

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## Was **בר נשא** a Messianic Title?

PROF. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

ITHACA, N. Y.

IT is significant that the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* never occurs in the epistolary literature of the New Testament. Paul designates the Christ as *ὁ ἰσχυρὸς Ἀδάμ, ὁ δεῦτερος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* (1 Cor. xv. 45 ff.). Thus he evidently labors to express the ideal, supernal humanity of Jesus. But it never seems to have occurred to him to use for this purpose the common Synoptic title. In 1 Cor. xv. 26, 27 he quotes Ps. viii. in such a way as to show that he considers it as Messianic. To his thinking the "man" of the text referred to Christ. Yet he never called Jesus *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*. This fact can scarcely be accounted for except on the supposition that the manner in which the Evangelists employ the phrase was unknown to him. The possibility is, of course, not precluded that he may have heard Jesus called "the son of man" and regarded this term as an inadequate characterization of that heavenly man who was no longer to be known "according to the flesh." But such disregard is not compatible with a knowledge on his part of this as the one Messianic title assumed by the Master himself.

The disciples of Paul built upon his foundations. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that in developing, as they did, the apostle's Christology, they never refer to Christ as "the son of man." In Heb. ii. 6, 7, Ps. viii. is again quoted as Messianic, and it is clear that the author introduces it because of the contrast between "man" and the "angels" (*G<sup>AL</sup>*) and also because the "man" to his mind was none else than Christ. But it is equally evident that he does not regard *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* as a title, but sees in the passage a prophecy of Christ's temporary subordination as a man to the angels.

Nowhere in the New Testament do we meet with so many names of the Christ as in Revelation. All the more striking is the fact that *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is not one of them. It is certainly remarkable that the Christ, who in his lifetime, according to the Synoptics, never

used any other title than this, should in his exalted state have so completely dropped it that it fails to appear even in those epistles and addresses in which he most carefully describes himself (cf. i. 17 ff., ii., xxii. 13, 16). Still more significant is the occurrence of the phrase *ὁμοιον υἱὸν ἀθρώπου* (i. 13, xiv. 14). The Messiah is clearly referred to; but the description is drawn almost exclusively from the Old Testament<sup>1</sup> (Dan. vii. 13, G<sup>A1</sup> and G<sup>Θ</sup> *ὡς υἱὸν ἀθρώπου*; Ez. i. 26 and Dan. vii. 9), and certainly not on the basis of the Synoptic apocalypse,<sup>2</sup> since in that case the author undoubtedly would have written *εἶδον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀθρώπου*. The conclusion is well nigh inevitable that this writer had neither read our gospels nor heard of the title which they claim that Jesus assumed.

The only passage outside of the gospels where *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀθρώπου* occurs is Acts vii. 56. Having accused his hearers of the murder of the righteous one, Stephen looks into heaven and exclaims: "I see the heavens opened and the son of man standing on the right hand of God." This is generally supposed to mean: "I see the Messiah standing on the right hand of God." Two queries at once suggest themselves. Why should the Sanhedrists have taken offence at a statement so thoroughly in harmony with their own views on the subject? That the Messiah's place was at the right hand of God, was certainly no heresy from their standpoint. On the other hand, how could Paul, whose subsequent career shows the indelible impression left upon him by this address and this vision, have so completely forgotten or set aside the significant title thus given the Messiah by the proto-martyr? The probability is either that the title has been substituted for the name, or else that the expression was not originally meant as a title. However that may be, the author of Acts is clearly acquainted with the phrase as a Messianic title. This renders it the more remarkable that in the many speeches edited by him none of the apostles, but only this Hellenistic Jew, uses the expression.

In the Synoptics *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀθρώπου* occurs 69 times: 30 in Matthew, 14 in Mark, and 25 in Luke. When the duplicates are

<sup>1</sup> The feature borrowed from Dan. vii. 9 is also found in Enoch xiv. 20, which may have been older than Daniel (cf. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 1893, pp. 26, 56). Enoch xlvi. 1 ff. is evidently reminiscent of Dan. vii. 13. There is nothing that absolutely demands an acquaintance on the part of the author of Revelation with the Book of Enoch; and the absence in Revelation of all the characteristic Messianic titles of Enoch, such as *ὁ ἐκλεκτός*, *ὁ ἀγαπητός*, *ὁ δίκαιος*, to say nothing of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀθρώπου*, is significant.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jacobsen, *Die Johannes-Apocalypse und die Canonischen Evangelien*, "Protestantische Kirchenzeitung," xxxiii, 1886, p. 563 ff.

removed, however, there are found to be only 35 separate utterances that contain the phrase. Of these, 8 are found in all three gospels, viz. :

1. Mark ii. 10 [Matt. ix. 6; Lk. v. 24].
2. " ii. 28 [Matt. xii. 8; Lk. vi. 5].
3. " viii. 38 [Matt. xvi. 27; Lk. ix. 26].
4. " ix. 31 [Matt. xvii. 22; Lk. ix. 44, xxiv. 7].
5. " x. 33 [Matt. xx. 18; Lk. xviii. 31].
6. " xiii. 26 [Matt. xxiv. 30, twice; Lk. xxi. 27].
7. " xiv. 21, twice [Matt. xxvi. 24, twice; Lk. xxii. 22].
8. " xiv. 62 [Matt. xxvi. 64; Lk. xxii. 69].

Four are found in Mark and Matthew, viz. :

- |                                |                                 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9. Mark ix. 9 [Matt. xvii. 9]. | 11. Mark x. 45 [Matt. xx. 28].  |
| 10. " ix. 12 [Matt. xvii. 12]. | 12. " xiv. 41 [Matt. xxvi. 45]. |

One is found in Mark and Luke, viz. :

13. Mark viii. 31 [Lk. ix. 22].

Seven are found in Matthew and Luke, viz. :

14. Matthew viii. 20 [Lk. ix. 58].
15. " xi. 19 [Lk. vii. 34].
16. " xii. 32 [Lk. xii. 10].
17. " xii. 40 [Lk. xi. 30].
18. " xxiv. 27 [Lk. xvii. 24].
19. " xxiv. 37, 39 [Lk. xvii. 26, 30].
20. " xxiv. 44 [Lk. xii. 40].

Eight are found only in Matthew, viz. :

- 21-28. Matthew x. 23, xiii. 37, 41, xvi. 13, 28, xix. 28, xxv. 31, xxvi. 2.

Seven are found only in Luke, viz. :

- 29-35. Luke vi. 22, xii. 8, xvii. 22, xviii. 8, xix. 10, xxi. 36, xxii. 48.<sup>8</sup>

There can be little room for doubt as to the meaning attached to the expression by the Synoptists. It is sufficiently evident that they understood it as a Messianic title.

The phrase is found eleven times in John, viz. : i. 51, iii. 13, 14, vi. 27, 53, 62, viii. 28, xii. 23, 34 twice, xiii. 31. In v. 27 *ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*-

<sup>8</sup> H. L. Oort, *De uitdrukking ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in het Nieuwe Testament*, Leiden, 1893, counts forty-two. I look upon a few more as duplicates. My table was made up before acquaintance with this excellent monograph.

του occurs, neither word having the article. As is generally admitted, the author was familiar with the Synoptics (i. 51 is in the main a quotation of Matt. xxvi. 64). He also appears to have understood the term as a designation of the Messiah. It is in most instances put upon the lips of Jesus. But in xii. 34 the people use it. "Who is this Son of Man?" clearly means "Who is this Messiah?" And when the Evangelist continues his reflections, leaving the historic situation behind, as in iii. 13-21, he still employs the title. In iii. 13 the words  $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega$ , which would show that the ascended Christ is still designated as "the son of man," are not to be removed from the text on the ground of their absence from  $\aleph B L$ , seeing that they are well sustained by the Western and Aramaic texts, but to be emended into  $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau \omega \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega$  or  $\epsilon \xi \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega$  (cf. I Cor. xv. 45), as the Sinaitic Syriac has  $\text{ܕܘܢ ܐܘܢ}$  against the  $\text{ܕܘܢ ܐܘܢ}$  of the Pešitta. The independent treatment of the  $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi \tau \omega \upsilon \nu \iota \omega \upsilon \tau \omega \upsilon \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu$  in vi. 32 ff. is even more significant. Here where we apparently have to do with the terminology of the eucharist, the phrases  $\phi \alpha \gamma \epsilon \acute{\iota} \nu \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \tau \omega \upsilon \nu \iota \omega \upsilon \tau \omega \upsilon \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu$  and  $\pi \acute{\iota} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \omega \alpha \iota \mu \alpha \tau \omega \upsilon \nu \iota \omega \upsilon \tau \omega \upsilon \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu$  make it extremely probable that the term was actually used, in the circles in which the author moved, as a title of the Christ. It would thus appear that this Evangelist looked upon the expression as synonymous with "the Messiah," and used it concerning the Christ without any fear that he would be offended by a designation he had himself preferred. Yet v. 27 gives evidence that he retained, in a measure, the consciousness of its original sense and reflected upon its significance. For it certainly cannot mean: "He has given him authority to judge because he is a Messiah." Messiah is not a generic title. It evidently meant: "because he is a man," his human character being closely connected with his authority to pass judgment on human affairs. But if  $\nu \acute{\iota} \omega \varsigma \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu$ , in this writer, simply signifies "man," the question may be raised whether  $\delta \nu \acute{\iota} \omega \varsigma \tau \omega \upsilon \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu \delta \omega \nu \epsilon \xi \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega$  (iii. 13) is not also an equivalent of Paul's  $\delta \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \varsigma \epsilon \xi \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega$ . With this Pauline expression in mind, and conscious of the identity of thought, the writer can scarcely have had any other reason for a deviation in form than the influence of the Synoptics.

In examining the Synoptic passages one is at once impressed with the evident secondary character of some of them. At least in seven cases a comparison with the parallel texts indicates a late introduction of the term. Thus Lk. xviii. 29 has undoubtedly preserved a more original form of the saying ( $\epsilon \acute{\iota} \nu \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \varsigma \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \acute{\iota} \alpha \varsigma \tau \omega \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omega \upsilon$ ) than

either Mk. x. 29 (*ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*) or Matt. xix. 28, 29 (*καθίστη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κ.τ.λ.* and *ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος*). The statement of a fact (Mk. xiv. 1, 2; Lk. xxii. 1, 2) has in Matt. xxvi. 2 been changed into a prediction. Luke vi. 22 substitutes *ἔνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* for *ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ* (Matt. v. 11); and similarly Lk. xii. 8 the title for *καγὼ* (Matt. x. 32). The dignified silence in Mk. xiv. 45, and the broken sentence *ἐφ' ὃ πάρει* (Matt. xxvi. 50), which on account of its difficulty demands careful consideration, are unquestionably older than the speech assigned to Jesus in Lk. xxii. 48.

In my judgment Matt. xvi. 13 also belongs to this class. Mark viii. 27 and Lk. ix. 18 agree against the form given to the question in Matthew, and the text of the First Gospel in this place is extremely doubtful. The Sinaitic Syriac (*ܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ*; *ܕܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܢܐ*; "What do men say concerning me? *i.e.* Who is this son of man?") suggests that the question originally was identical in all the three gospels, but that a second question was added in Matthew, perhaps under the influence of Jn. xii. 34, which then with more or less success was worked into the first; hence the *μὲ* retained in some MSS. Oort<sup>4</sup> regards the present Matthew in this pericope as older than Mark and Luke, and their version as based on a fundamental misapprehension of their source. They understood the text before them to record a query raised by Jesus for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was considered to be the Messiah or not, and a reply by Peter affirming his Messiahship. In this they were mistaken. For according to Matthew, so Oort interprets, Jesus has for a long time been recognized as the Messiah, but on this occasion is anxious to know the views of his disciples concerning the nature of the Messiah and gratified with Peter's confession that he who is the Messiah is the Son of the living God.<sup>5</sup> Van Manen,<sup>6</sup> in defending this view of his pupil, recognizes that the case demands the removal of *ὁ Χριστός* from the reply, and consequently strikes it out, argues the superiority of a narrative, which on this hypothesis becomes entirely consistent, to the self-contradictory accounts of Mark and Luke, and explains the whole as "an anticipated sketch of the development of the views concerning Jesus," setting

<sup>4</sup> *L.c.* p. 57 ff.

<sup>5</sup> "Hij vraagt niet: "wie ben ik? de Messias al of niet? maar: voor wien houdt gij den Messias, van welken aard is hij?" . . . Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. Deze woorden moeten aldus geïnterpreteerd worden: "gij, die de Messias zijt, zijt de Zoon des levenden Gods," p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> "Theologisch Tijdschrift," 1894, p. 183 ff.

forth the conviction that Jesus is not only the Messiah, but "a metaphysical being in the later Pauline or Greek philosophical sense."

But what motive could have led Mark and Luke to erase τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and to substitute ὁ Χριστός for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, particularly if this change involved a flat contradiction of their previous statements and the tendency was all the other way? Were they indeed less regardful than Matthew of literary consistency and less influenced by current thought? That would not seriously impair their value. Again, is there any evidence that in the development of Christological ideas ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ever outgrew in significance ὁ Χριστός? When a Jew accepted Jesus as the Messiah, he no doubt found it necessary to modify many of his views, but the Messianic conceptions and titles with which he had been familiar from his childhood remained the foundation. Neither Paul's pre-existent heavenly man nor the Johannine *Logos* was a new Christian creation. The Messiah of Enoch xxxvii.-lxxi. and Rev. xii.<sup>7</sup> is pre-existent, born in heaven, a metaphysical being as much as the Pauline Christ, and the מְשִׁיחַ-Λόγος speculation existed before the Fourth Gospel.<sup>8</sup> The previous training of the Greek would naturally make ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ a more popular term with him than the less intelligible Jewish title. Yet the two seem to have grown together. Paul uses by preference ὁ Χριστός. In the Johannine literature ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, or abbreviated ὁ υἱός, preponderates. But to believe that Jesus is "the Christ" (1 Jn. v. 1) and that he is "the Son of God" (1 Jn. v. 5) is evidently the same. One phrase is frequently added to the other, as if by way of explanation. Justin uses both as equivalent (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 100, p. 327 B). A comparison of *Hom. Clem.* xvii. 18 (Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ζῶντος θεοῦ), quoted by Oort for his purpose, with *Ep. Clem. ad Jac.* i. p. 6 (ᾧ πρώτῳ ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν ἀπεκάλυψεν, ὃν ὁ Χριστὸς εὐλόγως ἐμακάρισεν) will show that the case is not different here, the quotation being probably from memory and according to the sense; hence the shortened form. Finally, is there any ground for maintaining that either the contemporaries of Jesus or the heretics of the second century regarded the Messiah as a re-incarnation of an earlier prophet? Yet if the question really concerns the nature of the Christ, the answer must be understood to affirm that while many regard the Christ as a former

<sup>7</sup> For the Jewish composition of this chapter, see the convincing arguments of Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1895, pp. 171 ff.

<sup>8</sup> On the relation of the Philonic to the Johannine *Logos* see the well-considered judgment of Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, 1891, p. 106 ff.

prophet returned to earth, the true disciples know by divine revelation that he is a heavenly being. This last difficulty<sup>9</sup> renders it probable that the second question which the Sinaitic Syriac found in its Greek text (τί δὴ ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) is not to be interpreted, What is this Messiah? but was already a part of the Aramaic original of Matthew, though not of the original saying, meaning, What is this man? and intended to specify what kind of utterances concerning himself Jesus desired to hear. The addition to Peter's answer seems to be simply explanatory, and should be compared with Matt. xxvi. 63, where it would be preposterous to suppose that the Jewish high priest is represented as inquiring whether Jesus is "a metaphysical being in the later Pauline or Greek philosophical sense." The insertion of Peter's confession in all the Synoptics, after Jesus has been proclaimed as the Messiah by God and men and demons, and has repeatedly used concerning himself what they appear to have understood as a Messianic title, is, in my opinion, best explained by the constraining force of a well-attested tradition.

Τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ is also better sustained (Mk. ix. 1; Lk. ix. 27) than τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου of Matt. xvi. 28.

Six passages are probably to be regarded as interpretations by the Evangelists, rather than genuine *logia*. There is Mk. ix. 9 [Matt. xvii. 9]. In the lifetime of the Master, not even his most intimate disciples had had anything to relate concerning his luminous heavenly body. Did this necessarily exclude the possibility of a vision of this body before his death? Not to the minds of the Evangelists. But it was still too well known that Jesus would not have such a vision (*δραμα*, Matt. xvii. 9) pointed out as a crowning proof of his Messiahship. Historically, the transfiguration would seem to rest on the faith in Jesus' resurrection. Mark ix. 9 is a suggestion of this connection. Jews ask for signs, but in Matt. xii. 39 Jesus assures them that this hunger after miracles is not to be satisfied; no other sign is to be given to his contemporaries than the sign of Jonah. The natural meaning of this saying is significant and glorious: not miracles for Jewish crowds to stare at, but preaching of repentance to idolaters, and manifestation of divine mercy towards them! Yet Jews will ask for signs, even Christian Jews; and the Evangelists were willing, where the Master had refused, to grant to this miracle-hungry,

<sup>9</sup> Oort is conscious of this difficulty, but declares: "Het geldt nu niet of Jesus de Messias was; dit is uitgemaakt; maar wat Jesus Christus was, een mensch (sic!), een prophet, of een hemeling?" p. 59.

evil, and adulterous generation both many another sign and a gratifying, though clumsy, transformation of the sign he actually promised on this occasion, vs. 40 [Lk. xi. 30]. The allegorical interpretation of the parable of the Tares (Matt. xiii. 37-41) is deeply interesting as showing both the strong and healthy feeling against Antinomianism in the early church and the wisdom with which her best leaders left the punishment of heretics to the *parousia* rather than anticipate it by a rigorous church discipline; but it is now generally recognized that the Evangelist wrote the commentary. Luke xix. 10 apparently belongs to the same category. The verse is lost in the Sinaitic Syriac. After vs. 9 there is room for about five words; there certainly is not room for the ten of the Pešitta. In view of this it would be difficult to say what the original words in Luke were. The interpolation of the same phrase in Matt. xviii. 11 indicates a desire to find a suitable place for this beautiful comment. Matthew xi. 19 [Lk. vii. 34] bears the stamp of later reflection on the difference between John's teaching and that of Jesus. Both belong to the past: "John the Baptist came;" "the Son of Man came." Mark x. 45 [Matt. xx. 28] likewise comments on the evident exemplification in the Master's own life and death of the principle he has just laid down.

The Synoptic Apocalypse (Mk. xiii. 5-32; Matt. xxiv. 4-36; Lk. xxi. 8-36, with the Appendix of eschatological parables, Matt. xxiv. 37-xxv. 46 and parallels) contains nine distinct references to the return of "the Son of Man" in glory.<sup>10</sup> From the analogy of such apocalyptic discourses ascribed to Enoch, Noah, Moses, Isaiah, Baruch, Daniel, Ezra, Peter, and John, we are scarcely warranted in assuming a basis of real *λόγια* for the Apocalypse of Jesus. Outside of this opusculum we have only three predictions of a *parousia* (Mk. viii. 38 and xiv. 62 with their parallels, and Matt. xvi. 28).

There are six almost identical announcements of the coming catastrophe, and to three of these are added predictions of a speedy resurrection. While the reiteration six times of the same words is improbable, it strengthens the presumption that a real saying of Jesus is the foundation. Against the genuineness of the added prediction concerning a resurrection after three days, there are grave objections. Not only are the disciples unprepared for any such event, and consequently attach no significance to his words, but also, as Holtzmann has well pointed out,<sup>11</sup> the risen Christ himself refers, indeed, to the predictions in the prophets, but not to any prediction of his own

<sup>10</sup> Those numbered 6, 18, 19, 20, 21, 27, 31, 32, 34, in my list.

<sup>11</sup> *Hand-Commentar*, 1889, p. 196.

(Lk. xxiv. 25, 27). Even more important seems to me the contradiction with the view actually held by Jesus and sustained with such marvellous ingenuity (Mk. xii. 26, 27; Matt. xxii. 29-33; Lk. xx. 34-38). He saw in God's declaration that he was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob the evidence that these men had been raised to life already in the time of Moses, and he believed in the power of God thus to bring forth life out of death; but he clearly did not connect this resurrection to a new life with a resuscitation of the body.

There remain four passages that fall before the episode at Cæsarea Philippi, and one or two utterances after this event. These, in my judgment, cannot be fairly treated without being re-translated into the language used by Jesus himself.<sup>12</sup> First of all, it may be well to inquire of what Aramaic expression  $\delta \nu\iota\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\epsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  is the translation. The following can come under consideration:

- |                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. בר אדם.                       | 4. ברה דנברא. |
| 2. בר אינש or בר אנש or בר אנשא. | 5. ברה דאנשא. |
| 3. בר נש or בר נשא.              |               |

**בר אדם** is the translation of **בן אדם** in the Jerusalem Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan to Ezekiel in every place where the latter term occurs. **אדם** was undoubtedly used interchangeably with **אנש**, and **בר אדם** with **בר אנש** in Jerusalem. In Targum Onkelos to Num. xxiii. 19 pl. **בני אנשא** is used for sg. **בן אדם**. It is important, however, that **אדם** is less used than **אינש** in Talmud Jeruſalmi; and that **בר אדם** does not seem to occur either in that work or in the Midraſim that represent the same dialect. These, to be sure, only represent the Aramaic spoken in Galilee in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries A.D. But as they are the only literary productions that we have which undoubtedly were written in the dialect of Galilee, it is probable that they indicate better what was the vernacular of Jesus than even the older works that were written in Jerusalem.<sup>13</sup>

**אינש** is the common form in the Galilean dialect, while **אנש** is more common in the Judæan. But after a **בר** it is probable that the initial aleph was dropped.<sup>14</sup> In distinction from the Edessene,  $\iota\iota$

<sup>12</sup> These words of Wellhausen cannot be too strongly emphasized: "Wer die Reden Jesu wissenschaftlich erklären will, muss im Stande sein, sie nöthigenfalls in die Sprache zurück zu übersetzen, die Jesus gebraucht hat . . . Was nicht ins Aramäische retrovertirt werden kann, hat nicht in den Logien des Matthäus gestanden," *Der Syrische Evangelienpalimpsest vom Sinai*, 1895, p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. on this point Dalman, *Aramäische Grammatik*, 1894, p. 31 ff.

<sup>14</sup> The initial aleph in the Imv. of **אתא** was sometimes, though rarely, dropped in the Galilean. I was wrong in maintaining against Siegfried that the Imv. **תא**

which the emphatic had lost its force and a suffix was added to the construct form with a following **בַּר**, the Palestinian Aramaic in both its dialects retained the indefinite form, and, while the emphatic was often loosely used, in the main kept up the distinction. **בַּר נֶשָׂא** occurs in *Moed Kaṭon* 82 d in a connection that clearly shows it to be indefinite: "No man has heard Rab say," etc. On the other hand, the definite form is used (*Sabb.* 3 b), where the reference is to an offender spoken of before, "the man shall be hanged." **בַּר נֶשָׂא** would have been translated, no doubt, *ὁ ἀνθρώπου*. The actual translation points to **בַּר נֶשָׂא**.

**בַּר נֶשָׂא** and **בַּר דִּנְבְּרָא** are translations of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. In the Jerusalem lectionary we meet also **בַּר דִּבְרֵי נֶשָׂא**. The Pešitta uses uniformly **בַּר דִּנְבְּרָא**, even Jn. v. 27; Heb. ii. 6; Rev. i. 13 and xiv. 14; so also the Sinaitic Syriac in the Gospels. That it is everywhere regarded as a Messianic title, is best shown by its being substituted for **בַּר נֶשָׂא** or **בַּר אֲנָשִׁין** (Dan. vii. 13) in the quotations of the O.T. According to Wellhausen, "diese Uebersetzung gibt nicht *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, sondern *ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* wieder, und ist eigentlich, wegen der Verbindung des Singular-Suffixes mit dem folgenden virtuellen Plural, völlig unmöglich" (*l.c.* p. 12). But would a man to whom the Aramaic was a living language have chosen a singular suffix if he had not meant the following noun to be a singular, as it sometimes is, or used it generically, rather than as a plural? Or is it possible that he had in mind Dan. vii. 13 and tried to render definite **בַּר אֲנָשִׁין**. That he had before him *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* and labored to express the definite article, there can be no doubt. The use of the suffix, provided the noun is understood as a singular, is perfectly idiomatic. **בַּר נֶשָׂא**, in the Edessene, would mean simply "man," "a man."

In the Galilean dialect **בַּר נֶשָׂא** meant "man," "the man." Wellhausen is unquestionably right in claiming that the proper Greek translation would have been *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*.<sup>15</sup> But the translator of the sayings of Jesus into Greek had read G<sup>Al</sup>, and when the Alexandrian had rendered **בַּר אָדָם** by *ὁ ἀνθρώπου* and not by *ἄνθρωπος*,

was unknown in Palestinian Aramaic. Dalman quotes *Sanh.* 24<sup>d</sup>, and *Ech. A.* i. 4. But Paul probably got the formula **בַּר אֲתָא** from Jerusalem, and the Judæan dialect retained the aleph. The significant *Imv.* **אָתָא** in Lk. xvi. 2 of the Sinaitic Syriac has also inclined Wellhausen to the view expressed by me in this *Journal* (Vol. XIII., 1894, p. 50 ff.). Cf. *Der Syrische Evangelienpalimpsest*, 1895, p. 3, note.

<sup>15</sup> *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 1894, p. 312, note.

thus following closely the Semitic idiom, he naturally paid regard to precedent, and in order faithfully to render the emphatic ending, he used the article, for which we ought to be grateful. For it may be worth something to know that Jesus said **בַּר נִשָּׂא** and not **אִישׁ**, even though the two be synonyms. There is nothing peculiar in the phrase. It is exceedingly common in Hebrew and Aramaic, and may have been equally so in other Semitic languages. **בֶּן אָדָם** is used as a synonym of **אִישׁ** in numerous passages (e.g. Num. xxiii. 19), of **אִנּוּשׁ** (e.g. Ps. viii. 5), of **נִבְרָר** (e.g. Job xvi. 21); so also in Jer. xlix. 33 (xxx. 11 in G<sup>Al</sup>), Ps. lxxx. 18 (lxxix. 18 in G<sup>Al</sup>), cxlvi. 2 (cxlv. 2 in G<sup>Al</sup>). The plural **בְּנֵי אָדָם** occurs in Is. lii. 14; Ps. xi. 4 (x. 4 in G<sup>Al</sup>), xii. 2, 9 (xi. 2, 9 in G<sup>Al</sup>), liii. 3 (lii. 3 in G<sup>Al</sup>), and **בְּנֵי אָדָם** in 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Chron. vi. 30; Ps. xxxiii. 13 (xxxii. 13 in G<sup>Al</sup>), cxlv. 12 (cxliv. 12 in G<sup>Al</sup>). It is curious that G<sup>Al</sup> in 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Chron. vi. 30, rendered **בְּנֵי הָאָדָם** *vioi ἀνθρώπων*, while in Is. lii. 14; Ps. xi. 4, xii. 2, 9, **בְּנֵי אָדָם** was translated *of vioi τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. The Targums use **בַּר אִנּוּשׁ** even where the Hebrew has simply **אָדָם** (as Job v. 7). In the Edessene **בַּר נִשָּׂא** is the common term for "man," "a man." In the Arabic Bible we meet **ابن آدم** (so Ezekiel, *passim*; Ps. viii. 5), or **ابن انسان** (Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14), and **ابن الانسان** as a translation of **υἱοσ υἱων** (also Jn. v. 27). Even more striking is the Ethiopic use of **ፀልዖ : ሰላሳ**, **ፀልዖ : ሰላሳ**, and **ፀልዖ : ለገለ : ለግዕዝዮ**; **ለገለ : ለግዕዝዮ** = *proles matris vivi* is used alone in many of the passages where the Greek had *vioi ἀνθρώπων*. But in many places the longer form **ፀልዖ : ለገለ : ለግዕዝዮ**, meaning literally "the son of the offspring of the mother of (all) living," is used where the meaning is simply "man," as in Ez. ii. 1 and throughout the book; Ps. lxxxix. (Heb. lxxx.) 18; Dan. vii. 13; as well as in the N.T. and in Enoch. Particularly this last phrase shows that there was once in South Semitic speech a stronger tendency in this direction than classical Arabic literature would lead us to imagine.

The question now arises whether this phrase ordinarily signifying simply "man" could possibly have been understood by Jesus' contemporaries as a Messianic title and whether Jesus ever could have spoken of himself as **בַּר נִשָּׂא** with the hope and intention of being understood as thereby claiming to be the Messiah. It has been confidently asserted that the term was well known as a designation

of the coming Messiah; and for evidence reference is made to Dan. vii. 13, the Book of Enoch, and Jn. xii. 34.

In Dan. vii. 13 the seer says that he beheld one coming in the clouds of heaven who looked like a man, had a human appearance. What he meant he explained with sufficient clearness (vii. 27; cf. ii. 44). As different as any beast is from a man, so different was any kingdom that had been from the kingdom of the people of the Most High that was to be established. This interpretation, which seems to us demanded by the language, was also accepted widely in Jewish circles. Eerdmans<sup>16</sup> has called attention to the fact that so little did many of the rabbis think of כִּרְאָנָא as a Messianic title that when they began to seek for a personal Messiah in this passage they invented from it such titles as כִּרְאָנָא (Targum to 1 Chron. iii. 24) and כִּרְאָנָא נְפִלִי (νεφέλη, *Sanh.* 96 b). Nevertheless, there were others, in later times certainly, and possibly before the time of Christ, who saw in this son of man the Messiah, and used precisely this phrase in referring to him.

ⲠⲃⲔ : ⲀⲓⲀⲗ : occurs in the Book of Enoch five times, viz. xlvi. 2, 3, 4, xlvi. 2, and lx. 10; ⲠⲃⲔ : ⲀⲗⲀ : three times, viz. lxix. 29 a and b, and lxxi. 14; ⲠⲃⲔ : ⲗⲓⲕ : ⲗⲓⲗⲓⲡⲟ : eight times, viz. lxii. 7, 9, 14, lxiii. 11, lxix. 26, 27, lxx. 1, lxxi. 17; and ⲠⲃⲔ : ⲀⲗⲀⲓⲥ : once, viz. lxii. 5 (G reads ⲀⲗⲀ : alone; but in its turn reads ⲀⲗⲀⲓⲥ : in lxxi. 14). It will be seen that all these passages belong to the Parables (xxxvii.-lxxi., except the Noachic fragments liv. 7-lv. 2, lxxv.-lxxix. 25). These were probably written not long before 64 B.C. Like the rest of the book they were originally written in Aramaic. This has been conclusively proved by the fragments of the Greek text found at Akhmim. (Cf. Dillmann, in *Sitzungsberichte d. k. pr. Akademie d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, li., liii., 1892.) These fragments indeed cover only the first thirty chapters; but the character of the language of the Parables finds its best explanation in the same supposition. Whether the Parables were translated directly from the Aramaic, or from the Greek translation, cannot be determined with certainty. However that may be, the variety of expressions used by the Ethiopic transla-

<sup>16</sup> "Theologisch Tijdschrift," xxviii. p. 167, 1894. Eerdmans' excellent article entitled *De Oorsprong van de Uitdrukking "Zoon des Menschen" als evangelische Messias-titel* is a criticism of Oort's book from what seems to me the right standpoint.

tor shows that he did not understand the term as a fixed title. In two instances (lx. 10 and lxxi. 14) it refers to the prophet. The phrase  $\text{ፌልዳ : ጠላሲት} :$  is probably an Ethiopic equivalent of  $\text{ፌልዳ : ጠላሲ} :$  if the son of Mary had been meant we should expect  $\text{ዘርላ : ጠላሲት} :$  or  $\text{ፌልዳ : ድኅገል} :$  Perhaps in all cases the original was  $\text{בר נשא}$ ; only in lx. 10  $\text{בר אדם}$  is more likely. The Greek may have had  $\delta \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ , if the translation was subsequent to that of Matthew. Eerdmans (*l.c.*) puts much emphasis on the demonstrative "this man" or "that man"; and, in xlvi. 3,  $\text{ዝኒቱ : ውላቱ : ፌልዳ : ሰጠላ} :$  probably represents an original  $\text{בר נשא דדן}$ ,  $\text{οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου}$ . Yet it must not be overlooked that the Ethiopic, which has no definite article, constantly uses the demonstrative simply to give definiteness to the noun. In most instances the translator may have had only  $\text{בר נשא}$  or  $\delta \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$  before him.<sup>17</sup> I agree with Eerdmans that the phrase is not a title, and simply means "the man." But the dependence upon Daniel seems to me evident, and we clearly meet in this work a Messianic interpretation of Daniel's  $\text{בר אנש}$ . The man whom the seer in Enoch beholds is an individual, the Messiah. No genuine *logion* shows any acquaintance on the part of Jesus with this apocalypse.

John xii. 34 only shows that in Johannine circles the phrase had become a Messianic title which would naturally be so understood by the readers of the Gospel; it yields no evidence that the Aramaic phrase, if used by Jesus, would be taken in that sense by the people.

Turning then to the four passages that report sayings of Jesus previous to his visit to Cæsarea Philippi, we first meet his assertion that  $\text{בר נשא}$  has a right to pardon sin (Mk. ii. 10). The question in debate is whether a man can assure his fellow-man that his sins are pardoned. The Pharisees maintain that none but God can forgive sin. Jesus affirms,  $\text{שליט בר נשא למשבק חטאין}$  = "man has the power to pardon sins." This thought finds again expression when Jesus enjoins upon his disciples to exercise this authority, this blessed privilege of assuring their fellow-men of the pardon of their sins when

<sup>17</sup> The too literal translation of Charles is misleading on this point. Due regard for either the Ethiopic or the English would have prevented him from rendering  $\text{ሉቲ : ለፌልዳ : ለጊላ : ለጦሎጦዎ} :$  "to him to the son of man" (lxix. 27), instead of "to the man," or at most "to the son of man"; cf. Dillmann, *Grammatik*, p. 334.

their disposition would justify them in doing so (Matt. xviii. 18; Jn. xx. 23).

Mark ii. 23 ff. presents an even clearer case. The disciples have been eating the corn as they passed through the field and are accused of not keeping the Sabbath. Jesus evidently has not eaten; the accusation is against his disciples. But he defends them by quoting the example of David. David ate of the shewbread that according to the law he had no right to eat, and gave his followers permission to do so. The point is not that David and "his greater son" may take liberties with God's law which would be wrong for others, but clearly that so saintly a man as David recognized that the sustenance of life was in God's eyes more important than the maintenance of the temple service. Lest this should be misinterpreted he adds, according to Matt. xii. 8, another argument. The law allows the priests to work on the Sabbath, thus regarding the cessation of labor as less important than the maintenance of divine worship. The thought is not that he and his had priestly rights, for they had none, and Jesus had no interest in the sacrificial cult, as the next statement shows. But even from the standpoint of the law there were things more important than cessation of work. The whole sacrificial system was, in his judgment, of less significance than the principle of love violated in this charge against the innocent. Institutions have their value only as they serve man's good. Man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man; therefore man is lord even of the Sabbath, **מַר לְכֵן בַּר נְשָׂא אִף דְּשַׁבְּתָא**. The Aramaic words can scarcely have conveyed any other than this sense, which also is alone relevant to the argument.

Matt. viii. 19 ff. relates how a scribe came to Jesus and said: "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." Jesus answers epigrammatically: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heavens nests, while **בַּר נְשָׂא**, *i.e.* man, has nowhere to lay his head." Oort admits that "op zichzelf zou dit wel een goeden zin opleveren" (p. 56). Man's life is full of danger and uncertainty. Where will he reside to-morrow? The beast is not deprived of home and hearth by his convictions. No doubt, the scribe saw quickly the hint, without the thought ever crossing his mind that the Galilean teacher had in the same breath announced himself as the Messiah, and complained that, though he was so great a man, he neither owned a house nor had a place in which to lodge over night.

The enemies of Jesus charged him with performing his cures by the aid of Beelzebub. In this he saw a blasphemy, because he felt

that the Spirit of God was upon him ; yet he was careful to distinguish between an attack upon a fellowman and a denunciation of the Spirit of God actuating him, saying "if any one speaks against **כֹּהֵן אֱלֹהִים**, *i.e.* the man, that may be pardoned him, but he that speaks against the Holy Spirit can have no pardon" (Matt. xii. 32). No one in the audience could have understood him to say: "You may blaspheme the Messiah with impunity, but not the Holy Ghost." The distinction is clearly between the divine Spirit and the human instrumentality.

These passages certainly do not justify the view that Jesus ever called himself "the man" before the episode at Cæsarea Philippi. I agree with those scholars who see in this place the real scene of his Messianic temptations. Hitherto he has not been proclaimed as the Messiah, and has not so announced himself. The reason is apparent. The Messianic conception of the people and of his own disciples is not his ideal. He has cherished no dreams of deliverance from Roman oppression and conquest of the world. With him the great question has been what his life should be, what he ought to do for his fellow-men ; and his answer, that man is a child of God and should love, and trust, and deal in sincerity with, his Father and his brothers. With a less secure abode on earth than the birds of the air he may trust implicitly the unseen friend who cares for him ; with no other condition than a loving and forgiving spirit he may be certain of God's forgiveness and assure his brothers of it ; with love in his heart he may freely dispose of the institutions the Father has established for man's good. He has recognized that the world's great need is manhood, and his own supreme desire has been to be a true man. He has lived out his conviction that the kingdom of God is, as the author of Daniel pictured it, the kingdom of man, and that God's true Messiah is the true man. What has been the result? That the people at large do not regard him at all as the Messiah, but as a good prophet, still waiting for the man after their heart. But also that his disciples, in spite of his silence and contrast with the vulgar ideal, recognize in him God's Anointed. Only the Father can have revealed this to them. There is joy in this testimony, but also danger. Temptations come. If he is the Messiah, why not gratify every legitimate desire of his nature, why not trust in his Father to help him perform the expected miracle that would give him recognition, why not be what yonder Cæsar in the city square is, the king of the world? Passages from the Scriptures come to tempt him ; and others to support him. It is significant that the latter are not



notions. If an apocalyptic writer in the days of the Maccabæan struggles could have risen to this conception, there certainly can be no reason why the world's greatest seer of religious truth should not also have cherished it. To this word an individualistic interpretation is given in the Synoptic Apocalypse, just as the original passage in Daniel is so interpreted in Enoch.

Thus there is no convincing evidence either that Jesus found among his people **בֵּר נְשָׂא** as a Messianic title, or that he used it himself in that sense.<sup>19</sup> If Stephen is correctly reported (Acts vii. 56), Paul's eloquent silence<sup>20</sup> may indicate that he simply meant to say, I see the man with whose murder I have just charged you standing on the right hand of God. But the accuracy of the narrative is not beyond doubt.

The Aramaic expression never seems to have developed into a Messianic title. The Greek translation certainly did. How early it began to be used as such, is difficult to determine. The evident dependence of the Synoptic Apocalypse on the Johannine, where it does not yet appear, may afford a hint. If the Aramaic source of Matthew had already been translated when the Apocalypse of Jesus was written, the rendering of **בֵּר נְשָׂא** by *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in such *λόγια* as Matt. xvii. 22 and xxvi. 24 may readily have given rise to its use as a title. How widely it prevailed cannot be ascertained. It is significant, however, that of the seventy-four *ἄγραφα* examined by

<sup>19</sup> Charles (*l.c.* Appendix B) regards the son of man in Enoch as a supernatural being and not a mere man, and thinks that Jesus "adopted this title, with its supernatural attributes of superhuman glory," but transformed it under the influence of the Servant of Yahweh conception in Isaiah, and since "the object of Jesus' coming was the revelation of the Father," he would not "vindicate the supernatural claims he made at the outset" "after the external Judaistic conceptions of the Book of Enoch," but "in a sinless and redemptive life, death, and resurrection." Is it possible on sound principles of historico-critical interpretation to maintain that Jesus made for himself at the outset supernatural claims? Have we the necessary data for any conclusions as to such ante-natal purposes as here seem to be assigned to Jesus? In his closing paragraph this scholar rips up the fabric he has woven by the statement that Jesus' use of this expression must after all have been an enigma to his hearers. If it was a commonly understood equivalent of "the Messiah," what is there that is enigmatic about it? It is the episode at Caesarea Philippi that, on this view, becomes the real enigma.

<sup>20</sup> This silence cannot be accounted for by reverence on his part. Would Paul regard the protomartyr as irreverent in the moment of his heavenly vision? Would reverence lead him to discard a favorite self-designation of the master for such terms as *ὁ δευτερος ἀνθρώπος*, or *ὁ ἑσχατος Ἀδὰμ*?

Resch,<sup>21</sup> which represent a long-continued and independent stream of tradition, not one contains the phrase.

If I am right, Jesus never designated himself either as "the perfect man" or as "a mere man." His exalted conception of the ideal and his profound humility recoiled even from accepting the epithet 'good' when applied to him (Mk. x. 18); and to be a man was not to him a mean thing, signifying a state of humiliation. Quite the contrary; it is his eternal glory that with unremitting zeal he sought to find what man should be, that with deep intuition he discerned what in the truest sense man is, and that faithful unto death he realized what on the highest side of his nature man may be.

<sup>21</sup> *Agrapha*, 1889, in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*.