

Professor Dalman on 'The Son of Man.'

BY THE REV. DAVID EATON, M.A., GLASGOW.

PROFESSOR DALMAN of Leipzig, who is one of the greatest living Aramaic scholars, has recently published the first volume of a work on 'The Words of Jesus,'¹ the fruit of many years' study. In secs. 1 and 2 of the Introduction he shows that Aramaic was the mother-tongue of our Saviour; that He must have spoken Aramaic to His disciples and the people; and that a collection of His sayings meant for 'Hebrews' would in all probability have been written not in Hebrew, but in Aramaic. In sec. 3 he discusses the Hebraisms and Aramaisms of the Synoptic Gospels, and gives a select list of them in sec. 4. In the latter section he also explains the remarkable fact that Hebraisms properly so-called occur especially in Luke, and more particularly in the first chapters. In these chapters, however, Luke is not using a translation from a Hebrew original; his Hebraising style is due to himself. Here, as in the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, he, in keeping with the wonderful contents of the narrative, uses the biblical style more consistently than elsewhere. His Hebraisms should rather be called 'Septuaginta-Græcisms.'

In secs. 5 and 6 he shows that there is no good reason for believing in the existence of an original gospel in Hebrew, and that the early tradition, according to which there was an original Gospel of Matthew in Aramaic, still lacks confirmation. There is nothing improbable in the view that the occasional agreement of the Synoptists in the matter of expression points to the sources used by them being written in Greek. The Christian Church had, even in Jerusalem, many Hellenists (*i.e.* Greek-speaking Jews) among its members. It was, therefore, from the first bilingual; in the gatherings of the infant community Jesus' deeds and words must have been narrated both in Greek and Aramaic. The 'Hebrews' would understand a little Greek; but

¹ *Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache erörtert von Gustaf Dalman, ao. Professor der Theologie in Leipzig. Band I. Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe, nebst Anhang: Messianische Texte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xv. 320. Price M.8.50.*

very frequently the 'Hellenists' would understand no Aramaic or Hebrew. The earliest 'Gospel' might have been written in Greek.

In sec. 7 he explains the aim he has set before himself in this work, which is to consist of several volumes. It is a fact that Jesus spoke to the Jews in Aramaic, and that the apostles did so also (though not exclusively). It is only for the *words* of Jesus that an original Aramaic form (not necessarily written) is beyond dispute. It is the duty of biblical science to inquire what the words of Jesus were in this, their original form, and what sense they had in this form to the Jewish hearers; to think them back, as it were, into the original language and the contemporary way of thinking. This can be done only approximately; but it can be done, in the case of the leading thoughts and frequently used terms in the Synoptists, with a great measure of success. A mere Aramaic translation of our Lord's words in the Synoptists would have little scientific value; there must also be afforded a full glance into the meaning of the new text, and into the form which the exegetical problems now assume.

This is what Professor Dalman gives us in this volume, in which, besides the Introduction and an Appendix of Messianic texts from post-canonical Jewish literature, he discusses the most important of our Lord's words and ideas: the Kingdom (or rather reign) of God; the future æon; eternal life; the world; 'the Lord,' as a divine name; the Father in heaven; other divine names and ways of speaking of God; the Son of Man; the Son of God; the Christ; the Son of David; 'the Lord' and 'Master,' as names of Jesus.

In order that the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES may be able to form some idea of the contents of this learned and instructive volume, I have condensed pp. 191-218 on 'The Son of man.' Readers of German should secure the volume for themselves. It throws much fresh light on every question of which it treats.

1. *The Linguistic Form of the Expression, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.* In biblical Hebrew the expression 'son of man' (in the singular), apart from its frequent use in Ezekiel and in Dn 8¹⁷ as a form

of address, occurs very seldom. It is found only in poetical passages, when its use is occasioned by the parallelism, and means not 'the son of a man,' but a member of the genus man (*e.g.* Nu 23¹⁹, Is 51¹² 56², Jer 49¹⁸ 33, Ps 85 80¹⁸ 146³, etc.). This is its meaning also in the Apocrypha (Jth 8¹⁶, Sir 17³⁰) and in biblical Aramaic, where 'one like unto a son of man' (Dn 7¹³) means one resembling a member of the genus man, and 'a man' is expressed by other terms (Dn 7⁴ 2²⁵). In the Mishna 'son of man' is not employed; the Targum of Onkelos follows generally the Hebrew text; and in the Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch it is found only in Nu 23¹⁹. The Targum of the prophets has once 'son of man' instead of 'sons of men' (Mic 5⁶, Eng. tr. v.7); but elsewhere it follows the Hebrew text. In Aramaic inscriptions belonging to Palestine there is no single instance of its use. It is in Judæo-Galilæan and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic that we first find it used for 'a man'; it is occasionally so used also in the Jerusalem Targum of the Pentateuch (*e.g.* Nu 9¹³), and twice in the Aramaic recension of the Book of Tobit.

We may, therefore, confidently affirm that in the Judæo-Palestinian Aramaic of the earlier period 'son of man' was unusual; that it was employed only in imitation of the Hebrew text, and that it was not the term for 'a man.' In earlier Judæo-Aramaic literature it is never found with the article (in the singular); 'the son of man' never occurs in the sense of 'the man,' which is always expressed otherwise. And this being the case with the Jews and the Samaritans, etc., we may assume that the Galilæans of our Lord's time formed no exception, and that the use of 'the son of man' = 'the man' in Judæo-Galilæan and Christian-Palestinian literature was an innovation.

Our Saviour's own words as reported in the Gospels are also worthy of notice. 'Men' in the singular and plural are very frequently spoken of; but *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* never occurs for 'man,' and *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* occurs only in Mk 3²⁸. If Jesus had always used only 'son of man' for 'man,' it is exceedingly improbable that the Hellenistic reporters of His words would have studiously avoided that expression, except when giving His own self-designation.

Nevertheless, Holtzmann calls it a 'discovery' that in Jesus' mother-tongue 'son of man' was

the only term for 'man'; Wellhausen makes a similar statement; and Lietzmann asserts that Jesus could not have taken to Himself the title 'Son of man,' because such a title does not exist in Aramaic, and for linguistic reasons cannot exist. A conscientious study even of biblical Aramaic would have made such statements impossible.

When, therefore, the Aramaic for 'son of man' is determined by the article, it must be translated not 'the man,' but 'the son of man.' It was difficult, however, to render this Aramaic expression into Greek. The rendering in our Gospels is the product of great perplexity. It may, indeed, be regarded as the singular of *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, coined by the LXX for the Hebrew 'sons of men,' and found in Mk 3²⁸, Eph 3⁵. But while the plural, 'the sons of men,' must mean men generally, both members of the expression received in the singular a strange emphasis. No help would have been found in *ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* which could only have meant 'the son of a man,' *ἄνθρωπος* not being a collective term. It would have been easiest to turn the Aramaic into *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*; but what misunderstandings this change of the uncommon original expression into a common one would have caused in the Gospels. They, therefore, preferred to reproduce the impression which 'Son of man,' with the article, produced in Aramaic, by the strongest determination possible of the compound Greek expression. They thus avoided the misunderstanding that only 'the man,' as man, was meant, and they also gained the possibility of a self-designation of Jesus by this expression. It is very probable, however, that the Hellenists from the first understood it, not in the Semitic, but in the Greek sense, as if Jesus thereby denoted Himself somehow on the human side as one 'sprung, descended, from men.' We can, therefore, easily understand that the Christian Hellenists avoided the expression as much as possible, and did not adopt it into their religious language. The original Aramaic could easily be employed as a special designation of a definite person; but it could not be rendered exactly either into Greek or into Syriac and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic.

2. *It was not a current Name for the Messiah.*—To the author of the Book of Daniel the 'one like unto a son of man' of 7¹³ is a personification of the 'people of the saints of the Most High' (v.27),

who are one day to receive from God an imperishable world-dominion. In contrast with the beasts that come up from the sea, the symbols of the previous world-powers, he comes 'with,' or rather 'upon the clouds of heaven,' and symbolises the future possessors of world-dominion. He comes not from the earth, still less from the sea, but from heaven; he is a being standing near God, and well suited to typify the people of the saints of God. It is important to notice that nothing further is said of him than that he is man-like. He does not differ from the four beasts in that he alone has reason, for the first of these receives a man's heart (v.⁴), and the last of them has human eyes and can speak (v.⁶). As compared with the winged lion, the devouring bear, the four-headed leopard, and the ten-horned fourth beast, the most terrible of them all, he rather appears as unarmed, harmless, and incapable of taking possession of the world by his own power; he is only—like a son of man. If he is to become ruler of the world, it is God that must make him so.

The Similitudes of the Book of Enoch and 2 Esdras are the only known Jewish books of the first century A.D. that treat of Dn 7¹³. They both make the 'one like unto a son of man' an individual, viz. the Messiah. The Similitudes sometimes call the Messiah 'that son of man,' sometimes only 'the son of man.' It is evident that 'son of man' is not assumed by the author to be a current Messianic title; but he himself certainly uses it in that sense. He always designates the mysterious being, who was never upon the earth and yet is not God, by this name.

The author of 2 Es 13 never uses the expression 'Son of man.' He calls the Messiah 'that man' (v.³), 'the man that came out of the sea' (vv.^{5, 25, 51}), 'the same man' (v.¹²), 'my Son . . . whom thou sawest as a man ascending' (v.³²). Though he intentionally makes the man-like being come up from the sea, the author undoubtedly refers to Dn 7. But a Messianic title could not be derived from the prosaic term 'man,' which he uses instead of 'son of man.'

Many Jewish authorities *after* the first century plainly assume the Messianic sense of Dn 7¹³. There are evidences, however, that it was not universally so interpreted; e.g. according to an anonymous saying in a Midrash, the thrones in v.⁹ are set for the magnates of Israel, who, with God at their head, will judge the nations (cf. Mt 19²⁸).

We may, therefore, sum up as follows:—The 'son of man' of Dn 7¹³ was occasionally understood of the Messiah; one apocalyptic piece of the early period gave the Messiah that and *no other name*; but it was not a current Jewish Messianic name. There was nothing to prevent it becoming so; but the Rabbis did not form their picture of the Messiah mainly from Dn 7.

3. *It was not a mere Figure of Speech.*—An old opinion has recently been revived that, at least in a number of cases, when Jesus called Himself the Son of man, this was merely a substitute, common among the Jews, for the first personal pronoun. But this custom, of speaking of oneself in the third person, was by no means universal among the Hebrews. And while there are certainly many instances of a Jew, speaking of himself, saying 'this man,' there is no example of 'this son of man' being so used. Indeed, such an example could hardly occur; for, as we have already seen, 'son of man' was not in Aramaic the common term for 'man.'

It can only be said that we need not be surprised if we find Jesus speaking of Himself in the third person. But the expression which He used in doing so was an unusual one, and requires a special explanation.

4. *As a Designation of Jesus it was used only by Himself.*—In all three Synoptists it is found only in His own mouth. John once (12³⁴) puts it into the mouth of the people. Stephen (Ac 7⁵⁰) and James (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23), when dying, use it; but in both cases there is an unmistakable allusion to the saying of Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Lk 22⁶⁹, Mt 26⁶⁴). He is nowhere else called the Son of man (except in the 'Liturgy of St. James'), not even in the Apocalypse of St. John, although it speaks twice, with an allusion to Daniel, of one like unto a son of man (1¹³ 14¹⁴). We must not infer from this that the author did not know that Jesus called Himself the Son of man; but he certainly refrained from using that designation as a name of Jesus.

In 1 Th 4¹⁶, 2 Th 1⁷, St. Paul, alluding to the corresponding sayings of Jesus regarding His return, calls Him not 'the Son of man,' but 'the Lord'; and in 1 Co 15^{47f.} he calls Christ 'the second man from heaven' and 'the heavenly one,' without any allusion to our Lord's self-designation.

That Jesus alone used of Himself this designation, is a fact that needs explanation. Some

recent writers maintain that it proves that Jesus Himself did not use it, and that there must have been somewhere a primitive Hellenistic Church that was fond of it, and made Jesus often speak of Himself in the third person, in order to find occasion for the employment of it. But from such a conjecture we should be deterred by the fact that, even yet, though the Gospels have for 1800 years proclaimed Jesus as 'the Son of Man,' this expression has not become a current designation of Christ, and that we speak in books and sermons of 'the Son of man' only when referring to Jesus' own words. Probably the same feeling that prevents us from doing so was keen from the very beginning.

Moreover, we can easily understand why, in the Greek-speaking Church, this designation of our Lord was avoided. Many of the Greek and Latin Fathers saw in it an allusion to the human side of the origin of Jesus; and, after what we have said at the close of No. 1, this need not surprise us. $\delta \nu\iota\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ could not be understood by Greeks otherwise than of one, who gave himself out to be the son of a man. In the Greek-speaking Church such a name of Jesus could be employed in dogmatic discussions; but it was not suited for practical use.

5. *The meaning of the Designation to the Synoptists.*—In Mt it occurs first in 8²⁰; in Mk in 2¹⁰; and in Lk in 5²⁴. None of them makes any attempt to explain the term. Had they wished their readers to think of the Messiah coming in the clouds of heaven, they would surely have used first an utterance in which the Messianic glory of the Son of man was expressed; but in Matthew the first saying is of the Son of man, who lacks that which even beasts have, and in Mark and Luke of the Son of man, who has authority to forgive sins on earth. They do not assume, however, that their readers will understand the latter statement as meaning that this power belongs to Jesus *quâ* 'the Son of man,' but that He, who calls Himself only 'the Son of man,' has received this authority (this is plainly implied in Mt 9⁸). In the narrative of Peter's confession, Matthew, by the changes peculiar to him (16¹³ 'the Son of man' instead of 'I,' Mk 8²⁷, Lk 9¹⁸; 'the Christ, the Son of the living God,' v. 16, for 'the Christ,' Mk 8²⁹, 'the Christ of God' Lk 9²⁰) makes it plain that He, who calls Himself only 'the Son of man,' is in reality the opposite of that, viz. God's Son. It is made prominent in

16¹⁷ that Peter has acquired this knowledge not from men, but from God. Jesus has manifestly not helped him to it by His self-designation as 'the Son of man.' Neither have Mark and Luke seen in this designation a way of indicating His Messianic dignity; His command to tell no one of His Messiahship (Mk 8³⁰, Lk 9²¹, cf. Mt 16²⁰) would have seemed to them meaningless, if He had always publicly confessed Himself as the Messiah. There is also a hint that 'Son of man' denotes the Messiah, not in His glory, but in His lowliness, in what is said of the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit as compared with blaspheming the Son of man (Lk 12¹⁰, Mt 12³²; in Mk 3^{28f.}, the original form of the saying, the contrast is between blaspheming in general and blaspheming the Spirit, present in power in Jesus). Matthew and Luke cannot mean to distinguish between two persons of the Godhead, as if it were a venial sin to blaspheme the 'Son.' Jesus is rather distinguished *as man* from the divine Spirit working through Him; reviling of Jesus may be forgiven; blasphemy of the divine power in Him is unforgivable, because it is blasphemy of *God*.

We are, therefore, justified in saying that to the Synoptists, as to the early Church, 'the Son of man' was not a designation pointing to the glory of the Messiah, but (as it must necessarily have seemed to a Hellenist) an intentional disguising of Messiahship behind a name, which lays stress on the humanity of its bearer. To them it was not Jesus' sayings regarding the sufferings of 'the Son of man,' but those regarding His glory, that were paradoxes. What was marvellous was not that 'the Son of Man' should be put to death, but that He should return on the clouds of heaven.

6. *How Jesus Himself understood the Designation.*—Seeing that He nowhere explains its meaning, we must first study the expression itself, and then consider it along with the witness He bore to His person.

It is exceedingly likely that Jesus derived this strange designation from the Old Testament, in which a similar expression occurs (*in Aramaic*, the language spoken by Jesus) only in Dn 7¹³. But His Jewish hearers would not necessarily have understood Him as claiming to be the Messiah; for, as we have already seen, Dn 7¹³ was not interpreted by everyone in a Messianic sense. Besides, it spoke of one like unto a son of man coming with (or on) the clouds of heaven, in order to

become lord of the world. This could not be said of Jesus. To one who did not know that He actually spoke of His death, resurrection, and glorious return, a reference to Dn 7 would probably have seemed impossible, and His self-designation enigmatical. His hearers could only have inferred that for some reason or other He looked upon Himself as a man above (*i.e.* more than) others. But no Jew could have imagined that He meant 'the ideal man' in any sense whatever.

It cannot be doubted, however, that Jesus drew this self-designation from Dn 7¹³ (cf. Mt 24³⁰ 26⁶⁴ and parallels). He merely meant by it that He was the one in whom that vision in Daniel was being fulfilled. But certainly all His hearers did not perceive this connexion between the name He gave Himself and the Book of Daniel; there was a time when even His disciples did not perceive it. Why, then, did He so name Himself in the hearing of persons ignorant of that connexion? Did He actually use the expression when speaking to such?

It is very difficult to answer these questions with certainty. In the first place, none of the Gospels reports His sayings in exact chronological order; and in this respect they often differ from one another. Secondly, the recollection of His disciples as to the use of the expression 'Son of man' could not have been infallible; it is not conceivable that they remembered exactly in which sayings He used it, and in which not. It is found in Mt 16¹³, but not in the parallels, Mk 8²⁷, Lk 9¹⁸; in Lk 6²² 12⁸, but not in Mt 5¹¹ 10³³; in Mk 10⁴⁵ and Mt 20⁵⁸, but not in Lk 22²⁷; in Mk 8³¹ and Lk 9²², but not in Mt 16²¹. Such being the state of the case, we cannot be certain when first, and before what persons, Jesus used the name 'the Son of man.'

The evangelists seem to be of opinion that He did so always, and in the hearing of everyone. His first use of it in Mk (2¹⁰) and Lk (5²⁴) is in public; in Mt (8²⁰) He first uses it when speaking to one not yet a disciple. In such cases He could not have expected to be understood by His hearers. It may be said that He purposely spoke to them in a riddle, which would lead them to meditate on His person; but if, from the beginning, He called Himself 'the Son of man,' His disciples would almost certainly have asked and obtained from Him an explanation of the expression. That they had not done so before Peter's confession is plain

from Mt 16¹⁷, as well as from the command in Mk 8³⁰, Lk 9²¹, to say nothing to the people of His Messianic dignity. He cannot have previously avowed Himself as the Messiah in a manner thoroughly transparent to His disciples. Accordingly, the teaching regarding His Messiahship, which Matthew reports before Peter's confession (13³⁶⁻⁴³ 7²¹⁻²³; cf. Lk 6⁴⁶, which does not speak of Jesus as Judge of the world; also Mt 10¹⁷⁻²⁵), must be placed after that event, more especially as it assumes His future absence from the disciples, and therefore His death. In Mk (8³⁸) and Lk (9²⁶) His first saying regarding His coming in glory is found after Peter's confession and the open announcement of His death. It is probable, therefore, though not *absolutely certain*, that He had not previously called Himself 'the Son of man.'

A careful study of the Synoptists justifies this assertion. In Matthew 'the Son of man' occurs nine times before Peter's confession. Of four of these occasions we have already spoken (8²⁰ 10²³ 13^{37, 41}); 12³² is an explanatory doublet of v. 31 (cf. Mk 3^{28f.}); and 12⁴⁰ is put by Lk (11³⁰) after Peter's confession. There remain only three instances in which there is evidence of the use of 'the Son of man' before that confession, viz., Mt 11^{18f.} (Lk 7^{33f.}) 9⁶ (Mk 2¹⁰, Lk 5²⁴) and 12⁸ (Mk 2⁵⁸, Lk 6⁵).

Several modern expositors get rid of two of these passages (Mt 9⁶ 12⁸) by assuming that Jesus speaks in them only of man generally, or of Himself as a man. With reference to Mt 9⁶, J. Weiss says it would have been absurd to prove that 'the Son of Man,' *i.e.* the Messiah, had power to forgive sins, because 'none of Jesus' opponents doubted that the Messiah had such power.' But His opponents would hardly have understood 'Son of man' as a Messianic designation; and it is a fact, which J. Weiss ought to know, that Judaism has never, from the Old Testament to the present day, dared to ascribe such power to the Messiah. And Mt 9⁸ only shows how the evangelist himself understood the expression (see above, No. 5).

It might be said with more apparent justice of Mt 12⁸ that 'Son of man' means man generally, more especially as, according to Mk 2²⁷, man has just been described as the aim of the Sabbath. But Mark alone has this latter sentence; Matthew has instead of it something different, while Luke has nothing corresponding. Mk 2²⁷ is an insertion parallel to Mt 12⁶⁻⁷. The saying regarding the

lord of the Sabbath was probably an independent *logion*, which was added to this section of the Gospel story only because of its similarity in meaning. Jesus said merely that, just as in the well-known case of David, necessity justified the action of His disciples, not that He, as lord of the Sabbath, had authorized their action. And taking even Mark's text as it stands, we must remember (cf. No. 1) that in Aramaic 'son of man' was not the term for 'man.' If it were so employed here, how are we to account for the fact that 'man' is called $\delta \text{ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma}$ in v.²⁷, but $\delta \text{ \nu\iota\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon}$ in v.²⁸?

It is a simpler and more legitimate way of getting rid of these passages, to put them after Peter's confession. In all three Synoptists the section in question has in its midst the saying regarding the absence of the bridegroom, which will lead his comrades to fast (Mt 9¹⁵, Mk 2²⁰, Lk 5³⁵). Here Jesus presupposes His death; and though it is by no means made out that it was only after Peter's confession that He gained the knowledge of His violent end, it seems that it was only after that event that He spoke of it to His disciples. From that time onwards the name 'Son of man' would be transparent to *them* as the designation, derived from Dn 7¹³, of the one destined to be the ruler of the world. But to the multitude He did not disclose the full meaning of the term till, with His open confession before the Sanhedrin (Mt 26⁶⁴, Mk 14⁶², Lk 22⁶⁹), He removed every doubt, and thereby gave to His judges the possibility of delivering Him up to death.

It is only with the help of the Book of Daniel that we can discover the precise meaning that Jesus attached to this designation of Himself. The decisive reason why He fell back upon Daniel and his designation of the future ruler of the world, was because nowhere else is it stated so clearly that the necessary transformation of all conditions on earth is to be looked for from God alone (cf. Dn 2^{34, 35} 7^{13f. 27} 11¹⁴). He had seen in Galilee how self-help led to no successful issue; and He willed not to be regarded as 'Messiah' by the people, because they expected from their Messiah political emancipation, and a violent snatching of dominion to Himself. For another reason also, the designation 'the Son of Man' was

appropriate for Jesus. The name 'Messiah' denoted the ruler of the time of redemption *quá* ruler; it was appropriate for the destined person only when he had ascended the throne, and not before he had done so. In point of fact, a suffering and dying of the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity is, according to the testimony of the prophets, inconceivable. When Jesus attached to the confession of Peter the first announcement of His violent death, He did so in order to make it plain that His sovereignty was still remote, and that *His* Messiahship, instead of including, excluded all self-help. The 'one like unto a son of man' of Dn 7¹³ is, however, one who has yet to receive his dominion. He *may* also be one who has to pass through suffering and death. He is certainly no powerful one, no conqueror, no destroyer; he is only 'a human being,' whom God has taken under His protection and destined to great things. And Jesus calls Himself 'the Son of man,' not as the 'lowly' one, but as the naturally weak human being, whom God will make Lord of the world (cf. Ps 8^{4f}, also the use of $\tau\omicron \text{ \acute{\alpha}\rho\lambda\iota\omicron\nu}$, 'the lambkin,' for Christ, in Rev.).

If this interpretation of the expression is correct, it follows—(1) that Jesus' way of apprehending the designation was peculiar to Himself, and not derived from Enoch or 2 Esdras; (2) that lowliness and suffering, as well as majesty, might be predicated of 'the Son of man'; (3) that the meaning, which the term had for those who did not divine its connexion with Dn 7, was no erroneous one, seeing that they also must have gathered from it that Jesus had no intention of being a self-raised usurper; (4) that it was *possible* that even the disciples were satisfied from the first with this interpretation of it, and asked no further explanation from Jesus; (5) that the way in which the Hellenistic Synoptists and the early Church understood the expression was not erroneous, so far as they saw in it a confession by Jesus of His humanity; and (6) that the Church was also right in being unwilling to make use of the designation; for since 'the human being' has seated Himself upon God's throne, He is, in point of fact, no longer only a man, but a Ruler over heaven and earth, 'the Lord,' as Paul in the Epistles to the Thessalonians rightly calls Him, who comes with the clouds of heaven.