THE USE AND MEANING OF THE PHRASE 'THE SON OF MAN' IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS: PART II.

IN the last number of this JOURNAL the leading facts connected with the Aramaic use of *barnasha* were laid before the reader. We now proceed to a critical examination of the phrase 'the Son of Man' as employed in the first three Gospels.

The following synoptical table will be useful for reference in what follows, and may be of service to those who wish to pursue the subject further than is here attempted.

PASSAGES IN THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS RELATING TO THE SON OF MAN[1].

I. *Passages which are placed, in any of the Gospels, before Peter's confession (Matt. xvi 13, Mark viii 27, Luke ix 18).*

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
1	viii 20 Foxes have holes ...	... ...	ix 58 [*after the confession*]
2*	*v 11 Reproach for my sake	... ...	vi 22 for the S. of M.'s sake
3	ix 5–8 authority to forgive sins	ii 9–12	v 23–26
4*	x 23 till S. of M. has come	*om. in vi 8 sqq.	*om. in ix 3–5, and x 2–16
5	xi 18, 19 eating and drinking	... ...	vii 33, 34
6	xii 6–8 Lord of Sabbath ...	ii 27, 28 ...	vi 5
7*	xii 31, 32 blasphemy against S. of M.	*iii 28–30 ...	xii 10 [*after the confession*]
8	xii 39, 40 sign of Jonah ...	... ...	xi 29, 30 [*after the confession*]
8a	Compare xvi 4	viii 12	
9	xiii 37 the sower is S. of M.		
10	xiii 41 will send angels		

[1] Numbers marked with an asterisk indicate that the phrase 'Son of Man' is changed or omitted in one or more of the parallel passages. The Gospel in which the change or omission takes place is also indicated by an asterisk. Catch-words are given, which will be sufficient to remind the reader of the passage.

II. *Peter's Confession, and Predictions of Sufferings.*

11*	xvi 13 that S. of M. is. *με omitted by weighty authorities.*	*viii 27 I am ...	*ix 18 I am
12*	*xvi 21 must go and suffer ...	viii 31, 32 ...	ix 20–22
13	xvii 11–13 Elijah comes ...	ix 12, 13	
14	xvii 22, 23 delivered into hands of men	ix 30, 31 ...	ix 43, 44
15	xx 17–19 going to Jerusalem	x 32–34 ...	xviii 31–33
16*	xx 25–28 give life a ransom for many	x 42–45 ...	*xxii 25–27
17*	xxvi 2 delivered to be crucified	om. in xiv 1, 2	om. in xxii 1, 2
18	xxvi 24 woe to that man ...	xiv 21	xxii 22
19*	xxvi 45, 46 delivered into hands of sinners	xiv 41, 42 ...	*xxii 46
20*	*xxviii 6 not here; risen ...	*xvi 6	xxiv 6, 7, S. of M. must be delivered (*added by Luke*)

III. *Passages relating to the Future Advent.*

20a	See No. 4		
21	xvi 27 come in glory... ...	viii 38	ix 26
21b*	28 coming in his kingdom	*ix 1	*27
22*	*x 32, 33 confess before my Father	... ...	xii 8, 9
23*	xix 28 twelve thrones ...	see x 28–30, om. verse about S. of M.	see xviii 28–30, and xxii 28–30; om. verse about S. of M.
24	xxiv 27 lightning from east to west	... ...	xvii 24
25a*	xxiv 30a sign of S. of M. in heaven	*omitted ...	*omitted
25b	30b coming on clouds ...	xiii 26	xxi 27
26	xxiv 37 days of Noah ...	... ...	xvii 26
27*	*Omitted	... ...	xvii 29, 30 Lot went out from Sodom
28*	xxiv 39 the flood came ...	... ...	*xvii 27, om. reference to S. of M.
29	xxiv 44 in an hour when ye think not	compare xiii 33	xii 40
30	xxv 13 know not the day. *S. of M. clause omitted by best authorities*		
31	xxv 31 sit on throne of glory		
32	xxvi 64 see seated on right hand	xiv 62	xxii 69
33	... ...	... ...	xvii 22 one of the days of S. of M.
34	... ...	... ...	xviii 8 shall he find faith?
35*	*	*	xxi 36 to stand before S. of M.

IV. *Miscellaneous Passages.*

36*	xvii 9 tell no one the vision...	ix 9	*ix 36
37	xviii 11 to save the lost. *Om. by weighty authorities*	... ...	xix 10
38	... ...	... ...	ix 55 not to destroy. *Om. by best authorities*
39*	*xxvi 50 wherefore come? ...	... ...	xxii 48 betrayest with a kiss?

In proceeding to our critical investigation we may begin by noticing a very important fact, which may fairly be regarded as established. The expression 'Son of Man' was not a popular or recognised title of the Messiah in the time of Jesus. The only passage which can be appealed to in the Old Testament is Dan. vii 13. There we are told that after a vision of four great beasts which came up from the sea, and symbolised four heathen kingdoms, the Prophet saw one coming 'with the clouds of heaven like unto a son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations and languages should serve him.' This description suggests, not a real man of flesh and blood, but a visionary appearance in the human form, which, as I understand it, was raised up from the earth, and brought with clouds before the throne of God, to receive from Him an everlasting kingdom. This form symbolised, as we are told in the interpretation of the vision, the saints of the Most High, the people of Israel, who had been oppressed by the brute force of heathen dominion, but to whom in time the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven should be given by the Most High[1]. Now this noble poetical vision could easily lend itself to a Messianic interpretation, and actually received such an interpretation in later times; but it is to be observed that the rabbis, when framing a title for

[1] See the interpretation of the vision discussed at length in my *Jewish Messiah*, pp. 228 sqq. See also Holsten, *Biblisch-theologische Studien*, III *Die Bedeutung der Ausdrucksform ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου im Bewusstsein Jesu*, in the *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.* 1891, pp. 61 sqq. The view of Holsten, which is in agreement with the interpretation in my *Jewish Messiah*, that the one like a son of man was brought from earth to heaven, is approved by A. Klöpper, *Der Sohn des Menschen in den synopt. Evangelien*, in the *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.* 1899, pp. 164 sqq. On the other hand Dalman, p. 198, thinks the one like a son of man is brought from heaven, but considers this appropriate to one representing the people of God.

the Messiah from the imagery of this passage, called Him, not 'Son of Man,' but 'Son of the clouds[1].'

Reliance is, however, placed by many on the Book of Enoch, where the Son of Man appears as a supernatural Messiah[2]. I need not quote the passages, which may be read in Dr. Charles' translation[3]. While some interpreters have supposed that a personal Messiah is presented even in Daniel's vision, others have admitted that the Son of Man appears as an individual for the first time in Enoch; but then it is assumed that Enoch was a well-known book, that it proves that the Son of Man was a popular designation of the Messiah, and even that Jesus Himself adopted the title from this work[4]. But in fact there is no evidence that the book, and especially the part of it under consideration, was well known among the Jews. Dr. Charles presents several apparent allusions to it in later works; but these works are all of the Apocalyptic kind, and their authors would naturally have recourse to previous apocalypses; only eight of the passages are connected, not by quotation, but by more or less resemblance, with the portion of the book with which we are at present concerned, and not one of them betrays the slightest acquaintance with the distinctive Messianic descriptions[5]. So far indeed as I have been able to ascertain, these remarkable descriptions have left not a single trace in Jewish literature. If they are themselves really of Jewish origin, they are perfectly unique; and the natural inference surely is that

[1] Lietzmann, p. 41.

[2] So cautious a critic as Prof. Sanday relies on this book as rendering it highly probable that 'among the Jews at the Christian era, at least among such as shared the lively expectations which were then abroad of the great deliverance which was approaching, it was distinctly understood that the "Son of Man" meant "the Messiah,"' though he admits that it was not a common title ('On the title "Son of Man"' in *The Expositor*, 1891, vol. iii pp. 27–29). In his article 'Jesus Christ,' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, he says, 'It is probable that its use did not go beyond a small circle' (ii 622[b]).

[3] Chaps. xlv sqq. They are placed together and translated in my *Jewish Messiah*, pp. 50 sqq., but the translation there is made from the German, not direct from the Ethiopic.

[4] So, for instance, says Dr. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 316; substantially repeated in his *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity*, 1899, p. 214, where he says that the title, as used by Enoch, 'is historically the source of the New Testament designation, if the date assigned to the former [the Similitudes] is correct.'

[5] See the passages collected by Charles, pp. 33 sqq.

'Son of Man' was not a customary designation of the Messiah when they were written, or ever afterwards. Here we might be content to pause; but a few other observations may be of use.

When we examine the Enoch text, it becomes apparent that the 'son of man' is not used as a Messianic title. The expression is introduced in the following words: '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[1]."' In the sequel, 'son of man' is generally used with a demonstrative, evidently referring to the person introduced in the foregoing passage. In that passage, 'son of man' is clearly not a title. It is Enoch who in his ignorance first uses the term: he sees some one like a man, and asks who this son of man is, and thenceforward 'the son of man' naturally refers back to that particular son of man who has been introduced in such stately language. This argument is not affected by the remark of N. Schmidt that little weight is to be attached to the presence or absence of the demonstrative in Ethiopic[2]; or by Schmiedel's appeal to the few passages in which the demonstrative is wanting[3]. Dr. Charles thinks that Lietzmann is sufficiently refuted by proving that the Ethiopic demonstrative is probably the rendering of the Greek article, so that the expression in Enoch represents the Greek ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and is a

[1] xlvi 1–4.

[2] 'Was בר אנש a Messianic title?' In the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1896, p. 48. Referred to by Dalman, p. 199.

[3] p. 256. He, however, abandons the appeal to this part of Enoch on account of the uncertainty of its date.

Messianic title[1]. This appears to me very inconclusive reasoning. The article is quite sufficient to indicate the particular son of man who is referred to throughout. Moreover we may assume that the Greek is a literal rendering of the Hebrew, and that the Greek and Ethiopic translators would naturally understand the phrase in a Messianic sense. But if we translate back into the Semitic original, the phrase would presumably denote simply the 'man,' namely the particular man who was seen with the Head of Days[2]. When the writer wishes to use a really Messianic title, he speaks of 'his Anointed[3]' or 'the Elect One[4]' or 'Mine Elect[5].' Dalman has overlooked this, for he says that the writer 'avoids every other Messianic title in this portion of the Similitudes,' and thereby lends to the expression the 'son of man' the significance of a title[6]. I think the most that we can legitimately affirm is that the use of the phrase in Enoch might prepare the way for its adoption as a title.

The foregoing remarks have been made on the hypothesis that the parts of the 'Similitudes' in question are a genuine product of pre-Christian Jewish thought. But I still regard this as a very doubtful point. Hilgenfeld, in his advanced years, maintains his early thesis that they are of Christian origin[7]; and without committing ourselves to this opinion we cannot rely upon every passage and every phrase in a book which confessedly is of such composite origin and has been so freely interpolated. All the evidence, therefore, seems to prove that we cannot safely avail ourselves of this work in attempting the solution of our problem.

In Fourth Ezra too the Messiah is introduced under the image of a man, but neither 'man' nor 'son of man' is used as a descriptive title: 'I saw a vision in the night; and lo! a great wind arose in the sea, so as to disturb all its waves. And I saw, and lo! the wind caused to ascend out of the heart of the sea as it were the similitude of a man[8], and I saw, and lo! that man flew with

[1] *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 214, n. 1.

[2] See Lietzmann, p. 45.

[3] xlviii 10; lii 4.

[4] xlix 2, 4; li 3, 5; lii 6, 9; liii 6; lxi 5, 8; lxii 1.

[5] lv 4.

[6] p. 199.

[7] *Der Menschensohn-Messias* in the *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.* 1892, pp. 445-464 containing a criticism of Baldensperger, who relies on the Similitudes as proving that the Son of Man was a title of the Messiah (see Lietzmann, p. 18).

[8] רבותא in the Syriac Version, Dalman, p. 200.

the clouds of heaven[1].' In the interpretation of the vision it is explained that the man seen ascending from the sea is he whom the Most High preserves, through whom He will save His creation[2].

For the consideration of the sparse attempts to show that in the rabbinical writings the phrase 'the Son of Man' is found as a title of the Messiah I may be content to refer to Lietzmann[3] and Dalman[4]. The few passages adduced quite fail to establish the point.

We may now turn to the use of the expression which is ascribed to Jesus by the Gospels. In considering this very difficult question it is reasonable to rely on the Synoptics as containing the earlier and more historical tradition. The passages in the Fourth Gospel are all peculiar to that work.

We may notice first the opinion which has been strongly advocated in recent times, that Christ never used the phrase as a designation of Himself.

The main argument in support of this position is founded on the meaning of the term in Aramaic. It seems absurd to suppose that Jesus spoke of Himself simply as 'the man.' According to the account in the Gospels He used this term before Peter's confession; and yet it is apparent from the account of that event that neither the people nor the disciples understood it in a Messianic sense. Accordingly, during the early part of His ministry He employed a phrase which conveyed no meaning to those who heard it, and yet He was never asked to explain it. The common opinion is that He purposely adopted an enigmatical expression, in order to excite curiosity, and lead to a gradual understanding and recognition of His claims.

Another argument is founded on the absence of the term from the earliest Christian literature outside the Gospels. Wellhausen lays special stress on the fact that it is not found in Paul's Epistles, and this, he thinks, is hard to understand if it was current in the Evangelical tradition known to him[5]. Perhaps it is a sufficient reply to this that the term would not be readily understood by Greeks; and that the Church understood it as

[1] xiii 1–3. [2] Ibid. 25, 26. [3] pp. 48–50.
[4] pp. 201–3.
[5] pp. 213 sq. See also Lietzmann, pp. 56, 86.

descriptive of Christ's lowly human nature, as contrasted with His heavenly exaltation, and therefore naturally resorted to phrases of higher import; and that the Messianic application of the eighth Psalm in 1 Cor. xv 27, and Eph. i 22 (cf. Heb. ii 6 sqq.) is most easily explained through the presence there of the term 'Son of Man.'

Lietzmann[1] points out that in the two passages of the Apocalypse (i 13, xiv 14) where the seer beholds one 'like a son of man[2],' the phrase cannot be equivalent to the Messiah, for he would not say he saw one *like* the Messiah. But I cannot agree with him when he adds that if the author had been acquainted with *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* as a Messianic designation of Jesus he must have written *εἶδον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. This explicitness would destroy the visionary character of the scene. If that was what the writer meant, he could have said, 'I saw Christ'; but in describing a vision he falls back upon the imagery of Daniel, and mentions only what presented itself to the eye, a being like a man.

The only other passage which it seems necessary to notice is one in the Epistle of Barnabas, which, as presented by Lietzmann[3], seems to have great force. He has, however, omitted an essential part of the context. The passage is in xii 8–10, and represents Jesus (Joshua) the son of Nun as a type of the later Jesus. Quoting from Exod. xvii 14 the author gives the concluding portion as follows:—*ἐκκόψει ἐκ ῥιζῶν τὸν οἶκον πάντα τοῦ Ἀμαλὴκ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*[4]. Then immediately follow the words referred to by Lietzmann, *ἴδε πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, οὐχὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τύπῳ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς*. It seems to me impossible to infer from this that the writer was not acquainted with the title 'Son of Man' in the Gospels. He is obviously alluding to the passage just quoted, and points out that, as it does not say 'Son of Man,' but 'the Son of God,' the reference must be to the later Jesus. On the whole, then, I think we cannot attach much importance to the argument from silence.

Another line of evidence is found in the phenomena presented by the Gospels themselves[5]. An examination of our Synoptic table shows that in several instances the phrase 'the Son of Man'

[1] p. 56. [2] *ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου.*

[3] p. 58. He, however, withdraws this argument in his reply to Schmiedel.

[4] The LXX is entirely different. [5] See Lietzmann, pp. 86 sq.

which is found in one Gospel is either changed or omitted in the parallel passage in one or both of the others, and it may fairly be argued that this proves the uncertainty of the tradition, and suggests the possibility that the phrase may be due to the Evangelists rather than to the speaker whose words they profess to report. I am not sure, however, that this argument is very sound. We must judge of its force by referring to the nature of memory, and it seems obvious that we might remember perfectly that a man was in the habit of using a certain expression, and yet we might be doubtful whether he had used it on any particular occasion; so that if we suppose that Jesus sometimes spoke of the Son of Man, and sometimes in uttering a similar thought employed the first personal pronoun, we should expect to find in the Gospels exactly the kind of vacillation which they actually display. Another point tending, it is said, to arouse suspicion is the fact that for critical reasons now this group of passages and now that have been rejected as unhistorical, so that the combined attack dissipates almost the entire set. For instance, Christ's predictions of His death are thought to be the apology of the Church for the shameful death of the Messiah; His references to a future coming are a piece of Jewish Apocalypse which He can never have uttered; and sayings which to some minds appear to bear the stamp of genuineness seem to others to be obviously the spurious outcome of ecclesiastical interpretation. Our judgement in such matters is necessarily affected by our subjective point of view, so that one critic retains what another condemns. We may have to consider some of the instances for ourselves; but at present we simply note the fact that on grounds of historical criticism competent scholars throw doubts upon the authenticity of a large proportion of the passages under consideration.

Such, then, are the arguments which are adduced to support the conclusion that Jesus never referred to Himself as 'the Son of Man.' But the contention would fail in a very important point unless some reasonable explanation were given of the presence in the Gospels of a large number of passages in which Jesus does so describe Himself. Different explanations have been suggested, and these we must briefly notice.

Mr. Carpenter, without referring to the Aramaic, reaches his

results on purely critical grounds[1]. For the details of the argument I must refer the reader to the work itself; but the following statement of his conclusions, in his own words, makes his position clear. '(1) Jesus employed the term Son of Man in the symbolic sense in which it is used in Daniel vii, as an emblem of the Kingdom of Righteousness to be established by a great Divine manifestation among a holy people. (2) His followers understood it in a personal sense, and, after His death, impressed with the conviction that He was the Messiah, they identified Him with the Son of Man. In elaborating the remembrance of His warnings of His impending fate into a sort of justification for His passion, this name, impressed on their memory by His own use of it, acquired an important Messianic significance, and was employed in preference to any other. (3) Hence it became incorporated in statements descriptive of the function of Jesus, now current in the shape of comments, explanations, and glosses, though in many cases founded on His own thought. (4) It was further embodied in sayings now woven into the anecdotes and discourses of Jesus, the first germs of which may well be authentic, though in their present sense they are likewise Messianic. (5) Wherever, therefore, the term is individualised and used Messianically, we have evidence of the later influence of the Church. Jesus never used it to designate Himself[2].' This explanation has the merit of clearing away 'from the Teacher all those charges of fanatical delusion which have been founded on the supposition that in predicting the "coming of the Son of Man" He foretold His own return in clouds of glory[3],' and of ascribing to Him a noble prophetic vision of 'some great Divine manifestation of the eternal powers of justice and truth, before which the world's selfishness and violence should pass away[4].' Its weakness appears to me to lie in the fact that it is after all purely conjectural. Mr. Carpenter of course sees clearly that it cannot be carried through the eschatological passages as they stand. There are only a few to which it is applicable; and there is not one which requires it. Appeal is indeed made to Matt. xvi 28 and its parallels[5], and the following inference is drawn—'The "coming of the Son of Man,"

[1] *The first three Gospels: their origin and relations*, 1890, pp. 209 sq., 371 sq.
[2] pp. 387–8. [3] p. 254. [4] p. 251.
[5] No. 21 in the table.

then, *is* the "coming of the Kingdom of God." It is not the appearance of a person, it is the emblem of a great moral crisis, in which the divine forces of Love and Truth will be displayed among men[1].' The positive inference is correct; but the negative does not follow, for the appearance of the Messianic head implies the coming of the Divine Kingdom. The absence of the Son of Man from Mark and Luke might make it doubtful whether Jesus spoke of the Son of Man in this connexion at all, and then, of course, the argument would fall to the ground. But it may very well be the case that the omission is due to the fact that the personal return had not taken place, and therefore a more indefinite expression is substituted for the original saying. Let us suppose, then, that Matthew's is the earlier tradition. In that case Mark and Luke become the ecclesiastical interpreters, to whom Mr. Carpenter generally accords so little favour; or must we not rather say that the omission proves that they attached a personal meaning to the Son of Man, for their doing so serves to explain the omission? I cannot, therefore, see that this passage affords any evidence of the impersonal meaning of the Son of Man in the words of Jesus. The explanation, so far as I can judge, must remain a very doubtful, though interesting, hypothesis.

More recent opinions rest primarily on the alleged requirements of Aramaic. Wellhausen is in substantial agreement with Lietzmann, and I need not treat their arguments apart, but content myself with a general notice of the more important points.

A most interesting fact is the presence in the Gospels of a small group of passages in which *barnasha* may be used in its generic sense. The most striking instance is the statement that 'the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath[2].' In Mark this statement is based upon the principle that 'the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' It always seemed to me that Jesus cannot have intended to claim authority over the Sabbath only for Himself; for the logical inference is that, as the Sabbath was made for man, its use must be subject to man's judgement. Moreover Jesus was defending the action of the disciples, not His own, so that it was they, and not He, who

[1] p. 248. [2] No. 6 in the table.

had exercised the right of judgement. It now appears that the Aramaic-speaking people could hardly have understood Him in any other way. I see here, therefore, not a clumsy interpretation of the Church, but one of those grand and far-reaching utterances which show the real depth and power of Christ's thought. Grotius long ago pointed out that the Son of Man here means *homo quivis*, and he quotes Rabbi Jonathan as saying that the Sabbath was delivered into the hand of men, and not men into the hand of the Sabbath[1]. If such a dictum was current in the time of Christ, He adopted it, and gave it its wide practical application.

Another very interesting passage is that in which Christ declares that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins[2]. It is usual to represent this as the personal appropriation of a Divine prerogative, the interpreters, as is so often the case, agreeing with the opinion of the Scribes, and thinking it would be blasphemy for one who was really a man in the ordinary sense to forgive sins. Yet Jesus may be making this high claim on behalf of mankind; and that He does so is confirmed by the words of Matthew, 'They glorified God who had given such authority to men.' The change of words in the other Gospels may be due to a different conception of the passage, and a wish to remove an expression that might give rise to misunderstanding[3]. It is objected to this explanation that it would be absurd to suppose that every common ploughman possessed this high authority. But the generalising of the statement does not involve such a result. When we say that man can measure the distances of the planets, we do not mean that every one can do so, but that this power lies within the range of human faculty. So when we

[1] The whole comment of Grotius is quoted with approval by Arnold Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache: das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt*, 1896, p. 144. Dr. Driver has kindly sent me the following note: 'See Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, ii 493, according to whom the dictum is assigned more correctly in Mechilta on Ex. xxxi 14 to R. Shimeon b. Menassya (c. 190 A.D.). It is deduced by a very Rabbinical argument from Ex. xxxi 14, "it is holy *for you*."'

[2] No. 3 in the table.

[3] Schmiedel thinks the concluding words, according to the usual construction of the passage, can refer only to the miracle. The repetition of ἐξουσία seems against this explanation; but no doubt the miracle is here included with the forgiveness in one act. His suggestion that τοῖς ἀνθρώποις is a *dativus commodi* seems opposed to the obvious sense of the passage. See his articles, pp. 299 sq.

say that man has authority to forgive, we can only mean that this is included among the prerogatives of mankind, which each man must exercise according to the nature and extent of his gift. May I illustrate in a word or two the truth of Christ's saying? All men exercise this authority, some wisely and tenderly, some with reckless obstinacy, as though God had authorised their cruelty and malice. The look that pierces the heart, the gentle words of forgiveness, may heal the suffering of a sinful life, even as Christ healed the sinful woman whom the Pharisee, scandalized at this contact with sin and tampering with the rights of God, would have driven to despair and ruin. How many die in their sins because men take upon themselves not to forgive. He who lives with a holy pity in his heart is, wherever he goes, a dispenser of Divine grace, and pronounces forgiveness with a God-given authority. Scribes and Pharisees may call this blasphemy if they please; but such, I believe, was the thought of Christ.

The next passage requiring attention is that relating to blasphemy against the Son of Man and against the Holy Spirit[1]. In Mark there is nothing about the Son of Man, and it is conceivable that the writer may have omitted this part of the account because he could not recognise such a wide distinction between the Spirit and the Messiah. But another, and, I think, plausible explanation is suggested by Lietzmann[2]. In Matthew, verses 31 and 32 seem like duplicate versions of the same saying, and may be derived from two recensions contained in the Aramaic. The first contained the words לבני נשא, translated by Matthew τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, and by Mark τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The second form is presented by Matthew in verse 32, and by Luke in quite a different connexion, to which it does not seem properly to belong. In this the Aramaic may have been על בר נש, 'Whoever speaks a word against a man.' Wellhausen thinks that Mark gives the correct form, and that the other is due to mere misunderstanding[3].

There are two other passages where the general term might be used, but undoubtedly with a special personal implication. In reply to a Scribe who wished to follow Him Jesus said, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the man

[1] No. 7 in the table. [2] p. 88 sq.

[3] p. 203 sq.

(that is, the man whom you are addressing) has not where to lay his head[1].' The form of expression is suggested by the contrast with the lower animals, and would be quite intelligible, especially when it had the accompaniments of voice and gesture. The other passage[2] is where Jesus contrasts Himself with John the Baptist, 'The Son of Man came eating and drinking.' As Wellhausen[3] suggests, the expression may have been indeterminate, 'now comes a man (*barnash*) who eats and drinks.' This receives some confirmation from the following ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος.

These instances, it is alleged, are sufficient to prove that Jesus actually used *barnasha* in connexions which were liable to misinterpretation, especially when the phrase was translated into Greek, for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a strange expression, and would easily suggest a personal reference. The next step would be to look for an explanation in the Old Testament, and immediately Dan. vii 13 would present itself as the solution of the riddle, for the Son of Man there alluded to could be no other than the Saviour in whose speedy return the disciples so fervently believed. From this source the expression became common in Christian apocalypses, of which there are remnants in our Gospels; and when these were put into the mouth of Jesus, the term was fully converted into a self-designation, and then spread into other kinds of sayings, especially those relating to His suffering and death.

In conclusion I must mention what seems to me a very important concession on the part of Wellhausen. He does not think that the error proceeded originally from the Greeks, but believes rather that in many places *barnasha* is used in the specific Messianic *sense*, and then the Greeks introduced the specific *word*. He suggests that possibly ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was originally used everywhere for *barnasha*, and afterwards confined to passages where it signified the Messiah, and elsewhere ὁ ἄνθρωπος took its place[4]. This concession, if well founded, seems to cut away the whole of the argument based on the Aramaic expression; for if other people can have used *barnasha* in a Messianic sense, why may not Jesus have done so?

The opinion in favour of which the foregoing arguments have been adduced has certainly some attractive features, and gives

[1] No. 1 in the table
[2] No. 5 in the table.
[3] p. 205.
[4] p. 214 sq.

a plausible explanation to some perplexing phenomena in the Gospels. But, on the other hand, there appear to me to be some rather weighty objections, which make its acceptance difficult.

First, the term is found in all four Gospels, and this shows that the tradition was firmly established. There seems to be no particular reason for its appearance in the Fourth Gospel except the fact that it was at least believed to be a common expression in the mouth of Jesus. Now if we suppose that the Synoptic Gospels were written from forty to sixty years after the time of Christ, still they were based on earlier material, and even after forty years the memory of characteristic sayings may be perfectly clear, so that it is not antecedently probable that the habitual use of a very striking mode of speech should be attributed to Jesus from mere misunderstanding. I have not a particularly good memory, but I can recall many sayings that were uttered more than forty or even fifty years ago, and in some cases can vividly recollect the scene. The Apostles must have known whether their Master spoke of Himself in the way recorded in the Gospels or not; and the Gospels are sufficiently near Apostolical sources to make us pause before admitting that the Church is responsible for the appearance of so striking a characteristic. This argument depends for its force, to some extent, on the number of passages affected; for we may well hesitate to apply to numerous passages scattered throughout all the Gospels a mode of criticism which we think legitimately applicable to a small and concentrated group, which separates itself from the general tenor of the narrative.

Another consideration is this, that the Church was more likely to omit than to insert the phrase. Reliance is placed upon the silence of Christian writers to show that the phrase was not known. But the Gospels conclusively prove that it *was* known; and to imagine that it was a favourite expression just during the period when the Gospels were composed, and that before that time it was not known, and after that time it was not in common use, is to construct history to suit the hypothesis. The Church would have preferred some title apparently higher and more dignified.

This argument is confirmed by the fact that the Evangelists,

in their own narrative, never refer to Jesus as 'the Son of Man.' It is true that they generally confine themselves to the simple name, Jesus; but this is by no means invariably the case. He is spoken of as 'the Christ' or 'Jesus Christ' in Matt. i 1, 16, 17, 18; Mark i 1; John i 17, xx 31; and as 'Lord' (ὁ κύριος) in the appendix to Mark, xvi 19, 20, and in Luke vii 13, x 1, xi 39, xii 42, xiii 15, xvii 5, 6, xviii 6, xix 8, xxii 61 (*bis*), and xxiv 3 (where there is some doubt about the reading); John iv 1, vi 23, xi 2, xx 20. The author of the Book of Acts, which belongs to the same circle of early history as the Gospels, might easily have found opportunities for introducing the title, if he had a predilection for it; yet with the single exception of Stephen's dying exclamation, he fails to do so. If, then, we confined our attention to the Evangelists' own practice, we might plausibly argue that they were as ignorant of the title as the Apostle Paul. But even this does not exhaust the peculiarity of the facts. In the Gospels the term is used *only* by Jesus Himself, except that twice it is quoted from Him by the people[1]. While this appears to me to afford conclusive proof that it was not a popular title among the contemporaries of Christ, and that it had not become such even in Christian circles, it seems at the same time to justify a very strong presumption that it cannot have been forced into the speech of Jesus without adequate historical reason.

The impression which is made by these facts is only strengthened by the two exceptions which occur. It is related that Stephen, just before his martyrdom, exclaimed, 'Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God[2].' We do not know that Stephen was among the immediate followers of Christ; but at all events he was one of the very early disciples, and his death took place while the words of Jesus were still fresh in the memory. It is not evident that the exclamation refers to the vision of Daniel, but it is certainly in keeping with it; and while 'the Son of Man' undoubtedly denotes Christ, it includes the idea that in His person humanity is raised to the right hand of God. So, I think, the phrase was inevitably understood by the Jews if Jesus was in the habit of designating Himself as the Son of Man; and hence their fury. But if Jesus had not become known under this title, it would have conveyed no meaning, and

[1] John xii 34. [2] Acts vii 56.

we should be obliged to eliminate it along with the numerous passages in the Gospels. The other instance of its use bears a somewhat similar character. It is related by Hegesippus that James the Just, immediately prior to his martyrdom, was placed upon the wing of the Temple, and asked to declare to the people what was the door of Jesus the Crucified. 'And he answered with a loud voice, Why do you ask me about Jesus the Son of Man? And He Himself is seated in heaven on the right hand of the Great Power, and is to come on the clouds of heaven[1].' Here the allusion to Daniel is obvious, so that 'the Son of Man' indicates that particular Son of Man who was seen in the Prophet's vision. Although this event took place not long before the destruction of Jerusalem, James was, like Stephen, one of the early disciples, and may have spoken from recollection of Christ's own language. In this case, however, the reference to Daniel would serve to explain the words, and the mention of Jesus would at the same time convey the personal sense. How far we can depend on the story of Hegesippus is a question which we need not discuss. The point is that, if these accounts are true, they do not tend to establish the thesis that the title 'Son of Man' was ascribed to Jesus through the inventiveness or misunderstanding of the Church.

I may further mention one or two objections which Professor Sanday has raised, especially against Mr. Carpenter's hypothesis. If the Church was so scrupulous as is supposed not to attribute to Jesus the use of the word Messiah in relation to Himself, it would not be so bold in recasting the facts connected with the Son of Man[2]. This argument has a bearing on every form of the hypothesis; the following applies only to Mr. Carpenter's. It is, says Dr. Sanday, on dogmatic, and not critical, grounds that he gets rid of the passages relating to the forgiveness of sins and to the Sabbath, and also that in which it is said that the Son of Man came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many[3]. It is quite true that these are not rejected on the ground of documentary evidence, and therefore their rejection seems quite arbitrary to those who reason from

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* ii 23.

[2] 'On the title "Son of Man,"' in *The Expositor*, 1891, vol. iii p. 23.

[3] p. 24 sq.

a different doctrinal position. We ought, however, to remember that what are called subjective judgements rest on presumptions which themselves have been based on evidence, but cannot be continually restated; and no doubt Mr. Carpenter would be quite prepared to support by arguments the assumptions which he uses as a clue to criticism. However, in this case my own subjective judgement agrees with Professor Sanday's. Not only have the sayings in question good documentary evidence, but they seem to me to bear the stamp of originality and genuineness.

On the whole, then, I think this hypothesis must be rejected, unless it be impossible to produce any other that will bear serious examination.

Various opinions have been held by those who accept the testimony of the Gospels that Jesus spoke of Himself as the Son of Man. I cannot attempt to give a history of these opinions, which may be found sketched in Lietzmann, but must be content with referring to a few leading types.

The Fathers regard the term as descriptive of Christ's human nature. It will be sufficient to refer to a few of the early writers in illustration of this opinion. Justin Martyr says that Jesus called Himself the Son of Man either from His birth through a virgin, who was descended from David and the patriarchs, or because Abraham himself was the father of those from whom she derived her lineage, and men are called fathers of the children who are born to their daughters[1]. Irenaeus combines these reasons, saying that the Son of God became Son of Man by His birth from Mary, who was sprung from men and who was herself a human being[2]. Tertullian insists upon the same interpretation, in opposition to the docetism of Marcion[3]. This view, in the form in which it was held by the Fathers, is now generally abandoned. It contains a sound argument in support of the human nature of Jesus; but it failed to explain why Jesus so constantly used the term in speaking of Himself, for His human nature was obvious to all beholders, and did not need to be insisted on. There are, however, one or two interesting points connected with this ancient opinion. The Fathers recognised in the phrase a significance of its own, and though they connected

[1] *Dial.* 100.

[2] Homo = ἄνθρωπος. *Adv. Haer.* III xix 3.

[3] *Adv. Marc.* iv 10.

it with the passage in Daniel, they did not regard it as a mere alternative for the word 'Messiah.' They did not treat it as a current Messianic title, but rather assumed that Jesus applied it to Himself, not because He was the Messiah, but on account of the speciality of His nature. This helps to confirm the conclusion which we have already reached, that the term was not a familiar designation of the Messiah.

Another view is that adopted by Beza, Cocceius, Paulus, and Fritzsche, that the phrase is simply an oriental periphrasis for the first personal pronoun [1]. This, if it could be substantiated, would have the advantage, which is wanting in some other hypotheses, of explaining why Jesus spoke of Himself in the third person at all. But although there are examples of the use of הָהוּא גַּבְרָא 'this man,' הָהִיא אִתְּתָא 'this woman,' as a designation of the speaker, they are not numerous [2], and Dalman assures us that there is no example of a similar use of הָהוּא אֱנָשָׁא, or of הָהוּא בַר אֱנָשָׁא [3]. This interpretation, therefore, is so improbable that it has been generally rejected. It has, however, been recently revived, but only in reference to a few passages, by Arnold Meyer [4]. He appeals to two examples in Job:—'Mine eye poureth out tears unto God; that He would maintain the right of a man with God, and of a son of man with his neighbour [5],' where 'man' is used for 'I' in contrast with God; '*why is light given* to a man whose way is hid, and whom God hath hedged in?' [6] where it indicates 'myself' as a man of a particular kind. He would apply this analogy to the passages numbered 1, 3, and 5 in our table. This hypothesis, with its very limited application, cannot be justly stigmatized as a return to the older view, and does not involve the same degree of improbability.

Another explanation of the term is one of which Neander may be taken as the chief representative. He says that Christ must have had special reasons for adopting, with an obvious predilection, the less known Messianic title, and he finds these reasons in Christ's conscious relation to the human race. 'Jesus calls Himself Son of Man in relation to His human appearance as the one belonging to humanity, who in human nature has wrought so

[1] See Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, II p. 70; Dalman, p. 204.
[2] See examples quoted in Lietzmann, p. 83 sq., and references in Dalman, p. 204.
[3] p. 205.
[4] *Jesu Muttersprache*, pp. 93 sqq.
[5] xvi 20, 21.
[6] iii 23.

much for that nature, through whom it is glorified, who is man in the most pre-eminent sense, the sense corresponding to the idea, who realises the archetype of humanity.' He admits that the name involves 'an allusion to the description of the Messiah in Dan. vii,' but conceives that it owes its more profound significance to Christ's own divine and human consciousness. The two titles 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man' bear a reciprocal relation to each other. 'As Christ used the one to designate His human personality, so He employed the other to point out His Divine: and as He attached a sense far more profound than was common to the former title, so He ascribed a deeper meaning than was usual to the latter[1].' It is hardly a sufficient refutation of this view to say that Jesus was not a Greek philosopher, and that this kind of representation was quite foreign to Jewish thought; for if Jesus had the consciousness which is supposed, He must have been able to shape it in thought and to express it in words. Moreover the passage in Daniel, though not using the language of Greek philosophy, certainly suggests the final triumph of the human ideal over the brute forces of heathenism. It is a more serious objection to Neander's opinion that it is purely conjectural, that there is nothing in the Gospels which naturally suggests it, and there is no evidence that Christ's hearers ever understood Him in the required sense[2].

A similar objection applies to the view of Baur, who maintains that Jesus adopted the title in order to emphasise the fact that He was absolutely man, with all the lowliness and weakness of human nature. According to this supposition Jesus must have described Himself as *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, at all events in the earlier period of His ministry, and the articles must have been added by the society of believers, or possibly by Jesus Himself at a later period; and also the passages in which *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* has a specifically Messianic meaning must be ascribed to the remodelling activity of the Church[3].

[1] *Life of Christ*, translation, pp. 98–100. The first quotation is from the German in Lietzmann, p. 2.

[2] There is a searching refutation of this view by Holsten, on philological grounds [article before referred to (p. 541 n. 1), pp. 49 sqq.]: a term used in this way must include all the characteristics of the genus, and therefore in the present instance the non-ideal elements as well as the ideal.

[3] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1860, pp. 274–292, summarised in Lietzmann, pp. 3–5; also his *NT. Theologie*, pp. 75–82.

Again, the opinion that it is in every instance a term which designates the Messiah, even though it may indicate some special aspect of Messiahship, is maintained by a number of distinguished critics. I may begin the list with Hilgenfeld, who emphasises this view in an article, 'Die Evangelien und die geschichtliche Gestalt Jesu,' in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1863, pp. 311–340[1]. In 1864 Weizsäcker defended the same position in his *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*[2]. The expression is never explained in the Gospels, and consequently it must have had an accepted meaning. But though it was used in apocalyptic circles, it cannot have been a generally recognised name of the Messiah; for if it had been Jesus would have been attacked on that ground. It may therefore have been understood first in a prophetic sense, as it is found especially in Ezekiel, and its full Messianic sense became only gradually clear to the Apostles. To the mass of the people the name presented less a revelation than a problem; and it taught the disciples to see in Him, as Messiah, a man of human descent[3]. Keim also maintains the strict Messianic sense, which he thinks is present even in the earliest use of the expression. He refers its origin not only to Daniel, but to the eighth Psalm; but, in opposition to Weizsäcker, he rejects the appeal to Ezekiel, because Jesus could not have borne the name at the same time in a prophetic and a Messianic sense[4].

By far the most elaborate defence of this view with which I am acquainted is that by Holsten in the article already referred to[5]. He thinks an incontestable proof that Jesus used the title before the confession of Peter is afforded by the passages numbered 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 in our table[6]. The Jews, however, must have understood the phrase in the sense of 'the man,' and in thinking He was John the Baptist or Elijah connected the person of Jesus with the highest name that the Jewish consciousness had given to a man[7]. Matthew alone has preserved the historical situation at Caesarea Philippi, for Christ's question was intended to ascertain whether the people had grasped the intended meaning of the 'Son of Man' as identical with the Messiah, the Son of

[1] The part about the Son of Man is pp. 327–334.
[2] pp. 426 sqq.
[3] So in his *Das apost. Zeitalter*[2], 1890, p. 109.
[4] *Gesch. Jesu*, II (1871) pp. 71, 72.
[5] On p. 541 n. 1. [6] Holsten, pp. 17–19. [7] pp. 20 sq.

God [1]. It follows that Jesus used the expression in His Galilean ministry, that in His own consciousness He identified it with the Christ, the Son of God, that He used no other recognised name of the Messiah, and further that He must have conceived the possibility that the people and the disciples would infer His Messiahship from His use of the phrase, and that He intended and expected this. But this possibility was not a necessity, as the title was not an accepted one for the Messiah, and was susceptible of a different explanation. In the saying, 'The Son of Man has authority to forgive sins,' the people must have understood 'the Son of Man' in the sense of ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The sayings in Matt. xii 8, viii 20 [2] may have been similarly understood. He cannot have expressed such thoughts as Matt. xiii 41 or x 23 [3] during His Galilean ministry [4]. It further follows that He had not disclosed the meaning of this name, that He must have had reasons for concealing its Messianic meaning during the Galilean period, and that after Peter's confession the reason for concealing it from the disciples must have ceased, and for concealing it from the people have continued [5]. The proof of the Messianic meaning is found in an examination of the several passages where the phrase occurs. The following passages in our table contain predicates which admit only an immediate reference to the Messiah—4, 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, [30], 31, 32, 33, 35. Most of the remaining passages require a mediate reference to the Messiah; for they either make the expression equivalent to the Messiah [6], or express a form of the Messiah's activity—the authority committed to Him to forgive sins [7]; to dissolve in the service of man the commandment respecting the Sabbath [8]; to bring deliverance to lost men [9]; to give up His life as a ransom for many [10], and so to experience suffering, crucifixion, burial, and resurrection [11]; or the Son of Man is represented as an object of Messianic prediction in the Scriptures [12]; or the expression is used in connexion with a thought which has reference to the Messiah [13]; or, finally, it is brought into connexion with others who stand in

[1] p. 29.
[2] Nos. 10 and 4 in the table.
[3] Nos. 6 and 1 in the table.
[4] pp. 30 sq.
[5] p. 32.
[6] 11.
[7] 3.
[8] 6.
[9] 37, 38.
[10] 16.
[11] 8 *Mt*, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 36.
[12] 2, 8 *Lc*, 19, 34, 39.
[13] 13, 15 *Lc*, 18.

relation to the Messiah—with John the Baptist or Elijah [1], with the Holy Spirit [2], with the Devil [3]. Only number 1 remains, in which the expression need not necessarily refer to the Messiah, or in which the sense may well be that Jesus, as the Messianic Saviour, must wander about without a fixed home [4]. It appears, then, that not a single predicate is derived from an analysis of the notion of *man*, whether in an exalted sense or the reverse [5]. Nevertheless Holsten contends that Jesus could not have chosen the term unless He had the distinct consciousness that as one begotten by a man He belonged to the genus man, and one cannot escape from this conclusion by saying it was only a designation of office, and not of essence [6].

The origin of Christ's use of the term is explained by Holsten as follows. He thinks Jesus derived it from Daniel, considering Himself to be *the* individual of the genus man referred to by the Prophet [7]. He assumes the recognised fact that Jesus, during His Galilean ministry, possessed a certainty of His Messiahship in a definite form of the Messianic consciousness [8]. This arose from a confidence, founded on experience, that God had bestowed His Spirit upon Him, the man, in contradistinction from other men. From this must have resulted the conviction that God had destined Him to the fulfilment of a particular aim in the realisation of His saving will; that He had chosen Him, however, not to be the prophet of the Messiah—for He had already raised up John the Baptist for this purpose—but to be the Messiah Himself [9]. The confidence in His Messiahship was at once negatively defined. In His religious feeling He had broken with the Davidic ideal of Messiah's kingdom, and expected the realisation of the Kingdom of Heaven through an act of God from heaven. Thereby He renounced all the attributes wherein the Jewish consciousness recognised the promised Messiah [10]. Hence necessarily arose the conviction that, according to God's will, the Messianic kingdom and the Messianic ruler must exist under two forms. In the one, the contents of which were given by the actual experience of life, He who was destined to be the

[1] 5, 13.
[2] 7.
[3] 9.
[4] pp. 35 sqq.
[5] p. 37.
[6] p. 47.
[7] pp. 52–55.
[8] p. 55.
[9] p. 56.
[10] pp. 56–58.

Messiah was fitted with the Divine power of the Messianic spirit; but outwardly He was without the attributes of the Messianic ruler, and was therefore given up to unbelief, persecution and suffering. In the other, the contents of which were formed by hope based on experience, the destined Messiah was endowed outwardly with all the attributes of the ruler of the Kingdom of Heaven, and became manifest as the Messianic king to all the peoples of the earth[1]. Under these conditions of thought and feeling the question must have forced itself on Jesus whether His image of the Messiah was the true one, announced by the Prophets of God in the Scriptures. The prophetic picture of the Messiah was not uniform; and He had to reject the Davidic ideal of the older prophets, retaining only its spiritual features. Nevertheless He required a form and name for His idea of the Messiah; and these He found in the apocalyptic prophecy of Daniel, and the view there given of the בר אנש. Accordingly He felt himself destined, when God established the Kingdom of Heaven, to be brought from earth before God on the clouds of heaven, in order to return to earth in the glory of the heavenly ruler[2]. In reference to this unrealised expectation Holsten warns us in a note that we must not call what would be fanaticism for us fanaticism in Jesus, for it involved nothing contradictory to the laws of the universe known to the Jews[3].

From this religious interpretation of the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου Holsten believes that all the facts referring to it in the Synoptic Gospels may be explained. Among other things he says it explains the peculiar manner of speech in the third person, where Jesus utters predicates of Himself which result not from the individuality but from the Messiahship of His person. I suppose this means that Jesus referred to such predicates as characteristic of the Son of Man, whoever He might be, in accordance with the representations of Scripture; and so He virtually made an appeal to prophecy, which would not have been understood if He had used the first person. For instance, when He says the Son of Man will come in His glory, He implies that this has been foretold, and He tacitly applies the prediction to Himself only on the ground that He is the Son of Man; so that the effect would be quite different if He said 'I shall come in

[1] pp. 58 sq. [2] pp. 59–61. [3] p. 60, n. 2.

glory.' This, I think, might render the use of the third person intelligible, at least in many of its applications; but whether it is what Holsten intended to imply I am not sure. Further, the interchange with the first person is explained because Jesus attained His Messianic consciousness first in the course of His Galilean ministry, and hence λόγια τοῦ κυρίου arose and became fixed, which were expressed in the first person even where one could expect the third; and the later tradition preserved the twofold form of speech[1].

Finally Holsten asks whether the signification 'Son of Man,' recognised in the consciousness of the Synoptic Jesus, can be assumed for the consciousness of the historical Jesus. This question is twofold: whether the circle of thoughts can be ascribed to the historical Jesus; and whether the form of these thoughts can be carried back to the historical consciousness and life of Jesus. The circle of thoughts embraces a threefold content. A part is rooted in the Messianic activity of Jesus in Galilee, a second part in His life on the way to Jerusalem and in Jerusalem, a third in His Messianic life after the death on the cross. The scene in Caesarea serves to separate these portions. The separation is carried through purely in Mark, less purely in Matthew, and still less so in Luke[2]. The only point in the contents of the thought which can seem foreign to the Messianic consciousness of the historical Jesus is the representation of the Son of Man as judge of the world[3]; for in Daniel God is the judge[4]. The form of the thoughts, however, cannot be regarded as an expression historically real of the consciousness of Jesus. The announcment of the death and resurrection cannot have been made before the arrival in Jerusalem[5], or the saying about the saving character of His death before the last supper[6]. Jesus may, however, have spoken of anticipated sufferings before His departure from Galilee, where he had already had experience of suffering[7].

I do not think Klöpper, in the article previously referred to[8], makes any important addition to Holsten's arguments. He, too, regards the title as purely Messianic, and insists that even in the

[1] pp. 69 sq. [2] p. 72. [3] Nos. 10, 21, 23, 31 in the table.
[4] p. 74. [5] Nos. 12, 14, 15, 17, 36 in the table.
[6] No. 16 in the table. [7] pp. 75 sq. [8] On p. 541 n. 1.

passages about the forgiveness of sins and the observance of the Sabbath[1] the expression 'the Son of Man' can have none but an exclusive sense[2].

A thoughtful essay by Mr. Vernon Bartlet[3] calls attention to the Old Testament ideas which he believes were included by Christ under the term 'Son of Man.' He would not say that the *term* was not in any way suggested by Dan. vii 13; but, he adds, 'to adopt a term is one thing, to derive one's use of it from a single striking passage in which it occurs is another[4].' He refers also to the use of the expression in Ezekiel and the eighth Psalm[5], and thus sums up his main position: the title, 'as habitually used by Jesus, had primary reference to Himself as the unique personalised type of the kingdom of God, the main features of whose character were given most vividly and completely in the picture of Jehovah's Servant in Isa. lii 13–liii; other associations of a more Apocalyptic type being confined to vague and picturesque hints as to the future developments, when weakness should give place to manifested glory[6].'

Dalman, while believing that Jesus appropriated the name because He was the destined Messiah, does not regard it as in itself a Messianic title. The Synoptists, he thinks, did not view it as a designation of the Messiah's glory, but as the intentional veiling of the Messiahship behind a name which emphasised the humanity of its bearer. Jesus Himself, as we learn from passages 25 and 32 in our table, derived this self-designation from Daniel[7], and it is very probable that He found the Son of Man of Daniel also in the eighth Psalm[8]. In calling Himself בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, therefore, He simply claimed to be the one in whom the vision of Daniel found its fulfilment. The name, however, would not be understood; and if we believe that Jesus purposely spoke in riddles, we are met by the difficulty that the disciples would have asked for an explanation, and this was not given before Peter's confession. It is therefore *probable* that the term was not used before the confession, and that the earlier instances in the Gospels are misplaced through the uncertainty of the chronology,

[1] Nos. 3 and 6 in the table.
[2] pp. 174 sq.
[3] In *The Expositor*, 1892, vol. vi pp. 427–443.
[4] p. 428.
[5] pp. 434 sq.
[6] p. 437. The passage quoted is in italics.
[7] p. 211.
[8] p. 218.

or incorrectly reported through defective memory. This probability would, he considers, be a certainty if the term were a proper Messianic name[1]. From the time of the confession 'the Son of Man' was understood by the disciples as the designation, borrowed from Daniel, of Him who was destined to the empire of the world. To the mass of the people its full sense was not disclosed till Jesus made His public declaration before the Sanhedrim[2]. Jesus gave the preference to Daniel because nowhere else is it so clear that the necessary change in the condition of the world is to be expected from God alone. He avoided the term 'Messiah' on account of the false expectations with which it was associated, and also because Messiah was not His proper title till He was seated on the throne. The Son of Man in Daniel is one who is to receive the Kingdom, and might therefore pass through sufferings and death; He is no conqueror, but a child of man taken by God under His protection, and destined to future greatness. Accordingly Jesus assumed the title as being in His nature a weak child of man, whom God would make the Lord of the world. The ancient Church, though wrong in its more precise interpretation, was not wrong when it recognised in the assumption of the title by Jesus an acknowledgement of His humanity; and it was also right in not using the designation on its own part, for since the Son of Man was seated on the throne of God, He had ceased to be only a man, and had become the ruler over heaven and earth[3].

It is evident from the foregoing account of various opinions that the solution of the problem before us is not easy. None of the opinions which I have briefly described appears to me wholly satisfactory; and though I may despair of presenting any more acceptable hypothesis, I may at least point out some difficulties which I think have not been fully explained.

In the first place, Christ's repeated reference to Himself in the third person, as though He were speaking of some one else, is, when we think of it, an exceedingly strange mode of speech; and I suppose it is only from early familiarity that the strangeness is not recognised, and I have met with no serious attempt to deal with it on the part of those who believe that it is correctly ascribed to Jesus. It is not even as though this curious practice

[1] pp. 212 sq. [2] p. 216. [3] pp. 217 sq.

were consistently carried through, or limited to sayings of a particular class; for He frequently uses the first person in the ordinary way, and He sometimes speaks of the Son of Man when we should naturally expect the first person[1], and sometimes in the reports of the same saying we find 'the Son of Man' in one Gospel and the first person in another[2]. But this is not all. It is generally assumed that Jesus, whatever He meant by the term, taught the people that He was the Son of Man; and Klöpper goes so far as to maintain that, whether or not Daniel had already received a Messianic interpretation, Jesus might take His own independent position, and say, I am the one appearing as a Son of Man, I am the Son of Man[3]. But that is precisely what He never does. The only approach to anything of the kind is in Matt. xvi 13[4], where με is of doubtful authority, and where, if we retain it, He evidently assumes that the disciples already know Him as the Son of Man. We must observe, moreover, that 'the Son of Man' is absent from the parallel passages, and this whole passage in Matthew contains, I think, signs of inferior authenticity. Accordingly, it is purely a matter of inference from certain passages that He must have meant Himself, because there is no third person to whom the statement will apply[5], while in a still larger number of instances there is nothing to indicate that He referred to Himself. No hypothesis can be wholly satisfactory which does not give some explanation of this most curious fact.

Secondly, the phrase has all the appearance of being used in two distinct senses, which are nowhere reconciled. This may be seen most clearly by comparing passage 4 in the table with 5, 15, 37, and 38. In the former we are told that the disciples will not have gone through the cities of Israel ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: implying that He had not yet come, and apparently referring to some one different from the speaker. In the latter passages we learn that the Son of Man has already come, and is. It is easy to say that in the former instance the second coming is referred to; but neither here nor anywhere else in the Synoptics is there any allusion to a *second* coming. From the apocalyptic passages taken by themselves no one would divine that there had

[1] Nos. 1, 5, 8, 9 in the table.
[2] Nos. 2, 11, 16, 22 (cf. 12) in the table.
[3] l. c. p. 170.
[4] No. 11 in the table.
[5] See 1, 5, 8, 11–20, 36–39.

been a first coming, and an earlier παρουσία, with perhaps the exception of one peculiar to Matthew[1], where the connexion suggests that the Son of Man may be the speaker, and one in Luke[2], where 'the Son of Man' is peculiar to that Gospel. Again and again, as we read these passages, the question involuntarily recurs to the mind, Can Jesus mean Himself? If any one will read Matt. xxv 31–46, and try to dissociate his mind from all pre-conceptions, I think he will find it hard to believe that Jesus is there speaking of Himself. No doubt the personal reference follows from the question of the Apostles in xxiv 3, 'What is the sign of Thy presence, and of the end of the age?' But the question is differently given in Mark xiii 4, 'What is the sign when all these things are about to be fulfilled?' and in Luke xxi 7, 'What is the sign when these things are about to take place?' and, as Jesus had said nothing about His coming, this seems the most probable form of the question. In any case I refer to the impression made by Christ's own reported words, when taken by themselves.

In the third place, two of the crucial passages seem to me to yield no coherent meaning if the term be understood in a Messianic sense. In passage 3 in the table we are told that Jesus healed a paralytic man in order that the people might know that the Son of Man had authority on earth to forgive sins. But how could the act of Jesus disclose anything in regard to the Messiah, unless it was first known that He was the Messiah? The act could prove nothing except what Matthew says, that God had given such authority to men. The use of the expression here, therefore, seems inconsistent with a limited Messianic application, and, while it undoubtedly includes Jesus, does not exclude others. This argument is not met by Schmiedel's suggestion[3] that Jesus wished to prove at once His authority to forgive sins, and His Messiahship; for this would require His words to be, 'That ye may know that I have authority to forgive sins, and therefore am the Messiah.'

A similar criticism will apply to the passage about the Sabbath[4]. As it stands in Mark, which appears to me the most original, and to give the true explanation of the saying, Christ infers that the

[1] No. 23 in the table.
[2] p. 299.
[3] No. 22 in the table.
[4] No. 6 in the table.

Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath from the fact that the Sabbath was made for man. But this general principle would not prove that the Messiah was Lord of the Sabbath, at least to the exclusion of others; nor, if that were an accepted truth, could it prove to the people that Jesus had any authority in the matter, since he was not known to be the Messiah. The inference clearly is that man may judge how to use that which was instituted for the benefit of man. Matthew and Luke may perhaps have wished to avoid this inference, and to give the saying a more limited scope. But the bare statement that the Messiah was lord of the Sabbath could have no possible effect unless it were first admitted that Jesus was the Messiah. To say that the disciples were justified in plucking ears of corn because some future and unknown Messiah was lord of the Sabbath would be nonsense. Here, then, as in the previous passage, Jesus, while including *Himself* under the term 'Son of Man,' does not exclude others.

Viewing these phenomena, we may be inclined to suppose that Jesus did not use the term in a very strict or limited sense, and that He may have given it a somewhat varying application according to circumstances. If He started from Daniel, which is not properly Messianic, He may very well have regarded it as a typical expression, standing for the true representatives of humanity, 'the people of the saints of the Most High,' the ideal people of God. This view would readily connect itself with the servant of God in Isaiah lii 13–liii, for there the same epoch of redemption seems to be alluded to, and the same exaltation[1] after a period of suffering and oppression. Then, if, as we have supposed, He was conscious of His own Messianic calling, He *must* have regarded Himself as the head of this ideal class—the Son of Man in a pre-eminent sense—the one in whom (though not in whom exclusively) prophecy found its fulfilment. It is also conceivable that He may not have identified Himself as Messiah with Him who was to come as the conquering Son of Man, but may have understood the Prophet's vision as a poetical description of the spiritual conquest of the world's brute forces by a divinely commissioned humanity, personified as the Son of Man. This hypothesis is certainly not without difficulties. The last supposition is especially open to objection, though it seems to follow from the facts which

[1] lii 13.

I have pointed out. Some modifications will be required in the traditional accounts of Christ's sayings, which have become coloured by the later conceptions of the Evangelists. No other view, however, is free from difficulties; and our hypothesis has the advantage of retaining all the well-attested utterances of Jesus, of not interfering with the chronology, and of incorporating what may be true in some other views which we have seen reason to reject. Let us briefly review the passages, following the numbers in the table.

In 1 'the Son of Man' may stand, not for man universally, but for man in the ideal sense in which the phrase occurs in Daniel, and in which 'the servant of God' is spoken of in Isaiah, the oppressed saints and saviours of men, who at some time are to receive the dominion. The meaning will then be, not that I individually have not where to lay my head, but that the true servant of God as such, the man who is waiting and labouring for the Kingdom of God, is more homeless than the birds, and therefore I am so, and you who would follow me must be so likewise. This interpretation at once preserves the personal application and explains the use of the third person, which introduces a kind of argumentative appeal. In 2, Matthew's may be the original form of the saying, and Luke's version may be due to the habit of making 'the Son of Man' synonymous with the first personal pronoun. Luke's reading, however, might have a more general sense—for the sake of man regarded on his more spiritual side, 'the people of the saints.' 3 we have dealt with; but now we can remove the absolute universality which is objected to, and understand the Son of Man in its higher religious sense; and thus all validity disappears from Schmiedel's argument, that, according to this interpretation, Jesus must have ascribed to men universally the power of healing disease miraculously[1]. That He did ascribe this power to others besides Himself is admitted; and He seems to have connected it especially with faith and prayer. 4 is peculiar to Matthew, and must be classed with the eschatological passages. 5 requires a different explanation, for the reference is clearly limited to Jesus Himself. We may perhaps fall back on the Aramaic, and suppose, with Wellhausen[2], that the original saying was, 'Now comes a man who eats and drinks,' the gesture

[1] p. 298 sq. [2] p. 205.

and intonation showing that Jesus meant Himself. 6 we have noticed above; and, as in 3, we are now relieved of an unconditional universality. In 7 the reading of Mark tends to throw doubt upon the saying about the Son of Man. But I quite agree with Schmiedel that an Evangelist was much more likely to alter the tradition in the direction of Mark than in that of Matthew and Luke. Nevertheless, if we follow Matthew, we cannot understand the expression in the highest Messianic sense; for the contrast is clearly between human imperfection and the Holy Spirit of God, and if 'the Son of Man' were used here in a strict and limited Messianic sense, the saying would not refer so much to Jesus personally, in His lowly human appearance, as to the Divine function which He was called upon to fulfil, and thus the force of the contrast would disappear. The meaning, therefore, must be general—He who shall speak against God's human servant, whoever he may be, as you have spoken against Me, shall be forgiven: for this may be due to a mere misunderstanding of human motives; but the ascription to Beelzebub of deeds which bear the stamp of the Holy Spirit is a different matter, and betrays an unpardonable moral blindness and malignity. In 8 the original form of the saying may have been without 'the Son of Man,' for verse 40 in Matthew can hardly be regarded as genuine, and in Luke also verse 30 may be an explanatory comment: compare 8^{a}, where we seem to have a different report of the same saying, and these additions are wanting. In 9 the sense may be general, though it is pre-eminently true of Christ. 10 is apocalyptic, and contains no evidence of a personal reference. In 11 the text of Mark and Luke throws suspicion upon 'the Son of Man' in Matthew. There it is of course strictly personal in its application; but, if genuine, it furnishes a proof that the 'Son of Man' had no narrowly defined meaning, and certainly was no recognised name for the Messiah. The possibility of a general and elastic meaning will be at once apparent if we use another term—Who do men say that I, the servant of God, am?' The passages about His sufferings, 12–20, clearly refer only to Himself. But we should observe that the sayings have probably been coloured, and rendered more distinct in their details, by the subsequent knowledge of the Evangelists; for not only were the disciples quite unprepared for Christ's death, but

we are distinctly told that they did not understand His references to His sufferings, although, as they stand, they are perfectly explicit[1]. It seems probable, therefore, that the allusions to His suffering were of a more general kind; and they seem to have been founded, not only on Christ's experience of opposition, but on His reading of the Prophets[2]. He may have reasoned thus:— Every one who labours for the Kingdom of God must suffer; the people of the saints, the Son of Man, in Daniel was oppressed; the servant of God in Isaiah laid down his life; it is the lot of every true son of man, and therefore it must be mine, for I am pre-eminently the Son of Man of prophecy. This would explain at once the use of the third person and the mystification of the disciples. On the passages relating to the future coming I have already remarked. In 36 the reference to the resurrection hardly seems appropriate to the time, and is not sustained by Luke. In 37 and 38 the reference is personal; but still may allude to a general characteristic of the true Son of Man. In 39, where the reference is personal, Luke's reading is without the support of the other Gospels.

Thus our hypothesis, which has been suggested by some striking facts in our records, seems on the whole to agree with the text of the Gospels, to which it does much less violence than some other views. Still it is only as an hypothesis, the best which I am at present able to form, that I commend it to the reader's attention.

JAMES DRUMMOND.

[1] See Mark ix 32; Luke ix 45, xviii 34.

[2] In 12, δεῖ: in 13, γέγραπται: in 15, πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα: in 20, δεῖ.