

PINO DI LUCCIO *

**THE «SON OF MAN»
AND THE ESCHATOLOGY
OF THE Q BEATITUDES:
THE CASE OF Lk 6,22c**

Fecha de recepción: mayo 2007.

Fecha de aceptación y versión final: agosto 2007.

ABSTRACT: In recent research it has been demonstrated that the Aramaic equivalent of «Son of Man» is the translation of אָדָם, אִישׁ, אָנוּשׁ, בֶּן אָדָם, נֶפֶשׁ and is thus a normal term for «man». On the contrary, the main occurrences in NT point to a specific, known, individual figure. Taking as a case study Lk 6,22c, this study suggests the hypothesis that when the expression «Son of Man» was introduced into Q beatitudes, it had a messianic meaning, and that it joins together two views of eschatology: an eschatology of the (close) final judgment in addition to the eschatology of the reward in heaven, which may have belonged to an earlier stage of the composition (Lk 6,22ab-23).

KEY WORDS: Son of Man, Document Q, Beatitudes, Judgment, Eschatology.

***El «Hijo del Hombre» y la escatología de las Bienaventuranzas de Q:
El ejemplo de Lc 6,22c***

RESUMEN: La investigación reciente ha demostrado que el término arameo equivalente a «Hijo del Hombre» es traducción de אָדָם, אִישׁ, אָנוּשׁ, בֶּן אָדָם, נֶפֶשׁ y es

* Profesor de Nuevo Testamento en el Pontificio Instituto Bíblico de Jerusalén y en la Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén; pdl157@hotmail.com

pues un término habitual para «hombre». Por el contrario, la mayoría de las ocurrencias en el NT señala a una figura individual conocida y específica. Tomando el caso de Lc 6,22c, este trabajo sugiere la hipótesis de que cuando la expresión «Hijo del Hombre» fue introducido en las Bienaventuranzas de Q tenía un significado mesiánico, y que aúna dos modos de ver la escatología: una escatología del (cercano) juicio final que se añadió a una escatología de la recompensa en el cielo, la cual habría pertenecido a un estado primitivo de la composición (Lc 6,22ab-23).

PALABRAS CLAVE: Hijo del Hombre, Documento Q, Bienaventuranzas, Juicio, Escatología.

In the course of the past forty years¹, the meaning of the expression «Son of Man» — attested in the Hebrew Bible (בן אדם, cf. Num 23,19; Isa 51,12; 56,2; Jer 49,18.33; 50,40; 51,43; Ezek 2,1.3; 3,1.3.4.10; Ps 8,5; 80,18; 146,3; Job 16,21; 25,6; 35,8; Dan 8,17; 10,16. Cf. also בן אנוש in Dan 7,13 and בן אנוש in Ps 144,3), and widely used throughout the canonical gospels (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου)² — has been the subject of an inflamed debate among New Testament (NT) scholars. M. Casey, in a study of the occurrences of the expression «Son of Man» in all the Aramaic targums, the Peshitta, 1QapGen, 11QtgJob, and the Samaritan targum, has demonstrated that in the Aramaic targums (א)נש(א) בר — the Aramaic equivalent of «Son of Man» — is the in the Aramaic targums translation of אדם, איש, אנוש, אדם, בן אדם, נפש and sometimes refers to an unspecified individual or to man in general. Used with a negative it means «nobody». In the texts analyzed by M. Casey, «Son of Man» is thus a normal term for «man»³.

¹ I wrote the bulk of these pages during Lent 2005, during my visit to the Jesuits who minister in the diocese of Matanzas (Cuba). I dedicate this work to them and to the friends of Pedro Betancourt, Torriente, Agromonte, Manguito, and Jagüey Grande.

² Cf. Mk 2,10 = Mt 9,6 = Lk 5,24; Mk 2,28 = Mt 12,8 = Lk 6,5; Mk 8,31 = Lk 9,22; Mk 8,38 = Lk 9,26; Mk 9,12; Mk 9,31 = Mt 17,22 = Lk 9,44; Mk 10,33 = Mt 22,18 = Lk 18,31; Mk 14,21 = Mt 26,24 = Lk 22,22; Mk 14,41 = Mt 26,45; Mk 14,62; Mt 8,20 = Lk 9,58; Mt 10,32 = Lk 12,8; Mt 11,19 = Lk 7,34; Mt 12,40 = Lk 11,30; Mt 16,27 = Lk 9,26; Mt 26,2; Lk 12,8-9; Lk 22,48; Jn 1,51; 3,13.14; 5,27; 6,27.53.62; 8,28; 9,35; 12,23.32.34; 13,31. «Son of Man» occurs on the lips of Stephen in Acts 7,56 and twice in the book of Revelation (1,13; 14,14. Cf. also Heb 2,6 with Ps 8,5). In the gospel, only Jesus uses the expression «Son of Man», only in the third person singular, and always in direct speech. It may refer to the present or to the future, to his passion or to his glory.

³ Cf. P. M. CASEY, «The use of the term (א)נש(א) בר in the Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Bible», *JSNT* 54 (1994) p.87-118. In the Aramaic targums to the Pen-

The main issues concerning the meaning of «Son of Man», however, are its almost exclusive arthrous (definite) occurrence in the NT (with the exceptions of Jn 5,27; Heb 2,6; Rev 1,13; 14,14), which leads one to think of a specific, known, individual figure; and the relative scarce occurrence of the expression outside the Hebrew Bible, its ancient translations, and the NT (cf. 1QS 11,20, where the article is added by the scribe over the line; 1QH 12,30; and the earliest attestation in Sefire 3,16-17 and in an inscription from northern Syria from the eighth century BCE)⁴. In the Similitudes of 1 En 46,2-4; 48,2; 60,10; 62,5.7.9.14; 69,27.29; 71,17, and 4 Esd 13, the «Son of Man» of Dan 7,13 has a messianic interpretation⁵. But the dating of the first is a debated matter, while the latter is dated to the end of the first century CE, and thus does not give any attestation of the familiarity of such a figure prior to the gospel's composition.

tateuch, בר אנש is the translation of אדם or האדם (cf. N on Gen 1,26.27; 2,18; 8,21; 9,5; TJI on Gen 9,5; Deut 5,21; 20,19), איש (cf. CGmf on Ex 19,13; Deut 34,6), and יהוה הנפש (cf. TJI on Num 9,13). בר אנש is the translation of אדם in the Aramaic translations of Ps 144,4; Job 34, 29 and of בני אדם in Jon Targ on Mic 5,6. אנש and בר אנש are translation of אדם in Jon Targ on Isa 51,12 (בר אנשא); 56,2; Jer 49,18.33; 50,40; 51,43. In the targums on the Writings בר אנש is rendered בן אדם (cf. Ps 8,5; 80,18; 146,3; Job 25,6; 35,8), which here it may also be the translation of words such as בן אנוש, אנש, and גבר (cf. Ps 8,5; 144,3; Job 25,6; 16,21). Hebrew בן אדם is translated by the plural בני אנשא in N and TJII on Num 23,19. In the Aramaic targums on Ezek and Dan 8,17, בר אדם is the translation of אדם. בן. [For the abbreviation N, cf. A. Díez Macho, (ed.), *Neophyti 1*, Targum Palestinese Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana (Madrid - Barcelona 1968-1978). For TJII, M. L. Klein (ed.), *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources*, 2 vols., AnBib 76 (Rome 1980). For TJI, E. G. Clarke, (ed.), *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (Hoboken, New Jersey 1984). For CG, M. C. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati 1986). And for Jon Targ, A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, III. The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan (Leiden 1959)].

⁴ In 1QapGen 21,13; 11QtgJob 26,2-3; and probably also in the partially restored 11QtgJob 9,9, בר אנש and בר אנש have the generic meaning of «human being». In the last two cases, the Aramaic corresponds to Hebrew בן אדם (cf. Job 35,8; 25,6), where the targum has בר אנש. For occurrences of the expression בר אנש in ancient Aramaic, cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Major Publications and Tools for Study, SBL Resources for Biblical Studies 20 (Atlanta, Georgia 1990) p.147-53. For a study on the Aramaic background of «Son of Man» in the synoptic gospels, cf. G. Schwarz, *Jesus «der Menschensohn»: Aramäistische Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Menschensohnworten Jesu*, BWANT 119 (Stuttgart 1986).

⁵ Cf. J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York 1995), p.141-46, 173-94; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, vol. I (London 1971), p.268-72.

A relevant factor in the history of the «Son of Man» debate has been G. Vermes' statement that the expression was originally used in the canonical gospels as a «circumlocution for 'I'» (cf. Mk 2,10 and Mt 16,13 with Mk 8,27), as the use of בר נש, בר נשא in Rabbinical literature shows (cf. Gen R 7,2; Gen R 38,13; Num R 19,3; j Ber 5b; j Ber 5c; j Ket 35a)⁶. According to J.A. Fitzmyer, the examples chosen by G. Vermes to examine the meaning of «Son of Man» (בר נש, בר נשא) belong to late Aramaic. In biblical or Qumran Aramaic, the correct spelling would have been בר אנש⁷. To this caveat, G. Vermes has responded that in Galilean Aramaic, the gutturals were mispronounced or not pronounced at all. The spelling of Lazarus in Lk 16,20; Jn 11,1; Josephus, Jewish War 5,567; and other examples of first-century CE ossuaries from Jerusalem together with examples from the Qumran and Murabaat documents support his position⁸. Thus the Aramaic בר נש, בר נשא, in the passages scrutinized by M. Casey and G. Vermes, does not have the connotation of a special messianic *title*, and the use of «Son of Man» as a personal pronoun and a circumlocution for the speaker, according to G. Vermes' proposal⁹, could explain why Mt 5,11 has ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ where Lk 6,22 has ἔνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου¹⁰.

⁶ G. Cf. VERMES, «The Use of bar nash/bar nasha in Jewish Aramaic», in: M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed., Oxford 1967), p.310-28. Republished in *Post Biblical Jewish Studies*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity VIII (Leiden 1975), p.147-65. This use of «Son of Man» corresponds to «that man» (ההוא גברא) for the first person singular (cf. Lam R 1,5 with Ekhah Rabbati 1,5; Gen R 79,6; 100,5). Cf. G. VERMES, *Jesus the Jew* (Philadelphia, London 1973), p.160-91; «The Use of bar nash/bar nasha», cit., p.310-28.

⁷ Cf. J. A. FITZMYER, «Review of M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts», *CBO* 30 (1968) p.420-28; «The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament», *NTS* 20 (1973-74) p.382-407; «Methodology in the Study of Jesus' Sayings in the New Testament», in: J. DUPONT, (ed.), *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (Gembloux 1975) p.73-102. Cf. also JEREMIAS, *New Testament Theology*, cit., p.261, note 1; «Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien», *ZNW* 58 (1967) p.165 and note 9.

⁸ Cf. G. VERMES, «The 'Son of Man' Debate», *JSNT* 1 (1978) p.19-32; «Another View of the 'Son of Man' Debate», *JSNT* 4 (1979) p.56-68. Cf. also G. DALMAN, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch nach den Idiomen des Palästinischen Talmud, des OnkelosTargum und ProphetenTargum und der Jerusalemischen Targume* (2nd ed., Leipzig 1905), p.57-58, 96-99. For the reply, cf. J. A. FITZMYER, «Another View of the 'Son of Man' Debate», *JSNT* 4 (1979) p.58-68; «The New Testament Title 'Son of Man' Philologically Considered», in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, SBLMS 25 (Missoula MT, 1979) p.143-60.

⁹ G. Schwarz has maintained that this is also the meaning of בן אדם in Job 16,21. Cf. SCHWARZ, *Jesus «der Menschensohn»*, cit., p.4-6, 74-75, 84.

¹⁰ Luke may preserve the ancient form of Q. Cf. the International Q Project and

«SON OF MAN» AS A MESSIANIC TITLE

In spite of the fact that G. Vermes' position on the original use of «Son of Man» in the gospel as a circumlocution for the speaker — and also his assertion regarding the lack of intertestamental witnesses to the messianic use of the expression¹¹ — found agreement among many NT scholars, other critics have not been fully convinced¹². Some consider the occurrence of ο υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the canonical gospels in a way similar to the one adopted by G. Vermes, adding further nuances. G. Vermes' position, for example, has been accepted by B. Lindars. In his view, the «periphrasis for I» is an «idiomatic use of the definite article in indefinite statements» corresponding to «a particular member of the class» where the speaker is included in the «generic» characterization of מְשִׁיחַ בֶּרֶךְ¹³. B. Lin-

the Critical Edition of Q in A. LINDEMANN (ed.), *The Saying Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, BETL 158 (Leuven 2001) p.98-99. There are other examples in the canonical gospels of such use of the first person singular where «Son of Man» occurs in a corresponding text. Cf. JEREMIAS, *New Testament Theology*, cit., p.262-63; «Die älteste Schichte der Menschensohn-Logien», cit., p.159ff.

¹¹ Cf. VERMES, *Jesus the Jew*, cit., p.169-77; 257-60; «The 'Son of Man' Debate», cit., p.27. Cf. also P. M. CASEY, «The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch», *JSJ* 7 (1976) p.11-29, and J. D. G. DUNN, *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London 1980), p.67-81.

¹² Cf. J. J. COLLINS, «The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch», in: G. W. E. NICKELSBURG - J. J. COLLINS (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (Chico 1980), p.111-33; J. COPPENS, «Le fils d'homme dans les traditions juives postbibliques hormis du livre des paraboles de l'Hénoch éthiopiens», *EthL* 57 (1981) p.58-82; B. MCNEIL, «The Son of Man and the Messiah: A Footnote», *NTS* 25 (1979-80) p.419-21.

¹³ Cf. B. LINDARS, «Response to Richard Bauckham: The Idiomatic Use of Bar Enasha», *JSNT* 23 (1985) p.35-41; *Jesus Son of Man* (London 1983). With the «general use» of the Aramaic expression מְשִׁיחַ בֶּרֶךְ, the speaker says something about himself. This, according to B. Lindars, would be the criterion for determining the authenticity of the «dominical sayings» in the gospel (cf. Mt 8,20 = Lk 9,58; Mt 9,6 = Mk 2,10-11 = Lk 5,24; Mt 11,19 = Lk 7,34; Mt 12,32 = Lk 12,10; Lk 11,30; Mk 14,21.45). Cf. also P. M. CASEY, «The Son of Man Problem», *ZNW* 67 (1976) p.147-54; «The Jackals and the Son of Man (Matt. 8.20/Luke 9.58)», *JSNT* 23 (1985) p.3-22. On the «authenticity» of the expression «Son of Man» in the canonical gospels, the opinion of the critics diverges. According to I. H. Marshall, it is «authentic». Cf. I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter 1978), p.253-54. According to A. Vögtle, Jesus used the expression «Son of Man» with an apocalyptic meaning. Cf. A. VÖGTLE, «Bezeugt die Logienquelle die authentische Redeweise Jesu vom 'Menschensohn'?», in: J. DELOBEL (ed.), *Logia. Les paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus. Méorial Joseph Coppens*, BETL 59 (Leu-

dars has maintained that there never existed a «Son of Man» Christology in the early Church, and the discussed expression is the result of the literary editing of Jesus' sayings. Also at this point, however, «Son of Man» was not a messianic *title* but a self-designation of Jesus.

Other critics, on the other hand, still continue to consider the expression in the NT as a *title*¹⁴ — at least at one advanced stage of the gospels' traditions. J. Jeremias has brought some examples from the canonical gospels (cf. Mk 3,28 par Mt 12,31 with Lk 12,10 par Mt 12,32; and Mt 8,20 par Lk 9,58; Mt 11,19 par Lk 7,34, etc.) to show that, in some cases, the generic «Son of Man» designating «man in general» became an apocalyptic *title* in the early Church. The cases in which, according to him, the expression is used as a *title* from the early beginnings of the history of the gospel traditions are Mk 13,26 par; 14,62 par; Mt 24,27.37b. 39b par (= Lk 17,24.26); Mt 10,23; 25,31; Lk 17,22.30; 18,8; 21,36; Jn 1,51¹⁵. The opinions of the critics at times oscillate between those for whom «Son of Man» in the gospel or in the mouth of Jesus is not a *title* (though it is more than a simple circumlocution for the speaker), and those who maintain that during the first century CE, the expression was a messianic *title* and should be understood in this way when it occurs in the canonical gospels. Starting from one example brought by G. Vermes (j Sheb 9,1), B. Chilton has shown that the Aramaic «Son of Man» (בר נשא/בר אנשא / בר נש) can be generic, in the sense that the speaker is included in the class of human beings as mortal humanity. In the mouth of the historical Jesus, however, it was also used to refer to the angelic figure of Dan 7,13-14. Then «in the literary construal» of the synoptic gospels, it referred to the «suffering and eschatological judge»¹⁶. For F. J. Moloney, «Son

ven 1982) p.77-99. According to R. Bultmann, Jesus used «Son of Man» in the third person because he was referring to an eschatological figure who was not he himself. The early communities would have been responsible for the attribution of the eschatological title to Jesus. Cf. R. BULTMANN, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford 1963), p.9 and p.29ff.

¹⁴ Cf. E. P. MEADORS, «The 'Messianic' Implications of the Q Material», *JBL* 118 (1999) p.269-72. Cf. also A. Y. COLLINS, «The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings», in: B. A. PEARSON (ed.), *The Future of Christianity* (Minneapolis 1991), p.220-28; «The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man'», *HTR* 80 (1987) p.391-408; COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, cit., p.184-85.

¹⁵ Cf. JEREMIAS, *New Testament Theology*, cit., p.261-63.

¹⁶ Cf. B. CHILTON, «(The) Son of (The) Man, and Jesus», in: B. CHILTON - C. A. EVANS (eds.), *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (Leiden - Boston - Köln 1999), p.259-87.

of Man» had a messianic meaning in the first century CE¹⁷. The interpretation of Ps 8,5 in Mt 21,16, 1Cor 25,27, Eph 1,22, and Heb 2,6-8 would show, according to him, that the NT authors knew the pre-Christian Aramaic translation of the Psalm, where *בר נשא* has the characteristics of a messianic figure (cf. also Targ on Ps 80,16.18)¹⁸. The process of «individualization» operated by the targumist is demonstrated by the fact that in v. 5b, it is not remembered «man», as in the Masoretic text, but «his works» (*עבודוי*), namely the works of the *בר נשא* of v. 5a and v. 5b, which in v. 4 referred to God and in v. 7 are put under the dominion of the «Son of Man»¹⁹. These «works» according to F.J. Moloney, imply the destruction of the enemy and avenger of v. 3, which in the targums becomes «the author of enmity and the violent one» (*לבתלא בעל דבבא וגזומא*). The «process of individualization» may be seen, in addition to vv. 3 and 5, also in vv. 8-9 where, to the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the

¹⁷ This view had been maintained with different nuances by P. BILLERBECK - L. STRACK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, 4 vols. (Munich 1922-69), I vol., p.485, 958; W. BOUSSET, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3rd ed., Tübingen 1966); P. FIEBIG, *Der Menschensohn* (Tübingen - Leipzig 1901), p.95, 268; W. HORBURY, «The Messianic Association of the 'Son of Man'», *JTS* 36 (1985) p.34-55, has maintained an early messianic interpretation of Dan 7 (cf. 11Q Melch lin. 18; Ezekiel the Tragedian lin. 68-89; Sib Or 5, 414; 432; 1 En 46-72; 2 Esd 11,37; 12,32; 13,3ff with Gen 49,9; Isa 11,1ff; Ps 2; 110; [m] Hag 14a; Sanh 38b; 98a; Num R 13,14 on Num 7,13; Justin, Dial 32), adducing early messianic interpretation of words for «man» in passages other than Dan 7 (cf. 1QH 3,7-10; 1QS 4,20-2; Targ on Ps 80,16.18; LXX, Peshitta, TJI, TO on Num 24,7.17; Philo, Mos 1,290; m Yoma 1,3.5; Test Jud 24,1; Test Napht 4,5 with Isa 45,8; and Isa 66,7; 2 Sam 23,1; Zech 6,12; cf. also 1 Kings 2,4; 8,25; 9,5; 2 Chr 6,16; 7,18; Jer 33,17; MT with LXX on Isa 32,2; Ps 87,5; and Sir 45,25; Sib Or 5,414; Acts 17,31).

¹⁸ Cf. F. J. MOLONEY, «The Re-Interpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate», *NTS* 27 (1981) p.656-72. F. J. Moloney — who has maintained that the use of the expression *בר נשא* in Targ on Ps 8,5 refers to an individualized «Son of Man» — comparing the Walton Polyglot edition of the targums of the year 1657 with the Regia Polyglot of the year 1573, concluded that the Aramaic version of Ps 8 is a pre-Christian work. The Regia Polyglot, according to him, has censured the messianic features of the «Son of Man» contained in the Walton Polyglot and known to the NT authors. Cf. MOLONEY, «The Re-Interpretation of Psalm VIII», cit., p.656-72, and the caveat of M. Casey in CASEY, «The use of the term (*נשא*)*בר*», cit., p.105-9.

¹⁹ «It appears to me that the Targumist made this addition purposely and with considerable skill. In v. 4 the heavens are described as 'the works' of the hands of God, while in v. 7 we are told 'the works' of the hands of God have been put under the dominion of the Son of Man». MOLONEY, «The Re-Interpretation of Psalm VIII», cit., p.663.

fish of the sea of the Masoretic text, the Aramaic translation adds the Leviathan — the primordial beast that according to 1 En 60,7-9; 4 Esd 6,49-53; 2 Bar 29,3-8, and the Aramaic targums on Gen 3,15, will appear at the end of time to suffer a final defeat²⁰.

The conclusions of F. J. Moloney incite to investigate thoroughly the meaning of the occurrence of «Son of Man» in Lk 6,22c — where the «eschatological» meaning of the expression is supported by the content of the close literary context. I will start with a comparison between the Q beatitudes (Lk 6,20bff) and one text from Qumran, 4Q521. In the latter text — in spite of the absence of the explicit mention of «Son of Man» — the quotations of Isa 61,1ff and other Isaiah texts that speak of an agent of the Lord who will bring salvation to the poor and to the oppressed (42,1-2; 49,1-2; 57,15; 66,2) offer parallel terms and phrases to the gospel beatitudes (Lk 6,20b-23; cf. Mt 5,3-12) and may enlighten the meaning of «Son of Man» in Lk 6,22c. The biblical texts from Isaiah mentioned above, in fact, are related to the expectations of a Messiah and to his «final» actions in favor of a portion of the people, in a way that is similar to the destiny promised to the pious (ܡܦܝܕܝܢ) of 4Q521, and to the blessed and the persecuted on account of the «Son of Man» in Q beatitudes. The comparison between the Q beatitudes (Lk 6,20bff) and a contemporary text from Qumran (4Q521) may point out the use of the expression «Son of Man» — in the case of Lk 6,22c — as an «eschatological» *title*²¹.

²⁰ Cf. MOLONEY, «The Re-Interpretation of Psalm VIII», cit., p.665. J. Bowker, on the basis of the Aramaic occurrence of the expression ܨܢ ܒܪ and ܨܢܐ ܒܪ in the translation of the books of Psalms (cf. Ps 8,4; 9,20ff; 37,37ff; 39,12ff; 60,11ff; 80,17ff; 88,4; 90,3; 92,6; 103,15; 104,14ff; 140,2; 144,3ff; 146,3ff) and Job (cf. Job 4,17; 5,6ff; 7,1.17.20; 9,2.32; 10,4ff; 14,1.10.12.19; 15,4.16; 16,21ff; 20,4.29; 25,4.6ff; 28,13; 33,12.17ff.26ff; 34,11.15.29) has proposed, instead, that the expression refers to the condition of the human being «born to die». Jesus, in the gospel of Mark, would have used it having in mind this meaning and Daniel 7,13ff, where the «Son of Man» is a vindicated figure. «To some extent, the two senses are not entirely separated, since the vindicated figure in Dan. vii is involved in (or associated with) suffering and death. But one Biblical sense emphasizes death (without reference to vindication), the other emphasizes vindication». J. BOWKER, «The Son of Man», *JThS* 28 (1977) p.44. J. Bowker recognizes five areas of exception, admitting that «Son of Man» can also mean «someone», «anyone», «no one», and simply «human being». But according to him, the expression was normally associated with the man's frailty and his subjection to death because ܡܦܝܢ ܒܪ, its Hebrew correspondent, has a special connection with Adam's penalty of death in Gen 3,19. Cf. BOWKER, «The Son of Man», cit., p.37-41.

²¹ Recent studies of Q speak of a stratification of the source common to Luke and

4Q521 AND THE ESCHATOLOGIES OF LUKE'S BEATITUDES

4Q521 (frag. 2; 2,4-14), dated by E. Puech to the Hasmonean period — between 100 and 80 BCE²² — presents a number of similarities to the gospel beatitudes. In the text from Qumran, the apocalyptic Messiah, or the Lord himself, is expected to act in a way that recalls the context in which the «Son of Man» is quoted in Q beatitudes (cf. also 4Q171)²³.

(3) Strengthen yourselves, you who are seeking the Lord, in his service! (4) Will you not in this encounter the Lord, all those who hope in their heart? (5) For the Lord will consider the pious, and call the righteous by name, (6) and his spirit will hover upon the poor, and he will renew the faithful with his strength. (7) For he will honor the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom, (8) freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twis[t.ed.] (9) And for[e]ver shall I cling [to those who h]ope, and in his mercy [...] (10) and the fru[it of...] ... not be delayed. (11) And the Lord will perform marvelous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id,] (12) [for] he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the poor (13) and [...] ... [...] he will lead the [...] ... and enrich the hungry. (14) [...] and all ... [...]²⁴.

Matthew. In its most ancient stage, it would have been characterized by wisdom sayings to which were added sayings with eschatological features. Cf. J. S. KLOPPENBORG, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis 2000); J. M. ROBINSON, *The Sayings Gospel Q*. Collected Essays Edited by C. Heil and J. Verheyden (Leuven 2005).

²² Cf. É. PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)», *RevQ* 15/4 (1992) p.475-519 [p.480]. According to É. Puech, the date of the text, not the copy, would be the second century BCE. Cf. p.515.

²³ For J. J. Collins, 4Q521 describes the activity of a prophetic Messiah, whom he identifies with Elijah or a prophet like Elijah. In 4Q521, J. J. Collins takes God as the speaker and the one making the prediction, and Elijah or an Elijah-like figure as the one predicted. Cf. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, cit., p.117ff. Cf. also C. EVANS, «Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4», in: C. EVANS - P. FLINT (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids 1997), p.97. On the Messiah/s of Qumran, cf. 1QS 9,111; CD 7,20; 12,23-13,1; 14,19; 19,33-20,1; 4Q175; 1Q28a 2,11-22; 1QSb 5,20-28, and A. CAQUOT, «Le messianisme qumrânien», in: M. DELCOR (ed.), *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (Paris-Gembloux 1978) p.231-47.

²⁴ Translation from F. G. MARTÍNEZ - E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Leiden 1997-98), vol. II, p.1045.

In addition to l. 13 — which, as reconstructed by E. Puech, creates a parallel with Lk 6,21 (נהל ורעבים יעשר) [נדלי]ם ישב[יע] נתושים ינהל ורעבים יעשר); cf. Lk 1,53; Rev 7,16ff; 1 Sam 2,5,8; Ps 22,27; 37,19; 107,7,9; 146,9; Test Jud 25,4)²⁵, and the quotation of Isa 61 (cf. l. 12), which is a biblical background of the gospel beatitudes — the mention of the poor upon whom hover the spirit of the Lord in l. 6 (ועל ענוים רוחו תרחף) and to whom will be announced the good news in l. 12 (ענוים יבשר); cf. Isa 29,19; Ps Sol 11,1) is one of the Qumran parallels to the Greek *πτωχοί* of Lk 6,20b and Mt 5,3 (cf. 4Q161 frags. 8-10, 3; 4Q184 frag. 1,16; 1QM 14,7; 4Q491 frags. 8-10, col. 1,5; 1QH 6,3; 13,21; 23[top], 13-16; 1QS 4,3)²⁶. Moreover, the mention of the throne of the eternal kingdom in l. 7 (כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד) may be seen as a parallel to the «eschatological» context of Lk 6,22c.23ab (cf. Mt 5,11-12 and Dan 7,9.13-14.18), where the «Son of Man» is quoted. Finally, if *יש לוא יתאחר* in l.10 refers to the reward for «good deeds» (cf. 1QS 1,5; 1QH 5,6ff; m Avot 4,17; b Ber 60b)²⁷, we have here a parallel to the *μισθός* of Lk 6,23b and Mt 5,12b (cf. 11QPs 22,10; 4Q385 frag. 2,3; and Ps 28,4; 62,13; Job 34,11; Ps Sol 15,14; 17,31; 4 Esd 4,35; 7,35ff; Wis 3,13.15; 5,15-16; Rev 11,18).

The possible mention of the reward in 4Q521 l. 10 renders the theology of this text from Qumran particularly meaningful for the comprehension of the literary and theological history of the formation and composition of the Q beatitudes. 4Q521 frag. 2; 2,10 seems to refer, in fact,

²⁵ «Et les [pauvre]s il comblera, les expulsés il conduira et les affamés il enrichira/invitera au banquet (?)». PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique», cit., p.485-86.

²⁶ According to R. A. Guelich, there would be no relation between Isa 61,1-3 and Luke's beatitudes. Cf. R. A. GUELICH, «The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-Requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?», *JBL* 95/3 (1976) p.415-34, especially p.424-25. «Neither Luke 6,20b-21 nor the pre-Matthean tradition behind 5,3-9 was directly related to Isa 61,1-3. Matthew was the first to link verbally and materially these Beatitudes to Isa 61,1-3». GUELICH, «The Matthean Beatitudes», cit., p.431. Cf. also E. SCHWEIZER, «Formgeschichtliches zu den Seligpreisungen Jesu», *NTS* 19 (1972-1973) p.121-26; G. STRECKER, «Die Makarismen der Bergpredigt», *NTS* 17 (1970-1971) p.255-75, especially p.261, note 7. W. Grimm has maintained, instead, that the connection between Isa 61 and the beatitudes of the gospel was stronger in the early stage of the Q tradition than it is in Matthew's redaction. Cf. W. GRIMM, *Weil ich dich liebe. Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deuterijosaja* (Frankfurt am Main 1976), p.68-77.

²⁷ E. Puech has reconstructed l. 10 in the following way: *ופר[מעש]ה טוב לאיש* and has translated it «et le fru[it d'une]bonne [oeuvre] ne sera différé pou personne». PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique», cit., p.485-86.

to the reward of the just not in heaven, as in Lk 6,23 (cf. Mt 5,12), but at the time of the exaltation of the pious «upon the throne of an eternal kingdom» (על כסא מלכות עד), referring to a determined point of earthly history²⁸. If the «Son of Man» of Lk 6,22c is a late insertion into Q beatitudes, as is maintained by a number of NT critics²⁹, the debated expression, in this case, may point out the figure of an eschatological judge, according to the theology of 4Q521 and other Qumran texts (cf. 11QMelch), creating a contrast with the eschatology of the reward in heaven in Lk 6,23 and Mt 5,12.

The expression, used in Lk 6,22c as a *title*, could have been inserted into Q beatitudes in order to modify the eschatology of the reward in heaven of Lk 6,23, common to the theology of the Pharisees (cf. t Pea 4,18-19)³⁰, with one closer to Qumran — where the reward and the «end» are inscribed in the course of the events of this world. In the first century CE, in fact, the notion of the future time and space of salvation, expressed in the Jewish literature of the time by the opposition between עולם הזה (this World) and עולם הבא (future World), was intended in various ways and not precisely fixed.

«When we seek to explain the doctrines of the Sages concerning redemption and to distinguish between the different elements of which

²⁸ The «throne of the eternal kingdom» of 4Q521 l. 7 is without parallels in the Hebrew Bible and at Qumran. It may be a development of the concept of God's throne in 1 Sam 2,7-8, and may refer to other texts, such as Dan 7,13-14. «[...] trône du Fils de l'homme lors du jugement avec l'association des justes et des martyrs, d'autant que le Fils de l'homme symbolise les saints du Très-Haut qui reçoivent le royaume en Dn 7,13-14 et 18, e.g. 4 M 17,18, Ap d' Élie 1,9; 3,50». PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique», cit., p.489.

²⁹ Cf. JEREMIAS, «Die älteste Schichte», cit., p.159-72, who noticed a tendency to add this title to sayings that originally did not contain it. Also according to J. A. FITZMYER, «The title 'Son of Man' has been secondarily introduced here by Luke». J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-X)*. Introduction, Translation and Notes, The Anchor Bible 28A (Garden City, New York 1985) p.635. Instead, according to H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HThKNT III/1 (Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1969) p.334, note 62, the Lucan form may be original. Cf. also W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, THNT 3 (Berlin 1961; 3rd ed., 1966) p.144.

³⁰ On the doctrine of merit and reward in Rabbinic literature and in NT times, cf. BILLERBECK STRACK, *Kommentar*, cit., vol. I, p.231-32, 390-91, 592-93; vol. IV/1, p.484, 500; vol. IV/2, p.799-976; A. MARMORSTEIN, *The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinic Literature* (London 1920); W. PESCH, *Der Lohngedanke in der Lehre Jesu* (München 1955).

they were composed, we are compelled to have recourse to the apocryphal-apocalyptic literature, to the writings of the early Christians, and now also to the Qumran Scrolls [...] They are also of value for ascertaining clearly the meaning of eschatological terms that are often used in different senses, like 'world to come', which 'is neither the Messianic era nor that of the resurrection of the dead, but refers to the celestial world in which the soul of the righteous abide'. The existence, on the one hand, of separate terms, and their fusion, on the other hand, into a single term through semantic blurring, show that the different trends did not come into being interrelated and linked together»³¹.

The change of the early formulation of the Q beatitudes' theology of the «end» (Lk 6,22ab.23), with the insertion of the «Son of Man» in Lk 6,22c³², may point out an outdistancing of the Q beatitudes' «eschatology» from that of the Pharisees, characterized, in some Rabbinic traditions, by the reward in heaven (t Pea 4,18-19)³³. But the insertion of

³¹ E. E. URBACH, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem 1975, 1979), vol. I, p.651-52. Cf. also BILLERBECK STRACK, *Kommentar*, cit., vol. IV/2, p.799-976; especially p.815-21.

³² For occurrences of «Son of Man» in Q, cf. Lk 7,34 = Mt 11,19; Lk 9,58 = Mt 8,20; Lk 12,40 = Mt 24,44; Lk 12,8 = Mt 10,32; Lk 17,24 = Mt 24,27; and Lk 17,26 = Mt 24,37; Lk 17,30 = Mt 24,39; Lk 22,28-30 = Mt 19,28. A. Y. COLLINS also includes Lk 12,40 = Mt 24,44; Lk 17,24 = Mt 24,27; Lk 17,26 = Mt 24,37; Lk 22,28-30 = Mt 19,28. Cf. A. Y. COLLINS, «The Son of Man Sayings in the Saying Source», in: M. P. HORGAN - P. J. KOBELSKI (eds.), *To Touch the Text. Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph Fitzmyer, S.J.* (New York 1989), p.357-82. For the eschatological character of the «Son of Man» in Q (and 2Sam 7,8-16; Isa 11,1-10; Daniel; Ps Sol 17-18; 1 En 48; 4QFlorilegium) cf. MEADORS, «The 'Messianic' Implications of the Q Material», cit., p.272-75. The problem that is the focus of contemporary Q research on this topic is whether, in the ancient strata of the source, «Son of Man» contained the proclamation of the redemptive power of Jesus' death and resurrection. Most of the occurrences of the expression in Q are considered to derive not from the earliest stage of the Logia source, but to belong to a later stage of its tradition, or to its redaction. To a late stage and to the redaction of Q are ascribed the occurrences in Lk 6,22-23; 7,33-34; 9,58c; 11,30; 12,8-9.10.40. To the earliest stage of the Q tradition is ascribed the occurrence in Lk 17,24.26.30. Cf. W. SCHENK, «Der Einfluss der Logienquelle auf das Markusevangelium», *ZNW* 70 (1979) p.146-49; W. SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, ÖTKNT 2 (Gütersloh 1979) p.152-54.

³³ Heaven is the place of the reward also in Mek on Ex 31,13; b Tamid 7,4 [33b]; b Ber 17a (cf. also b Ber 57b; ARN 2; PRE 18; 19). Cf. BILLERBECK STRACK, *Kommentar*, cit., vol. IV/2, p.832-33, 839-40; vol. I, p.206-14 and p.890.

Lk 6,22c does not necessarily imply a full matching with the theology represented by the Qumran text. The insertion of the «Son of Man» into Q beatitudes, in fact, may have been aimed at specifying not only a different stand on eschatology from that of the synagogue but also a theological difference in regard to Qumran. To speak of the «Son of Man» in a text such as Q beatitudes, which presented common phraseology, themes, and biblical references to the theology adopted at Qumran, may have been prompted by the need to clarify the theological differences between the early Christian community that were represented by Q and those Qumran communities that were represented by 4Q521³⁴. The need to insert the expression as a *title* in Lk 6,22c may have been felt necessary precisely due to the use of similar biblical references and terminology in 4Q521 and in Q beatitudes that were required to clarify the terms of the eschatology of Q's communities. Once the expression as *title* had been inserted, the differences in the theology expressed by some Qumran texts, such as the one quoted above, would have become evident; first of all, because no such expression occurred in those texts; and secondarily, because the combination of two different views of eschatology in Lk 6,22-23 — the reward in heaven and the final judgment at the end of the time in the course of earthly history — rendered the theology of the Q beatitudes singular. The insertion of «Son of Man» — which, if F. J. Moloney and other NT critics are right, was already used with messianic connotations by the first century CE — could have clarified in this way some characteristics of the belief of Jesus' followers and underlined the differences in regard to the eschatology of Qumran and that of the Pharisees. I would thus suggest that the insertion of «Son of Man» in Lk 6,22c may have served to define the differences bet-

³⁴ The main difference in the belief of Qumran and in the communities of Q lay certainly in the fact that, for those who had become followers of Jesus, the prophecies of Isa 61 had already been fulfilled. Cf. also Lk 7,21-23; Mt 11,4-6 (and Lk 10,9; Mt 8,16; 9,35; 10,1.8; Jn 9,14; 10,21 with Deut 32,39; Isa 29,18ff; 35,5ff; 42,7; Hos 6,1; Ps 145,14; Jub 23,29ff; 1 En 67,8; 95,4; 96,3). In the Q source, Isa 61,1ff is quoted to present Jesus' healings and exorcisms as a demonstration of his eschatological messianism. Cf. Lk 7,22; 11,20 and Mt 11,4-6; 12,28; cf. also Lk 4,18-19; Acts 10,38. An eschatological interpretation of Isa 61 is found also in TJI on Num 25,12; Jon Targ on Isa 61,1; and Midr Ekhah on Lam 3,50; Yalkut haMakhiri. Cf. J. A. SANDERS, «From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4», in: J. NEUSNER (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Part 1, New Testament, SJLA 12 (Leiden, 1975) p.75-106.

ween the eschatology of the Q communities and similar views of eschatology shared among some Jewish circles during the first century CE³⁵.

THE «SON OF MAN», THE KINGDOM, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF Q THEOLOGIES

With the insertion of «Son of Man» in Lk 6,22c, the «prophetic» preaching of Jesus' beatitudes — as the irruption of God's kingdom (cf. Lk 6,20b) — and the «eschatological» significance of the persecutions (cf. Lk 6,22ab-23), may have been stressed to produce a singular theology of the kingdom as «future» (Lk 6,23) and, at the same time, «close-at-hand» (Lk 6,22c). The title «Son of Man» may have allowed such a theological synthesis because of the reference of the expression to Dan 7,13-14, where the «eschatological figure» of the *בן אנוש* is presented on the clouds of heaven and is expected to have an everlasting dominion and kingship over peoples, nations, and languages. In the Book of Daniel — which ends with a beatitude, after speaking of the persecution and the vindication of the faithful at the resurrection of the dead (Dan 12,12-13) — both realities of God's kingdom evi-

³⁵ A number of similarities are found between 4Q521 and the beatitudes of the gospel. The expression *ינהל נתושים* («les expulsés il conduira») of l. 13, as it has been reconstructed by PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique», cit., p.485-86, is a unique parallel to *ἄφορισωσιν* of Lk 6,22. Furthermore, a beatitude occurs in 4Q521 frag. 2 col. 3 l. 2, according to the reconstruction of É. Puech: *[א]שרי אשר ברכת אדני ברצונו* («[H]eureux (?) l'homme/le messie (?) sur [l. 3] qui/que la bénédiction du Seigneur dans sa bienveillance»); and in ll. 4-5, the eschatological joy is mentioned (*גלה הארץ בכל מקום [ם] כי כל ישראל בגיל*), «La terre a exulté en tous lieu[x et - -] car tout Israël (est) dans l'exultation»), which also occurs in Lk 6,23 and Mt 5,12 (cf. 1 En 51,4-5; 61; Test Levi 18,5; 4 Esd 7,28 and 4Q246 col. 2,1ff, specially l. 5, where with *מלכות* occurs the word *קשוט* which may correspond to the Greek *δικαιοσύνη* and furnish a parallel to the «justice of the kingdom» of Matthew's redaction of Q beatitudes). Cf. PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique», cit., p.495-96, and É. PUECH, «Fragment d'une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan) et le 'Royaume de Dieu'», *RB* 99 (1992) p.118ff. É. Puech has maintained that the theology of 4Q521 did not originate in Qumran, but that it was adopted there. Cf. PUECH, «Une apocalypse messianique», cit., p.515-19. Thus in 4Q521, we may have religious ideas that were shared among Jewish circles during the first century CE. In my opinion, it is not necessary to suppose a dependence at the origin of the Q beatitudes' formation from the text of 4Q521: the similarities between the two texts may be explained on the basis of the associations created by the quotation of the same biblical references and the occurrence of common religious ideas and expressions of belief.

denced in Q beatitudes are, in fact, displayed: the present (Dan 4,29; 6,27) and the future (Dan 2). Furthermore, in the book of Daniel, as in Q, both the «Son of Man» and the kingdom are seen as imminent and as implying one another³⁶. For this reason, and for the points made in the preceding paragraph, I assume that the joining of these two concepts into Q beatitudes may have belonged to a late stage of the source common to the gospels of Luke and Matthew, and may have been done with a reference to Dan 7,13-14. Notwithstanding the prudence shown by some critics on the possible relationship between the occurrence of the expression in Lk 6,22c and the figure of Dan 7,13³⁷, it is meaningful, in fact, that both — the kingdom and the «Son of Man» — are found in Lk 6,20bff and in the book of Daniel (cf. 2,44; 4,3.34; 6,27; 7,13-14). In the latter, the revelation of God, present and future, and the final judgment that coincides with the «end» and the resurrection, when the faithful shall live in glory while the wicked shall be punished (cf. Dan 12,1-3,13), give «eschatological» features to the compo-

³⁶ A number of studies on Q have underlined the centrality of the «Son of Man» (cf. Lk 7,34 = Mt 11,19; Lk 11,30 = Mt 12,40) and the kingdom coming in the source common to Matthew and Luke. Cf. P. HOFFMANN, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, NT Abh 8 (Münster W. 1972) p.81-233; H. SCHÜRMANN, «Beobachtungen zum Menschensohntitel in der Redenquelle», in: R. PESCH - R. SCHNACKENBURG (eds.), *Jesus und der Menschensohn*. Festschrift für A. Vögtle (Freiburg i. Br. 1975), p.124-47; H. E. TÖDT, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischer Überlieferung* (Gütersloh 1959), p.44-62. According to B. CHILTON, «The kingdom is the public theme of Jesus' ministry, what was spoken of openly and fully to anyone who would hear. The Son of Man was the esoteric theme, the explanation to those who responded to the message of the kingdom of how Jesus could know what he did. Many Rabbis spoke of the visionary reality of God's throne, which they usually referred to as the 'chariot', in the manner of Ezekiel 1. The vision of Daniel 7 is in part inspired by the passage in Ezekiel, which even speaks of a human appearance with the throne (Ezek 1,26). Jesus claimed that access to the heavenly Son of Man gave him, as human Son of Man, the insight which he displayed into the throne of God». CHILTON, «(The) Son of (The) Man, and Jesus», cit., p.285.

³⁷ According to J. D. G. DUNN, in Q there are «allusions of greater or less probability» to Dan 7 only in Mt 19,28 = Lk 22,30; Mt 24,27 = Lk 17,24; Mt 24,37 = Lk 17,26; Mt 24,44 = Lk 12,40. Cf. DUNN, *Christology in the Making*, cit., p.67. For the influence of Daniel on the expression «Son of Man» in the canonical gospels, cf. O. BETZ, *Jesus und das Danielbuch. II. Die Menschensohnworte Jesu und die Zukunftserwartung des Paulus (Daniel 7,13-14)*, ANTUJ 6/11 (Frankfurt am Main 1985), and HORBURY, «The Messianic Association», p.34-55, for whom the expression was a title. For a critical view on the dependence of all the «Son of Man» sayings of the canonical gospels from Dan 7, cf. P. M. CASEY, «Method in our Madness, and Madness in their Methods. Some Approaches to the Son of Man Problem in Recent Scholarship», *JSNT* 42 (1991) p.27-42.

sition (cf. Dan 2,36-45; 7,1-27; 4,14.22.31.32.34) similar to those that characterize Lk 6,22-23 (and Lk 6,24-26).

D. Flusser maintained that, «According to Jesus, the coming of God's rule, and hope in the eschatological savior were two different aspects of the expectation of the end. The idea of the kingdom of God and of the Son of Man were never confused in his mind»³⁸. I accept D. Flusser's suggestion, and I propose that the association of the «Son of Man» with the kingdom may have been created in Q beatitudes by the insertion of the expression in Lk 6,22c³⁹. The insertion of the expression «Son of Man» as a *title* in a late stage of the Q beatitudes may be due to the development of the theologies of the source common to Luke and Matthew, needed for the clarification of the terms of its eschatology, and at the same time for the differentiation of the religious identity of the members of the early community of Jesus' followers represented by Q. Such «eschatological» use of «Son of Man» in Q beatitudes does not contradict the proposal of G. Vermes on the meaning of בר נש in Rabbinical literature. It may be true, as he has maintained, that in CG (mb) on Gen 4,14 (cf. N on Gen 4,14) ברנש (another form of בר נשא) can only

³⁸ D. FLUSSER, *Jesus* (Jerusalem 1997, 1998), p.108.

³⁹ According to O. Betz, Jesus himself used the «Hoheitsaussagen» referring to Dan 7,13-14. Cf. BETZ, *Jesus und das Danielbuch*, cit., p.15-16, 175. I. H. Marshall has pointed out that a reference to the Danielic figure may exist in Jesus' sayings even when an explicit reference to Dan 7 does not occur. «[...] it is sufficient that Jesus should make clear allusions sufficiently often to create a context in which less-explicit references would be naturally understood». I. H. MARSHALL, «The Synoptic 'Son of Man' Sayings in the Light of Linguistic Study», in: T. E. SCHMIDT - M. SILVA (eds.), *To Tell the Mystery. Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry* (Sheffield 1994), p.93. R. Bauckham has maintained that «authentic Son of Man sayings are those in which allusion to Daniel 7 is explicit apart from the phrase 'Son of Man' itself». He suggests that Jesus used «Son of Man» in the indefinite sense («a man», «someone») with an «oblique or ambiguous self-reference», and when he used the expression referring to Dan 7,13 (cf. Mk 14,62), it was neither a title nor an unambiguous self-reference but a literal echo of the biblical text. The quasi-titular use of the expression was extended, in the Greek translation, to other sayings of Jesus' preaching. Cf. R. BAUCKHAM, «The Son of Man: 'A Man in my Position' or 'Someone'?, *JSNT* 23 (1985) p.28-30. According to J. D. G. Dunn, the expression «Son of Man» as it now stands in the gospels is a title for Jesus, but «There are no good reasons for the hypothesis that Daniel or his readers would have understood the human figure of his vision as a particular individual». It was Jesus himself or the first community who first linked «the vindication» after death to Dan 7,13. Cf. DUNN, *Christology in the Making*, cit., p.74, 87.

be «I»⁴⁰. But probably, in this and in some other occurrences attested in the Jewish literature of the first centuries CE, «Son of Man» had become «I» because of the messianic and eschatological use of the expression in such texts as Q beatitudes, in the developments of traditions probably connected to Q (cf. Lk 5,24; 9,26; 12,40; 17,22ff), and in other NT and early Christian writings where the «Son of Man» has the «superhuman» features that 4Q521 attributes to an agent of the Lord or to the Lord himself⁴¹.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

With this study, I have suggested the hypothesis that when the expression «Son of Man» was introduced into Q beatitudes, it had a messianic meaning. With the insertion of the expression as a messianic *title* in Lk 6,22c, it was inserted into Q beatitudes also an eschatology of the (close) final judgment — in addition to the eschatology of the reward in heaven, which may have belonged to an earlier stage of the composition (Lk 6,22ab-23). Joining together two views of eschatology, the one who was responsible for the insertion of Lk 6,22c (who may have been the redactor of Q beatitudes), associated Lk 6,22-23 to Dan 7 — a text that had been written in a time of persecutions (cf. Acts 4,32; 1Cor 11,12-27; Gal 3,26-29)⁴² — pro-

⁴⁰ Cf. VERMES, «The Use of *בן אדם*», cit., p.310-28. The targumic tradition on Gen 4 has been dated to the first century BCE. Cf. L. FINKELSTEIN, *The Pharisees* (New York 1962), p.769; S. ISENBERG, «An Anti-Sadducees Polemic in the Palestinian Targum Tradition», *HTR* 63 (1970) p.433-44.

⁴¹ For the use of the expression in Rabbinical literature in polemic with its use in the theology developed by the early Christians, cf. j Taanit 2,1 (65b); and E. SJÖBERG, «*בן אדם* und *בן אנוש* im Hebräischen und Aramäischen», *AcOr* 21 (1950-53) p.59. It may be meaningful to notice, in this context, that the *בן אנוש* of Gen 4 — who according to the targums is Cain — cannot be hidden. The Messiah, instead, is hidden (j Sanh 98a; cf. also j Ber 5a), in heaven (2 Bar 30,1; 4 Ezra 14,9), or preserved by God in a secret place (cf. 1 En 46,1-2; 48,2-3; 62,7; 4 Ezra 7,28-29; 12,31-34; 13,26; 2 Apoc Bar 30,1-2; Odes Sol 41,15). In b Pes 54a, it is said that the name of the Messiah is hidden. Justin also speaks of a hidden Messiah (Dial with Tryph 8; cf. Col 1,15; Jn 1,18; 7,26-27). Some other things about the Messiah are manifest. For example, he was born when the Temple was destroyed (j Ber 5a), or prior to the creation of the world (Pes Rabbati 152b), and he will come from Rome (cf. PT on Ex 12,42).

⁴² G. Vermes has pointed out that the expression of Dan 7,13 — which originally referred collectively to the Israelites persecuted by Antiochus Epiphanes (the «saint of the Most High») — was applied to Jesus in the gospels only after his death, when he was

ducing a theology of the kingdom as «future» and at the same time «close-at-hand». The expression could have been used subsequently — in some cases — by some sages with the purpose of stating that the «Son of Man» is the speaker or a man like everybody else, and that «he» does not have any eschatological meaning. In Matthew's list — which follows the theologies of its source⁴³ — the «Son of Man» may have been omitted in order to avoid the position of the sages on the meaning of the expression as it is found, for example, in the Aramaic targums (cf. N and CG on Gen 4,14); or in order to avoid a polemic with the synagogue. It is also possible that the choice to omit the expression «Son of Man» in Mt 5,11 points out a different theological view from that of the Q beatitudes. By the time of the Matthean redaction of the Q beatitudes, the end was no longer expected to be accomplished in the near future (cf. the omission of *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* of Lk 6,22 in Mt 5,12), and expressions such as the one found in the book of Daniel would not fit the theology of the new list. The latter seems, in fact, to be focused on the ethical implications of the kingdom announced by Jesus and by his followers — more than on the wait of its close full accomplishment on earth⁴⁴.

proclaimed the exalted Messiah. For G. Vermes, the expression in Dan 7,13 is not a title. He quotes passages from Rabbinical literature where the «Son of Man» of Dan 7,13 is identified with the Messiah but, according to him, that was due to the interpretation of the second throne in Dan 7,9 (and probably to the conferment of an everlasting crown to the human figure), and not to the occurrence of «Son of Man» as a title. Also in Esd 4,13 and 1 En 46; 62,5-14; 70-71, according to G. Vermes, «Son of Man», who is the pre-existent royal Messiah (cf. also 1 En 48,2.10) and is paralleled to Dan 7,13, would not be used as a title. Cf. VERMES, *Jesus the Jew*, cit., pp.163-72, 182-86.

⁴³ For J. Jeremias, in those cases in which the first person singular occurs where «Son of Man» appears in a parallel text, this last must be considered late and the first original. «[...] not a single instance of the opposite process, the elimination of the expression, can be demonstrated. Rather, once the title *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* had gained a footing, it did not let itself be suppressed again. That means that wherever we find rivalry between the simple *ἐγώ* and the solemn *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, in all probability the simple *ἐγώ* is the earlier tradition». JEREMIAS, *New Testament Theology*, cit., p.263.

⁴⁴ «Le royaume ne s'y présente [in Matthew's beatitudes] plus comme la réalisation des promesses messianiques (rédaction primitive) ou comme une juste compensation pour ceux qui n'ont aucune part au bonheur du monde présent (rédaction de Luc); il est une récompense pour ceux qui s'en seront rendus dignes par leurs dispositions intimes et par leur manière de vivre le message évangélique». J. DUPONT, *Les béatitudes*, Le problème littéraire, vol. I (2nd ed., Paris 1958), p.298ff. Cf. also MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke*, cit., p.246.