

THE MESSIAH AND THE SON OF MAN.¹

BY ARTHUR S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D.

RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF MANCHESTER.

THERE is no problem more momentous for the student of Christian origins nor one more keenly debated than that which is to engage our attention. Jesus challenged His disciples with the question "Who do you say that I am?" But for us it is far more important to discover what Jesus believed and claimed Himself to be. The ultimate question, indeed, is what He really was. But the answer is to be sought not on one line of enquiry only but on several. For we must estimate the impression He made on His contemporaries, whether friendly or hostile; the influence He exerted on those He selected for companionship and training; the record of His activity; the presentation of His personality; the quality of His teaching; His death and His triumph over death. To these we must add the movement He created, the men He transformed, the worship He evoked, the place He has filled in universal history. But the issue with which we are concerned must fill its indispensable place in the enquiry. The secret of His own consciousness will always in a measure elude us; but so far as He explicitly disclosed it or we can with justice divine it, so far we must appropriate it and give it its full weight in our theory of His person.

So much will probably be on all hands admitted. For whatever our personal attitude to the ultimate problem may be, the view which Jesus Himself took of His Nature and His task is a datum of undeniable significance. But many will wonder why I should speak of a problem, on which much debate has been concentrated. For is it not clear from the records themselves that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, the Son of David, the Son of man, the Son of God?

¹ The substance of two lectures delivered in the John Rylands Library.

But a historical student has to investigate not only the contents but also the truth of his sources. Even if for himself he held that the documents were Divinely protected from the least taint of error, he could not evade the obligation to establish their truth for those who did not share this conviction. Since the conviction itself is in our own day more and more widely abandoned, we must treat the question, so far as the subject itself permits, as a historical problem to be solved by the methods proper to historical enquiry. And when we take up the literature of the subject we quickly discover that there is scarcely any point which is not disputed by scholars of great eminence.

Since the only sources of our information are documentary, it would be necessary in any extended treatment to investigate the literary problems which the documents present. For our purpose and in our space this would be inappropriate, so I must simply indicate the critical presuppositions. It is well known that the large majority of critics regard Mark as our oldest Gospel and as a source employed by the authors of the first and third Gospels. It is also widely, though not quite so widely, held that these two Gospels employed a second source, no longer extant. This, which is now usually indicated by the symbol Q, consisted largely of sayings and discourses of Jesus. The relation between these two primary sources, Mark and Q, is variously estimated, some assuming Mark to be the earlier, others Q, while others again regard them as nearly contemporaneous. Of course it does not follow that if one of them was appreciably older than the other it would have been employed by the later writer, though some scholars hold that there was dependence on one side or the other. Other possibilities to be borne in mind are that the documents themselves, notably Mark, may have passed through successive editions, and been known to Matthew in one form and to Luke in another. And while chronological priority may not unreasonably be held to imply on the whole greater historical trustworthiness, this principle needs to be applied with more caution than has often been exhibited. I must also regard it as highly probable that Luke had access to a very valuable set of reminiscences whether in oral or in written form. We cannot forget that he accompanied Paul to Jerusalem on the visit which was terminated by his arrest and was with him on his voyage to Rome. It does not follow that he was in Palestine for the whole

of the intervening period; but he had first-rate opportunities for gathering reminiscences of Jesus from members of the Palestinian Church.¹

It is now more and more widely believed that the Fourth Gospel is to be almost entirely set aside by those who are seeking to reconstruct the career and teaching of Jesus. This attitude has been for a long time prevalent in Germany and it has made great headway among scholars in Great Britain and in America. In recent years, especially since the work of Wellhausen, Schwartz and Spitta, the problem of its composite structure has more and more engaged the attention of scholars. A comparison of the first with the second edition of Loisy's *Le Quatrième Évangile* will show how far opinion has travelled in the interval. Probably the student will do well, in a subject so rapidly moving, to adopt an attitude of extreme caution towards theories which have yet to be thoroughly tested, all the more that different analyses proceed upon different principles. But whatever the truth may be about the authorship, the date, or the unity of the Fourth Gospel, I believe that it has preserved for us a number of precious reminiscences. In the present state of opinion, however, it is desirable to build on our earliest sources in the first instance. It must of course be recognised that we cannot exclude the possibility that the

¹ I should perhaps add that Synoptic criticism is passing into a new stage. In this stress is laid on the necessity of investigating the problem of form and determining the literary types in the first three Gospels. The following books may be mentioned: Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919); Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (1919); Martin Albertz, *Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche* (1921); Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (1921); Georg Bertram, *Die Leidensgeschichte und der Christuskult* (1922). In his *Kyrios Christos* (second edition, p. 33) Bousset says that he hardly needs to emphasise that he assumes the two-document theory as the basis of his investigation. But he adds that there are far more difficult and still more important problems which have scarcely yet been attempted. Previous criticism has been too much occupied with analysis into sources. A new method must be adopted which will put stylistic criticism in the foreground and investigate the laws of oral tradition. The problem is to trace the process by which Mark and Q grew up. This will no doubt prove a fruitful field of investigation and it may have important bearings on the future investigation of the Gospel history and religion. But since the discussion of it is only in its initial stages, it is better, in the investigation of our special problem, to leave it out of account.

Christology of the Church may have affected the report of the sayings or activities of Jesus.

I begin with the problem of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is undeniable that the Church from its earliest days regarded Jesus as the Messiah.¹ Our oldest sources take back this belief into the lifetime of Jesus. They represent Jesus Himself as accepting the title. The belief is said to have been formulated by Peter at Cæsarea Philippi (Mark viii. 30) ; and the people are aware of it, at least from the time of the triumphant entry into Jerusalem. In spite of this, it has been doubted by some modern scholars whether Jesus ever made any claim to be the Messiah or even was so regarded by the disciples in His lifetime. I take the case of Wrede as illustrating this position, especially since he called attention to phenomena in the Gospels which had received insufficient consideration.² He put great emphasis on the in-

¹ Since some readers may question my right to assume this, I may refer to the opening paragraph of Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* in which he says that, however much the self-consciousness of Jesus Himself might be contested, it may be taken as fully assured that the community at Jerusalem was established from the outset on the basis of the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah expected by the Jewish people. I might add that while he refuses to go so far as to say that Jesus never used the title Son of man of Himself, this negative being incapable of proof, yet in very numerous cases he believes that this self-designation did not go back to Jesus, but originated in the tradition of the community, and that here if anywhere, we have before us in the confession of Jesus as the Son of man the conviction of the primitive community (second edition, p. 5). In view of Bousset's extremely negative position with reference to the view that Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah and Son of man, his testimony may presumably be deemed sufficient warrant for my statement.

² W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901). The book attracted great attention in Germany. English readers should consult Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, chap. 19. Wrede's work and his own little work *The Secret of the Messiahship and the Passion* (*Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis* (1901), which, with its curiously similar title, was published on the same day, are used by Schweitzer to point the moral of his historical investigation that we must choose between Wrede's radical scepticism or J. Weiss's and his own radical eschatology. For a severe criticism of Wrede see Sanday *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp. 69-76. Jülicher's *Neue Linien in der Kritik der Evangelischen Überlieferung* has an important discussion of Wrede, as also of Harnack and Wellhausen. The work opens with a very sarcastic estimate of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*. Bousset in his discussion of the Messianic secret absolutely agrees with Wrede's presentation of the facts but differs in his estimate of them (*Kyrios Christos*,

junctions to secrecy recorded in the Synoptic Gospels and especially in Mark. The demons are forbidden to disclose the Messiahship, and similarly the disciples after Peter's confession. He laid stress also on the difficulty caused by the prolonged delay in the disclosure itself. The solution which he offered was that Mark devised the theory of the Messianic secret to account for a difficulty. The disciples, having attained the conviction that Jesus had risen from the dead, drew the inference that He was the Messiah. A difficulty, however, was created by the fact that it was not known that Jesus had made any such claim in His lifetime. Confronted by this difficulty, Mark put forward the theory that Jesus was conscious of His Messiahship from His Baptism, but guarded it as a secret ; it was divined by the demoniacs with their psychical sensitiveness, and later declared by Peter, who had been illuminated by Divine revelation. In each case silence as to the secret was rigidly enjoined. Thus it came to pass that, although Jesus had known Himself to be the Messiah and the secret had been divulged to a limited circle, it had remained, outside of it, entirely unknown.

Wrede's solution has met with little if any acceptance. And rightly, for it involves a scepticism as to the trustworthiness of our narratives so radical that, if it could be justified, we could hardly trust them for anything. His account of the origin of the conviction in the primitive Church is exposed to the gravest objections. He asserts that the early Church based its identification of Jesus with the Messiah on the belief that He had risen from the dead. But the consequence by no means follows. We have no ground for supposing that the belief in Messiahship would be a likely inference to draw from the belief in a man's resurrection. The Old Testament knew cases of resurrection in which no one dreamed of such an inference. And there is a contemporary case which is quite conclusive. Herod and some of the people thought that Jesus was John the Baptist who had risen from the dead. But not one of them hit upon the idea that He

second edition, pp. 66 f.). In particular, while allowing that Mark's tendency in this respect has coloured the narrative of the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, he disagrees with Wrede's inclination to regard the whole story as an invention. "Peter's Messianic confession must stand as historical. But owing to the evangelist's tendency to paint the picture over, the answer of Jesus has been unfortunately lost to us." The first sentence is a noteworthy concession to historical truth.

was therefore the Messiah. Further the conviction entertained by the disciples that Jesus had risen from the dead needs itself to be explained. If the resurrection actually occurred, the problem does not exist ; but as Wrede did not regard it as an actual fact, it must be explained in some other way. The belief is supposed to rest on the visions and these are regarded not as objective but as subjective. But how would these be generated ? They could be explained only as effects of the impression made by Jesus during His lifetime. But a conviction so amazing in the circumstances, to the consideration of which I will return—the accursed mode of His death, the verdict of the religious leaders, the apparent ruin of His cause—require us to postulate that the impression they had formed of His personality was of a wholly exceptional kind. This creates a strong presumption in favour of the view that Jesus was in His own lifetime regarded as Messiah ; and, if so, certainly not without His own knowledge and approval. Wrede's theory of the Messianic secret is accordingly untenable. But at this point it is best to merge the special in the wider discussion, and to state the grounds on which the view, not of Wrede alone, but of other scholars that Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah, must be rejected. We can then return to the problem of the Messianic secret.

The story of the Baptism raises several critical questions. But the fact that Jesus was baptised by John may be taken as quite certain since it cannot have been invented. For had it never taken place, it would not have occurred to any follower of Jesus to relate that his Master had submitted to baptism at the hands of John, since this might be interpreted to imply a recognition of His dependence on John and inferiority to him. And this all the more that the baptism administered by John was a repentance-baptism received for the remission of sins. It is quite clear from the addition of the conversation between John and Jesus in Matt. iii. 14 f. that this difficulty was acutely felt in the early Church. We cannot be sure that Q recorded the baptism since the texts of Matthew and Luke can be accounted for without the assumption that they used Q. Yet it is probable on general grounds that Q did relate the story. It included the account of the detailed temptations, and this becomes intelligible only from the story of the Baptism and the heavenly voice. Moreover, since Q recorded the ministry of John it is scarcely credible that it omitted what

was for Christians the act in which that ministry culminated. But unless we hold that Mark at this point drew upon Q, we have no evidence that either Matthew or Luke derived their story of the Baptism from it. Fortunately, however, for our purpose this is not serious, since the declaration of Divine Sonship is guaranteed by the fact that the first two temptations start from it. We can accordingly assert with considerable assurance that both of our earliest sources related that Jesus heard the Divine declaration "Thou art my beloved Son."

A statement critically so well attested ought, it would seem, to command our confidence. Yet very eminent critics have doubted it. Replying to the question whether this was the oldest form of the tradition, Harnack says: "I share with Wellhausen the conviction that it was not, that it has rather taken the place of the more ancient story of the Transfiguration" (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 138). This judgment rests on the assumption that the story of the Baptism and that of the Transfiguration are parallel and give mutually exclusive accounts of the Divine declaration of the Sonship of Jesus. But as the two accounts stand in Mark, there are noteworthy differences between them. Wellhausen recognises these, but attributes them to the skill with which Mark has incorporated them and made them distinct incidents (*Das Evangelium Marci*, first edition, p. 75, second edition, pp. 69 f.). But there is no conclusive reason for adopting this view. The appropriateness of the difference in language, which Wellhausen attributes to the skill with which the author adjusted the language to the different situations he had created, may just as well be explained on the more obvious assumption that the situations were, in fact, different. And even if the oldest tradition knew of one occasion only on which the heavenly voice was uttered, it still would not follow that this occasion was the Transfiguration rather than the Baptism. Indeed we may hesitate all the more to follow Wellhausen that he believes the story of the Transfiguration to have been originally the account of an appearance of Jesus after the Resurrection! And the probabilities of the case speak strongly for the view that at the Baptism Jesus attained the consciousness of Divine Sonship. The definite conviction of a Divine call to a special mission could alone have justified to Him the acceptance of His vocation and the entry on His public ministry. The experience in the wilderness follows naturally, one might almost

say inevitably, upon this. And Q's story of the Temptation, if authentic, guarantees the story that in the Baptism Jesus attained the conviction of His Sonship. The denial of the experience on the banks of the Jordan logically carries with it the rejection of the triple temptation, which would then lose its occasion and starting-point, and thus one act of critical violence logically leads on to another. In view of all these considerations, we may with some confidence accept the representation of our sources that with the submission to John's Baptism there was linked the consciousness of Divine Sonship ; that its sequel was retirement into the wilderness and temptation there ; and that this temptation took the form which it received in Matthew and Luke, who at this point were drawing upon Q.

The consciousness which Jesus attained in His Baptism was not of a Sonship shared by others, for this had all along been central in His religious life, but of a Sonship which was unique. It probably included the conviction that He was the Messiah, for this seems to be implied in the third temptation ; but it need not have been exhausted by this.

This conclusion is corroborated by the account of the immediate sequel to the Baptism. Under the constraint of the Spirit who had descended upon Him, He went into the solitude of the wilderness. The object of His retirement was that He might meditate on all that this new consciousness involved, might discern clearly the task to which His vocation committed Him, and the means by which He was to achieve it, and withal that He might be tested to the uttermost and remain sure alike of Himself and His mission. The first two temptations, if I correctly understand them, are directed to the same end, while approaching it by opposite ways. They test the conviction of His Sonship, which must rest on the inward witness of the Spirit and the voice of God, a conviction which must, to be of avail for Him, stand above all need of confirmation by signs and wonders. If He yields to the suggestion to reassure Himself by such expedients, the battle will have been already lost, since the attempt would imply that He had already begun to doubt. Caught in the period of reaction from His ecstasy, with His physical forces at their lowest and the apparent indifference of God to His fate only too plain, He maintains His conviction unshaken. But now His second problem emerges. Secure in the knowledge He has won of the secret of His personality and the nature of His vocation, there is the possibility that His mission may prove a

failure if it be pursued along false lines. It is in this third temptation, to do homage to Satan for the sovereignty of the world, that the Messianic element in His vocation is most clearly implied. For the Messianic hope of His countrymen looked forward to a mighty conqueror who should break the yoke of the oppressor and establish the sovereignty of the Jewish people over the other nations. And it was naturally a real temptation to Jesus to accept this conception of Messiahship with which He was familiar ; and a striking proof of His spiritual insight that He refused to compromise with a lower ideal and remain steadfast in uttermost obedience to what He knew to be the will of God.

This account of the Baptism and the Temptation commends itself by its internal consistency, by its harmony with the situation, and by its fitness as a prelude to what is to follow. If it is correct, it establishes the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, and whatever else may be involved in the consciousness of Divine Sonship, as His secure possession before His ministry began. But the case for His Messianic consciousness has other supports than this and to these I must now turn.

The triumphal entry into Jerusalem implies His Messianic consciousness. For it must have been intended as a fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy : " Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion ; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem : behold, thy king cometh unto thee : he is righteous and victorious ; poor, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt, the foal of an ass " (Zech. ix. 9). We need not insist that Jesus instigated the popular enthusiasm by any disclosure of what the act meant for Himself. It is quite conceivable that He desired no popular demonstration. The main intention of the act was to conform to the Messianic rôle as the prophet had depicted it. The consequences of the action did not so much concern Him. It is not quite clear, in fact, that the demonstration was designed as a welcome to the Messianic King. In our oldest source the acclamations are reported in this way : " Hosanna ; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord : Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, *the kingdom* of our father David : Hosanna in the highest." This need not imply more than that Jesus was regarded as a harbinger of the Kingdom. The later documents definitely make the identification with the Messiah, Matthew using the term " Son of David," Luke, " the King," John, " the King of Israel." But John adds the significant words, " These things understood not his disciples at the first : but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that

these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him " (xii. 16). The difficulty in regarding the triumphal entry as a Messianic demonstration is that the authorities took no action upon it ; and apparently no reference was made to it at the trial of Jesus, though it would have greatly strengthened the case against Him. But, whatever the attitude of the people may have been, and however the disciples regarded the action of Jesus, it seems to be clear that in His own mind the action was imposed upon Him by the necessity of fulfilling Messianic prophecy ; and that He felt the pressure of this necessity and acted in accordance with it, demonstrates that He believed Himself to be the Messiah.

The case is even stronger when we come to His trial and crucifixion. The trial before the Jewish authorities may be dismissed by some as yielding untrustworthy evidence. It is open to a critic to argue that, in the nature of the case, we have no authentic evidence. But even if there was no one among His judges from whom the information could have been directly derived, it would betray a singular lack of familiarity with actual life to suppose that the facts would not have leaked out. Moreover, His accusers must have stated such relevant evidence as they had secured when they brought Him to Pilate. And the confession of Messiahship, if such it is, bears intrinsic marks of genuineness. Its peculiar form as reported by Matthew (xxvi. 64) and Luke (xxii. 70) guarantees its authenticity. Matthew's "Thou hast said" and Luke's "Ye say that I am" seem to be intended as an affirmative reply and are so taken by the High Priest and the judges. This sense is, in fact, fixed by the use of the same formula to Judas in Matt. xxvi. 25. It was not a common formula to express affirmation ; and probably there is a shade of meaning in it which distinguishes it from a bare affirmation.¹ In the Greek, at any rate, the second personal pronoun is emphatic, and the suggestion seems to be that the meaning is : "It is you who employ the term ; I should not have used it myself ; but I admit that it is correct." This guarded and almost ambiguous statement is so apt to the actual situation in which Jesus found Himself, that it is difficult to think that it was put into his mouth by a later writer.

¹ See Thayer, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xiii. pp. 307-313. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash : Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, pp. 990 f.

But the trial before Pilate and the Crucifixion supply still more decisive evidence. Very few who acknowledge the historical existence of Jesus have had the hardihood to deny that He was put to death by crucifixion. But since denial has not been altogether wanting, though based on the flimsiest grounds, I will briefly explain why the crucifixion must be regarded as a historical fact. When I was considering a number of years ago whether we could devise arguments to prove the historical existence of Jesus which would be quite independent of evidence derived from the Christian documents, it occurred to me that we could infer the fact with certainty from the form which the Jewish Messianic doctrine had received in the Christian Church.¹ It may be argued that already by the first century A.D. Judaism had developed the doctrine of a suffering and slain Messiah, though this is dubious. It is, however, quite certain that it could not have represented the Messiah as put to death by crucifixion. For this mode of death is accounted as accursed in the Hebrew law which says : " he that is hanged is accursed of God " (Deut. xxi. 23). This mode of death has, in fact, seemed to the Jews to negative decisively the
 ✓ Messiahship of Jesus. If, then, we find a Jewish sect which has for its central dogma the Messiahship of one whom it asserts to have been crucified, there can be only one explanation for this. The story of the Founder's death by crucifixion obviously could not have been invented. For it presented an insuperable difficulty to the propaganda of the sect. To the Jews it seemed to place an impassable barrier in the way of the acceptance of Christianity, while to the Greeks the story seemed the extreme of folly. The leaders of a new movement do not create gratuitous difficulties for themselves ; nothing but sheer necessity could have forced the Christian leaders to go to their Jewish countrymen with the story of a crucified Messiah. Only in one way can we account for the form their message took. They must have been adherents of¹ a leader whom they believed to be Messiah, who had been executed on the cross. And in spite of the verdict of the Law, which was for them the verdict of God, they must still have believed Him to be Messiah. By this line of argument we establish not only the historical existence of Jesus but also His death by cruci-

¹ I first stated this argument in my lecture *Did Jesus Rise Again?* (1902); see also *Christianity : its Nature and its Truth*, pp. 156-158; *The Bible : its Origin, its Significance, and its Abiding Worth*, p. 318.

fixion. For in no other way could we account for the abnormal development which the Jewish Messianic belief received in the Christian Church.

To the fuller implications of this for our particular subject I shall return ; but I am at present establishing the fact of the crucifixion. While the more merciful Jewish law made stoning the normal form of capital punishment, crucifixion was a Roman mode of execution. The question is accordingly, How did Jesus come to be executed by this Roman mode of death ? He was, we are told, delivered to the Roman authorities by His fellow-countrymen. Now, however worthy of death the Jewish rulers may, from their own standpoint, have felt Jesus to be, they could not expect a Roman Governor to condemn and crucify Him on the ground that Jewish law required His death. They had to charge Him with a crime of which Roman administration could take cognizance. His claim to Messiahship afforded them the plausible pretext they needed, since this could be represented to Pilate as high treason against the Emperor. Pilate realised that Jesus was not an ordinary Messianic revolutionary, and was, therefore, willing to release Him. At the same time Jesus did not disavow but apparently admitted the truth of the charge, so that Pilate finally gave way. Here, again, we have in all our Synoptists the curious formula of affirmation "Thou sayest." Jesus throws on Pilate the responsibility for using the term, while admitting that it was correct. Had He repudiated the charge, it is very questionable if Pilate would have yielded to the Jews. He could have securely defied them if he had satisfied himself that the accusation had no substance. What seems to have determined his final action was the fact that the prisoner would not deny His Messiahship, and, indeed, appeared to admit it. Pilate realised that, however innocent the Messiahship in question might be, it would be a serious matter for him if he should be proved to have released a man charged with claiming to be the Messiah, who had Himself chosen to go to the cross rather than to plead innocence. We may, accordingly, infer with practical certainty from the fact of the crucifixion that Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah. This is further corroborated by the title over the cross which represented Jesus as King of the Jews. There is no valid reason for doubting its authenticity.

A case so strong stands in no need of further evidence. And yet

one of the strongest proofs remains to be mentioned. I have pointed out already in reply to Wrede that the conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus held by the Church was in the circumstances so amazing that it can be explained only on the basis of the impressions His disciples had formed of Jesus during His lifetime. The circumstances I enumerated were "The accursed mode of His death, the verdict of the religious leaders, the apparent ruin of His cause." Their mood was one of terrible disillusion. They had followed Jesus to the capital hoping that He would set up the Kingdom of God. They had entered Jerusalem in triumph ; but the days slipped by and the hate of His enemies, in alliance with the treason of a disciple, had secured His downfall. So this was the end of their Messianic dream. They could not be indifferent to the fact that His claims had been rejected by the appointed custodians of religion, who were charged with the duty of adjudicating on such pretensions. And all this had been endorsed by the mode of His death, for this had brought Him under the Law's anathema, "He that is hanged is accursed of God."

/ That with such overwhelming evidence against it, His disciples should have recovered a faith in His Messiahship, which they had held before His death is itself amazing ; but that after His accursed death such a faith should have been for the first time created is, we may surely say, a sheer impossibility.

We may then infer with confidence that already before His death His disciples had believed Jesus to be the Messiah. But if so, we may take the further step of affirming that this cannot have been without the knowledge and the approval of Jesus. For Jesus could not have been unaware of the views entertained by His followers. And sooner or later He must have taken up a definite attitude to them. If He did not believe Himself to be the Messiah He could not have countenanced the belief of His followers that He was. And even if in His lifetime they had believed Him in spite of His own disclaimer to be the Messiah, itself a barely credible hypothesis, the tragic sequel would once for all have disabused them of their belief. And this would have equally been the case if the judgment of Jesus had been in suspense. We are left accordingly with the only remaining possibility that Jesus Himself had put His seal of approbation on their faith. And it is all the more necessary to assume this, that it was after all not so easy for a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus to

spring up spontaneously in the minds of His disciples. It was one of the difficulties which early Christian apologetic had to face that He had not fulfilled the Messianic rôle as foreshadowed by Old Testament prophets and elaborated in Jewish theology. In the momentous scene at Cæsarea Philippi the disciples enumerate the popular identifications of Jesus (Mark, viii. 28). Men had thought of Him as John the Baptist or Elijah or one of the prophets. From this it is clear that while the people readily recognised something so extraordinary in Jesus that they readily believed Him to be a great prophet who had returned from the realm of the dead, they had not identified Him with the Messiah ; and if we can trust the record in Matthew, Jesus accounted for Peter's confession of His Messiahship as the result of a Divinely given insight into His vocation (xvi. 17). But in any case it is clear that the career of Jesus did not naturally suggest to the Jews that He would prove to be the Messiah. We may accordingly regard it as incredible that the disciples should have maintained a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, unless they were aware that this was His own belief about Himself. Such knowledge of His own mind was the sheet-anchor of their faith when they affirmed it to hostile priests and incredulous rulers.

Thus by several lines of mutually independent arguments, each of them weighty and some sufficient if they stood alone, but irresistible in their combination and their concentration from different angles on the same conclusion, we have demonstrated beyond all reasonable question that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah. This conclusion will be corroborated in the sequel and the significance of His conviction will be more fully disclosed. But the fact that the conclusion has been doubted warns us that the reasons for this doubt have to be explored more fully. And with this I return to the problem of the Messianic secret.

If Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah why did He Himself maintain such secrecy about it and enjoin such secrecy on others ? Why did He elicit the confession of His Messiahship from His disciples at so late a point in His ministry ? Why was it that He did not declare Himself to the people ? Why had the confession to be extorted from Him at His trial ? The view has been taken that the silence of Jesus was due to His own uncertainty. Only when His ministry was far advanced did He become sure in His own mind.

Through prolonged hesitation and acute inward struggle He had to reach the conviction that He was the Messiah. He may have felt that the Messianic category did not fit His self-consciousness ; or He may even have shrunk from Messiahship as unwelcome. But this suspense and indecision and inner conflict have to be read into the narratives. Jesus rather impresses us as one whose own mind was fully made up and whose way stretched plainly before Him. And if I have been right in arguing that the story of the Baptism and the Temptation may be trusted, then we must believe that Jesus left the Jordan and entered the wilderness with a certainty of His Messianic vocation so deep that no doubt could touch it. There is no need to hesitate about this, if the reserve of Jesus can be satisfactorily accounted for in another way than the assumption of His own uncertainty.

The usual explanation that He avoided the disclosure to the people because His conception of the Messiahship was so different from theirs seems to be adequate. He could not have proclaimed Himself as Messiah without evoking the popular enthusiasm which was in a very inflammable condition. Revolution against Rome might easily have broken out, and a life and death struggle might have been its inevitable sequel. In such a struggle Jesus could have had no share. His refusal to participate in it would have ruined all chance of winning the people for His cause ; and disillusion, especially if attended by military defeat, would have embittered them against Him. Nor could His purpose have been accomplished if He had explicitly declared that, though He was the Messiah, He was not the kind of Messiah they anticipated. This would have been practically equivalent in their eyes to a denial that He was the Messiah at all. They neither understood nor desired any other than the hero of their imperialist dreams. To make a claim so interpreted would have rendered them still more inaccessible to His message.

And this is true also of His reticence with His disciples. Had He disclosed the secret of His vocation, the associations which gathered about the title would have set them from the first on the wrong lines for understanding Him. If He desired to lead them to the conviction that He was the Messiah but to reinterpret the idea for them, the best way was taken. They became familiar with Himself, His ideals, His mode of action and His teaching. When the

time came for the Messiahship to be revealed, they could recognise, though even then with great difficulty, that Jesus was a Messiah other than the Messiah of national expectation. They could now control their interpretation of His vocation by their impression of His Person. They could see the doctrine in a new light because they read it through their knowledge of Him. And it was far better that Jesus should lead them through intimate familiarity with Him, though watching His actions and listening to His words to form their own judgment of Him, rather than by premature disclosure to force the truth upon them before they were ready for it, and when they would have inevitably misunderstood it.

II.

So far then I have sought to establish the fact that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, without entering on the question what this consciousness really involved. We have seen that Jesus clearly recognised a deep divergence between His own and the traditional conception of the Messiah. In meeting His third temptation He definitely set aside the ideal of gaining the Empire of the world. To this renunciation He remained loyal throughout His ministry, and died because He would not disclaim His Messiahship or be untrue to His ideal. If we are to understand His vocation as He Himself interpreted it, we must widen the scope of our enquiry and investigate the other terms which He employed.

The title which most clearly expresses the definite Messianic idea is the title "Son of David." It is rather striking that it is infrequent in the Gospels. The genealogies in Matthew and Luke trace His descent through David. Paul lays stress on the fact that He was born of the seed of David and in this he follows the primitive Christian apologetic as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. Stress is also laid on it in the birth stories. Jesus does not repudiate the title when it is addressed to Him, but He does not use it with reference to Himself. In one passage indeed He is believed by many to controvert the idea expressed by it. On the Scribes' definition of the Messiah as the Son of David He comments with the question, How is this to be reconciled with the 110th Psalm? For if the Messiah is the Son of David, He is by that very fact David's inferior and yet David speaks of Him as his Lord. It does not necessarily follow that Jesus was conscious that He had no claim to Davidic descent,

or that he was depreciating the Davidic descent of the Messiah. It may quite well be that He wished to bring out that Davidic origin was not the full truth about the Messiah. He was David's son—Yes, but He was also David's Lord. In any case it was not the dominant element in His Messianic consciousness.

Of greater importance was the title "Son of God." In a general sense Jesus proclaimed the universal Fatherhood of God and this involved a corresponding universal sonship. His own religious experience was in His earlier years illustrated by His reply to Joseph and Mary when they found Him in the Temple, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" But to this consciousness of a sonship which He shared with others there was added in His Baptism the consciousness of a unique relationship to God. He was the beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased. The reference in the latter words is to the first of the Servant poems (Isa. xlii. 1). The title might be equivalent to Messiah. It is so used in the Gospels. An interesting case is to be found in (Luke iv. 41). The demons cry out to Jesus, 'Thou art the Son of God.' The evangelist continues "And rebuking them, he suffered them not to speak because they knew that he was the Christ." Matthew's version of the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi runs, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (xvi. 16). At the trial the two terms are coupled together, the high priest puts the crucial question to Jesus in the form, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (Mark xiv. 61). Whether the term is limited to this in the stories of the Baptism and the Temptation is uncertain. It seems from the third temptation to have at least included His Messianic vocation, but we cannot be sure that it was restricted to this. We have a very remarkable passage (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22) which seems to carry with it a more than Messianic consciousness, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." Here a uniqueness and intimacy of relationship is expressed which seems to transcend that which belonged to His Messianic vocation, and to involve a higher valuation of His Person than is expressed by the strictly Messianic titles. In this connexion we may remember the striking confession of ignorance which we find in the utterance on the time of the

Second Coming in which He places Himself in an ascending climax above men and angels alike.

The problems presented by the title Son of man are more difficult and complex than those presented by the other titles. In the Old Testament the term son of man is simply equivalent to 'man.' This is clear from the parallelism of the two terms. Thus Balaam says :—

God is not a man, that he should lie;
Neither the son of man, that he should repent.
—(Num. xxiii. 19).

The Psalmist, overwhelmed by the majesty of the starry sky, expresses his wonder at God's care for a creature so insignificant as man and the dominion he has entrusted to him :—

What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man that thou visitest him?
—(Ps. viii. 4).

And this usage is in accordance with Hebrew idiom. In the Book of Ezekiel the prophet is constantly addressed by God as 'son of man.' The suggestion is that of human frailty, contrasted with the overwhelming glory and greatness of God. We might freely render it "Frail mortal" or "Child of earth."

More important for our purpose is the use of the term in Dan. vii. 13. The passage runs : "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him." The writer proceeds to describe his reign over all nations ; "His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (14). It is in this figure that the vision of the four beasts culminates. These are said to represent four kings ; but really they are four empires, as is clear from vii. 23. This suggests that the 'one like unto a son of man' also represents an empire ; though taken by itself the more natural interpretation would be that a personal figure is intended. The collective interpretation is confirmed by vii. 18, 22, 27, in which "the saints of the Most High," or "the people of the saints of the Most High" are those to whom the kingdom is finally given. The significance of the whole vision is accordingly this. The four successive empires of heathenism are symbolised by beasts, to

indicate that they are military powers, greedy and ferocious. To them succeeds the kingdom of the saints. This is symbolised by a man, to indicate its humane character in contrast to the brutality of 'the empires which had preceded it. The figure in Daniel is accordingly not to be interpreted as personal or identified with the Messiah. Israel is intended.

When, however, we turn to the section of the Book of Enoch known as the Similitudes (chs. xxxvii.-lxxi.), the Son of man is personal and stands for the Messiah. He is a pre-existent heavenly Being, the Righteous One, Divinely chosen for pre-eminence, gifted with power to reveal all the treasures of what is secret. Seated on the throne of glory He judges the kings and the mighty and slays all the sinners. He delivers the oppressors of the righteous to the angels of punishment; and though they appeal for mercy their repentance is in vain. It is probably not from Psalm viii. or from Ezekiel that the use of the title in the Gospels is derived, but from Daniel though with a sense transformed by the later development, so that in place of the collective people we have the personal Messiah.¹

In the New Testament the title is used by Jesus alone, apart from Acts vii. 56 where the words of Stephen in his ecstasy echo, with a significant change, the words uttered by Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Mark xiv. 62, Luke xxii. 69). In the Gospels it occurs, according to Holtzmann's reckoning eighty-one times, sixty-nine in the Synoptists and twelve in John. The instances in John are not parallel to those in the Synoptists. The latter may be reduced to forty distinct utterances (so Driver); another estimate gives forty-two. It is, therefore, undeniably represented as a very characteristic expression on the lips of Jesus. It is not only significant that it occurs so frequently, but it is attested by all our sources. It is found in Mark and Q, in sections peculiar to Matthew and in sections peculiar to Luke, and finally in John. It is true that the number of instances on which we can rely is less than forty in the Synoptists. For in some cases

¹ It is possible, of course, that originally the figure of the Son of man may have been individual rather than collective, and that the collective significance, as we find it in Daniel, has been imposed on the original sense. There are features in the description in the Book of Daniel itself which do not suit Israel. See Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), pp. 340-349; Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, fourth edition, p. 60. But for our purpose it is unnecessary to discuss this.

the term may not be used in its technical but in a more general sense ; while in other cases, where one evangelist reports it, another does not include it in his version of the same utterance. It is also possible that where it is used in its technical sense, and the evangelists agree in recording it, it may have been absent from the actual utterance of Jesus. But any reasonable deduction on these lines still leaves us with a great mass of sayings which, so far as the grounds mentioned are concerned, leave no room for question.

Nevertheless, some scholars doubt or even deny that Jesus applied the title in its technical sense to Himself. The most serious objection to the authenticity of sayings in which it bears this specific sense as opposed to the general meaning 'man' is the philological. Assuming that Jesus spoke Aramaic it is argued that the distinction between 'man' and 'son of man' which can be expressed in Greek is incapable of expression in Aramaic, since *Barnasha* is the term which would have to stand for both. In some cases the sense 'man' can be fitted into sayings in the Gospels in which the term occurs ; but numerous sayings will not bear this interpretation. It might seem to follow that these sayings are not authentic, if Wellhausen's canon is to be accepted that whatever sayings attributed to Jesus are authentic must be capable of retranslation into Aramaic. We must, however, leave the possibility open that Jesus regularly employed the Hebrew term taken direct from the Old Testament, and presumably familiar to His hearers. This would not sound strange in an Aramaic discourse. That He used the Greek rendering would be credible only if the discourse was in Greek. Such solutions, however, while they ought to be recognised as possibilities, can hardly inspire any confidence.

But it is not necessary to infer that on this ground the sayings must be regarded as spurious. For a time Wellhausen believed that Jesus spoke of Himself as the 'Man,' though he recognised that this mode of self-designation was strange. After the publication of Lietzmann's discussion, he advanced to the position that Jesus never used the term with reference to Himself.¹ The point of the objection

¹ Wellhausen expressed his earlier view in the article on *Israel*, reprinted from the expanded German form in the English translation of his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885). Speaking of Jesus as the firstborn of the Father he says : " He stands in this relation to God, not because His

is that in Aramaic the distinction between 'man' and 'Son of man' could not be expressed. This is intrinsically rather improbable; some way might surely be found of conveying in language a distinction which had been made in thought. And it is certainly nothing less than startling that Wellhausen came to the conclusion that the distinction *was* made by the Jerusalem Christians in Aramaic. In the second edition of his *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (1911) he closes his section on the Son of man with the words: "But that the Son of man gained its Messianic significance in Greek I doubt, although it was easier to distinguish it from 'man' in this language than in Aramaic. For this would involve too late a date and it does not follow from Mark ii. 10, 28. The Christians of Jerusalem will already have distinguished the specific Barnascha from the ordinary Barnarscha" (p. 130). This, however, implies that the distinction *could* be made in Aramaic; and if the primitive community could make and express it, there seems to be no insuperable objection to the belief that this step might have been already taken by Jesus, or even that He found it already made in the religious terminology of His time. Moreover it is difficult to doubt that the distinction was made in the Aramaic sources which lie behind the Gospels. It is remarkable that the writers distinguish so surely between 'man' and

nature is unique, but because He is man; He uses always and emphatically this general name of the race to designate His own person" (p. 511). This is repeated in his classical chapter "Das Evangelium" in his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, first edition, 1894 (p. 312). He adds an important footnote in which he argues on philological grounds that Jesus spoke of Himself as "The Man," though he recognised that this was an extremely peculiar mode of speech. This was repeated in the second edition, but in the third edition (p. 381) he broke with this view since he had come to the conclusion, previously drawn by Lietzmann, that Jesus never employed the term in place of the first personal pronoun, but that this mode of address had been attributed to Him by the redactors of the evangelic tradition. This was followed in 1899 by a very important discussion of the whole problem in the sixth part of his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (pp. 187-215), to which he added several pages in his preface (IV.-VIII.) handling Dalman without the gloves. With this should be taken his references in his commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels, but especially the discussions in his *Einleitung in die drei Ersten Evangelien* (first edition (1905), pp. 96 f., second edition (1911), pp. 95 f.). It should be observed that the second edition contains a great deal of additional matter including a special section on the Son of man (pp. 123-130) in which some of the matter already given in the *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* is reproduced.

‘Son of man’; we may well ask whether they would have been so sure-footed, if their sources had left them to pick their own way. Lastly, it must be remembered that our knowledge of the actual language spoken by Jesus is imperfect, and that expert opinion as to the linguistic possibilities is by no means all on one side.

But however strong the philological objections may be, we have no right to settle the question on this ground alone. We must let other considerations have their weight; and these make it extremely difficult to deny the authenticity of all the sayings. This has, it is true, been denied, or gravely questioned on other grounds. Bousset in his *Kyrios Christos*¹ sets aside the philological argument and fully accepts the view that the technical significance was already attached to the term in Aramaic. He believes, in fact, that it was current in the primitive Aramaic-speaking Church of Jerusalem. But while he will not deny outright that Jesus ever applied the term to Himself and says that we can never attain complete certainty on the point, the whole drift of his discussion is directed to the reduction of genuine instances to the vanishing point. Partly this is done by wholesale elimination of passages in the secondary sources, partly by a process of critical attrition applied to the passages in the primary sources one by one.² It would not be possible in my space to follow his argument in detail; I am bound to say, with all the respect due to a scholar so learned and so stimulating, that the discussion impresses me as written by one who had to find reasons for a conclusion which he had reached largely on *a priori* grounds. It is accordingly not to be wondered at that so loyal an ally as Reitzenstein should break away from him at this critical point. He says in his recent work *Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (1921) that, on Bousset’s view, both the individual passages and the development as a whole appear to him a riddle (p. 117). He says later that it is quite intelligible to him that barnasha really was the self-designation of Jesus (pp. 118 f.). He reaffirms his belief that Jesus was conscious that He was the Son of man, and adds that without this self-consciousness neither His later activity nor the employment of the title would be intelligible (p. 130). And Edward Meyer in his very independent and stimulating work *Ursprung*

¹ Second edition, pp. 11 f.

² His discussion of the whole problem is to be found on pp. 5-22.

und Anfänge des Christentums (1921) emphatically asserts his conviction that Jesus applied to Himself the designation Son of man (ii. 345).

It is, in fact, difficult to conceive a case much stronger on its positive side than that for the application of the title to Himself by Jesus. The evidence that He used it, it has already been pointed out, is drawn from every one of our documentary sources. To deny with Bousset the validity of the philological objection, and yet to question the use of the title by Jesus is to fly in the face of all our testimony. And this consideration is reinforced by the total disappearance of the title (save in Acts vii. 56) in the whole of the New Testament literature apart from the utterances of Jesus Himself. Had it been a designation coined by His followers, the restriction of its use to utterances falsely attributed to Him, and the failure to employ it in their narratives about Him would be inexplicable. Its complete absence from the Epistles and probably from the Apocalypse is on the hypothesis of its later invention also surprising. Nor can any reasonable hypothesis be devised to explain the unwarranted introduction of this feature into the evangelic records and especially on such a scale. The only reasonable explanation of the facts is that the use of it by Jesus was so characteristic and familiar that in any record pretending to faithfulness it was impossible to ignore it; though the evidence of the early chapters of Acts suggests that it was not congenial to the Palestinian communities in which the evangelic tradition took shape.

The result then seems to be that general considerations make it almost incredible that Jesus should not have used the term in a specific sense as His own self-designation, while the philological objection, even if pressed to the full, does not interpose an absolute veto.

Assuming then that Jesus used the term in this way, what meaning did He put upon it?

In the first instance, at any rate, it is desirable to start from Mark's evidence. It is certainly remarkable that with two possible exceptions Jesus does not use the term in its specific sense till after the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi. The exceptions are Mark ii. 10, 28. In ii. 28 the view that the Son of man simply means 'man' is plausible, though by no means certain. In ii. 10 it is less plausible although possible; still the people may have understood Jesus to mean this,

(cf. Matt. ix. 8).¹ In any case we have no certain instance of the specific sense in Mark before viii. 31. This follows immediately on Peter's confession of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is noteworthy that in our earliest source two only of the fourteen instances occur before Cæsarea Philippi. The twelve instances which remain are viii. 31, 38 ; ix. 9, 12, 31 ; x. 33, 45 ; xiii. 26 ; xiv. 21, 41, 62. The two leading ideas are the Passion and the return in glory, the former type of passages being considerably more numerous, though possibly the number ought to be reduced on the ground that predictions of the Passion have been duplicated. This, however, does not affect the main conclusion that these passages fall into two groups. There is no serious ground for suspecting their authenticity.

Further, the passages unmistakeably identify the Son of man with Jesus. The Passion group, with its prediction of betrayal, suffering, rejection, death, resurrection, unquestionably makes the identification. If viii. 31 and xiii. 26 stood alone, it would be possible to argue that Jesus did not identify Himself with the Son of man. He speaks quite objectively of the Son of man and in the same sentence speaks of Himself with the first personal pronoun : "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me . . . the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him" (viii. 38). The apparent distinction is noteworthy and needs explanation ; but we ought not on the ground of it to infer that Jesus did not identify Himself with the Son of man. Quite apart from the identification in the Passion group of sayings, the same seems to be implied in xiv. 62. Here the answer to the high priest's challenge, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed ?" is "I am, and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven." Here, again, we have the perplexing use of the Son of man alongside of the use of the first person singular. But it is difficult to resist the conclusion that in this context Jesus means to identify the two. He could scarcely in one breath have affirmed His identity with the Messiah and implied His distinction from the Son of

¹ On these two passages see in addition to the commentaries E. Meyer *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, i. 104 ; ii. 345. He finds Wellhausen's view that the term Son of man in these passages simply means 'man' incomprehensible. He thinks that in virtue of its mysterious esoteric character Jesus could, even before the confession of Peter, employ it without the disciples drawing the conclusion that He was the Messiah.

man. This is not to say that the Son of man is necessarily equivalent to Messiah ; but, if the ideas are distinct, Jesus was conscious that both were fulfilled in Him just as He was at once Messiah and Servant of Yahweh.

— The previous history of the term in Daniel and Enoch accounts for those passages which represent Him as returning with the clouds of heaven ; but its connexion with the Passion is His own contribution.

The passages common only to Matthew and Luke are not numerous. They are Matt. viii. 20 = Luke ix. 58 ; Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 34 ; Matt. xxiv. 27 = Luke xvii. 24 ; Matt. xxiv. 37 = Luke xvii. 26 ; Matt. xxiv. 44 = Luke xii. 40. The last three of these fall into the eschatological group ; while the first " The Son of man hath not where to lay his head " has some affinity with the Passion group though it does not belong to it. The second passage " The Son of man came eating and drinking " is remote from both groups. Yet through the comparison with John the Baptist an official suggestion is conveyed by the title. Jesus is not merely a prophet. The same applies to Matt. xii. 40, Luke xi. 30, where the Son of man is a sign, as Jonah was to the Ninevites. Both of these passages, as well as Matt. viii. 20, Luke ix. 58, identify Jesus with the Son of man.

— There is one passage which belongs to all three Synoptists (Mark iii. 28 f., Matt. xii. 31 f., Luke xii. 10), though it occurs in Luke in a different connexion than in Mark and Matthew. On the other hand Matthew and Luke agree in introducing the Son of man, though Mark is without it. This is the well-known passage on the unpardonable sin. All agree in the statement that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven. Matthew and Luke agree that whosoever speaks a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him. But this is absent from Mark. Instead of it, however, he says : " All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme." This is a very interesting passage for the problem in literary criticism that it presents. But it is interesting for our purpose. At first sight Mark seems original. The ambiguous *barnasha* meant simply 'men' in this instance. The blasphemy against men is contrasted with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and this was really just the charge that Jesus cast out demons by demoniacal agency. Matthew and

Luke took the term to mean Son of man, and drew a contrast between Him and the Holy Spirit which was the opposite of what Jesus intended. Yet in favour of the originality of Matthew and Luke it may be urged that a Christian writer would not have treated blasphemy against the Son of man as less serious than blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, unless the words of Jesus had warranted the distinction.

Of the passages peculiar to Matthew, x. 23, xiii. 41, xix. 28, xxv. 31 are eschatological. xxvi. 2 is a Passion reference. In xvi. 13, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" the title is almost certainly an insertion. Not only is it absent from the parallels in Mark and Luke; but its introduction here is most inappropriate. Otherwise the usage in these passages conforms closely to that common in Mark. In some other passages than xvi. 13 the term is inserted where the parallels omit it.

Of the passages peculiar to Luke, xii. 8, xvii. 30, xviii. 8, xxi. 36, are eschatological. xvii. 22 is akin to these. vi. 22 refers to persecution for the Son of man's sake, but the parallel in Matt. v. 11 has "for my sake." xix. 10, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," is, of course, not eschatological; but it also seems to have no connexion with the Passion. It expresses the sense of a mission, and is not unnaturally understood of His coming into the world.

In the Synoptic Gospels that class of passages which can be directly connected with Daniel and the later apocalyptic development may be taken as coming with full claim to authenticity; though individual sayings may have the term where it was not actually used. In this group the Son of man is represented as a heavenly being who sits at the right hand of Power, who comes on the clouds with the angels to be the judge of men.

But if we can assume that Jesus really predicted His suffering and death, there is full justification for believing that He connected the idea of the Son of man directly with His passion. He may have combined with it the idea of the Servant of Yahweh.¹ This would

¹ The Servant of Yahweh is the figure of the prophet and martyr depicted in the Servant passages in the Second Isaiah (Isa. xlii. 1-4, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13-liii. 12). On the original significance of the figure it is not necessary to dwell; probably it stands originally for Israel regarded from the

be natural as soon as He had realised that He could come as Son of man on the clouds, only if He had first passed through suffering, death, and resurrection to the right hand of God. The Passion is thus taken into his vocation as Son of man. A title which had originally a purely eschatological reference, so far at least as manifestation on earth was concerned, received an extension backward into the earthly career of Jesus. This being so, we need not hesitate to recognise a still further extension, and to admit that Jesus used the term where neither the return in glory nor the Passion was in question. It has been held by several scholars that Jesus did not regard Himself as Messiah or Son of man during His earthly life. He believed that He was to be the Messiah, but was not so as yet. This, however, does violence to the documents. The confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi and Jesus' own confession at His trial, imply that He was already Messiah. If so, there is no insuperable objection to the view that Jesus, conscious of His present identity with the Son of man, should have used the term of Himself in connexions where neither the eschatological nor the Passion reference was involved.

Many have understood Jesus to mean by this title the representative man or the ideal man, the representative of the whole race, not merely of a nation. This is antecedently improbable on account of its abstract, philosophical character. Moreover it is difficult to believe that the term can be detached from Dan. vii. in view of the coincidence between it and the language of Jesus with reference to the

point of view of its function, its place in the Divine plan of God for the world. But the Servant is probably in any case to be sharply distinguished from the Messiah, and it is desirable not to speak of these passages as Messianic. The two lines of thought met in Jesus but it only leads to confusion, if the two in their pre-Christian development are not kept apart. In view of the immense importance which has been attached in Christian doctrine and apologetic to these passages, and above all to the fourth, it is very astonishing that they have left so little impression on the New Testament. Paul in particular makes practically no use of them. That they were early applied to Jesus is clear from the use of the term "Servant" to designate Him in the early chapters of the Acts, and from the incident of Philip and the Ethiopian. For the sake of the general reader it may be emphasised that the fourth passage begins with lii. 13, not with liii. 1. The arrangement in the Authorised Version is perhaps the most unfortunate example of incompetent division of chapters in the whole Bible.

Parousia. We are safest if we start from the eschatological associations of the phrase, and recognise that extensions of the meaning were given to it by Jesus in consequence of His conviction as to what the vocation involved ; while further extensions were due to the consciousness of His identity with the Son of man. Naturally those instances in which the title has special reference to the vocation come to us with the greatest presumption of authenticity. By this it is not meant that the sayings in which it is used without such reference are suspicious ; but that there is more probability that the term has been inserted when Jesus simply used the first personal pronoun.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The literature is so extensive that only a selection can be made. The student should be warned that in the case of German works it is essential to use, wherever possible, the latest editions, since the successive editions are frequently much revised and brought up to date, and in some instances largely recast. It ought to be added, however, that in the present distress it has been sometimes found necessary to omit sections from the previous edition to reduce the cost of production. Thus the third edition of Feine's *Theologie des neuen Testaments* contains matter excluded from the fourth or abbreviated in it, though the fourth edition takes account of the literature which appeared during the three years' interval which separated the two editions. The editions are indicated in the following list by a small superior number.

The subject is discussed at length in the larger works on New Testament Theology. The following may be mentioned : B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,¹ 1903, English translation, 1882-3, and *Die Religion des Neuen Testaments*, 1903 ; Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*,² 1896, English translation from the first edition of 1891-2, *New Testament Theology* 1895 ; G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 1899 ; Bovon, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, 1893 ; Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*,² 1911 ; Schlatter, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1909-10, the first volume has been recast and published under the title *Die Geschichte des Christus*, 1921 ; Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,³ 1919,⁴ 1922, and *Die Religion des Neuen Testaments*, 1921 ; Weinel, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,³ 1921.

Other general treatises are Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, 1904, English translation from the first edition of 1901, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1903-4, and *Einführung in das Theologische Studium*,³ 1921; Jülicher, *Die Religion Jesu und die Anfänge des Christentums bis zum Nicaenum in Geschichte der Christlichen Religion*,² 1909 (*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Teil I., Abteilung IV. 1); Pfeiderer, *Das Urchristentum*,² 1902, English translation, *Primitive Christianity*, 1906-11; Knopf, *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, 1919 (a second edition has been prepared since the author's death by Lietzmann and Weinel); Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*,¹ 1913,² 1921. Wernle replied to the first edition in *Jesus und Paulus*, 1915, to which Bousset retorted in *Jesus der Herr*, 1916. He was fortunately able to revise the first four chapters for the second edition of *Kyrios Christos* which was prepared for publication after his death by G. Krüger; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 1921.

Works on the teaching, or the life and teaching, of Jesus also contain discussions of the problems. The following may be mentioned: Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*,² 1901, English translation from the first edition of 1886-90, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1892, omits the critical investigation; Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, 1889; Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*,⁴ 1913; Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels*, 1912; Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 1907; Bousset, *Jesus*, 1904, English translation, 1906; Wernle, *Jesus*,² 1916; Loofs, *Wer war Jesus Christus?* 1916 (a thoroughly revised edition of the American Lectures, *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* 1913); Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, 1923; T. Walker, *The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His age*, 1923. The articles on Jesus in the dictionaries and encyclopædias should be mentioned here: in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* by Sanday; *Encyclopædia Biblica* by Bruce; Hastings, *One Volume Dictionary* by W. P. Paterson; Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* by Douglas Mackenzie; *The Standard Bible Dictionary* by Denney; *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* by Heitmüller. The article by Sanday has been issued in a separate form, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 1906; similarly that by Heitmüller, *Jesus*, 1913.

Works especially bearing on the subject of this lecture: Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*,² 1892. Of the third edition the first part *Die Messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums* appeared in 1903, but nothing further has apparently been published; H. J. Holtzmann, *Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, 1907; Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901; A. Schweitzer, *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis*, 1901; *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*,² 1913, English translation

from the first edition, 1906, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* 1910; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*,¹ 1892,² 1922, *Christus: Die Anfänge des Dogmas*, 1909, English translation, *Christ: The Beginnings of Dogma*, 1911; Pfleiderer, *The Early Christian Conceptions of Christ*, 1905; Warfield, *The Lord of Glory*, 1907; J. E. Carpenter, *The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ*, 1911; Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, 1907; Shailer Matthews, *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*, 1906; E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, 1911; Bacon, *Jesus the Son of God*, 1911, *Jesus and Paul*, 1921; Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, 1901; Schmiedel, *Protestantische Monatshefte* for 1898 and 1901; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898 (reviewed by A. A. Bevan, *Critical Review*, 1899), English translation, *The Words of Jesus*, 1902; E. A. Abbott, *The Son of Man*, 1910; Causse, *L'Évolution de l'Esperance Messianique dans le Christianisme Primitif*, 1908; Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes*, 1916; Foakes Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I., Vol. I., 1920; Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 1922; Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 1913. The articles "Son of God" (Sanday), and "Son of Man" (Driver) in *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, and on the same subjects by N. Schmidt in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* are important. The discussions by Wellhausen and some others have already been recorded.