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 vivi*, corresponding to the Assyrian *mār-amēlî*, son of a man, which denotes a full-born man, just as Assyrian *mār-bānî*, son of a begetter (AL 15 19 148) means aristocrat. Afterwards Aram. *bar-māṣā* = Assyrian *mār-amēlî*, 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 *hābū gābrāt*, that man, may be used for the first or second persons, just as in Biblical Hebrew *hā-îš ha-hābū* may denote *I*.

Similarly Lat. *hic homo* may stand for *ego, huic hominem* for *mīhī*, and *hunc hominem* for *me*; cf. Plaut. *Trin.* 1115, also 172 507; *Capt.* 148; Ter. *Andr.* 310. *Heaut.* prolo 13. In phrases like *per hanc ductum obtestor te* the pronoun *hanc* (cf. ὑδὲ χείρ* Soph. *Ant.* 43) means *my, just as hæc urbs (ὑδὲ ἡ πόλις) may signify *our city, and hunc in collum* on my neck. In Greek we find ὑδὲ ἄνηψ (or ὑδὲ γονὶ) for ἐγώ: cf. *Od. Tyr.* 815: τίς τοῦτος γ' ἄνδρος νόν ἔτει άθλωτέρος, also 829, 1018. Euripides says ὑπὲρ τοῦτο ἄνδρος for ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, and Plato uses οὐτοσὶ ἄνηψ ὄν παύσαται φιλαρμόνοις for ὄν ὧν παύσει.

In Mark 2 16, *ut autem scribis quia filius hominis habet polestatem in terra dimittendi pecuniam* the rendering *hic homo* (or *ὑδὲ ἄνηψ*) would have been more correct than *filius hominis* (or ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀθραπόν). The Vulgate uses *quia* like *sit* 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).
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