

The Bible, Finland, and the Civil War of 1918

Reception History and Effective History of the Bible as Contextualized Biblical Studies

Abstract:

Reception history and the effective history of the Bible give a good paradigm to see the Bible in temporally and geographically different contexts. I discuss methodological issues of intertextuality, reception and effect. After that, I present two examples that illustrate the contextual possibilities of this paradigm. The first one is the use of the biblical *lex talionis* in the Finnish civil war of 1918. The second example is the modernist poet Edith Södergran whose apocalyptic poems interpreted the same war. I argue that reception historical and effective historical approach makes it possible for biblical scholars to participate in the social and cultural discussions in their contexts.

1 Searching for Nordic Exegesis

Is there such a paradigm or *proprium* as 'Nordic Exegesis'? This was asked in the Nordic New Testament Conference in Joensuu, Finland, June 11-15, 2010.

In a way the answer to the question is obviously "yes". The very fact that biblical scholars from the Nordic countries sat and discussed exegetical matters in Joensuu prove the existence of Nordic exegesis. The Nordic background, context, and scholarly tradition surely wield an influence on Nordic biblical studies. But at the same time one can ask whether scholars find any merit in this fact. As far as I see biblical scholars are usually doing something which does not greatly differ from biblical studies outside the Nordic countries. Scholars participate in the international discussion and write books and articles for an international audience. In other words, scholars are all the time decontextualizing their work. But can we make a reverse move, that is, contextualize our exegesis?

It is difficult to imagine contextualization in methodological matters. One can, of course, create new methodology in the Nordic countries, which reflects our background. Methodology, however, always has a general character so that it is aimed at being more than just Nordic. An emphatically Nordic character of exegesis can be found only in the object of our study. However, Second Temple Judaism, early Christianity and other familiar objects of exegetical study can hardly be thought to have a Nordic character. What is usually referred with the German word *Wirkungsgeschichte* is a more promising area for contextualized biblical studies.

The promise of *Wirkungsgeschichte* is nicely described by Ulrich Luz, professor emeritus in the University of Bern. Some fifteen years ago he published a little book entitled *Matthew in History*. Luz begins it by describing how the students feel and think about biblical studies. First, he says, they do not understand "the value of historical criticism when everything is hypothetical and almost nothing is clear." Second – and this comes closer to the idea of the contextualization of biblical studies – Luz states that the students feel that the historical-critical explanation of texts does not "really lead to understanding the texts. Quite the contrary, they separate the texts from our experience and life

instead of bringing both into helpful dialogue.” Even the distinguished professor himself confesses: “I found that many of the numerous modern historical-critical commentaries were tedious. Apart from the fact that they tend to repeat time and again the same things, I often had the impression that they did not add much to a real understanding of the texts.” Luz thinks that historical criticism has created a gap between us and the Bible.¹

Luz describes the problem of decontextualizing: what the biblical scholars are usually doing seems to have nothing to do with us. His answer was *Wirkungsgeschichte*. It is a historical fact that the Bible is read in many different times and different contexts which are farther or closer to the modern reader. The one, who is searching for “Nordic exegesis” is naturally interested in the Bible in the Nordic context – the appropriate historical period is from the coming of Christianity until today.

This article illustrates the possibility of Nordic exegesis. I will present two examples of the use and the effect of the Bible in the ideological debate on the Finnish Civil War of 1918.² The dual task – use and effect – reflect my understanding of the area which is often called *Wirkungsgeschichte*. While this German word suggests only the effect, *Wirkung*, I would like to pay attention also to the role of the reader of the Bible: she/he (mis)interprets the text and uses it as a part of her/his own agenda. This activity is usually called reception. Therefore I prefer to follow Heikki Räisänen who has distinguished the reception and the effect of the Bible.³ Consequently I call this area of biblical studies *the reception history and the effective history of the Bible*. We will take a general look at the methodology in this area of biblical studies before illustrating it with concrete examples from Finland.

2 Methodological Considerations

I propose that a reception historical and effective historical study should be done in three stages corresponding to three different analyses: (A) intertextual analysis, (B) reception historical analysis and (C) effective historical analysis. I concentrate only on texts. Music and visual arts pose questions of their own.

Intertextual Analysis

When pinpointing biblical connections in a text we, are dealing with a phenomenon that goes by the vague term “intertextuality” and I consequently refer to this stage of study as an *intertextual analysis*. Scholars have understood intertextuality to have several meanings,⁴ but roughly speaking it can be divided into two: broad and narrow meanings. The broad meaning of intertextuality covers the cases when the reader finds an interconnection regardless of what the author has done: one can associate a text with the Bible though such a connection is not indicated in the text. The broad meaning would lead us to the endless and fantastic sea of biblical connections which a trained scholar’s imagination can associate. I propose that we limit our task to the narrow meaning, in other words, to ask if the author has written a biblical connection into the text.

A biblical connection is easy to acknowledge when it is openly indicated, for example, with a clear reference to the biblical book and verse or more generally (e.g., “the Bible says that...”). The author

can also generally mention the Bible or gospel or a certain biblical name like Judas or Gethsemane. Sometimes words from the Bible are placed inside quotation marks though without further reference to the source. In this case, the author indicates that she/he is using a source but leaves for the reader the task to acknowledge it. Much more usual are the cases of biblical word usage without any reference to the source. It depends on the scholar's ability if she/he can acknowledge them. This requires knowledge of different biblical translations which the author could be using. Obviously, the connection cannot be based on a translation later than the source.

Wording is not the only way to create a connection to the Bible. Sometimes we can acknowledge biblical style – for example parallelism – without any actual biblical words being used. Another possibility is a modification of an expression where the biblical words are changed, but the origin is still possible to acknowledge. Similarly even larger themes, stories and biblical figures can be modified which is a well-known phenomenon in literature. We can mention here apocalypticism, which has had a strong impact on Western thinking, not least on Marxism as is well known.⁵ The connection between Marxism and apocalypticism is largely structural: both an apocalypticist and a Marxist awaited the new, happier era for humanity after the time of afflictions. In this case, the structural similarities are deep enough to attest that Marxism had a connection to the Bible. However, even better are concrete connections to biblical words – like the hundredfold crop (Mark 4:8,20 parr.) which illustrates the Marxist “heaven” in the march of the Finnish red guard.⁶

In sum, we can find different types of biblical connections. The following list is heuristic, but it may help to pinpoint biblical connections in the sources.

1. Open connections
 - a. full or partial citations
 - b. references (e.g. “Acts 1:1”)
 - c. references to biblical themes or stories
 - d. false citations (presented as biblical though they are not)
2. Modifications
 - a. modifications of biblical expressions
 - b. modifications of biblical themes, stories and figures
3. Names
 - a. personal names
 - b. occupational titles (e.g. “prophet”, “apostle”)
 - c. local names
4. Biblical style (e.g. parallelism)
5. The Bible or gospel as such (without further reference to biblical words)

Reception historical Analysis

In the reception historical part of the study we ask how an author of a source uses and interprets the Bible. We are not asking if she/he actually misuses or misinterprets the Bible, but rather just trying to understand how an author understands the biblical material she/he uses, and what role the the biblical material serves as a part of her/his general agenda. In a word, we are asking about the ideological significance of the Bible for an author.

First, we should note that not all biblical connections are ideologically significant. An author can make a biblical connection unintentionally, as when using expressions and proverbs without recognizing their biblical elements. In these cases the biblical connection can sometimes – if recognized as biblical – even be destructive of the ideology of the author. Such connections naturally play no part in the author’s agenda. Yet, we should not classify all unintentional connections as ideologically insignificant. An author can make good use of biblical elements without knowing their origin in the Bible.⁷ A conscious connection to the Bible is in most cases ideologically significant.

When assessed that the biblical connection has ideological significance, we should analyze its role in an author’s agenda. This is made in the widening horizons: in the (a) textual, (b) historical and (c) ideological context. The threefold analysis is a modification of Kari Syreeni’s model of three worlds.⁸

(a) *The textual context* is the whole text containing a biblical connection, but a connection should, of course, be primarily understood in its closest textual context. The main question concerns the role of a connection as a part of a text: argumentative, justifying or rhetorical, overt or nearly invisible? How decisive is it for an author’s message? Are there analogical connections, biblical or other in the same text? How is the interpretation of a biblical text presupposed by the biblical connection in its textual context?

(b) *The historical context* consists of everything that had happened up to the composing of an analyzed text. In practice, one should pay attention to the historical situation during the origin of an analyzed text. What events and other texts have influenced the analyzed text and the role of the biblical connection? Does a biblical connection mirror a particular contemporary interpretation of a biblical text?

(c) *The ideological context* consists of the main convictions of the author. It can be reconstructed with the help of the textual and the historical context. Here we can reach the main question of the reception historical analysis: what is the ideological role of a biblical connection? One connection may have many roles at the same time.

A central reason for the use of the Bible is its certain authority. One can justify or condemn things, deeds, opinions and so on by invoking the authority of the Bible. This can also happen indirectly, as when an author invokes a proverb and its proverbial authority without knowing the biblical origin. Moreover, a biblical wording or style can give an authoritative or a divine flavour for a text, but sometimes the same features just provide subtlety. The difference between these two is like drawing a line in the water.

Authority may arouse resistance. The Bible as an authoritative text can itself be the object of this resistance and the connections to the Bible are presented in order to dethrone the Book. But the Bible can give arguments to resist other authorities – sometimes with warm humor or biting irony. Besides its authority the Bible is well known enough to characterize causes of events, acts, things, persons, places etc. For example, if someone is called a Judas, the person is clearly being labeled as a traitor; if a place is called Golgotha, a judicial murder has taken place there. If a picture of dead revolutionaries is clarified with the verse “whoever takes the sword will perish by the sword” (Matt. 27:52),⁹ a certain cause of events is characterized as unavoidable. The Bible itself or gospel can be used to characterize a certain set of values. When the members of the Finnish Red Guard are labeled as “these fanatical adherents of the new gospel of barbarity”, the gospel is just a symbol for the values of the author. He sees the reds as perverting these values, turning the real Gospel over to a perverse one.¹⁰

A connection may play several of the abovementioned ideological roles. They are just examples and no exhaustive list can be created. In practice, the ideological role – if any – must be attested case by case. The following list is just a heuristic tool which helps to acknowledge different roles of biblical connections.

1. Authoritative roles
 - a. Justification or condemnation of deeds and opinions.
 - b. Authoritative or divine flavor for a text (esp. biblical style and rhetorical use)
2. Antiauthoritative roles
 - a. Resistance towards the Bible itself
 - b. Resistance towards other authority with the help of the Bible
3. Characterization
 - a. Characterization of certain causes of events as unavoidable or divine
 - b. Characterization of certain acts by comparing them with biblical ones (eg. Golgotha, Judas)
 - c. The Bible and gospel as characterizing symbols for a certain set of values
4. Subtlety of style or opinions

Effective Historical Analysis

In the effective historical part of the study we investigate the actual effect of the Bible on an author's agenda. We can also ask further: what is the impact of the Bible through an author's agenda. These questions necessitate distinguishing the biblical material from all the other in reception: does the biblical material constitute a decisive part of an author's argumentation; or is it justifying ideas which are basically other than biblical; or is the biblical material just a relatively insignificant element of an agenda which actually has nothing to do with the Bible? In the effective historical analysis we have to ascertain a meaning of a biblical text itself and compare it to the reception of the same text. Such a comparison makes visible the role of the Bible in the reception.

Here, however, we encounter here a major principal problem: what is the meaning of a text without a reader? In the reception history, one cannot but observe the fact that meanings of a text are always more or less reconstructions of readers, who are strongly influenced by their context and their understanding. Dale B. Martin puts it succinctly by saying: "Texts don't mean. People mean with texts."¹¹ This observation has derived its full weight in the reader-response-criticism.¹² According to this criticism the text always includes gaps which the reader fills and thus creates a meaningful whole. Moreover, any reader is strongly dependent on her/his context which provides the limits of interpretation. First, readers do live more or less in an interpretive tradition which steers the understanding of a text. Second, readers often apply the text in certain contexts with certain aims. The needs of the application make the readers select useful biblical materials, forget the rest and present everything in a specific light.

If we admit that there is no meaning of a text apart from a reader, how can we divide off the meaning of a text from the whole act of reading? I think we cannot unless we take the author into account. So, I propose that in an effective historical analysis "the meaning of a text" should be reconstructed with the help of the knowledge historical criticism has made available to us. I admit

that this understanding of “the meaning of a text” is not the only one possible and can be criticized. However, I claim that it is reasonable enough and functional.

First, this understanding of the effective historical analysis can be built upon a foundation of the massive work done in historical criticism, instead of undermining its undeniable merits. This creates a dialogue between the results of historical criticism and later applications of the Bible. Second, because of its dialogical character, the effective historical analysis is a bridge along which the historical criticism finds its way up to later receptions and in the best case also closer to us. Thus, there is a certain promise that the effective historical analysis brings back the hermeneutical potential of the historical criticism. The idea is close to that of Ulrich Luz as described in the beginning of this article.

The effective historical analysis proceeds in three steps. First, one should try to attest what the author wanted to say with the text. I say “try” as I am well aware of the difficulties in ascertaining such things. Still, we can operate with probabilities in the good fashion of historical criticism.¹³ Second, the probable meanings of a biblical author should be compared to the biblical connection in an analyzed text. The similarities refer to an effect of the Bible on a connection. Third, we can ask how – if at all – the Bible has influenced opinions and events through a biblical connection: how much the Bible has contributed to the course of events; did it just justify something or is there even something which cannot exist without a biblical effect?¹⁴

***Lex talionis*: the Polyphonic Interpretation of the Finnish Civil War**

The tugboat *Hurma* functioned for several decades in Lake Saimaa. It was famous for running aground on rocks unusually often. People had their own explanation for the bad luck: the boat bore a curse because it had transported rebels sentenced to be executed during the Finnish Civil War.¹⁵ The odd – not to say superstitious – explanation reflected the moral trauma which the civil war left on Finnish society.

The course of events began to unfold rapidly towards the war after the Russian Revolution in 1917. Finland had been an autonomous grand duchy of Russia since 1809, but in the middle of the revolutionary chaos it declared its full independence in December 1917. However, the power struggle had spread to Finland and it led to a socialistic revolution of the so-called “reds” in January 1918. The pro-governmental “whites” crushed the revolution in a few months. The short war in the spring of 1918 resulted in about 35,000 deaths. What was characteristic for the war is the fact that the majority of the deaths were due to executions (over 10,000) or diseases and starvation in the prisoner camps (ca. 13,000).¹⁶

Most of the deceased belonged to the revolutionary “reds,” while the “whites” were never prosecuted for what happened. This violated the vernacular morals which soon acknowledged supernatural punishments in the form of diseases, accidents and other misfortunes of the executioners. Even artefacts like the tugboat *Hurma* became objects of condemnation.¹⁷ Such morals were strongly connected to the biblical *lex talionis* which was widespread throughout the church and the judiciary for centuries.¹⁸ It is no wonder that the talio principle became one of the focal moral convictions below the surface of ideological debates after the war (and to some extent even today).

It justified, condemned, and explained what has happened. It appears in the form of several biblical dicta serving both “white” and “red” convictions.

Perhaps the most famous wording of the talio principle is “Eye for eye, tooth for tooth” (Ex. 21:24; Lev. 24:20; Deut. 19:21).¹⁹ This form of the principle was rarely used to justify anything in the Finnish debates. Seemingly the reason is Jesus’ rejection of it in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:38-42). This fact, however, did not prevent all use of the talio principle as Jesus’ rejection of “Eye for eye” does not mean a rejection of the talio principle itself. Actually Jesus maintains it in the Sermon on the Mount: “With the judgement you make you will be judged, and the measure you give will be the measure you get” (Matt. 7:2). In the Gospel of Matthew Jesus proclaims the talio principle also when arrested: “all who take the sword will perish by the sword” (Matt. 26:52). One can find the talio in Paul, too: “you reap whatever you sow” (Gal. 6:7).

The list of biblical forms of the talio principle could be continued – above are just a few of them. We will see that the different occurrences neither present a univocal understanding of the principle in the Bible nor are received univocally in the Finnish debates after the war. I classify the reception of the biblical *lex talionis* into three main types: (1) juridical, (2) deterministic, and (3) pacifistic. In the following we will see examples of every category. We will also note how growing equality and democracy influenced the understanding of the talio principle.

The traditional line of the legal justification was based on the so-called blood debt. Its biblical basis was in Num. 35:31-34: unjustly spilled blood pollutes the land and it can be expiated only by the blood of the one who has spilled the blood. This idea was also read from the story of Cain and Abel: Abel’s blood cries out from the ground and makes it cursed (Gen. 4:10-12; cf. Rev. 6:9). Blood debt motivated the state law from the 17th until the 19th century.²⁰ Yet, the idea was still alive in the beginning of the 20th century.

The blood or corpses that “cry out” became a common image and one could present numerous examples; two is enough. Carl Gustaf Emil Mannerheim, the chief commander of the white troops motivated his soldiers by promulgating that “the mutilated corpses of murdered citizens and the ruins of burnt villages cry up to heaven for retaliation against the traitors!”²¹ The “reds” could answer: “Now cries out the innocent blood of the executed” which leads to the burial of “mannerheims.”²² If the crying blood in these statements is rather a rhetorical picture than a real reference to the blood debt, the same does not hold true with Lutheran Archbishop Gustaf Johansson. He explicitly mentioned blood debt claiming in July 1918 that there was “a horrible blood debt upon the people and this fact requires an earthly expiation.” The guilty were the revolutionary “reds.” Bishop O. I. Colliander subscribed to the archbishop’s view while there were also more lenient views in the Finnish church.²³ Colliander was firmly on the path of punishments even some years after the war. He wrote against the amnesty of rebels, but now without a reference to the blood debt:

Above all, such an amnesty is directly against God’s just will and order which it tramples. For God says that whatever persons sow, they must also reap it (Gal. 6:7). God of course forgives the sins of a repenting sinner and gives eternal life, but He does not free the sinner from suffering the earthly consequences of the sin.²⁴

Now Colliander did not speak of blood debt, but he spoke of God's just will which is expressed in the form of the talio principle by Paul. As the idea of a literal blood debt was already somewhat antiquated, Colliander's invocation of God's will may echo a modernization. Professor Robert Hermanson, one of the leading Finnish jurists in those days also defended the talio principle. Despite his conservative religiosity Hermanson did not refer to the pre-modern idea of blood debt, but philosophically rationalized *lex talionis*. He presented this rationalization in the appreciated Olaus Petri guest lectures which Hermanson held in Uppsala, Sweden, in autumn 1918. The title of those lectures was "Justice and Its Link to the Religious Truths" and they were later published in Finland.²⁵

Hermanson and Colliander understood the talio principle as a principle of justice which one should follow, but which one can also fail to follow. This understanding fits with the Mosaic legislation which clearly presents *lex talionis* as a rule to be followed. This is, however, not the only way the Bible presents it. Colliander actually does not acknowledge Paul's application of talio principle in Gal. 6:7. According to Paul one cannot fail to follow the rule of sowing and the resulting crop: whatever you sow deterministically leads to a certain kind of crop.

Paul's deterministic idea was acknowledged for example by Jarl Hemmer, a Finnish Swedish-speaking poet and novelist. His poem *Det värsta (The Worst)* describes the inevitable consequence of bloodshed: hatred. Referring to Gal. 6:7 he writes that "here was sown a seeding which poisonously smarts / in a thousand grieving breasts." The poem ends with a tragic prophecy:

Så skörda, Finland, allt vad du sått
med tallösa blodigt skriande brott! –
Hur bittra blir gärningar, tankar och ord!
Den största mordet var kärlekens mord.
Nu växer blott hat på din jord.

So reap, Finland, all what you have sown
with numerous blood-crying crimes! –
How bitter become deeds, thoughts and words!
The biggest murder was the murder of love.
Now only hatred is growing on our field.²⁶

Hemmer, who had "white" sympathies, saw that the "reds" set the course of events in motion which led to reciprocal hatred. He, however, is far from justifying the "white" acts. They are counted as hatred, "poisonously" smarting in the breasts, but they are also seen as an inevitable crop. A step further is to use the same deterministic talio principle to deny the existence of hatred and even responsibility. An example of this step is presented in a picture history published by the "whites" 15 years after the war. A picture of "red" corpses in front of "white" soldiers is explained in the caption "Everyone who takes the sword will perish by the sword. – The sorrowful results of the fate prepared by the reds for themselves in Varkaus."²⁷

In the explanation of the picture Jesus' words (Matt. 26:52) are used to shift the blame onto the "reds": they have begun a deterministic process which led to their destruction. This determinism is even strengthened by a reference to their fate. Moreover, the caption says no word of the "whites" which creates an impression that the "whites" are just spectators of an ancient tragedy bemoaning "the sorrowful results of fate." This is a moral dodge as the "whites" executed "reds" in Varkaus

extremely harshly. The “reds” even exaggerated the executions and made propagandistic use of them.²⁸ The talio principle provided the possibility to shift the blame back onto the “reds.”

The moral dodge in the name of the deterministic talio principle was not only in “white” use. The “reds” had strong ideological reasons to understand the talio principle in deterministic terms as well. Allan Wallenius who belonged to the “reds” and fled to Sweden after the war, provides a good example. In Sweden he wrote bitter words of the “eye for eye” principle which he presented as alien for the “reds” but characteristic for the “whites.” The harshness of the “white” talio principle leads Wallenius to anticipate a new revolution based on – the biblical talio: “at that time the bourgeoisie will reap what they have sown.”²⁹

We may wonder how Wallenius could justify anything with the talio principle after condemning it. Wallenius, however, understood the “white” and the “red” principles differently. For him the “white” talio is nothing but a legal justification: the “whites” freely adopted a harsh procedure while the “reds” were under a necessity. Wallenius claimed that the revolutionary payback is only a deterministic consequence of the “white” terror: the “whites” will just reap what they have sown. Actually, determinism helps him to shift the blame onto the “whites” who – as Wallenius claims – had begun the violence leading deterministically to the “red” counter-violence.

Wallenius’ deterministic understanding of Paul’s words certainly reflects his Marxist ideology. Its philosophy of history was based on a development towards the great revolution. As noted earlier, this view of history owes much to apocalypticism characteristic of the New Testament. Paul’s talio principle should also be understood in apocalyptic terms. He is anticipating in a future crop as he speaks of the reaping of eternal life at harvest time (Gal. 6:8-9).

As we saw, there is certain determinism in Paul’s words, but not in Wallenius’ or Hemmer’s sense. Paul’s aim is not to say that the deeds of others compel one to similar deeds. Conversely, in Paul the talio principle emphasizes one’s own responsibility to avoid all evil. This becomes clear when Paul’s saying on sowing and reaping is read in the textual context:

God is not mocked, for you reap whatever you sow. If you sow to your own flesh, you will reap corruption from the flesh; but if you sow to the Spirit, you will reap eternal life from the Spirit. So let us not grow weary in doing what is right, for we will reap at harvest time, if we do not give up. So then, whenever we have an opportunity, let us work for the good of all, and especially for those of the family of faith. (Gal. 6:7-10)

Paul assumes that a Christian can choose between sowing to the Spirit and to the flesh.³⁰ Among “the works of the flesh” he mentions “enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions.” Paul is clearly not saying that Christians inevitably do these things if their opponents have done them first. Conversely, he warns against doing such deeds since “those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21). Thus, in reception Paul’s deterministic talio principle has changed its character.

In the pacifistic reception *lex talionis* was understood as a warning to take weapons. A belletristic presents the pacifistic interpretation of the talio principle in order to reject it. In the account below a juror is discussing with a peasant couple just before the war. Anticipating a violent outcome they ponder the need of a “white” guard:

- Fight!
- Yes, probably it happens so when all is said and done, conceded the juror.
- Whoever takes the sword will perish by the sword, said the housewife, a pious woman.
- It is so, conceded the juror, - but it is also otherwise. The one who takes the sword to oppress others may perish, but the one who takes it to defend oneself should not perish. This is how I understand this sentence in the Scripture.³¹

The housewife embodies the pacifistic interpretation of the sentence on taking up the sword. The interpretation is based on two things in the Bible. First, it puts emphasis on the general character of the sentence: all without exception will perish if they take up the sword. Second, it implies Jesus' exhortation in the immediate textual context: "Put your sword back into its place; for all who take the sword will perish by the sword" (Matt. 26:52). The exhortation addressed to one disciple is interpreted in as general a manner as the sentence on the talio principle: all should put the sword away.

The Matthean context, however, does not prefer a general interpretation. The general sentence on the talio principle does not fully fit its context as Jesus is surely not implying that 12 angel legions will perish in action. So, the Matthean Jesus does not literally mean that all who take the sword will perish by the sword. Actually Jesus' prohibition to use the sword is motivated by a situational reason, the fulfilment of the Scripture (Matt. 26:53-54): the disciple should not try to hinder what is due to come. The existence of a general talio principle in this context may be explained as the use of a fixed proverb or a modification of Isa. 50:11 in Targum.³²

The juror, however, does not reject the pacifist interpretation because of its textual context. He presents the self-defense as limiting the general character of Jesus' sentence on the talio principle. This is a bad move as a real pacifist surely knew what the Matthean Jesus said about self-defense in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:38-48). The juror, however, also has another argument at hand. His figure embodies the idea of the so-called legal authority which was based on a conventional Finnish interpretation of the state authority in Rom. 13.³³ After discussing the talio principle the juror describes all disarray in the country and sighs: "The authority has no power and thereby no way to object." The reader understands that the sword one takes is the sword of authority (Rom. 13:4). Paul was brought to rescue what Jesus seemed to question.

Actually, the housewife in the account is far from a principal pacifism. She did not question the use of the violence as such, but disapproved the taking of the sword, because it would lead to an unwanted result, destruction. Her understanding is suggestive of Matthew who accepted an eschatological talio principle,³⁴ and thus did not question the right of the talionic payback. The non-eschatological form of this thinking does approve even the earthly payback (e.g., "will perish by the sword") while disapproving the first action (e.g., "all who take the sword").

This thinking is only half-hearted pacifism. True pacifist thinking disapproves of both the first action and the payback. This is what Alex Halonen, a Finnish socialist did in his book *Suomen työväki ja väkivaltaiset menettelytavat* (The Finnish Proletariat and Violent Methods) some years after the war. The book should be to read as a response to communists who still planned a new revolution.

"Whoever sows the wind will reap the whirlwind," says biblical wisdom. Noble principles and high ideals cannot be realized through base and superficial means. No justice is forged through injustice, no love through hatred, no reconciliation and brotherhood through confrontation

and violence, and no era of humanity through tyranny and class dictatorship. The fact, that we may have suffered with injustice or have become victims of hatred, does not make them acceptable and does not give us any right to use them. *For two injustices do not create one justice and two hatreds do not create one love.* Conversely, they generate embryos of their own kind, embryos increasingly escalating. But justice generates justice and love generates love.³⁵

The Finnish Bolshevik Jukka Rahja, who emigrated to the Soviet Union after the revolution collapsed in Finland, adapted the same biblical language to prophesy a new revolutionary whirlwind.³⁶ Halonen may have had Rahja in mind when writing these lines,³⁷ but at least he thought of the communism of Rahja and his ilk as the reference to class dictatorship reveals. Hosea's dictum fits well with Halonen's idea of escalation as Hosea suggests an intensifying payback: "they sow the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind" (Hos. 8:7).

Hosea does not strictly follow the talio principle (the same for same), but this is what the law of Moses can also enact. False witnesses should be punished as they *meant* to violate others: "you shall do to the false witness just as the false witness had meant to do to the other. - - - Show no pity: life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" (Deut. 19:19-21). Even the social statuses can be taken into account. If the one killed is a slave, then the talio principle can be mitigated (Ex. 21:20-21,32). A violation against God multiplies the punishment (Num. 14:34). The higher the insulted person is ranked, the more severe the punishment (cf. Aristotle, *Ethica Nichomachea* 1132b)³⁸.

In the beginning of the 20th century, Finland was increasingly becoming a democracy with an emphasis on equal value of citizens. However, the traditional view comes up when the captain of the tugboat Hurma explained why the transported "reds" earned death: they had resisted God and authority, and "their wages is death." This explanation was connected to Rom. 6:29 and 13:1-7. The idea of "wages" implies that the captain saw death as an appropriate consequence for the crime – which did not include murder. The explanation of the severe consequence seems to be based on the aggravating effect of the status distinction: it is large between a rebel and authority, but enormous between a rebel and God. Therefore only death was punishment enough.

But people with more democratic ideas did not understand the thinking of the captain. For them God guaranteed a "life for life" principle without qualifications. They speculated that the mass executions of the "reds" were a vengeance for a mass murder of the "whites" which had superficial links to the executed "reds."³⁹ This mass murder fitted with the number of executed and fulfilled the democratic and equal requirements of the talio principle. But others thought that the captain of the tugboat had just defiled his hands with innocent blood – and as was known innocent blood cries up to heaven. When the captain later met difficulties, people said that God's punishment had caught even him.⁴⁰

The examples of the reception and the effect of the biblical talio principle is mainly connected on the level of concrete biblical verses. This is not always the case in reception historical and effective historical study. Edith Södergran's war poems exemplify how the biblical apocalypticism could be the leading structure, while the connections to biblical verses are not decisive though their high frequency.

Apocalypse of a Poet: Edith Södergran's Apocalyptic Understanding

Edith Södergran was born in 1892. Her father worked as a supervisor in a sawmill in Raivola, a village close to the eastern border of Finland. At that time Finland was an autonomous grand duchy of the Russian empire and the connections to St. Petersburg were lively in the Finnish borderlands. The cosmopolitan and multilingual atmosphere of this metropolis had a strong effect on Edith Södergran. Her native language was Swedish, but in everyday life she heard Russian and Finnish. Moreover, she went to a German school in St. Petersburg and wrote her first poems in this language, but changed to Swedish in which she received no formal tuition.

In 1907 Södergran's father died from tuberculosis. In the next year she herself received the same diagnosis, which led to several periods in sanatoria until 1913, when she denied further treatments and remained at Raivola until her death in 1923. Södergran's first collection of poems, *Dikter (Poems)*, was published in 1916. At that time she was an unknown person in the Finnish cultural life. She had no contacts to Finnish literary circles and her modernist poems won little understanding. This was her situation when the Russian revolution broke out in 1917. The revolution led to the Finnish independence in December 1917 and, then, to the aforementioned revolution in Finland in January 1918. Södergran's home in Raivola was involved in one of the last operations of the civil war.

On the morning of Tuesday, 23th April 1918 white troops appeared in Raivola after some gunshots. This was only the beginning as the reds had become entrenched in the railway station outside the village and deployed against the whites with the help of artillery and an armored train. The white artillery was stuck in mud during the march and the whites inched forward with great difficulty. In the evening, however, the whites succeeded in driving away the armored train and entered the station which was on fire. The battle was over. Rainer Stahel, the commander of the white troops, described the landscape poetically: "Eerily but at the same time beautifully grew the flames towards the sky where the moon rose and shed its gentle light over the grim battlefield."⁴¹ What happened in the moonlight Stahel left unspoken, but not Södergran. In the autumn 1918 she published a collection of poems, *Septemberlyran (The September Lyre)*, which includes a little poem *Månens hemlighet (The Moon's Secret)*.

Månen vet ... att blod skall gjas här i natt.
På kopparbanor över sjön går en visshet fram:
lik skola ligga bland alarna på en underskön strand.
Månen skall kasta sitt skönaste ljus på den sällsamma stranden.
Vinden skall gå som ett väckarehorn mellan tallarna:
Vad jorden är skön i denna ensliga stund.

The moon knows . . . that blood will be shed here tonight.
On tracks of copper over the lake a certainty goes forth:
Corpses shall lie amidst the alders on a wonderfully beautiful shore.
The moon shall cast its most beautiful light on the strange shore.
The wind shall pass like a wakening bugle call between the pines:
How beautiful is the earth in this lonely hour.⁴²

What Södergran relates can be read even from the defeated figure. There were many more deaths among the reds at the battle of Raivola though assaulters usually suffer greater defeats than the

defenders. Seemingly, the surrendered reds or some part of them were executed – a common practice in the Finnish civil war.⁴³ This kind of severe practice of stabilization continued in Finland some months after the war. Over 30,000 persons died during the war and its aftermath. Södergran did not see the course of events with pure disgust as *Månens hemlighet* demonstrates. Readers have often felt that the picture of dead corpses in a beautiful landscape is embarrassing. Scholars have spoken of aesthetized violence and asked why Södergran created such a picture.⁴⁴ The short poem itself does not give us any hints. After making a profound analysis of the poem, professor Walter Baumgartner ends by reading it together with Södergran's other war poems.⁴⁵ *Månens hemlighet* makes most sense as a part of her apocalyptic war poems. Two such poems include *Apokalypsens genius (Fragment) (The Spirit of the Apocalypse)* and *Världen badar i blod... (The World is Bathing in Blood)*. These poems highlight Södergran's apocalyptic worldview where war and violence has its place.

In the autumn of 1918 Södergran supposed that war would brake out again. This did not happen, but in the midst of war rumors she wrote *Apokalypsens genius (Fragment)*.⁴⁶ In this poem we may anticipate certain memories of the battle in Raivola and the burning station. At the same time it is clear that there are several connections with the Bible, especially with the book of Revelation. This is already clear from the title of the poem.

Människor, det häver sig i mitt bröst.
Brand, rök, lukten av bränt kött:
det är kriget.

Ur kriget är jag kommen - ur kaos uppstigen -
jag är elementen - bibliskt gångande - apokalypsen.
Över livet blickar jag mig om - det är gudomligt.
Mitt är kriget - eder tysta herres härmiljoner
vem behövde er? Djupen gapa.
Outsägliga ting ske bakom ödets förlåt.

Betvylare, bespottare,
lägggen icke edert finger på livets mystär.
Livet är gudomligt och för barn.

Sångarna voro inga harpospelare,
nej - förklädda gudar - Guds spioner.
Gamla tiders sångare - trösten eder,
gott blod har flutit i edra ådror -
ymnigaste röda krigarblod.
Sångens anda är kriget.

People, there is a heaving in my breast.
Fire, smoke, the stench of burnt flesh:
It is the war.

Out of the war have I come – risen out of chaos—
I am the elements—biblically riding—the apocalypse.
I look around across life—it is godlike.
The war is mine—your silent master's armed millions
Who needed you? The deeps gape.
Unsayable things are happening behind the veils of destiny.
Doubters, mockers,
Do not lay a finger on life's mystery.

Life is godlike and for children.

The singers were no harpists,
No—disguised gods—spies of God.
Singers of bygone times—be consoled,
Good blood has flowed in your veins—
Most abundant red blood of warriors.
The spirit of the song is the war.⁴⁷

The poem is a fragmented weft of influences from different sources, not least from biblical ones. As such it seems to make up a cryptic and ambiguous whole – like the book of the Revelation. It is clear that the last book of the Bible was very significant for Södergran,⁴⁸ though it is unclear if it influenced her fragmented style. In *Apokalypsens genius* the biblical connections are plain. The “I” of the poem is “biblically riding” and “the apocalypse.” Fire, smoke and burnt flesh are apocalyptic images (Rev. 9:18; 17:16) though they fit well with what happened in the battle of Raivola. Gaping depths are also known from the Revelation (9:2, 11; 11:7; 17:8) while the apocalyptic “I” is characterized as Yahweh who destroys through his godly sight (Ex. 14:24). This God says like Yahweh in the book of Samuel: “The war is mine” (1 Sam. 17:47).

Södergran’s use of the Bible is anything but traditional or ecclesiastic. Ebba Witt-Brattström notes that Södergran was strongly influenced by Russian messianism. During the last decades of the czarist government, the intellectuals and artists in Russia understood themselves as heralds of a new era. In this messianism several components were blended together: apocalyptic visions, Nietzschean ideas of an *Übermensch* and Russian nationalism. While Södergran did not adapt the last component – the Russian nationalism – the presence of the former components is well documented in the scholarly literature.⁴⁹ Thus, she was strongly under the influence of a world-view which was deeply rooted in apocalypticism. In this spirit Södergran understood the afflictions of the war as sorrows before the great turn. The new era is anticipated in the harmonizing end of the poem: apocalyptic chaos turns into a description of singers who are spying gods – a Homeric theme (*Od.* 17.484-487; cf. Epictetus, *Disc.* 1.24.3-10).⁵⁰ Finally, we get the song which bears war as its spirit.

How should we understand this apocalyptic vision? Is it really speaking about war as a prerequisite for the new poetry (song)? Or is war just a metaphor for the chaos which precedes everything new in arts and literature?⁵¹ The metaphorical interpretation would mean that the whole poem is not a comment on the war but rather on arts and literature. It is, however, quite unlikely that war is just a metaphor. Södergran’s apocalyptic world-view suggests more. An analysis of another poem, *Världen badar i blod...*, will show that she describes a war which is surely not a metaphor.

Världen badar i blod för att Gud måtte leva.
Att hans härlighet fortbestår, skall all annan förgås.
Vad veta vi människor hur den evige smäktar
och vad gudarna dricka för att nära sin kraft.
Gud vill skapa ånyo. Han vill omforma världen till ett klarare tecken.
Därför gjordar han sig med ett bälte av blixtrar,
därför bär han en krona av flammande taggar,
därför höljer han jorden i blindhet och natt.
Därför skådar han grymt. Hans skaparehänder krama jorden med kraft.
Vad han skapar vet ingen. Men det går som en bävan
över halvvakna sinnen. Det är som en svindel inför avgrunders blick.

Innan jublande körer brista ut i lovsång
är det tyst som i skogen förrän solen går upp.

The world is bathing in blood because God had to live.
In order that his glory may persist, all other must perish.
What do we human beings know of how the eternal languishes
and what the gods drink to feed their strength?
God wants to create anew. He wants to reform the world to a clearer sign.
Therefore he girds himself with a belt of lightnings,
therefore he bears a crown of blazing thorns,
therefore he shrouds the earth in blindness and night.
therefore his gaze is cruel. His creator's hands squeeze the earth mightily.
What it is he creates no one knows. But it moves like a dread
over half-awake senses. It is like a vertigo at the sight of abysses.
Before joyous choirs burst out into a song of praise
it is silent as in the forest before the sun rises.⁵²

The global blood bath is a clear reference to the Great War which was still going on when Södergran published this poem in the autumn of 1918. The period of afflictions just precedes the new and happy era in world history. Södergran turns out to be a good apocalyptic seer. The general idea of her cosmic poem is familiar from the Bible: God creates the world anew (Is. 43:19; 65:17; 66:22; Ps. 104:30; Rev. 21:5). There are several other themes which sound biblical: God reforms the world like a potter of Jeremiah (18:3-7), God gives a sign (e.g., John 6:30), there are joyous choirs and silence (Rev. 7:1-12; 8:1; 19:1-5). Some themes are reminiscent of plagues in Egypt: blood (Ex. 7:14-21), darkness (Ex. 10:21-23) and lightnings (Ex. 9:23-24). Similar plagues can be found also in other pericopes (e.g., Hab. 3:6,11; Rev. 6:12; 16:18).

It is, of course, impossible to prove that Södergran used this or that biblical verse. Nevertheless, one can surely acknowledge the biblical character of the poem. Södergran uses biblical and other material freely and comprises a new whole. Like John the Seer, Södergran picks up biblical themes and presents them in apocalyptic frames. She proclaims that the disasters of the war are the birth-pangs of the great turn.

This turn, however, is something very different from what early Christian apocalypticism preached. When she wrote the poems we have read, she felt a strong interest in Friedrich Nietzsche. It is well known that Nietzsche was no friend of Christianity and neither was Södergran at that time.⁵³ This can be seen in the poem *Apokalypsens genius*. The well known *locus classicus* in the Christian proclamation is Isaiah 53. The prophet speaks of God's suffering but silent (tyst) servant (53:7; cf. Acts 8:32) and this is seemingly in Södergran's mind when she asked: "your silent master's (tysta herre's) armed millions, who needed you?" The silent master is surely Christ.⁵⁴ This is attested by one of her contemporary poems, *Rosenaltaret* (*The Rose Altar*).

Jag träder ut till eder
med ett glatt budskap:
Guds rike börjar.
Icke Kristi
tynande välde.

I come out to you
with a joyous message:
the Kingdom of God is beginning.
Not Christ's

wasting empire.⁵⁵

These words make plain that Södergran expected something other than a Christian world order. According to her, Christianity was weak and fading away in contrast to the God who is strong, has a cruel gaze, and hands that squeeze hard. This fits well with Södergran's sympathy for Nietzsche. Like Nietzsche, she saw that only some strong individuals can lead the world.⁵⁶ From this point of view her God or gods are understood figuratively: they refer to exceptional individuals who are coming to transform history.⁵⁷

Is Södergran's Nietzscheanism the key to understanding the poem *Månens hemlighet*? Can we read it as an appraisal for the whites who were strong enough to prevail in the battle of Raivola? No. The whites were strong but their army did not consist of individuals and heralds of a new era. Just the contrary: the whites defended the traditional order – including the church and Lutheran Christianity. If we compare the whites and the reds, the latter were surely bringing something new and revolutionary. But Södergran was no socialist either. She saw that the prevailing society must be defended – until something new is born, something which was still unknown to her: “What it is he creates no one knows.” Södergran was pro-white just for the moment, but basically she was against both the white and the red orders.

Södergran's stance can only be understood only from the apocalyptic framework. The afflictions of the Great War, the Russian revolution and the Finnish civil war were just the birth-pangs of a totally new and different era.⁵⁸ This deterministic and global understanding of history requires more than Nietzschean individuals. God or gods denote the cosmic power which leads history deterministically to the point where the new order enters.

From this apocalyptic framework it was not interesting if the corpses on the shore were white or red – actually, Södergran says nothing of their “color” in the poem. What interests her is the bloodshed itself as it witnesses of the great turn and of a better future.⁵⁹ It is as though Jesus exhorted in Luke's version of the synoptic apocalypse: “Now when these things begin to take place, stand up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near” (Luke 21:28; trans. NRSV). It is no exaggeration to count Södergran among the apocalypticists. The Bible was a central source of her poetry which she blended together with other influences. Methodologically speaking: her reception of the Bible involves a truly biblical effect.

Contextualized Exegesis

Above, I have presented cases of the reception and the effect of the Bible in the Finnish debate on the civil war. It may be true that these cases exemplify more specifically the Finnish context than the Nordic context in general. Fortunately, this is not decisive for my argument. What is decisive is the idea of the reception and the effective history of the Bible as a contextualized exegesis. This idea can surely be applied in any context.

The reception history and the effective history of the Bible provides an expedient to overcome the gap between the objects of biblical scholarship and our context, the gap so vividly described by Ulrich Luz. In this way, biblical scholars *as biblical scholars* can participate in the social and cultural

discussions in their contexts. When this happens in the Nordic context, we have encountered the paradigm of the *proprium* of Nordic exegesis.

Niko Huttunen, Docent
P.O. Box 4 (Berggatan 6 A 13)
00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
niko.huttunen@helsinki.fi

¹ Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew in History: Interpretation, Influence and Effects*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 1-4. His complaints must be read as exaggerations. Later in the book (pp. 85-89) he presents the merits of historical criticism.

² The examples are taken from my study *Raamatullinen sota. Raamatun käyttö ja vaikutus vuoden 1918 sisällissodan tulkinnoissa* (Biblical War: The Use and Effect of the Bible in the Interpretations of the Civil War of 1918) (Historiallisia tutkimuksia 255. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 2010). The translations of the Finnish and Swedish texts are my own unless otherwise indicated.

³ Räisänen, Heikki, *Challenges to Biblical Interpretation. Collected Essays 1991-2000*. (Biblical Interpretation Series 59. Leiden: Brill, 2001), 269-270.

⁴ See, e.g., Aichele G. & Phillips G. A., "Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995).

⁵ For Marxism see, e.g., Økland, Jorunn, "The Spectre Revealed and Made Manifest: The Book of Revelation in the Writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels." (in: *The Way the World Ends. The Apocalypse of John in Culture and Ideology*. Eds. Willam John Lyons and Jorunn Økland. The Bible in the Modern World 19. Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009).

⁶ The last stanza begins: "As we sow/ once comes into ear /hundredfold brighter new era of happiness." (Finnish original: "Kylvömme kun tehdään / kasvaa kerran tähkään / sadoin verroin kirkkaamana onnen aika uus.)

⁷ A good example is the Finnish word "esivalta" (state authority) which is originally a translation for the Greek *exousia* (e.g., Rom. 13). "Esivalta" is an acceptable word in the standard language despite its somewhat archaic and elevated character. The word is associated with obedience and obeisance to police, officials, the state law etc. – things that clearly originate to Paul (Rom 13). As far as I can see, the Swedish "överhet" and German "Obrigkeit" bear similar associations.

⁸ Syreeni, Kari, "Wonderlands: A Beginner's Guide to Three Worlds." *SEÅ* 64 (1999).

⁹ *Suomen vapaussota kuvissa I* (Ed. by L. Malmberg & al. Helsinki: Otava, 1934), 272-273.

¹⁰ Von der Goltz *Meine Sendung in Finnland und im Baltikum* (Leipzig: Koehler 1920), 69. My trans. German original: "Diese fanatischen Anhänger des neuen Evangeliums der Unkultur." It may be noted that the use of "gospel" highlights the author's ambivalence towards religion. From one point of view there is the real gospel with which the author associates his values in contrast to "the new gospel of brutality". But from another point of view he sees gospel as an apt counterpart to that ideology – thus admitting their relative similarity.

¹¹ Martin, Dale B., *Sex and the Single Savior. Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 1.

¹² E.g., McKnight, Edgar V., "Reader-Response Criticism." (in: *To Each Its Own Meaning. An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Ed. by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1993).

¹³ Cf. Räisänen *Challenges*, 271 n. 30: "of course, it would be quite hopeless to try to pinpoint the one 'original' meaning of any text. But I think it is legitimate to speak of the range of possible original meanings which still excludes a number of interpretations as implausible."

¹⁴ Cf. Räisänen *Challenges*, 271.

¹⁵ Pakkanen, Esko, *Hurma ja Kaukaan muut höyrylaivat* (Vantaa: Suomen höyrypursiseura 1995), 237.

¹⁶ The Finnish government set up a research project in 1998 to discover the total number of war deaths during the unstable period 1914-1922. The project led to several publications. The essential results are published in a statistical report *Sotaoloissa vuosina 1914-22 surmansa saaneet. Tilastoraportti* (2004). For the the civil war in 1918, see Westerlund's article in the report. The involvement of the Nordic countries with the war is discussed in *Norden och krigen i Finland och Baltikum 1918-19* (2004), a publication of the same research project which is also published on the internet by the Office of the Council of State (Valtioneuvoston kanslia / Statsrådets kansli).

-
- ¹⁷ Peltonen, Ulla-Maija, *Punakapinan muistot. Tutkimus työväen muistelukerronnan muotoutumisesta vuoden 1918 jälkeen* (Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 657. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 1996), 204-242.
- ¹⁸ Virtanen, Leea, *Suomalainen kansanperinne* (Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 471. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 1988), 234-237.
- ¹⁹ All the biblical translations are from the New Revised Standard Version unless otherwise indicated.
- ²⁰ Koskivirta, Anu, "Sisäinen vihollinen." *Henkirikos ja kontrolli Pohjois-Savossa ja Karjalassa Ruotsin vallan ajan viimeisinä vuosikymmeninä* (Yliopistopaino: Helsinki.2001), 54, 98-100, 327, 332; Ylikangas, Heikki, "Raamattu ja oikeus." (in: *Raamattu ja länsimainen kulttuuri. STKS:n symposiumissa marraskuussa 2002 pidetyt esitelmät*. Ed. by Lassi Larjo. Suomalaisen teologisen kirjallisuuseuran julkaisuja 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen teologinen kirjallisuusseura, 2003), 66-68.
- ²¹ Ignatius, Hannes, *Gustaf Mannerheim. Luonnekuva, puheet, sähkösanomat vapaustaistelun ajoilta* (Helsinki: Otava, 1918), 40.
- ²² Henkipatto, *Punaiset ja valkoiset. Kuvaus Suomen luokkasodasta* (Stockholm: Frams förlag, 1919), 70-71.
- ²³ Toiviainen, Kalevi, *Muurinvartija. O. I. Colliander Kuopion ja Savonlinnan hiippakuntien piispana 1897-1924* (Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 194. Helsinki: Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura, 2005), 238-239.
- ²⁴ Colliander, O. Immanuel, *Nykyinen murrosaika pyhän Raamatun ilmoittaman jumalanvaltakunnan historian valossa* (Savonlinna: Etelä-Savon kirjapaino osakeyhtiö, 1922), 86.
- ²⁵ Hermanson, Robert, *Det rätta och dess samband med religiösa sanningar. Olaus Petri –föreläsningar Hållna vid Uppsala Universitet*. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1919; in Finnish 1921). Two years after Hermanson, Albert Schweitzer held the Olaus Petri lectures.
- ²⁶ Hemmer, Jarl, *Ett land i kamp. Tio dikter* (Helsingfors: Söderström & C:o., 1918), 24-25.
- ²⁷ *Suomen vapaussota kuvissa I*, 272-273.
- ²⁸ E.g., Itkonen, Hannu, *Varkautelaisten vuosisata* (Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 944. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 2004), 126-131.
- ²⁹ Wallenius, Allan, *Röda brott och vita. En parallell* (Stockholm: Frams.1918), 28, 33, 37.
- ³⁰ For the Spirit and Flesh, see, e.g., Barclay *Obeying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 178-215.
- ³¹ Karimo, Aarno, *Karjalan nousu 1918* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1937), 13.
- ³² Nolland, John, *The Gospel of Matthew. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGNT. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 1113; Kosmala, Hans, "Matthew xxvi 52 – A Quotation from the Targum", *NovT* 4 (1960), 3-4; Chilton, Bruce, **Virhe. Vain pääasiakirja.** *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible. Jesus' Own Interpretation of Isaiah* (London: SPCK 1984), 98-101. We can also see the general talio principle as a condemnation for the arresting crowd who have swords and clubs (Matt. 26:47, 55). Through the crowd the condemnation could be addressed to the whole of Israel what Matthew implies in his gospel. Cf. the talionic self-condemnation in Matt. 27:25: "His blood be on us and on our children!"
- ³³ Huttunen, *Raamatullinen sota*, 89-124.
- ³⁴ This is rightly noted by Ernst Käsemann in the article "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie" (*ZThK* 57 [1960]) which became famous on the claim that apocalypticism is the mother of all Christian theology (p. 180). Käsemann repeatedly speaks of an eschatological jus talionis (pp. 166, 170-171, 173-174, 176, 180, 182, 184) in Matthew.
- ³⁵ Halonen, Alex, *Suomen työväki ja väkivaltaiset menettelytavat* (Helsinki: Otava 1923), 94-95.
- ³⁶ *Suomen työväen vallankumous 1918. Arviota ja itsekritiikkiä* (Leningrad: Kirja, 1928), 145.
- ³⁷ Rahja's speech was published in 1928 in the book mentioned in the footnote above. Rahja, however, died already in 1920 and so his speech actually preceded Halonen's book published in 1923.
- ³⁸ Aristotle, **Virhe. Vain pääasiakirja.** *Ethica Nicomachea*. Recognovit berevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. Bywater. SCBO. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1949.
- ³⁹ Tikka, Marko & Arponen, Antti, *Koston kevät. Lappeenrannan teloitukset 1918* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1999), 264.
- ⁴⁰ Valtakari, Aura, *Kansanomainen laivanrakennus Lappeella, Lappeenrannassa ja Taipalsaarella v. 1888-1950*. (Jyväskylän yliopisto, Etnologian laitos, tutkimuksia 13. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 1980), 24.
- ⁴¹ Stahel "Raivolana valtaus 23.4. 1918." (in: *Suomen kohtaloa ratkaistaessa. Kokoelma muistelmia vapaussodasta*. Ed. by Hannes Ignatius & Heikki Nurmio & Kaarle Soikkeli. Helsinki: Otava, 1927), 163. My translation.

-
- ⁴² Södergran, Edith, *Samlade dikter* (Ed. by G. Tideström. Helsingfors: Holger Schildts Förlag, 1949). Trans. David McDuff in Edith Södergran, *Complete Poems*. Newcastle: Bloodaxe Books, 1984.
- ⁴³ Roselius, Aapo & Tikka, Marko, "Taisteluiden jälkeen välittömästi paikalla ammutut." (in: *Sotaoloissa vuosina 1914–22 surmansa saaneet. Tilastoraportti*. Ed. by Lars Westerlund. Valtioneuvoston kanslian julkaisusarja 10/2004. Helsinki, 2004).
- ⁴⁴ For discussion, see Hackman, Boel, *Jag kan sjunga hur jag vill. Tankevärld och konstsyn i Edith Södergrans diktning* (Helsingfors: Söderströms, 2000), 175-178.
- ⁴⁵ Baumgartner, Walter, "Das Geheimnis des Mondes – oder des Windes? Ein Gedicht von Edith Södergran." *Skandinavistik. Zeitschrift für Sprache, Literatur und Kultur der nordischen Länder* 27 (1997).
- ⁴⁶ Tideström, Gunnar, *Edith Södergran* (Helsingfors: Holger Schildts förlag, 1960), 141-143.
- ⁴⁷ Södergran, *Samlade dikter*. Trans. McDuff in *Complete Poems*.
- ⁴⁸ Hedberg, Johan, *Eros skapar världen ny. Apokalyps och pånyttfödelse i Edith Södergrans lyrik* (Göteborg: Daidalos 1991).
- ⁴⁹ Witt-Brattström, Ebba, *Ediths jag. Edith Södergran och modernismens födelse* (Stockholm: Norstedts 1997), 69-79.
- ⁵⁰ Homer, *Odyssea*. Recognovit H. van Thiel. Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1991; Epictetus, *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The manual, and Fragments with an English Translation* by W.A. Oldfather in *Two Volumes I: Discourses, Book I and II*. LCL. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1985-1995.
- ⁵¹ Haux, Caroline, "Estetisk våld. Edith Södergran, offret och den konstnärliga utsagan." (in: *Speglingar. Svensk 1900-talslitteratur i möte med biblisk tradition*. Ed. by Stefan Klint & Kari Syreeni. Skellefteå: Norma, 2001), 40.
- ⁵² Södergran, *Samlade dikter*. Trans. McDuff in *Complete Poems*.
- ⁵³ Södergran's interest in Nietzsche is discussed in every study on the poet. Especially Olof Enckell (*Esteticism och nietzscheanism i Edith Södergrans lyrik. Studier i finlandsvensk modernism 1*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland. Helsingfors, 1949) is concentrated on her "nietzscheanism".
- ⁵⁴ Haapala, Vesa, *Kaipaus ja kielto. Edith Södergranin Dikter-kokoelman poetiikkaa* (Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 1012. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura: Helsinki, 2005), 290.
- ⁵⁵ Södergran, *Samlade dikter*. Trans. McDuff in *Complete Poems*.
- ⁵⁶ For Södergran's view of *Übermensch*, see Haapala, *Kaipaus ja kielto*, 274-277.
- ⁵⁷ Haapala, *Kaipaus ja kielto*, 312-318.
- ⁵⁸ Tideström, *Edith Södergran*, 141-142; Haapala, *Kaipaus ja kielto*, 264.
- ⁵⁹ Baumgartner, "Geheimnis", 12.