RECENT STUDY OF THE TERM 'SON OF MAN'

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THERE are certain problems connected with the term 'son of man' that have not yet been solved in such a manner as to set at rest all reasonable doubt. It is still possible, for instance, to question whether any passage in which Jesus has been supposed to use the phrase בר נשא in its ordinary generic sense is genuine. It is pertinent to inquire whether *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* may not have originated in a mistranslation of בר נשא used in this sense in some Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse. And it is proper to consider whether the term in some form many not have been derived from speculations, of Jewish or pagan origin, concerning the second, the last, or the heavenly Man. But the investigations of the last thirty years have not been in vain. They have affected the methods of research; the questions involved are to-day approached in a new way. They have established some facts, such as these: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is a translation of בר נשא, and בר נשא was not a current messianic title. Critical judgment is unmistakably gravitating toward the position that, in the gospels, the Greek term, as understood by the evangelists, is likely to have its earlier home in the eschatological series.

If, nevertheless, there is on many points no consensus of opinion, this is not strange in view of the far-reaching implications and the increasingly rigorous demands of scientific exegesis. The former make caution commendable however attractive a theory may be; the latter enhance the difficulties of the task. Aside from the philological equipment, extensive

acquaintance with the relevant literature, and insight into the peculiarities of the various Semitic dialects, there are numerous other requirements which have been justly urged. Textual criticism must be allowed to adhere to its own canons. When primary and secondary strata of tradition are separated, the accretions must be accounted for. A philological observation may furnish a significant clue, but it must be followed through all the literary data, with due regard for the necessary criticism of sources and the main theories propounded in this field. Historical methods must be applied in the sifting of the material and the search for ascertainable facts.

In his valuable contribution to this subject in the Symposium on Eschatology,[1] Bacon mentions at the outset the "distinct relief to students accustomed to think of meekness and lowliness as typical traits in the personal character of Jesus in the authoritative declaration of eminent philologians that the self-designation 'the Son of Man' would be unintelligible in the Palestinian Aramaic of Jesus' time, so that the title with all its connotation of superhuman authority and dignity must be ascribed to the period after the development of the resurrection faith." He then proceeds to give his reasons for not accepting this relief, but preferring a different solution; thus revealing at the same time the scholar's hospitality to new points of view and his sense of duty to test each noteworthy hypothesis in the light of the facts and the apparently assured results of long continued nvestigations.

Since the discussion of the phrase by so distinguished an Aramaist as Dalman[2] seemed to Bacon to dispose of the conclusions I presented to this Society in 1895[3] and Lietzmann independently reached and published in 1896,[4] and since Bacon's theory is based throughout, with a single exception to be noted below, on what are designated as "Dalman's proofs," it is natural to begin this review with a reference to the character of his arguments. It should be stated that the way was prepared for

[1] *JBL*, XLI, 1922, 143 ff.

[2] *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898.

[3] 'Was בר אנש a Messianic Title?' *JBL*, XV, 1896, 36 ff.

[4] *Der Menschensohn*, 1896, 124 f.

my conclusions and those of Lietzmann by some important hints of Génébrard, Grotius, Bolten, Uloth, Lagarde, and Wellhausen and an elaborate study by Eerdmans;[5] and also that they have been adopted and defended by Wellhausen, Marti, Pfleiderer, Nöldeke, Merx, Haupt, and other scholars. Dalman's arguments may here be briefly discussed, as they have already been examined very carefully by Bevan,[6] Wellhausen,[7] and myself.[8] Dalman recognizes that בר נשא is the only Aramaic phrase that can have been translated *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*; that whereever it is actually found in extant Aramaic literature it has only the meaning 'der Mensch,' 'man,' 'the man,' 'quidam;' and that it occurs in this sense with great frequency even in the Galilean dialect. But he suggests the possibility that it may not have been used, and not even understood, in Galilee in the first century A. D. He appeals to the absence of the term in Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions and the late age of the Palestinian Talmud and the younger Targumim. Its absence in Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions known to us is not strange when one considers how seldom 'man' in a generic sense would be likely to be used and its rare occurrence in the epigraphic material preserved in any language. Rather is it surprising, in view of its limited use in Genza and Qolasta, to find it employed in some of the Mandaic magic formulas published by Montgomery.[9] Fiebig has shown that Simeon b. Jochai and Hoshaya employed it in the second century A. D. An innovation due to Edessene influence at so early a date is out of the question. It is possible that אנשא and גברא were more frequently used than בר נשא; but the collective, and virtually plural, meaning of אנשא was never quite lost sight of, so that הו בר נשא is found, but not הו אנשא. That בר נשא should have been used in Galilee in the second century, but not even understood a few generations earlier in the sense it has in Aramaic speech every-

[5] *Th. Tjidschrift*, 1894, 153 ff., 1895, 49 ff. Arnold Meyer called attention to the hints of Génébrard and Bolten, *Jesu Muttersprache*, 1896.

[6] *Critical Review*, IX, 1899, 144 ff.

[7] *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, 1899; *Die drei ersten Evangelien*,[2] 1911.

[8] 'Son of Man' in *Enc. Bibl.*, 1903; *The Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905.

[9] *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*, 1913, 117, 146.

where, is well nigh inconceivable. The best proof that it was used in this sense in Judaean Aramaic in the second century B. C. is Dan. 7 13. Bacon says: "The linguistic objection seems not to be sustained." It is Dalman's conjecture that has not been sustained. No student familiar with Aramaic has attempted to defend it, and none has indicated his approval.

Even the one scholar who dissents from the generally accepted opinion that *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is a translation of בר נשא does not express any doubt as to the use and intelligibility of this term in the Galilee of Jesus' time. In an article, remarkable alike for its subtlety of reasoning and its acquaintance with patristic literature, Badham[10] argues in favor of בר אדם. He supposes that Jesus used this term in the sense of son of Adam, second Adam, successor of Adam, and maintains that this suits all the passages in the synoptic gospels. Jesus, he thinks, had constantly in mind the contrast between himself and the first Adam. Healing, physical and spiritual, is quite in harmony with the character of the second Adam. So is forgiveness of sin. The creation of Adam was prior to the creation of the Sabbath, hence the Sabbath was made for Adam, and the second Adam had authority over it. Like the first he is a sower, but of the good seed. He restores the beauty and joy of paradise. Inasmuch as he is man, *he* may be blasphemed, but not the Holy Spirit. Homelessness is the lot of the successor of Adam. The second Adam has come to be a savior. He must suffer and die to expiate the guilt of the first Adam; and he will win the victory, come on the clouds of heaven, and restore paradise. It is in the regeneration, *i. e.*, the new birth of the world, that the second Adam will sit on the throne of his glory. This is in harmony with the predictions of suffering and death, because the final bringing to nought of evil, the destruction of the enemy, is at the same time the rescue of the oppressed. As evidence of the correctness of this interpretation Badham then introduces a wealth of proof-texts from the early fathers of the church, showing that they found in the phrase precisely this allusion to the second Adam in contrast with the first.

[10] *Th. Tijdschrift*, 1911, 395 ff.

It is evident, however, that *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* presupposes a term containing the article. The poetic expression בן אדם rendered בר אדם in the Targums which followed the Hebrew, is translated into Greek *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, but never *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, though the plural בני האדם is rendered *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* and in Ecclus. even *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. On the other hand, the synoptic gospels never use *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, but always *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Other forms like ברה דאנשא, ברה דנברא, and ברה דבר נשא are not found in Jewish writings, but are of Christian origin, being attempts to render the Greek phrase. The only Aramaic term that could have occasioned the unidiomatic *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is בר נשא. Badham's contention is not strengthened by his interpretation of the gospel passages. Even on the assumption that Jesus regarded himself as the second Adam it must be admitted that the exegesis is often strained and unnatural. But the assumption is extremely difficult. It involves ascribing to him an order of ideas to which he nowhere gives expression in simple and unambiguous language and which seems as much in contrast with his own thought as it is in harmony with later conceptions. Badhams's ingenious endeavor to substitute another Aramaic phrase is no more convincing than Dalman's effort to prove the necessity for another than the ordinary meaning of בר נשא.

Although this term is nowhere found in extant Aramaic literature in any other sense, it has been thought possible that it occurred with a different meaning in the original text of the Parables of Enoch. In 1908,[11] I set forth my reasons for believing that this work was written in Aramaic, and that בר נשא occurred in its earliest form, but only in the ordinary sense. This admirably suits the passages in c. 46: 'I saw one like a man;' 'I asked in regard to that man;' 'he answered: this is the man who has righteousness;' 'this man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings;' and also 48 2 'in that hour that man was called by the Lord of Spirits.' But it involves the assumption that already the Aramaic text in subsequent

[11] '*The Original Language of the Parables of Enoch*,' in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper*, 1908, 329 ff.

sections was tampered with by Christian copyists who introduced the terms ברה דבר נשא and ברה דנברא, and probably, though perhaps not necessarily, the further assumption that the Ethiopic text was translated directly from the Aramaic, for which the utter absence of any sign of acquaintance with this particular work in patristic literature was cited. Five years later Charles published an extensive critique of my position, upholding his former view that the original language was Hebrew, the term used בן האדם, and the translation in the supposed Greek version everywhere *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. In a study of the Apocalypse of Noah and the Parables of Enoch contributed to the forthcoming Haupt Memorial Volume, I have examined in detail the arguments of Charles, showing that none of the passages quoted presuppose a Hebrew rather than an Aramaic original, that the only text in patristic literature (Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum*, 1, 3) cited to prove acquaintance with the work rather proves the opposite, and that Christian retouching is obvious in the translation and probable in the original. It may be added that בן אדם (not בן האדם) in j. Taanith 65 b has been very satisfactorily explained by Dalman (*l. c.*, 202 f.), and that Badham also has pointedly asked "why Justin should not have confuted his Jewish opponent with the 'son of man' passages if he had known them," and made some judicious remarks on the subject of Christian coloring (*l. c.*, 444 f.).

In 4 Ezra 13 1 ff., *quasi similitudinem hominis* and *ille homo* are also likely to go back to כדמות בר אנש and הו בר נשא. Wellhausen, who at first was inclined to think of a Hebrew original (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, 1899, 241), later reached the conclusion: "Das Original war also jüdisch-aramäisch, wie das des Enoch." (*Die drei ersten Evangelien*[2], 1911, 124 f.). This continues to be my conviction even after the arguments of Box (in Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O. T.*, 1913). The Syriac version has בר נשא and הו בר נשא, and the Ethiopic *be'esi*, which may indicate a Greek *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*. Here, as in En., 'that man' is not a title. It is natural to suppose an influence of Dan. 7 13. But the man-like being in En. is not identical with that in Dan., nor is the one in

4 Ezra identical with that in Eth. En. In his excellent outline of the growth of the messianic idea, Moore rightly observes: "The 'Son of Man' (in Eth. En.) is not the Messiah pre-existent in heaven as it is the fashion to say—if that had been the author's meaning the visions would have read differently."[12] In 4 Ezra 13 1, the one like a man may refer to the Messiah.

The term *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is found in all strata of the gospels, the earlier as well as the later ones. In classifying the 69 occurrences in the synoptics, obvious duplicates and passages obelised by critical editors must of course be eliminated. Badham places the distinct sayings in two groups, including in the first group those found in all and also those in Mt. alone, Mt. and Mk., and Mk. and Lk.; and in the second those found in Mt. and Lk., but also those in Lk. alone. Jackson and Lake[13] divide them into four groups: 1. those in Q, including Mt. 19 28, though the phrase is not found in the parallel Lk. 22 30, and leaving out Mt. 24 39 = Lk. 17 30; 2. those in Mk., including not only those in all but also those in Mt. and Mk., and Mk. and Lk.; 3. those in Mt. alone, leaving out Mt. 26 24 b; and 4. those in Lk. alone. A better method would seem to be the one I adopted, dividing them into six groups: 1. those in all (8); 2. in Mt. and Mk. (5); 3. in Mt. and Lk. (8); 4. in Mk. and Lk. (1); 5. in Mt. alone (9); and 6. in Lk. alone (8). This has been recognized by Bacon, who follows my tabulation. Jackson and Lake do not enter into an examination in detail of the later strata, but pay special attention to Q and Mk.; "for where these agree, if anywhere, trustworthy information is given." Now in Q there are four passages referring to the Parousia, and these are supported by three additional ones in Mk. On the other hand, there are no passages in Q referring to the Passion. Hence they infer that the references to the Parousia are earlier than those to the Passion and more likely to be genuine, as "they

[12] In Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1922, 346—362.

[13] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1922.

are wholly intelligible in the light of contemporary Jewish thought." In them Jesus is understood as speaking objectively concerning the Son of Man, without identifying himself with this personage. There are also two passages in Mk. (2 10, 28) where the phrase is a translation of בר נשא in its generic sense; and one in Q (Mt. 12 31 — Lk. 12 10) where the same is probable, as Mk. 3 28 has 'the sons of men.'

The most important part of the study of these scholars is no doubt the careful reasoning by which they have convinced themselves that the Marcan passages concerning the Passion are late and unauthentic. It is a methodical error to accept both the conclusion that Jesus used, and was understood to mean, בר נשא in its ordinary generic sense and the supposition that it carried a different meaning based on Dalman's conjecture that it was not yet employed and understood in Galilee at the time of Jesus in its generic sense. If the latter were true, the former would be impossible; if the former is true, there is no room for the latter. This applies whether Jesus spoke of himself or concerning some one or some thing else. The idea that he referred, not to himself, but objectively either to his ideal (Brücker, *JPTh* 1886) or to the Coming One (J. Weiss, *Predigt Jesu*, 1892), which has been taken up by Harnack, Heitmüller, Jackson and Lake, Bacon and others, can bring no real relief to those who cling to the thought of a messianic secret cherished by Jesus, if it is admitted that he used the term in its ordinary generic sense, and when it is realized that no evidence has yet been discovered of its employment as a title of the Messiah or of a heavenly being capable of identification with him. It is worth considering also that an unmistakable allusion to the celestial being in Dan. would suggest to his disciples precisely those features of the current messianic ideal, victory and rule over the gentiles, which it is supposed that Jesus wished to remove from their conception of his Messiahship.

Bacon examines in detail the passages in each of the six groups with the result that those in Mt. alone represent changes or expansions made by the evangelist, those in Lk. alone schematic or stylistic improvements, and that in Mk.

and Lk. is not authentic. Of the eight in Q, four, in the eschatological discourse, refer objectively to the Coming One, Jesus intending no identification of himself with this Son of Man; three are suspicious (Mt. 8 20, a proverbial saying, 11 19, unhistorical, 12 40, a misunderstanding); and 12 32 probably shows the generic use of בר נשא. Of those in Mk. seven are regarded as authentic references to the Betrayal and Passion, three objective references to the Coming One, and the rest suspicious, including 2 10, the power to forgive sins, 2 28, authority over the Sabbath, 9 9, transfiguration not to be told until after the resurrection, and 10 45, even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto. It is not unimportant that so large a number of passages are rejected as due to the evangelists. These were so regarded by many scholars before the last phase of the discussion; and in spite of the reaction against the view based on Aramaic usage it is recognized that the authenticity of about two thirds of the sayings containing the phrase is subject to doubt. While upholding the priority of Q, Bacon attempts, against Jackson and Lake, to render probable the genuineness of the references to the Passion. It is to be noticed also that, though he frankly bases his structure on 'Dalman's proofs,' he nevertheless in one passage resorts to the idea of a בר נשא in the generic sense, which, if Dalman had proved anything, would be impossible. Nor can he quite follow this scholar in his conjecture that the heavenly being that comes on the clouds in Dan. 7 13 "*might* be one who should have passed through suffering and death, and is, in any case, by his very nature no mighty one, no conqueror, no destroyer, but merely a mortal (Menschenkind) whom God has taken under his protection, and for whom he destines great things," though Bacon thinks of him as a "Suppliant before the throne of God." Of all this there is certainly no hint in the text itself. Bacon also makes the concession to Jackson and Lake that "in Mk. no parallel is attempted between Jesus' career and the work and fate of the Isaian 'Servant of Yahwe.'" This weakens the force of his objection to the view of these scholars that it was the actual suffering and death of Jesus that caused the prediction to be put on his lips and

transferred the title from the eschatological to the passion series. In Bacon's opinion, Jesus finally identified himself with Daniel's Son of Man and was condemned to death because he declared himself to be the Messiah and predicted that the Sanhedrin would see him sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven (Mk. 14 62), which was regarded as blasphemy. In his remarkable book ישו הנו צדי (1922), Klausner also sets forth the view that, in proclaiming himself as the Messiah, Jesus defined his Messiahship by referring to Daniel's Son of Man. Klausner holds that from the beginning of his ministry Jesus thought of himself, not only as a prophet like Ezekiel, but also as a superhuman being, closely related to the deity, like Daniel's Son of Man. The blasphemy consisted in his conception of himself as a Messiah, raised above humanity, and associated with the deity in a manner incompatible with strict monotheism. But what was said in the council chamber is not known; even the Christian witnesses disagree; and none of the disciples was present.

Eduard Meyer[14] does not question that *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is a translation of בר נשא.[15] He recognizes that the term has its origin, so far as the gospels are concerned, in the eschatological series.[16] He does not ascribe the Synoptic Apocalypse (Mk. 13 and parallels) to Jesus: "es ist ganz klar, daß diese ganze Verkündigung mit dem historischen Jesus nichts zu tun hat, sondern ein Erzeugnis der ersten Generation der Christengemeinde ist, deren Schicksale vorausgesagt werden," perhaps so late as 62 A. D.[17] Whether Jesus spoke of 'the Son of Man' before the High Priest "bleibt mindestens fraglich," since this feature of the confession "trägt die spezifischen Züge der erst nach seinem Tode ausgebildeten christlichen Lehre."[18] Concerning the prediction of the passion he says: "unmöglich ist es, daß Jesus sein Schicksal mit allem Detail vorausgesagt habe, so selbstverständlich es auch nachher

[14] *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, I, 1921; II, 1922.
[15] *l. c.*, I, 104.
[16] *l. c.*, I, 337.
[17] *l. c.*, I, 129 f.
[18] *l. c.*, I, 194.

der Christengemeinde erscheinen mußte. Daß ihm dasselbe Schicksal bevorstehe, wie so vielen Propheten, mochte er ahnen und aussprechen, die Einzelgestaltung konnte niemand im voraus wissen."[19] Consequently, he has no confidence in the genuineness of the bulk of passages in which the term occurs. There remain then the passages in which it has been suggested that Jesus originally used בר נשא in the sense it invariably has in extant Aramaic literature. Here he finds it 'unbegreiflich' that scholars familiar with Aramaic should have thought it possible that Jesus actually said: "man (בר נשא) has authority to forgive sins" or "man (בר נשא) is lord of the Sabbath." Even if it were true that "damit wird eine philosophische Auffassung hineingetragen, die der Welt des Judentums wie des Christentums völlig fremd ist und ihren Begriff der Sünde und der Sündenvergebung geradezu aufhebt," such flashes of rare insight, which need not be connected with any specifically modern philosophical reasoning, are often characteristic of religious genius. How difficult it would be to conceive of some ideas and sentiments that seem to us unmistakably expressed in the Book of Job as appearing in any period of early Jewish history, were the probability of the age we assign to this work and the accuracy of our modern interpretation to be measured by the generally prevailing views in Judaism and Christianity! As to the second saying, it is interesting to observe the different judgment of a man like Adalbert Merx:[20] "Der Grund für die Tilgung der Worte in D: 'der Sabbath ist um des Menschen willen gemacht' mit der daran gehängten Konsequenz, daß der Mensch Herr ist über den Sabbath, — denn das ist der wahre Sinn, und nicht etwa der Menschensohn, das bedarf keines Beweises, sondern ist selbstverständlich, — liegt auf flacher Hand. Mit einem solchen Prinzip ließ sich ein hierurgischer Kultus weder bei Juden noch bei Christen aufrecht erhalten. Er war damit unter die Beurteilung des menschlichen Bewußtseins gestellt,

[19] *l. c.*, I, 117.

[20] *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 1905, 37; cp. also *Das Evangelium Matthaeus*, 1902, 205.

das der priesterlichen Anforderung gegenüber frei wurde. Solche und ähnliche Prinzipien konnten in der Kirche nicht geduldet werden, sie meistert ihren Meister, indem sie ihn, und nicht etwa den Menschen für den Herrn des Sabbaths erklärt." What is significant in the discussion of this subject by the great Berlin historian is, not his endeavor on the slender basis of a few passages, capable of and fairly demanding a different interpretation, still to maintain the increasingly difficult position of a cryptic Messiahship, involving the occasional, though rare, use by Jesus of the generic term for 'man,' in an esoteric sense, partly to reveal, partly to conceal his somewhat modified Messianic claims, but rather his clear recognition of both the eschatological discourse and the predictions of death and resurrection as products of the Christology of the early church.

Mention should also be made of the ingenious attempt by Bruno Violet[21] to create a new 'son of man' passage. In Mk. 11 14 Jesus says to the figtree: *μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδείς καρπὸν φάγοι.* This would imply that he cursed the tree. So it was understood by the scribe who added to the account in Mt. 21 18 ff. the closing words of 19 and 20, not found in Mk. Violet suggests that the Syriac rendering in Peš. need not mean: 'no man *shall* eat,' but may mean: 'no man *will* eat,' and further that in Galilean Aramaic בר נשא may have been used, בר having later dropped out. Taking בר נשא to be Jesus' designation of himself, he then derives this saying: "The Son of Man will never again eat fruits from thee." It is a prediction concerning himself, not a curse of the tree. Jesus is conscious that he is going to his death, and will never again enjoy the fruits of this tree. It is true that the Impf. may mean 'no man will eat.' Merx[22] had already pointed out this possibility, and asked the question whether the story may not be "eine mißverstandene und zur Geschichte umbildete ursprüngliche Parabel." A simpler explanation is

[21] In *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, N. F., XIX. 2.

[22] *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 1905, 133.

possible. Jesus is hungry, sees a figtree in the distance, finds on approaching more closely that it is withered, and remarks: 'no man will ever eat fruits from thee,' reflecting perhaps, without formulating a parable, on the hopeless condition of his people. This *obiter dictum*, afterwards remembered, may easily have been misunderstood and given rise to the idea of a curse and a selfish, unnecessary and senseless miracle. Whether the original had אנש, בר אנש, or בר נשא, the meaning would be the same. But בר נשא is less likely after the negative, and had it been in the text, it would no doubt have been rendered *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* and caused no more trouble to a number of exegetes than in Mk. 2 8 or 2 10.

To most scholars the question whether the references to the parousia are more genuine than those to the passion seems to reduce itself to one of the relative age of Q and Mk. If Q is older, there would be a presumption in favor of the former. But the problem may not be so simple. Wellhausen argues for the priority of Mk.; and though Harnack, Heitmüller, Jülicher (at least so far as Q^1 is concerned), Jackson and Lake, Bacon and others stress the priority of Q, there is much disagreement among them. One may, indeed, strongly maintain the priority of Mk. to our present Mt. and Lk. and also the posteriority of Mk. to an earlier source or several such sources without being in sympathy with this or that theory as regards the degree of Mk.'s originality and the nature of the earlier source or sources. It is thought by many scholars that the non-Marcan material found in both Mt. and Lk. may have been derived from a common source, and it has become customary to designate it as Q. There can be no objection to such a *siglum* to indicate this well defined and available material, if it is deemed desirable. But it should be borne in mind that the existence of Q as a separate Greek document is a modern assumption, based on no early ecclesiastical tradition, and not hinted at either in Mt. or Lk. It is a supposititious document invented to account for certain striking similarities between Mt. and Lk. in these sections and for certain equally striking dissimilarities which appeared to preclude derivation of one from the other, particularly if the

latter was regarded as coming from an immediate disciple of Jesus. That such a document ever existed can neither be proved nor disproved. Books have been recovered which had apparently left no trace behind them and were unknown even by name; of others only the name has survived; and with many we are acquainted only through obviously very imperfect translations or later versions from these. Nevertheless, such an assumption need not be resorted to, if the facts can equally well be accounted for without it. Is it not conceivable that our present Mt. and Lk. stood in very much the same relation to an earlier form of Mt. as they are assumed to have held to Q? In spite of marked divergencies, the essential identity and, in the main, sequence of sections speak for a common source, the differences being explained as due to the vicissitudes of copying, expansion and contraction, recasting and editorial activity, personal and regional idiosyncrasies of thought, and stylistic preferences. Why should it be considered improbable that the common source was an earlier form of Mt., used with the same freedom both by the later expander and editor of Mt. and by Lk. as is assumed in the case of Q? Harnack[23] has shown that almost invariably the more original form is found in Mt. In the presence of a freely flowing and highly prized oral tradition attaching itself to more than one of the apostles, it is by no means necessary to suppose that one collection, even if ascribed to Matthew, was at all times *maßgebend*.

When Q is defined as the non-Marcan material common to Mt. and Lk., it should of course be distinguished, not only from Mk., but also from the oldest source, and it should not be pieced out with passages found only in Mt. or only in Lk. Upon this Bacon very justly insists. "The oldest source is not Q," he says. It contained, in his opinion, much beside Q, and Mk. may have used it. That Mk. used this source is indeed highly probable. That he was acquainted with Q is at least incapable of proof, since the Q material is non-Marcan. It is indeed subject to grave doubts. Why should he have so consistently left out all of these

[23] *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 1907.

statements? The same applies, with equal force, to the assumption that Q was an integral part of the oldest source. What motive can Mk. have had in discarding or passing by in silence everything found in Q? The more one reflects upon this strange procedure, the more plausible it becomes that Mk. did not find the bulk of the Q material in the oldest source. The evidence that he knew and used this earlier source must be looked for chiefly elsewhere. If Mk. is earlier than Q, as Wellhausen thinks, it does not follow that there was not a source earlier than Mk. Mk.'s right to be called the first narrator of the life of Jesus actually known to us need not be questioned, since even if the oldest source had certain headings, introductions, and incidental accounts such as we possess in 'The Words of Amos' and 'The Words of Jeremiah' (G), its substance was no doubt a collection of sayings rather than an attempt at a biography. Nor need it be doubted that Mk. furnished the general framework for the later form of Mt. and for Lk. The freedom of Mk.'s gospel from many late elements in the other synoptics is obvious. But the problem of the relative age of Mk. and certain strata in Mt. and Lk. is only confused by the stress laid on manifest accretions, from the infancy stories to the textually doubtful baptismal formula. The right method would seem to be to start with what Mk. has in common with Mt. and Lk. Here such questions as these legitimately arise: Was Mk.'s information derived from a distinct source, so that there was a double tradition, such as Harnack supposes in the case of Mk. and Q? Or does the material in Mt. and Lk. come from Mk.? Or did Mk. use a source also underlying Mt. and Lk.? *A priori* it would be possible to think of two independent strands of tradition, a Petrine and a Matthaean. But it is extremely difficult to conceive of these as running so closely parallel with each other, both in contents and arrangement. A comparison tends to indicate that the more primitive form of a saying is often found in Mt. or Lk. This has been shown by many scholars, notably by Merx,[24] and has again been pointed out

[24] *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, I, 1902; II, 1905; *passim*.

by those who maintain a pre-Marcan source. The impression has been strengthened by Wellhausen's searching analysis of Mk. and by Bacon's important observations on the advanced position of Mk. on so vital a point as his Christology. It remains most probable that Mk. used an earlier source which to some extent has been preserved in Mt. (and Lk.). This, of course, does not preclude the possibility that many passages now found in all the three gospels were subsequent additions in Mk. which found their way into Mt. and Lk.; or that later additions in Mt. also were incorporated in Mk. and Lk.

The eschatological discourse (Mt. 24, Mk. 13, Lk. 24) may very well be such a later addition, passing from gospel to gospel. Colani (1864) suggested that it is 'a veritable apocalypse,' and Wellhausen (1893) that it came from an originally Jewish apocalypse written just before the fall of Jerusalem. In this apocalypse reference is made (Mk. 13 26 and parallels) objectively to 'the Son of Man.' Wellhausen says: "Nun steht freilich der Vers Mc. 13 26 in einer im Grunde jüdischen Apokalypse, zeigt jedoch den Ausgangspunkt der an Jesus als Menschensohn geknüpften christlichen Parusiehoffnung,"[25] *i. e.*, not the starting point for the hope among the early Christians of the return of Jesus, but for the ascription of this hope to him. It may be added that here also, and not in Q, is likely to be the starting point of the use of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a title and a supposed self-designation. Unfortunately, we do not know how this 'Son of Man' was first introduced in the original apocalypse, whether Jewish or Christian. The first reference may have been similar to that in Dan., Eth. En. and 4 Ezra; or it may, in the original, as Haupt[26] suggests, have had the meaning 'Some One,' the one you know. When this apocalypse was put upon the lips of Jesus, it was evident to all readers that he used it concerning himself; and when the Greek title had once been established as a self-designation, it could then pass to the predictions of his death ascribed to him, and give a new significance to the phrase already used

[25] *Die drei ersten Evangelien*[1], 1905, 133.
[26] *The Monist*, 1919, 1 ff.

as a rendering of בר נשא in possibly genuine utterances of Jesus. Wellhausen's dictum: "Sicher ist, daß, wenn Jesus seine Jünger nicht zum voraus über seinen Tod und Auferstehung belehrt hat, so erst recht nicht über seine Parusie"[27] is no doubt correct historically, but does not show the order in which this phrase came to be used as a self-designation. A further indication of the date when this insertion would be possible may be found in the passage so similar in its tenor preceding it in Mt. (23 34–38) and split up in Lk. (11 49–51; 13 34–35), with its allusion to the murder of Zechariah b. Berechiah (Josephus, *Bell. jud.*, IV, 5, 4), if it once formed a part of the same work. Wellhausen has convincingly shown that no other Zechariah can be meant, and has set in its right light the late legend referred to by Moore (*JAOS*, 1906, 317 ff.).[28] That 'The Wisdom of God' is the title of a book was hinted at by Paulus, van Hengel, Ewald, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, and Gfrörer; that the whole passage belonged to it was made probable by Strauß (*ZWTh*, 1863, 84 ff.). But the view that the apocalypse comes from this book, however plausible, cannot be proved.

Burton[29] distinguishes between four major sources: 1. Mk.; 2. the original Mt. (M); 3. a Galilean source (G); and 4. a Perean document (P), found in Lk. 9 57–18 14; 19 1–28. In these sources he gives place to 14 'son of man' passages in Mk., 6 in M (Mt. 10 23; 13 37, 41; 19 28; 24 30 a; 25 31), 2 in G (Lk. 6 22; 7 34), and 11 in P (Lk. 9 58; 12 8, 10 a, 40; 11 30; 17 22, 24, 26, 30; 18 8; 19 10). It is interesting to observe that this eminent New Testament scholar regards 250 verses found only in Mt. as coming from the *logia* referred to by Papias so that "the present gospel naturally took the name of that old document which it alone, of our present gospels at least, reproduced and of which it might almost be considered only an enlarged edition."[30] It is also worthy of note that Burton rejects the hypothesis of Q, and that his G contains only two

[27] *l. c.*[3], 1911, 96.
[28] *l. c.*[3], 1911, 118 ff.
[29] *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*, 1904.
[30] *ib.*, 41.

passages referring to the 'son of man,' viz. Lk. 6 22 'for the son of man's sake,' and 7 34 'the son of man is come eating and drinking,' which are both subject to serious doubt. The return to the earliest ecclesiastical tradition seems to be a step in the direction of historic probability, while the abandonment of the theory that the non-Marcan material common to Mt. and Lk. constitutes a distinct document for the assumption of an equally supposititious source G has the disadvantage that its limits must be determined solely by subjective judgment, with the same absence of external testimony. He has been followed in the main by Sharman[31] and Wickes[32]. Sharman, however, either rejects altogether or seriously questions every one of the 'son of man' passages ascribed by Burton to M.[33] Wickes makes a distinction in Burton's P between the material common to Mt. and Lk. and the material not used in Mt. In the part of P regarded by him as Judaean he finds only one 'son of man' passage (19 10). This is loosely attached to what precedes and its character is such that it has long been questioned. None of these scholars seems to have made a special study of the 'son of man' question, or at least taken note of the discussion in their publications. Yet there is an unmistakable tendency on the part of students accepting this new approach to the synoptic problem to eliminate the title entirely from M, G, and the Judaean source in P.

What the earliest source contained can only be a matter of inference and conjecture. Some passages in the so called Q may have had a place in it, though overlooked or intentionally left out by Mk.; some preserved in all three gospels may have formed part of it, others not; some only found in Mt. or Lk. may have been in it. It is by no means improbable that among the sources used by Lk. there was a document not known to either the original Mt. or Mk., and it is possible that it had some such limits as Wickes has conjectured for his second group. In that case Lk. may have dealt with that

[31] *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future according to the Synoptic Gospels*, 1909.

[32] *The Sources of Luke's Perean Section*, 1913.

[33] *l. c.*

source as freely as he apparently did with the earlier form of Mt. and with Mk. It may also be that he derived this material from oral tradition on which, like Papias later, he confessedly leaned to some extent. As to its age and reliability, whether it came to him in one way or the other, we are obviously confined to subjective considerations. So far from being able to say that because a reported saying had a place in the earliest source it is presumably genuine, we can only conclude that because of its intrinsic probability it may have belonged to it, though we cannot be confident even of that. No light is thrown on its contents by the tradition referred to by Papias. If, as he avers,[34] Matthew wrote the words of the Lord in the Hebrew dialect, *i. e.*, in Aramaic, he obviously knew nothing with certainty concerning this document. Should it ever be discovered, it would no doubt contain many surprises, and perhaps raise more questions than it would settle. Even if its authenticity could be proved, it would still be doubtful whether it was the first draft or a late copy, and whether the sayings reported in it were genuine; and behind it would lie oral tradition with its unavoidable changes.

Even the passages in which Jesus has been supposed to use the term בר נשא in a generic sense furnish a problem. It was natural that Bruno Bauer, Volkmar, Jacobsen, Martineau, Oort, van Manen, Baljou, and Brandt should regard the Greek term as everywhere a creation of the evangelists. But Patton[35] has recently taken up the same position, and Bacon has independently arrived at very nearly the same conclusion so far as this group is concerned. In regard to Mt. 8 20 and 11 19 I quite agree to-day with Bacon. He has called attention also to the absence of Mk. 2 27 in D and the minuscules that go with it. This is important, as D is often relatively free from interpolations. It should be added that 2 27 a is lacking in the Sinaitic Syriac; it is also absent in Mt. and Lk. This weakens the case for 2 28. On the other hand, if 2 27 is an interpolation, the man who wrote it would seem necessarily to

[34] In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 39.

[35] *American Journal of Religion*, Sept. 1922.

have understood the Greek term as a rendering of בר נשא in its generic sense; and the ὥστε follows more naturally after 2 27, which may have been passed over by D and abbreviated in Sin. Syr. Patton emphasizes the anacoluthon in 2 10 ff. Gen. 3 22–23 has been appealed to as a similar instance; but there we should probably read ונשלחהו for וישלחהו. 'He says to the sick of the palsy' looks like a remark by the evangelist; and in Lk. the people praise God who has given such power to men. In Mt. 12 32 Patton takes umbrage at the distinctively Christian use of the term The Holy Ghost. But the holy spirit is not distinctively Christian, and Bacon's exegesis removes the difficulty. The three passages, Mt. 9 6, 12 8, 32 and parallels, seem to be genuine. They have been interpreted, with rare insight, by Francis A. Henry.[36] The literal unidiomatic translation, reminding of *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in Ecclus. may still for some time have conveyed to those who understood Aramaic its original meaning.

Is it possible that the spread of the title from the apocalyptic series to the other groups was facilitated or at least that the common understanding of it in patristic literature can be explained by the Pauline 'second man,' 'last man,' 'man from heaven' or the Gnostic *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*? Moore[37] has shown that there is no evidence of any kind that such terms as 'the last, the second, the coming Adam' were current among Jewish scholars in Palestine as a designation of the Messiah, or ever generally current. The source where Christian scholars have found it, *Neve Shalom*, comes from the end of the 15th century. But the Pauline terms do not give the impression of being innovations by him. It may even be suggested that in 1 Cor. 15 45 a written source is quoted: "And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last man a quickening spirit." Jackson and Lake think that Paul may have disliked the unidiomatic Greek term and translated בר נשא, *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*. That is improbable. The Gnostic material has been conveniently placed before us by Badham.[38] The

[36] *Jesus and the Christian Religion*[2], 1923, 51 ff.
[37] *JBL*, XVI, 1897, 158.
[38] *l. c.*, 420 ff.

Naasenes, or Ophites, who were a pre-Christian sect, according to Hippolytus "honored as the beginning of all things *ἄνθρωπος*, 'Man,' and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, a 'Son of Man'"; this man is bisexual and is called by them Adam. Irenaeus describes the Ophites as designating the Father of All the first man; and his Idea, *ἔννοια*, proceeding from him they style Son of Man, the Second Man. Badham questions my inference that both of these terms were used in pre-Christian times, and suggests that the latter was introduced after contact with Christianity. It should be remembered, however, that the necessity for introducing another *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, son of Yaldabaoth and Achamoth, distinct from the heavenly *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* would not have existed, if there had not been such a prototype in heaven. "Do not lie, Yaldabaoth," says Achamoth; "the Father of All, the first *ἄνθρωπος* is above thee, and so is *ἄνθρωπος, υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*." If there were a Christian contamination, one would expect the article. The two men in the Samothracian mysteries to which the Ophites referred are clearly pre-Christian. When generation is so strongly emphasized, sonship is a natural phrase. The conception of the supreme principle as man may be of mythical or philosophical origin. Reflection on his own nature and meditation on the divine may lead to the idea that what man is in his essence that God is also, and the reverse, hence to consubstantiality, *ὁμοουσία*, of God and man. This actually took place in India; and it is, therefore, significant that the supreme being, the first principle of the universe, should in the Vedas be called *purusha*, 'man,'[39] and the derived being both *purusha* and

[39] *Rig Veda*, X, 90 (916). Grassmann (*Rig Veda*, II, 1877, 486 f.) regards this hymn as among the latest insertions in the Rig Veda, and relegates it to the *Anhang*. He cites as reasons the apparent references to the Rig-, Sama- and Yajur Vedas and acquaintance with the beginning of the Atharva Veda, the names of the four castes, and the language and character which seem to point to the period of the latest parts of the Atharva Veda. Oldenberg (*Die Religion des Veda*, 1894, 277) recognizes in this hymn describing 'die Entstehung der Menschheit aus dem Leibe des großen tausendfüßigen Urmensch (*purusha*)' 'eine priesterlicherweise schnörkelhaft ausgesponnene, aber möglicherweise uralte Vorstellung.' Obviously *purusha* = man is a

nārāyana, 'son of man.'[40] Here is either an analogy to Gnostic usage, or a borrowing. Chaldaeanism was a syncretistic religion whose elements were not all from ancient Babylonia. Like so many ideas, *e. g.* metempsychosis and atavar, this one may have passed from one end of the world touched by Hellenism to the other. A part of India as well as Phrygia and Babylonia belonged to the Seleucid Empire. But in Babylonian mythology there is also likely to have been a figure spoken of by preference as 'the man.' Gods became men; men became gods. Kristensen[41] thinks the phrase goes back to the Adapa myth. Following Zimmern's suggestion that Adapa = Adam, and that of Jeremias, Zimmern and Winckler that Adapa's designation as *zer ameluti* = בר נשא, he discusses 1) the parallel between Adapa and Adam, 2) the general conception of man in antiquity as one who by virtue of his nature from the beginning has insight into the mysteries of heaven, earth, and the realm below, so that 3) one who in an especial degree possesses this (magician, priest, prophet, king) is in a higher sense than the ordinary a 'man,' a 'son of man,' a typical, ideal *zer ameli* or *sa n si*. This use of the term in a pregnant sense has also been noted by Haupt[42] who calls attention to the fact that *mar ameli* is a gentleman, and בר נשא a man,

designation of the universe, the macrocosm being conceived after the fashion of the microcosm. In X, 90, 5 there seems to be a distinction between purusha, the absolute being, and *purusha* as the first-born. By identification with the Atman in the Upanishads the later conception of the term was developed. Cp. Oldenberg, *Die Lehre der Upanischaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus*, 1915, *passim*. A special study of this development would be welcome. The distinction between *purusha* and *prakṛti* in the Saṃkhya and Yoga systems is clearly set forth by Surendranath Dasgupta, *Yoga*, 1925.

[40] Grill (*Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1902, 348) cites *Mâhâna royana Upanishad*, XI, as evidence for the use of *Nārāyana*, 'the one like a man,' 'the son of man' as a designation of *purusha* in the sense of the derived primeval existence. That *Purusha-Nārāyana* is identified with Vishnu does not militate against this. Whether there is a historic connection or not, these Indian speculations correspond with those found in some Gnostic sects.

[41] *Th. Tijdschrift*, 1911, 1 ff.

[42] *The Monist*, 1919, 1 ff.

a noble man, and may be understood as an *exemplar vitae humanae*, a symbol, *ecce homo!* It is possible, therefore, that later speculation attached itself to the conception of man in a pregnant sense, leading even into the realm of mythology; but a critical examination of the Synoptic material does not justify the assumption that Jesus himself used the term בר נשא in any other than the ordinary generic sense.

The impression that meekness and lowliness, modesty and humility were typical traits in the character of Jesus need not be given up. There is no necessity for supposing that either before the episode at Caesarea Philippi or in his last days Jesus cherished ambitions to lord it over men in one way or another. Nothing compels the belief that he ever told his disciples: "Ye shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."[43] A later scribe, if not Lk., is more likely than the master himself to have picked out prophecies of 'great David's greater son' in the story of Mephibosheth (2 Sam. 9) and the enthroned judges of Ps. 122. He may have had his share of erroneous beliefs and human weaknesses; but there is no evidence that he surrendered morally, as many others have, to the lure of kingship, the itch for power over his fellow-men, the passion for political or spiritual domination. In spite of the growing idea in the early church that he had not only predicted his death and resurrection on the third day, but also his return on the clouds of heaven, clothed with superhuman authority and dignity, it is permissible to think that he remained faithful unto death, even the death on the cross, to his clearly expressed convictions, in what may be regarded as genuine utterances, concerning man's duties, rights, and privileges, his way of life and service. There is more reverence in honest doubt than in an easy acceptance of even the salient points in a late, fluctuating and steadily growing tradition. To remove the outer wrappings with which loyal love and devout speculation have surrounded him is not to take away from but to add unto the grandeur and majesty of his personality. These

[43] *JBL*, 1922, 182.

garments themselves have had their value, and may in part have been woven with material coming down from primitive times. But the body is more than the raiment. He himself will never be fully known. Each human life has its mystery; it is deepened in the case of a great religious genius. Through ages to come he will, no doubt, remain an object of reverent study. For mankind will not suffer its spiritual heroes to see corruption. In seeking, however, for the permanent place of Jesus in the life of man, students will begin with a quest for the historically probable and learn to free themselves from a mistaken estimate based on questionable data. Without yielding to an unreasonable scepticism that refuses to be guided at all by the only material at our disposal and declines the duty of accounting for its development, without rejecting any part of the tradition simply on the ground that it contravenes an *a priori* judgment of what Jesus could have said and thought concerning himself, without resorting to any but the generally accepted methods of textual, literary and historical criticism, relief from such a conception of the Prophet of Nazareth is still available.