

## The Son of Man = hic homo = ego

In the remarks on *Hidalgo* and *Filius Hominis*, presented at the meeting of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Association on Oct. 15, 1920 (see above, p. 167) I pointed out that the Aramaic original of the NT term *son of man* signified, not *filius hominis*, but *filius viri*, corresponding to the Assyr. *mâr-amîli*, son of a man, which denotes a *full-born man*, just as Assyr. *mâr-bânû*, son of a begetter (AL<sup>5</sup> 19, 148) means *aristocrat*. Afterwards Aram. *bar-nâšû* = Assyr. *mâr-amîli*, gentleman, was employed for *man* in general, and *man* may be used for the first or second or third persons. In the Aramaic idiom of the Babylonian Talmud and in the colloquial speech of Galilee *hâhû gâbrâ*, that man, may be used for the first or second persons, just as in Biblical Hebrew *hû-’îš hu-hû* may denote *I*.

Similarly Lat. *hic homo* may stand for *ego*, *huic homini* for *mihi*, and *huuc hominem* for *me*; cf. Plaut. *Trin.* 1115, also 172, 507; *Capt.* 148; Ter. *Andr.* 310, *Heaut.* prol. 13. In phrases like *per hanc dextram obtestor te* the pronoun *haec* (cf. ἤδε χεῖρ. Soph. *Ant.* 43) means *my*, just as *haec urbs* (ἤδε ἡ πόλις) may signify *our city*, and *huuc in collum*: on my neck. In Greek we find ὅδε ἀνὴρ (or ἤδε γυνή) for ἐγώ: cf. *Oed. Tyr.* 815: τίς τοῦδέ γ’ ἀνδρὸς νῦν ἐτ’ ἀθλιώτερος, also 829, 1018. Euripides says ὑπὲρ τοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς for ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, and Plato uses οὐτοσί ἀνὴρ οὐ παύσεται φλυαριῶν for σὺ οὐ παύσει.

In Mark 2 10, *ut autem sciatis quia filius hominis habet potestatem in terra dimittendi peccata*, the rendering *hic homo* (or ὅδε ἀνὴρ) would have been more correct than *filius hominis* (or ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). The Vulgate uses *quia* like ὅτι, not only for *because*, but also for *that* (cf. Job 19 25; Matt. 6 32; Luke 2 49; John 16 30 21 4, 12, 17; Acts 23 5; Rom. 7 13; contrast 2 Cor. 11 31; 1 Cor. 12 2). Also Heb. *ki* has both meanings, and it may be also (like *quod*, that, because, although) concessive; but this interpretation cannot be applied to Tertullian's *credo quia absurdum* (AJP 41, 180, n. 3).

Johns Hopkins University

PAUL HAAPT