

Steven Thompson, PhD
Senior lecturer in biblical studies
Avondale College
Central Avenue, Cooranbong, NSW 2265, Australia
Work (02) 4980 2225
Fax (02) 4977 3839
Mobile 0414 810 653
steve.thompson@avondale.edu.au

Gustaf Dalman, Anti-Semitism, and the Language of Jesus Debate

[Short title: Dalman, Anti-Semitism, Jesus' Language]

Abstract

The theory that Jesus of Nazareth spoke and taught exclusively in Aramaic rather than Hebrew achieved its present dominant position just over a century ago due largely to the labour of Gustaf Dalman. His primary motivation was not the recovery of the historical Jesus, however, but to support his deep commitment to the Protestant movement to convert Jews. This movement did not escape the impact of escalating anti-Semitism in society, intensified by rapid progress towards German national unification. One Christian response to anti-Semitism was to "extract" Jesus from Judaism by contrasting him with "Jewish" attitudes and values held by Jewish spiritual authorities. Dalman's contribution was to extract Jesus from the ethnically exclusive Hebrew language by insisting that he spoke only the more widely-used lingua franca of the region, Aramaic. By over-stating his case and going beyond the evidence, Dalman revealed his indebtedness to the anti-Semitic spirit of his age.

Key words: Anti-Semitism, assimilation, Aramaic language, Franz Delitzsch, Germany, Gustaf Dalman, Hebraisms, Hebrew language, Historical Jesus, Institutum Judaicum, Jesus, Jewish emancipation, Judaising, *Judenmission*

Today's widely-accepted conclusion that Jesus of Nazareth spoke Aramaic rather than Hebrew did not have its genesis in early Christian memory, or in an academic or ecclesiastical ivory tower. Rather, it emerged, and was promoted, as part of a comprehensive missionary strategy by a band of Christian activists deeply committed to the conversion of European Jews. And while it employed the paraphernalia and processes of academia, its immediate context was a potent mix of eschatological expectation, deep pietistic conviction, escalating social turmoil and growing anti-Semitism in late nineteenth-century Germany. In the nation's rush towards national unity, the historic aloofness and exclusivity of some Jews appeared an obstacle, and provoked a series of Germanising and Christianising efforts targeting Jews. Christian contributions to this process included de-emphasising the Jewishness of Jesus, and extracting him from Judaism and things Jewish. In its nineteenth-century phase, this was typically expressed by means of antitheses, favourable presentations of Jesus against a background of less favourable "Jewish" counterparts, especially the religious authorities of his day.¹ In its twentieth-century phase this extraction process resorted to the extreme of totally denying any Jewishness to the "Aryan" Jesus. This article focuses on a single component of the extraction belonging to the former stage, the argument that Jesus taught only in the Aramaic language, a lingua franca of the region understood by the common people, while avoiding the ethnically-specific Hebrew language with its connotations of Old Testament, and of Jewish exclusivity.

Germany's most influential and productive Aramaic scholar, Gustaf Dalman (1855-1941), almost single-handedly reversed the course of the debate about the language of Jesus away from Hebrew and decidedly in the direction of Aramaic.² Most accounts of Dalman's role, focusing as they do on linguistic features of the time of Jesus, overlook the impact on his academic work made by the fact that his primary commitment was to the Protestant mission to the Jews. The fuller picture of Dalman's life and times has become more accessible during the past quarter century thanks to the appearance, between 1980 and 1995, of critical histories of the German Protestant mission to the Jews by Paul Aring and Christopher Clark,³ and the detailed biography of Dalman by Julia Männchen.⁴ These authors have assembled and evaluated previously difficult-to-access evidence pertinent to Dalman's times, life, mission endeavours, and his successful challenge to the traditional view of the mother tongue of Jesus. By drawing on this wealth of information, we are now able to situate Dalman within his times, and to identify the operative influences at work on the academic debate about the language of Jesus.⁵

Mission to the Jews

It is the thesis of this article that the late nineteenth-century phase of the debate about which language Jesus spoke found its proper academic as well as its social setting within the German Protestant Christianity, more precisely, among those leading the Protestant missions to the Jews. A brief sketch of that movement is relevant, and will open by introducing the term *Judenmission*, which has been employed by historians as a general designation for the organised endeavours of German Protestants, especially Pietists, to convert Jews.⁶ Those interested in mission work among Jews typically prepared themselves by attending a centre usually called *Institutum Judaicum*, which prepared mission workers by the study of Judaism, combined with study of Christian mission strategy. The first of these in Germany may have appeared as early as 1650.⁷ The first institute of direct

relevance for our topic was founded in Halle in 1728 by Johann Heinrich Callenberg (1694-1760), with support from like-minded Protestant groups across Europe, and from London's Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.⁸ Its work, starting with distributing Christian leaflets, extended to providing housing and support for converted Jews in an environment emphasizing the dignity of manual labour and the learning of a trade. The institutes also prepared people for direct missionary work by equipping them with an acute critique of Judaism and an apologetic presentation of Christianity.⁹

The scholarly foundation of the *Institutum* was laid by Callenberg, whose impressive academic qualifications and his position in the University of Halle provided support for his mission to Jews.¹⁰ His mode of communication with Jews included several Yiddish language publications in which Christianity was presented in a manner understandable to Jews.¹¹ It is significant for our study that Callenberg's *Institutum Judaicum* set a precedent and provided a pattern for a revival of the movement in Germany during the 1880s. Hermann Strack founded his *Institutum Judaicum* in Berlin in 1883.¹² Three years later Franz Delitzsch founded one in Leipzig.¹³ Similar Institutes sprang up in Halle, Breslau, Rostock and Bonn.

The exalted scholarly pedigree of the publications flowing from at least the first two of these institutes is indicated by the scholarly standing of their founders. Strack is famous for his grammar of biblical Aramaic and his introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, and Delitzsch for his encyclopaedic knowledge of Rabbinic literature, his contributions to a hugely-influential series of Old Testament commentaries which remain in print, and his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, also still in print. While scholarship was clearly a significant product of these institutes, it is important to stress their primary existence as missionary training centres. The combination of evangelical piety, missionary commitment, and serious scholarship are indicators of the high priority which

their directors assigned to their visions of the *Judenmission*, and the seriousness with which they approached it. With such rigorous training in matters Jewish, students were equipped for a sophisticated level of interaction with educated Jews in their task of sharing Christianity.¹⁴ The Leipzig Institute would, during the 1890s, take on additional significance as the site from which its director, Gustaf Dalman, would reverse the direction of the language of Jesus debate.

The German Protestant motive for conversion of Jews was rooted in two fundamental beliefs. The first was a widely-expressed millenarian, eschatological belief that the imminent end of the age would be preceded by a mass conversion of the Jews.¹⁵ The second motive arose from the view that unassimilated and unconverted Jews constituted a threat to German prosperity, unification and nationalism, due to their differentness and perceived unwillingness to support the vision of a united Christian Germany, which could take its place alongside previously-united neighbour European states. More specifically, unconverted German Jews posed a threat of an economic, political and social nature. Converted Jews were expected to become "German" by assimilation—that is, by adopting Protestantism and by learning and practicing a trade, agriculture, or similar manual work.¹⁶ In his detailed history of the German Protestant mission to Jews, Christopher Clark argued that

... the key term 'conversion' came to refer as much to a social and occupational adjustment as to a change in belief. In order to be accepted as an authentic convert, the Pietist missionaries expected the Jews to move out of the conventionally 'Jewish' sectors of the economy and adopt what they called a 'Christian profession'—one of the guild-controlled trades.¹⁷

The *Judenmission* movement thus fostered a unique blend of mission conviction, millennial expectation, and scholarship, partly fuelled by a shared vision of a unified, culturally homogeneous German nation.

By the middle of the nineteenth century the *Judenmission* faced rapidly-changing national economic and political circumstances.¹⁸ Social and political upheaval accompanying rapid industrialization and migration of farm workers into the cities unsettled and alarmed many Germans, and led political opportunists to search for scapegoats.¹⁹ They did not have to search far. German Jews were either too visible, or too invisible, to satisfy their critics. They were under-represented in several occupations, in the civil service, and in the military, all of which had long been closed to them.²⁰ A large number, on the other hand, appeared to be employed in business, trade and finance.²¹ Ruth Gay notes that

The new world opened up by the Industrial Revolution needed power and transportation, capital for new enterprises, and organizing ability. These opportunities gave Jews a new role. What was distinctive about these modern Jewish entrepreneurs was not only their willingness to venture capital on new machines and new industrial processes but also their use of untried fiscal structures, such as issuing shares on the company and trading them on the stock market. This readiness to experiment had unforeseen evil consequences for the Jews later in the century, when a modern anti-Semitic movement began to identify Jews with capitalism, a system the Jew-haters derided as the destroyer of an old and pure (if imaginary) German way of life.²²

Because of the concentration of Jews in finance, any national economic instability or unfavourable business and financial development tended to attract attention to, and project blame on, Jews. This happened following industrial overproduction in 1873 which led to

factory closures, failures of many businesses, and a serious depression.²³ Two years later an international agricultural crisis left many German farmers unable to market their produce. Anti-Jewish publicists used these crises to draw unfavourable attention to an alleged growing Jewish stranglehold on the nation's finance.²⁴

Jews, under-represented in agriculture, crafts and industry, came to be characterised in popular novels and in segments of the media as uncultured, materialistic, amoral, and work-shy—in contrast to the basic values the "typical" German attributed to himself.²⁵ German Protestants, brought up with high regard for agriculture and manual trades, which they considered a core "biblical" value of their religion, were urged by anti-Semitic propagandists to look suspiciously on Jews who reportedly showed little regard for agriculture and craftsmanship.²⁶

Anti-Semitism increasingly impacted German society during the final thirty years of the nineteenth century.²⁷ Historians date the emergence of what they term "modern anti-Semitism" in contrast to historic Christian anti-Judaism to this period.²⁸ Some descriptions of this new phase of anti-Semitism characterise it by the term *Weltanschauung* ("worldview"), arguing that it had taken on the dimensions of a worldview.²⁹ By 1879 it went beyond sporadic outbreaks and emerged as a movement.³⁰ The term *Antisemiten* ("anti-Semites") first appeared in print that year.³¹ Also, the *Antisemiten-Liga* ("anti-Semitic League") was founded with the declared aim of saving the Fatherland from being completely Judaised.³² Two forms developed: Christian anti-Semitism, and anti-Christian anti-Semitism. The latter, more racially based, distanced itself from Christianity and incorporated non-Christian and anti-Christian elements.³³ More relevant to this article's topic is the Christian variety of anti-Semitism, which appeared in the responses of a range of German Christians to the perceived Jewish threat to national and Christian life and values.³⁴

During the 1870s anti-Semitic publicists reacted against what they considered excesses in the Jewish press's ongoing "attacks" against Christianity and things Christian, and the general Jewish dilution of traditional "German" values. The influential Berlin cathedral and court preacher and founder of the Christian Social Workers Party, Adolf Stöcker, in his programmatic first speech on the "Jewish question," delivered on September 19, 1879, probably voiced the Christian anti-Semitic attitudes of many Protestants:³⁵

we hate nobody, certainly we do not hate the Jews; we consider them to be our fellow citizens and we love them as the people of the prophets and the apostles, from whom our Saviour came. However, we will not be deterred, when Jewish newspapers encroach upon our faith, and the Jewish spirit of mammon corrupts our people, to mark these dangers.³⁶

His delineation of the "Jewish problem", and his subsequent "advice" to German Jews was moderate, compared with that from some of his non-Christian anti-Semitic counterparts. He advocated for Jews more modesty, more tolerance of Christian values, and more conformity to German culture and values, including the willingness to do some hard work, rather than using capital and Jewish-controlled segments of the press to further their interests.³⁷ In brief, he advocated a surrender of Jewish identity, followed by assimilation, as the solution to the Jewish presence in Germany. Failure of Germany's Jews to cooperate, he warned, would lead to an unavoidable catastrophe. Stöcker at this date spoke for and to Protestants, who saw in him a believer, whose concern for the nation and its Jews was a legitimate expression of his Christian faith.³⁸

In response to the spread of modern anti-Semitism across German society, *Judenmission* leaders radicalised their mission attitudes and strategies. Their traditional approach of encounters with travelling Jews, entering Jewish enclaves equipped with knowledge of Yiddish, and more direct proselytism of Jewish youth in the cities, began to

be met with active resistance by secularised, educated Jews employing Christian patterns of reasoning.³⁹ Earlier optimism among *Judenmission* workers about Christianising Jews began to be replaced by critical and pessimistic generalisations – "why are the Jews so stiff-necked and unteachable?"⁴⁰ Statements reflecting the fear of a Judaising of the German state and Christian values also began to appear.⁴¹

Prior to legislation enacted between 1869 and 1871 in the Prussian Diet, Jews in Prussia and the North German Confederation lived under legal restraints on their participation in selected areas of life and public discourse. An attempt to emancipate German Jews in 1812 was "limited in several important aspects."⁴² Subsequent moves to extend the benefits of emancipation were firmly resisted by the conservative government majority, which was strongly supported by elements within the Lutheran Church, which shared the government's vision of a Germany in which Jews would be converted to Protestantism and assimilated into the dominant Protestant culture.⁴³ This conservative-Protestant alliance argued that "only Christianity, not emancipation, could make the Jew happy."⁴⁴ This call for conversion and assimilation was issued repeatedly at conferences of *Judenmission* workers from 1870 and onwards into the twentieth century.⁴⁵ This was only one component of a strategy designed jointly by the Prussian state and the Lutheran Church to resist the growing impact of secularisation on German society, and to keep Germany a "Christian" state.⁴⁶ The formidable resistance of this alliance delayed Jewish emancipation until 1869, by which time enough liberals had entered government to enact the legislation granting political and legal equality to citizens regardless of religion.⁴⁷

Emancipation immediately impacted Protestant-Jewish relations. The Jewish press and publicists were now free not only to publish rebuttals of accusations made against them by Protestants, but also to go on the offensive, openly attacking Protestant beliefs and culture, including the person and significance of Jesus Christ.⁴⁸ This so-called (mis)use of

recently-gained Jewish religious freedom was perceived by some Protestants as abusive and insulting.⁴⁹ Anti-Semitic agitators characterised them as attacks on "German" faith and values. Some Protestants harboured a deeper fear—eventual Jewish control of the press itself. "Now that the barriers to social advancement had been lifted throughout the German Empire, they would hasten to extend their power and influence. Control of the press and the acquisition and manipulation of capital would both serve their cause."⁵⁰

When emancipation of Prussian Jews between 1869 and 1871 swept away what to *Judenmission* leaders was a major incentive for Jews to assimilate, they responded in two ways. First, they attempted, from 1871, to more closely coordinate the many independent *Judenmission* efforts through a new centralized organization called *Evangelische-lutherische Centralverein für Mission unter Israel*.⁵¹ Second, they began adopting a modified philosophy of mission which absorbed some of the less radical and violent aspects of anti-Semitism.⁵² This is explicitly admitted by *Judenmission* leader and Old Testament scholar Franz Delitzsch, when he wrote in 1881 "From the side of the Christians an un-Christian race hatred that cries to heaven has been subtly introduced into this movement ..."⁵³ This development in *Judenmission* philosophy could certainly not be characterised: *judenfreundlich* ("Jew-friendly").⁵⁴ Aring referred to the escalating hardening of theological and humanitarian attitudes that characterised the views of *Judenmission* workers of this era, leading to what he termed "the wrecking of the *Judenmission*."⁵⁵ Julia Männchen's assessment of this uptake of anti-Semitism into the radicalized *Judenmission* is equally frank: "... it distinguished itself from the [wider, national] anti-Semitic movement in little more than choice of means."⁵⁶

Attitudes towards Jews, expressed in publications of the *Judenmission*, range from sympathy on one hand to explicit anti-Semitism on the other. Franz Delitzsch, Gustaf Dalman, Hermann Strack and other *Judenmission* leaders went repeatedly into print

defending Jews against scurrilous, unfounded accusations intended to stir up anti-Jewish sentiment.⁵⁷ Their activities support Uriel Tal's point that "In the sphere of domestic politics the conservative Christians kept aloof from political and racial anti-Semitism and were only in favor of Christian anti-Semitism that was dictated by political considerations and party interests."⁵⁸ On the other hand, in the words of Shulamit Volkov, "It was no longer possible to remain neutral on the Jewish Question."⁵⁹ *Judenmission* leaders and workers voiced their anti-Semitic sentiments in the pages of their organizations' publications. Aring traced what he termed "missionary impatience" with Jews in articles appearing in *Judenmission* publications from the mid 1860s.⁶⁰ Männchen agreed, stating that one needs only to glance through a few issues of *Saat auf Hoffnung*, Franz Delitzsch's Jewish mission journal, to note how the *Judenmission* was coloured with the anti-Semitic thoughts and prejudices then current in society.⁶¹ Delitzsch, acknowledging his personal ambivalence towards anti-Semitism, "explained that a 'Christian sense of honour' sometimes outweighed his instinctive objection to 'the antisemitic tendency of the *Zeitgeist*'."⁶²

Judenmission publicists typically expressed the fear that the Jews constitute a danger to Germany in general, and to Christianity in particular. They saw specific dangers linked, first, to the emancipation of the Jews, which granted them equality with other citizens and allowed them to achieve such a level of influence that they now constitute a threat to the nation because of Jewish inclination to usury, and their extensive networking, Jew helping Jew. Second, they were seen as contributing to the general de-Christianizing of the nation. Third, Jewish disparaging of Christ and of Christianity in print both through Jewish publications and to a lesser degree in the mainstream newspapers, they alleged, fomented anti-Semitism.⁶³

Clark summarised the rationale for the radicalized late nineteenth-century *Judenmission* philosophy, now incorporating self-consciously some of the milder attitudes of the anti-Semitic movement, in the following words:

By the late 1880s it was clear to the publicists of the Berlin [*Judenmission*] society that the mission to the Jews was a defensive institution designed to protect what remained of Protestant Christianity in Germany from the influence of the Jews. ... The view that missionaries were fighting a rearguard action in the struggle against 'Judaisation' became one of the staples of mission publicity.⁶⁴

Gustaf Dalman—Pertinent Biographical Features

The essential link between the late nineteenth-century German *Judenmission* and the language of Jesus debate was the person and work of Gustaf Dalman. He was born Gustaf Herman Marx in 1855 in Niesky, Silesia.⁶⁵ Only in 1886, at the age of 31, did he take his mother's Swedish maiden name, Dalman. The reason he gave for the change was to keep her family's name from dying out, and when suspicion was expressed that he changed his name to conceal Jewish ancestry, he denied it.⁶⁶ Growing up in a deeply religious Moravian home, Dalman as a teenager developed a strong sense of call to the *Judenmission*, indicated by his initial attempt, while still a teenager, to translate New Testament passages into Hebrew.⁶⁷ He was described as something a loner, focused intently on study, and possessing a character "in which thoroughness and closeness of application were attributes even from earliest childhood, and a passionate desire to learn and understand everything connected with Biblical and post-Biblical Jewish Literature, one might almost say, was absorbed with his mother's milk."⁶⁸ He studied at the Moravian seminary at Gnadenfeld, then taught Old Testament and practical theology there from 1881 until 1887, when he left the Moravians for the Lutherans. He then completed his doctorate at Leipzig, and began

lecturing in Franz Delitzsch's Institute, serving as its director from Delitzsch's death in 1890 until his own departure for Jerusalem in 1902.

Dalman's life's commitment, until he left the institute in 1902 at the age of 47, was to the *Judenmission*, and to scholarship directly supporting it. This is reflected in his published bibliography, which includes approximately one thousand entries, more than two hundred of which relate directly to the *Judenmission*, in addition to his monographs on Aramaic and the language of Jesus.⁶⁹ It is important to establish that the *Judenmission* was not a side interest for Dalman, conducted in spare time when he was not applying himself to scholarship. Rather, it was his main endeavour. His groundbreaking work on Aramaic was subordinated to, and supportive of, his commitment to the *Judenmission*. Scholarship for Dalman was not a goal in itself, but a tool to further the Christian mission to the Jews.

Dalman's Attitude Toward the Jews

Dalman's ambivalent relation to anti-Semitism mirrored the complex national context in which he and his *Judenmission* colleagues worked.⁷⁰ In his autobiography he declared that he kept himself completely separated from the anti-Semitic conflict: "*Den antisemitischen und philosemitischen Kampfplätzen stand ich völlig fern ...*"⁷¹ But one of his published speeches indicated otherwise. At the Cologne mission conference of 6-9 October 1900, he was reported arguing that anti-Semitism was not a hindrance for the *Judenmission*; to the contrary, many Jews had been driven into the church by it.⁷² In his speech titled *Die Judenmission, ein Werk der Kirche*, delivered on May 22, 1888 to the general assembly of the *Central Verein für Mission unter Israel*, Dalman characterized growing anti-Semitism in the nation as a challenge to the church to greater effort in the *Judenmission*, with the goal of limiting or even removing the influence of the Jews in Germany.⁷³ He expressed in print the following: Jews were by nature *unstet* ("inconstant"—in which sense is not explained by his biographer, but one assumes it includes a lack of

commitment to business and financial obligations).⁷⁴ They posed a threat to the *Judenmission* itself due to Jewish materialistic tendencies, which led some of them to view conversion to Christianity as an opportunistic business transaction.⁷⁵ He warned mission workers against the powerful grip on many Jews of *dem intellektuellen und sittlichen Schmutze des Ostens* ("the intellectual and moral filth of the East").⁷⁶ Männchen sums up Dalman's aim for the *Judenmission* in terms nearly identical to those above for the wider *Judenmission* movement: first and foremost the task of the *Judenmission* was the salvation and preservation of Christianity, rather than salvation of the Jews.⁷⁷

All the while that Dalman was engaged in the rapidly-changing conditions of mission work among Jews, and in responding to the escalating anti-Semitism in German public dialogue, he vigorously researched ancient Judaism, especially its Aramaic sources. His findings would have major repercussions on one aspect of the lively late nineteenth-century quest for the historical Jesus, whose life and teaching were subject to intense recovery efforts at the hands of biblical scholars, historians, and a few social engineers of the day.

Dalman's Hebrew and Aramaic Scholarship

Dalman's Hebrew scholarship impressed his superior, Professor Franz Delitzsch at the Leipzig Institute, to the degree that, days before the latter's death in February 1890, he handed over to Dalman the editorial responsibility for the 11th edition of his famous translation of the New Testament into Hebrew. It appeared in 1892.⁷⁸ Another monument to Dalman's Hebrew scholarship, his *Aramäische-neuhebräisches Wörterbuch*, which appeared between 1897 and 1901, testifies to his academic diligence. Both works remain in print, and in use, more than a century later.

But Dalman's enduring scholarly contribution was to the establishment of the theory that Aramaic was the main, even the sole, language of Jesus and ordinary Palestinian

Jews of his day. Building on the rapid post-Reformation recovery of knowledge of the Aramaic language, his publications significantly advanced the state of Aramaic scholarship. The following works by Dalman were most influential in this respect: *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* (Leipzig 1894)⁷⁹; *Aramäische Dialektproben...mit Wörterverzeichnis* (Leipzig 1896)⁸⁰; *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (part 1 Frankfurt 1897; part 2 Frankfurt 1901)⁸¹; *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig 1898)⁸²; *Jesus-Jeschua* (Leipzig 1922)⁸³. All but the last of these appeared during his years at the Leipzig Institute. Collectively they have exerted greater influence on subsequent research into the language of Jesus than any other body of scholarship to appear in modern times.

Language of Jesus Debate

By dint of scholarly output and mission vision during the 1890s, Dalman nearly single-handedly provided the linguistic data and promotional initiative to put in place the theory that Aramaic alone, not Hebrew, was the language of Jesus. His strategy of publishing monographs and reference works, rather than entering scholarly dialogue through specialist journal articles, has probably extended the duration as well as the depth of his impact on the language of Jesus debate. Subsequent assessment by New Testament scholars of Dalman's work on the language of Jesus was summarised by Matthew Black in 1946 as "the most important contribution which has been made to the subject" during the nineteenth century.⁸⁴ James Barr in 1970 concurred: "Gustaf Dalman, the great authority whose influence—more than that of any other scholar—has weighed down the balance toward the view that Jesus taught in Aramaic."⁸⁵

Traditional View: Jesus Spoke Hebrew and Aramaic

The traditional view of Western Christendom, that Jesus spoke Hebrew as well as some Aramaic, was based ultimately on incidental references to Hebrew in the New Testament and in other early Christian documents. New Testament occurrences of τῆ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ "in the Hebrew language" (Acts 21:40, 22:2, 26:14) and the adverb Ἑβραϊστὶ "in Hebrew" (John 5:2, 19:13, 17, 20; 20:16, Rev 9:11, 16:16), supported by testimony from the second-century Papias (Fragment 2.16) that Matthew wrote τῆ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, influenced the prevailing view in the early church that Hebrew was the language of Jesus and fellow Palestinian Jews. Testimony of Irenaeus (attributed to him by Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.39.16), Eusebius (*De Theophania* 4.12), Epiphanius (*Panarion* 29.9.4) and Jerome (*De viris illustribus* 3; also Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.8.2) to the existence of a (if not *the*) Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, also supported this theory.⁸⁶ However, churchmen with connections to Palestine, including Jerome, knew that in Palestine of their day both Hebrew and Aramaic were spoken (Eusebius, *Demonstratio evangelica* 3.4.44; 3.7.10).⁸⁷

The Western church lost contact with Palestine, and the resulting loss of its knowledge of Aramaic and Syriac rendered it unable to access the essential data needed for critical engagement with the question about Jesus' mother tongue. Western European recovery of the knowledge of the Aramaic language between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries made available once again the data which Dalman and his contemporaries used in their challenge to the dominant theory the Jesus spoke Hebrew. In general, before Dalman, churchmen and academics assumed that while Jesus spoke some Aramaic, Hebrew was his, and Palestinian Judaism's, main language.⁸⁸

Franz Delitzsch, who dominated the language of Jesus debate prior to Dalman, was the last notable supporter of the view that Hebrew was Jesus' mother tongue.⁸⁹ With his

Jewish ancestry and Pietist upbringing, Delitzsch was deeply committed to biblical interpretation, to the literature of Rabbinic Judaism, and to the *Judenmission*.⁹⁰ In his own words "the purely scientific interest in the literature of the Jews and the spiritual interest in their conversion, have long struggled for the mastery in my soul."⁹¹ A Hebrew-speaking Jesus was congenial to him for theological as well as linguistic reasons, because he placed Judaism of the second temple period squarely in continuity with the world of the Old Testament. Its salvation history provided the platform on which Jesus stood, and from which he drew in forging Christian belief. Therefore it was natural for Jesus, along with contemporary Palestinian Jews, to speak Hebrew, argued Delitzsch in the introduction to his 1877 Hebrew translation of the New Testament.⁹² He reiterated this vigorously in his introduction to the 1883 edition, asserting that the main Semitic mark left on the New Testament was Hebrew, not Aramaic, and declaring that Jesus and the apostles thought in and spoke mostly Hebrew.⁹³ His contemporary Alfred Resch supported the view that Jesus spoke Hebrew in several substantial publications.⁹⁴

Dalman Challenges the Traditional View

Contrary to his mentor however, Dalman by 1891 published his conclusion that Hebrew was not the language in which Jesus taught.⁹⁵ Männchen places his decision against the immediate background of Delitzsch's efforts to select the appropriate Hebrew dialect for his New Testament translation. The options for Delitzsch were either the classical language of the Old Testament, or the later Hebrew of the Talmud and Midrashim. He constructed a form of Hebrew which mixed both dialects, resulting, according to Dalman, in "a mixture of Old Testament and talmudic Hebrew which is his own creation, and not paralleled in any Jewish document."⁹⁶ Dalman in the same article stated a second, to him more fundamental, objection: "I could not convince myself that the New Testament writings

had generally been conceived in Hebrew, and I suspected that Jesus and his disciples in the Palestinian environment spoke not Hebrew but Aramaic."⁹⁷

While Dalman's objection to a Hebrew-speaking Jesus was stated here in scholarly terms, some of his later statements about Jesus' language go beyond objective evaluation of the evidence to take on a campaigning tone and edge. Pinchas Lapide, for example, designated Dalman's 1922 monograph *Jesus-Jeschua* "a kind of 'anti-Delitzsch' statement."⁹⁸ It is unlikely that Dalman was intentionally anti-Delitzsch. Rather, his vigorous promotion of Aramaic as the mother tongue of Jesus was driven in part by his need to set up an antithesis of Hebrew-speaking versus Aramaic-speaking, in order to partly extract the Founder of Christianity from establishment Judaism. By separating Jesus from Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament and the Jewish theological authorities, Dalman hoped to more securely locate him within the milieu of everyday, common Aramaic-speaking Jews.

It is the thesis of this article that Dalman's insistence that Jesus spoke Aramaic rather than Hebrew was not due to the logical follow-on of his considerable Aramaic scholarship. Rather, a gap appeared in his logic as he attempted to take his readers from his extensive Aramaic studies on one hand, to his assertions that Jesus did not speak Hebrew on the other:

[Jesus] endeavour[ed] to come into contact with the life and the experience of the common people. Even assuming that He was able to speak Hebrew, it is unthinkable that He should not have condescended to express Himself in the language of those who gathered to listen to Him.⁹⁹

While Dalman convincingly demonstrated the widespread use of Aramaic in the world of Jesus, and its frequent appearance behind expressions in the synoptic Gospels, he failed to deal effectively with the clear evidence that Hebrew was also present in that

milieu. In leaping this logical gap himself, Dalman assumed that his reader would adopt his own conviction that neither Jesus nor his everyday audiences understood Hebrew, on the strength of its often-repeated assertion. Note for example the series of assertions in the introductory chapter to his 1898 monograph *Die Worte Jesu*. While there are only limited direct links in the footnotes to his already-published Aramaic scholarship, he frequently insisted that Hebrew had ceased to directly influence Jesus, the Jews of the second temple period, and the earliest transmitters of the Gospel tradition: "... Jesus grew up speaking the Aramaic tongue, and ... He would be obliged to speak Aramaic to His disciples and to the people in order to be understood."¹⁰⁰ "We conclude that the teaching of our Lord everywhere: in the boat, on the mountain, or in the synagogue, could not have been in any other language than Aramaic."¹⁰¹

Dalman further asserted, again without citing evidence, that knowledge of Hebrew had long since faded from the collective memory of Palestinian Jews of the second temple period, replaced by Greek and Aramaic: "... the world of thought peculiar to the Jews, which had then to be apprehended in a Greek mould, had already been fashioned in Aramaic and no longer in Hebrew."¹⁰² "... signs are not wanting to show that the authors of our Gospels, in their present form at least, were not conversant with the Hebrew language."¹⁰³ "Hebrew influence was active only indirectly ... insofar as a Hebrew past underlay the Aramaic present of the Jewish people."¹⁰⁴ "The spiritual intercourse also which Jewish Hellenists continuously had with Hebraists in Palestine implied a constant interchange between Greek and Aramaic (but not Hebrew) modes of expression ..."¹⁰⁵ These statements make it clear that Dalman maintained what has more recently been labelled "the most extreme thesis" about the language situation of first-century A.D. Palestine—that during the exile and after their return to Palestine, Jews ceased to use

Hebrew, except for liturgy and scholarship, and used only Aramaic for everyday communication.¹⁰⁶

Later Tendency to Hebraize and Judaize the Words of Jesus?

Dalman clearly acknowledged the presence, in the Greek Gospels, of Hebraisms as well as Aramaisms. But in his eagerness to deny that Gospel Hebraisms pointed to Hebrew in the language milieu for Jesus, Dalman attempted to account for their presence another way. He did so by invoking a later ancient tendency to Hebraize the gospel material after it had been translated into Greek.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, he argued, in order to restore the words of Jesus to their original Aramaic form, it was necessary to remove these alleged later Hebraisms: "The words of Jesus, purged of special Hebraisms of every kind, will accordingly have the highest probability of being original."¹⁰⁸ "Even to Aramaic transmitters of his words we cannot therefore impute any tendency to Hebraize them ..."¹⁰⁹ Thus for Dalman "the thesis is justified that the fewer the Hebraisms, the greater the originality."¹¹⁰ Dalman's opinion of attempts to reach the original sayings of Jesus by retranslating them into Hebrew is expressed in the following statement:

The existence of a primary Gospel in the Hebrew language had to be considered antecedently improbable, because no occasion was discovered for the use of this language. And if we have now succeeded in showing that the special Hebraisms of the Synoptic Gospels are to all appearance of Greek origin, ... the attempts hitherto made to infer a Hebrew original from the variants in the Gospel texts are unsuccessful ...¹¹¹

In the absence of any attempt on Dalman's part to argue, demonstrate or document this alleged later Hebraizing of the Greek Gospels, his reader is left with the impression that Dalman's "de-Hebraizing" of Jesus and the Gospels was driven by ideology rather than evidence.

Two features of Dalman's view emerge from his assertions cited above. The first is his repeated insistence on the impossibility that Hebrew was known and used among ordinary Jewish people, except in formal liturgical settings, at the time of Jesus. The second is his introduction of a time gap of unspecified duration between the Judaism of Jesus' day and the earlier Judaism whose collective memory included a knowledge of Hebrew. Further, Dalman's insistence on a strict either/or option on Jesus' mother tongue is a mirror image of the equally one-sided position reached near the end of his life, by his mentor Delitzsch. Earlier in his career Delitzsch acknowledged that some Aramaic could have been used in Jesus' milieu, but near the end of his life he resorted to the extreme position that only Hebrew was used in Palestinian Jewish daily life. Arnold Meyer rightly took Delitzsch to task for assuming such an extreme position.¹¹² Dalman went to the opposite but equal extreme when he denied any place to Hebrew in the everyday discourse of first-century Palestinian Jewish common people, and of Jesus.

Extracting Jesus from Judaism

To attribute to Jesus himself any Hebraisms would be not only anachronistic, maintained Dalman, it would also constitute falsifying the words of Jesus by "Judaising" them.¹¹³ In Dalman's usage, "false Judaising" is reading back into the Gospels a later Judaising tendency not originally present in the words of Jesus. For Dalman it was important that Jesus be differentiated from Judaism: "... the soul burns with the ardent desire ... to visualise Him as He was among Jews, Samaritans, and pagans, from all of whom He differed ..."¹¹⁴ "The fact that, although *of* Israel, He was yet not merely a Jew, admits no question."¹¹⁵ Dalman argued for a separation between Judaism on the one hand, and both the words and the ideas of Jesus on the other. Note the unwarranted leap from "words" to "ideas" and "conceptions" in the following passage:

Thus our research will also be guarded against a false Judaizing of the words of Jesus, such as easily arises and often has arisen, where isolated dicta, separated from their context, have been compared with Rabbinic ideas and expressions. Further, the theory which has been advanced ... that Jesus at first began His work with Jewish ideas and then gradually charged these with a new content, cannot justify itself in presence of the Gospel accounts. For there the teaching of Jesus, extending only over a short period of time, appears, in regard to the fundamental conceptions, uniform and unvarying.¹¹⁶

If this evaluation of Dalman's stated aim of distancing Jesus and his teaching from Judaism, and from false Judaizing strikes the reader as an unsupported exercise in circular reasoning, it is important to recall the circumstances and forces swirling around Dalman and the *Judenmission*. He was by no means the only German engaged in the effort to extract Jesus from Judaism. Under the impetus of growing anti-Semitism, such efforts received the attention of an increasing range of persons in the late nineteenth century.¹¹⁷ There is no suggestion that Dalman practiced any of the more extreme forms of "extraction" employed by some anti-Christian anti-Semites when, for example, they argued that Jesus was Aryan.¹¹⁸ Dalman's relatively much more modest, open-ended attempt to extract Jesus from Judaism was in harmony with the variety of anti-Semitism practiced by conservative German Protestants in the late nineteenth-century.

Summary of Dalman's Contribution

Dalman's scholarly work on the language of Jesus was not carried out in isolation from his commitment to the *Judenmission*, any more than it was carried out free from the wider social and political currents in Germany, including growing anti-Semitism. Like his fellow *Judenmission* leaders, Dalman adopted the mission strategy of urging German Jews

to assimilate to "German" Protestant beliefs and values. The very future of the German state, he and many fellow Protestant Germans believed, depended on the success of the mission to convert and assimilate Jews. In order to accomplish it, Dalman set about extracting Jesus from Judaism, in stages. First, he argued that Jesus taught exclusively in Aramaic, an international *lingua franca* of the ancient near East and language of common Jewish people, rather than the exclusively Jewish Hebrew language of the theologians. He then further extracted Jesus from his milieu by asserting that he was not fully Jewish. Thus Dalman's conclusions fitted comfortably with the late nineteenth-century process which downplayed the Jewishness of Jesus.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to re-assess Dalman's contribution to the language of Jesus debate in the light of recently-published studies which make much more accessible his devotion to his beloved *Judenmission*. It concludes that Dalman's one-sided and unsupportable denial that Jesus taught in Hebrew was influenced by escalating anti-Semitism in his nation and within his faith community. Dalman thus attempted to provide for the Christian Jesus sufficient separation from Jewish society, from Jewish beliefs, and from the peculiar Jewish language, Hebrew. Joseph Blenkinsopp's summary of the impact of anti-Semitism on nineteenth-century German Protestant Old Testament scholarship seems pertinent at this point: "While there were perhaps a few major Old Testament scholars of the nineteenth century who were explicitly and openly anti-Jewish ... it is sadly necessary to acknowledge that the discipline was carried on to a considerable extent under presuppositions decidedly unfavourable to a positive theological evaluation of Judaism."¹¹⁹

This study should remind students of the historical Jesus that their reconstructions are always work-in-progress. They are done under the impact of personal conviction and experience, as well as of the literary and historical evidence. They are therefore never fully

freed from influence by political and social ideology. It should also indicate to historians yet another way that anti-Semitism impacted late nineteenth-century German Protestant belief and mission.

¹ The "either-or" antithesis between Jesus and Judaism was symptomatic of a trend among nineteenth-century German Christian theologians, who contrasted Jesus with the Judaism of his day in increasingly stark antithetic terms. This tendency was noted as early as the 1920s. See George Foote Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism", *Harvard Theological Review* 14 (1921): 197-254.

² Dalman was not the only Aramaic scholar turning opinion on the language of Jesus from Hebrew to Aramaic. Julius Wellhausen, Eberhard Nestle and Arnold Meyer were contemporaries, who shared the task. See Arnold Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache: Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt* (Freiburg im Breslau: J.C.B. Mohr, 1896), 29-32.

³ Paul Aring, *Christliche Judenmission: ihre Geschichte und Problematik dargestellt und untersucht am Beispiel des evangelischen Rhinlands*, *Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog*, no. 4 (Neukirchen Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980); ———, *Christen und Juden Heute und die „Judenmission“?: Geschichte und Theologie protestanter Judenmission im Deutschland, dargestellt und untersucht am Beispiel des Protestantismus im mittleren Deutschland*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt: Haag und Herchen, 1989); Christopher Clark, *The Politics of Conversion: Missionary Protestantism and the Jews of Prussia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

⁴ Julia Männchen, *Gustaf Dalmans Leben und Wirken in der Brüdergemeine, für die Judenmission und an der Universität Leipzig 1855-1902*. *Abhandlungen des deutschen Palästinavereins*, no. 9, bk. 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987); ———, *Gustaf Dalman als Palästinawissenschaftler in Jerusalem und Greifswald 1902-1941*. *Abhandlungen des deutschen Palästinavereins*, no. 9, bk. 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993).

⁵ It is not the purpose of this article to evaluate the merits of the language of Jesus debate itself. Such surveys include Arnold Meyer, 8-35; Albert Schweitzer, "Aramäisches. Rabbinisches. Buddhistisches." Chap. 17 in *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 9th ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1984); H. Ott, "Um die Muttersprache Jesu Forschungen seit Gustaf Dalman," *Novum Testamentum* 9 (1967): 1-25; James Barr, "Which Language did Jesus Speak?—Some Remarks of a Semitist," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 53 (1970): 9-29; Max Wilcox, "Semitisms in the New Testament," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, vol. 25, bk. 1 (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1984), 978-994; Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series, no. 102 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 1-72.

⁶ Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 22-50. See also Birger Pernow, "Judenmission," in vol. 3 of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959), 976-978.

⁷ According to Pernow, 976.

⁸ For detailed history see, especially, Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 51-150; cf. W. Holsten, "Institutum Judaicum," in vol. 3 of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 3rd ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959), 786; Clark, 47-57.

⁹ Holsten, 785-786. Cf. Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 63-69.

¹⁰ Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 335, n.1 lists Callenberg's extensive major publications.

¹¹ Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 51-52.

¹² Not 1833 as stated by Holsten, 785. Strack's Institute survived until 1933, when it was shut down by the state.

¹³ Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 48, 78. It survives to the present under the title Institutum Delitzschianum.

¹⁴ Aring, *Judenmission*, 128.

¹⁵ Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 37-42 outlines early German Pietist eschatology. For passing references to the millennialist hope see Uriel Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870-1914*, trans. Noah Jonathan Jacobs (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975), 302; Martin Friedrich, "Vom christlichen Antijudaismus zum modernen Antisemitismus," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 102 (1991): 334, 343; Clark, 246, provides a comprehensive sketch and critique: "In the mid-1880s news of a conversion movement among the Jews of Kishinev and reports of a thriving proselyte colony in the Crimea ... triggered a wave of eschatological enthusiasm among the Prussian missions. Here, it seemed, was confirmation that the long-awaited mass conversion of Jewry was at hand."

¹⁶ For a discussion of the role of Jewish assimilation compared with conversion, see Friedrich, 319-321; Pernow, 976.

¹⁷ Clark, 2.

¹⁸ Shulamit Volkov, *Germans, Jews, and Antisemites: Trials in Emancipation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 100-107.

¹⁹ "Troubled by the social changes that industrialization brought in its wake, conservatives denounced those very symbols of modernity—capitalism and urbanism—that had freed the worker from a condition little better than serfdom." Ruth Gay, *The Jews of Germany: A Historical Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 215.

²⁰ See Katharine A. Lerman, "Bismarckian Germany," in *German History Since 1800*. ed. Mary Fulbrook (London: Arnold, 1997), 175.

²¹ According to Lerman, 160, "Jews were disproportionately successful in the professions, in business, in the arts and in intellectual life more generally."

²² Gay, 169. Volkov, 103, employed the term *Verjudung* to characterise this popular public misconception.

²³ Tal, 236. See also Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction: Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 247. Lerman, 159, notes that the 1873 economic crash and subsequent slowdown led to fear and instability in all social groups.

²⁴ Tal, 236. Gay, 215 argues that Wilhelm Marr's influential anti-Semitic propaganda was a major support of this view.

²⁵ Katz, 204-206; Clark, 259-266. According to Lerman, 175, "Economic anti-Semitism charged Jews with usury and greed."

²⁶ Tal, 240-241; Clark, 259-260.

²⁷ Recent assessments in Volkov, 10-108; Librett, 261-263; Lerman, 159-176; Peter Pulzer, "The Return of Old Hatreds," in *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*. ed. Michael A. Jeyer, vol. 3 of *Integration in Dispute, 1871-1918*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 196-251; Katz, 245-272.

²⁸ Shulamit Volkov, *Die Juden in Deutschland 1780-1918*. Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte vol. 16 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994), 47-53;117-121. See also Friedrich, 319-322.

²⁹ *Weltanschauung* has been applied to 1870s German anti-Semitism by Reinhard Rürup, Fritz Stern, Werner Jochmann and other social historians of the epoch, according to Volkov, *Juden in Deutschland*, 108-109. She prefers the broader concept of "culture" over worldview, 110-116.

³⁰ Katz, 245; Pulzer, 204.

³¹ Gay, 215 credits the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* with the first use of *Antisemiten*. Clark, 273 credits Wilhelm Marr with the first use of *Antisemitismus*.

³² According to Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 72; Gay, 215.

³³ Tal devotes chapter 5 to these two developing strands.

³⁴ Tal, 235-240; Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 71-76; Friedrich, 343; Clark, 271-278.

³⁵ According to Wanda Kampmann, *Deutsche und Juden: Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Judentums* (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1963), 228, 245.

³⁶ Adolf Stöcker, "Unsere Forderungen an das moderne Judentum," speech of 19 September 1879, published in his *Christlich-sozial. Reden und Aufsätze* (Berlin, 1890). Reference and speech summary in Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 73. For sketches of Stöcker's role, plus excerpts from his speech (incorrectly dated 9 September on p. 252), see Tal, 252-259, and Kampmann, 246-247.

³⁷ Kampmann, 247. The most extensive analysis of Stöcker's role in Christian anti-Semitism remains that of Tal, 248-259.

³⁸ Kampmann, 251-252.

³⁹ Clark, 162-163.

⁴⁰ Aring, *Christliche Judenmission*, 170.

⁴¹ Aring, *Christliche Judenmission*, 169; Clark, 175.

⁴² For surveys of the history of German Jewish emancipation, see Volkov, *Juden in Deutschland*, 102-106; Kampmann, 206-212. For his survey of Protestant resistance to Jewish emancipation see Clark, 92, 163-175.

⁴³ This epoch is surveyed by Tal, 121-159, and Katz, 210-220.

⁴⁴ "Das moderne Judentum und dessen Reformation," *Blätter für Israels Gegenwart und Zukunft* 1 (1845): 21-22 cited in Clark, 164.

⁴⁵ Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 278-286.

⁴⁶ "...under the guidance of the conservatives from the late 1870s... the Prussian State becomes a 'Christian State' in a way that equally bases itself on the cultural particularity of German national historical traditions and on Lutheranism, as the German, and more

specifically, Prussian, religion." Jeffrey S. Librett, *The Rhetoric of Cultural Dialogue: Jews and Germans from Moses Mendelssohn to Richard Wagner and Beyond* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 261. For further, detailed discussion of the concept of a German Christian state, see Tal, 140-159, and Katz, 195-202.

⁴⁷ "The edict proclaimed by the North German Confederation in 1869 abolishing 'all remaining restrictions of civil and political rights derived from the difference in religious creed' was not extended to all parts of the new Empire until 1871." Gay, 161. See also Katz, 210-220. For an outline of the movement for and against emancipation, and a summary of its aftermath in Hamburg, see Michael Tilly, "Vor dem 'Judenspiegel' ": Wilhelm Marr und die Juden in Hamburg" *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 58 (2006): 1-15.

⁴⁸ Tal, 209-213 provides a good summary, with illustrations, of the journalistic strategy employed.

⁴⁹ No less a person than Franz Delitzsch expressed his concern about this development of the new-found religious freedom which surfaced from the previously-underground stream of Jewish publications, evaluating Jesus and Christianity from a decidedly anti-Christian point of view. See Franz Delitzsch, "Christentum und jüdische Presse," *Saat auf Hoffnung* 19 (1882): 83-146, cited by Tal, 212-213; cf. Männchen, *Dalmans Leben*, 154.

⁵⁰ Tal, 255.

⁵¹ Aring, *Christen und Juden*, 221; Pernow, 977; Männchen, *Dalmans Leben*, 43; Clark, 247 n.15 (whose minor variation of the form of the organisation's title is probably incorrect. I follow the form of the title found in Aring, Pernow and Männchen).

⁵² Clark, 252-278, provides an extensive summary of this revised mission philosophy.

⁵³ Tal, 231, citing Leopold Auerbach, *Das Judentum und seine Bekenner in Preussen und in anderen deutschen Bundesstaaten* (Berlin, 1890), 19.

⁵⁴ Friedrich, 343.

⁵⁵ Aring, *Judenmission*, 152; cf 169-170.

⁵⁶ "...und unterscheidet sich von der antisemitischen Bewegung in kaum mehr als der Wahl der Mittel." Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 79. See also Friedrich, 343-347; Aring, *Judenmission*, 170; Clark, 271. For samples of the heated Protestant-Jewish rhetoric which appeared in print during this era, see Aring, *Christen un Juden*, 264-270.

⁵⁷ Tal, 208; 212; Clark, 273-274; Männchen, *Dalmans Leben*, 93-114 devotes a chapter entitled "*Auseinandersetzung mit dem Antisemitismus*" to explore Dalman's and other *Judenmission* leaders' ambivalent relationships to anti-Semitism.

⁵⁸ Tal, 231.

⁵⁹ Volkov, *Juden in Deutschland*, 118.

⁶⁰ Aring, *Judenmission*, 169.

⁶¹ "Aber man braucht nur einen Jahrgang der von Franz Delitzsch herausgegebenen *Judenmission*zeitschrift '*Saat auf Hoffnung*' anzusehen, um festzustellen, wie sehr auch in diesen Kreisen das Bild, das man vom Juden, vom jüdischen Volk hat, von den damals gängigen antisemitischen Gedanken und Vorurteilen gefärbt ist." Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 87.

⁶² Siegfried Wagner, *Franz Delitzsch, Leben und Werk* (Munich: Brunnen-Verlag, 1978), 407 (cited by Clark, 274-275).

⁶³ Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 87, finds these themes in *Saat auf Hoffnung* 18 (1881): 17, 20, 61ff, 106, and with some regularity in other issues of the journal. See also Friedrich, 343-347.

⁶⁴ Clark, 271.

⁶⁵ Dalman's birth is incorrectly dated 1865 in Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: Macmillan, 1910), 272, n.5.

⁶⁶ Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 5, 39-40. Irene Garbell does not address the issue of his possible Jewishness, merely designating him: "Protestant theologian" in "Dalman, Gustaf Herman," vol. 5 of *Encyclopedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 1972), 1232.

⁶⁷ Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 41.

⁶⁸ Paul P. Levertoff, in his translator's note, published in Gustaf Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1929), ix.

⁶⁹ D.K.H. Rengstorf and W. Müller, compilers, "Das Schrifttum Gustaf Dalmans," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universität Greifswald* vol. 4 (1954/55), Gesellschafts-und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 3, 209-232.

⁷⁰ See Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 106-107.

⁷¹ Gustaf Dalman, *Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, vol. 4 (Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1928), 6, as cited in Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 109.

⁷² Aring, *Christliche Judenmission*, 203, who cites conference proceedings titled "Protokolle der in Köln a. Rh. vom 6. bis 9. Oktoter 1900 abgehaltenen allgemeinen Missionskonferenz für die Arbeit der evang. Kirche an Israel".

⁷³ "So versteht er die antisemitische Bewegung als Herausforderung an die Kirche zu größerer Aktivität in Sachen Judenmission mit dem Ziel, den Einfluß der Juden in Deutschland einzuschränken bzw. zu beseitigen." Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 78.

⁷⁴ Gustaf Dalman, *Kurzgefasstes Handbuch der Mission unter Israel* (Berlin: Institutum Judaicum in Berlin, 1893), 26 cited in Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 87.

⁷⁵ Dalman, *Handbuch der Mission*, 37, cited in Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 87.

⁷⁶ Dalman, *Handbuch der Mission*, 41 cited in Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 87.

⁷⁷ Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 79.

⁷⁸ Männchen, *Dalmans Leben und Wirken*, 53. See also Pinchas Lapide, *Hebrew in the Church: The Foundations of Jewish-Christian Dialog* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), 86, 89.

⁷⁹ 2nd edition 1905; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliches Buchgesellschaft, 1965, 1988.

⁸⁰ 2nd edition 1927.

⁸¹ 2nd edition 1922; reprinted Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.

⁸² 2nd edition 1930; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliches Buchgesellschaft, 1965.

English translation Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902; reprinted Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1997.

⁸³ 2nd edition 1929; English translation London: SPCK, 1929; reprinted Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

⁸⁴ *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 3.

Black's assessment remained unchanged in the final, 1967 edition.

⁸⁵ Barr, 20.

⁸⁶ Later references to Matthew's Hebrew Gospel have been assembled by Lapide, 2-3. A.F.J. Klijn, "Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian and Aramaic Gospel Tradition" in *Text and Interpretation: Studies Presented to Matthew Black* ed. E. Best and R McL. Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 169-177 critically assessed this patristic evidence.

⁸⁷ This history has been recounted by Meyer, 3-7, and most recently by Casey, 1-3.

⁸⁸ Meyer, 30-35.

⁸⁹ The view that Jesus spoke Hebrew survives to the present, however. It was re-awakened in 1954 by Harris Birkeland. Extensive Hebrew language documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls have supported it, though it still remains a distinctly minority view.

⁹⁰ He was "of a pietistic Lutheran background and Jewish descent" according to the entry "Delitzsch, Franz Julius," *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, 2nd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 390.

⁹¹ Cited by Levertoff in Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, ix.

⁹² Franz Delitzsch, *Die Bücher des Neuen Testaments aus dem Griechischen ins Hebräische übersetzt* (1877), as summarized by Schweitzer, 283, n. 7.

⁹³ *The Hebrew New Testament* (Leipzig: British & Foreign Bible Society 1883), 30-31, cited in Meyer, 29. However, Meyer takes Delitzsch to task for abandoning his earlier position of allowing for some Aramaic in the New Testament.

⁹⁴ Alfred Resch, "Τα Λογια Ιησου: Ein Beitrag zur synoptischen Evangelienforschung" in *Theologischen Studien. Herrn Wirkl. Oberkonsistorialrath Professor D. Bernhard Weiss zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897), 95-128; *Aussercanonische Paralleltexzte zu den Evangelien*, vols 1-4 in *Texte und Untersuchung*, ed. Adolf von Harnack) 10: 1-3 (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1893-97); *Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898); *Agrapha: Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente in Texte und Untersuchung*, vol 15, ed. Adolf von Harnack (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1906), 3-4.

⁹⁵ Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1929), 23 and *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902), 17. See also Männchen, *Dalman's Leben und Wirken*, 54.

⁹⁶ Dalman, "Das hebräische Neue Testament von Franz Delitzsch in neuer Ausgabe" *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 12/31 (July 31, 1891): 290, cited in Lapede, 90.

⁹⁷ Dalman, "hebräische Neue Testament", 290.

⁹⁸ Lapede, 89.

⁹⁹ Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, 22. This position is also argued by Meyer, 42-47; 53-58.

¹⁰⁰ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 11.

¹⁰¹ Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, 23.

¹⁰² Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 17.

¹⁰³ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 56.

¹⁰⁴ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 17.

¹⁰⁵ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 17.

¹⁰⁶ The term "most extreme" is applied twice to this view by Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 169-170. He traces the view back to the medieval Jewish philologist Saadia.

¹⁰⁷ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 18; *Worte Jesu*, 33.

¹⁰⁸ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 20.

¹⁰⁹ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 20.

¹¹⁰ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 42; *Worte Jesu*, 33-34.

¹¹¹ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 44.

¹¹² Meyer, 29.

¹¹³ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 74-75; *Jesus-Jeshua*, 7.

¹¹⁴ Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, xii.

¹¹⁵ Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, xii.

¹¹⁶ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 74-75.

¹¹⁷ For efforts by others to extract Jesus from Judaism altogether, see Tal, 259, 272, 276-279. Schweitzer traces such efforts in chapter 17.

¹¹⁸ More extreme anti-Semitism was expressed in a very public manner in 1904 by Franz Delitzsch's son, the assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch, in his infamous "Babel und Bibel" lectures. See the summary and analysis by Bill Arnold and David Weisberg, "A Centennial

Review of Friedrich Delitzsch's '*Babel und Bibel*' Lectures" *Journal of Biblical Literature*

21 (2002): 448.

¹¹⁹ *Prophecy and Canon: a Contribution to the Study of Jewish Origins* (Notre Dame, IN:

University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), 21.