

composed of sinless individuals. But if so, he goes beyond other prophets, and one cannot be quite sure that his conceptions rigorously exclude the emergence of evil in the renewed people of God. The legislation of Ezekiel's vision (chap. 40ff.) is essentially a Messianic programme, and yet it clearly contemplates and provides for the occurrence of at least inadvertent transgressions. The representation of Isa 11⁴ seems to go even further; the Messiah, in the exercise of His kingly functions, will slay the 'wicked' (a stronger term than is here employed) with the breath of his lips.

The Messianic ideal of the prophets is, to a greater extent than we commonly realize, a political ideal. It does not necessarily imply that all individuals shall be perfect, but only that the sanctity of the community shall be maintained, either by propitiation or by the swift destruction of hardened sinners. Moreover, in the passage before us, we have always the alternative of regarding the case as hypothetical. It would therefore be hazardous to reject the clause solely on the ground urged by your correspondent.

JOHN SKINNER.

Westminster College, Cambridge.

The Name 'Son of Man' and the Messianic Consciousness of Jesus.

BY THE REV. L. A. MUIRHEAD, B.D., BROUGHTY FERRY.

THE above is the title of an article which appeared not long ago in the *Protestantische Monatshefte*,¹ and I have asked the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to allow space for a brief notice of it, partly because the magazine in which it appears deserves to be much better known in this country, but quite as much because of the importance of the article itself, and the light it sheds upon a discussion which remains too exclusively in the hands of specialists. The article comes from the careful pen of Professor P. W. Schmiedel of Zürich, best known to the learned world through its expectation of the revised German edition of Winer's *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, on which he has been engaged for about ten years. Schmiedel is by no means an 'orthodox' theologian, yet he enters the lists against Wellhausen in the latter's contention that 'Son of man' on the lips of Jesus had no Messianic significance, and conservative critics of the Gospels, who have been startled by the recent appearances of the irrepressible 'Philolog'

¹ The *Protestantische Monatshefte* has been in existence for about two and a half years, having completed its fifth semester in last June. The editor is Dr. Websky, Luther Strasse 51, Berlin, W., and the publisher is George Reimer, Anhalt Strasse 12, Berlin, S.W. The price per half-year is 4 marks. Some show copies were sent me recently by Professor Schmiedel. I shall be glad so far as possible to meet the wishes of readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES who may wish to see one or more of them.

in N.T. territory, may yet have to thank Schmiedel for the means of repelling at least one formidable attack upon orthodox beliefs. As is natural, the article deals almost exclusively with what may be called the Aramaic phase of the question regarding the relation of Jesus to Jewish Messianic ideals. Aramaic was the mother tongue of Jesus. The study² of it as a possible source of knowledge regarding the contents of the Gospels takes us as far back as the sixteenth century, and there has practically never been any doubt in the mind even of the unlearned readers of the O.T. that 'son of man' in the ordinary usage of Hebrew means simply *man* (cp., e.g., Nu 23¹⁹, Is 51¹², Ps 8⁵). Yet it has been left to moderns like Wellhausen and Lietzmann³ to point out two things: (1) That what holds of the Hebrew equivalent for 'son of man' holds *a fortiori* of the Aramaic *bar-nash* or (with the definite article) *bar-nasha*. (2) That in certain circumstances this fact may have a decisive influence on the settlement of the question whether

² Aramaic was studied by Archbishop Générard, who died 1597. See Arnold Meyer's *Muttersprache Jesu*, 1896.

³ *Menschensohn*, 1896, probably the best monograph on the subject, although the attempt of the author to construe the N.T. on the assumption that the apostles knew nothing of any use by Jesus of 'Son of man' in a Messianic sense will appear to most people like the attempt to rest a pyramid upon its apex.

the evidence contained in the Gospels that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah is reliable.

In order to understand precisely the position of Wellhausen, it may be helpful to mention categorically his *admissions*:—(1) Jesus sometimes—though not so often as the Gospels represent¹—used the phrase ‘Son of man’ instead of the simple personal pronoun *I* or *me*. (2) The authors of our Greek Gospels understood the phrase in a Messianic sense. (3) But these authors are carefully to be distinguished from the first disciples of Jesus, who could only have understood *bar-nash* in its natural sense of *man*. Most striking of all is the admission, made however only in the *second* edition of the *History*,² and with special reference to Enoch (chaps. 37–71):³ (4) That the use of *Son of man* as a title of the Messiah *may* be pre-Christian. In spite of these admissions Wellhausen maintains that Jesus in using the phrase *Bar-nash* did not mean to designate himself as the Messiah. He has therefore to explain two things:—*First*, What *Bar-nash* on the lips of Jesus actually meant. *Second*, How the special Messianic sense, manifest in our Gospels, came to be imported into the phrase. In regard to the first matter, Wellhausen holds that in calling Himself *Bar-nasha* Jesus meant to convey that He had a unique filial consciousness towards God. This belonged to Him as *man*, and might therefore be shared by other men. Jesus meant to say that He was the typical man. He did not mean to say that He was the Messiah. As to the second matter, the misunderstanding that Jesus had spoken of Himself as the Messiah would naturally arise (in the passage of the reports of the sayings of Jesus from Aramaic into Greek) from the literalistic rendering of *Bar-nasha* by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. It would be facilitated by the fact that apocalyptic writings, presumably later than the time of Jesus, to which at any rate there is no proof that He had access, had by the time our Gospels were stereotyped in Greek introduced the use of the phrase in the Messianic sense,

¹ Cp., e.g., Mt 16¹³ with Mk 8²⁷.

² *History*, p. 346. The page references are throughout to the German edition.

³ The so-called ‘Book of Similitudes,’ where *Son of man* repeatedly occurs as the title of the Messiah. The book as a whole is admittedly pre-Christian, but until recently most scholars have inclined to the opinion that the *Son of man* passages are Christian interpolation. This is not the view of the latest authority, Charles (*Book of Enoch*, Oxford, 1893).

the basis of the usage being, as is now on all hands admitted, Dan 7¹³. In regard to the passages in *Enoch* (chaps. 37–71), where the Messiah appears with the title *Son of man*, Wellhausen maintains (in the *second* edition of the *History*) that even if it were certain that they are pre-Christian, it has still to be made probable that Jesus knew the book, and that its idea of the Messiah took any hold of His mind. The theory of the meaning of *Bar-nasha*, advocated by Wellhausen, supplies leverage to his discredit of the reports in Mt 24, and parallels, of the eschatological sayings of Jesus. These, he is at liberty to say, are precisely the passages in regard to which the presumption of interpolation in the style of current apocalypses is strongest. They are also those in which it is least possible to reconcile the context or situation with what Wellhausen believes to have been the sense of *Bar-nasha* as used by Jesus.

In criticising these positions of Wellhausen, Schmiedel makes some notable concessions. For one thing, he fully admits the philological basis of Wellhausen’s argument. Not only is *man* the natural meaning of *bar-nash*, but in some dialects the latter is the only phrase in which the idea can be expressed. In the *Jerusalem Translation of the Gospels*, written in the Galilæan dialect of Aramaic, the phrase in question is represented by ‘Son of the son of man,’ a linguistic monstrosity ‘which points only the more forcibly to the necessity of making oneself familiar with the spirit of the language which Jesus spoke.’ On the other hand, Schmiedel puts his critical knife very effectively into the theory that the authors of our Greek Gospels must have blundered or repeated the blunders of others in the rendering of *Bar-nasha* as used by Jesus by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Why, in that case, did they not blunder equally in rendering the same phrase in other places? Why, e.g., in Mk 2²⁷ do we not read: ‘The Sabbath was made for the *son of man*,’ etc., and that all the more that in the next verse we read not: *Man*, but: ‘The *son of man* is Lord of the Sabbath.’ There has clearly been discrimination on the part of the Greek translators between a *usual* and a *special* sense of *bar-nash*. When would the process of discrimination begin? Naturally with the passage of the reports of the sayings of Jesus from Aramaic into Greek and this passage, as Wellhausen admits, began immediately after the death of Jesus, *i.e.* at a time when according to Wellhausen no help could in all

probability be got from Jewish Apocalypses, so far as the Messianic sense of the phrase *Son of man* is concerned. Again, Schmiedel is quite prepared to admit the possibility that the *Son of man* passages in *Enoch* may be Christian interpolation, and so far as ability to deal with this part of the problem depends on a knowledge of Ethiopic (in which language the only complete text of *Enoch* exists), he finds himself condemned to silence before the differing verdicts of experts like Lietzmann and Charles. Yet he is able to show that, judged by their own arguments, the philological opponents of the pre-Christian origin of the *Son of man* passages in *Enoch* are far from having made out their case. In reference, e.g., to the meaning of the Ethiopic demonstrative pronoun usually translated *this* or *that*, he indicates one passage (*Enoch* 63²), where the pronoun is used before the name for Jehovah ('Lord of spirits'), and points to Lietzmann's admission that here the sense can only be, not: '*this* Lord of spirits,' but: '*He*, the Lord of spirits.' Why then may there not be passages in the Ethiopian text of *Enoch*, in which, when the same pronoun occurs before 'son of man' the sense is not, as Lietzmann would have it always: *This man*, but: *He, the Son of man* i.e., the Messiah? If we admit the possibility of this, might we not perhaps find in the Book of *Enoch* itself the transition from the ordinary to the specific use of *Son of man* (its use, viz. as the title of the Messiah), which Lietzmann thinks appears only in the later apocalypses? So far as I am aware the view of Lietzmann that not even in *Enoch* (chaps. 37-71), as judged by the Ethiopic text, does the phrase *Son of man* appear as a distinctive title of the Messiah, is peculiar to himself. He holds that Greek and other translators have blundered in their rendering of the original text of *Enoch* (which was doubtless Aramaic), just as according to Wellhausen the authors of our Greek Gospels have blundered in the rendering of *Bar-nasha* as used by Jesus. If this view were correct, the proof that the so-called *Son of man* passages in *Enoch* were pre-Christian would not help the case of those who are in search for a genuine precedent to what they believe to have been the usage in the time of Jesus. It is noteworthy that Wellhausen, though evidently hard pressed by the arguments in favour of the pre-Christian origin of the *Enoch* passages, does not take refuge in the position of Lietzmann. In

declining that refuge, he exposes his own position to formidable attack.

For, in the first place, if we agree with Wellhausen in putting Lietzmann aside, we shall not agree with him in saying that the proof of the pre-Christian origin of the *Son of man* passages in *Enoch* is still unimportant; and, in the second place, we shall hold that, though the *proof* of the early origin of these passages is not perfect, the *presumption* in favour of it is strong. Looking to the latter point, we may call to mind (1) that the section (*Enoch*, chaps. 37-71) in which the passages occur is admittedly on the whole pre-Christian; (2) that the passages themselves are woven into the general context in such a way as to leave the *onus probandi* with those who assert interpolation, and (3) last, not least, that the representation of the Messiah, made by the alleged Christian interpolator, could hardly have been so wholly out of touch with the historic personality of Jesus as are the *Son of man* passages in *Enoch*.

Now supposing we had *proved* that the *Son of man* passages in *Enoch* were pre-Christian, should we or should we not have knocked all bottom of probability out of the theory that the Greek evangelists had blundered in representing Jesus as having used the phrase *Son of man* to denote His Messiahship? Wellhausen says, *No*; but Schmiedel has easy work in exposing the tight place in which he thereby puts himself.

This exposure is for the general reader the most interesting part of Schmiedel's valuable article, and I shall prolong this notice only to give a brief summary of it. In the first edition of his *History* (1894), p. 312, Wellhausen wrote: 'If the misunderstanding [of the Aramaic *Bar-nasha*] shows itself in a certain section of the Book of *Enoch*, it is a sign that this part is infected with Christian influence, for it is wholly incredible that Jesus should have read this book and appropriated its mistake.' That is to say, in 1894 Wellhausen had convinced himself or was content to assume that the *Son of man* passages in *Enoch* were Christian interpolation, or possibly he held (as Lietzmann now holds) that even if they were pre-Christian, they did not prove the existence of a usage, according to which *Son of man* = *the Messiah*. Since 1894, however, Wellhausen must have seen reason to doubt both of these positions. For in the second edition of the *History*, the passage above cited does not appear. Instead of

it we read (p. 346): 'The Son of man in the Book of Enoch must be left out of the game so long as it is not established that the part of the book in question *was* known or *could have been known* to Jesus.'

Both the strength and the weakness of this sentence lie in the evident determination of Wellhausen not to tie up his theory regarding the meaning of *Bar-nasha* on the lips of Jesus with the view that the passages in Enoch are Christian interpolation. But unless he falls back (as he does not) on the view of Lietzmann that the usage, *Son of man = the Messiah*, is not to be found in Enoch, he really cannot afford to admit the possibility of the pre-Christian origin of the Son of man passages in that book. For, as Schmiedel very justly remarks, it is only the latter of the two alternatives (the *could have been known*) mentioned in the last-cited passage which need cause any concern to those who combat Wellhausen's view. If the Book of Enoch (as we have it in chaps. 37-71) existed in the time of Jesus, we do not need to prove that He must have read it in order to account for His adoption in a specific sense of a phrase, which this book (and for ought we know, other books) may very well have made to some extent current in that sense among the Jews.

Yet again, even if we agree with Wellhausen, to leave the Book of Enoch 'out of the game,' we can still, according to Schmiedel, put him in a tight place by means of his concession (a concession in itself creditable to Wellhausen's sense of history) that Jesus *did* use the phrase *Bar-nasha* in an emphatic *personal* though not in a

Messianic sense. In reference to this, Wellhausen frankly admits it to be 'extremely peculiar' that instead of saying simply 'I,' Jesus should have said 'The Man,' 'but,' he adds, 'it would be not less remarkable to say "The Messiah" instead of "I"' (*History, loc. cit.*).

Schmiedel's comment on this 'Machtspruch' (the polite German name for *critical impudence*) is worth quoting: 'Really! *Cæsar commanded the attack*. Instead of this the words in the Gallic War might run: *The general commanded the attack*. But could it also be said: *The soldier commanded the attack?* or, *Cæsar exhorted the soldiers*. It might also be said: *The general exhorted the soldiers*; but what of: *The soldier exhorted the soldiers?* To show that the last example is not irrelevant, we need only quote (*à la* Wellhausen) Mk 9³¹: '*The Man will be delivered into the hands of men.*'

To conclude: No one holds that to establish, as I believe it can be established, that the phrase *Son of man* was in the time of Jesus a more or less current Jewish title of the Messiah, necessarily takes us very far in understanding what the Messiahship of Jesus meant to Himself, but I cannot but think that a serious blow is struck at the historicity of the Gospels, if we are left to choose between the alternatives either that Jesus did not apply the phrase to Himself at all, or that the phrase had not to Jewish ears a Messianic reference. I confess it seems to me that the latter alternative is as repugnant to the interests of faith as the former, and for this reason among others I am grateful to Professor Schmiedel for the article herewith in part reproduced.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GALATIANS.

GALATIANS I. 4.

'Who gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us out of this present evil world, according to the will of our God and Father' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'Who gave Himself.'—St. Paul here touches on the doctrinal, as in v.¹ he touched on the personal, point of controversy with the false teachers. He holds up at once before the Galatians, who were returning to the bondage of

the law, the picture of the dying Saviour, who, by the one sacrifice on the cross, fully and for ever accomplished our redemption, so that we need not resort to any human means of salvation, or go back to a preparatory dispensation.
—SCHAFF.

THIS is the strongest imaginable description of what Christ did to redeem us. The phrase occurs in 1 Mac 6⁴⁴ with reference to the Eleazar who rushed upon certain death to kill the elephant which was carrying the king, Antiochus: 'He gave himself to save his people.' It is applied to Christ also in Tit 2¹⁴, 'Who gave Himself for