

THE TWO JESUS BOYS

Historical grail research is also capable of throwing light on the historic life of Christ. In our research report "Wolfram von Eschenbach and the Reality of the Grail", we have assumed out of conviction and therefore as a matter of course that the great conjunction of the year 7 BC represents that event which Matthew describes in the second chapter of his Gospel as the Star of the Wise Men or Magi from the East, and that the first repetition of this great conjunction in the year 848 marks the date that Parzival became King of the Grail. Objections have been made against this "belief".

The objection was not that these two conjunctions took place. If anyone were to make such a claim, he would have to be told that he does not know the laws of astronomy.

There are, however, additional grounds for rejecting the cosmic connection between the Star of Bethlehem and the Star of Munsalvaesche. It is said, for example, that the great conjunction in the year 7 BC could in no way be the Star of Bethlehem, because Jesus, as everybody knows, was not born in the year 7 BC, but in the year zero.

What are we now to make of this other "belief"?

The first astronomer in modern times who drew attention to the great conjunction in the year 7 BC as the *Star of Bethlehem* was Johannes Kepler. He recognized in this stellar event that celestial occurrence which the evangelist Matthew describes as the cosmic accompaniment to the birth of Jesus. The Three Magi directed their gaze towards a stellar event in the heavens during the time of His birth. Kepler interpreted the corresponding passage in the Gospel of Matthew astronomically. He also admittedly supposed that at the same time a new star, a Nova, could have appeared, because a Nova he had observed himself in the year 1604, came after a great conjunction.

Modern astronomy confirms Kepler's evaluation of the great conjunction six years before Christ and its connection with the Star of Bethlehem, but rejects a Nova.

Since the discovery of a Babylonian clay tablet in the British Museum (information Kc.35429) on which the detailed phases of the great conjunction (which the Magi followed) are drawn, there can be no more doubt as to the validity of Kepler's astronomical interpretation of the Nativity of the Matthew Jesus.

If this date of birth is used as a starting point, then all of Matthew's information falls into place with the historical-political conditions in the Jerusalem of that time. Everything has its historic veracity. The Gospel of Matthew appears to be true. The only discrepancy consists in the fact that our calendar does not begin until six and a half years later.

But also Luke describes the birth of a Jesus. One cannot say *the birth of Jesus*. What he says is on all points contradictory to what Matthew says. Luke describes completely different conditions. Herod is long since dead. There is no mention of child-murder and the parents of Jesus live in Nazareth, while the parents of the Jesus described by Matthew were inhabitants of Bethlehem.

The parents of the Jesus of Nazareth return after the time of purification without any hindrance to Jerusalem to present their boy in the temple, while the parents of the Jesus of Bethlehem flee into Egypt and stay there until the political conditions in Jerusalem have fundamentally changed.

Considered by itself, the description of the Nativity by Luke is also intrinsically consistent. It does not contradict recorded history. The Nativity is moreover approximately in line with our calendar. Hence the Gospel of Luke also appears to be true. Both gospels can however only be simultaneously true, if they speak of two different Nativities occurring at different times in Bethlehem. But just this is - after almost 2000 years - in no way officially recognized to be so in Christendom. Both descriptions, which considered by themselves are

historically plausible, are mutually contradictory, because Luke describes the Nativity in such a way that it must have taken place historically 5 to 6 years after the Nativity described by Matthew. This contradiction has for centuries been the greatest riddle in Gospel Research and still remains so far and wide.

I am of the opinion that this main polemical question within Gospel Research has completely been resolved in the year 1909 by Rudolf Steiner, who indicated that at that time *TWO* boys named Jesus were born in Bethlehem.(f.9) The evangelists Matthew and Luke do not describe one and the same Nativity from two different points of view, but clearly two different Nativities altogether.

One of the births took place *before* Herod's death, while the other one occurred later. All apparent contradictions in the two Nativities disappear, if we recognize this discovery by Rudolf Steiner to the full. One thousand nine hundred and nine years after the birth of Christ, Rudolf Steiner revealed the true history of this Nativity and made it accessible to human understanding. This is, considered historically, the first spiritual gift from Christ who at that time became active in the etheric realm. It is no coincidence that this revelation occurred in that particular *geo*" graphical area, namely Basle (Switzerland), which was also the theater for the Grail events in the ninth century. (F.10)

If only the fact is taken note of that two Jesus boys were born, but not recognized that their difference in age amounted to several years, then the incompatible chronological differences continue to exist. In that sense we admittedly learned an interesting supplement to the Nativity, but this addition to our knowledge is not of vital importance to our historic understanding of the Gospels, because the chronological contradictions that are preventing the true Nativity of Christendom from being recognized are not diminished, but augmented anew.

Through his discovery of the two Jesus boys, Rudolf Steiner conclusively demonstrated the truth of the two Nativities, which would otherwise have remained completely contradictory. This demonstration of the truth would however be overruled, were the difference in age between, the two Jesus boys to amount to only a few months.

It is worthwhile to ponder over this question in all its consequences. Four different opinions or thought patterns are dominant today:

A. It is said that only one Jesus was born, namely the one described by Matthew. This Nativity, so it is argued, proves to be more convincing than the one described by Luke. Objections raised from the position of the Gospel of Luke against the interpretation that the great conjunction is a sign of the birth of the Messiah are refuted by the most distinguished exponent. of the Matthew story in the following way: (f.11)

1. Form and content of the periscope (Matt. 2. 1-12) give rise to the supposition that the personal report from the Magi, only slightly changed by the evangelist, stems from another source.
2. From the regained knowledge of the late Babylonian astronomy there results a factual view of the so often misunderstood sayings about the star. Not a trace of anything legendary remains.
3. The rising of the star at night and its position while standing still, strongly emphasized by the Periscope, can be identified as two phases of the planet Jupiter, which are exactly dated and described in two clay tablets. To calculate these phases in advance and to simultaneously have insight into the rarity of the epiphenomena - repeated only after many centuries was only possible for very few of the surviving astronomers in Babylon.
4. The interpretation of this celestial process as maintained by the Magi from the Gospel can be logically deduced from the classifications evidently found in Babylonian astrology. A certain knowledge of biblical prophecies and political considerations could strengthen the expectations of the Magi.
5. The astronomical dating of the Magi's journey falls within the realm of historically accepted time frames.
6. Overall, it may be said that the Periscope in question is not to be evaluated as a product of random literary

imagination, but as a definite historic document.

B. It is said that only *one* Jesus was born, namely the one described by *Luke*. Only this Nativity, so it is argued, complies approximately with the Christian calendar, and it may be assumed that those who established the calendar certainly had good reason for fixing on Luke. To that must be said: Luke himself gives admittedly some indications for exactly dating his birth of Jesus. His version however has, as long as only one birth is considered, hardly any hope of becoming accepted next to Matthew.

Among the convinced followers of the theory that there were two Jesus boys there are also two streams.

C. The first one argues that there were two different Nativities. The two Jesus boys however were born only a few months after each other and in fact at the beginning of our calendar. The Star of Bethlehem can therefore not be identified as the great conjunction of the year 7 BC, because this conjunction did not take place in the year zero.

D. The second one argues that there were two different Nativities. The one described by Matthew, for reasons given under A. in the year 7 BC, *and* the one listed under B., at the beginning of our calendar.

I am convinced that only the fourth opinion can claim to be in harmony with all the information given by the two evangelists.

Opinion A confirms Matthew, but excludes Luke;

Opinion B confirms Luke, but excludes Matthew.

Opinion C confirms Luke, but excludes in spite of the acceptance of the birth of a second Jesus the Nativity by Matthew.

Opinion A is predominant today among the researchers who reckon with only one Jesus boy. It is argued so convincingly that it can be fully accepted by the exponent of opinion D with respect to the elder Jesus boy. But this exponent of the opinion D reckons in addition with a second birth, the one that Luke describes. He fixes this birth so much later, however, that both gospels are in synchrony with history, .

With researchers from group C and D we are exclusively dealing with students of Rudolph Steiner, or with researchers who accept the validity of Rudolf Steiner's research out of his own insight. Hence it must be asked why two types of researchers, who both believe to be in accord with Rudolf Steiner, come to two different opinions.

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to first of all compare the two Nativities and establish how the two Gospels agree and disagree.

Matthew as well as Luke describe the birth of a boy, who is a descendant from Abraham. The family trees from Abraham to David in both gospels are in complete agreement. What, makes examining the identity of both family trees somewhat difficult is that the family tree by Luke leads from David back to Abraham, respectively through Adam back to God, while the other family tree enumerates the generations in the opposite direction, from Abraham up to David. If we write both family trees in the same direction, then the correspondence until David is evident. We would therefore have to expect, if there was only *one* Jesus born, correspondence as well from David up to Joseph. After David however this correspondence is no longer there. The line of descent from Matthew leads from David through his son Solomon to a Joseph who lives in Bethlehem. The one from Luke runs through Nathan, the other son from David to a Joseph living in Nazareth. From the line of ancestors it is clearly evident that the two Joseph's cannot be identical. Their sons too, who are both called Jesus, are therefore two different persons. The two wives, who are both called Maria, are two different persons as well, for one married to a Nazarene and the other to a Bethlehemite.

From the Gospel of Matthew can be gathered that the Jesus from the line of Solomon of the House of David was born - still within Herod's lifetime - in Bethlehem, the home of his parents for his life was in danger because of

this. The Lukas Jesus was born later. "During the time of Augustus" tell us nothing, for the elder Jesus was also born during the time of Emperor Augustus, Luke, however, says that at that time a certain Cyrenius was governor of Syria (Luke 2.2). The parents of the Luke Jesus live in Nazareth in the district of Galilee, which was part of Syria. Joseph and Maria come to their hometown only in passing "to be taxed". There is rightly no mention of any danger by Herod, because Cyrenius became Governor of Syria only after Herod's death.

Completely different as well is the description of how the Nativity became known. The Nativity by Matthew is accompanied by a "star", which announces to the wise men from the East "that the time is fulfilled (at hand)". These Magi come "from where the Sun rises" to Jerusalem and inquire of Herod about the *place* of birth of the new King. The Pharisees point to Bethlehem. Herod for his part wants to know from the Magi *-when* the child was born.

After worshipping the Jesus from Bethlehem the Magi return, avoiding Jerusalem, to their home country. The parents flee with the child into Egypt and Herod orders the child-murder. That is what Matthew reports. Kings do not come to the birth of the Luke Jesus, but shepherds in the field, to whom; the nativity was revealed by an Angel. The parents return home unscathed by way of Jerusalem (the lion's den during the time of Herod) and go from there every three years in no danger to Jerusalem for the Passover feast.

From this comparison, it is clear that in one case Herod plays a decisive role, while in the other case there is absolutely no mention of any danger from Herod.. Rudolf Steiner, the re-discoverer of the two Jesus boys, indicated himself that one of the boys was born *before* and the other one *after* the child-murder.

It should be mentioned in advance that Rudolf Steiner never gave an exact date for the Nativity. Neither did he know yet - at the time that the lecture was held from which the following passage is taken - what the date of the death at the cross was: April 3, 33. In the 5th lecture of *The Gospel of St Luke*, he says:

"Thus certain facts will be presented today, *the consequences of-which* are indicated in the Gospels, though not the facts themselves. Nevertheless you can put them to the test and you will find them substantiated.

"The birth of the two Jesus boys were separated by a period of a few months. But Jesus of the Gospel of Luke and John the Baptist were both born too late to have been victims of the so-called 'massacre of the innocents'. Has the thought never struck you that those who read about the Bethlehem massacre must ask themselves: How could there have been a John? But the facts can be substantiated in all respects. Think about it: the Jesus from Matthew's Gospel was taken to Egypt by his parents, and John, supposedly, was born shortly before or about the same time. According to the usual view, John remained in Palestine, but in that case he would certainly have been a victim of Herod's murderous deed. You see how necessary it is to devote serious thought to these things; for if all the children of two years old and younger were actually put to death at that time, John would have been one of them. But this riddle will become intelligible if, in the light of the facts disclosed by the Akasha Chronicle, you realize that the events related in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew did *not* take place at the same time. The Nathan Jesus was born after the Bethlehem massacre; so too was John. Although the interval was only a matter of months, it was long enough to make these facts possible.

"You will also learn to understand the Jesus of the Gospel of Matthew in the light of the more intimate facts. In this boy was reincarnated the Zarathustra individuality, from whom the people of ancient Persia had once received the teaching concerning Ahura Mazdao, the great Sun Being. We know that this Sun Being must be regarded as the soul and spirit of the external, physical sun. Hence Zarathustra was able to say: 'Behold not only the radiance of the physical sun; behold too, the mighty Being who sends down His spiritual blessings as the physical sun sends down its beneficent light and warmth! -- Ahura Mazdao, later called Christ in other words - it was He whom Zarathustra proclaimed to the people of Persia, but not yet as a Being who walked on the Earth. Pointing to the sun, Zarathustra could only say: "There is His habitation; He is gradually drawing near and one day He will live in a body on the Earth!"

This passage contains the solution to the centuries-old question in Gospel Research concerning the truth of the two Nativities. But it also at the same time contains the seed for a new interpretation that can overrule this solution. The critical sentence reads: "Thus the interval between the two births amounted to a few months".

The interpretation of this sentence by students of Rudolf Steiner today gives rise to the above described opinion C: "There are two Jesus boys whose births are only a few months apart." By giving most of the weight to this sentence that the births are only a few months apart, these students accept that due to this emphasis on one item of research by Rudolf Steiner other results will be denied. The greatest consequence of this exegesis, however, is that it prevents the solution to a centuries-old problem in Gospels Research, which Rudolf Steiner succeeded in solving, from being publicly recognized. The chronological contradictions are not eliminated, we take into account that there were indeed two Jesus boys, but have them born in Bethlehem as it were at the same time, i.e. only a few months apart. The "contradictions" between the family trees as well as the "contradictions" in the geographical conditions (Judaea-Samaria and Galilee-Syria) are admittedly resolved, but as long as these slight differences in age are assumed to exist the anachronisms remain.

In the above quotation we are also challenged to think for ourselves. Rudolf Steiner says: "You see, it is necessary to really think about all these things..."

Let us use this thinking to check the opinion that the age difference between the two boys amounted to "only a few months": If our starting point is that Jesus of Bethlehem must have been older than Jesus of Nazareth, then this means that the age difference amounted to at least six months. The Angel of Annunciation says to Mary (Luke 1.36): "And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her..."

If the younger Jesus was born around Christmas, then we have to set the date for the birth of John on "St John's Tide", thus on June 24. Now we also believe in addition that the birth of Jesus of Bethlehem must be set forward another six months. If, however, we are of the opinion that Jesus of Bethlehem was born "from the Virgin (Mary)", which requires that the Sun was in Virgo, thus in September, then we have to go back three more months. Depending on whether we assume Christmas or Michaelmas to be the date of birth of the elder Jesus, we come to an age difference of at least twelve or fourteen months.

Between the birth of the elder Jesus and the birth of John must lie the death of Herod. The latter died, as is historically documented, in the year 4 BC, on the day of the eclipse of the moon on March 13. Based on these considerations the births of the Jesus boys would have to be set on Christmas in 5 BC and 4 BC. This assumption however has a flaw. At that time, Quintilius Varus was Governor of Syria. According to Luke, Cyrenius should be Governor in Syria. Cyrenius however did not become Governor there until Varus had been transferred to Gennania.

The difference in age becomes even greater when a later result of research by Rudolf Steiner is taken into account. Rudolf Steiner has determined the exact age and time of death of the crucified Jesus Christ as described by Luke. Together with the establishment of the date of birth of the Matthew Jesus - who died in the year 11 AD as a result of the events around the twelve year old Luke Jesus - by Johannes Kepler, the exact birthdays may be known today as follows:

Based on the research by Rudolf Steiner into the original Good Friday and the age of the Crucified One, the birth of the Luke Jesus is to be set on Christmas in the year 2 BC. ($33 \text{ minus } 33 \frac{1}{3} = \text{Christmas } 2 \text{ BC}$). John the Baptist was born six months earlier, i.e. around St. John's tide in the year 2 BC. From the calculation of the great conjunction, it follows that the birth of the other Jesus occurred in September of the year 7 BC. Only these two dates penal the references given by Matthew and Luke to exist side by side without contradiction. Based on the view of Kepler (Matthew-Jesus) and the research of Rudolf Steiner (Luke-Jesus), the difference in age between the two Jesus boys amounts to $5 \frac{1}{4}$ years.

The supposition of the idea that the birthdays are only a few months apart, prevents a synchronization of the

information given by the Gospels with accepted history.

This diminishes their truth and thereby also the words of Rudolf Steiner: "The Gospels always describe the truth; it is not necessary to sit and ponder over them. Thanks to Anthroposophy people will again come to take the Gospels literally."(St Luke Gospel, Basle 1909.)

The adherents of the theory that the Jesus boys are of the same age say that Kepler's view is false, because the conjunction did not take place in the year zero. This does not only injustice to Kepler, for it also transports the Gospel's Periscope about the Magi into the realm of fantasy. Above all, by referring to Rudolf Steiner, Rudolf Steiner is done injustice to, because he has after all declared that both Gospels are true, provided they are read correctly.

I have grappled with this problem for decades. Only when I discovered the star of Munsalvaesche, did I know for sure that Kepler was right and that Rudolf Steiner is being falsely interpreted, when it said that both Jesus boys are about the same age.

Rudolf Steiner actually left the age of the two Jesus boys up in the air. He never says exactly how long the interval is between the two births. What he does say, however, is that it must be at least long enough to account for the fact that one Jesus could live in peace, while the other was threatened by child-murder. The death of Herod was also for Rudolf Steiner the decisive factor. A historically accepted date such as Herod's death may therefore not simply be ignored.

If Rudolf Steiner had known the exact dates and said for example that one boy was born 2 ½ years before Herod's death, and the other not until three years after this death, then the question concerning the safety of one of the boys and the danger of the other would not have been raised.

The same problem arose with the twelve year old Jesus in the temple. After the discovery of the two Jesus boys, there were now also two "twelve year old boys named Jesus in the temple", between whom the events took place that Rudolf Steiner describes, and as a result of which we were afterwards left with only *one* Jesus. Rudolf Steiner speaks often in this context about two "twelve year olds", sometimes however clearly differentiating: "When the Nathan Jesus was approaching his twelfth year". From the last sentence may be concluded that indeed the Nathan Jesus, but not the Solomon Jesus was at that time twelve years old. The question whether there were one or two twelve year olds can not be solved by referring to Rudolf Steiner, because he left indications from which can be concluded that the two Jesus boys were of the same age, as well as indications from which can be gathered that they were not.

Rudolf Steiner must have had a reason for not exactly indicating these dates of birth. As a matter of fact, he mentioned strikingly few dates. The only date he indicates exactly as a result of spiritual scientific research is the date of the crucifixion. In the first edition of the Calendar of the Soul from 1912, he says that the original Good Friday fell on April 3, 33. This Soul Calendar begins on Easter 1912 or "1879 years after the birth of the I". Together with the result of research that the Crucified One was 33 1/3 years old, it can be calculated that the birth of the Luke Jesus occurred around Christmas in the year 2 BC. If with regard to the Luke Jesus, we take Rudolf Steiner into account, we then find that the historical-political information given by the Gospel of Luke coincides with the historically recorded conditions, just as the information from Matthew does, if we presuppose the date of birth of the Matthew Jesus- Michaelmas 7 BC established by Johannes Kepler. Nothing can therefore now prevent us any more from both of these dates of birth as valid.

As a result, the epoch-making discovery by Rudolf Steiner that there were two Nativities now also make an important contribution to our understanding of the Gospels, because we have found the right dates of birth of the two Jesus boys. We should out of respect for Rudolf Steiner' not simply refuse to accept these dates.

I in any case do not believe that it is right to reject the great conjunction in the year 7 BC as the star of Bethlehem by referring to Rudolf Steiner. He himself referred, albeit somewhat vaguely, to this conjunction by mentioning that Zarathustra drew the attention of his students to that sign in the heavens. .

Before delving into this reference, I would like to mention another researcher, who with the knowledge of Rudolf Steiner's research and on the basis of the accepted historical dates of the two Gospels, comes to the conclusion that the two dates of birth are five, respectively six, years apart. This researcher, Emil Funk (f.12), does not evaluate the Matthew periscope about the three Magi. By consciously leaving it out, he simply rejects it, thereby overlooking the most essential, chronological information of the Gospel of Matthew. He says: "The famous triple conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn that is constantly brought in connection with this Jesus boy occurred in the year 7 BC. Yet I reject the view that this conjunction is identical with the Star of the Magi. There could, however, be a certain connection with the birth of the Solomon Jesus boy. A definite decision about whether the year 7 BC is right can for the time being not be made."

A researcher, who evaluates the historical tradition with knowledge acquired from Rudolph Steiner, comes to the conclusion therefore that the year 6 BC would be right for the date of birth of the Solomonian Jesus. Funk is the only researcher who, like those of the opinion C, accepts the two Nativities, but not the great conjunction as a sign for the birth of the Matthew Jesus. Yet he realizes that the equality in age of the two boys can not be upheld. He moves the birth of the Matthew Jesus so far ahead that all anachronisms between the two Gospels (which continue to exist in the assumption of age equality) disappear. But Funk ignores the Gospel of Matthew, by assuming only a supersensible, physically invisible star, although Matthew says that the Magi saw the star in the sky.

I have asked myself whether Rudolf Steiner's words about the truth of the Gospel weighed I more heavily than his words about the two twelve year old Jesus boys. I came to the conclusion I that he could justifiably be of the opinion to have solved a centuries-old question in Gospels Research, something which is but possible in the assumption that the dates of birth are sufficiently far apart. That is why I allowed myself to treat the great conjunction of the year 7BC without reservation as the Star of Bethlehem.

The objections from those adhering to opinion C, have not prompted me to change my view. Kepler's view that the Matthew Jesus was born in the year 7 BC, is not "unfounded belief". Kepler was not an unspiritual person and in any case a good astronomer. The Magi from the East can not be evaluated without the aid of astronomy. Kepler was not so far from the mark in, next to a physically visible conjunction, also looking for a physically visible new star. He was only looking in the wrong field. Rudolf Steiner was the first one to recognize that the events were in effect accompanied by a new star. He found this new star in the supersensible realm: the *reincarnated Zarathustra*. He says:

"Deep and fervent attachment to the individuality (not the personality) of Zarathustra prevailed in the Mystery-schools of Chaldea. These Wise Men of the East felt that they were intimately connected with their great leader. They saw in him the 'Star of Humanity', for 'Zoroaster (Zarathustra) means 'Gold Star', or 'Star of Splendor'. They saw in him a reflection of the Sun itself. And with their profound wisdom they could not fail to know when their Master would be born again in Bethlehem. Led by their 'Star, they brought as offerings to him the outer symbols for the most precious gift he had been able to bestow upon man. "This most precious gift was knowledge of the outer world, of the mysteries of the Cosmos received into the human astral body of thinking, feeling and veiling. Hence the pupils of Zarathustra strove to impregnate these soul-forces with the wisdom that can be drawn from the deep foundations of the divine-spiritual world. Symbols for this knowledge, which can be acquired by mastering the secrets of the outer world, were gold, frankincense and myrrh: gold - the symbol of thinking, frankincense - the symbol of piety which pervades man as feeling, and myrrh - the symbol of the power of will. Thus by appearing before their Master who was born again in Bethlehem the Magi gave evidence of their union with him. The writer of the Gospel of Matthew relates what is literally true when he describes how the Wise Men, among Zarathustra had once worked, knew that he had reappeared among men, and how they expressed their connection with him through the three symbols of gold, frankincense and myrrh - the symbols for the precious gift he had bestowed upon them.

"Zarathustra, as Jesus of the Solomon line of the House of David, now needed to work with all possible power in order to give again to men, in a rejuvenated form, everything he had already given in earlier times. For this purpose he had to gather and concentrate all the power he had ever possessed. Hence he could not be born in a body from the priestly line of the House of David, but only in one from the line of kings. In this way the Gospel of Matthew indicates the connection of the royal name in ancient Persia with the ancestry of the child in whom Zarathustra was reincarnated.

"Indications of these momentous happenings are also contained in ancient Books of Wisdom originating in the East. Whoever really understands these Books of Wisdom reads them differently than those who are ignorant of the facts and therefore confuse everything. In the Old Testament there are, for instance, two prophecies: one of the apocryphal Books of Enoch pointing more to the Nathan Messiah of the priestly line, and the other in the Psalms referring to the Messiah of the royal line. Every detail in the scriptures harmonizes with the facts that can be ascertained from the Akashic Chronicle.

"It was necessary for Zarathustra to gather all the forces he had formerly possessed. He had surrendered his astral and etheric bodies to Hermes and Moses respectively, and through them to Egyptian and Hebraic culture. It was necessary for him to re-unite with these forces, as it were to fetch back from Egypt the forces of his etheric body. A profound mystery is revealed here to us: Jesus of the Solomon line of the House of David, the reincarnated Zarathustra, was led to Egypt, for in Egypt were the forces that had streamed from his astral body and his etheric body when the former had been bestowed upon Hermes and the latter upon Moses. Because he had influenced the culture and civilization of Egypt, he had to gather to himself the forces he had once relinquished. Hence the 'Flight into Egypt' and its spiritual consequences: the absorption of all the forces he now needed in order to give again to men full strength and in rejuvenated form, what he had bestowed upon them in the past ages.

"Thus the history of the Jesus whose parents lived originally in Bethlehem is correctly related by Matthew. Luke relates only that the parents of the Jesus of whom he is writing resided in Nazareth, that they went to Bethlehem to be 'taxed' and that Jesus was born during that short period. The parents then returned to Nazareth with the child. In the Gospel of Matthew we are told that Jesus was born in Bethlehem and that he had to be taken to Egypt. It was after their return from Egypt that the parents settled in Nazareth, for the child who was the reincarnation of Zarathustra, was destined to grow up near the child who represented the other stream - the stream of Buddhism. Thus the two streams were brought together in actual reality."

This passage makes it clear that the Gospels are true, meaning also that they correspond with historical events. This presupposes, however, that the great conjunction be recognized as the Star of the Wise Men and that the theory of the equality in age of the two Jesus boys as maintained by group C, is out of the question.

Now we would like to reconstruct how Zarathustra could have his students absorb the outer secrets of the orbits of the planets in such a way that it enabled them to find their Master and present Him with gold, frankincense and myrrh upon being born again in Bethlehem.

Our starting point is the following situation:

We cannot blame Johannes Kepler for not knowing what would only be revealed 300 years later by Rudolf Steiner: He knows nothing about the two Jesus boys yet. He therefore attempts to explain the discrepancies that arise from the false assumption that Luke and Matthew are describing one and the same Nativity. So he asks himself for example: "Why did the evangelist Luke not include the date of the year of Herod's government with his description of the birth of Christ.?" He means: "It was always customary to designate the histories with the years of the reigning kings."

Yet this is exactly what both evangelists do. Matthew mentions Herod, for the latter was King of Judaea and Samaria. Bethlehem was located in this area. Luke mentions Cyrenius, the Governor of Syria. Nazareth came under the sovereignty of Cyrenius. What Kepler finds strange is just proof for the validity of Rudolf Steiner's finding that the two evangelists are describing two different Jesus boys, whose parents live in different lands. The parents of the one are subjects of Herod in Judaea, while the parents of the other live in Galilee in the province of Syria. In his dispute with the medicinal doctor Helisaeus Roslin, Kepler is constantly confusing the Luke Jesus with the Matthew Jesus, because he could not yet have known these facts. His attempts at explaining the situation are just as little convincing as a contemporary astronomer who knows nothing about the two Jesus boys yet or who places their dates of birth so close together that the advantage, which his starting point has compared to the ignorant, is lost again.

Today the time has surely come to so interpret the research of Kepler and Rudolf Steiner that it results in an explanation of the two Nativities free from contradictions.

This is what has been attempted here in the sense of opinion group D. We believe that Rudolf Steiner himself must be aligned to this group, because his references to the Christ prophecy of Zarathustra can only refer to the great conjunction in Pisces, which in more modern times was first recognized by Kepler and since then above all by the Viennese astronomer Konradin Ferrari to be that event, which was already known to Kyot-Willehalm as "The Star of the Wise Men". Willehalm chose this star to be his standard bearer. Wolfram says (Wh. 369, 13-21):

*Where the star was shining forth
with such radiance
from the banner of the Count
(Let none of you get the idea
that it was the star which -
so the story goes -
guided the Three Kings.
This star was providing
much jousting for the Saracens!)*

The aim of our excursion to this Star of the Wise Men in the context of our Grail Research was to reveal and make public the singularity of understanding concerning the meaning of this "star" from Kyot-Willehalm through Wolfram von Eschenbach and Kepler until Rudolf Steiner. This link forms the continuation of a Grail line that was already followed by Zarathustra, later by Zoroaster and Pythagoras and then by the Wise Men from the East.

That we are more than justified in placing Rudolf Steiner in this line, shall now be made further recognizable by attempting to interpret Rudolf Steiner's indications concerning a Christ prophecy by Zarathustra in just this sense.

(9-29-99; footnotes at end of next article)