

The Presentation of this book.

La Presentacion da este Libro,  
the Spaniards call the presentation of their book to the reader.  
I shall try to <sup>present</sup> ~~state~~ the intant of this book as precisely as I  
can, in this introduction.

Blasphemers are more helpful than the lukewarm. The <sup>Blasphemer</sup> ~~Blasphemer~~  
at least makes a noise when he <sup>what seems to him</sup> points out/the weakest link in  
the chain which links God and men,

SOURCE??

Adolf Hitler- during the "thousand years" of his World Domination  
-set off his own <sup>epoch</sup> ~~time~~ by stating: 'the solar constellation of Chri-  
stianity has ended. In this hissing remark, the existence of a  
Christian Era was relegated to the limbo of the past:" There no  
longer is a Christian Era." Accordingly, the term 'Christ' in ~~BE~~  
B. C. and Anno Domini were dropped from German terminology.

But <sup>men</sup> ~~the~~ lukewarm have pushed in this direction for a very  
long time. A glance into Toynbee, Spengler, Nehru, Berr's Histoire  
Universelle, the Cambridge History, the American Textbooks of Histo-  
and- especially - the curricula of our History Departments- all  
do point into the same direction as Friedrich Nietzsche and his  
theologian-friend Franz Overbeck <sup>had pointed with regard to</sup> ~~have done with~~ the Christian  
Era, The counting of the years after the Birth of Christ belongs -  
- this is the majority opinion already -  
with the Jewish Era ~~from~~ the Creation of the World, with the Hed-  
schrah of Muhammed, or with the years ab urbe condita, after the  
founding of Rome ( 753 B. C. ). It is an arbitrary single era, one  
among many. Hence, the Christian Era is no longer recognized as  
making epoch among all previous eras. And the year Zero is not  
treated as the turning point and the gateway into a new, the final,  
and, last not least, <sup>our own</sup> Era. Few people doubt that  
we are free to start a new Era like Hitler; <sup>any time we wish to</sup>  
do so. From Nietzsche to Hitler, active destruction of the era has

proceeded. But looking back we can see two more definite stepping stones which have given this last attack its opportunity.

For 150 years people have concentrated their efforts on the Life and Times of Jesus. Innumerable books have tried to change him, the Lord of the Eons of Eons, the Second Adam, the Son of Man, the Judge of this World, into a contemporary of Kaiphas, Judas, Tiberius, and Pilate. They have searched his vocabulary for colloquialisms of his own place and time. Now, as a child of his time, he lost all power over the times. As children of our own time, we disappear with that time. Of most people, after the obituary, no trace remains; of Lincoln Stanton could say: 'Now he belongs to the ages. We have not heard this said for a long time.'

This zeal for the transient environment of Palestine in 'Jesus' days, then, is one step away from <sup>understanding</sup> this right to give our era his name. But there is an <sup>older</sup> ~~grievance~~ <sup>slip</sup> ~~against~~ <sup>desire</sup> the last centuries with their immersion in world conquest and world knowledge. Strangely enough, Roman Catholics, Reformed and Lutheran ~~thinkers~~ <sup>committed</sup> thinkers have equally <sup>slip</sup> ~~produced~~ <sup>grievance</sup> this. It is their constant mistranslation of ~~the~~ <sup>Biblical</sup> terms for era, <sup>for the</sup> ending and closing of eras, and for Christ's relation to the epochs of History. The centre of this confusion is known to <sup>every</sup> ~~every~~ reader who has ever heard the formula of the prayer, 'World without End.' When the King James' Version <sup>used</sup> ~~wrote~~ this wording, <sup>in 1611</sup> the phrase was already wrong. But today, it is fatal and antireligious. Why? The term World in Shakespeare's days still had some ring of the Whirling tides of time in it. But today, 'World' means the universe expanded in space. And so <sup>The phrase of our prayer states</sup> ~~it means~~ that this world never comes

to an end. But the Greek text means the very opposite. It runs <sup>c</sup>and into the eons of eons <sup>d</sup>, thereby stating that the world comes to one end after another, only God remains. Just as we jokingly exclaim: "... period! ", ~~xxxx~~ <sup>so</sup> the Bible knew that man had to live in the perpetual expectation of an end of his little world. Each "eon" was such one aion of man's orientati computation and organisation. And now in this fantastic caleidoscop of human eras, ~~xxxx~~ and worldly <sup>catastrophical</sup> histories endings, the Breath of a new Spirit was ~~blown~~ <sup>breathed</sup> and enthroned the Master who would initial as well as subscribe eras and out of whose mouth the beginnings and the ends of all the eras would be interpreted and understood. Our <sup>rapidly spreading</sup> Pentecostal sects are, of course, filled by the tremor of this specific meaning of Christinity. But already 150 years ago, the Universalists harped on the same sore point of Thomistic, Lutheran, and Calvinistic Doctrine: Nothing, according to the Bible, is eternal except God. Eons may punish souls during their times. But the punishment in hell <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ of one eon only (Aionios) and this ~~could~~ <sup>can</sup> not mean <sup>e</sup>eternal. This wrong translation of aionios = eternal, for ever and for ever, still fills our theological dictionaries. It is palpably wrong. It has poisoned theology. But it has prepared people to think that we either live for the moment or for eternity, But if so, there ~~is~~ no Christian place for an era, an epoch, an age. Then one second and the complete absence of the time flow are the two extremes between <sup>which poor me</sup> ~~man~~ is suspended. This is crude non-

Miss MBB (initiate)

Lower

add quotes MBB "et"

sense.

I do not live by or for the latest news. And I do not <sup>care for</sup> ~~understand~~ the very notion of any timeless eternity.

Poor mortal, I am stung with a constant sense of time. But I can cover time-spans from one day to a year to a generation to a century, with my intent and my understanding. And I am [asked to believe] that neither my creator nor the man who revealed him to us, <sup>MBB enters</sup> ~~do~~ enter upon the measures of time which alone I can understand? I know, they do. For, I have lived through epoch making events which have changed the lives of all men on this globe. And in the light of the Lord of the Eons, I have found my path through these ends of my world and the beginnings of the next aion. To tell me, <sup>oh</sup> ~~OH~~ the Christian era has been a helpful myth in the past, but now, we don't need it any longer, is like telling me: the raft on which you passed the abyss, <sup>MBB "over"</sup> must be condemned. I have found that there is a way of living through the end and the beginning of an era in perfect freedom, neither as the slave of capitalism nor as the slave of communism, neither as merely a German nor as merely an American, neither as a soldier nor as as a scholar. And I should now go and destroy the raft, my raft, simply because people who never passed an abyss, <sup>[over? or crossed] "T"</sup> say: there is no abyss; therefore the Lord of Continuity through all the abysses between eras, can be put up at our rummage sale of old wear."

And nowhere are we less instructed for our polonaising through epochs as God gives them and takes them, than in our theological literature or instruction.

In this situation, I have had to learn anew in what the Christian Era consists. I have tried to distinguish it from the times in which Spengler, Toynbee, Nietzsche, Darwin, Sartre, prefer to live. I have had to understand that ever since ZERO, the Christian Era is rivalled by all the preceding pagan eras in our midst. The positive value of the last century's

quadrant

needed

*MDB  
criticism*

of the Christian Era  
eclipse/~~is~~ has become quite clear to me. ~~The~~ <sup>Its</sup> total omission of Christ's  
universal chronology and ~~the~~ <sup>its</sup> concentration on the "times of Jesus",  
is of great help to you and me and to all of us who wake up after  
the Great Flood. We now see how much paganism and how much balking  
at the Christian Era from inhabitants of pagan eras or eons, is still  
with us. A. D. and B. C. indeed cannot be understood by the academic  
professionals. As a student in our leading Theological "Cemetery"  
wrote to me in despair: "Here, the veil of the Temple has not ~~yet been~~  
~~rent yet.~~ <sup>torn asunder.</sup>"

~~without footnotes~~

The reader, I do hope, finds here in simple language what  
constitutes the Christian Era; I have said it <sup>up</sup> by ~~holding up~~ <sup>up</sup> ~~the~~  
~~synphonizing the Four~~  
gospels. They, more than anything else, have been mangled by Biblical  
criticism. The rascal Robert Graves, a corrupt Genius, is the last  
jester about the gospel and the gospel writers. I have tried to  
get myself and my readers out of the bottomless pit of Biblical  
criticism and its dividing ~~the~~ four gospels into three ~~versus~~ one,  
the Synoptics and John. I have accepted the first statement of the  
New Testament, that a New Era has started, and I have thought that  
obviously, the gospels themselves might be stepping stones in  
the formation of this new Aion. <sup>In</sup> ~~stead~~ <sup>stead</sup> of a mere harmony of the  
gospels, <sup>I</sup> have asked: ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> they ~~movements~~ <sup>movements</sup> of a symphony?  
Of course, they are. And he who climbs this stair of the wondrous  
four ~~events~~, called the gospels, according to Matthew, "and, Luke  
John, . understands again the wondrous <sup>(Anno Domini)</sup> by which we count  
the stepping stones of the incarnation, of the Christian Era .

*MDB  
criticism  
of the Bible text*

Technically, this book presupposes that you can if you wish, read the four gospels yourself. The only stress laid on you is this that I do treat you as of age and as capable of, listening to an argument on all four gospels in unity. I would have considered any other treatment an insult to your own literacy and maturity.

I had to mention some errata of scholarship as any reader may have run into one or the other of them. But I have tried to keep the text readable as one sustained argument and therefore have not cluttered it with proofs of erudition, Anybody who cares to look for such credentials, may find them in my THE CHRISTIAN

FUTURE ~~XXX~~ ( New York 1946) and THE DRIVING POWER

of WESTERN CIVILIZATION ( Boston 1950. ) *and in many other places. Erudition is presupposed as a natural.*

But what are credentials when we ask ourselves : Is

there a Christian Era ?

Advent 1954

Four Wells , Norwich, Vermont.

# 1. The Speech of Antiquity

We ~~now~~ <sup>when we</sup> leave the first cycle of human speech and enter upon our own era. The <sup>ancient</sup> cycle began in the primitive tribe, among a little group of frantic and frightened, yelling and bouncing men, who took heart, spoke and danced, and proceeded from fright, yelling and bouncing to an inspired way of life.

They placed themselves under verbs, pronouns, nouns, and numbers. Speech made them human by dressing and investing them with power, as the children of Man, as listeners to the spirits of their dead.

The second phase lifted the heart of man into the universe. The tatoos on the body were replaced by the tatoos on the temple, as the whole universe spoke to the Great House of Egypt, to Pharao, and to the Emperor of China, the Son of the Skyworld.

Tell me who speaks to you and I shall know who you are. Pharao was anxious to be the Ka of the skyworld, the child of sun and moon and all the stars, of Horus of the Horizon, of the Southern World of Noon, of the Northern World of Midnight, as the listener of the universe. The Son of Heaven became the heart, the hieroglyphs <sup>it</sup> became the tattoo of a living universe.

Once ritual was established in tribe and empire, Poetry <sup>the blood</sup> flower of antiquity began. And it led us into the Green Pastures <sup>MDS lower</sup> where Nausikaa meets Odysseus on the sea shore and where Achilleus meets his mother, the ocean's goddess, Thetys; since panic was eliminated by ritual, poetry could return into "Nature". "Nature" equals: "The World minus panic". Poetry listens unafraid to nature because it is the child of peace, the listener of peace and law.

Poetry, however, can <sup>not</sup> make the world's laws or peaces better than they are. Poetry transfigures that nature which ritual has freed from panic. But the world still is the world, in many districts where world wars, world riddles, world revolutions, world chaos looms. *dropped by NBT*

The Homeric stream of poetry ran in one direction, towards the world. Homer took advantage of ritual's attainments. Israel's stream of psalms ran in the opposite direction. Israel felt the disadvantage of ritual's multiplicity and incompleteness.

Israel directed its efforts not towards "the World minus panic", but towards the fact that it still was full of panic. Israel saw that ritual contradicted ritual, and that neither temples nor tatoos nor poems ever would get outside their own local and temporal boundaries. So the more rituals or temples were built, or the more poems imagined, the greater became the confusion of tongues, the tower of Bable. Israel withdrew from this world of Tohu and Bohu, *of locally restricted myths.*

Israel built a temple, it is true, but they added that God did not live in it, Israel voided the temple. Israel circumcised her young men, it is true; but they did it to the child in the cradle, not to the initiate adolescent; *see* *see once!* *in the* clan's fertility rites the boy was meant to become inspired as a bisexual being, by circumcision. Israel voided ~~this~~ rite. Israel wrote poems but she denied that she "made" them; no idols or pictures made by men could be worshipped. She insisted that



she was told <sup>by the living voice of God</sup> and that she replied. Israel voided the arts. In these three acts, she emptied the three great "speeches" of the heathen, the tribal, the templar, the artistic, of their lure and charm as absolutes. The real speech, Israel insisted, was yet to come. It only was heard by him who could hear the future, who could live as the listener of the revolving Eon, as the prophet of the future.

When all this had been said, when the Sioux had spoken and the Chinese, the Greek and the Jew, one world came to an end. This was and is the complete cycle of antiquity:

1. Listeners to the spirits of the dead, created Ritual.
2. Listeners to the skyworld and the <sup>cosmic</sup> universe, built the temples.
3. Listeners to laws and <sup>cities</sup> ~~peace~~ already achieved, became poets and artists.
4. Listeners to the future, became prophets.

These four phases of speech were unified and superseded in Jesus. And because of this action, he is called the Christ. Christ is the fruit of the lips of antiquity. Jesus had listened to the spirits of old. The sex war in Adam and Eve and all their offspring was overcome by Mary and her son who superseded the <sup>ancient</sup> marriage <sup>as well as</sup> and the burial ritual. Jesus had listened to the 'skyworld' calendar and the government of the universe for he came when Pontius Pilate represented the mundane unity of Rome's orb, in Palestine. And on the day of Easter, he himself replaced the bloody sacrifices inside the gates of the temple. Jesus had listened to law and peace already achieved, for his

speech certainly transfigures the lillies and the sparrows, the adultress and the thief; outside the gates of the cities of men, the world held no terrors for him. But he superseded all poems. He wrote no book; when he wrote in the sand, the real poem was he himself.<sup>1</sup>

Jesus had listened to the future. For the psalms were on his lips, and the Messianic faith of Israel formed him. But he was no prophet. This is the first thing we are told of him. It is central. He was not expecting somebody else, he was the expected one. <sup>W.B. Uzzell Jr.</sup> They called him, because all they knew were the men who had lived before him; Joseph's son, carpenter, King, priest, rabbi, prophet, messiah.

These names clearly signify terminals. They are the terminals of the four streams of speech sketched by us. The last king, the last priest, the last prophet, the messiah - all this *achieved* would simply mean the end of the world. And Jesus was the end of our first world indeed. He took the sins of this first world upon himself. This sentence simply states the fact that tribal ritual, skyworld temples, nature-praising poetry, messianic psalms, in separation, end <sup>ed</sup> as dead *ends unless they were reversed.* *check revised.*

In this sense, Jesus paid the penalty of death for being the heir of these dead ends. They slew him because he held all their riches and wealth, in his hands and heart, his mind and soul. He was too rich not to share the catastrophe of this all too rich ancient world.

---

1. Compare: "We are God's Poem". Eph. II, 10.

But the terminal of the four modes of speech also became the starting point. Jesus founded the Church since he was the fruit of all the pure lips of antiquity. He spoke in the four currents created before him. How else could he speak? He did quote Deuteronomy when he formulated the golden rule. But we are more than we say. Jesus was not contained in any of the rules and rituals although he filled and enlivened them all, when the poem of his life touched on their themes. He evoked by his ~~preached~~ the man who, in every act, exceeds this act noticeably. When they thought that he was the carpenter, he was the rabbi. When they called him rabbi, he was the prophet. When they called him prophet he was the Messiah. And when they called him <sup>Israel's</sup> Messiah, he stood revealed as the One <sup>Son of Man</sup> who had listened to the free God, to the living God only. His real life always exceeded his social role. This excess is "man", in the Christian era. That which will not adjust, is man.<sup>1</sup>

We are the children of listening. Because we listen to our parents, we bear their name. Because we listen to the constellations and conjunctures of our social sky, we are children of our times. Because we listen to the lure of law, we are children of nature. And because we listen to the call from our destiny, we are sons and daughters of the Revolution.

Jesus is the ~~Abn~~ <sup>Abn</sup> of ~~antiquity~~ <sup>antiquity</sup>. He filled and fulfilled the four

---

1. "Excessus mentis" is an official term with John Eriugena, Bonaventura and Cusanus, for the Christian soul's life.

"listening posts" of

Child of the ancestors *in Tribes,*  
 Child of the times *in Empires,*  
 Child of nature *in Greece,*  
 Child of revolution *in Israel.*

However, he showed that they only could be fulfilled here and now before our eyes in this acceptable year of the Lord called Today. One had to be free from any one of the laws of the four listening posts, before one could refill them with life.

Jesus was the son of ritual, the son of all the words spoken. But by showing that he was free from their separate authority, he became the founder of a new language in which they all could be fused for a new start.

Now, here we come upon our dilemma when speaking about him. The 19th century cut Jesus' connection with his past. It was an artistic century. It loved life and hated suffering. It disliked the question, Why did he have to die? It concentrated on the life of Jesus. Biographies became the great fashion. So, Jesus too received his biography. This was new. It was the opposite of the Christian tradition. This had been *keep quote* thanatography. A biography ends with the death of the "biographee". The story of Jesus makes sense only when his death begins and antecedes our lives. A Christian is a man to whom He speaks. The Body of Christ are those who listen to him. But the biographical craze has produced a state of mind according to which it is enough for a Christian to speak of Christ and to call himself a Christian.

[Yet the only question which he raises in: Have I sealed authenticity for you? Do you live after me?] *check other T5*

To the Rousseautes of our days, Jesus is the adolescent of innocence, the Y.M.C.A. hero, the good boy. The biographies have deprived him of his real name. For to us he is uninteresting, unless he is the Word. We have shown that to speak means to make beginnings the fruits of ends. If the tomb of Jesus is not the womb of the Christian era, we had better forget his whole story as a fairy tale.

The voiding of the ecclesiastical manner of speech about Christ has happened. No criticism of Biblical criticism can unmake it. They have written down Jesus into a speechless child of nature. On the other hand, the history of speech requires a reconquest of Christ's place in its dialectics. <sup>and antiphonal MDB</sup> As the Word, which has become flesh, Jesus occupies the center in the history of speech.

This, then, is our dilemma: To the modern man, Jesus is just a man who lived from 3 B.C. to 27 or 29 A.D. This is of no concern to us. On the other hand, speech had gone full cycle through Red Indian, Egypt, Greek and Jew, and we speak neither of their four languages nor think their thoughts any more. Yet we can understand all four of them very well. We look them through. Their meaning is opened to us. And for our peace of mind, we must know the reason.

How can we make the fruits of the last century of biographical Christianity into a seed for our understanding of speech?

## 2. The Fruit of lips.

Our first steps beyond the critical, analytical, biographical century should be frankly egotistical. Our times' need

is a reconquest of the wave continuum of the spirit. We, too, must speak. And we cannot speak unless we are sure that we continue to speak <sup>and that we may reach into posterity.</sup> Speech has this in common with love that although both are discovered by the individual, once for the first time, they also are <sup>far reaching</sup> universal. In a man's first love, he also discovers the <sup>time continuum</sup> unity of all love; the continuity of history, the order of the universe, the destiny of man, all stand disclosed to the soul who falls in love for the first time. By his falling in love, his eyes are opened and his ears are sensitive to identities <sup>through all generations.</sup> He can read the riddles, he can decipher the flowers and the stars, he can speak and shout and sing. To <sup>be</sup> (love) <sup>by</sup> one other person, means to know every <sup>phase of time.</sup> And the eloquence of love hails from the assuredness that all creatures speak in one tongue. As speakers as well as lovers, we need assurance that we move in a continuum, that our discovery of real life and our words make sense <sup>forever and forever.</sup> Otherwise we go mad and all spirit leaves us. It is impossible to assume that we do something different when we speak, from the peoples of all times. Our speech would be up in the air, a meaningless stammering unless we have the right to believe that all speech is legitimate and authorized as one and the same life process from the first day on which man has spoken, to the last.

It is, therefore, literally in self-defense that I have to live down the two dogmas of science: 1. a man's life ends with his death; 2. a man's words are merely means of expressing his

*vapid* thoughts. These two dogmas void our words of all meaning, and the last thirty years of catastrophe are the logical answer to them. These dogmas are the obvious nonsense of a science which treats man as nature *and does not see its own claim of being valid and* *Free.* ✓  
MVB

Against these two dogmas, I hold that we are the fruit of lips, and that our lips shall bear fruit.

I am satisfied that this makes sense. It restores my right to listen and to speak. But this sense as any sense demands universal application. I have tried to satisfy the reader that Jesus is the fruit of the four streams of speech preceding him. He is the fruit of the lips of all antiquity.

My answer to the historical and artistic and literary and biographical and critical century has been strictly linguistic. God did not make a nice unhistorical wild flower somewhere in Palestine. All mankind participated in making this man, in as far as they had spoken fruitfully, consequentially, committally, continually.

## 2. The Heart and The Lips.

The streams of speech which came to an end on the cross, *we have sketched.* ~~on previous chapters retrieved.~~ But at the same time the Cross blocks the road backwards towards any of these streams. I cannot relapse into tribal ritual or Pharaonic 'skyworlds.' Hitler who tried precisely this, stands revealed as a madman. And the two other streams are blocked, too: The modern Greeks, *i.e.* the physicists, and the modern Jews, *i.e.* the Zionists, certainly are not <sup>The</sup> Greeks or Jews of antiquity. The Greeks glorified in the beauties of the cosmos; our physicists empty it of meaning.

The Jews glorified nothing but God. The Zionists have built a university in Jerusalem, as their first communal building. This road block of the Word, then, is a fact. Not one of the streams of speech of ancient man surges through us, directly.

Since this is so, we must consider him the seed of all speech of our era. As listeners and speaker, as singers and teachers, we are the fruit of his lips.

If this shall be more than a pun, then, we must inquire boldly into the question of "lips". The lips of the living Jesus, wonderful as his words must have been, cannot be listened to by us.

His lips must reach us. But how to recognize them? By this question the task ~~is determined~~ of this ~~task~~ is determined. The lips of the historically effective Jesus have been the four gospels. The four gospels of Mathew, Marc, ~~Lu~~ Luke, John are the lips of the risen Christ. They bespeak the meaning of his death. They are the lips which tell us what it meant that this heart broke. We have been expected to be the fruits of these lips.

In self-defense man may do desperate things. In self-defense we may make bold to acquire a clear conception of fruitful speech. Since Jesus is the road-block which separates us from the fruitful rivers of speech of the ancients, we must acquire a knowledge of his "lips". How were these lips formed? Can it be said that the four gospels to us are the lips of the "Word" at its crucifixion? Obviously, they cannot suffice



unless they avail themselves of all the powers of pre-Christian speech and by doing so, progress beyond anything ever said before.

But, then, can this be true? And why four gospels? Why not one or two?

It is our hypothesis that the four gospels are the lips whose fruits we are expected to be, and that they are His lips. It follows that since the four gospels are One organ, his lips, the secret of their unity is the secret we have to understand.

The "naturalistic" century of Biblical criticism knew very well that the very existence of "lips" of the crucified Christ would block their own study of Jesus, the natural man. The attack of Biblical criticism was concentrated on this one argument: That we should not read the four gospels as four. Accordingly, they were reduced to one: This was done, by keeping three and rejecting one. Behind the three first, the synoptic gospels, one common source, the famous "P", was placed by Baur; this, we had to believe was the document from which the three all came. [The gospel of John was stripped of its source character and relegated somewhere to the second century from which distance it could not bear much testimony on the facts. Thus St. John became "legend", while the three synoptic gospels were made one by reducing them to a written source. Consequently, they could not be called unified as they could not be better than their "source".

17 JAN 18

Indeed one source by itself is as good as another. One source is not sacred. Once the three synoptic gospels were reduced to one source, they became simply material for our reconstruction of the life of Jesus from all the material. Reitzenstein used Oriental mystery-religions, Dibelius used artistic models, Scholem Asch used Jewish Rabbinic traditions to explain "Jesus". Jesus became alternately the expression of one of the styles or modes of life preceding him. He was dissolved as the road-block. He belonged with antiquity. He was speaking, thinking, praying, teaching like many men of ancient times. There was no reason to fuss about this man, the little man from the "Orient". Anatole France summed it all up in the remark of Pontius Pilate to a friend. Sitting on the Riviera and reviewing his interesting career, Pilate said to his interviewer: "Jesus of Nazareth? Je ne me souviens pas". Indeed, there was left nothing memorable about him; according to the critics Jesus became a souvenir of antiquity.

It is not an overstatement to say that the scientific reduction of the four gospels to the rubble heap of source-material is the condition for this result.

But what can convince modern man that the gospels are anything better? Negatively, the eagerness of reducing the gospels to practically one, has vanished nowadays. What had this eagerness achieved? The critics had "proven" that a Greek gospel, Marc, was the gospel which originated first. There was nothing indeed, which they had not proven. For

instance they had succeeded to a point where nobody believed that the Letter to the Hebrews was written to the Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> In other words, every one stone of our tradition had been turned upside down and was made to say the opposite from what it said. But this period of turning upside down is at an end. It has no interest to me. For readers who cannot study the question I may mention some facts which put the whole era "from Reimarus to Wrede" in its quest for an historical Jesus "behind" our source material, in jeopardy. They form a road-block now against the reductionists. We shall never know an "historical" Jesus "behind" so-called "material".

1. John writes as an eye witness who knows the minutest details when he cares to mention them. The apostle is the author of the gospel. Therefore it carries authority.

2. All four gospels are apostolic. Matthew was the converted publican among the apostles, Marc obeyed Peter, Luke lived with Paul. John dictated to a Greek secretary.

3. Matthew wrote in Aramaic and he wrote first.

4. Marc states bluntly that he is quoting from Matthew. These four facts simply refute the critics who attacked the quadrilateral of four authoritative gospels. I mention these facts for the comfort of souls who are intimidated by the awe before this "science". I was brought up among the outstanding source critics of those days. One of my first books was

---

1. Chapman, Matthew, Mark and Luke, 1937 p. 187, note 2.

dedicated to one of them, I. Vahlen, though it was written in another field. I did a lot of work with sources and unknown authors and relations between sources myself. In 1912, working in an archive over a 13th century manuscript, I read this sentence on the parchment: "Multi enim studio contradicendi amiserunt sensum". Many, in their eagerness to contradict at all costs lost the understanding. I was impressed.

To contradict is one thing. Everybody is free to do so. But he is not free to pretend that his contradiction ever can pull a positive solution out of the mind's magic hat.

Applied to the Bible, this means: It is not everybody's business to read the Bible as the lips of which the reader is to be the fruit. It is anybody's privilege to say: I don't believe that John wrote his gospel or we cannot know when it was written. Man can affix his No to any statement coming to him from any other man as much as he may attach his Yes to it. Never, on the other hand, can he replace the repudiated statement by speculation. This, however, is exactly what the Biblical critics have done. They have not acquiesced in disbelieving tradition. They have positively told us who wrote the real story, and how it looked and when our gospels were written and for which partisan purposes.

It is not given to the mind to know reality by negation. Our tradition may be wrong and untrustworthy. But then we simply do not have the right tradition. No logical somersaults can produce the positive story. When the mind tries to act as

the creator of real facts, we have the story of Gnosis all over again. Gnosis in education is when you tell people how education should be and then think: "Now they are educated" - Gnosis in history is when you tell people how history might have been and then think, "Now, it has been this way".

This insight into the negative aspect of a century of criticism, impressed a great man so deeply that he shelved his fame as an expert of Biblical criticism, studied medicine and moved out to Africa to treat Negroes. Albert Schweitzer before leaving Europe, published his book which expressed this insight, his famous "Final Criticism of 150 Years of Research on the Life of Jesus". This title, we may bestow on his book, now, in retrospect. Its first title was "Von Reimarus bis Wrede, Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung". ("The Quest of the Historical Jesus", is the English title). Schweitzer's leaving of Europe for the speechless physical world of the Jungles was precipitated by the negative work of the critics. His insight in their failure cured him for quite a while. In the end, however, his scholarly habits returned and he relapsed. That which he had forbidden himself for Jesus he now did for Paul. His big volume on the mysticism of Paul was written on the very lines he had condemned in research of Jesus.

Hence Schweitzer has become a tragic figure, straddling a fence, rejecting criticism and unable to stay away from it. This may warn us that the work of 150 years is not readily dismissed by sheer violence. Schweitzer by negating negation,

did not establish a new position. When his faith required positive speech once more, he lapsed into the grooves which were in existence. In his preface to the *Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*, Schweitzer is aware of his own dilemma. He admits that he reads the New Testament as a source. He wishes to reconstruct out of its material somebody else's far distant religion. It definitely is not the lips of a voice which created a new dimension of speech, the dimension in which all the generations of men may become brothers and one. To the contrary, as a son of nature, Schweitzer wishes to prove to himself and to his readers that every generation has a different spirit.

Certainly, every generation has a different spirit. But is it not equally certain that the man who was called the A and the O, the beginning and the end of all times, knew this one fact as well as Albert Schweitzer or a Parisian fashion-maker or a New York headlines-writer, or the German Youth Movement? In fact it was precisely these Ghosts of the different times and places which aroused Jesus. He decided to do something about the Schweitzers <sup>and Buettmanns</sup> of his own days and of all days. And he said that we could introduce in the world a power by which these ghosts could be laid. Because these ghosts and spirits of the times were uppermost in his mind, he called the new power the Sane Ghost and the Healing Spirit.

When Schweitzer wrote on Paul, he dealt with the one man who had first applied this new power on a colossal scale. By

Schweitzer's scientific standards - not his practical - both men, Jesus and Paul had failed in their own avowed purpose of connecting all times.

Following the vicissitudes of <sup>Schweitzer, of ✓ MDS</sup> this great and admirable Christian and - to me - completely ununderstandable theologian, I had to ask myself if I was better equipped. My great advantage as I see it, is that I never was a minister nor a theologian, by profession. Instead, I was nourished at the very springhead of the art which when it spread to the theologians made them believe in the mind's gnostic creativity, made them into history-gnostics. Knowing their premises too well, I shied away from the vicious circle of first getting a position for a lifetime, a livelihood for dealing with certain authoritative texts, of then spending this lifetime by <sup>demolishing</sup> contradicting these texts, and of finally replacing them by the "real" tradition as the result of this contradicting. We may not wish to be the fruits of His lips, of the gospels; but who is interested in being taught, with great seriousness, as a life study, that there were no lips?

By staying away, I was spared the temptation as well as the shock of Schweitzer, the temptation which produced his Paul, the shock which shipped him to Africa. My approach to the Word which made our era has not been marked by this kind of theological illusion and disillusionment. Instead, I remained convinced that the century of "Nature" simply had asked the wrong questions: The Biblical and Homeric critics were

loyal and honest believers in Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle. These, their three authorities, taught that language was man's natural equipment. On the basis of this dogma, the whole house of criticism was raised. How could Jesus be the Word, how could John say: "In the Beginning was the Word", how could Matthew quote Jesus as saying: "I shall be with you verily to the end of the World" in the face of the naturalistic dogma? And especially, how could the four gospels be called inspired, if the words of men were data of the dictionary and the grammar book? They could not. The dogma that speech is as natural with man as it is with the apes, compelled four or five generations of professional workers to produce every thinkable theory of reduction and atomization which would reduce the gospels to material. The critics impressed the world and themselves with their own greater honesty and sincerity; compared with them, the fundamentalists often had no brilliancy, no brains, no guts. And indeed, the brilliancy of this century of analysis was more than a fire work. It was the genuine outburst of the natural mind. What is the natural mind? The natural mind hopes to know and to employ and to manipulate nature. The critics hoped to employ the Bible as mere nature, as source material for the new natural history of mankind, for the coming natural science of evolution. This undertaking of a natural history, they thought possible because their college halls and libraries seemed firmly established in the shadow of revered institutions like Church and



State. Little did they know that scholarship is based on a common bond between laity and scholars called the Church, and on a common law of freedom called the State, in our era. Before we can criticize at leisure, we must be at leisure. No science of man is truly scientific which remains ignorant of this, its own, premise. The premise of a common peace within which the critic may criticize, means that he, the critic himself must uphold the unity and continuity of speech through all ages and between all groups of men. For, peace is the fruit of speech, and is not to be had otherwise. And science needs, presupposes, requires peace.

Once this is understood, speech ceases to be an "object" of natural science: The peace needed by the scientist and the speech which he makes the object of his studies, stand revealed - as one and the same process. To study man, in sociology, piece-meal, individual by individual, class by class, nation by nation, one man here, one man there, Spanish, Greek, English, history or grammar, as separate individuals, or bodies of knowledge, and at the same time to live by a peace created in the name of one hope in science, one faith in the laity, one love for the Truth, is too much of a contradiction. This, the 19th century undertook and it exploded speechlessly! If the natural method is applied to Jesus, he becomes a glowing boy scout (Spemann and many others; consider a book title like "Jesus the Adolescent"), or the psychoanalytical twin of Judas (Rank and others) or a powerless idiot (Gerhard Hauptmann) or just sentimental (Scholem Asch).

Now all this may, of course, be true. But the roadblock into the linguistic past would still be there, Jesus or no Jesus. We live in another world than Cicero and Gamaliel, Montezuma of Mexico and Red Jacket of the Seneca tribe. To define this our world, is everybody's concern.

It ~~is not~~ <sup>does not have to be</sup> the concern of theologians like Schweitzer, or <sup>of</sup> philologists, but <sup>of</sup> everybody's who wishes to live in peace because two world wars have nearly plunged us back into a truly pre-Christian, pre-Homeric, pre-Mosaic world. My defense against this onslaught on my peace, my world, my era, is based on one dogma: Speech is a continuum.

Now the four Evangelists insist that something happened to this very continuum in their days. Hence I propose to ask: What did happen? My way of finding this out, seems rather obvious to me in retrospect. And I now shall try to state the skeleton of my logic:

All the four Evangelists say unanimously: Speech and writing must be changed, in fact they are changed, by the Word. If they do not lie, their own speech and writings must bear evidence of this alleged change.

If we can find out <sup>that</sup> ~~if~~ their speech differs and in what respect it differs from anything said before, the change of which they try to convince us and the change which speech underwent in their gospel writing, will have to be one and the same change. "Conversion", "faith", "redemption", "revelation", "speaking in tongues", "pouring out of the Holy Ghost", all

these quite dead terms, could be identified with the process to be observed in the texts of their gospels. This would prove their case: 3. *The Speed of The Gospels.*

To sum it all up, the gospel writers themselves must be the documents of the linguistic change by the Word.

The four Evangelists in their new way of speaking, would not be the only documents of such a change. Faithful Christians will continue to be impressed by the change in the nature of man by martyrs and missionaries. An apostle like Paul who was both martyr and missionary will seem a better witness to an orthodox Christian than Luke's text. And greater masses will always be attracted by relics, miracles, Cathedrals and monasteries.

But for the pure mind, for science, for the intellect, neither bones nor stones will ever prove that a change of mind occurred. The scientific conscience in all of us rebels against such external evidence. Monks are found in India, martyrs and disciples in China, shrines in Thailand and Yukatan, cathedrals in Mexico. The mind does not and need not trust in a historical change of man's nature ever on such a basis, because it is not the mind's business to trust, to believe in external evidence.

But the mind cannot help believing in a change of mind from a change of style.

The believer, then, will not have to wait for our arguments. The unbeliever, however, has to be shown. The crucible

in which a style is chemically so to speak, transformed, must be shown. And it is "The Mind", in our times, not the soul nor the body, who is unable to understand Christianity as the medium of his own mental and scientific truth. Only when the intellect is able to identify the process by which it arrives at truth, as the process which proceeds in the four gospels, will the mind go back on its accusation that Christianity is as dead as a dodo and never was anything but a salubrious or opprobrious myth.

The "four gospels" - we shall use quotation marks when we treat them as a Singular, a Whole, - can prove this one thing: The Word did change the world of mind for good.

A book of antiquity is closed to all other books. A school of thought in antiquity is closed to all other schools. One book: It begins and it ends. Two covers contain it.

This is not true of the four gospels. They respond to a dead end. They continue through a change of mind. They progress through time, and, at the end, they barely begin. At the end of all four gospels, John says that the whole cosmos was not big enough to contain all the books which it would be possible to produce on Christianity. This sounds fantastic. But after all, this, my own <sup>book</sup> ~~chapter~~, is proof that John's mirth had cause. John must have been as boyishly cheerful as his master. As a very old man, he still boasted that he once ran faster than Peter (John 19.4). The oldest apostle ended the last gospel with a remark of not very strict seriousness;

this is a notable feature of the New Testament, or, more cautiously of this Whole of which the four gospels are stanzas.

The exuberance of the end of "the four gospels" contrasts with the tone of the beginning. "The Four Gospels" opens on a tone of circumspection. Matthew is dignified, serious, and moving cautiously. All through the four gospels, we may observe that it becomes gradually easier to speak of the event. There is an acceleration and a growth in assurance in the four parts. This growth in articulatedness and assurance may be shown in every one gospel. But this growth though identical finds a very different expression, in each case. The second gospel expresses the growth by being brief. Marc has 677 verses compared to Matthew's 1072. There are many reasons for this as I well know. But when everything is said, it remains true, that *ceteris paribus* the brief treatment of a theme usually betrays greater confidence of the author than a lengthy one. To Peter, the inspirer of Marc, the task must have seemed to need less argument. Where Matthew had given the complete speeches, Marc was allowed to write that he would only give some quotations.

Luke, again, is comfortably writing two volumes, at his desk, with references to other writers. We may figure him writing neither in the suspense, penury, danger of Matthew, nor in the vestry of the catacombs and bending before Peter, spurred by the Apostle's vehemence, as Marc, but sitting in a room equipped with books and documents, in some leisure and

with time for reflection, and writing for his student Theophilus. What an immense change from Matthew the first advocate of the new world of Jesus before the great world of the Bible who speaks to enemies, to the deacon or secretary of Peter, who tries to satisfy the authority of this prince of the apostles, to Luke, who, after his master's Paul death, is free to instruct a faithful young disciple. And yet, there is an ever greater growth in articulatedness to come. When John dictated to his Greek secretary, he was removed from any earthly pressure. The weights which loaded down Matthew, from enmity, Marc from obedience, Luke from his duty to teach, were absent. The highest degree of artistic and visionary and rational power is coupled with a child-like exuberance and hurry. He takes pains to correct intimate details of the tradition in the midst of sublime poignancy. John begins with the superlative "In the beginning was the Word" - and by the way therein supplements Matthew's ending: "I shall be with you to the end of the world, every day."

But he ends not with this solemn vision through time, but on the tone of a youthful outburst: "The space of the universe would not be able to contain all the books on Jesus" - Faith which began tremblingly with the one indisputable point that Jesus could be called legally "the Son of David and of Abraham", has become an ocean when John writes.

Compared to Peter's virile orders to Marc: "Cut this out; this will do. Enough has been said", to Luke's broad narrative

"as I said before", to John's "I could go on forever", Matthew carries the burden of being the loneliest because the first, very visibly. And yet, for a superficial eye, John may appear to be the most lonely one, writing in great solitude, while Luke is academically entrenched in a study, and Marc lives protected at least by a faithful congregation, and Matthew stands in a crowd of opponents trying to get a hearing. But, solitude, or loneliness, in speech, differs widely from solitude by lack of physical contact. We may be lonely in New York, and very social mentally on a mountain peak. The four gospels show how speech or style or articulation is created by our degree of moral loneliness.

Against the whole synagogue and temple of Jerusalem, the publican and sinner Matthew must stand on his careful brief. They are in power; he is an outcast.

Compare John: Jerusalem, the Holy City, is labelled with perfect assurance "The World" and "Darkness" in John's first chapter. Well, of course, she had vanished when he wrote. Already, John lives in a new rising world who together with him sees the light, perceives the Word and runs boyishly and joyously forward to greet the Lord's coming into his own. For John, the solitude is with Zion, not with John.

Matthew wrote with the echelons of Zion standing proudly. While he delivered his speech, he could scarcely hope to dwell in peace in Jerusalem any longer. He was a wayfaring man, on the way out and away from the old order of things. Matthew's

gospel is a farewell plea, a last attempt to convince Jerusalem that they had slain the Just because they had not expected any longer a radical change in the methods of God's government of the world.

This very expectation, however, had been the only *raison d'etre* of Israel, in the midst of the world. Obviously, then, Matthew's plea had to do justice to Israel's righteous place and to the new dispensation, in one breath. Everybody knows that Matthew is filled with allegations from the Bible. But to know this, will not suffice. Being the first writer of a gospel, Matthew had no New Testament and no part of the New Testament which could have given him the right or the power to treat the Bible of his day as the Old Testament. That a man quotes the Bible, is not impressive to us; even the Devil may quote Scripture. But the linguistic significance of the first gospel lies in something else. By his writing his gospel, he transformed the Bible of his day into the Old Testament. The Bible of Israel became the Old Testament in the process of his writing. For all readers of Matthew this was an accomplished fact. For Matthew, it was the accomplishment of which he did not become conscious before it was done.,

Matthew marches and progresses in his gospel writing from speaking as a Jew to speaking as a non-Jew. The text is plain. In his first chapter, Matthew begins: This is the book of the birth of Jesus the Christ, who is a son of David, a son of Abraham. In the same first chapter, verse 21: "Jesus shall



free his people from their sins". Obviously, we are in Israel. For, it does not seem necessary to Matthew to explain the pronoun "his" in his people at all. But in chapter 28, the last, Matthew's own eloquence had carried him beyond the Jewish world. And when he came to describe the machinations of the priests and elders of the Jews, he wrote: "This became common talk among the Jews to this day..." The Jews no longer are divided into believers and unbelievers in Christ. The Jews as Jews are outside Matthew's family. The fence between them and Matthew is infinitely higher in chapter 28 than in chapter 1. The outpouring of his experience, his memories, his notes, changed the writer's own mind. Everybody should become a different person by writing a book. No professor of literature will deny this eventually of a great book in poetry. A book which is the fruit of lived life, separates the man who writes it, from the period of his life in which it grew. Fruits always make epoch because their season follows a cycle of seasons: Harvest time makes the whole previous year irretrievable. The wisdom of our tradition consists in the fact that in the first gospel a man writes himself out of Israel by writing up Jesus. Thus, he realized for his readers the fact that to write up Jesus meant to write down the Bible as the Old Testament. This could not have been achieved by argument. A clever lawyer may prove any case by affirmations, claims, quotations and yet remain unmoved himself. Many people have written exercises, perfect logical treatises, on

Christianity to prove or to refute its case. This did not make them into evangelists. An evangelist is a man who by speaking of Jesus, changes his own mind; by being in process, he leads others into the same process. The gospel of Matthew instituted the process of seeing the world and Israel in a new light because it was this very process itself. Christianity is the world as it always has been plus the death of Jesus. Matthew's gospel was the first proof that this one addition to the world would make a difference to the world of speech, that everything in the world would have to be rewritten in the light of this event. For, had not Matthew faithfully started with purely Biblical argument? Had he not begun to write inside or within "his" people. Modern readers quite often are bored with Matthew's first chapter because the genealogy through Joseph through David to Abraham seems so impertinent. But without it, Matthew could never have driven himself and his Christian readers to the point where "his people" have ceased to be his or their people.

Standing upright and pleading in danger of his own life, and then abandoning his Jewish allegiance, Matthew wrote his gospel. He reversed the meaning of the Bible by experiencing that it was no longer the last word. The last sentence of the gospel - critics have rejected it because it takes us, indeed, on a new plane - expresses this fact very simply.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. "Baptize in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

Instead of the Bible being the last word, for Jews, they are told that Jesus will be with them daily until the end of the world. In this one sentence, the short life of Jesus on earth suddenly acquires such momentum that the little addition to the world which this life seemed to be at best, suddenly grows to gigantic proportions. In this sentence, the full power of the addition breaks upon the reader. This one life balances in the scales as heavily as the whole history of mankind from Abraham and David down to the days in which Matthew lives. In this sentence, which dares to speak of all the future history as separated from the Jewish Bible, the gospel has become gospel in the full sense; because only now, has the past become the past and the Bible the Old Testament. This is all the more remarkable as Matthew certainly had no inkling of the fate of his own book. Writing in Aramaic, he hardly could expect it to be saved as the first book of a Greek Canon, by a translation.

We now might go on immediately and draw attention to the drama inside each gospel as we have tried to show for Matthew. We might show how Peter succeeded to force Marc that Peter's honorable mentioning was to disappear from the gospel and his weaknesses to be put in. The human drama between Marc and Peter was as real, and as much a change of mind as Matthew's discovery of the Bible as the Testament of a bygone Past. And in Luke, the two books, Gospel and Acts are one drama. Paul has not known Jesus in the flesh and does not care to quote

his sayings. And yet Paul is able to preach the gospel with the power of a "world heart", as "the right arm of Jesus", as he later was called. Gospel and Acts reveal the identity of Christ. Paul and Jesus, Christ in the flesh, and Christ in Paul, are the pillars of the bridge which Luke built to his own surprise. The "abrupt" ending of Acts has often been criticized. But <sup>is it abrupt?</sup> ~~what of it.~~ Luke's Gospel ends: "But they worshipped and returned to Jerusalem with great joy and were in the temple all the time, praised and lauded God." His Acts end: "Paul stayed in his rooms for two years, receiving all visitors, preached the kingdom of God and taught the Lord Jesus with all joy unrestrictedly." <sup>Now</sup> Compare the beginnings of Gospel and Acts: "Jesus is born; the Church is born." In Peter and Paul the Christ who lived in Jesus, lived for another generation. Paul, at the end, is in Rome.

Where Paul is, there now is the temple, this to Luke's own amazement. Paul's martyrdom did not belong into Luke's process and progress. The thesis that Acts remained unfinished is as <sup>valuable</sup> ~~profound~~ as the <sup>modern</sup> ~~proposition~~ that Homer's Iliad should have ended or <sup>once</sup> ~~did~~ end with the death of Achilles! Luke discovered the duplication, the victory over the sequence of generations, by the Spirit, and he discovered, as he went along, that his histories of Jesus in the flesh in Israel and of the acts of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1, 2) with the Gentiles (end of

I. See above p.

intended  
as chapter  
of a book

Acts 28, 29) ran parallel. But as Peter had prevailed so that Marc had to omit all praise of Peter, so did Luke not write for the glorification of Paul but of the Lord. The death of Paul told at the end of Acts - just as the death of Achilleus at the end of the Iliad, - would have destroyed the recognition of the Holy Ghost as "Christ once more". And why, became it Luke's task to identify two generations, Jesus and the apostles, by one work in two parts? Why had the baptism of fire at Pentecost to be the parallel to the birth of the child in Bethlehem, and the journeys of Paul through the gentiles the parallel to Jesus' teaching in Israel? The reason is obvious. Luke himself wrote to a "second-generation Christian". Between him and Theophilus, the question of "Fathers and Sons" of the Spirit existed as between Jesus and the apostles. The crux of Christianity is the law of nature that nothing which we inherit comes to us in the <sup>and attractive</sup> form of newness. Luke's Acts parallel the Gospel because Theophilus had to be changed from a hereditary or traditional Christian into a primary and immediate listener of the Spirit. As Luke's writings reproduced a bridge over two generations, so Luke's relation to his reader forced Theophilus to think of his own children. In as far as he succeeded in building the parallel between Gospel and Acts, in so far he also succeeded in building the bridge from Theophilus into the future Church. *He wrote for four generations: Jesus, Paul, Theophilus, Theophilus's heirs*

The modern reader may be hesitant before admitting this logic. Why should Theophilus treat his own children and grandchildren

differently because he read of the parallel between Gospel and Acts, Judea and the Empire, Jerusalem and Rome? What has a book to do with our own behavior? The modern is right to hesitate. To read, for us, is not a phase of acting. But to read, for Theophilus, was something quite different. First of all, the gospel in general was spread exclusively by word of mouth. THE WAY as the new life was called, was the WAY in which people lived and spoke, to the exclusion of books. A Christian of the first century was introduced into a way of life and underway, on the way, was told the things necessary for his becoming a missionary himself, a witness, a confessor, possibly a martyr. To hear was nothing but the first step for telling others. Curiosity was not served but salvation. And ~~this~~ <sup>its continuous flow</sup> was achieved by the foolishness of oral preaching. The tremendous novelty of the written gospels therefore, was that anything written should be admitted to the rank of gospel truth at all.

#### 4. Ink and Blood.

Christ had not written. And the whole truth of the cross was based on this, his sheer incredible and certainly super-human faith. Who among us dares to entrust his greatest truth to the silliness of unbelieving neighbors? But since this had been dared, the example was set. And writing was stigmatized as second-rate. It was less good, less desirable, less trustworthy, than preaching. I think that we still can realize that Matthew wrote with blood, sweat, and tears, asking forgiveness for the use of ink. He needed a valid excuse. For, "one of the fallen angels" was considered, in his days, the

one who instructed mankind in writing and thereby made many men sin until this day. But men were not created to aver their faith with pen and ink.<sup>1</sup> I think that Matthew took the great liberty of returning to the use of the pen (defiled though it was then as it is today by the makers of books without end -) under the impact of the stoning of Stephen. This would mean that the first blood spilled cleansed the first ink employed in the new dispensation. I conclude this from the fact that Stephen's great speech before the priests is reflected in the first chapter of Matthew.<sup>2</sup>

The glory of the first martyr gave weight to the otherwise highly suspect <sup>ink</sup> written words of the first gospel writer. Stephen's great defense of the transfer of the Spirit into new forms had to be salvaged. After Stephen had paid for it with his life, the sacred new message would not be defiled by ink. The Gospels were <sup>The</sup> reluctant admissions of writing into the New WAY. By the way, even then they were meant to be read out loud.

We are so crazy as to ask anybody: Why don't you write? But with the first disciples of the new spirit it was the other way round: Must we write? May we write? Dare we write? And the truth rests on this chastity of our minds which has become more rare than chastity of bodies. When must we write? In danger of life, our own or others, in self defense, if it is

---

1. Book of Henech, 69, 10.  
2. Below page \$ 70 - 81

the only way of saving our identity in a crisis. We must speak and write and think and teach and testify when we and our mind would disintegrate without. We speak lest we go mad. It all amounts to the rule that a new style will not be created except under supreme pressure. Matthew gained the right to use the pen as his sword when the blood of martyrs reddened the soil of Palestine. Similarly, Marc wrote with the arena and the Cross waiting for Peter in Rome.

Now, our contention is that Luke wrote with a similar excitement or pressure. And this is not so obvious. He was not in the centers of danger. He lived to a ripe old age - 84 - in Greece somewhere as the Canon of the Gospels tell us. And his style pleased Ernest Renan so well that he called Luke's Gospel the most beautiful book ever written. Now, Renan had a Greek mentality. And we may feel embarrassed by his compliment; for, the Greek<sup>mentality</sup> is apt to praise the playful and the light touch. The emphatic hurts him as less elegant.

Indeed, the pressure in Luke is very different from the excitement created by the obvious dangers which surrounded Matthew and Marc. Luke must have been at leisure when he went over the origins of his faith.

Nevertheless, a new and specific pressure was introduced into the world of history writing by Luke. Chronicles had listed the annals of Rome and Paros and Athens. Historians had written up the spirit of Rome by which it conquered the orb in fifty years, or the spirit of the Athenians under



Pericles. Similarly, the various books of the Old Testament all testify to the specific mentality of one period. The books under the name of Moses, and the song of songs, and Jeremiah, and Judges, and Kings, <sup>are</sup> ~~all~~ <sup>ions</sup> translated ~~as~~ ~~of~~ One Spirit into innumerable expressions. Therefore, the first sentence of Luke also gives us the clue to his theme. The Inter-temporal character of the spirit became his theme. To be inspired means to translate; by fixing his attention on this seam between the times, Luke became the first human being who was able to telescope the spirits of two periods and to envisage them as subservient ("Ministers of the Word", to minister means to be subservient, in Greek) to one spirit, the Spirit of all spirits. ↓

The very meaning of the term Holy Ghost is lost if we cease to make him include the spirits of the times. Any peaceful group, in gaiety, harmony, friendship, goodness may have the right spirit without having the inclusiveness of the Holy Spirit. But today, we usually compare the right and the wrong spirit often as though they moved on one plane. For Luke, this alone is Holy which has power over the many fashions of the ages. These fashions of every age, these spirits of the times are genuine and real. Each generation has its genius. Jesus' genius belonged to his own unique life. Herman Melville's genius as the author of Moby Dick and Pierre was "time-conditioned". But the Spirit is genius to the second power so to speak. God is the father of all Spirits. The discovery

of Jesus was that genius was not enough. And so he yielded his genius, his own spirit for the peace between the spirits of all times. Not his body was his contribution to history - how many soldiers have given their bodies for the spirit of their national gods - Jesus gave up his genius because he decided to break the endless recurrence of the cycles in the affairs and businesses of man. He was fed up with the spirits of each time, including his own genius. For this reason, he wrote no book. For, he wanted to turn the hearts of all the generations to each other regardless of their mental fashions.

Luke was the first man who was privileged to put this change in the meaning of spirit into a two-phase book. In his two volumes, the Spirit was made to tower over the spirits. The genius of Christ's own walk through Judea and the genius in the actions of the <sup>apo</sup>(stolic age were both narrated as facets of one spirit. Ever since, the people have asked from their historians to give them more than one period in an evolution. America ~~could~~ have no history which inspires unless its history ~~can~~ <sup>can</sup> be divided clearly into great periods. Unless we may sense One spirit to be at work behind the spirits of several periods, we cannot get excited over history. History is dead and it is dangerous to flirt with the graves of the past. To imitate any great man or deed, is absurd and always paralyzes. But history is good and rises us from the dead when we penetrate behind the facts and realize the amount of sacrifice and creation behind every little fact which surrounds us. The

knowledge of historical facts is harmful unless we look them through as either inspired or corrupt.

Any great historian after Luke has admitted a plurality of spirits of the times and has tried to let One spirit shine through them all.

The first triumph over the spirit of one time and the fashion of one country was given to Luke. In his books was embodied the difference between genius and Spirit, in modern terms, or between THE spirit and the many spirits, in his terms.

This triumph could not be celebrated by theorizing "about" the Spirit. It had to be done in the opposite manner, by making the fullest allowance for the diversity of time and place, at each occasion. THE WORD, which before <sup>had seemed to</sup> belonged to specific countries and specific times, now proved to be one in East and West, with Jesus on earth and with Christ risen. The blind fanaticism of any school of thought or national literature, the zeal of the reader Theophilus, were purified. Theophilus was warned that the spirit would <sup>emit</sup> ~~dismiss~~ new forms out of his loins in every generation. The genius of one age could not be mistaken for the spirit of God. For, we have exactly as much future as we recognize as our past. Future and history are our articles of faith. If a man wishes to perish with his own time, nobody can hinder or refute him. The time limits of our role on earth are our own choice. By giving the Church in which Theophilus found himself, a prehistory of

more than one period and more than one genius, Luke gave all Christians also a posthistory, beyond their own period and age. The right of history to mould us at all, depends on the triumph of The Power to Translate over the powers that be, at any one age. This conviction, of course, lived in Stephen, in Matthew, and in their master. But in Luke, a literary document was allowed to embody this truth.

The genius and the spirit of any one time runs riot in isolation. A naive surrender to the spirit of the times plunged Europe into two destructive wars. Man had given time the reigns over ~~itself~~ <sup>himself</sup>. And the spirits of the times became demons. If we expect each time to have its own spirit, we shall ~~live~~ <sup>abide</sup> with the Hitler Youth, in Massacriqa.

However, if we expect the Holy Ghost to exist in a hothouse outside the seasons of the human mind, we end in sterilization and futility. We should begin to think of each generation as One Body of Time, and of the Spirit as one, connecting all these bodies. It took 1900 years to learn this. A Body of Time, to this day, is a new-fangled term. But it is today's most correct expression and translation of Luke's spirits which were superseded by the Holy Ghost. If and when our times ~~will~~ become bodies of time, we will have done that which Luke described as the acts of Jesus and of the apostles.

The generation of Theophilus which read Luke, saw the fall of Jerusalem, and the transition from the apostolic age to the episcopal. The Church is distinguished by the rapid

5:15  
19 JAN

↑  
progress from one age to another, in a breathtaking advance.

That which Protestantism has often criticized as the rapid corruption of Source Christianity, is the most excellent proof of Luke's principle of incessant translation. The martyrs, the bishops, the confessors, the apologists, the Fathers, the monks, and hermits, the missionaries, all these modes of saintliness followed upon the apostles and the evangelists and the teachers and prophets of the first generation of the Church, in a swift change of scene. I would turn round Luther's axiom of the value of Source Christianity and would say that I could not believe in the Holy Ghost unless he had changed his forms of expression *even as in Luther and his prince.* How to proceed from genius to genius and yet to proceed in One spirit, is our trouble again. It becomes harder in every century and we must allow our young people a deliberate amount of ignorance lest their genius be stifled. But proceed out of One spirit we all must, despite the variety of times and places.

This throws light on the progress in Marc's Gospel. As in Matthew and in Luke, Marc's Gospel is a victory over the dangers of time. Peter was in charge of the sheep. (John is very emphatic on this topic, at the end of his Gospel, and he agrees with Matthew.) The true relation between Jesus and the apostles was at stake if Peter, the greatest of the apostles, could be considered too much of an equal to Jesus. Peter's Gospel then, had to establish once and forever, Christ's uniqueness as "the Son of God". Peter who had denied the Lord, now

had to deny that he, Peter, was more than a sinful man. If this could be done for Peter, who was the leader, it would be accomplished for all Christians forever. Now, Marc does exactly this. He begins simply with the statement that Jesus was the Son of God, and he ends with the endless stream of mission to be carried out by "subservients", who obey the Lord, and do not obey Peter or any carnal authority. It is more difficult to trace this negative process in Marc than the similar negative process in Matthew. In Matthew, the order preceding Jesus became the Old Testament; the spirit receded from Israel when Jesus came and took over. In Marc, it was shown that Christ alone was and would remain the Son of God. All future generations were put under this one and only perfect incarnation, because Peter placed himself at an infinite distance under this same Son of God. The process of Marc protects Jesus against the future. The glorification of Peter is victoriously obstructed and prevented. Marc says that Peter was "afraid" (9, 5) when the other Evangelists do not dare to say so; he changes the singular of a word of Peter in Matthew: "I shall", into the more modest "we shall". He cut out his name when an intelligent question was asked. "Peter's house", of Matthew, in Marc becomes the house to which four of the apostles came. Peter has himself called "Satan" in Marc without <sup>the</sup> an/exculpating explanation<sup>1</sup> given by the other Gospels.

---

1. Chapman, p. 38 ff.

And it may be called the climax of Peter's self-denial that Marc is not allowed to give the name Peter to one of the two disciples who saw the risen Christ at Emmaus. Yet, Paul bluntly says that Peter was the first man to see the risen Lord. In other words, no higher credentials could be found, in the eyes of Paul himself, for an apostolate than the one on which Marc was ordered to be silent! Luke and John took pains to make up for this silence, in their brotherly care to mention Peter's primacy.<sup>1</sup>

"In the Marcan gospel Jesus is isolated and wholly misunderstood...by his chosen disciples. In Marc this is of vital importance because the salvation is wrought...in complete isolation. Matthew and Luke are unable to force this through with the staggering brutality of Marc.<sup>2</sup>"

The temptation fought by Marc is well stated in 13,11 when Jesus is reported to have said: "For it is not you who are going to speak but the Spirit". Peter who had denied the Lord at his Passion, now proceeds to protect the Lord against such dependancy on frail men. He had the right, and he alone, to prevent Marc from placing Peter near the Lord. If the result was found to be of "staggering brutality"; the critics overlooked that Peter's battle was against his own potential authority; In Jesus' name only shall the gospel be preached (Marc 16.17).

---

1. Luke 24,13 ff. John, 21, chapter, Paul, I Cor., 15,5.  
 2. Hoskyns and Davey, the Riddle of the New Testament, New York, 1931, p. 137 f.

The process in John is different again, but dramatic progress is made nevertheless in this apparently ethereal gospel; ~~too~~. John was the <sup>friend</sup> ~~brother~~ of the Lord, by natural sympathy, as no other apostle. As a brother, he was loved and liked in addition to being called and chosen. Natural congeniality, creature-like affinity, was John's special source of knowledge; <sup>similar sources of enhanced understanding were</sup> ~~as well as~~ Peter's office in the church, Matthew's experience of being saved, Luke's responsibility to the next generation, ~~were sources of enhanced understanding~~. A teacher like Luke comes to understand better and better because of his having immature and unenthused students. A bishop like Peter comes to take great care because of his responsibility for the salvation of souls, Matthew knows and understands <sup>better be-</sup> cause he has been taken out of a rather opprobrious business life and feels deep gratitude and joy for his own salvation. John as a kindred spirit, understands that which nobody else will understand at first: The origin of a living person. Members of one physical family understand each other's backgrounds, the origin of each other's reactions and gestures lies open to them. It is not different with kindred spirits. For, the spirit precedes the incarnation, a spirit is the original thought of the creator of which the living man is the execution. A kindred spirit, then, understands by sympathy and "congeniality", in its genuine sense, where Jesus came from, out of which depth of necessity, out of which pre-legal, pre-national, pre-religious, original matrix. John begins, as



a kindred spirit, with the real, the original place of ~~Man~~ <sup>his divine friend</sup> in God's mind. But the progress of his gospel leads him from this heaven to earth. The miraculous process in John is the road from the Word in God to the man in the flesh Jesus. John makes him interrupt his most sublime speeches with the sober and concrete physical movement: "Let us go", and it is John who keeps this precious testimony of Jesus' realism, and nobody else (14,31). His personal and private intimacy would not have had to look at Jesus from the outside ever. He lived with him on the inside of his soul. But that he should identify his brother Jesus <sup>in</sup> with the small events of everyday life, <sup>as Christ</sup> together.

<sup>Word's</sup> ~~with the~~ brothers cosmic office, this is John's victory. <sup>the valet de chambre</sup> cannot see the hero. John saw <sup>him</sup> in his alter ego. bridge-building. John's soul was "naturaliter Christiana".

Therefore, he did not need signs or happenings to know and understand. <sup>He knew him by heart, "mente cordis"?</sup> In writing the gospel, John learned to recognize

the worldly ways of <sup>knowing</sup> his Lord as equally justified; being one with him in eternity, he humbled himself to be only one of

his disciples, in history! This is the beauty of John's last chapters; Thomas had to see before he believed; <sup>Such Missourianism</sup> was quite in-

conceivable to John himself; but John transmitted <sup>the story of Thomas</sup> his story faithfully, as the approach to Christ most opposite to his

own. <sup>And</sup> he glorified Peter, as the one who was in authority even over John because the Lord had said so. From the innermost heart to the outer paraphernalia of social office and position, John proceeds and thereby forbids all hearts who are Christian by nature, to flee the world of history and realization.

All four gospels then, are processes by which four apostles could deposit their human limitation at the foot of the cross and make their individual experience into a contribution: Matthew acknowledged that he no longer was a Jew, Marc, Peter's disciple acknowledged that Peter had lost his own name, Luke the companion of Paul acknowledged that Paul did among the Gentiles that which Jesus had done among the Jews; John acknowledged that although a kindred spirit may understand the eternal meaning without argument, it is equally necessary <sup>That</sup> ~~and~~ the faithful soul obeys in the division of labor in this visible world with its very slow progress.

Our term "to acknowledge" <sup>Mald of the Evangelists</sup> (here, is not meant to be the same as signing a receipt. It took a change of mind during the writing, to discover the consequences for the writer himself!

Take Matthew's case. We are tempted, by the critics who point to his many quotations from Scripture, to see in him a lawyer who writes a marvelous brief for his client. The lawyer has the last sentence in mind when he writes the first. Such a brief <sup>we are told,</sup> is planned on one plane, and is of one mind (at least this is the theory; I do not believe in it). But Matthew begins: "Jesus was the king of the Jews" and at the end, he knows of himself: "For heaven's sake, I no longer am a Jew", and leaves.

We turn to Marc. Marc kneels at Peter's service. Peter to him is the last authority. At the end of his gospel, he

knows that he, Marc, cannot rely on Peter, as little as on any other sinful man. Marc - how often may it have pained him to hear Peter <sup>obey</sup> ~~cut out~~ <sup>in delecting</sup> a piece <sup>redounding to Peter's honor</sup> mentioning himself, - became courageous enough to transcend his place as Peter's amanuensis. In hearing from Peter, how the prince of the apostles ~~treated~~ <sup>disowned</sup> his own worth, Marc received a lesson ~~On~~ the unity of the Church. The church can be one only if only ~~one~~ <sup>It</sup> gives the name to her body. And Marc went to Alexandria, in God's spirit, not in Peter's. The change through Luke was wrought on Theophilus. Theophilus knew Luke. And the conversion of the Gentiles easily was for him the only thing in which he was interested. But the writings of Luke changed this. The original drama now was conspicuous as the eternal ~~the~~ matrix out of which Paul was only one single fruit. And so, every generation must re-enter this one genuine matrix; after Paul, all generations would have to take their food, their analogy, from the gospel of the master before they could go on record as disciples with their own "acts". All would have to listen to the Evangelist before they could translate the gospel as Paul had done. All would have to be teachers of the next generation so that the younger might do greater things still. True enough, heaven had come to earth on Pentecost (Acts I) and made ~~a~~ <sup>new</sup> earth, with Rome, instead of Jerusalem, in the center. But one man alone had been placed in the position to reveal the true heaven. He had to be upheld if the same heaven, that is God in human hearts, should come and renovate the earth

in every generation. Theophilus, then, had to ascend beyond mere baptism. He now could see himself burdened with a task of translation for his children as tremendous as the translation of the gospel wrought by Paul and Peter, for the Gentiles, in obedience to the Lord. In Luke's two books, Jesus' command to baptize the nations grew in geometrical progression. For, it revealed what would and could be achieved afterwards: Christians once baptized, could stand on each other's shoulders and grow to ever new heights. And John - John, the hermit on Patmos, came to see the earth besides the heaven in which he lived, heart to heart, with his master. For this reason, the last sentence of John speaks of the space of the universe which could not contain all the books on Jesus. The space of the universe? What was this to John who <sup>in his vision</sup> had seen the Word which was with the father, in the beginning before the universe was created. Yet this same created universe became his last word. He was ready to leave God's heaven and to enter his creature "world", for the love of God. He came to see and feel and taste this material universe of which he had no need. But God had created it and wished him to love it, too.

There is, therefore, a remarkable sequence in the writers of the four Gospels. The name of Jesus in the ancient church consisted of four parts - Jesus, Christus, God's Son, Saviour. The four Greek initials of his four names were read as

ICHTHYS, (ichthys, fish).<sup>1</sup> The four gospels reproduced this name. Matthew the sinner knew the Lord to be his personal saviour (soter), Marc knew him from the first as the Son of God, (Υἱὸς Θεοῦ), Luke saw in him the "Christ" who converted Paul to whom Jesus never had spoken; to Paul, Jesus could not be Jesus but Christ exclusively, and John, the kindred spirit, understood him as an older brother, and that is, he thought of him as "Jesus", personally.

4. Jesus
3. Christus
2. Son of God
1. Savior

were the aspects under which the four Evangelists wrote.

And now enters the law of speech into action which contradicts nature and the mere evolution of time always. This

law says: That which is most central or primary in an event shall become articulated last.<sup>2</sup>) The quality of Jesus by which he reached farthest and most visibly and perturbingly into his environment was that he saved sinners. The closest touch with his heart where he was most Jesus, his own real unique person, was for John. John gives the innermost thoughts of Jesus; Matthew's gives all the <sup>external</sup> credentials of Jesus as the Savior. Matthew could tell his experience first; John could say it last. Why? The order is strange but it repeats the experience of Jesus himself who was <sup>and "worked" towards</sup> visible only at the end <sup>of his way</sup>

1. The cryptogram ingeniously concealed and yet told the claims of the House built on the fish, in a persecuting world.

*which just the same had moved like from the start.*

as to his innermost <sup>center</sup> ~~life~~. That the world sees not us but our "surface" function first, is the experience of any living soul. We first are visible by our least central features. The outer man is known before the inner; the historical acts are known before their perpetual meaning. Only through Pentecost and Paul's experiences among the Gentiles the perpetual meaning of the "Christ" became known while Peter could stick to his own historical experience with the living Son of God. The sequence of the four gospels is necessary because this sequence reverses the order which begins with the natural individuality of Jesus. And such a reverse of nature is the necessary sequence in human articulation! Ichthys, "1. Jesus, 2. Christus, 3. God's Son, 4. Savior", is the correct natural order for describing this individuality. The linguistic, spoken, written evidence of this had to become conscious in the opposite order and sequence of 4. Savior, 3. God's Son, 2. Christ, 1. Jesus.

We now shall turn to the practical connection between the four gospels, the liberties they took with each other as in this connection the real key to "the Four Gospels" will be found. Before doing so, however, I wish to give a peripheral example of their interaction.

The example concerns the treatment of World History by them. History is rhythmical. Any historian who has not been specialized by French or English or German or Russian history, and any interested layman can see for himself that the Russian

2) Any book on logic or psychology of education mentions the fact that the first in experience is the last in mental deduction and vice versa. It seems strange that our historians never have made use of this law, in their treatment of our sources. The structure of the Three Men in the Fiery Furnace - Song is the most explicit example of this. These men <sup>being</sup> because they are in mortal danger; hence they speak of everybody else before they speak of them-

Revolution and our present World Wars follow the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars after four to five generations. A similar timespan separates Cromwell from Robespierre. And again, it is four to five generations from Cromwell back to Luther.<sup>1</sup> Why did they break out after 4 x 30 years? We may not be able to answer the question. That does not alter the fact that it is one, based on data which are too impressive to be left unconnected.

This same question irked the early church. Obviously, Jesus had come in the nick of time, that is one generation before the destruction of the Temple. For John in his old age, and the Church, after 70 A.D. Jesus' correct timing was obvious. He had taken the seed out of Zion before it was made sterile there. But before 70, this argument could not be used. Jesus scented the corruption. He interpreted the signs of the time one generation ahead. Between his crucifixion and the year 70, <sup>The</sup> ~~faith in him~~ <sup>of the Christians</sup> looked for scientific argument ~~which would support his interpretation.~~ Lenin or Trotzki could foresee the World Revolution from a ~~support his interpretation~~ logical study of Revolutions, long before 1914, while Nietzsche simply smelled the corruption. Stephen in his oral and Matthew, in his written plea to a Judean aristocracy in power tried to prove a logical rhythm for the arrival of Jesus. History had taken leaps, ever so often, Stephen said before the Council. Abraham he listed and his family down to Joseph,

1. On this list 1517, 1649, 1789, 1917 see Out of Revolution, Autobiography of Western Man.

in the first place. Then Moses. Then David and Solomon, finally the prophets and the Babylonian captivity. Don't you see, he exclaimed, that Jesus is a turning point like the captivity, like David, like Moses, like Abraham?<sup>1</sup> Stephen's speech was the first Christian Economy of the Spirit. In Matthew, this plea of Stephen grew into a law of history. Every 14 generations, he wrote, a transfer of the spirit is recorded: There are 14 generations from Abraham to David, 14 generations from David to the captivity, 14 generations from Babylon to the coming of Christ in the person of a descendant of Abraham and David. The so-called genealogy in the first chapter of Matthew is a philosophy of revolution and of the rhythm of revolutions.

Luke, too, gave a genealogy of Jesus. *Only*, this genealogy was no longer intended as the basis of his argument. The core of Stephen's great eloquent outburst had been that the spirit changes his expressions time after time. This, - and we must not forget it - simply is true. Matthew systematized it and said that it had happened in every fourteenth generation. Luke who after Paul's apostolate to the Gentiles, did not need <sup>Matthew's</sup> "law", kept the riddle of spiritual transfer in mind. But he could afford to generalize further. He gave 3 x 14 generations from Jesus to the founder of Judaism; and he extended the list to 77 generations from God's creation of Adam

---

1. Acts, VII.



to Jesus. On the other hand, he replaced the number of 14 by 22 in two instances. We see a principle of freedom in unity at work. The common question is a real question to all three, Stephen, Matthew, Luke. For those who do not recognize it as an eternal question, I may point to its secular version on which we come in a rather isolated manner when we go on asking why the Roman Empire fell when it fell. Well, it fell when the spirit had left it. Then, kingdoms fall. So our classroom question about the Roman Empire simply singles out one instance of the whole riddle of "duration" in which people always must be interested: *How long will our own order last?*')

Now Matthew suggested a regularity. Luke corrected the figures. The 3 x 14 had proved wrong. So, they were changed. But the question itself though unanswered, was left in suspense. This was achieved not by a dialectical process of Yes and No, but by the typical research process of "Yes, perhaps, but certainly in a different manner". This was a new method; the Greek mind had moved always by opposites. The new method was possible because heart and soul of the various thinkers had become one before the argument started. If conducted in a modern scientific manner, research depends on unity of mind on essentials. This is an attainment of our era. Augustine expressed this condition of scientific progress by his famous "in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas". Of this, Stephen, Matthew, Luke, have given the first perfect example of which I know.

1) When Carthage fell, her conqueror Scipio turned to his friend Polybius: "Polybius, a glorious moment; but I have a dread foreboding that some day the same doom will be pronounced upon my own country". Was it not perhaps for this wisdom of the

Stephen exclaimed: The Son of Abraham has made the very sacrifice which Abraham spared his son Isaac. A new eon has come ending the history of Abraham's seed. Matthew reflected on this exclamation and the son of Abraham became the son of God, in his gospel, and for history. Luke comprehended the period between Jesus the son of God to Adam the son of God as one time span. *He levelled the break made by Abraham.* Luke created the Christian era. In our textbooks, this distinction between Christianity and antiquity is ascribed to a much later date (533 A.D.)<sup>1</sup> But the actual accomplishment of a new era was the cooperative effort of Stephen, Matthew, and Luke. And in Luke's third chapter, the new frame of reference, one era before, one after Christ, is clearly stated.

And now "the four Gospels" have to be shown to be one, even in a literary sense. "The four gospels", we insist, are the lips through which the heart of "Ichthys" has spoken through the ages. We must read them all. Why we must read them all, we have tried to evince by recognizing the four layers of nearness to their Master which they represent. The Master obviously lives in all of them at a different degree of distance. As there are shortsighted and farsighted people, friend and foe, so a man is not represented fully at any one of the four distances. Jesus claimed to be the Savior of sinners, the fulfiller of ritual, the Redeemer of merely human

---

1. See The Christian Future, p.

language, the son of Joseph of Nazareth; we can hear and understand these claims only on the four different wave lengths of the saved sinner, the converted ritualistic zealot, the emancipated teacher, the born and yet appointed friend.

Now we must try to show that the Evangelists knew of their unity, too. We know, of course, that they read each other. But we cannot separate from this fact the question why, then, one after another wrote his gospel in addition. Did they wish to replace one by the other? If so, why did the Church keep all four? Why could the Church not admit any of the later gospels?

### 6. End begets Beginning.

Let us first use a simile to explain the situation.

John the Evangelist was asked in dotage why his sermon was so short that he only would say: "Children, keep each other at heart". He gave the famous answer: "For two reasons: it is enough and the Lord has said so". The four gospels suffice since every one of the four claims made by Ichthys, has become "lips" in one man's dramatic change of mind. The Lord has made these four claims, no more. And he has said so. Let us read the gospels once more: Do they give evidence of mutual dependence beyond the "material" used? Yes, they do. They beget each other. Every gospel begins exactly at the point to which the previous gospel has progressed on its tortuous path. The last word of the one is the overture and sets the

tone for the next.<sup>1</sup> "The last word" is not meant in a literal or pedantic sense; by it, we understand the last step of thought, reached in the dramatic progress.

If this is so, then the gospels continue each other, beginning to think and to speak where the former evangelist had ended, and turning his final word into an opening of a new drama. Matthew's last word is that Jesus has become the Son of God, in the sense of the Trinity. Marc begins: The Son of God (not; the Son of David, as Matthew). Marc ends with the "Mission of the ministers of the word." Fittingly, the missionary Luke begins with "the ministers of the word". Luke, ~~ends~~ *and moreover,* ends in Acts, with a long statement: That the Jews have ears and do not hear and have eyes but do not see, but "the Gentiles shall hear".

Majestically, John breaks in at exactly this last word of Acts: "Indeed, the darkness has not seen the light, the world has not seen it, but his own have beheld his glory and we have seen him". Also, Luke ends with the power of the gospel; John begins with the Word's Power.

This is not an accident, this connection of ends and beginnings. Laboriously, every gospel works itself up to its climax. Easily, the mantle of the gospel writer then falls on the man who is prepared best to take over at this very point:

---

1. Luke's two books are treated here as one work. For this, the reasons have been given in the text before.

	<u>Beginning</u>	<u>End</u>
Matthew	Son of David	Son of God
Marc	Son of God	
Marc	<u>End:</u> Ministers of the Word	Luke <u>Beginning</u> of his gospel Ministers of his Word
Luke	<u>End of Acts:</u> The Jews have no ears and no eyes; the Gentiles shall hear	John <u>Beginning</u> The world, the darkness has not seen; His own have beheld his glory

### S u r v e y

1. Matthew	<u>Beginning:</u>	Son of David and Abraham
2. Matthew	<u>End:</u>	The Son of God (baptize in the name of the Father and the Son and the Spirit)
Marc	<u>Beginning:</u>	The Son of God
3. Marc	<u>End:</u>	The Ministers of the Word
Luke	<u>Beginning:</u>	The Ministers of the Word
4a. Luke	<u>End:</u>	Gospel Fullness of praise Acts Fullness of speech
John	<u>Beginning:</u>	In the Beginning was the Word
4b. Luke Acts	<u>End:</u>	The Jews have no eyes and no ears. The Gentiles shall hear.
John	<u>Beginning:</u>	The World has not seen the light. His own people gave him no welcome. We have beheld his glory
5. John	<u>End:</u>	This man Jesus in the space of the Universe, <i>was redeemed as god's World.</i>
Matthew	<u>Beginning:</u>	Jesus (Christ, Son of David, son of Abraham)

This list scanty as it is should be read as the scenario of four dramatic actions.

Scene One: Matthew, the tax collector, digs beneath the figures and concepts of his accounts and discovers the full power which human words may acquire when they are spoken on a man's way to his death, *as his seed.*

Scene Two: Peter, the boorish fisherman is placed in the center of the last Western sky-world, in Rome with The God-Man Caesar, the astrology of her temples, the hieroglyphs; *and here he* proclaims the true temple, the Word, and the true hieroglyphs of this temple, the ministers of the Word. \*

Scene Three: Luke the Greek physician, versed in the art of healing, is placed in the Jewish medium of No to the physical world and of fear of contamination with physical idols, and places this No between the natural law of Jews as well as Gentiles, on the one side, and the new creative Yes of the Christian.

Scene Four: John, the prophet of Revelation, comes into the Greek cosmos, and frees their art and poetry by making God's poetry his theme. He asks how does God write a poem?

When we now implement this scenario, we shall unravel the scenes by beginning with John. For, his case is the easiest for us moderns to understand. The reason is that we understand poetry best, better than science or prayer or ritual. *We have idolized art; hence we know its law.*

4. John's Gospel has always been described as hellenizing, or hellenistic. However, this very fact made the gospel suspect. Why should Luke, the Greek be less hellenistic than John of Galilee? But this is necessary as soon as we treat speech as a proceeding from *'somewhere'* to *'somewhere'*. John was called into the Greek and Luke into the Jewish world of mind;

Peter was called into the Roman sky-world and later his amanuensis, Marc, even went to the cradle of all sky-worlds, to Egypt. Matthew the ill-mannered, discovered the price to be paid for ritual.

Because speech moves, John did not write a hellenistic gospel. Instead, he redeemed the Greek genius of poetry. The Greeks worshipped the Logos. They talked and talked to a degree of drunkenness. Rhetorics, logic, philosophy, theatres, were their daily bread; the arts were their vice, their virtue, their life, their religion.

Whatever their poetry, their art of making, touched with its magic wand, was transformed like the stones which formed the walls of Thebes under the music of Orpheus. We followed Homer's song of Achilles' wrath until we wept over Hektor, his enemy. And we read the story of "The Man", Odysseus, until we believed Homer, that it was, after all, and really, a "Penelopeia".

Plato had been frightened by this genius of his people. He had turned against poetry and proposed to abolish Homer. But Prohibition never works. The salvation of the Greek *eraid*, "plane", as the greatest Greek orator, John Goldenmouth, called this Odyssey of genius, the salvation had to come from the Jews. The Jews had voided the arts, and had sung their psalms and prophecies not as poetry but as responses. Accordingly, John, in the first and last Christian prophecy, in Revelation, had received his vision on Patmos, lying on the ground as one

dead. And for this very reason, John the Evangelist, not Plato, was in a position to emancipate the Greek mind.

How was it done? Not man or wife, not Greek or Trojan became his great argument. Instead he sang that very power which makes man able to write poetry, man as God's poem. This is the meaning of The Word which became flesh. In the fourth gospel the inner poetry of the man himself who writes or speaks, albeit poetry what he says, was revealed. John could do it because he was immune against morbus poeticus which had seared Plato.

2. Luke, as a Greek and as a physician, was immune against the morbus propheticus, the Jewish negation of the world's successes. God was One, One only, the Jews maintained in the face of a pluralistic, power seeking, polytheistic chaos. Israel is so right in this respect - just as Greek genius is right, and Plato wrong to forbid it, - that even Jesus could not overcome their horror of any final realization. They crucified him because God had to remain in the future. It took the Greek Luke to make evident the limitations of their "No". As a doctor of the body, Luke knew of the healing powers of poison, ~~too~~, of surgery, of many seemingly negative processes. Luke could admit that no man is superior; <sup>or outside The Body politic.</sup> ~~and No body,~~ therefore, can claim to be a doctor of society's ills. God alone "is". But if man were God's drug, blood plasma, vitamin, serum, to be injected into the system? A man of God enters the arteries of society and may be devoured there as Jesus was.



Yet, will he purify and cure it, as the Christ if he knew what he did. In this case, God's Oneness as upheld by the prophets is not jettisoned. And this, indeed is Luke's gospel in the gospel and in acts. Jesus has instituted this process by which men sacrifice themselves for their enemies, for a society which reacts violently against them. And he who opened men's eyes to this destiny of any child or man of being "injected into the bloodstream of society", is the anointed, the "Christ" whom all others can but follow.

Very well do I know that the front of Luke towards a salvation of the Jews is not even considered a remote possibility by the majority of the critics. Therefore, some technical points may be mentioned which should suffice to make his case at least a non liquet, from the purely external evidence. Luke probably wrote in Kaisareia in Asia Minor. Strong Jewish elements in such a church are no wanton premise. He was the first to write a book in the strict sense that this book could be used for readings at the Services in Church as parallel readings to the Old Testament. His constant change of the "he says" in Mark, to a cultivated style of "he said", has often been noted. This was needed when the perikope should have the dignity of being read out loud.

Luke respected the Jewish name of their religious center. For, he uses the name Jerusalem thirty times, and in 26 of these 30 places, the form is the Hebrew form Jerusalem, not the Greek form Hierosolyma. All the other gospels do the

opposite. Somebody who spoke to Jews, would be as considerate as Luke and spare the ears of his listeners. Quite recently, it has been held that his style is filled with Hebraisms, and that he quotes the Old Testament not from the Greek but from the Hebrew original text.<sup>1</sup>

The point on which Israel was hardest of hearing, and not by accident but because of her most profound faith, was that God could be known to have said "Yes" to a Man's religious mandate. God was always keeping man away from idolatry, away from the temptation to erect heaven on earth already. We have mentioned, in the letter on Hitler and Israel, the fact that the Gentiles deified a man with great ease. To show Luke's dilemma, I now quote the terrible hymn to the deified Demetrios which a Greek, Hermokles, had composed for the general Demetrios:

"He is the Sun to love you.  
Hail, offspring of Poseidon, powerful God.  
The other gods have no ears though mighty they  
are not, or they will not hear us wail:  
Thee our eye beholdeth.  
Not wood, not stone, but living, breathing, real.

Thee our prayer unfoldeth.  
First give us peace. Give, dearest, for thou  
canst  
Thou art Lord and Master.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Albert C. Clark, The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford 1933 p. XXIII. Clark thinks that this proves Luke to have been a Jew himself. To me, this is not conclusive. But of course, it would prove the significance which we ascribe to Luke, even better. The old 2d century preface to the gospel contradicts it, however.
  2. Quoted from the translation in the Oxford book of Greek verse, by J. A. Symons.

Luke must have been thoroughly familiar with this kind of blasphemy in politics. Caesar's worship was strictly in line with this poem. Luke abhorred it as much as his Jewish friends. How could he convince them that the delicate line between mortal men and the Creator of Heaven and Earth, was not destroyed by the new belief in God's Son Incarnate?

It could only be done in the manner in which Paul did it in his preaching. First, man must allow God to speak his "NO", by his willingness to suffer. Only after God, as a burning fire, has taken from man, as mortal man, all the dross and the transient attributes, can the complete affirmation, the unconditional surrender to "Yes" be admitted. The naive mind says: "I should be God"; "I should be the messiah"; "I should be the lawgiver". God breaks this will. But the man who has not his own will, and does not his own will, and pays the penalties for the unavoidable admixture of self will in his life, he is "Yes."<sup>1</sup>

Following this traverse over the narrow mountain ridge between too much self-confidence and too little, Luke alone has certain reports on Jesus which center around this ~~red~~ relation between the naive first Yes, the divine No, the creative and incarnating and history making second Yes. His alone is the story that Jesus saw a man working on the Sabbath. He approached him and said: "Man, if you know what you are doing, you are

---

1. II. Corinthians, 1, chapter 4 ff., 17 ff.

blessed. If not, you are cursed and a breaker of the law."  
(After VI, 10).

Solely, in Luke, is the cross-examination of Jesus so carefully stated that Jesus himself never says: "I am the Messiah". Marc allowed Jesus to say (14, 61) "I am the Messiah". Luke knew Marc's book. Therefore, his more extensive report may indicate that he respected the scandal given by Marc's rather indifferent admission that Jesus had called himself the son of the living God. Egyptians or Greeks or Romans could believe in the apotheosis of mortal men by their own proclamation. But Israel with her awe of the Oneness of God, could not admit that any man could give himself his own rank. Luke conceded this point: They, the Jews, not Jesus, speak the decisive words. Only in this manner, can a man become the Word said by God that he himself does not make any of his own mortal statements into divine truth.<sup>1</sup> For Luke, the perpetual concurrence between the Father's power to make all the world around Jesus act and speak as they did, and the Son's own acts and saying, is the real proof that here God said a full "Yes" to the Son. Since the Son forwent power for faith, forewent the opportunity of making suffer for suffering himself, he exhibited his proper credentials. He who denies himself, thereby plays Israel's eternal role of the admonisher, himself to himself. In this manner, by accepting

---

1. This is the argument also used by the letter to the Hebrews.

*See this point: Jesus own weakness in Gethsemane and upon the cross, was vividly debated in the first century; see von Hartmann, Zwei dogmatische Korrekturen im Hebräerbrief, Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften 1929, 3562-73.*

defeat, Christianity built the truth of the Old Testament into itself. If the prophets had heard the command: say No to the idols, why should it be blasphemy now to say: "I hear the command to say No to our will and Yes to the step beyond this No?" And so Luke's point from the beginning is that with God nothing is impossible (I, 37). And as Jesus dies for his enemies so his enemies must reveal him in his true mission. By this interaction alone does the human will become discernible from God's will. And only after this can the change of mind occur; in the fact that the hated bringer of the gospel accepts the penalty from the hands of the receivers, the bringer's will is purified from his mere self. This changes the mind of the persecutors. This, then, is Luke's gospel.

Since I write as the listener to language, my argument is mainly to those who are not at all interested in theology properly speaking and who, therefore, do not first wish to hear about all the highly learned arguments inside theology about Luke. However, it is only fair to add for those who are versed in these critical investigations, that Luke did not cover the whole field of Jewish tradition. We shall see this when we turn to Matthew. The strictly historical or naturalistic study of the gospels has oversimplified the battlefronts on which the cross was erected. We shall see that Greek and Jew were two out of four fronts while "Gentile" and "Jew", in the New Testament often are considered to be an exhaustive dichotomy.

The listener to language finds that Luke attacks a weak point in himself. The greatest piety, the highest type of religion, in Jesus days, was found with the righteous of Israel. Not their inferiority but their rigor and excellency imposed on the priests of Jerusalem the duty to condemn Jesus. It was blasphemy to call oneself God and to proclaim one's seat at the right hand of God. It is not an arbitrary resistance offered by the Jews but a highly respectable one which all the good people of our own days consider to be praiseworthy again. Luke's argument, then, is an eternal argument and fights an eternal position of great merits. But Israel was a combination of prophetic purity and of Hebrew solidarity. Israel is a chosen race, chosen as well as race. Luke dealt with the prophetic aspect of Israel only. We shall see that the Hebrew side had to be dealt with by someone very different.

\* \* \*

This must suffice for gospel four and gospel three: morbus Graecus and morbus Propheticus; both found their antidote.

John the Hebrew prophet is able to redeem Greek poetry, and Luke the Greek doctor, can re-fertilize Israel's stubborn Negations: But is there a similar exchange of polarities, a similar transfer of energy between Matthew and Marc, on the one side, and their respective public, on the other? I think it is. The reader will do well to look back upon our former chapters which penetrated before Jews and Greeks likewise. We found temples and hieroglyphs, and rituals and tattoos organizing the human race. Now, the first two gospels achieve for

Egypt and for tribal ritual the same emancipation which John achieves by "unspelling" poetry and Luke by healing the healing "No" of psalms. Since we today are infinitely less familiar with the Sky World and its hieroglyphs or the ritual of burial and sacrifice in the tribes, their cure demands a somewhat more laborious exposition. We turn to Marc's gospel, Number two, and we remember the hieroglyphs painted on the walls of the temples which brought heaven to earth. The Emperor Henry II, a saint of the Church (1002-1024 A.D.), wore as his mantle of coronation a cloth on which the sun, the moon, the stars of the firmament were woven. Because the emperor was the cosmocrator; he was lifted into the hub of the wheel to unite night and day, to reconcile the North where the sun never shines, to the south to which the polar stars of midnight never move. The emperor, the Son of Heaven as he was called in China, was the prime mover of a reconciled, a non-panicky, non-chaotic heaven and earth. His knowledge and compliance with the stars shielded the people from the panic of the catastrophes. When the people of our days hold a President of the United States responsible for a world-wide depression, they follow in the foot-steps of all ancient nations who believed that the eternal cycles could be perfected by a human lifted into the hub of the wheel. The incense burned before the emperor's statue was a means to enliven his nostrils so that he might smell the harmony and beauty of the universe. He who did not burn incense, did not say H~~el~~

Hitler, destroyed the Skyworld. He must die.

Against this daily situation, the gospel of <sup>M</sup>arc on the true Son of God ~~was~~ written. It <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ written in a world which for the sake of security pretended that the emperor was the heart of its world, was the Son of God, and which upheld this with spells, calendars, sacrifices, symbols, temples, hieroglyphs. It <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ written by men who denied the emperor's claim, and who, therefore, plunged those for whom they wrote the gospel, in imminent danger of death for high treason against the welfare of the empire.

They preached in the midst of an unchallenged Sky-world, with "the abomination of Desolation,"<sup>1</sup> a king's statue, standing in the center of a spellbound universe, "standing where it ought not", in the center of the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem. This speech which I am quoting here from Marc, is given in Matthew first. And we would have no right to ascribe to Marc any special interest in it. Matthew, being the first, was very catholic in his materials, certainly more catholic than the shorter Marc. And yet, I am going to quote some famous sentences from this speech of Jesus and I am going to affirm that for Peter, this speech had greater significance than for any other apostle. Two reasons can I give for justification <sup>thesis</sup> of this attitude which otherwise would be arbitrary. First, the critics always have acknowledged that Marc is

---

1. Marc 13, 14.



clearer as to the eschatological picture than Luke or Matthew. Weymouth-Robertson remark: "Certain features of the discourse stand out most clearly in Marc's record of it." And, "the clearest outline of this eschatological discourse is in Marc."<sup>1</sup>

Marc, in other words, has taken great pains with this speech. The second and weightier reason is this. This speech on the signs of the sky world is the only speech which Marc gives in full. All other speeches were curtailed by him or omitted. Now, <sup>if</sup> one speech out of many <sup>in Matthew's</sup> given completely, within the whole book of Marc, <sup>it</sup> thereby is placed in the center of attention.

In this speech which the reader may look up for himself, the astrological sky world is described: "The Sun will be darkened and the moon will not shed the light, the stars will be seen falling from heaven and the forces which are in the heavens will be disordered." As these disorders were prevented to happen by the imperial, <sup>or Pharaonic</sup> spells of the Sky world, Jesus' prophecy of the end of their power, is meant literally. Our modern commentators as true Gilbert Murrays, however, shake their heads sadly:<sup>2</sup> "The details of this description are of course not to be taken literally. They are the attempt of poetic imagery to realize what it means that God should intervene in human history." But, the modern fails to ask, how

- 
1. Weymouth-Robertson, The New Testament, 5, ed. p. 62 and p. 118.
  2. Weymouth-Robertson, p. 119.

WGEKX b J J 9 f  
 "SACRAGE the bones" → FG

could God intervene as long as the sky world was in power? Marc was concerned with the cure from the morbus Egyptiacus, not with poetry. What, then, was his cure? It was simple. It was dangerous. It was: fellowship. Men had to take the place of the dead stars in the firmament. Jesus had to take the place of the Sun. Marc's whole gospel tries to show that Jesus has lived the one perfect solar year of a human sun, a human heart. But the people, nobody, not even one of his disciples, have recognized the presence of the good life. But he has trusted them nevertheless. He has called them when they did not understand, and they have been in fellowship with him. We know already that Peter declines all merits in the case. The disciples during the perfect and acceptable year of the Lord, were in suspense. In III, 12, he forbade them to say who he was. In IV, 1, they are told: for you the open truth, for the crowds the parables. In 8, 31 "They were told for the first Time..." In 9, 9 "He strictly forbade them to tell anyone what they had seen until after the son of Man had risen from the dead". In 10, 38, they are told: "You know not what you are asking". In 10, 32, "they were awe-struck and those who followed him did so in fear". All the time, the only link between them and the Lord is suspense and expectation on their part.

Around this discrepancy of Jesus' time and their time the whole gospel is built. For, Jesus is already performing. The time is fulfilled. He walks on earth as the sun. But the

disciples ask him: "Tell us when these things will be (XIII, 4)".

Why is Marc filled with this discrepancy between Jesus who lives the perfect year and the fellowship who expect it in some mysterious future? Why does the very last chapter of Marc abound in statements of the disbelief of the disciples such as "Simon, are you asleep?" "They could not believe it", "They were afraid". "They did not believe them either". "He upbraided them for their unbelief and obstinacy"?

In fact the critics have thought that Marc's gospel must be mutilated or incomplete because it ends so abruptly and on a note of despair. Now, we are already warned against this strange suspiciousness of reason against the ends and the beginnings of creative literature. Tristram Shandy certainly would not pass muster with them, for its incredible first page. If a belated fellowship, however, is the center of Marc's gospel, we may read its end with perfect understanding. This "spurious" ending says: "Go the world over and proclaim the gospel to all mankind. And signs shall attend those who believe". "So the Lord Jesus having thus spoken.. sat down at the right hand of God. And they went out and preached everywhere the Lord working with them and confirming the word by the signs which accompanied it".

The reader now will be thoroughly befuddled and shake his head. That John sings "The Word" where Homer had sung "The Man", that Luke says "Christ now" where the Jews only had heard "Not Yet Christ", a humanistically educated reader, I trust

will have no trouble to relate. But that Jesus destroyed the hieroglyphs of the skyworld and the astral calendars of the Sun God Emperor, the Sol Invictus, of the empires, seems so far fetched because our own world seems so superior to "signs." If the modern mind wishes to have an analogy, it is the social cycle of business, the power and the worship of power which may be used as analogy. The modern belief in medicine, machines, in a hugely endowed institution, is of a similar nature as the sun cult of antiquity. The terms "influence", "influential", "power", and "conjuncture", "cycle" and "depression", are our astronomical terms. They are now used for social conditions, not for cosmic occurrences. The analogy may be valuable, just the same, to show that we too are accustomed to accept such "constellations" patiently like rain and sunshine. This means that we, too, have some hieroglyphs which confine us as sacred spells. However, this may be with us; <sup>in any case,</sup> the order of the ancient sky-world was reversed by the one last sentence of Marc that God confirmed the words of the preachers by the signs which accompanied them. In the sky-world, the word of the Son of the Sky took effect without standing the test of the real world. The Gods appeared ex machina, by machine; the rain or the blood were produced by priests who acted the Jupiter or the Isis. The hieroglyphs were bound to come true by black magic if the white magic forsook them.

The Christian ministers of the word replaced this riskless magic by the highly risky belief in the continuum of a word

spoken from the bottom of the heart because it would provoke all the good spirits in the hearers in an unpredictable degree and manner. Had not Jesus himself "yielded the spirit" (15, 37) throwing himself into a heartless world full of faith that a free response would answer his call, that a fruit would come out of the seed of his life? *as such, the cosmos, precisely this, the pagans had tried to believe. He who* The world has no heart! ~~He who~~ does not recognize the fields of force created by the spell of sacred names, who does not recognize that chaos and panic are exercised by venerable names, will be reluctant to acknowledge the process by which these fields of force collapsed under the shock of the new faith. The catholic church replaced the sorcery and spell of the temples not by ignoring them but by replacing astrology through faith in the spirit of fellowship. The difference between a son of heaven, placed in the center of the universe commanding the stars and winds as the emperor of China did till 1911, and the Son of God, lies in this one difference. The emperor of China does not risk his own life, in proclaiming the New Year. Is this the whole difference? It is indeed. We who buy patent medicines, big names, psychologically sold to us, have difficulties in distinguishing between white and black magic. We either fall victim to advertising or we do not believe in any power of the Word. Peter believed that Jesus had created a new aeon by his faith in fellowship. The twelve stars which bowed to Joseph in his dream, Jesus had replaced by the twelve apostles whose feet he washed and who did not respond before fifty

days after his death. But he called them, in his unlimited faith in a future free response on their part. And as soon as the first response came in complete freedom when they were alone, a new heart burst upon the dead world. The real heaven and the real earth now became visible, "The whole world over", that is wherever a man was willing to risk his life for those who resisted him. Jesus became the heart of a living universe by his faith in a free response. "This first creation of God's World" as Peter calls it, was reclaimed from the sky world by faith in the continuum of all speech. These speakers could hold each other by their hands and transmit the new power of one common spirit. They spoke in the name of the only one who had started this faith in free response when nobody had it. His day had gone by. But in the night which he left behind him, the people could become bright stars, waiting for the full light of another day. That we are not amiss in our interpretation, could be proved most directly from the second letter of Peter. Here, the heavens - id est the sky world - are all ablaze. They will be dissolved. A new heaven and a new earth will come, without astrology, "until day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts. (Peter, second letter II, 19). This is eloquent. For the sky world of Egypt had as its center the simultaneous appearance of the brightest star of the night and of the sun, on July 19. This was New Year's Day as night and day, north and south, seemed to be reconciled at this one moment. In Peter's words, this was to be replaced by the

dawn in the hearts of men, the new heaven. But, alas, I shrink from making use of this letter because this may do harm to my thesis since the critics are very severe about this letter and say that it cannot be Peter's.

It, therefore, must suffice to bring into focus the actual front on which the Church fought. Peter and the papacy, arche-types of the powerlusting priest for many, came into existence as victors over the temple cults of antiquity.

A Jewish fisherman, Peter was on the one hand conversant with the real cosmic processes of weather, water, air and sky. On the other hand, as an Israelite, he was not polluted by astrology. Here, then, was a man preserved from contamination with ancient science but in excellent command of his five senses. This was the man picked out to dissolve the old heavens with their local calendars, to replace the hieroglyphs of Stonehenge or Memphis by the suffering of the living bodies of the martyrs. The ministers of the word became the hieroglyphs of the new temple.

For this, at least, I am allowed to quote Peter himself. His first letter no longer is denied him today. In this letter, we find him proclaiming the victory over the stones of the ancient temples. And we only will understand the sentence if we remember that these temples were covered with spells and hieroglyphs. Peter exclaims that he acts not by "gnosis", the

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

prediction of the astrologers, but by the "prognosis" of God. ~~God~~ <sup>Peter</sup> called ~~him~~ at a time when he did not know at all what he was expected to do, <sup>and</sup> before he could respond in "imitation of the One who has called" him (I, 15). And now comes the literal definition: "And yourselves, you are like living stones and be built up into a spirit-filled temple." (II, 5).<sup>1) and 2)</sup>

So much for Peter and Marc, the later bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. The Morbus Egyptiacus was cured.

4. Now, we are back to our first evangelist, to Matthew. We have little right to expect from him a similarly clear and specific front. Since he was the first to write at all, he had to report all and everything. And we found this to be true, in the case of the speech on the skyworld<sup>on</sup> which Marc elaborated. And yet, Matthew though the first is surprisingly specific. And the disease which he overcomes, is with us like the other diseases, only, this disease is so close and so near ourselves that it is more difficult and more disagreeable to discover. We get a glimpse of his character as a specific medicine against a specific disease when we read (XIX) that

- 
1. Correspondingly, the beginning of the letter to the Hebrews has to be corrected in our translations: "After partial and varied speech God has spoken through the Son, the ~~reflection~~ of God's splendor, the Hieroglyph of God's core!" It is the only occurrence of the word "character", hieroglyph, in the New Testament. 2) Ignatius, ~~however~~, writing to the Ephesians, vividly combats the temples of stone. He is so keen to replace the dead structure of the Temple that he calls the Holy Ghost the rope and the ~~cross~~ the new crane <sup>of derrick</sup> ~~plane~~ and the Christians the stones which by this crane are lifted to the altitude of the divine building.



he expects the twelve apostles not as the twelve stars but as the judges over the twelve tribes of Israel. Why did he remember this? Could it be that he felt the necessity of breaking the taboos of tribal ritual peculiarly strong?

We have seen Peter's employment, and Luke's, and John's. *because of the specific immunities. Matthew*

It would appear that he *(writing)* could not and would not be employed for *(anything)* which had to do with literature or writing. For as oral as Peter the fisherman must have been and as much as he probably detested ink, Matthew certainly was familiar with paper work and written records, only too well. Since we do not expect him to be used inside his old activities where he had used writing for superficial purposes to say the least, we may expect him to fight elsewhere.

Now, we read that he was not received in good society. And on the other hand, he begins with Jesus' place in the social register of Israel. He stresses this fact that his master belonged into the very best society, as the son of kings. And goes on to show that there were privileges connected with this social place which Jesus abandoned. "The son of kings should be scotfree" (17, 27). He should not pay customs duty nor any tax, be it capitation tax nor the half shekel tax as Jesus smilingly says (17, 27). But, Matthew goes on to say, the reverse happens. He expresses the whole meaning of Jesus' life in terms of an account: and I am sorry to grate the refined feelings of the *subsidy* reader, but he does say: He gave his life as the price for buying back many. (20, 28).

This is not a figure of speech with Matthew. Matthew understands Jesus to be the right heir of the chieftaincy who instead volunteers to become the victim at the tribe's feast. But by being the voluntary victim, he becomes the first victim in the world who can speak. Nobody had ever spoken in this role. But victims <sup>though mute</sup> were essential. The association between the ancestors and the living was based on the common meal at which the dead partook as though alive, and the whole burial and funeral rite was based on this association between the dead and the living. The spirits of the dead asked for food, and these ghosts were bloodthirsty if they were not fed, according to the faith or superstition of all tribes. We accomplish the same by high entrance fees into clubs or fraternities. We become members, in this manner. Sacrifices were the core of ritual since they alone incorporated the group and gave it a legal status as a public corporation, beyond the grave, beyond the accidents of birth and death. Sacrifice, then, was the only means of establishing order and of creating legal persons.

And to speak the proper names, to make the proper movements at these sacrifices was essential. They were that which we hold essential as table manners. To how many people of our own time, table manners are the yardstick of promotion, membership, fellowship. The table manners of antiquity were equally strict. With us, a waiter at table is not expected to join the conversation of his own accord. Even less do we

expect the roast-beef and the fish to talk. The price of a good dinner party is the complete silence kept by those who serve and by the food which is served. And my whole paragraph will be condemned by any reader of good taste because I mention the remote possibility that the roast beef might speak. And this is Matthew's whole point. The verdict 'bad taste' - how often had he heard it turned against himself and his bad company - he knew to be more murderous for a man than any other crime. Society expects us to play the rules of the game. It is inexorable if we break these etiquettes. And yet, I had to commit this break of etiquette myself if I wished to introduce Matthew at all. For herein lies his real achievement. He is the only Evangelist who tells of Jesus' escape to Egypt when Herod murdered the children of Bethlehem. The whole point of Matthew is that though Herod could not murder him, he was murdered by good society for his breach of etiquette because he insisted to give or lend speech to the victims of society. That Jesus spoke as the victim, made him impossible. Matthew scandalized the Jews. After all, they had nothing but burned offerings since Abraham did not slaughter Isaac. They were highly civilized. In Sweden it could happen still a thousand years later that a king butchered six of his sons to placate the spirits. When he turned to his seventh son, the people saved the child, became Christians and gave up human sacrifices. But <sup>Israel</sup> ~~this~~ after all, was the nation of Abraham and Moses. To this day, all Jews think that

the gospel is in bad taste. We read the word "scandal" in our texts, but bad taste would really convey better the whincing under an outrage against our taste's. The ritual of any society - and I am afraid, we lose sight of this more readily than of anything else - protects itself by this violent recoiling. It does so at all times and in all places. Matthew: "Why do your disciples transgress the tradition of the Elders by not washing their hands before meals?" The Scribes asked. "Why do you", Jesus retorted, "transgress God's command and deny your own parents something they need because it is 'consecrated'?" "You have made futile God's words for the sake of your table manners". (15, 2) "Eating with unwashed hands does not make unclean".

Against the taboo of table manners, Matthew "sins" and Jesus "sins". For, Matthew shows Jesus as the speaking victim, the meat and wine who begin to speak, in the midst of dinner. The shock administered by Matthew is wonderfully formulated by a modern critic: "The reference to eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood is impossible in an Aramaic gospel in Jerusalem in the first century; nothing could be more repugnant to Jewish ways and feelings. Words such as these would horrify Jewish residents of Jerusalem, then or now. The Jews were and still are, utterly opposed to the drinking of blood which the Law repeatedly forbade. It would be difficult to imagine a sentence less likely to have been written in a Jewish Christian circle any where at any time. No Jewish

1) "The Gospel was as much a scandal to the first century as it is to the twentieth."  
Hoskyns and David p. 261

evangelist could have recorded it."<sup>1</sup> This is an eloquent paragraph and the feeling of vomiting is probably well nigh aroused in many a reader. The humor of this passage lies in two facts: first, that the critic deals with John who in this matter simply affirms Matthew. The critic tries to refute the Jewish origin of John. And he ignores the case of Matthew, who obviously wrote for Hebrews. The second humorous fact is the modern assumption that every scandal can be avoided. The Jews stoned Stephen, killed James, jailed Peter because they were furious. The lamb, the blood, the bread, all these terms, of course, were blasphemies. But the whole history of the Church was based on this fury. Paul in Athens when he for once tried to be adaptable, was a complete failure. Matthew was abhorred and the gospel was abhorred and, be honest, is abhorred by all men of good taste, today.<sup>2</sup>

The price of all ritual is sacrifice. When we bind ourselves to a ghost of the past, a piece of paper, to a house, to a grave, we are apt to spill somebody else's blood for the purpose. And so it is to this day. This is all right if it is in our consciousness which price we pay. But Jesus created a brotherhood, the brotherhood of the silent victims, by becoming the first speaker among them. Why could he speak? Because he volunteered where before the victims had been drafted. But the Eucharist is still a scandal to a Jew. It makes him vomit, quite literally, as it would any man of etiquette. Matthew knew that the pudenda of life were real. That it was less bad taste to

1. Edgar J. Goodspeed, Journal of Biblical Literature, 1944, p.90 is the author of the paragraph quoted in the text.

speak as the victim, as bread and wine, than to do the act of condemning the Just. He was immune against the mortal disease of good society. He knew that everything has its price. And that nothing is more expensive than freedom from the taboos of good society. And so he ceased to call the first man who had spoken for the victims and as a victim, by his name in society, son of David, Son of Abraham, as he had begun in Chapter One. This taboo was broken. Matthew, in his last chapter found himself in the infinitely more exciting society of sinners who no longer were bound together by high entrance fees but by the name of the first victim who had spoken out loud. It is not impossible, by the way, that Matthew went to Ethiopia. Now, the point of this mission would be that the Ethiopians, to this day, observe the whole Jewish ceremonial as well as the New Testament liturgy. They circumcise and baptize; they observe the Sabbath as well as the Sunday. One cannot tell; but it would be in accordance with the Word of the gospel if this duplication happened because of Matthew. Because only the superstition of ritual was the disease which he fought. Manners must be; but manners are not more than manners.

Matthew by illuminating the breaking of table manners, went over primeval ground. In primeval days, the table manners had been the creative elements from which the body politic sprang. Instead of snatching food from each other - in our <sup>CCC.</sup> camps of the unemployed this beastly snatching was not rare and always indicated ~~the complete~~ <sup>loss</sup> ~~break~~ of camp morale - like the animals, the introduction of common meals created a new peace of mind. Around

the meal for the dead or perhaps more exactly with their dead, the new incorporation took place. Food was placed between the living and the dead, and both partook of it, in one spirit and in one name. Hence, the sacrificial meals were the first constitutions of mankind. Here it was that the community was enacted because the stomach's enlightened "self"-interest, was forgotten when the best pieces were reserved for the dead and later, the gods. Permanency eclipsed the interests of the living generation. The accidents of birth and of being alive, were overshadowed by the eternity of the dead. In the cooling shadow of this permanency and eternal order, peaceful arrangements were made between friend and foe; hospitality, the right of the enemy to eat with us, was introduced and became possible because ritual showed man his place in the succession of endless times. Here, people did not eat like the animals but they toasted each other by their full name. The salutation at meals is primeval. Man greeted each other and thought of each other at meals as "convivials," <sup>id est</sup> as co-livers, as the other fellow's life counted more in one's own eyes, than the "self," now.

To these primeval foundations of society Matthew takes us back. John spoke to peoples who knew the arts and sciences. Luke spoke to the greatest religionists and puritans of the ancient world. Mark spoke to the civilized inhabitants of the temple state. But Matthew penetrated, by his "bad taste," to the most archaic layer of all society, to the tribal layer of ritual. Hence, Matthew gave a version of the gospel which had

to become the most universal and the most fundamental feature of the new Way of Life. The Mass and the Eucharist, the inner core of all divine services is written up in Matthew.

Since he made it clear, that Christ bought, by his sacrifice, the salvation of the sacrificers, it was now written that the victim of every meal, that bread and wine, spoke to the dining communion and invited them to shift with their master to the other side of the counter, so to speak, to the side of the victim. In Mass, every member is invited to be sacrificed or to be ready to be sacrificed for the salvation and the renovation of the world. In Mass, the first victim, invites the others, the partakers, to a service in which they themselves are the offerings. In the dullness of the average mind, this fact rarely makes a dent. People have degraded the divine service to a church parade or a social gathering. But the church was built on the faith that from now on, no divine service was permitted unless the people considered themselves as the sacrifice offered. The whole expression of a Body of Christ, with the head in Heaven, meant exactly this, that we who would crucify the Lord every day, in our rage and envy and indifference, now, with our eyes opened once for what we have done and are doing, declare solemnly: We now, together with our head, step on the side of the silent victims and offer us to our Maker so that he can remake it as he pleases. How else could ever a new inspiration befall us a people unless we offer ourselves as the body for this inspiration? Time and again, man has to be ripped open by the ploughshare of suffering and open himself like a dry and dessicated earth to dew and rain. And



ever since one man did this manifestly all alone and by himself, his congregations relieve the members of the total pressure of absolute loneliness. In every generation, the group which may be remodeled, may increase, until the whole of mankind will be allowed to fall silent and to cleanse themselves from the chatter and clatter of the day, and to listen to the spirit, simultaneously.

When the founder of the first Christian University in Japan died, he left a note to his favorite pupil: "I have reason to believe that you will be my successor. May I caution you against some weaknesses which you will have to combat in the exercise of your new office." And he went on to list them. In the excitement of the hour, this note as all other papers he left, were read by all the people present at his death. Feeling humiliated, Mr. Kanamori fled the house, denied the Christian faith, and became a popular lecturer for the next thirty years. But when his wife with whom he led a model life, died, he could not stand his loneliness. He returned to the old place, made a public apology, and preached over the text that we shall be a living offering. "A living offering it must be. This is what I did not understand. As the bullocks were brought to the altar formerly, and might break away and hurt the people in the neighborhood, so I did not accept my opportunity, my opportunity of living down this humiliation."

And in the Japanese celebration of the Lord's Supper, this overwhelming experience of a living sacrifice colored the ritual. The dagger used in the solemn ceremony of formal suicide so popular among Samurai was brought in wrapped in a white sheet of

paper which had to be folded in a certain manner. The whiteness of the paper alluded to the sacrifice of life that was to take place. From this worldly model, the form of wrapping in white paper was taken over and the bread at communion offered to the communicants in such a wrapping. The meaning of the sacrifice and of offering is thereby translated into Japanese in as striking a manner, I daresay, as it is in Matthew's gospel translated from the Old into the New Testament.

Matthew, the most drastic, the least mannered, also is the most elementary evangelist. Through him, we have received the ritual in writing. Our era would otherwise have been without any dress for its nakedness. It is very nice to leave obsolete cloth behind you, but our era needed dress, some dress, just the same. Now we received the power of ritual free from superstition or myth or magic. Everybody can understand Matthew, child and genius, warrior and farmer, unless his heart is alien to self-sacrifice. The minds which scorn the sacraments as myth or obsolete, never fail to frighten me by their childishness. What an ignorant and uneducated heart they must have; how the gristmill of their brain must have crushed all serious experience of life and of their own deepest hopes. Usually, these same people expect to be adored by their family, read by the public, paid by their endowed institution. How can they expect it unless man's nature is fulfilled by his entering the ranks of the offerings? It is our highest nature that we should be offerings. *•Eurygy is only another name for almighty god's tabernacles." 1)*

The victim made eloquent, the world heart created by responses,

1) This statement is made by Father Smith in Bruce Marshall's "The World, The Flesh and Father Smith", Boston, Houghton, Mifflin 1945.

the No of God turned into an intermediary medicine of suffering on the road to a new incarnation, the human soul God's newest poem, these were the four glad tidings. The blind alleys of ritual, temple cult, Israel, Greece, opened up to each other. And these four men succeeded because they were immune <sup>to</sup> the specific disease of speech which their tidings deluged. This is the reason why it is faulty to call John hellenistic, Marc Egyptian, Matthew Judaizing, Luke Paulinian. The restoration of free speech by the gospels proceeded by a matching of opposites. <sup>Neither does the</sup> Not prophetic John writes <sup>nor does the</sup> for the Jews, and learned Luke <sup>write</sup> for the Greeks. The fisherman Peter writes for the scientific world. And not a man of good taste and good standing matches the Old Testament, by his first gospel, but the in no way venerable publican.

### 8 The Cross of Grammar.

Once we keep in mind the specific disease cured by each gospel, their literary form and style immediately appear to be impeccable. All, <sup>not one of the true evangelists</sup> in the eyes of the critics had ~~not~~ the right ending. All, when read as medicine, proved as right at the end as in their beginnings. They are impossible as sources for natural history. They are sound as wells of speech. Now, we experienced something similar with the ends and beginnings of Odyssey and Iliad. <sup>The critics destroyed the ends as we read them now.</sup> And how else could it be? What is <sup>the</sup> end and <sup>the</sup> beginning of speech? The beginnings of a human breath disclose the time and place of this particular act of the spirit. End and beginning bring an inspiration down to earth. End and beginning of any book declare whether it is true or not. But this truth is a threefold truth. A word may be true as to content;

it may be true enough to be verified in its own author's <sup>actions;</sup> finally,  
it may be so true that it compels the next speaker to respond  
and to go on speaking. Shakespeare compelled Milton to swerve  
out of the path of poetry since his speech was so perfect that  
Milton complained.<sup>1)</sup> Of the truth of the facts told in the gospel,  
the Church has lived. On the truth of the men who said it, in  
their own lives, the Christian world has lived. These two as-  
pects of the truth have been effective for a long time. My mind  
as I have explained before (p. 20) is concerned with the third  
aspect of all truth, its forcefulness in begetting response, in changing  
language.  
This third truth is a question of the power of style. And this  
truth about the four gospels, I have proved to my own mind's  
satisfaction and I hope to the greatest skeptics' satisfaction:  
The gospels were true enough to compel the next speaker to go  
on speaking above and beyond the last word of the last speaker.  
Each one had to step in where the last speaker left off. They  
were imparting the concrete time and scene of their speech so  
vividly to each other that they touched each other off, to the  
next move. They sing, over forty years perhaps, one gospel, each  
in his own key, on his specific wave-length, according to his  
lights, in handing the joyful and arduous task over to the better  
man, one after another. In this act, then, the "four gospels"  
become a continuation of Jesus' life through the minds which  
were made over by their office of Evangelists. They were created  
into the lips of the Word.

Matthew, by the irresistible call of his Savior writes him-  
self out of the City of Man within which he had been the publican,

<sup>1)</sup> "On Shakespeare", 1630.

into the Church. He is precipitated or projected into a new Eon, by the one word: Come!

Marc is inside this church and by his relation to Peter, he is protected from outside pressure. Peter's vehement subjective emotions, Peter's task absorb his helper, but Marc has a roof over his head, the roof of fellowship; he does not have to change allegiance.

Luke narrates. His is the documented story of the past. Having a student before him, he ~~transmits~~ <sup>for transmitting</sup> as the cable (the glories of the first two generations, ~~for~~ <sup>+</sup> the later born so that ~~not~~ <sup>then</sup> ~~less~~ ~~and~~ ~~at~~ ~~least~~ four generations now are in communion, from Jesus to the Church of Theophilus' children.

John is outside this cycle of command, fellowship, history. He is at the source, in the eternal beginning. By this one word: "In the Beginning," John renders Jesus the decisive service, which takes the event of his death out of antiquity. In antiquity, Jesus' death could only have met the treatment by ritual, by calendar, by poetry, by Israel. In the eyes of a friend, in Greece, to take the poetical world first, what would have been Jesus' fate, at best? The friend John would have mourned the friend, as Homer mourned Achilleus, in an immortal poem, in a "Kriton" or "Apologia" by a Plato, perhaps. In Israel, death would have refuted Jesus' enterprise as a failure. God, in Israel's eyes had said No to the crucified Messiah. In Egypt, Jesus would have had the stars against him; a better Horo-scope, a new cycle with another Christ would have to be waited for. In tribal ritual, Jesus would have become the hero of a myth. Christianity would

have become one more tribe, with his disciples celebrating Easter, and with his myth enacted annually, for his little clan. John's gospel blocked this relapse into ritual, skyworld's cycles, poetry, and Jewish Negation. Jesus was not an end, his death was not an end. Matthew, Marc, Luke had told already how one free man had mastered the unending chains of these cycles and had started a new life outside the ancient city of man, in One Church all over the world. John sealed the event of a new era, beyond tribe, temple, poetry, Israel; the new era would be open instead of cyclical because the four streams of speech were now reunited and could gush forth in eternal originality as on creation's first day; the unending repetition of cycles was broken if the cross in which these streams of speech met, was held forth as the beginning of progress. Our era defies cycles. Of course, it is tempted by them; at this very moment Western Man has been nearly dragged down to eternal recurrence, to Spengler's fatalism. It must wake up again to the cross of grammar with the help of the grammar of the cross. John placed Man's power to create speech before any of his particular historical performances: "In the beginning was the Word--Tribe, Egypt, Homer, Israel, were man's creations. Because everlasting man is the listener and the speaker. Hence man is superior to any one of his previous rituals of speech. "How can Christ be under fate!" Augustine exclaimed, "since fatum means the words which have been said before, and Christ is the Word which is said Now." God has made man in his image to speak as an eternal beginning and Jesus had remained free to the bitter end.

Our era is not cyclical as long as the roadblock of Christianity lies between it and antiquity.

The three other gospels could still be read as mere history, by later generations. The whole 19th Century dispensed with John and concentrated on the first three gospels, the "synoptics." Without John, the "gospel" would not have existed as more than mere history. In John, the church conquers her danger of becoming a purely ritualistic, a purely mythological, a purely poetical, a purely fictitious institution. She now sees all her temporal forms in the light of an eternal beginning, because her Founder always is ahead of her and of any of her ways of speech: The Word which is in the Beginning.

The four Evangelists immunize our era against the relapse in mere natural inertia and blind cycles. They represent the cross of grammar of antiquity in the new era. In the cross of drama, lyrics, narrative and judgment all speech was moulded. But once established, these grammatical forms drove on under their own momentum in endless rituals. The rituals could not be looked through and became magic, spell, cycle, routine, play of the intellect, sport of logic, superstitions. The Word languished.

The Evangelists reversed the cross of grammar into a grammar of the cross. One man had lived from fiat to factum est, from "Go out into my world" to "It has been done, my father," from listening to the call through poetry to story to summing up, completing his whole life as one grammatical cycle. The gospels depicted this cycle.

As Hilarius Isaac put it, at the end of the Fourth Century:

"Why were the experiences and sayings of the Lord organized in four volumes and by four authors?"

"Four volumes, four authors, both was congruous. For, we have before us, in the words of Isaia, the One Acceptable Year. This year is contained in four volumes as in four revolutions similarly to the four seasons through which a year evolves: one season is in need of the other mutually. Accordingly the acts and sayings of the Lord are circumscribed within the area of four books of which one stands in need of the other. Together, they are perfect in conveying the plenitude of time.

"Secondly, there was a good reason why it should be organized by four authors. Of the year's seasons, the terms show diversity; of the gospels too the nomenclature is diverse; and if they seem to contradict each other in their words, they do not dissent when they are interpreted in the light of this reason. The seasons of nature, too, are as different as possible in their names, their weather conditions, their astronomical aspect; but in the result of producing the fruits which come to live, they do not dissent." 1

In our modern terms, we may say that each gospel is aware of the perfect cycle of this life from Imperativus personalis to Subjunctivus Lyricus to Narrativus Historicus to Indicativus Abstractus. But each gospel writer was stirred up by one especially, Matthew who had experienced the violence of a sudden order: Follow me, took his clue from the Imperativus personalis; Marc wrote for

---

1. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum L, 430.



and with the prince of the apostles, took his clue from the fellowship of the twelve, a strongly lyrical note; Luke who was Paul's companion and had not lived in this fellowship as little as Paul, wrote from Christmas on, as any narrator who has no particular time span in common with the events he narrates. And John, who did not need any outer credentials or events to believe in his friend, took his clue from Jesus' victory over the endless cycles of ritual, of eons, of revolutions which engulfed the ancient world. He began with the progress brought on by the power of the Word, in his Indicativus Abstractus: In the Beginning was the Word. And there <sup>by</sup> defined Jesus as <sup>God's</sup> Freedom to come out of his silence and to speak his final word. *Jesus now revealed the last silence of his father.*<sup>1)</sup>  
 Here, then, was the grammar of the cross. And now, after all the gropings of the ages, the phases of all group life became transparent, as the cross of grammar.

Before a man is not initiated into this cross of grammar as a citizen who listens to the call of duty, as a lover who hears the soul of his life call upon his name, as the patient who sees his chance to get well, as the thinker who realizes the category of freedom  $\neq$  for himself despite the laws which his mind thinks up for nature—before a man has not <sup>made</sup> at least one of these four experiences, he uses speech to no reasonable purpose. *However this profitless type of speech without experience is with us.* As soon as the gospels were written, this speech without experience began to dabble with the new facts proposed by the existence of the church. This dabbling was called gnosis. People tried to think the new life without in some form of call, listening, passion or change of heart being touched by it first. Therefore except for the four gospels, the whole story in Palestine

1) Iguentius, Letter to the Magnesians ch. 9: Jesus is God's Word, coming forth out of God's silence.

would not have withstood<sup>1</sup> the onslaught of the Gnostics from Simon Magus who ran around at a time when the blood of the martyrs still reddened the soil of Palestine, and proclaimed a little harlot to be Mary, and himself the Saviour, to Marcion who admitted no other gospel but the one written by Luke and declared that this had fallen down from heaven directly. The Gnostics separate the life of the writer or teacher or apostle or speaker from the content of his speech. In other words, the gnostics have not entered the realm of experience in which the man himself is the fruit of lips, and the heart of somebody else's lips. Gnosis is all over the world today. The Churches themselves are filled with it. Pacifism is gnosis, an attempt to know the world before having been spoken to. During the last century, our last ramparts against the relapse into gnosis, have been the earthly love between man and wife. In Juliet's call on Romeo, many a man of the 19th Century even so dimly, learned to know himself as called forth to be the lips of the soul whom he loved. The next generations who follow this last century of the Great Lovers seem to hear nothing but the call to arms. And it may be that in the experience of this call, they for the time being, find their only antidote against Gnosis. For this reason, the insight into the structure of the gospels is no luxury. The teachers of the old and of the young, of girls as well as of boys, will corrupt those taught if they go on with their innumerable

---

1. This is proved by the discovery made by Harnack: that the Gnostics forced the Church to self-defense. She issued a statement with regard to the origin of the four gospels between 150 and 180 A.D. Harnack, Berlin Akademie S.B. 1928, 330ff. This statement is precise and authentic and irrefutable. See p. 9

*I rally around the four evangelists in sheer*

numbers and facts in the abstract of the judgment seat. A teacher who is not an initiate in one of the four ways described above is not qualified to teach. He does not understand the conditions under which it is alone meaningful to speak.

Because the word "freedom" has replaced the experience of freedom, "goodness," the experience of getting better, "kindness" the experience of falling in love, adjustment, the experience of a personal commitment, every effort should be made to make the mind conscious of the grammar of meaningful speech.

It is for this reason that I invite the reader to hear with me a little bit longer in this chapter. It will not suffice to "understand" the four gospels. We also need means to bring their insight to fruition. This can be done if means and ways exist to make the cross of grammar visible, in the arts and symbols of our society's imagination. I do think that new ways open up from our discovery into the grammar of the cross at a time when we seem to be paralyzed by fictions, myth, repetition, suspicion, *and when words have lost their meaning. We move in a vacuum.*

### *9. The Shape of the Evangelists.*

The Spirit of Man was fully incarnated once, and it was impressed on the four gospel writers in four different manners.

Hence, the four gospels are so to speak four wax models of the *typical* ~~anatomy~~ <sup>modalities</sup> of the human mind. Let us tentatively extend the lines of these mental profiles far enough to the point where their impact on the body of the evangelist ~~is~~ becomes transparent. Our body, as we all know, is not a kind of wooden box or receptacle but it tries to correspond as best it can to our mental processes.

*Our bodies are expressive of the whole man.*

We lie dreaming or half-dreaming and we have our best ideas. We sit down when we wish to think through a variety of versions or impressions. We kneel or "we break down," as we graphically say, when we are overcome by a desire to recognize some higher power than ours. We jump up and pace the floor when we are in a fighting mood. Obviously, modern man suppresses or misplaces many of these physical reactions to mental processes. But in his language he uses them even though his body may have never been skilled to express them. We say that an artist "conceives" like a woman, that a criminal "broke down" under the weight of the evidence, that the speaker was in a "fighting" mood, that a teacher occupies a "Chair."

Obviously, then, one bodily response expresses one mental attitude in preference to another.

I think of Matthew as standing and fighting, of John as the visionary in the words of "Revelation," lying on the ground as one dead, of Marc as bending over or kneeling next to Peter, and of Luke, of course, as sitting at his desk.

In contrast, the old symbols used for the four evangelists by the artistic traditions of the last 1800 centuries leave us cold, or at least, they leave me cold, and they have been discarded practically for the last 150 years by all artists of rank, even in ecclesiastical art. Could it be that there was a good reason for this discountenance of a venerable tradition? May it not be that these inveterate forms and symbols were obsolete, antiquated by our very progress, and that we may be grateful for the interval of formlessness after 1789 because now, a simpler

form of symbol nearer to our understanding, has been maturing?

The old attributes of the gospelmakers were the lion, for Marc, an angel for Matthew, an ox for Luke, and the eagle for John.<sup>1</sup>

These attributes were taken from the complex Cherubim of the Old Testament, the forms of which in turn were connected with Egyptian and Babylonian beliefs. These Old Testament Cherubims were composed of eagle, bull, lion, angel. The Old Testament lost its grip over our symbolic imagination long ago.

But could it not be, that man is in his very body, moulded into the carrier of the Word, in distinction from the animal world? No animal can sit or stand or kneel or lie perfectly prostrate as one dead, as a vessel of speech, in listening and expressing.<sup>2)</sup> The Spirit compels us to take shape in a way appropriate to listening and speaking man. The Word could not have come into the world if it had not the power to mark out the man who speaks, and the ways in which he speaks. To stand means to be under orders, in action. To kneel means to receive on faith and in peace, to sit means to instruct and to narrate, to lie prostrate means to conceive like the artist, the genius of receptivity and creativity.

It does not seem arbitrary to proclaim the truth that the spirit does mould the body, and does prescribe us our shape. The Spirit does call upon our bodies and we conform to him.

---

1. For many years, I have collected the <sup>archeological</sup> material, and I hasten to say that these attributes are by no means unanimous; when they first were used, the ~~con~~tribution to the individual evangelists was not as stereotype as later.

2) also, of course, animals can't embrace or "greet" in each other's palms by shaking hands.

10. THE FOUR APOSTLES

Religions create faces. An agnostic ~~xxxxxxx~~ student of anthropology went to Iraq and reported that he found the same physical stock divided by religions to such an extent that by now, this stock looked like four different races: "Le Sette <sup>di</sup>religiose hanno una tendenza a sviluppare un tipo anthropologico proprio" ( Giuseppe Fur-  
 lani ). But this takes us too far afield. However, it had to be stated that with the four gospels, new peoples and new races , new nations actually are set into motion. My, Autobi-  
 ography of Western <sup>Man</sup>, called "Out of Revolution" has ~~describ~~  
 the creation of these new branches over the last one thousand years . And the secular historians have not even reported that this book is a book on <sup>The</sup> biological history of the species .  
 For the power of the gospel to create FRUIT of LIPS, is de-  
 nied except at Mass when the gospel of St. John cannot help reminding people of this incarnating force of God's word.  
 But <sup>although</sup> I cannot enlarge here on the ever increasing power of recreating races ever since the times of the apostles, I think the reader may be helped if he can see some model case of such rebirth in the ranks of the evangelists themselves. The four evangelists themselves had experienced the new life and as little as their texts are accidental but square and fundamental and indispensable, so are they themselves not a motley crowd, but a wonderfully influenced quadrilateral. A few words must suffice. The four evangelists represent four phases of the Church. And the four phases are represented by James ( the brother of John) whom the High Priest ~~murdered~~ in 42 A. D, of Peter who went to Antioch and to Rome, of Paul who did not live to see the destruction of Jerusalem as little as Peter or James and of John who as the only apostle survived the end of the Temple . First of all, the whole synoptic problem boils down to the fact that three evangelists wrote under the guidance of apostles who did not see the fall of the old Israel, and therefore had to write quite differently from John.

Second , not however second in importance, is the help which

we receive when we see each gospel in its full temporal function under one specific mighty plenipotentiary of the Lord. Let us survey the four gospels as sources for the rule of the inspiring apostles.

Who ever thinks of James as great or important ? However, he was the brother of John; this alone should make us pause. He was a martyr. He it was who held the first Church in Jerusalem together; he it was who seems to have been respected highly by the learned and lawful Jews . He seems to have had a religious experience not just as the Lord's disciple but on his own as a zealot in the days of the Baptist. <sup>From</sup> ~~Of~~ all this, his authority over Matthew's gospel may be divined. Certainly Matthew wrote under this great Bishop's eyes. Certainly, the beginning of the Christian ~~era~~ of world history which is proclaimed in the 25th chapter of Matthew , verses 30 to 45. <sup>of</sup> a history composed of the alliance between the Church and the underdog at any time and in any place, is an announcement of such public significance, of such revolutionizing scope that Matthew's Bishop must have approved of it. The Liberal critics have submerged this new chronology , this new era in which kings, emperors, Priests cease to count and in which the underdog shall make epoch, as though here was just a new parable or a sentimental moralism. But Matthew has placed this announcement of a new <sup>Eon</sup> ~~Aion~~ in which every single step would be the healing of the wound of one sin, one disease of the body <sup>of the c</sup> ~~of the c~~ <sup>mos</sup> ~~secret~~ after an other, he has placed it between the life and the <sup>P</sup> ~~passion~~, that is at the most central spot in his gospel. These incredible 15 verses <sup>became</sup> ~~were~~ James ' and every Bishop's

History in the new aion

guiding light ever since. The reader should reread it to convince himself that here we have the lasting program of <sup>World</sup> ~~Magistrate in the Lord's kingdom from now on.~~ <sup>That is why the 19th century did not read it</sup> To conceive that it was written under the eyes and with the consent of 'esus' first successor and at a time when the 'ews were still the first addressee of the good news, underscores once more the majesty of Matthew's plea. "Do not count the kings of Isr<sub>el</sub>, do not count the prophets, do not count the series of high priests- all these genealogies were undertaken at that time and played a tremendous role in the imagination of the Jews- no, do count every tear dried, every pain alleviated, every abuse reformed, as the hours of the new aion. This <sup>is truly world history</sup> though <sup>proclaimed</sup> ~~in~~ in the narrow confines of ~~Jerusalem~~ Jerusalem. No wonder that such a new constitution was unacceptable. James lost his life; Matthew lost his people.

That Peter, step by step, was led out of this narrow precinct of the Holy City into the world of Juppiter and Isis, that he was very much against his will, made to dine with Roman officer and speak to people who did not know who Moses or Abraham or David were, this miraculous purge has allowed Marc's gospel to be written and probably has <sup>finally</sup> brought Marc into the one land <sup>of Egypt</sup> that had to be gospelized as though the Jews had never existed. The strange renunciation of anything Jewish in Marc is the result of this slow emancipation of Peter himself.

Luke learned from Paul how the curious individual mind of the common Greek mediterranean world, ~~th'~~ had to be spoken too. No. If like Peter who found strong emperor worship and Egyptian or Roman religion in his way, Paul had to deal with the pluralism of



esoteric ~~is~~ and personal piety, ~~with~~ <sup>No</sup> Roman would ~~not~~ doubt that ~~the~~ Gods had to be worshipped in public liturgy. But the inner man of the Greek KOINE had grown fastidious. Inner piety seemed enough. Why go to the bloody spectacle of crucifixion, of political rowdiness, of public disturbance? Why incarnate when a pure heart was all that God wanted? Why change the world? Why proselytize? why replace anything spiritual because it was not good enough as long as it was refined compared with the mob's superstitions? Again, this apostle had been hewn out gradually from a Jewish fanatic into a man who had to remember every word from his Greek College days in Tharsus. Who had to dig deep into those layers of his training which his father had given him and for which he never had cared too much? Greek, /Poetry, the Roman citizenship the knowledge of a trade, all these things <sup>to Paul</sup> (became of vital importance the more his Jewish puritanic zeal for the Law had to be revised by the new Law of Liberty based on the voluntary sacrifice of one's own will. Peter, the native of Palestine, was directed <sup>R</sup>omeward. We would misread Paul if ~~we~~ overlooked his deliberate <sup>first</sup> course from Tharsus for Jerusalem. He was not directed from Palestine towards Rome; he was turned around <sup>from his fanatic longing for Jerusalem to</sup> rediscover his own Gentile background of Asia Minor, of the Roman Empire, of Greek craftsmanship, of the world wide Greek spirit. <sup>Whatever</sup> <sup>from Tharsus returned to Jerusalem. But Saul did. And now he was Paul.</sup> Paul writes to the Romans, he simply includes Rome into this reappropriated non-Jewish World of the whole Mediterranean and he treats Rome as he might have treated Spain if he really went there. That the most spirited of men was asked to rediscover or to unearth the Spirit in all the secular places which had contributed to his formation, made Paul the model of the Jew who had to readmit his Gentile heritage. <sup>The</sup> <sup>non-Jewish elements of his background were no longer repressed. Now</sup> before he could become the teacher of the Gentiles on the highest plane of Jewish spirituality and <sup>there</sup> before the Purity of the One God

his gentiled

gratitude.

through Christ in the Spirit could replace the 'Harken Israel, t  
 Lord thy God, is the One and Only One.' We should try to see the  
 tremendous danger of a watering down of the height of the pure  
 faith of the Rabbis in weaker hands; then, the gospel of Luke  
 assumes the gigantic proportions of Paul's own struggle to translate  
 the full purity of Jewish monotheism into the trinitarian open  
 road into the world. *And then, he shall be astounded for his*  
*making by the Gentile World contained so many reasons for his*  
 James, Peter and Paul... have they emerged behind their respective  
 gospels as the proconsuls of the Lord in Hebrew, Roman, and in  
 Greek as the famous inscription of Pilatus on the Cross postulated?  
*If you the Hebrew Law, the Roman Temple, the Greek individuality*  
 Then, the miraculous synthesis of John's gospel will become  
 visible. The brother of James, the natural friend of the Lord,  
 the companion, eye the coworker of Peter, all this allows John  
 to inherit from all of them their achievements, their official  
 date in the history of the Church. He will not lose anything  
 they have *to* *and to represent* learned when taking up the succession.

But to these miraculous gifts of inheritance he receives the  
 fourth gift; he is allowed to see his master and friend fully vindic-  
 ted. The epoch secretly initiated <sup>ti</sup> by the Son of Man, bursts into the  
 open with the Fall of the Temple. Freed from any comparison, the  
 gospel now stands on its own merits. The lean-to, Judaism, is broken  
 off, the tree now must be planted in eternity alone, in the creation  
 at the very beginning long before the world existed, and in the end  
 when heaven and earth will pass away. The author of Revelation has  
 the power of proclaiming the epoch; *in the fall of Jerusalem* the new aion is accepted by the  
 father as the gift of the son. The most loveable and the most  
 political and untemperizing of all the apostles is distinguished by  
 the virginity of his soul; into it, the event of the outer end  
 of the old Israel can be engraved, the end now has not to be announ-

1) Hoskyns and Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament 1931 p. 282: "Those who are convinced that Jesus can be described within the framework of modern humanitarian and ethical ~~xxxx~~ idealism, are frankly shocked by the Fourth Gospel. The denial of Apostolic authorship and even of a relation to Apostolic reminiscences is felt (by these readers and critics) to be essential".

as in the other gospels

and, it has not to be proven, it has not to be solicited, It can be ~~assumed~~ <sup>presupposed!</sup> ~~the~~ unquestioning <sup>tone</sup> ~~character~~ is the distinguishing feature of the Gospel according to St. John.

And this, in turn, is a gift of God's history, not of John's private merit. John remains the <sup>ap</sup>postle of cosmic history without particularized office or bishopric; open to the event of God's coming.

With this, we have said it before, he can bring into a world of mere cults, rituals, possibilities, books, ideas, the stern fact of the incarnation as the new date in history. He can redeem the creative spirits of all the geniuses since Homer by revealing to them the higher law of order inside which even genius is one in a fellowship of ~~followers of the Word~~ all those who are illuminated by the Word. *Jesus made equal; John proclaimed the equal.*

In John, the Hebrew, the Roman, the Greek form of Gospel truth, is reunited. In the death cells of Hitler, that is outside this world of James, Peter, and Paul, John's words were sought for more than the words from any older gospel. <sup>of his own</sup> ~~their~~ full and free life of peace often leads readers to find John overwritte, mystical, exaggerating. On Patmos, in the face of death, the truth has to be stated not in the three languages of this world but in the uncontaminated terms of the center of the fire. John who concludes the cycle of the four gospels, is capable of starting it all over because <sup>only</sup> to the sceptic he seems to speak out of nowhere; ~~and~~ the sufferer knows that he speaks from there where the divisions on this earth have disappeared. The Church ends each service with the first verse of John: In the Beginning was the Word. We now see wh

If "the Four Gospels" were His lips, the lips formed themselves by Matthew going forward motivating Marc to move into the inner sanctuary, Marc motivating Luke to look up the records from the past, Luke motivating John to move into the eternal cosmic seat of truth. And thus, these four men reached <sup>out in four directions:</sup> into the new world, the inner sanctum, the times of the past, the eternal truth; they reformed the cross of grammar, of which those pages had to speak so often, by forming a grammar of the cross, in which mortal men united may <sup>conceive</sup> ~~reach~~ the truth. ~~For one moment, the~~ <sup>of being yet in process of being</sup> created, <sup>off being in the crucible today.</sup> For one moment, the cross of grammar had become flesh in one living being. For this, he ~~was~~ called the Word. But this earth has no place for the absolute truth, it breaks <sup>up</sup> ~~it~~ into <sup>and situations.</sup> times. And the Cross was the only place where the full truth of a man's heart could be revealed at one glance. <sup>However, first we misinterpret the cosmic order represented by the four directions of the Cross, the Evangelists bring each one</sup> <sup>Singly down to earth.</sup> Four great truths have been kept alive by the gospels, and even the most ritualistic clergy, the most cynical science, the most legalistic inquisition, the most superstitious mobs have not been able to exclude these <sup>truths</sup> <sup>perpetual</sup> from a (hearing). To the contrary, these institutions themselves had to teach the gospel truth which defied their own natural tendencies, at their own altars, in their own courts, by their own systems, during their own election campaigns. These four truths were: 1. Freedom, 2. The relativity of any law for the free, 3. The price of freedom, 4. The absolute authority of the law for those who are not free.

1. Freedom was not the freedom to think since thought can only think the law. When William James languished through four long years from being a so-called free thinker, he one day discovered that his mind only could see laws. He jumped from his

sickbed and declared: "In freedom, a man must believe by his actions; it cannot be proven." This was his gospel truth. He who loves is free.

2. Freedom makes all the laws relative. For he who loves understands all laws as having been introduced to defend freedom. Marriage is the fruit of love. The Constitution is the fruit of comradeship in arms. Science is the fruit of a brotherhood of minds. That which is freedom for the founders is law for their trusting and grateful heirs. They speak the language of their fathers willingly, as laid down in the laws because they recognize themselves in the names bestowed on them by the founders.

3. The price of freedom is threefold: time, wealth, life. All three must be given freely to achieve great ends. Freedom "is" an empty word where not at least one of these three powers is given freely. Freedom's way into the world consists of the investment of these three powers in the service of a new love, a new faith, a new hope. No other incarnation of freedom is possible.

4. The relation between freedom and law is absolute. Nobody who is unwilling to pay the price, may enjoy freedom. He who is not willing to marry, cannot and can never know what <sup>full</sup> love <sup>between the sexes</sup> is. He who is not willing to suffer for the truth, can never know what the truth is. He who does not defend his country will not and shall never understand what freedom is. He must be dealt with accordingly, by and under the majesty of the law.

In these four truths the four names of Jesus are retranslated. They are his names in which and under which the gospels

were written. Never before had a poem, a law, a prophecy, a book, pointed beyond themselves to the price which it cost to compose the poem, to pass the law, to conceive the prophecy, to articulate the book. The gospels have been abused. They have been reduced to material. And they have been exalted to sacred words in themselves. However, as long as they are the four gospels, they protect their readers against themselves. This, antiquity had not known. All the lips of antiquity had become idols and gods and scripture and authority, in themselves. To our era, then, only those processes belong which inherited the evangelical quality of being done in the heart's name, and of being said in His name. The rest remained pre-Christian even when it was enacted in 1500 or 1900. As the symbols of the four evangelists themselves were pre-Christian, and may become baptized in his name only today, so the Christian era saw numberless books on Christianity which though boasting of it, are not Christian themselves.

Gradually, in religion, in art, in science, in economics, in education, such makeshifts, books or sayings, will have to go.

They stand condemned in the light of the four gospels, as fruitless words. And we are free to live after the era of fruitless words because we are living in the pedigree of freedom of which Isaia had foretold: "I shall create fruit of lips." ')

) chapter 57, 19

12. THE OLDEST OFFICIAL REMARKS ON THE GOSPELS

Dom Donatien de Bruyne, in *Revue Benedictine*, 1928, gave us the restored text of four prologues to the four gospels which go back to about 160 of our era. Adolf Harnack accepted his thesis immediately (Berlin Academy, SB. 1928, 322ff.). These prologues were written in defense against the Marcionite rejection of three gospels (John, Matthew, Marc), and his arbitrary editing of the fourth. For this reason, the prologue on this fourth, Luke, was the main task undertaken by the official Church, and therefore, the prologue to Luke is by far the longest.

Since no reader will have the text of these prologues, and since few may have heard of them, I here give them in translation. They were written one hundred years or eighty years after the gospels were written. But they were provoked by a fierce controversy which practically raised all the issues of the critics of the last 150 years. The Christians were under fire all the time, from the outside as well as from Jews, Romans, Greeks, Heretics. It is in no way different today. Therefore, the arguments of the four adversaries then may well be listed. They add spice to these "prologues."

1. The Jews: The Jews had endless "genealogies." Paul in the first letter to Timothy (1,4) warns against them. Our prologue to Luke mentions them. The Letter to the Hebrews, on the one hand, concurs with Matthew and Luke in freely quoting the genealogy of Joseph: "It is undeniable that our Lord sprang from the tribe of Judah." (7,14) On the other hand, the same

Letter says that Jesus as THE WORD was without a father or mother, and "without a genealogy."<sup>1</sup> The Jews of course concentrated their attack on the illegitimate birth of Jesus. In the first volume of the Acta Patrum Orientalia, we have a very humorous account of a discussion between a Jew and a Christian on this subject, the reading of which can be highly recommended.

2. The Greeks: The Greek argument were collected by Celsus who wrote at the time of our prologues. (See my book, "The Christian Future," on this.) But the simplest access to the Greek attitude is in Acts, at the occasion of Paul's defeat in Athens, on the Areopag. To the Greeks, the Resurrection was the stumbling block. They were the people of genius, and genius means the cult of eternal new beginnings, the right of every newborn man to act as a child of nature, to behave as though nothing before had been thought or done. The Resurrection means that we all come after Christ. It is our first technical expression for the Christian Era. By our faith in his Resurrection, Jesus becomes the Roadblock, id est, the Word, under whose impact every one word of the earlier languages, is reilluminated and retranslated and filled with new and deeper meaning. The term of a Christian Era was formulated in 530 of our era first, by a monk who was tired of quoting the Roman emperors for his history. This man, Dionysius Exiguus, said for the first time: Anno Domini, instead. That is, he applied the inner Christian vision of the new Aeon, to the outer world. Anybody today who says A.D. exploits the

---

1. On this, see Leisegang, Logos, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-encyclopedie, 1079)



original term "resurrection," in its secular application. In other words, our modern academic world no longer is Greek, for this one reason that it believes, for all practical purposes, in the beginning of a new era, by the resurrection.

But the Greeks of Paul's days, lived from Genius to Genius, or as Luke says, "to the latest new thing" (Acts 17,21). The Apostle Paul tried to accommodate them by making a speech in which he politely stressed all the agreement between him and the Athenians first, and mentioned the <sup>ridicule and scandal, the</sup> resurrection in the last sentence only. Whereupon, as might be expected, they scoffed. In the <sup>first chapter of the first</sup> Letter to the Corinthians, Paul reviewed his mistake of concealing the conflict to the last and promised to come out with this fundamental difference boldly, from now on. Modern criticism, of course, has denied that Paul could have made this speech. In a monograph of 1939 by Dibelius (Heidelberg Academy) on Luke, this Athenian world has left a lasting monument of its truly Greek faith and incapacity to understand the very meaning of the resurrection. Any reader who wishes to learn about the method and the right of Biblical Criticism, should try to read Dibelius' argument; it should be translated and be made a text-book study in Sunday Schools. It is a shining example of the Greek mind. This is its logic: Paul has not made the speech. It is too cleverly composed. Luke has invented it and composed it. And - O wonder - the speech was not a failure and a slip as we all have thought, but it was - because it was so truly Greek - a great success! Paul did not change his mind from this experience, with the so highly recommended "adjustment" to one's audience.

So, Dibelius, on the one hand, construes an invention by Luke, Paul's truest disciple, and on the other - a success of this "invented" speech, in real history! This is very Greek because the Greeks live by literature, by thought, and all the time they evaluated "ideas" more than successive and consecutive progress. They played with everything, to the point where young men served as girls to their teachers. The love of man and man, woman and woman, was transferred from the mind to the bodies, in Greece quite logically since ideas were more real to them than any other order. When Ideas reign supreme, we forget ourselves. In the realm of ideas, a man may have motherly or bridal feelings or thoughts. In fact, we all have. But in the realm of reality, this is perversion. The Resurrection by which THE WORD sacrificed his genius to his obedience, made these Platonists and

*Alkibiadeses furious. Mr. Dibelius is their offspring. He does not understand that Paul recognized his "Athenian" style as a mistake.*

3. The Romans: The Romans although helpless against the Greek and the Jewish arguments, allowing for homosexuality among the educated with a shrug, and believing in the lasting divisions of the clans, as the Hebrews, had their own grudge against the new faith: The destruction of their Sky World, of their Augustus as the Center of the Cosmic Order. The Christians were rebels. They did not worship the Gods of whose various cults the cult of Caesar was the coping stone. The Christians rejected any such visible coping stone. Instead, they worshipped their corner stone. That is, they began exactly on the opposite end from where the worshippers in the temples started. The cornerstone is down in the crypt. The coping stone hangs high up in the center of the

vault, above us. Virgin birth, resurrection, keystone, were and are the stumbling blocks for the Jewish, the Greek, the Roman faith.

4. The Heretics: The Heretics from within were impatient. They were loathe to be reminded of the past dark ages. They felt superior to Jews, Greeks, Romans. They were sure that the meeting with the WORD, the RISEN, the CORNERSTONE, had given them a completely new nature. The Heretics were sure that they never would fabricate genealogies of "daughters of the Revolution," or of "Royal Descent"; they were sure that they never would, from idealism, transgress the ten commandments; and they saw no difference between the invisible cornerstone in the crypt, down in the catacombs, in humiliation, and the visible coping stone of the Church Triumphant, high up in splendor and power. The one hundred per cent nationalists, the André Gides and Prousts, the People who equated Christ and Hitler, all these types of naive progressives were the heretics. They were trapped by their naive conviction that they themselves no longer had to fear a relapse into the shortcomings of a clannishness, <sup>of</sup> Genius, and <sup>of</sup> the cult of success.

Against the genealogies, the geniuses with their ideas, the power politicians, and the naive believers in progress without the risk of relapse, the prologues reiterated the necessity of the four gospels. For they showed that they all knew of each other and intended to create a "series." The prologue of Marc calls this creating a series quite literally "adseruit," "he formed a series," Marc added the second link of the chain. Hence,

we have proved that our oldest tradition conceives of the gospels not as rivals but as a series.

That this series is in process, and emerges, in every one of its links or members or cells, from the very depth of the error which it overcomes, we have seen. This "series" ~~=~~ character of all four gospels together permeates, as a living movement of progress, each gospel, with every one of them beginning at a different angle and proceeding from there to its opposite pole. This could not be recognized as long as the progress in John's book was not admitted; the progress from the word into the flesh though clearly stated as the topic by John himself was overlooked in favor of some Buddhistlike admiration for the famous first chapter of John. Against this fatal worship of first lines, we related the first to the last chapter and marvelled that the same Eternal Word which was with the Father in the Beginning, had become the man Jesus whose name would fill the libraries of the universe. Once, the mere awe before the first chapter of John, gives way to an acceptance of the inner movement of this book, it is not at all separated from the three other gospels, in its method. It moves in exactly the same manner from one extreme to the other. Because the extreme opposites coincide in THE WORD: The genealogies prove Jesus to hail from the tribe of Juda; yet he is without father or genealogy. The sayings prove him to be a genius; yet he gives back his genius for the comprehensive Spirit of the Church. The miracles prove him to be a cosmic force; yet, this cosmic force does not dominate but serves. And the prophecies prove him to be the Fruit of the Lips of all the peoples of the

of the world; ~~Yet~~, he is a person, a man in space and time, the personal friend of John.

\* \* \*

And now, the reader may enjoy the old texts, the first authentic statement of the slow, sober, realistic and reluctant birth of the "Four Gospels," the statement of 160 Anno Domini.

Texts:

On Matthew: "Matthew wrote his gospel among the Jews in their language, and he was the first gospel writer."

On Marc: "Marcus followed in the series, he was called the stump-fingered, simply because in relation to the big size of his whole body, his fingers were extravagantly short. He was interpreter to Peter. After the passing away of Peter himself he wrote down this very gospel of his in the province of Italy." ("And with this gospel, he proceeded to Egypt and became the first bishop of Alexandria" but this last sentence seems to be of a later vintage.)

On Luke: (This prologue begins differently because Marcion used the text of this gospel and, at the same time, he said it had fallen down from heaven and was not written by Luke. Hence, the first word is: "Estin" this Luke," that means "The facts about Luke are these: This, then, is the text of the lengthiest prologue which had to contradict the rather flattering contention of the heretics that the gospel according to Luke was not written by a mortal man.) "The facts about Luke are these: He was from Antioch and a Syrian, a physician in his profession. He had become a student of apostles and later accompanied Paul, until Paul was martyred, a servant of the Lord with singleness of purpose,

unmarried, without offspring in his eighty-fourth year falling asleep in the province of Boeotia, full of holy inspiration."

"This man Luke found already gospels in existence, one which Matthew had written in Palestine, the other by Marc in Italy; moved on by the holy spirit he was living in Achaia when he composed this whole gospel. And he himself made this clear in his own prologue that before him others had been writing and that it was necessary for the faithful of Gentile descent to put forth the precise narrative of the economy of salvation, for their protection lest they be led astray by the mythological tales of the Jews or deceived by arbitrarily selected and baseless speculations miss the truth. As the most necessary element therefore we read in Luke the birth of John the Baptist as John is the beginning of the Good News. For, he became the precursor of the Lord, participated in the organic unfolding of the Good News, in the institution of baptism and in the communication of the spirit. And this order of the economy (of salvation) one of the twelve prophets had foreseen." (This secured the unity with the old Testament)

"And so later on the same Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles. Later John, the apostle, one of the original twelve, wrote "Revelation" on the island of Patmos and after that, his gospel."

On John: "The gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John still in his lifetime, as Papias, a beloved disciple of John has reported. And the gospel was written down under the dictation of John, and it was written down correctly."

The WORD Himself

We are not studying the history either of the Church or of the World. We are laying the foundations for a history of the human spirit.

The spirit had moved the chieftains and the priests and the poets and the prophets; however, they all were driven by this power without being able to account for the driving power. For this reason, men had been driven by the spirit to cross purposes. And the confusion of tongues, and the incessant war between these tongues had become dominant.

This was changed by the man who paused. He halted the mere flow of talkative, news mongering, mystical, or practical humanity. So what? He saw that in separation, they were evil and poisonous even though in themselves they were highly elaborate and efficient. Jesus did not say that poetry or magic or ritual or prophecy were not excellent. He knew that they were and how well he knew, he proved by his creative inventiveness of new ritual, his poetical genius of the parable, his effortless superiority to obsessions and demonics, his prophetic insight into the future of the world's history. But with all these four rivers of speech filled to the brim, he emptied himself of all of them. He, the harvest of all times, decided to change into the seed of a future completely protected against mere times. The old dividedness of the human soul by these canyons wrought in us through the flow of these rivers of speech was to cease.

He placed himself between the era of those canyons and our own lives lest we too were swayed by the avalanche blaste, the

obsession which drives all unbelievers unknowingly forward by the mere inertia of their particular jargon of thought.

To this day, we have nothing to carry us but namegiving speech, and cosmic writing, natural poetry, and prophetic vision. We may call them the mores and science, and the arts, and politics. But this is only a slight difference in terms, compared with antiquity in which the mores were tattoos enounced at the tribe's assemblies, the science carved as "runes" in the temple's cosmic body, the art consecrated by one of the muses, and political progress and change prophesied in danger of life.

The "time-cups"<sup>1</sup> formed on these four wavelengths, of the "oyez," "harken," "listen, be silent," in all law giving assemblies of the "contemplate," "measure," "enter," "ascend" of all the cosmic temples, the "sing, tell, say, adorn, glorify" of all the nine muses, the "thou shalt tell them, warn, flee, expect, fall, prostrate, expect, promise, hope," of all the prophecies, these times were merged by Jesus. For this reason, the Liberals could define him as an artistic genius, the psychoanalysts, a tribal ritualist, the Jews, a prophet, the Fundamentalists a cosmic force, during the last century of critical dissection. The mind's anatomy could find those elements within him, of course. As he had to atone the division of these four "offices" of human speech, he obviously must master them, himself. But all were simply the abutment against which he pressed the new life. He rejected his four offices in as far as they were the dead ends of ancient ritual, cult, prophecy, poetry.<sup>1)</sup> Having demonstrated that he could

<sup>1</sup> See above p.

<sup>1)</sup> "a biography of Jesus cannot be provided. He was bringing into being a new order and writing out a purpose in complete isolation. The future order which it was the purpose of Jesus to bring into being depended on his death." Hoskyns and Davey, *Rehinde* p. 248 f.



heal, rule, teach, sing, he dismissed all this as not good enough. And in this dismissal of his own role of harvest, he made the end into the beginning. His whole life is like an unconquerable wall, inscribed: Never again. The blind avalanche of single-track reasoning lost its momentum by his intervention.

The humanity of the final man is in our four offices as solons, scientists, artists, prophets. Our divinity is in renouncing every one of these offices when they separate mankind. Jesus gave up his own spirit lest anything pre-Christian, preceding him, should enter the new creature. He placed himself between the past and the future, and nothing of the man Jesus was allowed to enter the new order of his second body, the Church. People who speak of his sacrifice, often do not understand this. He interposed his whole life, from beginning to end, and not just his last day, between the past and our era. His own life was used up in the housecleaning. He volunteered to have his own flesh belong to the old eon. For this reason, it is appropriate that we speak of the risen Christ as the first cell of the New Body of our own humanity.

REVELATION

Jesus is the first name of a new language of mankind. Our sacrifice of our own private, professional, accidental nomenclature is our contribution to the common and universal and single and unanimous new tongue founded on and in his name. The Letter to the Hebrews simply says so: "your sacrifice consists in your admitting that his name precedes all other words of your vocabulary." Now, the crux of Christendom, in our days, is its denominations, its splits, sects, churches, schisms, confessions, religious squabbles. Neither Mr. Rockefeller nor I nor anybody else can see anything good in these fissions. At best they seem Donquichotic, at worst, hateful and baleful. But behind the denominations there looms a bigger issue, the issue of all speech of our era. It is one thing to repudiate the denominations, and a second step to refuse the name of a Christian. The Word cannot come into the world unless it is ushered in by us, into our native tongue and locality, in each age. And this acceptance of the Cross is a scandal and is ridiculous, each time. All natural minds, the Greek, and the Roman, and the Hebrew, and the Gothic, hate the idea that a new language should start right here and now, a new tongue which empties their great literatures and codes and manuals of science and Emily Posts, of their ultimate value. Since this is exactly what the new name "Christian" at our letter head does, the four "anti-gospel" parties all declare the very mentioning of the name of Jesus Christ to be bad taste; As we have seen, it is bad taste; they declare it to be unscientific; as we have seen, it is unscientific; they declare it to be blasphemous; As we have seen, it is blasphemous. And they declare

it to be inconsistent; as we have seen, it is inconsistent as it is preached in a new tongue every day and every year and every century.

The Name of the Word is our sacrifice. And if we are too timid to mention this name for the sake of taste, of science, of good feeling, of systematic consistency, we exclude ourselves from the new eon and from the crucial language of free men. We prefer to be B.C. and we soon will boast that there is no A.D.

The presentday crisis, then, is between the deep longing of all of us to drop the denominations and the high necessity to confess the scandal and the ridicule of the Cross. The Word of Mankind will remain a helpless, stammering and a vile repetition of dead words if we, for the sake of taste, manners, science, system, decline to respond to our sponsor, to understand his stand, and to dare the world by the disreputable Words, Christ, Christians. If Jesus is the "Logos," the Word, we must become as the Greeks called it, "homo-logos," <sup>which means,</sup> of the same Word. We must revamp our words by making him explicitly the Keyword of all our own words and everybody must do this, in person. The simple reason for this iron law of speech in our era can now be stated; when people speak or act, the fruits of their words and acts are hidden from them. We all, in weak moments, think that we can get away with empty or lying or conventional phrases. And we like to imagine that such words or deeds have no consequences. We say: "I was driven to say this; I was motivated by fear or self-interest or pity." And this explanation seems to excuse us. But what do we actually aver, by those statements? We aver that we

are mere cogs on the wheel of blind fate. For all these three common explanations of our ways of talking, connect our sayings with some "reason," some cause or motive which hails from the past. All our excuses are facing backward. Jesus' sayings are all forward looking. Every one of them made sense solely in the light of the future. Not one of them was "caused" by any precedent, convention, excuse, cause, reason, motive; to the contrary, all his antecedents advised against every one of his acts and sayings. He said so and he did so because he could not help creating a future different from the past. As Ambrose Vernon has put it: Jesus went to the cross because he could not help it. "By their fruits, ye shall know them," is not true of us but of our Lord. Now, in his crucifixion, the clash of backward justification by precedent, motives, environment, piety, with the forward love, is totally visible. He who lives under the cross, knows that he is not excused by all his rational, social, natural, physical propensities. He knows that of course, man is a coward, man is a conformist, man is patterned and conditioned. But after Christ, he also knows that this is one-half of the ledger only. The heavier the pressure of conditions and prejudice and tradition and nature, the more necessary that we should feel provoked to break these chains of mere causation. Now, people have made Spartacus rebellions, and nasty doggerels and psalms of repentance before Christ. The new law which he proclaimed was that one's own life and words were the starting places for a new incarnation. Facing forward, every one of his acts was a seed to bear fruit in unending times to come. Not one of his acts could

be understood as well by his contemporaries as it can by us who see all the implications. Implications become explicit through the lapse of time. And Jesus was the first man to prove this by not giving in to any one temptation to reap the harvests of the past as the tempter offered him to do. We all can skim the milk for the cream, in our time. We all can get big salaries if we take the jobs which are organized already and therefore paid. But man's life as God's poem, or society's scapegoat, or the earnest of the spirit, as Paul called it, has no place in the budget of any going concern or society. Any man who is a child of God is supernumerary. There is no place for him in the surveys, questionnaires, statistics, because he is so unlabeled as the child in the manger for whom the innkeeper had no room. How could he? Jesus was unforeseen, unpredictable. Yet, get this well, he was foretold and visible. The ordinary coward wants to be told by going to the quacks of the soul that he is predictable and yet does he not wish to be looked through by his neighbors. He is secretive and superstitious, at the same time.

Unforeseen, yet foretold,  
visible yet unpredictable,

is the man who lives in our era.

Predictable yet concealed  
Not promised yet foreseen,

is the sterile life.

Now the reader although unaccustomed to do so, in our world of speechless thinking, may by now be ready to analyze the four terms in this "fork" by which we predicate some general truth

about speech and the power of speech over our lives. One term is "foretold," the other is unpredictable, in the Christian life between past and future. The other "fork" is "predictable" and "unpromised." The dead soul, to take up the latter "fork" first, is easily understood. He follows the line of least resistance. The psychologist whom he consults, comforts him by saying: Well, your behavior is natural. You are afraid. You are sexually restless, etc. etc. The client is glad to hear that anybody would act like him, under the circumstances. This man is predictable. If you knew his pressures and urges, you would always know what he will do, next. He is, however, so repetitive that he is not expected or promised or heralded because no new contribution can be hoped for from him. We know this type of a man since the days of Adam. He is, therefore, very anxious to remain unknown to us, in his private religion, private opinions, private affairs. People like to call this "privacy," their "personal life" or they slip the formula, "On the personal level." Of course, this is a mere way of divorcing the potential powers for doing unpredictable deeds and saying unpredictable words, from our highly predictable actual behavior. This phrase "on the personal level," is a wonderful way of cheating oneself. A person is a man who as far as he is personal, lets the truth shine right through him. The term "person" means to let shine through, to become transparent, to stand revealed and to be representative. Eisenhower has no life on the personal level because he represents the American G. I. There, his person is, stands, lives, comes to realization, and nowhere else. The

constant abuse of the term "person" for unused freedom, concealed opinions, private affairs, forces us today to avoid the word. It is sick. It means solely, to most people, that they have some secrets to themselves. This is their balm and comfort; for it means: although we are predictable and although we do follow the law of averages, yet you do not know everything about me. Hence, you are not totally my master and boss. A man who is both, completely known and completely predictable, would be obviously, in the hands of the psychologist and demagogue one hundred per cent. The predictable man must at least feebly try to remain unknown.

There is, however, another way. You may be one hundred per cent known, for all your handicaps, disadvantages, as Jesus was, and yet remain free and unpredictable. He clearly could be seen to be without office, without beauty, without power, and without family. And he deceived them not because they did not know him on a personal level, but because they did not believe that he, of all people, was the promised one, the one man whom the sages had foretold as the one truly free man who could be nothing but seed of a future, first word of a second incarnation. Jesus was not invisible but he was foretold, promised, as the harvest of all the sighs of all men of all ages in their caves of predetermination, fate, scientific predictions. He was a person in that he let the spirit become transparent. And on his face, the reflection of God's freedom to create the world, outshone the blood, sweat, and tears which the mortal man expired. We speak of the three persons of the trinity because they are the three ways by





...there shall be incarnation.

And this we all believe [...] by opening our lips, by speaking at all. Anybody who enters upon the ocean of speech has believed in the truth. We have believed before we speak. That we speak, is the fruit of our faith in the Word, which comes forth out of the mouth of the Godhead; we need [not ask for?] denominations and their accounts of doctrine. Many believe [who decline to be] labeled as believers.

But it is true that the many do not think that they believe. The veil is not lifted for most men; they do not see what they do when they speak. They speak *about* God and ignore the fact that God must have spoken from the beginning if their own words shall make any sense. Scientists, especially, are ignorant of the man-creating, peace-creating, science-creating character of speech. Their inveiglement is responsible for the crucial sacrifice, for the necessity of placing the name of Jesus in front and ahead of our own words.

## F A I T H      a n d      T I M E .

11/15/65 - Note - This  
 Section not in basic  
 set when handed to me  
 but in a separate folder.  
 Also not in German  
 text. ccc

Since the New Era and in as far as we enter upon it,  
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ we know again that which the kings, the priests,

the prophets, the poets had forgotten and do forget time and again:  
 that to speak also means to hear, that to think also means to thank,  
 that to call names also means to be called names, that to create also  
 means to be created.

The complete equilibrium between my commandeering  
 and my obeying position in the universe is destroyed by all those who  
 crave power or science or art or authority for their sake. In our era,  
 the king never is without the slave, the judge never without the culprit  
 the scientists never without their consciences, the priest never  
 without his own layman's soul. In our era, man is not without wife,  
 hoary head not without child in his heart, for the crucified one always  
 has spoken to us before we have thought, always has suffered before we  
 have made suffer, always has obeyed before we have commanded, always  
 has been a song before we have opened our mouth to sing.

Man no longer is alone . Well , this would be an empty logical statement  
 if this pagan word "Man" in its abstract singular of One Man was not  
 exploded in the "Ichthys", the Son of Man of the old covenant and the  
 King of the new covenant, the lowly one , Jesus and the exalted one,  
 Christ, disproves that God created single atoms, called with the  
 abstract collective M A N. We are not all General Issue of one  
 animal species. We are every one of us a species and together we do  
 constitute <sup>a species out of innumerable species, species specierum.</sup> ~~XXXXXXX~~; this is not a specious pun. No, it is  
 the simple fact that outside the Christian era, we are particularized  
 into the shabby halfness of one sex, one generation one place, one  
 class, one intelligence, one individual separatedness. Inside the  
 Christian era, every one hearer of the word who links up with one

single underdog, any one team composed of speaker and listener, of battered ~~up~~ victim and baptized good Samaritan, together ~~form~~ make epoch.

To give a very simple example. If every judge in our courts would only judge one single criminal case and solve it by living with the culprit as long as it was necessary, our prisons would be replaced by an " eschatological" substitute . Now, this sounds ridiculous. And yet, our attempt of probation points precisely in this direction. For, probation obviously does not work- all reports agree on this- unless the condemned person is able to move into a changed environment. At least, one person, from now on, must be seen by him he did not meet before, and probably, at least one person whom he used to meet before, should be expunged from his daily routines. THus, though the judge himself may as yet remain on his bench, he in fact whenever he passes sentence, does expectt that somewhere in our society somebody will join the culprit and make his probation period meaningful. But when this actual-ly happens- and I do not speak of our overburdenend officials of probation but of good Samaritans who do this once but with their whole heart- when it does happen, it does make epoch. Why ? Because one man has conceived of this crime and this trial as addressed to him in person and to nobody else. That is he will not speak of "society" havang to foot the bill; he will not plead with the City Fathers; he will say: this means me.

Has this anything to do with the history of the human race throug the Christian Era ? It has indeed. For, 900 years ago, this program wa outlined. Then, the Church entered the world and made epoch by changing all our criminal law for the first time. And the motto simply ran: A judge

cannot be a judge unless he discovers in his own heart the wrinkle for which he, too, might have become guilty of the deed confessed to him by one repentant soul.

My proposal about probation hails right from this sentence of the Great Confessional of 1050. And of course, this ~~man's~~ <sup>book's</sup> wisdom comes right down from ~~Stephens~~ // the New Testament as here all men receive their individual character ~~from the~~ in due time out of the whole process of creating the One Man out of us all. Who knows his tomorrow We shall be who we shall be, is the truth of men led by their creator through the night of their own preconceptions about themselves. It Certainly it is ~~such~~ <sup>HIM</sup> a terrifying truth that we shall be like ~~God~~ <sup>He</sup> who shall be who he shall be, in the Old Testament's terms, ~~that~~ <sup>Therefore</sup> no man can face up to this "We shall be who we shall be" unless <sup>holds firm</sup> inside ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> bond with all men, inside one era, one creation, one communion of mutual commitment and mutual reliance. No one alone has the capability of saying "I shall be who I shall be", without being ridiculous, or the devil who is so many forms that he has to call himself "Legion". \*) ~~xxxxxx~~ Yet, if he says that we all together are the Son who shall become as divine as the Father, he will find inside this history his own line which just he and he alone is asked to speak. The We who shall be who they shall be, do not consist of dumb animals. These "We" cannot contain anybody who remains just anybody. Everybody must ~~xxxx~~ <sup>enter</sup> inside <sup>and into</sup> the we in his appointed hour, /in his power of becoming somebody, this definite person. This strange composition of the unified Man out of persons was described as ~~the Breath of one's calling~~ \*) this treacherous search for many forms is described in my book "The Multiformity of Man" Beachhead Press, Norwich 1988.

by Augustine in his commentary on Man's creation( de Gen. ad lit. I, as, the breath of one's calling by which in secret the divine Wisdom speaks to that creature whose principle consists in ~~his~~ having to turn around and to face about."

When the man faces about, he sees the woman inside himself; when the judge faces about, he sees the criminal inside himself. When the king faces about, he sees the slave inside himself. All this is obscured among us as today the servant has to face about to see the boss inside himself, the public has to face about and see the government inside itself. Aye, even the children fall prey to modern education unless they face about and discover the teacher inside themselves.

We have seen the gospels as phases in the process by which this gospel of the perfect man marched to the <sup>tribes</sup> ~~Jews~~ first, to the Romans second, to the ~~Saints~~ <sup>Saints</sup> third, to the Greek last.

And because it went through four different forms, it became free from any one of them, as <sup>free</sup> (their Lord, as the GOOD NEWS itself had been free.

In a book written at that very moment, the achievement of the four gospel writers was declared impossible. And we ~~shall~~ <sup>have</sup> quoted the paragraph from the Book of Henoch as this question of writing books in <sup>m</sup> matters of life and death, is our question and the trouble of any age. The Evangelists ~~are~~ <sup>in advance</sup> condemned in these words: ~~The fourth of the fallen angels was the one who instructed mankind in writing and thereby many sinned from eternity to eternity and until this day. For men were not created for such a purpose to give confirmation to their good faith with pen and ink\*)." That~~ <sup>an impressive</sup> statement. And all the critics who have reduced the gospel to one source, would make <sup>out</sup> the writer of this "Source" of our Gospel

gospels

as a fallen angel indeed. I would side with the Book of Henoch if we had one gospel only. But we have four. And we have four as relay runners in the race of the gospel from its Marathon, from the Cross, to <sup>our</sup> Athens <sup>id est into</sup> and the world of men. In its fourfoldness, the ~~written~~ <sup>gospel</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>interesting</sup> is the luminous track left in the dark from Christ on Golgatha to the Church of James in Jerusalem, to ~~the~~ Church of Peter in Rome, to the Churches of Paul all over the Gentile World and <sup>finally</sup> to <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ the Island of Patmos, this eternal exile of any coming Christianity within the world ~~if~~ <sup>as of</sup> it just is <sup>today</sup>. The four gospels form a line and the single gospel is one point on that line which begins beyond all of them, and <sup>which</sup> ~~it~~ ends at a point, Patmos, which points beyond all organized Christianity of its own times.

It is at this moment that we understand the full meaning of the emphasis given by the evangelists to their <sup>fair</sup> servicing the Word, at the specific hour : they have never said : written by John, Marc, etc. We to this day are required if we are not cynical, to say "according to St. Matthew", "according to St. Marc". This, I well know, is not much respected today. To me, it seems to bear out all the principles of our undertaking. First the gospel is Jesus himself. But ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> is so compelling that rivers of life stream from him and compell men to write down the Good News. Four men in a succession of forty years "accord" and this according is the premise for any one of the four gospels. He who because of his <sup>to</sup> library or philological erudition begins from one of the four, <sup>only</sup> must end by denying that there ever was any gospel. For the gospel proves itself simply by moving four evangelists through four decades. If only one man wrote a book, he would be the fallen angel of the Book of Henoch. The membership of all four writers inside

this Body of Time which with a dusty name we remember barely as a living Body because we think of it as an organisation in space, this Body of Time consists of a great poem, of which Christ is the first line and the gospel writers are the next lines. But it is all one song. In the new Era of Christianity, men are hours, and the bricks of the temples of old now have become days or hours represented by living souls and peoples. This vision of a Body through Time seems to transcend the logicians's logic. Fortunately, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ we live by it every one of us, just the same. We constitute <sup>it</sup>, all the faithful, Christ in our own time, or there never has been any Christianity. But if this so, then the gospelwriters did not write books by themselves or as individuals, but they relayed the message at the hour in which they were called. Because time was of the essence, the ink was purified and the paper was vivified. By the term "according", the symphony of all the voices explained each individual writer's movement. If you hold that Dante's Divine Comedy was written verse after verse, and no verse <sup>it</sup> related to the end from the beginning, then you must judge the gospels as separate entities. However, you then must forgive me if I am not interested in your views because you prove yourself a complete barbarian in matters of creation. A great symphony first exists as a whole and later it unfolds in its single movements. Quacks may patch four movements together; that, however, entitles us to call them quacks. The whole test of Christianity is that it binds all the times together. Hence, the four gospels first are one before they are distributed over Forty years. You may laugh at this proposition. But this is the faith of the Founder of our Era; <sup>it</sup> is the faith of the four evangelists and it is the only faith deserving the majestic name of FAITH at all.

We are sown into one field of force which is time. And the runners of the Marathon, the torchbearers in this relay race break through the iron ring of each cycle of culture, each epoch of a civilization, each period of one partial environment. By their fruits, ye shall know them, and by nothing but their fruits. Sown in the incredible and incredulous situation, by their fruits they outgrow this given situation and stake out the wider heaven of one race through all epochs and all times. Thus, the millennia of Spengler, the 20 odd civilizations of Toynbee, the parts of the Cambridge Universal History are transformed willy-nilly into the Chapters of One book, into mile-stones of one Road. But without them, <sup>gospel</sup> there would be neither one book nor one road. For at every moment, the men of their own times and their own civilization and their own culture or their own revolution delight in their self-importance and scorn any idea of getting outside one's own time, as an insult to common sense. The gospel always is the common sense of tomorrow, never the common sense of yesterday.

for the same reason,

But ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ there is only one gospel at all times. If you travel through the four decades of the four gospels you have identified the unity of the gospel, and when <sup>after that</sup> you meet the people who live and die to their own times only, you may not convince them that there is a Christian Era, but you may know// that there can be.