

The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY, 1917

"GOD OUR FATHER AND THE LORD JESUS CHRIST"

In the opening sentence of the very first of Paul's letters which have come down to us—and that is as much as to say, in the very first sentence which, so far as we know, he ever wrote,—he makes use of a phrase in speaking of the Christians' God, which at once attracts our interested attention. According to the generous way he had of thinking and speaking of his readers at the height of their professions, he describes the church at Thessalonica as living and moving and having its being in God. But, as it was a Christian church which he was addressing, he does not content himself, in this description, with the simple term "God". He uses the compound phrase, "God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." The Thessalonians, he says, because they were Christians, lived and moved and had their being "in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

It is quite clear that this compound phrase was not new on Paul's lips, coined for this occasion. It bears on its face the evidence of a long and familiar use, by which it had been worn down to its bare bones. All the articles have been rubbed off, and with them all other accessories; and it stands out in its baldest elements as just "God Father and Lord Jesus Christ." Plainly we have here a mode of speaking of the Christians' God which was customary with Paul.

We are not surprised, therefore, to find this phrase repeated in precisely the same connection in the opening verses of the next letter which Paul wrote—2 Thessalonians—with only the slight variation that an "our" is inserted with "God the Father",—"in God our Father and the Lord

THE KYRIOS CHRISTOS CONTROVERSY

If the power to stir up discussion and provoke dissent be a fair test of the "live" character of a book, then this character belongs in a high degree to Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*. Though the controversy it has started has not as yet attained the dimensions of some other famous theological debates, for a controversy in war-time it shows respectable size. In the midst of the clash of arms the other muses are wont to keep silent; but the muse of divinity is made of sterner stuff and cannot be frightened into retirement. One cannot withhold a word of admiration from the interest in theological problems that sustains itself under such circumstances. It must be genuine indeed. Both Bousset and the foremost of his critics protest that in view of the war situation they hesitated to enter upon a controversial discussion, and both justify their decision not to act on this feeling from the inherent importance of the issue. Another participant in the debate states that his article was made ready for the press at Brzeziny near Lodz in Poland, and expresses regret for having been unable to read up on the controversy on account of "present occupation." It is a grim excuse to offer, but one that by all readers will be readily granted.

Now that Bousset has issued an answer to his critics and in it more carefully defined and defended, on some points also modified, his position, it seems a proper time to take stock of the arguments which have been advanced, and to fix the status of the debate at the present moment.¹ In this rejoinder Bousset deals chiefly with Wernle and Althaus and makes only occasional reference to other reviews of his work. The two writers named differ con-

¹ *Jesus der Herr*, Nachträge und Auseinandersetzungen zu *Kyrios Christos*. Von Wilhelm Bousset. (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Neue Folge, Heft 8), 1916.

siderably in the tone and temper of their criticism. Wernle² carries into the debate a great deal of feeling. Here and there his style becomes overanimated and cannot be wholly acquitted of the fault of polemic acerbity. He evidently feels that Bousset's standpoint endangers favorite positions of his own and of the school he represents. He wields moreover a broad brush, taking issue with Bousset's hypothesis in its large bearings on the development of primitive Christianity as a whole. In the sweep of his argumentation he sometimes forgets to pay sufficient heed to the concrete details of fact, especially in linguistic matters,—a point in which Bousset is particularly strong. Althaus³ on the other hand specializes his attack and addresses himself mainly to Bousset's central contention, that the Kyrios-title as applied to Jesus is of Hellenistic and not of early Palestinian origin, and thus is able to give full attention to the linguistic side of the problem. His articles were written after a personal exchange of views with Bousset had taken place; and consequently the discussion on his part proceeds after a most calm and objective fashion. It must be set down to Bousset's credit that even in answering Wernle he has kept the note of excessive militancy fairly well in abeyance.

In connection with the answer to Wernle not merely Bousset's *Nachträge* but also an article of Heitmüller's⁴ comes under consideration. Heitmüller was drawn into the fray through Wernle's reflecting upon an earlier article of his entitled "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus"⁵ in which

² "Jesus und Paulus. Antithesen zu Bousset's Kyrios Christos." Von Dr. Theol. Paul Wernle. (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, xxv, 1915, pp. 1-92).

³ "Unser Herr Jesus. Eine Neutestamentliche Untersuchung. Zur Auseinandersetzung mit W. Bousset." Von Privatdozent Lic. Paul Althaus. (*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xxvi, 1915, pp. 439-457 and 513-545).

⁴ "Jesus and Paulus. Freundschaftliche kritische Bemerkungen zu P. Wernle's Artikel "Jesus und Paulus." Von D. Wilhelm Heitmüller. (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, xxv, 1915, pp. 156-179).

⁵ Published in the *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xiii, 1912, pp. 320 ff.

he had anticipated some of Bousset's conclusions. He contents himself with answering these reflections chiefly relating to the "religionsgeschichtliche" method of investigation, and for the rest leaves Bousset to fight out the broader battle with Wernle for himself.

Although standing outside of the controversy an article of Köhler's⁶ ought to be noted because of its important bearing on certain phases of the problem. As expressly noted by this author, this article, though published after the appearance of Bousset's book, was written and sent in previously to it, and therefore should be read altogether independently of Bousset's hypothesis. In this very independence, however, lies the warrant for considering it with an eye to the question at issue. The undesigned agreement of Köhler's results with Bousset's lends to them a weight and interest which otherwise they would scarcely possess.

Bousset complains that hardly any of his critics has dealt with the book as a whole. The portion relating to the Biblical development has had to bear the brunt of the attack, and the later stages have been ignored. This is what might have been expected. It is easy to decree that the lines between the New Testament and the immediately succeeding periods of the history of early Christianity are purely artificial and that the distinction between Biblical Theology and the History of Doctrine is wholly conventional. But this is as yet a mere "religionsgeschichtlich" ideal which is far from realization in practice even in "liberal" circles. When a work like Bousset's appears, which actually proceeds to obliterate the boundary marks and make the evolution continuous, the theological interest declines to follow. Criticism finds it hard to shake off the consciousness that after all the things on record in the Biblical documents constitute a world by themselves.

It may not be superfluous to restate here in a few words the main import of Bousset's theory. There is a negative

⁶ "Der κύριος Ἰησοῦς in den Evangelien und der Spruch vom Herr-Herr sagen." Von Pastor Konrad Köhler in Briese, Schlesien (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, lxxviii, 1915, 471-490).

and a positive side to it. The negative side concerns the absence from the early Palestinian pre-Hellenistic Christology of the concept and title Kyrios, "Lord." This early stage of the belief of the Church, as reflected in Mark and the Logia, centered in the conception of Jesus as the "Son of Man." An additional argument for the non-existence of the Kyrios title in that early period is derived from linguistic observations in connection with the word "Mar," its Aramaic equivalent. Even the prevalence of a secular, non-religious Mar applied to Jesus as a teacher, which might have prepared the way for later usage, is called in question. So much for the negative side. As its positive counterpart, Bousset submits the following. The Kyrios name is of Hellenistic origin. It existed in the pre-Pauline Gentile Christian Church into which it had been imported by converts who had been familiar with its use in their pagan cults. Both originally and in its Christian adaptation it was a cult title. That is to say, it sprang up in the practice of worship, not on doctrinal ground. Paul received it from the Hellenistic Christian environment into which he was thrown after his conversion. Thus there is inserted between the two factors hitherto reckoned with, viz., the early Palestinian and the Pauline developments, a third intermediate stage, that of the pre-Pauline Hellenistic branch of the Church. Chiefly through the influence of this intermediate factor on Paul, it became a most important force in shaping the further history of the Christian religion. Paul's Christ faith and Christ mysticism—these two characteristic features of the Apostle's Christianity—are the offspring of it, although the thorough ethicizing and spiritualizing of both remains Paul's personal contribution. In consequence of this the traditional view as to the genetic structure of Paul's theology needs thorough revision. It is not oriented, as the Reformation naively believed, in the forensic idea of justification but rather in the mystical relation of the believer to the Kyrios Christ. The other is a mere corollary. The fundamental

view of Paul as to the condition of the race is that of dualism, corresponding to the mystical supernaturalizing as the goal of salvation, not that of an ethically complexioned apostasy through the fall of Adam, which would have for its proper correlate the Reformation view of a forensic redemptive soteriology.

Let us try to examine some of the criticism brought to bear upon these several positions and the way in which Bousset seeks to meet it. We confine ourselves in the present article to the negative side of the theme, the alleged non-existence of the concept and title in the early Palestinian Church. First there is the non-occurrence of *Kyrios* as a title of Jesus in Mark and the Logia. In a previous article on this subject⁷ we urged that, if not the formal title, at least the conception of Messianic lordship is attested by these documents. The Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath; the Christ is lord of David. On Bousset's principle the tradition in ascribing these statements to Jesus implies the familiarity of the early disciples with the thought embodied in them. Those who made Jesus lay claim to lordship believed that He was lord. In itself this yields no proof for the existence of *Kύριος* as a formal title; it suggests only the possibility of the early crystallizing of the idea into such a usage. Familiarity with the lordship of the Messiah need not but may have led to designating Him absolutely as "the Lord" or "our Lord." Althaus falls back upon this distinction between attribution of lordship and formal naming of Jesus "Lord" to explain the phenomena in the oldest sources. He observes that, after once the conception of Jesus' lordship had sprung up, it would naturally be at first employed as a predicate of office; Jesus would not be called "the Lord" or "our Lord", but it would be affirmed that He was lord.⁸ He illustrates this from the parallel case of "Christ" which, according to the older elements in Acts was predicatively applied to

⁷ The PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, xiii, 1915, pp. 161-189.

⁸ P. 449.

Jesus in Palestinian circles, and first in Paul is seen well on its way to becoming a formal title and proper name. And yet "Christ" is no more in evidence in the Logia or Mark than Kyrios. The conclusion then would be that there was a period in the earliest life of the Palestinian Church in which the lordship of Jesus found only predicative expression, and that only subsequently, although still within Palestinian circles, this led to the use of "the Lord" or "our Lord" as a formal name of the Saviour. This representation falls in with Acts ii. 34, 36 where the Messiah is called by Peter, in dependence on the Psalmist, "David's Lord" and the Apostle declares that God made Jesus "both Lord and Christ," and also with x. 36 when Peter calls Him "Lord of all." The question is whether Acts bears out the theory of a later emergence of the title. The passages where Luke as narrator speaks of "the Lord" or "the Lord Jesus" do not, of course, bear on the point, for in these we have simply the usage of his time of writing which is not meant to be taken as reproductive of the usage in the time spoken of (cpr. ii.47; iv.33; v.14; viii.16, 25; ix.10, 11, 15, 27(?), 28, 31(?), 35, 42; xi.20, 21, 23, 24). Further, in some of the passages, where the actors within the frame of the history speak of "the Lord", this may refer to God and not to Jesus (cpr. ii.20, 21, "the day of the Lord" in the quotation from Joel; xii.11, 17, "the Lord has sent His angel," "the Lord had brought him out of the prison"). Still further, where the vocative Kyrie appears, this need not in itself be considered indicative of the existence of the formal Messianic title, it might be a simple continuation of the address on the lips of the disciples during the Gospel ministry (cpr. vii.59, 60 Stephen; ix. 5, 6, Saul; ix.10, 13 Ananias). Unfortunately chapter i.21 stands in the way of this otherwise attractive construction. Althaus does not indicate what view he takes as to the historical value of the narrative of this chapter. If i.21 could be discounted the first certain instance of the titular

use would occur in ix.17 where Ananias says to Saul "the Lord Jesus . . . has sent me." Afterwards we meet with it in Peter's mouth; xi.16, 17 "I remembered the word of the Lord" . . . "who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ." This would carry to a point sufficiently far along in the history to leave room for the first period of purely predicative use postulated by Althaus. The transition would not need to be conceived as an abrupt one; there might have been in the reminiscent Kyrie that continued the address of the pre-resurrection period already an admixture of the heightened meaning conveyed by the predicative ascription of lordship and in so far a gradual preparation for the use of the title in its pregnant higher sense (cpr. i.6 with the later instances). But it is not necessary to pursue this further for, as already stated, i.21 upsets the theory for those who accept the account in which this verse occurs as historical.

Bousset does not take kindly to the compromise proposed. Subsequently to the publication of his *Kyrios Christos* and before the appearance of his *Nachträge* he had already disposed of the evidence of Acts in a way which not merely robs it of all value for the upholders of early Palestinian Kyrios usage but even turns it to positive account as a confirmation of the later Hellenistic provenience of the title.¹⁰ In the article cited below he endeavors to show that *κύριος* occurs in such contexts in Acts as are of non-Palestinian source, except where it has been introduced by a later hand, so that the presence or absence of *kyrios* becomes a critical test for the literary dissection of Acts. We need not enter upon a discussion of this criticism which is to such a degree subjective as to elude objective refutation.¹¹ It requires attention only

⁹ P. 532.

¹⁰ *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xv, 1914, pp. 141-162.

¹¹ A mere statement of the various grounds on which Bousset bases his critical procedure should suffice to prove its subjective character. The passages xi. 19-30; xii, 25; xiii, xiv, which repeatedly speak

in so far as it would invalidate the appeal of Althaus to ii.36 in favor of a predicative recognition of Jesus' lordship in virtue of the resurrection. Bousset cannot deny that Acts ii.36 stands in an ancient environment. He takes exception only to the word *κύριον* because this depends on the preceding argumentation from *Psa. xvi* and *cx.*

of Jesus as *ὁ κύριος* are considered of Antiochian provenience, and so can be discounted. In ix, the account of Paul's conversion, *Kyrios* occurs from nine to twelve times (voc. and nom.). Of this also Bousset denies the Palestinian character and inclines to making Luke the author of most of the material. The parallel accounts in xxii and xxvi would seem to point to varying sources, as in fact both Harnack and Schwartz assume a separate source for ix. Against the former Bousset remarks simply that he has not attempted to allot this chapter to any of the larger source-complexes he assumes for the earlier part of Acts. But, he adds, even if ix rests on an older source, this is not Palestinian. The ground for this judgment is not stated. The mere geographical location of the event (on the road to Damascus) affords no warrant for it, for, although xv begins and ends in Antioch, Bousset declines to assign it for that reason to Harnack's Antiochian source of xi, 19 ff and xiii, xiv. It is further urged that ix connects with viii. 3; and viii. 3, on the interpretation of Mommsen—also followed by Schwartz—must be later, because it conflicts with Gal. i. 22 where Paul declares that he was at the time spoken of still unknown by face to the Judean Churches. This passage is taken to exclude not only every early intercourse of the converted Paul with the disciples in Jerusalem, but also every contact of the pre-Christian, persecuting Saul with the church there. Wernle (p. 57) has said all that is necessary to say on the precariousness of this exegesis. Paul's mind in making the statement in Galatians was not dwelling on his life before the conversion, but on the question of the source of his Christian convictions. Besides, in the immediately following words "they heard our one time persecutor, etc." Paul distinctly implies his contact as a persecutor with the Church in Jerusalem. Bousset further alleges that viii. 2, 3 break the connection between vs. 1 and vs. 4, but it is foolish to insist upon absolutely logical or chronological sequence of thought in an account of this kind. The importance attached in Bousset's criticism to the later origin of these verses, which in themselves do not contain *Kyrios*, is due to their backward connection with vii 58-60, in which the same redaction is discovered. Here *Kyrie* is found twice in the mouth of Stephen. The same tendency, to connect Paul's history with the mother-church, is visible here, and certain literary observations accede (twice "they stoned him" in vs. 58 and vs. 59). So everything after vs. 58a is declared a "stylistic interpolation" and the twofold *Kyrie* is gotten rid of. But the question arises,

This peculiar argumentation recurs in Acts xiii.35 ff in a source which cannot be ancient. Where such exact analogies prevail the hand of the author of Acts is to be recognized and hence it is inferred that in ii.36 he is responsible for the deduction of the lordship of Jesus from the Psalter. Althaus replies to this that such modes of quoting Scrip-

why the redactor should have repeated the clause "they stoned him"; he would naturally have omitted the first, if he knew how to "stylize." In viii, the account of Philip's mission to Samaria, Kyrios appears in vss. 16, 25 (in vs. 22, 24 it probably refers, according to Bousset, to God, because direct prayer to Jesus is rare in the New Testament). Waitz here distinguished two sources vs. 5-8, 26 ff. and vs. 9-25. Bousset adopts this, on the ground that a double conversion of the Samaritans by Philip and Peter is related—which is not really the case—and because the "grotesque idea of a confirmation" of the Samaritans by the bestowal of the Holy Spirit betrays itself as late. The whole episode that brings Peter and John upon the scene for the expression of this idea has been superimposed upon the earlier account, and thus the two instances of Kyrios are shown not to belong to the latter. We can discover nothing "grotesque" in the representation. An account of the confirmation of the Samaritans it certainly does not purport to be. To be sure the parallel case of xix.1 ff belongs to a Hellenistic milieu. Chap. xi, 16, 17, Peter's self-justification in the Cornelius-case, has Kyrios twice. Bousset simply observes that with vs. 16 "a new train of thought obviously sets in." We doubt whether this will be obvious to any ordinary reader who has no point to make. It is true that in the preceding context the idea of baptism plays no rôle. At the same time it was naturally suggested by the idea of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, for these two in early Christian experience were coincident. Bousset further appeals to the quotation in vs. 16 of a word of Jesus, which occurs not in the Gospels but only in Acts i, 5 as proof that in both passages where this word is quoted Luke's hand is involved. But Luke according to his Gospel (iii.16) knew very well that this was a word of the Baptist; if therefore it is given in the two passages in Acts as a word of Jesus Himself, there is every reason to believe that in this he relied on tradition and did not transfer the saying from John to Jesus of his own account. In Chap. i Kyrios occurs in vss. 6, 21, 24. Bousset finds no difficulty here because he assumes that the contents are on the whole the production of Luke. But that Harnack begins his assignment to sources with Chap. ii is scarcely sufficient evidence for this. Bousset is compelled to admit that vss. 6 ff have a primitive flavor, of a peculiar Palestinian sort. The Judas-legend also is probably Palestinian. Of course it is not meant to deny that where Luke speaks in this chapter in his capacity of author, Lucan ideas

ture were not peculiar to any single author, but common property, and that the whole character of the argument proves it to belong to the earliest controversy with the Jews. It ought to be observed that Althaus' position in regard to this Psalm passage involves a difference in the range of its interpretation as between Mk. xii.35, 37 and parallels and Acts ii.36. In regard to the former he concedes to Bousset that not a general lordship of the Messiah but only His lordship over David is affirmed. In Acts,

find expression; only this should not be allowed to discredit a-priori what he represents the actors in the history as speaking. The passages ii. 47; iv. 33; v. 14; ix. 31, 35, 42, all of them descriptive of the state of the Church, speak repeatedly of ὁ κύριος. These are all Lucan, of course, and Bousset need not have been at pains to point to this in connection with his argument. That Luke is familiar with the title, cannot, of itself, prove that the earlier disciples were not. Bousset further calls attention to the occurrence of the terms πιστεύειν, πίστις, according to him expressive of later conceptions, in combination with the Kyrios references (so v. 14; ix, 42). This is purely negative and again non-significant so far as Luke speaks; in xi. 17 Peter speaks, but there is nothing suspicious about the πιστεύειν here considered in itself; it would become suspect only if weight could be attached to the other arguments urged in support of the secondariness of the passage; in viii. 12, 13 πιστεύειν is not immediately connected with κύριος although both appear in the same alleged interpolation or redaction. The same applies to vi. 7. Two separate insufficient grounds of suspicion cannot, even when combined, justify the rejection of a passage. In regard to Chap. x. 36, 37, "the great anacoluthon", Bousset makes short work; he brings order into the impossible tangle of words by simply cutting out vs. 36 as a gloss or at least a marginal observation perhaps from the hand of the last redactor of Acts. This has the merit of simplicity, but it does not explain how the glossator or redactor conceived of the connection of "the word which He sent etc." either with the foregoing or the following. With neither does it properly connect. That the text is out of joint is quite probable, but that the clause "He is Lord of all" necessarily belongs to whatever accretion it may contain, cannot be proven. More seriously than to any other passage Bousset addresses himself to the removal of κύριος in Peter's speech (ii. 36). To render this plausible he attempts to break up the discourse into several parts. It is composite because of the repeated formula of address in vs. 14, 22, 29. Schwartz calls such a repetition "unheard of." Yet the examples of Acts. xiii. 17, 26; xxiii. 1, 5, 6; xxv. 24, 26; xxvi. 2, 7, 19, 27 might have shown him that there is nothing oratorically impossible in this even in antique discourse; in modern

on the other hand, the affirmation of a comprehensive Messianic lordship is based on it. If the Gospel episode is historical and belongs to the last days of the life of Jesus, whereas the episode in Acts belongs to the earliest days of the Church, this difference might easily explain itself. Jesus might have employed the quotation of His own special restricted purpose. Peter might have put it to a more comprehensive use. But Althaus is not quite prepared to affirm to the historicity of the Gospel episode and the use by Jesus of the words attributed to Him in this passage. He only believes it "the more probable" view that Jesus did make use of the Psalm.¹² If on the other hand both the Gospel passage and that in Acts should be held to reflect the preoccupation of the early disciples with the Psalm, then it is plain that the whole distinction between restricted and universal lordship as differentiating the two becomes impossible. If the disciples from the earliest times appealed to the Psalm to establish the universal lordship of Jesus and also on occasion by means of it argued that the Messiah was David's Lord, then the latter must from the outset have rested on the wider background of the former. A conception of lordship over David apart from

address in prayer and otherwise it may be heard frequently. No more weight can be attached to the double affirmation of the resurrection, vs. 24 and 32; in a fervent popular address this is all natural enough. A difficulty lies only in the quotation of the Joel prophecy (vss. 17 ff). If here by "the day of the Lord" "the day of the Lord Jesus", is meant, as Bousset feels inclined to assume, then this might seem to rest on the Septuagint designation of God as "Lord" (= Jehovah) and in so far to be Hellenistic in character. But that the transfer of Jehovah functions to Jesus rests entirely on this linguistic basis of identification is far from certain. Peter might not have spoken, in quoting the Old Testament, of "the day of the Lord", and yet have transferred the idea to "Jesus the Lord." Finally in regard to Chap. xv Bousset does not appeal for explanation of the Kyrios in vss. 11 and 26 to the Antiochian source of the chapter, which Harnack who connects it with xi, 19 ff and xiii, xiv assumes. He simply declares vs. 11 superfluous and suspect on account of its Pauline idiom, and considers vss. 24-26 a later addition because of the double "it seemed good to us" in vs. 25 and vs. 28.

¹² P. 516.

universal Messianic sovereignty never existed. But even on the other supposition, viz., that of the historicity of the Gospel episode, we do not believe that the possible distinction between the narrower and the wider range of the concept is a very real one. It is true, Jesus' immediate purpose in the Gospel argument is to prove that the Messiah is David's Lord. But this is certainly meant in the principal sense that the Messiahship lies on a higher plane than that characterized by the title "Son of David." The point is not what the mutual relation between David and the Messiah is, personally considered, but what the nature and sphere of the Messiahship are. When this is recognized it will readily be seen that the whole tenor of the Gospel passage postulates for the mind of him who spoke or wrote it, just as much as the passage in Acts, the general idea of comprehensive Messianic lordship. And after all the same is plainly enough presupposed by the content of the quotation itself, which does not confine itself to the opening verse of the Psalm, but both in the Gospel and in Acts takes in the statement about the Messiah's sitting at the right hand of God and the subjection to Him of all foes. It is not necessary to appeal to the unrestricted form of the statement (Mk. xii.37 = Matt. xxii.45 = Lk. xx.44 "David calls Him Lord") for this by itself, as we shall presently see, does not call for the comprehensive conception of lordship. Finally the question should be put: how is this lordship over David concretely to be conceived of? It is not a purely abstract theorem, no mere rabbinical exploitation of a Scripture phrase to which no living Christological belief corresponded. Some concrete form of realization of the idea must have accompanied the affirmation. The conception is evidently eschatological; when the Messiah will reign He will also be David's King. But so conceived the eschatological character guarantees the comprehensive range. The tradition which either handed on or created this utterance was accustomed to view Christ as Messianic Lord in general.

Althaus' refusal to recognize the unrestricted lordship in the Marcan passage results in his argument against Bousset falling short of its purpose. In view of the non-occurrence of the title in Mark and the Logia, urged as proof of its non-existence in the early Palestinian Church, he falls back upon the currency of the idea in that Church in predicative form. The conclusion then would be that, taking Mark and the Logia as reflections of the early Palestinian belief, we might expect in them the same predicative way of speaking. But what we do find is according to Althaus something less, viz., that predicative way of speaking in a restricted sense ("Lord of David"). This much then of Bousset's contention would at any rate remain unrefuted, namely, that Mark and the Logia do not have even the predicative idea of a universal lordship of the Messiah.

Much more summary and far less circumspect is Wernle's criticism of Bousset's treatment of the evidence in the earliest sources. He finds Bousset's procedure arbitrary. According to Bousset the evidence either lacks cogency, or is secondary, or suspected on account of its liturgical style. In view of this Wernle exclaims: "How could any argument for the use of Kyrios or its Aramaic equivalent in the primitive Church possibly be conducted when neither the Kyrios Psalm . . . nor all the Gospel passages containing Kyrios together are allowed to prove anything?"¹³ Bousset passes by in silence the pericope about the Messiah being David's Lord.¹⁴ According to Mark the Kingdom has come and hence it is quite natural to believe that the Messiah sits as Kyrios at the right hand of God. Wernle overlooks that this last argument lacks all force against Bousset who attributes to Jesus and Mark the exclusively eschatological conception of the Kingdom. He further observes that the Logia have neither "Son of David" nor "Kyrios" nor "Christ" as Messianic titles, but implicate

¹³ P. 21.

¹⁴ P. 4.

the Messianic idea in what is said about the confession of Jesus, Matt. x.32.¹⁵ In referring to Acts ii.36 Bousset neglects the *καὶ κύριον*, although it bears the stress, the whole argument being based on Psalm cx.¹⁶ This has meanwhile been attended to by Bousset in his article on "Kyrios in the Criticism of Acts" above mentioned. Psalm cx must have been much alive in the primitive Church, as appears also from Paul's knowledge of its Messianic character (I Cor. xv.25). Finally Wernle, like Althaus, places the origin of Kyrios as a title after the exaltation so that on that account alone it could not be expected to make its appearance in the Gospels. But, if it is in a few instances anachronistically carried back into the phraseology of the Gospels, this should not be made to prove its post-Pauline character. It is not attempted to trace the title back to Jesus Himself. Wernle deals with it simply as symptomatic of the early tradition.¹⁷ The sharp distinction between predicative use in the beginning and a later titular use, as developed by Althaus, is not drawn. It should be said that Wernle who himself freely indulges in the literary criticism of the Gospels where it suits his purpose is hardly justified in his indignant protest against the exercise of the same right by Bousset. The whole method may be precarious, but that Bousset has made a specially flagrant use of it is not apparent.

To the argument from the parallel case of "Christ" which shares with "Kyrios" the feature of almost total absence from Mark and the Logia,¹⁸ Bousset does not attach convincing force. He submits that to the use of "Christ" with reference to the earthly Jesus there was an antecedent hindrance in the pronounced eschatological as-

¹⁵ P. 6.

¹⁶ P. 12.

¹⁷ P. 21.

¹⁸ It occurs nowhere in the Logia; in Mark only viii. 29; ix. 41 (shown to be secondary according to Bousset by comparison with Matt. x. 42); xiv. 61; xv. 32. In the narrative of Mark it does not occur, if the title of the Gospel be discounted.

sociations of this title, the Christ being to the primitive Church a future rather than a past or present figure.¹⁹ With "Kyrios" he thinks it was different. Since this title has no special eschatological import but expresses a present dignity, the authors of Mark and the Logia could have spoken freely of "the Kyrios" in their narrative if such a title had been known to them. This answer overlooks the fact that the eschatological coloring of the Christ-title could never have hindered its introduction into the eschatological material of Mark and the Logia. Besides, it is not quite true that no hindrance of such a kind existed in the case of "Kyrios". It is true that the latter title is not exclusively eschatological as Bousset declares "Christ" to be. But it is not entirely devoid of eschatological associations. Especially in parabolic material "the Kyrios" occurs sometimes in eschatological setting, and while this does not directly designate Jesus but the actor in the parable, yet the significant allusion to the Kyrios Christ should not, we think, be denied. However, whether this be so or not, the view ought to have been reckoned with, according to which "Kyrios" was a predicate or title of the exalted Jesus, a view expressed by both Wernle and Althaus. The consciousness of this fact might have had something to do with the absence of the title from the two oldest sources. So much historical tact may perhaps be ascribed to the first collectors of the tradition. Bousset, to be sure, speaks ironically of Wernle's remarks in this direction.²⁰ He believes the historical tact would have been in place only where the words of Jesus came under consideration, in the objective narrative the consciousness of the post-resurrection origin could have made no difference. We for our part would seek the line of least resistance on the other side: in the words of Jesus, who was credited with anticipating the future, the Kyrios would be more easily introduced than in those of the speaker in the Gospel

¹⁹ *Nachträge*, p. 15.

²⁰ *Nachträge*, p. 14.

history or the narrative. And Bousset again overlooks the point that, according to Althaus at least, the earliest period applied the term only predicatively, not as a title. But, apart from this, in the Logia there was hardly enough narrative material to give the title a fair chance of emergence; and as for Mark, standing nearer to the event and having fresher memory of the specific appurtenance of the title to the exalted Jesus, he might be credited with sufficient historical tact to keep it out even of his narrative. Bousset's ironical reference to the historical fidelity and "tact" which some would ascribe to the tradition is all the more misplaced since he himself makes, as we have seen, this same element of "tact" operate to the exclusion of Christ from the narrative on eschatological grounds.

The main point, however, to be criticized in Bousset's contention as to the absence of Kyrios from Mark and the Logia, is that it is not quite in accordance with the facts. It does occur in Matt. x.24. Bousset is not explicit as to whether he includes this saying in the Logia or not. He calls it a "synoptical logion."²¹ Others assign it to that source without hesitation.²² Probably Bousset discounts it on the ground of its purely parabolic character and regards the use made of it according to him by the Fourth Evangelist in xiii. 13 as a misinterpretation.²³ With the figure in the parable and the person of Jesus so naturally coalescing the point raised is immaterial. The transfer to Jesus is made with sufficient plainness in vs. 25, "If they have called the master of the house (οἰκοδεσπότης) Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?"²⁴ In Mark xi.3, in the narrative of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the conception also occurs (ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει). Dalman²⁵ and

²¹ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 99.

²² Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* pp. 57, 90.

²³ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 187, note 2.

²⁴ Neither Wernle nor Althaus appeals to Matt. x. 24, probably on account of its parabolic character. Dalman also separates sharply between the formal designation of God as "Lord" and the lord in parabolic representations. *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 149.

²⁵ *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 270.

Althaus²⁶ see in this the mere objectivation of the way in which the disciples were accustomed to address Jesus as their teacher (Rab or Mar). Wernle does not commit himself on the import of the word in this passage, although expressing impatience with the easy manner in which Bousset brushes aside its evidence.²⁷ Heitmüller thinks that ὁ κύριος here does not bear "a sacral sense."²⁸ Köhler arrives at the same conclusion in quite an original way.²⁹ Observing that the Syra Vetus presupposes the reading ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ both in Mark and Luke, and the Curetonian Syriac, Ephraem, the Aethiopic and Armenian Versions in Matthew the reading ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν (the plural referring to the ass and its colt), Köhler regards this as the true reading and concludes that the κύριος refers to the owner of the animal and not to Jesus. Jesus would instruct the disciples to tell the enquirers that the owner through them sent for the animal, because he, the owner, needed it. In accordance with this he purposes to delete πάλιν in the clause αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε on the ground that it is a "Wanderwort", i.e., has an uncertain position in the codices and is not read by Syra Vetus and Vulgate. The elimination of πάλιν is necessary to this view because with it in the text the κύριος must be Jesus. Its uncertain place is hardly sufficient ground for excising it. But even if it be left out on the ground of the two ancient versions which omit it, this creates only the bare grammatical possibility and by no means the exegetical necessity of understanding the κύριος of the owner of the animal. In Luke the entire clause in which the πάλιν occurs is lacking. The Evangelist therefore had a free hand and yet he understands the κύριος in vs. 31 of Jesus, for in vs. 33 "the owners" (in the plural) of the animal are spoken of. And what is certain of Luke is probable of

²⁶ P. 532.

²⁷ P. 21.

²⁸ Quoted by Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 96.

²⁹ P. 473.

Matthew also who has the clause but without the *πάλιν*. The omission of the *πάλιν* affects only the understanding of the subject of *ἀποστέλλει*. This becomes in Matthew the *τις* who makes enquiry about what the disciples are doing; on learning that *ὁ κύριος* has need of the animals, he will straightway send them. With *πάλιν* in the text not merely the preceding *κύριος* becomes necessarily Jesus, but also the *πάλιν ἀποστέλλων* must be Jesus.³⁰ The presence, therefore, of *πάλιν* in the text compels us to understand the *κύριος* of Jesus; its absence leaves the matter undecided. In the latter case the question becomes entirely staked on the possessive pronouns which Syra Vetus and other ancient versions append to *κύριος*. Köhler argues that these pronouns must be original in the text because nobody could have thought of adding to an absolute *ὁ κύριος*, which could be understood of Jesus only, a pronominal determination which changed the subject. It is not, however, so difficult to conceive how the Syriac and other translators came to supply "Lord" with a suffix which it did not have in the Greek. A simple misunderstanding of the *αὐτοῦ* in the Greek text, which took it to be the possessive belonging to *κύριος*, while in reality it is the object of the verb *χρεῖαν ἔχει*, would lead to this. Instead of construing *ὁ κύριος — αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει*, the translator construed *ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ — χρεῖαν ἔχει*, and then on his own responsibility added the missing object to the verb. We feel sure, however, that the Syriac and the other versions which have this reading mean by the *κύριος* Jesus no less than the ordinary Greek text. In ascribing to them the opposite view Köhler does not take into account how utterly impossible it must have been for the translators to ascribe to Jesus the practice of a deception, for such

³⁰ The English versions, both Authorized and Revised in Matthew, and the Authorized Version also in Mark, render "straightway he will send them," understanding "the sender" of the owner, and yet "the Lord" in the preceding clause is to them Jesus. The Revised Version in Mark reads "straightway he will send him back hither," in which the subject "he" stands for Jesus.

and nothing else would be involved in his instruction to the disciples to say that the real owner needed the animal. There is no escape from the assumption that by *ὁ κύριος* all these ancient authorities intend to designate Jesus as the lord, the sovereign disposer of the animal. And the same may be confidently affirmed of the conjectural Greek text, if it ever existed, to which Köhler would trace back the peculiar reading of these versions. If the Evangelists actually wrote *ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ* this also must have expressed to them the same idea,—that the Messianic Lord required the animal for a special use of His own. For ourselves we feel convinced that the Greek text never read otherwise than it reads at present in our Gospels. Of course, it remains an ulterior question what lies back of this Greek text in the original Aramaic speech of Jesus. Did He tell the disciples to say Maran “our Lord” or Mareh “its Lord.” If Maran, then our text follows the common tendency of the Greek idiom to drop the possessive pronoun in such a case: it speaks of “the Lord” instead of “our Lord”, and what we have is more than the conception of Messianic lordship: Maran = *ὁ κύριος* stands as a formal title of Jesus. The versions named on this view made a mistake not merely in their reading of the Greek text, but also in their reproduction of the original intent of Jesus since out of “the Lord” they made “its Lord.” If on the other hand Jesus used Mareh, “its Lord”, then the Greek translator, probably from the stylistic motive to avoid the double *αὐτοῦ*, rendered Mareh “its Lord” by *ὁ κύριος* “the Lord”, and thus opened the possibility of reading more into the designation than Jesus had meant to put into it. What Jesus meant as a phrase descriptive of Messianic ownership could now be construed as a formal title and as a matter of fact was extensively so understood afterward. The curious circumstance would then result that the Syriac and other translators, through a happy misunderstanding of the Greek text, restored the original import of the saying which had become obscured in the inter-

mediate Greek stage. But no matter what view may be taken as to the reconstruction of the original Aramaic form of the saying, one thing is certain,—the conception of Messianic lordship cannot be eliminated from it.

It is a satisfaction to see that Bousset does not resort to any such devices to void the *ὁ κύριος* in our passage of its high meaning. It does according to him designate Jesus, and it designates Him as "the Lord" specifically; *ὁ κύριος* is not a mere synonym of *ὁ διδάσκαλος* in Mark xiv.14. But what he thus exegetically gives with the one hand he critically takes back with the other. While insisting against Heitmüller upon the "sacral" sense of the term, he does not fear that this will endanger the position taken in regard to the absence of this sense from the Marcan tradition, because in this one case an exception can be safely made. His sense of safety arises from the belief that the whole passage is secondary, i.e., does not form part of the earliest Palestinian tradition. It is subject to suspicion because of its pronounced Messianic tendency, a feature which to Bousset's mind everywhere betrays a rather advanced stage in the remodelling of the original material. He quotes with approval Wellhausen's conjecture to the effect that an accidental popular disturbance at the entry of the prophet Jesus has here been transformed into a pre-arranged Messianic self-demonstration on His part. He also argues that, if the entry had taken place under such pronounced Messianic auspices, the subsequent arguing of the leaders concerning the authority by which Jesus cleansed the Temple³¹ would have been superfluous. The feature of the supernatural procuring of the colt marks the account as legendary and is of a kind with that of the preparation for the passover in Mark xiv in which the same feature occurs. Both are later accretions to the primitive tradition.³² The very occurrence of the word *κύριος* in the passage affords reason for sus-

³¹ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 52, 96.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 71.

picion, not, of course, in itself, for that in a discussion about the antiquity of the Kyrios title would be too palpably a *circulus vitiosus*, but because it is the only Marcan context where the term appears. So far as these arguments are based on a priori rejection of the supernatural they require no answer. The tendency to discredit the account of the entry is simply symptomatic of the general trend of scepticism in regard to the Messianic consciousness of Jesus by which both Wellhausen and Bousset are affected. The "exousia" question raised by the authorities would clash with the manner of entrance only if it were represented as a bona-fide request for information; as a matter of fact it was a political move which, so far from excluding, seems to presuppose clear knowledge of Jesus' Messianic claims. Wernle very properly observes that Mark would scarcely have narrated the episode, which was rather objectionable from his own Gentile Christian point of view, had it not been based on tradition, and that as a matter of fact the Evangelist seeks to guard it against a one-sided nationalistic interpretation by the material with which he follows it up.³³ The uniqueness of the passage in Mark as containing the title Kyrios exists only if the formal title be found here, and even in this case should create no prejudice against it, for in Matthew and Luke, no less than in Mark, it constitutes a unique instance of its kind. If on the other hand not the formal title but the affirmation of Messianic lordship be found in the saying, then it ceases to be unique.

Bousset's standpoint in regard to the "Son of David" pericope in its bearing on the Christological background of Mark is not as clearly defined as one might wish. As stated above he emphasizes the restricted range of the idea. He also urges that it does not apply to Jesus but to the Messiah in the abstract.³⁴ This is altogether negligible for the present point of enquiry, for if the lordship over

³³ P. 29.

³⁴ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 95.

David formed part of the Messianic theology reflected here, then it would certainly not have been left unapplied to Jesus in circles which professed Him as the Messiah. But when Bousset declares the utterance scarcely intelligible in the mouth of Jesus³⁵ because He refused information concerning his "exousia," he seems to treat it again as a matter of personal reference to Jesus and not as an abstract Christological debate. And in general the criticism offered would affect only the authenticity of the episode as part of the life of Jesus but by no means its appurtenance to the oldest stratum of the Marcan tradition. Bousset himself tells us that in it we have "incipient Church dogmatic",³⁶ "theology of the primitive Church",³⁷ "primitive Christian Palestinian dogmatic",³⁸ and the Psalm on which the argument is based had "at a very early time" attracted the attention of the Christians,³⁹ that it constitutes one of the essential foundations on which the theology of the Palestinian Church was reared.⁴⁰ What reason then can there be for refusing to accept it as evidence for the familiarity of these early circles with the conception of Jesus' "lordship". To be sure, according to Bousset, the passage gives a specimen of "the technically developed argument from prophecy."⁴¹ But who can prove that this kind of argumentation does not date back to the pre-Hellenistic period? That the pericope appears loosely appended to a collection of genuine discourses of Jesus,⁴² is a piece of purely subjective criticism which it is hardly worth while to consider. If one were to say that with its Messianic *pointe* it forms an exceedingly fitting climax to the preceding controversial encounters, this might not be

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³⁶ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 5.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁴⁰ *Nachträge*, p. 16.

⁴¹ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 51.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 51.

strictly capable of proof, but the one observation would be as much in place as the other.

On the silence of Mark and the Logia Bousset moreover stakes his argument for the progressive emergence of Kyrios in the later Gospels, Matthew and Luke. The weakness of this argument lies in that it neglects to discriminate between the various relations in which the term is applied. Three such relations are to be reckoned with: Kyrios within the frame of the narrative, i.e. in the mouth of speakers in the Gospel history, who employ it objectively in the third person; Kyrios as a designation of Jesus used by the Evangelists; Kyrie in the Gospel history as a vocative of address. As soon as this distinction is made, the straightforward simplicity and self-evidencing appearance of Bousset's construction vanish and a rather complicated web of phenomena takes their place. It soon becomes clear that no such progressive increase in the frequency of Kyrios and Kyrie exists as would be indicative of its origin at a certain point and in a certain milieu and of its gradual spread in the sequel.

The first fact to be noticed in passing over from Mark to Matthew and Luke is that there is no real change so far as the introduction of the third person Kyrios into the episodes of the ministry of Jesus itself is concerned. Both the later Evangelists confine themselves to the three instances of the Sabbath-controversy, the entry into Jerusalem and the argument about the Davidic sonship of the Messiah where they found the Kyrios in Mark.⁴³ Even where there is no dependence on Mark, but material is drawn from other sources, the Evangelists on the whole observe this rule. In Matthew's account of the resurrection, xxviii.6, the angel speaks of "the place where the Lord lay." It is very doubtful, however, whether *ὁ κύριος* is original in the text. Some of the best authorities omit it; it is not read by Westcott and Hort.⁴⁴ If it be retained in the text,

⁴³ Althaus, p. 533.

⁴⁴ Köhler, p. 474.

it should be remembered that the statement forms part of the post-resurrection narrative and may imply the dating of the lordship from the resurrection. This is certainly true of Luke xxiv.34, where the disciples say "the Lord is risen indeed", as a comparison with Acts ii.36 shows. By itself stands Luke i.43 in which Elisabeth addresses Mary as "the mother of my Lord." According to Köhler⁴⁵ this is no real exception because it is only an instance of the well-known Oriental excess of politeness assuming here the indirect form of honoring the mother through a title applied to the child. Just as one would speak to a person of distinction with "my Lord has done this or that", using the ceremonial third person, so the mother of a distinguished person might be addressed in the same way as "the mother of my Lord", and no deeper meaning, perhaps not even a conceptual reference to the Messianic lordship, need be implied.⁴⁶ If this be not thought plausible, either a unique anticipation of the later developed usage may be here assumed, or perhaps evidence discovered of the usage of "Lord" as a pre-Christian Messianic title.⁴⁷ At any rate this one case cannot invalidate the observation that on the whole Matthew and Luke refrain from injecting into the consciousness and speech of the participants in Gospel history the representation of Jesus as *κύριος*. And this is a fact of great significance. It places Mark in line with Matthew and Luke so far as the conscious restraint evidenced in this matter is concerned. What otherwise might be due to ignorance in Mark can

⁴⁵ Köhler, *ibid.*

⁴⁶ Bousset would, of course, find here simply the anachronistic carrying back of the later Kyrios worship into the legend of the nativity. Köhler finds a similar third person Kyrios of address in Luke i.38, where on the authority of Irenaeus he would change the *ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου* into *ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη σου κύριε* making the person addressed by κύριε the angel. He suggests that this corresponds better with the following clause *γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου* p. 472.

⁴⁷ Böhlig and Bousset deny the existence of such a Messianic title in Jewish Christology. *Kyrios Christos*, p. 109, note 1.

no longer be so explained when it proves identical in character with what may be seen in Matthew and Luke where, in view of the date of writing, ignorance is out of the question.

In the above comparison between Mark and Matthew and Luke we have left out of account the parabolic material in which Jesus is compared to a *kyrios*. This implied parabolic ascription of the *Kyrios* dignity to Jesus is not entirely lacking in Mark (xiii.35) but it is more in evidence in Matthew and Luke. Of a relatively late origin of the conception or title this would be indicative only if all such parabolic material had to be regarded as a late product of the tradition, not known to the early Palestinian Church. As a matter of fact the comparison is present already not only in Mark but also in the Logia. We have here then not a case of the introduction into the Marcan material of later ideas, but of adding to it from other sources which need by no means be younger or less trustworthy.

We have also left out of account the cases of uncertain reference. In the gospel of the nativity Luke represents Gabriel, Elisabeth, Zacharias as speaking in Old Testament language of the Baptist's "preparing the way of the Lord", or "making ready a people prepared for the Lord" or of his "going before the face of the Lord" (i.17, 76). This may attach itself to the representation that Jehovah is coming to His people in the eschatological crisis. In that case the "Lord" is not Jesus but God. In the Semitic original of these passages not Adonai but some other designation of God will on this view have occurred which the Hellenistic Luke rendered by *κύριος* on the basis of the Greek Bible. Others, however, find here the equation Christ = *ὁ κύριος*. The question then arises, whether such identification was possible on the basis of the Hebrew or Aramaic form of Scripture as then quoted, or must be explained on the basis of familiarity with the Greek Bible. Into this we shall have occasion to look presently.

In the context of the passages Luke means by *ὁ κύριος*, as a rule, God, (cpr. i.6, ii, 15, 16, 25, 28, 32, 45, 46, 68). In ii.11 many, including both Bousset⁴⁸ and Köhler,⁴⁹ prefer the reading *Χριστὸς κυρίου* "the Lord's Christ" to *Χριστὸς κύριος* "Christ, the Lord." If the former be adopted, here also "the Lord" is God, not Jesus (cpr. Luke ii.26).

The situation is somewhat different in regard to the use of *κύριος* by the Evangelists to designate Jesus in their own narrative. Here a perceptible difference between Mark and Luke presents itself. Mark refrains from this except in the two closing verses of his Gospel, which must be here discounted because belonging to what is considered by many the non-authentic conclusion of the document.⁵⁰ If it were not for this one might find in the sudden change an indication of Mark's view that the lordship of Jesus began with the resurrection. This might also be applied to Matt. xxviii.6, where, however, as stated above, the genuineness of *ὁ κύριος* is highly doubtful. Apart from this one passage, Matthew must be classed with Mark in that he equally refrains from designating Jesus *ὁ κύριος*. At Matthew's time of writing this way of referring to Jesus was quite prevalent; his abstention from it, therefore, is conscious and calculated to throw doubt on the theory that precisely similar phenomena in Mark must be due to the non-existence of the title. But while Mark and Matthew thus go together, a very pronounced departure from their mode of speaking sets in with Luke. Luke is quite free in his employment of *ὁ κύριος* as a narrative subject. He introduces this no less than fifteen times

⁴⁸ *Nachträge*, p. 13, note 1. In Psa. Sol. xvii. 32 the same combination and in xviii, 7 the equivocal *Χριστοῦ κυρίου* occurs. Bousset inclines to the view that in these two passages, as well as in the Lucan passage, the writer meant "the Lord's Christ."

⁴⁹ P. 475.

⁵⁰ Bousset appeals to the appearance of *ὁ κύριος* not less than twice in the spurious appendix of Mark as convincing proof of the later origin of the title.

(vii. 13, 19; x. 1, 39, 41; xi. 39; xii. 42; xiii. 15; xvii. 5, 6; xviii. 6; xix. 8; xxii. 61 (twice); xxiv. 3) not counting iii.4 where, in the quotation from Isaiah, ὁ κύριος may have been understood by the Evangelist either of God or of Christ.

This frequency of the narrative κύριος in Luke, compared with its absence in Mark and Matthew might, of course, indicate that in the interval between the composition of Matthew's Gospel and that of Luke the title had originated or at least come into prevailing use. Inevitable such a conclusion would not be. Historical tact might have restrained the first two Evangelists from introducing into their narrative a post-resurrection title which, as such, they felt to be out of keeping with the time with which the narrative had to do, while Luke might have been less scrupulous in this matter. No historical blame could attach to this, for where the historian speaks in his own person, he is entitled to the use of the terminology of his time; fault could only be found with the introduction of such terminology into the consciousness and speech of the earlier period and into this fault, so far as the public ministry of Jesus is concerned, Luke does not fall. It is a question, however, whether Luke actually indulged in this freer handling of the title which the present text of his Gospel reveals and on which so much of Bousset's argument depends. Köhler brings the light of textual criticism to bear upon this and comes to the interesting conclusion that in practically all these cases κύριος in our present Lucan text is not original but a later substitute for the simple Jesus or the personal pronoun "he".⁵¹ On the basis of Merx' tabulation of the Syriac readings in the latter's Commentary he eliminates the κύριος from Luke vii.13, 19; x.i.39, 41; xi.39; xii.42; xiii.15; xvii.5, 6; xviii.6; xix.8; xxii.61. In none of these is it found in the Syra Vetust and in some of them the Curetonian Syriac and the Peshitto,

⁵¹ P. 475.

as well as Codex D, corroborate its testimony.⁵² Köhler assumes that in all these cases in Luke the original Greek text was without the *κύριος* but that the solemn reading of the Gospel in the Church introduced it, and it persisted because it was more in keeping than the simple "Jesus" with the current mode of reference to the Saviour.

Köhler's argumentation might seem at first sight inconsistent with itself, because the testimony of the Syra Vetus is accepted in Luke where it omits the *κύριος* and rejected in the two sections of Matthew and John where it introduces the *κύριος*. This inconsistency is only apparent. In regard to the Lucan passages, the Curetonian and Peshitto bear out the correctness of the Syra Vetus, whilst in the two sections of Matthew and John there is not a single instance of confirmation by these other authorities. But if Köhler has correctly diagnosed the original state of the text in Luke, a matter for experts in textual criticism to settle among themselves, then it will be seen at a glance that Bousset's theory, so far as it is based on the sudden emergence of *ὁ κύριος* in Luke's narrative style, is left without real support. The passages from which Köhler ejects the title are precisely the passages, and constitute all the passages, where Luke employs it as a narrative subject. And the one passage in which it remains is Luke xxiv.3 in the narrative of the resurrection ("they found not the body of the Lord Jesus"). Luke, therefore, takes his place wholly in line with Mark and Matthew, not only in keeping *κύριος* out of the speech of the personages in the Gospel ministry but also in refraining from its use in his own narrative of the life of

⁵² The opposite phenomenon is observed in Matthew and John in each of which Gospels there is a whole section where the Syra Vetus throughout speaks of Jesus as Maran, "our Lord", and where our text has "Jesus" or "he" (Matt. viii. 1 xi. 18; John i. 35 vi. 11). The difference is that in Luke, on Köhler's view, these liturgical readings have permanently supplanted the original ones, whereas in Matthew and John they did not succeed in doing so. The principle applied to Luke Köhler also applies to Matt. xxviii. 6; here even the other textual authorities cast doubt upon *ὁ κύριος*.

Jesus up to the point of the resurrection. The attitude of all three Evangelists appears to be determined by considerations of tact and is not the result of historical evolution. And the silence of Luke, which could not be due to ignorance, once more strikingly proves that there is no need of so interpreting the silence of the tradition in Mark and the Logia.

The historical faithfulness and objectivity which the Evangelists prove to have practised in this matter entitles them to great credit.⁵³ Even if the Lucan passages be not discounted, it still will remain true that in by far the majority of cases the Evangelists, Luke as well as the others, are accustomed to speak of the Saviour by means of the simple "Jesus" or "He." To us with our modern preoccupation with "the historical Jesus" there may seem to be nothing exceptional or meritorious in this. It requires no special effort of historical sobriety on our part to employ constantly the simple "Jesus." But such a preoccupation with the historical aspect of our Lord's career hardly existed when and where the Evangelists wrote. The tendency was to exalt the Saviour and emphasize the transcendental side of His person and work. When in the face of this the Evangelists, not excluding John, succeed in preserving the historical setting of the life of Him whom they knew to be more than a mere man or a historically limited figure, this is no small accomplishment.

From the third person Kyrios in its twofold relation above specified must be distinguished the cases of Kyrie in the vocative. To these also Bousset had been inclined to appeal in support of his theory, inasmuch as in Mark and the Logia each only a single case of this mode of address is found, whereas both Matthew and Luke bring numerous instances.⁵⁴ Köhler also observes that a com-

⁵³ Köhler, p. 476.

⁵⁴ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 96. In *Nachträge*, p. 17, on the other hand, against Althaus "Kyrie-Mari is a mode of address which proves nothing for our investigation."

parison with Mark shows how the original formula of politeness experienced with Matthew and Luke the influence of the later religious usage.⁵⁵ Conflicting interests attach themselves to this aspect of the controversy. On the one hand, the increased frequency in the later Evangelists may be quoted as proof of the later origin of the Kyrios title, of which these vocatives would then be meant by the Evangelists as full representations. On the other hand, a higher meaning than that of mere secular or scholastic politeness may be sought in them in order to obtain a substantial preparation for the fully developed religious usage of the period after the resurrection. And again in the interest of the historicity of the writers it may be attempted to tone down the significance of this mode of address so as to keep it well within the limits of the ordinary social and scholastic custom of the times. The question is, of course, primarily an exegetical one; how much or how little did the writers mean to put into the address? Only in the second place does it become a critical problem; what historical right had they to attribute to it more or less of the high sense which seems to make it a prelude to the later Kyrios appellation?

In order to answer the first question the facts of the Gospels in regard to Kyrie ought to be examined somewhat in detail. That Kyrie can be a form of polite address without religious connotation follows from such passages where it is applied to others than Jesus (Matt. xxvii.63; John xii.21; xx.15). The Evangelist Matthew might have so meant it where he adds the title to the text of Mark. In viii.2 the leper says *κύριε*; the corresponding passage in Mark has no formula of address. Here the absence of every title might have been felt as savoring of lack of respect. But the addition is also made in xx.30, 31 where Mark has "Son of David", which certainly satisfied the demands of politeness or reverence. Nor does this explanation apply where Matthew changes

⁵⁵ P. 479.

the *ῥαββεῖ* or *διδάσκαλε* of Mark into *κύριε*. Here again the former was sufficiently respectful. Another motive must have come into play. What this is may be inferred from the fact that this change is not indiscriminately made but only, and regularly, where the disciples address Jesus (with the exception of xxvi.49, the *ῥαββεῖ* of the traitor). In cases also where Mark has no parallel, Matthew reserves this Kyrie for the true disciples (cpr. xiv.28, 30; xviii.21; xxv.37, 44; xxvi.22). Especially instructive on this point are Matt. viii.19, 21 and xxvi.22, 25. In the former the Scribe says to Jesus *διδάσκαλε* but "another of his disciples" says *κύριε*. In the latter at the Supper the true disciples say "*κύριε* is it I," but Judas "*διδάσκαλε* is it I." When Jesus is approached in a purely scholastic capacity by non-disciples Matthew carefully retains the *ῥαββεῖ* or *διδάσκαλε* of Mark (cpr. xxii.36 = Mark xii.32; xix.16 = Mark x.17; xxii.16 = Mark xii.14; xxii.24 = Mark xii.19). A further observation to be made is that Matthew introduces the Kyrie in miracle episodes (viii.2, 6, 8, 25; ix.28; xiv.28, 30; xv.22, 25, 27; xvii.15; xx.31, 33). For Matthew we may therefore formulate the rule that the true disciples and those appealing to Jesus for supernatural help address Him by means of *κύριε*. To a large extent this scheme is also followed by Luke, but not quite so consistently. Luke has in viii.24—the episode of the storm—*ἐπιστάτα*, where Mark has *διδάσκαλε*, Matthew *κύριε*. Similarly in ix.33—the transfiguration—where Mark has *ῥαββεῖ*, Matthew *κύριε*; in ix.54, *κύριε* on the lips of John, where Mark has *διδάσκαλε*, (this episode has no parallel in Matthew). No more than Matthew does Luke make the disciples say *διδάσκαλε*, even where Mark has this. The only exception to this is v.5, where Peter says *διδάσκαλε* but here obviously a difference in his state of mind before and after the miracle finds expression, for in v.8 he says *κύριε*. Elsewhere also those desiring miraculous help say in Luke *κύριε*. To this the only exception is that in ix.38, in the mouth of the father of the epileptic child,

Mark's διδάσκαλε is retained. Apart from these two exceptions, therefore, the rule holds good for Luke also that ἐπιστάτα and κύριε are forms of address characteristic of the relation of the true disciples to Jesus and expressive of the state of mind of those who appeal to Jesus' miraculous power.⁵⁶

The two observations made suggest that the additional reverence which the later Evangelists desire to convey by their use of κύριε and ἐπιστάτα is of a specifically religious complexion.⁵⁷ It is not a question of greater politeness being observed with regard to Jesus, but of some form of religious honor paid to Him. It is not so easy to determine how far this access of reverence went according to the conception of the Evangelists. Their procedure as outlined seems bound to invite the charge that they have carried back the later religious attitude of the Church towards Jesus into the minds of the witnesses of His earthly life and thus sacrificed the fidelity of the historian to their own instinct of worship. So Köhler conceives of it. But his position is not quite consistent with itself. He credits the Evangelists with sufficient historical tact to refrain from the third person Kyrios in their narrative of Jesus' life and yet implies that this tact abandoned them where they had to put on record the forms of address applied to Jesus. It might perhaps be urged in excuse of this inconsistency that the suggestion of a lack of reverence must have come to the Evangelists in a stronger degree where the words are a direct face-to-face address to Jesus, than where it is a case of objective narrative about Him. We feel, however, that there is not a sufficiently near approach to the later appellatio divina in these Gospel vocatives to justify Köhler's assumption. Beyond the bare διδάσκαλε they certainly go in the degree and tone of

⁵⁶ Luke, it will be observed, reserves ἐπιστάτα for the 'disciples, only that, besides the access of reverence, it also clearly retains the note of scholastic respect prominent in Mark's διδάσκαλε.

⁵⁷ Nowhere do the demons address Jesus with Kyrie (cpr. Mark i. 24 = Luke iv. 34; Mark v. 2 = Matt. viii. 29 = Luke viii. 28).

reverence, but the increase marked can be very real and yet remain quite consciously distinct from and below the import of the Kyrie of the later period. That the Gospel Kyrie is not meant to be fused with the latter appears from the following. The vocative Kyrie is never followed up by a *ὁ κύριος* of the Evangelist; we never read in immediate succession of somebody addressing Jesus with Kyrie and of *ὁ κύριος* as making reply to this. This holds true of Matthew on the surface. As for Luke there are a few cases in which such a sequence actually appears in the common text. In vii.13, to be sure, *ὁ κύριος* is too far removed from *κύριε* in vs. 6 to have been induced by the latter; but in x.41; xii.42; xix.8 the associative connection between vocative and nominative cannot be denied. These three passages, however, belong to the number from which Köhler, on the authority of the Syra Vetus, eliminates *ὁ κύριος*. The fact stands, therefore, that the Evangelists nowhere take occasion from the Kyrie of address to speak of Jesus as "the Lord" in their immediately subjoined words. Yet the instances in which they might have been tempted to do so are, both in Matthew and in Luke, not a few (cpr. Matt. viii.2, 8, 10, 21, 25; ix.28; xiv.28, 30; xv.22, 25, 27; xvi.22; xvii.15, xviii.21; xx.31-34; xxv.11; xxvi.22; Luke v.8, 12; ix.54, 59, 61; x.17; xi.1; xiii.23; xvii.37; xviii.41; xxii.33, 38, 49). It is not likely that they would have resisted the temptation, if the later richness of meaning had been strongly present to their minds. Especially Luke must have been clearly conscious of the great difference between the *κύριε* of address in the Gospel and the *κυριότης* which he makes Peter affirm in the Acts to have begun with the resurrection. In the Fourth Gospel also the distinction between the Kyrie of address and the *ὁ κύριος* of description remains in force. The former is freely used, the latter confined to the closing sections, chaps. xx. and xxi.

Most ground for affirming an approach to the later

pregnant meaning exists in the one case where Jesus Himself comments upon the title Kyrie as addressed to Him by apparent disciples, who none the less fail to observe His commandments (Luke vi.46) or who shall not enter into the Kingdom because they do not the will of the Father in heaven (Matt. vii.21) or by the same class of disciples in the day of judgment, who will in vain appeal to the miraculous use they have made of this name *κύριος* (vs. 22). Especially this last feature seems to anticipate the specific power afterwards ascribed to the *ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου* in the performance of miracles. But it is plain that, even from the standpoint of the Evangelists, the meaning which Jesus Himself would put into the title, when representing Himself as using it retrospectively in the day of judgment, cannot simply be identified with the sense it bears upon the lips of others in the Gospel history. Bousset⁵⁸ and Köhler⁵⁹ assume that Luke has the original form of the logion and that Matthew under the influence of later ideas has altered the sense. The Logia contained the saying only in its Lucan form. It is a question, however, whether even the *κύριε* in the Lucan version can be reduced to the level of the mere teaching authority of Jesus. The "not doing", with which those who employ it are reproached, points rather to a sovereignty of different character. The teacher may expect that his disciples will learn and receive; the *κύριος* who here speaks demands that His followers shall do. It is far from certain that Matthew has essentially changed the meaning.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 63, 103, note 5. Bousset thinks the *κύριε κύριε* in Matthew is cult address.

⁵⁹ Pp. 483 ff. Köhler would interpret Luke vi. 46 as a sharp condemnation on the part of Jesus of the mere conventional formula of politeness, *κύριε*, and puts the saying on a line with Mark x. 17—the repudiation of the phrase "good master." As to Matt. vii. 21, this is a later polemic against the misuse of Joel iii, 5 by a certain class of Pauline Christians. The phraseology of the passage and that of the passage from Joel are too different to render this plausible.

⁶⁰ Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Matthäi*, p. 33, makes use of the

The fact then remains that to the Evangelists Kyrie occupies an intermediate position between the respectful address of the disciple to his teacher and the worshipful invocation of their divine Lord by the later Christians. It is not an unhistorical duplicate of the latter. The further question, whether, while not guilty of this graver anachronism, they perhaps even so put more into the title than they had historical warrant for, can only be considered together with the problem of the Aramaic original lying back of the Greek word.

Bousset enlists in support of his view the linguistic difficulty of pointing out an Aramaic original for the New Testament δ $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as applied to Jesus. He dwells on this at some length in his *Nachträge* in order to expose the easy-going raisonnement of Wernle, who appears to be scarcely conscious of the existence of a problem here.⁶¹ Althaus recognizes the problem, but does not think Bousset's sceptical attitude justified by the facts.⁶² According to Dalman, to whom all parties defer as an authority in such matters, the word "Mar" usually supposed to underlie $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, in distinction from "Rab", the original for $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon$, occurs both with reference to God and to men.⁶³ The king is so addressed (Dan. iv.6). The master of a slave, the possessor of a pearl are Mare in these relations. Mar appears as a form of respectful address from the layman to the learned, or from one scholar to another.

difference between the two versions for determining the relative date of Mark and the Logia. The Logia knows the address by means of Kyrie, whereas the older Mark still knows only $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon$. As it may be seen from this, Wellhausen differs from Bousset and Köhler in his interpretation of Luke vi.46. He finds in it the higher meaning of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

⁶¹ *Nachträge*, pp. 66 ff.

⁶² Pp. 530 ff.

⁶³ *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 146 ff; 266 ff. Zahn (*Einleitung*, i. p. 46) and, quoting him, Köhler, p. 472 refer to מָר, a transliterated Semitic form of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as possibly current in Biblical times. Dalman, who himself at one time thought this possible (*Der Gottesname Adonai*, pp. 81, 84) now declares this a usage found only in the latest Targums (*Die Worte Jesu*, p. 268).

David receives this title from Abigail, also secular rulers from their subjects, Moses from Joshua. According to a certain tradition King Jehoshaphat was accustomed to greet every learned man with the complex title Rabbi, Rabbi, Mari, Mari.⁶⁴ In one place Rabbi uMari occurs by way of address to the Messiah. The word could also be employed in addressing God, Elahi uMari "my God and my Lord"; "Maran in the heavens"; Maran "our Lord"; Mareikon "your Lord"; Mareiha "her Lord", i.e., of the congregation of Israel.

Apart from the one case in Daniel, these instances are all, so far as the literary attestation is concerned, later than the Gospels. Bousset on this account disputes their admissibility in evidence of a Palestinian equivalent for the Gospel *κύριος*. That the latter has no real connection with any such use of Mare, he further concludes from the fact that Mare, as was already largely the case with the Old Testament Adon, never appears absolutely but always with a determining genitive or suffix, no matter whether used of God or of men. Where the Syriac Bible has the absolute Mare for God, the Jewish authorities cited by Dalman furnish no analogy for this. God is not "Lord" absolutely but "Lord of somebody." Only in the Babylonian Talmud there seems to be a partial exception to this. Now Bousset maintains that, inasmuch as *ὁ κύριος* in the New Testament is used of Christ without determination, it cannot be a reproduction of determinate forms of Mar, but must be explained as an independent Hellenistic growth. In Hellenistic circles the absolute *ὁ κύριος* appears as a divine titulation.

The question is whether, assuming with the old view an original Palestinian "Lord" with suffixes, it is impossible to conceive that in the evolution of the usage the suffix might have been dropped. This would have had to happen either before or in the act of the passage of the title into Greek. As to the former, although the Aramaic idiom

⁶⁴ Mari is conjecturally emended out of Mori by Dalman.

was against it, the possibility cannot be denied a priori. The expansive force of the term acquired from the stupendous new experiences of the disciples with regard to Jesus, especially after the resurrection, may have overcome the mere technicality of idiom. Beginning with Mari, Maran, the early Church may have learned to feel that the determination by suffix was out of keeping with the absoluteness of the sovereignty ascribed to Jesus (cpr. Acts x.36 οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος). Or, if the Palestinian Church continued to speak of Mari, Maran, the same motive may, together with the influence of Greek idiom, have brought about the change when the title passed over onto Greek soil. These are mere surmises, but Bousset's assumption of the impossibility of such a development has no better claim to acceptance. His argument makes altogether too much of the absence of the suffix in the New Testament. He thinks that if these Greek forms were renderings of an Aramaic usage, then some trace at least of the suffix that invariably accompanied the latter ought to have been preserved. We believe sufficient traces have been preserved to make a previous Aramaic currency of the title plausible, as we shall see presently. But, even if these should be all differently explained, as Bousset attempts to do, and be no real remnants of Aramaic idiom, even then the uniform suffixless usage of the New Testament would require no other explanation than that the suffix had been dropped in the Aramaic speaking Palestinian Church itself, so that the Greek version could not preserve any trace of it. To be sure, Bousset is not willing to reckon with this even as a possibility. He considers only the view that rendering into Greek eliminated the suffixes. To this he objects that the retention of the suffixes could not have offended against Greek idiom.⁶⁵ Althaus judges differently. He observes: "In Greek either the sense of the value of the ever changing suffixes was lost, or the constant use of the suffixes

⁶⁵ *Nachträge*, p. 22.

was felt to be foreign to Greek idiom."⁶⁶ The data collected by Bousset himself suggest that there may be more in this question of Greek idiom than he is willing to concede. Among all the instances of the religious use of *κύριος* he quotes from Hellenistic pagan documents there is not a single one which shows the word combined with a suffix.⁶⁷ In the New Testament no such uniformity prevails; the usage is at least mixed; why should it be thought impossible that the difference is due to the presence of a Semitic original in the one case and its absence in the other? And if this were the case, would it not naturally explain the mixed phenomena of the New Testament, the Aramaic idiom persisting in certain cases, dropping out in others? We do not mean to say that exclusively linguistic motives lie at the bottom of the difference. Deep-rooted religious idiosyncrasies probably stand back of and express themselves in the linguistic usage, the Semite, particularly the Jew, and still more the Christian, emphasizing the personal or collective ownership of the worshipper in the deity, the pagan Hellenistic consciousness lacking the sense of this. But this would be only one more reason why in the passing over of the title onto Greek soil, the linguistic motive could not uniformly prevail, being checked by the counterforce of religious feeling. At the same time, neither could it be expected that the religious impulse in favor of a continued use of the suffix should have entirely overborne the sense of idiom. For in all likelihood, as above observed, the latter in its turn had the support of a religious consideration of a different character, the tendency towards conceiving of the lordship of Jesus as absolute.

In order to give concrete shape to the above reason-

⁶⁶ P. 519.

⁶⁷ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 111-118. According to Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 267, in the syncretistic cults of Cilicia and Syria *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν* occurs. Althaus, p. 520, would explain this from a Semitic original lying back of such cases, or from imitation of a Semitic way of speaking.

ing, let us examine for a moment the instances of a pronominally determined *κύριος* in the New Testament in which traces of an Aramaic basis might be discovered. The form Maranatha here first of all comes to mind. It is claimed by Althaus and Wernle as direct evidence of the custom of the primitive Palestinian Church to speak of Jesus as Maran "our Lord."⁶⁸ In *Kyrios Christos*⁶⁹ Bousset parried this argument by assuming that the form Maranatha originated in the bilingual Church of Antioch. It would then prove nothing as to the existence of the same word in the oldest Palestinian Church; the Aramaic speaking Christians at Antioch would simply have borrowed it from their Greek speaking fellow Christians who used the absolute *ὁ κύριος*, and in accordance with their idiom would have added the suffix. This reasoning was unsatisfactory because it gave no explanation of the value attached by Paul to the strange sounding word in writing to Greek speaking Christians. If this word by its very outlandish, mysterious form was to remind them of its sacred origin and use in the mother-Church at Jerusalem, we can account for the solemnity with which Paul introduces it, whereas no similar preference for the Aramaic could have been shown, if side by side in Antioch the Greek and Aramaic forms had been current. Provenience from the mother-Church is also assumed by Zahn,⁷⁰ who suggests that Paul in I Cor. xvi.22 has in mind the Cephass people and for this reason uses, side by side with anathema, a formula which by its very sound would be familiar to them. Althaus further observes that the occurrence of Maranatha in the Didache falls in with the theory of Palestinian origin, since the Didache-prayers with their "hosanna", "maranatha" and "amen" point to an Aramaic environment, although the Didache itself comes from a Gentile-Christian environ-

⁶⁸ Althaus, p. 517; Wernle, p. 20.

⁶⁹ Pp. 98 ff.

⁷⁰ *Einleitung*², i, p. 216.

ment.⁷¹ Bousset now in his *Nachträge*⁷² abandons his original view of Syriac Gentile-Christian origin of the formula and strikes out an altogether new path. Maranatha is simply a Jewish oath-formula, like "Korban." As a Jewish formula it refers, of course, to God; He, not the Messiah, is the "Maran" to whom it makes appeal. Consequently Maranatha loses all bearing on the Kyrios-Christos controversy.

We cannot feel that this new explanation is more satisfactory than Bousset's former proposal. It does not account for Paul's preference for the Aramaic form. Nor does it seem possible that the Apostle, to whom *ὁ κύριος* is everywhere else the Lord Jesus and the Lord Jesus the Judge, should in this solemn connection have meant it not of Christ but of God. This is not saying, of course, that Bousset's identification of Maranatha with an old Jewish formula of swearing is wrong. In itself, though unverified, it sounds plausible enough. Only, if adopting it, we should still regard it probable that a special Christian adaptation had been given to the formula which substituted for the Maran-Jehovah the Maran-Christ. The closing words of the Apocalypse *ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ* (Rev. xxii.20) sound like a Greek rendering of Maranatha, which likewise supports the later, if not the original, reference to Jesus.⁷³ Of course, Bousset's present view admits of modification in this direction, that the transfer of Maranatha from God to Christ could be considered a Hellenistic or Pauline process. In that case its value as proof of the currency of the Kyrios-title in the oldest Palestinian

⁷¹ P. 517. As a further feature pointing to Palestine Zahn has called attention to the phrase *ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων* in the prayer of Did.x. The phrase presupposes a land whose fields lie on the mountains.

⁷² Pp. 22, 23.

⁷³ Bousset remarks on this, *Nachträge*, p. 23, note 1: "In Rev. xxii, 20 no translation of Maranatha need be found." We admit no absolute necessity exists, but the connection is certainly highly probable.

Church would be lost. Against this, however, speaks the retention by Paul of the Aramaic form, which invests this form with a solemnity hardly derivable from any other source than the mother-Church. So long as no better explanation is offered we may appeal to Maranatha not merely as evidence against Bousset's hypothesis in general, but also as an example of the peculiar form of combination with a suffix in which the title was at first current.⁷⁴

The suffix also appears in John xx.13, when Mary Magdalene speaks of Jesus as "my Lord" and in vs. 28 where Thomas addresses Jesus as *ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου*. Writers like Bousset, however, will be loath to recognize reminiscences of Aramaic idiom in the Fourth Gospel. But no objection can lie against an appeal to the Pauline usage, which almost without exception adds *ἡμῶν* in cases where there is added to *ὁ κύριος* the name *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. Bousset who carefully tabulates the instances and explains the apparent exceptions, admitting only Phil. iii.20 and II Thess. iii.12 as real exceptions, thinks he can account for this phenomenon from consideration of stylistic euphony, so that it would have nothing to do with an underlying Aramaic idiom.⁷⁵ The *ἡμῶν* simply serves the purpose of keeping apart the accumulated titles. A confirmation of this he finds in the fact that *ἡμῶν* is omitted by Paul where the formula *θεὸς πατὴρ ἡμῶν* precedes *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.⁷⁶ This observation may be correct so far as the omission of the pronoun in the latter case is concerned, but does not settle the question as to the ulterior provenience of the shorter

⁷⁴ Bousset's first view also might have been given this turn that the formula originated in Antioch, was afterwards adopted by the mother-Church, so that Palestinian currency would not prove Palestinian origin of either the formula or the Kyrios conception implied. But this again would leave the solemnity attaching to the Aramaic sound unaccounted for.

⁷⁵ *Nachträge*, pp. 20 ff.

⁷⁶ Exceptions Eph. vi.23 and possibly Gal. i. 3; I Thess. i. 1; II Thess. i. 1.

formula. This sounds very liturgical and probably was derived from and held in common use by Paul with the mother-Church. While nothing certain can be determined as to this, Bousset certainly has not shown that his own explanation is more than a bare possibility. If Paul in the fuller formula was dependent on Palestinian usage, he may have deferred to Greek idiom in the simple *ὁ κύριος* which appears with him almost always without suffix.⁷⁷

The insistence that the suffix shall reappear in every case where an Aramaic original lies back of the Greek is not warranted by the instances where *κύριε* occurs in the Gospels as a mere formula of politeness. Unless this is entirely unhistorical, there must have been a suffix in the original, and yet it has disappeared in the translation. Bousset himself does not categorically deny that in single cases a Gospel *κύριε* may rest on Mari or Maran, and in doing so admits at least the possibility of the dropping off of the pronoun.⁷⁸

In Luke i.43 ("the mother of my Lord") also the suffix has been preserved. Even if this be not admitted as historical, it reflects at least Luke's consciousness of the necessity of the suffix in the Aramaic form.

The point might be urged that, apart from Paul, the cases where a possible Aramaic suffix might be traced are so few and the cases without the suffix so much more numerous as to decide the question against us. So far as the Gospels are concerned such an argument will hardly stand. The number of cases where the suffix had a chance to assert itself in the Gospels is not very large. Of course the *ὁ κύριος* of the Evangelists here must remain out of consideration.⁷⁹ We can reckon only with the tradition

⁷⁷ Exceptions I Tim. i. 14; II Tim. i. 8. Bousset discounts these because they occur in the Pastoral Epistles.

⁷⁸ *Nachträge*, p. 17, note 2.

⁷⁹ This is true even if Köhler's wholesale elimination of these cases be not approved. The Evangelists in their narrative follow contemporary Hellenistic *usus loquendi* and could not be expected to preserve traces of an old Aramaic form.

material that has come down from a Palestinian milieu and as such might have carried with itself the mark of a Palestinian Kyrios-usage in the appended suffix. As we have seen the third-person *ὁ κύριος* occurs only in one passage of Mark (xi.3), nowhere in the Logia, once in Matthew (xxi.3), twice in Luke (i.43; xix.31). As a matter of fact then, apart from the vocatives, there are actually only two passages, the one peculiar to Luke, the other common to the three Synoptics, in which the suffix had a chance to project itself out of the Aramaic into the Greek text. In one of these two cases it does appear in the Greek, in the other case it does not. As for the vocatives here the Greek idiom must have spoken so strongly as to preclude from the outset the preservation of the Aramaic suffix.⁸⁰

The title Rabbi, Rabban, does not in the translation into Greek retain its suffix but is rendered in the Gospels by the simple *διδάσκαλε*. Yet here the pronoun was as indispensable in the original as in the case of Mar. We have here, therefore, an exact analogy for the disappearance of the suffix in the latter. Bousset urges that the two cases are not analogous, because Rabbi and Rabban through frequent use had become so worn as to cause the force of the suffix to be no longer felt in them.⁸¹ Mar on the other hand, if it was in use at all, as a title of respect must have been rare; consequently the attrition of the suffix could not have operated here to the same degree. In answer to this it may be said that there are no certain data to determine the frequency of Mar either in secular or religious relations. Bousset infers its rareness as a teacher's title from Matt. xxiii.7 ff; but it is doubtful whether we are warranted in finding here a complete list

⁸⁰ In Thomas' exclamation, John xx. 28, the nominative takes the place of the vocative, which rendered the retention of the pronoun easier. Besides, this is more than a passing vocative of address. It is a confession.

⁸¹ According to Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, p. 274) the suffix in Rabbi was not quite meaningless before the 3d or 4th century after Christ.

of all scholastic titles of respect. Bousset's own modified view as to Maranatha, making it a common Jewish oath-formula, implies a relatively great frequency at least of Maran in its religious application to God and would suggest that in that relation the suffix cannot have been over-strongly felt. And if it was not, the same lack of feeling for it would be apt to extend to Mari and Maran in secular or semi-religious use. Even if Bousset's contention as to the fundamental difference between Rab and Mar in this matter were granted, it ought to be remembered that the omission of the suffixes from Rabbi, Rabban, in the process of translation into Greek, might have affected other analogous terms of respect, even though in that case there was less of attrition of the force of the suffix in the original. Finally it should be noted that in Matt. xxiii.9, *πατήρ*, which appears as an honorific scholastic title, side by side with the transliterated *ῥαββεῖ*, also lacks the possessive pronoun, although it is certain that in the Aramaic the Ab must have been supplied with the appropriate suffix.

We may now return to the question whether the Evangelists lie open to the charge of having put an historically impossible meaning into their Kyrie. The answer to this is frequently staked on the other question, whether they had a separate Aramaic word, distinct from Rabbi = *διδάσκαλε*, to bear them out in this. If Mari was in use side by side with Rabbi, then the alternating *κύριε-διδάσκαλε* is supposed to be historically justified. This is not, however, a satisfactory way of putting the problem. For it is undeniable, at any rate on the basis of the two-document hypothesis, that Matthew and Luke have in several instances changed the Rabbi—*διδάσκαλε* of Mark into *κύριε*; in these cases, therefore, the historical correctness of their procedure is entirely independent of the possible currency of Mari. If it were unwarranted here, the further question whether perhaps in other cases, where they cannot be controlled by Mark, their Kyrie rests on

Mari or on Rabbi loses its importance. Assuming κύριε to carry more meaning than διδάσκαλε, the warrant for introducing it in place of the latter will have to rest on the possible import of the Rabbi lying back of διδάσκαλε. The whole question therefore resolves itself into two parts: first, in heightening the sense of the address from διδάσκαλε to κύριε did the later Evangelists go beyond the range of meaning possible to Rabbi? And secondly, in the other cases, not controllable by Mark, is there any reason to assume that the basis of their rendering was not the same? Did they here also render an original Rabbi by Kyrie, or was their basis in some cases Mari?⁸²

In trying to answer the first of these questions the following should be remembered. Rabbi or Rabban, which Mark renders by διδάσκαλε, is not a term exclusively expressive of scholastic respect, so that Mark's rendering would be the only allowable one. The word has no such restricted range of meaning. It is used in a

⁸² Resch (*Logia Jesu* according to Dalman p. 269) traces every Kyrie in the Gospels back to Rabbi, considering it a mere variant for διδάσκαλε; in other words he denies the access of reverence which others discover in Kyrie. Bousset considers the Kyrie in Matthew and Luke due to the substitution of the later religious Kyrios idea for the quite differently complexioned Rabbi which the disciples actually used. While Resch saves the fidelity of the Evangelists, he lowers the import of Kyrie; Bousset heightens the latter but sacrifices to it the historicity of the representation. He is, however, willing to admit that perhaps, in some isolated case, the Kyrie may have historic background and represent a Mari or Maran, not as synonymous with Rabbi but merely as a general title of respect more widely applied which as such might have occasionally been addressed also to a teacher (*Nachträge*, p. 17). Köhler also occupies the same general position; Rabbi and διδάσκαλε are to him the historical thing; in Mark and the *Logia* there is no trace of anything but the Kyrie of common politeness; the Kyrie of the other Evangelists reflects the later high religious meaning of the phrase κύριος Ἰησοῦς (pp. 482 ff.). A different view of the matter is taken by Dalman and Althaus. Both assume that, side by side with Rabbi, the term Mari played a rôle in the intercourse of Jesus with others and that this Mari did not only carry the sense of common politeness but also that of specific respect for a teacher (Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 269 ff.; Althaus, pp. 531 ff.).

great variety of applications where the elements of obedience and unqualified submission stand more in the foreground than in the relation between disciple and teacher, which is largely colored by the notion of respect. Dalman⁸³ tells us that besides designating the teacher, Rab is, in certain cases, the equivalent of Nasi, Baal, Allaph, Saris, Sar, Ab, for all of which references are cited from the Targum of Onkelos. It also occurs elsewhere for the leader of a caravan and a prince of demons. By the Samaritans it is addressed to God. Dalman also observes, however, that there is no Aramaic example of its denoting "lord" over against the servant. As to Rabban (derivative from Rab; the ending it not the suffix but intensive), this has a similar variety of applications; it stands for a military captain in the Targum of Onkelos; then it is used in the second century after Christ for "the patriarch" (the head of the Jewish community = *ἐθνάρχης*); still later it becomes the equivalent of Rab; its plural always served as plural of the latter.⁸⁴ In Palestinian Aramaic Rabban was changed into Ribbon, a form which the later Jews reserved for God. From all of which Dalman concludes that Rabbi was "a more than ordinarily respectful mode of address, whose import is by no means fully reproduced by the Greek *διδάσκαλε*." "My ruler" would be a more adequate translation. The one called Rabbi is thereby recognized as superior in rank to the speaker. A close analogy is furnished by the Latin "magister", which also designates superiors of the most various kind, and then becomes specialized in the sense of "teacher." If we may assume that the variety of import, disclosed by this latitude of application of Rabbi and due to the etymological force of the word, was capable of being felt in biblical times, then the disciples may very well have associated with their address of Jesus as Rabbi, Rabban, a deeper and differently

⁸³ *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 274 ff.

⁸⁴ The natural plural of Rab, Rabbin, had only the appellative meaning "great ones."

complexioned reverence and devotion than the average scribal pupil would yield to the average teacher of the law. The uniqueness of the relation involved is recognized by Matt. xxiii.8 ("One is your Master, Christ"), a uniqueness no less absolute than that of the religious father-relation when predicated of God (vs.9). Nor should it be overlooked in this connection that already in the ordinary use of Rabbi the elements of authority and submission are more prominent than in the modern term "teacher."

In view of all this there is no occasion to charge Matthew and Luke with a lack of historical fidelity, when, where the disciples or applicants for miraculous help are concerned, they turn Mark's διδάσκαλε into κύριε. In doing this they commit no anachronism, but simply emphasize that element in the mental attitude of such persons towards Jesus which the name "teacher" did not fully cover. The "Master" of our English Bible is a partial attempt in the same direction.⁸⁵ The flexible term Kyrie, uniting in itself the expression of non-religious and religious states of feeling in varying degrees of mixture, was admirably suited to such a purpose. It is not possible absolutely to determine with what degree or quality of reverence the title, according to the understanding of the Evangelists, was in each case fraught to the disciples. It may have been only slightly exceeding the usual devotion of a disciple for his teacher. And again it may have bordered upon specifically religious worship. In cases of the latter kind there would be every warrant for saying that a solid basis was laid, even in the Rabbi of the pre-resurrection intercourse, for the Kyrie of post-resurrection Christendom.

But, although the antiquity of the Kyrios-relation, so

⁸⁵ A. V. and the Original Revision put "Master" for Rabbi and διδάσκαλε, but do not discriminate between the disciples and others, whereas Matthew and Luke make the disciples and applicants for miraculous help say Kyrie, the others διδάσκαλε. The American Revision renders uniformly "teacher" except in cases where Luke has ἐπιστάτα which it renders by "Master."

far as its substance is concerned, does not depend on the use of Mari, Maran by the disciples, it remains, of course, possible that the same import that could be put into Rabbi was also expressed by the other term, and that by its peculiar associations this term contributed a share of its own to the early development of the Kyrios-concept. To what extent Mari, Maran, lies back of Kyrie is hard to determine. Dalman, as we have seen, affirms it on the basis of the evidence in the later Jewish literature, which proves for Mare both a scholastic and a specific religious use. Even in regard to Luke vi.46, we cannot be sure of this. The repetition of Kyrie does not necessarily postulate any other term than Rabbi; for, according to Dalman, Jewish tradition represents King Jehoshaphat as greeting every learned master with Rabbi, Rabbi, Mari, Mari.⁸⁶ It is only in connection with Matt. vii.21, 22, that κύριε, κύριε, in the Lucan passage requires an interpretation which Rabbi seems scarcely quite able to support. In vs. 22 the situation is eschatological, the κύριε, κύριε, is uttered in the day of judgment, and the activities appealed to have been done ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι of this Kyrios. Matthew's understanding of the Kyrie, Kyrie, in vs. 21 cannot, of course, have been different from this understanding of it in vs. 22. For those who believe that Matthew gives a correct, though fuller, version of Luke vi.46, this is decisive; it will presuppose to them a use of Mar in the mouth of Jesus which fully anticipates the later Church usage. Only this constitutes no proof for those who, like Bousset and Köhler, believe that Matthew under the influence of the later development has altered the meaning which the saying had in the Logia, whereas Luke has correctly preserved it. Equally unavailing is the argumentation from John xiii.13 ("ye call me διδάσκαλον καὶ κύριον"). Here the two Greek words presuppose two corresponding Aramaic terms with different shades of meaning, and we believe the Evangelist

⁸⁶ *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 268.

to be correct in assuming these. But according to Bousset the Evangelist was under a misapprehension. He formed the saying on the basis of Matt. x.24 ("the disciple is not above his διδάσκαλος nor the servant above his κύριος"). Overlooking the parabolic nature of the statement the Fourth Evangelist found here the double title διδάσκαλος and κύριος predicated of Jesus. It was not historic information but familiarity with the κύριος of the Church-language that led him into the mistaken exegesis.

If these instances leave the matter uncertain, there are some other considerations which add to the probability of the partial dependence of the Gospel-Kyrios on Mar. Jesus, as we have seen, predicates of Himself a Messianic sovereignty and lordship. In the cases where this occurs, certainly Mar rather than Rab or any other term would have been the appropriate word for Him to use. And it is all the more plausible to put Mar back of this because all three of the Synoptics pointedly differentiate between the expression of this idea in Mk. xi.3 (and parallels) and the mere objectivation of the teacher Rabbi in Mk. xiv.14 (and parallels). At the entry they make Jesus say: "ὁ κύριος has need of him"; in the injunction to prepare the passover they make him say: "ὁ διδάσκαλος saith." Here even Mark, who everywhere else has διδάσκαλος, employs κύριος and he must have had a good reason for it. Mar is the one who has the sovereign disposal of the animal; Rab is the one of whom the goodman of the house is to be reminded as the teacher or master of the disciples. We cannot agree with Althaus,⁸⁷ who thinks that the two situations are exactly alike, for in the one case the point is to justify a use of property, in the other to identify the person who makes a request. It is quite true, of course, that there remains a wide difference between "the lord of something" on the one hand, and "the Lord" as a Messianic conception or title on the other hand.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ P. 532.

⁸⁸ Bousset seems to us to exaggerate the difference, when he described it as "himmelweit," *Nachträge*, p. 18.

Still such isolated affirmations of Jesus' Messianic ownership in regard to particular persons or things (the Sabbath, the colt, David), especially when coupled with the suggestion of a wider range of this right, as they are in the "Sabbath saying" and in the "Lord of David" pericope, could hardly fail to prepare the disciples' minds for the conception of Jesus as Mar in the absolute sense. In the parabolic material of the Gospels also Mar may have been the term for the *κύριος* of the servants. Some of these representations are the exclusive property of Matthew and Luke (Matt. x.24, 25; xxv.1-13; 31-46; Luke xii.36, 37; xiii.25); in some "the lord" spoken of is conceived as God and not as Jesus (Matt. xxi.33-44 = Luke xx.9-18; Matt. xxii.1-13 = Luke xiv. 16-23). But other material of this kind is common to both Evangelists (Matt. xxiv. 45-51 = Luke xii. 42-48; Matt. xxv. 14-30 = Luke xix. 12-27). And Matt. xxiv.42 is covered by Mark xiii.35. Whatever Gospel critics may think of this material in general, there is enough vouched for by Matthew and Luke (and Mark) to render the elimination of all of it as secondary, in the sense of post-Palestinian, exceedingly precarious. And in the majority of these passages "the lord" is plainly Jesus, and that in an eschatological situation. It is not a case of the mere comparison of Jesus to a lord of servants, but the conception of His lordship over the disciples fills out the whole background. Now this way of alluding to Himself as "lord of servants" must have been equally suggestive to the disciples as the direct references to Messianic ownership previously commented upon. How far the remembrance of it entered into and affected their mode of addressing Jesus with Rabbi, Rabban, or Mari, Maran, we are not able to tell. But that it paved the way for the subsequent Kyrios-appellation there can be no reasonable doubt.

Another word that comes under consideration as a possible Semitic equivalent for *κύριος* is the Hebrew Adon. A point of contact for this would lie in the use made of

Psa. cx.1 both by Jesus and by the early disciples, for here the Messiah is found represented as the Adon of David.⁸⁹ As Althaus expresses it,⁹⁰ "after once the exaltation of Jesus had been found back in Psa. cx, there was added to the Aramaic Mar the Hebrew Adoni as a possible expression of the faith of Jesus' lordship." Altogether apart from Jesus' use of the Psalm, which some think unhistorical, as soon as the disciples themselves began to reflect upon its implications, they would employ it in their testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus. It need not follow from this that Adon, any more than Mar, became from the outset a fully developed title; its first use may have been that of a predicate. Complicated is the further question which is connected with this, whether the combination of the two forms of Adon in the first verse of the Psalm could have carried the suggestion of a transfer of the Adonai—dignity of God to Jesus and so have become one of the causes of the identification of the Kyrios—Christ with the Kyrios—God, which plays so large a role in the New Testament. This question depends for its answer on the fixing of the precise date at which Adonai became a substitute for Jehovah in the reading of the Old Testament. According to Dalman it is certain that

⁸⁹ With such an Adon the appropriate suffix would have to be postulated no less than with Mar or Rab. In Mark xii. 36 (and parallels) the suffix appears "The Lord said to my Lord." But in vs. 37 (and parallels) apparently the absolute form emerges: αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον. To understand this as applying the absolute title ὁ κύριος to Jesus might invite the charge that the whole representation is Hellenistically influenced. Even for God the suffixless form Ha Adon is rare in the Old Testament (Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonai*, 1889, pp. 12, 13). The Aramaic Mar never appears absolutely when applied to God. Moreover, if the starting-point of the application of Adon to Jesus lay in the Adoni of Psa. cx.1, then the likelihood is that the suffix was retained. The words λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον probably mean even to the Greek writing Evangelists no more than that David calls Him Lord with reference to himself, i.e. his Lord. The Aramaic basis will have had the suffix. The Greek translator found this superfluous because the subject David carried the necessary reference of the lordship to David within itself.

⁹⁰ P. 531.

the sacred tetragram had ceased to be pronounced before the time of Jesus. This is not equivalent, however, to saying that its place was taken everywhere at that date by Adonai. According to Geiger⁹¹ the original Jewish practice, which always remained the Samaritan practice, was to read for Jehovah everywhere Shema. Then the use of Adonai as an equivalent would be a secondary development brought about by translating back into the Hebrew Adonai the $\delta\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ of the Septuagint. In the Septuagint this $\delta\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ would then have to be considered as the direct equivalent of Jehovah, and not of an intermediate Adonai substituted for Jehovah previously to the origin of the Septuagint, as has been commonly assumed. Dalman dismisses this view of Geiger as incapable of proof.⁹² He believes that as early as the time of Jesus in the public reading of the Scriptures in the Temple and in the Targum-reading in the synagogue the substitution of Adonai had already taken place, but that in private quotation from the Old Testament Adonai was not so employed; either the Hebrew "Hashem" or the Aramaic "Shema" here took the place of Jehovah. Bousset is unwilling to go so far because the statements of the Mishna, on which Dalman bases his opinion, speak only of the usage in the Temple, and therefore prove the practice in question to have existed only before the Temple was destroyed and do not necessarily carry it back to the days of Jesus.⁹³ This difference is immaterial for our present purpose. Dalman and Bousset agree in this that Jesus and the early Palestinian disciples in quoting Psalm cx as private persons would not have quoted it in the form "Adonai" said to Adoni, but either "Shema" or "Hashem" said to Adoni. Therewith, of course, the whole suggestive association between the Messianic title and the divine name Adonai, so far as it depended on sound, disappeared. But,

⁹¹ *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iii, p. 261.

⁹³ *Nachträge*, p. 19, note 1.

even if this denial of the popular private use of Adonai for Jehovah in Old Testament quotations should be disputed, the further question arises whether in the Psalm Adonai as a name for God and the form of Adon predicated of the Messiah were identical in their vocalisation and thus capable of suggesting for the latter the import of an appellatio divina. Dalman declares the non-differentiation of the divine Adonai and the other form of Adon at the time of Jesus possible. As regards vocalisation, therefore, the one Adonai might have communicated its import to the other. But, as already stated, Dalman believes this excluded in the case of Jesus and the disciples because they did not use Adonai for God at all. Further, according to Dalman as well as Bousset the whole process of transferring the lordship of God to Jesus on the basis of the identity of titles is conceivable only on Hellenistic ground, for there and there only was the absolute form *ὁ κύριος* current with reference to both God and Christ. In Aramaic speaking circles it did not exist in regard to either.⁹⁴ In deferring to this judgment of an expert it is not necessary to rule out absolutely all pre-Hellenistic or extra-Hellenistic transfer of Old Testament Jehovah attributes or predicates to the Messiah. Even linguistic association, apart from Adonai, need not have been entirely excluded. If God was called Maran, although we are told this appellation was rare,⁹⁵ and Jesus was called

⁹⁴ Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 147: "The significant transition from the divine name Jahve to the divine name 'Lord' has not taken place on the soil of Hebraistic Judaism; it belongs to the sphere of Jewish Hellenism, and from the latter entered into the usage of the Church, also of the Semitic-speaking Church." This, on Dalman's own premises would strictly apply only to the absolute form 'Lord' (without suffix) and to the popular way of speaking. If in the Temple and synagogue Adonai was substituted for Jehovah and a similar form of Adon used for the Messiah, then the possibility of a Hebraistic (Jewish or Christian) identification of the two is not a priori excluded. The divine name and the Messianic title would both have had the suffix and been understood as "my Lord", and this would have differentiated the usage from the absolute Hellenistic one.

⁹⁵ Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 148, 271. If Maranatha was oath-formula, it cannot have been so very rare.

Maran, then the similarity of names could be found significant. But entirely apart from linguistic influence, there may have existed, as Althaus observes,⁹⁶ other causes of a material kind that favored the close association of Jesus with Jehovah. "In Jesus the exercise of the functions of the Old Testament covenant God had been experienced."

Bousset quotes with approval Böhlig's observation that *κύριος* as a Messianic title does not occur in the earlier Jewish literature.⁹⁷ The instance usually quoted from Test. xii Patr., Benj. xii is held to be no exception because here a Christian redaction is assumed. To this it may be replied that on Bousset's own present view the title "Son of God" had no place in the Jewish Christology and yet was early in use among Christians. Christian usage was not tied down in its Messianic terminology to the Jewish way of speaking. It must have made an immense difference for the evolution of Christological terms whether the Messiah was a future person or a reality whose sovereignty and power had been experienced by his followers. The real experience would call for appropriate forms of expression, even though the previous purely abstract belief in the same thing had remained unformulated.⁹⁸ Moreover according to Dalman,⁹⁹ at least in the later Jewish literature Rabbi uMari appears as addressed to the Messiah. That the idea of the Messiah's lordship was unknown to pre-Christian Judaism, Böhlig and Bousset themselves would scarcely assert. The argumentation from Ps. cx, if it has an anti-Judaistic point, presupposes the opposite, for it implies acknowledgement of the Messiah's lordship over David on the part of the Jews and understanding of the Psalm to that effect. But the absence of the name or formal title is of no importance; for the

⁹⁶ P. 536.

⁹⁷ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 109, note 1.

⁹⁸ Wernle, p. 7.

⁹⁹ *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 268. The quotation is from C. Sanh. 98a.

possibilities of a further Christian development the presence of the idea is the essential thing.

The discussion of the Kyrios title has brought into new relief the problems connected with three other Messianic titles, "Son of Man," "Son of God," and "*παῖς θεοῦ*." In Bousset's construction Son of Man serves to fill the vacuum created by the denial of the Palestinian provenience of the Kyrios name. It lends itself well to this purpose because of its eschatological complexion. The religious frame of mind that oriented itself by means of it was purely prospective and as such essentially distinct from the mystical experience of intercourse with a present Saviour which goes naturally with the conception of Christ as Kyrios. Thus by ascribing to the early Palestinian circle a specific Son of Man theology Bousset is able to maintain that not only the Kyrios title but also the Kyrios type of religion was as yet foreign to that generation of believers and first originated with Christian Hellenism. At the same time the Son of Man concept stands for the highest form of Jewish Messianic belief and so provides an easier transition to the subsequent high ground of the Kyrios faith than any other interpretation of Jesus. It need not then create wonder that Bousset's treatment of this title had drawn the fire of his critics. Bousset seeks to show through a comparison with Mark and the Logia that in certain passages of Mark the title has been subsequently introduced and construes this as evidence of its central place in the early Palestinian faith. It was according to him characteristic not, or at least not so certainly, of Jesus' Messianic consciousness, but of the Messianic creed of the first disciples. Wernle takes issue with him as to the secondary character of the Marcan form of these passages.¹⁰⁰ Mark viii.38 appears to him more original than Matt. x.33 and Mark x.42-45 than Luke xxii.24 ff, but he refrains from further pursuing the question of a possible growth of the Messianic element

¹⁰⁰ Pp. 7, 8.

and a corresponding increase in the use of the Son of Man title in the course of the tradition. Not whether this or any other title was more or less prevalent in the primitive Church, but whether any single title, specifically the Kyrios title, was foreign to it is the important point. Son of Man might have been the dominating conception and yet this would prove nothing as to the non-existence of Kyrios. Althaus' criticism moves in part along the same lines.¹⁰¹ He also finds Bousset's wholesale removal of the Son of Man title from the genuine sayings of Jesus unwarranted. After allowance is made for the secondary character of its occurrence in such passages as Matt. xii.32 = Luke xii.10; Matt. xvi.13, 28; xviii.11; Mark x.45 compared with Luke xxii.27; Luke vi.22; xxi.36; xxii.48, enough remains on which even the most rigorous comparative synoptical criticism can lay no hold, and when Bousset attempts to carry the process of elimination further by the method of "inner criticism", Althaus declines to follow along this subjective track. The passion predictions cannot be simply thrown out as "dogmatic," for the first of them stands in inseparable connection with the episode of Peter's rebuke and with Jesus' highly original answer. Nor can the Son of Man passages belonging to the early part of the life of Jesus be discounted simply on the ground that Son of Man was a well known Messianic title and that Jesus cannot at so early a point have openly designated Himself as Messiah. Althaus in answer to this falls back upon the occult currency and the mysterious significance of the title. He also maintains that the title must have occurred in certain sayings of Jesus before the temptation could arise to introduce it into others. The restriction of its use to Jesus' own speech and its peculiar restriction there to the third person appear hard to explain on the theory of its later entrance into the tradition. He seems to feel like Wernle that it is hardly worth while to dispute with Bousset about the place of the title in

¹⁰¹ Pp. 449 ff.

Jesus' own consciousness and career, because Bousset's sole concern seems to be with its symptomatic character as expressing the faith of the early Palestinian Church, and that the denial of its activity in the life of Jesus is entirely subservient to the theory of its predominance in the early Church. Bousset attributes much weight in support of the latter to the fact that the early disciples held to the Messianic transcendentalism from which the Son of Man title was inseparable. Althaus urges in reply that such a filling out of the form with a transcendental content may well have been due to Jesus Himself, or have taken place at least in dependence on sayings of His that pointed in that direction. That there was no compulsion of a Son of Man dogmatic in the primitive Church he seeks to show from two considerations: first the absence of the preëxistence idea from the Synoptics; secondly, according to Acts ii.36, Jesus was exalted to be Christ; if the early Church had made Jesus Son of Man and this was their central conception of Him, then the Gospels ought to express the idea of His elevation to the Messianic rank in the form that He was made Son of Man. This idea is not contained in them; they know only the exaltation of Him who was antecedently the Son of Man. The historical Jesus appears throughout as the Son of Man in spite of the fact that this was rather unsuited to the inherent transcendentalism of the Son of Man conception.

We cannot find that Bousset in his *Nachträge* has successfully met these various points of criticism.¹⁰² Even in the passages where he seeks to base the secondariness of the title on synoptical comparison and where Althaus falls in with him, the reasoning is by no means convincing. Wernle, we think, is right in giving to Mark viii.38 the priority over Matt. x.33, for as a matter of fact the distinction between the untitled Jesus of the present whom it is easy to be ashamed of and the transcendental, avowed Son of Man of the future who can acknowledge or not

¹⁰² Pp. 7 ff.

acknowledge people in the judgment is highly significant and more readily explainable from the original mind of Jesus than from a mechanical dogmatic cast of thought of the early disciples. Bousset thinks that to accept the priority of Mark's form of the saying would inevitably suggest Wellhausen's view that Jesus actually here distinguishes Himself from the Son of Man as a different future personage.¹⁰³ This, of course, is quite remote from Wernle's intention. Wernle merely means that Jesus distinguishes between two aspects of His own appearance, the present humble, and the future exalted one, and that He speaks of the latter in the third person because it seemed as yet mysterious and foreign to Him. This Bousset rejects as "a risky psychological speculation." And yet at a later point he himself attempts to explain the restriction of the use of Son of Man to Jesus' own speech from the eschatological nature of the title, which as such could not be employed in narrative about and address to the present Jesus, and therefore had to be confined to Jesus' own words, who could be made after a mysterious fashion so to designate Himself in the third person. Here the "psychological speculation" which was not allowed in regard to the consciousness of Jesus is applied to the minds of the early disciples. If the disciples felt the title to be too eschatological to apply to the earthly Jesus, why should not Jesus Himself have been guided by the same feeling? And what else but highly "psychological" is the reasoning which Bousset opposes to this assumed self-objectivation of Jesus as future Son of Man, viz., that this would imply His having reckoned with His death as a given fact from the beginning, because only Jesus' death can have appeared to Him as the mediating link between His present self and His future Son of Man self. The thesis that Jesus

¹⁰³ This view was advocated before Wellhausen by Völter, *Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, 1907. To Völter's latest publication on the Son of Man problem "*Die Menschensohn-Frage neu untersucht*", 1916, we have had no access.

would not have reckoned with His death from the beginning is largely of psychological origin.¹⁰⁴

In regard to Mark x.45 also we would incline to side with Wernle, if feeling bound to raise the question of its priority or secondariness as compared with Luke xxii.24. If, as Bousset concedes to Wernle, Luke took the passage from the Logia and interwove it with his account of the Supper, this furnishes a natural explanation of the change from "the Son of Man came to serve" to the direct form "I am among you as he that serveth." In the intimate act of the Supper the third person was less in place.

The peculiar feature that the title appears in Jesus' speech only, which in his original book Bousset had not reflected upon, remains a formidable objection to any theory that would deny the historicity of the title in the life of Jesus. Bousset now in his *Nachträge* seeks to meet this difficulty, but not, it seems to us, successfully. As stated above, the eschatological character of the title is supposed to have unsuited it for use in narrative or in address to Jesus. So nothing remained but to put it upon the lips of Jesus Himself. We have already observed that this is "psychological speculation"; but apart from this it is inadequate as an explanation. It would suffice only if in the speech of Jesus the reference were consistently eschatological. If the narrators of the tradition were so obsessed with its eschatological character that they could not bring themselves to speak or to make others speak in their narrative about the Son of Man, then why did the obsession with this idea fail to work in their account of the sayings of Jesus Himself? Jesus in a number of passages applies the title to Himself as the present Christ, nay as the humiliated and suffering Christ. That Bousset would con-

¹⁰⁴ Bousset thinks that on the principle of an evolution of faith in Jesus' function as future Judge, Matt. x. 33; Mark viii. 38; Matt. xvi. 27 ought to be placed in this sequence of priority. But the saying Matt. xix. 28 (cpr. Luke xxii. 28) whose appurtenance to the Logia Bousset admits (*Nachträge*, p. 8) proves the conception of Jesus' forensic function to be as old as the oldest accessible tradition.

sider these instances unhistorical is nothing to the point, for the problem here is to account for the tradition carrying this representation back into the life of Jesus.¹⁰⁵

Considerable force also inheres in the two other points made by Althaus, the abeyance of the preëxistence idea in the Synoptics and the non-occurrence of the idea that Jesus was made Son of Man through the exaltation. The former we would prefer to formulate differently, for it is not true in our opinion that the preëxistence idea is absent from or even excluded by the synoptical representation. In some of the passages which speak of Jesus' coming on His earthly mission and couple this with the name Son of Man it shines through clearly enough. But it is not explicitly brought forward. And this is a feature far more easily explainable, at least for those who discount the Fourth Gospel, from the consciousness of Jesus, than from the consciousness of the early Church about Jesus' person. That the disciples in bringing to bear upon Jesus the category of Son of Man, with which the idea of preëxistence is so closely interwoven, should have left this feature unutilized, is hard to believe. Bousset thinks that the memory of Jesus' earthly life with its common human features erected a barrier here. They remembered Him too much as a man to affirm His preëxistence. But, as Althaus well observes, this would have operated equally in the opposite direction; it should have proved a barrier to the transcendental eschatology. If the Son of Man was once a thoroughly eschatological figure, then there could be no hindrance to investing Him with preëxistence, His earthly life notwithstanding. The stretch of imaginative

¹⁰⁵ The absence of Son of Man in the vocative of address does not create the same difficulty from Bousset's standpoint, for he seems to hold that the exalted Jesus was not in the first Palestinian days an object of worship. He was spoken about as a past and future figure, but not spoken to as an accessible reality. If they did not address Him as Son of Man, it could not be expected that they would carry such a form of address back into the tradition. But with the objective speaking about Him it was different.

faith was no greater in one direction than in the other. And it is certainly remarkable that the preëxistence idea of Paul shows no connection with the Son of Man Christology. Had the early Palestinian Church viewed Jesus chiefly as the Son of Man without coupling with this the predicate of preëxistence, and had Paul subsequently introduced the latter as a new element, then we might expect that the vehicle for importing it would have been the Son of Man conception. That would have furnished the easiest contact with the earlier Christology.

It remains strange on Bousset's view that in the Gospels the representation of Jesus' having been made Son of Man is nowhere found. For on that view the two conditions favorable to such a form of statement were plainly given, on the one hand the purely prospective eschatological conception of the Son of Man function detached from every idea of preëxistence; on the other hand the "factitive" type of Christology. In what is considered in critical circles the primitive material in Acts, a clear distinction is drawn between the first humiliated stage and the subsequent exalted stage of Jesus' career, and the distinction is carried through in the terminology, for the name *παῖς θεοῦ* is significant of the one, the formula "made Lord and Christ" of the other. Had the designation of Son of Man been as central and characteristic of the early faith, as we are asked to believe, then the "factitive" way of speaking would have inevitably attached itself to that in preference to any other designation.

It is a curious development through which criticism has passed in regard to the Son of Man title. Not so long ago the theory of Lietzmann and others found wide acceptance according to which the name was impossible in Aramaic speech as a Messianic title, and hence must be of Greek origin sprung into being through a misunderstanding or mistranslation of a Semitic idiom which meant an individual of the human species. Now according to Bousset it was the typical name for the Messiah in the

Aramaic speaking early Church. To be sure Lietzmann and Bousset still agree in this that they are sceptical about the use of the phrase by Jesus. At least Bousset inclines to this position though not definitely committing himself. But he inclines to it on other than linguistic grounds. To him the whole conception is ancient mythological inheritance and as such not subject to petty technicalities of idiom. It is the introduction of the mythological element into New Testament science that has wrought this revolution in the treatment of the Son of Man title.

A few words may be added about the second title which Bousset, together with Kyrios, felt at first disposed to eliminate from the early Palestinian stage of belief, that of "Son of God." We say "felt disposed", for at this point he has in his *Nachträge* somewhat modified his original position. His first view was based on the prominence of *παῖς θεοῦ* in the oldest sources of Acts and the feeling that by the side of this there was no room for *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, also on the lack of evidence that "Son of God" ever figured as a Messianic title in Jewish Christology. Wernle has pointed out that Son of God is integral both in Mark and the Logia. The rare occurrence of it in Jewish writings he explains from reaction against favorite Christian use. Paul presupposes the title as known at least from the Old Testament and so the pre-Pauline Church will have treated it as known. But Bousset, Wernle feels, wants to give the Old Testament as little influence as possible. That the title should have been absent from an earlier form of Mark is incredible, because every earlier form must have contained the account of Jesus' baptism. Bousset has felt the weight of these considerations and now concedes¹⁰⁶ that Son of God is probably Palestinian. But he still continues to deny (with Dalman)¹⁰⁷ its previous existence as a Jewish Messianic title. If early Palestinian, it was spun by Christians out

¹⁰⁶ *Nachträge*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁷ *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 219 ff.

of the Old Testament. It ought to be observed, however, that Wernle's approach to the traditional view in recognizing the antiquity of the title is based on its depotentialization to a purely Messianic meaning. Bousset, because believing in its Hellenistic origin could on his earlier view fill it from the outset with a higher metaphysical content and could find this higher content represented in the Gospels. Wernle on the contrary insists upon it that Son of God is wholly equivalent to "Christ." In the great saying Matt. xi.27 "Father" and "Son" are correlated after an almost purely metaphorical fashion. Bousset explains this passage and its content in dependence on Norden from Hellenistic antecedents. Even the Pauline conception of Son of God according to Wernle does not project Jesus into the intra-divine sphere; it adds only the element of preëxistence and is on the whole explainable from Jewish Christian sources. Here, however, Wernle reaches the point where Bousset declines to follow him with further concessions. Paul's Son of God, Bousset insists, cannot, without residuum, be explained from the possible Palestinian Son of God. Paul associates with the name supramundane existence and mission from a higher world. Bousset further emphasizes that "to the popular mode of conception from the earliest time onwards . . . Son of God has passed as a single equivalent for God."¹⁰⁸ Even Mark has it also in this higher sense (cpr. xvi. 39). Finally Bousset and Wernle come together again in their unwillingness to affirm that the title Son of God descends from Jesus Himself. Wernle goes no farther than saying: "It cannot be much younger than the first vigorous ransacking of the Old Testament for the purpose of finding material for Messianic theology."¹⁰⁹ And Bousset adheres to his original position in this that Jesus never employed Son of God in a terminological sense.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ *Nachträge*, p. 8. We suppose this refers to the Hellenistic popular conception.

¹⁰⁹ P. II.

¹¹⁰ *Nachträge*, p. 5, note I.

It is not necessary to waste many words about this dispute. We have here the familiar phenomenon that either by chronology or by minimizing exegesis the values which the historic Church has attached to its denomination of Christ are made away with. If the high (so-called "metaphysical") import is recognized, then it must be later, un-Palestinian, Hellenistic. If the antiquity is recognized, then it must be reduced to the level of a purely-official metaphorical designation. Bousset's exegetical instinct certainly is right, and Wernle's historical instinct is no less right, and we may be pardoned for distrusting the historical scepticism of the former and the minimizing exegesis of the latter. To our view the high sense and the early existence of the name even in Jesus' mouth may be confidently affirmed together. If Bousset had done full justice to the transcendentalism of the Son of Man title and not insisted upon keeping it apart from every association of preëxistence, he would have been more willing to recognize the pre-Pauline "metaphysical" element in the name Son of God, for if the Palestinian Christians believed Jesus to have been preëxistent as the Son of Man, they would hardly have denied Him the same predicate in His capacity as Son of God. The associations of the two names would necessarily flow together.

The mutual exclusiveness of *παῖς θεοῦ* and *υἱὸς θεοῦ* on which Bousset at first laid stress can, of course, be urged no longer, if *υἱὸς θεοῦ* is recognized as possibly ancient Palestinian. Then the two must have existed side by side, however much the meaning might seem to be divergent. Wernle, however, has called attention to the fact that in the later references collected by Bousset from early Christian literature *παῖς θεοῦ* is wholly equivalent to *υἱὸς θεοῦ* and every connotation of "servant" is absent.¹¹¹ According to Bousset *παῖς θεοῦ* was in its early usage specifically distinct from *υἱὸς* and reproduces the subordinationistic aspect of the Messiahship in dependence

¹¹¹ Pp. 12 ff.

on the Ebed-Jahve conception of Isaiah, for which *παῖς* is the Septuagint rendering. Wernle seems inclined to extend the synonymy with *υἱός* backwards at least into the time of Mark's writing, for he explains on the basis of this the coupling together of the *υἱός* subject with the *παῖς* predicates taken from Isaiah xlii.1 in Mark's account of the baptism. Bousset in his first work had suggested that in the original form of this account the subject was *παῖς* and that Mark substituted for this the Hellenistic *υἱός*. He did not, however, follow up his own suggestion because it ran athwart a previously expressed view to the effect that the baptism account as a whole is not early Palestinian. As to the equivalence of *παῖς* with *υἱός* in Acts Wernle is undecided. He hesitates to affirm this, because Luke in the Gospel (vii. 2, 7, 10) uses *παῖς* interchangeably with *δοῦλος*, and therefore could scarcely have made *παῖς* take the place of *υἱός* with reference to Jesus. If we understand Wernle correctly, he does not, if this difficulty could be removed, mean to posit the identity of the two for the early Palestinian circle, but simply for the vocabulary of the Hellenist Luke at his time of writing. It could then rest on the Septuagint which in rendering Ebed by *παῖς* had through the double meaning of *παῖς* cleared the path for this raising of the Isaianic figure to the higher status of sonship. If this is Wernle's meaning, then Bousset's criticism of his having overlooked the linguistic difficulty of Aramaeic equivalence of the two conceptions, is out of place, for the whole process belongs to Hellenistic soil; Luke's carrying back the equivalence into the earliest period of the Aramaeic speaking Church is an anachronism. For our part we are inclined to believe that both Bousset's and Wernle's views on this question contain an element of truth. With Bousset we would like to insist upon the reliability of the Lucan witness to the place which *παῖς θεοῦ* had in the vocabulary of the earliest Apostolic Church. On the other hand we feel strongly with Wernle

that the conception as handled in Acts approaches much more closely to the idea of Jesus' sonship than is usually realized. The English Authorized Version is not entirely wrong when, in Acts iii.13, 26, it renders $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ by "son" and in iv.27, 30, when it renders the same term by "child." Especially in iv.27 there is a plain reflection on the meaning of $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ = "child", because the innocence, exposure to maltreatment, helplessness in the hands of enemies, Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles and the people of Israel being all gathered against him, are associated with the name. In fact $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ has here about the same import as the figure of the lamb has for the Ebed in Isaiah liii. From the copying of this figure we may perhaps explain Peter's statement that in this universal conspiracy against the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ was seen the execution of what God's hand and counsel had foreordained should come to pass; the foreordination was on record in that part of the prophecy of Isaiah. The attribute $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ which in iv.27, 30 is joined with $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$, usually understood of the consecration of the Messiah to God's service, may in view of this possible dependence on the Isaianic passage, have to be interpreted of the righteousness of Jesus, the more so since only in this sense it forms a contrast to the wickedness of the enemies. It is further worthy of notice that Luke employs $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ of Israel in the Gospel (i.54). While this also may be traced back to the Isaiah prophecy, where Israel collectively is called the Ebed of Jehovah, it would easily coalesce with the other representation of Israel as the Son of God, likewise represented in the same cycle of prophecies. A similar association may have been present in Luke i.69; Acts iv.25 where David is called $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$; David is, of course, the servant of God, but the servant in a very special degree of intimacy, and to the Davidic house the status of divine sonship had been awarded. The remarkable absence of $\υ\iota\delta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ from Acts (with the exception of ix.20) also counts for something in favor of this view, for on the view that $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ sufficiently connotes the son-

ship idea this feature explains itself. There can be no doubt, of course, that the phrase is historically derived from Isaiah. This will be argued against the attempt to put into it the richer content of sonship because, in that case, it no longer faithfully reproduces its Old Testament prototype. But the basis for such a mutual approach of the servant idea and the non-conception lies in the Ebed Jahve sections of Isaiah themselves. The emphasis that is frequently placed on the servant element in the prophetic delineation is exaggerated. The other ingredient, that of loving intimacy with God, is equally prominent, and this from the outset paves the way for the intermarriage of the idea of the "Servant of Jehovah" with that of the "Son of God."¹¹² The Septuagint seem to have already felt this, for they by no means uniformly render Ebed by *παῖς* but sometimes by *δοῦλος* or *δουλείων* cpr. *θεράπων* Numb. xii.7 for Moses as Ebed).¹¹³ The distinction indicates that in

¹¹² It should not be forgotten that to the Hebrew mind "son" and "servant" are less remote conceptions than to our modern way of thinking (cpr. Luke xv, 29).

¹¹³ So Isa. xlviii. 20; xlix. 3, 5; lxxv. 8. In the other passages where *παῖς* occurs the rendering has evidently been influenced by the associations of the conception in the original. These are of a two-fold nature: on the one hand the Ebed is the object of divine love and election (xli. 8; xlii. 1; xliii. 10; xliv. 1, 2; xlv. 4); on the other hand he is the object of divine formation (xliii. 1, 10; xliv. 1, 2, 21). Both these ideas lie on the line of approach to the idea of sonship. Of the divine love this needs no pointing out; as concerns the formation of the Ebed, this also has a peculiar shade of affection and moreover may suggest the begetting of a child by the parent. In xlix, 6 the designation of the Ebed by that name is represented as "a great thing," and in l. 10 the close identification of the Ebed with God is emphasized. For the expression of all this, of course, not *δοῦλος* but *παῖς* was the appropriate term, and it is entirely out of the question that the two should have been synonymous to the translators. Where the rendering is *δοῦλος* these same associations are absent from the writer's thought and the instrumental aspect of the Ebed stand in the foreground. The approximation of *παῖς* to the idea of "son" may be also seen in Sap. Sol. ii. 13 ff; the righteous names himself *παῖς* and this is explained by the other statements: "if he is God's *υἱός* He will uphold him "and" he vaunteth that God is his father."

the *παῖς* conception they mean to include something which *δοῦλος* does not contain. If this was already felt at the time of the Septuagint, it does not seem overbold to surmise that in early Christian Christology the two conceptions were significantly brought together. Perhaps it would be possible to go a step farther. Bousset has called attention to the fact that in several of the later Christian passages which contain *παῖς* this occurs in prayers which reveal Jewish synagogal affinities.¹¹⁴ This suggests the possibility that it may have already played a role in pre-Christian Jewish Christology, either with or without assimilation to the name Son of God. A linguistic difficulty remains, however, when the fusion of the two ideas is assigned to an Aramaic environment. If it took place on Greek soil, then the double meaning of *παῖς* would immediately account for it. But in Semitic speech no single word uniting these two ideas of "servant" and "son" can be pointed out. Here, therefore, the servant conception and the son conception must have been expressed by distinct terms. And the separation of these two ideas from the one undistributed concept in Isaiah must have taken place without the assistance from the language which a reader of the Greek Bible would receive through the equivocal term *παῖς*. This much might be said, that, if the Septuagint already distinguished two elements in the figure which they expressed by *δοῦλος* and *παῖς*, then the same discernment cannot be a priori denied to later Jewish or Christian readers of the Old Testament, even though they were not acquainted with and so did not enjoy the help of the previous distinction of the Septuagint. Perhaps it is not impossible that the *παῖς* of the Greek Bible exerted an influence beyond the sphere of Greek speaking Judaism, and that even in Aramaic circles the "son" aspect of the Servant of Jehovah became recognized. If it actually had come to mean more than "servant" in such circles, the

¹¹⁴ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 68, 69. It occurs in prayers of this character in I Clem. lix and Did. ix. and x.

word chosen to express the filial aspect will probably have been distinct from "son." The Aramaic language was certainly rich enough to supply two terms for the two synonymous ideas. The occurrence in Luke of both *υἱός* and *παῖς* renders a double Aramaic basis probable. Whether the form in which the title appears, *παῖς θεοῦ*, instead of the Septuagint *παῖς κυρίου*, also preserves a trace of the approximation of the idea to that of the Son of God we do not venture to decide.

Princeton

GEERHARDUS VOS