

seen me a later version, which in some way derives from Luke.

Mk. 11 12-14, 20 par.: *The Accursed Fig Tree*. We must suppose that originally the cursing of the Fig Tree and its results were reported together and that their separation by vv. 15-19 is due to editorial activity which broke up the admittedly unoriginal connection of 11 15-19 with 11 27-33, though that connection did arise in some earlier stage of the tradition (see pp. 20f.). This editorial activity is to be ascribed to the evangelist Mark, and in that case we may also have to assume that he has edited the story of the cursing of the fig tree itself. The present story ends in an apophthegm (vv. 21-26) that is certainly secondary (p. 25); the withered fig tree is actually a 'special proof of faith' (Wellhausen). The end of the first section (καὶ ἤκουον ὁ μωθηταὶ αὐτοῦ v. 14) and the beginning of the second (καὶ παραπροευνόμενοι πρῶτῳ εἶδον τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραωμένην ἐκ ῥιζῶν v. 20) could be original, and perhaps the story originally ended with v. 20. There is editorial work in the beginning at v. 12, which links the section with its context, though its extent cannot be determined with certainty. I believe that Matthew had the story before him in the same form in which we have it in Mark. He has done away with the interval and, following a familiar motif, asserted the instantaneousness of the miracle.

Matt. 17 24-27: *The Shkel in the Fish's Mouth*. This story is already outside the real class of miracle stories; for the miracle is a secondary consideration, and the doctrinal purpose the main thing.² The apophthegmatic side of the section and the possibility of its origin have already been discussed on pp. 34f.

3. THE FORM AND HISTORY OF MIRACLE STORIES³

Jn. 20 30f. shows clearly as Dibelius (*Formgeschichte*, p. 18.2) quite rightly points out, that it is of the very essence of the gospel to con-

¹ Cp. the analysis of Jn. 21 1-14 in L. Brun, *Die Auferstehung Christi in der wehrstl. Ueberlieferung*, 1925, p. 58.

² This miracle belongs to the category of 'miraculous self-aids' (M. Dibelius, *Th.R.*, N.F., I, 1929, p. 206; also *Evangelium u. Welt*, 1929, p. 51), a motif which is very frequent in the legends of the saints.

³ A. Fridrichsen, in *Le Problème du Miracle*, 1925, discusses the question what meaning the miracle and the miracle story had for early Christianity, especially for its missionary work. It is from this point of view that he interprets the N.T. (especially the Synoptic) miracle stories and sayings about miracles. In Fridrichsen, p. 114, is a very full note of the literature on miracle stories and the whole question of miracle as such. H. Rust, *Die Wunder der Bibel* (I, Die Visionen des N.T.; II, Das Tungen reden; III, Die Weissagungen; in: *Die Okkulte Welt*, nos. 67/70, 103, 129, no date) seeks to establish criteria for distinguishing real happenings from products of fantasy or combination on the basis of investigation into occult phenomena.

The History of the Synoptic Tradition

New York p. 218-22

miracle stories. The meaning and form of the miracle stories in Synoptics bear this out entirely. They are not told just as remarkable occurrences, but as miracles of Jesus. This is partly why healings preponderate and nature miracles are relatively few. Yet their purpose is hardly biographical in the strict sense. The miraculous deeds are not proofs of his character but of his messianic authority, or his divine power. For this reason it is not usually said that pity, or the intention to quicken faith is a motive of Jesus.¹ It is for this reason that the Evangelists are not conscious of the problem of the relationship of his miraculous actions to his refusal of a sign. The miracles are, as it were, something apart from his individual will, an automatic functioning.² This is particularly clear in the story of the woman with an issue of blood: Jesus feels, when the woman touches him, that a δύναις has gone out of him. It is for this reason that the exorcisms of demons are in the first place the chief demonstrations of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is consistent with this to observe that what is as good as no notice at all is taken of the inner disposition of the person healed. Admittedly it goes without saying that it is a condition of healing the sick that those who ask for the cure should have faith. But this πίστις is not a believing attitude to Jesus' preaching or to his Person in the modern sense of the word, but is a trust in the miracle worker which is his proper due.³ The inhabitants of Nazareth are said to have ἀπιστοῖα, when Jesus fails to perform any miracle among them (Mk. 6⁶, see p. 32, n. 1). How little πίστις is mentioned as a matter of psychological interest, or as a psychological condition of the possibility of healing is shown by that fact that the basis for Jesus to effect a cure need not be the πίστις of the sick person, but can quite well be the πίστις of those who seek a healing on his behalf (Mk. 2⁵, 9²⁴; Matt. 8¹⁰, 15²⁸). Since πίστις involves the acknowledgement of Jesus, all the light falls on him who deserves such acknowledgement, instead of on the sick person. So e.g. no consideration is given to the spiritual condition of the man sick of the palsy in Mk. 2 1-12; he comes into view simply as an object of the miraculous cure. For the same reason the interest in him ceases once

¹ Pity is only mentioned, infrequently: perhaps Mk. 1⁴¹, though here it could well be that ἀπιστοῖα was original, not συμπόνησθαι; 8² (otherwise Mk. 10⁵²); Lk. 7¹³. Also A. Froevig, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu als Lehre und Wundertaetler*, 1918 sees, pp. 256ff., that pity is not thought of as the distinctive motive of Jesus.

² Cp. J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1911, p. 157: 'His miracles are but involuntary eruptions of his true nature.' The same is stated by E. Bickermann, *Z.N.W.*, 22, 1923, p. 134.

³ 'Ja foi, c'est le tribut dû au grand prophète'—Fridrichsen, *Probl. d. Mir.*, p. 51. Cp. the section pp. 51-56 in Fridrichsen in its entirety and the notes, pp. 120f. On ἀπιστοῖα as an affront to the God of our Salvation; cp. O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder*, 1909, pp. 87f.

not told by Jesus

purpose

no control over miracle

faith necessary in miracle

Jesus gets credit as good not the cured

© 1963 by Harper & Row

the miracle has been reported. In Mk. 9¹⁴⁻²⁷ neither the grateful joy of the paralytic nor that of his father is mentioned at all. It is only in Mk. 5¹⁹, in an editorial supplement that the healed person is said to have asked ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾗ, though that in turn was probably intended but to serve as the occasion for the injunction to spread the fame of Jesus in the Decapolis.¹ (There is a special case in Lk. 17¹¹⁻¹⁹ where the miracle story has been given an apophthegmatic character, leaving the point in a contrast between gratitude and ingratitude.) The same applies to the other miracle stories; they lack, as it were, a conclusion. Thus the feeding stories have no indication of the impression the miracle made, as the secondary addition in Jn. 6^{14f.} makes plain. In the same way a conclusion is lacking to the story of walking on the water, where once more John exposes the need of an apocryphal addition (6^{22f.}). And if Mark reports the impression made by the stilling of the storm (Mk. 4⁴¹) he does it manifestly without any psychological interest in the disciples themselves, but rather for the sole purpose of focusing attention on the magnitude of the miracle. The style of the miracle story is related to that of the apophthegm (pp. 63f.) to this extent—the 'absence of portraiture' (Dibelius loc. cit.) and all that it involves is characteristic of both. Here as there nothing but the point matters—there a saying of Jesus, here a miracle. Not until John is there any interest in the consequences of a miracle in its setting in the story of Jesus. He uses the miracle in chap. 5 to give rise to the situation for his discussion with the Jews, and finally makes Jesus' miracles the cause of the last catastrophe (11^{45ff.}, 12^{9f.}).²

From this standpoint we must examine the style of the miracle stories individually. Contributions to the phenomenology of miracle stories can be found in many places, especially in O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungsweunder*.³ What follows is only a brief review, in so far as it is necessary for the understanding of the Synoptic miracle stories.⁴

¹ I do not think we can interpret Mk. 5^{19f.} as a 'command to silence', i.e. the healed man may recite Jesus' deeds only in his own home, the place of secrecy; though he actually exceeded his instructions (*Wrede, Messiasgch.*, pp. 140f.). Even if Mark so understood the passage it cannot possibly be the original meaning of the verse (as it obviously came to Mark). O. Bauernfeind is here quite right (op. cit., pp. 44f., 69f.); I just cannot believe that vv. 19f. is thought of as Jesus' final victory over the demons (see above, p. 210 n. 3.). Fridrichsen, op. cit., p. 82, is right: 'Ces paroles de Jésus après la guérison sont la voix du missionnaire, qui se sert du miracle pour propager la foi. Il en était du christianisme primitif comme de toute autre oeuvre missionnaire, la propagande se faisait en grande partie par la famille.'

² There is some sort of beginning of this point of view in Mk. 3⁶; though here it is the breaking of the Sabbath rather than the miracle itself which is the essential thing.

³ *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, VIII, 1, Giessen, 1909.

⁴ I cannot see why just because Dibelius somewhat broadly distinguishes miracle stories from apophthegms and discovers similar motifs outside early Christianity, he has to classify them as 'profane', 'worldly', or 'secular'. (M. Dibelius, *Formgeschichte*, pp. 41f.; *Geschichte der uechristl. Lit.*, I, 1926, p. 28; *Evangelium u. Welt*, pp. 51f.)

There are characteristic features for the exposition of the miracle stories which depict the gravity of the complaint so as to bring the act of the healer into its proper light—

The length of the sickness: Mk. 5^{25f.} (12 years), 9²¹ (ἐκ παιδιόθεν); Lk. 13¹¹; Acts 3², 4²², 9³³, 14⁸; Jn. 9¹; Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.*, III, 38; Ditt. *Syll.*, II, 802, 95; 805.5; *Neugriech. Maerchen*, hrsg. v. P. Kretschmer (in *Die Maerchen der Weltliteratur*, 1917, p. 237).

(Here too must be placed details of the age of the sick person or of the dead: Mk. 5⁴²; *Vit. Apoll.*, III, 38, 39.)

The dreadful or dangerous character of the disease: Mk. 5³⁻⁵, 9¹⁸, 22; *Act. Thom.*, 64, p. 81, 6ss; Lucian, *Philops.*, 11, 16 (καταπίπτοντος πρὸς τὴν σελήνην καὶ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ διαστρέφοντος καὶ ἄφροῦ πιμπλαμένου τοῦ στόμα); *Vit. Apoll.*, IV, 20.

The ineffective treatment of physicians: Mk. 5²⁶; Tob. 2¹⁰; Parallels in Weinreich, op. cit., pp. 195-7; also *Neugriech. Maerchen*, p. 237.

Doubt and contemptuous treatment of the healer: Mk. 5⁴⁰ (κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ); 2 Kings 5¹¹; IG, IV, 951, pp. 23f. (ἀπίσται τοῖς ἰαμασιν καὶ ὑποδίσουρε τὰ ἐπιγράμματα). 35f. (τῶν ἰαμάτων τινὰ διεγέλα). 74f. (ἔψευον δὴ τινες . . . τὰν εὐθλίαν αὐτοῦ τὸ νομίζειν βλεψέσθαι . . .). 84f.; *Vit. Apoll.*, IV, 45; cp. Weinreich, op. cit., pp. 87f.

Here too we may place the motif of the contrast of the master and the disciples: Mk. 9^{14ff.}; Matt. 14²¹⁻³¹?; 2 Kings 4³¹; Lucian *Philops.*, 36; Aelian, *De Nat. An.*, IX, 33. Cp. Weinreich, op. cit., pp. 81ff. and Bolte-Polivka, *Anm. zu den K.H.M.*, II, p. 162 on no. 81.

It is a traditional feature of revivifying the dead for the healer to meet the funeral procession: Lk. 7^{11ff.}; *Vit. Apoll.*, IV, 45; Apul., *Florida*, 19; cp. Weinreich, pp. 171-3. IG, IV, 952, pp. 27ff.—the God meets a sick person carried on a stretcher.

It is characteristic of the miracle itself that the actual miraculous event is almost never described, such as the actual multiplication of the bread by the miracle worker, but only the accompanying circumstances.

Further under the standpoint which determines the exposition we must include cases where the difficulty of the healing is emphasized, as in Tac., *Hist.*, IV, 81. In the miracle stories of the N.T. that is only the case when occasionally some special manipulation is reported: Mk. 7³³, 8²³.¹ But it is characteristic that it should occur so in-

¹ On the use of spittle cp. O. Weinreich, op. cit., pp. 97f.; Klostermann on Mk. 7³³ beside those mentioned there: Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, I, 1888, p. 527; S. Seligmann, *Der boese Blick*, I, 1910, pp. 293-8; J. J. Hess, *Z.A.N.*, 35, 1915, pp. 130f. (Spittle mixed with water for healing blindness, with earth for healing skin diseases); K. Sittl, *Die Gebarden der Griechen u. Roemer*, 1890, p. 120; J. Doelger, *Der Exorcismus im altchristl. Taufritual*, 1909, pp. 118ff., 130ff. Frequent in fairy stories; cp from the 'Maerchen der Weltlit', *Ind. Maerchen*, pp. 227, 233; *Afrikan. M.*, p. 257; *Suedsee M.*, pp. 224f.; *Tuerkstan M.*, p. 115. Cp. also Bin Gorion, *Der Born Judas*, II, pp. 33f.

results only

is frequent in N.T. but not in Hellenism

fr ntly there, and yet be a frequent feature in Hellenistic miracle stories,¹ e.g. Jos., *Ant.*, VIII, 2.5 where the Jewish exorcist Eleazar draws the demon out of the nose of the possessed person by means of a ring in which there is a root as prescribed by Solomon; further, Lucian, *Philops.*, 11, where a piece of a virgin's tombstone is placed on the invalid's foot; cp. the manipulations and, as they may be called, operative interventions in IG, IV, 951, pp. 27f., 40f., 77, 99f., 120f., etc.; cp. Weinreich, 173.3. H. Jahnow has shown the probability² (*Z.N.W.*, 24, 1925, pp. 155-8) that the removal of the roof in Mk. 2.4 goes back to an exorcist custom (the proper way into the house must be kept hidden from the demon). But the Christian tradition either forgot or transformed the meaning of this motif, in ascribing the crowd surrounding the house as the reason for the stripping of the roof. Matthew completely omits it.

Besides this it is sometimes reported that the *healer comes to the invalid* (or to his dwelling place): Lk. 4.39 (ἐπιστάς); IG, IV, 951, pp. 37, 69; Lucian, *Philops.*, 16 (ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἐπιστῆ κειμένους); Diod. Sic., I, 25; Suidas under Θεόπομπτος, cp. Weinreich, 11f.; G. Dehn, *Arch. Jahrb.*, 1913, pp. 399ff.: Sarapis went to the sick bed to heal.

Very often the miracle working *gesture is a touch* (by the hand), and it is difficult to tell whether the primitive idea of it as a transference of power is still active. *Touching or grasping with the hand*: Mk. 1.31, 41, 5.41, 7.33, 8.22; Matt. 9.29, 20.34; Lk. 7.14, 13.13, 14.4; Acts 3.7 (9.41 no longer understood here and reported at the wrong place), 28.8; Ber. 5b; P. Kil. 9.32b, 23.35 (Strack-B. II, 2f.; IV, 771); *Act. Thom.*, 53, P. 169, 14s; *Vit. Apoll.*, III, 39; IV, 45; Weinreich, 1-75; J. Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (1911), pp. 102-16.³ *The touching of garments*: Mk. 5.27-29, 6.56; Matt. 14.36; Acts (5.15), 19.12.

The miracle working word: Mk. 1.41, 2.11, 3.5, 10.52; Lk. 8.54, 13.12, 17.14; Jos., *Ant.*, VIII, 2.5; Lucian, *Philops.*, 7f., 10, 11, 12, 16 (ἐξόδοντες), etc.

The miracle working word is frequently given in strange, incomprehensible sounds, or alternatively handed down in some foreign language: Mk. 5.41, 7.34; Jos., *Ant.*, VIII, 2.5; Lucian, *Philops.*, 9 (ῥῆσις βαρβαρική); 31 (προχειρισόμενος τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ἐπίρρησιν ἀγυπτιαίων τῆ φωνῆ); *Vit. Apoll.*, IV, 45 (καὶ τὶ ἀφανῶς ἐπειπῶν); cp. Orig., *Contra Celsum*, I, 24; V, 45; A. Dieterich,

¹ Ecclesiastical authors consequently emphasize this distinction too. Cp. Fridrichsen, *Probl. du Mir.*, p. 61.

² The objections raised by S. Krauss, *Z.N.W.*, 25, 1926, pp. 307-10 are not convincing.

³ Cp. also J. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II, 1890, p. 383; M. Dibelius on Herm. *Vit.*, I, 4.2 (*Birgenz. Band zum Handb. zum N.T.*).

*Mithrasliturgie*², pp. 39f., 221; H. Leisegang, *Pneuma Hagion*, p. 100.1; E. Underhill, *Mysticism*, 1928, pp. 208f.

Healing by the use of a miracle *working name* is not reported of Jesus himself, but cp. Mk. 9.38; Acts 3.6ff., 9.34, 16.18, 19.13; Tos. Hullin, II, 21-23 (Fiebig, *Jued. Wundergeschichten*, pp. 35f.); Jos., *Ant.*, VIII, 2.5 (the name of Solomon); Lucian, *Philops.*, 10 (ὑπὸ ἱερῶν ὀνομαστῶν), 12 (ἐπειπῶν ἱερστικά τινα ἐκ βίβλου παλαιῆς ὀνόματα ἐπτά), etc.

The original idea is that the demon who has caused the sickness is threatened by the miracle working word; hence more frequently ἐπιτιμῶν and ἐπιδικασσῶν are used, and, naturally, particularly where there is an expulsion of demons in the narrower sense: Mk. 1.25, 27, 9.25; Lk. 4.41; Lucian, *Philops.*, 16 (ὄρκους ἐπ' ἄγων . . . καὶ ἀπειλῶν); *Vit. Apoll.*, III, 38; IV, 20.

But this same style is employed for miracles where it is impossible to say whether the old idea of threatening the demon is still alive or not: Mk. 4.39 (threatening the wind); Lk. 4.39 (threatening a fever). In Lk. 13.11 the πνεῦμα ἄσθενεῖας is specifically mentioned, but there is no mention of a threat; the expression is probably purely formal. Cp. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, 18.8; an amulet in which are mentioned the ἄγγελος τοῦ ῥιγοῦντοῦ and the ἄγγελος who has ἐξουσία over the ἀσθενούντες and the δδυνώμενοι.¹

Demon healings² are distinguished by special peculiarities: *the demon senses his master*,³ he knows the exorcist's power: Mk. 1.24, 5.7, 9.20; Acts 16.17, 19.15; *Attoriental. Texte*², edited by Gressmann, 78f. (the evil spirit addresses the Egyptian God who has been brought to the sick man, and says: 'Thou, great God, comest in peace, thou to whom the evil spirits bow down,' etc.), Pes. f. 112b/113a (Fiebig, *Jued. Wundergeschichten*, pp. 25f.; Lucian, *Abdicat.*, 6. In some circumstances the demon can defend himself too: Acts 19.16; cp. Bauernfeind, op. cit., pp. 33f.

¹ The Stilling of the Storm is also thought of as a threat to the demons in B.B. 73a (Strack-B. I, 490): the wave was struck with a stick which had a sacred formula engraved on it.

² The material collected by A. Tittius (*Theol. Festschr. fuer G. M. Bonwetsch*, 1918, pp. 34-36) from recent psychiatric literature can only be used for the development of the miracle story style in general, and not, as the author thinks, for particular N.T. stories. Since his work, there has appeared on the psychological question: T. K. Oesterreich, *Die Besessenheit*, 1921; E. R. Mickletham, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, 1922; B. Grabinski, *Wunder, Stigmatisation u. Besessenheit in der Gegenwart*, 1923; Herb. Seng., *Die Heilungen Jesu in medizin. Beleuchtung*², 1926. On the history of religion or the ethnological side cp. J. Tamborino, *De antiquorum daemonismo* (Religionsgesch. Vers. u. Vorarb., VII, 3), 1909; R. Wuensch Zuer Geisterbannung im Altert., *Festschr. z. Jahrh.feier der Univ. Breslau*, 1911, pp. 9-32; J. Manninen, *Die dæmonischen Krankheiten im finnischen Volksglauben* (*J.F.C.* 45), 1922; J. A. Janssen, *Naphtouse et son district*, 1927 (here pp. 229ff. on possession, exorcism of demons and questioning of demons); T. Canaan, *Daemonenglaube im Lande der Bibel*, 1929. Cp. also Klostermann on Mk. 1.23.

³ It is a common notion that the demon himself speaks through the invalid: cp. Klostermann on Mk. 1.24.

² *The demon asks a favour*: Mk. 5⁷; *Act. Thom.*, 76, p. 190, 18ss; *Vit. Apoll.*, IV, 20, or at least the *concession of some right*; *Altoriental. Texte*², pp. 78f. (the spirit asks that a sacrifice be given him before he departs); *Pes. loc. cit.* ('Let me have a little more time to play yet!') and he was given Sabbath nights and Wednesday nights.¹ In addition to these we occasionally find a dialogue between the exorcist and the demons Mk. 5⁹; Lucian, *Philops.*, 16 (ἐπειδὴν γὰρ... ἔρηται ὅθεν εἰσεληλύθει εἰς τὸ σῶμα, ὁ μὲν νοσῶν αὐτὸς σιωπᾷ, ὁ δαίμων δὲ ἀποκρίνεται ἐλληγίζων ἢ βαρβαρίζων ἢ ὅθεν ἄν αὐτὸς ἦ, ὅπως τε καὶ ὅθεν ἐπῆλθεν ἐς τὸν ἄνθρωπον); *Act. Thom.*, 31-33, 45s, 75-77. Then it is characteristic to have a command for the demon to be silent: Mk. 1²⁵ (4³⁹); cp. E. Rohde, *Psyche*, II⁶, 424; *Pap. Osl. Fasc.*, I, 1925, no. 1, 7, 164.²

It is a special feature if the public is withdrawn when the miracle is performed: Mk. 5⁴⁰, 7³³, 8²³; Acts 9⁴⁰; 1 Kings 17¹⁹; 2 Kings 4⁴, 3³, 9^{6f.}; Ta'an 23b (cp. Bickermann, *Z.N.W.*, 22, 1923, p. 133.2); Life of St. Ephraem the Syrian (c. Brockelmann, *Syr. Grammatik*², *Chrestomathie*), 37.19ff. This has nothing to do with the Messianic secret, as Dibelius has rightly discerned (*Formgeschichte*, pp. 51f.); yet he misconceives the motive in thinking that it prevents Jesus from appearing like a magician on the look-out for propaganda. The original meaning is much more likely that the miracle was unobserved because it was not fitting to see the Godhead at his work. For the same reason a divine saying is received in secret, Jg. 3^{19f.}; and the Godhead works by night (Gunkel on Gen. 19¹⁴⁻¹⁶); Lot and his family are not permitted to see God's judgement, and Lot's wife, who looked on it, was changed to a pillar of salt (Gen. 19²⁶). The motif was then admittedly misunderstood and further developed and became a conventional feature.³

Traditional features are also used to describe the successful accomplishment of a miracle. The success seldom comes by degrees: Mk. 8^{24f.}; *Neugriech. Maerchen*, p. 237 ('... thus the blind man... could

¹ Cp. K. Muellenhoff, *Sagen. Maerchen u. Lieder der Herzogtumer Schleswig-Holstein u. Lauenberg*, 1845, p. 195: 'He (the banned spirit) had only one more request, that he might take his place under the drawbridge'; p. 259: 'The evil spirit was also ready to yield, he only asked that he might be exiled on dry land and not to the waters in the bay.'

² It is somewhat different when Jesus commands the demons to be silent Mk. 1³⁴, 3^{11f.}, so that they should not reveal him as the Messiah. These passages are literary compositions by Mark on the basis of his theory of a messianic secret. Bauernfeind's explanations of Mk. 3^{11f.} (op. cit., pp. 56-67) appear to me to be quite impossible.

³ In folk-tales and fairy story the motif is very frequent: cp. B. Gutmann, *Volksbuch der Wadschagga*, 1914, p. 77 (while the dog practises magic, the master must shut his eyes); p. 106 (Dangerous to see the spirits' dance). From the 'Maerchen der Weltteil': *Afrika*, *AM.*, pp. 105f. (Magic disturbed is ineffective); *Indianern. aus Suedamerika*, pp. 270f.; *Indianern. aus Nordamerika*, pp. 21, 25; *Tim. u. estn. M.*, pp. 121, 179f.; *Zigeuner M.*, p. 138; *Nord. M.*, I, pp. 116f., etc. Cp. Wundt, *Volkerpsych.*, IV², pp. 93f.; V², p. 174.

... see a little the fourth time, and the youth had to rub in the ointment six times before he could see properly'); the same occurs in a healing of the blind in *Franzoes. Maerchen*, II, p. 224. The motif has been correctly interpreted by Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, II, pp. 72-75: the successive stages are meant to serve as illustration: what happens instantaneously cannot be seen. Perhaps some sort of rationalization was also at work, as e.g. in primitive creation stories where the process of creation sometimes takes place by degrees; cp. B. N. Soederblom, *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens*, 1916, pp. 129ff.; A. Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion*, I, 1887, pp. 191, 198; W. Schmidt, *Rel. u. Myth. der austrones. Voelker* (Sz. B. d. Wiener Ak., 1916), pp. 6, 7f. In the majority of cases the instantaneousness of the miracle is emphasized: Mk. 5²⁰, 4², 10⁵²; Matt. 21¹⁹; Lk. 4³⁹, 5²⁵, 8⁴⁷, 13¹³; Acts 3⁷, 5¹⁰, 12²³, 13¹¹, 16²⁶; Jn. 5⁹. There are parallels in Weinreich, pp. 197f.¹ Particularly miraculous are healings at a distance: Mk. 7²⁹; Matt. 8¹³; Jn. 4⁵⁰; Ber. f. 34b (Fiebig, *Jued. Wundergeschichten*, pp. 19f.). In all these cases it is stated that the miracle took place at the very time that the miracle working word was spoken.

On one occasion stress is laid on the παράδοξος of a miracle: Lk. 5²⁶ (indirectly in Lk. 5^{5f.}); this is according to style, cp. Weinreich, pp. 198f.; E. Peterson, *Εἰς θεός* 1926, pp. 184, 190. A demonstration of the cure is meant to serve as a conviction of its reality: Mk. 1³¹, 4⁴, 2^{11f.}, 5⁴³ (see p. 214); Jn. 5⁸; Lucian, *Philops.*, 11, 'The lame man who was healed carried his stretcher out'; IG, IV, 951, pp. 105ff. (the person cured carried an enormous stone).

Here too we must consider the cases where the exorcized demon creates some disturbance as he departs: Mk. 5¹³; Jos., *Ant.*, VIII, 2.5 (Turning a vessel of water upside down); *Vit. Apoll.*, IV, 20 (Knocking down a statue). Parallels of demons going into animals can be found in Wohlstein, *Ztschr. f. Assyriologie*, IX, 1894, p. 31; cp. *Z.N.W.*, XV, 1914, p. 45; and in the *Autobiography of Barth. Sastrou* (ob. 1603) in *Das Unerkannte*, edited by E. Nielsen, 1922, p. 101.

But sometimes all that is said is that the healed person is dismissed (ὑπογε and such words); Mk. 5¹⁹, 3⁴, 7²⁹, 10⁵²; Matt. 8¹³; Lucian, *Philops.*, 16 (ἀποπέμπει ἄρτίους); Diog. Laert., VIII, 67 (ἀποστείλας τὴν νεκρὸν ἄνθρωπον i.e. Empedocles dismissed the resuscitated man).

Finally, it accords with the style of miracle stories that the impression the miracle creates upon the crowd that sees it is reported; by this means the παράδοξος of the miracle is stressed at the same time as belief in the miracle is demanded. The public is frequently described

¹ The word characteristic of certain miracle stories ἑσάφηνς (E. Peterson, *Εἰς θεός*, p. 184.1) is not found in N.T. stories of healing, though it is used in the epiphanies of Lk. 2¹³; Acts 9³, 22⁶ and is used in Lk. 9³⁰ of an attack by a demon.

as ἔς (ἄπιοντες): Mk. 1²⁷, 2¹²; Lk. 4³⁶, 5²⁰, 7¹⁶; Acts 9³⁵; or as ὁ δὲ, (οἱ ὄχλοι): Matt. 9⁸, 3³, 12²⁵, 15³¹; Lk. 11¹⁴, 13¹⁷; or as ὁ λαός Lk. 18⁴²; Acts 3⁹. In describing the effect of the miracle characteristic words are: θαυμάζειν Matt. 8²⁷, 9³³, 15³¹, 21²⁰; Lk. 8²⁵, 11¹⁸; Acts 2⁷; φοβεῖσθαι Mk. 4⁴¹, 5¹⁵ (cp. 9⁶); Matt. 9⁸, 17⁶; φόβος Mk. 4⁴¹; Lk. 7¹⁶; Acts 5¹¹ (cp. 19¹⁷); θαυβεῖσθαι Mk. 1²⁷; θάμβος Lk. 4³⁶, 5⁹; Acts 3¹⁰; ἐξίστασθαι Mk. 2¹², 5⁴², 6⁵¹; Matt. 12²³; Acts 2⁷, 8¹³ (cp. 8⁹, 11, 10⁴⁵); ἔκστασις Mk. 5⁴² (cp. 16⁸); Lk. 5²⁶; Acts 3¹⁰; ἐκπλήττεσθαι Mk. 7³⁷; Lk. 9⁴³ (cp. Acts 13¹²). While these expressions have their parallels in Hellenistic miracle stories (cp. E. Peterson *Eis theós*, pp. 193-5), the following words which are associated with them or replace them, clearly derive from a Jewish-Christian background: δοξάζειν (τ. θεόν) Mk. 2¹² par.; Matt. 15³¹; Lk. 18⁴³; δίδοναι αἶνον (τ. θεῶν) Lk. 18⁴³ (cp. Acts 3⁹); χαίρειν Lk. 13¹⁷ (cp. Acts 8⁹). Peterson draws attention to the fact that the frequent acclamation (μέγας ὁ θεός and the like) which often come at the end of a miracle story in later Christian and pagan miracle stories is not found in the N.T. stories. That can hardly be explained by the secret character of the life of Jesus in the Gospels (op. cit., 319), for the acclamation is absent from Acts as well. So the reason is in all probability to be found in literary history: the acclamation formula was first introduced into miracle stories in later times from Egypt (op. cit., 195). On the significance of the public witness to the miracles cp. P. Wendland, *De Fabellis*, pp. 7f.; H. Werner, *Zum Λούκιος ἡ ὄνος, Hermes*, 53, 1918, p. 242.

Even if one confines one's attention to the N.T. material it can be seen that *miracle stories have their own history in the tradition*. The motifs change, variations develop and themes are worked up.

The stories of the *exorcism of demons* were of especial significance to the Church as proofs that Jesus was Messiah. They were frequently emphasized in the summaries: Mk. 1³²⁻³⁴, 3⁹, 3¹¹, 6⁷; Matt. 4²⁴, 10⁸; Lk. 7²¹; Acts 5¹⁶, 10³⁸. It is thus understandable that when the motif of exorcism was embodied in different particular stories, they were not all traceable, in terms of literary criticism, to one story. Mark reports four (or five) healings of demon-possessed persons: 1²¹⁻²⁸ (3²²), 5¹⁻²⁰, 9¹⁴⁻²⁷ (a combination of two cases). In addition in Q we find Matt. 12²²⁻²⁴ par., which is a more distinct variant of Mk. 3²² and Matt. 9³²⁻³⁴, which is a secondary editing of the motif. In *other healings*¹ it is not so important to know what disease Jesus

¹ Whether originally all Jesus' healings were exorcisms is a fair question, cp. J. Weiss, *R.E.*, IV, p. 413; H. Jahnow, *Z.N.W.*, 21, 1925, p. 158. It is not probable that they were, though it is noteworthy that the healings in Mk. 7³³, 8²³ are also thought of as exorcisms as can be seen from the use of *spittle*.

healed, as to recognize the miracle as such. This is the case in the healing of the deaf mute Mk. 7³¹⁻³⁷ and its clear variant, the healing of the blind man Mk. 8²²⁻²⁶. The healing of two blind men and the dumb man possessed of a devil Matt. 9²⁷⁻³¹ and Matt. 3²⁻³⁴ are only variants of Markan miracles.¹ And Mk. 3¹⁻⁵; Lk. 13¹⁰⁻¹⁷, 14¹⁻⁶ are likewise but variations on the theme of Sabbath healing. The miracle of healing the ten lepers in Lk. 17¹¹⁻¹⁹ is a heightened version of Mk. 1⁴⁰⁻⁴⁵, as the command in Lk. 17¹⁴ particularly shows: ἐπιδείξατέ ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἰερεῦσιν. The distant healings in Mk. 7²⁴⁻³⁰ and Matt. 8⁵⁻¹³ par. are variants (see pp. 38f.). Accordingly it is not safe to say that Matt. 8⁵⁻¹³ par. and the raising of Jairus' daughter Mk. 5²¹⁻³⁴ are variants (K. L. Schmidt, *Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 73); but it is quite likely that the raising of the widow's son at Nain Lk. 7¹¹⁻¹⁷ is a counterpart to the raising of Jairus' daughter in the Synoptic tradition.

The course of the development and change of motifs becomes particularly clear if the Johannine healings are included. In Jn. 5^{8ff.} the motif of the lame man who has to carry his bed is combined with that of Sabbath healing. The manipulation at the healing of the man born blind in Jn. 9^{1ff.} derives from Mk. 8²³, and again the motif of Sabbath breaking provides a secondary element in combination. With this we may compare how the miracle of the bird made out of soil is combined, in the Nativity Gospel of St. Thomas 2^{ff.} with the motif of Sabbath breaking. Jn. 4⁴⁰⁻⁵⁴ is a heightened version of the story of the Centurion from Capernaum: the healing is at an even greater distance; its occurrence at the precise moment is expressly established by witnesses.²

The same sort of considerations apply to the *nature miracles*. The two feeding miracles are clearly variants Mk. 6³⁴⁻⁴⁴, 8¹⁻⁹, and even indeed in their formulation they agree fully in structure and in part even verbally. The motif is used also in Jn. 6^{1ff.}, though here σπλῶγγιζοθαί has dropped out at the beginning and the question asked by Jesus serves only to put the disciples to the test, οὐτὸς γὰρ ἦδει τί ἐμελλεν ποιῆν. The stories of stilling the storm and walking on the water in Mk. 4³⁷⁻⁴¹, 6⁴⁵⁻⁵² are admittedly not properly variants, but the motif of the first is used in the second (see above). And how another motif can be added to a miracle story is seen in the expansion of Matt. 14²²⁻³³ by vv. 28-31. On the other hand in Jn. 6¹⁶⁻²⁶ the motif of stilling the storm has been left out of the story

¹ Cod. Δ adds τοῦ λόν at Mk. 8²² the word δαιμονιζόμενον (W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu in*

Zeitalter der Neutest, Apokr., 1909, p. 367.

² A further variant of the story is to be found in the *Historia Societatis Jesu* (Koeln 1685) transferred to Francis Xavier (*Das Unerkannte*, edited by E. Nielsen, 1922, p. 98).