

Wider den Herr Rohry
28-1-1903

Die Frucht unserer Lippen *Wider den Herr Rohry* 468

I.
Vorwort zu I und II

pluridogin
Sprache der Heiligung
= Die Mitgeschöpfer, eine Einführung
in die heilige Schrift
Hilfswort von G. Roth, G. F. 1907
11-6

I. The Co-Creators.

"I shall create Fruit of lips," says the Lord to the prophet Isaiah .

This is said of the future . However, He who shall be, also has been. God is not a sudden or new apparition in the middle of a previously godless time. Therefore, he has always done, what he promises to do more fully and more visbly when the fruit of lips appears in the flesh. God must have created fruit of lips before our era, from the very first day that lips moved and spoke and prayed and sang .

Whose lips then have created fruit and what is this fruit? Whose lips, we first must ask. Thousands of years before the Exodus from Egypt millions of men have walked the earth and have talked with the seriousness of a Dutch uncle, and the Word Incarnate supposedly has nothing to do with the passionate movements of their lips ?

I cannot believe it. It is true, we emerge from a century in which the Incarnate Word has been analyzed as a boy from Betlehem, an adolescent from Nazareth, a fisher or carpenter from Galilee, A teacher in Israel. With all the contemporary religious nonsense of Mithras, Manicheism, Dionysos, and Demeter, Jesus has been compared. Biographers have covered his life , and psychologists have uncovered his ppyche. Such an overwritten child of Mary and Panther ~~xx~~ certainly would be as far from being the fruit of our lips as from the God who created Adam and Eve on the first day of creation.

My question will not make sense to the Renan, Harnack, Schweitzer, Reitzenstein, Karl Barth, Builmann, Dibelius, Scholem Asch, or Buber.

If the reader , however, can forget this biographical- psychological inundation for a moment, if he can forget the environment around Jesus in his own days, he may understand ~~that~~ that our own question can only be asked after Jesus has ceased to be a case study of psychology.

All the individualism of the last period ends in "casism" if I may use this phrase; Once you admit that you and everybody else are individuals, you cannot possibly object to the objectivity by which you are treated as a case. "Case" may be the reverse of the medal; but as long as "individual" is read on the obverse of your ~~badge~~ badge as a human being, the inevitable result will always be that to the onlooker, you appear as a case. Hence, you are never sure that they won't prove your lunacy to their own satisfaction. As individuals we become so inaccessible to each other that every one appears to every one else as a case. Homo homini lupus, has been said of primitive man. Homo homini Casus, is the present day's tremendous truth.

I think that this produces a fickleness in human relations which leaves everything to accident. If we all can look at each other as lunatics, the sun of reason has set.

I therefore have ~~livedxxxxxxx~~ started to look in another direction altogether, for you, for me, and for the men of old, too. For the last fifty years, I have tried to live and to think and to teach and to write and to do research under the positive assumption that neither you nor I nor my human "objects" of historical research deserve this badge with the obverse, individual, and the reverse, case.

I am not an individual and I happen to know this. I have yet to find "individuals" except in their thinking. Scratch off the word of Individualistic self-consciousness, and normal men suddenly surround you every where despite their own ideas of individualism. These normal men are either torn or linked, dubious or loyal, members of rebels, that is they are either more or they are less than one man. And they hang together or they are desperate for not hanging together with others. The greatest individuals so called, Pietro Aretino, Goethe, Rousseau, depended more on women than any normal men. And the only individual which might be called one, Jesus, declined this otherwise legitimate label, and asked to be considered son, bridegroom, seed, fruit.

The contrast between Jesus of Nazareth and Goethe, in this respect, is really stupendous. Goethe not for one minute could live as an individual: "Meine Seele ist auf Deinen Lippen" = My soul is on your lips, he wrote to her whom he called 'sister and wife'. And never has the destiny of man been more exactly stated than in this great sentence of a lover who is redeemed by his love. ^{NAN} Jesus very well knew the normalcy of all these mutual completions and in order to restore them in us, he himself forewent them. It was his contribution to suffer as a criminal because the criminal is the only individual in a healthy society. Crime is the individualizing feature of humanity. If I commit a crime, I do become a case. The courts are set in motion against me.

Hence, we see the difference between any normal man and a case. To a normal man, we address ourselves and we speak to him. But against a criminal, we are forced to speak of him as an object to be tried, a case to be investigated, a nuisance to be weeded out.

The most normal man, compared with a case, would be the man of whom nobody talks differently in his absence as in his presence. For, if any one of us would impress all men of his brotherly presence all the time, he could never become a case. Let us, then, in the face of all the casemongers state it clearly that every human being as long as he or she speaks, breathes^{out}, listens, and inhales, trusts that it is possible to escape "Casism". As a casus, as fallen nature, we may be individuals. But normally we are the organs of a milleniar process of integration. This membership within our own family and within the whole human family is claimed by the most puny contemporary as long as he has not been ruined by our official philosophies or psychoanalysts.

Jesus with his contemporaries. Jesus does not belong into his time. And we shall believe his own word for the fact that he was not at home in his own day or time or environment. Therefore, neither Palestine nor his carnal family nor the simultaneous mystery cults are of the slightest interest either to the man Jesus himself or to us who try to understand his role in secular history and worldly anthropology.

We shall ask without any interest in organized religion or in Enlightenment's debunking sport, what did change when the first Man came forth who declared himself the Son of the whole of antiquity and therefore proclaimed that the generation of the first Adam, of the Titans, the Heroes, the Jews and the Greeks had given him life as their heir, as the Fruit of their Lips.

So let me repeat the peculiar condition for this book. It is written for those who can write off their curiosity for reading A Life of Jesus.

I do not share this curiosity. In fact, I am nauseated by the impertinent inventions of a boy or an adolescent. If the Renans and the Scholem Axchs were right, Christianity, indeed, would be finished.

Fortunately, there never shall be a biography of Jesus of any authority. The "testamented" things about his existence furnish a Thanatography, an understandable account of his transforming five thousand years of antiquity into the new Era in which we live.

What is meant by his being ^{the} fruit of the Lips of Antiquity, and in which way we may be called the Fruit of His Lips, is the theme of any future which can be granted to the human family at the end and after the Great Enlightenment and its Twilight of the Gods, ^{of}

It is a scientific theme. But the science which is able to treat this theme, is itself not a science of Greek antiquity; it is ~~but~~ a new science which we must purify of all ~~the~~ pre-Christian Alexandrinisms, all Platonic or Aristotelian naivetés.

The Roman Church has nominated the Virgin Mary co-redemptrix. That is an escape. The pious pagans, the righteous men of the first psalm deserve the title Co-creators. And we are vitally interested in this pedigree. Because we all need and deserve the rank of co-creators ourselves. It has happened before.