"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 visibly 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 psyche. Such an overwritten child of Mary and Panther nn 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, Bultmann, 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 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 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 seven 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 everywhere 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: "Wer, ist errettet durch sein Lieben". Who, is redeemed by his love.

Jesus very well knew the normalcy of all these mutual-completions and in us, he had none of 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, nuisance to be weeded out.

The most normal man, compared with a case, would be the man of whom nobody talks any 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, 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 millennial process of integration. This membership within our own family and within the whole human family

*The text is not fully legible and contains several errors and unintelligible phrases.*
This much I was compelled to say about our own contemporary scene in order to explain my purpose in this writing.

Denying my own or any healthy person's desire to pose as an individual, admitting that we all want to be sons and lovers, husbands and daughters, wives, and fathers, I apply this membership doctrine to Jesus of Nazareth and the New Testament.

To an absurdity" of a man who did not think of having a life of his own, seems remarkably inept. Offly culprits are treated in this way that all their own claims of their peculiar identity are not even listened to.

The age of the Enlightenment has declined to listen to the man's own statements about himself. It has forced a life of his own, a biography and an evolution and a psychology upon him. The man himself spent one or three years in denying just these points:

"I have no life of my own, I have no data of personal career, environment, development. I was before the world was created. Do not analyze my psyche, but look at the fruits of the wine which I am in process of becoming.

Nobody would listen to such nonsense, among the biblical critics, as they knew better that an individual is something by itself. They enriched the Christian appeal and looked at them as objects: "Nunc est biblia Verbi." For me, I will listen to his claim that he was not an individual. I shall accept his claim that Nazareth, carpentry, Judaism, birth out of wedlock, were liabilities which he had to turn into assets, by becoming the first man created by human lips, with the spirit begetting him through Mary's ear.

I shall try to understand how the faithful vows, oaths, commands, hymns have finally procreated their product, the fruit of their lips. Jesus is the second Adam, that is the first Man who is the sum, result, effect of all righteous living in the age of the first Adam, during the first five thousand years of our life as a human family. He is Adam's Adam, and the phrase Second Adam does not abandon his relation to Adam the first and to all the sons of Adam. Quite the contrary, the Second Adam ennobles them by being their legitimate off-spring. He legally is, that elusive first Adam's eldest to beget. He thus enters the first Adam's illegitimate status. And his illegitimacy, we may venture to suggest in anticipation, as Mary's Son, was a condition for his being the legitimate heir of all the just and good people of antiquity. The whole race since Adam is the co-creator of the Christ. The interesting thread, I would say, the only interesting or important thread to be examined about the Man of Men, about Jesus, is his heidrom and pedigree and the way he took possession of it. In order to uncover these threads, towards the First Adam on which he hung, we must cut ruthlessly all the threads which, in modern literature, are woven to connect.
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 inventitious inventions of a boy or an adolescent. If the Hennans and the Scholom 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 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.

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 a new science which we must purify of all pre-Christian Alexandrinisms, all Platonic or Aristotelian naivës.

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.