incumbency. Everybody enjoyed the joke, and Mr. Moore exercised a wise discretion by staying away.

The Archbishop died at Lambeth, January 18, 1805, and is buried in Lambeth Church. There are two portraits of him at Lambeth; that by Romney in the guardroom shows him as a remarkably handsome man. In the smaller dining-room beside the long corridor is another, full length, but in profile. And tradition has it that this was so painted because in later years the Archbishop had a large wen growing on his face, to his disfigurement, and therefore that side of it is turned away from the spectator.

W. BENHAM.

ART. IV.—JESUS CHRIST'S USE OF THE TITLE "THE SON OF MAN."

OUR Lord's self-description as "the Son of Man" has been spoken of as "a riddle which has come down to our own day."[1] This may, perhaps, need some measure of qualification if it is to escape criticism on the score of overstatement; but it is, at any rate, the case that the title, as we meet with it in the Gospels, has been felt to be not free from serious difficulty. If we found it there alone, it would indeed surrender itself to more or less easy and satisfactory explanation; but the source of the perplexity, of course, is that we do find it elsewhere, and that we are at a loss to determine the real relationship between its employment outside the Gospels with the application that it receives in their pages. Was it, as Jesus Christ made use of it, "a new title"? Did it, as Godet[2] says, "spring spontaneously from the depths of Jesus' own consciousness"? Or did our Lord directly borrow it from the literature of a preceding generation? If He did, what was the new colouring that He gave to it? Was it recognised in His day as a Messianic phrase? Did He adopt it because it was admittedly Messianic in its character?

Such questions suggest themselves at once to every careful reader of the New Testament; but directly he turns to critical books or commentaries for assistance, he finds them mutually contradictory. If he opens Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures, he sees the phrase dealt with as conveying a clear claim to be the Messiah: "It was in itself, to Jewish ears, a clear assertion of Messiahship. . . . As habitually used by our Lord, it

[1] Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology," English translation, i., 60.
[2] On Luke v. 24.

was a constant setting forth of His Messianic dignity in the face of the people of Israel. . . . For the disciples, the term 'Son of Man' implied first of all the Messiahship of their Master."[1] But if He examines Bishop Westcott's famous commentary on St. John, he finds such a view flatly contradicted: "There is nothing to show that the title was understood to be a title of Messiah."[2] But if the student turns to Edersheim—a well-known and highly-credited authority in Jewish matters—he has a guide in agreement with Canon Liddon. The phrase is again treated as a "well-understood" reference to the Messiah.[3] So, too, Mr. Ottley, in his work on the Incarnation, declares that "the title 'Son of Man' had already acquired what may be called an official sense. It had come to be used as a title of Messiah, with special reference to its use in the Book of Daniel."[4] On the other hand, Dr. Martineau agrees (in part, at any rate) with Bishop Westcott. He does, indeed, think that, "for the Evangelists themselves [the expression] had settled into its Messianic sense"; but he denies that it was in this sense that Jesus Christ Himself adopted and used it: "If, then, Jesus occasionally spoke of Himself as 'the Son of Man,' it by no means implied any Messianic claim. It might, on the contrary, be intended to emphasize the very features of His life and love which are least congenial with the national ideal."[5]

If the average reader turns from these most divergent interpretations to a consideration of the matter for himself, the argument that will at first make most impression upon him will probably be that of Bishop Westcott: "It is inconceivable that the Lord should have adopted a title which was popularly held to be synonymous with that of Messiah, while He carefully avoided that of Messiah itself"; and, acquiescing in this argument, he will go on to accept, on the Bishop's authority, the further contention that there is linguistic distinction traceable between the phrase in the Gospels and the supposed parallels to it elsewhere. But should he find leisure to pursue the matter further, and to read for himself the Book of Enoch, this confidence is like to receive a very rude shock. He then discovers that the distinction, upon the accuracy of which he had relied, cannot apparently be maintained. And if he consults Professor Charles—the latest English editor of Enoch—he finds him correcting the Bishop of Durham with much the same sort of confidence as a tutor might correct the exercise of an undergraduate: "Dr. Westcott asserts that the title in Enoch is 'A Son of

[1] Lecture 1. [2] P. 31. [3] "Life and Times," i. 505, note.
[4] Vol. i., p. 72. [5] "Seat of Authority," 3rd edit., pp. 336, 339.

Man'; but wrongly, for it is as definitely 'The Son of Man' as the language and sense can make it. The being so named, further, is superhuman, and not merely human, as Dr. Westcott states."[1] Under the pressure of the very justifiable perplexity that his discovery causes him, the student's next impulse is to take refuge in the post-Christian date of these parts of the Apocalyse in question. But here once more he finds it very difficult to obtain any repose for his weary feet. He is told that, though there are indeed excellent scholars who will support him in such a contention, the majority are against him; and if he goes for himself into the merits of the discussion, he will quickly feel the force of what Dr. Sanday says: "No sooner is such a view seriously entertained than the difficulties begin to accumulate."[2] He will, therefore, have to retrace his steps, only to find that now, when he reads the Gospels, there is a strong sense of confusion and incomprehensibility often with him: for to understand the Scriptural narrative we need to postulate a continuous and deep-seated reserve attaching almost throughout to the self-revelation of our Lord, and abandoned wholly only at the absolute end of His ministry, except so far as some isolated individual need might be concerned. For example, Canon Liddon's interpretation of Matt. xvi. 13 deprives the question, not indeed of all force, but, at any rate, of the vigour of meaning which otherwise attaches to it, and renders it difficult, or even impossible, to understand the magnitude of the reward promised to St. Peter. To Canon Liddon "the point" of the question was this: "What is He besides being the 'Son of Man'? As the Son of Man He *is* Messiah; but what is the Personality which sustains the Messianic office?" In other words, St. Peter's glory was not that he saw in the lowly ministry of our Lord the fulfilment of the hopes of centuries, but that, having been told plainly that Jesus was the Messiah, he solved with success the problem of the theological significance of what he had learnt. In the same way, to take another illustration, Professor Charles's interpretation of John xii. 34, though by no means impossible or even far-fetched, seems to deprive the passage of its simpler and more natural meaning. "It is," he writes, "just the strangeness of this *new* conception of this current phrase of a Messiah who was to suffer death that makes the people ask, 'Who is this Son of Man?' We have heard of the law that the Christ abideth for ever."[3] But most readers of the verse will feel that the puzzle was in the phrase itself, and not in

[1] P. 18.
[2] *Expositor*, vol. iv., series 3, "The Son of Man." [3] P. 317.

the particular adaptation of it. In other words, the emphasis falls on the expression "Son of Man," and not on the word "this." Neither, however, of these difficulties would, perhaps, be fatal by itself. We could—if these two passages stood alone in their seeming opposition to the plainness of the Messianic character of the phrase, as it comes before us in the Gospels—bring ourselves to accept, it may be, Canon Liddon's reading of the question in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, a reading exactly identical with that of Lightfoot in "Horæ Hebraicæ," and Professor Charles's accentuation in John xii. 34; but they do not stand alone. The feeling of semi-unintelligibility, which comes from this conclusion as to the meaning of the expression, may be said to extend to the Gospels as a whole. And the student, when he reaches this stage, simply feels that he has been harried into something like a quagmire, and that his footing is no longer on any solid path to which he can trust to lead him through the various parts of the Evangelists' narratives in which this title occurs.

I propose in this paper to add one more to the many contributions which have already been made to the matter of this riddle, and to endeavour to ascertain whether "the conclusion of the whole matter" really is one of more or less darkness and confusion, or whether it is not possible so to arrange all the known or conjectured facts in such a way as to produce an orderly scheme of doctrinal development, and to bring clearness and good sense into the Scriptural records of our Lord's use of the term.

The real fountain-head of the phrase is almost undoubtedly Dan. vii. 13. Godet does indeed suggest that we must go behind this, and not content ourselves with tracing the allusion back to this Apocalyptic passage, and he suggests that its real origin is to be found in Gen. iii. 15. But it is very difficult to find any solidity of connection, and we may be content to commence our investigation with the vision in Daniel. Not that we have there the full phrase of the Gospels, as Bishop Westcott points out, and as a reference to the Revised Version will also show. The revelation is of One like unto *a* son of man. "The thought on which the seer dwells is simply that of the human appearance of the being presented to him." But there, at least, in the middle of the second century before Christ, in a work dating, as modern scholarship has proved beyond all reasonable doubt, from the Maccabean era, and emanating, as the presence in the book of the doctrine of immortality clearly shows, from the first beginnings of the school of the Pharisees—there we do have the real, unmistakable origin of this title.

The important change of the indefinite article into the definite—the change which was to give the phrase linguistic finality and completion—probably came, roughly speaking, within the next hundred years. It is in the Similitudes, or Allegories, of the Book of Enoch—*i.e.*, in chapters xxxvii. to lxxi.—that we meet with it, in all likelihood, for the first time. The passages in which we find it are familiar enough, but it may nevertheless be well to quote parts of the more important references. I give them in Professor Charles's translation.

Chap. xlvi. 1 to 6: "And there I saw One who had a head of days, and His head was white like wool, and with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me, This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty ones from their couches and the strong from their thrones, and will loosen the reins of the strong and grind to powder the teeth of the sinners. And he will put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms because they do not extol and praise him, nor thankfully acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them. And he will put down the countenance of the strong and shame will cover them: darkness will be their dwelling and worms their bed, and they will have no hope of rising from their beds, because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits."

Chap. xlviii. 1 to 6: "And in that place I saw a fountain of righteousness which was inexhaustible: around it were many fountains of wisdom, and all the thirsty drank of them and were filled with wisdom, and had their dwellings with the righteous and holy and elect. And at that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits and his name before the Head of Days. And before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits. He will be a staff to the righteous on which they will support themselves and not fall, and he will be the light of the Gentiles, and the hope of those who are troubled of heart. All who dwell on earth will fall down and bow the knee before him and will

bless and laud and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits. And for this reason has he been chosen and hidden before Him before the creation of the world and for evermore."

Chap. lxii. 8 to 14: And the congregation of the holy and elect will be sown, and all the elect will stand before him on that day. And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth will fall down on their faces before him, and worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man, and will petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands. Nevertheless, that Lord of Spirits will (so) press them that they will hastily go forth from His presence, and their faces will be filled with shame, and darkness will be piled upon their faces. And the angels of punishment will take them in charge to execute vengeance on them, because they have oppressed His children and His elect. And they will be a spectacle for the righteous and for His elect: they will rejoice over them because the wrath of the Lord of Spirits resteth upon them, and His sword is drunk with their blood [lit. "from them."] And the righteous and the elect will be saved on that day, and will never again from thenceforth see the face of the sinners and unrighteous. And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up for ever and ever."

Chap. lxix. 26 to end: "And there was great joy amongst them, and they blessed and glorified and extolled because the name of the Son of Man was revealed unto them: and he sat on the throne of his glory, and the sum of judgment was committed unto him, the Son of Man, and he caused the sinners and those who have led the world astray to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth. With chains shall they be bound, and in their assemblage-place of destruction shall they be imprisoned, and all their works vanish from the face of the earth. And from henceforth there will be nothing that is corruptible; for the Son of Man has appeared and sits on the throne of his glory, and all evil will pass away before his face and depart; but the word of the Son of Man will be strong before the Lord of Spirits. This is the third Similitude of Enoch."

The date of these celebrated passages is the first of the problems that offers itself for solution in connection with our subject. If, indeed, they are post-Christian, or if they are pre-Christian in substance, but owe the fulness of their present shape to later interpolations, then it is obvious that their use of the title under discussion has no bearing upon our Lord's employment of it as His favourite mode of self-designation. On the contrary, it was He who indirectly gave this great patch of interest and brilliancy to a Jewish apoca-

lyptic work; and, as I have said, there are scholars who adopt this view. Drummond does so in his Jewish Messiah; so, too, does Kuenen.[1] Stanton is quoted by Charles as of a similar opinion. Hausrath also "thinks that the Messiah-passages may have won somewhat of a Christian colouring in the process of translation from Hebrew to Greek and Greek to Ethiopic by Christian hands."[2] Professor Charles, however, is of a totally different mind: "All evidence internal and external will, as we shall see presently, prove not only that they are Jewish, but also pre-Christian."[3] Schürer takes the same sort of line, though his date for them is much nearer the time of Christ than Professor Charles's. The latter assigns them either to the years 94 to 79 B.C. or 70 to 64 B.C., and he prefers the earlier of the two periods. Schürer, however, fixes the reign of Herod the Great as the "terminus a quo," and the fall of Jerusalem as the opposite limit.[4] And Professor Sanday, to judge from his article in the *Expositor* to which allusion has already been made, is quite willing to acquiesce in this verdict. Anyhow, we have it on his authority that the majority of the scholastic world prefer a date before the Incarnation to one which admits of the introduction into the book of existing Christian phraseology. And if we turn from a balancing of names to a counter-weighing of arguments, there are more than one consideration which make a great impression upon us. There is, in the Similitudes, no allusion to the destruction of the sacred city by Titus. But, apart from this, there is no mention of the earlier interference and domination of Rome in the very place where we should expect to find it, if the power of Rome, at the time of writing, was either an existing tyranny or a formidable element of danger on the horizon. Rome is not referred to either openly or apocalyptically. It is from the wild hordes of the Parthians and Medes that Jerusalem needs

[1] "History of Israel," iii. 265.

[2] Professor Charles thus states Hausrath's views (p. 17). As he quotes from the third German edition, and the English translation is made from the second, the discrepancy which the reader of the English version will notice may be explained by supposing that the author modified his opinions in the interval. But in the English translation Hausrath does not—so, at least, I understand him—place the Similitudes "in the reign of Herod the Great," but "forty years before the first appearance of the Romans in Palestine," and I can find no mention of later Christian handling. Bishop Westcott's statement in "Dict. of Bible" (new edition of vol. i.), that Schürer thinks these portions of the book to be "of Christian origin," I can only understand by supposing a misprint of "Christian" for pre-Christian.

[3] P. 16.

[4] "Hist. of Jewish People," E.T., Div. II., vol. iii., 67, 68.

deliverance, not from the iron legions of Italy.[1] But there is an argument of a wider and more general character, and at the same time of more searching efficacy than either of these. If the passages under discussion date, whether in their origin or in their present form, from such a part of the Christian era as will give time for the pressure of Christian influence, they are either the outcome of genuinely Jewish feeling, which sought to rescue the phrase "Son of Man" from Christian keeping, and to turn it to account for Israelitish purposes as well, or they are the product of Christian piety working on a Jewish original. They cannot, however, be the first. No Jew would have ventured to introduce into any apocalyptic book a term rendered for ever odious to his countrymen's ears by its association with the crucified Jesus. It would have been an outrage which would have condemned the work from the very first. The tide of prejudice and hatred was running far too strong for any such endeavour to be within the bounds of feasibility, and, so far as I know, it is not contended by anyone who has a right to a hearing that it is in such an explanation that we may look for the truth. If there is Christian influence at all, it is Christian influence coming directly on to the product of a Jewish brain with the intention of Christianizing it. If the lineaments were altered in any way, it was from strictly Jewish to Jewish-Christian. But if such an alteration were made at all, why was it not carried out with much greater fulness? How is it that the Christian hand did not do its work far more decisively? Why is not the impress sharp and distinct?[2] We need, if we are to suppose Christian influence, allusions, however veiled, to that which was the great stumbling-block to Jewish minds. We need the familiar doctrines of the Christian faith vindicated at least by implication. But there is no shadow of any such attempt at vindication in the Similitudes. We do indeed find in them doctrines which the inspiration of the Church was to adjudge worthy of permanence, which were to be worked into the Christian interpretation of the Lord's person, which, for that matter, our Lord was Himself to take

[1] *Vide* chap. lvi. and Charles's note. Schürer thinks that this passage supposes the Parthian invasion of 40 to 38 B.C. to have already taken place, and he brings the date of the Similitudes lower down in consequence.

[2] Schürer has put the point with clearness: "An anonymous Christian author would scarcely have been so reserved as to avoid making any allusion to the historical personality of Jesus. Surely, if the writer had any object in view at all, it would be to win converts to the faith. But could he hope to accomplish this object if he always spoke merely of the coming of the Messiah in glory, merely of the Chosen One as the Judge of the world, without making the slightest reference to the fact that, in the first place, He would have to appear in the estate of humiliation?"

up and weave into the wondrous web of His self-understanding and self-revelation. We do find there divinity, pre-existence with God, exaltation as Judge of the world; but we do *not* find self-abasement, self-oblation, self-sacrifice. We do not find the glory of the Incarnation, and of the ministry, and, above all, of the Cross. And, as we do not find them, it is most difficult to suppose that there has been Christian handling. We can scarcely, in the presence of such immense lacunæ, claim for these "allegories" a genuinely post-Christian date.

But if we once bring ourselves to concur in a distinctively Jewish source for these chapters, it does not much matter for our present purpose whether we date them early or late in the first century B.C. It would, it is true, suit the argument of this essay better to place them, with Schürer, in the reign of Herod the Great, rather than with Professor Charles, fifty to seventy years before; and there is no such trace in the New Testament of the influence of this section of Enoch as would necessarily forbid our doing so.[1] I need not, however, dwell upon this minor question, for, whichever way we decide to answer it, the bearing of our decision upon this discussion will not be very serious. The really momentous thing is the complete pre-Christianity of this use in Enoch of the expression which the affection and reverence of more than eighteen centuries connect so closely with Jesus Christ.

---

[1] The only possible exception (so far as I am aware) is Luke i. 52: "He hath put down princes from their thrones;" *cf.* Enoch xlvi. 5: "He will put down the kings from their thrones." This, of course, opens up the question of the date of the *Magnificat*, with regard to which there seems to me to be very strong reason for supposing it to be, more or less, as given by St. Luke, since it bears no signs of the discipline of the crucifixion. But if we attribute it to Mary, this one reflection in it of Enoch—if it be a reflection, and not a coincidence—may be explained by recollecting her connection, through her kinswoman Elisabeth, with a priestly family, which was apparently (Luke i. 6) in sympathy with the Pharisees. The Book of Enoch is, of course, mentioned in Jude 14, where it is quoted practically as Scripture; but the quotation is from a section of Enoch different to that under discussion, and unquestionably earlier. It does not follow from this reference that the author knew the Similitudes, though it would not affect the argument if it could be shown that he did; for that the educated world knew them is part of the main contention of this essay.

(*To be continued.*)