continue to be foreigners. Since Jews live everywhere, Kittel argues, the ‘Jewish problem’ should not be considered as any other minority problem.¹⁷⁵

Secondly, Kittel points to Jewish emancipation and assimilation, which brought the question to a head.¹⁷⁶ It is a fundamental fact that “the ‘Jewish problem’ does not first and foremost pertain to the fate of individuals, but to the fate of the people”. This ‘Jewish problem’ must be settled, Kittel argues, listing possible solutions to it:

The question of what must happen with Judaism may be answered in a fourfold way:

1. an attempt could be made to exterminate the Jews (pogroms)
2. the Jewish state in Palestine or elsewhere could be restored, and an attempt could be made to gather the Jews of the world there (Zionism)
3. the Jews could be allowed to be incorporated into the other peoples (assimilation)
4. the historical status as foreigners among the peoples could be resolutely and consciously safeguarded.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 8–9.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 10–11.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 12. Jewish emancipation was a legal consequence of the constitutional law of 1871 of the *Kaiserreich*, which stated that the confessions had equal status.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 13.

The book expounds and discusses these four alternatives:

A violent extermination of Judaism as a serious consideration is out of the question: if the systems of the Spanish Inquisition or the Russian pogroms did not succeed in this, it is less possible in the twentieth century than ever. The thought also lacks inner sense. A historical fact, as in the case of this people, is at most solved in demagogical slogans, but never in history itself through extermination of the people. The point of an historical situation is always that it gives us a task to master. Killing all Jews does not mean mastering the task, however. Besides, the whole thought is so absurd that it is not worth wasting many words on its defence, so that there is no need to establish the absolute unchristianness of such a 'solution'.¹⁷⁸

No wonder this passage has been much discussed. In his second edition, where the last clause ("Besides [...] 'solution'") was added following criticism, Kittel quotes two critical remarks about the fact that he does not reject extermination outright.¹⁷⁹ Here, probably as a result of the criticism raised against his book, Kittel stresses the need for love and humanity.¹⁸⁰

Despite his later addition, the question is how to interpret his silence in the first edition, where the four options stand in all their

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 14. Since the passage met with strong opposition even in 1933, I render the whole text in the original German: "*Eine gewaltsame Ausrottung des Judentums kommt für eine ernsthafte Betrachtung nicht in Frage: wenn sie den Systemen der spanischen Inquisition oder den russischen Pogromen nicht gelungen ist, wird sie für das 20. Jahrhundert erst recht nicht möglich sein. Der Gedanke entbehrt auch des inneren Sinnes. Ein geschichtlicher Tatbestand, wie er mit diesem Volk gegeben ist, wird höchstens in demagogischen Schlagworten, niemals aber in der Geschichte selbst durch Ausrottung des Volkes gelöst. Der Sinn einer geschichtlichen Lage ist immer, daß sie uns eine Aufgabe stellt, die wir meistern sollen. Alle Juden totschiagen heißt aber nicht, die Aufgabe meistern. Im übrigen ist der ganze Gedanke so absurd, daß es nicht die Mühe wert ist, zu einer Abwehr viele Worte zu verlieren; vollends daß es nicht einer Feststellung der schlechthinigen Unchristlichkeit einer solchen 'Lösung' bedarf.*"

¹⁷⁹ The comments are from *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 1 July 1933, and the British *The Jewish Chronicle*, 11 August 1933, *ibid.*, 115. The second edition was published sometime in September–October 1933, see advertisement in *Theologische Blätter* 12, issue 10, October 1933, and includes a reply to an open letter that Martin Buber published in the August edition of *Theologische Blätter*, where he responds critically to Kittel's ideas of Jews having a status as foreigners, Martin Buber, "Offener Brief an Gerhard Kittel", *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 8, August 1933 (1933).

¹⁸⁰ For example: Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 8: "Für den Christen vollends [...]," to be compared with Kittel, "Die Judenfrage", 7–8, beginning with the same words but having a different content. It also seems clear that Kittel includes some things aimed at critics in the Nazi camp, e.g. the strengthened reference to the party programme, 8.

naked brutality.¹⁸¹ On the one hand, it seems unlikely that Kittel saw extermination as an alternative, but on the other hand, the failure to reject such an outrageous alternative speaks of how occupied Kittel is with the need to 'solve' the 'Jewish problem'. His argument is frightening in its 'objectivity': the reason against extermination is first of all practical, not ideological. It did not succeed in Spain or Russia, nor does an outward extermination have any inner meaning. This can be interpreted in different ways, but Kittel's cool reasoning seems to show a determination that is deeply rooted in his ideology. The 'Jewish problem' must be solved.¹⁸²

The second alternative, Zionism, is no solution to Kittel either, primarily for political reasons, such as the lack of success in the experiments that had already been carried out, and the fact that Judaism itself was divided over the issue.¹⁸³ The third and fourth alternatives are the ones that Kittel considers: assimilation, or status as foreigner. The old ghetto, with Jews living on their own, is regarded by Kittel as quite a peaceful solution, and he considers their guest status to be a matter of course, in fact explaining any violent reactions against Jews as being due to Jews overstepping the boundaries of their guest status.

To Kittel, assimilated Judaism is the worst poison in the body of the German people, its precursor being the *Hofjuden*, the assimilated Jews of European courts from the seventeenth century onwards. Having stated Jewish emancipation as a fact, with its abolition of the ghetto (which to him implies "the self-evident limitations for foreigners"), with social and civil equality for Jews, Kittel begins to list the consequences of assimilation. Jewish conversions to Christianity, which became common, were insincere, and this led to *religion becoming merely superficial*. This development reached its peak after 1918, when the benefits connected with the Christian confession disappeared, and Jews in general became part of the liberal synagogue with its "enlightened religion".¹⁸⁴ Jewish emancipation in turn led to mixed marriages (*Konnubium*) between Germans and Jews, the motives being money—poor German nobility intermarrying with the Jewish financial elite—and sex, since the foreign

¹⁸¹ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage", 14.

¹⁸² Below I only discuss the second edition of *Die Judenfrage*, having demonstrated Kittel's attitude in the first edition.

¹⁸³ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 14–18.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

was also sexually attractive. These were the two enticements that lured the genuine German man into a mixed marriage.¹⁸⁵ From this came racial mixing, which was a greater problem for Germany than other countries, with its eastern border and influx of Jews coming out of the ghetto, hungry for assimilation. Only the 1933 legislation put an end to racial mixing, Kittel says.¹⁸⁶

However, according to Kittel, the connection between the ‘Jewish problem’ and decadence is greater than any biological problem, and this in turn is linked to assimilation. The decadence of the assimilated Jews comes from their being uprooted from their own people, and “*this decadence, and nothing else, is the real, fundamental problem of the modern Jewish problem, compared to which the Jewish problem of the Middle Ages and its ghetto is a small and harmless problem*”, he contends.¹⁸⁷ Assimilated Judaism is “a poison eating its way through the body of the people (*Völkskörper*) like a terrible disease”. This Judaism opposes German religious, cultural and national thought, which is genuine and real, undermining culture by means of anything from resignation to fiery agitation.

Yet to Kittel the root cause is always the soulless rootlessness of assimilated Judaism. It has no religion, and thus it furthers a disintegration of religion, and since it is not bound by any limitations, the result of assimilated Judaism is unrestrained seduction, Kittel argues, tapping into traditional criticisms. Assimilated Judaism governs through literature and the press, through financial politics without responsibility to a people, and through administration of justice and medical science that is not in the service of the people. Kittel admits that such things are not only found among Jews, but assimilated Judaism is a root cause of the whole problem. This is especially true during the Weimar Republic, which Kittel calls the “years of depravation”.¹⁸⁸

Kittel goes on to discuss the internationalism of Judaism, especially “international money power”, and the question of the working class being treated as an international concern—Marx, Rosa Luxemburg and

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 22.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 23–25.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 25. Text spaced in Kittel’s text.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 26–27. Kittel talks about what is characteristic of the “last fourteen years”, that is, the years of the Weimar Republic. The expression “the years of depravation after 1918” is found in Gerhard Kittel, “*Lexicographia Sacra*. Two lectures on the making of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge”, “*Theology*” *Occasional Papers* 7 (1938), 351. This attitude is also found in Schlatter.

other revolutionaries are mentioned here.¹⁸⁹ It is interesting that Kittel can combine what is normally as fire and water, and make them both pertain to Jews and Judaism: international money power, i.e. Jewish capitalism, and the strongest opponents of capitalism, the revolutionaries. The stress on internationalism instead of nationalism is a problem, introducing cultural ideas that threaten national thought. Kittel gives his response to the Jews' way of talking about mere 'humanity' rather than national entities with a vision of nationalism: "True greatness of humanity does not develop with 'the human as such' but with people who have grown, rooted in the soil of blood, nationality and history." These are governed by eternal law, Kittel writes.¹⁹⁰ Hence, Jews stand for internationalism and humanity in general, as opposed to the national and German.

Assimilation has become the dogma of the modern era, Kittel continues, even though pious Judaism, people such as Adolf Stoecker and others have tried to stop it. They were met with ridicule, as was Adolf Hitler, Kittel states, and since November 1918, Judaism had made uninhibited demands on the leadership of the German people.¹⁹¹ Kittel is probably alluding to the revolutionary events of early November 1918, where the Jewish socialists Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were instrumental and which eventually led to the Weimar Republic. Kittel continues by talking about the Jews from the countries east of Germany: at the same time as these events were taking place, there was an influx of *Ostjuden*, Jews from Eastern Europe, resulting in "a grotesque excess of the assimilation process, *which necessarily must have a violent end*".¹⁹²

The natural reaction to this was anti-Semitism, Kittel contends. To begin with, there was a popular anti-Semitism, joking about Jews, particularly Eastern Jews—which even assimilated Jews could do. But the negative thing about this, Kittel thinks, was that the focus was moved from the real problem, and anti-Semitism was made to look

¹⁸⁹ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 28–29.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 29–31.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 32. The events took place on 9 November 1918, but whether they can be called a 'revolution' is debated, see Carola Stern and Heinrich A. Winkler, eds., *Wendepunkte deutscher Geschichte 1848–1990* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001), 99–101.

¹⁹² Similarly Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 33, my emphasis.

like mere envy and hate against Jews. This deprived anti-Semitism of understanding as well as adequate consequences, and Kittel mentions his own Tübingen University as a rare example of a university where there was no 'Jewish problem' either in the faculty or in the student body—in practical terms Kittel must mean that the university was '*Judenrein*'.¹⁹³ Kittel regards the German intelligentsia and bourgeoisie as responsible for any explosions caused by the 'Jewish problem', and his logic is clear: had it acted as the Tübingen leadership, there would be no 'Jewish problem'.

However, Kittel's concern is seeing a genuine anti-Semitism of the people, and he stresses the "voice of the blood and the quest for the corporate, *Volks*-minded conditioning of our thinking and feeling". The simple strata of the people, German farmers and craftsmen, see through the vice of writers and journalists, and Kittel shows an understanding for pyres and stink bombs coming from the youth and general population.¹⁹⁴ The new and passionate anti-Semitism is justified to Kittel. It had to come because the actual problem, that of a *foreign* and *different* race, had not been dealt with. Here Kittel very clearly motivates his view from a racist standpoint,¹⁹⁵ although he takes a stand against popular theories of ritual murder and the like. A downside of anti-Semitism, however, is the wrong criticism of the Old Testament. According to Kittel, the fiercest attack on the Old Testament, Friedrich Delitzsch's *Die große Täuschung*, was written by the grandchild of a Jew, i.e. Franz Delitzsch.¹⁹⁶ Nevertheless, Kittel holds that true Judaism has always warned against mixing with other peoples. This was a sin punishable by death, and pious Jews from the East still curse a son who marries a non-Jew, Kittel writes. He concludes this long argument with the words, "*Assimilation is sin and transgression of a will of God ordained in the Volk and among the peoples.*"¹⁹⁷

¹⁹³ Ibid., 35.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 36.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 37, see also 35.

¹⁹⁶ Commenting on Delitzsch, *Die große Täuschung. Fortgesetzte kritische Betrachtungen zum Alten Testament, vornehmlich den Prophetenschriften und Psalmen, nebst Schlußfolgerungen*. Kittel's claim that Delitzsch was Jewish is probably wrong; see the discussion of Delitzsch above. However, the interesting thing here is that Kittel blames the Jews for this attack on the Old Testament, by referring to Friedrich Delitzsch!

¹⁹⁷ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 39.

Kittel's Solution: Status as a Foreigner

Kittel's solution to the 'Jewish problem' is to restore the status as foreigner (*Wiederherstellung des Gastzustandes*), making Jews a guest people that is not assimilated into the Germans. This is willed by God and is therefore also accepted by true Judaism as a suffering, Kittel submits.¹⁹⁸ In this stand, Kittel does not take a different, more liberal line than National Socialism; in fact, he only legitimises the newly implemented racial policy, the results of Kittel's research also being used for this purpose.¹⁹⁹ This apartheid policy had to be implemented "with all determination and total consistency", even if the whole world cried about barbarity.²⁰⁰ The slogan "German citizens of Jewish faith" had to be blotted out. Instead, Kittel calls for a judicial legislation for "Jews living in Germany", which should heed *völkisch* necessities as well as justice.

Kittel regards pious Judaism as less dangerous than assimilated Judaism, being easy to spot.²⁰¹

Paradoxically enough, one might say: a really pious Eastern Jew, still rooted in the customs of his fathers, with or without a kaftan, would in fact denote a smaller problem as a foreigner, needing less control or identification (*Ausweisung*) than an elegant general secretary of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith or a crafty lawyer, whose grandfather had even become a citizen.²⁰²

This shows Kittel's view in a nutshell: traditional Jews are preferable, since they are easier to identify and control, while having less influence. His contempt for intellectual and influential Jews is evident. However—and here he goes against public National Socialist opinion—Kittel maintains that the pious Jews should enjoy freedom and

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 40.

¹⁹⁹ See the presentation of an official at a high political level in the NSDAP, Feldscher, "Der Jude als fremder im Reich", *Archiv für Judenfragen. Schriften zur geistigen Überwindung des Judentums. Herausgeber Anti-jüdische Aktion 1, Gruppe A 1* (1943), where the policy is described precisely so: "The Second Reich started with the equality of the Jews. The Third Reich has forced them back into their status as foreigners," 21. Feldscher several times refers to Kittel's results to support his argument.

²⁰⁰ In Kittel's discussion, similar statements recur several times: "Therefore a purposeful *völkisch* state must do nothing except restore the normal condition [the status of Jews as a guest people, A.G.] with implacable hardness and radical consistency, and make it the normal condition," Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 51.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 41–42.

²⁰² Ibid., 42.

respect for their Jewish lifestyle, especially the religious aspects of it. To him, it cannot be in the interest of the *völkisch* cause to demean or hinder such Jewish life, and so the synagogue, circumcision, Sabbath, etc. should be protected. Kittel holds that it would be more effective to have a commandment to slaughter according to Jewish rites than to prohibit it, because, again, it is worse if the assimilated Jews who eat non-kosher food or pork break the rules than if those who eat vegetarian food do.²⁰³ Likewise, Jewish children who refuse school on a Sabbath should not be punished, etc.

Kittel draws far-reaching political consequences from his analysis. The immediate reason for the discussion of the status of the Jews was the so-called Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, passed on 7 April 1933, and Kittel states that Jews should be removed from such positions, with the exception of such Jews who fought in the war, or whose fathers or sons fell, as well as those who were civil servants before 1914. He draws the same consequences for the *press*, which he wants to dejudaise, as for *literature*: Jews should not write in German, and if they do, it should be published in specifically marked books—at this point, thirty-eight per cent of German authors are Jewish, Kittel claims.²⁰⁴ Nor should teachers' positions in the academia be filled with people of guest status, since they are to teach *German* youth, and Kittel thinks it amiss that more than half the faculty could be Jewish at times. He also blames problems in the country on medical doctors and solicitors. The problem is so much greater, he argues, because Jews abound within the areas mentioned.

Kittel recommends strong action to change the status of the Jews into that of guests, with all its consequences. This does not mean that the medieval ghetto should be restored; instead, his vision is some sort of *cultural ghetto*. He envisions Hebrew newspapers, Jewish private schools and Jewish cultural life, simply so that what is Jewish cannot be equated with what is German.²⁰⁵ As will be demonstrated below, intermarriage was one of Kittel's main quarrels with Judaism. If intermarriage is not prohibited, the consequence of such a marriage must be that the whole family comes under Jewish legislation, and a civil servant who marries a Jew must be dismissed. Thus intermarriage must be seen as “a *völkisch*

²⁰³ Ibid., 43.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 47–48.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 61–62.

impossibility and a moral aberration".²⁰⁶ Kittel continues to contemplate the problems of the descendants of intermarried couples, which are complicated but must be solved with energy. One can hope, Kittel writes, that within some years or decades, the "body of the German people (*Völkskörper*) can process this element of Jewish blood received in the course of a hundred years",²⁰⁷ that is, he hopes that this element can be eliminated. Here Kittel subscribes to a purely racist view of Jewish blood as a carrier of unwanted qualities.

Although the 'Jewish problem' must be handled with courage, Kittel also foresees various hardships befalling the Jews, e.g. 'soulful' pain, since many noble people would be deprived of their profession and thus the meaning of life. Attempts should be made to mitigate the hardships, but "we must not become weak either", Kittel writes.²⁰⁸ A development that has been so harmful to Germany cannot be endured, and even though considerations should be made regarding how to help the victims, they should never "lead to sentimental enfeeblement, never so that the necessary process of purification and making [the people, A.G.] sound is impeded".²⁰⁹ An eye on the individual's situation must not be allowed to interfere with the destiny of the *Volk*, the people, Kittel argues, the scripture that God visits iniquities to the third and fourth generation being valid.

Kittel holds that the racial legislation is good for the Jews. To Kittel, the 'Jewish problem' is a religious question, forcing Jews to take a stand as Jews.²¹⁰ Most of contemporary Judaism does not have religion anymore, which Kittel sees as a matter of life and death for Judaism: Judaism without religion is not Judaism. Judaism must come to God, Kittel maintains: "Becoming a Jew again means nothing other than having the courage to return to the sources of Jewish religion, not to modern philosophemes, but to the living God."²¹¹ But coming to God also means willingly accepting 'God's history', i.e. that Jews are condemned to the status as foreigners, the suffering of being dispersed:

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 64.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 67. 'Process' is my translation of *verarbeiten*, which is for instance used for the purification of metal.

²⁰⁸ Similar ideas are expressed several times, e.g. Ibid., 67–68.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 68.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 84.

²¹¹ Ibid., 70–73.

*Genuine Judaism remains with the symbol of the peaceless and homeless foreigner, wandering over the earth, who waits for God's promise and the Day of God, whether it comes tomorrow or in thousands of years.*²¹²

The question is if it is possible to awaken a living religion within the Judaism that accepts its status as foreigners. Kittel discusses how such an awakening could occur, drawing an analogy to the situation of the Christian churches. In fact, from a religious point of view, there is no solution to the 'Jewish problem', Kittel contends: pious Judaism awaits a fulfilment of its history and destiny, which will only happen on the Day of God.²¹³

The ideological foundation of this long discussion by Kittel is a racist analysis: simply because the Jews are Jews, they are bound to suffer the status as foreigners among the peoples. Although Kittel shows great sympathy for traditional Jewry, the same thing goes for them. All Jews are under the same judgment, originally emanating from their expulsion from Jerusalem. Kittel repeatedly stresses that the restoration of the foreign status is an historical necessity for cleansing the blood of the German *Volkskörper*, and he wholeheartedly and with a frequent use of words such as "inplacable", "necessary", warning against weakness, and so on, supports the apartheid policies already inflicted upon the German Jews. In this part of the book, he often refers to Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, giving his assent. But the fact that he motivates his policy with theological arguments makes it even more frightening: God himself is behind it, and thus it is all the more irrevocable. And since the struggle against Judaism is important, the place of the Christians is at the forefront of this struggle.²¹⁴ This also became official ideology, at least until the extermination policy commenced.²¹⁵

Jewish Christianity

Kittel also includes a discussion on so-called Jewish Christianity. It puts a heavy guilt on the Christian Church and Jewry, that for a hundred years there have been so many godless conversions to Christianity, Kittel complains, and that baptism has been ridiculed in comic magazines.

²¹² Ibid., 74. To this, Buber remarks that the 'Wandering Jew' is no Jewish motif whatsoever, Buber, "Offener Brief an Gerhard Kittel".

²¹³ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 76.

²¹⁴ Ibid., 76.

²¹⁵ See Feldscher, "Der Jude Als Fremder Im Reich".

Kittel stresses that “*a baptism of a Jew does not affect his being Jewish; becoming a Christian does not mean becoming German. The converted Jew does not become German but Judenchrist (Jewish-Christian)*”,²¹⁶ in the same way that converted Chinese or Indians do not become Middle Europeans. Here Kittel wants to disconnect being German and being Christian. His point is that Jewish Christians need to develop a separate existence, needing a Jewish-Christian theology and lifestyle. However, a consequence of this is that a Jewish Christian cannot become a vicar or elder in a German church, just as a Negro, Kittel writes, would not become the pastor of a white American church, and vice versa. Here, too, he reinforces racist thinking.²¹⁷ To Kittel, the goal is a Jewish-Christian church. He expresses that the Jewish Christians are his Christian brothers, and if they have no Jewish-Christian church, they must be free to partake in the German-Christian services. A Jewish-Christian church would not be a second-class church, but a “brother church”. However, Kittel considers it necessary to cut the link between baptism and assimilation.

Theologically, Christianity has to remember that the Jewish people were once the ‘people of God’—note that Kittel here knows of no present or future role for Israel. The Saviour of the world came from Judaism, and Kittel acknowledges the statement in John 4:22, that salvation comes from the Jews, as a necessary part of the Bible.²¹⁸ However, he holds that Jewish Christians can understand the cause of their status as foreigners in a special way. They are aware of the curse on them, i.e. that the Jews crucified Christ, and that Christ cried over Jerusalem and saw its coming destruction as a curse from God. *With these thoughts, Kittel effectively tries to legitimise even the hardships that his Jewish-Christian ‘brethren’ faced.*

Jewish Christians and the Ministry in the Church

In his second edition of the book, Kittel includes a separate chapter on the Jewish Christians, commenting on the recent discussion in Germany, and the *Kirchenkampf*. This had escalated since the Reichsbischof Friedrich von Bodelschwingh was pressured to resign and the NSDAP man Ludwig Müller took his place on 21 September 1933. Apart from leadership issues, the key question in this struggle was whether

²¹⁶ Kittel, “Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe”, 78.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 79.

²¹⁸ Ibid., 81.

the Aryan paragraph should be implemented in the Church as well as in society.²¹⁹ Kittel repeats the statement that a Jew who becomes a Christian does not become a German, although he does become a Christian.²²⁰ The Jewish-Christian man is Kittel's Christian brother, as the Jewish-Christian church is part of the *Una Sancta*; here Kittel refers to Gal. 3:28.²²¹ However, this equality in Christ has no application to the ministry of the Church, and Kittel welcomes the implementation of the Aryan paragraph in the Church as well.²²²

To Kittel, there are natural divisions that are not declared void in Christ. What, then, would happen to the German Protestant Church when Jewish Christians were dismissed from their offices through the new legislation?²²³ Kittel argues that Gal. 3:28 has nothing to do with a range of practical issues in concrete human life. Paul did not wish to abolish the difference between slave and free, the Greek is not a Jew and vice versa, nor can the difference between husband and wife be abolished. Moreover, Paul refused to let women be in the ministry of the Word (1 Cor. 14:34), although Kittel does not regard Paul as thereby discriminating against women. Kittel's point is that these differences do not discriminate against any part, and neither do the new racial laws. There are natural borders, which must not be transgressed, Kittel maintains, and this does not violate the principle in Gal. 3:28, that we are "one in Christ".

Hence, even though the Jewish Christian is a Christian brother—as Kittel repeatedly stresses—he cannot be a minister in a German church. Kittel's biblical example is the 'Hellenists' of Acts 6.²²⁴ The seven who were called to the first ministry in the earliest church were chosen so that their ethnic make-up would fit the people whom they ministered

²¹⁹ For a background, see e.g. Smid, *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*.

²²⁰ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 101.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 101–102.

²²² This is clear from footnote 92, *ibid.*, 127–128, where Kittel in principle endorses the legislation for ministers of the Church of the Altpreussische Union, which is analogous to the civil Aryan paragraph. However, Kittel holds that the critical point is how these laws are implemented, and that is where it will be evident whether they are Christian or unchristian, 128. This chapter was sent to all theological university teachers in Germany, Europe and America, Meier, *Die theologischen Fakultäten im Dritten Reich*, 128.

²²³ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 101.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 105–106.

to. Since the widows were Hellenists, Hellenists were ordained to meet their needs, without the Hebrews (i.e. Jewish Christians from Palestine) feeling that they were second-class Christians because they were not considered for the ministry.²²⁵ Kittel opposes the thought that apartheid policy is loveless. It would, he contends, be lack of love on the part of the Hebrews (here analogous to the 1933 Jewish Christians in Germany) to demand a position, purporting that love implies equality. The apostles would have considered it loveless of the Hebrews to demand such equality. Here Kittel makes sweeping analogies in order to prove his case. The apostles are not identified with the Hebrews (which did, and sometimes still does, belong to standard exegesis),²²⁶ the Hebrews are analogous to German-Jewish Christians, and the more prestigious 'Hellenists' are the Germans. The message is that the Jewish Christians should not aspire to any ministry to Germans, and Jewish-Christian ministers should willingly sacrifice their ministry, Kittel maintains.²²⁷

He thus supports the formation of Jewish-Christian churches:

I wish Jewish Christianity, for its own sake, the enrichment that could grow out of its Jewish-Christian thought and feeling. I wish them the great Jewish-Christian theologians, who would have the will to consciously pursue Jewish-Christian theology.²²⁸

Kittel believes that 'Jewish Christianity' could let its voice be heard in future ecumenical contexts. He calls the Jews

the people of salvation history [...] a living reminder among the national churches that there is a specific people and a specific church, out of which also salvation has come to the national churches.²²⁹

Here Kittel points to the Jews as the people of salvation history, not that they now have any other function in this history than to be a reminder that if God has not had mercy on the natural branches, how could he have mercy on the ones that are grafted in?

²²⁵ Ibid., 106. This piece of exegesis is adventurous. All of the leaders in Acts 6 were probably of Jewish blood, and the reason for choosing 'Hellenists' was probably the language, see Gerdmar, "Hebreer och hellenister i urförsamlingen—ett receptionskritiskt perspektiv".

²²⁶ See the effective counter-argument to this in Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*.

²²⁷ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 106.

²²⁸ Ibid., 111.

²²⁹ Ibid., 112.

Die Judenfrage in Conclusion

Kittel chose to write on the 'Jewish problem' very early during National Socialism. It appears that he did this, not to mitigate anything in the racial policy, but quite the contrary: this racial law is motivated and legitimised on the basis of 'God's history'. Jews are doomed to be a wandering and homeless people, and so it shall be in the new Germany. At this point, Kittel, without any critical distance, subscribes to the racist ideology of National Socialism. There is a fundamental difference between a Jew and a German, he states, falling back on *völkisch* ideas of profound differences between peoples, due to their geographical and ethnic roots, in this case making it impossible for a Jewish-Christian minister to function in a German setting. Kittel often returns to the policies against the Jews as being unavoidable, taking a clearly racist position here. The same is true of his entire discussion of different strategies for overcoming the 'Jewish problem', a discussion that is frightening in its 'objectivity'. However, the fact is that Kittel faced criticisms, not only from people who wanted to defend the Jews, but also from NSDAP circles for being too friendly towards the Jews. On a left-right scale in the party, Kittel is quite conservative regarding methods. He is against street violence, although he sometimes defends it as necessary reactions to the absurd situation of the 'Jewish problem'. On the other hand, his basis for the racist policies in the gospel becomes a strong legitimisation of these policies. When Kittel discusses Jewish Christianity and the furthering of their church life, it can at times sound friendly and generous. Nonetheless, his racist analysis is fundamental: Jews, although not inferior to Germans, are different and have no part in German life. It is difficult to understand how Kittel can harmonise his racist policies with the idea that Jews are not inferior. Despite this insistence, Kittel's entire support of racial legislation, and his views of how German blood must be purified after intermarriage has been abandoned, are clear enough. And although he acknowledges that his apartheid is cruel, he finds it unavoidable.

Kittel's views are well founded in his theology and ideology. His discussion in *Die Judenfrage* does not give the impression of being hastily scrambled together, but it is well reflected. The background is his theologically fundamental idea that Judaism was Jesus' worst enemy, as well as Kittel's political preferences. The Weimar Republic was detestable to Kittel, and much of the decadence that he purports to find there was, in his mind, linked to assimilated Judaism. Signs of such attitudes have already been found, e.g. in his mention of Rathenau. The discussion in

Die Judenfrage is a product of Kittel's profound reflection, rooted in his theology of Judaism and his political views. That he was considered an asset is evidenced by his being a key person in the Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany, which would become a substantial part of his scholarly work during National Socialism.

Theologising Apartheid: The Unheils Geschichte of the Jews

Between the first and second editions of *Die Judenfrage*, Kittel published the article "Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage" ("New Testament Thoughts Regarding the Jewish Problem") in the widely distributed *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung* on 29 September 1933, and the article "Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Bibel" in the journal *Glaube und Volk*.²³⁰ The first short but programmatic article reveals Kittel's theological rationale for the racist policy that he suggests. He argues mainly on the basis of Romans 9–11, here seen as a text on how the Jews, according to God's *Unheils Geschichte* (history of calamity), were doomed to suffer oppression during National Socialism.²³¹ The context, again, is Germany after 1 April 1933.²³² The second article in an even clearer way develops Kittel's theologising of the Jewish fate in terms of *Heilsgeschichte* (salvation history) and *Unheils Geschichte* (history of calamity).²³³ Here history must be understood not in terms of modern descriptive history, but as an idealistic history, a divinely legitimised determination of a certain development, with *Unheils Geschichte* being simply the reverse of salvation history.

Just as in *Die Judenfrage*, Kittel insists that the 'Jewish problem' is not a political or race-theoretical one; to him only the believers can really comprehend it:

²³⁰ Gerhard Kittel, "Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage", *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 29 September 1933. On the role of these so-called *Sonntagszeitungen*, see Ino Arndt, "Machtübernahme und Judenboykott in der Sicht evangelischer Sonntagsblätter", in *Miscellanea. Festschrift für Helmut Krausnick zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Wolfgang Benz (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980). See also Anders Gerdmar, "Nazistisk bibeltolkning i en evangelisk veckotidning på 1930-talet", in *Ad Lucem. Tidskrift för livsåskådning och kultur* (1999a) (Swedish).

²³¹ See also Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 26–27.

²³² Speaking about Bismarck, Kittel, "Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage", 905.

²³³ On Kittel's use of *Heilsgeschichte* and *Unheils Geschichte*, see also Anders Gerdmar, "Exegesis, Postmodernism, and Auschwitz—On Human Dignity and the Ethics of Interpretation", *Studia Theologica* 51 (1997), 122–128.

Only the believer sees this, who knows from his Bible *that this people is a special people*, a people with a specific history, who knows anything of the *Heilsgeschichte* as well as the *Unheilsgeschichte* that God has imposed on them. It surprises me how little the question of Judaism is treated as a religious, as a salvation-historical, question, even by serious and conscious Christians.²³⁴

Kittel begins to forcefully develop his *Unheilsgeschichte* of the Jews, and thus introduces this very graphic hermeneutical term to the contemporary German discussion about the situation of the Jews:

The Bible knows both a Heilsgeschichte and an Unheilsgeschichte, which the Lord God has imposed on this people, and anyone who presumes to speak of Israel in the name of the Bible must have the courage to speak about both. He who wants to refer to the Bible may *neither* speak only about the 'cursed and rejected people' *nor* only about the 'chosen people', but only about the people that is *both* in the history imposed on it by God.²³⁵

Here, Kittel draws upon salvation history as one of the most prominent heuristic models used in exegesis and theology during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This is also his own hermeneutic tradition, as developed within the Lutheran Pietist tradition that he was brought up in. The role of salvation history has already been noted among scholars such as Beck, Tholuck, von Hofmann, Delitzsch, Strack and Schlatter. It was later popularised in exegesis—or indeed, exegetical hermeneutics—by, among others, Gerhard von Rad in the Old Testament area, and Oscar Cullmann in the New Testament.

The interpretations of salvation history vary among the aforementioned scholars, but Kittel exploits some fundamental traits. *History* has a crucial role and is more than a rendering of what has happened. Just as in the idealistic Hegelian philosophy of history, for example, history is *deterministic*: salvation or calamity is determined in an overarching and seemingly unchangeable, irreversible historical development. The history is *God's*, and whatever happens to Israel has been imposed by

²³⁴ Gerhard Kittel, "Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Bibel", *Glaube und Volk* 2 (1933), 152.

²³⁵ Kittel, "Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage", 904. Emphasis in the text: "*Die Bibel weiß sowohl von einer Heilsgeschichte als auch von einer Unheilsgeschichte, die Gott der Herr über dies Volk verhängt hat*, und wer sich anmaßt, im Namen der Bibel von Israel zu reden, der muß den Mut haben, *von beidem* zu reden. Wer auf die Bibel sich berufen will, darf *weder* allein von dem 'verfluchten und verworfenen Volk' *noch* allein von dem 'auserwählten Volk' reden, sondern allein von dem Volke, das *beides* in seiner von Gott ihm verhängten Geschichte ist."

him. Kittel also states that God's history must not be hindered, implying that it would be a sin not to see to an implementation of God's *Unheilsgeschichte* with the Jews. This thinking thus gives the highest possible legitimation to what befalls Israel. One main difference between Kittel and the general salvation-historical tradition is that the latter talks far less about *Unheilsgeschichte*, although the concept is used, and more of the positive *Heilsgeschichte*; the role of Israel in this history is positive, typically that "all Israel shall be saved". Through this development of the salvation-historical research tradition, Kittel thus reverses its time-honoured meaning. Using this concept, Kittel interprets contemporary Judaism as standing under a curse.

Kittel goes on to identify Romans 9–11 as "the most important and exhaustive treatise of the 'Jewish problem'".²³⁶ This statement and the heading "New Testament thoughts regarding the Jewish problem" speak the same language: even the New Testament discussed the 'Jewish problem'! Kittel immediately merges his modern German horizon with Paul's, without clarifying that Paul's text has quite another context than his interpretation of it. The theme of the text is not predestination, as traditionally in exegesis, Kittel contends:

With this [seeing the text as pertaining to predestination, A.G.] one has left the theme of Paul, and with this one evades that it speaks of a certain destiny of a certain people, which is without comparison in the entire history of the world or of the peoples. *Its theme is not the question of predestination, but only the question of the Jewish people.*²³⁷

Even though Kittel may be correct in his exegesis of the passage in relation to predestination, Paul's interest in the salvation of the Jews is put into the contemporary race-theoretical discussion, and suddenly it pertains to the 'Jewish problem'.

In Kittel's discussion, the positive history of Israel is predominantly a past history. Israel was the chosen people—it received "sonship, glory, the covenants, the gift of the Law, the worship and the promises", Rom. 9:4—but its fate is all the more tragic. Kittel says that the Jews *were* the people of God: "it is about that people, which was the people of God, and which has rejected the Son of God".²³⁸ However, Kittel does sometimes, in an eschatological context, talk about the people as

²³⁶ Ibid., 903.

²³⁷ Ibid., 903. Emphasis in the text.

²³⁸ Ibid., 905.

being the people of God.²³⁹ The curse will be lifted; God's mercy has not ceased; and in the end times, branches of the olive tree will be grafted in anew by faith. Hence, at times, Kittel sees a positive future for some Jews. The section in Romans 11 (25–29), however, which is often interpreted as talking of a positive future for Israel, is not mentioned. Just as Paul, Kittel says that he is pained to see the situation of the Jews, stressing that one must not speak lightly, lovelessly or frivolously about them.²⁴⁰ Kittel holds that his sorrow for the Jews may be greater than that of some of his critics, since he is not only acquainted with many noble Jews, but through his studies he also probably knows more than them about the spirit of the Jews.

The question is whether we are “obedient to God's history”, Kittel contends.²⁴¹ According to ‘God's history’, calamity must come upon Israel. It must not be denied, because this, too, is biblical, and “we do nothing pious by denying this calamity”.²⁴² Kittel uses the parable of the wicked husbandmen to show that Jews are doomed to be smashed (*zerschlagen*) and crushed (*zermalmen*) because of their rejection and killing of the Son. Here Kittel redirects the judgment from the scribes and high priests, who perceived themselves as being apostrophised by Jesus' parable, to the entire people: “*We have no right to make these words unspoken by Jesus,*” he says.

Moreover, in Romans 9–11, Paul accepted the *Unheil* of Israel as necessary, and it is no tragedy in the common meaning of the word. The Jew became a homeless and restless foreigner on this earth, which is the judgment of Jesus on the people when he says “their house is forsaken” (Luke 13:34*f*). Kittel is horrified at Christians who do not perceive the ‘Jewish problem’ as a religious, salvation-historical question. Christians should be aware of this historical determination of *Unheil*, calamity, since the Jews rejected the Son of God.²⁴³ It is obvious that Kittel wants to impose his divinely approved *Unheilsgeschichte* on Christians who are too easy-going towards the Jews. “The Bible is always concrete,” Kittel argues, and so the actual theological considerations should be applied to the ‘Jewish problem’. What is currently happening to the Jews is difficult and dreadful, Kittel states, indicating that he is familiar with

²³⁹ Ibid., 906.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 904–905.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 905.

²⁴² Ibid., 904; similarly Kittel, “Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Bibel”, 153.

²⁴³ Kittel, “Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage”, 905.

the situation of the Jews, but he nevertheless legitimises these actions. No one but God has the right to change the curse on Israel, he argues. In concrete terms, Kittel's primary enemy is Jewish assimilation, where the proponents of assimilation are to blame for the 'Jewish problem'. Both Bismarck and Goethe had resisted it, and to Kittel, it is God's clear will that Jews should be foreigners on this earth.²⁴⁴

Even if Jews convert, this does not suspend either their status as foreigners or their hardships, Kittel holds. Instead, it enables them to understand and carry the suffering. Missions to Jews does not revoke the curse of being a stranger, therefore, nor blot out differences of race and people; what happens is simply that Jews find their Messiah. *The Jews' status as foreigners in Germany is by no means to be removed; it is "willed by God"*. Consequently, this German state policy should not be complained about. Instead, "even all bitterness in the fate of the Jews in the year of 1933 will have its completion and has its goal in this alone: 'that he would show mercy to all' (Rom. 11:32)". Our task is not to lift the status as foreigner, nor the desolation off his house, only to be obedient.²⁴⁵ Kittel ends with an admonition to German Christians to not be proud, since they, as well as the Jews, are dependent on the mercy of God.

What Kittel does not say is also important. The passages in Romans 9–11, which quite clearly speak about Israel's birthright to the promises (9:1–5; 11:1–18, 27–28), are toned down, whereas he adduces arguments for the Jews' status as foreigners. Thus Romans 9–11 is reframed to fit contemporary German racial politics. In the whole context of Romans, the chapters can be read as a defence of the status of the Jews as God's chosen people, with polemic against Gentile Romans being too proud in their attitude towards the Jewish Christians. However, the expert on the New Testament and Judaism of apostolic times legitimises the ongoing oppression of Jews through a divinely determined salvation history. It is interesting—and indeed frightening—to see how Kittel's argument gains strength from the time-honoured and still-cherished salvation history. Salvation history—'God's history'—provides the determination and the irrevocable character of the disastrous fate of the Jews, and the German people become the executor of this divinely legitimised *Unheil*. With this determination of the Jews for calamity—and the

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 905–906.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 906.

idea that it is indeed as much a service to God to implement it, as it is unrighteous to hinder it—Kittel's theology becomes an asset to the political authorities and a disaster for the Jews. In addition, theologians and pastors are given a powerful hermeneutical tool for legitimising oppression of Jews.

Conservative Standpoints and Criticism of Popular Anti-Semitic Legends

Launched in 1934 as an organ of the new German theology, *Deutsche Theologie* was greeted with enthusiasm by Reichsbischof Ludwig Müller in its introductory pages. In this journal, Kittel writes articles on central Christian topics, which are neither of any noteworthy political interest, nor of any relevance to the 'Jewish problem'. They do help place Kittel in his theological habitus, however: with a basically Protestant-Lutheran standpoint, defending a traditional Biblicist view, Kittel seems true to his conservative theological outlook.²⁴⁶

However, in an article in *Deutsche Theologie* in 1935, Kittel sharply criticises those who purport to find a law about ritual human slaughter in Judaism.²⁴⁷ According to Kittel's defence, this was written against the fiercely anti-Semitic magazine *Der Stürmer*.²⁴⁸ The debate is an old one, and Kittel mentions the Rohling debate in the 1880s.²⁴⁹ Central to it was a discussion of a text from the *Tikkune Sohar*, which was said to include a law on the slaughter of humans, but Kittel points to two expert translations of the text to show that there were no such ideas. In principle, however, in this text Kittel wants to *further* what he regards as *true* anti-Semitism, which went deeper than superstitious or legendary stories, and purify it from such ideas that could disguise the real causes of anti-Semitism, things that were not credible, which were "only likely to discredit and weaken serious anti-Semitism". This demonstrates Kittel's openly anti-Semitic confession.

As many others, Kittel reflected theologically on the relationship between Church and State. His *Christus und Imperator*, 1939, shows that he regarded the State as a divine order, which explains his understanding

²⁴⁶ Gerhard Kittel, "Jesu Worte über sein Sterben", *Deutsche Theologie* 3, no. 6 (1936); Gerhard Kittel, "Die Auferstehung Jesu", *Deutsche Theologie* 4, no. 4/5 (1937); Gerhard Kittel, "Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Geschichte Jesu", *Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1934).

²⁴⁷ Gerhard Kittel, "Das Menschenschächtgesetz", *Deutsche Theologie* 1, no. 1 (1935).

²⁴⁸ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", noted in his bibliography.

²⁴⁹ For this, see my discussion of Franz Delitzsch above.

of the existing political situation as being according to God's will. Here Kittel discusses the relationship between Christ and the State. In a Lutheran manner, he clarifies that the Church and State both have a mandate from on high²⁵⁰—the assertion of the State and prince having a divine mandate was naturally in line with the political interests of the regime.²⁵¹ Kittel often parallels the role of the State with other estates given in creation, i.e. marriage and family, and the outcome of his discussion is that, even though there may be abuse, the State always has its divinely appointed task.²⁵²

Kittel's Work on Judaism in TDNT

Kittel reached the peak of his international scholarly reputation during National Socialism, by editing and publishing *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* ("Theological Dictionary of the New Testament").²⁵³ In its scope, the project was—and still is—unequalled as a handbook in New Testament exegesis. The first four parts emerged during National Socialism, part one being edited by Kittel and dedicated to "Adolf Schlatter, the eighty-year-old". Started by Kittel in November 1928, the first four volumes were produced at an enormous pace, compared to the remaining six volumes, which the inheritor of the project, Georg Friedrich, worked on for thirty years! TDNT was more than a scholarly work, however. The propaganda experts of National Socialism were well aware of the role of culture and scholarship in Europe and the rest of the world, and the propaganda value of this work should not be underestimated. The publication of the first volume was a major event in the theological world.²⁵⁴ Alan Rosen points to the fact that "Kittel",

²⁵⁰ Gerhard Kittel, *Christus Imperator. Das Urteil der Ersten Christenheit über den Staat* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1939), 17–18.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 27–28.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 43, 47. The same argument, but in a briefer form, is contained in the article Gerhard Kittel, "Das Urteil des Neuen Testaments über den Staat", *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* 14 (1937).

²⁵³ Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1–10 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934–1979); Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, "Theological Dictionary of the New Testament" (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972–).

²⁵⁴ Alan Rosen, "'Familiarly known as Kittel': The Moral Politics of the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament", in *Tainted Greatness. Antisemitism and Cultural Heroes*, ed. Nancy A. Harrowitz, *Themes in the History of Philosophy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 40.

still the popular name of the ten-volume work, is even now highly esteemed, despite having originated in a National Socialist context. Rosen argues that the magnitude of the work gives Kittel a reputation that disguises who he really was: "Certain genres seem particularly capable of smuggling into the canon tainted figures and morally questionable assumptions."²⁵⁵ J. S. Vos was the first to devote an article to the 'anti-Jewish' bias, analysing the entire work.²⁵⁶ Fifteen years later, Maurice Casey took up the question, concluding that "the TDNT is a very dangerous book", due to the authors' frame of reference.²⁵⁷

Through TDNT, Kittel wanted to develop a tool for biblical theology by studying the words, a sacred lexicography.²⁵⁸ His edition was planned as a revision of Hermann Cremer's *Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität*, a work begun by Julius Kögel, but which Kittel inherited when the latter passed away.²⁵⁹ TDNT has been criticised from a methodological point of view by for example James Barr,²⁶⁰ and many present-day scholars would regard his methodological remarks as extremely theologically biased as well as linguistically dubious.²⁶¹ As Meeks points out, even in TDNT, Kittel implements his critical view of a "depraved Judaism". The high point of religion and theology being the great eighth-century prophets, after the Exile, there was an assimilation and a turn towards legalism.²⁶² With Jesus and the apostles, however, the true meaning of the words can be appreciated. Meeks's

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 44.

²⁵⁶ J. S. Vos, "Antijudaismus/Antisemitismus im Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament", *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 35 (1984).

²⁵⁷ Maurice Casey, "Antisemitic Assumptions in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament", *Novum Testamentum* 41, no. 3 (1999), 291.

²⁵⁸ Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 535. See Kittel, "Lexicographia Sacra. Two lectures on the making of the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge". Also available in German, Gerhard Kittel, "Lexicographia Sacra", *Deutsche Theologie* 4, no. April (1938).

²⁵⁹ Kittel, "Lexicographia Sacra. Two lectures on the making of the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge", 4.

²⁶⁰ James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), see also the discussion in Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 536.

²⁶¹ See e.g. his presentation of a *Lexicographia Sacra* and *Philologia Sacra vere Theologica*, Kittel, "Lexicographia Sacra. Two lectures on the making of the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge", 7–8.

²⁶² Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 537–538. Meeks refers to Kittel, "Lexicographia Sacra. Two lectures

observation seems justified: Kittel applies the classic scheme of the Old Testament as representing a time of innocence, and later Hellenistic or Palestinian Judaism a time of depravity, whereas “the New Testament [often, A.G.] goes right back through the Jewish depraved form to the Old Testament origin of the word”.²⁶³ For theological-ideological reasons, Kittel models the linguistic development not on evidence, but on the established ‘Late Judaism’ hypothesis. As noted above, Kittel’s work during National Socialism reinforces the ‘Late Judaism’ hypothesis, which he was more reluctant to accept in the 1920s.

But to what extent does Kittel’s work with the TDNT reflect his ideological bias against the Jews? Firstly, as editor, he was responsible for the quality of the articles and for any bias in them. Among the contributors, six were active in the Institut zur Erforschung (und Beseitigung) des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben in Eisenach, the scholarly director of which was Walter Grundmann:²⁶⁴ Grundmann, G. Bertram, H. Odeberg, C. Schneider, H. Preisker and G. Delling. Others were active in the Deutsche Christen: W. Beyer and E. Stauffer.²⁶⁵ But pronounced anti-Nazis, such as Rudolf Bultmann and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, were also involved in the work. Standing close to Kittel was Karl-Georg Kuhn, his co-worker at the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage—a teacher at the University of Tübingen and a dedicated National Socialist, he could lecture in an SA uniform with an honorary dagger.²⁶⁶ Whereas Vos holds that Kuhn’s contributions to TDNT are not biased, Casey takes the opposite view.²⁶⁷ As for Walter

on the making of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge”, 24.

²⁶³ Kittel, “Lexicographia Sacra. Two lectures on the making of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge”, 24.

²⁶⁴ Grundmann and the Eisenach institute are discussed in the following chapter.

²⁶⁵ Vos, “Antijudaismus/Antisemitismus im Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament”, 91.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 93.

²⁶⁷ Casey, “Antisemitic Assumptions in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament”, 282–286. Casey criticises a discussion by James Dunn that builds on Kuhn’s article, saying that Ἰουδαῖος was not the preferred self-designation by Jews and that the people behind the Gospel of John used the term ‘Jew’ for a group that was hostile to them. Looking at Kuhn’s article, he says that Ἰουδαῖος could easily have been used with a disdainful tone, but he balances this by stating that it most often was not used in this way. Kuhn, “Ἰσραήλ, Ἰουδαῖος in der nach-at.lichen jüdischen Literatur”, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), 361. However, Casey seems right in that there is no evidence for the disdainful use of Ἰουδαῖος and that Kuhn’s bias may have played a role.

Grundmann, Vos demonstrates that he in some articles falls back on ‘Christian anti-Judaism’. Vos gives further examples of ‘Christian anti-Judaism’ and contemporary racist notions from articles by e.g. Georg Bertram and Carl Schneider.²⁶⁸

It is worth noting that in the capacity of author, Kittel’s contribution is small, the only large article being that about λόγος; instead, his primary role lay in the entrepreneurial and editorial dimensions of the project.²⁶⁹ Kittel seems sensitive to the requirements of this scholarly environment. In his mostly rather brief articles (altogether twenty-six entries in the first four volumes), Kittel says very little of ideological relevance to Judaism and has very few—and only slightly—negative statements.²⁷⁰ To ἄββᾶ, Kittel says that the religious use of the term shows that there is quite a different intimacy with God than in Judaism; to ἀκολουθέω, Kittel stresses the newness of the Christian concept of religious ‘imitation’, in contrast to both the Old Testament (Elijah-Elisha) and rabbinic literature; the New Testament concept is “as for the content, wholly new”.²⁷¹ However, to εἰκόν, he talks about the “ambition of the Jews”; to λόγος, in the Prologue of John, Kittel sees the incarnated Word as “the antithesis of the Torah of the Jews”, thus stressing the opposition between Judaism and Christianity.²⁷² But even though these statements emphasise the difference between Judaism and Christianity, no racist statements are included. As for the work at large, the ‘Christian anti-Judaism’ and racist statements found in other articles—which are not too many—are in line with his overall outlook

²⁶⁸ E.g. when Schneider talks about the ‘Weltjudentum’ at the court of Caesar, Schneider, “μέτωπον”, 639: “One of the driving forces behind the persecutions of Christians, even in the Roman Empire at the time of the Apocalypse, was World Judaism, which after Nero was especially influential at the Roman court.”

²⁶⁹ This adds to the picture that Kittel in fact did not produce all that much original research during his scholarly life.

²⁷⁰ So also Vos, “Antijudaismus/Antisemitismus im Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament”, 93. The entries for are: ΑΩ (vol. I, 1933), ἄββᾶ (ibid.), Ἄγαρ (ibid.), ἄγγελος and others (ibid.), αἰνιγμα (ἔσοπτρον) (ibid.), αἰχμάλωτος and others (ibid.), ἀκέραιος (ibid.), ἀκολουθέω and others (ibid.), ἀκούω and others (ibid.), תּמֶנֶ (ibid.), ἀναλογία (ibid.), ἀρκέω and others (ibid.), ἀυγάζω, ἀπαύγασμα (ibid.); δεσμός, δέσμιος (vol. II, 1935), δόγμα, δογματίζω (ibid.), δόξα (ibid.), εἶδος, εἰδέα (ιδέα) (ibid.), εἰκόν (ibid.), ἔρημος and others (ibid.), ἔσοπτρον, κατοπρίζομαι (ibid.), ἔσχατος (ibid.), Θαμάρ and others (vol. III, 1938), θέατρον, θεατρίζομαι (ibid.), λαλέω and others (vol. IV, 1942), λόγος and others (ibid.), λογεῖα (ibid.).

²⁷¹ Gerhard Kittel, “ἀκολουθέω”, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), 213.

²⁷² Gerhard Kittel, “λόγος”, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942), 138.

at this time. Casey's suggestion that readers "should read it with their critical wits sharpened to the highest degree" is thus somewhat overstated.²⁷³ However, during National Socialism, the greatest damage done by TDNT was that it brought enormous prestige to German theological scholarship and to Kittel himself, who could consequently combine National Socialist ideology with international fame. For instance, it was when presenting his *Lexicographia Sacra* that Kittel told his learned British audience in Cambridge in October 1937 that Hitler always carried a New Testament in his vest pocket.²⁷⁴

Kittel's Race-Historical Works at Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage

Apart from the TDNT, most of Kittel's publications during the years 1937–1945 are historical works about Judaism in the context of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage. This commitment, and the productions that go with it, conform to the overarching goal of the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands (Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany), as "the Führer of the new Germany put the Jewish problem on a completely new foundation in a radical resolution for the German people",²⁷⁵ the quotation being from Kittel's main paper at the inauguration of the institute. Kittel produced a few pieces of painstaking research under the auspices of the institute,²⁷⁶ some of them being preliminary to his analyses of the expansion of Judaism. However, as will be demonstrated, this work was done with a clearly racist agenda.

The Emergence of Judaism as the Emergence of the 'Jewish Problem'

Kittel links his political analysis of the role of contemporary Judaism to a certain historiography. If contemporary Judaism had been identical to Old Testament 'Judaism', it would have been difficult for Kittel to

²⁷³ Casey, "Antisemitic Assumptions in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament", 291.

²⁷⁴ Ericksen, "Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel", 2403.

²⁷⁵ Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage", 63.

²⁷⁶ See Gerhard Kittel, "Die Ausbreitung des Judentums bis zum Beginn des Mittelalters", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1941); Gerhard Kittel, "Die Ausbreitung des Judentums bis zum Beginn des Mittelalters, II. Teil", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1944); the latter article begins with a clear confession of the need to chart the Jews as a "ferment of national decomposition".

argue for policies against it. Consequently, he begins his speech at the inauguration of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage by asking whether Judaism should be identified with Old Testament religion and history, or be seen as a phenomenon of depravation.²⁷⁷ The title of the speech is “The Emergence of Judaism and the Emergence of the Jewish Problem”, with Kittel arguing that the ‘Jewish problem’ is rooted in the essence of Judaism.²⁷⁸ The two variables with which Kittel operates are the religion of old Israel and Judaism. In effect, he differentiates between the Old Testament ‘original’, with the patriarchs, Moses, the great prophets, the covenant and election on the one hand,²⁷⁹ and the depravation of the people on the other. Old Israel had an ethical and religious character:

The whole history of Old Testament religion is at its deepest depth the struggle to purify this covenantal idea of the various waste products that stick to it, and to bring out and show off its religious-ethical fundamental character.²⁸⁰

This religion proclaims God’s judgment on sin and unrighteousness; and it is a monotheistic religion, although God is not only the God of Israel, but of all the nations.²⁸¹ In evaluating different phases of it, the touchstones for Kittel are the extent to which the religion is ethical (*sittlich*) and religious.

The depravation of Israel is described in three areas. Firstly, there is the Diaspora, which resulted in a homelessness and lack of ties to the soil (*Boden*), and in relation to this, that Judaism became a *racial mixture*. The latter process began when the northern kingdom mixed with northern tribes, continuing with more racial mixing during the Exile. The extensive proselytism caused further racial amalgamation, as did the *Kon nubium*, intermarriage.²⁸² In the same vein as in his article in *Der Biologe* (see below), Kittel describes this as a racial restructuring. Moreover, the Diaspora existence meant that the Jews did not have their own state, having since lived as a foreign people and a ‘guest people’ (*Fremdvolk und Gastvolk*). Judaism, therefore, is different from old Israel.

²⁷⁷ Kittel, “Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage”, 43.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 63.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 43, 56.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 56.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 57.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 44–51.

Secondly, the *thought* degenerated to reach its end in the Talmud and the Talmud Jew. The latter is the result of a thousand-year development, from the time of the prophets with its ethical-religious imperatives, to Talmudic times with their theocratic legalism. Kittel often returns to this thousand-year period between the end of the Exile and the institution of the ghetto in the early Middle Ages.²⁸³ The development starts with the Deuteronomistic reform in 621 BCE, when the message of the prophetic voices is implemented in law and practice, as a religion of the Book and the Law.²⁸⁴ After the Exile, there is a breakthrough; religious law becomes official law, and Israel becomes a ‘church state’ (*Kirchenstaat*). The legalistic religion regulates everything with an ever-developing casuistry, although there are people who live this life under the Law in an earnest manner. This new religion, Kittel contends, paves the way for Judaism.²⁸⁵ However, at the same time, the casuistry makes the ethical demand invalid, and there is only mechanical obedience. Also, Kittel adds, the casuistic thinking allows room for wrongs: thinking that everything not prohibited is permitted opens up for illicit acts in the sexual domain.²⁸⁶ Here Kittel—without giving any evidence—seems to be tapping into a myth that Jews were inclined to be licentious. He continues by stating that this Talmudic casuistry and legalism provokes the peoples whom the Jews live among, but even the assimilated Jews, despite their willingness to adjust to the environment, have a tendency to distance themselves from other peoples, a tendency that is given in their Jewish blood.²⁸⁷

The third factor that Kittel stresses for the emergence of Judaism and the ‘Jewish problem’ is *the claim to power* that has developed in Judaism. Beginning with the legitimate Old Testament idea of covenant and election, Judaism transformed this into ambitions for power.²⁸⁸ This happened when the people were forced into the Diaspora and thus were deprived of their state and country. In this situation, the people

²⁸³ See e.g. Gerhard Kittel, “Die ältesten jüdischen Bilder. Eine Aufgabe für die wissenschaftliche Gemeinschaftsarbeit”, in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Vierten Münchner Arbeitstagung des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands vom 4. bis 6. Juli 1939, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1940), 235.

²⁸⁴ Kittel, “Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage”, 51–52.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 52–53.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 56, 60.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 56.

began to formulate a hope and dream of power and political ambitions, disguised as a “religiously embellished hope”.²⁸⁹ In the basic analysis, to Judaism there is a dualism between God’s people and the ungodly satanic kingdom:

Judaism = God’s people, divine people, people of world dominion, which is called to dominion over the others; *other peoples* = *there to be eliminated as opposing God, to be conquered and ruled, to be subject to the execution of power by the people of God*. Now the great prophetic insights were transformed into their complete opposite. God’s power over the history of all the world now has as its only goal to lead history in a way that serves Israel’s glory and rule.²⁹⁰

Kittel sees these ambitions for power as essential to Judaism, and he depicts the Jews, with their ambitions to rule, as a potentially dangerous people—a description of Jews that must have supported the existing political agenda. Kittel also finds parallels between secularised Alexandrian influences in culture and literature, and the ambition of modern secularised Judaism to rule the cultural life, the press, literature, science, politics and economy.²⁹¹ The same consciousness remains in the blood of the Jews through the millennia. In this section, therefore, Kittel’s argument reinforces a range of classic anti-Semitic topoi.

Kittel returns to the first question, arguing that there is a difference between Old Testament religion and Judaism. He maintains that even though there are connections, one cannot say that they are identical, or that the Old Testament is a Jewish book. Just as the *Kaiserreich* in Germany cannot be equated with the years of depravation after 1918, the Old Testament cannot be equated with Jewish depravation. However, according to Kittel, the Old Testament included both tendencies:

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 57.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., 57–58: “Judentum = Volk Gottes, göttliches Volk, Volk der Weltherrschaft, das zur Herrschaft über die andern berufen ist; übrige Völker = dazu da, als gottwidrig vernichtet zu werden, überwunden, beherrscht zu werden, Gegenstand der Machtausübung durch das Volk Gottes zu sein. Nun sind jene großen prophetischen Erkenntnisse in ihr volles Gegenteil verwandelt. Die Geschichtsmächtigkeit Gottes über alle Welt hat jetzt ihren einzigen und ausschließlichen Zweck in einer der Herrlichkeit und Herrschaft Israels dienenden Geschichtsführung,” emphasis mine.

²⁹¹ Hugo Odeberg, a friend and colleague of Kittel, uses the same argumentation in an article emanating from a seminar at the Institut zur Erforschung (und Beseitigung) des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben in Eisenach, Hugo Odeberg, “Hellenismus und Judentum. Verjudung und Entjudung der antiken Welt”, in *Die völkische Gestalt des Glaubens*, ed. Walter Grundmann, *Beiheft zu Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses* (Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1943).

that which became casuistic legalism and hunger for power, and that which was fulfilled in the New Testament.²⁹²

To Kittel, assimilation is a cause for anti-Semitism,²⁹³ at the same time as it gives the Jews the greatest inroads into society, with opportunities for them to realise their power aspirations.²⁹⁴ Compared to Talmud Jews, who certainly constitute a major problem for the peoples, with their hatred and bloodthirsty dreams of the Day of the Lord, assimilated Judaism is worse: "then the Jewish problem is set ablaze", since all inhibitions that would keep Judaism in check are gone.²⁹⁵ But even though liberal Judaism and liberal Christianity have compromised with one another, there is no sharper enemy of Judaism and its encroachments than Christianity and the Church:

In the world there were and are no opponents that are more unappeasable than genuine Judaism and genuine Christianity. [...] [A downplaying of the oppositions, A.G.] that does not see the problem of the Jewish question or sees it as harmless is no longer a symptom of a genuine and vital Christianity but of a declined Christianity.²⁹⁶

Kittel's remark here was probably not as politically correct as the rest, since the audience would hardly have sympathised with his conservative Christian defence of the Church's role as the main enemy of Judaism. He envisions a strong and theologically conservative Christianity, which would be able to counter Judaism. However, his apology for this type of Christianity does not take away the fact that Kittel in his speech provided strong legitimation for the Nuremberg racial laws that had been passed a year earlier and were now being implemented. Summing up, Kittel establishes that the 'Jewish problem' is no accidental occurrence but is rooted in the essence of Judaism and developed during its first thousand years of existence. Therefore it is not possible to deal with the 'Jewish problem' as a minor issue, and Kittel welcomes the National Socialist policies putting the question on a new foundation.²⁹⁷

In this important speech, held at the centre where the new Nazi historiography of Germany and Judaism was created, Kittel first of all gives a rather traditional picture of Judaism; it basically accords

²⁹² Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage", 60.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 55, with Philo as an example.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 60.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 61.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 62.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.

with the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis of a postexilic development from the religion of the prophets into a legalistic casuistry and could almost have been taken from Wellhausen or Bousset. Compared to Kittel's somewhat different and more positive description of Palestinian 'Late Judaism' from the 1920s, this new picture of Judaism is entirely negative. It fits into his overall aim with the article, however—given a context as the main paper at the inauguration of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage, a brighter picture of Judaism would have been out of place. Even Orthodox Judaism, which often receives comparatively positive remarks by Kittel, is described as hateful and bloodthirsty to a greater extent here than in *Die Judenfrage*, although the description is not entirely negative. The other two points are the history of racial mixing in the Diaspora, and Kittel's attempt to prove the Jews' claims to dominance, having been deprived of their land and roots. In the speech, Kittel unreflectively mixes his historical argument with non-academic and Nazi ideological rubrics for Jews: they aim for power; they are dominant in the financial world, the press, culture, etc. Thus Kittel produces ideology instead of history here, and *his central thesis, that the 'Jewish problem' is an intrinsic essence of Judaism, provides a powerful argument for the forceful implementation of new policies against Jews*. Jews are always the same, negative force, Kittel states, with this analysis deepening the 'Jewish problem', making it not only a contemporary German concern, but also a world-historical, international one. Through this ideologically tainted way of dealing with Jewish history, Kittel confirms that his work as an exegete and as an historian of Judaism is strongly influenced by his political-ideological horizons.

Racial Mixing and the Konnubium

Kittel's primary interest is racial mixing—proving that Judaism is a racial mixture and opposing intermarriage, the *Konnubium*. In the journal *Der Biologe*, Kittel purports that a racial-biological, religio-historical, theological and political lesson can be learned from the history of the Jewish people.²⁹⁸ Based entirely on contemporary racial biology, editor Lehmann says of the article, "When the Jewish problem is biologically substantiated in such an unequivocal way as in the following explanation

²⁹⁸ Gerhard Kittel, "Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion", *Der Biologe*, no. 11 (1937). For Kittel's wartime writings, see Erickson, "Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel".

by the theologian *Kittel*, the biologist can learn something essential from theologians.”²⁹⁹ Having already presented his research on intermarriage in a longer article,³⁰⁰ in this context, Kittel adds a more extensive discussion of racial issues, especially the “Jewish racial mixture”.

Kittel refers to the leading Nazi racial biologist Hans Günther: due to the great variations in height, shape of the face, eye colour, hair, nose, soulish properties, etc., Judaism must not be considered a race, but a racial mixture. The gist of the article is that Nazi racial policies, especially with regard to intermarriage, are the historic answer to what Kittel sees as a major enemy of German culture: a restructuring of the racial-blood composition of the people.³⁰¹

In order to show the roots of the racial mixing, Kittel presents a survey from postexilic to modern Judaism, arguing that Judaism was already a racial mixture when it came out of the ghetto at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The key question is that of intermarriage—or relations between Jews and non-Jews inside and outside of marriage—since that is how blood is mixed.³⁰² The thousand years in the ghetto did not lead to any racial mixing; therefore, Kittel goes back to Ezra and Nehemiah, the intermarriage question and how Israel at this point dissolved all intermarriages: “all mixed blood was radically eliminated (*ausgeschieden*)”.³⁰³ Here Kittel reads contemporary racial-blood ideology back into the time of Ezra in an anachronistic manner, and thus he is also able to legitimise the phenomenon as such: eliminating mixed blood and intermarriages is sound—the Jews themselves did this. Kittel neither makes an analysis of what really happened in Israel, nor shows any awareness that the categories of ‘race’ and ‘blood’ are anachronistic and ideologically tainted. Although there were strict

²⁹⁹ Kittel, “Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion”, 342.

³⁰⁰ Gerhard Kittel, “Das Konnubium mit den Nicht-Juden im antiken Judentum.”, in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Zweiten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 12. bis 14. Mai 1937, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937).

³⁰¹ Kittel, “Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion”, “der große blutmässige Umschichtungsprozeß”, 348. The Holocaust was a ‘logical’ consequence of the racial analysis and ideology in Germany, see James M. Glass, *“Life Unworthy of Life” Racial Phobia and Mass Murder in Hitler’s Germany* (New York: Basic Books, 1997) for the further development of racial ideas like Kittel’s.

³⁰² Kittel, “Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion”, 342.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, 343.

regulations at this time, Kittel writes, they were by no means heeded, and major developments in Jewish history brought about the opposite instead. These developments were the Jewish Diaspora and with it 'World Judaism' and proselytism, which led to more mixing. Thus, in the centuries after Ezra and Nehemiah, racial mixing took place, and texts such as 1 Maccabees and Jubilees indicate that it was prevalent.

More dangerous than mixing due to intermarriage and promiscuity, however, is the Jewish agenda to influence other peoples.³⁰⁴ Esther became queen, and through her influence, enemies of the Jews were eliminated. This is an example of the "conquest, subduing and pervading of the world outside Judaism", when hundreds of thousands, even millions, from all peoples and races convert to Judaism. Kittel concludes that Judaism consists mostly of proselytes.³⁰⁵ The children of couples where one or both were proselytes became Jews, and another great source of such 'new' Jews, Kittel maintains, are slaves of both Jewish and non-Jewish owners. Female Jewish slaves had to bear children to non-Jewish owners, children were born to liberated non-Jewish slaves married to female Jewish slaves, and non-Jewish slaves of Jews were circumcised by force, thus becoming Jews. With up to hundreds and thousands of slaves, Kittel concludes that this process may have produced a large number of racially mixed Jews. Such slaves introduced a wide variety of other racial blood into the Jewish racial mixture.³⁰⁶ Although this process was slowed down by Hadrian and stopped by Constantine, '*World Judaism*' was already a fact, Kittel claims, his argumentation as forceful as it is distorted.

What, then, was old Israel's attitude to intermarriage? In the earliest days of the Israelite tribes, intermarriage was a small problem, since marriage mostly took place between people from the same tribe. The exception was when men, such as Moses and Joseph, lived in another country, but Kittel considers this to have been harmless: "the harmlessness of the young people in the making".³⁰⁷ Again, Kittel parallels many earlier historians of Judaism, who describe the old, original, tribal Israel as genuine, and later Judaism as a depravation. This harmless condition continued after the conquest, when the people refused to mix with the Canaanite tribes and took wives only from other tribes—David's

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 345.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 345.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 350.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 346.

background in Jewish-Moabite intermarriages is not mentioned, whereas the marriage to Bathsheba belongs to the harmless ones—Kittel notes that nothing is said about mixed marriages, only about the murder of Uriah.³⁰⁸ The point that Kittel makes is that there was no extensive racial mixing as long as the people lived within the Land.

But around the time of the Exile, things change. The period of harmlessness comes to an end, and Judaism becomes ‘World Judaism’. According to Kittel, Judaism emerges during the period between the first century BCE and the first century CE as a *new formation* (*Neubildung*), a completely changed, depraved metamorphosis.³⁰⁹

Judaism is no longer the limited people of old Israel, with its firmly demarcated areas of settlement, but it is a World Judaism, spread out in many thousands of individuals and small colonies over the whole *oikomene*.³¹⁰

de Wette had previously pinpointed the emergence of Judaism to after the Exile, and although Kittel states that the breaking away from old Israel occurred somewhat later, he too stresses the discontinuity between the old, ‘harmless’ age and depraved Judaism.³¹¹ This is when ‘World Judaism’ comes into being—a new Judaism that lacks national roots and natural instincts to resist the mixing, and has substituted its national limitations for religious limitedness. Here, as in *Die Judenfrage*, a crucial point for Kittel is the role of assimilation.³¹² ‘World Judaism’, with its “assimilation proselytes” and “assimilation circumcision”, is analogous to “assimilation baptism”. This Diaspora era of extensive racial mixing only ends with Constantine’s prohibition in the fourth century against circumcision of non-Jewish slaves and against intermarriage between Jews and Christians.³¹³

Kittel’s emphasis on the difference between Israel and Judaism has other reasons than his ambition to expose the essence of Judaism. Kittel also links his discussion to the question of the Old Testament, a vital issue to Kittel, who also refers to it in *Die Judenfrage*. At the time, the Old Testament was being criticised by certain National Socialists,

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 346.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 351.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 345.

³¹¹ See the discussion on de Wette above.

³¹² Kittel, “Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion”, 348.

³¹³ Ibid., 350.

including the Deutsche Christen, as a Jewish document,³¹⁴ which Kittel and conservative theologians in general regarded as a major threat. But by disconnecting Judaism from the old Israel, whose scriptures are contained in the Old Testament, Kittel is able to 'rescue' the Old Testament.

Thus Kittel contends that Judaism is a racial mixture that came about between Ezra and early medieval times, and that it is a new formation with more discontinuity than continuity with Old Testament Israel. His main theological result is related to intermarriage, however. Kittel wants to base the question of racial mixing on the Holy Scriptures, since a genuine biblical faith does not hinder the legitimate demand for genuine biological thinking.³¹⁵ Kittel continues:

The genuine biblical line shows—through the old people of Israel—a very clear attitude regarding the intermarriage question [...], how a people out of an original naïve harmlessness came to understand the risks, which not only threaten the outward life, but also its inward, soulful, cultural and religious life.³¹⁶

Here Kittel reads the existing racial problems back into the time of Ezra, thus *creating a theological legitimization of contemporary racial apartheid*: "a theology and Church that stand on the biblical foundation [must] very well say something to its people about the God-ordained duty of keeping the blood pure", in order to stop the inflow of "foreign blood".³¹⁷ With this statement, Kittel uses his racial-biological 'analysis' of the intermarriage issue in Ezra's Israel to legitimise contemporary German policy after the Nuremberg Laws.

Finally, Kittel draws political consequences from his discussion, arguing that intermarriage was the strongest weapon of the assimilation-*emancipation* epoch after the Jews came out of the ghetto. However,

³¹⁴ The Deutsche Christen had early on denounced the canonicity of the Old Testament. Leader Reinhold Krause's announcement at the infamous Sports Palace Rally, that the Old Testament was a hindrance to reaching Nazi Germany with the Christian message, was a reason why many prominent members of the movement left, including Kittel. See Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich*, 143–148, 174.

³¹⁵ Kittel, "Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion", 352.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 351.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 351, emphasis mine. Also noted by Siegle-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 29: "The commandment to keep the race pure has precedence over love for one's neighbour."

National Socialism and Adolf Hitler have now radically eradicated the *Konnubium* between Jews and non-Jews, and provided a “healthy coercion” (*heilsame Zwang*) of assimilated Judaism back to its own foundations and laws.³¹⁸ Kittel’s conclusion is the same in his longer article “The *Konnubium* with the Non-Jews in the Judaism of Antiquity”, where he makes the same analysis but in much greater detail, also including a basic study of the emergence of Judaism.³¹⁹ In a speech held two years later, on 14 January 1939, Kittel closely follows the lines of argumentation used in the article in *Der Biologe*, in places extending the argument, but not adding anything of significance for this study.³²⁰ Kittel also expanded his study to include pictures of Jews, purposing to assemble pictorial evidence of Judaism in the thousand-year period of racial mixing.³²¹

In all these works, Kittel seems to have done solid groundwork, but his studies are governed by, and serve, the ruling racial ideology and ‘scholarship’. The analytical instruments are coloured by his ideological outlook, which basically renders the whole analysis useless from a scholarly point of view. His work at the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage, too, became more racial history and less exegesis, although Kittel uses his competence in the history of Israel, Judaism and early Christianity. In his book *Die historischen Voraussetzungen der jüdischen Rassenmischung* (“The Historical Conditions for the Jewish Racial Mixing”),³²² Kittel had presented a map showing the spread of Jewish settlements in the Imperium Romanum, and here he supplies the evidence behind it. Again, his interest is to document the conditions for Jewish racial mixing through settlements, intermarriage and proselytism. What is puzzling to the modern reader is that the eminent exegete invests his

³¹⁸ Kittel, “Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion”, 352.

³¹⁹ Kittel, “Das Konnubium mit den Nicht-Juden im antiken Judentum”; on the emergence of Judaism, see 61.

³²⁰ Gerhard Kittel, *Die historischen Voraussetzungen der jüdischen Rassenmischung. Mit zwei Karten, davon eine Ausschlagskarte am Schluß des Buches*, Schriften des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939). His article “The *Konnubium* with the Non-Jews in the Judaism of Antiquity” is a fuller discussion of the historical material, but has the same content and often the same formulations, Kittel, “Das Konnubium mit den Nicht-Juden im antiken Judentum”.

³²¹ Kittel, “Die ältesten jüdischen Bilder. Eine Aufgabe für die wissenschaftliche Gemeinschaftsarbeit”.

³²² Kittel, *Die historischen Voraussetzungen der jüdischen Rassenmischung. Mit zwei Karten, davon eine Ausschlagskarte am Schluß des Buches*.

time and gifts in this project, which has no other scholarly application than being part of the National Socialist racist agenda.

World Judaism of Antiquity

The large volume *Das antike Weltjudentum: Tatsachen, Texte, Bilder* ("World Judaism of Antiquity: Facts, Texts, Pictures"), by Kittel and Eugen Fischer, was printed despite the strict wartime rationing of paper and publications. Kittel is the author of around four-fifths of the book—the text is Kittel's, as are many of the pictures—whereas Fischer provided racial analyses of a number of pictures of mummies.³²³ Thus Kittel was responsible for the framework and the book's ideological statements.³²⁴

The perspective is modern 'World Judaism', seen from the perspective of the "fateful struggle of Europe" (*Schicksalskampf Europas*). According to Kittel, 'World Judaism' has spread into the political, economic and inner life of the nations, taking positions of power; it is the greatest threat, he writes, its influence on non-Jewish peoples being the eeriest thing.³²⁵ Spreading through assimilation and proselytism, Judaism's goal was only power: "*Always the goal: power over the world [...] Always, in any period, whether in the first or in the twentieth century, the dream of World Judaism is absolute world dominion, then and now!*"³²⁶ Again, Kittel sees Jews as having an essential character, and he uses this to underline the contemporary political picture of Jews and Judaism.

Through his book, Kittel wants to make "the real Jewish problem visible", but his presentation is a sample of anti-Semitic topoi. Classical texts, pictures and epigraphy are pedantically amassed as evidence for Kittel's historical analysis, but it is the few additions and headings that give the data a racist interpretation. Kittel talks about "the Wandering Jew of antiquity", and evidences this with texts about Jews who

³²³ Eugen Fischer and Gerhard Kittel, *Das antike Weltjudentum. Tatsachen, Texte, Bilder*, vol. 7, *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*. Schriften des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1943). In a small common comment, Fischer and Kittel discuss some statues that were allegedly old Jewish ones, Eugen Fischer and Gerhard Kittel, "Über zwei angeblich Juden darstellende antike Skulpturen", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1944). The comment shows the two scholars using their scholarly expertise to evaluate things like the shape of skulls and noses.

³²⁴ So also Ericksen, "Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel", 2407.

³²⁵ Fischer and Kittel, *Das antike Weltjudentum. Tatsachen, Texte, Bilder*, 9.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, 10, 11, emphasis mine. Cf. also 44, 89: "Power over the world".

moved but originally came from another place³²⁷ (it is surprising that Kittel, in a purportedly scholarly context, draws on such a myth as that of the Wandering Jew). Under the heading “The result: World Judaism”, Kittel wishes to show that the Diaspora equals ‘World Judaism’ and Jewish plans of world dominion, even though no evidence for this view is presented.³²⁸ Moving into the area of race, he again describes the two phenomena that he thinks caused the amalgamation of races—intermarriage and proselytism—and its result, “racial mixing” (*Rassengemisch*).³²⁹ Kittel describes evidence for the “trade Jew”, the traditional “interest, coin and money Jew” and rogues, but also for Jews looking for privileges and influence.³³⁰ In addition, he points to internationalism and Zionism.³³¹ In sum, Kittel gathers old evidence to support a modern racist agenda.

In a picture section, Kittel describes terracotta figures produced in Trier in the third and fourth centuries.³³² Since Kittel refers to the same material in his article in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* IV, my analysis is of that text; the pictures, however, are included in “World Judaism of Antiquity”.³³³ Kittel makes much of the Trier figures, arguing that these strongly caricatured figures are early anti-Semitic depictions. To begin with, he discusses whether a crooked nose is a sign of Jewishness, but he establishes that this is not necessarily the case. It is evident, however, that Jews lived in the Trier area at the time when the terracottas were created, and Kittel finds another piece of evidence for his theory that the terracottas depict Jews.³³⁴ Several caricatures have a strong phallic emphasis, and these male organs are circumcised; moreover, the crooked nose and such a phallus are to a certain extent depicted in the same figure, Kittel argues.³³⁵ He then refers to a Rabbi Altmann,

³²⁷ Ibid., 35.

³²⁸ Ibid., 38.

³²⁹ Ibid., 39, 48.

³³⁰ Ibid., 53, 55, 59, 61–70.

³³¹ Ibid., 74.

³³² Ibid., 167–219, from 175 only pictures.

³³³ Gerhard Kittel, “Die ältesten jüdischen Judenkarikaturen. Die ‘Trierer Terrakotten’”, in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Vierten Münchner Arbeitstagung des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands vom 4. bis 6. Juli 1939, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1940).

³³⁴ Ibid., 250–251.

³³⁵ Ibid., 253. Also Fischer and Kittel, *Das antike Weltjudentum. Tatsachen, Texte, Bilder*, 167. Ericksen, “Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel” comments on the article, 2405–2406.

who maintains that the pictures clearly evidence circumcision. Thus the figurines present the circumcised men as libidinous, and there is also a depiction of a “shameless woman”.³³⁶ According to Kittel, these figures demonstrate that Jews had sexual relations with non-Jewish women as early as 270 CE and that the problem of racial mixing was evident even before Christianity came to Gaul.³³⁷ To him, this proves that there was a campaign against intermarriage and concubinage between Jews and non-Jews in Europe at that time, in Kittel’s mind possibly similar to the one that was taking place in Germany: “Perhaps it is not too bold to call this group [of pictures, A.G.] the oldest mockery of miscegenation (*Rassenschande*, Eng. racial defilement).” Using the National Socialist technical term *Rassenschande*, Kittel links the discussion of the figures to the racist agenda of his research institute.³³⁸ Licentious Jewish men were the initiators of this attack on Germanic women, and Kittel holds that pre-Christian Germanic people spontaneously reacted against these lustful assaults.³³⁹ This notion of Jewish ambitions to entice Germanic women seems to be based more on popular anti-Semitic lore than on historical material. The anti-Semitic press often included pictures of a Jew lusting after a blond German girl.

Summing up Kittel’s Racial-Historical Research

Through the historical and theological argumentation developed under the auspices of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage, Kittel undergirds and religiously legitimises the Nuremberg Laws of 14 November 1935. These laws stated who was a Jew, and were followed by detailed instructions regarding choice of a mate (*Gattenwahl*) from a racial perspective, and how to find out who was a Jew, who was of German blood and which marriages were prohibited.³⁴⁰ Intermarriage and racial mixing being of particular importance to Kittel, he operates freely within the racial ideology, adjusting his historical and theological argument to fit it. From a scholarly point of view, the fundamental structures of Kittel’s work are more ideology than scholarship. He moves swiftly between the

³³⁶ Kittel, “Die ältesten jüdischen Judenkarikaturen. Die ‘Trierer Terrakotten’”, 253–254.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, 257.

³³⁸ On the racist Nuremberg legislation, see Burleigh and Wippermann, *The Racial State*, 44–51.

³³⁹ As noted by Ericksen, “Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel”, 2406.

³⁴⁰ See Burleigh and Wippermann, *The Racial State*, 44–51.

perspectives of historic times and ‘Third Reich’ Germany, reading the practices of National Socialist ideology back into historical precedents. Throughout his argument runs the essentialist idea that Jews are the same at all times. The attempt to use Ezra to biblically motivate German men and women to keep their blood pure is exegetically unconvincing, to say the least. In effect, by means of ‘healthy coercion’, Kittel wants Jews to keep marrying Jews, and Germans to marry Germans, in order to stop the unhealthy inflow of Jewish blood into the German *Volkskörper* (body of the people): “Adolf Hitler has taught the German people once again to listen to the right instincts and to feel in a sound way”, Kittel ends the article, thus legitimising the Nuremberg racial legislation as an historic turning point.

Late Wartime Publications

A common theme in anti-Semitic discourse has been the right of Jews to kill non-Jews, and Kittel discusses this in his most overtly anti-Semitic text, which was published in Joseph Goebbels’s journal *Archiv für Judenfragen* (Anti-jüdische Aktion).³⁴¹ The publication was devoted to enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) regarding the threat posed by Jewish blood and the spirit of Judaism. The context is strongly anti-Semitic, the Jews being presented in the editorial as a threat that needs to be overcome. Because of their immense influence on the political course of the world and on the current war, research on Judaism has grown in importance, editor Friedrich Löffler writes. He continues to state that although it is true that racial-biological science is important and can contribute to the ‘Jewish problem’, the subject of the controversy is world-view (*Weltanschauung*).³⁴²

A quotation by Theodor Fritsch introduces Kittel’s discussion:

Is it possible to honestly and thoroughly look at any area without coming across the Jews and their negative influences? Look at the press, literature, art, theatre, higher education, politics, economic life, public morals, trade or whatever you wish, and you will always discover the Hebrews.³⁴³

³⁴¹ For Goebbels as the leader of Anti-jüdische Aktion, see Ericksen, “Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel”, 2409.

³⁴² Siegfried Löffler, “Weg und Ziel”, *Archiv für Judenfragen. Schriften zur geistigen Überwindung des Judentums. Herausgeber Anti-jüdische Aktion* 1, Gruppe A 1 (1943), 1–3.

³⁴³ Kittel, “Die Behandlung des Nichtjuden nach dem Talmud”, 6.

Kittel proceeds to argue that there is indubitably an abysmal hate among the Jews towards non-Jews, and that they can draw radical consequences from this, even to the extent of killing. This hateful relationship with the non-Jews (the *Goyim*, ‘Gentiles’, the *Acherim*, ‘the Others’) is grounded in the racial and religious essence of Judaism.³⁴⁴ Since the non-Jews are outside of Judaism, they do not truly belong to real humanity but are seen as *Untermenschen*, a ‘something’, a miscarriage.³⁴⁵ Therefore, it is lawful to kill a non-Jew, Kittel contends, stating that according to the Mishna, an Israelite murderer is not liable to punishment if he kills a man when intending to kill an animal, an Israelite when intending to kill a non-Jew, and a normal child when intending to kill a miscarried child.³⁴⁶ From this, Kittel draws the conclusion that non-Jewish life is not real life, but is equal to that of an animal. However, he omits the reference to *God’s* punishment, as well as the information that there are enough manuscripts that omit the clause to question its authenticity. Moreover, this is neither a command nor a license to kill non-Jews, but a specific regulation for murder as part of a large system of legislation, something that Kittel does not problematise. Instead, he uses it as evidence for a general attitude of hatred on the part of the Jews vis-à-vis non-Jews, saying that “it is an expression of a firm Talmudic precept”,³⁴⁷ but that Jewish apologetics tried to disguise the real attitude.

According to Kittel, the Jews living in Europe had been careful about showing their true colours for opportunistic reasons, but they were “building up their position carefully and methodically”.³⁴⁸ In reality, this fierce opposition was always present in Judaism, and when activated, “cherished dreams of an eventual Jewish world dominion” would come to pass. Kittel maintains that even when the Jews seem harmless, these ideas are always there, and the poison is not removed.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 7–9.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., 10–11.

³⁴⁶ Kittel’s argument does not hold water. Firstly, the passage about the killing of the non-Jew is not included in all manuscripts, probably due to weak manuscriptal support; it is omitted in the Blackman Mishna, for example, Philip Blackman, ed. *Mishnayoth*, 3 ed. (New York: The Judaica Press, 1964–1965), IV Nezikin. Mishna Sanhedrin 9:2. Secondly, if included in the text, as in the Giessen Mishna, there is a commentary saying that the murderer is liable to *God’s* punishment, according to Mekilta to Ex. 21:14. G. Beer, O. Holtzmann, and S. Krauß, eds., *Die Mischna. Text, Übersetzung und ausführliche Erklärung* (Giessen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann in Giessen, 1912–), IV. Seder Neziqin, 4. u. 5. Traktat. Sanhedrin-Makkot, IX 2b, p. 253, commentary p. 254.

³⁴⁷ Kittel, “Die Behandlung des Nichtjuden nach dem Talmud”, 13.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 15.

To Kittel, Jews aspire to dominion. Their eschatological power aspirations are projected into the secular, becoming “quite real power impulses that fill the individual Jew [...] letting him intoxicate himself with the idea of his rule over the ‘Other’”.³⁴⁹ Kittel’s example is “der Jud Süß”, the seventeenth/eighteenth-century Jewish *Hofjude* Joseph Süß-Oppenheimer, who was in the news at the time of writing, due to the National Socialist screen version by Veit Harlan.³⁵⁰ Süß-Oppenheimer was *the* National Socialist example of Jewish financial power in combination with villainy and political power:

And exactly so all the financial Jews and political Jews and economic Jews and Jewish clans from the alabarch Alexander in Alexandria, the ‘Rothschild of antiquity’, as he was called by Ulrich Wilcken [...], to Léon Blum and Morgenthau.³⁵¹

Alabarch Alexander was the first Jew to become a premier, embodying what Kittel often detested in his texts: Jewish, jurist, literary author, wealthy and powerful. Henry Morgenthau, Jr. was the German-Jewish Secretary of the US Treasury under Roosevelt; here Kittel explicates what he means by Jewish world dominion, since the USA at the time of writing posed a real threat to the German war efforts. And Blum could be regarded as a representative of the Bolshevik threat, which was seen as having Jewish roots. The continuation of Kittel’s argument confirms this reading. According to him, the fantastic apocalyptic dreams of world dominion were transformed into a political mentality:

For naturally everything that is said about the non-Jews in these Talmudic dreams of world dominion also pertains to their governments. Fundamentally, they are all a nullity, since they are all non-Jews. [If a government is, A.G.] hostile to Jews, this hatred hits it immediately and paints its destruction.³⁵²

Given the situation of the Jews in Germany after ten years of racist policy, the general perspective of the article is entirely unrealistic, with Kittel legitimising these policies through his argument. Jews must be dealt with harshly and decidedly, Kittel contended, even in *Die Judenfrage*, since their tendency to dominate and other evil characteristics are part of their essence. However, the great threat that he addresses

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 17.

³⁵⁰ See *Meyers enzyklopädisches Lexikon* 1978, s.v. Süß-Oppenheim.

³⁵¹ Kittel, “Die Behandlung des Nichtjuden nach dem Talmud”, 17.

³⁵² Ibid., 17.

is Jewish influence at the government level, and that Jews, inspired by the Talmud, believe that they have the right to kill non-Jewish people and nations:

Any problem of right or wrong regarding the *political* murder of non-Jews does not exist in Talmudic thinking. At the very most, the question may be if it is expedient, if it will lead to any result; and the result must be that it will become a torch for the general elimination of the adversary and for the hour of Judaism!³⁵³

Here Kittel is probably commenting on the political wartime situation. Germany's enemies were thought to be ruled by 'World Judaism', and Kittel explains the Jewish rationale behind the killing that now befell non-Jews, i.e. Germans.

This article is Kittel's nadir as a scholar. Questionable and tendentious readings of Talmudic texts, where texts are taken out of context, are interpreted as referring to Jewish aspirations to world dominion. This is in turn mixed with an analysis of the political world situation in terms of race struggle, resulting in a text targeted against Jewry and Judaism as enemies of humanity. Considering the situation of the Jews in Germany, the article is absurd. Ericksen discusses whether Kittel at the time of writing was informed of the extermination that was taking place in Eastern Europe.³⁵⁴ As noted, Kittel writes in "My Defence" that his son, who was on leave from the front, informed him about murders in Poland and Russia in early 1943; elsewhere, he says that such information was rare until about 1942.³⁵⁵ Nevertheless, his vehement assault on 'World Judaism' served to legitimise the existing racial policy and the persecution of Jews. Kittel probably did not take pride in this article, since he does not include it in his own documentation of printed works in his defence.

However, Kittel had not lost his professionalism. While writing the article mentioned above, he was also active in some traditional New Testament exegetical work, publishing a thought-provoking study on the Letter of James.³⁵⁶ He states that the letter is not pseudepigraphical and was probably written by the Lord's brother James, with a

³⁵³ Ibid., 17, my emphasis.

³⁵⁴ Ericksen, "Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel", 2410.

³⁵⁵ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 43; 41.

³⁵⁶ Gerhard Kittel, "Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 41 (1942).

Palestinian Jewish-Christian pedigree. Kittel warns against turning Jewish Christianity into something that “always wishes to counterfeit and Judaize the gospel of Jesus”, seeing this as an example of a different Jewish Christianity, which is truly moved by Jesus and tries to model its thinking and actions after him.³⁵⁷ Kittel has already stated that the letter is not Jewish but Christian, and here he expresses his respect for sincere Jewish Christianity, a position that he retains throughout his life, even though he holds that Jewish Christians should live under racial apartheid.

Kittel also contributes to the German wartime picture of England with his article on the roots of the English idea of election, published in the propagandist series *Reich und Reichsfeinde* (“The Reich and Enemies of the Reich”).³⁵⁸ In order to depreciate the English people, Kittel primarily uses analogies to Jews and Judaism. Historically, the English have regarded themselves as a ‘peculiar people’, Kittel contends;³⁵⁹ they are the ‘Island Pharisees’, and there are also rabbinic parallels.³⁶⁰ Finally, Kittel states that the war they were fighting was a struggle for a new Europe, in which Adolf Hitler demonstrated the soberness of a great statesman.³⁶¹

Kittel's Last Speeches

In his farewell lecture when leaving his position in Vienna in February 1943, Kittel reported on his study of epigraphy from Asia Minor. The printed version, *Das kleinasiatische Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* (“The Judaism of Asia Minor in Hellenistic-Roman Times”), is brief but rich in information.³⁶² Its tone is different from the articles published in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, and there are no attacks on Judaism or formulations that can be related to Nazi racist policy. Nevertheless, the basic racial agenda is unaltered. Judaism influenced the culture of

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 104.

³⁵⁸ Gerhard Kittel, “Die Wurzeln des Englischen Erwählungsglaubens”, in *Reich und Reichsfeinde, Schriften des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1943).

³⁵⁹ Ibid., 102, 104.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 106.

³⁶¹ Ibid., 127.

³⁶² Gerhard Kittel, “Das kleinasiatische Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit”, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1/2 (1944).

Asia Minor, not the reverse,³⁶³ and it must also have affected the whole racial structure, Kittel contends.³⁶⁴ Believing that there was a process of Judaisation in antiquity, as was the Jews' goal,³⁶⁵ Kittel writes that the reason for the great expansion of Judaism in Asia Minor was the proselytes, which also meant a large inflow of blood from the people of Asia Minor into Judaism, and in turn affected much of European Jewry. I will discuss his Vienna lecture of 22 March 1943 in connection with Martin Dibelius's expert verdict on Kittel below.³⁶⁶

The last speech preserved from the hand of Kittel is another lecture at the University of Vienna, held on 15 June 1944. It is an apology for Christianity as a power that has hindered the influence of Judaism and racial mixing. By this time, Kittel knew of the extensive killings of Jews and deportations to the east, an observation that forms a necessary background to the interpretation of his speech, *Das Rassenproblem der Spätantike und das Frühchristentum* ("The Racial Problem in Late Antiquity and Early Christianity").³⁶⁷ This is another document that Kittel omits in the bibliography attached to his defence.

The tendency of the entire paper is clearly racist. Although there were no racial-biological insights in antiquity, there were people who had a sound instinct in racial questions, Kittel contends, stating that he dares to talk about "a racial problem in late antiquity".³⁶⁸ Discussing anti-Semitic reactions in antiquity, he claims that none of the cults in Rome provoked such enmity as the Jews: "It was the Jewish people group and the Jewish religion that triggered this verdict [that Jews were full of hostile hatred towards all others, A.G.]."³⁶⁹ The cause of their unpopularity was that they lived as guests in the country, yet demanded equal rights. Even here, Kittel sees a Judaism that is both a 'World Judaism' and a *völkisch* entity.³⁷⁰ Behind its claims lies the Jews' idea that they are an elect people, Kittel argues, the Jews of antiquity

³⁶³ Ibid., 15.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 17.

³⁶⁵ Ibid., 17–18.

³⁶⁶ Gerhard Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums. Vortrag gehalten in der Wiener Universität am 22. März 1943. Typescript" (Wien: Institut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte in Tübingen, 1943); Gerhard Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums", *Die Welt als Geschichte. Eine Zeitschrift für Universalgeschichte* 9 (1943).

³⁶⁷ Gerhard Kittel, "Das Rassenproblem der Spätantike und das Frühchristentum. (Typewritten manuscript)", in *Tübingen University, Theological Library* (1944).

³⁶⁸ Ibid., 1–2.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 2.

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 3.

having the ambition of getting into power.³⁷¹ To Kittel, the racial question was a matter of great urgency at this time; as in the other texts, he sees racial mixing as a major problem,³⁷² with the Romans having to try to stop the growing influence of Judaism by shutting it into the ghetto.³⁷³ Moreover, he states that Jesus was non-Jewish or anti-Jewish in his preaching, and that Christianity is always strongly antithetical to Judaism, at which point he poses the question of whether Jesus and his teaching can be explained on the basis of a Palestinian background, although he refrains from answering.³⁷⁴ Kittel's purpose, however, is to discuss the role of Christianity in the racial situation in the Western hemisphere. Firstly, he repudiates the idea that Jewish-Christian missionaries meant an influx of Jewish blood into Europe. Secondly, he rejects that Christianity furthered a racial 'levelling' based on for example Gal. 3:28. Kittel goes on to show that rather than supporting an inclusion of Judaism, it is there to crush the Jewish claim to a prerogative. He exemplifies this with the Talmud saying that a non-Jew has no more worth than a dog.³⁷⁵ Christianity does not mean racial levelling (*Nivellierung*), Kittel states, but the opposite: it upholds the (racial) orders of creation, against any Jewish claims to a prerogative!

Furthermore, as a result of the anti-Judaism inherent in Christianity, the Diaspora Jews were distanced from the other peoples of the West through the ghetto.³⁷⁶ *Nothing else succeeded in hampering the Jewish expansion as Christianity did*, Kittel contends. He proceeds to show how Christianity stands in absolute opposition to Judaism, and also gives a harsh interpretation of Rom. 11:17. Talking about the wrath and judgment of God, Kittel holds that God's judgment on the Jews is more severe, which to him is exemplified by the parable of the vinedressers in Matt. 21:43, but also by Romans 11: "In Paul this corresponds exactly to Rom. 11:17—"they will be broken off from the olive tree"—which absolutely means a violent, cursing annulment of a previously privileged position." Again, Kittel's exegesis of Rom. 11:17 is strongly biased to fit his ideas of curse and rejection, not appreciating how Paul in this very verse admonishes the *Gentiles*, a fact that can hardly have been overlooked

³⁷¹ Ibid., 4.

³⁷² Ibid., 3.

³⁷³ Ibid., 4.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 4, 7.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 5.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 7–8.

by Kittel. To him, this is an example of “the Christian doctrine of the curse and rejection of Judaism”,³⁷⁷ and Kittel argues that Paul himself had a Christian anti-Judaism.

Only Christianity had been able to hinder a *völkisch*-racial Judaisation of the world of antiquity, Kittel contends. This is the first great contribution of early Christianity to the racial question of antiquity, as Christianity managed to unite the peoples of a chaotic West ‘in Christ’.³⁷⁸ The result was “a Christian West, unified and led by young *Germanentum*”. Three things created the West: Roman political-military tradition, the unbroken racial impulse of the Germanic tribes, and the unifying Christian world-view. The second contribution of Christianity, which was no less important, was to prepare the way for “these young racial powers”, which have a role in overcoming the racial problems of late antiquity.³⁷⁹ Finally, Kittel points to how even race issues are ultimately settled before God.

In this apology for the role of Christianity, Kittel paints Diaspora Judaism as the threat to the West, whereas Christianity, by forcing it into the ghetto as well as overcoming it ‘from the inside’, was the power that stopped Judaism and paved the way for the Germanic tribes’ role in history. Kittel has an apologetic ambition here, but Judaism pays the price for it. The whole argumentation is thoroughly racist, legitimising the racial policy only one year before the fall of National Socialism.

Kittel’s Defence Evaluated

In the aftermath of the Second World War, William Fox Albright writes regarding Kittel:

In view of the incredible viciousness of his attacks on Judaism and the Jews, which continued at least until 1943, Gerhard Kittel must bear the guilt of having contributed more, perhaps, than any other Christian theologian to the mass murder of Jews by the Nazis.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁷ Ibid., 7–8.

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 10.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 11.

³⁸⁰ William Foxwell Albright, “The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies”, in *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Harold R. Willoughby (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1947), 165. The article gives an interesting insight into the situation that exegesis faced just after the war.

However, the evaluation of Kittel's position towards the Jews during National Socialism has varied. On the defensive end, there is of course Kittel's own *Meine Verteidigung* ("My Defence") from 1946, which consistently defends his position.³⁸¹ The tenor of his argument is that he was not a believing Nazi, except during the first period, but that he wished to defend Jews against "street anti-Semitism". He confesses to having a part in the collective guilt of the German people, but does not admit to any personal guilt.³⁸² There was a denazification proceeding against Kittel, and he was rehabilitated in February 1948³⁸³—his defence, as well as Dibelius's and Dora Schlatter's writings in his favour, must be seen in the light of this process.³⁸⁴

Kittel's view of Judaism is unaltered. He states that, throughout his career, he has stressed the fundamental and uncompromising opposition between Judaism and Christianity, although he has also pointed to a continuity between the two. He purports to have stood for the salvation-historical place of the people of Israel,³⁸⁵ but states that Judaism is different from the prophetic religion of the Old Testament, and that the Jews crucified Christ. Having spread throughout the Western world after the Exile, the Jews had backslidden, and their history is therefore "curse" and "rejection", and there is an *Unheilsgechichte* as well as a *Heilsgeschichte*. The opposition between Christian and Jewish was metaphysical:

He *always, long before 1933* [Kittel writes about himself in third person, A.G.], pointed to the implacable and irreconcilable opposition between the Christian and the Jewish idea, *not* in fact in the sense of a *historical-incident*al opposition, but of a *metaphysical one*.³⁸⁶

Kittel also points to having described the New Testament as "the most anti-Jewish book in world history" in *Die Judenfrage*. He reinforces that Jesus' speech to the Pharisees in Matthew 23 is condemning, that the

³⁸¹ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung".

³⁸² Ibid., 1–2.

³⁸³ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 77.

³⁸⁴ These proceedings were not always successful; at times there was a great risk that the people who had upheld the Nazi regime slipped out of the net, see Reinhard Grohnert, *Die Entnazifizierung in Baden 1945–1949: Konzeptionen und Praxis der "Epuration" am Beispiel eines Landes der französischen Besatzungszone*, vol. 123, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg. Reihe B, Forschungen (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1991), 211.

³⁸⁵ This is only partly true from the above reading of Kittel's texts.

³⁸⁶ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 6.

so-called World Judaism claims power, that John 8:40–44 is a judgment on Judaism as a privileged religion,³⁸⁷ and that Jesus in that same chapter also condemns Jews as children of the devil. These examples show that Kittel still maintains typical anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic standpoints. Nevertheless, his writing of *Die Judenfrage* criticised “vulgar anti-Semitism”. Kittel holds that he should have paid attention to the ‘Jewish problem’ even earlier, because if ignored, a “dreadful, violent, explosive solution” would force itself upon Germany. His recipe, at this time as well as during National Socialism, is a “clear Christian anti-Judaism”. It is evident that Kittel possesses a profound and firmly rooted ideological rejection of Judaism, and instead of diminishing it, he stresses that it is his lifetime ideology. It is also apparent that his criticism of Judaism is not only a theological criticism of tenets of Jewish faith, but that it includes other ideological dimensions, such as race, where exegesis is used to legitimise a racist view.

Kittel's Defence of Die Judenfrage

According to Kittel, his purpose with the lecture on 1 June 1933 was to move the ‘Jewish problem’ from the sphere of anti-Semitic slogans to that of a Christian ethical responsibility. Thus, by helping to bring the ‘Jewish problem’ back to its religious roots, he wanted to lessen the risk of anti-Semitism,³⁸⁸ purporting to have opposed purely racial anti-Semitism in doing so. He defends his policy to once again give the Jews a guest status, and he hopes to see Germans and Jews coexist with mutual respect. The fact is that Kittel does not change his apartheid policy at all, arguing that if this proposed guest status had been established fifty years earlier, the process would have been less painful.³⁸⁹

And yet there is no other alternative but to remove a false way and seek a new one, since the encroachments and abuse on the part of the ‘foreigners’ or ‘guests’ must also be fought. But woe if full righteousness and sobriety is not ensured towards any foreigners on the part of the Germans, and if any revilement or general defamation of the decent pious Jews is not avoided.³⁹⁰

It is surprising that, despite the Holocaust, Kittel does not renounce his 1933 position of advocating a guest status for the Jews. Instead, he

³⁸⁷ Ibid., 7.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 21.

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 23.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 23.

emphasises Jewish-Christian voices that had supported his book and the criticism that he faced from radical National Socialists.³⁹¹ The aspect that Kittel stresses is his wish to counter “vulgar anti-Semitism” and to secure righteous treatment of the Jews. He argues that his references to the NSDAP programme in *Die Judenfrage* were for a good purpose, and that he had joined the party in order to resist its destructive wing:³⁹² “This honest, upright faith in the possibility of development within the party to an idealistic end was the decisive, yes the only, reason for his becoming a member.”³⁹³ Kittel also tells of his initial faith in Hitler’s good intentions. However, Kittel’s own description must be balanced with how he, in his production during National Socialism, repeatedly airs anti-Semitic sentiments, strongly opposes racial mixing, and advocates a return to a modern type of ghetto. I have already pointed out that Kittel’s National Socialist involvement seems to go far deeper than his own post-war description tries to make probable. Kittel stresses several times that the new Jewish policy must be carried out by force, and that he consistently and wholeheartedly stands for the Aryan and Nuremberg legislations of 1933 and 1935. In practical terms, this means that Kittel supported professors and pastors of Jewish blood being removed from their positions, students being expelled from their universities, and Jews and Germans being prohibited from marrying.

The Jewish-Christian problem is another issue where Kittel wants to explain his stance. Kittel never wanted to support racial anti-Semitism, he contends, stressing that Jewish Christians are fully Christian on a par with Germans, and claiming to have diametrically opposed racial anti-Semitism. However, Kittel does not renounce the statement that the Jewish-Christian does not become German through baptism. Although true in itself for any nationality, in the German context it says, for example, that the boundaries of blood prohibit Jewish-Christian pastors from ministering in German churches. Thus, even in 1946, Kittel reinforces the racial thinking, not relinquishing the ideas he had expressed during National Socialism. This shows that Kittel’s *völkisch*-racist ideology, in combination with a theological ‘anti-Judaism’, did not change with the German collapse, but lasted even to his defence, where he might have benefited from rejecting it. Likewise, Kittel defends his view of inter-

³⁹¹ Ibid., 26.

³⁹² Ibid., 28.

³⁹³ Ibid., 28. Kittel talks of himself in the third person.

marriage as only building on biblical foundations and Christian ethics, and justifies his article on *das Konnubium* and the one in *Der Biologe* by stating that a resistance to this can be found in traditions from the Old Testament to Protestant Lutheranism, as well as in old church synods. Against the abundant evidence in his articles, as demonstrated above, Kittel holds that his views on intermarriage are not a racial issue. It is highly surprising that Kittel can thus downplay the overtly racist perspective of these articles regarding the need for the purity of the German blood. Moreover, even in 1946, he continues to stand for his verdict that the Talmud gives Jews the right to kill a *goy*.³⁹⁴

Kittel on his Work at the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage

Kittel also plays down the National Socialist character of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage, as well as the leader Walter Frank's National Socialism, purporting that their commitment to the National Socialist cause was non-existent. However, this seems to misrepresent the facts. The Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage was an important resource for legitimising the racial policies of National Socialism. Inaugurated in the presence of Rudolf Heß, as the Führer's deputy, and a range of other important figures in the National Socialist power elite, such as Reichspropagandaminister Goebbels and Reichsführer-SS Heinrich Himmler,³⁹⁵ the institute was presented as a major "scientific weapon in the Nazi fight against Jews".³⁹⁶ Its second conference involved "men of practical action", such as the leading anti-Semitic *Gauleiter* Julius Streicher, and Joseph Goebbels is cited as giving directions for the scholarly work. Thus it seems to have been common for high Nazi officials to partake in the proceedings, which shows that the institute was central to the National Socialist cause.³⁹⁷ Consequently, Kittel's argument that the institute had nothing to do with the NSDAP is incorrect. The 'Third

³⁹⁴ Ibid., 47.

³⁹⁵ See Karl Alexander von Müller, "Begrüßungsansprache", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Ersten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 19. bis 21. November 1936*, *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937), 11. Martin Dibelius calls the research institute a semi-official NSDAP institution, Gerhard Kittels Arbeiten über das antike Judentum. Ein Gutachten von Prof. D. Dr Martin Dibelius, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2, p. 4.

³⁹⁶ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 46.

³⁹⁷ Wilhelm Grau, "Vorbemerkung", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937), 7.

Reich' was a National Socialist state,³⁹⁸ and the work of the institute was at the heart of National Socialist Jewish policy, aiming to break the purported Jewish influence over the German scholarly world. Walter Frank—in contrast to Kittel's suggestion that Frank was not a National Socialist³⁹⁹—says the following of Judaism in his inauguration message, "Deutsche Wissenschaft und Judenfrage" ("German Scholarship and the Jewish Problem"):

In German politics the kingdom of Israel had its end in the spring of 1933. But in German scholarship it has reigned longer, through its governors.⁴⁰⁰

He continues:

The obscure people of this era are those who, under the spell of a rotten political ideology, oppose the use of scholarly criticism for great scholarly problems, such as the Jewish problem. *But with the brown battalions of the new Germany marches the daring desire to make new expeditions in unknown lands of scholarly knowledge.*⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁸ See Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 33–35, where he wishes to diminish the National Socialist profile of the project. See also the comments by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz in Düringer and Weintz, eds., Düringer and Weintz, eds., *Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore. Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit*, 151, 164–165.

³⁹⁹ Walter Frank, "Die deutsche Wissenschaft und Judenfrage", in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Ersten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 19. bis 21. November 1936, Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937). It may be true that Frank was not a party member, just as the very loyal National Socialist Karl Georg Kuhn, see Heiber, *Walter Frank und sein Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland*, 454 n. 4. However, there is ample evidence of the identification of Frank with the NSDAP, Heiber, 1005. Moreover, Frank was thought highly of by Hitler himself, who cherished his biography of the *Hofprediger* Adolf Stoecker, respected by the Führer for his success in making anti-Semitism a popular movement, Frank, *Hofprediger Adolf Stoecker und die christlichsoziale Bewegung*. Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors* notes that Frank, according to his own account, "had become acquainted with the practical mass struggle against Jewry in Nuremberg at Julius Streicher's rallies", 45, that Frank was appointed as leader of the institute by Hitler, and that its honorary members included *Rasse-Günther*, 46. It is correct that Walter Frank later fell out of favour with the Nazi leadership, a consequence of the Nazi power game and Frank's sometimes outrageous statements. For this, see Heiber, *Walter Frank und sein Reichsinstitut*.

⁴⁰⁰ Frank, "Die deutsche Wissenschaft und Judenfrage", 23.

⁴⁰¹ "Die Obskuranten unseres Zeitalter sind die, die im Banne einer morschen politischen Ideologie sich heute der Anwendung der wissenschaftlichen Kritik auf grosse wissenschaftliche Probleme, wie die Judenfrage, widersetzen. Mit den braunen Batallionen des neuen Deutschlands aber marschiert zugleich auch der wagende Wille zu neuen Entdeckungsfahrten in fremde Lande der wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnis," *ibid.*, 28–29.

Walter Frank undoubtedly supported the brown battalions, and it is naïve to think that he would have reached that position had he not been National Socialist. Thus there is no doubt that the context into which Kittel threw himself had an overtly racist agenda and was an important part of the National Socialist racial state.⁴⁰² Yet in his defence, Kittel contends that his involvement meant nothing other than objective scholarly work.⁴⁰³ The texts analysed above prove the opposite.

Kittel defends his involvement in the Reichsinstitut by stating that he resisted all efforts to make him serve the anti-Jewish propaganda.⁴⁰⁴ In his view, his work at the institute had the purpose of defending the Old Testament and Christianity against currents within National Socialism that directed their criticism of Judaism against these entities. Kittel considers himself to have been able to counter these tendencies through his discussion of early Judaism in relation to Israelites and Christianity.⁴⁰⁵ “Regarding the blurring of the three entities Israel–Judaism–Christianity, the historical facts of which are becoming obscure, his goal is always to present the difference and delimitation between these.”⁴⁰⁶ Judaism is the *Abfall*, and Kittel insists on never identifying Israel with Judaism.⁴⁰⁷

Kittel sees the connection between the Old Testament and Judaism as a threat to Christianity in Germany, and hindering it seems to be one rationale behind his work, at the same time as his research in effect strongly supports the racial legislation. Defence of the Bible is also the rationale behind his cooperation with the anthropologist Eugen Fischer, to describe the Jew of late antiquity from an anthropological point of view. Kittel contends that he was on the way, “through anthropology and allied with this, to finally overcome vulgar racial anti-Semitism”.⁴⁰⁸ However, the main product of their cooperation, “World Judaism of Antiquity”, is not a criticism of vulgar racial anti-Semitism; instead, data are gathered to reinforce racist views on Jews. When Kittel wants to show that racial mixing is an historical fact, he does this in order

⁴⁰² Burleigh and Wippermann, *The Racial State*, 305. As noted, Burleigh shows how comprehensive the racial ideology was in the National Socialist state; it was scarcely possible to live in this state in a neutral way.

⁴⁰³ Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, 33–35.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 44.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 34, 44.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 34, see also 59.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., 35.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., 39.

to untie Judaism from Israel: Judaism is entirely different from Israel. In effect, he develops a racist view of Judaism in order to defend the Old Testament and thereby Christianity against groups that wanted to taint these with their supposed connection to Judaism. The discussion of the Old Testament takes comparatively little space in his writings, however.

Kittel had also recruited one of his students, the Tübingen Orientalist Karl-Georg Kuhn, to the Reichsinstitut. According to Helmut Heiber, Kuhn, like the rest of the people involved in the Vienna institute, seamlessly combined his Christian conviction with anti-Semitism.⁴⁰⁹ Together, Kittel, Kuhn and the philosopher Max Wundt were proudly regarded as pioneers of scholarship against Judaism by the principal of the University of Tübingen and the city's press, placing Tübingen at the forefront of National Socialist research into Judaism.⁴¹⁰ Thus Kittel's entrepreneurial gifts were not only invested in the TDNT project, but he took an active part in the work of the Reichsinstitut. From its launch in 1936, he was constantly initiating projects, publishing, and enthusiastically contributing to the seminars of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage.

Kittel and the Persecution of the Jews

As for Kittel's relationship to the Jews, he admits to being programmatically 'anti-Jewish' but not anti-Semitic, and he strongly criticises *Radau-Antisemitismus*. In his defence, he points to his relationship with certain Jews,⁴¹¹ listing contacts with "Jews, half-Jews, Jewish Christians", e.g. his teacher Israel Kahan, to which he dedicated *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, and some Jewish acquaintances, mentioning instances when he had acted on their behalf. As already noted, he returns twice to the time when he, on 1 April 1933, had walked back and forth along the Tübingen Wilhelmstraße in order to protect the wallpaper shop of Jewish-Christian Hugo Löwenstein⁴¹²—most of his examples pertain to Jewish Christians, a group that stood closer to Kittel than other Jews. Kittel explains that he did not take more

⁴⁰⁹ Heiber, *Walter Frank und sein Reichsinstitut*, 453–454.

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 454.

⁴¹¹ See Friedrich and Friedrich, "Kittel, Gerhard, 1888–1948", and Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Düringer and Weintz, eds., *Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore. Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit*, 140.

⁴¹² Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 62–63.

action with the fact that he “constantly stood with one foot in the K.Z. (Concentration Camp)”. Another reason for passivity was that “[Kittel] had the feeling that fate must run its course”.⁴¹³ This seems deeply rooted in Kittel’s interpretive framework, as for example expressed in *Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage*:⁴¹⁴ in ‘God’s history’, there is an *Unheilsgeschichte* of the Jews, where their misfortunes are determined. This is how he could suggest and support anti-Semitic policies.

Answering the question of whether he had any direct guilt in the persecutions of Jews, Kittel categorically repudiates that

because of him or his writings, directly or indirectly, a single hair on a single Jew had been harmed; that, should he not have written any part of his writings or any sentences in his books, or should he not have written anything at all about the Jews, one synagogue less would have been burnt, one Jew less would have been deported, one individual less would have been killed. [...] His works [...] could not be evaluated as furthering party tendencies and as justifying the Jewish policies.⁴¹⁵

The reading of Kittel’s writings makes clear that he actively and purposely legitimises the racial policy and even defends what had been described as Hitler’s “barbarity and brutality” in implementing it,⁴¹⁶ although he never explicitly supports any of the things mentioned. His verdict, however, displays a naivety, or a deliberately concocted excuse, that does not appreciate the role played by such a prominent person’s general and consistent legitimisation of racial ideology. To pious Protestant Germans, the theological legitimisation of the *Unheil* of the Jews as a God-willed calamity provided the most profound legitimisation of the racial laws. Well aware of his unique position as an internationally and nationally renowned specialist in Judaica and the ‘Jewish problem’,⁴¹⁷ Kittel must have understood his role in legitimising National Socialist racial policy.

Moreover, Kittel states that, apart from *Die Judenfrage*, he did not engage in the Jewish policy, maintaining that when he had referred to politics in his speeches (often explicitly supporting Hitler and his racial

⁴¹³ “Er hatte das Gefühl, dass das Verhängnis wohl seinen Lauf nehmen müsse,” *ibid.*, 42.

⁴¹⁴ Kittel, “Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage”, discussed above.

⁴¹⁵ Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, 53–54, similarly 57.

⁴¹⁶ Kittel, “Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage”, 63, quoted above.

⁴¹⁷ Kittel, “Meine Verteidigung”, 3–4.

politics), it was to quieten the attacks from those in the audience who were doctrinally National Socialist. He contends that he never stood for a general National Socialist anti-Semitism, but addressed certain key issues, such as reversing assimilation or hindering mixed marriages.⁴¹⁸ However, it has already been made clear that even in 1946, Kittel stood by his earlier ideas, including *Die Judenfrage* and his analysis of assimilated Judaism. In Kittel's version, he did not compromise with the currents of contemporary politics by any means, and it is true that his view of Jews and Judaism did not emerge when National Socialism came to power. In a letter to Herbert Loewe dated 11 August 1933, Kittel contends that he had given in to the political winds of 1933, but "what I say today, I have said for many years, only I always hoped that insightful men would understand what was necessary before violence set in".⁴¹⁹ Admittedly, he sometimes uses his knowledge and position to oppose "vulgar anti-Semitic" propaganda,⁴²⁰ but of his production during National Socialism, the only texts that seem free of racist bias are his TDNT articles and the article on the Letter of James. Walter Grundmann, Kittel's assistant in Tübingen between 1930 and 1932, writes that Kittel, whom he knew well, was the great Judaism specialist, who was in contact with many Jews but was "fundamentally an adversary of Jews" (*grundsätzlicher Judengegner*).⁴²¹ There is no reason to doubt this part of Grundmann's report.

Persecution of Jews in Germany was something that Kittel, according to his defence, regarded as unpleasant, although he claims that he did not know of concrete abuse and killing of Jews until 1942. He talks about "vague news in the beginning of 1943", even though he admits to having been aware of harsh and unrighteous treatment, repression and looting, especially mentioning the *Kristallnacht*.⁴²² Kittel states that he protested against such treatment in various ways, listing several attempts, including a public critical comment on the policy in 1943. Particularly remarkable is Kittel's involvement in the proceedings against Herschel Grünspar, who murdered the German embassy official von Rath, where

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., 40.

⁴¹⁹ Quoted from Ericksen, "Assessing the Heritage: German Protestant Theologians, Nazis, and the Jewish Question", 35, and 192 n. 53.

⁴²⁰ See Kittel, "Das Menschenschächtgesetz", discussed above.

⁴²¹ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 23.

⁴²² Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 41, 43.

Kittel argues that his interrogation of Grünspan had prevented 'World Judaism' from being accused of the murder.⁴²³

The veracity of Kittel's efforts on behalf of Jews is difficult to ascertain, and Kittel's attitude to these matters seems to be twofold. It should also be noted that it was possible to hold racist views and yet oppose National Socialist or anti-Semitic brutality. Criticism of "street anti-Semitism", *Radau-Antisemitismus*, is a recurrent theme from *Die Judenfrage* onwards, Kittel belonging to the circles that did not like this type of anti-Semitism. As in any movement, there were different wings in the National Socialist circles. Kittel seems to have belonged to the conservative, bourgeois one, where civility and certain ethical standards were crucial. As already noted, the National Socialist ideologist Alfred Rosenberg's KfdK, to which Kittel belonged, aimed at attracting Kittel's category by presenting a National Socialist image fit for the salons of the cultural elite. However, this was more a question of culture and perhaps aesthetics, than a programmatic rejection of racial policies.

Kittel's overall ideology aimed at apartheid and the elimination of Jewish blood in the "body of the German people". His forceful rejection of intermarriage was fully in line with the measures taken after the Jewish boycott on 1 April 1933 and the Nuremberg Laws of November 1935. More than two thousand anti-Semitic laws had been passed and implemented in German everyday life, meaning, for example, that all Jews had to wear the yellow star, that Kittel's Jewish colleagues were prohibited from working as professors and pastors, and that Jewish students were not allowed to study. Kittel saw this racial policy as necessary and God-willed. The fact that he could act on behalf of an individual who was affected by the laws, such as Hugo Löwenstein, is favourable, but in principle it does not change his standpoint.⁴²⁴ Kittel's theological foundation, expressed in his 1933 publications,⁴²⁵ had envisaged hardships for the Jews as a necessary consequence of God's curse on them.

Martin Dibelius's Expert Opinion on Kittel's Work

Among the scholarly evaluations of Kittel's stance towards Jews, that of Martin Dibelius is of special interest, since it gives a contemporary

⁴²³ Ibid., 47.

⁴²⁴ See *ibid.*, 63.

⁴²⁵ Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe"; Kittel, "Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage".

picture of Kittel's work, while telling something about Dibelius's own position. As noted in the chapter on Dibelius, he became a leading figure in scholarly Germany after the war. The expert opinion is attached to Kittel's defence,⁴²⁶ since Dibelius had offered, and was then called upon, to give a statement. Dibelius discusses eight publications by Kittel from 1937 to 1944, most of them included in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*. His general verdict is that the scholarliness of the works is indubitable, and that Kittel's results are nowhere affected by political considerations. Dibelius agrees with Kittel's picture that Judaism took shape from 500 BCE to 500 CE through two phenomena: Diaspora Judaism, including expansion, proselytism and assimilation; and legalistic hierarchy (exclusiveness, casuistry and Pharisaism). That is, Dibelius sides with Kittel in an interpretation of Judaism that is in line with much of the Enlightenment research tradition, but with an emphasis on proselytism, which is one of the foci in Kittel's interpretation of history.

Dibelius also supports Kittel's view of the Trier terracottas as caricatures of Jews. It is not possible to discuss here whether these are anti-Semitic caricatures, but when Dibelius agrees with Kittel's interpretation, he also backs his conclusion that this is an early example of *Rassenschande*, miscegenation, on Germanic soil. Kittel's arguments that the figures evidence "the problem of early racial mixing" and that there was a campaign against intermarriage and concubinage between Jews and non-Jews are taken for granted, disregarding his whole race-analytical framework.

Evaluating the main contributions of Kittel, those on the *Konnubium*, Dibelius similarly maintains that Kittel does not include racial perspectives and again accepts his basic analysis. Although Kittel's racial analysis includes ideas such as Jews always striving for world dominion and racial restructuring taking place through racial mixing, Dibelius interprets Kittel in more positive terms, saying that Kittel goes against the party line when he stresses that intermarriage is negative for religious, not racial, reasons. But Dibelius gives only part of the picture, as the reading of the eight articles that he discusses clearly indicates. Later, however, Dibelius takes a stand against the idea found several times in

⁴²⁶ Gerhard Kittels Arbeiten über das antike Judentum. Ein Gutachten von Prof. D. Dr Martin Dibelius, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2; Dora Schlatter's testimonial, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31,2.

the eight articles, that 'World Judaism' had expanded in order to gain power and thus had become a danger to the world.⁴²⁷

Dibelius then proceeds to defend Kittel's most controversial statements, arguing that where such are found, they do not affect the method and result of Kittel's scholarship. I have already surmised that Dibelius overlooks the racist interpretive framework and many clearly racist passages in the eight articles. One is the infamous quotation that has already been quoted here, which Dibelius also quotes, saying that it "intimates a certain agreement of the author with certain measures of the party":

it was not arbitrary brutality and barbarity when the Führer of the new Germany put the Jewish problem on a completely new foundation in a radical resolution for the German people as the first people of the present day, but it was honest political action, born out of historical sobriety.⁴²⁸

Concluding this section, Dibelius nevertheless argues that Kittel did not only air party ideology but that these considerations "were part of his thoroughly reflected overall ideology, which is far from the vulgar view of National Socialism".⁴²⁹

The second aggravating statement is chosen by Dibelius as one of two from everything that Kittel writes in the eight articles. So as to be on the safe side, Dibelius calls the statement "not univocal"; however, several times in his defence, Kittel refers to this statement as having been risky to him, stating that the day after the speech in question, a colleague had asked if the Gestapo had not shown up.⁴³⁰

To evaluate Dibelius's verdict, we need to look closer at the speech and Kittel's attitudes at the end of the 'Third Reich'. The quotation included in the defence is from Kittel's speech in Vienna in March 1943:

In reality it was a door of demons; in reality it did not lead to a paradisiac valley, but into a valley of chaos and curse and horror (*Grauen*). Would a person who knows and honours history as his or her teacher be surprised

⁴²⁷ Dibelius, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2, p. 3.

⁴²⁸ Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage", 63. Kittel tries to reinterpret this message, which in clear terms supports and historically establishes the 'Jewish problem', Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 40, but the words cannot be understood other than as a strong support of Hitler's policies.

⁴²⁹ Dibelius, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2, p. 3.

⁴³⁰ Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums", a speech held at the University of Vienna, 22 March 1943.

if, in the place where there is a terrible struggle to get out of the valley, all horrors accumulate and all demons rage?⁴³¹

At first sight, assimilation is the villain that broke up the ghetto, only for Judaism to be disappointed that there was no paradise on the outside, but a place of chaos, curse, horror and demons. The context shows that Kittel, regretting the break-up of the ghetto, blames the horrors on the Jews and their wish to assimilate. This is not surprising, since, even in *Die Judenfrage*, Kittel sees a popular and violent reaction to assimilation and emancipation as unavoidable, and perhaps even reasonable.⁴³²

Kittel's general argument is the same as that found in several of the already-discussed treatises with the same heading.⁴³³ However, here Kittel wants to throw light on the horrors of the Jews: the killing and extermination of the Jews, which Kittel was aware of early in 1943. Since this speech was held on 22 March and was published probably a few months later, it seems reasonable that Kittel knew what was happening to the Jews.

To understand the section that Kittel later presents as a criticism of the existing National Socialist policies, it is helpful to look at the whole article. It is hardly correct, as Kittel purports in his defence, that his message was provocative to the National Socialist party. The imagery he uses is the 'door' of the ghetto, which the Christian Western society allowed to be broken open through assimilation. This letting out of the Jews from the ghetto is the cause of the chaos that Kittel describes.⁴³⁴ Talking of the 'genuine Christian West' and the 'Jewish problem', and all the synodal decisions that hindered people from marrying, socialising or eating with Jews, and which prevented Jews from holding public offices, judging a non-Jewish population, etc., Kittel does not regard such measures as negative. Instead, he describes the break-up of the ghetto as a crisis:

after about a thousand years, an enormous crisis broke out across the Christian West, under which the world is still trembling (*erzittert*). It was

⁴³¹ The lecture was available to me as a typescript at the Institut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte in Tübingen, Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums. Vortrag gehalten in der Wiener Universität am 22. März 1943. Typescript". See also Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 43.

⁴³² Kittel, "Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe", 38–39.

⁴³³ Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage".

⁴³⁴ Kittel, "Die Entstehung des Judentums", 81–82.

simply a part of this crisis, when the ghetto's undisputed self-evidence was regarded as problematic and the question was asked how Christian it was. The Christian West began to loosen and give up its stand on the Jewish problem, and began to be ashamed and deny its office as a warder (*Wächter*). [...] What was accomplished through the *emancipation and assimilation* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and what is today accomplished across the oceans, more violently and pressing than ever, is nothing Christian, but an unchristian process.⁴³⁵

Hence Kittel sees this emancipation and assimilation as Judaism's attempt at a second epoch of 'World Judaism', which threatens to overrun a secularised and powerless Christianity. When Western Christianity left its office as warder at the doors of the ghetto and let Judaism out, they invited seductive principles such as *liberté* and *égalité*. Kittel says that this "door of demons [...] did not lead to a paradisiac valley, but into a valley of chaos and curse and horror". The demons that Kittel is talking about are *liberté* and *égalité*, rather than something else.

Thus what Kittel presents as a criticism of the regime is in reality another impassioned and sharp attack on Jewish assimilation. The ghetto is the ideal solution to the 'Jewish problem', and the Christian West has the responsibility of keeping the door closed. Emancipated and assimilated Judaism is responsible for the present struggle, which should probably be interpreted as the oppression and killing of Jews. Rather than taking a stand against this, Kittel sees it as an inevitable consequence of assimilation. This reading contradicts Kittel's own sugared version of his speech.

However, Dibelius defends Kittel, not appreciating the racist potential of his speech, but noting extenuating circumstances: pious Jews have the same view of assimilated Judaism as Kittel, but most of all, Kittel says this because of his long-term and deep convictions about assimilated Judaism. But Dibelius does not criticise Kittel's overall discussion.

Dibelius ends his verdict by affirming Kittel's scholarly manner of carrying out his work, comparing it to the Eisenach institute and its

⁴³⁵ "Nach abermal einem Jahrtausend aber brach die ungeheure Krise über das christliche Abendland herein, unter der noch heute die Welt bis in ihre letzte Fuge erzittert. Es war nichts als ein Teil dieser Krise, wenn jene undiskutierte Selbstverständlichkeit der Ghettolösung problematisch und ihre Christlichkeit in Frage gestellt wurde. Das christliche Abendland fing an, jenes Wächteramt sich zu schämen und es zu verläugnen [...] Was sich in *Emanzipation und Assimilation* im 19. Und 20. Jh. vollzog und was über den Meeren sich heute heftiger und aufdringlicher als je vollzieht, ist nicht ein christlicher, sondern ein a-christlicher Vorgang," *ibid.*, 82.

productions. He describes Kittel as courageously independent in relation to the party,⁴³⁶ stating that Kittel had felt obliged to publish his articles under the auspices of the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands in order to prevent a “vulgar anti-Semite” from filling that position. Theology, not politics, lies behind his view of the Jews, Dibelius contends, approving of Kittel’s view that the Old Testament Israel and ‘World Judaism’ are not identical. He concludes, “I have written these verdicts in order to show that Kittel [...] does not leave the areas of ordinary scholarship. [...] The works under discussion are written with an unobjectionably scholarly attitude, do not serve the party line and have theological considerations as their presupposition.”⁴³⁷ However, according to the National Socialist sources, Kittel’s loyalty to the party was never questioned, but he is described as being active, faithful and, according to Gustav Entz, as having a good relationship with National Socialist rulers.

In his analysis of Kittel’s eight articles, Dibelius unfortunately overlooks the dominant racist perspective. *Instead, these comments by Dibelius confirm the picture painted above in the discussion of Dibelius’s production.* Evaluating these articles, Dibelius is well aware of where the explosive parts are to be found, and he does his best to disarm them. Kittel’s 1943 description of a ‘World Judaism’ released from the ghetto and causing a dreadful confrontation with the Christian West is difficult to interpret other than as a theologian giving a rationale, or at least a deterministic explanation, for the oppression of Jews. This sharpens the picture of Kittel as a henchman of the regime.

The Relationship between Kittel and Schlatter

The relationship with Adolf Schlatter is also used in Kittel’s defence. As is already noted above, Kittel and Adolf Schlatter had a close relationship, which is confirmed by several circumstances: Kittel’s own testimony, the comments of Adolf Schlatter’s daughter Dora, and far-reaching similarities in their theological work. Even in 1922, Schlatter had wanted Kittel to succeed him as New Testament chair at Tübingen, although Wilhelm Heitmüller, an exegete with an entirely different view from Schlatter’s, was called to the professorship. When, after Heitmüller’s death, Kittel got the position in 1926, Schlatter felt

⁴³⁶ Dibelius, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2, p. 4.

⁴³⁷ Dibelius, Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2, p. 4.

that his longtime chair was in good hands and that he could withdraw from teaching.⁴³⁸

Kittel himself confirms the relationship. In a memorial address for Schlatter at the University of Tübingen on 23 May 1938, Kittel talks of Schlatter using the words of Elisha over Elijah: "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and its horsemen."⁴³⁹ Referring to their conversation at Schlatter's deathbed, Kittel states that he had told Schlatter

that all of us who have stood under his influence in different ways belong to the fringe of a joyful, yes-saying (*jasägenden*), optimistic theology and Church. Then once again there was a blaze of all the old passion: "Yes, *Herr* Colleague, I believe you are right; I believe that then I have really been of some consequence."⁴⁴⁰

This passage and the fact that Kittel was at the deathbed and held this memorial speech are evidence of the relationship. Kittel also underlines Schlatter's loyalty to the people, which was of the greatest importance to him: "The deepest earthly fellowship that he ranged himself in is his *Völkstum* [...] as a God-given reality, which denotes his existence, and without which he is not."⁴⁴¹ From an early stage, Schlatter's life was characterised by this strong loyalty to the (German, although he was Swiss) *Volk*, as something that God himself backed⁴⁴²—thus, at least in Kittel's description, Schlatter was a strong German nationalist. Even though Kittel notes that Schlatter would not have accepted a notion such as 'disciples of Schlatter', or *Schlatterianer*,⁴⁴³ it is evident that Schlatter was influential in the life of Kittel and others, and Kittel describes him as such. Another person to salute Schlatter for his positive influence on his own theological work and that of others was Paul Althaus, also a student of Schlatter's.⁴⁴⁴

In the same vein, Dora Schlatter bears witness to a very close relationship between Schlatter and Kittel. Her statement is included in Kittel's defence, supporting his case by referring to Schlatter and his authority:

⁴³⁸ Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 592, 621.

⁴³⁹ Gerhard Kittel, "Adolf Schlatter", in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, ed. Paul Althaus (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1938), 16, 30.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁴⁴² *Ibid.*, 29.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴⁴⁴ Althaus, "Adolf Schlatters Gabe an die systematische Theologie".

Professor Dr Gerhard Kittel has stood in the closest connection with my father, Professor D. Adolf Schlatter. Professor Kittel has presented all his concerns, his works, his questions to him, and obtained his advice. His scholarly essays and his lectures were talked through with my father, and they worked on them together. Professor Kittel's opinions were endorsed and the difficulties in this cooperation were fully understood. My father was anxious that the ties to the others should not be severed, but that an attempt should be made to guard against the bad. In this way, he, with his full sympathy, accompanied Professor Kittel on the road that he had to walk, up to the very last days before his death in May 1938.

Conversely, my father discussed his work "Will the Jew Prevail over Us?" in detail with Professor Kittel, gave him the manuscript to read, and completed its publication following his urgent advice and request. This work is known to be one of the sharpest public attacks against the National Socialist *Weltanschauung* and Jewish policies, and was therefore confiscated by the Gestapo. This work, too, was an expression of the convictions that were fully shared by both men.

Tübingen, Olgastraße 2, January 1947,
Dora Schlatter⁴⁴⁵

This text confirms the picture that Schlatter and Kittel were very close.⁴⁴⁶ According to Dora Schlatter, they basically shared the same views, even though Schlatter regarded himself as having a guarding role. Dora Schlatter does not state that Schlatter was negative to any of Kittel's writings or statements, which must include the book *Die Judenfrage*, the articles published in that connection, as well as the volumes published in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* during Schlatter's lifetime. As I

⁴⁴⁵ Universitätsarchiv Tübingen 162/31,2: "Professor Dr. Gerhard Kittel hat in engster Fühlungnahme mit meinem Vater Professor D. Adolf Schlatter gestanden. Professor Kittel hat ihm alle seine Anliegen, seine Arbeiten, seine Fragen vorgelegt und seinen Rat eingeholt. Seine wissenschaftlichen Aufsätze und seine Vorträge wurden mit meinem Vater durchgesprochen und miteinander erarbeitet. Professor Kittels Stellungnahme wurde gutgeheissen und die Schwierigkeiten in der Mitarbeit vollauf gesehen. Es lag meinem Vater daran, dass die Brücke zu den Anderen nicht abgebrochen wurde, sondern der Versuch unternommen wurde, Schlimmes zu verhüten. So begleitete er den Weg, den Professor Kittel gehen musste, bis in die allerletzten Tage vor seinem Tode im Mai 1938 mit seiner ganzen Anteilnahme. Umgekehrt besprach mein Vater seine Schrift 'Wird der Jude über uns siegen?' ausführlich mit Professor Kittel, gab ihm das Manuskript zu lesen, vollzog die Veröffentlichung auf dessen dringenden Rat und Wunsch. Die Schrift stellte bekanntlich einen der schärfsten öffentlichen Angriffe gegen die nationalsozialistische weltanschauungs- und Judenpolitik dar und wurde deshalb von der Gestapo beschlagnahmt. Auch diese Schrift war Ausdruck der vollen gemeinsamen Überzeugung beider Männer."

⁴⁴⁶ The description of various interactions between Schlatter and Kittel in Neuer's biography confirms this picture, Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, see e.g. 632, 692, 700, 713, 724.

have argued in the section on Schlatter, his pamphlet *Wird der Jude über uns siegen?*, to which Dora Schlatter refers, *did* take a stand against the National Socialist circles that wanted to introduce heathen practices to German Christmas celebrations, but *regarding the Jews*, the writing has a message that plays into the hands of racists. There is no doubt that Kittel and Schlatter retained their classic Protestant views and therefore had quarrels with groups that seemed to threaten such views, including the National Socialist groups that were anti-Christian or stood for a Deutsche Christen line of thought. However, the accumulated picture with regard to their view on Jews and Judaism during National Socialism is that they, despite these reservations against certain National Socialist ideas, jointly supported certain policies against the Jews.

Thus, if Dora Schlatter is correct, Kittel did not fight his own battle as regards the 'Jewish problem', but he stood in a close relationship with Schlatter. The two scholars, described by Kittel as father and son, had much in common: the basic theological outlook, the view of Scripture and the deep conviction that Judaism and Christianity stand in strong and irreconcilable opposition to one another. This does not imply that Schlatter was a National Socialist; rather, he stood on the other side, arguing that for Church and theology to survive, they had to develop a dialogue with the people of the new Germany. The writings of the two men point to a far-reaching consensus, and confirm Dora Schlatter's picture.

The Scholarly Evaluation of Kittel

The scholarly discussion of Kittel's stance during National Socialism begins in 1946 with Max Weinreich's book *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People*,⁴⁴⁷ which features Kittel's role. Fifty years later, however, Rosen argues that Kittel's National Socialist role has not been adequately understood, stating that instead of a critical distance to Kittel, there is a familiarity with him among most students of exegesis, in spite of his National Socialist involvement.⁴⁴⁸ This seems true despite Ericksen's contributions and the German debate.

⁴⁴⁷ Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors*, 41–43. New edition: Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People* (New Haven: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1999).

⁴⁴⁸ Rosen, "Familiarly known as Kittel".

The Debate Caused by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz

More than thirty years after the war, Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz wrote an article about Kittel, where she concludes, "From being a sympathiser of the purportedly moderate Führer, he had become an opponent of the National Socialist policy of elimination." Having misjudged Hitler and the National Socialist world-view,⁴⁴⁹ Kittel is presented as fairly moderate compared to e.g. Rosenberg and Julius Streicher,⁴⁵⁰ and overall, Siegele-Wenschkewitz's early interpretation of Kittel is quite favourable. In addition to contrasting him with the aforementioned Nazis, she points to the strong reactions of the Tübingen *Gauleiter* Wilhelm Murr against Kittel. Against this background, it is interesting to read the Sipo report, where Kittel is regarded as a good and loyal party member. Moreover, Kittel was even asked by the National Socialist authorities to fill the position as vice chancellor of the University of Tübingen.⁴⁵¹ Siegele-Wenschkewitz's methodology being to contrast Kittel with other National Socialist figures,⁴⁵² she argues that Kittel's ambition was to steer a middle course in the existing situation. She thus provides a defence of Kittel without explicitly drawing the consequences of Kittel's suggested policy for German Jewry. Nor does his being "an opponent of the Nazi policy of extermination" seem to be substantiated.

Siegele-Wenschkewitz was sharply criticised by Martin Rese for the tendency of the article.⁴⁵³ Rese disapproves of the fact that she only discusses the situation of 1933 and Kittel's book *Die Judenfrage*, whereas she disregards Kittel's involvement in the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage as well as his knowledge of a 'Jewish problem' before 1933. To Rese's mind, she gives a far too positive picture of Kittel as simply one of many Germans who were deceived by Hitler.⁴⁵⁴ Siegele-Wenschkewitz's book on Kittel, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor die Judenfrage*, 1980,

⁴⁴⁹ Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, "Die Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät Tübingen in den Anfangsjahren des Dritten Reichs. II. Gerhard Kittel und die Judenfrage", *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. Beiheft* 4 (1978), 80.

⁴⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 62.

⁴⁵¹ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 13–14.

⁴⁵² Siegele-Wenschkewitz, "Die Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät Tübingen in den Anfangsjahren des Dritten Reichs. II. Gerhard Kittel und die Judenfrage", 73–74; on her methodology, see 55.

⁴⁵³ Rese, "Antisemitismus und neutestamentliche Forschung" (with which also Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 30–31, agrees).

⁴⁵⁴ Rese, "Antisemitismus und neutestamentliche Forschung", 562, 569.

addresses Rese's criticism,⁴⁵⁵ intending to substantiate her position. She describes her thesis that "Kittel's anti-Semitic action came about only through the political situation of 1933 and his evaluation of it, which he later considered to be wrong", whereas Rese sees his anti-Semitism as a long-term conviction.⁴⁵⁶ That Rese was right has also been supported here, e.g. through Kittel's involvement in KfdK, the constant anti-Semitic tenor of his writings during the 'Third Reich' and what he says in the defence.

Siegele-Wenschkewitz also clarifies that her book does not purpose to "rescue" or rehabilitate Gerhard Kittel".⁴⁵⁷ However, her verdict on Kittel is not substantiated when she says:

Kittel's fundamental error was not a position on the *Judenfrage* applied even before 1933, that is, a latent anti-Semitism, which determined his political alternative in 1933: his fundamental error was the misjudgment of Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist *Weltanschauung*.⁴⁵⁸

The evidence above shows, firstly, that Kittel's political view is a consequence of his 'anti-Judaism', and secondly, that he most probably had racist convictions even before 1933. The racial and theological analyses in his 1933 publications do not seem to be a passing fancy, but they developed over a longer period.

Neither did Siegele-Wenschkewitz's arguments convince Robert P. Ericksen, who states that her response is flawed and includes a "somewhat emotional reaction".⁴⁵⁹ Discussing Kittel's actions *after* 1933, Siegele-Wenschkewitz states that Kittel could not take a line against racist anti-Semitism since he saw anti-Judaism as essentially belonging to Christianity,⁴⁶⁰ pointing to Kittel's involvement in the Forschungsabteilung *Judenfrage*. Once again, her position is puzzling: "I must stress once more that my purpose is not to judge the person Gerhard Kittel. His theology and political decisions are representative of a great number of his contemporaries and colleagues."⁴⁶¹ Siegele-Wenschkewitz's

⁴⁵⁵ Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*, 34–37.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., 36.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., 43.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid., 110.

⁴⁵⁹ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 204 n. 17.

⁴⁶⁰ Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, "Mitverantwortung und Schuld der Christen am Holocaust", *Evangelische Theologie* 42 (1982).

⁴⁶¹ Ibid., 181.

posthumously published evaluation of Kittel's *Verteidigung* assesses the defence of Kittel's actions during National Socialism, and here she finds that Kittel's description is not trustworthy.⁴⁶²

In 1985, Ericksen takes a surprisingly sympathetic stand to Kittel, concluding his discussion by stating, "[Kittel] was not an evil man, but he took an evil stance. It may or may not have been improper to try, convict and imprison Kittel in 1945."⁴⁶³ Presenting the wartime writings of Kittel in 1989, however, Ericksen does not mince matters: through his scholarship, Kittel served the purposes of Nazi policies, and Ericksen asks if Kittel was not aware of the extermination of Jews when he published these strongly anti-Jewish articles.⁴⁶⁴ In 1999, Ericksen's verdict is equally sharp.⁴⁶⁵ He also questions whether Kittel should be seen as a serious New Testament scholar in view of his wartime writings.⁴⁶⁶ Wayne Meeks's insightful article in 2004 deals with the role of interpreting strategies, as well as the blatant paradoxes in Kittel's thinking: uncommon sympathy with regard to the depth and seriousness of the rabbinic texts, at the same time as he was involved in Nazi oppression of the Jews.⁴⁶⁷ Describing Kittel's scholarly production, Meeks especially points to his salvation-historical emphasis and the notion of *Unheilsgeschichte*.

The scholarly view on Kittel progressed from Siegele-Wenschkewitz's fairly conciliatory picture of Kittel in 1978, which regarded Kittel as someone who first presumed that the German Führer was a blessing to Germany, but then repented and became an opponent of National Socialism—a wholly unjustified description—to the present analysis of a Kittel who saw a fundamental opposition between Judaism and Christianity, and who consciously and consistently supported racial policies throughout the 'Third Reich' and even afterwards. The National Socialist evaluation of Kittel that emerges from the Sipo report and

⁴⁶² Siegele-Wenschkewitz, "'Meine Verteidigung' von Gerhard Kittel und eine Denkschrift von Walter Grundmann", 164–165.

⁴⁶³ Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*, 31.

⁴⁶⁴ Ericksen, "Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel", 2410–2411.

⁴⁶⁵ Ericksen, "Assessing the Heritage: German Protestant Theologians, Nazis, and the 'Jewish Question'", 33–39.

⁴⁶⁶ In Ericksen, "Genocide, Religion, and Gerhard Kittel. Protestant Theologians Face the Third Reich", he sees a connection, even if not explicit, between a contribution like Kittel's and the genocide, 75–76.

⁴⁶⁷ Meeks, "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel", 514–516.

from a thorough reading of his entire production from the period leaves little room for a rehabilitation of Kittel.

Conclusion

Kittel's case is intriguing, since it revolves around Jews and Judaism, but at the same time includes positions that might appear contradictory. On the one hand, Kittel is a 'renewer' of New Testament scholarly work on Judaism, with his alternative to the traditional 'Late Judaism' hypothesis and Bousset–Gressmann's approach. Rabbinics is given an entirely different place than in Bousset–Gressmann, as is Palestine, as a locale for the development of Christianity. On the other hand, Kittel uses his erudition to support the racist policies of National Socialism. While it might look as if Kittel changed his view on Jews and Judaism altogether, it is clear that he maintains his fundamental idea of the opposition between Jesus and Judaism from 1912 to 1946. This is also his own verdict. According to his own account, he did not essentially change his views on Jews and Judaism in 1933, but his thinking was in place long before that;⁴⁶⁸ nor did he change them after National Socialism, as his defence indicates. Nevertheless, Kittel's negative picture of Jews and Judaism grows increasingly darker during National Socialism. It is in 1933 that Kittel introduces his dark determinism, *Unheilsgeschichte*, and his salvation-historical theology begins to focus on God's judgment and curse upon Israel. This refocusing is typical for Kittel during National Socialism: from salvation history to its opposite, from Jewish history of late antiquity to the mixing of race and blood. After the war, Kittel seems quite content with his views during the National Socialist period. This can only be explained by the fact that Kittel's basic views were not the result of compromise, but had their roots in his conviction about a fundamental and fierce opposition between Jesus and Judaism, a conviction held from 1912 to his death, which also led to his legitimization of the racial legislation.

Kittel's *characterisation* of Judaism varies somewhat. On the one hand, in his book on Palestinian 'Late Judaism', Kittel does much to show the positive dimension of things that Bousset–Gressmann had not appreciated, the sum of his discussion being that there is a very strong

⁴⁶⁸ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 5–10.

connection between early Christianity and Palestinian Judaism. By acknowledging *Palestinian* Judaism, Kittel upgrades what others describe as narrow, nationally limited, etc. to something more positive. Thus there is a new dimension in Kittel, compared to the Enlightenment research tradition, which cut the Palestinian tree at its roots and moved any viable Judaism to the Diaspora. Kittel argues that Jesus draws from Palestinian 'Late Judaism' and that Christianity's "innermost sanctuary" is at the core of Palestinian 'Late Judaism'. This reformulation of 'Late Judaism' is an important change. To him, there is no other possible environment of early Christianity, and there is an organic connection between Palestinian Judaism and Jesus. On this point, Kittel diverges from the entire Enlightenment tradition. However, his roots, upbringing and study within the salvation-historical research tradition, gave him ample opportunity to internalise and develop such a view. In the research climate of the time, Kittel undoubtedly moved early Christianity considerably closer to Palestinian 'Late Judaism' than most scholars had done, and his intensive work with rabbinic sources speaks for itself. His verdict regarding Judaism is unusually positive: Judaism is still the religion that has attempted to unite ethics and religion, and even in its worst forms, Kittel says, it does its best to fulfil God's demands, Kittel's modern example being Orthodox Judaism. Whereas scholars such as Bousset denigrate the ethical standard of 'Late Judaism', Kittel does not do so.

Nevertheless, Kittel's description of early Christianity includes the same black backdrop as the one found in e.g. Bousset's 'Late Judaism' hypothesis. Palestinian 'Late Judaism', too, is dry, barren, ossified. Yes, the rabbis give a solid moral teaching, but it is still characterised by weighing and accounting, whereas Jesus settles the whole ethical question with a few clean, clear statements. Hence there is an opposition between Jesus and the rabbis. Even after the Holocaust, Kittel states that the opposition between Christianity and Judaism is fundamental, and this view surfaces here, even though Kittel draws Jesus closer to Judaism. Thus Kittel's eminent rabbinic knowledge can be used to paint Judaism in black colours, just as it can be used to see a continuity with it. When Jesus is in focus, the contrast becomes clear. With Jesus, all ritualism has disappeared; all joy in dialectics, and every trace of ethics tied to nationalism has been superseded. But Judaism crucified Jesus.

With the turn to National Socialism, however, Kittel's caricatures become cruder, as a new racist ideology merges with 'Late Judaism' hypotheses. Jews are now depicted as a people who interpret their

prerogative in terms of world dominion, a salient feature of anti-Semitic propaganda. By the same token, other peoples are there to be dominated by the Jews, and the great prophets' vision of a specific role for Israel is turned into its opposite: Israel's glory and rule; casuistic legalism and hunger for power. In the latter phase, after 1933, Kittel begins to refocus on Jews and Judaism in a negative way, reinterpreting important theological tenets in racist terms. Not entirely new to him, these attitudes grow out of Kittel's fundamental opposition between Judaism and Christianity.

Kittel's foundation is a *Palestinian* 'Late Judaism' hypothesis, although he stresses the continuity with the Old Testament and Israel. The great prophets with their ethical-religious imperative are especially important, and Jesus is in effect an inheritor of them. The very fact that Kittel so forcefully situates the birthplace of early Christianity in Palestine shows the same continuity. As noted, it is precisely in this *historiography* of early Christianity that Kittel deviates from the main target of his polemic, Bousset–Gressmann, but also from the entire Enlightenment research tradition. Again, his inheritance from the salvation-historical research tradition and the *Instituta Judaica* is evident. Although he saw the start of a winning formula when Judaism could merge with the Greek spirit in the Diaspora, Kittel turns this around. The birthplace of the Christianity that developed into a world religion being Palestine, Kittel gives a different picture than most scholars before him. Paul is a good example here—Palestinian in thinking, theology and education, but of Hellenistic culture. Yet there is no thought of a marriage with the Greek spirit—the 'content' is Palestinian, and this can be expressed in two cultures, Palestinian and Hellenistic. Thus the melting pot where early Christianity is born is 'moved' to Palestine, a provocative thought against the background of the History of Religions school, for example. From 1933, however, Kittel's historiography becomes more similar to the Enlightenment research tradition: there is an Old Testament 'original', with patriarchs, Moses, the great prophets, the covenant and election, and after that a depravation. Just as in de Wette, the Exile becomes the critical point. The period of harmlessness ends, and Judaism becomes 'World Judaism'. Elsewhere, Kittel says that in the period between the first century BCE and the first century CE, Judaism becomes a new formation, a completely changed, depraved metamorphosis, with legalism expressed through an ever-developing casuistry.

Kittel's predilection for Palestinian Judaism is sometimes paired with an equal antipathy to the Diaspora. He upholds a dichotomy, just as

his opponents, but reverses it. The Diaspora is never a place of positive development, but the good things come from Palestine. Paul, the Diaspora Jew, for example, went to Palestine, was trained and then became a blessing to the Diaspora. Parallel to this is Kittel's abhorrence of assimilated (Diaspora type) Judaism, paired with his respect for modern Orthodox (Palestinian type) Judaism. Much of the Diaspora's evil is the assimilation—it is evident that Kittel anachronistically constructs the Jewish past to fit his ideas of an intact, Bible-based piety versus a liberalised religion that assimilates into the modern, more international world with its dangerous values. When writing his articles on the emergence of Judaism under the auspices of the Reichsinstitut, the Diaspora existence is reinterpreted in *völkisch* and racial terms. The lacking relationship to the soil (*Boden*) is now a reason for the homelessness of Judaism, and in this situation, the blood is affected—racial mixing begins. To Kittel, the Diaspora now becomes the great melting pot of racial and blood mixing, which is linked to assimilation. The traditional dichotomy between Palestine and the Diaspora having first been turned upside down to mean the opposite of for example Bousset–Gressmann, it is then interpreted in racial terms. The now negative Diaspora becomes the start of what Kittel at this point fights tooth and nail: the influx of Jewish blood into the body of the Germanic people. Another important thing that happens in the Diaspora is that Judaism emerges as something other than Israel. Israel, with the Old Testament, Moses and the prophets always holds a place of sanctity in Kittel's thinking. But in the Diaspora, Israel is changed and mixed into a new entity, Judaism. Thus Kittel is able to claim a relationship with Israel and the Old Testament, and still isolate Judaism.

Kittel seems to see a common, almost archetypal, structure in the relationship between Judaism and the outside world, where antiquity, the Middle Ages and the present merge and represent the same dynamics. On the good side is Palestinian Judaism, at home in Palestine, the intact Israel, unaffected by foreign and liberal ideas. This is somehow also represented by the ghetto, where Kittel would like to see a flourishing and separate Hebrew culture. On the evil side is the outside world, which the Jews wrongly long for. Here Judaism is merged and assimilated with negative things: new, liberalising ideas and practices, such as intermarriage and the ideals of the French Revolution. When Judaism comes out of the ('Palestinian') ghetto, it is compromised by foreign values, but it also threatens the other peoples with its Jewish blood. As long as Judaism kept to its ghetto, however, all was calm.

Christianity is a “daughter religion” of Judaism. Jesus was Jewish, as were the apostles, and Kittel states that Christianity does not offer anything new, only the fulfilment of the old: “At no point has the New Testament religion denied its home in Old Testament piety.” This is Kittel’s fundamental view regarding *continuity or discontinuity*. He does see a fundamental and essential opposition between Jesus and Judaism/the rabbis, but this is not because he is against Palestinian Judaism or Israel, but because the rabbis and Israel did not accept Jesus as the Messiah. Nevertheless, if Bousset–Gressmann saw discontinuity between early Christianity and Palestinian Judaism, Kittel’s view is the opposite. Jesus stands in continuity with the Jewish past, reviving the demands of the prophets, yet starting a new movement. Here Kittel has a duality that is difficult to redeem: Jesus is a Jew, a pious Jew, who ceased to be a Jew; similarly, becoming Christian means ceasing to be Jewish. At the same time, Kittel is able to say that, *as a religion*, Christianity is not better than Judaism! In his book on Palestinian ‘Late Judaism’, Kittel extensively, and perhaps more systematically than his predecessors in the salvation-historical research tradition, demonstrates the similarities and continuity between Palestinian ‘Late Judaism’ and Christianity. The breaking point is something else: *the relationship to Jesus as Saviour, and this is where Kittel wishes to place the stumbling block*.

During National Socialism, the discontinuity between Judaism and old Israel becomes salient. Israel *was* the people of God, Kittel says, indicating a supersessionist view. He draws an interesting parallel: just as one cannot equate the *Kaiserreich* with Germany after 1918, there is a difference between Old Testament religion and Judaism, caused by a degeneration. Old Testament Israel and the *Kaiserreich* are on one side, whereas depraved Judaism and the abhorred Weimar Republic are on the other. The discontinuity is also racial. The racial mixing that took place between Ezra and early medieval times created a Judaism with more discontinuity than continuity with the Old Testament Israel. Once again, Kittel’s perspective has changed. In 1926, the discontinuity was only spiritual, having to do with how people related to Jesus and his religious-ethical demand, whereas now the discontinuity encompasses anything from religion to blood and race.

As for his *symbolic world*, Kittel confesses himself to be a Lutheran with a salvation-historical orientation. Thus Kittel stands in the salvation-historical research tradition, with its defence of the Scriptures, its focus on salvation, where faith in Jesus is the true stumbling block, but also its specific ‘divine history’—a favourite notion with Kittel is ‘God’s

history'. The defence of the Scriptures and classic Christian tenets is evident in Kittel. Most prominent in this regard is Kittel's defence of the Old Testament, which runs all through his writings during National Socialism. This is no wonder, considering his background in the parental home of the great Old Testament specialist Rudolf Kittel, and the Lutheran Pietist circles to which father and son belonged. Thus Kittel is willing to sacrifice the continuity of modern Judaism with Israel in order to rescue the place of the Old Testament in National Socialist Germany, by severing it from the negative factor of Judaism. He develops this apologetic strategy while facing a strongly negative view of the Old Testament among the *Deutsche Christen*—which in part caused the Sports Palace scandal, after which Kittel and many others left the *Deutsche Christen*—as well as other groups within the NSDAP.⁴⁶⁹ In Kittel's own words, "He could effectively step into the struggle about the Bible, by showing that Israel and Judaism, the Old Testament and Talmud are not only not the same, but that their difference is due to a complete shift in what is high and valuable in them (*durch eine völlige Verlagerung der Höhen- und Wertlage bedingt ist*)."⁴⁷⁰

In the salvation-historical symbolic world, the Jew usually holds a place of honour. Israel and the prophets undoubtedly do, and they are also important in Kittel's theological system, so important that Jesus is true Israelite religion *redivivus*. However, the picture is more complicated in Kittel. The 'symbolic Jew', or rather, the 'symbolic Israelite' (at least after 1933), is highly regarded in Kittel's symbolic world, and on a couple of occasions, Kittel is actually able to surmise that he has a positive eschatological future, when the olive braches will be grafted back into the tree. But just as in Schlatter, there is a time axis where the fortunes of Israel and the Jews change. Israel *was* once the people of God, but when the Jews did not accept Jesus as the Messiah, there was a rupture. In an eschatological perspective, the people may perhaps be grafted back into the tree anyway, but hardly as God's people. Thus there is only a slight hope of a rehabilitation of what was once God's people. This view on Israel is not new: Delitzsch, who can be regarded as a key theologian in Kittel's research tradition argues in the same way, and Schlatter operates with similar thoughts. In each

⁴⁶⁹ Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich*, 174.

⁴⁷⁰ Kittel, "Meine Verteidigung", 59.

of these cases, the question of Jews and their salvation through faith in Jesus is the key.

Yet with Kittel's new race-oriented interpretation of salvation history, *Unheilsgeschichte*, the Jews are moved to the opposite side: they are no longer part of God's salvation history, as in Beck and others, but of God's *Unheilsgeschichte*, determined for suffering. The salvation-historical determinism that promised Israel an end-time relief now promises the Jews a present calamity. Here Kittel's logic suffers: if Israel is severed from Judaism, how can the same Israel be punished by punishing the Jews? In any event, the 'symbolic Jew' is a figure under a divine curse, just as the 'symbolic Israelite' was one of honour. By putting salvation-historical thought into a racial key, Kittel effectively and pedagogically legitimises the oppression of Jews, the homelessness—in political terms, the guest status—as being willed by God. Exegesis serves politics, and the 'real Jew' is transformed into a 'symbolic Jew', loaded with negative connotations. The focus of 1926, on salvation through faith in Jesus, the ethical-religious inheritor of Israel, has shifted to a focus on the *Unheil* of the Jewish minority.

Kittel's symbolic world has other elements than the theological ones. Another feature that runs through his production is his Christian conservative front against liberal politics, liberal Judaism and their prime example, the Weimar Republic. This surfaces even in 1926, when Kittel talks about the depravation after Moses, as Judaism developed either into moral philosophy without religion, or into ritualism. 'Enlightened' Jews become the example of this downfall: Lessing's Jewish figure Nathan the Wise and Walther Rathenau, the Jewish, leftist democrat, embodying the Weimar Republic. Thus, even at this time, Kittel detests assimilated Judaism as a poison in the body of the German people, and this is not so much religious as cultural-political. In his mind, the 'Jewish problem' is in reality the problem of assimilated, decadent Judaism, which he regards as the villain in Germany: it is "a poison eating its way through the body of the people (*Volkskörper*) like a terrible disease". Kittel's membership of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur, which seems to have been previously overlooked, supports this picture. His cultural-political 'analysis' of the 'Jewish problem' in Germany is an important background to his standpoint. In fact, to specify the constitution of the 'symbolic Jew', he is an assimilated Jew, a concept that contains all that Kittel considers dangerous, before and during National Socialism: atheism, immorality, power, intermarriage, racial mixing and enmity towards Christianity.

There is no doubt that Kittel stood for what he boldly confesses as an anti-Judaism. In his time, the concept of anti-Judaism overlaps with anti-Semitism; Goebbels, for example, calls his overtly anti-Semitic magazine anti-Jewish. Elsewhere, Kittel says that he is against “vulgar anti-Semitism” and for “genuine anti-Semitism”. To him, this means a racial apartheid, a kind of reinstatement of the ghetto, where the Jews live their own lives, and especially keep to their religion. Thus Judaism and Jewish blood are negative to the body of the German people, but that does not imply that each individual Jew is evil. Nor does Kittel accept that Jesus was Aryan. Kittel also takes a clear stand against opponents to Christianity within the NSDAP—even the Sipo notes that he is hopelessly faithful to his religion—and, after 1934, against the *Deutsche Christen*. To a great extent, Kittel belonged more to the Confessing Church circles, although he would have quarrels with them regarding their relationship to National Socialism. Bishop Wurm, too, defended Kittel,⁴⁷¹ and it is clear from this study that Kittel and his older friend and mentor Schlatter shared many convictions, even though Schlatter stayed outside of the National Socialist party. In line with his criticism of the *Deutsche Christen*, and most probably because of its attitude towards the Old Testament, Kittel was very critical to the Eisenach institute, which was thoroughly intertwined with the *Deutsche Christen*.

There is a far-reaching, or even total, integration between Kittel’s theological and political thought, at least from the mid-1920s, which has great relevance for *legitimation/delegitimation*. The Christian German state is undoubtedly Kittel’s ideal, whereas Judaism, assimilated Judaism in particular, becomes a threat to it, these frontiers being deeply grounded in Kittel’s theology. Fundamental to this is his idea of an irreconcilable opposition between Jesus and Judaism, to which the Christian Germany and the threatening Jewish forces are parallel—a thought that is increasingly found in his production from 1912 to 1947. In this thinking, Christianity belongs to the good side and Judaism to the dark side of reality. By constructing reality in this way, Christianity and Jesus are placed on the sacred canopy, whereas Judaism is placed below, under a curse, and at the bottom of his symbolic world. The opponents are charged with positive and negative power respectively,

⁴⁷¹ Siegle-Wenschkewitz, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage*. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte, 118–119.

and when this dichotomy is transferred to social and political reality, Judaism is identified with contemporary, 'real Jews', and Christianity with Christian Germany. Even in Kittel's discussions in 1926, he equates the detested historical Judaism with the modern, liberal one. By 1933, Kittel has developed a most powerful tool for the legitimate oppression of Jews, *Unheilsgeschichte*. I regard this notion and Kittel's application of it as *the ultimate theological and religious legitimization of anti-Semitism: God himself determines calamity and apartheid for the Jews*. Jews being placed under God's curse is a most powerful legitimization of a harsh handling of the 'Jewish problem'. Entering the debate on the Aryan legislation, Kittel's bestselling book, *Die Judenfrage*, became a first-class theological-ideological legitimator of the newly established policy, due both to the authority of its author and to the argument, which supports the existing policy. The book can impossibly be read as anything other than a powerful support of apartheid, which was a precondition for later measures against Jews.

Kittel's extensive work at the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage adds to his legitimization of National Socialist racial policies. His first lecture explicitly supports the racial Nuremberg Laws of November 1935, but Kittel's grand narrative of how Israel went from Palestine into the chaos of racial mixing, with Jewish blood eventually entering Europe and Germany, threatening these cultures with its essential and detrimental qualities, provided the National Socialist ideologists with an historical picture that matched and legitimised the contemporary racial purification project. Thus Kittel effectively supported the Nuremberg policy that was implemented through a fully schematised racial *Gattenwahl*, and by referring to Ezra as well as medieval church policies, Kittel encourages the elimination of mixed marriages. His main strategy of disconnecting Judaism from biblical Israel and the Old Testament also removed the protection offered by the thought that German Judaism was somehow connected with the God of Israel, who was still regarded as the fundament of German culture.

However, Kittel was hardly an active supporter of violence, although he expressed several times that it was inevitable, and on a left-right scale, he probably belonged to the conservative side regarding methods for solving the 'Jewish problem'. Most of Kittel's writing was done in a scholarly environment, but the ideological framework of the research had the purpose of legitimising existing policy. Dibelius's expert opinion that Kittel is innocent, since he only carried out a scholarly investigation, overlooks the legitimising power of such scholarship.

In conclusion, Kittel seems to have regarded Judaism and Christianity as absolute opponents throughout his life, and when this fierce opposition crossed over into social and political strategies, Kittel's statements became increasingly racist. The most salient, but also most frightening, feature is Kittel's divine determination of the horrors that befell Jews and Judaism as a result of the curse upon them. Kittel's theology seems basically coherent at its roots, but it is implemented differently due to the ideology and policy of the Weimar Republic, followed by the German racial state, the policies of which Kittel supported on the basis of his particular—and distorted—interpretation of salvation history.

WALTER GRUNDMANN: TOWARDS A NON-JEWISH JESUS

Walter Grundmann (1906–1976) has lately received much interest, with a number of articles and books being devoted to him.¹ The reason is hardly that Grundmann is a particularly interesting exegete—the part

¹ Grundmann and the Eisenach institute is given its own article in the following pioneer work on scholarship under Hitler, Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People*, 62–65. He also is noted in the following church-historical work on the *Kirchenkampf*, Carsten Nicolaisen, “Die Stellung der ‘Deutschen Christen’ zum Alten Testament”, in *Zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes. Gesammelte Aufsätze II*, ed. Heinz Brunotte and Ernst Wolf, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 212–216. The groundwork on Grundmann was done by Susannah Heschel, however, Susannah Heschel, “Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life”, in *Church History* (1994); Susannah Heschel, “Theologen für Hitler. Walter Grundmann und das ‘Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben’”, in *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Arnoldshainer Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994); Susannah Heschel, “Transforming Jesus from Jew to Aryan: Theological Politics in Nazi Germany”, *Dialog* 35 (1996); Susannah Heschel, “Making Nazism a Christian Movement: The Development of a Christian Theology of Antisemitism during the Third Reich”, in *What Kind of God? Essays in Honor of Richard L. Rubenstein*, ed. Betty Rogers Rubenstein and Michael Berenbaum, *Studies in the Shoah* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1995); Susannah Heschel, “When Jesus Was an Aryan. The Protestant Church and Antisemitic Propaganda”, in *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*, ed. Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999), a variant of this being Susannah Heschel, “When Jesus Was an Aryan. The Protestant Church and Antisemitic Propaganda”, in *In God's Name. Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Omer Bartov (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001); Susannah Heschel, “The Theological Faculty of the University of Jena during the Third Reich”, www.oslo2000.uio.no/AIO/AIO16/group%208/Heschel.pdf. Siegele-Wenschkewitz makes him a major figure in the anthology Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, ed. *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, vol. 66, *Arnoldshainer Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994), and also discusses his biographical notes in Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “‘Meine Verteidigung’ von Gerhard Kittel und eine Denkschrift von Walter Grundmann”. See also Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “New Testament Scholarship and the Nazi-State. Christian responsibility and guilt in the Holocaust”, in *Remembering for the future. Working papers and addenda*, ed. Yehuda Bauer, et al. (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989), on Kittel and Grundmann. The volumes Siegele-Wenschkewitz, ed. *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen* and Ericksen and Heschel, eds., *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust* place Grundmann and others in their historical and church-historical milieu, and Siegele-Wenschkewitz 1994 includes a presentation of Grundmann's development, Klaus-Peter

Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 *Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche* Ende 1933", in *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Arnoldsheiner Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994), and of the Nazi "People's Testament", Birgit Jerke, "Wie wurde das Neue Testament zu einem sogenannten *Volkestestament* 'entjudet'? Aus der Arbeit des Eisenacher 'Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben'", in *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, ed. Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, *Arnoldsheiner Texte* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994); see also Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz's introduction to the volume. The book *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium*, Peter von der Osten-Sacken, ed. *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, vol. 20, Studien zu Kirche und Israel (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002), is devoted to the environment of Walter Grundmann and the Institute, Thuringia, where a profiled and influential branch of the Deutsche Christen was strong. The articles specifically discuss Walter Grundmann: Susannah Heschel, "Deutsche Theologen für Hitler. Walter Grundmann und das Eisenacher 'Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben'", in *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002); Wolfgang Schenk, "Der Jenaer Jesus. Zu werk und Wirkung des völkischen Theologen Walter Grundmann und seiner Kollegen", in *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002); Peter von der Osten-Sacken, "Die grosse Lästerei". Beobachtungen zur Gründung des Eisenacher Instituts und zeitgenössische Dokumente zur kritischen Wertung seiner Arbeit sowie zu Beurteilung Walter Grundmanns", in *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002); Peter von der Osten-Sacken, "Walter Grundmann—Nationalsozialist, Kirchenmann und Theologe", in *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002); Wolfgang Schenk, "Literatur zum Thema 'Thüringer Deutsche Christen'", in *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002), the latter which includes approx. 150 works by Grundmann's pen. See also Gerdmar, "Exegesis, Postmodernism, and Auschwitz—On Human Dignity and the Ethics of Interpretation"; Gerdmar, "Nazistisk bibeltolkning i en evangelisk veckotidning på 1930-talet"; Anders Gerdmar, "Nazistisk bibeltolkning—om teologiskt auktoritetsspråk och receptionsetik", in *Ordets makt och tankens frihet. Om språket som maktfaktor. Humanistdagarna vid Uppsala Universitet 1999*, ed. Rut Boström Andersson (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1999b); Anders Gerdmar, "Ett nytt evangelium", *Dagens Nyheter*, 21 Dec. 2003; Gerdmar, "Polemiken mot judar i Nya testamentet och dess reception. Utkast till en analytisk typologi"; Anders Gerdmar, "En germansk Jesus på svensk botten: svensk-tyskt forskningssamarbete med rasistiska förtecken 1941–1945. Paper vid Historikermötet i Uppsala 22–24 april 2005" (Uppsala, 2005), all relating to Grundmann and his work (in Swedish apart from the first). A second recent volume on Grundmann is Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl Wilhelm Niebuhr, eds., *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007), with articles on Grundmann and Völkische Theologie, Tobias Schüfer, "Walter Grundmanns Programm einer erneuerten Wissenschaft. Die 'Völkische Theologie' von 1937 und ihre Ausgestaltung in der 'Jenaer Studienreform'", in *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, ed. Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl-Wilhelm

of his work that is not ideologically tainted is quite ordinary²—but he has become the main example of nazified theology. In this role, he is an excellent example of exegesis performed in a spirit of political and academic correctness. Below I will *concentrate on how Grundmann uses exegesis* in dealing with the Jews, a field that has received less attention than the work at the Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben (Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life), below called the Institute. The reason for including Grundmann is to see how his interpretation relates to the research traditions, Grundmann having been Kittel's research assistant in Tübingen, and having received inspiration from Schlatter. My discussion pertains only to Grundmann during National Socialism,³ and since his entire bibliography is very large, especially with numerous pamphlets published during National

Niebuhr, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007); on his theological development, Volker Leppin, "Gott und Nation. Wandlungen der Verhältnisbestimmung bei Grundmanns Weg vom Oberkirchenrat in Sachsen zum Lehrbeauftragten für Völkische Theologie in Jena", in *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, ed. Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007); on Grundmann as an exegete, Karl Wilhelm Niebuhr, "Walter Grundmanns Vorlesung 'N.T.-Theologie' von 1937/38 und sein Buch 'Die Geschichte Jesu Christi' von 1957. Vorläufige Beobachtungen", in *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, ed. Roland Deines, Volker Leppin, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007); and for Grundmann on Jesus as a Galilean, Deines, "Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann". The volume also includes an extended German version of my 2005 paper, Gerdmar, "Ein germanischer Jesus auf schwedischem Boden: schwedisch-deutsche Forschungszusammenarbeit mit rassistischen Vorzeichen 1941–1945". See also Peter M. Head, "The Nazi Quest for an Aryan Jesus". *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 2:1 (2004), 55–89.

² For example the widespread commentaries Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, ed. Erich Fascher, vol. 1, *Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968); Walter Grundmann, "Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus", in *Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974). However, being 'ordinary' does not say anything about the ethics of a person, see Christopher R. Browning, *Ordinary Men. Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York: Aaron Asher Books. HarperCollins Publishers, 1992), and the ensuing (most heated) debate. As is demonstrated in von der Osten-Sacken, "Walter Grundmann—Nationalsozialist, Kirchenmann und Theologe", 304–311, Grundmann continued his anti-Jewish exegesis in his new position as a leading theologian and churchman in the socialist East Germany. For this remarkable and startling career shift, see Heschel, "The Theological Faculty of the University of Jena during the Third Reich", which also tells of Grundmann's involvement in the Stasi.

³ For his whole development, see von der Osten-Sacken, "Walter Grundmann—Nationalsozialist, Kirchenmann und Theologe".

Socialism, I will concentrate on his most important exegetical works of the period.⁴

Grundmann's background was quite different from Gerhard Kittel's, even though they had intensive contact for a period.⁵ The son of a stationmaster, this non-academic background did not stop him from making a fast academic career. Just as his *Doktorvater* Kittel, Grundmann was twenty-five years old when he, in 1931, defended his thesis. As noted, between 1930 and 1932, Grundmann was the scholarly assistant of Kittel and worked with him on the first edition of TDNT. Early on, Grundmann took a strong stand against communism and atheism, and developed a criticism of the Enlightenment.⁶

On 1 December 1930, *Universitätsassistent* Walter Grundmann became a member of the NSDAP in Tübingen. This early joining of the party placed him among those not suspected of opportunism, as they joined the party after the National Socialists came to power in early 1933. The pioneers of 1930–1932 enjoyed a high status and often obtained leadership positions in e.g. the SS.⁷ From 1 April 1934, Grundmann was a supporting member (*Förderndes Mitglied*, FM) of the SS (membership no. 1032691).⁸ Such members vowed to give a monthly contribution to the organisation and were allowed to carry the FM badge, although they were not involved in any concrete activities.⁹ Academics were

⁴ For a discussion of a broader scope of his works, also including his non-exegetical writings, see Deines, "Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines anti-semitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann".

⁵ For a rudimentary biography, see Christoph Schmitt, "Grundmann, Walter", in *Biographisches-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Available in preliminary form at http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/g/grundmann_w.shtml accessed 7 Oct. 2005 (Verlag Traugott Bautz, 2006), along with Heschel, "Theologen für Hitler. Walter Grundmann und das 'Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben'", Heschel, "The Theological Faculty of the University of Jena during the Third Reich", and Schenk, "Der Jenaer Jesus. Zu werk und Wirkung des völkischen Theologen Walter Grundmann und seiner Kollegen".

⁶ Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933", 173.

⁷ Grundmann was member no. 382544 (archive card in Bundesarchiv, BA NSDAP-Gaukartei). For the SS, see Robert Lewis Koehl, *The Black Corps. The Structure and Power Struggles of the Nazi SS* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983), 92. Through the election success of 14 September 1930, the NSDAP became a power to reckon with in German politics.

⁸ Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life", 592.

⁹ Hans Buchheim, "Die SS—das Herrschaftsinstrument. Befehl und Gehorsam", in *Anatomie des SS-States*, ed. Hans Buchheim, et al. (Olten und Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, 1965), 190–191.

sought after, first for the SS and then for the SD, and Grundmann was probably *gefundenes Fressen* to these groups.¹⁰ He was thus an early and dedicated National Socialist.

Grundmann's career combined church work, theological academic involvement and National Socialist activity. From 1932, he was the leader of the National Socialist Pastors' League (*Pfarrerbund*), and he was among the founders of the Deutsche Christen in Saxony in 1933, the same year that he was appointed *Oberkirchenrat* in the Church of Saxony. However, Grundmann became a national figure through his authorship of the "Twenty-Eight Theses", which became a form of confession for the Deutsche Christen of Saxony, and later for several other *Land* churches.¹¹ When the national Deutsche Christen movement accepted the theses, Grundmann became a leading ideologist in the movement. On 1 November 1936, Grundmann became acting professor of *völkisch* theology and New Testament at the University of Jena, having just turned thirty,¹² and two years later, he was promoted by the rector of the university, Professor Wolf Meyer-Erlach, to ordinary professor.¹³ Recommending Grundmann's appointment, Meyer-Erlach wrote that the theological faculty at Jena wanted to become a stronghold for National Socialism, envisioning that Grundmann's scholarship would be "pathbreaking for a National Socialist perspective in the realm of theology".¹⁴ One of the things he did at Jena was to strike off Hebrew from the curriculum, arguing that the early church had read the Greek Old Testament, not the Hebrew one.

When Walter Grundmann returned after military service from 1943 to 1945 and some time at a Russian prisoner-of-war camp, he was deprived of his professorial position. However, from 1947, he was active

¹⁰ Koehl, *The Black Corps. The Structure and Power Struggles of the Nazi SS*, 92.

¹¹ The text is in Schmidt, *Die Bekenntnisse und grundsätzlichen Äusserungen zur Kirchenfrage des Jahres 1933*, and Grundmann's development of it in Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*. On the Deutsche Christen, see Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* and Claus P. Wagners, "'Gott sprach. Es werde Volk, und es ward Volk!' Zum theologischen und geistesgeschichtlichen Kontext der Deutschen Christen in ihren unterschiedlichen Strömungen", in *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Studien zu Kirche und Israel* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002).

¹² See Heschel, "The Theological Faculty of the University of Jena during the Third Reich"; Schenk, "Der Jenaer Jesus. Zu werk und Wirkung des völkischen Theologen Walter Grundmann und seiner Kollegen", 180.

¹³ Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life", 592.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 592–593.

again in the Thuringian church, rehabilitated and pursuing a new career as principal of a seminar for catechists, and university teacher in the New Testament, now in the socialist German Democratic Republic. Two years before his death, he was appointed the honorary position of *Kirchenrat* in Thuringia, a position similar to that of his early National Socialist career.¹⁵ Several other members of the Institute experienced similar quick rehabilitations.¹⁶ Grundmann is known by New Testament students as the author of several commentaries on New Testament books, and as one of Kittel's helpers in the TDNT project.

The Eisenach Institute

The Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben was inaugurated at Wartburg Castle, "a place of the same symbolic significance as Wittenberg", on 6 May 1939, with 600 people in attendance.¹⁷ From the start, Walter Grundmann was the academic director and the acting leader of the Institute, while the nominal leader was one of the founding fathers of the Deutsche Christen, Siegfried Leffler. The ideological base of the Institute was the strong and radical Deutsche Christen group of Thuringia, led by Leffler, which provided an ideal environment.¹⁸ Although later removed, it is clear that the word *Beseitigung* ('Eradication') was included in the name of the Institute from the outset.¹⁹ The Institute was supported by eleven *Land* churches and was a vast and ambitious enterprise with

¹⁵ Heschel, "Transforming Jesus from Jew to Aryan: Theological Politics in Nazi Germany", 186.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 185.

¹⁷ Walter Grundmann, ed. *Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1942), Vorwort. For a fresh discussion on the Institute, see von der Osten-Sacken, "Walter Grundmann—Nationalsozialist, Kirchenmann und Theologe". For the background of the Institute, see e.g. Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life". The first name suggestion was Institute for the Purification of Church Life from the Jewish Spirit, von der Osten-Sacken, "Walter Grundmann—Nationalsozialist, Kirchenmann und Theologe", 315.

¹⁸ Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life", 588–589.

¹⁹ See e.g. the programme for its inauguration on 6 May 1939 at Wartburg Castle (EZA 7/4166), a place chosen to refer to Luther and his Reformation, and Walter Grundmann, *Die Entjudung des religiösen Lebens als Aufgabe deutscher Theologie und Kirche. Vortrag von Prof. Dr. W. Grundmann gehalten bei der feierlichen Eröffnungssitzung des "Institutes zur*

hundreds of working members, a broad scope and sizeable projects, all aimed at dejudaising German church life. For this purpose, the members were organised into different working sections, including fundamental, historical-genetical and practical investigations.²⁰ The first included the Scripture principle and its application in German culture; typology of religions, discussing the typical opposition between Aryan and Semitic religiosity; evaluation of art and how to express the *arteigen* (what is according to the German kind and mentality) when Old Testament motifs are used; and geopolitics, studying how Christianity and Judaism relate to different peoples. The historical investigation studied the Jewish influence on the Roman-Catholic Church, as well as how specific Jewish thoughts might have affected the Reformation and great German religious personages, such as Luther, Herder and Stoecker. A separate section studied the “Jewish counterfeit” of genuinely Western ideas, in addition to Jewish literature and Jewish influence on canonical law and popular German culture. Finally, the practical sections included projects such as a *Volkstestament*, a hymnal, a book on German piety for spiritual guidance, and informative material for German churches, “to clarify the opposition between Christian and Jewish lifestyle”.²¹

Grundmann was the driving force behind these projects, and the Institute was productive. The *Volkstestament*, published as *Die Botschaft Gottes* (“The Message of God”) in 1940,²² was printed in 100,000 copies,²³ and the new hymnal *Grosser Gott wir loben Dich* was released that same year. All were designed to follow ‘Third Reich’ ideology and eradicate Jewish traits.²⁴ The list of the eighty-eight earliest collaborators featured many bishops and other church leaders, but also university professors and doctors of theology. Getting off to a flying start, later lists show that it grew in importance as more collaborators were added to it.²⁵ By 1937,

Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben” in Eisenach (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1939), a speech held at the inauguration.

²⁰ This is documented in the presentation of the projects in *Die Arbeitsgliederung des Institutes. Arbeitskreise und Forschungsaufträge* 3–4 (EZA 7/4166).

²¹ *Die Arbeitsgliederung des Institutes. Arbeitskreise und Forschungsaufträge* 4 (EZA 7/4166).

²² Institut zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben, *Die Botschaft Gottes* (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1940).

²³ Heschel, “Transforming Jesus from Jew to Aryan: Theological Politics in Nazi Germany”, 184.

²⁴ On *Die Botschaft Gottes*, see Jerke, “Wie wurde das Neue Testament zu einem sogenannten *Volkstestament* ‘entjudet’?” and Gerdmar, “Ett nytt evangelium”.

²⁵ See Hans Prolingheuer, *Wir sind in die Irre gegangen: die Schuld der Kirche unterm Hakenkreuz* (Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1987).

the Deutsche Christen had almost a monopoly in Germany's theological academia: all the deans, more than one-third of the professors and half of the lecturers.²⁶ The Institute counted several prominent New Testament professors, including Gerhard Delling, Herbert Preisker, Carl Schneider, Rudolf Meyer, Georg Bertram and Grundmann himself,²⁷ and several of the academically most merited members of the Institute were also involved in the TDNT.

Grundmann's Overall Theology and Ideology

Before studying Grundmann's exegetical contributions, I will discuss some texts that point to his theological foundation and his development during National Socialism.²⁸ Grundmann was a prolific writer with a vast production, especially of small pamphlets and articles printed in National Socialist and Deutsche Christen publications. He seems to have changed his outlook during the twelve years of National Socialism, starting out with quite a classic Protestant position, typical of the theological environment of Tübingen, with both Schlatter and Kittel as inspirers. It is difficult to say what Grundmann's position was to Pietism. No doubt he cherished Schlatter's way of "opening up the Bible", but in his autobiography, he indicates that he left it; the Pietist way had evoked the concerns of Grundmann's father, and Grundmann says that he also saw through it and got over it. But he continues to stress that Pietism had understood the personal character of faith: "one is a Christian based on a decision of the heart meeting the grace of God that approaches us".²⁹ In other words, Grundmann confesses to having a Pietist background, stressing the Bible and personal conversion, which is what I have here called a Pietist touch.³⁰ However, especially in a longer perspective, it is evident that he moved far from the posi-

²⁶ Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life", 589.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 595.

²⁸ For his early development, see Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933".

²⁹ LKA Eisenach, typescript of Grundmann's *Erkenntnis und Wahrheit*, 15.

³⁰ Deines, "Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann", 91–92 notes that Grundmann at the outset represented a salvation historical theology.

tion that he held as a student. Just as Kittel, Grundmann regarded the Weimar Republic as the villain behind the crisis that he saw in Germany, although the root cause was individualism.³¹ He also has a Lutheran foundation,³² sharing the Lutheran doctrine of the State with several of the conservative Lutheran theologians of his time.³³ Grundmann saw Schlatter as a trailblazer for National Socialism. Honouring his teacher on his eighty-fifth birthday, he writes in 1937: "From the viewpoint of theology, Adolf Schlatter paved the way for us to National Socialism," referring to Schlatter's theology of creation and history.³⁴ He was also fascinated by Adolf Stoecker and his connection between the Christian gospel and social responsibility, and he urged the need for missionary work among the German people in the early 'Third Reich'.

Grundmann's two teachers Schlatter and Kittel are described in his autobiographical text, *Erkenntnis und Wahrheit*.³⁵ I am well aware that it is complicated to evaluate Grundmann's theological and spiritual habitat through a document written decades later; nevertheless, he gives some information that might be enlightening. Since he hardly has anything to gain by it, I do not see any reason to doubt Grundmann's honesty in giving these descriptions. His picture of Schlatter is very positive; describing him when preaching and in private conversations at his home, to Grundmann Schlatter is the fiery-eyed preacher of grace and joy.³⁶ Grundmann's choice and description of certain events may also reveal his own views. He remembers:

On the Day of Penance in 1927, he stood at the pulpit of the collegiate church in the evening service, and he began his sermon: "Penance is a joyful matter. What are you looking at so sadly? How could I not rejoice,

³¹ Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933", 174.

³² Ibid., 175–76.

³³ Ibid., 178–179.

³⁴ See Deines, "Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines anti-semitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann", 109. The quotation is from *Deutsche Frömmigkeit* 8, 1937: "Adolf Schlatter. Ein Wort des Grußes und des Gedenkens zu seinem 85. Geburtstag am 16. August." I agree with Deines a.a.o., note 188, that there is no evidence of any correspondence between Schlatter and Grundmann, since correspondence is lacking in the archives of both Schlatter and Grundmann, Hannelore Schneider, E-mail communication, Thu, 04 Oct. 2007, and for Schlatter: Bock, *Adolf-Schlatter-Archiv*.

³⁵ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript.

³⁶ Kittel uses the same expression in his necrologue, see above.

when the right way was shown to me, on which I could reach the goal, and on which I could turn from the wrong way? That brings joy."³⁷

This seems to be classic evangelistic preaching of Schlatter's reformed Pietist kind. Schlatter could preach on grace, but also of the earnestness of sin, and here Grundmann appreciates Schlatter's message and his insistence on the joy of salvation. "Faith is fellowship with the Father, who gives us his Son," Grundmann writes.³⁸ He also tells his readers that he has made important thoughts of Schlatter his own: from Schlatter he learned that Christian faith creates joy in the heart of men. He concludes:

Much has linked me to him, and one of the great joys of my life is that his son, Theodor Schlatter, told me that his father thought highly of me and had stood up for me during the time of the *Kirchenkampf*, when I frequently faced hostility. I owe much to Adolf Schlatter; more than anyone else he opened up the Bible to me, and my own exegetical work is again and again greatly influenced by him.³⁹

The impression given is that Schlatter is a great inspirer of Grundmann, and that Grundmann shares the basic tenets of sin and forgiveness, and the joy that follows forgiveness. I would hence describe the overall picture of Grundmann in the beginning of the 1930s as that of a Lutheran Christian with a Pietist touch, who shared Schlatter's criticism of the Weimar Republic, Enlightenment, atheism and moral degeneration, but also the positive gospel message. The same is to some extent true at least in the earliest days of National Socialism; however, before long, a symbiosis developed between Christian and National Socialist, which seems incompatible with the former stance. As noted above, Schlatter was surprisingly positive to Grundmann's "Twenty-Eight Theses", and Schlatter's position during the *Kirchenkampf* does not make it impossible to believe that he may have defended Grundmann as someone attempting to engage in dialogue with the *SA-Mann*.⁴⁰ The phrasing referring to Schlatter's defence of Grundmann during the *Kirchenkampf*

³⁷ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 21.

³⁸ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 21.

³⁹ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 22: "Mich hat viel mit ihm verbunden, und es gehört zu den großen Freuden meines Lebens, daß mir sein Sohn, Theodor Schlatter, erzählte, daß sein Vater große Stücke auf mich gehalten habe und für mich in der Zeit der Kirchenkampfes eingetreten sei, als ich vielfach angefeindet wurde. Ich verdanke Adolf Schlatter viel, vor allen anderen hat er mir die Bibel aufgeschlossen, und meine eigene exegetische Arbeit geht immer wieder zu ihm in die Schule."

⁴⁰ See the discussion of Schlatter above.

is clear enough: Grundmann is grateful that he had Schlatter's support. What this means is not made explicit. According to Neuer, it should not be misunderstood as support for Grundmann personally, but for Grundmann as a representative of the 'moderate' Deutsche Christen, Schlatter's position being that the fellowship with the Deutsche Christen should not be severed.⁴¹ Several other factors indicate that Schlatter was keen not to break with the Deutsche Christen in 1933/34, but nevertheless, Grundmann definitely also sees Schlatter as supporting him personally. Although the mutual lack of correspondence gives reason to doubt that Grundmann and Schlatter had regular contact, Grundmann's seems to regard Schlatter as a theological pathfinder and a major source of inspiration.

Grundmann also talks of Kittel in positive terms, as his teacher and *Doktorvater*:

As before, I am shattered when I think about his banishment from Tübingen by the French in 1945, when the monks from Beuron gave him a home and an opportunity to work; the last lines that I exchanged with him after the breakdown came from Beuron. Only as a dying man was he allowed to return to Tübingen, to come home and be buried there. My life companion and I have many times been guests at his house in Tübingen and especially at Walchensee. Our last meeting took place in December 1942 in Vienna, filled with sombre (*düster*) thoughts in view of the German destiny and the fate of Europe.⁴²

Grundmann was a doctoral student with Kittel, as well as his close co-worker on the TDNT, and he notes that "the New Testament work with Adolf Schlatter and Gerhard Kittel had strengthened his resolve to continue in the area of New Testament research". Grundmann was also called to be Kittel's assistant,⁴³ and after completing his dissertation, he was invited by Kittel to write a commentary on James and 2 Peter. The two men kept in touch, and in 1938, Grundmann joined the SNTS, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. It seems clear that Grundmann was quite close to Schlatter and Kittel, in a personal, scholarly and theological sense. Given Kittel's membership of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur and his enrolment in the NSDAP as early as in May 1933, in the early years the young Grundmann was able to find acceptance for his political stance in this environment,

⁴¹ Werner Neuer, E-mail message to the author, 11 Nov. 2007.

⁴² LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 23.

⁴³ LKA Eisenach, typescript, 73.

having himself become a member of the NSDAP in December 1930. There is no reason to doubt that, even at this point, they had much in common theologically, as emerges from Grundmann's comments on Kittel and Schlatter, from the fact that he was trained by them, as well as from the early productions by his hand. Grundmann had a connection with Kittel from the 1920s and at least to the end of the 1930s. Roland Deines notes that his writing at the time of his dissertation, 1932, is "totally free from racist and anti-Semitic terminology", and that he includes both the Old and New Testament, and uses rabbinic sources. Deines continues:

What Grundmann represents here is a traditional salvation-historical theology, in which the controversy between Jesus and his Jewish environment is formulated with the classic vocabulary of churchly anti-Judaism, without the positive connection to the salvation history of Israel being abolished.⁴⁴

This confirms the picture that Grundmann, at the outset, shared the theology of Schlatter and Kittel.

Grundmann increasingly integrated *völkische* ideas into his theology, from small beginnings in *Gott und Nation*, published in the spring of 1933 but written in 1931, to his works after 1936/37, which emphasise a theology of creation that went well with his political development.⁴⁵ In 1933–34, this still involved resistance to Nordic influences in the theology, and his outlook was basically Lutheran with a Pietist touch, though with the addition that it was often interpreted in political terms. In his later production, however, he shows an increasing willingness to incorporate some of the syncretistic traits prevalent in Deutsche Christen circles, as well as methodology that was foreign to a more conservative stance.

Overall, as a theologian, Grundmann seems eclectic, incorporating new views into old paradigms. Moreover, in his view of the Bible, he appears to be increasingly more open to historical-critical method than during his time in Tübingen, as the discussion below will indicate. In retrospect, Grundmann comments on how his attitude changed

⁴⁴ Deines, "Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann", 91–92.

⁴⁵ See Leppin, "Gott und Nation. Wandlungen der Verhältnisbestimmung bei Grundmanns Weg vom Oberkirchenrat in Sachsen zum Lehrbeauftragten für Völkische Theologie in Jena" and Deines, "Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann", 91–92.

during the Second World War through reading Bultmann's essay on demythologisation.⁴⁶ This historical-critical work had questioned the salvation-historical thought pattern, and Grundmann had gained a new hermeneutical insight into the Bible:

When, still during the Second World War, I read the essay of Rudolf Bultmann that initiated the discussion, I immediately had the impression that here one had gone forward into the core of the problems that we are currently facing. To me, this looked like the possibility of a new frontier in the *Kirchenkampf* under the question: preaching the message to the people in the twentieth century, or furthering a tradition in a language and under presuppositions belonging to such past centuries.⁴⁷

There is no reason to doubt Grundmann's description, and it accords with his later writings. Grundmann was inspired by Bultmann in this strategic shift from the salvation-historical paradigm to a more historical-critical and existential interpretation of the Scriptures.

Grundmann 1933–1934: Völkisch Renewal of Lutheran Theology

Early on in National Socialism, Grundmann presents a vision of a symbiosis between State and Church. In the book *Totale Kirche im totalen Staat*, written in the autumn of 1933,⁴⁸ he sets about discussing the relationship between “the Total State of Adolf Hitler”—which Grundmann wholeheartedly welcomes—and the German Protestant Church (Deutsche Evangelische Kirche).⁴⁹ Compared to the Bismarck state, which to Grundmann ended only in 1933, Hitler's state is the Total State, putting a total claim on the people. Giving his consent, Grundmann presents the totalitarian demands on the people, including the lack of freedom for the press, the end of equality for all, the racial legislation, etc. The New German Man is he who enters the *Völksgemeinschaft* (community of the people). And it is necessary: *Deutschland* is in a total crisis, where all powers must unite. Moreover, the Total State

⁴⁶ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 84.

⁴⁷ LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript, 84.

⁴⁸ Grundmann, *Totale Kirche im Totalen Staat. Mit einem Geleitwort von Landesbischof F. Coch*. The preface is dated late autumn (*Nebelung*) 1933.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 8. The English reader should note that the English term ‘evangelical’ and the German *evangelisch* denote different things. Whereas *evangelisch* means Protestant in general, including all facets of Protestantism, from confessional to liberal, ‘evangelical’ often stands for conservative and revivalist Protestantism.

has something of the Reformation's view of the State.⁵⁰ Whereas the Weimar state regarded religion as a private concern—which, according to Grundmann, led to its destruction—in the Total State, religion is a concern of the *Volk*. Hence a national religion and a national Church are inevitable, with blood and race being fundamental.⁵¹ Because racial biology and racial hygiene secure the race, a national religion must be placed on a racial foundation. Grundmann envisions a total symbiosis between people and Church, not for the Church to be positioned beside the State (the liberal solution), nor opposite to it (the solution of dialectical theology), nor above it (the Catholic way), nor under it (a state church governed by the State). Grundmann's alternative is the Total Church in, and in symbiosis with, the Total State: the German people as God's people.⁵² Adam describes Grundmann as seeing a complementary relationship between National Socialist ideology and Christianity.⁵³ God said, "Let there be a *Volk*," and there was a *Volk*; similarly, the Deutsche Christen struggle for the creation of a Church among the people, a *Völkiskirche*.⁵⁴ Here Grundmann chooses a strategy that is quite different from the Lutheran two-kingdom model, which was prevalent in analyses of the relationship between Church and State in the Confessing Church, and he in no way problematises this symbiosis. However, as noted, Schlatter's thought contains a theology of creation that goes further in sanctioning the actions of the State.⁵⁵

But how does this symbiosis affect the Christian religion? Here Grundmann admits that Christianity has not developed out of the German people. There is only one gospel, that of Jesus Christ, and Christianity goes beyond race and culture. According to Grundmann, the Christian proclamation is not religion, which is only a racially and culturally conditioned quest for the eternal; it is an *answer* emanating

⁵⁰ Ibid., 12–18.

⁵¹ Ibid., 19–21.

⁵² Ibid., 22–25.

⁵³ Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Völkiskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933", 173.

⁵⁴ Grundmann, *Totale Kirche im Totalen Staat. Mit einem Geleitwort von Landesbischof F. Coch*, 25.

⁵⁵ It is interesting to compare Grundmann's discussion here to that of Schlatter in Schlatter, *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*. Although Schlatter would not accept all of Grundmann's discussion, there are certain affinities, e.g. in this fairly close relationship between Total Church and Total State. The wording is partly also the same.

from beyond the boundaries of human life, a message about Christ. He is the Word of the living God, the image of the living God.

Jesus is neither Jewish nor Aryan, Grundmann contends, dehistoricising him. Speaking of the gospel in the existing situation, it is probably imperative for Grundmann to disconnect Jesus from his biological descent and make him relevant to the Germans under National Socialist rule. Jesus Christ is thus not conditioned by being Jewish or Aryan—he comes from beyond (*jenseits*) and is a miraculous new creation. Needing to find a formula for Christ's being that 'rescues' him from being Jewish, this is Grundmann's solution. Hence Grundmann also turns against a liberal theological picture of Jesus, making him a mere moral preacher or hero of virtues, since he as a human would belong to a specific race. But because he is a miraculous new creation by the living God, "we as German people cannot do without him".⁵⁶ He is foreign to race and kind inasmuch as he is foreign to humanity—here Grundmann in fact constructs an 'Apollinarian' Christology, to avoid anchoring Jesus in race and *Volk*. Faith in Jesus is therefore not destruction of race, but perfection of it.

To Grundmann, the Total Church in the Total State is a truly Lutheran project. German Christianity has found its true character in Martin Luther, Grundmann contends, and for it to become a *Völkreligion*, he wants to see an elaboration of this German Christianity with a Lutheran character.⁵⁷ Grundmann envisions a Church that proclaims the message of Christ and gathers the believers into a fellowship. This is where the people approaches its perfection, and it is also an "order for the life of the *Völk*".⁵⁸ In line with Luther, Grundmann sees it as the mission of the Church to preach Law and Gospel. The obligation to obey the Total State is legitimised through the Law, and when the Total State places its demands on men, "this is part of the Law", Grundmann argues. Using the Lutheran term, Grundmann later refers to this as the *usus politicus* of the Law. Here the interpretation of the Total State as the implementation of the *usus politicus* becomes strong legitimisation for the new state. The word *politicus* in Luther's *usus politicus* is thus politicised by Grundmann, with a new twist that fits the existing political agenda.

⁵⁶ Grundmann, *Totale Kirche im Totalen Staat. Mit einem Geleitwort von Landesbischof F. Coch*, 29.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 34.

Through the preaching of the Law, the people receive knowledge of guilt—but this, too, is politicised by Grundmann, who links it to Adolf Hitler. A person wanting to fulfil the demand and categorical imperative of the Total State sees that he stands guilty, as Adolf Hitler has expressed it: “You are nothing, your people is everything.” The answer to this is the gospel of Jesus Christ as the deliverer from demonic powers of guilt and death. Even the sacrifice of Jesus has parallels in German history, and once again, Grundmann’s symbiosis between gospel and politics is evident. Just as the new Germany arose out of the sacrifice of the war, the sacrifice of Jesus opens up the possibility of an eternal life.⁵⁹ Out of this, Grundmann envisions an eternal Germany, not in historical terms, but one that has its realisation in Christ-believing Germans. Thus Grundmann insists on a basically traditional Protestant position with regard to the gospel and eternity, although he attempts to link this to the vision of the Total State.

In the discussion above, Grundmann tries to defend the place of Christianity and the Church in the Total State, but not only from a distant apologetic perspective. He aims at a symbiosis, yet without giving up the essentials of Lutheran soteriology. Two things are of interest to this investigation of how Grundmann relates to the Jews. Firstly, there is the symbiosis with the racial state of Germany, where at the time of publication, the Aryan paragraph had been implemented. By wholeheartedly assenting to the State and its divine legitimation, the Jews are effectively excluded. Grundmann also supports racial biology and racial hygiene, securing the race, and holds that a national religion must be placed on a racial foundation. Secondly, Grundmann elevates Jesus over history and over the Jewish and Aryan races, in order to rescue Christianity from the criticism that it is Jewish. Moreover, when the Law in Grundmann’s politicised sense becomes synonymous with the *usus politicus*, he leaves the traditional Lutheran understanding of Church and State, while giving the demand to obey the legislation of the new Reich divine authority. To disobey, then, is not only to disobey the State, but to disobey God, which of course also applies to how the State treats the Jews.

Race is a divine order in the *völkisch* state, and Grundmann makes much of the *German* character of German Christianity, calling it a

⁵⁹ Ibid., 39–40.

Christianity of Luther. The Reformation is a *völkisch* concern: in Luther, German religion experienced its breakthrough. This Christianity takes Jesus Christ and God, who is over us, seriously, and it also sees people and race as divine gifts and orders.⁶⁰ Luther's work was stopped by the Counter-Reformation, liberalism and orthodoxy, but through Hitler, the German people has become a reality. And only as a Lutheran Christian Church is "the Total Church in the Total State" possible.⁶¹ It is easy to see the various frontiers against which Grundmann considers himself forced to preach this message: both the *völkisch* theologians, who wanted to replace the Christian faith with a Germanic one, and groups that were closer to a traditional Lutheran theology.

The same thinking permeates Grundmann's perhaps most influential work, at least at the start of National Socialism: "Twenty-Eight Theses of the Saxon People's Church", which was predominantly worded by Grundmann. This became an important confessional document that, among other things, determined the Deutsche Christen's views on the Old Testament, the Jews and whether Jesus was Aryan.

The background is the so-called Sports Palace Rally on 13 November 1933, which gathered 20,000 people in the Berlin arena and is the best-known single event in the history of the Deutsche Christen. It was here that the *Studienrat* Dr Reinhold Krause, leader of the Berlin Deutsche Christen, presented his views that the Old Testament should be removed from the Christian canon and that the notion of original sin should be abandoned, as should the cross as a symbol of atonement. He also argued that Jesus was not Jewish, and criticised the apostle Paul.⁶² This led to the public resignation of prominent members, such as Gerhard Kittel, Heinrich Bornkamm and Friedrich Gogarten, from the movement. Apart from these people leaving, the entire movement experienced a crisis, which Doris Bergen calls a fragmentation—"the movement's central organisation lay in shambles". This gave the Saxon, and later, Thuringian, Deutsche Christen a leadership role, the Saxon

⁶⁰ Ibid., 78–79.

⁶¹ Ibid., 79.

⁶² Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life", 588; Bergen, "Storm Troopers of Christ. The German Christian Movement and the Ecclesiastical Final Solution", 43–44.

leadership having suggested that the Saxon course should become the course of the Deutsche Evangelische Kirche.⁶³

Grundmann, being the author of the theses, in effect became a leading ideologist of the entire movement. According to him, the so-called Saxon course that is found in his theses stands for the Saxon Reformation heritage, people who wish to be “fully *evangelisch*-Lutheran Christians, and fully National Socialist German”.⁶⁴ Grundmann’s argument in *Totale Kirche* is recognisable in his commentary on the theses, the first thesis being almost identical to Grundmann’s text in *Totale Kirche*.⁶⁵ The commentary is thoroughly permeated by *völkisch*-racial ideology, putting the Church on a firm racial foundation. This affects the situation of the Jews; only racial Germans can be members and officials of the Church.⁶⁶ In the theses as a whole, Grundmann tries to unite a racially and *Volk*-oriented message with a Protestant gospel of Jesus Christ: God is Lord and Father; God reveals himself in Jesus Christ; and we humans only find the way to the Father through Jesus.⁶⁷ This theological stance is interesting in the midst of a racialised theology. However, here I will comment only on issues pertaining to Jews and Judaism.

The view of the Old Testament and the entire Bible was critical to the future of the Deutsche Christen, and here Grundmann takes a stand for the Bible against those who criticised it for being Jewish. The Church has its unchangeable foundation, also in the ‘Third Reich’, Grundmann maintains,⁶⁸ and the New Testament is normative for all preaching. Paul’s teaching cannot be called Jewish, since Judaism is overcome by Paul. The Old Testament, however, does not have the same value, and merely serves as an example of the sins and downfall of a nation, testifying to the curse that is still on the Jews. Nevertheless, even in 1934, Grundmann is able to speak of the Old Testament

⁶³ Saxon: Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, 4–5; Thuringian: Bergen, “Storm Troopers of Christ. The German Christian Movement and the Ecclesiastical Final Solution”, 44.

⁶⁴ Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, 4.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 9; Grundmann, *Totale Kirche im Totalen Staat. Mit einem Geleitwort von Landesbischof F. Coch*, 22–24.

⁶⁶ Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, 14.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 30.

as containing “a piece of revelation”.⁶⁹ Moreover, the Old Testament contains “the first rays of divine love”.⁷⁰ Here he tries to take a middle road as regards the Old Testament—not rejected altogether, but still radically downgraded. The rationale behind this de facto rejection of the Old Testament is solely the racial question: in order to ‘rescue’ Christianity in *völkisch* circles, the Old Testament must be done away with, and Paul’s teaching must be classified as non-Jewish. Here there is a point of contention between Kittel and Grundmann, Kittel defending the Old Testament at any price, whereas Grundmann is willing to, in practice, sacrifice the Old Testament.

To sum up, in this early period, Grundmann maintains a Lutheran outlook, although it is interwoven with a *völkisch*-racial thinking. He clearly sides against any influence from Nordic-Germanic religion, and endeavours to keep this theology intact, at the same time as he envisions a symbiosis between Total State and Total Church. Furthermore, Grundmann vindicates the New Testament as a foundation that cannot be changed, but places the Old Testament on a secondary level, due to its connection with the Jewish people.

*Grundmann 1938: Germanentum and Christianity against the
Jewish Myth*

Grundmann’s commitment to the racial state and thus against the place of the Jews would grow even stronger. In the texts from 1933–34, he endeavours to secure a place for classic Protestant faith by stating that Jesus Christ is not rooted in any specific people, that he is beyond race and *Volk*, even though Grundmann wholeheartedly accepts *völkisch*-racial ideology. A shift has occurred in his text in *Germanenchristentum*, 1938, Walter Sängers study on how Germanic traits are found in the art and architecture of the German church,⁷¹ where Grundmann writes

⁶⁹ Adam, “Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933”, 184.

⁷⁰ Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, 32–33.

⁷¹ For *Germanentum* as an ideology and its role in Grundmann’s work at the Institute, and particularly in cooperation with Nordic scholars and churchmen, see my Gerdmar, “Ein germanischer Jesus auf schwedischem Boden: schwedisch-deutsche Forschungszusammenarbeit mit rassistischen Vorzeichen 1941–1945”.

the “Foundational introduction”, *Mythos und Frohbotschaft* (“Myth and Good News”).⁷²

Here it is evident that Grundmann’s *völkisch*-racial view has developed into giving the Germanic more space. Grundmann highly treasures this shift in world-view, writing, “With the *völkisch*-racial view of the world, a new foundation for all areas of life has been given, and it has given the beholding people a new outlook, which helps them see reality in a new and deeper way.”⁷³ According to Grundmann, the Germanic-German myth lives

in the Germanic mythology, in the buildings of the Middle Age cathedral, in the political idea of the Reich, in the art of Albrecht Dürer, in the reformational exploit of Martin Luther, in the art of Goethe, in the music of Beethoven and in the world-view of National Socialism. It thus realises itself as religion, art, politics, as an idea in world-view, and philosophy.⁷⁴

A cultural-racial thinking is fundamental to this analysis, and Grundmann makes a synthesis of a range of things, the common denominator being the Germanic, thus taking a step further, towards a deeper synthesis between myth and Christianity. Whereas Church and State were in symbiosis in his 1934 publications, now there is also a symbiosis between Germanic and Christian. He begins with a racial-anthropological view: just as a human of a certain race has a certain body stature, skull, etc., so every kind of human has a certain religious essence. At this point, Grundmann has taken his racial world-view so far that Jews and Judaism must be regarded as completely alien.

Grundmann paints a picture of a struggle to free the country from foreign myths, i.e. Judaism. The shaping of religion, and

the religious struggle in the German sphere after the encounter with Christianity is a question of a right to life and of the vitality of the myth that was given to us from the outset. It *stands up to defend against a foreign*

⁷² Walter Sängner, *Germanenchristentum. Der Halberstädter Dom und seine Bildwerke als Zeugnisse deutscher Frömmigkeit. Mit einer grundsätzlichen Einleitung: Mythos und Frohbotschaft von Dr Walter Grundmann*, Jena, vol. 2, Studien zu deutscher Theologie und Frömmigkeit (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938).

⁷³ Walter Grundmann, “Mythos und Frohbotschaft”, in *Germanenchristentum. Der Halberstädter Dom und seine Bildwerke als Zeugnisse deutscher Frömmigkeit. Mit einer grundsätzlichen Einleitung: Mythos und Frohbotschaft von Dr Walter Grundmann*, Jena, Studien zu deutscher Theologie und Frömmigkeit (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938), 7.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 8.

myth that, connected to Christianity, grasps at the German life (*nach dem deutschen Leben griff*).⁷⁵

Whereas Grundmann had previously endeavoured to rescue a Lutheran identity in the ‘Third Reich’, now the struggle has changed. The “question of a right to life” is now not one of Protestantism per se, but of the “myth that was given to us at the outset”. Grundmann regards this as a German ideology and culture that later synthesises with Lutheranism and National Socialism. Judaism or Old Testament religion is the foreign myth that forced its way into the German *Lebensraum* (‘living space’).

Grundmann describes how the Old Testament myth of the Fall and of Abraham being elected as the bearer of salvation to the world made its way into Germanic culture, together with Christianity. The Old Testament became the standard, shaping the Church, which was permeated by this Old Testament spirit and the Israelite myth.⁷⁶ Yahweh is described as an Israelite national god, a mythical entity just like other gods. Here Grundmann depreciates the Old Testament in a way that he did not do in 1934, when the Old Testament still included a preparation for what would happen in Christ. In 1934, Grundmann stated that one should not throw the baby out with the bath water, that is, reject the entire Old Testament just because there is a line that depicts Judaism as being under the curse.⁷⁷

To Grundmann, it is a matter of urgency to free Germany from the Jewish foreign myth. It is important to understand the opposition between the Germanic and the foreign myth, and to develop an alternative. This should attempt to incorporate the kernel of the Christianity that can appeal to the German people, implying that the foreign myth cannot do so. Believing that there is a connection between Christianity and Germanic-German mythos, Grundmann seeks out men who combined the two,⁷⁸ giving as examples Gottschalk, Luther, Eckhart, Böhme, Hamann, Fichte and Chamberlain.⁷⁹ This rather surprising combination of figures comprises prominent German personages, who have little in common but can be used in various ways to legitimise Grundmann’s philosophy. The purpose is to see an encounter between the genuine

⁷⁵ Ibid., 9, emphasis mine.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 10.

⁷⁷ Grundmann, *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, 33–35.

⁷⁸ Grundmann, “Mythos und Frohbotschaft”, 9.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 9.

Christian kernel beyond its connection with the Old Testament, and the Germanic-German mythos, “a struggle for a true encounter between the myth specific to our kind (*arteigen*) and this kernel”.⁸⁰

Having disconnected Christianity from its historical background and the ‘Old Testament myth’, Grundmann turns his interest to the Nordic-Germanic myths from the Edda—about the Yggdrasil ash tree, the Urd well, the struggle between the dragons, and the hope of the returning Balder—without ceremony replacing the Old Testament narrative with the Nordic myth. He then proceeds to take Germanic myths of the *Treuga Dei*, Parcival and the Graal, and a selection of Nordic myths, into his theology and the heart of religion, in a way that is quite different from in 1934. Grundmann receives the myth, still trying to create space for a Lutheran kernel—faith, the message of the cross, sonship to God, and the kingdom of God—but joined with the political Reich. The last question is whether the kernel of Christianity itself comes from a specific myth, but according to Grundmann, the Christ event does not originate in any *völkisch* history but is an *Urgeschehen*, a primeval course of events. This strategy is not too different from when Grundmann earlier placed Jesus above history, to be able to see him as being beyond his Jewish background, for example.

Thus, in this short but programmatic text, Grundmann develops a highly eclectic synthesis of Protestant Christianity in a revised version, now without any connection to Judaism/Old Testament. The race-political context surfaces at the end:

When the Germans today stand in defence against Bolshevism [...], when they stand in the struggle for hereditary soundness and uprightness of life, *the Reich has really come among them*, and its ruler is the Führer.⁸¹

The fight against Bolshevism and for “hereditary soundness and uprightness of life” is a sign that “the Reich has really come among them”, Grundmann says. This choice of words, linked to gospel sayings with the same wording, lends divine authorisation to the National Socialist rule, to Hitler, and to the racist project of attaining “hereditary soundness”, purifying the blood of the German people, according to the Nuremberg Laws. This piece of theology shows a Grundmann who has cut the ties to Lutheran theology, merging reminiscences of it with a variety of Germanic myths. The only thing that cannot be combined

⁸⁰ Ibid., 10.

⁸¹ Ibid., 11–12, emphasis mine.

with the gospel is the Jewish roots and the Old Testament. Similar ideas were presented in his article “Das apokalyptische Geschichtsbild und das deutsche Geschichtsdenken” (“The Apocalyptic View of History and the German Idea of History”), published in 1942.⁸² Here Grundmann endeavours to construct a German view of history with elements from Luther, old Nordic mythology and National Socialist theory of history.⁸³ *Fazit* (the conclusion) is this: the prehistory of the Germans lies not in the Orient, but in “its own Nordic-Germanic past with its moral-religious values”.⁸⁴

Dejudaisation as a Task of German Theology and Church

Dejudaisation was the goal of the Institute, and in Grundmann’s speech at its inauguration, he expresses similar ideas as in the articles discussed above. Grundmann majors on Martin Luther and the Reformation, the speech being held at Wartburg because the dejudaisation was seen as a new reformation.⁸⁵ The subject of Jews and Judaism is introduced when Grundmann comes to the philosopher Johan Gottlieb Fichte. He argues that Fichte pioneered a *völkisch* outlook, criticising the French Revolution, while envisioning a key role for the German people, “the *Urvolk* in the heart of Europe”.⁸⁶ This German renewal would take place in opposition to the Jewish people, who were the beneficiaries of the French revolution. As Judaism came out of the ghetto, it became the foremost bearer of the ideas of the revolution, wanting to gain world rulership, as is achieved in Bolshevism.⁸⁷ The German people, Grundmann argues, has as its task to fight against the Jews.

⁸² Walter Grundmann, “Das apokalyptische Geschichtsbild und das deutsche Geschichtsdenken”, in *Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses. Sitzungsberichte der zweiten Arbeitstagung des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben vom 3. bis 5. März in Eisenach*, ed. Walter Grundmann, *Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben* (Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1942).

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 99–102; the other *passim*.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁸⁵ This is also evident from the preface to the dejudaised Bible produced by the Institute, *Die Botschaft Gottes*.

⁸⁶ Grundmann, *Die Entjudung des religiösen Lebens als Aufgabe deutscher Theologie und Kirche. Vortrag von Prof. Dr. W. Grundmann gehalten bei der feierlichen Eröffnungssitzung des “Instituts zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben” in Eisenach*, 8–9.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

This opposition to the Jews reaches into all areas of German life, including religious life, and studying and eliminating its influence is critical to the German situation, Grundmann writes. This includes delivering the Bible from elements that give offence, and regaining the foundational truth. Grundmann regards this as a reformative task,⁸⁸ pertaining also to the Old Testament. Just as in the Lutheran Reformation, a reconsideration of Scripture is necessary. It involves challenging the reformative view of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God, but also appreciating the historical-critical work about the reasons behind various texts, different layers in the texts, etc. To Grundmann, the historical-critical work with the Bible has opened the way to a new understanding of Jesus—it is clear that he has reoriented himself even in the area of biblical criticism, compared to his Tübingen background. Dealing with the Jewish dimensions in the Bible is important, he contends, and the *völkisch* breakthrough turns the spotlight on what is Jewish in the Old Testament and in parts of the New Testament, things that obstruct the access to the Scriptures for many Germans.⁸⁹ In contrast to Kittel's apologetic agenda of rescuing the Old Testament from Deutsche Christen who wanted to remove it, Grundmann's apologetic agenda is to remove what is Jewish in the Old and New Testaments in order to win Germans.

Grundmann contends that one must let go of "old self-evident things", for example the salvation-historical connection between Abraham and Christ, which is a mere construction by early Christianity. *Such (Jewish) salvation history must be replaced by a German salvation history: how God has worked in the German people.* Secondly, the thought that the Church is the true Israel and that it has a monopoly on divine salvation must be done away with.⁹⁰

To meet these needs, Grundmann finally sketches the practical tasks of the Institute, e.g. a New Testament that uncovers the oldest traditions and is freed of later changes, as well as a renewal of cult, hymns, liturgy and canon law, and informative material to show the German public that Christianity is not a continuation and perfection of Judaism. There are also scholarly tasks, e.g. to clarify the relationship between Jesus and Judaism, and to investigate the demographic situation in Palestine at

⁸⁸ Ibid., 10.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 11.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 15–16.

the time of Jesus.⁹¹ As is evident from Grundmann's research of Jesus of Galilee, the purpose was to show that Jesus was not Jewish.

The envisioned strategy goes to the heart of German theology and church life: there needs to be a new understanding of Scripture, and in fact a text that, using literary criticism, uncovers the oldest material. Such a dominant concept as a salvation history based on the Old Testament needs to be replaced by one based on German 'prehistory'.

Grundmann's Exegetical Work and the Jews, 1938–1945

This background to Grundmann's thought helps in understanding the way that his theological and political concerns were implemented in his own exegetical practice. Although Grundmann wrote extensively on a range of issues, theological, practical and cultural,⁹² he was an exegete by profession, having started out in the tradition of Gerhard Kittel and Adolf Schlatter.⁹³ However, in his later work, Grundmann's exegetical methodology changes into more of a historical criticism, e.g. literary criticism.

The methodological line from Schlatter and Kittel is evidenced in the article "Gesetz, Gerechtfertigung und Mystik bei Paulus" ("Law, Justification and Mysticism in Paul"). Although written earlier, it was

⁹¹ Ibid., 17–19.

⁹² Grundmann also published a book, Walter Grundmann, ed. *Das religiöse Gesicht des Judentums. Entstehung und Art*, Beiheft zu Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben (Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1942), which is primarily a summary of the research carried out at the new National Socialist research institutes: *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, and publications from his own Eisenach institute and the NSDAP Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage. The first part of the book includes "Hebräer, Israeliten, Juden. Zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Judentums" by Karl Friedrich Euler, and the second part, Grundmann's "Die geistige und religiöse Art des Judentums".

⁹³ Schenk, "Der Jenaer Jesus. Zu werk und Wirkung des völkischen Theologen Walter Grundmann und seiner Kollegen", 171; Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933", 186. Unfortunately Schenk does not substantiate his claim that Grundmann corresponded with Schlatter until the latter's death. For Grundmann's comments on Schlatter, see Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 605. Neuer rightly denies that there was any correspondence between Schlatter and Grundmann, since there are no such letters in Schlatter's literary remains, Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*, 729, n. 221. Grundmann does not mention any correspondence when writing about Schlatter in his autobiographical notes.

published in *ZNW* in 1933.⁹⁴ The article discusses the subject with rich evidence from rabbinic sources, in the same vein as Schlatter or Kittel. Here Grundmann says that Paul agrees with rabbinic theology,⁹⁵ although he distinguishes it from the Jewish view of “Torah as [...] guarantee of salvation”. With Paul’s view of the Law as that which brings the dominion of sin and death, “the division from Judaism is total”.⁹⁶ However, in this, Grundmann does not differ from scholarship at large, at least before the new perspective on Paul was introduced, but he fits in well with the other Tübingen exegetes; both Schlatter and Kittel are able to say the same thing.

On the Jews in John: “The Struggle Against the Jews is Everywhere”

Grundmann’s article “Das Heil kommt von den Juden” was published in *Deutsche Frömmigkeit* in 1938. In it, he argues that the view on Judaism’s role in Christianity is a “fateful question to the Christians of the German nation”.⁹⁷ In a political context, Grundmann’s exegesis touches not only on academic or spiritual aspects of Jews and Judaism, but also on the concrete situation of Jews and Germans. There is a struggle for existence (*Existenzkampf*) against the Jews and their intrigues to destroy the nation, both in domestic and foreign politics, he argues. Hence German Christianity must deal with the statement that “salvation comes from the Jews”. In his discussion of it, Grundmann unveils his view of the Jews. The Johannine view of the Jews in Grundmann’s interpretation immediately becomes politically relevant, as purported New Testament views of Jews are linked to the German Jewish policy of the 1930s.

In Grundmann’s discussion, the entire Fourth Gospel is constructed as a polemic against Judaism. Even if it were correct that the Fourth Gospel contains polemic against Jews qua Jews, this overemphasis is the result of Grundmann’s political interests. To him, Jesus’ dispute with Judaism is presented in chapters 2–4, and this conflict becomes a full-blown one in chapters 5–10, with the “exodus of Jesus from Judaism”.

⁹⁴ Walter Grundmann, “Gesetz, Gerechtfertigung und Mystik bei Paulus. Zum Problem der Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Verkündigung”, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1933).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁹⁷ Grundmann, “‘Das Heil kommt von den Juden?’ Eine Schicksalsfrage an die Christen deutscher Nation”.

The relationship with Judaism is also the historical reason for his death, as told in chapters 11–20.⁹⁸

Central to his argument are those passages that are problematic from his point of view, especially chapter four. The woman at Jacob's well "holds Jesus to be a Jew" (*Die Frau hält Jesus für einen Juden*, my emphasis), whereas the text (4:9) says, "How can you, although being a Jew (πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν κτλ) [...]." Instead of assenting to it, Jesus says that he is the living water, Grundmann argues. This self-presentation of Jesus separates him from Judaism and puts him in contrast to the Old Testament. Moreover, the Jews are the "so-called" chosen people, and the fact that he reveals himself among the Samaritans shows that he estranges himself from Judaism. Thus Grundmann takes every opportunity to dissociate Jesus from Judaism.

In the detailed analysis, chapters 2–4 are interpreted in the same vein. At the wedding in Cana in Galilee, the purity system of the Jews is replaced by the perfected worship brought by Jesus. Moreover, the confrontation between Jesus and the learned Jewish figure Nicodemus demonstrates that even a Jewish scholar had no understanding of the new things that Jesus came to inaugurate! As for the encounter with the Samaritan woman, Grundmann makes it a point that "the Jewish ground is left behind, but the Samaritan is fit to bring forth the revelation of the new", and Jesus' return to Judaea will bring the fundamental confrontation with Judaism.⁹⁹ To Grundmann, chapter four shows the replacement of Jewish worship with the new, although he neglects to mention that the new also replaces Samaritan worship. That is, *all* earlier worship is replaced by worship in spirit and in truth. Hence Grundmann's all-pervading controversy with Judaism goes beyond what can be based on the Johannine text. The discourse with the Samaritan woman is also interpreted with a bias against anything Jewish. When the woman says that she knows that a Messiah will come, Grundmann argues that this is not the Jewish Messiah, but a Messiah understood in Samaritan terms.

Naturally the main challenge to Grundmann's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel as being hostile to Jews is verse 22b. If Jesus is confessing

⁹⁸ Here Grundmann builds on Emanuel Hirsch, *Das vierte Evangelium in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt verdeutscht und erklärt* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936), 252–254.

⁹⁹ Grundmann, "‘Das Heil kommt von den Juden?’ Eine Schicksalsfrage an die Christen deutscher Nation", 4.

to a prerogative of Israel here, that salvation comes from the Jews, Grundmann's overall interpretation of the chapter, as well as of the entire Fourth Gospel, falls. With Bultmann's new commentary, however, Grundmann is able to see this as a gloss.¹⁰⁰ To Grundmann, the meaning of Ἰουδαῖοι in John's gospel is precise: it is "the description of those who reject the claim to the dominion of Jesus".¹⁰¹ Grundmann thus stipulates that Ἰουδαῖοι is strongly negative in John and uses this as an argument for verse 22 being a gloss. According to Grundmann, the gloss emanates from the author of the Apocalypse, who favours Jews in Rev. 2:9 and 3:9.

In Grundmann's overall interpretation, Jesus can only be understood on the basis of his opposition to the Jews. The conflict between Hebrews and Hellenists, as well as the first martyr, the Hellenist Stephen, a victim of this struggle, was also related to this. "This struggle is everywhere," Grundmann claims.¹⁰² Paul, too, had the choice between a Jewish sect and a new religion, choosing the latter. Grundmann contends that texts in the Synoptics, Acts, etc., in addition to John 4:22, are to be understood as counter-reactions in Jesus' conflict with the Jewish groups that were threatening to take over.

Grundmann's exegesis goes further than the exegetical guild, putting his exegesis within the framework of the National Socialist *Weltanschauung* (world-view). He explains the background to his exegesis:

The National Socialist world-view (*Weltanschauung*), at the centre of which is the conception of race, leads to a productive new impulse also in this area of the life of piety and scholarly work.¹⁰³

According to Grundmann's interpretive framework in the National Socialist world-view, Ἰουδαῖοι is inherently negative. Quoting Luther, he finally opts for an eradication of "all Jewish dirt from the holy old Bible". Grundmann's reception of the Johannine text is overtly racist, with a focus on the Jews and Judaism that does not correspond to the Johannine focus. The Ἰουδαῖοι is not only a foreign religion or people,

¹⁰⁰ Grundmann may have had access to the print proofs, since the publication happened as late as in 1941.

¹⁰¹ This he says with reference to the article in TDNT III, s.v. Ἰσραήλ, although the article as a whole says that Ἰουδαῖοι has no consistently negative meaning in John, a conclusion that Grundmann denies.

¹⁰² Grundmann, "Das Heil kommt von den Juden?" Eine Schicksalsfrage an die Christen deutscher Nation", 6–7.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 7, my emphasis.

but it is even a foreign and lower-standing race, whose influence must be fought and permanently eradicated. Apart from being a political enemy, Grundmann gives the Jews an almost supernatural role, demonising and describing them as a main threat to humanity. Hence Jesus did not come to fight satanic powers, but he came to fight Judaism—a theme that would recur in his book *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*. This book includes an appendix on John 4:22.¹⁰⁴

The Jews and the Sermon on the Mount

The peak of Grundmann's career was his inauguration address as professor of New Testament theology at the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena on 11 February 1939.¹⁰⁵ The topic chosen is a classic one, and compared to many other productions by Grundmann from the same time, it does not contain a strongly accentuated Deutsche Christen theology. This proves that Grundmann is able to play by the rules of the exegetical guild. Nevertheless, his dejudaisation programme is still present.

According to tradition, the sermon is given in two forms, that of Matthew and that of Luke, and in a brief redaction-critical analysis, Grundmann establishes that Matthew contains traces of ecclesiastical redaction.¹⁰⁶ Whereas Luke provides us with an older stage of the tradition of the Lord's Prayer, Matthew knows Luke's version but has in his secondary version included typical elements of the Church.¹⁰⁷ Grundmann's purpose is to show that when looking for the original form, we are left with Luke's gospel, since the Matthean tradition depicts Jesus as a second Moses. Grundmann's agenda, in his search for the original sermon, is to evade the Jewish-Christian Matthew. Incidentally, the antitheses that Jesus utters in Matthew 5 are not directed against the Old Testament (which would have been expressed "it is written"), but against the 'old', that is, the scribes. In contrast, Luke does not know of the antitheses, nor of the introduction to the speech, which presents Jesus as a new Moses. This is a "creation of the author, belonging to the

¹⁰⁴ Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, 224–231.

¹⁰⁵ Walter Grundmann, *Die Frage der ältesten Gestalt und des ursprünglichen Sinnes der Bergrede Jesu*, vol. 10, Schriften zur Nationalkirche (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1939).

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 8.

Jewish-Christian church of Jerusalem, who [...] presented the picture of Jesus according to the Jewish expectations and needs”.¹⁰⁸

Luke’s entire version is not original either, however: the woes against the rich “must be put in brackets”, although Grundmann does not substantiate that claim. The other part that Grundmann wants to omit is that which begins with “judge not” and ends with the logion about the “beam that is in thine own eye”. Grundmann argues that religio-historical comparison reveals that this is also in Palestinian Jewish tradition, which is why it must stem from the doctrinal development in the Palestinian church and should be left out of consideration. Here Grundmann refers to Bußmann’s *Synoptische Studien* II, 1929. Thus, having singled out the oldest reachable tradition (Luke 6:20–23, 27–36, 43–49), Grundmann studies this portion, which he regards as the original Sermon on the Mount.

The interpretation of the text builds on Grundmann’s analysis of history and religion in Palestine, particularly Galilee. In Palestinian life, there was a sharp opposition between the Pharisees and the so-called *am-ha-aretz*, who were knowledgeable in the Law—but regarded by the Pharisees as ignorant of it—and did not agree with the Pharisaic interpretation.¹⁰⁹ Grundmann backs this up with TB Baba Batra 8a, Aboth 2,5, Midr to Sam §9, TB Keth 111b. From the tractate Demai 2,3 (Seder Zeraim), he concludes that the Pharisees boycotted the *am-ha-aretz* financially and socially. In other words, there was a strong hate on the part of the Pharisees towards the *am-ha-aretz*, which is what Grundmann intends to demonstrate. In addition to this conflict, there was an opposition between Galilee and Judaea, “an opposition of *völkisch* character”. Since the Pharisees were connected to Judaea and the *am-ha-aretz* to Galilee, there was a double opposition.

Now Grundmann is able to form the background to the Sermon on the Mount in its original wording.¹¹⁰ Jesus sides with the *am-ha-aretz*, which to Grundmann is evidenced by the fact that the first of Jesus’ woes is a typical criticism of the Pharisees by the *am-ha-aretz*. In the sermon, he begins by addressing the same group: “Blessed are the poor, for yours is the kingdom of God” (Luke 6:20). Grundmann’s description of their counterpart, the Pharisees, is charged with prejudice:

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 8.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 10.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 12–13.

Whereas the Pharisaic Jew [*Jew* is a word that Grundmann does not use for the *am-ha-aretz*, A.G.] considers wealth and fortune to be a blessing from God, the interest of the capital that he has earned by fulfilling the Law, as a Jew would say, which is accumulated and stored up for him in heaven, and whereas he considered suffering to be a punishment from God, Jesus has a completely different assessment.¹¹¹

In passing, Grundmann comments on contemporary politics and pacifism. Quoting Jesus as saying, “Love your enemies,” he stresses that Jesus does not forbid “great and necessary fighting conflicts between nations”. What Jesus says cannot be used to support pacifism, nor does Jesus speak as a tenderhearted person or as someone without honour. Grundmann’s words are spoken in a Germany that had already occupied Sudeten Germany on 1 October 1938, and although the war with Poland had not begun at the time of writing (1 September 1939) Germany was on the brink of it.

To establish the distance between Jesus and Judaism, Grundmann stresses several times that what Jesus says has no connection to Judaism, and that Jesus in no way fulfils their expectations of a Messiah—this is why they “rejected him on the cross”.¹¹² However, the central message of the sermon is not the relationship to the Jews, but the message of sonship to God, the proclamation of the immediate relationship with God, which Jesus represents.¹¹³

This speech firstly demonstrates Grundmann’s command of exegetical tools, as he uses literary criticism to uncover the original wording of the text and deals with Rabbinica. Although Grundmann continues the traditions from his teachers Kittel and Schlatter, he works in a more radical historical-critical way than they do. This is not the Grundmann of the many pamphlets, but the professional exegete—by this time, Grundmann was a member of the leading international organisation for exegetes, SNTS, along with Kittel and a few other Germans. Nevertheless, the basic redactional analysis builds on the assumption that Matthew’s Christianity was foreign to Jesus, as it was ‘too Jewish’. The opposition between the Pharisees and the *am-ha-aretz* fits Grundmann’s racial agenda well. The *am-ha-aretz* seem to not be Jewish, but the Pharisees definitely are.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 13–14.

¹¹² Ibid., 19.

¹¹³ Ibid., 20.

Dichotomising Judaism and Hellenism as Ideological Strategy

The role of Judaism in early Christianity was a burning issue in Grundmann's circles, especially since Grundmann from 1939 was the scholarly leader of the Eisenach institute. It is in this context that two articles in the *ZNW* should be considered, where Grundmann discusses "The Problem of Hellenistic Christianity Within the Jerusalem Community" and "The Apostles Between Jerusalem and Antioch".¹¹⁴ Placing himself in the tradition from F. C. Baur, Bousset (he refers to the latter on several occasions) and the Enlightenment research tradition, Grundmann explains the emergence of the first Christian mission and the success of Christianity with the role of the Hellenists. However, Grundmann goes further than most of the scholars before him in making the Hellenists non-Jewish, which accords with his ideological strategy.

Building on Ernst Lohmeyer's *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (1936), Grundmann describes early Christianity as having dual sources and centres: the Galilean churches and the Jerusalem *Urgemeinde*.¹¹⁵ In Jerusalem, there were three circles: the Galilean group led by Peter; the Judaists, led by James; and the Hellenists, which had links to the Petrine circles.¹¹⁶ The Hellenists were not Hellenistic Jews, Grundmann argues, following Gillis P:son Wetter, but an early Christian party name for people living according to Greek manners and customs. The fact that the Seven in Acts 6 only had Greek names indicates that they were not Jews but Gentile Christians:¹¹⁷ "Thus we should look for non-Jews among the Hellenists, who as proselytes kept to a Jewish-Hellenistic synagogue, or people who had come directly into the Christian church," Grundmann concludes.¹¹⁸

In these circles, there were Gentiles, proselytes and Hellenistic Jews. Grundmann submits that the Hellenistic Jewish Christians had refused table fellowship with Gentile Christians, as in Gal. 2:11 *ff.* This crisis led to the formation of a separate Hellenistic church, instituted by the apostles as a solution to the issue and led by the Seven. As for their

¹¹⁴ Walter Grundmann, "Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Gemeinde", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 38 (1939); Walter Grundmann, "Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 39 (1940).

¹¹⁵ Grundmann, "Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Gemeinde", 45–46.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 57.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 58.

leader, Stephen, a confrontation arose over the role of Judaism in Christianity, and his opposition to Judaism led to his death. Following his martyrdom, there was a “public action against the Hellenists”, leading to the expulsion of the Hellenists from Jerusalem, which had fortunate consequences, however. According to Grundmann, “the first, pre-Pauline, mission enterprise was carried out by Hellenists, not Jews”.¹¹⁹

Here Grundmann explicitly states that the Hellenists were *not* Jews. The Christianity they preached was a Christianity that “could not be confused with Judaism, which was aware of the difference and showed the difference, a Christianity that did not live under the roof of the synagogue”.¹²⁰ Through a source-critical analysis of Stephen’s speech in Acts 7, Grundmann tries to uncover the theology of the Hellenists. Only the last part, where Stephen sharply addresses the audience, is original, he claims, whereas the rest is the product of the Jewish-Christian author of Acts.¹²¹ It is easy to see why Grundmann chooses this strategy. Stephen, who now has the role of non-Jewish leader of Hellenistic Christianity, could hardly have preached such an Old Testament sermon. Instead, he airs the same temple criticism as Jesus had, and “in close connection with Jesus’ conflict with Judaism, he charges Judaism with the murder of a prophet, which is proven anew through the judicial murder of Jesus”.¹²² Grundmann proceeds to analyse the words ἀρχηγός, σωτήρ and εὐεργεσία as deriving from Hellenistic circles. After a lengthy discussion, he concludes that these words are related to Heracles, that the figure of Heracles influenced the picture of Jesus, and that the Hellenists had a link to the circles of Heracles.¹²³ These rather surprising findings are a consequence of Grundmann turning the Hellenists into Greeks with a Greek culture. He concludes that Stephen and his Hellenists, in contrast to Judaism, had their own relationship with Christ, with God, and their own understanding of salvation. But once the Hellenistic understanding of salvation reached Antioch, the city became the base of Paul and missions: “the stream that runs here and fertilises wide lands has its main source in the Hellenistic circles in the *Urgemeinde*”.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 59.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 60.

¹²¹ Ibid., 61–63.

¹²² Ibid., 64.

¹²³ Ibid., 65–69.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 73.

The second article picks up the thread of the first and discusses the role of the apostles in this process. Again, the Judaistic Jerusalem traditions, linked to James, stand in opposition to the Galilean traditions. Although a brother of Jesus, James did not have the same freedom as Jesus, and he caused this narrowing, especially after Peter had left.¹²⁵ From the latter, there is a direct line to Jesus, represented by Peter and the Twelve. To Grundmann, two opposing factions of Christianity lay behind the conflicts in the Jerusalem church.¹²⁶ In his presentation, Peter is a positive figure, becoming a mediator between the parties and a pioneer of freedom from the Law and of missions to the Hellenists. However, the Judaists' insistence on bringing the Gentiles into the Jewish religion brought the failure of Peter's mediating line. Peter was thus unable to lead such an alternative 'mediating' movement, unlike Paul, who had been trained in Antioch and Jerusalem, Grundmann ends.¹²⁷

These two articles are examples of Grundmann in his profession as an exegete. In the first article in particular, he produces a fairly ambitious argument for his case, using source criticism, some redaction criticism and historical observations. Once again, his methodology differs from his background in moderate Tübingen, as he readily applies critical tools and several times builds on the research of Bousset and others like him. Hence, in his historiography of early Christianity, Grundmann is nearer to the Enlightenment research tradition than the salvation-historical one. His description of early Christianity comes close to that of scholars such as F. C. Baur, Bousset, Heitmüller and Bultmann,¹²⁸ and also touches on more adventurous syncretistic hypotheses. There are differences, however. For example, the role given to Peter is much more conciliatory than in e.g. Baur. In my earlier analyses, I have for three of these scholars pointed to the racist potential in using the dichotomy between Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, making the Jerusalem Jews the dark backdrop of Hellenised Christianity, the latter representing freedom, grace, universalism and, simply, Jesus.

¹²⁵ Grundmann, "Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia", 113.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 124.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 137.

¹²⁸ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums*; Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus"; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*; Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*.

Grundmann is able to fall back on this research tradition, but he also goes further. *He spends much time showing that Hellenists may in fact be non-Jews, and later he establishes that this is the case.* Hellenistic Christianity carried the gospel from Jesus to the world, without really passing the Judaistic Christianity of Jerusalem. To Grundmann, it is certainly not enough that this is done by Hellenistic *Jews*, the point is that they are *non-Jews*. Therefore, with Grundmann, the racist potential in the Jewish-Hellenistic heuristics comes to full fruition, albeit in decent, scholarly terms. From a scholarly point of view, however, Grundmann's arguments are far from convincing.¹²⁹ What is most likely is that the 'Hellenists' were simply Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews, probably very Torah-faithful ones—there is nothing to indicate that they were non-Jewish. Moreover, read in the context of Germany in 1939 and 1940, where so-called Jewish Christians at best were second-class members of the Church, a notion like 'Jewish Christians' gets a new ring to it. Through subtle but skilful arguments, developed from an ideological basis, Grundmann's exegesis reveals how important it is for him to eradicate Jews and Judaism from Christianity. Once again, the 150-year-old dichotomy works as a tool for pointing to the inferiority of Judaism and the superiority of the Greek, European, non-Jewish or even Aryan people.¹³⁰

Grundmann's Magnum Opus: Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum

If the racial origin of the 'Hellenists' was a problem to Grundmann, that of Jesus was naturally a major challenge in his theological circles. Grundmann's greatest monographic work deals with Jesus' relation to Judaism, as well as his racial descent, "a fateful question".¹³¹ There are two issues here: what was Jesus' position towards Judaism, and was he himself a Jew?¹³² In 1933, Grundmann had dismissed questions of the

¹²⁹ See Gerdmar, "Hebreer och hellenister i urförsamlingen—ett receptionskritiskt perspektiv", where I point out that Hegelian dialectic has distorted the reading of Acts 6:1 ff. See also Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* and Edvin Larsson, "Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde", *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987). See further my book, Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*, which criticises the Judaism-Hellenism dichotomy and its use in New Testament exegesis.

¹³⁰ For the last point, see Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, 200.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid., 3.

racial descent of Jesus as blasphemous or irrelevant,¹³³ making Jesus ahistorical instead of either Jewish or Aryan;¹³⁴ by 1940, however, he has changed his mind completely.¹³⁵

The book is an extensive discussion of these two questions, four chapters being devoted to the first, and one to the second. It is not feasible to give an account of the entire discussion within the scope of this book, nor is it possible to critique the whole presentation. But Grundmann's method is to describe the pillars of Judaism (Aboth 1:1), using extensive rabbinic material. In this, he seems to be following the tradition of his teachers Schlatter and Kittel. Point by point, he observes a stark opposition between the ways of Judaism and those of Jesus. Conflict is everywhere: Jesus came from the wrong part of the country, Galilee, which was criticised by Jochanan ben Zakkai;¹³⁶ he was raised in the synagogue, but his path took him away from it;¹³⁷ he related to the *am-ha-arez*, which was forbidden by the Pharisees; and, in his whole conduct, he envisaged a new way of life.¹³⁸ Whereas the Torah was at the centre of Jewish life, Jesus bade the Jewish Torah-oriented piety farewell. Furthermore, when Jesus stressed the love for God and man as one unit, he found himself on a collision course with the Pharisees and Jews, since loving God was to observe ritual practices, not something ethical.¹³⁹ In this way, Grundmann proceeds to draw a caricature of Judaism, on each point finding an opposition between Jesus and Jewish faith and life.

The idea that Jesus sided with the Galilean *am-ha-arez* is also important to Grundmann when describing religious Galilee. The strong contradiction with the Pharisees caused problems:

Jesus stands in the sharpest contradiction to the rabbis and Pharisees. All that we have said about his relationship to Jewish religion was essentially

¹³³ Adam, "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche Ende 1933", 185–186.

¹³⁴ See discussion above.

¹³⁵ On *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, see also Walter Grundmann, *Die Gotteskindschaft Jesu und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen* (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938), 120–123.

¹³⁶ Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, 6.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 9–11.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 15–18. This is not the place to argue against Grundmann's rabbinic studies, but the reading of *Pirqe Aboth* and other texts disproves his conclusions regarding love.

in conflict with them and the religion shaped by them. [...] this contradiction [...] had to lead to an opposition between Jesus and the people, because they had to choose between him and their earlier leaders.¹⁴⁰

This discussion is linked to the *am-ha-arez*, including the *anawim* (the poor), who, in contrast to the rest of the *am-ha-arez*, were religious people. Jesus' origins are in *am-ha-arez* circles, Grundmann argues.¹⁴¹ From these circles stems the Henocho literature, which belongs to Galilee—"It is Galilean *anawim* who speak to us in this literature"¹⁴²—and contains Persian as well as Greek-Hellenistic influences. These are the circles "from which Jesus from Nazareth comes, circles that strive for their own religious form and take up religious values of different types and origins".¹⁴³ Thus, to Grundmann, the *anawim* are closest to Jesus, and it is a group with a somewhat syncretistic trait. Although based on contemporary research, this reconstruction by Grundmann is bold, serving his dichotomisation of Pharisees—Jews contra *am-ha-arez*—Christians (including Greeks, Hellenists, etc.). Ultimately, Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees was not related to the different peoples, but was brought about by his unique knowledge of God.¹⁴⁴ But Jesus differs from Judaism in other ways, too, Grundmann says, e.g. in his rejection of the Messiah title and apocalyptic expectations,¹⁴⁵ and in his emphasis on love and faith.¹⁴⁶

Discussing "Jesus' confrontation with Judaism", Grundmann starts with the view of the Old Testament. Although he admits that Jesus used the Old Testament, he diminishes its importance to Jesus. To Judaism at the time of Jesus, the Old Testament is God's inspired Scripture, particularly the Torah. Jesus, on the other hand, often uses it negatively.¹⁴⁷ The challenge to Grundmann's thesis is Jesus' positive use of the Old Testament, but Grundmann concludes that it is only employed in confrontations with his opponents. Scripture itself is not the norm for Jesus—"most of the texts he did not use"—but the norm

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 76.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 81.

¹⁴² Ibid., 88.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 89–90.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 95.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 97–98.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 102–109.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 140–141.

is his own knowledge of God. Grundmann summarises that Jesus no longer had any common ground with Judaism anyway.¹⁴⁸

Jesus' primary interest and task was to bring good news to the *am-ha-arez*. But as he did this, he met with opposition from the Pharisees, which led to a division. According to Grundmann, the first attack came from Judaism, since "it had first reacted negatively to the unbridgeable opposition between Jesus' kind and its kind". The conflict escalated, first with verbal conflicts, always initiated by Judaism, but then Jesus counterattacked. The strongest example is the woes, and this is the point where Jesus finally broke off all fellowship with Judaism, Grundmann argues. The Passion of Jesus is the ultimate confrontation, where "Jesus had prepared himself for the fight, having sharply challenged his opponents".¹⁴⁹ It ends with death: "Through slander and lies, the Jews put Jesus on the cross,"¹⁵⁰ and they made sure that Jesus was crucified, which signified "utter expulsion and rejection before the entire world," Grundmann writes.

With this, Grundmann has dealt with the first question: what was Jesus' position towards Judaism? The conclusion is that, on every crucial point, Jesus stood in opposition to and thus utterly rejected Judaism; he stood above its Holy Scriptures and was murdered by the Jews:

We saw the struggle that raged between Jesus and Judaism and which led to the crucifixion of Jesus, a death that also outwardly made public Jesus' total separation from Judaism.¹⁵¹

Now Grundmann proceeds to the second question, the problem of Jesus' *völkisch* affiliation: was Jesus a Jew? Beginning with the demography of Galilee, Grundmann argues that Galilee had for a long time been open to different ethnic elements, that is, it had the "most varied population and race elements". This was augmented by its strategic position on the trade routes from north to south, as well as east to west. The Jews had never succeeded in getting a firm grip on Galilee, and according to Grundmann, all this taken together means that, from an ethnic point of view, there are a multitude of possibilities.¹⁵² Here there is a slip of Grundmann's pen in the presentation that otherwise

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 142–145.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 154.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 162.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 165.

¹⁵² Ibid., 168.

kept such a scholarly tone: “by 150 BCE Galilee is in reality also *free from Jews*”,¹⁵³ nor was there after this any dominant Jewish presence. Instead, there was an extensive Hellenistic cultural influence in Galilee, as well as Romans and people who were called ‘Gentiles’. Grundmann concludes that Jesus undoubtedly was from Galilee, and that he most likely was not Jewish:

When thus the Galilean pedigree of Jesus is without doubt, it follows from the above that he most likely was not a Jew, but rather in a *völkisch* sense belonged to one of the currents that were present in Galilee.¹⁵⁴

Secondly, Grundmann argues on the basis of Mary’s descent. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth is not an early one, Grundmann contends, concluding that it lacks historical basis, as does his birth in Bethlehem, i.e. outside of Galilee.¹⁵⁵ Jesus being the Son of David, born to a virgin are constructions of the Church, Grundmann says, using the genealogies in the gospels of Luke and Matthew as an argument. After an extensive discussion on the different lists, Grundmann turns to a specific aspect of Matthew’s genealogy, its five women: Mary, Tamar, Rahab, Ruth and Bathsheba. Questioning the rationale behind including the other women, he concludes that for Mary’s sake, it is of apologetic interest to do so, facing criticisms from Jewish circles against Jesus being a son of David. None of the women are of Israelite descent, but all belonged to the original population of the countries. Reinhold Seeberg had recently suggested that Mary was a Galilean non-Jew, with the same relationship to the genealogy as the other women:

*As certain as it is that Tamar and Rahab and Ruth and Bathsheba were included in the family of David, partly as his progenitor, Bathsheba as his wife, even though they were not from Judah, as certainly can the Galilean Mary be the mother of the Son of David. The apologetic tendency of the genealogy of Matthew leads to an exceedingly important fact: Mary, the mother of Jesus, was Galilean and according to her pedigree was not deemed a Jewess.*¹⁵⁶

¹⁵³ Ibid., 169, my emphasis.

¹⁵⁴ “Wenn also die galiläische Herkunft Jesu unbezweifelbar ist, so folgt auf Grund der eben angestellten Erörterung daraus, daß er mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit kein Jude gewesen ist, vielmehr völkisch einer der in Galiläa vorhandenen Strömungen angehört hat,” *ibid.*, 175.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 176–177, 186.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 196, emphasis in text: “So gewiß Thamar und Rahab und Ruth und Bathseba in das Geschlecht Davids eingegliedert wurden, so gewiß kann die Galiläerin Maria die Mutter des Sohnes Davids sein. Die apologetische Tendenz des

Moreover, the grandfather of Jesus is different in Luke's and Matthew's lists because they wanted to conceal the correct name, Grundmann argues. It was not a Jewish, but "a non-Semitic, a Greek name".¹⁵⁷ For the identity of Jesus' father, Grundmann turns to the Panthera legend, as well as to a note in Epiphanius that Joseph's father Jacob had the byname Panthera. According to Grundmann, Jacob Panthera was thus a Galilean, who with many others was subject to the forceful Judaisation of Galilee that took place in the time of Jesus' great-grandfather. The grandfather took a second name, also giving Old Testament names to his children, and so Joseph, too, had a non-Jewish Galilean pedigree. "*Jesus is the son of Galilean parents*," Grundmann concludes.¹⁵⁸ Jewish tradition then made Jesus a son of Panthera, not Joseph, and later he was turned into a soldier. The Jewish-Christian church, however, used these genealogies to counter such assaults and to vindicate Jesus as the Son of David. Grundmann concludes his central chapter on the pedigree of Jesus with the negative result that we can "with the highest probability assert that *Jesus was no Jew*". Nevertheless, Grundmann holds that it is not possible to ascertain Jesus' ethnic descent.¹⁵⁹

Given the scant material on which they are based, Grundmann's conclusions are bold, and the racial agenda is clear. Moreover, Grundmann bases much of the reasoning not on his own research, but on fairly popular discussions by Reinhold Seeberg and Emanuel Hirsch, and before that, H. S. Chamberlain. As noted, Martin Dibelius is more moderate but still keeps the door open for a non-Jewish pedigree of Jesus.

Grundmann's strategy throughout *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum* is to sever Jesus from any Jewish or Old Testament background. Thus he firstly contends that "the specifically Jewish and what is limited by the Old Testament, the concentration on Israel, the limitation of salvation to the last generation and the earthly character of salvation, as well as the legalism of living and acting, *are not taken over by Jesus*".¹⁶⁰ Instead, Jesus introduces a new kind of relationship to God. Secondly, to replace the Jewish Old Testament background, Grundmann returns

Matthäusstammbaumes führt zu einer überaus bedeutsamen Tatsache: Maria, die Mutter Jesu, war Galiläerin und galt ihrer Herkunft nach nicht als Jüdin."

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 197.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 199, emphasis in text.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 200.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 202, my emphasis.

to “Galilean piety”, with influences from Parsism and Hellenism. He notes that Hellenism, which the Pharisees did everything to counter, was more apt than Judaism to receive Christianity. Moreover:

[Quoting Eduard Meyer] “The whole further development of the spiritual life of Western humanity rests on the flowing together of developments related to Socrates and Jesus, partly in opposition, partly connecting.” Jesus’ organic type of thinking [...] brings him closer to the Greeks than to the Jews, whose thought patterns compared to the Greeks’ are dissecting and mechanical.¹⁶¹

Jesus is more Greek, Hellenistic, than Jewish, a thought that fits in with Grundmann’s analysis of the Hellenistic element in the Jerusalem church.¹⁶² Once more, the roots in Baurian historiography are evident. Grundmann ends by stating that according to the recent findings on the connection between the soul’s attitude and blood heritage, “the inescapable result is that in all probability, since he due to his soulish kind cannot have been a Jew, he was not one according to his blood either”.¹⁶³

The reading of Grundmann’s book, as well as his other exegetical production, is a dismal experience for the exegete, and differs somewhat from the reading of his many more National Socialist theological and politically programmatic texts. Those include ideas that are easily dismissed as propaganda. But although the exegetical texts also have a racist agenda, they use the methods of the guild and are written in scholarly language. In fact, Grundmann develops arguments respected among internationally renowned exegetes. An example is Bultmann, who after the war referred to Grundmann’s book in his commentary on John.¹⁶⁴ With his use of exegetical methods from rabbinic studies, literary criticism and redaction criticism, as well as his application of accepted heuristic models, such as the Judaism–Hellenism dichotomy, most scholars are able to follow Grundmann a long way, several of the

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 204–205.

¹⁶² Grundmann, “Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Gemeinde”, discussed above.

¹⁶³ Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, 205: “Aus der unsere Zeit geschenkten Erkenntnis der Einheit seelischer Haltung und blutsmäßigen Erbes ergibt sich mit Notwendigkeit, daß aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach Jesus, da er auf Grund seiner seelischen Artung kein Jude gewesen sein kann, es auch blutsmäßig nicht war, wofür wir bei der Frage nach seiner völkischen Zugehörigkeit einige wichtige Gesichtspunkte gewannen, die diese Beobachtung unterstützen.”

¹⁶⁴ See above, the discussion on Bultmann’s commentary on John.

techniques being neutral in relation to Jews and Judaism, whereas some of the thought patterns have been used to denigrate Jews and Judaism through a long scholarly tradition.

Conclusion

This study of Walter Grundmann has concentrated on texts that show his general ideological and theological outlook, and his exegetical production during National Socialism. *Methodologically* Grundmann is undoubtedly a decent and productive exegete, capable of interacting with the scholarly guild, into which he was also internationally accepted through his membership of SNTS. This is also demonstrated by the distribution and use of his post-war commentaries. Nevertheless, the entire production studied here indicates that his work was *influenced by his ideology*. This impression is strengthened as the years go by, the peak being his work under the auspices of the Institute, particularly *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*. Walter Grundmann stands out as a successful career academic, who was able to climb to a level that could scarcely have been reached as quickly without his party merits. Also, in the 1930s, Grundmann clearly changes his theology and his view of the Old Testament, biblical criticism and the Jewishness of Jesus, all in line with contemporary political trends.

In the texts studied, Grundmann does not major on *characterising* Jews and Judaism, but the tenor is unmistakable: Jews and Judaism represent something negative. The Jews rejected Jesus on the cross, and from the time they crucified Christ to the present time, there has been a curse on 'the Jew'. Grundmann thus has an essentialist view of Jews as being constantly under a curse, whether they live in antiquity or in the 1930s. The impression Grundmann gives is that the question of whether or not Jews and Judaism represent something negative is already settled, as if his negative view on Jews and Judaism would be axiomatic. It is uncontroversial and self-evident that Jews, in apostolic times as well as in contemporary Germany, represent a problem. This is shown in Grundmann's constant urge to see a dejudaisation. It is true that Grundmann dehistoricises Jesus early on, making him neither Jewish nor Aryan, but later he systematically dejudaises Jesus, Paul, the Bible and German Christianity. His main example of Judaism is the Pharisees, and in his dichotomisation of early Christianity, they are the

ones whom the *am-ha-aretz* oppose. The Pharisees are described with the traditional attributes, such as legalism and a religion without any real relationship with God. When Grundmann discusses John's gospel, the whole gospel is a sharp attack on the Jews: Jesus makes an 'exodus' from Judaism; his death is caused by the Jews; Nicodemus, as a leading representative of the Jews, understands nothing; anything that is non-Jewish is good, e.g. the Samaritans are better suited than Jews to bring forth good things; the woman at the well "holds Jesus to be a Jew". In sum, Grundmann characterises anything Jewish as negative, and its opposite as positive.

When writing New Testament *historiography*, Grundmann falls back on the tradition of Baur and others, dichotomising Jewish and Greek. The 'Hebrews' and 'Hellenists' of the Jerusalem church is one example. Whereas others speak of Jerusalem and Alexandria, or Jerusalem and Antioch, Grundmann operates with two centres: Galilee and Jerusalem. This is due to the thought of Galilee as a 'Hellenistic' area, Hellenists not being Jewish, and pertains particularly to the Seven in Acts 6, who were not Jews, but Greek, with Greek manners. Their Hellenistic Christianity, that is, non-Jewish Christianity, brought the gospel of Jesus to the world. In Grundmann's version, this traditional narrative gets its full racial implications. Building on the Jewish-Hellenistic dichotomy of Baur and others, he reinterprets it, taking it even further. If Baur's was potentially racist, or at least Eurocentric, thinking that Judaism did not elevate into a religion of freedom until it was fertilised by the Greek spirit,¹⁶⁵ Grundmann is overtly racist. The reason that Hellenistic *Jews* could not have carried the gospel to the world is that they are Jews. The discussion is parallel to that found in his book *Jesus der Galiläer*. By the same token, Grundmann connects the non-Jewish Hellenist Stephen with Heracles, rather than with the Old Testament.

In the texts studied, Grundmann describes a dichotomy between darkness and light, as do most of the earlier scholars. However, for obvious reasons, unlike almost every other scholar in this study, Grundmann does not see a positive Hebrew prehistory: Israel, Hebrew, Jew is never positive but always too negative to even be part of a backdrop

¹⁶⁵ For Baur, see Kelley, *Racializing Jesus*, 64–88. Kelley is basically correct, although, as I have demonstrated here, the racialisation has even deeper roots than the Tübingen school, at least down to some of the deists, an example of which is Morgan. Therefore, I am more inclined to see such structures in Western (and Eastern) Christianity.

to Christianity. In this, he switches from a similar anti-Judaism to that of his teachers, Kittel and Schlatter, to the opposite position, in line with the National Socialist party. He also cuts off the bearers of true Christianity, the Hellenists, from Jews and Judaism. It is true that Grundmann initially takes a mediating position regarding the role of the Old Testament, giving it a secondary place in Christianity, although this moderate position must be seen against the background of Reinhold Krause's extreme views and Grundmann's strategy of mediating. However, Grundmann becomes increasingly negative towards the Old Testament, and he cannot be evaluated in relation to Krause and even more extreme reinterpreters of Christianity. It is more rewarding to study Grundmann's path from his early years to a growing symbiosis between National Socialist ideology and his Christianity.¹⁶⁶

Grundmann's *continuity* is based on race. There is a certain continuity between Hellenists, Galileans, Germans and other Aryans. Jesus is probably non-Jewish, enabling us Aryans to relate to him, which would have been impossible had he been Jewish. Early on, Grundmann's solution was more moderate: Jesus was ahistoric and thus neither Jewish nor Aryan. But Grundmann increasingly replaces classic Christianity and the link to the Old Testament with the Aryan and Nordic, even replacing biblical salvation history with Germanic. Continuity and discontinuity are thus predominantly racially conditioned, not philosophically, theologically or culturally. In this emphasis on racial continuity/discontinuity, Grundmann stands alone among the scholars studied, including Gerhard Kittel.

Similarly, I would say that Grundmann's *symbolic world* is increasingly racialised. Starting out in a Protestant Lutheran faith, even with certain Pietist traits, with a certain relationship to the environment in which he was brought up as a scholar in Tübingen, Grundmann has an emphasis on sin and forgiveness. At least in 1933, he puts forward

¹⁶⁶ Werner Neuer believes that Schlatter's support of Grundmann in the *Kirchenkampf* must be understood not as a support of Grundmann but of not completely severing the relationship with the Deutsche Christen, Werner Neuer, E-mail message to the author, 11 Nov. 2007. However, as noted above, that Schlatter had taken a stand for Grundmann is clear enough from the formulation: "Mich hat viel mit ihm verbunden, und es gehört zu den großen Freuden meines Lebens, daß mir sein Sohn, Theodor Schlatter, erzählte, daß sein Vater große Stücke auf mich gehalten habe und für mich in der Zeit des Kirchenkampfes eingetreten sei, als ich vielfach angefeindet wurde." Quoted from Grundmann, "Erkenntnis und Wahrheit", 21, emphasis mine.

a Lutheran theology of Law and Gospel, which stresses the preaching of the Word, faith, the message of the cross, sonship to God, and the kingdom of God. But at the same time, Grundmann envisions a total symbiosis between people and Church: the Total Church in the Total State. At this point, Grundmann's symbolic world seems to include Lutheran faith, but as early as in 1933, Grundmann begins to talk of the Reich as a manifestation of the Reich of God. In 1939, this had come to full fruition. Confession of faith is no longer (the only) sign of the kingdom: "hereditary soundness and uprightness of life" are signs that "the Reich has really come among them". The evangelistic project and the political project are two sides of the same coin to Grundmann, and his ambition to engage in a dialogue with the new culture is evident, not least in his text about Germanentum, where Nordic ideology and Christianity are in symbiosis. Thus, at this point, there is a seamless unity in Grundmann's symbolic world between the *völkisch*-racial ideology and a Lutheran-syncretistic theology. The ultimate factor in his symbolic world is of course Jesus, Grundmann wanting to make possible the aryanisation of the centre of Christianity.

The 'symbolic Jew' is truly a relevant notion when describing Grundmann's theology. He is essentially a negative-foreign-dangerous being, who throughout history is the dark backdrop or counterpart to the stars on Grundmann's canopy: Christian, German, human. The essence goes with the blood, and everything Jewish must be eradicated from German culture, German Church and German blood. In Grundmann's Christian-German-Aryan symbolic world, there is one place for the 'symbolic Jew', below, as a force that threatens German culture and Church.

The very strategy to eliminate Jews and Judaism from the Church, the Bible, social and political life, etc. has a directly *legitimising* role in the anti-Semitic National Socialist Germany. It means that the *Lebensraum* of the Jews is decreased, whereas the Aryan is increased, first in ideology and theology, then in politics and social life. Thus the step may not be so far from Grundmann's theological legitimisation of the eradication of the Jewish to social and political action. If Jesus fought Judaism, for instance, it must be right to fight Judaism. Grundmann legitimised the racial policy in both Church and State, holding the charter speech at the Institute's inauguration under the sign of the swastika. Just as this was a symbiosis between National Socialist and Christian, so the work of Grundmann and the Institute was a symbiosis, with the goal

of delivering the Germanic-Nordic sphere from everything Jewish, and of nurturing and furthering a Total Germanic Church in a Total Reich. The dejudaisation of Christianity, the main legitimising force for German men and women, including soldiers, surely influenced the decisions that were made in private and public life, and at the frontiers that were opened in 1939.

CONCLUDING ANALYSIS

The analysis in this study is carried out in three steps. Firstly, it looks at *what* the exegetes said about Jews and Judaism, especially the characterisation of Jews and Judaism, how historiography is used and how the problem of continuity–discontinuity is dealt with. Secondly, it examines *why* they said what they said, attempting to understand the views on Jews and Judaism within the symbolic world of each scholar. Thirdly, it considers the possible social *consequences* of the respective views, that is, the link between symbolic world and legitimisation of societal treatment of Jews and Judaism.

Laudan's description of research traditions has turned out to be justified. The power of tradition is indeed surprising; in some cases, descriptions of Jews and Judaism and heuristic models have lived on from 1738 to the 1950s—and beyond.¹ But that does not mean that tradition is everything. This study contains ample evidence that these exegetes' views of Jews and Judaism are *a complex combination of research tradition, theological currents, cultural conceptions of Jews, as well as political ideas and considerations; and ultimately the views are formed out of the personal symbolic world and ethos of the exegete.*

The individual results of this study need no repetition. A general observation, however, is that the two dominating research traditions of German Protestant exegesis have each constructed Jews and Judaism ideologically, rather than empirically, wanting them to fit their overall theological agenda, where Jews are seen as instrumental in God's dealings with mankind (salvation-historical research tradition), or as representing the opposite of the system's ideals (Enlightenment research tradition). Ideas from both traditions can be used to denigrate or defend Jews and Judaism, and ultimately it is difficult to claim that one is more to blame than the other. But the broad and intensive occupation with Jews and Judaism, and the significant role that exegesis played in German Protestantism, indicate that the exegetical construction of Jews and Judaism is an important area of study. Since the interpretation of

¹ Several of the recurring motifs even have roots in the church fathers, medieval Christianity and the theology of the Reformation.

the Bible was a key legitimator in society, what the exegetical professors said about the Jews could carry much weight.

This study describes these views, giving a fairly dark picture with some rays of light. In several cases, compared to the results of previous research, the view of individual scholars is revised, and the picture of the two main research traditions becomes more complex, at the same time as their power is amply demonstrated. These results call for a renewed discussion of the role of exegesis as a formative discipline in modern Protestant theology as regards Jews, Judaism and anti-Semitism.

Hence none of the research traditions is innocent when it comes to legitimising anti-Semitism. However, the study does not justify tainting entire traditions with anti-Semitism, whether they be Enlightenment or salvation-historical, liberal or conservative. *What is essential is to understand the thought structures that open or close the door to anti-Semitism*, since there is often a link between the place of the ‘symbolic Jew’ and the social and political treatment of the ‘real Jew’.

The Description of Jews and Judaism in New Testament Exegesis

The question is not only what the individual scholars thought, but how their work served to legitimise or delegitimise discrimination and oppression of Jews and Judaism—the actual effect of their texts is not possible to know. In the concluding analysis, I will describe the overall picture that emerges from the study. By necessity, this will be done with broad strokes of the brush, streamlining the different views into one picture. As a result, no scholar corresponds to the whole of this presentation, but it hopes to describe the general picture conveyed to their audiences. For the individual scholars, I refer back to the discussion above, which demonstrates enough unity to see two dominant streams, yet a diversity within each stream.

The Characterisation of Jews and Judaism

The general description of Jews and Judaism within theology directly or indirectly affected Church and the public. The common characterisation of Jews and Judaism in the ‘Enlightenment research tradition’ can be summarised with de Wette’s words: “Judaism is degenerated, petrified *Hebraismus*”. This includes Judaism being a degeneration, but also the idea that there was a positive forerunner to Judaism, Hebraism.

The characterisations are negative stereotypes, not formed on the basis of empirical data, but constructed to fit a theological and ideological agenda. Morally, Jews are ‘minors’, who are contrasted with “free, universal religion”. Often, the dichotomy between particularism and universalism is used, talking of narrow Jewish particularism versus open Christian universalism. This is linked to the degeneration hypothesis, where Hebraism stands for the original, and Judaism for a depravation. An example of the particularism is the national peculiarity of Palestinian Jews, as opposed to universalism. National limitation and egotism is often paired with legalism, which in turn is linked to a disharmonious relationship between God and man. Lacking any immediate relationship with God, Jews and Judaism must compensate for this with the letter, mere form, body, outward religion and ceremonialism—all negative counterparts of the Enlightenment’s ideal: spirit, inwardness, spontaneous ethics and private religion. These traits also spill over into Jewish Christianity, which is rigorous, legalistic, narrow and nationally limited, these traits being essential to Jews, whether Christian or not. Only in the Gentile church is the spirit of Jesus fully manifested. In many other ways, too, ‘Jewish Christianity’ is discredited by scholars in the Enlightenment research tradition.

The salvation-historical research tradition gives a more positive picture, with some reservations; its fundamental attitude is fairly positive, yet without automatically accepting everything Jewish. The dividing line is faith in Jesus, which functions as the stumbling block. ‘Jew’ and ‘Judaism’ are basically positive terms, Judaism being the beautiful moon, although it is outshone by Christ. The word ‘particularism’ may be used, but more often in a positive sense, and interpreted as simply meaning that Israel is the elected people. Universalism is understood differently: Christianity did not become universal through the encounter with the ‘Greek spirit’ in the Diaspora but through the Messiah, and the message about the Messiah has a universality.

But however positive the basic appreciation of the salvation-historical research tradition is, Jews are often depicted as stubborn and legalistic here, too. The context of such descriptions is often missions to Israel, the matrix of this research tradition. Characteristically, there is a positive stance towards Israel, but with a clear evangelistic agenda, although different authors vary as to how positive or critical they are to Jews. Whereas one could claim that Jews are legalistic, another could say that the Torah makes the Jews ethically superior. Generally, Israel or the Jewish people are given a key role in the fulfilment of God’s plan.

The salvation-historical framework gives Israel a position of honour, with an eschatological and eternal role. Other positive traits can also be found: often the authors respect Jews and Judaism for the Law and their faithfulness towards it, as well as Jewish worship and prayer. Furthermore, the Jewishness of Jesus is stressed, the most radical statement being “Jesus is a Jew who is God” (Schlatter).

Nevertheless, some of these salvation-historical authors also give a more negative picture. This is interesting, since the basic pattern is significantly more positive than in the Enlightenment research tradition. Several authors state that the Jews killed Jesus (see below), this now being a national debt of the Jews, and Jews are described as “judicial and casuistic”, having characteristics such as “national aristocratic pride”, blindness, worldly-mindedness, liberalism and a falsely conceived emancipation. Moreover, Jews maintain the right to a monopoly on the absolute truth. Hence Jews are God’s elect—although some scholars consider this a past stage—but they have many negative traits nonetheless.

In addition to these descriptions, which are typical of the two research traditions, several of the exegetes from different camps use popular anti-Semitic stereotypes. These stereotypes convey things considered essential to Jews in all times. They include: the ‘Wandering Jew’ (Schlatter, Kittel, Dibelius); ‘World Judaism’ and its hunger for power (Schlatter, Kittel); moral depravity as being typical of Jews (Morgan, Semler, Schlatter, Kittel); money, greed (Herder, Bousset, Schlatter, Kittel); the Jewish banker and rabbi as the pillars of Judaism (Schlatter); Judaism and Marxism (Schlatter, Kittel); the ‘Jewish type’ and its self-glorification and pride in the religious as well as the worldly realm (Herder Schlatter, Bousset, Strack, Delitzsch); insincerity, religious theatrical acting, hypocrisy, double standards of morality, lack of truthfulness (Herder, Schlatter, Bousset). Moreover, Jews are described as barren, shallow and full of superstition.

To complete the picture, however, several of the scholars in the salvation-historical research tradition, for instance Delitzsch and Strack, became well-known for publicly defending Jews against such stereotypes, for instance countering the blood libel. Gerhard Kittel did the same, deeming such anti-Semitism to be negative and a threat to true anti-Semitism! Essentialist depictions like these depreciate Jews and Judaism, and place Jews outside of society, regarding them as dangerous (due to greed, immorality, hunger for power, Marxism, lack of truthfulness), and unpleasant and arrogant (due to pride, hypocrisy). In sum, anti-Semitic

stereotypes are used independently of theological outlook or research tradition, although in this material there happens to be a preponderance of such stereotypes in Schlatter and Kittel.

Other scholars have little or nothing of the characterisations and stereotypes mentioned above, among them Baur, Ritschl, Weiss, Bultmann and Beck.

Constructing Jewish Past

The historiographical construction of Jewish past is a powerful tool of Christian theology for expressing and illustrating its interpretation of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. *Historiography*—the writing of history understood precisely as creating a story²—happens in a social and ideological context, a certain ‘place’, often to serve certain interests, or is at least written according to the writer’s perspective. If this is true of modern writing of history, it is all the more true for the period studied here. In this study, we have dealt with such ‘interested’ historiography, ideological constructs that cannot be empirically evidenced. Rather, the description renders history in such a way that it supports the overall dogmatic view of Jews and Judaism in relation to early Christianity. Historiography then becomes an instrument for constructing Judaism to fit the narratives of Christian beginnings, often either defaming or elevating Jews and Judaism. For example, the Hegelian dialectic (and similar ones, for instance Droysen’s) is inherently discriminating. In this logic, the first stage, the thesis, is a passed stage, i.e. Palestinian Judaism, which received *Bildung*, culture, only when it entered the Diaspora, that is, when it encountered Greek culture, the antithesis. The same is true of the Hebrews in Jerusalem, who were not able to take the gospel to the world, as only the Hellenists could. When, in the wake of the tradition before him, Baur uses these models, they effectively render Jews and Judaism as a pre-stage, and Jews as pawns in a game that ends with enlightened Christianity. This can also be interpreted as a Eurocentric view, where the Orientals are minors and perhaps even servants to the higher cause of bringing forth not so much Christianity as enlightened European Christian culture. By the

² As noted, Hayden White, *Metahistory*, goes far in stressing the fictional dimension of history. In my view, history is much more reliable than that, but one must be aware of the role of historiography as a production of an ideologically framed interpretation of historical processes.

same token, the general thinking of universalism and particularism is parallel to the German universalistic/nationalistic project in the early nineteenth century, which was highly significant for Baur, for instance. In the same way, salvation-historical-oriented scholars write history to fit their overall theological view of the Jewish past. For example, Baur's colleague Beck constructs history to match his harmonious monarchical view, just as Delitzsch paints a romantic picture of Jerusalem and Judaism in the past.

The historiographical description of the Jews and Judaism in the Enlightenment research tradition is thus thoroughly idealistic and aetiological, rather than building historical hypotheses that try to ascertain *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, i.e. basing them on empirical facts. In the narrative presented, there is often a three-step evolution from a 'primordial' positive state of existence, via a degeneration, most often after the Exile, to the creation of the Hellenised Judaism that was a seedbed for Christianity. Hence Judaism was depraved in Babylon or Egypt (depending on the author), but re-established under Greek influence in the Diaspora (e.g. Semler, Herder, de Wette, Baur, Strauss), which presupposes that Palestinian Judaism in itself did not have the necessary qualities. As noted, this aetiology is linked to the dichotomy of particularism/national limitedness on the one hand, and universalism on the other. Particularism is related to Palestine and Palestinian Judaism, whereas universalism is related to the Diaspora, especially Alexandria, as well as to Greek thought and 'Hellenistic Judaism', thus providing a *praeparatio evangelica*.

In a dialectical model, there is a constant play between two opposites: Palestinian and Alexandrian; Pauline and Petrine; Hellenist and Hebrew. With the History of Religions school, the antithesis is enriched with a new syncretism in the Diaspora, including elements from mystery religions. The meeting place of Judaism and world religions is no longer obviously Alexandria, but could also be Antioch. Although some scholars who share most of the tenets of this research tradition may protest against details, or suggest other times and places for the depravation and then resurrection of a viable and true Judaism, basically they agree with this picture. An even more radical view sees a total rupture between Judaism and Christianity, however, the latter being *sui generis*, emanating from Christ's spirit alone. Such a view *dehistoricises* Christianity altogether. Again, Johannes Weiss is less inclined to interpretations such as this, and they are of minor importance to Dibelius.

Although just as ideologically tainted, the salvation-historical construct is different, being mostly more favourable to Jews and Judaism. The basic approach is organic, and none of these authors believes in a rupture between Hebrews and Jews, nor do they to the same extent apply degeneration hypotheses to Jewish history. Palestine is the birth place of early Christianity, in contrast to the Diaspora in Enlightenment research tradition, and Judaism does not need Greek philosophy and *Bildung* to develop. However, it is sometimes held that the 'Hellenists' were more apt to receive the universalist content of the teaching of Jesus than the Palestinian Jews were. This 'theological geography' is a reversed version of the Enlightenment one. It is in the Exile that negative things occur, while Palestine remains the centre of Judaism and early Christianity.

Whereas the historiography of the Enlightenment research tradition is idealistic, and sometimes inspired by Hegelian (or related historical-dialectical) logic,³ salvation-historical research tradition instead builds a biblical and salvation-historical narrative, drawing an arch from Abraham to the Messiah, and presenting a comprehensive biblical story from Adam to Christ. But, from a scholarly viewpoint, such history is a reversed form of Enlightenment historiography: its blueprint and construction are ideological, not based on empirical data, and the building blocks are taken from biblical history. Here, too, the historiographical description can at times resemble the 'Late Judaism' hypothesis, where the Jews relate political-national ideas to the coming of the Messiah. Whereas the early salvation-historical scholars have an entirely intra-biblical view, some include ideas like those in Schürer (for example Delitzsch and Schlatter). However, depravation hypotheses have little or no place; on the whole, salvation-historical research tradition wishes to keep holding old-time, orthodox, Old Testament-founded Judaism in honour, just as it acknowledges the Law as God's will.

³ It should also be remembered that Beck, just as his colleague Baur, was inspired by a Hegelian history of philosophy; even though the dialectics are not there, a basic idealism is.

Christianity and Judaism: Connected or Disconnected?

So, is Christianity rooted in the Old Testament and Judaism or not? In line with the ideas of Jewish past, the dominant view in Enlightenment research tradition says no, emphasising discontinuity between early Christianity and Judaism, and the Old and New Testaments, in the same way that it stressed the discontinuity between Hebrews and Jews. Different philosophical approaches lead to different ways of describing the relationship. Although scholars with a Hegelian inspiration see Judaism as a past stage, they are able to retain an element of it, as the synthesis is made up of thesis and antithesis. A Kantian (or neo-Kantian) philosophical approach seems to result in a sharper break with Judaism. As for the Old Testament, the scholars' positions are directly dependent on how 'Jewish' the book is to them: if it is a merely 'Jewish book', it may be either irrelevant or obsolete to those who take pains to keep Judaism at a distance. Hence, to some, there is no continuity between the Old and New Testaments, whereas some see the Old Testament as preparatory revelation. In the first case, there is an unbridgeable break between Judaism and Christianity, and the Old Testament is of no consequence to the scholars' own theology. Others are able to retain the Old Testament, provided it is not identified with Judaism, and so while maintaining an absolute opposition between Judaism and Christianity, certain forms of Old Testament religion, e.g. that of the prophets, have continuity with Christianity. The prophets are then seen as heroes of the past, or as an alternative to the legalistic priestly traditions—another less appreciated phenomenon.

Using different strategies, most of the scholars in the Enlightenment tradition describe a radical discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity. Judaism may, for example, be seen as a merely national religion, which is of no consequence to Christianity: Herder, due to his nationalism, appreciates Hebrew poetry and even contends that Judaism is the mother of Christianity, but it is nonetheless irrelevant to German Christianity. Others can bluntly state that Judaism is dead and that Christianity has as little continuity with it as with paganism. A more reconciling view is that Judaism is the earthly cover, whereas Christianity is the ethereality that it contains. A dialectical view sees a certain continuity between Judaism and Christianity, but then only with Hellenistic Christianity—that is, the typical 'Jewish' characteristics have been removed under the influence of Greek *Bildung*.

The entire 'Late Judaism' hypothesis is basically a support for discontinuity, negating any connection between this and Jesus, who in no way stood "under the spell of Judaism". Another strategy is to dehistoricise Jesus, disconnecting him from Palestinian early Christianity. Here the link between Jesus and Gentile Christianity is the *spirit of Jesus*; in this case, Jesus has been elevated to an idea, rather than being a real Jewish person.

Again, the dominant picture in the salvation-historical research tradition is the opposite: if the Enlightenment research tradition stressed discontinuity, the salvation-historical research tradition stresses continuity between Judaism and ancient Israel, or between Judaism and Christianity. As a vital question of continuity or discontinuity, the relationship between the Old Testament and early Christianity is strongly defended. Typical of the salvation-historical research tradition is also an unbreakable continuity between Judaism and Christianity, built on a 'revelatory continuity' between the Old and New Testaments. Thus continuity is inherent in the salvation-historical idea, where the new is only a more or less determined continuation of the old. The Messianic kingdom was nothing new, but developed out of Jewish theocracy. In the most optimistic version, God's people will finish their course in due time, and this will affect all peoples. A similar view is that David's kingdom and Christ's are one and the same, the covenant still being in effect. The role of Israel can be expressed as in the words of Karl Ludwig Schmidt: "A Church that does not want to have anything to do with Israel is an empty shell." The earliest representatives of this tradition, in particular, expected a happy eschatological end with an end-time entrance of Israel. Some authors see a continuity with ancient Judaism *pre*-Messiah, but a discontinuity with Jews and Judaism *post*-Messiah and up to modernity. An eschatological continuity is combined with a temporal discontinuity: the present-day Jews are not God's people, but in the eschatological time, Israel will (or may) play a decisive role.

In this study, exploring the roots of overt theological anti-Semitism is of special interest, which is why I will relate the theology of Gerhard Kittel and Walter Grundmann to the aforementioned. Kittel, who was at home in the salvation-historical tradition and had quarrels with much of the Enlightenment research tradition, gradually allowed anti-Semitic ideas to influence his scholarly work. As seen above, he shared the basic views of his teacher and mentor Adolf Schlatter, but eventually developed ideas that were foreign to salvation-historical research

tradition. In this, he went much further than Schlatter, who did not accept biological racism. Kittel's starting point is a fierce opposition between Jesus and Judaism, where he can to varying degrees fall back on for example Delitzsch and Schlatter. His major monograph is characterised by respect for Palestinian Judaism, but as his anti-Semitism grows increasingly sharper during National Socialism, Kittel reinforces the same negative descriptions that exist in the picture of 'Late Judaism'. These are now fertilised with anti-Semitic rhetoric, however: Judaism after the Exile becomes 'World Judaism', which was regarded as the force behind the threats that Germany perceived. Kittel has no antecedents for these racist views, but operating within the salvation-historical paradigm, he customises it to serve his ideas. Thus Diaspora Judaism—which in his salvation-historical background is negative rather than positive—becomes 'World Judaism' and the place of a racial mixing that begins in antiquity but then makes its way into European Middle Ages. There is a certain continuity with classic, Orthodox Judaism, representing old Israel, but there is complete discontinuity with modern, assimilated Judaism. Nevertheless, in Kittel's view, even Jewish orthodoxy should live under apartheid and in the ghetto! Kittel fights forcefully for the Old Testament, and many of his quarrels with parts of the National Socialist and Deutsche Christen movements can be related to this very point, from his public exit from the Deutsche Christen in 1933 to—at least in his own version—his research from 1937 onwards. The goal was partly to disconnect Judaism from the Old Testament, in order to 'save' the Old Testament. Kittel goes further in his supersessionism during National Socialism. Judaism *was* the people of God in the past, and although there may be an eschatological future where Israel has a place, this is probably something different from the racially mixed Judaism.

Grundmann to some degree shares the starting point of Kittel (and Schlatter), but he is much more eclectic and has less of his own theological backbone. That is, although Grundmann incorporated ideas from both traditions, he is neither a salvation-historical nor an Enlightenment-oriented theologian, but a National Socialist one. Even if he never sided with anti-Christian forces of National Socialism, as personified by Alfred Rosenberg, from an early stage and then increasingly throughout the 'Third Reich', he synthesised his Lutheranism with the National Socialist ideology, and later to a certain extent even Germanic mythology. On one point—the fierce opposition between Jesus and Judaism—

Grundmann clearly accords with Schlatter, but also with Kittel, whose influence seemed to be formative during his early years. Even though this opposition existed earlier—in salvation-historical research tradition, but also in for example Paul de Lagarde or Bousset—the conflict grew more intense in Schlatter, Kittel and Grundmann. This negative view on Judaism is also the tenor in Grundmann's description, an axiomatic anti-Judaism. However, much of his consistently and essentialistically negative view on the Jews is reminiscent of Enlightenment discourse on the Jews, with Grundmann employing some salient themes from this tradition. His presentation of the Hebrews and Hellenists builds on a firm foundation in the tradition from Baur and others, but is now twisted to fit the racial discourse. For example, 'Hellenistic' Galilee being a non-Jewish area makes it a place where Grundmann can construct Jesus as being non-Jewish. Early missions, too, are turned into something racist. According to the thought of the entire Enlightenment research tradition, only the Seven in Acts 6 were able to receive and further the gospel. To Grundmann, however, they were *ethnic* Greeks. The Enlightenment research tradition may have a racist *potential* here—that Hebrews as mere Palestinian Jews were too limited to do this—but Grundmann takes it further into an *overtly racist thought*. To him, even *Hellenistic* Jews could not be the bridge to the world, because they were Jews. This is one of many examples of Grundmann's dejudaisation of the New Testament. It would be impossible for anyone in the salvation-historical research tradition to, as Grundmann, connect the non-Jewish Hellenist Stephen with Heracles rather than with the Old Testament, as would be more natural in the Enlightenment research tradition after the breakthrough of the History of Religions school. Grundmann is also more radical than Kittel and the salvation-historical research tradition when it comes to exegetical methodology, for instance redaction criticism. It would be wrong, however, to make Grundmann a representative of either tradition. His writing contains no salvation history other than that it is time to replace the Jewish salvation-historical tradition with a German salvation history, and Grundmann is definitely at odds with the salvation-historical research tradition in his view of the Old Testament. Although he takes a mediating position in 1933, a few years later he is seen working actively against the Old Testament as part of German church life, due to its connection with Judaism. In this view of the Old Testament, Grundmann comes closer to Semler and Schleiermacher than to the salvation-historical theologians.

The 'Jew' in the Symbolic World

This study demonstrates that in the Christian biblical interpretation of the two main research traditions, Jews and Judaism play a decisive role, not only as a religion among others, but as a religion that Christian theology must relate to. It is a relationship that affects the heart of the interpretive tradition, the symbolic world, with its ideology, theology, ethos and comprehensive world-view. This includes the *social* symbolism, that is, how Jews are conceived in the overall social system. It is all the more important because the Christian state, or the Christian Germany, represents a kind of symbiosis between state and faith; theology and politics cannot be divided. More often than not, the exegetes do include the 'Jew' in their symbolic totality, and the place given to the 'symbolic Jew' has consequences in real life, too.

The central ideas of the Enlightenment research tradition form a meaningful symbolic totality, in which the 'Jew' often represents the opposite of core values. Religion is predominantly universal, as opposed to nationally limited and particularist, as is typical of Jews and Judaism. God is a universal deity, who should not be locked into categories, as the Jewish national god YHWH. By the same token, Jesus can be described as "a spiritualised symbol of true universal humanity". Christianity is the highest, most elevated or most spiritual form of religion in history, and both Jesus and Christianity are elevated above the Jewish roots. In soteriology, too, the Jews represent the negative aspect, although it is not understood in terms of sacrifice, forgiveness of sins and redemption. The 'salvation' that God offers is rather seen in terms of freedom and integrity, and since the religion of Judaism is a religion of works, ceremonies—and yet sometimes immorality (!)—it is the absolute opposite of the values of the Enlightenment research tradition. The 'symbolic Jew' personifies what the Enlightenment exegete wishes to move away from, not towards.

Thus Jews and Judaism represent what is opposite to the values of the Enlightenment symbolic world. The 'Jew' is the typical particularist, keeping stubbornly to his customs and to the peculiarity of his people. Religious and social symbolism are synonymous. Just as political particularism is negative, being a hindrance to the German universalist-nationalist dream, the Jews, too, are a disturbing factor, keeping to their identity and peculiarity. As Uriel Tal notes, the Enlightenment-liberal elite in Germany was positive to including the Jews in the state

body, but only if they gave up their particularity and became 'German'. Thus, when universalism/particularism is used in the nineteenth-century debate about the Jews, the question of emancipation and assimilation lurks in the background. So does the dichotomy of Orient and Occident, where Christianity represents the European, and Judaism the Oriental—the use of dichotomies in Baur, for instance, is intriguing. Politics is not far from theology.

Furthermore, since morals are central to the Enlightenment research tradition, the way that Jews and Judaism are regarded in this connection is vitally important. Again, Judaism represents the opposite of the Enlightenment ideals. True ethics are those that are spontaneous, springing out of the individual's own ethical conscience, as opposed to ethics governed by books and rules. Thus legalism, as the opposite of such spontaneous ethics, is a major scarecrow—and its primary representative is the 'Jew'. Morally, Jews are minors, still immature. The ethics of Jews and Judaism are a meticulous and casuistic effort to please an angry God, a ladder to salvation that no one can climb. Moreover, Jewish religion is something outward, and some scholars, drawing parallels between Judaism and Church, regard organised religion, with its authority, dogma and scriptures, as a threat to freedom.

Concerning time and eschatology, Enlightenment research tradition favours an immanent perspective. Transcendancy is regarded as linked to Jewish apocalypticism, which is described as a sign of degeneration and is not seldom seen as a consequence of Jewish rootlessness in the Diaspora. This is why, it is suggested, they long for an apocalyptic homeland with a Messianic king! To cultural-Protestant Germany, the idea of apocalyptic events presumably threatened the existing social harmony.

Jesus' connection with Judaism would also give Judaism a positive role, but in Enlightenment research tradition, Jesus is seldom presented as a Jew. Rather, the Jewish dimension is played down, and Jesus becomes an ahistorical entity, a universal 'spirit', despite his historical background. If Christianity is the highest stage in a history of development, Jews and Judaism represent an obsolete pre-stage, which may be included in Christianity as a synthesis of Jewish and Greek, or be seen as being of no consequence to Christianity.

In sum, the 'symbolic Jew' of the Enlightenment research tradition personifies the negative part of the equation, a particularistic and stubbornly legalistic entity that does not fit into the universalistic vision.

Jews and Judaism are seldom positively described or of any positive value. To those scholars who retain a link to the old religion, the distant 'Hebrews', not the Jews, represent the continuity with an ideal past.

In the symbolic world of the salvation-historical research tradition, the 'symbolic Jew' is generally not only a positive figure but even needed for God's plans to be fulfilled—although the Jews do not fill that role, they are redefined as opponents. The building blocks that make up the world are taken from the Bible, and the Old and New Testaments are treated as a revelatory unity. An organic view of 'God's history' is fundamental, and since the Hebrew Bible is an indispensable source, it is here that we find the greatest experts in the Hebrew Bible and Judaica. The time frame transcends human history and is thoroughly eschatological, even if not always distinctly apocalyptic. God's plans for humanity span from Abraham to the second coming of Jesus, the Messiah, who is presented as a son of Abraham. Abraham's children, physical Israel, are the carrier of the seed of faith, the family of Abraham becoming the vehicle for salvation. *Thus the 'Jew' is an indispensable instrument of God for accomplishing his plans*, a calling that is irrevocable, although the fulfilment of salvation history depends on the salvation of the Jews. Thus the 'symbolic Jew' is suprahistorical, and sometimes only existent in the ancient past, or in connection with the eschatological future.

Moreover, this symbolic world is thoroughly Christocentric and soteriological, the Pietist character with the conversionist approach being evident: the Jews must come to faith in Jesus. Missionary work among Jews is the motor of this movement, but inherent to it is also a confrontation with Judaism. Some of the salvation-historical scholars find it impossible to maintain this high view of Jews and Judaism, and they describe the role of the Jews in two phases, before and after Jesus. When the Jews did not receive Jesus as the Messiah—or do not receive him now—their role changes from being identified with the positive 'symbolic Jew', being an important factor in God's dealings with man, to the opposite. *Here the salvation-historical and Enlightenment traditions converge, just as in the negative characterisation*, and the distance between Bousset or Schürer and Delitzsch or Schlatter is not all that great. *However, for the salvation-historical scholars, the intensity seems to peak with the soteriological question.* From New Testament to modern times, Jews were the fiercest opponents of Jesus and Christianity, the arch over history being broken when the Jews were confronted with Jesus. This focus also explains the stark contrast between Jesus and Judaism. As for the ways to salvation

of Judaism and Christianity, they are absolute rivals. To handle this duality, the place of Jews and Judaism may be acknowledged in a suprahistorical perspective—with or without an eschatological role of Israel—whereas Judaism after Christ is seen as something entirely different. This supersessionist view is found in several authors. The duality is also the reason for the often noted enigma that some of the greatest scholars of Judaica are able to utter more or less anti-Semitic statements in connection with the New Testament, e.g. Gerhard Kittel, Adolf Schlatter and the Swedish scholar Hugo Odeberg.⁴ These are what Levenson rightly calls the defenders and detractors of Judaism, although his suggestion that such scholars are anti-Semites and philo-Semites at the same time is less fortunate.⁵

Furthermore, in the material of this study, the following scholars state that the Jews are guilty of deicide: Schlatter, Kittel, Delitzsch and Grundmann. All these contend that the Jews crucified Jesus, an idea that is not found elsewhere in this study.⁶ According to Kittel, when the rabbis and Israel did not accept Jesus as the Messiah, this meant the end of Judaism, after which the struggle between Jesus and Judaism only resulted in the Jews crucifying him. That “the Jews killed Jesus” is now a national debt of the Jews, Delitzsch states.

Again, roots of theological anti-Semitism are found in the paradigms in which the Nazi scholars were raised. As already noted, Kittel saw a fundamental and fierce opposition with Judaism—a lifelong attitude that is stated by Kittel as well as confirmed in his texts. However, during National Socialism, the negative features of Judaism are described in a cruder manner and can be exploited by his overtly racist ideas. Kittel's symbolic world has been deeply affected by the new ideology when he makes the central concept of salvation-historical research tradition a racist one. The *Unheilsgeschichte* of the Jews—to which I will return when discussing legitimation and delegitimation—is the reversal of salvation history into a deterministic ‘history of depravation’, giving

⁴ For the latter, see Gerdmar, “Ein germanischer Jesus auf schwedischem Boden: schwedisch-deutsche Forschungszusammenarbeit mit rassistischen Vorzeichen 1941–1945”, 327–337, where it is substantiated that Odeberg, in the context of the Eisenach institute, uses anti-Semitic stereotypes and arguments in his research articles.

⁵ Levenson, “Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack”.

⁶ I cannot answer for the whole production of all the authors, only for the works consulted or discussed in this study.

divine sanction to the suffering of the Jews in history, and especially in National Socialist Germany.

No less prone to adapt and politicise New Testament theology was Grundmann, who went even further in creating a new symbolic world by means of his inherited theological toolbox. To the Lutheran theology and tenets that he probably shared with Schlatter and Kittel from his Tübingen years, he adds perspectives that would have been regarded as 'liberal' in his previous Tübingen environment. Germanic motifs also increasingly enter his symbolic world. These are built into a new theological framework, customised to serve his mission to vindicate Christianity in the 'Third Reich'—a dejudaised, to a certain extent Germanised, Christianity. In effect, the racial state becomes the warp in the fabric of his theology. The Reich (kingdom) of God is the 'Third Reich', and since hereditary soundness is a sign that the Reich has come, all that is Jewish must be eradicated from Germany.⁷ Although Grundmann does not say that *Jews* should be eradicated, but that everything *Jewish* should, to less sophisticated interpreters of the Eisenach institute's programme, eradication of Jews may have been understood as a natural consequence. Soldiers were equipped with the dejudaised Bible, which was the most spectacular product of the Institute, but the ultimate dejudaisation was of course that of making Jesus non-Jewish—the Germanic peoples could not have a Jewish Saviour! Thus, just as in Kittel, the 'symbolic Jew' in Grundmann's symbolic world takes on proportions that were entirely foreign to theology before him. Grundmann's entire theology becomes increasingly racialised, and the dejudaisation of Jesus and German church life, in which he was instrumental, marks a radical break with Judaism and shows a strongly anti-Semitic stance.

⁷ It is doubtful whether Grundmann is correct when he says that he was the one to remove the word 'eradication' from the name of the Institute in Eisenach, see Grundmann, "Erkenntnis und Wahrheit", 45.

Exegesis and Legitimation of Anti-Semitism

To what extent is an exegete responsible for the consequences of his or her books and articles? Do these have an effect on what 'ordinary men and women' think and do?⁸ Or does exegesis merely address the exegetical guild and ministers? The answer depends on the context of the scholarship, but this study has indicated that in German society, where the Bible was constitutive of the social symbolism of Jews and Judaism, what the theological professor or clergy said about the 'Jewish problem' could directly or indirectly affect the situation of the Jews. Berger remarks that any exercise of social control requires legitimation, and in a situation where resistance is expected, "additional legitimations" are all the more important, "legitimat[ing] social institutions by bestowing upon them an ultimately valid ontological status, that is, by *locating* [social institutions, A.G.] within a sacred and cosmic frame of reference".⁹ Therefore, when scholars make the 'symbolic Jew' a positive or negative factor in their symbolic world, this may open up for or close the door to anti-Semitism.

At this time, most of the exegetes regarded Germany as a Christian state, where the theological symbolism was part of the social symbolism. What is more, several of the exegetes were involved in politics. Schleiermacher, de Wette, Baur, Strauss, Ritschl, Bousset, Weiss, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Strack, Schlatter, Kittel, Grundmann, Bultmann, Schmidt and Dibelius were all politically organised or interested in party politics or questions pertaining to the Jews. *In other words, the exegetes were not detached from social questions.* Furthermore, these were times when the process of Jewish emancipation was a major development, and I have noted a range of instances when exegetes were directly involved in political issues concerning Jews—a noted example is when Kittel served as expert in the case of Herschel Grünsplan, but also when Strauss in 1848 argued for racist strategies in a political discussion on Jewish emancipation. On the street outside the window of the professor's study, a struggle was in progress over social issues in general and the situation of the Jews in particular. In several cases, the scholars made a difference—positively or negatively—for example when Strack countered blood libels or

⁸ For the notion 'ordinary men' and the Holocaust, see the devastating account in Browning, *Ordinary Men*.

⁹ Berger, *The Sacred Canopy. Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*, 31, quotation on p. 33.

Bultmann opposed Aryan legislation in the Church. Surprisingly, many of the scholars in this study were involved with, and fascinated and inspired by, Adolf Stoecker, from Bousset to Schlatter—or they joined his one-time disciple, but later less sympathetic, Friedrich Naumann. In other words, the exegetical professor in this study is socially aware and often politically active. Thus he may also have observed the social relevance of his theology.

Anti-Judaism as Praeparatio Antisemitica

I initially noted that anti-Judaism is sometimes used for a merely theological stance to discern from anti-Semitism—anti-Judaism being innocent and legitimate, whereas anti-Semitism is guilty of oppression and crime. However, this study suggests that, although it may not be willed by the author, anti-Judaism can function, and often functions, as a *praeparatio antisemitica*. The picture of Jews and Judaism that biblical interpretation conveyed to the German society for the most part rendered Jewry a place of inferiority and dishonour, even though there are good examples—few but devoted—of strong defence of Jews and Judaism. With its consistent depreciation of Jews and Judaism, the Enlightenment research tradition contributed to this general picture, and salvation-historical scholars, too, agreed to many negative descriptions of Jews and Judaism, as well as pure anti-Semitic stereotypes. But the most intense thought of a strong and fundamental opposition between Judaism and Christianity is found in some salvation-historical scholars, of which several moved into varying degrees of racist depreciation of Jews, including accusations of deicide. The idea that Jesus was Aryan, however, which was foreign to salvation-historical scholars, also marks a radical break with Judaism. This indicates that a general religious depreciation of Jews and Judaism prepares the way for anti-Semitism, and that in a Christian context, the idea of a fierce opposition between Jesus and Judaism intensifies the conflict and even paves the way for anti-Semitic policies and actions.

Legitimation and Delegitimation of the Social Oppression of Jews

Legitimation and delegitimation of discrimination and oppression of Jews can be either direct or indirect—direct when the scholar in question is directly involved in social and political discourse regarding the

situation of the Jews, indirect when this is not the case but when what is said may nevertheless indirectly affect the situation of the Jews.

The sum of this investigation is that neither of the research traditions is immune to such legitimization of oppression. Enlightenment as well as salvation-historical research traditions include thoughts that open up for anti-Semitism, some of which are found in both traditions. Only in the early salvation-historical research tradition of Tholuck and Beck was the picture of Jews and Judaism unanimously positive, whereas the later Delitzsch and his successors partly began to introduce anti-Semitic stereotypes as well as motifs from the 'Late Judaism' descriptions of Jews and Judaism. At the same time, the organic view of Judaism and Christianity as intertwined in God's eternal plan for Israel and Judaism was revised, and with the exit of the organic ideas, supersessionist views increased. *In effect, the Enlightenment tradition's negative view on Jews and Judaism, together with a certain support from the salvation-historical tradition, contributed to the legitimization of the dominant picture of the 'Jew' as a foreign entity in the German body.* In our material, the opponents of such a stance were a few salvation-historical scholars, who maintained a positive view and protested loudly against anti-Semitic lies about Jews, although they themselves could join the anti-Jewish and sometimes even culturally anti-Semitic choir. *My conclusion is that where there is anti-Semitic sentiment, it will manifest, regardless of the theological model.* In places there is a dark ecumenism of anti-Judaism and sometimes anti-Semitism, an ecumenism between diametrically opposed systems that seldom agree otherwise. This points to the existence of a structural anti-Semitism beyond theological systems.

Legitimising Racist Oppression

Beginning with the overt racist legitimization, one of the strongest examples of the direct legitimization of oppression of Jews and Judaism is probably Gerhard Kittel's theologising about the situation of the Jews in the 'Third Reich'. In this, he may in some respects have gone even further than Grundmann. Reversing and perverting the commonly used and fundamental category of salvation history into *Unheilsgeschichte*, Kittel paints a very graphic picture of how profoundly God has rejected the Jews. He calls salvation history and *Unheilsgeschichte* 'God's history', thus making God the legitimator of the oppression of Jews. In a prophetic tone, Kittel warns his readers—theologians, churchmen and churchgoers alike—against resisting 'God's history' regarding the Jews. Thus biblical theology, which was a specialty of his tradition, legitimised the new racial

policies. This has precedents in Kittel's background, however: salvation history was its foundation, and throughout his life, Kittel—in his own words—saw a profound opposition between Judaism and Christianity, between Jesus and Judaism. These deep-rooted attitudes should not be underestimated. Parallel with this anti-Judaism, Kittel is very critical of the liberal Judaism of the Weimar Republic, sharing many of his views with his mentor and close friend, Adolf Schlatter. Kittel's attitudes were not just a passing fancy; even before National Socialism, he belonged to the proto-National Socialist organisation *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur*. *Die Judenfrage* shows that his racist legitimisation of the new Aryan legislation and apartheid is found in his theological as well as his political attitudes. Thus, in Kittel's political theology, his grim God had determined the sufferings of the Jews under National Socialism.

Grundmann's involvement in the dejudaisation project makes him a leading theological legitimator of oppression of the Jews and Judaism, as he provided ideology for the escalating persecution of Jews in and outside of Germany. The tenor of Grundmann's attitude to Jews and Judaism is the same as Kittel's: a profound opposition between the two. With an eclectic political theology, combining old elements with Germanic and Deutsche Christen theology, Grundmann constructs a view that legitimises the dejudaisation of German church life, focusing on a non-Jewish Jesus as the main opponent of Judaism. Due to his extensive writing in NSDAP-related articles, pamphlets and books, as well as his leadership role at the Eisenach institute, Grundmann probably belongs to the main theological legitimators of oppression of his contemporary Jews.

Schlatter's "Will the Jew Prevail over Us?" legitimises the regime's exclusion of Jews from the public arena and depicts Jews and Judaism as essential enemies of Germany, although he also takes a stand against biological anti-Semitism. Sharing Kittel and Grundmann's fierce anti-Judaism and criticism of the Weimar Republic, Schlatter assents to the implementation of the Aryan paragraph, even if he often also criticises National Socialist phenomena. This is not done consistently, however, and besides, an anti-National Socialist stance does not exclude anti-Jewish or anti-Semitic ideas.

Finally, late in his production, Strauss legitimises harsh racist policies against Jews, a "people within the people", a "separate organism", who haggle, avoid hard manual labour, etc. Strauss even supports a policy of thinning out Jewish blood, which he thinks could eliminate negative Jewish peculiarities.

Opposing Racist Oppression

It would be wrong not to point out that several members of the salvation-historical research tradition made themselves known for a persistent and unanimous defence of Jews and Judaism against anti-Semitism: Tholuck, Beck, Delitzsch and, not least, Strack. In this respect, salvation-historical research tradition surpasses Enlightenment research tradition—a conclusion that is true for this material, although the situation might be different in a more extensive study. However, some of the Enlightenment-oriented defenders of Jews and Judaism are also mentioned below.

When Beck says that Christianity and the Church are fundamentally joined to “Old Testament covenantal economy”, this delegitimises any oppressive activities against Jews, an effect that Beck may have envisioned. His theology purposes to safeguard against the “proud expelling of the Old Testament covenant people”. Its organic connection between Judaism and Christianity was probably in its original form a safeguard against Christian discrimination of Jews, a theology that he shared with Tholuck, who also regarded it as important to defend and support Jews socially.

The strongest active defenders of Jews and Judaism against discrimination are Strack and Delitzsch. In this, they differ from some other scholars, who defend the rights of Jewish *Christians* in the Church, but not of Jews in society, the latter being a typical position of the Confessing Church. Delitzsch strongly and publicly objected to everything that he regarded as anti-Semitic, and he was, especially during the tumultuous 1880s, considered a defender of Jews. His theology and view on Jews is ambiguous, seeing a special role of the Jews, while at the same time airing prejudice against Jews. Nevertheless, Delitzsch regards it as a disgrace for Christians to call themselves anti-Semites. Strack’s resistance to anti-Semitic propaganda was even greater. For thirty years, he used his expertise and professorial authority to counter anti-Semitic accusations against Jews, a position that is a consequence of his salvation-historical theology.

Although Weiss does not refer to cultural and political discourse, his insistence on the continuity between Jesus and Judaism would be a powerful legitimization of Jews and Judaism as acceptable and even positive, and an indirect delegitimation of racist policies. Karl Ludwig Schmidt’s firm belief in the role of Jews and Judaism in God’s salvation plan also guards the place of the Jews in German and European history. Differing from most of his colleagues, Schmidt consciously uses a

theological book on the 'Jewish problem' to try to defend the place of the Jews in God's plan and in contemporary Europe, and his dialogue with Martin Buber was for the time—January 1933—an important political statement. In the 1940s, he takes a clear stand against anti-Semitism, even though he betrays his fundamentally racist attitude when talking pejoratively of Jews in writing and in private correspondence. Hugo Gressmann's role is somewhat ambiguous, but he also took a practical stand against discrimination of Jews through his initiative to invite Jewish scholars to lecture at the institute in Berlin.

Rudolf Bultmann does not defend Jews in general, although he does stand up for Jewish-Christian ministers in the Protestant churches due to their being Christian. However, compared to Kittel, who acknowledged the existence of Jewish-Christian churches but supported the Aryan paragraph in the Church, Bultmann worked publicly and boldly to delegitimise this discrimination. Then again, he leaves it to the State to deal with the 'Jewish problem', which as a social question belongs to the divine mandate of the State.

Countering Jewish Emancipation

Theology that describes Jews and Judaism as inferior and problematic contributes to the legitimisation of oppression. I will first list imagery that renders Jews a place of inferiority, and then proceed to discuss statements that resist emancipation and give Jews a secondary position in society. Descriptions of Jews as inferior were amply demonstrated in scholars from the entire breadth of German Protestantism. These views marginalise Jews and Judaism, legitimising their place of inferiority in German society and culture.

Falling back on age-old anti-Semitism and the idea that Jews were inferior and essentially foreign to Germany society, several exegetes in this study counter emancipation, which, next to the mere defence against direct, verbal and physical attacks on Jews, was the most important and promising development for Jews and Judaism in Germany at the time.

Enlightenment and salvation-historical research tradition alike envision a Christian nation, albeit with different theological profiles. As noted by Uriel Tal, however, there is a preponderance for envisioning a united Germany in liberal theology, combining a claim of tolerance not only with profoundly negative views of Jews and Judaism, but also with an insistence on their assimilation as a prerequisite for receiving a place in society. This tension between enlightened tolerance and social

discrimination fits several of these theologians. Semler and Herder oppose persecution, but Semler's idea of the Jews as minors probably contributed to making discrimination permanent in a society where Jews were already regarded as *political* minors without citizenship. Herder's idea of Jews as a foreign and even parasitic plant on the body of the German people probably had a similar effect, at the same time as Herder was able to criticise ill-treatment of Jews. Schleiermacher, with many Jewish friends, nevertheless saw Jewishness as foreign to the European spirit and demanded assimilation in order for Jews to be granted equal rights, requiring them to conform and be emancipated, or stay outside of social life. de Wette takes the same road, wanting to tolerate the Jews without granting them civil rights, and urging the Christian German state to reform the Jews so that their lives would be built on the Christian faith and values. Jews being Jews, they ought to have this limited freedom and should conform to the Christian state. Baur's idea of the Jews being elevated by the Greek formation is in itself Orientalist; moreover, their perceived particularism makes them an obstacle to Baur's nationalist-universalist project. Ritschl's theology effectively marginalises Jews and Judaism, and his essentialist view on Jews accords with and legitimises the policy of his liberal Protestant state, where the Jews belong merely to the margins. *Hence, when Christianity in the bourgeois, cultural-Protestant Kaiserreich became a German religion that was immanent in the system, Jews and Judaism were marginalised in every respect, from religion to equal access, to teaching and studying.* Similarly, representatives of the salvation-historical research tradition maintain that the Christian state is the only option, and thus in practice counter emancipation. Finally, in the National Socialist exegetes, the emancipation of Jews is excluded, and Kittel replaces it with a theologically legitimised apartheid: the Jews should return to the ghetto, a solution that is best for Jews and Germans alike.

Summing Up: Association and Disassociation

As noted, the place of the 'symbolic Jew' affects how the 'real Jew' is treated. Certain ideological structures open up for anti-Semitism, while others close the door to it. Factors that seem particularly apt to *open* up for anti-Semitism as follows: The *disconnecting* of Judaism and Christianity naturally removes the unity that may cause Christians to see Jews and Judaism as organically related to themselves and thus want to protect them. Such *supersessionist* views turn the Jews into a people among others, or even into Christianity's enemy. *Essentialist deprecation* of Jews renders

them a place of inferiority. Furthermore, the idea that Judaism stands in *fierce opposition to Jesus* naturally places Judaism outside the protection of a Christian state, as does a *two-kingdom doctrine* that legitimises the Church leaving it to the State to deal with the 'Jewish problem', as with any social issue. In a similar way, *race* regarded as *an order of creation* becomes a divine legitimisation of race—the Jewish race—being permanently inferior. Finally, a deterministic *Unheilsgeschichte* that puts Jews under divine wrath is the most appalling legitimisation of anti-Semitic political action. It is difficult to know exactly how Luther's views of Jews and Judaism affected a scholar such as Kittel, but according to Luther, the Jews are predestined for *Unheil*, calamity and the wrath of God, whereas Christians are predestined for *Heil*, salvation—a motif that is recognisable in Kittel's talk of *Unheilsgeschichte*.¹⁰

Structures that seem to close the door to anti-Semitism are ideas that stress the *connection* between Judaism and Christianity. These include *organic models* of the relationship, and the insistence that Jews are necessary factors in God's salvation plan. A key issue is the relation to the *Old Testament*, or, more precisely, the idea that the modern Jews have a continuity with the ancient Israel described in the Old Testament. If Jesus is identified as Jewish, this acts as a protection for Jews and Judaism, as it becomes more difficult to attack his kinsmen. Where dejudaisation was a main concern, it was important to turn the Jewish Jesus into an Aryan and Germanic Saviour, as well as to enforce the idea that Jesus was the Jews' fiercest opponent ever.

Hence the *association* between Christians and Jews is key, the Jews always retaining their place as God's elect people, as is the *disassociation* of Judaism from Christianity, the Jews having lost that place of privilege and protection. From religious *disassociation*, there is often a link to ethnic discrimination and overt racism. But in a Christian culture, it seems difficult to lay a hand on Jews if there is an association between the Jews, God and the biblical Israel.

¹⁰ Martin Stöhr, "Martin Luther und die Juden", in *Christen und Juden. Ihr Gegenüber vom Apostelkonzil bis heute*, ed. Wolf-Dieter Marsch and Karl Thieme (Mainz, Göttingen: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 139. He also expressed a classic supersessionist view: the Church is the new people, the new Jerusalem, which is linked to a new covenant, WA, 53, 551.

Exegesis in Cultural-Political Context

Exegesis and theology are part of a larger cultural fabric. Ideas, values and moral choices of individuals and groups are root causes of anti-Semitism, and when the primary legitimation is theological, the texts that are considered holy play a decisive role, which is the reason for this study of biblical exegesis and anti-Semitism. However, although the above discussion has amply shown the power of tradition in furthering such ideas, mere adherence to a research tradition does not entirely explain the mechanics of theology and anti-Semitism. There are also other root causes. Through a complex interplay of ideology and political thought, theology, scholarly 'knowledge', cultural conceptions of Jews, as well as prevailing political ideas and considerations, the exegete develops his views on Jews and Judaism out of his personal thought and ethos. In order to suggest how these factors may have influenced the scholars' ideas and policies, I will tentatively broaden the discussion by placing the ideas furthered by biblical interpretation in their political and cultural context.

Firstly, it has been demonstrated that *culturally transmitted prejudice and stereotypes* influence people, including scholars, when thinking and acting in relation to Jews and Judaism. This is found throughout the material, and I have already pointed to stereotypes such as the 'Wandering Jew', a 'World Judaism' that is hungry for power, Jewish moral depravity, the greedy Jewish banker, the 'money Jew', Jews as Marxists, the proud 'Jewish type', the insincere, hypocritical Jew, and Jews as corporately responsible for deicide. These are expressions of *an anti-Semitic sentiment* that runs as an undercurrent in much of European and Christian culture. One sometimes wonders how theologians who disagree on many other issues, can nonetheless agree on the negative characteristics of Jews and Judaism, and the danger of letting them gain influence in society. This anti-Semitic sentiment, with cultural as well as theological elements, seems to be an explanation.

Secondly, there is *a nationalistic undercurrent* that influences how Jews and Judaism are dealt with. This applies to both research traditions, where the theological perspectives are more or less related to political positions, envisioning a Christian state that Jews ought to be assimilated into through conversion and baptism, or at least by giving up their particularity. As Peter Pulzer notes, "the term Christian in a political context explicitly came to have more and more of a national—even

racial—connotation”.¹¹ The father of German nationalism, Herder, defined the Jews as a foreign people, and the critical thought of them being a nation within the nation often recurs. In a liberal as well as a conservative environment, Jews were a marginalised and unprivileged group in the nation. Lacking equal rights, a certain ghettoisation was still in force; as late as the beginning of the First World War, it was almost impossible for an unbaptised Jew to become an officer.¹²

Linked to this is the problem of the Jews’ emancipation in Christian Germany, that is, *whether Jews could maintain their Jewish integrity* in the national project. The attitudes to Jews and Judaism in the cultural-Protestant Germany of the Christian *Kaiserreich* are discussed by Uriel Tal.¹³ Schmuël Ettinger summarises Tal’s results:

Dr Tal’s researches confirm the historical fact, also evident in other countries and in other periods, that precisely those who remain faithful to Christian tradition can find a definite place for Jews as a separate group within the nation, whereas the extreme liberals, although prepared to admit into their society individuals of Jewish origin, deny that Judaism can have any meaningful existence within the framework of modern society and hence demand of members of the minority group that they sever all ties with their historic and religious heritage.¹⁴

Politics was of vital importance to liberal German intellectuals, who envisioned a national unification into one political unit. Here the particularity of the Jews presented a problem, as did the task of integrating this ‘foreign body’, the Jews, into German society. At the same time, however, this group wanted to defend the right of Jews to maintain their Jewish identity¹⁵—a duality that is evidenced in the exegetes of this book. Many talked of emancipation, but according to Tal, the unification project gained the upper hand. The Janus face

¹¹ Pulzer, “The Return of Old Hatreds”, 222, also quoted above.

¹² Gerlach, *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekenkende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*, 21.

¹³ Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*.

¹⁴ Ettinger, “Foreword to Tal, Uriel, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*”, 10–11.

¹⁵ Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*, 32. Similarly, there were liberal Jewish voices that spoke of a Jewish cultural Protestantism, see Christian Wiese, “‘Das beste Gegengift gegen der Judenhaß?’ Wissenschaft des Judentums, protestantische Bibelkritik und Antisemitismus vor der Shoah”, in *Reuchlin und seine Erben. Forscher, Denker, Ideologen und Spinner*, ed. Peter Schäfer and Irina Wandrey, *Pforzheimer Reuchlinschriften* (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005).

of the Enlightenment is thus seen in the fact that even as enlightened intellectuals formed fronts against the political anti-Semitism of people such as Adolf Stoecker,¹⁶ they resisted emancipation on equal terms for the Jews. Their strategy for resisting anti-Semitism was that Jews “be completely absorbed into the nation”.¹⁷ In a speech against political anti-Semitism (!), the national liberal professor Rudolf von Gneist expressed it as follows: “When the Jews will give up their distinctiveness, we shall witness the final consummation of emancipation.”¹⁸ von Gneist belonged to the leading personalities of the Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus (Association for Defence Against Anti-Semitism), which was indeed devoted to guarding against anti-Semitism.¹⁹ Thus cultural Protestantism as a theological-political unity closed the door to the Jews, von Gneist confirming that Jews, due to their religious and cultural particularity, could not possibly become part of the nation. His statement resembles the criticism of Jewish particularism that is frequently found in this study, where Jews with their stubborn nationality and ethnic exclusivity are allegedly an antipode to the envisioned theological universalism. It should be noted that the Jews were not the only particularists to worry universalists, although they were the embodiment of this phenomenon. In this connection, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf’s discussion of the Jews and cultural Protestantism in the last decades of this study is enlightening. In the circles around the liberal flagship journal *Die Christliche Welt*, Graf on the one hand notes the national liberalism that is combined with protests against Aryan legislation in the Church, helping Jews to emigrate and advocating a theological criticism of a blood and soil theology. On the other hand, to the same people, Jews are a ‘guest people’, they may be spoken of in racial terms, and in fact, some in the cultural-Protestant group lends support to racial policies. Promoting a homogenous, enlightened Christian state causes

¹⁶ For this, see Bergmann, *Geschichte des Antisemitismus*, and for the expression ‘Janus face of the Enlightenment’, see Habermas, “The Entwinement of Myth and Enlightenment: Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno”, 109.

¹⁷ Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*, 50. See also pp. 161–164 for liberal Protestantism and Judaism: “The main hope and purpose of Liberal Protestantism, namely, the national and cultural unity of the Second Reich based on historical and Christian principles, had broken against the stiff neck of Judaism,” 164.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 78–79.

¹⁹ The complete volumes of its paper, *Abwehrblätter*, are published on the Internet by Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, “Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus” und “Abwehrblätter”.

this group to accept Jews, but only at the cost of their particularity. Martin Rade himself shows a curious combination of defending Jews against anti-Semitism and acknowledging that there are reasons for it, in the early 1930s advocating special laws for Jews. Likewise, his comments after the passing of the Nuremberg Laws seem to indicate that he considered it the State's privilege to create such racist laws.

Kurt Nowak argues, "It could be difficult, in the Protestant landscape of the 1920s, to find a group that defended the marked, legitimate place of the Jewish citizen in the modern development of German society with a humane and political unambiguity such as that of the constitution-loyal cultural Protestants."²⁰ Although Nowak may well be generally correct, in this study, there were hardly any cultural-Protestant voices that unambiguously defended Jews and Judaism in the 1920s—a small exception being Gressmann. Bultmann demonstrates several of the characteristics listed by Graf: liberalism combined with protests against Aryan legislation in the Church—not against Aryan legislation in the National Socialist state—as well as with helping Jews and putting up a theological resistance to National Socialist theology, for instance in the form developed by the *Deutsche Christen*. Interestingly, the liberal Bultmann belonged to the Confessing Church and also applied the Lutheran two-kingdom doctrine to the situation of the Jews. Moreover, he regarded the Jews as a 'guest people'. Thus Wiese's warning against an idealisation of liberal Protestantism's stance towards Jews seems justified:

Against an idealisation of the position of liberal Protestantism, which certainly took the most positive approach within Protestant theology, one must ask whether its theological picture of Judaism did not work counterproductively to its humanitarian intentions.²¹

However, in this study, exegetes of a liberal Protestant stance do not take the most humanitarian positions either, compared to for instance Delitzsch or Strack. Except for his Christian brethren, Bultmann did not defend the victims of Aryan legislation, leaving the fate of all other Jews to the State's own discretion. To Bultmann, race is a biological factor and a separate estate. His post-Auschwitz statements betray a secondary anti-Semitism—similar to Bousset's fifty years earlier—when

²⁰ Nowak, *Kulturprotestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik*, 35.

²¹ Wiese, *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?*, 15–16 n. 25.

he asks Jews to examine themselves for any responsibility that they might have for the tragic events during National Socialism. Dibelius, whom Graf links to this tradition,²² did not defend the Jews either, when he, in the racial state of Germany, claimed that “theology takes part in the national struggle, investigating what it means that a Christian stands in orders like family, people, race”, a statement that corresponds to other examples of compliance with racial discourse. The fact that these scholars and others could stand up for their Jewish friends does not diminish the role they played in legitimising or quietly assenting to anti-Semitism.

By the same token, the salvation-historical ‘missionary state’ also requires that the Jews conform to the Christian state through conversion. The Lutheran Pietist roots of the salvation-historical tradition go back to Spener’s Pietism, with its combination of missions to Israel, salvation history, interest in Judaica, defence of Jews against anti-Semitic assaults, but also the idea of forcing Jews to listen to Christian sermons. The modern salvation-historical tradition that is studied here begins with a second Pietist awakening in Prussia in the first half of the nineteenth century. Politically linked to the aristocracy, and theologically in full confrontation with Enlightenment theology, it had no interest in bourgeois emancipation. The Prussian way to emancipation was through conversion. Delitzsch, for instance, clearly envisioned a confessional Christian state, not a state with equality for Christians and Jews. Thus *German Protestantism in all its breadth shared the vision of a Christian nation, and the way to emancipation for Jews was to conform to the Christian state.*

Thirdly, the idea that *Jews are responsible for cultural degeneration and a threat to the existing political order* is another root of anti-Semitism. Suggesting that Jews are to blame for the cultural and moral degeneration of the land, Stoecker, for example, also argues that Jews should be kept out of the marketplace. His political-cultural make-up combines Lutheran Pietism, adherence to a Christian state, salvation-historical thinking—including Jesus being Jewish—a conservative stance and criticism of the influence of Jews in culture, finance, the press and education. The idea of Jews threatening German culture is most clearly evidenced in this study in Kittel’s and Schlatter’s criticism of an assimilated Jewry with a strongly negative influence on culture during the Weimar years. The ‘Jew’ is

²² It seems difficult to place Dibelius in either tradition, see Eckart, Sellin, and Wolgast, eds., *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, 205, 218.

thus regarded as the prime factor in Germany's degeneration after the First World War. However, Strack's example shows that the scholar's personal ethos is crucial. Initially inspired by Stoecker and sharing his theological ideas, cultural vision and more, Strack left Stoecker's movement, stating that Stoecker's unchristian hatred produced a degenerated anti-Semitism, and then devoted much of his life to countering the anti-Semitism of Stoecker and others. Yet with the same theological, cultural and political starting point, Kittel ended up in something even more racist than Stoecker, going from a strong cultural anti-Semitism, with classic Jewish stereotypes, into theories of racial mixing and the project of maintaining a pure German blood. Schlatter, on the other hand, sharing much of the background, stereotypes and view of assimilated Judaism, kept biological racism out of his thought, probably due to theological barriers and his personal ethos. Personal ethos, not only ideology or theology, is therefore decisive for where a person ends up in relation to the Jews.

A final root to the theological anti-Semitism seen in this study is not a specifically anti-Semitic undercurrent, but *the attraction to or pressure from contemporary political ideology*, which may go together with any ruling ideology. This spans all the way from a desire to be politically correct to a pressure from the political power to conform. A number of the exegetes in this study were involved in contemporary politics, and their theological constructions were often in line with the trend in society. When Strauss in revolutionary 1848 suggested overtly racist policies, he tapped into an existing trend, and it is remarkable to see how attractive Stoecker was to the theologically very different exegetes in the 1880s. On the other hand, conservative as well as liberal scholars left his movement when the anti-Semitism became too harsh. *During National Socialism, however, it is evident that several scholars adjusted to the new agenda*, albeit with various levels of acceptance of National Socialist ideology. Apart from Kittel and Grundmann, who were devoted to National Socialism at an early stage, scholars adjusted to varying degrees and in different ways. Schlatter and Bultmann complied with new legislation for the Jews, allowing the two-kingdom doctrine to create an ideological space for racist practices. The latter's secondary anti-Semitism and Dibelius's post-war support of Kittel's racist scholarship and comments on the possible non-Jewishness of Jesus and Paul—despite his *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen*, which nevertheless gives fairly little attention to the suffering of the Jews—show that their views during National Socialism

were not only formulated under pressure. There are also examples of resistance. As much as Schlatter attempts to engage in dialogue with the *SA-Mann*, in 1935 the same Schlatter is able to talk of Jesus as a Jew who is God, and condemn National Socialist attacks on Christmas. But on the whole, exegetes, just as ordinary men, seem to conform to contemporary political ideology.

Thus some major roots of theological anti-Semitism discovered in this study can be summarised under the following headings: anti-Semitic prejudice and stereotypes furthered by anti-Semitic sentiments that are an undercurrent of political or theological systems; a nationalism that forces Jews to conform; the notion of Jews and Judaism as threatening to German society and culture; and politically correct adjustment to prevailing ideology. However, the way in which individual exegetes relate to these is not determined by theological systems or research traditions. Rather, these seem to legitimise underlying ideas, sympathies, antipathies and *ressentiments*. The decisive factor seems to be *the ethos of the individual scholar*. Strack's criticism of Stoecker was that it was "unchristian, unrighteous [...] not love but hatred", even though Strack and Stoecker shared the same world-view, theology and background. In fact, Paul's struggle with the fate of the Jews in Romans 9–11, which engages many of the exegetes in this study, includes the element that Strack missed in Stoecker: the deep burden for and association with his Jewish compatriots, which caused Paul to write, "I wish that I personally would be accursed from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my compatriots by nature" (Rom. 9:1–5). Beyond theological or religious convictions, the view of human dignity, and attitudes of love or hate, are decisive.

Finally, a remarkable trait is the *compartmentalisation* that can be found among the various scholars. One may have a personal relationship with and sometimes take the risk of standing up for Jewish friends, despite ideologically maintaining that Jews are inferior, and occasionally even supporting policies that discriminate against Jews. Another may have a passion for Jewish studies and/or missions to Jews, yet express anti-Semitic prejudice. Hence the argument that being personally acquainted with Jews excludes a person from being anti-Semitic is not valid. Kittel is an example of this, mentioning a range of Jewish acquaintances, yet clearly suggesting anti-Semitic policies. This study shows that it is possible to hold seemingly contradictory views at the same time. From a psychological-anthropological point of view, Claudia Strauss maintains

that “everyone’s belief system is partly compartmentalised and partly integrated”,²³ and there are situations where *the same individual seems to hold competing views*.

We have seen this in Enlightenment thinkers with the ambition to emancipate Jews or with close Jewish friendships, who still require that they give up their Jewishness, and also in those who stand up for Jewish *Christians*, but not for Jews in general, since only the Christian compartment demands solidarity. The compartmentalisation is perhaps greatest among the salvation-historical scholars who are the leading and most enthusiastic experts in Jews and Judaism, at the same time as they may give dark descriptions of Jews and Judaism—and sometimes even overt racism. Examples are Gerhard Kittel, Adolf Schlatter and the Swedish New Testament professor Hugo Odeberg. Thus the ‘symbolic Jew’ can have a central place in God’s salvation plan, while the neighbouring ‘real Jew’ is considered a nuisance or even a threat. The Jewish *Christian* can be a brother, whereas the fate of a non-Christian Jew is less important. The compartments do have a certain connection, however. On one level, the Jewish people is fundamental to the entire salvation-historical system, but when Jesus comes and Israel does not corporately receive him as the Messiah, ‘the Jew’ loses his privileged position. Demoted, he increasingly becomes an enemy of Christianity, the Christian state, and the morals, economy and unity of the nations—or even their racial purity. It is true that the passion for Judaica begins with an interest in missions to Israel, and modern ‘Jewish Christians’ are valuable as the first fruits of this evangelistic endeavour. Moreover, associating with Orthodox Jews, representing pre-depraved Judaism with its high morals and earnest piety, is still natural; their honest devotion and existential struggle with the realities of blessing or curse—in the wake of Jochanan ben Zakkai—have the deep sympathy of several of these scholars. But the soteriological focus—and perhaps frustrated love when Jews once again do not enter the kingdom in great numbers—combined with cultural, theological and political considerations, may in part explain the mystery of passion for Jewish studies coupled with anti-Jewish, or even anti-Semitic, attitudes of scholars in the salvation-historical tradition. By the same token, the Janus face of emancipation on condition

²³ Claudia Strauss, “Research on cultural discontinuities”, in *A cognitive theory of cultural meaning*, ed. Claudia Strauss and Naomi Quinn, *Publications of the Society for Psychological Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 215.

of full assimilation is present in the Enlightenment tradition. Thus, in both research traditions, there is a compartmentalisation where seemingly contradictory tendencies come together in the same person or thought system due to a complex interplay of cultural, theological and personal preferences.

Exegesis after Auschwitz

It takes a whole new way of thinking in order to solve the problems which we have created with the old way of thinking.

Albert Einstein

For reasons presented in the Introduction, this study has with one exception focused on German Protestant exegesis, but this does not mean that thought structures such as these cannot be found elsewhere or that they are inherently German—a prime example is the Swedish exegete Hugo Odeberg. Nobel laureate and Auschwitz survivor Imre Kertész insists that Auschwitz is not a German-Jewish affair and should be understood as a world experience, rather than as applying only to those directly concerned.²⁴ Rephrasing Adorno, he says that “after Auschwitz you can only write poetry about Auschwitz”.²⁵ Hence, since Auschwitz is a universal experience, exegesis of texts that pertain to and affect Jews and Judaism, must somehow be written ‘about Auschwitz’.²⁶ In this quest for the roots of theological anti-Semitism, the continuity of ideas and paradigms that construct the Jews as the negative ‘other’ is apparent, from the earliest work discussed, from 1738, to the last, from 1952. This breadth and depth of negative views on Jews and Judaism are part of the warp that runs through the European and German cultural fabric. Overtly anti-Semitic scholars did not need to create the

²⁴ Imre Kertész, *Det landsförisade språket. Essäer och tal*, trans. Ervin Rosenberg (Stockholm: Norstedts, 2007), 151 (In Hungarian: *A száműzött nyelve*).

²⁵ Ibid., 52. Theodor W. Adorno said in 1949 that writing poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric.

²⁶ This does not mean that Auschwitz is only a result of Europe being basically Christian—National Socialist ideology was inherently anti-Christian—but that Christianity, not only German or Protestant, needs to reflect on its relationship to Auschwitz. On Auschwitz as a crisis of Christian theology, see e.g. the articles in Rolf Rendtorff and Eckhard Stegemann, eds., *Auschwitz—Krise der christlichen Theologie. Eine Vortragsreihe*, vol. 10, *Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1980).

ideas needed to theologically legitimise National Socialist racist ideology. They could use existing ideological structures—sometimes merely reusing them, other times reversing and perverting elements from the European Christian symbolic world in which they were raised.

The results of this study call exegesis and theology to self-critical reflection. The first caveat is to see that exegesis is socially relevant and therefore entails a responsibility; the exegete, like all others involved, is a moral agent. Secondly, exegetical scholarship must examine prevailing thought structures pertaining to Jews and Judaism in exegesis. After Auschwitz, exegesis slowly opened up for the Jewish roots of early Christianity and its consequences for theology, perhaps as a repentance at the gallows. This new turn—a Jewish as well as an historical turn—recognises Jesus as Jewish, a Jewish Paul and Christianity as a Jewish movement,²⁷ an awareness that only broke through in the 1970s, sparked primarily by E. P. Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* and Krister Stendahl's contribution. This ongoing discussion of the 'new perspective on Paul', challenging dogmatic patterns from the Reformation and indeed many of the stereotypes discussed here, is a healthy example of a reconsideration of Palestinian Judaism, in an area where Paul has traditionally been linked to a Diaspora and 'Hellenistic' background.²⁸ Similarly, the Jewish background of Jesus and the Gospels is increasingly acknowledged.

²⁷ From the 1950s onwards, there has been a growing interest in the New Testament and Judaism, a wealth of literature published during the second half of the 20th c. evidencing this 'Jewish' turn in New Testament studies; see e.g. Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ANSU (Lund and Copenhagen: Gleerups and Munksgaard, 1961); Birger Gerhardsson, *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, vol. 20, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* (Lund: Gleerups, 1964); and much later Bruce D. Chilton, *Rabbi Jesus. An Intimate Biography. The Jewish Life and Teaching That Inspired Christianity* (New York: Doubleday, 2000); Brad H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables* (New York 1989); Brad H. Young, *Jesus the Jewish Theologian* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995), to mention a few. Important contributions have been made by Jewish scholars, e.g. David Flusser, "Judaism and the Origins of Christianity" (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989); D. Flusser, "Das Christentum eine jüdische Religion" (München: 1990); David Flusser, *Jesus*, ed. R. Steven Notley, 2 Revised ed. (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1997); Vermes, *Jesus the Jew. A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*; Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism*; and Jacob Neusner's extensive production.

²⁸ This most influential debate has concentrated especially on the role of the Law and the meaning of 'righteousness' in Pauline discourse. From the late 1970s, the debate regarding the 'new perspective on Paul' has led to a reconsideration of the depiction of Judaism in Second Temple Judaism as legalistic, a reconsideration that got its breakthrough with the writings of E. P. Sanders and Krister Stendahl, see Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,

This study has focused on fundamental patterns, structures and heuristic models of New Testament exegesis, and the findings call for a rethinking of some of these structures. The stereotypical characterisation of Jews and Judaism, often based on New Testament images, needs continuous critical reflection.²⁹ Just as serious scholarship hardly uses the term 'Late Judaism' anymore, ideologically tainted dichotomic patterns in the area of historiography need to be abandoned. The fundamental Hegelian-type dichotomy between Judaism and Hellenism does not hold water empirically,³⁰ yet it retains its place in exegetical textbooks and studies, whereas historians seriously question the nature and scope of Hellenism. Parallel to this are the oppositions between Diaspora and Eretz Israel, Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism, Hebrews and Hellenists, Peter and Paul. The investigation has shown that this idealistic pattern preserves a picture in which the 'Jewish' side always gets the raw deal, whereas the side outside Eretz Israel is described as elevated by the Greek education and ethos of for example Alexandria and Philo. But handy manoeuvres such as using these dichotomies, petrifying an oversimplification and prejudice against the Jewish side, needs to be replaced with models that reflect a more realistic and complex picture of Second Temple Judaism. Similarly, this study shows that supersessionist models of disassociation between Jesus and Judaism, and early Christianity and Judaism, are ideologically tainted rather than based on New Testament evidence;³¹ as Soulen has

1985); Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*. The term 'new perspective on Paul' was coined by James Dunn, James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the law: studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990), but important contributions have been made by e.g. Tom Wright, N. T. Wright, *What St Paul really said* (Oxford: Lion, 1997); N. T. Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (London: SPCK, 2005). See also the discussion on the Torah in Friedrich Avemarie, *Tora und Leben: Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur*, vol. 55, *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

²⁹ See e.g. Deines, *Die Phariseer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*, 515–555.

³⁰ As is convincingly shown in Dale B. Martin, "Paul and the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: Toward a Social History of the Question", in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001); see also Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*.

³¹ They are difficult to base on New Testament evidence, given that texts such as Hebrews 8:13, about the first covenant 'wearing out', can be interpreted as an inner-Jewish discussion about two covenants in Israel, and that e.g. John's gospel rejecting Judaism altogether is difficult to argue provided that John 4:22 is authentic. Each of these discussions deserves a monograph.

shown, these dissociative patterns were developed from the second and third centuries, becoming part of the make-up of Christian theology.³² Modern exegesis has more readily emphasised the profound association between Judaism and Christianity, or rather Christianity as a Judaism.³³ Finally, dealing with the symbolic world of the New Testament is a hermeneutical challenge for a modern interpreter, the symbolic world of nascent Christianity being a Jewish one, which slowly found ways to interpret its new experiences of the Messiah and the Spirit in terms available in existing paradigms.³⁴ Whatever theological project the modern interpreter might have, she or he needs to appreciate the historical one before customising early Christianity into the prevailing theological paradigms. This is the lesson of the attempts to Aryanise Jesus at the cost of his historical peculiarity.

Thus the way in which exegetes have related to Jews and Judaism points to the need for a self-critical 'hermeneutics of suspicion', not only for texts, but for us as interpreters of texts and as ideologically conditioned writers of history. After Auschwitz, after the end of

³² Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*.

³³ Such an awareness more seldom makes its way into Christian theology. This observation was made during an analysis of a range of systematic theologies, exceptions being e.g. Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology. Volume 1: The Triune God* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1997); Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology. Volume 2: The Works of God* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1999), but see also Jürgen Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott: das Kreuz Jesu Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie*, 3 ed. (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1976). Soulen discusses Israel in Christian theology as a matter of principle.

³⁴ See e.g. Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, 2 ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998); Larry W. Hurtado, *At the Origins of Christian Worship. The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999); Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: devotion to Jesus in earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), and for the symbolic world of the New Testament authors, Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982); Alan F. Segal, *Two powers in heaven: early rabbinic reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Boston: Brill, 2002); Mary Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys. A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*, ed. Johann Maier, Judentum und Umwelt (Frankfurt a. M.: Verlag Peter Lang, 1984); Martha Himmel-farb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology. Antecedents and Early Evidence*, vol. 42, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); Clinton E. Arnold, *The Colossian Syncretism. The Interface Between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*, ed. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius, vol. 2/77, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995). For the way in which early Christians experienced the radical changes in their symbolic world, see Heikki Räisänen, *Beyond New Testament Theology: A Story and a Programme*, 2 ed. (London: SPCK, 2001).

scholarly innocence,³⁵ and after hermeneutics moved from methods of interpretation to awareness of how interpretation works, the ethos of the New Testament, as well as of the interpreter, comes into focus. A way forward for exegesis after Auschwitz is foreshadowed by Johannes Weiss, whose name there was never any reason to mention in connection with anti-Judaism or anti-Semitism. Weiss consciously purposed to work *independently of his own theological preferences*, and indeed in pronounced opposition to the philosophically and idealistically conditioned biblical studies in which he was trained. Instead, he carried out a *thorough and intersubjectively testable analysis* of the New Testament material, which in many ways is still up to the mark, including all relevant background material that was available, e.g. apocalyptic texts that were foreign to his own Christianity. Weiss even concluded that *his results threatened his own theological position*, but this did not prevent him from continuing, allowing for the ‘σκάνδαλον of particularism’ that challenged his own Enlightenment universalism.³⁶ The way in which he dealt with the ancient texts surrounding the New Testament pioneered a new way of treating the questions of Jesus and Judaism. Thus Weiss’s methodological programme *marked an historical, and indeed Jewish, turn* in New Testament exegesis, breaking the idealistic spell over New Testament history. Against his own ideological interests, he resituates a *Jewish Jesus* and early Christianity in their original and historical Jewish soil in Eretz Israel, thus foreshadowing a way for exegesis after Auschwitz.

³⁵ Jane Flax, “The End of Innocence”, in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (New York: Routledge, 1992).

³⁶ The notion ‘σκάνδαλον of particularism’ was coined by my friend Fr Mikael Liljeström, not to be confused with ‘scandal of particularism’.

ARCHIVE MATERIALS

Bundesarchiv, Berlin

Bundesarchiv, BA NSDAP-Gaukartei (Grundmann's National Socialist membership card)

Bundesarchiv, BA NSDAP-Zentralkartei (Kittel's National Socialist membership card)

Bundesarchiv, ZA VI 3413 (membership information about Kittel)

Evangelisches Zentralarchiv in Berlin (EZA)

EZA 7/4166:

Die Arbeitsgliederung des Institutes. Arbeitskreise und Forschungsaufträge 3–4, Programme for the inauguration on 6 May 1939 at Wartburg Castle

Hauptarchiv der v. Bodelschwingh'sten Anstalten Bethel

HA 2/39–209 Schlatter's covering letter to Friedrich von Bodelschwingh

HA 2/39–96 Draft to the so-called *Betheler Bekenntnis*

Heidelberg

Heidelberg Hs. 3814, II.K.3. Dibelius, Martin. "Christentum und Judentum." Heidelberg, 1945, typescript.

Heidelberg, UAT 162/31 no. 2 p. 4.: Gerhard Kittels Arbeiten über das antike Judentum. Ein Gutachten von Prof. D. Dr Martin Dibelius, Heidelberg

LKA Eisenach

LKA Eisenach, typescript of Grundmann's *Erkenntnis und Wahrheit*.

LKA Nürnberg

LKA Nürnberg, Personen XXVII (Strathmann) 2:

Letter from Schmidt to Hermann Strathmann, 24 June 1936

Letter from Schmidt to Hermann Strathmann, 3 October 1936

LKA Stuttgart

LKA Stuttgart D 40/689, typescript of Grundmann's *Erkenntnis und Wahrheit*.

Adolf Schlatter-Archiv no. 169/11: Schlatter: Rasse und Bruderschaft.

Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts

Letter from Chef der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD to the Auswärtiges Amt (IV B 2-686/43-E), 1 September 1943, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts Inland I-D, R98821.

Tübingen University, Theological Library

Kittel, Gerhard. "Das Rassenproblem der Spätantike und das Frühchristentum. (Type-written manuscript), 1944

ABBREVIATIONS

KfDK	Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur
CSVD	Christlich-soziale Volksdienst
E.T.	English Translation
NSDAP	National-sozialistische Partei Deutschlands
RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
SA	Sturm-Abteilung
S.B.	Strack-Billerbeck
SNTS	Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
WA	Weimar Ausgabe of Luther's <i>Schriften</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Klaus-Peter. "Der theologische Werdegang Walter Grundmanns bis zum Erscheinen der *28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche zum inneren Aufbau der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche* Ende 1933". In *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, 171–199. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994.
- Adam, Uwe Dietrich. *Hochschule und Nationalsozialismus. Die Universität Tübingen im Dritten Reich. Mit einem Anhang von Wilfried Setzler "Die Tübinger Studentenfrequenz im Dritten Reich"*. Edited by Hansmartin Decker-Hauff. Vol. 23, Contubernium. Tübingen, 1977.
- Aland, Kurt, ed. *Glanz und Niedergang der deutschen Universität. 50 Jahren deutscher Wissenschaftsgeschichte in Briefen an und von Hans Lietzmann (1892–1942)*. Berlin und New York: de Gruyter, 1979.
- Albright, William Foxwell. "The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies". In *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, edited by Harold R. Willoughby, 162–174. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1947.
- Altgeld, Wolfgang. *Katholizismus, Protestantismus, Judentum. Über religiös begründete Gegensätze und nationalreligiöse Ideen in der Geschichte des deutschen Nationalismus*. Edited by Konrad Repgen. Vol. 59, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte Reihe B: Forschungen. Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, 1992.
- Althaus, Paul. "Adolf Schlatters Gabe an die systematische Theologie". In *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, edited by Paul Althaus, 31–40. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1938.
- . "Zum Gedächtnis der abgerufenen Herausgeber der 'Beiträge'". In *Adolf Schlatter und Wilhelm Lütgert zum Gedächtnis*, edited by Paul Althaus. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939.
- Althaus, Paul, and Werner Elert. "Theologische Gutachten über die Zulassung von Christen jüdischer Herkunft zu den Ämtern der deutschen evangelischen Kirche". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 11 (1933): 321–324.
- Antisemitismus, Verein zur Abwehr des. "Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus" und "Abwehrblätter". <http://mdz1.bib-bvb.de/cocoon/abwehr/start.html>.
- Arndt, Ino. "Machtübernahme und Judenboykott in der Sicht evangelischer Sonntagsblätter". In *Miscellanea. Festschrift für Helmut Krausnick zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Wolfgang Benz, 15–31. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *The Colossian Syncretism. The Interface Between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius. Vol. 2/77, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Arnold, Udo. *Pro Iudaeis. Die Gutachten der hallischen Theologen im 18. Jahrhundert zu Fragen der Judentoleranz*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 14, Studien zu Kirche und Israel. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1993.
- Avemarie, Friedrich. *Tora und Leben: Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur*. Vol. 55, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Baeck, Leo. *Das Wesen des Judentums*. Berlin: Rathausen & Lamm, 1905.
- Baeck, Leo, et al. *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion*. Erster Jahrgang 1925–1926, Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann Verlag, 1927.

- Baird, William. *History of New Testament Research. Volume One. From Deism to Tübingen*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . *History of New Testament Research. Volume Two: From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Baltrusch, Ernst. *Die Juden und das Römische Reich: Geschichte einer konfliktreichen Beziehung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. *Pseudo-Hecataeus On the Jews. Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*. Edited by Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long and Andrew F. Stewart. Vol. 21, Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Baranowski, Shelley. "The Confessing Church and Antisemitism: Protestant Identity, German Nationhood, and the Exclusion of Jews". In *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust*, edited by R. P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, 90–109. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Barkenings, Hans-Joachim. "Die Stimme der Anderen. Der "heilsgeschichtliche Beruf Israels" in der Sicht evangelischer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts". In *Christen und Juden. Ihr Gegenüber vom Apostelkonzil bis heute*, edited by Wolf-Dieter Marsch and Karl Thieme, 201–231. Mainz/Göttingen: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Barnes, Kenneth C. *Nazism, Liberalism, & Christianity. Protestant Social Thought in Germany & Great Britain 1925–1937*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1991.
- . "Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Hitler's persecution of the Jews". In *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust*, edited by R. P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, 110–128. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barth, Karl. *Gottes Wille und unsere Wünsche*. Edited by Karl Barth and Ed. Thurneysen. Vol. 7, Theologische Existenz heute. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1934.
- Barth, Karl, and Gerhard Kittel. *Ein theologischer Briefwechsel*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934.
- Bauer, et al. "Neues Testament und Rassenfrage". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 10, Oktober 1933 (1933): 294–296.
- Bauernfeind, "ἀπερτή". In *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 457–461. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Baumgarten, Siegmund Jacob. "Review of The Moral Philosopher". In *Nachrichten von einer hallischen Bibliothek*, edited by Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten. Halle: Johann Justinus Gebauer, 1750.
- Baur, F. C. *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. Zweite, neu durchgearbeitete Ausgabe*. Tübingen: L. Fr. Fues, 1860.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Die christliche Gnosis oder die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Tübingen: Verlag von C. F. Oslander, 1835.
- . *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*. Edited by Ferdinand Friedrich Baur. Leipzig: Fues Verlag, 1864.
- . *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*. 2., nach dem Tode des Verfassers besorgt von Eduard Zeller ed. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (L. W. Riesland), 1866.
- . *Symbolik und Mythologie oder die Naturreligion des Alterthums*. Vol. 1–2. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924–25.
- . "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom". In *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, edited by Klaus Scholder, 1–206, 1963 (1831).
- . "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit zusammenhängende Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung".

- In *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*, edited by Klaus Scholder, 147–266. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1963 (1836).
- . *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. Vol. I–V. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1963–1975 (1831–).
- . *Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Edited by Klaus Scholder. Vol. 4, *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1970 (1862).
- . “Die Tübinger Schule und ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart”. In *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben. Für und wider die Tübinger Schule*, edited by Klaus Scholder, 293–465. Tübingen: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1975 (1859).
- Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm. “Beck, Johan Tobias”. Verlag Traugott Bautz, Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon, Bd IV, <http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/I/Leipoldt.shtml>.
- Beck, Johann Tobias. *Die Christliche Lehr-Wissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden. Ein Versuch von J. T. Beck*. Vol. 1. Die Logik der christlichen Lehre. Stuttgart: Verlag der Chr. Belser’schen Buchhandlung, 1841.
- . *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer*. Edited by Jul. Lindenmeyer. Vol. 1–2. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1884.
- Beckmann, Klaus. *Die fremde Wurzel. Altes Testament und Judentum in der evangelischen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Edited by Adolf Martin Ritter and Thomas Kaufmann. Vol. 85, *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- Beer, G., O. Holtzmann, and S. Krauß, eds. *Die Mishna. Text, Übersetzung und ausführliche Erklärung*. Giessen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann in Giessen, 1912–.
- Bein, Alex. *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems*. Vol. I. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980.
- . *Die Judenfrage. Biographie eines Weltproblems. Band II: Anmerkungen, Exkurse, Register*. Vol. II. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980.
- Benz, Wolfgang. *Der Holocaust*. 6 ed., C. H. Beck Wissen. München: C. H. Beck, 2005.
- Bergen, Doris L. *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- . “Storm Troopers of Christ. The German Christian Movement and the Ecclesiastical Final Solution”. In *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*, edited by Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, 40–67. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999.
- Berger, Klaus. *Exegese und Philosophie*. Edited by Helmut Merklein and Erich Zenger. Vol. 123/124, *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986.
- . “Nationalsoziale Religionsgeschichte. Wilhelm Bousset 1865–1920”. In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 279–294. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1993.
- Berger, Peter L. *The Sacred Canopy. Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Doubleday, 1967.
- Bergmann, Werner. *Geschichte des Antisemitismus*. 3 ed., C. H. Beck Wissen. München: C. H. Beck, 2006.
- Bergmann, Werner, and Mona Körte, eds. *Antisemitismusforschung in den Wissenschaften*. Berlin: Metropol, 2004.
- Blackman, Philip, ed. *Mishnayoth*. 3 ed. New York: The Judaica Press, 1964–1965.
- Blaschke, Olaf. *Katholizismus und Antisemitismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich*. Edited by Helmut Berding, Jürgen Kocka, Hans-Peter Ullmann and Hans-Ulrich Walter. Vol. 122, *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.
- Bock, Ernst. *Adolf-Schlatter-Archiv. Inventar. Als Manuskript gedruckt*. Stuttgart: Landeskirchliches Archiv Stuttgart, 1988.

- Bollmus, Reinhard. *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner. Zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystem*, Studien zur Zeitgeschichte. Herausgegeben vom Institut für Zeitgeschichte. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1970.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. "Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage". In *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Gesammelte Schriften*, edited by Eberhard Bethge, 44–53. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1959 (1933).
- Bousset, W. *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*. Vol. Neue Folge 4, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag, 1892.
- . "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts". *Die Christliche Welt* 11 (1897): 249–253.
- . "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 3–". *Die Christliche Welt* 12 (1897): 267–271.
- . "Thomas Carlyle. Ein Prophet des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 5". *Die Christliche Welt* 13 (1897): 296–299.
- . *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1903.
- . *Volksfrömmigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum. Antwort auf Herrn Perles' Kritik meiner "Religion des Judentums im N. T. Zeitalter"*. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1903.
- . *Das Wesen der Religion dargestellt an ihrer Geschichte*. Halle: Gebauer-Schwetschke Druckerei und Verlag, 1906.
- Bousset, Wilhelm, and Hugo Gressmann. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, verfasst von Wilhelm Bousset, herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann*. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. Vol. 21, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926.
- Brakelmann, Günther. "Stoecker, Adolf (1835–1909)". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, edited by Gerhard Müller, 194–195. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
- Brenner, Michael, Stefi Jersch-Wenzel, and Michael A. Meyer. *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Emancipation and Acculturation*. Edited by Michael A. Meyer. Vol. 2, German-Jewish History in Modern Times. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Breuer, Mordechai, and Michael Graetz. *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Tradition and Enlightenment 1600–1780*. Edited by Michael A. Meyer. Vol. 1, German-Jewish History in Modern Times. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Brezger, Rudolf. *Das Schrifttum von Professor D. A. Schlatter. Zusammengestellt von Rudolf Brezger*. Edited by Paul Althaus. Vol. 40: 2, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939.
- Browning, Christopher R. *Ordinary Men. Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*. New York: Aaron Asher Books. HarperCollins Publishers, 1992.
- Brumlik, Micha. "Laudatio auf die Preisschrift von Frau Dr. Bettina Stangneth 'Antisemitische und Antijüdische Motive bei Immanuel Kant'". In *Antisemitische und antisemitaistische Motive bei Denkern der Aufklärung*, edited by Horst Gronke, Thomas Meyer and Barbara Neißer, 33–45. Münster: LIT, 2001.
- Buber, Martin. "Offener Brief an Gerhard Kittel". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 8, August 1933 (1933): 248–249.
- Buchheim, Hans. "Die SS—das Herrschaftsinstrument. Befehl und Gehorsam". In *Anatomie des SS-States*, edited by Hans Buchheim, Martin Broszat, Hans-Adolf Jacobsen and Helmut Krausnick. Olten und Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, 1965.
- Bultmann, R. *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Urgemeinde". In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1514–1254, 1913.

- . "Urchristliche Religion (1915–1925)". In *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, edited by Otto Weinreich and M. P. Nilsson, 83–164. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1926.
- . "Review of Bousset, Wilhelm: Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter. In 3., verb. Aufl. hrsg. v. H. Greßmann". *Theologische Literaturzeitung* no. 11 (1928).
- . "Review of Gerhard Kittel: Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum". *Gnomon* 4 (1928): 297–305.
- . *Jesus*. Vol. 1, Die Unsterblichen. Die geistlichen Heroen der Menschheit in ihrem Leben und Wirken. Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1929.
- . *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. 2 ed. Vol. 12, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Neue Folge. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- . "Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte". *Theologische Rundschau* NF 4 (1932): 1–21.
- . "Der Arier-Paragraph im Raume der Kirche". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 12, Dezember 1933 (1933): 359–370.
- . "Die Aufgabe der Theologie in der gegenwärtigen Situation". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 6, Juni 1933 (1933): 161–166.
- . "Die Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für den christlichen Glauben". In *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, edited by Rudolf Bultmann, 313–336. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.
- . "Die liberale Theologie und die jüngste theologische Bewegung". In *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, edited by Rudolf Bultmann, 1–25. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933 (1924).
- . *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntress Lantero. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- . "Der Sinn des christlichen Schöpfungsglaubens". *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft* 51 (1936): 1–20.
- . *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. 10 ed. Vol. Zweite Abteilung, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1941.
- . *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1948–1953.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Vol. I–II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951–1955.
- . *Essays Philosophical and Theological*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. London: Macmillan and Co., 1955.
- . *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. London: Thames & Hudson, 1956.
- . "Das deutsche Volk und Israel". In *Glauben und Verstehen*, 55–60. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960 (1952).
- . "Christus des Gesetzes Ende". In *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 32–58. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1968 (1940).
- . "Weissagung und Erfüllung". In *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 162–186. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1968 (1949).
- . *New Testament Mythology and Other Basic Writings*. Translated by S. Ogden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1994.
- . "Autobiographische Bemerkungen Rudolf Bultmanns". In *Karl Barth—Rudolf Bultmann. Briefwechsel 1911–1966*, edited by Bernd Jaspert, 302–313. Zürich: Theologisches Verlag, 1994 (1956).
- Burleigh, Michael, and Wolfgang Wippermann. *The Racial State: Germany 1933–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- Busch, Eberhard. *Karl Barths Lebenslauf*. 5 ed. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1993.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *On heroes, hero-worship and the heroic in history*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1889.
- Carroll, James. *Constantine's Sword. The Church and the Jews*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2001.
- Casey, Maurice. "Antisemitic Assumptions in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament". *Novum Testamentum* 41, no. 3 (1999): 280–291.
- Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. 3 ed. Vol. 1. München: Verlagsanstalt F. Bruckmann A.-G., 1901.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *Rabbi Jesus. An Intimate Biography. The Jewish Life and Teaching That Inspired Christianity*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Clark, Christopher M. *The Politics of Conversion. Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728–1941*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness. Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Edited by Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long and Andrew F. Stewart. Vol. 21, Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cohen, Susan Sarah, ed. *Antisemitism: An Annotated Bibliography*. Vol. 1–19. Munich: K. G. Saur, 1984–2007.
- Colpe, Carsten. *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösungsmythos*. Vol. 78, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Cranston, Maurice. *The Romantic Movement*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Heil als Geschichte. Heilsgeschichtliche Existenz im Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1965.
- Dahm, Christof. "Strack, Hermann Leberecht". In *Biografisches-Bibliografisches Kirchenlexikon*, 4–8, 1996.
- Dalman, Gustaf. "Graf Zinzendorf und die Juden". *Saat auf Hoffnung* 26 (1889): 119–139; 202–219.
- . "Graf Zinzendorf und die Juden". *Saat auf Hoffnung* 27 (1890): 48–59.
- Davies, Alan T. "The Aryan Christ: A Motif in Christian Anti-Semitism". *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 12 (2004): 569–579.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Writing of History*. Translated by Tom Conley, European Perspectives. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- de Lagarde, Paul. *Deutsche Schriften*. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1878.
- de Wette, W. M. L. *Kritik der Israelitischen Geschichte. Erster Theil. Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte*. Vol. 2, Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1807.
- . *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*. Vol. 1, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813.
- de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht. *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik, in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt. Erster Theil: Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristentums*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813.
- . *Ueber Religion und Theologie. Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815.
- Dean-Otting, Mary. *Heavenly Journeys. A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Edited by Johann Maier, Judentum und Umwelt. Frankfurt a. M.: Verlag Peter Lang, 1984.
- Deines, Roland. *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*. Vol. 101, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

- . “Jesus der Galiläer: Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann”. In *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, edited by Roland Deines, Volker Leppin and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 43–131. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Deines, Roland, Volker Leppin, and Karl Wilhelm Niebuhr, eds. *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*. Edited by Klaus Fitschen, Wolfram Kinzig, Volker Leppin and Günther Wartenberg. Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie vom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften Alten Bundes bis auf die neueste Zeit*. Leipzig: Karl Tauchnitz, 1836.
- . *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. A. Crusius und ihre neueste Entwicklung seit der Christologie Hengstenbergs*. Edited by Franz Delitzsch and Carl Paul Caspari. Vol. 1, Biblisch-theologische und apologetisch-kritische Studien. Leipzig: Gebauersche Buchhandlung, 1845.
- . *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer mit archäologischen und dogmatischen Excursen über das Opfer und die Versöhnung*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1857.
- . *Jesus och Hillel med afseende på Renan och Geiger*. Stockholm: A. L. Norman, 1867.
- . *Paulus des Apostels Brief an die Römer aus dem griechischen Urtext auf Grund des Sinai-Codex in das hebräische übersetzt und aus Talmud und Midrasch erläutert*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1870.
- . *Handverkarliff på Jesu tid. Ett bidrag till den nytestamentliga tidens historia*. Örebro: Abr. Bohlin, 1874.
- . *Schachmatt den Blutlignern Rohling & Justus*. 2 ed. Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1883.
- . *Was D. Aug. Rohling beschworen hat und beschwören will. Zweite Streitschrift in Sachen des Antisemitismus*. 2 ed. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1883.
- . *Der tiefe Graben zwischen alter und moderner Theologie. Ein Bekenntnis*. Leipzig: Centralbureau der Instituta Judaica (W. Faber), 1888.
- . *Ernste Fragen an die Gebildeten jüdischer Religion*. Vol. 18 und 19, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum zu Leipzig. Leipzig: Centralbureau der Instituta Judaica (W. Faber), 1888.
- . *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk? Ein Beitrag zur Lichtung der Judenfrage*. Vol. 22, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum zu Leipzig. Leipzig: Centralbureau der Instituta Judaica (W. Faber), 1889.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Die große Täuschung. Fortgesetzte kritische Betrachtungen zum Alten Testament, vornehmlich den Prophetenschriften und Psalmen, nebst Schlußfolgerungen*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart und Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1921.
- Denzler, Georg. “Katholisch-Theologische Wissenschaft im Dritten Reich”. In *Theologische Wissenschaft im “Dritten Reich”*, edited by Georg Denzler, Leonore Siegele-Wenschekewitz and Vicco von Bülow. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 2000.
- Der Stadt Oldenburg, Kulturdezernat. *Gedenkfeier für Rudolf Bultmann. 1884–1976*. Oldenburg: Heinz Holzberg Verlag, 1985.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925.
- . *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur I. Evangelien und Apokalypsen*. Vol. 934, Sammlung Götschen. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1926.
- . *Geschichte der Urchristlichen Literatur II. Apostolisches und Nachapostolisches*. Vol. 935, Sammlung Götschen. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1926.
- . “Mensch und Gott”. *Der Jude. Sonderheft “Judentum und Christentum”* 4 (1926): 16–23.
- . “Zeit und Arbeit”. In *Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, edited by Erich Stange, 1–37. Leipzig: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1929.
- . “Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium”. In *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*.

- Philosophisch-historische Klasse*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1932.
- . *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. 2 ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.
- . *Jesus*. Vol. 1130, Sammlung Göschen. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1939.
- . *Britisches Christentum und britische Weltmacht*. Vol. 36, Das Britische Reich in der Weltpolitik. Schriften des Deutschen Instituts für Außenpolitische Forschung. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt Verlag, 1940.
- . *The Sermon of the Mount*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.
- . "Neue Deutungen und Umdeutungen des Evangeliums". *Die Christliche Welt* 55 (1941): 3–7.
- . *Wozu Theologie? Von Arbeit und Aufgabe theologischer Wissenschaft*. Leipzig: Leopold Klotz Verlag / J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1941.
- . "Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert". In *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1943.
- . "Christentum und Judentum". In *Heid.Hs. 3814, II.K.3*. Heidelberg, 1945.
- . *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm Graf*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . "Lebensbeschreibung". *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 111, no. 2 (2000 (1946)): 205–209.
- Dietrich, Wolfgang. "'Es gilt: Entweder—oder!'" Marburger Theologen zum christlich-jüdischen Verhältnis (I): Rudolf Bultmann". *Lutherische Monatshefte* 10 (1996): 30–32.
- Dithmar, Christiane. *Zinzendorfs nonkonformistische Haltung zum Judentum*. Edited by Michael Graetz. Vol. 1, Schriften der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg, Heidelberg: Winter, 2000.
- Droysen, J. G. *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. Vol. 1. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1843.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus, Paul and the law: studies in Mark and Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1990.
- Dwyer, Philip G. "The changing concerns of Prussian conservatism, 1830–1914". In *Modern Prussian History 1830–1947*, edited by Philip G. Dwyer. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001.
- Düding, Dieter. *Der Nationalsoziale Verein 1896–1903. Die gescheiterte Versuch einer parteipolitischen Synthese von Nationalismus, Sozialismus und Liberalismus*. Vol. 6, Studien zur Geschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Abhandlung der Forschungsabteilung des historischen Seminars der Universität Köln. München: R. Oldenbourg, 1972.
- Düringer, Hermann, and Karin Weintz, eds. *Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore. Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit*. Edited by Hermann Düringer, Margrit Frölich, Annette Mehlhorn, Kurt W. Schmidt and Ulrich O. Sievering. Vol. 112, Arnoldshainer Texte. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 2000.
- Dyson, A. O. "Theological legacies of the Enlightenment: England and Germany". In *England and Germany: studies in theological diplomacy*, edited by S. W. Sykes, 45–62. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982.
- Düsterberg, Rolf. "Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (KfdK)". Datenbank Schrift und Bild, <http://www.polunbi.de/pers/index.html>.
- Eckart, Wolfgang U., Volker Sellin, and Eike Wolgast, eds. *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2006.
- Egg, Gottfried. *Adolf Schlatters kritische Position gezeigt an seiner Matthäusinterpretation*. Edited by Alfred Jepsen, Otto Michel and Theodor Schlatter. Vol. 2/14, Arbeiten zur Theologie. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1968.
- Eisenhuth, Heinz Erich. "Idealismus, Christentum und Judentum". In *Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses. Sitzungsberichte der ersten Arbeitstagung des Institutes zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche*

- Leben vom 1. bis 3. März 1940 in Wittenberg*, edited by Walter Grundmann, 133–166. Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1940.
- Eisenmenger, Johann Andreas. *Entdecktes Judenthum. Das ist: Wörtgetreue Verdeutschung der wichtigsten Stellen des Talmuds und der sonstigen, den Christen zu einem grossen Teile noch ganz unbekannten, hebräisch-rabbinischen Literatur, welche einen sicheren Einblick in die jüdische Religions- und Sittenlehre gewähren*. Translated by Franz Xaver Schiefler. Dresden: Verlag von Otto Brandner, 1893 (1700).
- Elbogen, Ismar. “Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer mit besondere Rücksichtigung der Begriffe Gott und Mensch”. *BHwJ* 22 (1904): 1–88.
- Elbogen, Ismar, and Eleonore Sterling. *Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*. Vol. 111, Athenäums Taschenbücher. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988.
- Eley, Geoff, ed. *The “Goldhagen effect”: History, Memory, Nazism—Facing the German Past*. Edited by Geoff Eley, Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Engelmann, Hans. *Kirche am Abgrund. Adolf Stöcker und seine antijüdische Bewegung*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 5, Studien zu jüdischem Volk und christlicher Gemeinde. Berlin: Selbstverlag Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1984.
- Ericksen, R. P. *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- . “Genocide, Religion, and Gerhard Kittel. Protestant Theologians Face the Third Reich”. In *In God’s Name. Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Omer Bartov, 62–78. New York: Berghahn Books, 2001.
- Ericksen, Robert P. “Christians and the Holocaust: The Wartime Writings of Gerhard Kittel”. In *Remembering for the future. Working papers and addenda*, edited by Yehuda Bauer, Alice Eckardt, Franklin H. Littell, Elisabeth Maxwell, Robert Maxwell and David Patterson, 2400–2414. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989.
- . “Assessing the Heritage: German Protestant Theologians, Nazis, and the ‘Jewish Question’”. In *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*, edited by Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, 22–39. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999.
- Ericksen, Robert P., and Susannah Heschel, eds. *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*. Edited by Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999.
- Eschelbacher, Joseph. *Das Judentum im Urteile der modernen protestantischen Theologie*, Schriften, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Wissenschaft des Judentums. Leipzig: Buchhandlung Gustav Fock, 1907.
- Ettinger, S. “Jews and Judaism as Seen by the English Deists of the 18th Century (Hebrew)”. *Zion* 29 (1964): 182–207; I–II.
- Ettinger, Schmuël. “Foreword to Tal, Uriel, Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914”. 7–13. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Eze, Emmanuel Chukwudi. *Race and the Enlightenment. A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Fackenheim, Emil L. *The God Within. Kant, Schelling, and Historicity*. Edited by John Burbridge. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Farias, Victor. *Heidegger and Nazism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.
- Fein, Helen. *Accounting for Genocide. National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust*. New York and London: The Free Press and Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1979.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Feldscher. “Der Jude als Fremder im Reich”. *Archiv für Judenfragen. Schriften zur geistigen Überwindung des Judentums. Herausgeber Anti-jüdische Aktion 1, Gruppe A 1* (1943): 18–38.

- Fenske, Wolfgang. *Wie Jesus zum "Arier" wurde: Auswirkungen der Entjudaisierung Christi im 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005.
- Fischer, Eugen, and Gerhard Kittel. *Das antike Weltjudentum. Tatsachen, Texte, Bilder*. Vol. 7, Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Schriften des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1943.
- . "Über zwei angeblich Juden darstellende antike Skulpturen". In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, 221–222. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1944.
- Fix, Karl-Heinz. *Universitätstheologie und Politik. Die Heidelberger theologische Fakultät in der Weimarer Republik*. Edited by Hermann Jakobs, Detlef Junker, Jürgen Miethke, Volker Sellin, Hartmut Soell and Eike Wolgast. Vol. N.F. 7, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1994.
- Flax, Jane. "The End of Innocence". In *Feminists Theorize the Political*, edited by Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Flusser, D. "Das Christentum eine jüdische Religion". München, 1990.
- Flusser, David. "Judaism and the Origins of Christianity". Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989.
- . *Jesus*. Edited by R. Steven Notley. 2 Revised ed. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1997.
- Forstman, Jack. *Christian Faith in Dark Times. Theological Conflicts in the Shadow of Hitler*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.
- Frank, Walter. *Hofprediger Adolf Stoecker und die christlichsoziale Bewegung*. Zweite durchgesehene Auflage ed. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1935.
- . "Die deutsche Wissenschaft und Judenfrage". In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Ersten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 19. bis 21. November 1936*, 17–32. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937.
- Fredrickson, George M. *Racism: a Short History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative. A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Friedländer, Saul. *Nazi Germany and the Jews. Volume I: The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1997.
- Friedrich, Gerhard, and Johannes Friedrich. "Kittel, Gerhard, 1888–1948". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 1990.
- Friedrich, Peter. *Ferdinand Christian Baur als Symboliker*. Vol. 12, Studien zur Theologie und Geistesgeschichte des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Fries, Jakob Friedrich. *Von deutscher Philosophie Art und Kunst. Ein Votum für Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi gegen F. W. J. Schelling*. Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1812.
- . *Julius und Evagoras. Ein philosophischer Roman von Jakob Friedrich Fries*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Gager, John G. *The Origins of Antisemitism. Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*. New York: Oxford U.P., 1983.
- Gebhardt, B. "Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte". Stuttgart: Union Verlag, 1970.
- Geiger, Abraham. "Christliche Gelehrsamkeit in Beziehung auf Judenthum". *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 2 (1863): 292–297.
- Geiger, W. *Spekulation und Kritik. Die Geschichtstheologie Ferdinand Christian Baur's*. Vol. XXVIII, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus. München: Chr. Kaiser-Verlag, 1962.
- Geiser, Stefan. *Verantwortung und Schuld. Studien zu Martin Dibelius*. Edited by Theodor Ahrens, Jörg Dieken, Wolfgang Grünberg, Henneke Gülzow, Jens Schröter and Ina Willi-Plein. Vol. 20, Hamburger Theologische Studien. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2001.

- Geiss, Imanuel. *Geschichte des Rassismus*. Edited by Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Neue Historische Bibliothek. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- Gerdmar, Anders. "Exegesis, Postmodernism, and Auschwitz—On Human Dignity and the Ethics of Interpretation". *Studia Theologica* 51 (1997): 113–143.
- . "Nazistisk bibeltolkning i en evangelisk veckotidning på 1930-talet". In *Ad Lucem. Tidskrift för livsåskådning och kultur*, 24–29, 1999a.
- . "Nazistisk bibeltolkning—om teologiskt auktoritetsspråk och receptionsetik". In *Ordets makt och tankens frihet. Om språket som maktfaktor. Humanistdagarna vid Uppsala Universitet 1999*, edited by Rut Boström Andersson, 170–182. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1999b.
- . *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude*. Edited by Birger Olsson and Kari Syreeni. Vol. 36, Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.
- . "Hebreer och hellenister i urförsamlingen—ett receptionskritiskt perspektiv". *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 67 (2002): 105–119.
- . "Ett nytt evangelium". *Dagens Nyheter*, 21 Dec. 2003.
- . "Polemiken mot judar i Nya testamentet och dess reception. Utkast till en analytisk typologi". *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 69 (2004): 79–114.
- . "En germansk Jesus på svensk botten: svensk-tyskt forskningssamarbete med rasistiska förtecken 1941–1945. Paper vid Historikermötet i Uppsala 22–24 april 2005". Uppsala, 2005.
- . "Ein germanischer Jesus auf schwedischem Boden: schwedisch-deutsche Forschungszusammenarbeit mit rassistischen Vorzeichen 1941–1945". In *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, edited by Roland Deines, Volker Leppin and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 319–348. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ANSU. Lund and Copenhagen: Gleerups and Munksgaard, 1961.
- . *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. Vol. 20, Coniectanea Neotestamentica. Lund: Gleerups, 1964.
- . *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck and David Noel Freedman, The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- . *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Foreword by Jacob Neusner*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck and David Noel Freedman, The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Gerlach, Wolfgang. *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 10, Studien zu Kirche und Israel. Berlin: Selbstverlag Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1987.
- . *Als die Zeugen schwiegen. Bekennende Kirche und die Juden. Mit einem Vorwort von Eberhard Bethge*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. 2 ed. Vol. 10, Studien zu Kirche und Israel. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1993.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology. Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Vol. 42, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Gimmel, Jürgen. *Die politische Organisation kulturellen Ressentiments. Der "Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur" und das bildungsbürgerliche Unbehagen an der Moderne*. Edited by Klaus-Jürgen Scherrer, Adalbert Schlag and Burkard Thiele. Vol. 10, Schriftenreihe der Stipendiatinnen und Stipendiaten der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2001.
- Glass, James M. *"Life Unworthy of Life" Racial Phobia and Mass Murder in Hitler's Germany*. New York: Basic Books, 1997.
- Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler's Willing Executioners. Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1996.

- . *A Moral Reckoning. The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair*. New York: Vintage Books, 2003.
- Goldschneider, Calvin, and Alan S. Zuckerman. *The Transformation of the Jews*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Golling, Ralf. "Strack und die Judenmission". *Judaica* 38 (1982): 67–90.
- Golling, Ralf, and Peter von der Osten-Sacken, eds. *Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Mit einer Anhang über das Institut Kirche und Judentum*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 17, Studien zu Kirche und Israel (SKI). Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1996.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert*. Edited by Paul Althaus, Hermann Dörries und Joachim Jeremias. Vol. 2. Reihe: 55, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954.
- Goulder, Michael D. *Paul and the competing mission in Corinth*. Edited by S. E. Porter, Library of Pauline Studies. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001.
- Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm. "'Wir konnten den Rad nicht in die Speichen fallen'. Liberaler Protestantismus und 'Judenfrage' nach 1933". In *Der Holocaust und die Protestanten*, edited by Jochen-Christoph Kaiser and Martin Greschat, 151–185. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988.
- . ed. *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*. Vol. 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990.
- . ed. *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*. Vol. 2. Kaiserreich. Teil 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992.
- . "Protestantische Theologie in der Gesellschaft des Kaiserreichs". In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 12–117. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992.
- . "Die Spaltung des Protestantismus. Zum Verhältnis von evangelischer Kirche, Staat und 'Gesellschaft' im frühen 19. Jahrhundert". In *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Wolfgang Scheider, 157–190. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993.
- . "Nachwort des Herausgebers". In *Selbstbesinnung des Deutschen, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm Graf*, 51–93. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . *Der Protestantismus. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, C. H. Beck Wissen. München: C. H. Beck, 2006.
- Grau, Wilhelm. "Vorbemerkung". In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, 7–8. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937.
- Gressman, Hugo. "Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums". *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43 (1925): 1–32.
- . "Einführung". In *Entwicklungsstufen der jüdischen Religion*, 1–12. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann Verlag, 1927.
- Grohnert, Reinhard. *Die Entnazifizierung in Baden 1945–1949: Konzeptionen und Praxis der "Eupuration" am Beispiel eines Landes der französischen Besatzungszone*. Vol. 123, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg. Reihe B, Forschungen. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1991.
- Groß, Johannes T. *Ritualmordbeschuldigungen gegen Juden im Deutschen Kaiserreich (1871–1914)*. Vol. 47, Reihe Dokumente, Texte, Materialien / Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung der Technischen Universität Berlin Berlin: Metropol, 2002.
- Grundmann, Walter. "Gesetz, Gerechtfertigung und Mystik bei Paulus. Zum Problem der Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Verkündigung". *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1933): 52–65.
- . "Adolf Schlatter. Ein Wort des Grußes und des Gedenkens zu seinem 85. Geburtstag am 16. August". *Deutsche Frömmigkeit* (1938) 8:10–14.
- . *Die 28 Thesen der sächsischen Volkskirche erläutert*, Schriften der Deutschen Christen. Dresden: Deutsch-christlicher Verlag, 1934.

- . *Totale Kirche im Totalen Staat. Mit einem Geleitwort von Landesbischof F. Coch*. Dresden: Oskar Günther Verlag, 1934.
- . “‘Das Heil kommt von den Juden.’ Eine Schicksalsfrage an die Christen deutscher Nation”. *Deutsche Frömmigkeit* 6, no. 9, September (1938): 1–8.
- . *Die Gotteskindschaft Jesu und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*. Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938.
- . “Mythos und Frohbotschaft”. In *Germanenchristentum. Der Halberstädter Dom und seine Bildwerke als Zeugnisse deutscher Frömmigkeit. Mit einer grundsätzlichen Einleitung: Mythos und Frohbotschaft von Dr. Walter Grundmann, Jena*, 7–17. Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938.
- . “Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Gemeinde”. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 38 (1939): 45–73.
- . *Die Entjudung des religiösen Lebens als Aufgabe deutscher Theologie und Kirche. Vortrag von Prof. Dr. W. Grundmann gehalten bei der feierlichen Eröffnungssitzung des ‘Institutes zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben’ in Eisenach*. Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1939.
- . *Die Frage der ältesten Gestalt und des ursprünglichen Sinnes der Bergrede Jesu*. Vol. 10, Schriften zur Nationalkirche. Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1939.
- . “Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia”. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 39 (1940): 110–137.
- . *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben. Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1940.
- . “Das apokalyptische Geschichtsbild und das deutsche Geschichtsdenken”. In *Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses. Sitzungsberichte der zweiten Arbeitstagung des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben vom 3. bis 5. März in Eisenach*, edited by Walter Grundmann, 85–115. Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1942.
- , ed. *Das religiöse Gesicht des Judentums. Entstehung und Art*, Beiheft zu Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben. Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1942.
- , ed. *Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Studien zur Erforschung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1942.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Edited by Erich Fascher. Vol. 1, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.
- . “Erkenntnis und Wahrheit”. Eisenach, 1969 (see Archive Material).
- . “Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus”. In *Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testaments*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974.
- Grässer, Erich. “Antijudaismus bei Bultmann? Eine Erwiderung”. *Wissenschaft und Praxis in Kirche und Gesellschaft* 67 (1978): 419–429.
- Güdemann, Moritz. *Jüdische Apologetik*, Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums. Schriften, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Wissenschaft des Judentums. Glogau: Flemming, 1906.
- Habermas, Jürgen. “The Entwinement of Myth and Enlightenment: Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno”. In *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, 106–130. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.
- Hagner, Donald A. *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus. An Analysis and Critique of Modern Study of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Hakola, Raimo. “Identity matters. John, the Jews and Jewishness”. Doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki, 2003.
- Hanhart, Robert. “Paul Anton de Lagarde und seine Kritik an der Theologie”. In *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, edited by Bernd Moeller, 271–305. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

- Hannaford, Ivan. *Race. The History of an Idea in the West*. Washington: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1996.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. "The Rejection of the Jews in the synoptic Gospels and Acts". In *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity. Twelve theologians explore the development and dynamics of antisemitism within the Christian tradition*, edited by Alan T. Davies, 27–47. New York: The Paulist Press, 1979.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *What is Christianity (E. T. 1901)*. London: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1900.
- . *Das Wesen des Christentums. Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Fakultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität Berlin*. Vol. 72. Tausend. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1929.
- Harris, Horton. *David Friedrich Strauss and his theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- . *The Tübingen School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Harrisville, Roy A., and Walter Sundberg. *The Bible in Modern Culture. Theology and Historical-Critical Method from Spinoza to Käsemann*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Haslam, Nick, et al. "Psychological Essentialism, Implicit Theories, and Intergroup Relations". *Intergroup Processes & Relations Group* 9, no. 1 (2006): 63–76.
- Hauck, Albert. "Nordamerika, Vereinigten Staaten". In *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 197–198.
- Head, Peter M. "The Nazi Quest for an Aryan Jesus". *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 2:1 (2004), 55–89.
- Hegel, G. W. F. *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. Edited by Johannes Hoffmeister. 6 ed. Vol. 114, Der philosophischen Bibliothek. Hamburg: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1952 (1807).
- Heiber, Helmut. *Walter Frank und sein Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland*. Vol. 13, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1966.
- Heinemann, H. "The Conception of Reward in Mat. XX.1–16". *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 1, no. 2 (1948–1949): 85–89.
- Heinrichs, Wolfgang. "Das Bild vom Juden in der protestantischen Judenmission des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. In Umrissen dargestellt von 'Saar auf Hoffnung, Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche und Israel'". *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Zeitgeschichte* 44 (1992): 195–220.
- . *Das Judenbild im Protestantismus des Deutschen Kaiserreichs. Ein Beitrag zur Mentalitätsgeschichte des deutschen Bürgertums in der Krise der Moderne*. Edited by S. Flesch, B. Magen, D. Meyer and R. Mohr. 1 ed. Vol. 145, Schriftenreihe des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte. Köln: Rheinland-Verlag, 2000.
- Heitmüller, W. "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus". *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 13 (1912): 320–337.
- Hengel, Martin. "A Gentile in the Wilderness: My Encounter with Jews and Judaism". In *Overcoming Fear Between Jews and Christians*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Fran X. Blisard and Jerry L. Gorham, 67–83. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*. Vol. 3. Riga and Leipzig: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1787.
- . *Herders Sämtliche Werke herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1877–1899.
- Heschel, Susannah. "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life". In *Church History*, 587–605, 1994.
- . "The Image of Judaism in Nineteenth-Century Christian New Testament Scholarship in Germany". In *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries*, edited by Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

- . "Theologen für Hitler. Walter Grundmann und das 'Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben'". In *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, 125–170. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994.
- . "Making Nazism a Christian Movement: The Development of a Christian Theology of Antisemitism during the Third Reich". In *What Kind of God? Essays in Honor of Richard L. Rubenstein*, edited by Betty Rogers Rubenstein and Michael Berenbaum, 159–174. Lanham: University Press of America, 1995.
- . "Transforming Jesus from Jew to Aryan: Theological Politics in Nazi Germany". *Dialog* 35 (1996): 181–187.
- . *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*. Edited by William Scott Green, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- . "When Jesus Was an Aryan. The Protestant Church and Antisemitic Propaganda". In *Betrayal. German Churches and the Holocaust*, edited by Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, 68–89. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999.
- . "The Theological Faculty of the University of Jena during the Third Reich". www.oslo2000.uio.no/AIO/AIO16/group%208/Heschel.pdf.
- . "When Jesus Was an Aryan. The Protestant Church and Antisemitic Propaganda". In *In God's Name. Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Omer Bartov, 79–105. New York: Berghahn Books, 2001.
- . "Deutsche Theologen für Hitler. Walter Grundmann und das Eisenacher 'Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben'". In *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 70–90. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- Hester, Carl E. "Baur's Anfänge in Blaubeuren". In *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler. 8. Blauberger Symposium*, edited by Ulrich Köpf, 67–82. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994.
- Heusler, Andreas. *Germanentum. Vom Lebens- und Formgefühl der alten Germanen*, Kultur und Sprache. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934.
- Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Hirsch, Emanuel. *Das vierte Evangelium in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt verdeutscht und erklärt*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936.
- . *Geschichte der neuen evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949–54.
- . *Das Wesen des Christentums. Neu herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Arnulf von Scheliha*. Edited by Hans Martin Müller. Vol. 19, Gesammelte Werke. Waltrop: Hartmut Spinner, 2004 (1939).
- Hodgson, Peter C. *The Formation of Historical Theology. A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan, Makers of Modern Theology. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Hoffmann, Christhard. *Juden und Judentum in Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Vol. 9, Studies in Judaism in Modern Times. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988. Reprint: Münster: Verlagshaus Monsenstein und Vannerdat, 2007.
- Hornig, Gottfried. "Schleiermacher und Semler. Beobachtungen zur Erforschung ihres Beziehungsverhältnisses". In *Internationaler Schleiermacherkongreß Berlin 1984*, edited by K.-V. Selge. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.
- . *Johann Salomo Semler. Studien zu Leben und Werk des Hallenser Aufklärungstheologen*. Edited by Hans Joachim Kertscher and Fabienne Molin. Vol. 2, Hallesche Beiträge zur Europäischen Aufklärung. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1996.

- Howard, Thomas Albert. *Religion and the Rise of Historicism. W. M. L. de Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Huber, Ernst Rudolf. *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789. Band I. Reform und Restauration 1789 bis 1830*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1957.
- Hubmann, Gerald. "Völkischer Nationalismus und Antisemitismus im frühen 19. Jahrhundert: Die Schriften von Rühls und Fries zur Judenfrage". In *Antisemitismus—Zionismus—Antizionismus 1850–1940*, edited by Renate Heuer and Ralph-Rainer Wuthenow, 59–69. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1997.
- . "Sittlichkeit und Recht. Die jüdische Emancipationsfrage bei Jakob Friedrich Fries und anderen Staatsdenkern des Deutschen Idealisten". In *Antisemitische und anti-judaistische Motive bei Denkern der Aufklärung*, edited by Horst Gronke, Thomas Meyer and Barbara Neißer, 59–69. Münster: LIT, 2001.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2 ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.
- . *At the Origins of Christian Worship. The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- . *Lord Jesus Christ: devotion to Jesus in earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.
- Hübner, Hans. "Rudolf Bultmann und das Alte Testament". *Kerygma und Dogma* 30 (1984): 250–272.
- Institut zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben. *Die Botschaft Gottes*. Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1940.
- Janssen, Nittert. "Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung. Breitenwirkung durch Vorträge und "gemeinverständliche" Veröffentlichungen". In *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, edited by Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder, 109–136. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Jasper, Gotthard. "Theologiestudium in Tübingen vor 100 Jahren—im Spiegel der Briefe des Studienanfängers Paul Althaus an seine Eltern". *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte* 13, no. 2 (2006): 251–335.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Edited by Wlad Godzich and Jochen Schulte-Sasse. Vol. 2, Theory and History of Literature. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982.
- Jenkins, Richard. "Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization, and Power". In *Race and Ethnicity: Comparative and Theoretical Approaches*, edited by John Stone and Rutledge Dennis, 59–71. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003.
- Jenson, Robert W. *Systematic Theology. Volume 1: The Triune God*. Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1997.
- . *Systematic Theology. Volume 2: The Works of God*. Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1999.
- Jerke, Birgit. "Wie wurde das Neue Testament zu einem sogenannten Volkstestament 'entjudet'? Aus der Arbeit des Eisenacher 'Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben'". In *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, 201–234. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994.
- Jerusalem, Hebrew University of. "SICSA The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism". <http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/bibsear.html>.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Edited by Ferdinand Hahn and Dietrich-Alex Koch. 17 ed. Vol. 3, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Johnson, Marshall D. "Power Politics and New Testament Scholarship in the National Socialist Period". *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23, no. 1 (1986): 1–24.
- Jonas, Hans. "A Retrospective View". In *Proceedings of the International Colloquium On Gnosticism Stockholm August 20–25, 1973*, 1–15. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1977.

- Jäger, Hans-Wolf. "Herder, Johann Gottfried". In *Neue deutsche Bibliographie, herausgegeben von der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 595–603. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1969.
- Kahlert, Heinrich. *Der Held und seine Gemeinde. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Stifterpersönlichkeit und Verehrgemeinschaft in der Theologie des freien Protestantismus*. Vol. 238, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII, Theologie. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Kantzenbach, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Protestantisches Christentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*. Edited by Helmut Thielecke and Hans Thimme. Vol. 5/6, Evangelische Enzyklopädie. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965.
- Kattenbusch, Ferdinand. *Die deutsche evangelische Theologie. Erster Teil: Das Jahrhundert von Schleiermacher bis nach dem Weltkrieg*. Vol. 1. Giessen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann in Giessen, 1934.
- Katz, David S. *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Katz, Jacob. *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Katz, Steven Theodore. *Kontinuität und Diskontinuität zwischen christlichem und nationalsozialistischem Antisemitismus*, ed. by Volker Drehsen. Translated by Alexandra Riebe. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Kelley, Shawn. *Racializing Jesus. Race, ideology and the formation of modern biblical scholarship*. Edited by David Gunn and Gary A. Phillips, Biblical Limits. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Kertész, Imre. *Det landsförsäde språket. Essäer och tal*. Translated by Ervin Rosenberg. Stockholm: Norstedts, 2007.
- Kidd, Colin. *The Forging of Races. Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600–2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kinzig, Wolfram. "Philosemitismus. Teil I: Zur Geschichte des Begriffs". *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105, no. 2 (1994): 203–228.
- . "Philosemitismus. Teil II: Zur historiographischen Verwendung des Begriffs". *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105, no. 3 (1994): 361–382.
- Kirschner, Bruno. "Strack, Hermann Leberecht". In *Jüdisches Lexikon*, edited by Georg Herlitz and Bruno Kirschner, 735–736, 1987.
- Kittel, Gerhard. "Jesus bei Paulus". In *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 366–402. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1912.
- . *Jesus und die Rabbinen*. Edited by Kropatchek. Vol. IX, Serie 7, Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen. Berlin-Lichterfelde: Verlag von Edwin Runge, 1912.
- . *Rabbinica. Paulus im Talmud, Die "Macht" auf dem Haupte. Runde Zahlen*. Edited by Johannes Leipoldt. Vol. 1, 3. Heft, Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1920.
- . "Die γενεαλογίαι der Pastoralbriefe". *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 20, no. 1/2 (1921): 49–69.
- . "Die Bergpredigt und die Ethik des Judentums". *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* 2, no. 4 (1925): 555–594.
- . "Grundsätzliches und Methodisches zu den Übersetzungen rabbinischer Texte". *Aggelos. Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde* 1, no. 1/2 (1925): 60–64.
- . *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*. Edited by Rudolf Kittel. Vol. 3:1, BWANT. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926.
- . *Jesus und die Juden*. Vol. 42, Stimmen aus der deutschen christlichen Studentenbewegung. Berlin: Furche Verlag, 1926.
- . *Urchristentum, Spätjudentum, Hellenismus. Akademische Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 28. Oktober 1926*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926.

- . *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum*, Vorlesungen der Olaus-Petri-Stiftung, gehalten in der Universität Upsala 26.–29. Oktober 1931. Gütersloh: Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1932.
- . “ἀκολουθεῖω”. In *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 210–216. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- . “Die Judenfrage”. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- . “Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Bibel”. *Glaube und Volk* 2 (1933): 152–155.
- . “Die Judenfrage. Zweite, überarbeitete und durch 2 Beilagen vermehrte Ausgabe”. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- . “Neutestamentliche Gedanken zur Judenfrage”. *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 29 September 1933, 903–907.
- . *Religionshistorien och urkristendomen*, Olaus Petriföreläsningar vid Uppsala Universitet 26–29 oktober 1931. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelsens Bokförlag, 1933.
- . “Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Geschichte Jesu”. *Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1934): 77–83.
- . “Die Judenfrage”. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.
- . “Das Menschenschächtgesetz”. *Deutsche Theologie* 1, no. 1 (1935): 293–299.
- . “Jesu Worte über sein Sterben”. *Deutsche Theologie* 3, no. 6 (1936): 166–189.
- . “Das Konnubium mit den Nicht-Juden im antiken Judentum.”. In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Zweiten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 12. bis 14. Mai 1937*, 30–62. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937.
- . “Das Urteil des Neuen Testaments über den Staat”. *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* 14 (1937): 651–680.
- . “Das Urteil über die Rassenmischung im Judentum und in der biblischen Religion”. *Der Biologe* no. 11 (1937): 342–353.
- . “Die Auferstehung Jesu”. *Deutsche Theologie* 4, no. 4/5 (1937): 133–168.
- . “Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage”. In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Ersten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 19. bis 21. November 1936*, 43–63. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937.
- . “Adolf Schlatter”. In *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, edited by Paul Althaus, 16–30. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1938.
- . “Lexicographia Sacra”. *Deutsche Theologie* 4, no. April (1938): 91–109.
- . “Lexicographia Sacra. Two lectures on the making of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, delivered on October 20th and 21st, 1937, in the Divinity School, Cambridge”. “*Theology*” *Occasional Papers* 7 (1938).
- . *Christus Imperator. Das Urteil der Ersten Christenheit über den Staat*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1939.
- . *Die historischen Voraussetzungen der jüdischen Rassenmischung. Mit zwei Karten, davon eine Ausschlagskarte am Schluß des Buches*, Schriften des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939.
- . “Die ältesten jüdischen Bilder. Eine Aufgabe für die wissenschaftliche Gemeinschaftsarbeit”. In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Vierten Münchner Arbeitstagung des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands vom 4. bis 6. Juli 1939*, 235–257. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1940.
- . “Die ältesten jüdischen Judenkarikaturen. Die ‘Trierer Terrakotten’”. In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Vierten Münchner Arbeitstagung des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands vom 4. bis 6. Juli 1939*, 248–257. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1940.
- . “Die Ausbreitung des Judentums bis zum Beginn des Mittelalters”. In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, 290–310. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1941.
- . “Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes”. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 41 (1942): 71–105.

- . “λόγος”. In *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 100–140. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942.
- . “Die Behandlung des Nichtjuden nach dem Talmud”. *Archiv für Judenfragen. Schriften zur geistigen Überwindung des Judentums. Herausgeber Anti-jüdische Aktion 1, Gruppe A 1* (1943): 7–17.
- . “Die Entstehung des Judentums”. *Die Welt als Geschichte. Eine Zeitschrift für Universalgeschichte* 9 (1943): 68–82.
- . “Die Entstehung des Judentums. Vortrag gehalten in der Wiener Universität am 22. März 1943. Typescript”. Wien: Institut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte in Tübingen, 1943.
- . “Die Wurzeln des Englischen Erwählungsglaubens”. In *Reich und Reichsfeinde*, 99–127. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1943.
- . “Das kleinasiatische Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit”. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1/2 (1944): 9–20.
- . “Das Rassenproblem der Spätantike und das Frühchristentum. (Typewritten manuscript)”. In *Tübingen University, Theological Library*, 1944.
- . “Die Ausbreitung des Judentums bis zum Beginn des Mittelalters, II. Teil”. In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, 159–220. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1944.
- . “Meine Verteidigung”. In *Universitätsarchiv Tübingen 162/31,1*. Tübingen, 1946.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 1–10. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934–1979.
- . “Theological Dictionary of the New Testament”. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972–.
- Kjær-Hansen, Kai. *Josef Rabinowitsch og den messianske bevægelse*. Århus: Forlaget OKAY-BOG, Den danske Israelsmission, Forlaget Savanne, 1988.
- Klein, Charlotte. *Theologie und Anti-Judaismus. Eine Studie zur deutschen theologischen Literatur der Gegenwart*. Edited by Helmut Gollwitzer, Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1975.
- Koch, Grit. *Adolf Stoecker 1835–1909. Ein Leben zwischen Politik und Kirche*. Edited by Detlef Leistner-Opfermann and Dietmar Peschel-Rentsch. Vol. 101, Erlanger Studien. Erlangen und Jena: Verlag Palm & Enke, 1993.
- Koehl, Robert Lewis. *The Black Corps. The Structure and Power Struggles of the Nazi SS*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*. 2 ed. Neukirchen-Fluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem*, Schriften des Reichsinstitutes für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939.
- Kuhn, KG. “Ἰσραήλ, Ἰουδαῖος in der nach-at.lichen jüdischen Literatur”. In *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 360–370. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.
- Kuhn, Thomas S., ed. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Edited by Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap and Charles Morris. Second, enlarged ed. Vol. 2, 2, International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Kusche, Ulrich. *Die unterlegene Religion. Das Judentum im Urteil deutscher Alttestamentler*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 12, Studien zu Kirche und Israel Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1991.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Das Neue Testament. Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme*. Edited by Fritz Wagner and Richard Brodführer. 2 ed, Orbis Academicus. Problemgeschichten der Wissenschaft in Dokumenten und Darstellungen. Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 1970.

- Köpf, Ulrich. "Die theologischen Tübingen Schulen". In *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung, Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler. 8. Blauberger Symposium*, edited by Ulrich Köpf, 9–51. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. "Schlatter Reception Then: His New Testament Theology". *Southern Baptist Journal* 3, no. 1 (1999): 40–51.
- Lambropoulos, Vassilis. *The Rise of Eurocentrism. Anatomy of Interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Lang, Berel. *Heidegger's Silence*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Langewiesche, Dieter. "Bildungsbürgertum und Protestantismus in Gesellschaft und Politik: Württemberg in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts". In *Historisch-kritische Geschichtsbetrachtung, Ferdinand Christian Baur und seine Schüler. 8. Blauberger Symposium*, edited by Ulrich Köpf, 53–66. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994.
- Langmuir, Gavin I. *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Lannert, Berthold. *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiss*. Edited by Klaus Berger, François Vouga, Michael Wolter and Dieter Zeller. Vol. 2, Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 1989.
- . "Die Bedeutung der religionsgeschichtlichen Forschungen zur Geschichte des Urchristentums". In *Ernst Troeltschs Soziallehren: Studie zu ihrer Interpretation*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1993.
- Larsson. "Hellenisterna och urförsamlingen". In *Judendom och kristendom under de första århundradena*, edited by S. Hidal, et al. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1986.
- Larsson, Edvin. "Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde". *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 205–225.
- Laudan, Larry. *Progress and its Problems. Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Lehmkuhler, Karsten. *Kultus und Theologie. Dogmatik und Exegese in der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule*. Edited by Wolkhart Pannenberg and Reinhard Slenczka. Vol. 76, Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Lehnerer, Thomas. "Religiöse Individualität. Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768–1834)". In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus. Band 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 173–201. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990.
- Leipoldt, Johannes. *War Jesus Jude?* Leipzig, Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh., 1923.
- Leppin, Volker. "Gott und Nation. Wandlungen der Verhältnisbestimmung bei Grundmanns Weg vom Oberkirchenrat in Sachsen zum Lehrbeauftragten für Völkische Theologie in Jena". In *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, edited by Roland Deines, Volker Leppin and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 191–218. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Levenson, Alan. "Missionary Protestants as Defenders and Detractors of Judaism: Franz Delitzsch and Hermann Strack". *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 92, no. 3–4 (2002): 383–420.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Anti-Judaism and the Gospel of Matthew". In *Antijudaism and the Gospels*, edited by William R. Farmer, 9–36. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Christlich-Jüdische Beziehungen dargestellt an der Geschichte des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum". In *Brücke zwischen Kulturen und Völkern. Ein Bild für unsere Universität*, edited by Rudolf Hausner, 25–36. Münster: Copenrath, 1993.

- . "Adolf Schlatter (1852–1938) und das Judentum". Bonn, 2003.
- Liebeschütz, Hans. *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Neutestamentler in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. Hans von Soden und Rudolf Bultmann in Marburg". *Wort und Dienst. Jahrbuch der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel* Neue Folge 20 (1989): 25–52.
- Low, Alfred D. *Jews in the Eyes of the Germans. From the Enlightenment to Imperial Germany*. Philadelphia: Institute for Human Issues, 1979.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule". In *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, edited by Bernd Moeller, 325–361. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- . "Die 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule' und die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft". In *Die 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule'. Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*, edited by Gerd Lüdemann, 9–22. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Lüdemann, Gerd, and Martin Schröder. *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Lüdemann, Gerd, and Alf Özen. "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 618–624. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Lührmann, Dieter. "Rudolf Bultmann and the History of Religions School". In *Text and Logos. The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament*, edited by Theodore W. Jennings, 3–14. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Löffler, Siegfried. "Weg und Ziel". *Archiv für Judenfragen. Schriften zur geistigen Überwindung des Judentums. Herausgeber Anti-jüdische Aktion 1, Gruppe A 1* (1943): 1–5.
- Maier, Johann. *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*. Vol. 82, Erträge der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliches Buchgesellschaft, 1978.
- Manuel, Frank E. *The Broken Staff. Judaism through Christian Eyes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Martin, Dale B. "Paul and the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy: Toward a Social History of the Question". In *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 29–61. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Maser, Peter. *Hans Ernst von Kottwitz. Studien zur Erweckungsbewegung des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Schlesien und Berlin*. Edited by Peter Hauptmann. Vol. 21, Kirche im Osten. Studien zur osteuropäischen Kirchengeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Mazer, Th. *Johan Tobias Beck. En lifsbild ur den kristna kyrkans historia*. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1916.
- McNutt, James E. "Adolf Schlatter and the Jews". *German Studies Review* 26, no. 2 (2003): 353–370.
- . "Vessels of Wrath, Prepared to Perish. Adolf Schlatter and the Spiritual Extermination of the Jews". *Theology Today* 63, no. 2 (2006): 176–190.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads his Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel". In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, 513–544. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Meier, Kurt. *Kirche und Judentum. Die Haltung der evangelischen Kirche zur Judenpolitik des Dritten Reiches*. Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1968.
- . *Die theologischen Fakultäten im Dritten Reich*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
- Merk, Otto. "Baumgarten, Siegmund Jacob". In *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, edited by Walter Kasper, 93. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.
- . "Paul Anton de Lagarde und die Theologie in den ersten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jahrhunderts". In *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, edited by Roland Deines, Volker Leppin and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 17–42. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007.

- Moltmann, Jürgen. *Der gekreuzigte Gott: das Kreuz Jesu Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie*. 3 ed. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1976.
- Montefiore, C. G. *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1930.
- Moore, George Foot. "Christian Writers on Judaism". *Harvard Theological Review* 14, no. 3 (1921): 197–254.
- Morgan, Robert, and John Barton. *Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and G. N. Stanton, Oxford Bible Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Morgan, Thomas. *The Moral Philosopher in a dialogue between Philalethes a Christian Deist, and Theophanes a Christian Jew*. Vol. I. London: n.p., 1738.
- . *The Moral Philosopher. Being a farther vindication of Moral Truth and Reason*. Vol. II. London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1739.
- . *The Moral Philosopher. Superstition and Tyranny inconsistent with Theocracy*. Vol. III. London: n.p., 1740.
- Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.
- Moxnes, Halvor. "Den historiske Jesus i nasjonalismens tidsalder". *Norsk teologisk tidsskrift* 3 (2000): 179–192.
- Mühling, Andreas. "'Es hat diese Aussprache nun doch ihren Sinn'. Anmerkungen zu Karl Ludwig Schmidt und der Neutestamentler-Erklärung des Jahres 1933". *Theologische Zeitschrift* 49, no. 1 (1993): 353–364.
- . *Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "Und Wissenschaft ist Leben"*. Edited by Christoph Marksches, Joachim Mehlhausen and Gerhard Müller. Vol. 66, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
- Müller, Gotthold. *Identität und Immanenz. Zur Genese der Theologie von David Friedrich Strauss. Eine theologie- und philosophiegeschichtliche Studie. (Including Strauß, D.F.: Die Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge in ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung)*. Edited by Max Geiger. Vol. 10, Basler Studien zur Historischen und Systematischen Theologie. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1968.
- Müller, Paul-Gerhard. "Altes Testament, Israel und das Judentum in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns". In *Kontinuität und Einheit. Für Franz Mußner*, edited by Paul-Gerhard Müller and Werner Stenger, 439–472. Herder: Freiburg, 1981.
- Männchen, Julia. "Gustav Dalman and Jewish Missions". *Mishkan* 1 (1991): 64–73.
- Nagel, Anne Christine. *Martin Rade—Theologe und Politiker des Sozialen Liberalismus. Eine politische Biographie von Anne Christine Nagel*. Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Gangolf Hübinger. Vol. 4, Religiöse Kulturen der Moderne. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1996.
- Nanos, Mark D. *The Mystery of Romans: the Jewish context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Naumann, Friedrich. *Was heißt Christlich-Sozial? Gesammelte Aufsätze von Fr. Naumann. Zweites Heft*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1896.
- Ndwandwe, Hummingbird Charles Nkosingithi. "Reading 1 John in a Zulu context: hermeneutical issues". Doctoral Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2000.
- Neuer, Werner. *Adolf Schlatter: A Biography of Germany's Premier Biblical Theologian*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1996.
- . *Adolf Schlatter: Ein Leben für Theologie und Kirche*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1996.
- . "Schlatter, Adolf". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, edited by Gerhard Müller, 135–143. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- . E-mail message to the author, 11 Nov. 2007.
- Neugebauer, Fritz. "Wer war Adolf Schlatter?". *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 122, no. 9 (1997): 769–782.
- Nicolaisen, Carsten. "Die Stellung der 'Deutschen Christen' zum Alten Testament". In *Zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes. Gesammelte Aufsätze II*, edited by Heinz Brunotte and Ernst Wolf, 197–220. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

- Niebuhr, Karl Wilhelm. "Walter Grundmanns Vorlesung 'N.T.-Theologie' von 1937/38 und sein Buch 'Die Geschichte Jesu Christi' von 1957. Vorläufige Beobachtungen". In *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, edited by Roland Deines, Volker Leppin and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 239–274. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Nowak, Kurt. "Protestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik". *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 113, no. 8 (1988): 561–578.
- . *Kulturprotestantismus und Judentum in der Weimarer Republik*. Edited by Claus Ritterhoff. Vol. 4, Kleine Schriften zur Aufklärung. Wolfenbüttel, Göttingen: Lessing-Akademie, Wallstein Verlag, 1993.
- . "Theologie, Philologie und Geschichte. Adolf von Harnack als Kirchenhistoriker". In *Adolf von Harnack. Theologe, Historiker, Wissenschaftspolitiker*, edited by Kurt Nowak and Gerhard Oexle, 189–237. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Odeberg, Hugo. "Några synpunkter på den judiska litteraturens betydelse för den nytestamentliga exegetiken". *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 10, no. 2 (1934): 107–119.
- . "Hellenismus und Judentum. Verjudung und Entjudung der antiken Welt". In *Die völkische Gestalt des Glaubens*, edited by Walter Grundmann, 101–118. Leipzig: Verlag Georg Wigand, 1943.
- Ott, Hugo. *Martin Heidegger. Unterwegs zu seiner Biographie*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1988.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. "Geschichte/Geschichtsschreibung/Geschichtsphilosophie VIII". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 658–674. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- Park, T. Peter. "Thomas Carlyle and the Jews". *Journal of European Studies* 20 (1990): 1–21.
- Parkes, James. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A study in the origins of antisemitism*. London: Soncino Press, 1934.
- . "Jews and Christians in the Constantinian Empire". In *Studies in Church History. Papers read at the first winter and summer meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, edited by C. W. Dugmore and Charles Duggan, 69–79. London: Thomas Nelson, 1964.
- Pasto, James. "Who Owns the Jewish Past? Judaism, Judaisms, and the Writing of Jewish History". Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 1999.
- Paul, Ina Ulrike. "Paul Anton de Lagarde". In *Handbuch zur "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871–1918*, edited by Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz and Justus H. Ulbricht, 45–93. München: K.G. Saur, 1999.
- Perles, Felix. *Bousset's Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht*. Berlin: Wolf Peiser Verlag, 1903.
- Pinson, Koppel S. *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.
- Plümacher, Eckhard. "Delitzsch, Franz Julius". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, edited by Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller, 431–433. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981.
- Poliakov, Léon. *The Aryan Myth. A history of racist and nationalist ideas in Europe*, The Columbia Centre series. London: Chatto, Heinemann for Sussex University Press, 1974.
- Prolingheuer, Hans. *Wir sind in die Irre gegangen: die Schuld der Kirche unterm Hakenkreuz*. Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1987.
- Pulzer, Peter. "The Return of Old Hatreds". In *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Integration in Dispute 1871–1918*, edited by Michael A. Meyer, 196–251. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Puschner, Uwe. *Die völkische Bewegung im wilhelminischen Kaiserreich. Sprache—Rasse—Religion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.
- . "Völkisch. Plädoyer für einen 'engen' Begriff". In *"Erziehung zum deutschen Menschen". Völkische und nationalkonservative Erwachsenenbildung in der Weimarer Republik*, edited by Paul Ciupke, Klaus Heuer, Franz-Josef Jelich and Justus H. Ulbricht, 53–66. Essen: Klartext, 2007.
- . E-mail communication, 31 Mar. 2008.

- Rade, Martin. "Zur deutschen Judengesetzgebung". *Die Christliche Welt* 21 (1935): 994–997.
- Raupp, Werner. "Bultmann, Rudolf (Karl)". In *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, 174–233. Nordhausen: Bautz, 2003.
- Rebell, Walter. "Glaube und politisches Handeln bei Rudolf Bultmann". *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* 31, no. 2 (1987): 162–179.
- Rendtorff, Rolf, and Eckehard Stegemann, eds. *Auschwitz—Krise der christlichen Theologie. Eine Vortragsreihe*. Edited by Helmut Gollwitzer. Vol. 10, Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1980.
- Rese, Martin. "Antisemitismus und neutestamentliche Forschung, Anmerkungen zu dem Thema 'Gerhard Kittel und die Judenfrage'". *Evangelische Theologie* 39, no. 6 (1979): 557–570.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*. Zweite, durchgängig neu ausgearbeitete Auflage ed. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1857.
- Rogerson, John W. "Philosophy and the Rise of Biblical Criticism: England and Germany". In *England and Germany: studies in theological diplomacy*, edited by S. W. Sykes, 63–79. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982.
- . *W. M. L. de Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography*. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. Vol. 126, JSOTSup. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Rohling, August. *Der Talmudjude. Zu Beherzigung für Juden und Christen aller Stände*. 6 ed. Münster: Adolph Russel's Verlag, 1877.
- . *Franz Delitzsch und die Judenfrage. Antwortlich beantwortet von Prof. Dr. Aug. Rohling*. Prag: Verlag von Joh. B. Reinitzer & Co., 1881.
- Rohls, Jan. "Liberaler Romantik. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette". In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus. Band 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 233–250. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990.
- Rosen, Alan. "'Familiarly known as Kittel': The Moral Politics of the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament". In *Tainted Greatness. Antisemitism and Cultural Heroes*, edited by Nancy A. Harrowitz. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Rotenstreich, Nathan. *Jews and German Philosophy. The Polemics of Emancipation*. New York: Schocken Books, 1984.
- Rothe, Heinrich. "Die Stellung der evangelischen Theologie zum Judentum am Ausgang der Aufklärung". Doctoral thesis, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität, 1953.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Faith and Fratricide. The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1974.
- Runesson, Anders. "Particularistic Judaism and Universalistic Christianity? Some Critical Remarks on Terminology and Theology". *Studia Theologica* 54, no. 1 (2000): 55–75.
- Rutgers, L. V. *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*. Edited by Tj. Baarda, A. van der Kooij and A. S. van der Woude. Vol. 20, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Räsänen, Heikki. *Beyond New Testament Theology: A Story and a Programme*. 2 ed. London: SPCK, 2001.
- Rösner, Thomas. "Adolf Bartels". In *Handbuch zur "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871–1918*, edited by Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz and Justus H. Ulbricht, 874–894. München: K. G. Saur, 1999.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977.

- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1–13.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. "Der Jenaer Jesus. Zu werk und Wirkung des völkischen Theologen Walter Grundmann und seiner Kollegen". In *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 167–279. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- . "Literatur zum Thema 'Thüringer Deutsche Christen'". In *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 348–420. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Römerbrief. Ein Hilfsbüchlein für Bibelleser*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1887.
- . *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas*. Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1893.
- . *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament*. 2 ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1896.
- . *Jochanan ben Zakkai, der Zeitgenosse der Apostel*. Edited by Adolf Schlatter and Hermann Cremer. Vol. 3:4, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1899.
- . *Israels Geschichte von Alexander dem Großen bis Hadrian*. Vol. 3, Reiche der Alten Welt. Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1901.
- . *Christus und Christentum. J. T. Becks theologische Arbeit*. Edited by Adolf Schlatter and Wilhelm Lütgert. Vol. 8:4, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1904.
- . *Nya testamentet utlagdt och förklaradt: Bemynd. öfvers. under öfverinseende af Karl Öhman [& C. Silwer]. Med förord jämte öfversikt öfver Jesu lif i tidsföljd enligt de fyra evangelierna (synoptisk-kronologisk tafla) af W. Rudin*. Vol. 1–4. Stockholm: Schedins, 1906–1910.
- . *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Erster Teil: Das Wort Jesu*. Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1909.
- . *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Zweiter Teil: Die Lehre der Apostel*. Calw & Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1910.
- . *Die Gemeinde in der apostolischen Zeit und im Missionsgebiet*. Edited by Adolf Schlatter and Wilhelm Lütgert. Vol. 16:5, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912.
- . *Erlebtes. Erzählt von D. Adolf Schlatter*. 3 ed. Berlin: Furche Verlag, 1924.
- . *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament. Vierte Bearbeitung*. 4 ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927.
- . *Wir Christen und die Juden*. Vol. 7, Freizeit-Blätter. Velbert: Freizeiten-Verlag zu Velbert im Rheinland, 1930.
- . *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*. Edited by Adolf Schlatter and Wilhelm Lütgert. Vol. 26, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. 2. Reihe Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932.
- . *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*. Edited by Theodor Schlatter. Vol. 14, Sonderdrucke des Monatsblattes "Beth-El". Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1933.
- . "Die zehn Gebote der Träger unseres Volkstums". In *Die neue deutsche Art in der Kirche*, edited by Theodor Schlatter. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1933.
- . "Menschengemeinschaft-Gottesgemeinschaft". Paper presented at the 16. Freudenstädter Tagung. (Christlicher Akademikertagung für Württemberg und Baden). "Ich glaube an den Heiligen Geist", Kurhaus Palmenwald in Freudenstadt, 14–18 Oktober 1933.
- . *Rasse und Bruderschaft [Adolf Schlatter-Archiv Nr 169/11]* 1933.
- . "Die Grenzen der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft". *Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1935): 181–192.
- . *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1935.

- . *Wird der Jude über uns siegen? Ein Wort für die Weihnachtszeit*. Vol. 8, Freizeit-Blätter. Essen an der Ruhr: Freizeiten-Verlag zu Velbert im Rheinland, 1935.
- Schlatter, Theodor, ed. *Adolf Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter*. Edited by Paul Althaus, Hermann Dörries and Joachim Jeremias, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1952.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Friedrich Schleiermacher's sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 1:8. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1845.
- . *Friedrich Schleiermacher's sämtliche Werke. Erste Abtheilung Zur Theologie*. Vol. 1:6. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1864.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich David Ernst. *Die Weihnachtsfeier. Ein Gespräch*. Halle: Schimmlpfennig und Kompagnie, 1806.
- . *Schleiermachers Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums. Kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Register von Heinrich Scholz*. Edited by Carl Stange. Vol. 10, Quellenschriften zur Protestantismus. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh., 1910 (1811).
- . *Friedrich David Ernst Schleiermacher. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Edited by Hans-Joachim Birkner, Gerhard Ebeling, Hermann Fischer, Heinz Kimmerle and Kurt-Victor Selge, Quellenschriften zur Protestantismus. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- Schloemann, Martin. *Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten. System und Geschichte in der Theologie des Überganges zum Neuprotestantismus*. Vol. 26, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919.
- . "Die Kirche des Urchristentums. Eine lexikographische und biblisch-theologische Studie". In *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag, 7. November 1926*, edited by Karl Ludwig Schmidt, 258–319. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927.
- . *Ein Gang durch den Galaterbrief*. Edited by Karl Barth. Vol. 11/12, Theologische Studien. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1942.
- . *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9–11 des Römerbriefes*. Edited by Karl Barth. Vol. 13, Theologische Studien. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1943.
- . "Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments". In *Neues Testament Judentum Kirche. Kleine Schriften*, edited by Gerhard Sauter, 167–191. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1981 (1936).
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, and Martin Buber. "Kirche, Staat, Volk, Judentum. Zwiegespräch im Jüdischen Lehrhaus in Stuttgart am 14. Januar 1933". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 9, September 1933 (1933): 257–274.
- Schmidt, Kurt Dietrich. *Die Bekenntnisse und grundsätzlichen Äusserungen zur Kirchenfrage des Jahres 1933*. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1934.
- . "Der Widerstand der Kirche im Dritten Reich". *Lutherische Monatshefte* 1, no. 8 (1962): 366–370.
- Schmithals, Walter. *An Introduction to the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- Schmitt, Christoph. "Grundmann, Walter". In *Biographisches-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Available in preliminary form at http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/g/grundmann_w.shtml accessed 7 Oct. 2005; Verlag Traugott Bautz, 2006.
- Schmitz, Matthias. "Herder, Johann Gottfried". In *Metzler-Philosophen-Lexikon. Dreihundert biographisch-werkgeschichtliche Porträts von den Vorsokratikern bis zu den Neuen Philosophen*, edited by Bernd Lutz, 350–353. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1989.
- Schneider, Carl. "μέτοπον". In *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 638–640. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942.
- Schneider, Hannelore. E-mail communication, Thu, 04 Oct. 2007.
- Scholder, Klaus. *Ursprünge und Probleme der Bibelkritik im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der historisch-kritischen Theologie*. Edited by Ernst Wolf. Vol. 33, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966.

- . *Die Kirchen und das dritte Reich. Vorgeschichte und Zeit der Illusionen*. Vol. 1. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Ullstein, 1977.
- . "Baur, Ferdinand Christian (1792–1860)". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 352–359, 1980.
- Schwarz, Karl W. "'Grenzbürg' und 'Bollwerk'. Ein Bericht über die Wiener Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät in den Jahren 1938–1945". In *Theologische Fakultäten im Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Carsten Nicolaisen, 361–389. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906.
- Schüfer, Tobias. "Walter Grundmanns Programm einer erneuerten Wissenschaft. Die 'Völkische Theologie' von 1937 und ihre Ausgestaltung in der 'Jenaer Studienreform'". In *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich*, edited by Roland Deines, Volker Leppin and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 219–237. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986.
- Schürer, Emil. "Review of Schlatter, Prof. D. A. Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas". *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 18, no. 13 (1893): 321–328.
- . *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 and 4 ed. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1901–1909.
- Schäfer, Gerhard. *Die evangelische Landeskirche in Württemberg und der Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation zum Kirchenkampf. Band 3: der Einbruch des Reichsbischofs in die württ. Landeskirche 1934*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974.
- Schäfer, Peter. *Judeophobia. Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Schäfer, Rolf. "Ritschl, Albrecht 1822–1889 / Ritschlsche Schule". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 220–238. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Schönhagen, Benigna. *Tübingen unterm Hakenkreuz. Eine Universitätsstadt in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*. Vol. 4, Beiträge zur Tübinger Geschichte. Stuttgart: Theiss, 1991.
- Segal, Alan F. "Conversion and Universalism: Opposites that Attract". In *Origins and Method. Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity*, edited by Bradley H. McLean. Sheffield, 1993.
- . *Two powers in heaven: early rabbinic reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Seidel, J. Jürgen. "Schlatter, Adolf". In *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, 232–235. Herzberg: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1995.
- Semler, Johann Salomo. "Vorwort". In *Kürzer Begriff der theologischen Streitigkeiten, zum academischen Gebrauch von neuem mit einer Vorrede von der heutigen Polemik herausgeben von D. Johann Salomo Semler*. Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1759.
- . "Untersuchung ob die Therapeuten zu den Christen des ersten Jahrhunderts gehören". *Wöchentliche Hallische Anzeigen* 28–31 (1769): 28: 489–497, 429: 513–522, 430: 529–539, 431: 545–554.
- . *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon; nebst Antwort auf die tübingische Vertheidigung des Apocalypsis*. Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1771.
- . *Versuch einer freiern theologischen Lehrart zur Bestätigung und Erläuterung seines lateinischen Buchs*. Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1777.
- . *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*. Edited by Hans Scheible, Texte zur Kirchen- und Theologischesgeschichte. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1967 (1771–1776).
- Shapiro, Marc. "Noahic Laws". In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, edited by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder, 504–505. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore. *Nationalsozialismus und Kirchen. Religionspolitik von Partei und Staat bis 1935*. Vol. 5, Tübinger Schriften zur Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1974.
- . "Die Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät Tübingen in den Anfangsjahren des Dritten Reichs. II. Gerhard Kittel und die Judenfrage". *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. Beiheft* 4 (1978): 53–80.
- . *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage. Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte*. Vol. 208, Theologische Existenz heute. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1980.
- . "Mitverantwortung und Schuld der Christen am Holocaust". *Evangelische Theologie* 42 (1982): 171–190.
- . "New Testament Scholarship and the Nazi-State. Christian responsibility and guilt in the Holocaust". In *Remembering for the future. Working papers and addenda*, edited by Yehuda Bauer, Alice Eckardt, Franklin H. Littell, Elisabeth Maxwell, Robert Maxwell and David Patterson, 2717–2727. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989.
- . "Geschichtsverständnis angesichts des Nationalsozialismus. Der Tübinger Kirchenhistoriker Hanns Rückert in der Auseinandersetzung mit Karl Barth". In *Theologische Fakultäten im Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Carsten Nicolaisen, 113–144. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- . "Adolf Schlatters Sicht des Judentums". In *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, 95–110. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994.
- , ed. *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*. Edited by Walter Bechinger, Doron Kiesel, Bernhard Moltmann, Dietrich Neuhaus, Karl-Martin Schönhals, Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Ulrich O. Sievering. Vol. 66, Arnoldshainer Texte. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 1994.
- . "'Meine Verteidigung' von Gerhard Kittel und eine Denkschrift von Walter Grundmann". In *Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz. Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit*, edited by Hermann Düringer and Karin Weintz. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen Verlag, 2000.
- Smend, Rudolf. *Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Arbeit am Alten und am Neuen Testament*. Basel: Verlag Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1958.
- . "Die Kritik am Alten Testament". In *Friedrich Schleiermacher 1768–1834. Theologe—Philosoph—Pädagoge*, edited by Dietz Lange, 106–128. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Smid, Marikje. *Deutscher Protestantismus und Judentum 1932/1933*. Edited by Heinz Eduard Tödt. Vol. 2, Heidelberger Untersuchungen zu Widerstand, Judenverfolgung und Kirchenkampf im Dritten Reich. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1990.
- Smiga, George M. *Pain and Polemic. Anti-Judaism in the Gospels*. Edited by Helga Croner, Stimulus Books. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.
- Smith, Morton. "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963): 169–176.
- Soulen, R. Kendall. *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- St. Clair, William. *That Greece might still be free. The Philhellenes in the War of Dependence*. London: Oxford U.P., 1972.
- Stachlin, Ernst. *Dewettiana. Forschungen und Texte zu Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Leben und Werk*. Vol. 2, Studien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Basel. Basel: Verlag von Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1956.
- Steck, Karl Gerhard. *Die Idee des Heilsgeschichte. Hofmann-Schlatter-Cullmann*. Edited by Karl Barth and Max Geiger. Vol. 56, Theologische Studien. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag A.G. Zollikon, 1959.

- Stegemann, Wolfgang. "Das Verhältnis Rudolf Bultmanns zum Judentum. Ein Beitrag zur Pathologie des strukturellen theologischen Antijudaismus". *Kirche und Israel* 5 (1990): 26–44.
- Steiger, Günther. *Aufbruch. Urburschenschaft und Wartburgfest*. Leipzig: Urania-Verlag, 1967.
- Steinweis, Alan. "Hitler and Carlyle's 'Historical Greatness'". *History Today* no. June (1995).
- Stemberger, Günter. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated by Markus Bockmuehl. 2 ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and other essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Stenström, Thure. *Existentialismen. Studier i dess idétradition och litterära yttringar*. 3 ed. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1984.
- Sterling, Eleonore. *Judenhass. Die Anfänge des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815–1850)*. Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1969.
- Stern, Carola, and Heinrich A. Winkler, eds. *Wendepunkte deutscher Geschichte 1848–1990*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001.
- Stoecker, Adolf. *Christlich-Sozial. Reden und Aufsätze*. Berlin: Verlag der Buchhandlung der Berliner Stadtmission, 1890.
- Strack, Hermann L. *Herr Adolf Stöcker, christliche Liebe und Wahrhaftigkeit*. Karlsruhe und Leipzig: Verlag von H. Reuther, 1885.
- . *Der Blutaberglaube in der Menschheit, Blutmorde und Blutritus*. 4 ed. Vol. 14, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1892.
- . *Sind die Juden Verbrecher von Religionswegen?* Vol. 28, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1900.
- . *Das Wesen des Judentums. Vortrag gehalten auf der internationalen Konferenz für Judenmission zu Amsterdam*. Vol. 36, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.
- . *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben*. Edited by Hermann L. Strack. Vol. 37, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.
- . *Einleitung in Talmud und Midras*. 5 ed. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920.
- . *Jüdische Geheimgesetze? Mit drei Anhängen*. 6 ed. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922–1961.
- Strauss, Claudia. "Research on cultural discontinuities". In *A cognitive theory of cultural meaning*, edited by Claudia Strauss and Naomi Quinn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Strauss, David Friedrich. *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*. 2 ed. Vol. 2. Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1837.
- . *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*. 2 ed. Vol. 1. Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1837.
- . *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt*. Vol. I. Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1840.
- . "Judenverfolgung und Judenemanzipation". *Jahrbücher der Gegenwart* 30, no. April (1848): 117–119.
- . *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*. 2 ed. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1864.
- . *Der alte und der neue Glaube. Ein Bekenntnis*. 6 ed. Bonn: Verlag von Emil Strauß, 1873.
- Strauss, Herbert A., ed. *Bibliographie zum Antisemitismus: die Bestände der Bibliothek des Zentrums für Antisemitismusforschung der Technischen Universität Berlin / herausgegeben von Herbert A. Strauss; bearbeitet von Lydia Bressen [Katalog] und Antje Gerlach [Sachregister] = A Biblio-*

- graphy on Antisemitism: the Library of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at the Technical University of Berlin / edited by Herbert A. Strauss; compiled by Lydia Bressemer [Catalogue] and Antje Gerlach [Subject index].* Vol. 1–4. München: Saur, 1989–1993.
- Strohm, Christoph. *Theologische Ethik im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus. Der Weg Dietrich Bonhoeffers mit den Juristen Hans von Dohnanyi und Gerhard Leibholz in den Widerstand.* Edited by Heinz Eduard Tödt. Vol. 1, Heidelberger Untersuchungen zu Widerstand, Judenverfolgung und Kirchenkampf im Dritten Reich. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1989.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Adolf Schlatter als Bibelausleger". *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* Beiheft 4 (1978): 81–111.
- Stöhr, Martin. "Martin Luther und die Juden". In *Christen und Juden. Ihr Gegenüber vom Apostelkonzil bis heute*, edited by Wolf-Dieter Marsch and Karl Thieme, 115–140. Mainz, Göttingen: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Suchy, Barbara. "The Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus (I). From its Beginnings to the First World War". In *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, edited by Arnold Paucker, 204–239. London: Secker & Warburg, 1983.
- . "The Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus (II). From the First World War to its Dissolution in 1933". In *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, edited by Arnold Paucker, 67–103. London: Secker & Warburg, 1985.
- Syreeni, Kari. "A Single Eye: Aspects of the Symbolic World of Matt 6:22–23". *Studia Theologica* 53, no. 2 (1999).
- Sänger, Walter. *Germanenchristentum. Der Halberstädter Dom und seine Bildwerke als Zeugnisse deutscher Frömmigkeit. Mit einer grundsätzlichen Einleitung: Mythos und Frohbotschaft von Dr. Walter Grundmann, Jena.* Vol. 2, Studien zu deutscher Theologie und Frömmigkeit. Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938.
- Tal, Uriel. *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914.* Translated by Noah Jonathan Jacobs. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- . "On Modern Lutheranism and the Jews". In *Religion, Politics and Ideology in the Third Reich. Selected Essays*, edited by Michael Burleigh, 191–203. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Theissen, Gerd. *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion.* Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1999.
- Theologische Fakultät der Universität Marburg, Die. "Gutachten der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Marburg zum Kirchengesetz über die Religionsverhältnisse der Geistlichen und Kirchenbeamten". *Theologische Blätter* 12, no. 10 (1933): 289–294.
- Tholuck, A. *Läran om Synden och Försonaren eller Tviflarens sanna Inwigning.* Göteborg: Samuel Norberg, 1829.
- . *Kommentar zum Briefe Pauli and die Römer.* 2 ed. Halle: Eduard Anton, 1842.
- . *Ausführliche Auslegung der Bergpredigt Christi nach Matthäus.* 3 ed. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1845.
- Tice, Terence. *The Schleiermacher Bibliography.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Tilgner, Wolfgang. *Volksnomostheologie und Schöpfungsglaube. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes.* Edited by Kurt Dietrich Schmidt. Vol. 16, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Timm, Hermann. *Theorie und Praxis in der Theologie Albrecht Ritschls und Wilhelm Herrmanns. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Kulturprotestantismus.* Edited by Heinz Eduard Tödt and Heinz-Dietrich Wendland. Vol. 1, Studien zur evangelischen Ethik. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1967.
- Tödt, Heinz Eduard. "Glauben und politischen Einstellung bei Rudolf Bultmann. Anmerkungen zum Beitrag Walter Rebells". *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* 31, no. 2 (1987): 183–189.

- Ulrich, Jörg. *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden. Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*. Edited by H. C. Brennecke and E. Mühlenberg. Vol. 49, Patristische Texte und Studien. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Verheule, A. F. *Wilhelm Bousset. Leben und Werk. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Versuch*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Ton Bolland, 1973.
- Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew. A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- . *Jesus and the World of Judaism*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1983.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. "Karl Ludwig Schmidt". In *Neues Testament Judentum Kirche. Kleine Schriften*, edited by Gerhard Sauter, 13–36. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1981 (1968).
- Völker, Heinz-Hermann. "Franz Delitzsch als Förderer der Wissenschaft vom Judentum. Zur Vorgeschichte des Institutum Judaicum zu Leipzig und zur Debatte um die Errichtung eines Lehrstuhl für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur an einer deutschen Universität". *Judaica* 49 (1993): 90–100.
- von der Osten-Sacken, Peter, ed. *Leben als Begegnung. Ein Jahrhundert Martin Buber (1878–1978). Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 7, Veröffentlichungen aus dem Institut Kirche und Judentum. Berlin: Selbstverlag Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1978.
- . "Rückzug ins Wesen und aus der Geschichte. Antijudaismus bei Adolf von Harnack und Rudolf Bultmann". *Wissenschaft und Praxis in Kirche und Gesellschaft* 67, no. 1 (1978): 106–122.
- , ed. *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*. Edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken. Vol. 20, Studien zu Kirche und Israel. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- . "'Die grosse Lästerei'. Beobachtungen zur Gründung des Eisenacher Instituts und zeitgenössische Dokumente zur kritischen Wertung seiner Arbeit sowie zu Beurteilung Walter Grundmanns". In *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 313–347. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- . "Walter Grundmann—Nationalsozialist, Kirchenmann und Theologe". In *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 280–312. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- von Müller, Karl Alexander. "Begrüßungsansprache". In *Forschungen zur Judenfrage. Sitzungsberichte der Ersten Arbeitstagung der Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands vom 19. bis 21. November 1936*, 11–15. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament theology. Vol. 1, The theology of Israel's historical traditions*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979.
- Vos, J. S. "Antijudaismus/Antisemitismus im Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament". *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 35 (1984): 89–110.
- Wagener, Claus P. "'Gott sprach. Es werde Volk, und es ward Volk!' Zum theologischen und geistesgeschichtlichen Kontext der Deutschen Christen in ihren unterschiedlichen Strömungen". In *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zu Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen*, edited by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 35–69. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002.
- Wagner, Siegfried. *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk*, Monographien und Studienbücher. Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1991.
- Wagner, Siegfried, and Arnulf Baumann. "Franz Delitzsch, Scholar and Missionary". *Mishkan* 1 (1991): 46–55.
- Wassermann, Henry. "Prof. Dr. Hugo Gressmann: '...Ich bitte endlich, diese Gastvorlesungen auch als eine Anerkennung der jüdischen Wissenschaft zu betrachten'". In *Reuchlin und seine Erben. Forscher, Denker, Ideologen und Spinner*, edited by Peter Schäfer and Irina Wandrey, 285–292. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005.

- Waubke, Hans-Günther. *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Edited by Johannes Wallmann. Vol. 107, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Weber, Cornelia. *Altes Testament und völkische Frage. Der biblische Volksbegriff in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft der nationalsozialistischen Zeit, dargestellt am Beispiel von Johannes Hempel*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Hermann Spieckermann. Vol. 28, Forschungen zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Weber, Ferdinand. *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1880.
- . *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften / gemeinfasslich dargestellt von Ferdinand Weber; herausgegeben von Franz Delitzsch und Georg Schnedermann*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897.
- Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte. Erster Band. Vom Feudalismus des Alten Reiches bis zur Defensiven Modernisierung der Reformära 1700–1815*. München: C. H. Beck, 1987.
- Weinreich, Max. *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People*. New York: Yiddisch Scientific Institute, YIVO, 1946.
- . *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People*. New Haven: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1999.
- Weinzierl, Erika. "Antisemitismus VII. 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 155–165. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag, 1892.
- . *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900.
- . *Das Urchristentum. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben und am Schlusse ergänzt von D. Rudolf Knopf*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. I. Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's im Umriss*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1884.
- . *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. 6 ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1905.
- Wenz, Günther. "Erweckte Theologie". In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus. Band 1. Aufklärung, Idealismus, Vormärz*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 251–264. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1990.
- . "'Gehe Du in Dich, mein Guido'. August Tholuck als Theologe der Erweckungsbewegung". *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 27 (2001): 68–80.
- Weth, Gustav. *Die Heilsgeschichte: ihr universeller und ihr individueller Sinn in der offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Vol. Reihe 4; 2., Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus. München: Kaiser, 1931.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Wiefel, Wolfgang. "Franz Delitzschs Stellung in der Geschichte der Auslegung des Neuen Testaments". *Judaica* 49 (1993): 101–106.
- Wiener, Max. "John Toland and Judaism". *Hebrew Union College Annual* no. 16 (1941): 215–242.
- Wiese, Christian. *Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?* Vol. 61, Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- . "'Das beste Gegengift gegen der Judenhaß?' Wissenschaft des Judentums, protestantische Bibelkritik und Antisemitismus vor der Shoah". In *Reuchlin und seine Erben. Forscher, Denker, Ideologen und Spinner*, edited by Peter Schäfer and Irina Wandrey, 251–284. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005.
- Wolf, Hanns-Martin. "Beck, Johan Tobias (1804–1878)". In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 393–394. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Wolfes, Matthias. "Schuld und Verantwortung. Die Auseinandersetzung des Heidelberger Theologen Martin Dibelius mit dem Dritten Reich". *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 111, no. 2 (2000): 185–209.

- Wolgast, Eike. "Nationalsozialistische Hochschulpolitik und die evangelisch-theologischen Fakultäten". In *Theologische Fakultäten im Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz and Carsten Nicolaisen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Wright, N.T. *What St Paul really said*. Oxford: Lion, 1997.
- . *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*. London: SPCK, 2005.
- Yarbrough, Robert. "Schlatter Reception Now: His New Testament Theology". *Southern Baptist Journal* 3, no. 1 (1999): 52–65.
- Young, Brad H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables*. New York 1989.
- . *Jesus the Jewish Theologian*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.
- Zelger, Manuel. "Modernisierte Gemeindetheologie. Albrecht Ritschl 1822–1889". In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 182–204. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992.
- Zscharnack, Leopold. *Lessing und Semler. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie*. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1905.
- Zumbini, Massimo Ferrari. *Die Wurzeln des Bösen. Gründerjahre des Antisemitismus: Von der Bismarckzeit zu Hitler*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2003.
- Özen, Alf. "Die Göttinger Wurzeln der 'Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule'". In *Die "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule". Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*, edited by Gerd Lüdemann, 23–64. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.

NAME INDEX

- Adam, Klaus-Peter, 532, 534, 538–39, 544, 549, 555, 566
Adam, Uwe Dietrich, 443, 453
Adorno, Theodor W., 609
Aland, Kurt, 359
Albertz, Martin, 329
Albright, William Foxwell, 499
Altgeld, Wolfgang, 2
Althaus, Paul, 17, 256, 276, 515
Arndt, Ino, 468
Arnold, Clinton E., 612
Arnold, Udo, 47
Artapanos, 438
Avenarius, Friedrich, 611
- Bacher, Wilhelm, 425
Baeck, Leo, 141, 245, 400
Baird, William, 17, 26, 29, 32, 111, 126, 203
Baltrusch, Ernst, 3
Bar-Kochva, Bezalel, 270
Baranowski, Shelley, 396
Barclay, John M. G., 270
Barkenings, Hans-Joachim, 218–19, 222, 232, 237
Barnes, Kenneth C., 15, 395–96
Barr, James, 475
Barth, Karl, 332, 339, 340, 395
Barton, John, 74
Bauernfeind Otto, 340
Baumann, Arnulf, 213–14, 216–19
Baumgarten, Siegmund Jacob, 26, 30, 39, 45, 47
Baur, Ferdinand Christian, 16, 64, 97–120, 126, 139, 142, 157, 171, 198, 208, 211, 230, 270, 320, 335, 378, 402, 406, 428, 562, 564, 573, 581–83, 589, 593
Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm, 203
Beck, Johann Tobias, 16–17, 20, 57, 203–12, 264, 469, 583, 597
Beckmann, Klaus, 5, 17, 61–64, 66–67, 70–73, 122, 124–25, 128
Bein, Alex, 3, 8, 34, 90, 193, 441
Bengel, Johann Albrecht, 16, 222
Benz, Wolfgang, 13
- Bergen, Doris L., 277, 436, 446, 487, 526, 535, 547–48
Berger, Klaus, 144, 146, 159, 181–82
Berger, Peter L., 11, 593
Bergmann, Werner, 6, 603
Bertram, Georg, 467, 477, 538
Beyer, W., 476
Billerbeck, Paul, 240–41, 426
Bismarck, Otto von, 133–34, 468, 472, 543
Blaschke, Olaf, 2, 13
Bock, Ernst, 18, 256, 276, 539
Bodelschwingh, Friedrich von (the younger), 281–83, 464
Böhme, Jakob, 551
Bollmus, Reinhard, 448–49
Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, 282, 285, 322, 395–96
Bornkamm, Heinrich, 547
Bousset, Wilhelm, 4, 14, 16, 143–188, 233–34, 268, 275, 320, 334–35, 343, 351, 357, 369, 376–77, 379–82, 384–87, 389, 390, 406, 422–26, 431, 433–34, 439–40, 483, 521–25, 562, 564, 580, 587, 590, 593–94, 604
Brakelmann, Günther, 1
Brenner, Michael, 191–92
Breuer, Mordechai, 72, 90, 191
Brezger, Rudolf, 256
Browning, Christopher R., 533, 593
Buber, Martin, 335–36, 455, 463
Buchheim, Hans, 534
Bülow, Vicco von, 13
Bultmann, Rudolf, 2, 17, 74, 170, 172, 329, 340, 373–411, 564, 571, 593, 604
Burleigh, Michael, 2, 299, 317, 370, 447, 491, 505
Busch, Eberhard, 395
- Callenberg, Johann Heinrich, 194, 214
Carlyle, Thomas, 146, 148, 151, 181–82, 187
Carrol, James, 13
Casey, Maurice, 475–76, 478
Certeau, Michel de, 10, 624

- Chamberlain, Eva, 449
 Chamberlain, Houston Steward, 303,
 356, 436, 551, 570
 Chilton, Bruce D., 610
 Clark, Christopher M., 191–96, 214,
 224–25, 233, 240–41, 270, 612
 Cohen, Shaye J. D., 6
 Colpe, Carsten, 144
 Constantine, 485–486
 Cranston, Maurice, 53
 Cremer, Hermann, 255, 266
 Crusius, Chr. A., 219–20
 Cullmann, Oscar, 16, 203, 206, 469

 Dahm, Christof, 239
 Dalman, Gustaf, 193, 213, 215, 217,
 265, 380, 420
 Davies, Alan T., 6, 77, 303, 355, 436
 Dean-Otting, Mary, 612
 Deines, Roland, 4, 14, 136, 140, 145,
 213, 215, 239, 254, 255, 262, 266,
 354, 417, 420, 532–34, 538–39, 542,
 611
 Deissmann, Adolf, 331, 335, 347
 Lagarde, Paul de, 144–45, 180, 185,
 187, 356, 587
 Delitzsch, Franz, 13–16, 162, 213–237,
 239, 241–42, 246, 280–51, 264, 356,
 421, 459, 469, 526, 593, 605
 Delitzsch, Friedrich, 356, 436, 459
 Dellling, Gerhard, 476, 538
 Denzler, Georg, 13
 Dibelius, Martin, 2, 14, 17, 329, 347–71,
 497, 500, 503, 509–11, 513–14, 529,
 570, 580, 582, 593, 605–6
 Dietrich, Wolfgang, 374, 408
 Diez, Heinrich Friedrich von, 195
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 350
 Dithmar, Christiane, 193
 Dohm, C. W. von, 90
 Droysen, J. G., 117, 126, 581
 Düding, Dieter, 178, 179
 Duhm, Bernhard, 143, 145
 Dunn, James D. G., 476, 611
 Dürer, Albrecht, 550
 Dusterberg, Rolf, 448, 226
 Dwyer, Philip G., 177
 Dyson, A. O., 27, 39

 Eberhard, Johann August, 63
 Eckhart, 551
 Egg, Gottfried, 256
 Eichhorn, Albert, 144
 Einstein, Albert, 609

 Eisenhuth, Heinz Erich, 73
 Eisenmenger, Johann Andreas, 222, 225,
 242, 426
 Elbogen, Ismar, 88, 90, 116, 161–62,
 191
 Elert, Werner, 397, 399
 Engelmann, Hans, 177
 Entz, Gustav, 444, 514
 Ericksen, Robert P., 276–77, 285, 322,
 356, 391, 395–98, 417, 440–41,
 445–46, 453, 478, 483, 489–92, 495,
 500, 503, 508, 517–20, 531
 Eschelbacher, Joseph, 161–62
 Ettinger, Schmucl, 30, 191, 602
 Euler, Karl Friedrich, 555
 Eusebius of Caesarea, 86
 Eze, Emmanuel Chukwudi, 24, 36

 Fackenheim, Emil L., 71
 Farias, Victor, 401, 405
 Fein, Helen, 3–4
 Feldman, Louis H., 157, 270
 Feldscher, 460, 463
 Fenske, Wolfgang, 435
 Fichte, Johan Gottlieb, 146, 435, 551,
 553
 Fiebig, Paul, 213, 421
 Fischer, Eugen, 489–90, 505
 Fix, Karl-Heinz, 347–49
 Flax, Jane, 613
 Flusser, David, 610
 Forstman, Jack, 373, 376, 395–96
 Frank, Walter, 1, 415, 451, 503–6
 Frederick the Great, 181
 Fredrickson, George M., 7
 Frei, Hans W., 25
 Friedländer, David, 71, 76
 Friedländer, Paul, 405
 Friedländer, Saul, 6, 306, 309
 Friedrich, Georg, 417, 474
 Friedrich, Gerhard, 417, 419, 440, 474,
 506
 Friedrich, Johannes, 417, 419, 440, 506
 Friedrich, Peter, 98, 112–13, 116
 Fries, Jacob Friedrich, 78–9, 81, 88–91,
 151, 182, 187
 Fritsch, Theodor, 492
 Fürst, Julius, 218

 Gager, John G., 3
 Gebhardt, B., 114
 Geiger, Abraham, 121, 126, 217,
 226–27
 Geiger, W., 97, 111, 113

- Geiser, Stefan, 347–51, 358–59, 362–63
 Geiss, Imanuel, 7
 Gerdmar, Anders, 6, 14, 102, 104, 117, 173, 250, 269, 393, 466, 468, 532–33, 537, 549, 565, 591–92, 611
 Gerhardsson, Birger, 424, 610
 Gerlach, Wolfgang, 283, 289, 300, 318, 326, 373, 377, 395–96, 602
 Gfrörer, August Friedrich, 426
 Gieschen, Charles A., 612
 Gimmel, Jürgen, 448–49
 Glass, James M., 484
 Gneist, Rudolf von, 603
 Goebbels, Joseph, 7, 492, 503, 528
 Goethe, J. W., 359, 472, 550
 Gogarten, Friedrich, 547
 Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah, 3, 6, 14, 129
 Goldschneider, Calvin, 23–4
 Golling, Ralf, 214, 239–45, 249
 Goppelt, Leonhard, 17
 Gottschalk, 551
 Goulder, Michael D., 98
 Graetz, Michael, 71–2, 90, 191, 193
 Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm, 15, 17, 23, 62, 77, 133, 136, 144, 176, 195, 347–49, 363–64, 377, 408, 603–5
 Grässer, Erich, 374
 Grau, Wilhelm, 503
 Gressmann, Hugo, 150, 160, 163–71, 273, 380, 382, 406, 423–24, 433–34, 439, 521, 523–25, 598, 604
 Grohnert, Reinhard, 500
 Groß, Johannes T., 243
 Grundmann, Walter, 2, 14, 17, 73, 254, 276, 292–94, 329, 354, 356, 358, 363–64, 369, 393–94, 415–16, 436, 441, 476–77, 481, 508, 520, 531–75, 585–87, 591–93, 595–96, 606
 Grünspan, Herschel, 508
 Güdemann, Moritz, 161
 Gunkel, Hermann, 144, 166, 180, 347, 375
 Günther, Hans, 484
 Habermas, Jürgen, 38, 603
 Hackmann, Heinrich, 144
 Hadrian, 485
 Hagner, Donald A., 421
 Hakola, Raimo, 393
 Hamann, Johann Georg, 52, 551
 Hanhart, Robert, 180
 Hannaford, Ivan, 7
 Harnack, Adolf von, 64, 74, 141, 245, 331, 347–48, 369, 374, 376, 386, 389
 Harris, Horton, 97, 112, 121, 140
 Harrisville, Roy A., 98
 Haslam, Nick, 8
 Hauck, Albert, 218
 Head, Peter M., 533
 Hegel, G. W. F., 95–97, 99–100, 111, 113–14, 117, 121–24, 128, 135, 151, 203, 206
 Heiber, Helmut, 451, 504, 506
 Heidegger, Martin, 374, 401–5
 Heinemann, H., 241
 Heinrichs, Wolfgang, 15–16, 213–14, 222, 231, 233, 246–47, 249
 Heitmüller, Wilhelm, 144, 175, 335, 375–76, 379, 386–87, 406, 514, 564
 Hempel, Johannes, 214
 Hengel, Martin, 445, 612
 Herder, Johann Gottfried, 13, 16, 27, 51–61, 63, 68, 72–4, 82, 98, 402, 537, 580, 582, 584, 599, 602
 Herrmann, Wilhelm, 376
 Herz, Henrietta, 71
 Herz, Marcus, 71
 Heschel, Susannah, 4–5, 63, 96, 98, 121, 126, 136, 140–41, 217, 226, 277, 391, 395–96, 421, 446, 531–38, 547
 Heß, Rudolf, 503
 Hester, Carl E., 97, 113–16, 121
 Heusler, Andreas, 449
 Hill, Craig C., 102, 173, 466, 565
 Hillel, 226, 234
 Himmelfarb, Martha, 612
 Himmeler, Heinrich, 503
 Hirsch, Emanuel, 15, 17, 39, 44, 47, 204, 285, 322, 356, 436, 557, 570
 Hirsch, Levy, 214
 Hitler, Adolf, 1, 6, 182, 276, 278–79, 281–82, 332, 356, 395–96, 415, 418, 441–44, 447, 458, 463, 478, 488, 492, 496, 502, 504, 507, 511, 518–19, 531–32, 534, 543, 546–47, 552
 Hodgson, Peter C., 97, 111
 Hoffmann, Christhard, 5
 Hofmann, J. Chr. K. von, 15, 17, 216, 219, 469
 Hofmann, Rudolf A., 444
 Holl, Karl, 381, 407
 Hornig, Gottfried, 26, 39–40, 42, 46–7, 61–2
 Howard, Thomas Albert, 86, 88, 91
 Huber, Ernst Rudolf, 114
 Hubmann, Gerald, 79

- Hübner, Hans, 375
Humboldt, Wilhelm von, 87
Hurtado, Larry W., 612
- Jäger, Hans-Wolf, 51–2
Janssen, Nittert, 144
Jasper, Gotthard, 276
Jauss, Hans Robert, 9
Jenkins, Richard, 7
Jenson, Robert W., 612
Jersch-Wenzel, Stefi, 191–92
Jervell, Jacob, 106
Jochanan ben Zakkai, 261, 266–68, 275, 319, 434, 566, 608
Johnson, Marshall D., 332, 374
Jonas, Hans, 401, 405
Josephus, 82, 153, 224, 264–65, 270–71, 433
Jud Süß (Joseph Süß-Opppenheimer), 494
Jülicher, Adolf, 375
- Kahan, Issar Israel, 423, 433, 445, 506
Kahlert, Heinrich, 151, 181
Kaiser Wilhelm I, 133
Kant, Imanuel, 24, 63, 77–8, 87, 95–6
Kantzenbach, Friedrich Wilhelm, 192
Käsemann, Ernst, 97, 105
Kattenbusch, Ferdinand, 16
Katz, David S., 30
Katz, Jacob, 3, 30, 32–3, 35, 89–90, 191
Katz, Steven Theodore, 6
Kelley, Shawn, 5, 36, 95, 110, 117, 374, 401–5, 573
Kertész, Imre, 609
Kidd, Colin, 356
Kinzig, Wolfram, 61, 193
Kirschner, Bruno, 242
Kittel, Gerhard, 2, 7, 14, 17, 163, 165, 170, 178, 213, 215–16, 231, 236, 240, 251, 254, 276, 292, 298, 300, 305, 319, 321, 331, 334, 340, 342, 365, 368, 380, 382, 389, 397–98, 406, 415, 417–530
Kittel, Rudolf, 163, 418, 445, 526
Kjær-Hansen, Kai, 214
Klausner, Joseph, 433
Klein, Charlotte, 276, 357
Knopf, Rudolf, 171–72
Koch, Grit, 177–78
Koehl, Robert Lewis, 534–35
Kögel, Julius, 475
Köpf, Ulrich, 97, 115
Köstenberger, Andreas J., 253
- von Kottwitz, Baron, 195
Kotzebue, August von, 91
Kraus, Hans-Joachim, 95
Krause, Reinhold, 487, 547, 574
Krengel, J., 241
Kuhn, Karl Georg, 331, 476, 504, 506
Kuhn, Thomas S., 18
Kümmel, Werner Georg, 29, 107, 329, 333–34, 344, 353
Kusche, Ulrich, 14, 164–65, 171
- Lambropoulos, Vassilis, 25
Lamparter, Eduard, 317
Lang, Berel, 402–4
Langewiesche, Dieter, 115
Langmuir, Gavin I., 5
Lannert, Berthold, 146–47, 149, 172, 176, 179
Larsson, Edvin, 102, 565
Laudan, Larry, 18–19, 577
Leffler, Siegfried, 536
Lehmkuhler, Karsten, 145,
Lehnerer, Thomas, 62–3, 72–3
Leipoldt, Johannes, 213, 419–20, 423, 436
Leppin, Volker, 14, 145, 354, 532–33, 542
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 429, 527
Levenson, Alan, 213, 218, 223, 226, 237, 239, 241–42, 246, 248–50, 591
Levine, Amy-Jill, 6
Lichtenberger, Hermann, 214, 253, 259–61, 266, 277, 282, 284, 306, 315–16
Lichtenstein, J., 445
Liebeschütz, Hans, 64, 121, 128
Lightfoot, John, 425–26
Liljeström, Mikael, 613
Lindemann, Andreas, 374
Locke, John, 20, 30
Lohmeyer, Ernst, 562
Low, Alfred D., 23, 54, 57, 95
Lüdemann, Gerd, 137, 141, 143–44
Lührmann, Dieter, 375
Luther, Martin, 29, 56, 359, 386, 536–37, 545, 547, 550–51, 553, 558, 600
- Maier, Johann, 243, 612
Männchen, Julia, 217
Manuel, Frank E., 1, 30, 90
Marcuse, Herbert, 405
Marmorstein, A., 445
Martin, Dale B., 661

- Maser, Peter, 195–96
 Mazer, Th., 203
 McGrath, 25
 McNutt, James E., 253, 277, 325
 Meeks, Wayne A., 417–18, 424, 437, 441, 453, 475, 520
 Meier, Kurt, 397, 399, 465
 Mendelsohn, Moses, 24, 40, 71
 Merk, Otto, 26, 145
 Merx, Adalbert, 391
 Merz, Georg, 282
 Meyer-Erlach, Wolf, 535
 Meyer, Eduard, 164, 571
 Meyer, Michael A., 71, 187, 191–92
 Meyer, Paulus, 240
 Meyer, Rudolf, 538
 Michaelis, J. D., 46, 61
 Michaelis, Wilhelm, 447
 Michel, Otto, 256, 419
 Moltmann, Jürgen, 612
 Montefiore, C. G., 241
 Moore, George Foot, 3–4, 66, 81, 163, 380, 390, 426
 Morgan, Robert, 74
 Morgan, Thomas, 14, 26–7, 29–40, 45, 47, 49, 54, 56, 59–60, 70, 74, 98, 573, 580
 Mosse, George L., 51, 53, 87–9
 Moxnes, Halvor, 129
 Mühling, Andreas, 331–32, 334, 339, 341, 395
 Müller, Gotthold, 122, 127
 Müller, Karl Alexander von, 503
 Müller, Ludwig, 281, 443, 446, 464, 473
 Müller, Paul-Gerhard, 374–75, 377, 384, 388, 390
 Murr, Wilhelm, 518

 Nagel, Anne Christine, 176, 179
 Nanos, Mark D., 208
 Napoleon, 87, 114, 191
 Naumann, Friedrich, 176, 178–79, 187, 348, 377, 446–47, 594
 Ndwandwe, Hummingfield Charles Nkosinathi, 10
 Neuer, Werner, 253–56, 273, 275–77, 279, 281–83, 285–86, 288, 290–93, 298, 300–1, 305–6, 308, 315–16, 321, 515–16, 541, 555, 574
 Neugebauer, Fritz, 254, 256
 Neusner, Jacob, 5, 23, 424, 610
 Nicolaisen, Carsten, 1, 255, 444, 531
 Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm, 14, 145, 354, 532–33
 Nowak, Kurt, 4, 8, 15, 74, 384, 410, 604
 Odeberg, Hugo, 14, 434, 476, 481, 591, 608, 609
 Oetinger, Fr. Chr., 16
 Osten-Sacken, Peter von der, 14, 47, 177, 239–44, 249, 283, 289, 335, 374, 386, 389, 532–33, 535–36
 Ott, Hugo, 401
 Özen, Alf, 137, 143, 144–45

 Pältz, Eberhard Hermann, 98
 Pannenberg, Wolfhart, 16, 145
 Park, T. Peter, 182
 Parkes, James, 3, 32
 Pasto, James, 5, 14, 46, 54, 72, 77, 79, 81, 84–6, 89, 90, 148
 Paul, Ina Ulrike, 180
 Perles, Felix, 160–62, 165–67, 380, 384, 390, 425
 Philo of Alexandria, 82, 101, 119, 125, 129, 157, 254, 260–61, 270, 383, 426, 438, 482, 611
 Pinson, Koppel S., 62, 72
 Plato, 48, 82, 118, 151–52, 169, 186, 320
 Plümacher, Eckhard, 213
 Poliakov, Léon, 303, 355, 435
 Preisker, Herbert., 476, 538
 Protingheuer, Hans, 537
 Pulzer, Peter, 187, 601–2
 Puschner, Uwe, 180, 294–95, 449
 Pythagoras, 82

 Rad, Gerhard von, 16, 469
 Rath, Ernst, von 508
 Rabbi Akiba, 261, 275, 439
 Rabinowitsch, Josef, 214
 Rade, Martin, 166, 179–80, 377, 408–10, 604
 Rahlfs, Alfred, 144
 Räisänen, Heikki, 612
 Rathenau, Walther, 429, 441, 467, 527
 Reitzenstein, Richard August, 347, 376, 380
 Renan, Ernest, 226
 Rese, Martin, 441, 453, 518–19
 Ritschl, Albrecht, 14, 16, 95–6, 133–42, 144–46, 148, 171, 175, 183, 186, 581, 593, 599
 Ritschl, Auguste, 146
 Rogerson, John W., 27, 77–9, 87–8, 91
 Rohling, August, 225, 473

- Rohls, Jan, 77, 87
 Rosen, Alan, 474–75, 517
 Rosenberg, Alfred, 448, 450–51, 509, 518, 586
 Rösner, Thomas, 448
 Rotenstreich, Nathan, 24, 95–6
 Rothe, Heinrich, 39–40, 43–6, 53–6, 221
 Rothe, Richard, 134
 Rowland, Christopher, 612
 Rudolf, Otto, 144, 182
 Ruether, Rosemary Radford, 3, 405
 Rühs, Friedrich, 89–90
 Runesson, Anders, 104
 Ruprecht, Wilhelm, 179
 Rutgers, L.V., 270

 Said, Edward W., 5–6
 Sand, Karl, 91
 Sanders, E. P., 4, 241, 433, 610
 Sandmel, Samuel, 241
 Sänger, Walter, 549–50
 Sasse, Hermann, 282
 Schäfer, Gerhard, 278, 292, 443
 Schäfer, Peter, 5, 8, 163, 602
 Schäfer, Rolf, 135–36
 Schelling, F. W. J., 77–8, 81, 97–8, 111, 203
 Schenk, Wolfgang, 532, 534–35, 555
 Schlatter, Adolf, xiv, 2, 14, 16–18, 162, 176, 178, 194, 203, 213, 215, 231, 236, 251, 253–326, 329, 332, 342–44, 370, 395, 419–21, 426, 434, 443, 457, 469, 474, 514–17, 526, 528, 533, 538–44, 555–56, 561, 566, 574, 580–81, 583, 585–87, 590, 591, 593–94, 596, 605–8
 Schlatter, Dora, 500, 510, 516–17
 Schlatter, Theodor, 176, 253, 280, 285, 293, 540
 Schlegel, Friedrich von, 85
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst, 13, 16, 26–7, 39, 47, 61–76, 78, 83, 87, 93, 96, 98, 123, 129, 138, 146, 158, 194, 196, 218–19, 402, 587, 593, 599
 Schliemann, Adolph, 138
 Schloemann, Martin, 26
 Schmidt, J. E. C., 98
 Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, 2, 14, 17, 58, 167, 273, 329, 331–45, 347, 369, 395, 476, 585, 593, 597
 Schmidt, Kurt Dietrich, 1, 52, 282, 292, 535
 Schmithals, Walter, 403
 Schmitt, Carl, 294
 Schmitt, Christoph, 534
 Schmitz, Matthias, 52
 Schneider, Carl, 319, 476–77, 538
 Schnell, Johannes, 254
 Scholder, Klaus, 25, 97–8, 100, 105, 111, 116, 282
 Schönhagen, Benigna, 279, 281, 442–43, 445
 Schröder, Martin, 141, 143–44
 Schüfer, Tobias, 532
 Schürer, Emil, 4, 14, 74, 145, 150, 162, 173, 233, 256, 265–66, 270, 390, 402, 426, 431, 439, 583, 590
 Schwarz, Karl W., 444
 Schweitzer, Albert, 171
 Seeberg, Reinhold, 569–70
 Segal, Alan F., 104, 612
 Seidel, J. Jürgen, 322
 Semler, Johann Salomo, 13, 16, 26–7, 30, 39–49, 53–4, 56–7, 59, 61–2, 65, 68, 74–5, 82, 91, 98, 101, 107, 138, 143, 183, 197–98, 218, 335, 402, 424, 580, 582, 587, 599
 Shapiro, Marc, 104
 Siegle-Wenschkewitz, Leonore, 1, 13, 253, 255, 276, 278, 293, 306, 315, 415, 417, 419, 433, 440, 441, 443–44, 448, 453, 468, 487, 504, 506, 518–20, 528, 531–32
 Smend, Rudolf, 62, 77, 82–3, 94
 Smid, Marikje, 276, 282–83, 292, 306, 373, 395, 465
 Smith, Morton, 424
 Socrates, 118, 200, 320, 571
 Soulen, R. Kendall, 200, 611–12
 Spener, Philipp Jakob, 193, 195–96, 200, 605
 St. Clair, William, 114
 Staehlin, Ernst, 88, 91
 Steck, Karl Gerhard, 203, 206, 255
 Stegemann, Wolfgang, 374, 377, 389, 396–97, 400, 609
 Steiger, Günther, 88
 Steinweis, Alan, 182
 Stemberger, Günter, 241, 262
 Stendahl, Krister, 108, 433, 610–11
 Stenström, Thure, 403
 Stephan, Martin, 218, 221

- Sterling, Eleonore, 3, 8, 88–90, 116, 129, 191
 Stoecker, Adolf, 1, 58, 176–79, 182, 187, 216, 233, 244, 323, 348, 415, 419, 458, 504, 547, 539, 594, 603, 605–7
 Stöhr, Martin, 600
 Strabo, 153, 437
 Strack, Hermann L., 14, 16, 164, 194, 213–18, 223, 226, 233, 237, 239–51
 Stratenwerth, Gerhard, 282, 286
 Strathmann, Hermann, 333
 Strauss, David Friedrich, 1–2, 14, 16, 96, 121–31, 171, 199, 582, 593, 596, 606
 Strauss, Claudia, 607–8
 Streicher, Julius, 503–4, 518
 Stroh, Christoph, 282–86, 326
 Stuhlmacher, Peter, 253
 Suchy, Barbara, 410
 Sundberg, Walter, 98
 Syreeni, Kari, 11

 Tacitus, 154
 Tal, Uriel, 3, 133, 191, 242, 317, 588, 598, 602–3
 Theissen, Gerd, 11
 Tholuck, Friedrich August Gottreu, 13, 16–17, 189, 191, 194–201, 207, 218, 235, 469, 593, 595, 597
 Tice, Terence, 61
 Tilgner, Wolfgang, 52–3, 56, 73
 Timm, Hermann, 135
 Tödt, Heinz Eduard, 135, 276, 282, 377
 Toland, John, 20, 29–30, 37
 Treitschke, Heinrich von, 187
 Troeltsch, Ernst, 74, 144–46, 180, 376, 410

 Ulrich, Jörg, 86

 Verheule, A. F., 144, 146, 149, 154, 161, 180
 Vermees, Geza, 14, 422, 610
 Vielhauer, Philipp, 332
 Vischer, Wilhelm, 283
 Völker, Heinz-Hermann, 214, 216
 Voltaire, 30
 Vos, J. S., 475–77

 Wagener, Claus P., 535
 Wagenseil, Johann Christoph, 426

 Wagner, Siegfried, 213–19, 221, 225–27, 229, 233, 249, 445
 Wassermann, Henry, 163, 165–67, 171
 Waubke, Hans-Günther, 4, 68, 74, 136
 Weber, Cornelia, 5
 Weber, Ferdinand, 162–63, 217, 426
 Weber, Max, 384
 Wehler, Hans-Ulrich, 7, 57, 59, 87, 90, 115
 Weinreich, Max, 441, 504, 517, 531
 Weinzierl, Erika, 58
 Weiss, Johannes, 14, 16, 144–50, 171–76, 178–87, 215, 375–76, 378, 381–82, 385, 389, 581–82, 597, 613
 Wellhausen, Julius, 14, 77, 94, 144–45, 147–49, 173, 182, 260, 269–70, 357, 380, 384, 390, 402, 422, 431, 440, 483
 Wendt, H., 146
 Wenz, Günther, 195, 197
 Weth, Gustav, 16, 255
 de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht, 5, 13–14, 16, 29, 36, 54, 77–94, 98, 101, 115, 122, 126, 148, 161, 171, 180, 183, 194, 196–97, 203, 206, 210, 230, 234, 257, 260, 320, 402, 431, 486, 523, 578, 582, 593, 599
 Wetter, Gillis P:son, 562
 Wettstein, Johann Jakob, 426
 White, Hayden, 10, 581
 Wiefel, Wolfgang, 13, 215, 223
 Wiener, Max, 29, 30, 444, 497, 512
 Wiese, Christian, 141, 143, 150, 161–62, 165–66, 213, 217, 233, 240, 242–43, 245, 247, 410, 602, 604
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich, 144
 Wilcken, Ulrich, 494
 Wippermann, Wolfgang, 2, 299, 370, 447, 491, 505
 Wohlgemuth, J., 240
 Wolf, Hanns-Martin, 203
 Wolfes, Matthias, 347–48
 Wolff, Christian, 26, 63
 Wolgast, Eike, 1, 347, 349, 351, 358–59, 605
 Wrede, William, 144–46, 149, 171
 Wright, N. T., 611
 Wundt, Max, 506

 Yarbrough, Robert, 254
 Young, Brad H., 610

- Zahn, Theodor, 17, 255
Zelger, Manuel, 133
Zinzendorf, Nikolaus Graf von, 193
Zscharnack, Leopold, 26, 32, 39–40,
42–3, 45–6
- Zuckerman, Alan S., 23–4
Zumbini, Massimo Ferrari, 1, 6, 177,
233
Zunz, Leopold, 218

SUBJECT INDEX

- Abraham, 200, 204: Abrahamic covenant, 25; physical seed of, 305
Abwehrblätter, 603
 academia, 191
 accommodation, theory of, 39
 Acts, 104, 427
Adversus Ioudaios tradition, 405
 aestheticism, 63, 77
 actiology, 41, 101, 270, 582
 Alexander the Great, 36, 160, 357
 Alexandria, 55, 69, 100, 270
 Alexandrian Judaism, 42, 389;
 Alexandrian synthesis, 118
 allegory, 42
Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung, 468
 Allied forces, 351: bombings of, 405
 allosemitism, 249
 Altpreuussische Union, 282, 465
am-ha-arez, 241, 423: as non-Jewish people, 560–561
 American occupation, 364
anawim, 567
ancilla politici, theology as, 362
 angels, 80
 Anglo-Saxon exegesis, 2
 anti-anti-Semitism, 242, 324
 anti-Judaism, *passim*, 4, 6, 8, 276, 324, 392, 477, 501, 519: anti-Jewish stereotypes, 27; axiomatic, 587; of the Gospel of John, 174; preparing for anti-Semitism, 251, 594–595
 anti-Nazi, 306, 324, 476
 anti-Semitism, *passim* 20, 133, 165, 249, 324: of Adolf Stoecker, 176; anti-Semitic laws, 373; biological, 8, 345; because of Judaism, 153; of Carlyle, 182; as caused by Jews, 154, 459; contemporary with the History of Religions school, 175; cultural anti-Semitism, 345; definition of theological anti-Semitism, 5; discrimination of Jews, 318; eliminationist, 6; German political, 177, 217, 229, 225, 342; and Late Judaism, 156; as legitimate, 179; prejudice, 128; propaganda, 248; *Radau-Antisemitismus*, 506; reluctance to counter, 166; secondary, 604; street anti-Semitism, 500, 502; theological, xiii, 2, 15, 17, 585, 591, 606–607; typology of, 250
 apartheid policy, 2, 316, 417, 460, 466
 Apocalypse, 138
 apocalyptic Christianity, 80, 83, 122, 146, 158, 424–425, 433
 Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, 143, 161, 380
 Apollos, 105
 Apologetes, 273
 apologetics, 357
 apostles, 139
 Apostolic Council, 104
 Arabs, 342
 Aramaic, 269
 aristocracy, 191
 Aryan Christ, 322, 356
 Aryan legislation, 280, 286–287, 308, 368, 373–374, 453, 502: and the Church, 282, 286, 288, 377, 395, 465; stopping racial mixing, 457
 Aryan religiosity: opposed to Semitic, 537
 Aryans, 356
 assimilated Judaism: 71, 134, 309, 312, 314, 456, 482, 486, 489: assimilation demanded of Jews, 408; decadence of, 457; and immorality, intellectualism, 300; and internationalism, 457; and Marxism, 457, 580; and modern consciousness, 274; and modern influential Jews, 436, 457; moralism of, 429; opposition to, 453, 459; responsible for the 'Jewish Problem', 472, 512; rootlessness of, 457; secularised, 481; threat to Jewish identity, 216
 association of Judaism and Christianity, 599–600
 astrology, 438
 Athens, 115
 Auerstädt, 191

- Auschwitz, 609–613
 Austria, 58: Austro-Hungarian
 Empire, 348; conservatism of, 115;
 Catholicism of, 115
 authenticity–inauthenticity, 403:
 Palestinian Judaism as inauthenticity,
 403–404
- Babylon, 86
 Babylonian Talmud, 239
 baptism: of Jews, 88, 192, 317, 409,
 502; and assimilation, 464, 486;
 fellowship with baptised Jews, 298
 Barmen Declaration, the, 395
 Barnabas: racial descent of, 366
 Basel, 334, 254
 Bathsheba, 486, 569
 Bavaria, 195
Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
 (ed. Schlatter), 256
Berachot (Talmud tractate), 439
 Berlin Anti-Semitism Dispute (*Berliner*
Antisemitismusstreit), 187
 Berlin, 17, 87, 91, 213, 239, 250, 331,
 375, 419
 Bethel Confession, 281–292, 296, 300,
 396
 Bible criticism, 195
 biblical interpretation, 3
 biblical theology, 203, 216, 253
 Biblicism, 16, 20, 255, 473: exegesis,
 194, 203, 213, 321, 362
Bikkurim, 224
 birth of Jesus, 306
 blood and soil (*Blut und Boden*), 312, 400
 blood libel, 40, 47, 233, 242–243, 580
 blood: German, Aryan, 305; 442,
 Jewish, 480, 492
 Bolshevism, 449, 552–553
 Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, and the ‘Jewish
 problem’, 396
 Bonn, 135, 332
Botschaft Gottes, die (dejudaised New
 Testament version), 537, 553
 Bousset’s *Religion der Judentum*: revision
 of, 167
 boycott of Jewish stores (1 April 1933),
 277, 281, 373, 415
 Breslau, 419
 Britain, 349–50, 478: England, 25, 37,
 496; English people: as God’s people,
 350
 brown shirt, 287–288
 Brown Synod, 282
- Buddhism, 151, 376
Burschenschaften, 88, 114
- Cambridge, 441, 478
 Canaan, 54: tribes of, 485
 canon of Scripture, 45, 70, 258
 caricature of Judaism, 241
 casuistry, 266, 365, 384, 390, 439, 480
 Centralverein für die Mission unter
 Israel, 214
 ceremonial law, 76
 ceremonialism, 84, 134, 235, 422, 579
 characterisation, 9. *See also end of each*
chapter
 chauvinism, German, 180
 children of the devil: Jews as, 501
 Christ party, 105
 Christ, 55, 118: cult of, as Hellenistic,
 382; head of world system, 206
 Christian Social Movement, 446–447
 Christian-Social Workers’ Party, 415
 Christianity: as daughter religion
 of Judaism, 245, 434; as fulfilled
 Judaism, 351; Gentile, 137; as
 something Jewish, 354; Jewish vs.
 Pauline, 127; Judaism in opposition
 to, 365; as moral religion, 153;
 with racist connotations, 187; as
 redemptive religion, 366; syncretistic
 background of, 380; law-free, 387;
 Pauline, 37, 104, 108; spiritualised,
 123; in stark contrast to Judaism, 432
 Christlich-Soziale Arbeiterpartei, 177
 Christlich-Soziale Kongress, 178
 Christlich-Soziale Volksdienst, 279
Christliche Welt, 134, 144, 179, 181
 Christmas, 306–7, 309, 517
 Church of the Altpreuussische Union,
 373
 church struggle (*Kirchenkampf*), 281–293,
 297, 446, 451, 464–465, 540
 Church, 63, 135, 219: authority, 31;
 and State, 335. *See also* two-kingdom
 doctrine
 circumcision, 157, 303, 378, 384, 461,
 485–486, 490
 citizenship, 90, 116: second-class, 134
 Claudius, 108
 companions of Jews (*Judengenossen*), 313
 compartmentalisation, 249–250,
 607–609
 Confessing Church, 17, 318, 322, 324,
 276, 282, 284, 291, 373, 395–396,
 604: not defending Jews, 289

- confessional Lutheran theology, 204:
 exegesis of, 213
 confessional Protestantism, 191
 consistent eschatology, 136
 construction, ideological, 11
 contemporary Judaism, 363
 continuity and discontinuity, 10, 231.
 See also end of each chapter
 conversion of Jews, 47, 72, 192: as a
 prerequisite for assimilation, 194
 Corinth, 105
 covenant, 245, 264: God's covenantal
 economy, 208
 creation, God's, 73
 crucifixion of Jesus, 383: by the Jews,
 227, 263, 307, 357, 396, 464, 500,
 557, 563, 568
 cult, 79, 332
 cultural Protestantism, 15, 133, 408,
 410–411: defenders of Jews, 410,
 603; hindering equality of Jews, 408;
 and Judaism, 410; and History of
 Religions school, 146
 cultural stereotypes, 8
 culture, 7, 10

 Dachau, 358
Das Amt Rosenberg, 448
Das Leben Jesu ("Life of Jesus", D. F.
 Strauss), 121: as Jewish propaganda,
 199
Das Wesen des Christentums (Harnack), 245
Das Wesen des Judentums (Baeck), 245
Das Wesen des Judentums (Strack), 245
 dating: of Targums, 262; Mishnayot,
 262; Midrash, 262; Talmudian, 262;
 de-Christianisation: of Germany, 314;
 caused by Jews, 233
 de-nationalisation: caused by Jews, 233
 death of Jesus. *See* crucifixion of Jesus
 declaration of New Testament scholars,
 373
 defence of Jews and Judaism, 216, 233,
 239, 243, 301, 597, 603
 degeneration of Judaism, 31, 54, 79,
 122, 319, 384, 387: as enmity of the
 cross, 220; hypothesis of, absent in
 Beck, 206; hypothesis of, 258; Judaism
 as no degeneration, 440
 dehistorisation, 582
 deism, 25, 51, 14, 29, 35
 dejudaisation, 461, 553, 559, 576, 587
 delegitimation. *See end of each chapter*
 democracy, 114–115

 demography and anti-Semitism, 568
 demonology, 80, 85
 demythologisation programme, 124: of
 Bultmann, 402, 543
 denazification, 500
 depersonalisation of Jews, 111
 deportation of Jews, 349, 367, 446, 497
 depravation, 475, 479, 485; moral, as
 typical of Jews, 580
Der Freund Israels, 196
Der Stürmer, 473
 descent: Aryan or non-Aryan, 282
 despotism, 114
 determinism, 469
 Deuteronomistic reform, 480
 Deutsche Christen, 2, 276–278,
 310, 395–396, 443, 476, 487:
 and Eisenach Institute, 536; and
 Grundmann, 541–542, 559; left by
 Kittel and others, 452; Reichsbischof
 belonging to, 446; in Saxony, 535:
 and Schlatter, 281, 283, 289, 292;
 theology of, 436, 547; unity with, 293
 Deutsche Demokratische Partei
 (German Democratic Party), 332, 377
 Deutsche Staatspartei, 348
 Deutsche Vaterlandspartei, 448
 Deutschsoziale Partei, 415
 dialectical theology, 203, 255, 331,
 376–77
 dialectics, 100, 104, 107, 124, 581:
 philosophy of history, 111; method,
 111
 Diaspora Judaism, 42, 48, 100,
 269–270, 382, 499, 524; continuity
 with European Judaism, 365
 dichotomy, 107, 334: of Christianity
 and Judaism, 65; of Christianity
 and Judaism as antipodes, 112;
 of Hebrews–Hellenists, 558; of
 Israelitismus and *Judentum*, 185;
 of Jewish–Greek, 125, 266; of
 Judaism–Hellenism, 117, 424, 562,
 611; of Orient–Occident, 113, 589;
 of universalism and particularism,
 116; of Palestinian and Hellenistic
 Judaism, 388, 428; of Palestinian and
 Hellenistic Christianity, 379; racial
 implications of, 466, 564–565, 571
Die Christliche Welt (journal), 408, 603
 Die Freunde Israels, 254
Die Grundlagen des 19. Jahrhunderts
 (Chamberlain), 354
Die Judenfrage (Kittel), 441, 453–473

- Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (RGG), 144
 disassociation of Judaism and Christianity, 599–600
 discontinuity, 9. *See also end of each chapter*
 divine economy, 209
 dogma, 36, 62, 78, 82, 84, 175, 298
 dogmatic conservatism, 26
 dreams of superiority, Jewish, 59; of Nordic people, 312
- early Christianity, 379, 427: Jewish, 378–79; Gentile 378–79; as Palestinian Judaism, 427
 early liberalism (*Frühliberalismus*), 87
 Eastern Jews, 360
 Ebionitism, 109, 138
 ecclesiology, 335
 economic theology, 200
 Edda, 552
 Eden, 434
 Edict of Tolerance, 23–24
 education: as National Socialist strategy, 449
 Egypt, 32, 54, 86, 310
 Eighteen prayer, the, 385
 Eisenach, 14. *See also* Institut zur Erforschung (und Beseitigung) des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben
 election of Israel, 271, 391; Jews not being a peculiar people in John's gospel, 391
 emancipation, 23, 27, 51, 57, 114, 116, 131, 191, 216, 229: through conversion, 605; of the Jews, 29, 34, 72, 192, 233, 251, 365, 397, 400, 456, 512, 602–603: Strauss on, 128; of women, 465; of women and slaves, 397
 emigration, 408–409, 603
 empiricism, 581
Entdecktes Judentum (Eisenmenger), 225, 426
 Enlightenment theology, 329
 Enlightenment, 16, 20, 21, 25, 37, 70, 117, 152, 154, 192, 216, 265, 269, 402, 357; criticism of, 534, 540; historiography, 405
 Epicureanism, 100
 Epiphanius, 570
 epistemology, 111
- Erlangen statement on the Aryan paragraph, 397–399
 Erlangen, 146, 219, 255: University of Erlangen, 397
Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament (Schlatter), 256
 eschatology, 146, 267, 305, 317, 378, 440: eschatological re-entry of Israel, 222; according to Jesus, 381; Jewish, 82; according to Paul, 381; theories of, 223
 Essenes, 41–42, 65, 84, 101, 125, 138
 essentialism, 8, 34, 36, 156, 275, 311, 314, 319, 599: of nationality, 59; of social inferiority of Jews, 301; criticism of, 310
 ethics, 13, 24, 61, 78, 95, 266, 430, 566: importance of, 100, 113, 134; of Jesus, 172, 384, 431; of Late Judaism, 155, 182, 205, 268, 381, 427; Mosaic, 124
 ethnicity, 7, 250, 338
 ethos, 44, 52, 109–110, 125, 389: of the exegete, 19, 577, 606, 610
 Eurocentrism, 6, 573, 581
 Europe, 57, 113: culture of, 80, 609
 Eusebius, 86
 evangelism, 224, 289, 318, 322, 575, 608
 exegesis: allegorical, 101; definition of New Testament exegete, 13; and exegetical guild, 571, 577; Jewish turn in, 610, 613; and politics, 527, 593–594; role in legitimation–delegitimation, 578, 593; thought structures of, 610–612
 exile: Babylonian, 67, 81, 257, 360, 365, 384, 475, 480; Jewish in Diaspora, 227
 existentialism, 384, 403
 experience, 26, 63, 66
 expulsion of the Jews, 108
 extermination of Jews, 454, 456: knowledge of, 446, 495, 512
 Ezra, 138, 270, 484–485
- faith, 256, 259: in the Messiah, 309
 family: as divine order, 362, 474
 fecundation, 126
 feeling, 76, 78, 86: religious, 63
 feudalism, 87
 First World War, 329, 331, 361, 376–77

- Form criticism, 329
Forschungen zur Judenfrage, 342
Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments (FRLANT), 144
 Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage, 418–419, 442, 444, 476, 478, 503
 France, 26, 90, 192; military authorities of, 419
 freedom of the Church, 297, 373–374, 395, 399–400; and the Aryan paragraph, 398
 freedom, 42; of conscience, 46; from the Law, 42; of speech, 373
 French Revolution, 24, 52, 62, 87, 114: criticism of, 524; Jews as beneficiaries of, 553
 Führer, 317, 322, 349, 395, 409, 289, 295: cult of, 277; Hitler as deliverer, 278; needing Christians committed to the State, 296

 Galilee, 356, 363, 366, 392, 557, 560, 562, 566: and race, 355, 568–569; Judaisation of, 570, 587
 Gehenna, 434
 genealogy of Jesus, 569–570
 Gentiles, 263; Gentile Christianity, 29, 33, 68, 564, 304
 geographical circumstances, 52
 geography, theological, 583
 German Christian theology (*Deutsche Christen*), 362
 German Democratic Party (DDP), 348
 German Democratic Republic, 536
 German Jewry: as linked to the völkisch movement, 317
 German Protestant Church, 548, 577: dismissing Jewish-Christian pastors, 465
 German scholarship: and the Jewish Problem, 504
 German Security Police (*Sicherheitspolizei*, Sipo), 447, 518, 520
 German theology: crisis of, 362
 German-Jewish Reform, 226
Germanentum (Heusler), 449
 Germania, 86
 Germanic ideology, 299, 306, 499, 549–550, 574; Germanic religion, 361; Germanic–Nordic, 307; symbiosis with Christianity, 550; purity from, 291. *See also* Nordic

Germanien (Herder), 58
 Germanisation, 180, 361: of theology, 359
 Germany, 14, 25: culture of, 609; de-Germanisation by the Jews, 177; German idealism, 111; German idealistic philosophy, 181; ‘great German’ ideology, 348; nation-state of, 23, 133; professors of theology, 23; *Länder*: situation of Jews in, 191; patriotism, 72; racial pedigree of Germans, 342; republican, 113
Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Bultmann), 306, 334
Gesetz zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes und der deutsche Ehre (The Law for Protection of the German Blood and the German Honour), 442
 Gestapo, 306, 511, 516
 ghetto, 341, 365, 456–457, 461, 484, 487, 498, 512–513
 Giessen, 331
Glaube und Volk (journal), 468
 Gnosticism, 35, 376
 God: as distant in Judaism, 387
 God’s chosen people: Israel as, 230; the Jews as, 383; election of, 199
 golden rule, 430
 Good Friday, 308
 Gospel of John, 112, 427: and Judaism, 556
 Gospel of Luke, 427
 Gospel of Matthew, 174, 559: woes in, 568
 Gospels: and German-Jewish scholars, 421; originality of, 421; research in, 329; tradition, 378
 Göttingen, 143, 163, 179–180, 373
Göttinger Bibelwerk, 144
Goyim, 493
 Graal, 552
 grace, 274
 Greece, 86, 113: Greek–Turk conflict, 114
 Greek culture, 54, 563, 581: baths and theatre, 270; Greek Enlightenment and Judaism, 270, 439; Greek spirit, 380, 384; language, 269; philosophy, 383, 438; thought of, cultivating Judaism, 158
 Greifswald, 213, 255, 419
Grosser Gott wir loben Dich (dejudaised hymnal), 537

- guest people: the Jews as, 397, 399, 408–410, 441, 460, 479, 497, 501, 603–604
 guilt: of Germans for the Holocaust, 400, 405; of Jews for the Holocaust, 400–401
 halakha, 425
 Halle, 26, 30, 39, 61, 135, 194–195, 214
 heaven, 268
 Hebraism, 80, 82, 122: degeneration of, into Judaism, 199
 Hebrews (party in early Christianity), 102
 Hebrews (people), 29, 410: culture, 54; language, 535: grammar, 239; poetry in, 54
 Hegelian dialectic, 16, 96, 469, 581, 583, 611: and Baur, 97, 100; and Beck, 211; historical dialectics of, 95; and Strauss, 121–124; Ritschl breaking with, 141; and the Hebrew–Hellenist dichotomy, 565
 Heidegger's philosophy, 402: as conditioned by fascism, 405; and National Socialism, 404
 Heidelberg, 88, 135, 347, 358, 375; university, 349, 351, 364; theological faculty, 359, 362
Heilsgeschichte, 417, 468, 500
 hell, 85, 268
 Hellenism, 36, 55, 99, 157, 169, 269, 433, 571, 610: Hellenistic Christianity, 351; and race, 569; Jesus as Hellenistic, 571
 Hellenistic Judaism, 68, 380: as authenticity, 403–404; literature of, 424; as philosophical enlightenment, 389
 Hellenists, 102, 563, 565: as Gentiles, 562; as universalists, 335
 Heracles, 563
 hermeneutics, 11, 61, 125; of suspicion, 612
 hero cult, 149, 181
 Herrnhut, 61
 heuristics, 19
 historical empiricism, 184
 historical turn in exegesis, 161, 610
 historical-critical: exegesis, 26, 94, 213, 256, 331, 542, 554–555; theology, 39
 historicism, 329
 historiography, 5, 9–10, 581: actiological, 160, 184: idealistic, 161, 203. *See also end of each chapter*
 History of Religions school, 136, 143, 329, 369, 402, 582: in Göttingen, 145–146; influencing scholarship, 74, 347; and Jewish studies, 215; Kittel siding against, 382, 437, 440; and liberal Protestantism, 250; and New Testament studies, 144; and politics, 145, 176; as *Ritschlianer*, 135–136, 141; and Rudolf Bultmann, 144, 375–376, 379–80; siding against Tübingen School, 96; studying the matrix of the New Testament, 158; and syncretism, 389
 Holocaust, 2–4, 12–13, 23, 368, 401, 501, 522
 Holy Communion, 290
 horizon of the interpreter, 11
 human nature, 65
 humanism, 52
 humour, 33
 hypocrisy, Jewish, 580
 idealism, 102, 143, 149, 383, 613: exegetical, 175
 immanence and transcendence, 122
 immorality, 43
 individualism, religious, 63
 Indo-Germans, 338
 inferiority, 47
 inner-Jewish conflicts, 172
 inspiration of Scripture, 258
 Institut zur Erforschung (und Beseitigung) des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben (Eisenach), 14, 452, 476, 481, 536–538, 555
 Instituta Judaica, 426: Halle, 195
 Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum in Leipzig, 213–214, 225, 419, 445
 Institutum Judaicum in Berlin, 164, 166, 214, 239; started by Hermann Strack, 214; under National Socialism, 214
 intermarriage. *See marriage*
 intersubjectivity, 613
 intertestamental literature, 158: Enoch, Ezra, Baruch, *Assumptio Mosis*, 149
 inward in contrast to outward, 32, 44, 64, 84, 113, 130, 579
 Iranian religion, 149, 158, 352, 428
 Irenaeus, 200

- Isaac, 303
 Ishmael, 303
 Islam, 115, 152
 Israel, 198: chosen people, 332;
 no complete rejection of, 174;
 degeneration of, 365; different from
 Jews, 305; dignity of, 340; ethical
 religion of, 428; and faith, 197; fall
 of, 262–263; as foundation of the
 church, 220; the fullness of, 304;
 history of, 269; historical calling
 of, 304; national religion of, 155;
 postexilic, 258; pre-exilic, 365; the
 spiritual and the carnal, 303, 304
- Jacob, father of Joseph, 570
 James, Epistle of, 138, 427, 495
 Janus face, 38: of the Enlightenment,
 171, 602
 Jena, 87, 191, 535, 559
 Jerusalem, 55, 102, 562, 564: centre of
 Christian faith, 172; destruction of,
 454; temple, 150
 Jesus and rabbis, 419; independent of
 rabbis, 421
 Jesus, 65, 83, 109: as ‘above history’,
 389; and the cult of Christ, 379;
 dehistoricising of Jesus, 407; ethical
 demand of, 431; and Hillel, 226; and
 Judaism, 140; language of, 422; and
 ‘Late Judaism’, 147; as *the hero*, 159; as
 an anomaly, 183; Jewish scholarship
 of, 217; patristic sayings about, 243;
 religious demand of, 430; the spirit
 of, 380, 585; as symbol of universal
 humanity, 124; Talmudic sayings
 about, 243; words of, 421; as Yahweh,
 222
 Jesus as Jewish, 274, 303, 305, 310–311,
 335, 381, 613: belonging to the
 ‘Jewish church’, 355; not being
 Aryan, 310, 337, 392; in continuity
 with Palestinian-Jewish background,
 172; of Davidic descent, 354; and
 Israelite religion, 526; and Judaism,
 383; within his Jewish setting, 149;
 downplaying Jewishness of Jesus, 354;
 as a Palestinian Jew, 424, 431; as a
 Pharisee, 226; and purity, 267; as a
 rabbi, 383
 Jesus as non-Jewish, 565–572; fighting
 Judaism, 360–363; Galilean pedigree
 of, 354; possible non-Jewish pedigree
 of, 164, 353, 355, 366; neither Aryan
 nor Jewish, 545, 566; in opposition to
 the Jews, 392; not being Jewish, 547,
 565
 Jesus as opposed to Judaism, 180:
 anti-Jewish preaching of, 498; ceasing
 to be a Jew, 432; confrontation with
 Judaism, 557–559, 566–568; as an
 offence to the Jews, 428; used to
 legitimise racism, 575
 Jew Bill, 34
 Jew: suprahistorical, 11, 323, 590
 Jewish apocalypticism, 428: Persian
 influence in, 428
 Jewish believers in Messiah: expelled
 from Israel, 263
 Jewish Christianity (early church),
 29, 33–34, 68, 379, 496, 564, 570:
 and apostolic Christianity, 138; in
 Romans, 104, 108, 207; the first
 apostles not being Jewish Christians,
 139
 Jewish Christianity (under National
 Socialism), 463–466, 565: and Aryan
 paragraph, 286, 300; Jewish-Christian
 churches, 466
 Jewish: customs, 172; egotism, 127;
 Enlightenment, 40; essence, 392;
 ethics, 243; handicraft, 223; hatred,
 310; hermeneutics, 353; intellectual
 ability, 229; legalism, 385–87;
 legislation (1812), 193; literature, 221,
 256; morals, 154; officials: removed
 from state positions, 395; people: as
 priest to the nation, 197; poetry, 221;
 settlements, 488; theocracy, 197
 Jewish Diaspora: as ‘World Judaism’,
 485–486
 ‘Jewish problem’ (*die Judenfrage*), 8, 24,
 90, 176, 178, 192, 194, 331–32, 339,
 395, 402, 410, 418, 436: as a racial
 problem, 338; as a racial-biological,
 racial-hygienic question, 338
 Jewish propaganda: as a threat to
 missions to Jews, 201
 Jewish religion, 150: religious
 self-confidence, 245; spiritual life, 223;
 Jewish theology, Christian perception
 of, 217
 Jewish scholarship, 165: Christian
 cooperation with, 425
 Jewry: English, 34; European, 352, 365
 Jews, 310: American, 360; acquiring
 German family names, 191;
 as children of the devil, 393;

- claiming world dominion, 311; as a chosen people, 209; as a covenant people, 198; Diaspora, 101–102; emancipation, 360; eschatological coming in of, 173; European, 360; as epigons, 155; excluded from university, press, government, 307; their father being the devil, 391; and finance, 177; as foreign people, 409, 595; as a foreign race, 178; as hardened, 272; friendly relationship with, 405, 445, 506; hardened against the Messiah, 337; hatred of, 8; and higher education, 178; homeless by divine will, 312; as identified with unbelief, 392; as legalistic, 156, 178; as lazy, 237; as liberal, 134, and revolutionary hypocrisy of, 156, 317; as materialistic, 317; and media, 177; as minors, 48; as a moral danger, 178; nationalist, 317; negative evaluation of, 236, 364; not God's peculiar people, 393; as outcasts, 368; as a people within the people, 128; pious, 386; from Poland, 342; pride of, 156, 229, 246; as privileged in Nazi Germany, 313; as the representatives of the world, 391; as second-class citizens, 120; as a stiff people, 246
- Ἰουδαῖος, 391, 394, 476
- Job, 46, 81
- Johannine Christianity, 41
- Johannine dualism, 391
- John the Baptist, 261, 392
- John's gospel, 353, 391: as used in Nazi propaganda, 391
- Joseph II's Edict of Tolerance, 23–24
- Joseph, 570
- Josephus, 82, 153, 224, 264
- Jubilees, 485
- Judaea, 103, 269, 557, 560
- Judaica, 265
- Judaism *passim*: bloodthirsty; 483; claim to power, 442, 477, 480–481, 493, 580; Jewish as corresponding to the fleshly, 299; enemy of humanity, 495; enemy of the Church, 482; essence of, 418, 479, 482–483, 486, 493; as degeneration of Hebrews, 410; faith of, 267; and moral philosophy, 429; not identified with Israel, 505; nose as sign of Jewishness, 490; oppression of Jews, 473; postexilic, 427; ritualism of, 429
- Judaism: Alexandrian, 151, 157; Amoraic, 239; as an antipode of Christianity, 111; assimilated, 340; barrenness of, 158; churchification of, 153; decadent, 323; Diaspora, 156; hate and hatred of, 154; Hellenistic, 69, 99, 102; in continuity with Israel, 378; Late Hellenistic, 168; as a legalistic religion, 366; liberal 350; Orthodox, 245; Palestinian, 47, 55, 69, 96, 102, 151, 156; Pharisaic, 151; post-biblical, 165; and pride, 155; rabbinic, 79, 244–245; Reform, 245; spiritualised, 100; as syncretistic religion, 151; as spiritual superpower, 153; syncretistic, 164; Tannaitic, 239; as world power, 154
- Judeophobia, 8
- judicial murder, 227
- Jüdische Theologie* (Weber), 163
- Judith, 265
- Julius und Exagoras*, 151
- justification, 204
- Justin Martyr, 200
- Kaiserreich*, 23, 133
- Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* (KfDK), 441, 447, 452, 519; and NSDAP 541; and Rosenberg, 509
- Kiel, 265, 419
- killing of non-Jews, 503; and Mishna, 493; and Second World War, 495
- kingdom of God, 149; present or eschatological, 146; and racial purity, 552; ruled by Jehovah, 205; and Torah, 205
- Kirchenkampf*. *See* church struggle
- Kishinev, 214
- kosher food, 157, 461
- Kristallnacht* (9–10 November 1938), 367, 358, 508
- Kulturprotestantismus*. *See* cultural Protestantism
- Kyffhäuser-Verband, 448
- Kyrios Christos* (Bousset), 379, 386
- language of National Socialism, 370
- Late Judaism, 122, 150, 173, 180, 182, 220, 223, 228, 230, 232, 260–261, 268, 357, 384, 387, 390, 404, 426, 583, 611: Beck differing from, 205; as degeneration, 147; Jewish criticism of, 162; Kittel's 'Palestinian Late Judaism', 420, 424, 426, 430; Kittel's

- later development of, 476, 483; as religious amalgamation, 156; Schlatter and, 272; and universalism, 152
 Law, 54, 74, 109, 112, 123, 136, 196, 198, 209, 228, 258, 274, 352, 378, 381, 385, 425, 560; and Gospel, 545; freedom from, 564; intellectualised, 261; law-free Christianity, 35; piety of, 383
Lebensraum, 551, 575
 legalism, 29; Jewish, 109, 139, 570
 legitimisation and delegitimation, 3, 9, 11, 601–609. *See also end of each chapter*
 Leipzig, 213, 215, 217, 219, 419–420, 445
 Letter of Barnabas, 138
 Levites, 223
 lexicography, 475
 liberal Judaism, 429, 482; criticised by conservative Christians, 216
 liberal Protestantism, 15, 180, 250, 482; and the Jews, 410
 liberal research tradition, 171
 liberal theology, 255, 376; and Deutsche Christen, 396
 liberalism: national, 377, 408
 liberals, 87
 limitation, national, 85
 linguistics, 475
 literary criticism, 555, 571
 Lord's Prayer, 352, 421; and the Eighteen prayer, 422
 loyalty oath to Hitler, 395
 Lund University, 14
 Lutheran confessionalism, 218
 Lutheran Missouri Synod, 218
 Lutheran theology, 232, 402, 473, 546; two-kingdom doctrine of, 539; and National Socialism, 292, 545, 547; Saxon Lutheranism, 419
 Maccabees, 150: First Book of, 485
 manual labour, 128
 Marburg, 375: Marburg theological faculty, Marburg Declaration, 373
 Marcion, 64
 marriage, 306: intermarriage (*Konnubium*), 128, 456–457, 461, 479, 483, 485; and Aryan paragraph, 282; and racial legislation, 409, 442, 491; and grandfather/grandmother, 290
 Mary, 569
 mediating theology (*Vermittlungstheologie*), 15
Mein Kampf (Hitler), 463
 Mekilta to Exodus, 493
 merit, 261
 Messiah, 49, 66, 80, 122, 147, 198, 378, 567; Messianic expectation, 71; Messianic kingdom, 317
 methodology, 18
 Middle Ages, 365, 480
 Midrash, 214, 240–241
 millenarianism, 204, 222
 miracle workers: rabbis as, 422
 Mishna tractates, 239
 missionary state, 192, 233, 605
 missions to Jews, 53, 191–192, 195, 213, 216, 236, 239, 243–244, 246, 273, 337, 426–427, 472; in Russia, 214, 217; in Germany, 217; in Europe, 217; Jewish confidence in Christianity, 243
 Moabites, 486
 monarchy, 98, 377: monarchism, 176
 money: and Jews, 58, 60, 274, 456, 490, 580; greed of Jews, 275
 monotheism, 51, 54–55, 57, 81, 157, 245
 moral, 43, 78, 80: moral law, 53; moral order, 39; moral religion, 40
 Moravian Brethren, 195
 Moses, 29, 31, 53, 205, 274, 479; Jesus as a second, 559; Mosaic law, 105, 138; Mosaism, 83
 mummy, Judaism as a, 65
 mythology, 80–81
 Napoleonic Wars, 191
 Napoleonic, 62
 Nathan the Wise, 429
 national liberalism, 408, 603
 national limitedness: of Judaism, 197; national pride, Jewish, 233; national particularity, 127; as natural, 209
 national restoration, 56
 National Socialism, xiii, 17, 89, 129, 254, 279, 351, 361; language habitus of, 363; stand against, 339; and theology, 571
 National Socialist Party (NSDAP), 277, 415: different positions within, 445–446; church policy of, 395; cultural politics of, 448; party programme, 292, 455; 'positive Christianity' of, 453; Kittel active in, 444, 450–452, 514; and Grundmann, 534

- National Socialist Pastors' League (*Pfarrerbund*), 535
- National Socialist Teachers' Association, 442, 447
- national spirit, 52
- national states, 57
- nationalism, 73, 87, 100, 229, 601–602: Herder's, 59; romantic, 89; the Jewish confinement to, 154; German, 180
- nationality, Jewish: as positive, 205
- Nationalsoziale Verein, 176, 179, 348: Naumann, Friedrich, 176: anti-Semitic ideas of Naumann, 178; Naumann rejecting racial anti-Semitism, 179
- natural religion, 24, 31, 35, 37, 55, 64, 68
- Nazi theologians, 73
- 'Negro', 464
- Nehemiah, 485
- neo-paganism, 277, 308
- neo-Pietist awakening, 195
- Neology, 46, 39
- Neufriesianismus*, 182
- New Testament: as anti-Jewish, 500
- New York, 165
- Nicodemus, 557
- Noahidic laws, 104
- nobility, Pietist, 91
- Nordic, 296, 299, 306–307: myth, 542, 552, 574; Nordic-Germanic religion, 310, 361; Nordic National Socialists, 313. *See also* Germanic
- November 'Revolution' (1918), 458
- Nuremberg indictments, 367
- Nuremberg Party Congress, 308
- Nuremberg racial laws, 303, 305–306, 311, 316, 409, 442, 482, 502, 509, 604: "being good for Jews", 462; legitimised by theology, 487
- obedience to the State, 286
- Odes of Solomon, 419
- old covenant, 228
- Old Reich, 23
- Old Testament, 17, 30, 45, 53, 56, 61, 64, 69, 83, 127, 136, 149, 194, 215, 219, 239, 419, 427, 431, 446, 537, 547–549, 553, 600: compared with the Targums, 259; denigration of, 567; disconnected from Judaism, 481, 486–487, 505; and Judaism, 138; prophets, 360, 429; rejection of, 388; religion of, 258, 353, 479; severing Jesus from, 570
- olive tree, 209, 222, 232, 471, 498: as Christ, 264
- oral tradition, 427
- ordination in the Church, 287; Jewish Protestant pastors, 290
- ordo salutis*, 205
- organic relationship between Judaism and Christianity, 203, 600
- Orient and Occident, 126
- Oriental influences, 438
- Oriental languages, 195
- Orientalism, 5, 81, 114
- original sin, 246
- Orthodox Judaism, 273, 483: orthodoxy of the synagogue, 271; respected by Kittel, 429
- orthodoxy, 26, 31: Jewish, 71; Lutheran, 15
- Ostisch, 299
- Ostjuden* (Eastern Jews), 458
- outward, the, 79
- paganism, 67, 70, 83, 99–100, 105, 111, 160, 207: Greek, 101
- Palestine, 101, 125, 365, 380
- Palestinian Judaism, 42, 47, 55, 269: narrowness of, 126; and Orthodox Judaism, 524
- Palestinian setting of the New Testament, 427; Palestinian vs. Hellenistic Christianity, 334–35
- Palestinian *Urgemeinde* and Hellenistic church, 386
- Panthera legend, 227, 310, 570
- paradigms, scholarly, 4, 18
- parasites, Jews as, 57
- Parcival, 552
- Parsism, 82, 152, 571
- particularism, 44, 49, 51, 62, 64, 75, 81, 87, 98–100, 104, 108, 113, 154–155, 197, 209, 384, 390, 582, 603, 613: of Apocrypha, 67; political, 115; Jewish, 207; Gentile, 207; in positive sense, 230; as negative description, 334
- parties, 105
- Passion of Jesus, 568
- patriarchs, 479; patriarchal religion, 53, 204
- patriotism, 54, 286
- Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Sanders), 610
- Paul, 33, 84, 103, 174, 208, 260, 271, 351, 353, 362, 386, 547, 564:

- apostolate of, 105; as amalgamating Greek and Jewish, 169; as *criterium veritatis*, 390; as Jewish, 433; as Jewish Christian, 340; of Hellenistic culture, 433, anti-Judaism of, 458, 499; and the Law, 381; Palestinian-Jewish background, 173; Pharisaic-Jewish, 173; racial descent of, 366
- Pauline Christianity, 37
- pejorative statements: about Jews, 250
- Pentateuch, 79, 213
- perfumed Pietists, 191
- persecution of Jews: as divinely appointed, 530
- Peter, 105, 562, 564, 611
- Petrine party, 105
- Pfarrernotbund, 282
- phallus, 490
- Pharaoh, 263
- Pharisees, 42, 84, 101, 123, 134, 154, 198, 223, 226, 258, 366, 380, 425, 560, 566–567: reverence of, 255
- philhellenism, 86, 114
- philo-Semitism, 61, 193, 249
- Philo, 82, 101, 125, 157, 254, 260
- Philosophy of Religion, Alexandrian, 101
- philosophy, 26, 61: Cynic, 157; Greek, 42; Platonic, 41, 100, 125, 157; Pythagorean, 41; Stoic, 157; Wolffian, 27
- Pia Desideria* (Spener), 196
- Pietism, 16, 26, 61, 191, 214, 218, 244, 268, 305, 416, 419, 538: Bern, 255; and Instituta Judaica, 421; Prussian, 415; Lutheran Pietism, 39, 236, 251, 469, 605; Swabian Pietism, 16, 203
- Plato, 82, 151
- pogroms, 454: Russian, 455
- Poimandres*, 380
- Polish problem, 90
- political correctness, 370–371, 533, 606–607
- political ideology, 10
- politics: French, 86; theology and, 86, 115; and the History of Religions school, 176; and liberal theology, 175
- postexilic Judaism, 123, 230, 361
- powers that be, 322: obedience to, 364. *See also* two-kingdom doctrine
- praeparatio antisemitica*, 8, 594
- praeparatio evangelica*, 36, 48, 60, 264, 268, 582: Judaism as, 160; Hellenistic Judaism as, 167; Judaism's religious history as, 170
- preaching, political, 72
- predestination, 470
- prejudice: against Jews, 314, 601, 611
- Presbyterian, 29
- pride, Jewish, 259, 268, 270, 274–275, 580
- priestly state organism, 205, 210
- propaganda, 474, 496: through culture and scholarship, 474
- prophets, 46, 148, 155
- proselytes, 485, 479, 489
- Protection of German Blood and German Honour, 305
- Protestantism, 12, 80, 83: conservative, 15, 240; church of, 71; division of German, 15; German, 94; liberal, 15, 134; liberal-bourgeois, 15; Lutheran confessional, 15; political, 133
- Proverbs, 46
- Prussia, 58, 62, 73, 86–87, 90, 115, 133, 191: as a missionary state, 192
- Psalms, 46
- Pseudepigrapha, 161, 380
- punishment, 67
- Pythagoras, 82
- Qohelet, 46, 81
- rabbinic literature, 162, 224, 241, 249, 380, 382, 417, 419, 423, 477, 556, 566: difficulty of, 425; disregard of, 167; neglect of, 163, 433; rabbinic parables, 422; and sayings of Jesus, 422
- rabbinism: as arid traditionalism, 431; construction of rabbinic theological system, 426; study of 427; rabbinic thought, 223
- rabbis, 42, 309: negative view of, 420–423, 580; school of, 258
- race, 24, 250, 284, 290, 335, 339, 365, 395, 403, 559, 568: racial biology, 484, 497, 544, 546; categories, 339, 404; continuity Galileans–Aryans, 574; definition of, 7; discourse, 300, 370; as divine order, 362, 546, 600, 604; and Pauline understanding of flesh, 284; race politics, 356; racial discrimination, 7, 394; racial hygiene, 544, 546; racial ideology, 53, 275, 337; racial purity, 362; racial soul of Jews, 310; Semitic race, 341; state, 2,

- 299, 308–309, 312, 366, 447, 546;
 racial terminology, 355
 racial legislation, 308, 318, 351, 368.
See also Nuremberg racial laws
 racial mixing, 342, 356, 363, 365, 366,
 436, 457, 483–489, 498, 505: during
 the Exile, 479; and assimilation, 524;
 racial restructuring, 479
 racialisation, 117, 404, 570
 racism, 33, 36, 70, 88, 117, 129, 178,
 215, 333, 341, 363: biological, 8, 311;
 rejection of biological racism, 312,
 314
 Rahab, 569
Rassenschande (racial defilement), 409,
 491, 510
 rationalism, 15, 26, 51, 63, 78; rational
 Christianity, 26
 'real Jew', 11, 111, 131, 305, 324, 527,
 578, 599, 608. *See also end of each
 chapter*
 realism of Hebrew religion, 125
 reason, 31, 86
 reception analysis, 9
 redaction criticism, 559, 564, 571
 redemption, 112, 378, 438
 redemptive religions, 152
 Reform Judaism, 216, 228
 Reformation, 133: interpretation of
 Judaism, 257; theology of, 262;
 National Socialist thematisation of:
 547, 553–554
 Reichsbischof, 281, 464
Reichsbürgergesetz (The Reich Citizenship
 Law), 305, 442
*Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen
 Deutschlands*, 418: research at,
 478–492, 514
 rejection of Israel, 264
 religion: outer, 79; inner, 79; inward,
 84–85; outward, 85
 religious experience, 26, 66
 republicans, 115, 377
 research programmes, 18
 research traditions, *passim*, xiii, 2, 4, 11,
 15, 18–20, 577, 601, 607
 resistance to the National Socialist
 regime, 373
ressentiment, anti-Semitic, 20, 595, 601,
 607
 resurrection, 82, 428: of the dead, 122
 retribution, 66, 74, 81
 Revelation (Apocalypse), 174
 revelation, 44
 reward, 390: religion of, 360
 right to vote, 114, 116
 righteousness: by the Law, 109; by faith,
 109
 Ritschlian school, 135, 255
 ritual murder, 225, 240, 243
 ritualism, 390, 566
 Roman Catholicism, 30, 34, 35, 80,
 116, 198, 246, 270, 299, 537:
 caricature of, 390; exegesis of, 2, 13;
 and Judaism, 66; ultramontanism, 133
 Roman Empire, 3, 98, 117; culture of,
 54
 Romans, Letter to the, 107, 203, 206,
 221, 262, 271, 301
 Romanticism, 27, 51, 57–58, 62–63, 82,
 84: early, 77
 Rome, 319, 364
 Rostock, 219
 Russia, 214, 331
 Ruth, 569

 SA (*Sturmabteilung*), 283, 289, 349; 'SA
 man', 280, 283, 297
Saat auf Hoffnung, 214
 Sabazios cult, 438
 Sabbath, 136, 258, 384, 461
 sacrificial cult, 153
 Sadducees, 84, 101, 380
salon (Berlin), 71
 salvation history, 16, 193–194, 206, 213,
 216, 218, 220, 332, 334–35, 339, 341,
 466, 472, 525, 538, 542: German,
 554; as organic unity, 204; rejection
 of, 554; salvation-historical role of the
 Jews, 231, 318; of Israel, 232
 Samaritan woman, 557
 scholars, Swedish, 14
 Scotland, 347
 Second Temple Judaism, 147; 274, 362,
 417, 611: foreign influence in, 439
 Second World War, 12, 351 441, 499,
 543
 Secret Jewish Laws, 243
 Security Service (SD, German), 447
 Semitic studies, 216: Semitic philology,
 221, 239, 253, 423
 Septuagint studies, 144
 Sermon of the Mount, 110, 137, 197;
 421, 559–561; antitheses, 559
 sex: and Jews, 456–457, 480, 485, 490;
 Jews enticing German women, 491
 Shoah, 12
Shulchan Aruch, 242

- Shylock, 60
 Sifre to Deuteronomy, 417
 Sipo (German Security Police), 447, 518, 520
 Sirach, 258
Sitz im Leben, 329
 slavery, 465
 SNTS (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas), 349, 541, 561, 572
 Social Democracy, 333
 social institutions, 11
 social symbolism, 588
 socialism, 176
 Socrates, 118, 571
 soldiers, 576
 Son of David, 219, 354, 569–570
Sonnenwendfeier, 307
 soteriology, 250
 source criticism, 564
 Spanish Inquisition, 455
 Sparta, 115
 SPD, 332
 speculation, religious, 78
 speculative Christology, 122
 sphere of natural life, 322
 spirit, 112: European, 72
 spiritualisation, 110, 113, 380: of religion, 158
 spiritualism, 125
 split tolerance, 93
 spontaneity, 113
 Sports Palace Rally, 446, 487, 547
 SS (Schutzstaffeln), 534
 St Andrews University, 347
 state authority: divinisation of, 400; criticism of, 400
 State, 409: as divine order, 285, 473–474; German Christian state, 76, 133, 233, 249, 251; enlightened Christian state, 603; intervention in Church matters, 287; liberal, 300; in opposition to Church, 300; symbiosis with Church, 544. *See also* two-kingdom doctrine
 status of foreigners, 313, 454–456, 460–463, 472
 Stephen, 102–103, 126: and Jewish-Hellenistic enlightenment, 173
 Stephen: as non-Jewish, 563
 stereotypes, 9, 12, 20, 316: racist, 313; of Jews, 580, 601; and Judaism in exegesis, 611
 Stoicism, 100
 Strabo, 153
 street violence, 446
 students of Adolf Schlatter, 276, 515: and National Socialist exegesis, 276
 Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas (SNTS), 253: first meeting of, 349–50
 Stuttgarter Jüdischen Lehrhaus, 332
 Subject, the, 63, 113
 superiority of Christianity, 76, 167, 197, 244, 249
 supersessionism, 228, 230, 332, 388, 390, 525, 599, 611: temporal, 231; of the later Delitzsch, 235
 superstition, 30, 34, 79, 85, 99, 111, 580
 supranaturalism, 15
 Swabian Pietism. *See* Pietism
 Sweden, 254, 591
 Switzerland, 255, 332
 ‘symbolic Jew’, 11, 37. *See also end of each chapter*
 symbolic world, 4, 9, 9–12, 19, 588–593: symbols, 10; symbolic universe, 10. *See also end of each chapter*
 synagogues, 174, 232, 272, 352, 378, 461: burning of, 358; Greek, 257, 260; Palestinian, 257, 259–260; of Satan, 388; theology of, 257
 syncretism, 55, 151, 159, 389, 437, 542, 564, 567, 575
 Synoptics, 427: Synoptic tradition, 376
 synthesis, 98
 systematic theology, 612
 Tacitus, 154
 Talmud Jew, 436, 480
 Talmud, 214, 240–241, 267, 341–342, 421, 424, 451, 480, 503
 Tamar, 569
 Targums, 257, 259
 temple, 56, 103, 139, 223, 352, 378, 392: temple criticism, 563; temple of Jerusalem, 267
 Ten Commandments, 280
 tendency criticism, 104, 107
 theocracy, 80–81, 220
Theodor (de Wette), 78, 196
 theological faculties: future of, in National Socialist Germany, 359
 theological professors: and the NSDAP, 415
Theologische Blätter (journal), 332
Theologische Rundschau (journal), 144
Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (TDNT), 417, 474–478, 506, 508, 536, 538, 541

- theology of creation, 544
 theology: modern, 74; neo-Kantian, 135
 Therapists, 41, 101
 thesis and anti-thesis, 99, 124
 Thousand-Year Reich, 317
 Thuringia, 536, 547
Tikkune Sohar, 473
 tolerance, 30, 46, 76
 topography: of Palestine, 264
 Torah, 205, 427, 566–567
 Tosefta, 420
 Total Church, 294, 298, 544, 549
 Total State, 294, 296, 298, 361, 543, 549
 tradition, 577
 transcendence, 64
 translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, 215
 Trier terracottas, 490
 true Israel: as the church, 231
 Tübingen school, 137, 158, 161, 226, 402: Catholic, 97; new, 97; old, 97
 Tübingen, 13, 96, 115, 121, 133, 135, 203, 206, 213, 255, 278, 281, 325, 375, 415, 417, 419, 433, 441, 443–444, 452, 476, 506, 508, 514, 534, 538, 541–542, 554, 556, 564, 574: university as ‘*Judenrein*’, 459
Tübinger Sätze, 278, 442
 Twenty-Eight Theses of the Saxon People’s Church (*Deutsche Christen* document), 535, 540, 547; Schlatter’s view of, 292
 two-kingdom doctrine, 284–285, 322, 351, 410, 539, 544, 600, 604: and the Aryan paragraph, 397; Church not getting into politics, 289; guarantees rights of the Church, 297–298; Lutheran, 395–396; orders of creation, 284; race, biological differences and the human sphere, 397; spheres of natural life and death, 284; symbiosis of Church and State, 296; used to support racial policies, 300; and race, 398–399; and *völkisch* ideology, 398
 typology, 219
 ultramontane conservatives, 415
Unheilsgeschichte, 417, 468–473, 500, 507, 520, 591, 595, 600
 United States of America, 253, 349, 494
 universalism, 40, 44, 49, 51, 62, 64, 68, 75, 81, 87, 98, 104, 108, 113, 152, 154, 269, 381, 582, 603: of the prophets, 148: linked to particular history of Israel, 206; universal humanity, 74; universal religion, 24, 40
 university students: Jewish, 287; matriculation of, 290
 university: under National Socialism, 361
 Uppsala, 437
 Uriah, 486
usus politicus (of the Law), 545
 Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, 410, 603
 Vereine Deutscher Studenten, 348, 448, 453
Verjudung, 177
 Vienna, 441, 447, 506; Congress of, 90, 192; University of, 444, 496–497, 511
 Virgin Birth, 250, 569
Volk, 52, 58, 322
völkisch ideology, 73, 79, 277, 284, 294, 302, 320, 341, 362; *völkisch* consciousness, 354; *völkisch* as National Socialist notion, 294–295; *völkisch* theology in *völkisch* university, 361–362, 373
 Wandering Jew, 312–13, 463, 489, 580
 wars of liberation, 115
 Wartburg, 536, 553; *Wartburgfest*, 88
 Waterloo, 87
 Weimar Republic, 23, 178, 275, 317, 329, 410, 415, 429, 441, 544, 596; and cultural degeneration, 449, 457, 539, 540; difficulties under: 296; influenced by Jews, 458, 605
Weltanschauung, National Socialist, 313
Weltjudentum, 59, 477
Wird der Jude über uns siegen? (Schlatter), 306
Wissenschaft des Judentums, 216
 Wittenberg, 536
 women, 299, 397, 465, 569
 works, 260
 world history, 98
 ‘World Judaism’, 489–490, 580, 586
 World Spirit, 95, 111
 wrath of God, 262, 264

Württemberg, 114, 116

Würzburg, 359

Yahweh, as national God, 551

Yggdrasil, 552

Zarathustra, 151

Zentralverein für Mission unter Israel,
272, 276

Zionism, 340, 454, 456, 490

Zoroastrian religion, 82, 158

Zürich, 333

NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS

Matt. 21:43	498	Rom. 9:5	303
Matt. 23:38	313	Rom. 9:7–14	303
Matt. 27:51	352	Rom. 9:11–12	24
Mark 7:24–30	334	Rom. 9:30–10:21	263
		Rom. 9:31	208
Luke 13:34f	471	Rom. 9–11	107–8, 199, 209,
Luke 13:35	313		262, 302, 305,
			332, 339–40,
John 1:11	392–93		390, 468,
John 1:47	433, 445		470–72, 607
John 2–4	557	Rom. 11	197, 471, 498
John 4:9	393, 557	Rom. 11:1–18	472
John 4:22	205, 340,	Rom. 11:5	208
	391–92, 394,	Rom. 11:17	108, 222, 498
	464, 557–59,	Rom. 11:17–21	174
	611	Rom. 11:18	340
John 5:18	198	Rom. 11:23	222
John 7:11	198	Rom. 11:24ff	232
John 8	393	Rom. 11:24–25	222
John 8:17	393	Rom. 11:26	62, 340
John 8:31	393	Rom. 11:27–28	472
John 8:40–44	501	Rom. 11:32	472
John 8:41–47	393	Rom. 13	362, 364
John 8:51	393	Rom. 13:1	109
John 10:34	393	Rom. 15:20	109
John 12:32	393		
John 13:33	393	1 Cor. 1:12	105
		1 Cor. 7	398
Acts 6	465–66, 562,	1 Cor. 7:17–24	397
	573, 587	1 Cor. 12:13	397
Acts 6:1ff	565	1 Cor. 14:34	465
Acts 6–8	102		
Acts 7	563	Gal. 2:11ff	562
Acts 8:1	102	Gal. 3:28	397, 399, 465,
Acts 10:35	106		498
Acts 10:45	106	Gal. 6:16	340
Acts 18:2	108		
Acts 20	102	Eph. 2:12	174
Rom. 1:1–17	262	1 Thess. 2:15	173
Rom. 1–8	107–8		
Rom. 2:1–11	272	1 Peter	174, 301
Rom. 2:4	272		
Rom. 9	232	Heb. 8:13	611
Rom. 9:1–5	472, 607		
Rom. 9:3–5	303	Rev. 2:9	388, 558
Rom. 9:4	470	Rev. 3:9	558

