

772

**Philo,  
Strauß und Renan**

und daß

**Christenthum.**

Von

**Bruno Bauer.**

---

**Berlin.**

Verlag von Gustav Hempel.

1874.

## Contents.

I. Philo as Leader [Führer] from Hellenism to Christianity. _____	3
II. Strauss and his new faith. _____	11
III. Renan's position on French imperialism. _____	18
IV. Strauss' establishment in the world. _____	26
V. The Roman Caesars and the harbingers of Christianity. _____	34
VI. Philo's spiritual world religion. _____	45
VII. Philo in the New Testament. _____	75
VIII. Renan's Life of Jesus. _____	92
IX. Philo's writings. _____	103

## I. Philo as Leader [Führer] from Hellenism to Christianity.

I turn to the conclusion of my work on the origin of Protestant history. First I bring the Jewish prologue to Christianity, I mean the outline which the Jew Philo sketched of the core of evangelical history before it came into action, and the concept in which this Alexandrian master sketched some of the basic ideas of the so-called Pauline letters and the high priestly image of the letter to the Hebrews.

These creations of the Alexandrian, who had to negotiate with the Emperor Caligula in Rome in the year 40 as an ambassador of his Jewish fellow citizens at an advanced age, relieve me of the unnecessary trouble of bringing myself into direct polemical contact with the two men who have dominated the field of popular Gospel criticism over the last ten years.

Against Strauss's belief in an ancient Jewish image of the Messiah, which was established and detailed long before the Gospels were written and which the authors of the Gospels copied like an honorable blackboard and which Jesus also copied under the constraint of the Jewish.

I need not repeat my earlier proofs of the unfamiliarity of real history with such a commanding model image. I will let Philo speak for me and describe the new needs and moods that have shaped the image of a mediator descending, ascending and descending between heaven and earth.

Nor do I need to disturb Renan's pride in his landscape painting and in the skill of his brush, with which he has harmonized the magic of the localities of sacred history with the sweetness (according to Renan's expression) of the new message, in any way by direct intervention. I don't want to disturb his Jesus, who, like a chameleon, reflects the local color of his scenic surroundings or, like an insect, wears the color of the leaf that forms his world. Nor do I wish to offend in the least the German reviewers who (as, for example, in the

Berlin "Reform" of April 18, 1867) find Renan's superiority over the German scholars in the fortunate advantage that he has grasped the localities of Protestant history with his own eyes, has himself climbed the mountains on which Jesus was best inspired, and has swung on the Sea of Galilee, the center of the Protestant "idyll".

But Philo will appear and reveal in his soul lakes and seas from which the mysteries of antiquity will rise, and mountains on which a new theocracy will be founded, rising above the exhausted Rome and Greece.

And the same Alexandrian comes to us surrounded by a "choir of the Ancients and Pythian seers", as he himself calls them, whom he introduces to us as his collaborators. Heraclitus with his mystery of the antithesis, which animates the world and works its way up to unity, Plato with his world of ideas, the Stoics with their Logos, which forms the law of the world, and the whole host of Greek philosophers, come close to his hand and shine in his writings as the master craftsmen of revelation, which culminates in the Logos, the mediator, interpreter, intercessor and high priestly reconciler between heaven and earth.

This illustrious chorus of Philo's fellow-workers makes it completely unnecessary for me to comment on the narrow circle of vision in which Strauss makes an alleged template, on which the image of the Messiah had long been drawn in the Jewish synagogue, responsible for the shaping of Christianity and the Protestant "saga". And before the approach of the same men, from Heraclitus and Democritus to Zeno, the father of the Stoics, the enamel of the Galilean landscape, in which Renan finds the explanation of the Protestant "pastoral", pales like a theatrical decoration before the light of day.

When Philo clothed the Greek philosophical image of the world-ordering Logos with priestly functions, when he introduced the view of Heraclitus and his successors of human frailty and the renunciation of the Greek philosophical schools to the world into the law of Jehovah and paved the way for the same views in the theories of the Johannine

and Pauline writings, he stood as a witness in a question that has occupied the world until now.

It concerns the dispute about the mutual relationship between philosophy and religion.

The Enlightenment of the last century, with its aversion and tension against the church's doctrine of faith, could not negotiate the connection between these two areas of life without prejudice. The creators of Greek philosophy, despite the birth pains that the establishment of general world powers cost them, failed to recognize the kinship that still connected them with the ancient deities, and they thus proved the peoples right who accused them of enmity against the gods. The last philosopher, Hegel, brought religion and philosophy together as siblings who shake hands in the succession of the historical metamorphoses of his idea; only he claimed for the younger sibling the precedence that through the pure grasp of the idea it stood above the preceding stage of religion, which viewed the world process only in sensually formed images. He overlooked the fact that the world journey of his idea through nature and his historical spiritual realm is also only a symbolic image or spectrum which his imagination and religious mood have thrown onto the colorless table of his logic.

Philo actually settled this dispute. The Jewish thinker completed the turning point of antiquity, which occurred during his lifetime and was characterized, among other things, by the establishment of the worldly autocracy of a single person, by placing Greek philosophy in the middle of the Old Testament law and thus providing the Church with the formulas for the logical glorification of the heavenly One. He reworked Greek philosophy in such a way that it became the precursor of Christianity and enabled the latter to continue the work to which Heraclitus, Plato and the Stoics had devoted themselves.

A lecture by Mr. Michelet at the philosophical society in Berlin, about which the "National-Zeitung" of August 29, 1873, contains a report, makes it possible for me to illustrate this dispute between religion and philosophy by an "either-or", which this active disciple of

Hegel opposed to the doubters of the sublimity of the latter, according to the measure of this preface. Mr. Michelet spoke about the position that Mr. Zeller took on Hegel's philosophy in his inaugural address this year. He would not accept the assertion of the new Berlin professor that Hegel had neglected experience in his philosophical constructions, and avenged his master on his opponent by proving that the latter, too, imposes on philosophy the duty of going back from the objects of experience to "that which eludes perception, to the essence of things, the causes of appearance, and to ask for the unified cause from which the interaction of all things and the harmony of all being can be explained".

The triumph and defeat of these two new Berlin fighters are indifferent here as a private matter. On the other hand, the threat that Michelet holds out to the defenders of experience and opponents of the dialectical reconciliation of the world's opposites does me a useful service. When he says that to reject the dialectical reconciliation of opposites "means nothing other than rejecting the whole of philosophy, since Zeno, Heraclitus, Plato and all who followed, up to Kant, Fichte and Schelling, only prepared what Hegel carried out with consummate mastery", I accept this sentence, but apply it differently than the faithful disciple of Hegel expected with his threat.

For me, it is not a question of rejecting philosophy, but of its historical position in relation to religion. The opposition it has given itself with its shadowy unifying powers to the personal deities and world rulers of religion is a transient appearance. From the moment that Anaxagoras replaced his Ionian predecessors and the bold atomists, who, for lack of experience, could not attempt to explain nature through the details of the natural process, and opposed the spirit as the organizing power of the world, philosophy has not emerged from mythology. The spirit of Anaxagoras, like Plato's world of ideas, is the religious divinization and separation of the law from the world, of possibility from reality, of essence from things. Spinoza's substance, too, is still the Jewish unification and independence of the law against the real, and Hegel did nothing but use the categories that

Plato sought out as a weapon against the Sophists and their critique of the declining state of law and gods, which Aristotle then organized, the Scholastics of the Middle Ages to real existences, Fichte to tools for the struggle of the ego with the massive world, and Bardili to algebraic magic formulas, to ghostly powers that govern the mind and nature and make history.

Greco-Roman antiquity perished without arriving at an explanation of its religions and their gods. This downfall and the obscurity of antiquity about the origin of its gods are pragmatically connected with each other or are only manifestations of one and the same fact. Plato's rejection of the Homeric myths, and his exhortation to the states and authorities to introduce more worthy images of the gods into the schools, - the allegorical interpretations of others, who wished to save the objectionable accounts from the world of the gods as shells of moral truths, - the natural explanations of epicurean educated mythologists, who saw in the gods of legend deserving and deified kings and heroes of antiquity, cannot serve as a recognition of the ancient religions.

The philosophers themselves were not able to put an end to the colorful world of gods with their colorless systems, for in them they only simplified the relationship that popular belief ascribed to the gods in relation to the world. They copied the traditional religion and, for all their opposition to it, were so dependent on it that they called their new thought-creature by the names of the folk gods.

Anaxagoras honored his world-ordering spirit with the title of Zeus, just as Heraclitus lent the same name to the power that remains master over the opposites of the world and, when he wanted to describe the emergence and separation of the opposites, had Apollo as archer send the dividing arrows and attributed the unification of the divorced to the magic of the lyre of the same god.

Here too, in this asphyxiation and constriction of antiquity to its ossifying world, Philo acted as a trailblazer. He opened the way for the Greeks and Romans to emerge from themselves and undergo a

metamorphosis. First, by forging the monotheism to which antiquity had elevated itself by means of the philosophical separation of spirit and matter into the God of the Jews, and then by summarizing in sharply accentuated formulas those views and theories in which the philosophers had expressed their fear of nature and their disenchantment with the world.

The Enlightenment of the last century, when it delighted in the sight of the Greek gods out of weariness at the asceticism and carnality of Christianity, was greatly mistaken about the origin and inner fear of these idols. The seemingly bright images of the Greek gods emerged from the darkness of the night, from the depths of the unleashed elements, or acquired their glory in the struggle with the monstrosities of nature and the passions of primitive man. But even in the perfection of victory, which the later artists expressed in the figures of Zeus, Athena or Aphrodite, the memory of the hardships and tribulations of their origin and the fear that the battle with the elements and passions could break out again from the depths of the same still lingers over their rigid foreheads.

The philosophers, who since Anaxagoras' discovery of the world-ordering spirit dealt with the opposition between world and spirit, expected the latter to be resolved by the increasing glorification of the latter and reduced nature to a formless and shapeless mass, which receives the manifold ways of its appearance and all its peculiarity only as a borrowed gift from above. Then there were the political disappointments. The democracies had not been able to keep the promises of their heyday and had to see the constitutional forms with which they protected the absolutism of their rule against internal and external enemies transformed into tools of the emperors for their own oppression. The ruthlessness of the authorities, the gossip of the popular orators, the venality of the councillors led the small states, which had hitherto lived from the mediation of their neighbors and finally sank into the abyss themselves, and the participation of all in the management of the whole and in the enjoyment of its power, degenerated into the beggary of the mobs, who held out the beggar's



sack before the lean state coffers in order to squeeze the last obol from them for their daily food.

The thinkers and their schools saved themselves by retreating from this disappointment of antiquity. They protected themselves against violence by fortifying their inner independence; the weathered larva of the commonwealth had become indifferent to them, the pleasure in which the rich still sought a substitute for their diminished power was denatured by the hypochondriac of their morality. The world became a stranger to them, in whose darkness they wandered as the last shining points, without knowing for whom.

Then Philo arose to gather the lonely and the hermits. He took this view from the Greek philosophers that the world was a foreign place for "the wise", but he turned it into a basic dogma, expanded it into the doctrine that life in this world is a wandering journey in general, and showed its destination in an upper world which flesh and blood cannot inherit. He chose the Logos, which Heraclitus and the Stoics had revealed to him, as his upward leader.

Let's pause here for a moment! We are in the forecourt to Christianity, the development of which we will describe in a later section.

I shall first describe the position of the two men, whose detailed work I need no longer criticize after my earlier investigations and apart from the development of the Philonian system, in relation to the present. By the present I do not mean the public, whose applause or displeasure may exalt or disgust them, but the symptoms of rising imperialism, which, as in the days of the Greek schools of philosophy, uses the outworn forms of the old constitutional state to develop its omnipotence.

The question is: did they, like the thinkers of antiquity, construct for themselves an inner world that could survive the collapse of their environment, and then: did they fathom and understand the religion whose explanation they undertook better than the philosophers of antiquity were able to interpret their popular religion?

The one, Strauss, looks at the world very naively and the official present appears to him in the rosiest light. There is only one point in which he believes he has been unfortunate; religion has slipped from his grasp, but he soon founds a new one and what it cannot offer him in the way of edification, he replaces with a quiet domestic dilettantism.

The other, Renan, is more gruff. He stands by the garbage heap of history on which, in his view, destructive democracy has thrown the glories of the good old days. He weeps Lamartine tears over the end of things and at the same time, like Emil Ollivier, tries to pull a few scraps out of the garbage and recommends them to his contemporaries as helpful relics. These scraps also include (according to the preface to the edition of his "Life of Jesus" from the end of 1869) "a bit of ideal and love, a religious goal, a dream and sweet consolation for the weak".

This bit of ideal, this keyword and magic word indispensable for the preservation of world order, is his entire content, the sum and detail of his philosophy. Now to Strauss!

## II. Strauss and his new faith.

The doctor Guyot, whom the voters of Lyons sent as their representative to the French National Assembly last spring, wrote to the radical electoral committee of that city on April 21, 1873: "I have never been stingy with my interests, nor with my person, when it comes to collaborating in the great work of democracy; for this is my religion and I have no other, (the coexistence of two absolutes in the same brain even seems impossible to me; the one must cancel out the other).

In this man of the absolute, Strauss, the present one, who had Darwin give him a new deity in the universe and a replacement for Christianity, which had fallen into disrepute, had to welcome a man of his heart. The Frenchman, who cannot harbor two absolutes in his brain, but cannot live without one, has replaced the departed god of the old religion with the work of democracy, to which he offers the sacrifice of his interests and his person.

Our most important dramatic poet, Ferdinand Raimund, has given us in his romantic masterpiece, "The Prodigal", a poignant symbolic picture of the frugality with which man in his need of life can be modest with the remnants of a discarded possession. The melancholy charm which this enchanting piece exerts on us comes from a surplus which goes beyond the hero's personal fable; we feel that it is about something more than the rare happiness of an impoverished prodigal.

The fact that a benevolent fairy collects the jewels and valuables that youthful arrogance throws out of the window and saves them for the old age of her favorite does not seem to us to exhaust the meaning of the play, given the touching laments that run through it. It is as if we hear from the mixture of lamentations and youthful frenzy the fate of youth, which in chivalrous self-sufficiency also puts the inherited spiritual goods at risk, but as a man learns to keep house and finds in

the discarded still useful household to decorate and maintain the household.

We know this return from the assault on the old and the inherited to frugality and collection of the mind in the life of the peoples as the attempts of the conservative and religious reaction. One restricts oneself, withdraws from the adventures of public life, cleans up the old furniture and lights a votive lamp before the forgotten gods.

But the need for religious consecration is expressed more violently than in this restriction and renunciation precisely in the moments of the revolutionary storm. The masses do not want to let go of the halo that surrounds the objects of their former worship and, after they have cleaned up under the old, want to retain it for their new cult. They are more provident and stingier than Raimund's prodigals. They keep the old halos, the veils of mystery, the mysterious blankets and the golden thrones of heaven for their new deities.

And the leaders in the storming of the old and the discoverers of the new, what do they do by adding rung to rung to the ladder of further striving and of universal uplift? They extend the ladder to heaven, on which the innovators of each century work. They believe (and thus correctly interpret the instinct of the masses who faithfully look up to them and follow them) that they have only secured their discoveries and the dogmas they proclaim as the new rulers when they have placed these new rulers in the tent of the former divinity, in heaven. Every discoverer, every epoch of storm and stress, strives for a higher heaven, as befits the higher needs that have arisen. Thus history is one uninterrupted ascent to heaven, and each innovator believes that he has reached the seventh heaven until another pioneer, with a host of new people and new needs, overthrows him from his ideal height and rises above his heaven.

These stormers of heaven are proselytizers, the leaders of a new priesthood, the continuers and finishers of the church they have fought against, and from the seventh heaven they have taken from the

old believers, they want to rule the world they have conquered with a firmer hand than ever before.

When, for example, at the time of the French Revolution, Manuel undertook to expel all saints from paradise, his collaborators overthrew the Christian God from heaven and settled in his place, the state became the church, the citizen became a priest, the altar of the fatherland became the highest sanctuary, popular sovereignty became the only dogma, the renunciation of the pomp and works of the old faith became the true exorcism, — the nation celebrated a rebirth that was to be more thorough and comprehensive than that demanded by Christianity.

First Bailly had proclaimed the religion of the law, the worship of which is obedience, then Roland in her threatening letter had sought to frighten the king with the assurance that the Constitution had become the religion of the people, - now the works and activities of everyday civic life were to be illuminated and spiritualized by the light of the most universal ideas, and since the heavenly splendor of the festive moments would not endure in the bustle of working days, at least the attitude of the citizen was required to be unwaveringly directed towards the perfection of the political church in the world of ideals.

But even Robespierre's terror could not lend lasting weight to this demand.

We only briefly recall how Hegel, in order to remedy this need for revolution, so intimately intertwined the idea with reality that for the orthodox thinker in the whole world and history only the glory of the idea remained and freedom calmed down to the recognition of the given and to reconciliation with the real. If only the action-lust of man, who makes history and has called the real into being, could be put out of commission for ever by the reconciliation of the historical intrigue, or the book of history, when Hegel has certified it with the signature of his Bravo or "Conclusion!", could be slammed shut before his eyes!

Strauss now enters this circle, to which Feuerbach also belongs with his apotheosis of a single human passion, love, and with his humanization of Christianity through a sentimental cult of love, with his book on the "old and new faith".

Although he believes himself to be infinitely different from his idealist predecessors and immediately introduces the whole universe, in which there is no above and below and no room for a heaven elevated above the finite, into the scene, he seems to have completely abandoned the ascension of his predecessors. He adds no new rung to the heavenly ladder of the enlighteners and revolutionaries of the previous century and the philosophers and thinkers of the present century, does not rise above it, does not need a new heaven. He has grasped posto in a universe whose center is located in each of its points, which "in no subsequent moment is more perfect than in the preceding one, and in which all stages and stages of development and development, of ascent and descent, of becoming and passing away exist side by side and complement each other to infinity".

And yet he also has his seventh heaven, in which he lives and floats "happily". Of course, he is done with Christianity; he has gotten rid of it. In what way? That cannot interest us, since his alleged liberation bears no trace of the new and original. We will also leave his construction of the universe and his appropriation of Darwin's researches to themselves. Let him argue with men of letters about the value or unworthiness of his elaboration, if they consider it worth their while to discuss the reflection of the currently outstanding theories in his mind! May he experience from month to month, from year to year, the surprise of seeing his propositions, borrowed from the observations and conjectures of the present day, overturned and antiquated by more thorough observations and combinations of researchers.

But it will cause some astonishment in the circle of experts, who are still engaged in the liveliest debate on the question of the purposefulness of nature, when he endows nature with the great law

of progress and sees in it the "striving, which proves its divinity, for immeasurably progressive improvement and ennoblement".

Strauss is like the newer theologians. The more purified and cleansed of the old dogmas their religion has become, the more comprehensive it becomes and the more fervently it yearns to impose religious meaning on the most worldly circumstances. The more the personal God shrinks for the innovators, the more the religious powers expand. Robespierre's terrifying command to his republicans to prostrate themselves before the supreme being and sacrifice themselves on the altar of the fatherland is child's play compared to Strauss' demand that one should not allow oneself to doubt the testimonies of the divinity of nature.

Strauss also weaves the keywords of the previous Himmelsstürmer into his religion of nature. He calls the "lawful, vital and rational All the highest idea, and Feuerbach, in whom, after the fall of the personal good, "the species" still has the dramatic meaning that it is, as it were, the consuming and purifying oxygen in which the individuals glow, spray themselves and fizzle out for their glorification, borrows the thought thing of the same species as a pattern according to which the individual should dutifully transform himself.

Darwin should at least have led him to the idea that the species exists only through the struggle of individuals and enriches itself through their experiences.

After the proclamation of this natural catechism, he finally subjects his religiosity to a chemical test, he wants to see whether it still has life, reaches for Schopenhauer, who "slaps his highest idea in the face" at every opportunity, and really finds that his wounded feeling for the universe "reacts religiously".

While others perhaps keep the argument about pessimism and optimism, which is currently popular among dilettantes, at bay as a belletristic dispute by accepting Schopenhauer's assertion that this world is the worst possible world, and by recognizing the worst as the best possible world, because it, with its infirmities and its insecurity, is

the right field for man to maintain himself and to draw from the inner source of his compassion the strength to fight against the misery and suffering in his surroundings, Strauss's soul shrinks in horror at the alleged pessimism of that philosopher. Schopenhauer's theses appear to him as outbursts that strike his mind as absurdities and his soul as blasphemies.

The inquisitor and the curser stand before us in the flesh. In the metamorphosis that he experienced in Strauss, Ferdinand Raimund's Flottwell has taken with him from the vestiges of the old church precisely the most offensive instruments of exclusivity into his new heaven: the test of faith, the torture of the Inquisition and the harsh condemnation.

Strauss has the misfortune of being laughed at by those whose "old faith" he has pathetically bid farewell to and who reproach him with the fact that his dispute with the old is a fight with windmills and a failure against a caricature of Christianity. Let him, for example, read the lecture that Dr. Schmidt gave on 6. December 1872 in the "Berliner Unionsverein" on his book, and he will learn that there is Christianity without miracles, that religion has long since ceased to boast of proofs for the existence of God, that since Kant the conviction has prevailed that God cannot be known, since Schleiermacher, that feeling is the form of right communication with God, that Christianity has long since ceased to consist in turning away from a radical, supernatural existence, and is no longer in irreconcilable contradiction with the modern view of the world.

Strauss learns from this speech by the editor of the "Protestantische Kirchenzeitung" that his seemingly tragic question: "Are we still Christians", as well as his denial of it, does not affect large circles in the least. Most of the reviewers who have declared themselves against his book prove in their statements how little it takes to complete religion in its latest emptiness. The idea of the unity of the world, a guiding purpose, an organizing spirit, the ideal of the good, the shaming of matter by the spirit, freedom above all else! Freedom as the price of self-conquered morality! Finally, the great



17 Strauss and his new faith.

unknown before which natural scientists beat their breasts when they lose patience at the end of their experiments.

It is bad enough for Strauss that, with the same impatience and rashness, he is seized at the end of his lesson with Darwin by a shudder at the divinity of nature and immerses himself in Feuerbachian devotion to the ideal being of the species!

### III. Renan's position on French imperialism.

To love liberty enthusiastically and to go to the castle to the great and powerful and win their hearts for the wishes of the good people - that was Emil Ollivier's passion, which led him to the Chamber of Deputies, to the director of the 2nd of December, Mr. v. Morny, and finally to the presidency of the Imperial Council of Ministers. Just as Mirabeau (who, as is well known, was only a misguided Morny), alongside Louis XVI, harmonized the new liberty and royal power - what role could be more appealing for the righteous and nobleman!

Renan also felt that he had what it took to play this role of Ollivier's; he also went to the castle, but he was spared the ordeal to which his contemporary succumbed. While his kindred spirit ushered in the liberal period of the Empire (since January 1, 1867), he only managed to produce programs. But he ennobled these works of his pen with the holy water of tears and, with melancholy Lamartine sermons, bitterly lamented the isolation of the rulers and the torment of conscience of the righteous liberals, who would gladly serve the powerful if only time had erased the stain of its origin through the statute of limitations.

In addition to the role of the lamenting political Jeremiah, he has also taken on the role of the weeping spiritual prophet. He lives in a gentle mysticism, in which the keywords of German philosophy (from Kant to Feuerbach) buzz around. He has heard from Kant that God is a postulate of practical reason, and at the same time Feuerbach overthrew the good (as a person) from the throne of the Godhead and made the good, the beautiful and the true into an eternal being. As a result of his many-sided education, he therefore wants (in his "Studies in the History of Religion") to allow ordinary people to use the word "God", which in one form or another will always be the epitome of our supersensible needs, while he asserts for the absolution of the philosopher that the enthusiasm in which he feels himself elevated

above himself by the heavenly charm of the ideal, the good, the true and the beautiful, is also nothing other than worship.

Louis Veuillot expressed the wish (e.g. in the "Univers" of February 13, 1858) that France, whose genius was unbearable, should be led back to the Dupui's, Holbach's, etc. of the previous century. Renan, however, took revenge for this (in the *Revue des deux Mondes*) by complaining about the superficial spirit of the Latin nations, which lacked moral sense and religious initiative.

This complaint about the narrowness of the French genius is the third task in Renan's life, alongside pitying the saviors of the state and propaganda for the cult of the ideal.

Renan's mind is turned towards innovation, his heart inclined towards the old traditions. The ideal pulls him forward, but his softness trembles when he sees the horrors that the Revolution has brought upon France. His *Questions contemporaines* (1868), for example, sketches a chilling picture of the devastation in which the movement set in motion in 1789 ended. There is only a world of pygmies and rebels, - a code that has made everything ephemeral and fragmented and can only produce weakness and pettiness, - a nation in which the noble must fail.

Quite unlike the spiritual heroes of Greece, who in the collapse of their democracies and the change of emperors made themselves the building blocks of a new world, he immerses himself in prophecies and images of the future with his lamentations about the afflictions and suffering of the decent people, in which Dante's hell will close over the tattered nation oppressed by blood-soaked saviors.

The melancholy admirer of the past regrets the decline of the aristocratic *élan* and the priestly spirit. For example, he wrote in the "Journal des Débats" of May 11, 1868, on the occasion of an advertisement for Beulé's "Augustus, his family and his friends": "Our races are not noble enough to do without princes. Modern civilization was in many respects an artificial creation of the nobility and the courts in the midst of a ponderous mass that had little to do with it; if

the courts and the nobility disappear, civilization will suffer some danger among these races, since the noble components of their life have germinated and maintained themselves under the patronage of the princes."

His philosophy of Ollivier's politics consists in the idealization of the second empire. He praises the inspiration of the founder, but criticizes the execution and will have flattered Napoleon III not a little and yet elicited a quiet smile from him if he wanted the empire without the ministers and the majority satellites. His opinion that the servants entrusted with the execution of the leading thought were acting against it, and that the soul was paralyzed by its organs, corresponds to the regret with which the tyrant rulers who pave the way for perfect imperialism usually believe themselves to be surrounded by insecure friends and tactless servants.

The naivety with which he, in the same writing of 1868, laments the good man who, because he only wants to serve a government that is not discernible and in whose foundation he did not participate, is forced to remain aloof, is only a variation on the sigh of the pioneers of imperialism. Napoleon I wished to be his son, and his nephew, whom three kings separated from his predecessor, will sometimes have had the same wish for his person.

Renan's complaints do not explain the incipient imperialism, but only deplore its weakness, as if the transition from legitimacy and democracy to the leveling of earlier legal forms were possible without these infirmities of rootlessness! He who opposes the conclusion of the great world periods with such elegies is even less capable of recognizing in the devaluation of the earlier forms of life and principles the right fertile ground for a new world formation.

Renan has become so comfortable in the role of the lamenting prophet that he compares himself in his writing of the year ", 1871: "the intellectual and moral Reft with that fool of Jerusalem who, during the siege of the holy city, rushed about on its walls with the cry: "Disaster for Jerusalem, disaster for the temple!", until, unnoticed by

the people and struck by the stone of an enemy sling, he collapsed with the lament: "Disaster for me too!"

Of course, the disciples of the Stoa, who were building the new world state while the city conquerors were storming the Greek castles, would not have been capable of such a comparison. Nor would they have imagined that they could renew their fellow citizens by means of constitutional artifices, such as are common in the transition to imperialism, and by conservative refreshments of the orders of Dracon's or Solon's and Kleisthenes' times, as Renan would have liked to do to his own.

In his 1871 pamphlet, for example, he provides a recipe for how the French can free themselves from the democracy of Curi. Restore the monarchy. "Give France a young, serious, strictly moral king! Let him reign for fifty years; let him gather around him men who work consistently and are fanatical about their work, and France can live for another hundred years."

In addition to the king came the nobility, who would be responsible for the detailed leadership of the people. The same is rooted in the army, in that the officer positions are hereditary, the captain of the Landwehr in each canton acts as village lord and gendarmerie colonel.

In his "new faith", Strauss also accepts with a serious face the recommendation of political remedies, e.g. the indispensable "antidote" of the absence of a diet, which should paralyze the "poison" of universal suffrage; but Renan surpasses him in political virtuosity, constructing, for example a new Senate together with a Chamber of Deputies with a contemporary upper and lower nobility and a free regiment of the press and the universities, whose representatives should form the upper class of the reborn France and, with free access to the court of the monarch, as the higher spirits an aristocratic permanent center for the protection of art, science and taste against the democratic wildness and provincial swampiness.

The dynasty from which the young, strictly moral monarch may emerge is that of Bonaparte. According to Renan, France, although monarchically minded, no longer has a proper understanding of the law of succession in matters of government and would therefore prefer to amalgamate with a monarchy without a definite law of succession, i.e. an institution such as that which prevailed under the Roman Caesars. According to his antecedents, the House of Bourbon would not be suited to such a middle position: "the House of Bonaparte, on the other hand, would not fall out of its role if it adopted this undecided position, which does not contradict its origins and is justified by the full recognition that this House has always given to the principle of popular sovereignty.

He has an arcanum in his pocket for the church question, but only ever shows it from afar when he takes it out. It is called: separation of church and state, and he expects the church to burst after drinking this magic potion.

He expressed himself most clearly on this question in a letter to a friend published by the "Public" on April 20, 1869. But still with shy caution. He calls the endowment of the Church with freedom of association and the right of property a ticklish thing, a "delicate" question, and also appeases the fearful democrats with the consolation that the realization of such an ideal is still a long, long way off, and only after he has encouraged them to "trust in freedom", after exhorting them to "trust in freedom", he expresses the conviction that this, "introduced into the Church, will produce unexpected results in it, namely deep divisions, true schisms and dissolve the threatening (Catholic) unity.

A few days later, in his election manifesto of May 8 of the same year to the Parisian electorate, he declared that the priest was the master of his parish, but remained aloof from the affairs of the parish and politics, and then secretly added: "later comes the separation of church and state.

In other words, a peaceful division of power until the complete confrontation that is to lead to the disintegration of the Church, a deal that he tries to make quite palatable to the clergy in the "intellectual speech of 1871". "The Church, he proposed, should admit two categories of believers, those who adhere to the Word and those who adhere to the Spirit. At a certain level of education, belief in the supernatural becomes impossible for a number of people; do not force them to wear a lead skirt. Do not interfere with what we teach, with what we write, and we will not disabuse you of the people. Do not dispute our place at the university, at the academy, and we will leave the elementary school to you without restraint or restriction. Despite all this liberality, he also demands the abolition of Catholicism in the 1871 pamphlet and returns to the arcanum of the separation of church and state as the only solution to the problem, but he despairs of its practical feasibility and resigns himself and his readers to the hope that the papacy will finally dissolve of its own accord and make the struggle unnecessary.

In short, he finds himself at a dead end with his theory and cannot find the exit to practice. He felt that his theory was as weak and impotent as his critical research, without being able to account for it, and therefore took refuge in the hope of a miracle - a vision. In the preface to the illustrated popular edition of his "Life of Jesus" (from the beginning of 1870), he imagines the following scenario for such a miracle: "Night begins to spread its dark wings over the world. The sadness of the evening reigns; selfish calculations have taken the place of the old idealism; faith is dead, the holy branch (Aaron's) withered. But the skeleton of our sad world, so common, mediocre, without faith, love and hope, will clothe itself anew with flesh, and soon the pride of the Roman Church, which is the most complete denial of the Gospel, will be punished."

Bring together Lamartine's laments and visions, Dumas the Younger's aphorisms on the miseries of the present, add Offenbach's shaky opera texts to the mix and you have the ingredients that turn the evening of the present historical period into a joyful morning.

What Renan calls the ordinary and mediocre tone of the present in his poetic prose and condemns as the selfish calculations of French society is actually nothing more than the progressive Anglicization of France. His complaints about the disintegrating effect of democracy are based on his displeasure at the spread of the English regime, the industrial state and the love of peace. That is why, despite the homage he sometimes pays to Protestantism, and despite his bans against the papacy of "Catholic unity" and the organization which alone saved the episcopate in the unstable society of revolutionized France, he retains his admiration. Therefore, at the time of the Syrian expedition, he was able to flatter the empire and the clergy associated with it, expressing the conviction that the religious zeal of imperial France would succeed in opening up the Orient and the coasts of the Mediterranean to the Church of Rome for successful conquests.

That is why he finally shows the new monarchy, which he described in the "Reform" of 1871 with its feudal and priestly environment, a distant destination where it can pluck laurels and keep the swamped society salutarily occupied. This field of conquest for the new Catholic military state is to be China, since Syria is closed and Mexico has become inaccessible, the same China that pines for revenge for the destruction and plundering of thousands of years of literature and art collections in the Emperor's summer palace by the allied civilizers and has already brought the English so far that they have solemnly renounced the protection of Anglican missionaries by British gunboats (even with the consent of the bishops in the House of Lords)!

Before a year had passed after this warlike vision, Renan had forgotten it. He went to Rome in the autumn of 1872, had himself feted there in the Circolo Cavour, shook hands with Mr. Terenzio Mamiani, the former minister of Pius IX, to the cheers of the auditorium, called a monarchical restoration in France impossible, expressed fervent wishes for the fortification of the Republic and paid homage to the "wisdom of the experienced man who saved the French nation", that is, to the President of Peace, Mr. Thiers.



25 Renan's position on French imperialism.

A few "old seminarians" come together, said the Pope in his address to the Roman deputation from Monte Rioni on October 27, shake hands and rejoice in a very foolish way.

Renan's Roman speech, however, had a well-considered purpose. Gambetta's triumphs on his autumn tour through Savoy and southern France seemed to him to mean the imminent dissolution of the Versailles Assembly and he wanted to make himself known to the Republicans for the new elections.

Again, not even a year has passed and the reconciliation of the two lines of the House of Bourbon raises the image of a feudal-priestly monarchy on the horizon of France, as Renan had conceived it in 1871. Will he now finally take back his Roman revocation of Errfahrten or rest from his idealistic errors, sit down and put the first clear sentence on religion and Catholicism on paper?

#### IV. Strauss' establishment in the world.

We step out of the turbulent world in which Renan chases the ideal into the still life in which Strauss rejoices in the happiness with which his new faith endows him. It is a literary and artistic life for which a cozy corner suffices. The hardships of the ordinary children of men have no access to it; the struggles of the world have settled down before the threshold of the quiet hermitage; if the hermit once puts aside the books or the score and opens a window, he finds everything outside good and beautiful, and his satisfaction with himself expands into pleasure in the world order.

When we see Strauss in his hermitage devoted to the cult of beauty, he reminds us of the good child who has recently come out of retirement, who makes her father's heart laugh under the armor of his breast pocket filled with stock exchange papers or official business when he sees, coming home from business, how nobly his daughter knows how to occupy herself. She moves only within the circle of ideals with which the German classics endowed their people. In the Otilie of Goethe's *Elective Affinities* she reveres the muteness of a chaste and innocent suffering. She lives completely in the circle of the aristocratic family into which Wilhelm Meister, after becoming a landowner through his bourgeois means, is accepted and which combines the finest worldly manners with the noblest bourgeois sentiments. The girl, who has barely grown up, follows with interest how Wilhelm Meister, by entering the harbor of that noble family after his life's journey, completes the harmonious development of his abilities, and she also appreciates the noble heart behind Natalia's dryness. Schiller's poems are dear to her because of the instructional content that the rushing gradient of their rhythm carries with it. In the same poet's "Kabale und Liebe", her musician Miller is absolutely invaluable and she finds him German in the best sense of the word, just as her patriotic sense is refreshed by the contrast when the revolutionary crater of France rages in the background of the pure

heart-to-heart of Goethe's couple, Herrmann and Dorothea. The good girl is also capable of taking Lessing's Nathan seriously, becoming enthusiastic about the teachings of humanity and morality and learning many things from this wonderful work that she can apply to her life. Music gives the striving child, when it is tired of its intercourse and dialogue with the ideal, a pleasant collection again, and in the concert hall at the end of the day it lets the German masters of composition harmonize its soul.

Strauss lives in his heaven like this educated girl and no other. In describing the feelings and judgments of the good child, we could even use the key words from Strauss' confessions about his contact with the magnificent figures of German art. The businessman's daughter will also have been no less lacking in "lively participation in the great national war" three years ago than the famous scholar. Like him, she will have "helped her understanding of these things through historical studies" and by reading "popularly written historical works" and, again no less than him, "sought to expand her knowledge of nature" - and there is no lack of popular magazines and lectures to do so.

At the end of this parallel, however, we would like to express our doubt as to whether the barely graduated pensioner, like Strauss, should regard Gluck and Schiller as kindred geniuses and not rather find in the latter a plastic perfection which remained unattainable to the latter, and a modern rebirth of Hellenism which Schiller could not think of. Nor would it occur to her, on hearing Mozart's Marriage of Figaro, to separate text and music, to call the characters of Beaumarchais's original ordinary, and to explain the charm of the opera by the fact that Mozart "could not look at a text without ennobling it, no character without breathing a soul into it". For all her prissy boarding-school education, she will already find the soul in the text, namely that of the revolution which awakened Figaro's sense of honor and led him into the quarrel, and at the end she will also suspect something of the fact that the great men who go astray alongside the pugnacious and victorious barber and rise again at the

end through confession and forgiveness are the accomplices of the revolution.

It is, to use a standing cue from Goethe's Herrmann and Dorothea, a "pure" world in which the girl and Strauss walk. In it they walk on socks, are wary of any offense and live only in noble sentiments. That is why the girl's father's heart laughs that besides the trouble of his intercourse and many an unclean thing he introduces into his house, there is still a room in it in which the flame of the ideal is maintained. The friends of order, who still take offense at some of the twists and turns of Strauss's work, will perhaps in time also think like that businessman and praise themselves happily when that ideal life really spreads, the quietism of aesthetic dilettantism gains ground and they can devote themselves to their daily work with its sometimes ambiguous attributes, unscathed by annoying smart alecks.

Strauss goes one step further, however, and gives religious consecration to the Quietism that already pleases them so wonderfully. He calls the pleasure he derives from our poets "poetic edification", indeed, "the right and full edification". He also has a new Bible: - "for the religion of humanity and morality", Lessing's Nathan is "the sacred foundation book" for him

A quarter of a century ago, the teachers of the free churches looked for new texts to replace the biblical ones and found them in the "to a certain extent also inspired works of our poets, especially the "sentence-rich" Schiller. A flower reading from William Tell formed the first text booklet for free congregations.

Thus a breviary for the use of lovers of the religion of humanity and morality would be the right complement to the present Straussian book with its still doctrinal tone.

Strauss believes he hears the objection that edification from the masterpieces of German literature is only ever "information for scholars, at least for the educated", whereas the many readings and studies are not for the man of the people; for him only the Bible is "something he understands". And he responds to this objection with

holy seriousness, instructing the doubters that "one should not think that Lessing's Nathan or Goethe's Her husband and Dorothea are more difficult to understand or contain less truths of salvation, less golden sayings than a Pauline letter or a Johannine discourse on Christ", and incidentally he gives them the consolation that in future, the less the children of farmers are tormented with Palestinian geography and Jewish history, the more time will be left for them to draw from the rich cultural sources of their own people.

Those who for a moment made our heavenly man afraid must have looked around little among the people and noticed nothing of the zeal with which even people whom Strauss will count neither among the scholars nor among the educated, inform themselves about the highest affairs of their own people and of the whole world from their journal for state and scholarly matters. A glance at the "Gartenlaube" and its countless reproductions would also convince Strauss himself that the people are not lacking in friends who strive for their higher education, and it should delight him to see how this crowd of men endeavor to instill a worthy national pride in the people by illustrating and explaining "German character heads", how they show them the latest triumphs of natural science with illustrations and generally try to arouse their sympathy for everything great, beautiful and good. Then, generous book publishers ensure that the noblest and best of Germany's classic poets are compiled and throw "rays of light", or beacons and flashes of Goethe's, Schiller's, Herder's or Lessing's thoughts among the people.

There are already plenty of breviaries for new private and municipal buildings.

There is also the bookseller's invitation to subscribe to the nineteenth volume of a Berlin fashion, women's and family newspaper, the "Bazar". Anyone who still doubts the general enthusiasm for the promotion of the good and the beautiful need only look at the long list of names of men (all luminaries of German literature) who have promised their stimulating contribution, especially "historical and

literary essays", to a magazine that is printed in half a million copies, and he will no longer worry about the future of the new religion.

Indeed, so that the very young do not miss out, the publisher of Mr. Pletsch's Children's Journal points out in public advertisements that a good number of the most notable literary luminaries also want to make an effort for the awakening of the little ones. The happiness that Strauss finds in his fictional pleasures and in writing and rewriting in his hermitage seems to fill him so completely that he has hung up his work on the "Life of Jesus". The triumph with which he describes the story of the resurrection of Jesus as a "world-historical humbug" even gives this farewell the air of a theatrical action. It is as if a wild-eyed candidate, who has immersed himself in a reading of Goethe's Faust and feels that he has what it takes to be such a hero, suddenly jumps up and throws the sacred story, which he could not come to terms with, against the wall as the "hallucinations" of the first Christians.

In his previous works on the "life of Jesus", Strauss was guided by the assumption that Christ was present in the model long before the Gospels were written. Christ in the Jewish image of the Messiah. The feat required to transfer this character mask to the "real" Jesus consisted, in his view, only in his followers believing him to be the Messiah; but once this process had been completed, it was "self-evident" to the believers what had to happen to their Jesus and through him. In part, the faith of those around him had forced him to make many a proclamation that he would have liked to avoid.

The forced decisiveness to which the author of the "Life of Jesus" feels strengthened by his Darwinian rebirth is only expressed in the above-mentioned wild surges and in the dry seriousness with which he claims that in the world believing in the Messiah it had long been "known to a hair's breadth what the Messiah would be like and how things would go with him, therefore all this" must also apply to the Jesus of the believers.

From his first appearance until his present book, Strauss has shown no trace of ability to grasp Christianity in connection with the historical forces and social conditions of which it was surrounded and of which it was only a particular expression. Instead of explaining the basic Protestant writings primarily from within them and with the help of the literary tools they offered, he takes them over in the confusion that the explanations and unsuccessful reconciliations of rationalism, which Augustine and Calvin had already allowed to determine them, have instigated in them, and remains as helpless before it as his predecessors. From them he drew the legend of a Jewish dogmatics worked out in detail, which was accepted by Jesus and completely applied to him by the so-called evangelical tradition; like rationalism, he is exposed to the temptation of a natural explanation of the first best miracle narrative and often succumbs to it. In those cases which made the sacrifice of making himself the successor of the author of the "natural history of the prophet of Nazareth" too difficult for him, he pays homage to the omnipotence of natural law and takes refuge in mythical explanations. With regard to the "great" miracles he gives room to unbelief, in the "lesser" cases, which supposedly do not offend the course of nature too harshly, to faith, he only doubts "some incidental circumstances of the narrative" and moves with tedious tediousness in considerations as to whether one or the other statement of the reports is to be rejected or accepted, this or that aid is to be applied as advisable, conceivable, probable or undoubted, this or that natural middle link is to be inserted.

The material interest which makes Strauss, like his pupil Renan, incapable of investigating the literary character of the Gospels, was expressed naively by Renan when he countered the "flavored denial" that Strauss had denied the existence of Jesus with the fact that "every page of his book testifies to this existence".

Renan had no understanding of the fact that Strauss' book only testifies to his belief in this existence.

Although it now seems as if Strauss no longer wants to be disturbed in his hermitage by musings about "great" or small miracles,

the still life of his new heaven is not entirely unclouded. There are still troublemakers, evil or at least unpleasant people who want to break into it. We have already seen the presumptuous and nefarious hand that "slaps the new idea in the face at every opportunity". But then, in addition to the godless thinkers who deny the feeling of dependence that is "indispensable to every human being", there is a whole pack of fiends who want to confuse the beautiful gradation that the cloistered man admires in secular state life and does not want to see disturbed. They stand far away from his heaven, behind the well-ordered groups that he happily overlooks; but the mere thought of them can upset him. It is the proletarians who are uniting to form a fourth estate and want to overpower the old estates through universal suffrage. The egalitarianism of their spokesmen is abhorrent to him, their strikes arouse his displeasure, the "general brotherhood in shirtsleeves is repugnant to him.

But may Strauss only look a little more sharply out of his celestial window and he will discover in the groups, whose order is so pleasing to his eye, the evil that seems to him to stand only at the edge of the official world.

Where has the mania for strictness not already spread? The lecture halls of the philosophers at the universities have been practically empty for a long time; from all the ecclesiastical associations in Germany comes the complaint that the candidates have given up their work and are devoting themselves to "more fruitful" occupations; the school teachers are leaving the service and seeking higher wages with railroad administrations, and so it goes on up to the representatives of the high nobility and ministers out of office, who go among the founders of fruitful businesses. Possessive and propertyless have become blurred distinctions and the civil service, which has not yet declared strike, is in full march into the camp of the proletarians.

And as far as the distance between the educated and the so-called uneducated is concerned, does Strauss seriously believe that the devotion for which he decorates his heaven with the portraits of



33 Strauss' establishment in the world.

Ottilien, Natalia and the thoroughly "German" Miller will increase the realm of the insightful or educated?

If anything should interest the biblical and historical scholar in particular in order to sharpen his own eyes on the present, it is precisely the dissolution of the estates and the modern rabble, which is unpleasant for Strauß's aesthetic sense and in which the sense for official interests and for old politics has been extinguished. In these masses, which are in disarray and awaiting a new form of life, the image of that spiritual ruin stirs, which surrounded the throne of the Caesars and the cradle of Christianity and contained different forces of the future than that blackboard that hung on the wall in the Jewish synagogues and is said to have been copied "to a T" in the Gospels.

Let us now take a look at this classic type of lumpen rabble, so repugnant to Strauss, and its historical counterpart, the Caesars. --

## V. The Roman Caesars and the harbingers of Christianity.

In ancient times it was said of Phidias' statue that if it tried to rise from its seat, it would lift the temple roof above it and smash it. The Olympian Zeus did not rise up, but rather slouched as he grew older and finally fell from his seat of power. Instead, man rose up and shattered the statutes by which he had hitherto sat confined or crouched down. The laws and barriers that otherwise surrounded him fell shattered at his feet, confessed their impotence and he learned to be sufficient for himself.

This elevation was preceded by the men of violence, who broke up the spirits of the people and made the orders of the same, their pride and the highest purpose of their labors and efforts, the play of their combinations, in which they shifted the fabric of the world to and fro and rolled up the ruins of the established into new ephemeral forms, and made them the means of their personal domination. Sated by the assimilation of all that formed the spiritual treasure of the peoples, and intoxicated by the exhaustion of their national passions and motives, as well as by the victory over their city gods, they raised their heads to the region of divine glory and felt themselves equal and equal to it.

The parvenu Lysander led the way and, after rising above kingship and authority in his own home and dealing Athens a deathblow, had himself sacrificed and celebrated with the peans, which otherwise went to Apollo, the god of salvation. In Samos, the Heraeans, the festival of Here, were transformed into Lysandria in his honor when he had overthrown democracy there. The Macedonian dynasty, which was preparing to strike at Greece by overthrowing the legitimate line at home, became a family of gods. Philip was divinely worshipped at Amphipolis and Alexander demanded divine homage from the Greeks. The successors of the conqueror of Persia pervaded Asia, Egypt and Greece as visible and powerful deities and were

included in the ranks of the gods of salvation. The Roman Caesars from the lineage and kinship of the Julii completed the apotheosis of man.

But the triumphs of these men of violence and emperors would have been impossible if the men of thought had not worked ahead of them and opened the way to their successes through the cracks they had made in the existing orders and principles. All the wisdom of politics, the horrors of religion and the formulas of metaphysics had been declared by the Sophists to be weak attempts at order that wear out and above which man remains the sole author, the standard and the ultimate master. "Man is the measure of all things.

The political misery with which the Greek mainland closed its history seized the small states on the Ionian coast and on the islands even before the stage at which the former, passing through the democracy and dictatorship of the representatives of the latter, first attained a sense of their own power and destiny. Wedged between Persia and Athens, before they could experience any political development, they had only the alternative of mediation by Persia or Athens, with the precarious relief that the concurrence of Sparta against Athens provided them from time to time. The germ of their political life was already defective from the outset, their nationality weak, democracy without the strength to fight the struggle with the autocracy of tyranny, no important man could be found on the side of the latter, and in the revolt against Persia the leaders proved themselves incapable and indecisive. For the federation among themselves and at the end of it, the national mediatization, they lacked a city which, through a larger urban area and a more intensive inner life, would have been accessible to the ambition of making itself the center of a confederation of cities.

From the outset, Jonias was therefore tailor-made to prepare the break between the striving and self-aware spirits and impotent politics and the national cult of the gods. It was here that natural philosophy emerged, which sought out the law of the world in opposition to the weak political orders, the turning away from a degenerate democracy which, as the greatest of the Ionian scholars

put it, was blind to the reason for its legislature - it was here that emancipation from the school bible, Homer, began.

Heraclitus, the discoverer of the law of the world, the Logos, (around the year 460) recognized the inability of coastal democracy and was convinced that it could not restore its lost autonomy. When his fellow citizens of Ephesus asked him to give them a new constitution, he rejected the request because their city was already irredeemably in the grip of corrupt politics.

The oppressors of states could do no harm to men like the great Ephesian and his like-minded associates and successors, except for the Stoics, who brought man back to his inner self and prepared a dwelling place for the law of the world in the purified spirit. The thinkers and the men of the sword accomplished the same work by throwing fire into antiquity, but the former enjoyed the spectacle which the men of violence helped them to perform, with the consciousness that the latter were only working for them and as servants of their will. If the destroyers of states and peoples made of the world a single field of corpses, on which they threw together the disembodied pride of nations, their exhausted passions and sacrificed deities, the principles and universals that had become empty shells, a growing circle of men lost neither composure nor courage. On the contrary! They breathed a sigh of relief; a pall was lifted from their chests. When the purple of the imperial mantle shines on the throne, the time of free personality dawns. The history of personality begins with Caesar's happiness. Caesar may look with suspicious fear at that Golgotha of the disembodied world and investigate whether a limb is still moving in it, he may listen to whether a breath is still stirring in it, he may at least wash himself off with the damping of attempts at rebellion and smother the sparks of life that still flare up from time to time, but he cannot reach the liberated personality; if he succeeded in really crushing it, he would kill himself. She is what he is, only not burdened with the cares of the world he has killed and yet still fears. She is his equal and more powerful than he is, and if he stabs one of her as a troublesome doubter, as Alexander still did in the youthful

frenzy of imperialism, or removes suspects and discontented malcontents, there is a host of others who are inaccessible to the allure of mingling in his Caesarian business.

Diogenes, one of the old fathers of the Cynic freemen, who in his detachment from state, power and politics boasted of himself that the three tragic curses had befallen him, since he was without city, without house and fatherland and for his salvation a wandering beggar, sought in a humorous mood in the market of Athens with a light the solution of Greece's and the ancient world's mystery to men. This solution soon spread in the flesh and in a numerous brotherhood through the Greek and then the Roman world, which had been crushed by the Macedonians.

Shrouded in ingloriousness, they had bid farewell to the cares of this world, which the emperors jealously claimed as their privilege. That master of the cynics called this ingloriousness the fatherland of the wise and poverty the weapon in whose entrenchment he was invincible. When Alexander tried to tickle and tempt him with the question of whether he would like to see his fatherland restored, he answered: "Why? Another Alexander would only bring it down again." Asdrubal, who after the destruction of his native Carthage called himself Clitomachus in Athens as a disciple of Carneades, addressed a letter of consolation to his captive compatriots; his master enclosed a lecture in which he explained that a wise man would not feel sorrow after the fall of his fatherland.

Anaxagoras, who, preoccupied with his physical investigations, kept away from politics, answered the question as to whether he did not care at all about the fatherland by pointing to the sky. The historian of the ancient philosophers, Diogenes Laërtius, does not fail to notice how his heroes avoided contact with kings and rulers; Chrysippus, for example, although he published over 700 writings, did not dedicate anything to any of the kings and ignored Ptolemy's invitation to come to him.

The two poles of the declining antiquity belonged together and, with the exception of a few cases, repelled each other: Plato's participation in two marches of free soldiers who wanted to import the Attic regime to Syracuse was very badly received and he suffered only bitter disappointment from his interference in politics.

Although opposites, imperialism and individualism are manifestations of the same process. When the state omnipotence has subjugated, consumed and consumed the estates and divisions of a nation, it becomes the prey of the individuals, who face each other as military masters and subjects, the former burdened with the worries and anxieties of power, - The latter, though outwardly subject to power, yet despising the naked appearance of it, esteeming themselves equal to the masters, looking down with the same contempt as the latter on the degenerate, wretched commonwealth, and living under the conviction that they are no less called to sovereignty than the victorious powerful.

When Epicurus renewed atomism, when he allowed the infinite worlds to arise from the mechanical combination of atoms and taught man, as a spiritual atom, to mock the corruption of this world and the whims of chance through sobriety and frugality, he described the social condition of his time and brought it into systematic connection with the same condition of the universe. Lucretius' didactic poem *de rerum natura*, the glorification of Epicurus' teachings and the masterpiece of Roman poetic literature, is the triumphant song about the disintegration of the untenable Roman state and world order and the song of freedom of a Roman who has arrived at himself under the changing proscriptions of aristocracy and democracy.

The misfortune that the order of their previous lives had delivered nothing of its promises to them was regarded by these shattered ones as the source of the bliss to which they aspired. Renunciation of the world that was falling apart around them and which they were destroying completely by turning in on themselves was a blissful pleasure for them. Misery was their salvation, which they rejoiced in. They did not want to renounce misery, otherwise they

would have had to crawl back into the old world that they had peeled away from themselves. They wanted to be miserable - miserable next to the consuls and proconsuls, Caesars and emperors, more miserable than these rulers.

One set of these renouncing ascetics, the Stoic clan, under the beggar's or monk's cloak, which covered their shattered hearts, swelling at the same time with new pleasures, repeated, cultivated and increased the master-consciousness that stood against them under the purple cloak. "Everything is for the wise, said their master Zeno, for the law has given him all-encompassing authority. The wise alone are considered the kings of the world and only their kingship is blameless. To none but the wise man, who has passed through the school of misery, would they concede the honors of this world; none but the wise man is consul, praetor, emperor. The existing conditions, laws, orders, constitutions, the splendor of the rulers and the politics of the powerful, everything is an insubstantial appearance for them. Their judgment, the standard they set for the world, their self-satisfaction and peace of mind is the only thing real and worthy of existence in this staggering illusory world. Rome, into which the riches of the world flow, is not a city, the people who act in it are not citizens; the all-devouring cosmopolitan city is nothing against the free world association to which those belong who have renounced the fatherland, state, family, possessions, fame and honor of the old world, and the glory of Rome disappears before the new ruling community of the future.

The other group, the Epicurean Association, tempered this swelling sense of the future. They were the quiet ones in the country. The bliss of inner peace gained through the knowledge of world law was enough for them, and the proud imperturbability and lust for power of Zeno's school tempered them to mildness, gentleness and benevolence.

There they stand now, the representatives of this "rag-tag pack in Rome, the "Duzbrüder", if not in shirtsleeves, then in the frock of the vagabond philosopher, the strikers who have said valet to the civil

service, the intellectual top of the beggar proletariat, which, as the main result of Caesar's vaunted ruling power, must be nourished at state expense. They, who are also only proletarians, eke out a living by entertaining a blasé Roman with the wisdom of their sect, or they train a patrician son, who one day wants to be heard in court or in the Senate, in the art of lecturing; they are also tutors and educators of the future world rulers, or house stewards and keep accounts of the treasures which the family has gathered from the provinces. Household officials, if they are lucky, they must, if they remain alone, let it depend on whether the writings in which they clothe their struggle against Romanism in philosophical visions bring them an audience, or whether they perish in the hustle and bustle of the cosmopolitan city.

And above them, as above the Jews, with whom they maintained a lively spiritual intercourse in Rome as in the other cities on the Mediterranean, and above the Romans themselves, stood One who held the power of Rome and the whole world within Himself, who did away with the positive aspects of all antiquity and was enthroned as God above the subdued world.

Man's sense of God formed the end of antiquity, but even the quiet ones in the land had One whom they opposed as the victorious God to the old powers of heaven and the violent men of earth.

This one of the renouncers and the one elevated by renunciation was Epicurus, - the man "whom, as Lucretius sings, neither the legend of the gods nor lightning frightened, but only excited the manliness of the spirit even more, so that he first burst the prison gates of nature and wandered through the universe in spirit, from whence, returning victorious, he tells us what can arise, what cannot, and whence to any one limited power and the deeply founded limit, wherefore religion, now subdued, lies at our feet, and victory makes us equal to heaven. No! cries the same poet, the man who paved the way to the highest good, who dissolved the fear of the mind and purified hearts, he was not born of a mortal body, - no! he was a god, a god who, through his



art, drew life from these waves and such darkness and placed it in this calm, in this light.

Even the satirical poet Timon, who otherwise castigated the philosophers with his epigrams, warms up when he sees the serenity of the skeptic Pyrrho and cannot refrain from exclaiming: "You alone rule among men, like a god!"

The deity of the World Lord and that of the Masters, to whom the Silent Ones in the land owed their new life, faced each other and the question arose as to who would win in the end.

Possession spoke for the Caesar on the throne. He was Roma and her destiny. He alone still represented the ancient feeling of unity with the state; the old idea of the state was still alive in him, and in his eyes it was a crime of majesty for a so-called Roman citizen to presume to show a personal interest in the state. Interference in the affairs of state, which were the privilege of the emperor, was punishable by death. Nero once again rejected the senate's request to postpone the celebration of the founding of the city to the day of his accession; but the idea that the actual foundation of the city and its rule over the world was due to them was part of the emperors' self-image; some even changed the name of the city to its name, in which the salvation and order of the world rested.

Such a consciousness of power, which united the willpower of the world in itself and left it with only the feeling of brokenness and dependence, was at the same time the pantheon in which the deities of antiquity became human. Caligula, the virtuoso of this absorption of divinity, wore the attributes of the assimilated divine powers like symbols of victory and alternated with the display of these trophies, just as other children of men display the richness of their wardrobe in the diversity of their costumes. Sometimes he showed himself to the people as Bacchus with thyrsus and epheu wreath, sometimes as Hercules with club and lion skin, sometimes with a hat like the Dioscuri; as Mercury he appeared with the herald's staff and when he emerged as Apollo with the crown of rays on his head and with the

bow, he was accompanied by choirs who celebrated him with the paeon.

At night he could be heard courting Luna from his bed and inviting her to embrace and make love to him. During the day he had to deal with Jupiter Capitolinus, to whom he hissed in his ear and inclined his again; sometimes the business became loud and even quarrelsome; once he threatened: "Destroy me or I will destroy you! Finally, according to his own report, he was appeased by Jupiter and accepted into the community, whereupon he joined the Palatium with the Capitol. In gracious moments he called Capitolinus his brother, but left open the question of which of the two was the greater. He had one Tragöden scourged because he hesitated and refused to speak when he asked him in front of the statue of Jupiter who he thought was greater.

When his divine self-esteem finally reached its highest peak, he had the statues of Zeus come from Greece and with a short process put his head on them.

He was a jealous god who tolerated no one else next to him.

To the same Caligula belongs the sigh: "O, that the Roman people had but one neck!" The world and its history had become worthless; oh, that they had but one end; universal death was the just conclusion: thus the last Roman judged the tribal struggles that had burdened him with the weight of power and raised him to the throne of divinity. The Roman, who had plundered and plundered the world and stripped it of the charm of its local gods, felt disgusted by it and longed for the last role worthy of him, that of world judge. The world should not exist; its mere existence was worthy of punishment.

In this sense, Caligula publicly complained about the calm and tranquillity of his time, because it was not characterized by general misfortunes. He envied his predecessors for the luck they had had in the accidents of the armies or in natural calamities, and wished for his government the defeat of armies, famine, plague, fire or earthquakes that devour mankind.

In his opinion, wickedness and depravity were the inheritance of all men. "He deserved the same," he said when he was told that, through a confusion of names, someone other than the condemned man had been executed. When a robber named Tetrinius was brought to court, he said that "the accusers were also only Tetrinia"

The moral disgust with the world and the condemnation of general wickedness, which gave vent to itself in Caligula's fury of destruction, received its purest expression through Nero. This emperor proclaimed it as his firm conviction that no man was chaste or pure in any part of his body, and decided that all were subject to sin and impurity. The mere thought of experiencing the thorough end of the world filled him with delight, and when at a banquet someone quoted the verse: "after my death the earth may rise in fire", he intervened with the resolute correction: "rather during my lifetime".

To this end, the first natural philosophers, like Heraclitus, saw in the emergence of the individual and its mingling with the immortal a declaration of war against the infinite and in the existence of the finite a state of war and an injustice, the guilt of which was to be expiated by its dissolution into the infinite, so that the Caesars hurled the accusation of the sinfulness of mankind and longed for the end of the world?

Therefore the conscience awakened in the demonium of Socrates had shaken the natural security of antiquity to such an extent that even in the circle of the Cynics penal preachers arose, Krates, for example, who was nicknamed the door-opener because he went into houses and delivered his admonitions on sinfulness, Menedemus went about in the dress of an Erinnye because he would come from Hades to inspect sins and report them to the demons in the underworld - is that why the consciousness of sin spread in antiquity, so that the Caesars would take on the role of world judges?

And then the Stoics sharpened this consciousness to the degree that they denied the difference of degree between sins, assumed nothing intermediate between virtue and wickedness, and declared

the wise man himself to be only a myth or ideal, which the strivers could only approach in order that the deity of the Caesars might put the whole world in a state of accusation?

Finally, should Lucretius have come only to declare the whole world sick and afflicted with a guilt that would lead it to its certain ruin, so that the emperors would condemn the patient to execution?

## VI. Philo's spiritual world religion.

The sages of the Greek schools could do Caesar no harm if he adorned himself with their dogmas and judgments about the world, just as he united the rays of the deities around his head and took the former rights of the senate and the people into his authority.

In a world stripped of its other idealistic goods and adornments, the followers of the Stoa were shining but isolated points that had no influence on their surroundings and could not rival the emperor, who, like them, was only an emancipated subject but was clothed with omnipotence over the whole world.

Epicurus' followers formed a union that had its cohesion in a veneration of the master akin to religious worship and approached the modern religious anointing in the devout remembrance of the greatness of its founder, the redeemer and liberator from the fear of the old gods. But even the edifications of this association remained only a private pleasure and did not go beyond the consolations and delights of a friendship association.

Only a spiritual or moral power, which, like that of the Caesars, encompassed the world, could compete with the universalism that led the scepter of Rome and, in time, assert itself alongside it and against it. The salvation of the world, whose particulate existences had been shattered by Rome, could only come from a spiritual empire, which, like the universal power of the Caesars, had to be a universal empire and, since the external world had lost its value for the individual and for the communities, had to have its foundation within.

No more help could be expected from the popular gods. They had fallen with the constitutions and statutes and with the entire fatherland, which goods had been taken from the peoples, and in their place had come the universal god of salvation, the emperor, who had freed the provinces from the plundering and looting by the senatorial administrators.

Rome's highly vaunted religiosity had also lost its significance and had exhausted itself in the battle against the gods and statutes of the other peoples. When it had refuted the world of gods of the ancient world, it lost its own power with the opposition that served as a stimulant to its sense of self, just as Rome itself, after it had subjugated the world, dissolved as a particular state in the mass of conquest.

The religious customs which had guarded the order of the estates, above all the prestige of the patricians, and had tempered the heat of antagonism in the struggle between the estates, had become obsolete since the heads of the parties saw their supreme right in the duty of self-preservation, and the triumvirs, instead of consulting the priestly sacrifices, struck the pommel of their swords. Finally, the emperors, who enjoyed the fruits of the civil wars, no longer needed the state cult to secure their power and left it to a cool habit, while for the people, before the splendor of the spectacles with which the triumvirs had vied for their favor and before the excitement of the civil wars, the religious state ceremonies had lost their attraction. Under the first Caesars, especially under the fantasists Caligula and Nero, he had seen such astonishing things, experienced such unheard-of things, that he lost all thought of the old giant order.

In Jerusalem there was still a popular god who enjoyed zealous defenders who rallied around him against the foreign administrators of the land and rejected the attempts of the Roman governors to plant the religious and political emblems of the victors before his eyes. But it was only with difficulty that they succeeded, and the defenders of the last, still standing god of the people could not help feeling that a crisis was approaching in which the existence of the people and the prerogative of their god would be at stake.

Nevertheless, there was a crystallization point here around which a view could develop that corresponded to the universal tendencies of the world at that time. There was a unity of the divine World Lord and World Creator, which coincided with that to which Greek philosophy had risen. Furthermore, there was a law that claimed absolute validity for itself and only needed to amalgamate

with the Greek formation of the world-ordering Logos in order to create the idea of a moral and general world law for which the world pined after the demise of the particular constitutions.

But for this to happen, the Jewish national god had to undergo a thorough transformation, a rebirth as it were, and the law had to be pulled out of its national confines. Without a break with particularistic Judaism, the process of establishing a new, moral world order and the foundation of a spiritual world empire was not possible.

It is Philo who, after having been preceded by feeble attempts to allegorize and expand the law and to fuse it with Greek views, sought to lead this process.

To this end, he took possession of the world unity that the Romans had created and founded his spiritual world on it.

The Roman poets and historians compete in images in which they depict the upheaval of the whole world during the Triumvirate Wars and then the reassembly of the world body by the One who (Augustus), himself a god, protected the gods and the world.

Florus, after describing the self-destruction, in which the people turned upon themselves the sword with which they had struck all nations in turn, and the war, which must no longer be called a civil war, nor a war of confederates, nor a foreign war, but all these things together, since the Orient and the Occident confronted each other under the leadership of the contending rulers, takes (Epitome lib. 4, c. 3.) the image for this conclusion of antiquity from the heavens. As the silent stars, he says, resound at the annual turning of the heavens, and denote their turning with a thunder-storm, so at the turning of the Roman dominion, that is, of the human race, the whole body of the empire was shaken by all kinds of crises.

Lucretius, who did not live to see the extreme height and conclusion of these crises, explained world history in the sense of Epicurus as the processing of a unified and common material and at the same time proudly turned his back on the whole spectacle. For

him, history is a play of changing forms and constant renewal; but in change remains a life from which mortals feed one after another. One people rises (de rerum natura. Lib. 2, 76), another decays; in a short interval the kingdoms and ages of mortals change, and like runners they pass the torch of life to one another. But the wise man and his disciple look down proudly on this play of the moment, and walk boldly among kings and mighty men, respecting neither the glitter of gold nor the splendor of purple.

With equal pride Philo, as an admirer of the Stoa, faces history (he calls it a dream), but at the same time he brings from the school of Zeno and from the mysteries of Heraclitus, whom he admires, the materials for a more elaborate interpretation. Do you believe, he cries<sup>1</sup>, that any of mortal things and affairs are true and exist, and that they are not rather lifted up and into the void by deceptive and uncertain opinion, and are no different from dazzling dreams? And after describing the change of fortune of countries and peoples up to the last complete upheaval of Europe and Asia, indeed of the whole world, he comes to the interpretation. What the heap of people calls happiness is rather the divine Logos, which performs a chorus as if in a circle. One after another it flows from city, country and people to city, country and people and distributes the possessions of one to others, the possessions of all to all, so that the whole inhabited world becomes one city.

A city, - a state, - a polity, that is what the divided and formerly torn world has become under the guidance, indeed, under the passage of the Logos through the conflicting fragments. But in it there is not yet permanence and not yet peace.

The same Logos who leads the circle of advancing and retreating peoples teaches at the same time the transience of states and the vanity of the affairs of this world, and imparts to his followers the

---

<sup>1</sup>) Deus immut. p. 317. 318. We quote from Höschel's edition. Frank. 1691.



impulse to strive for the high road, on which they turn their backs on the transient and turn to the imperishable. )<sup>1</sup>

Heraclitus, who gave the name of Logos to the power that orders the process of the world, already taught that the laws of the individual states are an outflow and, in so far as they still give support to earthly affairs, have their foundation in him. The Stoics called this rational ground of the world, this power that orders the inner proportion of the universe and holds the system of the world together, the right or common Logos of nature or the common nature par excellence.

Philo, who saw in this Logos as an expression of divine reason or divine thought a kinship with the Word, in which the God of the Old Testament manifested his organizing power, appropriated the philosophical-mythical structure of the Greek masters and made it into a relay on which he soared to the supramundane realm of the spiritual community.

Thus the right Logos, formed in divine thought, is for him also the source of the Solonian and Lycurgical constitutions, which were sufficient for the Athenians and Lacedæmonians to be free<sup>2</sup>; but these particular laws are only an appendage of the single and general natural Logos, which governs the polity of the whole world as a single great city. And indeed, he adds, those who "want to explain the cause of the separation of the Hellenes and barbarians and the division of these two among themselves, the unlimited number of cities and their different constitutions from the favor or disfavor of the circumstances, from the changing fertility of the soil, the maritime location or inland locality, the insularity or continentality, do not hit the truth. Rather, greed and mutual distrust have caused them not to be content with the laws of nature, but rather to call what seems to them to serve the

---

<sup>1</sup> Deus immut. p. 318

<sup>2</sup> quod probus liber. p. 872.

interests of like-minded people laws, which are only local additions to the right logos of nature."<sup>1</sup>

At times, in the first moment of elevation above the particulars of politics, Philo praises the friends of wisdom who, as "true cosmopolitans", regard the world as a state and are registered in the register of citizens by the virtue entrusted with the administration of the universal state.<sup>2</sup>

But that is only the beginning. The royal path, which belongs to the "sole King and All-Ruler", leads to the realm of imperishable and incorporeal ideas, to the polity, whose guardian and overseer is truth. The people of God and heaven who enter this path do not concern themselves with world economy and do not want to become citizens of the world (cosmopolitans).<sup>3</sup>

The mighty stream of wisdom, in which the divine Logos, as one said, pours through the world, leaving no part of it empty and void, lifts itself up at the same time.<sup>4</sup>

This One is Heraclitus. The world process led by the Logos goes upwards in the system of the Ephesians.

And still, as Philo, proceeding from the natural philosophy of Heraclitus through the stoic internalization of the law of the world in the breast of the sage, adds and develops it further by means of the symbolism of his paternal, national law.

At the same time, however, this further education is a break with national and particular Judaism.

It is about the question of where true peace can be found. Jerusalem is called the vision of peace and the national Jew reveres it

---

<sup>1</sup> De Josepho. p. 530.

<sup>2</sup> De septenario et festis. p. 1174.

<sup>3</sup> De Gigant. p. 292.

<sup>4</sup> De somniis p. 1141.

as the city of God, since it is the seat of the temple. But this city, since it is supposed to offer the enjoyment of peace, answers Philo, cannot be found in the regions of the earth, for it is not built of wood and stone, but only in the peaceful and visionary soul.<sup>1</sup> A more honorable and holy house cannot be found for God than the spirit that desires to see and does not allow even a dream of agitation and restlessness.

"If the King of kings, the ruler of this world, out of kindness and love for mankind, deigns to visit his creature and descends from heaven to the uttermost parts of the earth to do good to our race, what kind of house shall we prepare for him? One of gold or one of wood? Away with it! Merely to say so would be profane. A worthy house is the prepared soul."<sup>2</sup>

The true service of God is therefore that of the soul, the true sacrificer the wise man who offers himself, the right sacrificial animal the spirit, the altar of sacrifice pleasing to God the one on which the purified souls are offered as a sacrifice.<sup>3</sup>

The seriousness of this break with national Judaism even appears in the form of a divine judgment. Such a shatteringly critical time, which dissolved the blood relationship between the estates, replaced the value derived from the family connection with the moral value and derived the character of good and bad from the personal attitude, had also overthrown the traditional advantage of the nobility. In the spirit of this period, which also began to eradicate the stigma of slavery, Philo said, for example, that since nobility was the peculiar lot of the pure mind, only the intelligent and righteous could be called noble, even if they were born in the house or were the offspring of purchased slaves, while the bad who sprang from the good could not be counted among the nobles despite their ancestors. Such people no

---

<sup>1</sup> De somniis p. 1142.

<sup>2</sup> Cherub. p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> Quod Detpotiori p. 159. de plantat. p. 237 de profug. p. 462. de victim. offerent. p. 851.

longer belonged as full citizens to the realm of virtue, which is the fatherland of the truly wise. <sup>1</sup>

The Romans had overthrown the aristocracy of the peoples after democracy in the Greek states had rendered the nobility powerless and the dying small states had sought to replace the rapid departure of their bourgeoisie by emancipating and summoning their slaves. The integrity which the Jewish people had preserved under their old law was only apparent. The stranger was already penetrating in bright heaps into the prerogative of the nobility of the people, and with his fresh powers, with a higher need of soul than the nationals felt in their customary service, and with a more comprehensive mental education than was familiar to them, conquered a station which went beyond that of the heirs of the law. The inwardness which the foreigners brought to their conception and treatment of the law had come so far that Philo could take his colors for his painting of the old curses of the law of the present, when he praises the foreigner, for example, that he receives as his own honor a firm standing in heaven, while the old full citizen, who disregards his right of nobility, is cast down to the lowest Tartarus and into deep darkness.<sup>2</sup>

The conquest of the nobility by the foreign unborn is a fact to which the Alexandrian often returns.<sup>3</sup> In addition, he rejects consanguinity if it does not prove itself in self-humiliation and in the service of the invisible world, and in one of his writings<sup>4</sup> he has the personification of the nobility pass judgment on the degenerate nobles with the words: you hate what I love, and what is displeasing to me is dear to you. On another occasion, he expresses the crisis affecting the national right of nobility in the form that God, as proof of his pleasure in the virtue arising from enmity, bids farewell to the roots of the old

---

<sup>1</sup> De nobilit. p. 904.

<sup>2</sup> De Execrat. p. 934.

<sup>3</sup> De Monarchia p. 819. de victim. offerent. p. 854.

<sup>4</sup> De nobilit. p. 904,

noble lineage and accepts the shoots which, in their refinement, bear better fruit.<sup>1</sup>

This shattering of the privilege of birth is associated with a fundamental change in the concept of God. According to the Greek translation which the Septuagint has given to the passage Exodus 3:14 with the formula: "I am the Being [Seyender]", Philo calls him simply the Being [Seyender] or the Being [Seyende, not sure what the difference is supposed to be], - a seemingly very meagre and meagre designation, especially in connection with the addition that his essence and his attributes are unknowable and that man's power of comprehension must be limited to trusting in his existence and being convinced that he is the supreme cause of everything.

As meaningless as the formula of the Being may seem, it is highly fruitful for the transformation of the world view. It loosens the connection of the world ruler with a single nationality. The Being, which is sufficient unto itself and has no relation to any specialty, or to anything else at all, is universal and can enter into relation with everything else. It is the power from which the solidity of existence comes for everything. In it there is no wavering, no doubt and no uncertainty. What approaches it and is surrounded by it feels at home, is immutably established and made permanent, and comes to rest, which cannot be found in the accidents and disturbances of this world.<sup>2</sup>

Peace - peace, stability and security were what the world finally wanted to enjoy after the uprooting of national and religious traditions. In being, Philo offered her the satisfaction of her longing. He who embraces the fullness of being is also happy and blissful, inaccessible to evil and subject to no affects. To him alone comes pure and loud joy, cheerfulness and good humor<sup>3</sup> and the God who once

---

<sup>1</sup> De Execrat. p. 935.

<sup>2</sup> De somniis p. 1139.

<sup>3</sup> De victimis p. 1176.

revealed himself in a destructive thunderstorm and sent out the army of the desert to destroy other peoples has become a laughing God.

The pure Being has consumed and eradicated the passions and bitterness of the past and smiles down from the purified heaven on the world to which it wants to give joyful existence.

When the Blessed One gave Abraham Isaac, who was to make Sarah laugh and in his well-tuned nature represent laughter itself, he gave "something of his own" in this gift.<sup>1</sup> Isaac was to be the synonym of the best joy of all pleasures, of laughter, of the Son of God dwelling within, the Son of Him who gives Himself to peaceful souls as delight, refreshment and cheerfulness.

Philo elaborates on the same thought elsewhere<sup>2</sup> in such a way that Sarah, filled with joy, feared that she would fall if she took on a joy that transcended human nature, and therefore denied that she had laughed, but was comforted by God and brought to confession so that it would be clear that the creature should not be completely deprived of joy.

But the soul of the Alexandrian founder of religion opens up to a true jubilation of joy when he proclaims<sup>3</sup> that Sara, surpassing the whole earthly world and enraptured by the joy in God, turns the endeavors of men, which relate to matters of war and peace, into laughter.

He who trusts in the One and is grounded in his peace and security, regards the changes of history as nothing more than a dream and does not allow himself to be moved or in the least challenged by the wisdom of those who want to work on the world from the outside and only entertain their restlessness.

---

<sup>1</sup> De Nomin. mutat. p. 1065. De Abrahamo p. 377, 378.

<sup>2</sup> De septen. p. 1177.

<sup>3</sup> De Temulent. p. 248.

In the same way, he who advances along the royal road to the bliss of the uncreated and the true king of the world is armed against the opinion and arrogance of those who consider themselves masters of the earthly. Only the One who is the Blessed One is ruler, overlord and the true owner.<sup>1</sup>

With the same superiority with which Philo looked down on the rulers of the world, he speaks of the rulers of the world. Visualizing the Macedonian Alexander, who thought he was uniting the dominion of Europe and Asia, standing in a convenient place where he could overlook both, and pointing to both with the words: "this here and that there is mine", he says: "that was spoken with the recklessness of a childish and idiotic soul, not in a royal spirit".<sup>2</sup> By this spirit he means the mind of Him who has penetrated the royal path to the true owner of the world.

According to Philo, however, God is not only the only owner, but also the true giver. While others give something that is different from the recipient, God not only gives this different thing, but also gives the recipient himself. He has given me, and so the existence of each individual is a gift that he has received from above.<sup>3</sup>

Thinking, sensing and understanding is not a self-acquired treasure that one may gather for oneself, but one must dedicate it to Him who is the author of thinking and unerring understanding.<sup>4</sup>

God is also the soul's true husband. He, the Father of all and the unprocreated father of all, places his seed in the soul and the birth that sprouts from it is his gift. The virtues are the gifts that it behoves God to give and man to receive. Without divine grace it is impossible to adhere to the imperishable; the ancient powers of grace, however,

---

<sup>1</sup> De Cherub. p. 122. Quod Deus immut. p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> De Cherub. p. 118, 119.

<sup>3</sup> De somniis. p. 1138.

<sup>4</sup> Heres divin. p. 491.

watch over the soul as helpers to assist mortals, inspire the chosen ones with divine gifts and the Sovereign condescends to help them. He rains down the graces. <sup>1</sup>

And indeed, the world with which the Gracious One associates is that of sinfulness and corruption.

This contrast, which Philo introduced into Judaism, was originally foreign to it. The religion of the law was still a natural religion. The Jew possessed in his birth and nationality the seal of his worth and recognition before God, who allowed himself to be appeased in his wrath and zeal for the individual offenses of the members of his people with the blood of animal sacrifices. The sacrifices were offered to the national god as long as the temple was still standing, but they were as little suited to the growing inwardness and the growing sense of morality as the Greek philosophers were able to make friends with the cult of their national gods as a result of their turning inwards. In Palestine, the slack habit of the people did the same to the decline in the value of sacrifices as the indifference of peoples weary of gripping catastrophes and the skepticism of the great in the Occident contributed to the discredit of the bloody cult.

The change in the general mood was decided by the development and sharpening of the conscience, which did not want to calm down when dealing with individual offenses or violations of the constitution. Added to this was the aversion to and disgust with pleasures, in the exaggeration of which the rich, absolved of political cares and duties, filled their leisure time, a shyness of emancipated sensuality and a tendency to asceticism and exercise in self-renunciation, with which the renewal of the Pythagorean school proceeded.

If these historical elements and moods had an effect on Philo when he formed his new antithesis of grace and human corruption, he was again supported in this main achievement by the Greek masters,

---

<sup>1</sup> De Cherub. p. 115. De Temulent. p. 258. De congress. p. 429. Migrat. Abrah. p. 369. De nominum mutat. p. 1066.



Heraclitus, who called the body, in which the fiery life of the universe has settled, the tomb of the soul, and the disciples of the Stoa, who, in accordance with their inward concentration of the law of the world, must have felt even more sensitively than Heraclitus the resistance which their individual conception of the soul of the world, chained to sensuality, offered to the striving for perfection.

Thus Philo also calls the body a prison and grave of the soul, a dungeon or tomb; sensuality is to him a dark cave, the flesh the foundation of ignorance of the imperishable, indeed, the body itself a corpse, and attachment to the life of blood deprives man of the share in divine and heavenly things which falls to him only when he is inspired from above.<sup>1</sup>

All that is born, insofar as it is born, is inherently sinful.<sup>2</sup> There are no limits to what stains the soul, and it is not possible to wash it off completely, for every mortal is left with innate defects, which it is impossible to cast off completely.<sup>3</sup>

The power that draws man out of this body of death and its fetters and lifts him up to eternal immortality is the promise of the Fatherly Creator, who, out of mercy, loosens the fetters and does not let up until he has fulfilled the word of promise through the deeds of truth; for "word and deed are one with God".<sup>4</sup> The train of liberation comes from above and goes upwards, thus completing the transformation of the Heraclitean world process into the moral. What is the communication of the spirit from above works in man as love for the heavenly, as desire for the inheritance of divine goods, as a work of wisdom and as the practice of virtue.

---

<sup>1</sup>De somniis p. 585. de Gigant. p. 286, 288. divinar. heres p. 490m 493.

<sup>2</sup>Moses III. p. 675.

<sup>3</sup>De mutat. nomin. p. 1051.

<sup>4</sup>De somniis p. 592.

The main concern of man in this transitory world must be to die to bodily life.<sup>1</sup> In the eyes of the world, those who die to themselves are the choir of the inglorious, the contemptible, the poor, the lowly, the sick and those who bear the signs of hunger on their faces, while the others, who care only for their own, are honored as the healthy.<sup>2</sup> The sick are the association of the simple, serene, gentle, mild, - the healthy are the proud. The word of the Blessed One to Abraham: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house," indicates the scale on which the mortal must rise to perfect salvation. The exit is the resettlement from the dungeon of the body, then follows the breaking off of familiarity with sensuality, and finally one must also free oneself from the temptations of the beauty of words and speech, with which reason wants to alienate us from true beauty, which consists in the representation of the thing itself.<sup>3</sup>

The brother of the soul (the body), the neighbor of the rational (the unreasonable) and the neighbor of the spirit (the representation of reason) must die, so that the best of the mortal, orphaned of the disturbing shells, may serve the best of the spiritual and embrace the one and only purely and inseparably.<sup>4</sup>

According to this view, the earthly world is a foreign land for the "people of God", which they inhabit only as fellow citizens, and their fatherland, to which they belong as citizens, is the heavenly region. In relation to the world, they are refugees, exiles and emigrants, like their symbol Abraham, who left the land of sensual perception and celestial service (Chaldea) and traveled the royal road to the sole king and all-ruler.<sup>5</sup> For the friend and beloved of God, the whole life of the body is

---

<sup>1</sup>See this formula in the writings Quod Deterius potiori p. 161. De Gigant. p. 285. De Mundo p. 1153.

<sup>2</sup> Quod Deterius pot. p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>De Migrat. Abrah. p. 388, 389.

<sup>4</sup>De profug. p. 463.

<sup>5</sup>De Gigant. p. 293. de confus. ling. p. 331.

but a wandering; his home is the house of virtue, in which, withdrawn from the world, he lives alone with his soul, and in fleeing from all that opposes God, he attains likeness to God and his blessed and blissful nature.<sup>1</sup>

The Jewish wanderer, who says farewell to the world in general and turns away from the rote cult of his fellow tribesmen to the experiences of his inner moral world, welcomes the fatherless and renounces of the Greek era as his traveling companions. He opens one of his main writings on the life of the sage with the saying that was considered a rule in the "most sacred choir" of the Pythagoreans, according to which one must avoid the popular military road.<sup>2</sup> He calls this saying the guiding star of those who deviate from the opinions of the crowd, tread new paths and put forward original ideas of dogmas. Anaxagoras and Democritus, who despised property and sold their possessions for the love of inner contemplation, are his people; Sophocles, who calls free those who follow the leadership of God alone, is his man.<sup>3</sup> Thus he gathers around him the other Greek tragedians, Aeschylus and Euripides, and the philosophers from Antisthenes to Zeno, as witnesses and at the same time as factual proofs of the power that the wise man exerts over the resistance of the world.<sup>4</sup> At another time he says: The master of the Stoa seems to have drawn his sentence about the privilege of the virtuous over the licentious from the legislation of the Jews.<sup>5</sup> After all, Moses was also commissioned to stand before Pharaoh in God's place. But then he finds the license of the wise in the infallible law, in the right Logos, in that law which, not transient and soulless, is written down by this or that in immaterial charts or pillars, but is printed by immortal nature

---

<sup>1</sup>De Abrah. p. 362. De Profug. p. 459.

<sup>2</sup> Quod probus liber. p. 865.

<sup>3</sup> De Vita contemplat. p. 891. Quod prob. lib. p. 868.

<sup>4</sup> Quod prob. lib. p. 868.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 873.

in immortal thought.<sup>1</sup> Trusting in this law of nature, which divides freedom and servitude according to the inner household of the spirit, Philo exhorts us to rise above the empty opinion of the crowd, and thus also above the entire corporative order of antiquity: "Let the sex registers and despotic documents, in general the corporeal, run, do not ascribe civil rights or freedom to the so-called citizens, nor servitude to the slaves born or bought in the house, but only ask about the nature of the soul."<sup>2</sup> - Step out of childhood, brought up by wet nurses with milk, become men through the strong nourishment of philosophy and work your way up to the flourishing conclusion, the Pythian: "To live according to nature (i.e. according to the logos of nature)".

The Alexandrian therefore confesses to the "dream" of the Stoics, in which the patricians and ancestor-proud appear as servants, the slaves as free, but thinks that this reversal only appears as a dream to those who live in the realm of mere opinion.

Yes, it is absurd and paradoxical that those who are in the midst of the city, yes, the men of the council, the courts and the people's assemblies, and those who perform the office of aediles and grammar school teachers, should be called exiles, but citizens who are not entered in the lists at all or who are condemned to exile and loss of citizenship - that the poor, who barely have their daily bread and live on the air of virtue should be called rich, - but the others, who revel in gold and silver and all kinds of possessions and whose wealth not only buys their relatives and friends, but also a crowd of fellow citizens and tribesmen outside the house and, in addition, pays for the peace and war expenses of the city, should be called poor? But it is only to an opinion bribed by the senses that this correct position of world conditions appears to be a dream and absurd.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Quod omnis probus p. 869.

<sup>2</sup> Quod prob. liber. p. 888.

<sup>3</sup> Quod prob. liber. p. 866.

Like the Stoics, Philo laid the foundations for the establishment of a spiritual power - not a theocracy that would set itself up as the permanent nurse of the secular estates and seek to keep them in immaturity, but a power that would presuppose the opposition of the world and assert its superiority over it.

The wise man is the true king. All who are born again, those born of virtue, are rulers, not by lot, the uncertain thing, not by choice of the most bought men, but raised to their height by nature (the right Logos of nature).<sup>1</sup> The true wealth, not the blind, but the clear-sighted, is the fullness of virtue, which, in contrast to the unrighteous and pseudonymous rulers, is to be regarded as the true and rightful supreme power that rules everything.<sup>2</sup>

Philo is often unkind to Joseph, the son of Jacob and governor of Egypt; he is concerned only with the affairs of the body and empty opinions, does not know how to command nature, which is opposed to the Logos, but is accustomed to nourish it and make it grow.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, he finds not without reason what some (he has Plato in mind) say, that the states can only come into existence when the kings philosophize or the philosophers rule.<sup>4</sup>

First, however, he restricts the realization of his ideal to the exercise of passive resistance against the demands that contradict the natural law of the Logos<sup>5</sup> thus to imperturbability against the demands of the world, - to apathy, that is, to insurmountability against the unlawful powers that want to command the soul, such as grief, fear, lust and the desire for fame. His sage joins the peaceful quiet ones who, though few in number, neither use power nor litigate among the Hellenes and barbarians, who want to know nothing of courts of law,

---

<sup>1</sup>De nomin. mutat. p. 1068.

<sup>2</sup>De Abrahamo p. 353.

<sup>3</sup>De agricult. p. 195.

<sup>4</sup>Vita Mos. II, p. 654.

<sup>5</sup>Quis heres div. rer. p. 537.

town halls, forums and popular assemblies, and who maintain the fire of wisdom from city to city so that virtue does not die in our generation.<sup>1</sup> He recognizes the indissoluble bond that holds together the sequence and analogy in everything that happens in the world (the providence of the Stoics, the εἰμαρμένη [Heimarmene, Greek Goddess of Fate, particularly among Stoics/Gnostics]). He adapts and adjusts his self to the circumstances, gladly and patiently endures the twists and turns of fortune, considers nothing that happens to man to be new and unusual or strange, reveres in the divine an eternal and blissful order and, as the free and unshakeable, endures the waves and turbulent storms of the earthly. <sup>2</sup>

Thus the wise man is accepted into the tranquillity of the beautiful and participates in the pure and loud joy of the same. He alone can laugh, which is not permitted to the wicked. His feeling of joy at his inner possessions and their growth coincides with the joy of the universe, which is God himself. All growth in nature is the laughter of the certain future; the growing vine shows the joy of the coming fruit; the day laughs towards the dawn before the sun rises; hope stirs everywhere as a foretaste of pleasure.<sup>3</sup> However, the joy of the wise man is still mixed with sorrow.

It is natural, says Philo, that the spirit, feeling itself enlarged by the promises of the privilege of the brave, righteous, and holy, should rise on high; but as a warning to us, who are wont to raise our necks above the least, it also falls, and immediately laughs again the laughter of the soul, sad of countenance indeed, but smiling in spirit with pure unmixed indwelling joy. Both at the same time, the one to certify that he does not exalt himself, but rather condemns the nothingness of the mortal; the other to confirm his piety by recognizing God as the author of grace alone and of good. Let the creature therefore fall and mourn, - naturally, for it is of itself unstable and fragile; let it rise through God

---

<sup>1</sup>De septen. et fest. p. 1174, 1175.

<sup>2</sup>De mutat. nomin. p. 1065. Quod omnis prob. liber. p. 868.

<sup>3</sup>Nomin. mutat. p. 1069-1071.

and laugh, for its support and its joy is God alone. <sup>1</sup> But the wise man, of whom so much praise is made and whose image is held up as the ideal of perfection and as the norm and goal of human endeavor, is he to be found in reality?

The Stoics denied it, Philo himself leaves the question open. Where, he writes, might one look around everywhere, sail the seas, visit the islands and inland lands of barbarians or Hellenes, and find the good? Are there not still some philosophers today who claim that neither the wise man nor wisdom exists? That from the creation of man to the present moment no one can be regarded as entirely blameless, that it is rather impossible for man, chained to the mortal body, to attain happiness? <sup>2</sup>

Philo first helps himself against this objection with the saying about Enoch: "he was pleasing to God and was not found". Relying on this saying, he states that wisdom is an existing being and that her lover, the wise man, also exists; but although he exists, he has escaped us because he does not want to associate with the wicked. That is why it is also said of him that he was raptured, that is, transferred and translated from mortal life to immortal life.

But Enoch's kind has not died out. There are still those who have become bodiless in spirit and have dissolved and merged into the One Sphere, into that of the soul, in whom the earthly has thus been eradicated and washed away and the sole ruling spirit has become pleasing to God. This kind is rare and hard to find, but not impossible to name. Those who belong to it hear the divine madness and have become rough and wild.<sup>3</sup>

Distinguished from these rare virtuosos and athletes, however, is the mass of the sex, which moves on the slippery ground of the earthly,

---

<sup>1</sup>Exactly.

<sup>2</sup> De mutat. nomin. p. 1149, 1150.

<sup>3</sup> De mutat. nomin. p. 1149, 1150.

is exposed to the fall and would succumb if there were not an intermediary between it and God - the virginal grace and the Logos.

The former kind of wise men, who in corybantic ecstasy soar up to the pure Being, find rest and security in his bosom, which is no longer disturbed by any distraction of earthly relations; the weak and frail multitude can only be brought into a friendly relationship with the supreme God through a middle being who condescends to the earthly and takes up residence in it.

When it is written: "I am your God", says Philo, this is not actually spoken, not to be understood in the proper sense. The Being as such is not related to something. It is full of itself and is sufficient unto itself; it always remains the same and is still the same in the becoming of the world. His is the universe, but he himself is actually nobody. The middle being or the majority of these intermediate members, in so far as the supreme mediator is surrounded by assistants, moves in relation to another.<sup>1</sup> The need for rest and, as it were, the madness of perfection draws to the One; the others, who toil in the toil and bondage of the earthly, long for the serving messengers and mediators.

The accomplished sage soars to pure monotheism; the fighters and wrestlers, on the other hand, need the intermediate powers of polytheism.

Philo found this useful polytheism, indispensable to mortals, in the philosophical views of the Greeks, and he justified his treatment of it by the agreement between the Greeks and their demons and heroes, and Moses and his messengers or angels, who serve the King of the universe and carry out his will among mortals.<sup>2</sup>

Heraclitus and the Stoics gave him the form in the sphere of polytheism which, as Logos, combines the effective world-movers and organizers into a unity; from Plato he took the sub-gods, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> De mutat. nomin. p. 1084.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. De Plantat. p. 216.



powers which make the god of the Stoics a many-named one were welcome to him for the population of the intermediate space between the Being and the madness of mortals. From Plato he received the formula for the inner drive that brings the being out of its self-sufficiency and moves it to share the gift of its best nature with the disordered being that stands opposite it in the featureless and soulless, inharmonious matter that lacks coherence and coherence. For the Father of the universe is good, without envy, and had decided "to do good to nature, which lacks the divine gift, with his rich grace, without sparing".<sup>1</sup>

The same natural tendency of the Being to work and to communicate was revealed to him by the Stoic opposition of the efficient cause and the passive, and his Stoic teachers provided him with the parallel of the efficient, which, as the pure spirit of the universe, sets the passive in motion, shapes it, animates it, and transforms it into the most perfect work.<sup>2</sup>

He combined the Ideas, which in Plato are eternal and original, with the powers of the effective principle of the Stoics, which used them to form shapeless matter and give individuality to each individual.<sup>3</sup> The Being, as the father and producer of ideas, conceives the world plan, the intelligible world, which, as the design of the whole, includes in itself the individual patterns, measures, norms, types, canons, - these all effective forces, - but the most universal, the general, encompassing them all, the idea of ideas is the Logos,<sup>4</sup> which, in its designation received from Heraclitus and the Stoics, is reminiscent of the word with which the God of the Old Testament creates and governs the world and which, as Philo expresses it, is one with fact and execution.

---

<sup>1</sup> De Opific. p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> De Opific. p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> De victim. offerent. p. 857.

<sup>4</sup> De Opific. p. 5.

This Logos is the firstborn of God, the eldest angel of the archangels and, since he is conceived as the thought of the world from the outset in the direction towards it of the Being, the elder son of God, while the world is the younger son - he is the image and shadow of God, while the world is his reflection and likeness. <sup>1</sup>

In the sentences that we have briefly summarized in the lines above, the Alexandrian has combined the powers that he needed to bring movement and direction to the world in his Seyenden. The Jewish One and the mythical ideas of the Greek philosophers had flowed together in his comprehensive spirit. Heraclitus and the Stoics were kindred spirits to him and their discoveries seemed to him so much his own that he sometimes claimed that they had drawn their wisdom from the writings of Moses or from the laws of the Jews. He was not a religious philosopher in the sense that he had formed a system different from the earlier systems from a newly formed principle. What was new in him was only the native feeling with which he moved within the dogmas of the Greek philosophers (with the exception of the atomists, with whom he could only feel himself in the strictest opposition). He was also original in his naivety and good faith, with which he presented the mythological formulas of the Greek schools of thought as self-evident, as revelations for eternity and a matter for the whole world. He completed the series of his previous, still timid or vague attempts to combine Judaism and Greek wisdom with a masterpiece by subjecting the philosophers of Greece to the Jewish One. Finally, he gave dogmatic expression to the turning away from the world with which antiquity ended, by keeping his soul away from direct contact with dead matter, so that in the creation of man he confined himself to the communication of the dominating spirit and left the formation of the mortal part of the soul to the mediatorial powers ("let us make man!"); with this escape from the sensual he shook the natural security of Judaism and at the same time prepared the Christian mortification of the body, which after this preliminary

---

<sup>1</sup> De confus. ling. p. 341. Quod Deus immutab. p. 298. De Plantat. p. 221. De Opific. p. 3.

work no longer needed the theoretical justification of the Alexandrian.

1

Nor was he a philosopher of religion in the sense in which more recent schools of philosophy have conceived the task of such a philosopher. He did not compile a comparative history of religious beliefs, still less did he think of tracing in their succession the development, revelation or mysterious realization of one and the same absolute fundamental being. Nor could he think of such an achievement. He still lacked the *tertium comparationis* against which the preceding stages could have been measured as the final religious perfection. Only Christianity gave this conclusion and immediately called into being, in the first youthful flowering of its historical development in Gnosticism, the philosophy of religion that was given with it. Philo considered only two forms of religious consciousness, the pagan service of nature and Judaism. The former, of which he regarded the Egyptian animal service as a characteristic type, was for him only the negation of religion and Greek philosophy was so much one with Judaism that he sometimes derived it from the proclamation of the law.

In all this, with the profit he brought to Judaism from the schools of philosophy, with the Logos as the mediator between God and the world, with its birth in divine thought and with its historical work in the human community, he prepared the forms for Christianity in which it could find its way into the Occident and the Orient and develop the first philosophy of religion by means of Gnosis.

Before we consider the form in which the Logos accomplishes his work of salvation between the Being and the world, we will only briefly touch on Philo's attempts to orient himself in this intermediate world.

---

<sup>1</sup>De opific. p. 16. Confus. ling. p. 346. De Profug. p. 460 and 479. De Mutat. nomin. p. 1049.

He takes seriously the multiplicity of powers that give the god of the Stoics his manifold names. They are unspeakably many to him.<sup>1</sup> His understanding of the passage at the beginning of the account of the Flood, according to which it was angels who mingled with the daughters of men, led him to assume that some of the angels whom God placed in the air descended to earth and mingled with mortal bodies, while those who remained pure were used for the supervision of mortals and as messengers to the world.<sup>2</sup> The crowd of servants is organized in ranks and groups. On the one hand, they are divided into those who have mercy and those who create the world;<sup>3</sup> on the other hand, the punishment of the transgressors of the law is left to the ministering spirits, who are used by the Dike, who sits enthroned next to the Being [Seyender] as next to Heraclitus' Zeus and oversees human actions, to punish sinners. God alone is the author of good and the guardian of peace, just as the war leaders punish deserters, while the king is responsible for maintaining general peace and distributing its goods.<sup>4</sup>

Then again he begins to designate the members of the series by name: as the dominion and the communicating goodness, as the power and the gift of grace, as the power of beneficence and that of admonition and warning.<sup>5</sup> But the Logos always remains the summarizing and supreme power of these divine figures, the image of God, the eldest of the intelligible world, the closest to the One and not separated from him by any partition; he is the metropolis of the spiritual world, while the series and antitheses of the powers are only planting cities.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Confus. ling. p. 345.

<sup>2</sup>De Gigant. p. 284. 285.

<sup>3</sup> De Profug. p. 465.

<sup>4</sup> De Decalog. p. 768. De Abraham. p. 370.

<sup>5</sup>De Plantat. p. 221.

<sup>6</sup> De Profug. p. 464. 465.

As Philo asserts the generality of the Logos above and in the individual powers, so he also returns again and again to the uniqueness of the same, when he has once in the play of allegories allowed himself to be tempted to put Wisdom, whose image the Proverbs of Solomon (Cap. 8.) sketch, in its place. The passage of this Scripture (chap. 8, 22) in which Wisdom says that God prepared it as the firstfruits of his works (according to the translation of the Seventy, that he created it as the principle of his ways to his work) presented itself to him as a stimulus to a combination, according to which the thinking power of the author of the universe received the seed from him and then in fruitful pain gave birth to the beloved Son of God, who appeared to the senses, this world.<sup>1</sup> It thus appears as the beginning and principle of all that has come into being, as the primordial power which he first and foremost cut off from his powers and through which the souls are watered and nourished.<sup>2</sup> However, his solution to the difficulty of how Wisdom, as the daughter of God, can be called the father of all that has come into being, namely, that, like all virtues, it has a feminine name,<sup>3</sup> but the power of man, does not itself suffice, and, if he sometimes takes the Logos and Wisdom so closely together that he calls the latter, for example, the element of the former,<sup>4</sup> at other times he goes so far as to say of Wisdom that she is nothing but the Logos.<sup>5</sup> He has become so accustomed to the world of Heraclitus and the Stoics that he feels at home only in the realm of the Logos. He fully recognized the relationship that the wisdom of that Old Testament book had with the Logos, but the coherence of the system that the world interpretations of Heraclitus and the Stoics offered him drew him back again and again to the circle of the Greek schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> De Temulent. p. 244.

<sup>2</sup> Legis Allegor. p. 1103.

<sup>3</sup> De Profug. p. 457.

<sup>4</sup> De somniis II, 1141.

<sup>5</sup> Legis Allegor. I, 52.

(In passing! That passage in Proverbs of Solomon C. 8, 27-31, according to which Wisdom, when she was God's master craftsman in shaping and forming the world, played before him and was his delight and entertainment, is itself only a reproduction of the Heraclitean theory that the formation of the world is a play of Zeus. But the divine play of the Greek demiurge is at the same time the experience of the world, in which the changing formations, which represent the entering of the divine into certain forms, dissolve again into unity. This seriousness of the separation of the one into the colorful appearance and the return of the manifold into unity, this serious play of Zeus multiplying and reuniting himself is transformed in the Old Testament Scriptures into the harmlessness of an amusement, before which, according to Jewish presupposition, the entertaining images remain).

Let us now mention, in order to gain a complete overview of Philo's Greekness, the inward indwelling of the Logos in the world - an immanence of the divine which he borrowed from the Stoa.

It is still a clumsy turn of phrase when, in order to preserve the power and intact might of the forces, he asserts that they remain unweakened, while in the molding of the formless substance they imprint the archetypes into it, just as the ring, even if it is pressed a thousand times into wax, remains unchanged.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, he calls the creature perfect in terms of quality, while it is subject to imperfection in terms of quantity, which is subject to change, because the species preserved under the seal of the Logos remains as an imprint of the Logos, which itself is immutable.<sup>2</sup> He also expressly opposes those who consider the incorporeal ideas to be an empty word and thus want to create the most necessary essence out of the existent things, which without species and quality would only be formless mass.<sup>3</sup> The species is therefore the permanent in the sensible, the idea the actual world substance in the form of thought,

---

<sup>1</sup> De Monarch. p. 817.

<sup>2</sup> De Profug. p. 452.

<sup>3</sup> De Victim. offer. p. 857.

while the inert and formless mass represents being in itself. The Logos, the unity of ideas, carries and holds the world; it is the unifying and cohesive force and the unbreakable bond of the universe. Even more! It passes through all the parts, stretches out from the center to the outermost boundaries and from these to the center and brings the parts together into unity.<sup>1</sup> The thinking of the world plan or the begetting of the firstborn, the Logos, therefore takes the form of the stoic extension, expansion or stretching out of the powers that God uses for creation.<sup>2</sup> God himself, who in extending these powers leaves no place in the world empty and passes through all the parts of being, carries the universe in his womb; he has rained down this whole world, is himself the guideline, measure and number of the universe, fills everything and is one and all. <sup>3</sup>

The Logos, which serves God as an instrument in this self-stretching, distributes itself through the world<sup>4</sup> in seed form according to Stoic usage and, as a divider and healer, makes its way through matter through the power of the law of opposites<sup>5</sup> discovered by Heraclitus (or borrowed from the lawgiver Moses).

In the sentences that we have compiled in the lines above, the Alexandrian builds his religious-philosophical work of art from the Jewish tradition of the otherworldly God and from the dogmas of the Greek philosophers of the inner-worldly revelation and self-expression of the divine, in which God and world, thought and being, the infinite and the finite, spirit and matter are separated and at the same time united by a bond founded in eternity.

---

<sup>1</sup>De Plantat. p. 215.

<sup>2</sup>De Nomin. mutat. p. 1084.

<sup>3</sup> Confus. ling. p. 339. 340. de Profug. p. 473. leg. Alleg. II, 61. leg. Alleg. I, 48.

<sup>4</sup> Quis heres divin. p. 497.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. p. 510.

This bond is the Logos, which unites the Godhead with the finite by penetrating the latter and commending it as the younger Son of God to the Father of the universe.

As the eternal thought of the world, it dwells in the mystery of the Father; in its manifestation it is the surely accurate and infallible exit and passage of the divine thought into the finite manifestation and offers it to the contemplation of the Father. <sup>1</sup>

Thus it is the beginning and end of all pleasure, of the joy and satisfaction with which the soul looks down on the successful masterpiece of creation, and of the pleasure that man receives before God. <sup>2</sup>

He is sent from above to the mortals, who are still struggling with the weakness of their souls, in order to fill them with invincible power, and he himself, like the Heraclitean Logos, who works his way up from his immersion in the opposites of his appearance to the heights, claims the way upwards,<sup>3</sup> on which he radiates his divine light. Thus, as he boasts of the office conferred on him as intercessor for the mortals longing for the imperishable and as the Lord's messenger to the subordinates themselves, he stands as a mediator between the Creator and the creature, neither uncreated like God nor created like mortals, but as a mediator between them and as a guarantor of the peace that God will maintain between them out of mercy for his own work. <sup>4</sup>

As a divider, as a powerful intermediary terminus and separator between the dead and the living, he places himself like a wall in front of the saints against the pressure of the unholy, just as he threw

---

<sup>1</sup> Quod Deus immutab. p. 298.

<sup>2</sup> De somn. p. 575.

<sup>3</sup> Legis Alleg. II, 80.

<sup>4</sup> Heres divin. p. 509.



himself in that cloud between the Egyptians and the Israelite army in one of the earlier cases in which Philo already sees him at work. <sup>1</sup>

While he serves as a breastwork, a fortress and armor against enemies for the saints, he lightens the burden of mortals weighed down by worries; he is their indissolubly united companion, friend, confidant and comrade, their adviser and helper, and a remedy for the wounds and sufferings of the soul.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, the Logos is the heavenly bread of wisdom, which the One who is the Seer pours down on the spirits who long to see<sup>3</sup> ; likewise the true High Priest, who takes the banquet of eternal graces and offers himself in the bowl, which he fills with unmixed drink. He himself is the drink.<sup>4</sup>

With this figuration of the high priest, Philo reaches the pinnacle of his depiction of the Logos.

Having entered into the soul, he is the voice of conscience and his dwelling in it does not allow any impurity to arise in it. Where he is, sin departs.<sup>5</sup>

Even in the old covenant, when the high priest entered the sanctuary, he carried the whole world with him by virtue of the symbolism he bore and needed the intercession of the Logos, the Paraclete, for the forgiveness of sins and to obtain overflowing grace. But the true High Priest, the Logos himself, the presider and mediator of the holy church, who reaches out to both extremes, God and man

---

<sup>1</sup> Exactly.

<sup>2</sup> De somniis p. 582.

<sup>3</sup> De Profug. p. 470.

<sup>4</sup> De somniis p. 1133.

<sup>5</sup> De Profug. p. 466. 467.

74 Philo's spiritual world religion.

head and base, represents in himself the whole human race and brings the opposites together.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> De Monarchia II, p. 825. de somniis p. 1133.

## VII. Philo in the New Testament.

I have called Philo's writings above the Introduction or the Overture to Christianity.

The gentle reader will now grant me that they are indeed a rich and exciting prelude to the drama in which the suffering and dying high priest opens the way to heavenly and eternal life for the faithful who say farewell to the world.

The great motifs which determine the struggle in the drama itself, the reversal of the world order, the election of the wretched and the renunciate and the rejection of the old privileges, the contrast between worldly power and heavenly rest, the turning away from the soul's dying and by experience refuted salvation exercises and attempts at salvation and the turning into the inner God-filled collection - these contrasts of the evangelical action are drawn with a sure hand in the Philonian work.

The Alexandrian master gave eloquent expression to the universal significance of his symphony and its purpose for the whole world of that time through the skill with which he used the soul vibrations of the Greek sages, from Heraclitus to the teachers of the Stoa, for the basic voices of his work. And by allowing the figures of sound in which the consecration of the High Priest representing the world is expressed to develop in the highest momentum of his divination on these sustaining voices, which he interwove with the oracles of the ancient law, he prepared the listeners for the moment when the curtain rises and the fulfillment of the mystery begins.

In accordance with the measure of brevity which I have chosen for this booklet as an announcement of my final work on the origin of evangelical history, I will point out the main points of contact between the writings of Philo and the New Testament.

Philo's statement that God has chosen the original, but does not look for the group of the well-born, this contrast between the old nobility and those who are not noble in the eyes of the world can be found literally at <sup>(ευγενεῖς, ἄγενεῖς)</sup> 1 Corinthians 1:27, 28.

The theme of the Sermon on the Mount and the parallel evangelical antitheses of the election of the poor, the sick, the stunted and the rejection of the rich, the healthy, and the splendid, the prize of the peaceable and the condemnation of the quarrelsome - all this has already been worked out by Philo. The Alexandrian lowly are also called by God in 2 Corinthians 7:6.

Just as Philo describes likeness to God as the goal of striving and the highest of happiness (De Decalog. p. 754), so in the Sermon on the Mount believers are to become perfect as the Father is in heaven (Matt. 5:48).

According to the logical nature, that is, according to the universal law of the Logos, the Alexandrian calls it abstaining from the oath, so that the word is equal to the oath, just as it happens in the Sermon on the Mount.

The Philonian theory of death, which is inherent in the body, and of sin, which is inherent in the flesh, is dealt with in the first eight chapters of Romans; the author of the fourth gospel borrowed the contrast between above and below, which originally came from Heraclitus, from it. The sentence of the first letter to the Corinthians (chap. 15, 50), that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, summarizes the numerous contrasts of the Alexandrian.

The author of the letter to the Hebrews (C. 11, 9-16) took literally from the Philonian writings that the escape from this world and the longing for the heavenly home is salvation and salvation and that life on earth is only a foreigner's life, and passed over with the political coloring of the latter into the letter to the Philippians (C. 3, 20: "our citizenship, our citizenship is in heaven").

The prerogative of the wise man proclaimed by Philo, i.e. Zeno's sentence (Diogenes Laertius, 7, 125) that "everything is for the wise man, for the law has given him a general authority", resounds with the main keyword in 1 Corinthians 3, 22 (Everything is yours - world, life and death, everything is yours).

Philo has reduced the words of Scripture to shadows of bodies, namely of real truths (De confus. ling. p. 344,) the institutes of the law, such as the tabernacle, to images of heavenly originals, the bloody sacrifices of the temple service to weak and sensual allusions to the spiritual sacrifice of the soul which the true high priest offers. It is from him that the author of Hebrews (chap. 8, 5) says that the tabernacle is the shadow of heavenly goods.

The Alexandrian allegorist elevated the idea that man is God's dwelling place, i.e. that the one who damages or corrupts man, who tampers with God's temple, to such a recognized proposition that the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Cap. 3, 15) could ask: "Do you not know that you are God's temple?" Of course, the author of the letter to the Hebrews (Cap. 3, 6) took the same phrase from the allegorical writings he often used.

The treasure [Das Thesaurinen, also could be translated to storehouse/accumulation, likely not thesaurus although the etymology is related], the trésor [Fr. for treasure?], is something that often occupies Philo. It is as if he wanted to turn his own people away from the Phoenician, Canaanite fear of storing up, as the type of pagan fiddling and worrying, and to strengthen their trust in the overflowing treasure of grace. The true treasure, he writes (Cherubim p. 115), is not gold and silver, the treasure of goodness is in God alone (De profug. p. 462). This corresponds to the sentence of the Sermon on the Mount, Matth. 6, 19-21: Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume them; store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, for where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.

The Greek-educated man, the admirer of the Athenians, who in Greece called Athens what the pupil is in the eye, in reason the soul, and who remembers with warm feeling how, in the theater at Athens, when the verse appeared in the performance of a tragedy by Euripides: "Freedom [Freiseyn] is the most worthy name", saw the audience stand up deeply moved and applauded the saying and the poet who glorified freedom not only in the action but also in its name,<sup>1</sup> has also often used the Hellenic competitions as an image for his admonitions. He praises the competitors, who prefer to wrestle to the death before giving up the olive branch, and presents them to the wise man as models of endurance.<sup>2</sup> So, he concludes one of these numerous admonitions,<sup>3</sup> oppose lust with the snake-killing attitude, fight this most beautiful battle and seek to be crowned with the glorious wreath against lust, which is otherwise superior to all others.

The example which the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (C. 9, 24-27) sets for his readers with his race for the imperishable prize of victory is formed according to these patterns, together with the reference to the arduous and serious preparations of worldly athletes, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also did not fail to recommend the struggle with sin under the image of the Greek competition (C. 12, 1.).

Let us only mention that the Philonian contrast between the immature, who can only be offered milk food, and the perfect, who can tolerate solid food, is imitated by the author of the first letter to the Corinthians (chap. 3, 2) and by that of the letter to the Hebrews (chap. 5, 13. u. 144) and that in the dividing, cutting and penetrating power of the Word (Logos) of God, which breaks through soul and spirit, joints and marrow to the conscience, the dividing Logos of Heraclitus, after passing through Philo's writings, has found its place.

---

<sup>1</sup> Quod Probus liber. p. 886.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 882.

<sup>3</sup> Legis Allegor. p. 1107.

We do not need to prove the connection between the logos theory of the fourth Gospel and Philo's remarks. It suffices to bring together Jesus' saying in this Gospel (chap. 5, 19) "the Son can do nothing of himself, except what he sees the Father doing" with Philo's saying that the Logos, the firstborn of God, imitated the ways of the Father by looking after his archetypes. The statement in Hebrews (chapter 1) that the Son, through whom God created the world, is above the angels, is only an elaboration of the Philonian theory according to which the Logos is the total representative of revelation, in which the individual powers act as ministering spirits.

So far we have seen the Alexandrian view develop to its strength, in which it grasps the Logos, which is the unbreakable bond of the universe, as the mediator between mortals and the Being. But this strength of theirs drives them still higher, up to a point where it appears as weakness and the image of the mediating and high priestly Logos dissolves in the unshadowed light of the Being.

Religions are tormented by a feeling of insecurity in which they themselves do not trust the specific figures of salvation, which form their fund and their peculiarity, to have the power for the final solution of the world's evil and strive beyond them for a more comprehensive solution in which their god of salvation recedes into the background. They themselves prophesy their end (thus the Persian, Greek, Germanic) and see, while their salvation rises in the morning, the dawn announcing itself on the evening of their horizon, whose night will one day cover them.

Philo also proclaimed this end of his Logos religion, and Christianity in its youthful vigor also took a similar prophecy of the Son's return to the bosom of the Father from the writings of the Alexandrian.

That the Being, says Philo, appears in the form of one of his powers, which as his messenger is his interpreter and interpreter, and gives rise to the idea that this revelatory image is the archetype itself,

is only condescension to the weak spirits, which are first to be educated and formed. <sup>1</sup>

The Logos as interpreter, mediator and interpreter of God is only for beginners and the uninitiated, for the wise and perfect is the Seyende. The figurations of the Logos have only a secondary brilliance, which extinguishes before the light of the Most High. When the Seyender appeared with the two oldest powers, the creative and the royal, as the mediator between them (to Abraham), he offered to contemplation sometimes the appearance of the One, sometimes that of three, - of the One, when the thoroughly purified soul not only transcends the majority of numbers, but also the neighbor of unity, three, when it has not yet passed through the great consecrations, is still rapt in the lesser ones, and cannot grasp the Being without another from itself, but only from its effects as the creative or dominant.<sup>2</sup>

Just as those who are unable to see into the sun itself regard the sunset as the sun itself and the changes of the moon as the moon itself, they also regard the image of God, his Logos, as himself. But the God of the universe has direct contact with the wise and with the perfected, and for them the secondary sun is extinguished in the light of the Being. <sup>3</sup>

Is it not now a similar abandonment of itself on the part of Christianity when the Son, (I Corinthians 15:18.) having subjected all things to the Father and delivered the kingdom to him, stands at the end of his mediatorship and God will be all in all, that is, will no longer reveal himself through the Son as his representative, no longer speak and work through him, no longer make his presence recognizable through him, but will work and reveal himself through the direct power of his being without mediator? Is this not the extinction of

---

<sup>1</sup>De somniis p. 599. de Mutat. nomin. p. 1046.

<sup>2</sup> De Legis Alleg. p. 99. De Abraham. p. 367. De somniis p. 567.

<sup>3</sup> De somniis p. 587. 600.



historical Christianity, just as Philo, in the circle of the wise and perfect, allows the historical revelations of the Being to be replaced by direct communication with Him?

Yet another coincidence between the fluctuations of Philo's soul and the timidity and indecision which Christianity has also shown towards the Mosaic Law since the first century of its existence up to this day! As decisively as the Alexandrian, according to our above description, has broken with the sensuality of the law and transformed the statutes of the Fathers into experiences, exercises and evidence of the mind, he nevertheless cannot separate himself from the letter of the law.

The Sabbath, he says, should not be rejected because of its importance, so that it alone should be kept, - because the feasts are symbols of spiritual joy and thanksgiving to God, therefore we should not give up the festive assemblies on the feast days, nor because circumcision means the separation of lust and all affections and the putting away of impious opinions, according to which the Spirit ascribes to himself the power to bear witness through himself, we should abolish the commandment of circumcision, otherwise we would have to disregard the regulations on sanctification for worship and a thousand other things if we wanted to adhere solely to the meaning of the symbol. The one is the body, the other the soul, which must not be separated. <sup>1</sup>

Quite the struggle that divided the first Christian communities and is still not settled within Protestantism as far as the Sabbath is concerned!

The same Philo, who wants to know nothing of God's dwelling in a temple built by human hands and rejects the bloody sacrifices, praises the temple in which countless multitudes from all parts of the world seek and find a haven of salvation from the busy and restless life, and is convinced that as long as the human race and the world

---

<sup>1</sup> De Migrat. Abrah. p. 402.

exist, the income and first fruits collected from all over the world and offered by emissaries will flow to the temple. <sup>1</sup>

Again, just as the law-breaker Paul in the Acts of the Apostles (see my writing on the same p. 92 ff.) hastens to the holy city to fulfill his legal duty and to celebrate a feast, although a promising field of activity presents itself to him in Ephesus, and then in Jerusalem itself, in order to prove his legal sense, allows himself to be purified in the temple as a result of a vow by hair-cutting and sacrifice!

Although Philo also sees the national nobility of the Jewish people as broken and overthrown by the influx of the indigenous people, he cannot let go of the privilege. The tribe has been abandoned by God, new shoots have been accepted and yet the tribe itself is to sprout again and gather the nations under its shadow.

Now the people of the Jews are a lonely orphan and have fallen into obscurity, but one day the unexpected call of freedom will reach the dispersed, they will all go to the promised land and be led by a more divine form than is characteristic of human nature, invisible to others, visible only to them, the saved.<sup>2</sup> At another time, Philo expects the rise of an army commander or warrior who will subdue the saints of great and multitudinous nations. <sup>3</sup>

But enough, the old trunk, whose roots have remained, will rejuvenate itself in new shoots, the extinguished nobility will be revived through repentance and will shine again and the peoples will give honor to the renewed law and renounce their patriotic and national statutes. <sup>4</sup>

Again, a belief in the eternity of the tribe and the blessing emanating from it, which was also expressed by the allegorizing

---

<sup>1</sup> De Monarch. p. 820-822.

<sup>2</sup> De creat. Princip. p. 727. De Execrat. p. 936.

<sup>3</sup> De Praem. et Poen. p. 925.

<sup>4</sup> De Execrat. p. 938. vita Mos. II, 660.

author of the passage in Romans chapters 9 to 11. He, too, waits with confidence for the revocation of the judgment passed on Israel; he cannot give up his faith in the far-reaching and absolute power with which the Jewish people will survive their inner rupture, which was signified by the rise of faith. He derives the blessing of the congregation, which was planted as a wildling in the good olive tree, from its roots and is convinced that the noble people will only develop and spread its blessing when its cut-off shoots are grafted back into its own trunk, into its noble olive tree.

Just as Philo's Mediator and Logos pales for the initiated in the light of what is seen, - just as the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians expects from the consummation of the ages the eternal suspension of the historical work of salvation conferred on the Son, just as the author of those three chapters of Romans (see the third section of my "Critique of the Pauline Epistles") considers the historical opposition between the converted Gentiles and the unbelieving Jews to be only a provisional and temporary phenomenon, over which the recognition and victory of universal Judaism will ultimately prevail.

Philo provided the formula for this endurance and strength of the tribe.

If we have to recognize a phenomenon in these downgradings and tensions of a high-tensioned theory that is found and developed in historical religion in general, then the Philonian theory has a feature in common with other religious views that we still encounter in it. We mean the moderation of the renunciation of the world, the limitation of asceticism, the appeasement of the fight against the flesh. It is well known that in Christianity the same minimization of the original opposition of spirit and flesh, world and kingdom of heaven, very soon took place, and when Protestantism was still in flower, the saying was common that the first part of every sermon impressed upon the hearers the impotence of the human will, the second, on the contrary, spurred them on to efficient activity.

Philo describes with great sympathy the life of the Essaeans in Palestine, who live as farmers and craftsmen scattered in the countryside in village-like settlements, pooling the proceeds of their work as a common good, using it for mutual service and, among other things, for the care of the sick. He cites them, like the leaners of the Persians and the gymnosophists of the Indians, as proof of the proposition that wisdom is not a myth after all and that there are still wise men. <sup>1</sup>

The features that he compiles for their overall picture correspond to the requirements that he otherwise asserts in his writings for the life of the wise. They abstain from the bloody sacrificial service and prefer to perform the priestly function themselves by preparing their spirit as a sacrifice. They store up neither gold nor silver and place their wealth in frugality, with which they provide only for the necessities of life, and in activity for their neighbor. The opposition of domination and servitude is abolished in their union. The bond of freedom that unites them does not allow servitude to arise among them, and they reject dominion not only as a violation of justice and a defilement of holiness, but also as a contradiction to the law of nature, which has given birth to all equally and cherishes and nurtures them like a mother as real brothers, not just brothers in name.

Their morality is divided into three parts: Love of God, love of virtue and love of people. Love for God is expressed in chastity, abstinence from swearing and lying, and love for people in giving up one's possessions and in community. The scriptures, which are read out in their Sabbath meetings and interpreted by experienced people, move in allegories.

According to more specific statements by Josephus in his *Antiquities* (18, 1.) and in the *Jewish War* (II, 8.), the association, which also had its representatives in cities, kept a strict secret about its writings and internal institutions, which new members were

---

<sup>1</sup>Quod Probus liber. p. 876

obliged to observe after a three-year examination. The ascetic quest for purity was expressed in the daily communal baths after five hours of work in the morning. The bathing robes were made of linen and gave the bathing place a religious touch. The communal meals, the preparation of which was supervised by the heads of the order and which were closed to strangers, also had the consecration of a religious act and the dining room was considered a sanctuary. The care with which they abstained from worldly speech until the rising of the sun and the formula with which they implored the star of the day to begin its daily course also had a religious tinge. Their turning away from matter is further expressed in their belief that the body is doomed to perish in death, but that the soul, rejoicing in its liberation from a protracted slavery, swings heavenward. The note of Josephus, finally, that they attribute the determination of the human lot to the disposition of fate (the εἰμαρμένη [Heimarmene]) and leave everything to God, proves that the Stoic liberation of moral consciousness from the effects of the course of the world and the arming against the same had come to them with the imperturbability of passive resistance and with the turning inward. They wanted to be the quiet ones in the country and not revolutionaries.

It cannot be our task here to form solid, historical constructs from individual, fluctuating details of Philo and Josephus or to summarize the contradictory notes of both writers into a durable unity. We also refrain from adding a new hypothesis to the numerous conjectures about the origin or the various formations of the name of the religious order. Enough, we take the existence and spread of this existence in Palestine as a testimony to the influence of the ferment that stirred in the Greek world in the last century before our era, also on Judaism, and can only agree with the old Jakob Brucker when he recognizes the influence of the neo-Pythogorean school in the ascetic system of the Essaeans.<sup>1</sup>

We are mainly interested here in the contradiction between the sympathy which Philo devotes to the Jewish circles who, like him, have

---

<sup>1</sup> Brucker, short questions from philosophical history. Ulm, 1733, part 4, page 257.

arrived at a moral development of Judaism under the influence of Hellenism, and between his declaration against an asceticism which he admired in them and recommended even in the strongest terms, - the contradiction between sympathy and reaction.

His writing dedicated to a Theodotus, in which he describes the Essaeans, is immediately followed by another on the contemplative life, in which he places the therapists, as practitioners, alongside them as theorists. He is so unclear about the derivation of the name that he derives it (as a result of the double meaning of the basic word: *curiren* and *dienen* [German or Latin?]) from the healing of the body or soul or from the service of the soul and in the previous writing praises the Essaeans as very special servants (therapists) of God.

In short, in the circle of these therapists, which also includes ascetic women, he finds the patterns of the "noble" who have reached the summit of virtue. They, like the Bacchantes and Corybantes, enraptured by heavenly love, rise to immortal and blessed life. They renounce, like the wise man, possessions, their relatives and friends, and after leaving their paternal homeland, they find their true fatherland in the associations that like-minded people have founded in individual circles in Egypt, especially near Alexandria. In their separate dwellings, which are not too far apart, they practice the mysteries of the sacred life, study the laws and sayings of the prophets, interpret them allegorically, and use the writings of their predecessors for this purpose, who have already deciphered the symbol of a higher meaning in the wording of the sacred books. Twice a day, at sunrise and sunset, they pray; in the morning they implore for their minds to be filled with heavenly light, at sunset they pray that their souls, freed from the burden of the sensual and turned to their inner deliberation, may find the truth. After the asceticism of the week, they gather on the seventh day in the common sanctuary, where they hear the elder's lecture, men and women separated by a wall three to four cubits high, and celebrate the festival with a common meal of bread and salt. After seven times seven days, the main festival takes place, at which all, men and women, appear dressed in white. The beginning of the celebration

is marked by a simple banquet, at which, since the association considers slavery to be contrary to nature, voluntary servants wait on tables. This is followed by entertainment and lectures on the hidden meaning of the scriptures, as well as a choral song and finally a night celebration, in which the separate choirs of women and men perform a round dance with singing until they are all filled with the love of God and, after passing through the Red Sea, unite into one choir dance. Shortly before the circle begins, the youngest carry the table out and place on it unleavened bread with unmixed salt as a sign of unity with the Temple and as a venerable symbol of the table standing in the antechamber of the Temple. The association has broken away from the bloody sacrifice of the temple, does not allow anything bloody on its altar, and yet lays on it for the priests of the old temple the very offering from which the members of the association themselves abstain.

Although Philo, in the writing dedicated to the therapists and in the flight of his enthusiasm, uses the same "citizens of heaven and earth",<sup>1</sup> he is still afraid, in a moment of calm, to present their aspirations as a general model. Thus he speaks at another time of two classes of people. Some have an unmixed desire for piety, renounce other business and devote their entire private lives to the service of God (θεραπεία δέον). The others, who recognize nothing good apart from human relations, confine themselves only to intercourse with men, divide enjoyment equally among all out of compassion for the community, and seek to mitigate the unpleasant to the best of their ability.<sup>2</sup>

These friends of man and those friends of God, he says, can easily be called the halfway house of virtue.

In contrast to the wild and impetuous sages, he speaks of the comrades of a gentle and tame wisdom who, in practicing piety, do not overlook the human. If, he remarks, you honor your parents, show

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. p. 903.

<sup>2</sup>De Decalog. p. 760.

mercy to the poor, defend your country or take up the just cause of all people, you will please all those who enjoy your services, but also God, who receives the right with special grace.<sup>1</sup>

If, furthermore, in the instruction which prudent patience and perseverance give to their pupil, you see the wicked foaming at the mouth against virtue and making a great being of riches, fame and pleasure, but praising unrighteousness as a means to all this, do not immediately choose the opposite path of poverty, lowliness and a rough and lonely life. If you want to convict the rich man of evil, do not turn away from the abundance of possessions. While he is miserly and usurious, or squanders his goods among unworthy persons, prostitutes and pimps, you will support the poor among your friends, bestow favors and gifts on your fatherland, and endow the daughters of the poor.<sup>2</sup> To those who flee the business and toil of political life without self-examination, who claim to have said goodbye to peace and pleasure and who live with a frowning face in austerity and roughness, Philo asks what they can do so that their present abstinence can be regarded as truly well-founded, to show for excellent achievements in human society, whether, when they were rich, they practised justice, showed moderation in the possession of means, were modest in the enjoyment of honours and whether they recognized the benefits of civil life, which they now ridicule?

In the same balancing sense he recalls how God, who before the creation of the world was sufficient unto Himself, out of kindness and compassion called the non-being into being and yet remained the same, and admonishes us to imitate Him, to admire the highest cause and not to disregard our own nature. <sup>3</sup>

Sensuality should also be practiced and cultivated, for without it the sensual world cannot be understood and the vestibule of

---

<sup>1</sup>De mutat. nomin. p. 1050.

<sup>2</sup> De Profug. p. 453. flgde.

<sup>3</sup> De mutat. nomin. p. 1051.



philosophy remains closed.<sup>1</sup> It is best to harmonize the female order of the soul, that of the affects, and the male order, that of the judgments, so that reason has the lead and the upper voice and the senses are in tune.<sup>2</sup>

Philo finally summarizes the variations of this theme in the freely flowing melody by writing: Just as Phidias in his statues has worked the most varied materials in such a way that they all, ore, ivory, gold, etc., express one idea, so the unifying power of the sage expresses itself. It embraces piety, holiness, physiology (the science of the heavens and what belongs to them), meteorology (of the air and its changes), morality, political economy, domestic economy, the royal art of government, and the science of legislation; but in all it represents one species.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, on the occasion of the story of Noah, the Alexandrian also enters into the dispute of the Greek philosophers on the question whether the wise man may indulge in intoxication, and answers it affirmatively<sup>4</sup>; for the wise man becomes sweeter when he is full of wine than when he is sober. It should also be noted that wisdom is not associated with gloominess, roughness or dejection, but with cheerful joy and cheerfulness, which inspires many a jest and fine mockery without discord, but always combined with dignified seriousness, just as the antiphonal notes in a well-tuned lyre blend into one melody.

The Jew would not tolerate the sacrifice of the traditional legal customs to their spiritual meaning and that only this should apply; the Jew in Philo sometimes reacted against his own commandment that cut through the soul: let the soul's brother, the body, die; let the contradictory, the neighbor of the logical, die; let the shining spiritual

---

<sup>1</sup> De Congress. p. 427

<sup>2</sup> De Migrat. Abrah. p. 403. 404.

<sup>3</sup> De Temulent. p. 252. 253.

<sup>4</sup> De Plantat. p. 234-239.

body of representation, in which the inner Logos of the world would like to show itself, be killed. <sup>1</sup>

The man who, for the death struggle against the body, against the illogical and against the shining garment of the spirit, holds up as a model the Levites who fell upon the people who worshipped the golden calf and killed brother, friend and neighbor<sup>2</sup> -, the man who in the opening of his writing on the "individual commandments"<sup>3</sup> moans about how political concerns and business seek to drag him from the "ether of thought, into which he rose in his youth on the wings of theory", the man whose soul enjoyed divine revelations and once, seized by God, revealed to him that it is the Logos who holds together and unites the supreme powers of being, goodness and power, as the mediator,<sup>4</sup> - the same friend of ecstasy and teacher of self-death at the same time recommends harmony with the powers of sensuality, from which one should distinguish oneself, alongside separation. Thus he says: the commandment to leave your country, your kinship and your father's house, that is, your body, sensuality and reason, does not mean separation from their essence, for, understood in this way, the command would mean death. Rather, it means: Separate yourself from them, so that you, bound by none, may stand above them all as king. Do not let them take possession of you; know yourself and you will know to whom you are subject and to whom you are to command. <sup>5</sup>

Appearance and essence, body and soul, representation and object should unite to create true beauty.

The man who, with the wisdom of the Greek schools, shook the natural security of the Jewish world and brought into its contentment the break with the body, the struggle of asceticism and the

---

<sup>1</sup>De Profug. p. 463.

<sup>2</sup>Exactly.

<sup>3</sup>Leg. spec. p. 776.

<sup>4</sup>De Cherub. p. 112.

<sup>5</sup>De migrat. Abrah. p. 389.

hypochondriac of self-renunciation, also had the Greek ideal of the harmony of spirit and flesh before his eyes.

If a later man said that salvation came from the Jews, the Alexandrian could say with equal justification that the salvation whose advent he proclaimed to his countrymen had come from the Greeks (even if he sometimes claimed for Moses the glory of originality and the priority of discovery as far as the germ developed by the Greek schools of philosophy was concerned).

Philo, however, proceeded too quickly when he wanted to heal the break with the body, sensuality and the world in general in the Hellenic spirit and lead it back to the harmonious representation of unity.

This harmony was not yet enough for the spirits into which he himself had thrown the discord. One important and great thing was still missing. The rupture still had to penetrate the world mediator, the sword of division and separation had to pass through the Logos.

The same presents the world and the universal community to the Being and is the source of the pleasure in which the world appears before him. But this presentation remains only a spectacle; the seriousness of history is still missing; the Logos must experience and overcome the misery of the world in himself.

This seriousness appears in the works of those who put Philo's logos into action on the ground of history.

The scholars who have studied Philo's works also deal with the question of whether his Logos possesses the power of personality. For us the answer lies in the fact of history that the Christian continuators of the Alexandrian were not yet satisfied with his conception of the Logos, and that it was only by passing through death that they secured for him permanent personality.

## VIII. Renan's Life of Jesus.

"Philo," says Renan in the preface to his Life of Jesus, "lived in a quite different province of Judaism from Jesus, but like him he was detached from the petty interests that prevailed in Jerusalem and was, so to speak, the elder brother of Jesus. He was 62 years old when the prophet of Nazareth was at the height of his activity and outlived him by at least ten years. What a pity that the providences of his life did not lead him to Gäliläa. What he would not have told us!"

But if the Alexandrian himself did not come to Galilee, had his work not reached the circles in which the Galilean's work of remembrance was preserved, interpreted and further developed?

No! replies Renan: "the beautiful attempts at religious philosophy with which the Jewish school of Alexandria occupied itself, and of which Philo was the spiritual interpreter, remained unknown to Jesus. The frequent echoes which are found between him and Philo, those exquisite maxims of love to God and rest in God, which form, as it were, a marriage between the Gospel and the writings of the famous Alexandrian thinker, stem from the common tendencies which the needs of the times had inspired in all exalted minds.

This means that the question of the influence of the Philonian writings on the formation of Christianity and of the co-authorship of the Greek philosophers in the formation of Christian doctrine and in the shaping of Christian life is quickly and easily put to rest.

Renan believes he can remedy the paucity of a view that detaches the work of salvation from the Greek preparatory work and from the cosmopolitan horizon created by Rome by using the image of the Messiah handed down by Strauss, which has supposedly dominated the Jewish world for centuries. The abundance of Jesus' miraculous deeds, which he, like Strauss, seeks to preserve in the greatest possible number by means of natural explanation, provides rich material. From his own treasure and from his Palestinian travel

memories, however, Renan takes an evangelical landscape painting, whose melting and colors impart an evangelical soul to the soil of sacred history, the mountains and streams, the lakes and climes. While the Greeks are silent and the thunder of Rome falls silent against the nationalities and their narrow interests, the landscape is given a miraculous voice that proclaims the mysteries of the Gospel and makes the inner life of kindred spirits resound.

The encyclopaedic sense of the present dreams of a work of art of the future that will represent the union of all the arts and raise the impression of music and the human voice to a magical height through the participation of painting, sculpture and architecture.

Renan has worked towards this work of art with his Life of Jesus, but has achieved even more than we have been promised so far for the opera. His lighting of the scene into which he introduces the hero of the evangelical soul is fairy-like and outshines the brilliant power of Parisian operatic illumination. The sky that he arches over Jesus is glowing with the ideal that the teacher of humanity will forever inscribe on the tablet of history, and radiates it into the soul of the receptive. Nature, which forms the scenery of Renan's evangelical story, is religiously inclined and preaches and explains the sacred text. Even the eyes of the animals, the birds swaying on the branches of the bushes, the water creatures peeping out from the edge of the lakes, are eloquent and in harmony with the theme of the play. The folk groups are as if made for the Healer and correspond to the landscape with their gentleness and loveliness.

Let us now take a look at the outline of this scene, which helps to give birth to primitive Christianity, that is, in Renan's view, the Midwife of the Gospel.

It was one of the Jesuits' higher means of education that they allowed their pupils to immerse themselves so deeply in the externalities of Protestant history that they could, for example, draw a sketch of the Garden of Gethsemane.

Thus Renan stretches his imagination to such an extent that the locality of evangelical history loses its material character and becomes spiritualized into a banner of the work of salvation. While the disciples of the Jesuits were content with the lines of the surveyor and the draughtsman and saw in them the evidence of the reality of history, their modern imitator lights electric lights that cover the scenery as far as the horizon and up to the mountain peaks, making matter tremble with their flames, as it were, and harmonizing it like a powerful instrument with the vox humana of the prophet.

The artistry of this decorative painting is based on the Parisian feuilleton-like perfection of a manner that is also practiced by German apologists and, by applying a few local colors, believes to convey the appearance of vividness and historical truth to a rhetorical reproduction of Protestant history. The perfection of the manner, however, also puts the shortcomings and weaknesses of this feat in the right light.

It is first of all the simple artifice of that Jesuit method of sensual illustration when Renan leads the readers through the streets of the present Nazareth, "perhaps" not very different from the old one, and shows them the playgrounds of the child Jesus; "no doubt" Joseph's house looked rather like today's "poor boutiques" of the place; "no doubt" Mary, the urn on her shoulder, found herself there every day at that now dilapidated well in the row of women whose beauty, already praised in the sixth century of our era, has conserved itself "in a striking" way.

A small printer's drawing is enough to make this locality unique in its kind. The surroundings of Nazareth are charming and no other place in the world was so well suited to dreams of absolute happiness. Even today, Nazareth is a delightful place to stay, the people are amiable and smiling, the gardens are fresh and green.

The evangelical painter gradually warms up when, after describing the mountain heights around Nazareth in poetic prose, he exclaims: "That was Jesus' horizon. This magic circle, cradle of the

kingdom, presented the world to him for years." But then the ideal momentum of enthusiasm lifts the modern seer to the vision of a future in which the Christian world, when it has arrived at a better concept of the respect due to its leaps, wants to replace the dubious and miserable sanctuaries with authentic holy places, will erect its temple right here, on this height of Nazareth. Here, at the starting point of Christianity and at the center of the action of its founder, the great church would have to rise where Christians could pray.

Here, where "the carpenter Joseph and thousands of forgotten Nazarenes sleep, who have not crossed the horizon of their valley," Renan also refers the philosopher, who "could find no better place in the world for a contemplation of the course of human affairs in order to find consolation in the face of their randomness and to assure himself of the divine purpose that passes through countless fatigues and despite the general nothingness of the world."

German criticism, which the Frenchman Renan had only become acquainted with in the Straussian genre, had to come to the point where, transplanted to Paris, it associated itself with Offenbach, for the tone and flow of his opera texts echo from this Renanian admonition to the philosopher. The gibberish of an Offenbach opera should help this German criticism to its appropriate further development.

Jesus is still in Nazareth. "Belief in the power of prayer, which commands the course of the clouds and has power over disease and even death," was his intellectual state; but what was the source of charlatanism among the people was connected with a firm concept of man's intimate relationship with the deity and with an exaggerated belief in the power of man - "beautiful errors, which were the source of his power."

After this poetic coloring of a text taken from German criticism, Renan takes his leave of Nazareth by looking back once again to that mountain where Jesus "no doubt sat twenty times and thought only of his work, of his race and of humanity."

At this moment, the electric lights of the stage finally flare up and "these mountains, this sea, this azure sky, this plateau on the horizon, which for Jesus were the transparent shadow of an invisible world and a new heaven, glow in a magical light."

The scene changes and is followed by the "delicious pastoral in which Christianity came to light on the Sea of Galilee.

Renan traveled through the country himself and, after seeing how green, shady and smiling it is, how the animals there are small but extraordinarily gentle, the turtledoves slender and lively, the blackbirds so nimble and light that the the blade of grass on which they alight hardly bends, the crested larks are so tame that they almost sit down in front of the wanderer, how the little tortoises with lively and gentle eyes look out of the streams and the storks with a serious, shamefaced expression have cast off all have discarded all timidity and seem to call to people to come to them, he was convinced that this was the right place to convey an idyllic and charming touch to the new spirit of emerging Christianity and the dreams of the future.

Nowhere, "in no country in the world do the mountains sink and swing more harmoniously and inspire you with higher thoughts. Jesus also seems to have loved them particularly and the most important acts of his life took place on the mountains."

The population of the country was in tune with its nature; "it was an exclusively idealistic people and spiritualized itself in ethereal dreams and in a kind of poetic mysticism that mixed heaven and earth."

The pastoral can now begin, in which Jesus appears as the herald of the kingdom of heaven and of a cult based on purity of heart and human brotherhood. Renan, the play's poet, director and theater manager, gives the signal to begin and at his signal the electric lights are fed with new luminosity, the Bengal flames rise, the gas light is turned up and while the flutes and shawms of the orchestra begin the introduction, the people lie down between the bushes of a lake, which, naturally and on the shore of the lake, is once again unique in its kind



and lets its waves gently lapping at promontories and their groves of rose laurel and tamarind or lose themselves in the thicket of mosses and flowers.

The groups that settle in these flowerbeds belong to an industrious, upright people who live in perfect harmony with the landscape, imbued with a cheerful and tender attitude to life. The yield of the lake, which in turn is one of the most fish-rich basins in the world, has created a certain prosperity among them. The fishing families formed a sweet, peaceful society that spread throughout the lake district through numerous family ties. Their unhurried lives gave their imaginations complete freedom; the ideas of the kingdom of God found more credence in these small circles of good people than anywhere else. In addition, the beautiful climate of Galilee made the existence of these righteous people a constant enchantment. These simple, good, happy ones, whether gently rocking on their delicate sea or dozing off on its shores in the evening, performed a true prelude to the kingdom of God.

No amount of critical salt could detract from the sweetness of this picturesque and scenic explanation of Christianity, in which the preliminary works of Greece, Rome and Alexandria have sunk to zero. One must enjoy this scenery, which is supposed to interpret the origin of Christianity - enjoy it in the eyes of the conductor, as he, commanding the surprises of the magic, at the same time squints at the audience and tickles himself over the impression that his wax figures, the calculated heightening of the illumination and the melting and shimmering on the mountains built of icing on the horizon make on the people from Paris to Petersburg.

Here, at the Lake of Happy People, the women also welcomed Jesus with zeal; three or four joined his constant companions and brought "an important element of enthusiasm and wonder to the new sect".

Renan believes in Jesus, although "all his power of love was transferred to what he called his divine vocation, noting an extremely

delicate feeling for women". According to Renan, this feeling was not separate from his exclusive devotion to his idea, but it is likely that women loved him more than his work, and there is no doubt that he was loved more than he loved.

According to Renan, one factor that contributed to this impression on women was the "extraordinary sweetness that the young carpenter's voice" suddenly took on when he appeared with the proclamation of the kingdom of heaven, and the "infinite charm that emanated from his person".

According to Renan, this charm also had an effect on one of those female companions, Mary Magdalene, who "suffered from nervous affections", but Jesus "calmed the disturbed" organization with his "pure and sweet beauty" and thus obtained a follower who, at the end of his life, was to render a true life service to the new church with the excitability of her feelings.

But the Galilean pastoral had to come to an end, because Strauss, Renan's "revered teacher", commanded it and Strauss wanted it, because it had determined the messianic dogmatics that had been established long before the Galilean idyll, which wrote of what had to happen "on a Haa and with the Messiah. And according to the wording of this dogma, the Jews had placed a burden on Jesus, which he bowed to and under which he dragged himself to Jerusalem.

Things become more serious and gloomy and Strauss's pupil lowers the flames of his stage.

As a mere herald of the kingdom of heaven, Renan says, Jesus was, along with the others of his contemporaries among the Jews, "the most charming of all, but as such he would not have given any permanence to his creation and would only have compromised it. "Every idea, in order to be realized, requires sacrifice. One does not emerge unsullied from the battle of life. Less pure means are necessary for regeneration."

The people wanted to see miracles.

He himself was the Son of God in his faith, while the people awaited the Son of David as the Messiah. His kingdom and the liberation he sought, and the kingdom whose power and independence the people longed for, belonged to different orders. But public opinion did him a kind of violence. He had himself given a title without which he could not count on success. At last, it seems, he took a liking to it, for he performed the miracles that were demanded of him under that title with the best of faces. In this, as in other circumstances of his life, he conformed, says Renan, to the ideas that were current in his time. Everything great was made by the people, so you only lead the people if you surrender to their ideas.

In addition to the miracles that Renan, following the Straussian model, came to terms with by means of natural explanation, there was finally the popular belief in the Last Judgement, when the Messiah would arrive in the clouds. Jesus also included this idea in his imagery. He had to, according to Renan, if he did not want to renounce success and remain alone as a mere Puritan.

Let us forgive him, comfort him and the readers of the French biographer, this hope of an empty apocalypse, of a return in great triumph on the clouds of heaven. Perhaps this was more the error of others than his own, and if it is true that he shared the illusions of all, what is the reason, since his dream made him strong against death and stood by him in a struggle to which he might not have been equal without it. The

Scene becomes gloomier. The consciousness of Renan's hero has "lost its original clarity through the fault of the people, not through his own. In Jerusalem, where he was to end, he was no longer himself; he no longer belonged to himself; his mission forced itself upon him and he followed the stream" - to his death.

Last but not least, a female figure shimmers through the darkness of the scene. It is Pilate's wife who, through the message of her dream, encouraged her husband in his sympathy for Jesus. "She had been able to see the sweet Galilean from some window

overlooking the temple courtyards, according to Strauss's continuator. Perhaps she saw him again in a dream and the blood of the beautiful young man, which was to be shed, had given her a nightmare.

Finally, in the dawn into which the darkness of the scene finally dissolves and which indicates the dawn of an eternal day and the turn to victory, a woman, that Mary Magdalene, plays the leading role. The cooperation of the German teacher and the French pupil brings about the "world-historical humbug" by means of the natural explanation of an evangelical account, without which the new man of the Gospel could not have overcome Roman Caesarism. In the vision of the woman who thought she saw the risen Christ, Renan, in his sweet manner, only allows the love excitement of a nervously irritated woman to play a part.

"Divine power of love, he exclaims, sacred moments when the passion of a hallucinated woman gives the world a resurrected God!"

On the whole, Renan borrowed from German rationalism and his teacher the belief in the mechanism of a messianic figure whose precisely prescribed movements the new man of the Gospel had to imitate. The Frenchman's only additions are the operatic effects to which he transforms the evangelical letter. He made up the larva, in whose pre-existence Strauss unshakeably believes that the Gospels were written, and accompanied the melodrama in which the bearer of the larva strides across the stage with shawms and the tam-tam of exaggerated adjectives, until the pastorate turns into the eerie tremolo, which is intended to lament the suffering of the hero as the larva grew with his innocent face.

If we now bring Renan, like Strauss, together with the typical Raimund figure, we need not say that he has also saved his heaven from the old world. His unearthly sanctuary, in whose pleasures he revels, is filled with the perfume of an evaporating religion; he has brought the blue enamel of his ideal heaven with him from his wanderings in the holy land, and he himself swings in gentle reverie, in which the round dances of the good Galileans and the proofs of love

which the women of evangelical history dedicated to the sweet master make him forget the abruptness of a democracy that is unpleasant to him.

Once again, while studying the "Apocalypse", he had the alleged author of the same, the "Seer of Patmos", paint for him the ideal in a new metamorphosis and he assures himself that it will one day be realized. "Through the clouds of a world in a state of embryo, the law of the progress of life, the inner feeling of a being that enlarges without cessation and the possibility of a state in which all will be in God what the buds on a tree, the myriad cells in a living being are."

Such a vision was fitting at a time when France was raving about the nun of Paray.

Incidentally, the French by no means devote the same admiration to their compatriot that he found in Germany. They call him a diluted apocalypticist and a sweetened Nazarene who, with the cassock of the seminary, has cast aside the austerity and rigor of the primitive Christianity he celebrated. For all his doubts, they find that his mystically colored style puts him in line with Chateaubriand's Catholic raptures and aesthetic raptures, and that he remains as sweet as his predecessor in the first empire.

High above him, however, who deduces the idyllic nature of primitive Christianity from the charms of the landscape of the Sea of Galilee, stands his compatriot from the previous century, who, as the creator and classic master of the contemplation and description of nature, declared the world to be the proper dwelling of man, but did not think to deduce the historical achievements of the occupant from the walls, scaffolding and floors of this dwelling. Not even in his idyllic play "Paul and Virginie" does Bernardin de Saint Pierre, the author of the *Etudes de la Nature*, allow the mood of the two children to emerge from the magic of the landscape, but lets the lovers transform nature according to the emotions of their hearts.

It was up to Renan to bring about the conversion of the apostle Paul by means of the impression made on him by the shady path

between the orchards outside Damascus with their "olive, nut-apricot and plum trees and the girandole bands of vines between the trunks of the same", in conjunction with a thunder that formed with unparalleled violence on the side walls of Hebron and with the feverish air of the locality there.

Only a virtuoso of landscape painting like him can allow himself the exclamation: "Myrtle and laurel groves or arid deserts, flowery or scrubby paths, unleashed torrents or peaceful watercourses, calm or stormy seas, brook or valley, - what was it to him, the Apostle Paul, if only the Word of God was not fettered and he himself carried the name of his Son everywhere." - Only he can find it remarkable that for the author of the Apocalypse, whom he transferred to Pathmos at the command of the legend, the wonderful nature of the island did not exist, just as Paul before Athens "had no eye for the enchanting localities" and the wonders of the city did not move him.

Renan's stay in the Holy Land and his autopsy concerning localities there is well authenticated. But it is questionable whether he really looked around in the Talmudic and other Jewish books, which he loves to quote, and borrowed his quotations from them. This question is settled, however, after Mr. Paulus Cassel proved in his work "Vom Wege nach Damaskus" (Gotha, 1872) that those quotations were taken from the writings of German scholars and Lightfoot.

## IX. Philo's writings.

I will later follow up this essay on Philo with another entitled "Seneca and Paul".

Nero's educator and advisor promoted the Alexandrian's work from the center of the Roman world, partly simultaneously with him, partly after his death, and made the Stoic opposition of the sage to the world and to the mass of humanity a popular dogma of the West. While Philo, with his treatment of the propositions of Heraclitus and the school of Zeno, paved the way to the spirits of the Orient, Agrippina's friend familiarized the Romans with the idea that the misery of the world and the evil afflicting mankind did not have their origin outside, in the twists and turns of the course of the world, but in man's own bosom, he also accustomed those who had fallen into sin to the resignation that uplift from the perversity of the world and from the depths of general sinfulness was only possible suddenly and through a miracle, the extent of which could only be measured by experience.

Paul, the New Testament proclaimer of this miracle of rebirth, is, according to the evidence I have provided in my "Critique of the Pauline Epistles", a collective name under which a rich epistolary literature has come down to us, among whose late products are also the four epistles, about which theological scholarship wants to leave no doubt. The period from Seneca to the end of Paul's activity, which even faculty scholars still see as working in epistles against the doctrines of the late Gnostics, thus extends from the years of the reign of Emperor Claudius to the middle of the second century, a rich period filled with great struggles and with the competition of general tendencies encompassing the world and aiming at world domination.

It was about world domination. Philo initiated the struggle when he combined the wisdom of Greece with his national law and created a middle power from the logos of Heraclitus and the Stoics, which

opened the royal path to the top not only for his tribe but also for the unborn, the poor and miserable of all nations.

The rise of Caesarism had fundamentally changed the position of the Jews in their settlements on the shores of the Mediterranean. Up to the times of Caesar and Augustus, their privileges or liberties in these colonies had come to them as a gift of grace, and they were treated as foreigners in comparison with Roman citizens or native Greeks, and in the provinces under the arbitrary power of the proconsuls and administrators, and in Alexandria even under the rule of a Greek royal house. The imperial power, however, leveled the national differences, such as the privileges and prerogatives, at the same time limiting the power of the prefects and in Alexandria eliminating the Greek government.

The Jews in Rome felt very well what they had lost in Caesar when he fell under the daggers of the Republicans, when they distinguished themselves at the funeral of the murdered man among the suffering strangers with their mourning procession and even made pilgrimages through the night to the funeral pyre from where the dictator had ascended to the gods. They had recognized in Caesar the Saviour of the world, who gave them equal rights with the former privileged.

The change that came with the consolidation of Caesarian power was felt earliest in Alexandria, where the Greek royal house fell with Cleopatra after the Battle of Actium. The province of Egypt came directly under the control of the emperor and the hundreds of thousands of Jews who lived in that port city and lost the protection of the Ptolemies had to rely on their own strength to assert themselves alongside the Greeks. Thus began the competition that Philo led to the top, using Greek wisdom to unite Hellenes and Jews in one community and win them over to the Logos, the messenger of salvation of the One and Only.

But superior fellow fighters came, who proclaimed the Logos who had become man and proved himself in death, and as Christians



called the poor and suffering of the whole world to themselves. Judaism, which under Philo's leadership believed itself to be on the road to victory, saved itself by joining its younger, more powerful and bolder brother and seeking to assert itself in the midst of his flocks. In the Christian camp itself, a war broke out between the so-called Jewish and Gentile Christianity, which, due to the extreme excesses of both enemy comrades, made it necessary for the church to balance the differences. In a series of gospels and their changing redactions, in alleged epistles and attempts at mediation, in an apocryphal literature, which also includes some apocrypha of the Old Testament, this fratricidal war went on, in which the victor, with the conquest of the opponent, at the same time promised himself dominion over the future and over the world, until the weariness and decay of the opposites or the elimination of the same from the community longing for peace brought about a settlement of its own accord. And at the end of this period, the last revolt, in which national Judaism once again tried to save its independence, collapsed and left the much disputed field to the disciples of the Logos.

In the description of a period in which Philo contributed to the formation of the Christian canon for a century after his death, we will often have to return to his writings and decide on the time of their origin. Here we will content ourselves with an overview and grouping of them.

First of all, a distinction must be made between the leading essays and their follow-ups. The former state the topic, the latter elaborate on it. The former provide information about the historical occasion, the latter explore the ideas contained in the history. The style of the basic essays is flat and intelligible, that of the explanatory expositions bold and bouncing. In the former, the author also indulges in allegories, but he introduces them with forethought and moves from them back to the basic historical theme with the same deliberation; in the latter, the historical text is usually a soft matter for him from the outset, which is transformed into allegories under his

hands, just as he treats text and interpretation as a single intellectual mass in the storm of enthusiasm in the course of the presentation.

The leading essays are four in number: *de Opificio*, *de Abrahamo*, *de Josepho* and the three books of the life of Moses; among the detailed essays that accompany the latter, the essay *de Decalogo* stands out, which contains several essays on the individual numbers of the ten commandments and, together with these explanations, forms a small whole in itself in the overall explanation of the Mosaic foundation.

The basic essay on the creation of the world, *de Opificio*, is a calmly progressing combination of the Platonic theory of creation and ideas with the Stoic doctrine of the Logos and with the mystery of the number seven, and goes as far as the seduction of the first human couple by the serpent, whereupon the author concludes with a recapitulation of Moses' teachings on God's relationship to the world.

The explanatory essays, which in the three books of the *Allegories of the Law* and in the writing *de Cherubim* take the history of the first human couple as the starting point of their allegories and then continue the history of the world and the first humanity up to the building of the Tower of Babel (*de confusione linguarum*), begin, with the exception of the essay *de Agricultura Noe* (inclusive, see the order, e.g. in Richter's edition), immediately with the saying of the Mosaic historical narrative, to which the fabric of the allegories is linked. Richter's edition, for example,) begin immediately with the saying of the Mosaic historical narrative, to which the web of allegories is linked; only the final essays of this group are connected by the author's own transitions.

The circle of essays that use the life of the first of the arch-fathers as the starting point for allegorical considerations has its center in the writing *de Abrahamo*. This is a self-contained whole, and the author himself says at the beginning and at the end of the essay (p. 350. 388.) that he proves in it that the laws of nature do not contradict each other, that the life of the patriarch himself was the law and the

unwritten statute, and that the law recorded by Moses was only the commentary on the life of the patriarchs. The allegorical speculation on the history of Abraham and the patriarchs in general is contained in the essays *de Migratione*, *quis rerum divinarum heres*, *de Congressu*, *de Profugis*, *de Mutatione nominum*.

The Joseph stories form a separate series. It is led by the writing *de Josepho*. It follows on from the previous group. The author says that after having described the three oldest paths of salvation in the lives of the patriarchs, namely the one that leads to the goal through knowledge (Abraham), the other, the power of the inner, gifted and pure, unbroken nature (Isaac), and the third, which leads to the goal in the struggle of exercise (Jacob), he now wants to describe the fourth, the politician. This writing (about Joseph), a complete history of his life, is a thoroughly planned writing, embellished with speeches by the protagonists and with moral and political remarks. The observations on the change of all things in history, the applications for moderate enjoyment, the warnings against the abuse of goods are written in a calmly reflective style. The interpretations of the events are judiciously inserted, and when the author has given an allegorical hint, he resumes the coherent historical narrative with prosaic calm.

The course of the two essays on dreams (*de Somniis*) is quite different - jumping, stormily progressing to bold visions. The author connects the first essay with the writing on Josephus himself, saying that in that previous work he had dealt with the dreams which the divine enters according to its own plan, but now he wants to discuss the kind of dreams in which our spirit, set in motion by that of the universe, seems to be inspired by God out of itself and enabled to see the future. And with reference to this other kind of dream he will describe (p. 1108) in the second writing on dreams the third kind, in which the soul is set in motion by itself, rises up and in rapturous enthusiasm prophesies the future with foreseeing power.

Among the writings that refer to Moses and the law, the treatise on the Decalogue is to be regarded as an independent one. The author refers to the fact that in the previous writings he described the

progenitors as the unwritten laws, and now wants to describe the ideas of the written laws one after the other. The essay goes through all ten commandments, the presentation is coherent, the topic is exhausted and at the end the author gives an overview of the train of thought of the writing, together with a recapitulation of the whole. The three essays de specialibus legibus, which deal with the interpretation of the individual laws, would thus relate to this basic treatise in the same way as the essays following the work on creation and the essays grouped around the biography of Abraham relate to its crystallization point. The first of these three essays on the special laws refers in its introduction to a similar detailed essay on the first two commandments, which, however, must first be sought.

Should the two essays de Monarchia (the Uniqueness and Autocracy of God) be this work? The author has preceded these two essays with the short treatise "On Circumcision", at the end of which he promises to go through the individual commandments and to deal first with those dealing with monarchy. It is probable that the treatises de Monarchia are intended as this interpretation of the first two commandments, especially since the author refers in the introduction to the short treatise on circumcision to a previous work in which he set out the general idea of the so-called ten commandments.

While the treatises on the idea and on the details of the laws from the leading book on the Decalogue, through the essay on circumcision to the books on the special laws, form a whole, the introduction to the book de Praemiis et Poenis marks a new section in the complete series of Philonian writings. The author surveys the whole of the communications of the "Prophet Moses" and finds them organized according to three ideas - the idea of creation, the historical idea and the legislative idea. About all this, he says, he has dealt in the preceding writings; now it remains for him to describe the battle-prize offered to the good and the punishment appointed to the wicked. At the end of the treatise, which deals primarily with the price of virtue, he refers explicitly to the following treatise on curses (de Execrationibus). The treatise on the nobility (de Nobilitate) lacks such

an explicit reference to the preceding essays, but the literal correspondence between the judgment passed on the degenerate old citizens and nobles (the Jews) and the preferential treatment accorded to the nobles who have proven their nobility of character brings this treatise into the closest connection with those essays. The same rejection of mere aristocratic blood and the admission of the unborn into the circle of the nobility is also placed alongside the essays *de Monarchia* I, p. 817. 818 and *de victim. offerent.* p. 854 to 856.

The three essays on sacrifice form a separate group: *de Praemiis sacerdotum*, *de Victimis* and *de vict. offerentibus*. The first refers to the second, the latter to the third.

Finally, the main writing that presides over all these essays, the life of Moses (in three books) and the treatise *de caritate*, which the author himself describes in the introduction (p. 697) as an appendix to his biography of Moses, is, like the dominant writings of the Abraham and Joseph groups, written in the simplest style and moves in a comfortable alternation between historical presentation, reflection, interpretation and allegory. The appendix, which is intended to portray the benevolence of Moses in his appointment of Joshua as leader of the people, in the blessing of the tribes and in the philanthropic spirit of his laws, is equally prosaic and the idea is intelligently executed. Incidentally, the author of the treatise *de Praemiis et Poenis* (p. 918) refers to his book in which he portrayed Moses as king, lawgiver, prophet and high priest, and the author of the essay *de Gigantibus* promises (p. 291) to give a complete account of Moses' prophetic life.

We have so far received two explanations from the author in which he comments on the plan and the order of his essays. At the beginning of the essay "on the Decalogue" he moves from the biographies of the wise men, whose lives were the unwritten law, to the interpretation of the written law. He provides the outline of his collection of writings and the Mosaic work of writing at the beginning of his treatise *de Praemiis et Poenis*. In addition to these two main passages on the order of his collection, there is a third in the essay *de*

Abrahamo (p. 349. 350), in which he comments on the position of the Abrahamitic treatises in relation to the fundamental work on creation (de Opificio). He says that the first of the five books in which the sacred laws are recorded is titled after the creation of the world, with which it begins (Genesis), although it also tells of many other things, such as peace and unrest, prosperity and scarcity, hunger and abundance, the greatest catastrophes of the earth through fire and water, and of people who lived together in virtue or in wickedness. But since all this belongs to the world and its experiences, and since the world is the most perfect and comprehensive, the whole book is dedicated to it. He has now dealt with creation in the earlier treatises; since the sequence demands the investigation of the laws, he wants to put the detail and the examination of the individual statutes aside for the time being and consider the more general and the archetypes first, that is, the men who have lived blamelessly – the models for imitation.

Does the author mean to say that the writing de Abrahamo immediately follows the treatise on creation (de Opificio)? Does he mean to deny that the allegorical essays, which currently intervene between these two basic writings and depict the experiences of the world up to the building of the Tower of Babel, are non-existent, because he sets up the model images of Enos, Enoch and Noah in that writing before he reaches Abraham? We do not consider this conclusion necessary. He was only concerned at that point to connect the one basic scripture with the other. If peace and strife, earthly catastrophes and the covenant of the wicked belong to the world and its affections, he could still accept the interpretation of the relevant accounts as an appendix to his writing about the origin of the world.

No one will be able or willing to prove that all the writings united in the Greek collection under Philo's name originate from him. Especially in the nebula of dull stars, which are heaped together in the group of individual interpretations of the law, several may have been added by later writers, imitators or pupils. It may also be that, as in the schools of painting of great masters, pupils have sketched individual studies under the eyes and in the spirit of the teacher. But

the basic writings and whole series of interpretative allegorical designs come from the master, whose creative power does not deny itself as inimitable and at the same time masters the detail with ease and knows how to mix his favorite colors.

As an example of the unsought and natural use of favorite colors, I cite only the return of the three types in which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob represent the possession of truth and wisdom. The first Patriarch had to leave the home of astronomy [or perhaps less formally, stargazing?], in which he sought God, and move to the foreign land of revelation in order to attain understanding and wisdom. For Isaac, truth is the laughing possession and development of his own nature, while in contrast to the security and peace of mind of his father, Jacob's life is a struggle with the affects and works its way through the fluctuations of the struggle. Thus, for example, in the writing *de Sacrificio Abel. et Cain.* p. 131 Jacob is the ascetic, Isaac the one who attained knowledge from himself, Abraham had to leave the mortal before he joined the people of God. In the writing of *quock Deterius Potiori*, Isaac stands out because of his nature. *De Plantat.* p. 238, Isaac is the laughter which is, so to speak, personal to the wisdom drawn from within. *Resipuit Noé* p. 283, Isaac is the type of the original, Jacob, on the other hand, is the athlete who trains himself to fight against the affects. Likewise *Quod Deus immutabilis* p. 296; *de Confus. ling.* p. 331; *de Abrah.* p. 357; *de Migrat. Abrah.* p. 392; *de Congress.* p. 429; *de Profug.* p. 451. The treatise *de Josepho* begins p. 526 with a review of the preceding biographical descriptions of the Three, the first of which bears the name of Knowledge, the second of Nature, the third of Exercise (Asceticism); also in the same treatise p. 558. 559; the treatise *de Somniis I.* moves p. 572. 573. 575. 590 in the same trilogy. Also the basic writing of the legislative treatises, *de Vita Mosis I*, p. 614, sees in Abraham the canon of didactic, in Isaac that of natural, in Jacob the canon of practicing (ascetic) wisdom; similarly, in the legislative explanatory writing *de Praemiis et Poenis* p. 914. 915 Abraham the wanderer from the knowledge of the sensual to that of the intelligible, Isaac the joy that delights in God, Jacob the wrestler who in relentless toil won the crown of victory, the beholding of God;

de Nomin. Mutat. p. 1045, in his historical revelation, the Seyende is the Lord and God of the three natures, of teaching, holiness and exercise, as whose symbols Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are recorded for memorial and remembrance; see further in the same writing p. 1058; in the writing Legis Allegor. III, p. 1097, the same trilogy is formed to the effect that Abraham was stripped (of mortal opinion) when he was called out of his country to God; Isaac is always naked and does not need to be stripped; Jacob only strives for spiritual nakedness; Isaac also appears in his role in the second writing de Somniis p. 1109.

The author's unity is also evidenced by the connection between the logos images, which form the luminous apex of the allegorical interpretations and visions of the individual groups. The unity of these tableaux is by no means the repetition of the same features, form and action, but a birth asserting itself in the flow of development. It is the evidence of a creative force which, like the upward-striving Heraclitean Logos, rises above the earthly and seeks to grasp the mediating power that guarantees the pleasure of the eternal to the decaying world. In the alternation of images, which nevertheless unite again to form the basic type of the neighbor of God and man, the source of all pleasure and spiritual peace, the effort of a man who wants to get to the bottom of the guarantee for general world peace cannot be overlooked.

He does not abandon the Platonic fund, which he used for his basic treatise on the creation of the world, but also uses it in the other groups of his essays and reminds us in the Mosaic-legislative group (de victim. offerent. p. 857) that the Ideas, the archetype of all created things, are not an empty word, but the powers of the Eternal and Omniscient, which give every kind of created thing its permanent peculiarity.

The stoic logos of nature, which stretches from the center of the universe to the outermost edges and from these to the center, traverses the triumphant course of nature and unites the parts into a unity, extends through all groups of the collection. It is, for example, in the minor stars of the main star of the Opificium, the form of



government of the Creator, which one must follow, that is, arrange one's life according to nature, if one wishes to enjoy bliss, (e.g. de Plantat. p. 221) In the Abrahamic group (de Migrat. Abrah. p. 407) living according to nature means following the track of the right Logos. The basic scripture of the dream-interpretation group (de Joseph. p. 530) calls the right logos of nature the polity of the metropolis which forms this world, to which polity the polities of the individual peoples are only additional aspects. And in the legislative group, in which the Logos (de Monarchia II, p. 823) as the image of God and de legib. special. II, p. 789 as the archetype of the spirit, and otherwise also the beneficent powers and punitive officials of the Being are not lacking, it is (de legib. special. p. 773) the right Logos of nature that fertilizes the soul with the seeds of virtue.

In the world-creation group (de sacrif. Abel et Cain. p. 139), as in the Abrahamic (de Abrah. p. 376), the Seyender is the mediator who presents himself to the view between the two basic forces, goodness and power.

The combination of Logos with Wisdom, or the unsuccessful attempt to secure a position in the system of revelation for the latter, taken from the "Proverbs of Solomon", is found in all four main groups (e.g. Legis Alleg. I, p. 52; de Profug. p. 457; de somn. II, p. 1141 and in de Caritat. p. 699, which belongs to the Moses group).

Furthermore, not only do the two treatises de somniis, belonging to the Joseph group, rise to the view of the Logos in his transfiguration to the High Priest, who offers himself to mortals as the potion of grace, but also in the Abraham group (de Profug. p. 266) the Logos appears as the High Priest, who, himself guiltless, begotten of the Father of all and born of Wisdom as Mother, where he enters, blots out sin.

Perhaps the simplicity of the language and the fatherly and comfortable attitude of the presentation, which characterize the three books of the biography of Moses, brought it about that the author, as in the suggestive fairy tale style, is content to say of the "beautiful figure, comparable to nothing visible" in the burning bush (*de Vita Mos. I, 612*) to say that it is probably to be taken for an image of the Seyenden, a messenger angel, and to say of the pillar of cloud (*Ebend. p. 628*) that perhaps one of the sub-commanders of the great king, an invisible angel, was enveloped in it. In the allegorical essays of the other groups, in accordance with their style, which advances vividly to the heart of the matter, the angel who met Hagar in the desert (*de Profug. p. 451*) and the one who gave light to the children of Israel in the desert (*de somniis I, 583*) are actually called the Logos.

I will only mention that in *Quod omnis Probus liber p. 872*, which deals with the Essaeans, the right Logos occurs, and in the essay on the therapists (*de vita contempl. p. 890*) the blessed divine powers are mentioned, and then stop.

The writing in which Philo supposedly describes his mission to the Emperor Caius Caligula (*Legatio ad Cajum p. 993*) does indeed know the series of divine powers, but in this as in the other *In Flaccum* we are confronted with problems for whose discussion we can only find space in the following work on "Seneca and Paul".

I do not include in these problems the contradictions between the two essays and the confusion that arises in each of them. In the essay on the mission to Caligula, it is the emperor himself who is angry with the Jews of Alexandria because they do not want to show him divine honor; in the letter against Flaccus, it is the pagan mob who persuade Flaccus Avilius, the hitherto righteous and blameless prefect of Egypt, that he can regain what he believes to be his faltering favor with Caius if he gives free rein to the eruption of the citizens of Alexandria against the Jews. Flaccus followed the advice, at least he did not prevent the pagan mob from erecting pillars in the Jewish houses of worship, nor did he oppose the bloody persecutions in which the hatred against the Jews was expressed.

The writing about the mission to Caius has Jewish envoys suddenly appearing in Rome, hoping to influence the emperor through an Egyptian palace servant, but only later realizing that he was encouraging the ruler in his anger against their people. In the course of the narrative, the author speaks of himself in the first person and says that he, who could be considered more insightful because of his advanced age and education, was well able to see through the unfavorable situation of the legation. The distress of the embassy reached its highest level, however, when suddenly one of them rushed to them, breathless, and reported, weeping and wailing, that the temple in Jerusalem was finished, since Caius had given the order that his colossal statue with the inscription of Zeus should be placed in the Holy of Holies. Thus the conflict between the prefect of Syria, Petronius, and the Jews of Palestine is reported, and with these two matters two embassies are brought onto the scene and intertwined, of whose authentication nothing is heard and both of which are said to have undertaken the journey to Caius against the express prohibition of the Roman authorities, since both the prefect of Egypt and the prefect of Syria had not wanted to know anything about sending an envoy.

The writing about the mission to Caius has the so-called Jewish king Agrippa still in Rome when those two legations arrived, making unsuccessful representations to the emperor on behalf of the Jews. In the letter against Flaccus, however, he lands in Alexandria on his return from Rome after his tetrarchy, and the mockery he experiences here from the city's mob is only the prelude to the uprising against the Alexandrian Jews, which gives rise to one of those embassies.

The author of the latter writing gives the prefect of Egypt all praise, in order, as he himself says, to make the later wickedness of the man really stand out on this foil. He was an intimate friend of Tiberius and had been entrusted by him with this prefecture for six years. He administered it for five years until the death of his imperial friend in the spirit of righteousness for which he enjoyed the latter's trust, and remained faithful to it even in his last year in office, until Caligula

underwent the well-known transformation after his illness in the eighth month of his first year of reign. Flaccus was therefore thorough, coherent and astute in his deliberations and decisions, and prompt in his execution; he soon familiarized himself with the intricate affairs of Egypt; in administration he showed a brilliant royal spirit; in the management of military affairs and the maintenance of discipline, as well as in civil legislation and the administration of justice, he was excellent.

But after the death of Tiberius had plunged him into deep mourning, he was completely shattered by the news that Caligula had had the deceased emperor's grandson eliminated. His last hope fell with Macro, the prefect of the imperial guard, whom Caligula rewarded with violent death for his intercession with Tiber. The fierce knight, who had not spared the imperial house, who met the knighthood in Macro, who offended the Senate with the removal of his father-in-law Silanus, finally reached for the crown of the gods and wanted to be worshipped as an Olympian. Flaccus, broken to the core, is now said to have become a different man as a result of these turns of events and to have been tempted by the ridiculous whispers of his secret enemies to win the intercession of the city of Alexandria with the emperor by persecuting the Jews, and indeed to have been open to the equally ridiculous incitement against Agrippa, who on his return journey to Judea landed in this city on Caligula's advice in order to fetch skilled sailors for the rest of his sea voyage.

Accordingly, the last year of his prefecture, which the emperor only ended with a coup d'état, must have been a very long one.

Moreover, the more recent chronologists, who enter the Egyptian prefectures of Flaccus in the Roman tables of years, have taken them only from this writing of the Philonian collection, which also offers the latest historians of the age of Jesus a convenient material for the novelistic embellishment of history.

Josephus does not know them, although he speaks (Archaeol. 18, 8, 1.) of the division and unrest in Alexandria between the Jews and

Greeks there, and reports very intelligently that each of the two factions sent envoys to Caius, and that Apion was the orator of the Greek, Philo the leader of the Jewish legation.

The author of the second writing on dreams in the Philonian collection (*de somniis* p. 1125) also speaks of an Egyptian prefect, known to him and his readers but no longer in command, who tried in vain to attack the Sabbath celebration and tried to bring the stubborn worshippers of the law to obedience through an address. After describing the behavior of the Jews during the sudden invasion of warlike enemies, the onset of water distress, the raging of fire, plague, earthquakes (works of men or God's fates), he concludes: "I am all these things, whirlwind, war, flood, lightning, not merely the name of fate and destiny, but the visible power."

But the author does not name this "evil one".

Now one of the problems that confront us in the writings on the mission to Caius and against Flaccus. The latter reports how the prefect tolerated the Alexandrian mob mocking King Agrippa when he docked at the richly populated port city during his parade in the city and in the gymnasium. They took a fool named Karabas, who was walking around naked in the streets, set him up on the high ground of the gymnasium so that he was visible to everyone, put a crown of papyrus leaves on his head, wrapped a mat around him as a cloak and gave him a reed as a scepter. After he had been decorated as king, young men with sticks on their shoulders stood by his side as lance bearers, others approached him to pay homage, others again approached him for legal rulings or advice on matters of state. The people around him acclaimed him as "Maris, which means 'lord' among the Syrians, for they knew that Agrippa was a Syrian and ruled over a large part of Syria."

The Gospels also tell of an unworthy man named Barabbas, whom the people appointed to take the place of the King of Truth. They do not clothe the unworthy man with royal ornaments, but rather the bearer of the unworthy king's dignity is adorned with the

insignia of secular rulership as a mockery. However, the correspondences between the Gospel account and the painting in Scripture against Flaccus are so literal that one cannot avoid the question of which side the original is on.

However, the discussion of this problem no longer belongs in the present work on Philo's preliminary work on Christianity, but in the historical overview of the origin of the Gospels.

In the same way, the sentence of the author of the Mission to Caius, (p. 1008) that God would sooner become a man than he would transform himself into a god (as Caligula claims of himself), goes so far beyond the Philonian view, in which the Logos is only the borderline neighbor of God and man, and his bodily appearances belong solely to the imagination, that we can only see in that "sooner" the concession to a later time.

And now even the baptism of blood, to which the Jews in the same writing in their address to Petronius, if only the temple remains unharmed, offer their families and themselves to the army, or which they want to perform on themselves after they have bathed and purified themselves in the blood of their own, - it is an idea to which nothing similar can be added in the other writings of the Philonian collection and which already touches on the later blood-soaked thoughts of the Christian fighters.

But I will come back to this in my next article, "Seneca and Paul", where I will begin with Caligula, in whom the swelling sense of God of the emperors and their contemporaries proclaimed itself in all its fantasy and, in contrast to the self-confidence of the later emperors, I will develop the superior certainty of victory of the Christians.