

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## THE 'SON OF MAN' IN THE USAGE OF JESUS

B. W. BACON  
YALE UNIVERSITY

TO students accustomed to think of "meekness and lowliness" as typical traits in the personal character of Jesus there was distinct relief in the authoritative declaration of eminent philologists some twenty years ago, that the self-designation 'the Son of Man' would be unintelligible in the Palestinian Aramaic of Jesus' time, so that the title with all its connotations of superhuman authority and dignity must be ascribed to the period after the development of the resurrection faith, and could not be an embodiment of Jesus' thought concerning himself.

The relief was all the greater to students who deplored the exaggeration, on the part of the so-called Eschatological school, of the extent to which Jesus' admitted acceptance of current apocalyptic beliefs affected his primary message. Some of us still feel that his primary message was of a different, almost an opposite type; a message of faith and hope, not of despair; glad tidings of a Power for good already at work in the world, and manifesting itself in human hearts, a Power like the subtle working of leaven, or the vitality of seeds, to whose quiet, inconspicuous working would be due the real accomplishment whereof the dramatic Day of Jehovah would be little more than the "manifestation".

Then came Dalman's *Worte Jesu* which seemed to prove, against those of the school of Schmidt and Wellhausen, that Jesus could quite well have employed the term *Bar nasha* in the sense required by the Gospel contexts, if he had so chosen,

without becoming unintelligible to his auditors. He would have been understood to mean by it "that 'mortal' (Menschenkind) referred to in Dan. 7 13 as 'brought with clouds to the Ancient of Days', to receive on Israel's behalf the everlasting kingdom". None of these expressions, 'the kingdom', 'the Ancient of Days', 'the Son of Man' would be intelligible in Jesus' utterance without implied reference to former use in a special and technical sense. But we certainly know that such technical use had been made of the first of the three, and there seems to be no small amount of evidence that such was the case also with the last. To what extent the expression *Bar nasha* was actually current in this sense is not the primary question, nor is it the extent to which it may have acquired, through the usage of *Enoch* and similar apocalypses, new connotations not intended in Daniel. The primary question is simply: Could Jesus have used the term as the Gospels represent, though not necessarily on the particular occasions, nor with the particular intention and connotation which they assume? This question, it would appear, can only be answered in the affirmative. One cannot object the non-appearance of the term in Paul, because Paul has other means of presenting the same doctrine, and unlike the evangelists was not translating from the Aramaic.

Those who were reluctant to accept Dalman's proofs that Jesus might have used the apocalyptic term might be expected on the other hand to welcome his suggestion that Jesus used it in a sense nearer to the original, Danielic sense than to that placed upon it by the apocalyptists who took it over. According to Dalman Jesus used the title Son of Man only to mean what I may call the Suppliant on Israel's behalf at the judgment-seat of the King of kings. In his own words (*op. cit.* p. 217):

If Jesus attached to Peter's confession of his Messiahship the first announcement of his violent death, this was in order to make it clear that accession to his dominion was still far off, and that Christhood did not imply, but on the contrary excluded, his intervening on his own behalf. Now the "one like unto a son of man" of Dan. 7 13 is one who has yet to receive his dominion. He *might* be one who should have

passed through suffering and death. In any case he is by his very nature no mighty one, no conqueror, no destroyer, but merely a 'mortal' (Menschenkind), whom God has taken under his protection, and for whom he destines great things.

Unfortunately this distinction of Dalman's between the ordinary, apocalyptic sense in which the title was commonly understood in Jesus' time, and the purely Danielic original sense of a suppliant Son of Man, is not borne out by the Gospel records. Jesus has indeed but slight sympathy with the apocalyptists; but we have no ground in this case as in his employment of the title "Messiah" (Χριστός), for maintaining that he undertook to raise the ordinary term to a new level of meaning "according to the things of God". The Gospels offer no indication as regards this title that he used it in any other than the commonly accepted sense. For if he had made the distinction there was the greatest occasion for the evangelists noting the fact.

Two points, however, do seem to have been established by Dalman and later writers in the course of this long controversy. (1) Jesus did make frequent use, even in his earlier ministry, of this peculiar expression "the Son of Man", using it as a designation for the agent of divine justice in Jehovah's 'Day'.<sup>1</sup> (2) In the latter part of his ministry Jesus so far departed from his usual objective, non-committal references to 'the Son of Man', his 'Day', or his 'Coming', and the like, as to suggest to his disciples a connection between this event and his own fate; though the suggestion may not have been brought home to them until the tragedy of Calvary recalled it in a lurid light.

If I may be permitted to anticipate the results of the study which I must presently describe in detail I would suggest the following as the historical facts which best account for all the phenomena.

(1) From the outset Jesus had a Son of Man doctrine. In taking up the Baptist's warning to repentance Jesus could

<sup>1</sup> On this point see the definite pronouncement of the editors of *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. I, p. 374: "Few things are so probable as the use of Son of Man by Jesus".

not but refer to the Being of whom John had spoken as coming after him to winnow Jehovah's threshing-floor, gathering the wheat into his garner, and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire, John is not speaking of Jehovah, to whom the saying "I am not worthy to loose his shoe's latchet" would not be applicable. Neither does he mean the Angel of the Covenant, of whom the phraseology derived from Malachi might incline us to think. The personality in mind is human, though endowed with miraculous powers, for it is when he hears of "the mighty works" done by Jesus that John sends to enquire: "Art thou the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχόμενος)?" The personality is the same, though John does not use (perhaps we may say, avoids using) the distinctive title.

(2) Jesus uses the distinctive title, but from the very nature of the case cannot have used it in application to himself during that period of his ministry wherein his messiahship was still a 'secret'. In all his utterances down to the revelation of this secret to the Twelve at Caesarea Philippi, and in all his *public* utterances down to the last, Jesus' use of the title must have been impersonal and objective, as who should say: "He whom Jehovah will send to execute His judgment". This necessary reserve is vividly illustrated in the incident of the Baptist's Enquiry; for the reply is purposely ambiguous. Its substance is: "Tell John of the work of saving grace which you see God accomplishing through me, and not to let the question of my personality stand in the way of the hope and cheer it should bring him". The refusal of a categorical reply on the question put stands at swords' points with the representation of the evangelist that in the very next breath Jesus openly spoke of himself to the surrounding multitude as "the Son of Man". The evangelist's idea is not that of his source.

(3) After the close of the Galilean ministry, confronted with the alternative of abandoning his mission to Israel or carrying his message to the national centre, Jesus reveals the fact that he has also a Son of David doctrine. In spite of recent very high authority in denial of this, no other explanation of the course of events from this time on until the rallying of the scattered flock under leadership of Peter to the watchword

"God hath made him both Lord and Christ" seems to me historically credible. From Caesarea Philippi on the movement of Jesus took on a nationalistic character. The religious ideal was to be attained through Israel's acceptance of his leadership in place of the husbandmen who refused to Jehovah the fruits of His vineyard. It is impossible to imagine belief in his messiahship growing up *after* the crucifixion. It is almost equally impossible to account for the conduct of friends or enemies before the great catastrophe without this claim on Jesus' part to *messianic* leadership.

(4) The problem grows out of the relation of these two beliefs, in this chronological relation. Not, first the doctrine of personal adherence to Jesus as Son of David, to which certain more or less incongruous attributes of the Son of Man become attached; but, first a doctrine of the Coming One, the Son of Man, quite without reference to the person of Jesus, followed through pressure of harsh necessity by the appeal to a personal loyalty centering in Jesus as anointed Leader of Israel toward a kingdom "according to the things of God".  
For

(5) At Caesarea Philippi the alternative had also to be faced of rejection and death. This was indeed the more probable of the two. Would this mean the failure of the divine ideal? Certainly not. But if not, the victory would have to come "on the clouds of heaven". The kingdom must be given not to a Son of David here on earth, but to a Son of Man (who may of course be no other than this same Son of David) at the judgment seat of the Highest. Until Calvary no follower of Jesus could have said by which road the deliverance must come. After it, rallying faith could not fail to lay hold of the Danielic prophecy to which the Gospels with one consent bear witness Jesus had himself appealed in presenting the alternative; and the bridge was the Isaian doctrine of the sacrificed Servant. Over this the broken following of Jesus, dismayed at the tragedy because unwilling with him to confront the darker as well as the more hopeful alternative, returned to its allegiance and an ultimate triumph.

On the whole it seems improbable that Jesus himself made

any appeal to the Isaian prophecy. But Paul is explicit in teaching that this was a foundation stone of the primitive faith. All sources unite in attributing to Peter and his associates in the first days after the great tragedy, the discovery, as by revelation of God, that "thus it behooved the Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory". First the doctrine of the Coming One, the Son of Man; second the doctrine of the Son of David, to whom it is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom; third the discovery that "according to the Scriptures" the Servant humbled and obedient unto a sacrificial death, is also he who is "exalted and made very high". Such is the progress of doctrine according to the testimony of New Testament Christology. Whether the phenomena of the documents in their use of the title Son of Man bear out this provisional understanding is the problem with which we have now to concern ourselves.

The most recent, and certainly one of the most scholarly discussions of this subject appears in Chapter IV of the well known work *Beginnings of Christianity* (1920) under the caption "Christology". The authors agree that analysis of Mark, our oldest Gospel, reveals the fact that to this evangelist Jesus was preeminently "the Christ", but (as these authors hold) not because he was "the Son of David"; rather because he was the Son of Man. The efforts of the later Synoptists to overcome the adverse implications of Mk. 12 35-37 by prefixing the genealogies and stories of the infancy they regard as a leading proof "that Jesus did not claim to be or consider himself to be the 'Davidic Messiah'" (p. 366). This was a subsequent development possibly "hastened by the conversion to Christianity of Jews who had maintained the claims of the Davidic dynasty against the Hasmonaeans or the Herods". By the time of the later strata of Synoptic tradition and the earlier chapters of Acts:

the identification of Jesus with the Scion of David had become a prominent part of Christian belief; to prove the Davidic claim of Jesus is one of the chief objects of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke. But the figure of the Scion of David had coalesced with that of the Son of Man rather than taken its place, and the term 'Christ' covered

both. Moreover, this merging of the two figures with each other was the result of their identification with Jesus, not the cause of it. The Anointed Son of Man is the anointed son of David not because the two figures were originally identical, or because 'anointed' was a Jewish title which could only belong to one person, but because Christians found both the Son of Man and the Son of David in Jesus, and therefore were forced to say that the Son of Man is the Son of David, and to attribute to either figure everything believed or prophesied of the other.

We can agree to the conclusion drawn by the editors that "the idea of the Son of David was added to that of the Son of Man, rather than the Son of Man to that of the Son of David" if it be recognized that the "merging of the two figures" is not a mere literary phenomenon in the early history of Gospel tradition, but something for which Jesus is himself responsible, whether in explicit words, or by implication, when he compelled his disciples to face the unwelcome possibility of martyrdom. Mark is indeed careful to show that in identifying himself with "the Christ" Jesus expressly disclaimed "Davidic" messiahship. That is called a conception "after the things of men", Satanic, part of the blindness which even Peter still shares with his people. According to Mark Jesus claims to be "the Christ" only in so far as this title has the apocalyptic sense of Son of Man. For this reason he attaches after his account of Peter's Confession a story of vision and Voice from heaven manifesting to Peter and his companions the true nature of the Christ and his redemptive work. It is to be "not according to the things of men, but of God". What seems to be overlooked in this able discussion of Markan Christology is the fact that this Gospel evinces not a primitive so much as an advanced stage in Christian belief. The Christ ἀγγελόγητος of Pa. 110 belongs to the typical Christology of the writer of Hebrews. Paul not only places this Christology in the very forefront of his systematic presentation of his gospel (Rom. 14), but forestalls Mark's antithesis between it and the mundane Christhood both here (Rom. 13) and elsewhere (II Cor. 5 16).

In this opposition to the Son of David Christology Mark



is not so much primitive as Pauline, and in opposing he presupposes. For the disproof of the expectation of "the scribes" in Mk. 12 35-37 is as much an answer to the cry "Thou son of David" of Bartimaeus and the multitude (10 47f; 11 10) as the Transfiguration vision to the Confession of Peter. Mk. 12 35-37 is an editorial supplement to the debate with Pharisee, Sadducee, and Scribe (12 13-34), not an original feature of the source. The Roman evangelist is anti-Jewish Christian.

Nor is Mark primitive in his use of the title Son of Man. He borrows it unexplained from earlier sources, assuming that his readers will know that it was (to use the modern phrase) "a favorite self-designation of Jesus". His prologue (Mk. 1 1-13), in which Jesus is simply "the Christ", "the Son of God" in the sense of I Pt. 1 20f. (not to say of Col. 1 15-17), defines his Christology once for all. He uses the title Son of Man as the appropriate one for certain connections (whose significance we have to search into), but his readers are supposed to know that this is a title which should have reminded the Jews of a Christhood according to the things of God, which they in their *πρώτοις* were blind to.

We cannot, therefore, accept the conclusion of our Cambridge scholars that:

The Christians who first of all regarded Jesus as the anointed Son of Man, the judge of the world, came soon to accept the popular expectation and to regard Jesus as the anointed Scion of David as well as the Son of Man.

Previous to his death Jesus' followers did not regard him as the Son of Man. The turning point of their faith was when, after the catastrophe, they began to do so. But they might never have come to the point of making this identification, near as it lay in view of Jesus' words of assurance as he neared the cross, had not the coincidence of his work and fate with that predicted for the Isaian Servant come first to their mind. We do agree, however, with these eminent scholars that the solution of the question must come through tracing

the meaning and connotation of these other titles (besides *Χριστός*)—Son of Man and Servant—in order to see how much

they represent in the earliest thought of the disciples, and how they were treated by Gentiles who had no previous knowledge of their meaning.

For this purpose our authors subjoin a table of occurrences of the title Son of Man in I. Marcan Passages; II. Passages in Q; III. Passages peculiar to Matthew; IV. Passages peculiar to Luke (p. 375f.). By comparison of these statistics two main inferences are drawn. (1) Mark and Q agree in the mass of passages "in which 'Son of Man' is used in connection with the Parousia. He is to come unexpectedly on the clouds of heaven, seated at the right hand of power". (2) "In Mark, but not in Q, there are equally noticeable passages in which the name of Son of Man is connected not with the Parousia, but with the Passion". These outstanding facts can only be accepted. It is doubtless also the fact that the Gospel writers have in a number of instances substituted the title for a simple "I" of the original, and probable that in one case (Mt. 8 20 — Lk. 9 58)—a case not so reckoned by the authors—"Son of Man" is due to literal translation of an Aramaic proverbial saying.<sup>2</sup> The three passages which the Cambridge authors adduce as instances of this we cannot accept. We reject the first (Mk. 2 28) because verse 27, on which their argument is based, is a typical instance of 'Western non-interpolation' and so forms no part of the authentic text. We reject the other two because of difference of interpretation.<sup>3</sup> Finally we must demur to the statement (p. 386) that "In Mark and Q there are no signs of any identification of Jesus with the sufferer of Isaiah 53". The references to Isaiah in Mark are rare, and even of these Mk. 9 12 has all the appearance of a gloss (though a gloss already known to Matthew; cf. Mt. 17 12). But "the Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of him" (Mk. 14 21) is surely a "clear reference to Ia. 53", and confirms the indications that "the use of the word *παράδοσις* in Mark 14 18, 21, etc., is connected with the constant use of the same word in Isaiah 53". True, Mark is no more primary in his use of the Servant theme

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 163.

than in his use of Son of David, or Son of Man. His references (including the reference to Ps. 22 1 in the duplicate to Mk. 15 37 prefixed in verses 34-36) are borrowed and unexplained. But in addition to his confirmation of the witness of Q that Jesus habitually spoke of the Coming one of John the Baptist as "the Son of Man" Mark certainly warrants our laying down the following as historic facts.

(1) From the time when Jesus set his face to go up to Jerusalem, but not before, Jesus turned his disciples' attention to his own personality, placing loyalty to himself in the foreground as essential to the cause.

(2) Without this change from an impersonal preaching of repentance in view of impending judgment to a direct effort to inaugurate a national movement under his personal leadership neither the popular support accorded to Jesus in his defiance of the hierocracy at Jerusalem, nor his execution by Pilate, nor the subsequent rallying to his banner of adherents who proclaimed him "the Christ", predicting his return as Son of Man, and explaining his sufferings as divinely appointed for the Servant, can be made historically intelligible.

(3) The self-devoting loyalty which animated Jesus' followers and explains this historical sequence was not obtained on the plea: "This is the Son of Man"; but "This is the Son of David". The more Mark is opposed to a Jewish-Christian type of Christology the more conclusive is his unwilling witness to this fact.

In order to show that the phenomena of the Gospels in their employment of the title Son of Man are in accordance with the growth of Christology as thus described we may now turn to a new survey of these employments, using a tabulation made independently of the present issues by Professor N. Schmidt, s. v. "Son of Man" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (vol. iv., col. 4713).

A beginning has been made in the task of discriminating the usage of the various Gospel writers by Harnack in his attempted reconstruction of the "Second Source".<sup>4</sup> We may

<sup>4</sup> *Sprüche und Reden*, English: *The Sayings of Jesus, the Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*, 1908.

properly speak of this "Second Source" as the oldest, for Wellhausen's attempt to explain the relation between it and Mark by dependence on the side of Mark has been reversed by almost unanimous consent. Harnack himself leaves open the question whether the relation in the case of Mark is that of direct literary dependence; but on the question of priority he feels no hesitation. After isolating by the usual processes the Q (or Second-Source) material, he undertakes the enquiry whether in it "the Son of Man" is already assumed to be "a favorite self-designation of Jesus". One who carefully follows his study of all the data will find it hard to escape the conclusion that in Q such is really the case. Harnack states his conclusion as follows (p. 239):

We must acknowledge that in Q the phrase has become simply a term which our Lord ordinarily used when speaking of himself. Seeing that Q pays no regard to chronology, this source is not suitable as an authority upon which to base investigations as to the period at which our Lord began so to describe himself. Such investigations can only be based upon the Gospel of St. Mark. Q, however, gives some help in that we learn from this source how completely and quickly the consciousness, that there was once a time when our Lord did not so name himself, had vanished from tradition. There can scarcely be any doubt as to the sense of the expression in Q. If in Q the only historical passages—historical, that is, in the narrower sense of the word—are the narratives of the testimony of the Baptist to the coming Messiah, (of the Baptism), and of the Messianic temptation, and if then abruptly and repeatedly the expression "the Son of Man" crops up in the collection of sayings, it necessarily follows that in Q the term can mean nothing else than "the Messiah"

Harnack, accordingly, considers that the title "Son of Man" had already been introduced in this precanonical source in a systematic way, as equivalent to "the Messiah". In Q, as later, it occurs only in the mouth of Jesus. As reported by Matthew (not Luke) the Source itself refers to Jesus as  $\delta$  Χριστός (Mt. 11 2?). But Harnack justly regards the representation as

unhistorical, at least as respects "the period at which our Lord began so to describe himself". In a footnote to the passage he is quite specific:

Of course one cannot be sure that Jesus always called himself Son of Man in those passages where Q makes him thus speak of himself. It is, for example, more than doubtful that Jesus used the expression in section 15 (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34), when before, in the same discourse (section 14, Mt. 11 2ff. — Lk. 7 18 ff.), he had plainly enough avoided any messianic self-designation.

In recognizing such systematic self-designation by Jesus to be inadmissible for the earlier period of the ministry Harnack is of course only confirming the admission of Dalman. Both yield to the common-sense consideration that such use would be incompatible with Jesus' admitted 'reserve' regarding his own person and destiny. But in referring us to Mark for more reliable testimony Harnack certainly does not promote the solution of the problem. For notoriously neither Mark nor any other extant Gospel gives any explanation of the term itself, nor of the use to which it is put by Jesus. If an explanation be sought we must seek it in the remoter period back of our extant Gospels.

For Mark is fully as unhistorical and anachronistic as Q in his representation of the usage of Jesus. At the very outset, in Mk. 2 10 and 28, this evangelist represents Jesus as meeting the objection of the scribes to his pronouncing forgiveness of sins, and of the Pharisees to his disregard of the Sabbath, by a defiant claim to have authority as "the Son of Man", even while still on earth, before ascending to his heavenly judgment seat, both to forgive sins and to set aside the institutions of Mosaism. In Jn. 5 1-47 this line of argument is carried to its logical issue. On occasion of a similar healing and disregard of the Sabbath Jesus is made to say (ver. 26f.):

For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself (cf. Mk. 3 4): and he gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man.

The dogmatic intention of the second evangelist to prove the claim of Jesus to superhuman authority (*ἐξουσία*) by appeal to his mighty works is unmistakable; but not more so than his indifference to historical consistency in making Jesus publicly defend this claim while at the same time keeping secret his Messianic calling and functions. But the inconsistency is much easier to explain if in this anachronistic use of the title 'Son of Man' Mark is not setting a precedent, but merely extending to wider use an unhistorical representation of the Second Source. Our first task, accordingly, must be to appraise at their true value the conclusions of Harnack regarding the use of this title in Q.

Great as are the exceptions which the present writer feels compelled to take to Harnack's views on other points, such as the nature of the Second Source, and its relation to Matthew and Luke respectively, it must be admitted that on the question here in debate his inferences represent not a maximum but a minimum. The Second Source is not Q. That is one of the misleading ambiguities of Harnack's treatment. Q is only the common material of Matthew and Luke which these two later Synoptists do not derive from Mark. It is (broadly speaking) what English critics used to call the 'double-tradition' material. The larger part of this is certainly taken from a written document which when employed by Matthew and Luke was already in the Greek language. We designate it the Second Source, because it stands next to Mark in the proportion of material it has furnished the two later Synoptists. How much of the single-tradition material of Matthew and Luke respectively has also been taken from this Source we can only judge by intrinsic affinities between it and Q material already accepted.

Then there is the 'triple-tradition' material, that is, material found in all three Synoptics. Usually it is in such form and context as to prove that Matthew and Luke have independently borrowed it from Mark. How much of this may have been taken by Mark himself from the Second Source, we have but the slenderest means of judging. Harnack goes to the extreme in excluding everything but Q material from his judgment of the nature of the Source. He admits nothing from single

tradition material, nothing from the triple tradition. He even excludes a portion of what other critics regard as genuine double-tradition material because it differs widely in form as between the two witnesses Matthew and Luke. This is done with small consideration for the fact that the differences can sometimes be explained as due to editorial changes characteristic of the evangelist in question. The basis of judgment for Harnack is therefore certainly a minimum.

This method is manifestly the safe one. It may do injustice to the constructive affirmations we might be able to make as to the nature of the Source. In point of fact it has led Harnack himself to certain unwarranted conclusions as to the fragmentary and incoherent character of the Source. Others, carried away by the illusion (unfortunately shared by Harnack) that Papias had something to say about this Source, something connecting it with the Apostle Matthew and describing its character, have pushed these unwarranted conclusions to still greater lengths. But these do not affect the question before us, save to reduce the material available for proof. Whatever else may have belonged to the Second Source we are sure of the main sections of Q material, and in these Harnack's conclusions are already justified. As our enquiries continue they will plainly appear as corroborated and reenforced by the data otherwise attainable.

The relatively small number of occurrences in the fourth Gospel may be omitted from present consideration. Interesting as is the usage which characterizes this Hellenistic Gospel, its comparatively late and dependent relation to the other three, and the theological rather than historical aim of the evangelist are so generally admitted, that we may reasonably confine our survey to the Synoptists and the Second Source. Here it may prove possible by comparison of each with the rest to determine with greater or less probability what principles have controlled the usage, both as respects occurrences merely transcribed from earlier sources and extensions undertaken by the evangelist on his own responsibility. Let us consider first the extensions.

We may probably assume a general assent to the conclusion of Harnack regarding the usage of Q in its broadest, most general form, that some of the occurrences in the Second

Source are due to the evangelist rather than to Jesus himself. The particular instance Harnack has in view is that of the saying contrasting the work of "the Son of Man" with that of the Baptist in the Q discourse on this subject (Mt. 11 19 — Lk. 7 34). But there may well be other cases also in which the pre-canonical evangelist has substituted the title for the personal pronoun according to his own idea of fitness. On the other hand only an extreme and unreasonably sceptical criticism would venture to assume that he had no historical foundation at all for his practice of limiting his use of the term to utterances of Jesus. We may therefore probably assume a general assent also to the converse proposition: Some of the occurrences in Q represent the actual usage of Jesus. A survey of the eight instances enumerated by Schmidt in the strictly Q material, that is, occurrences presented in common by Matthew and Luke in non-Markan material, ought to throw some light on the question what sort of usage, if any, came down to the pre-canonical evangelist by tradition or otherwise as representative of Jesus, and what sort of usage is typical of himself.

Of the eight occurrences in Q four, or precisely one-half, are of a single type and occur in a single connection. All four are found in the eschatological discourse of Mt. 24 27-44, paralleling Lk. 17 24-30 and 12 40. The section forms part of Matthew's parallel to the eschatological discourse of Mark (Mk. 13), combining with it that of the Second Source in Lk. 17 20-37, just as Luke himself has combined elements from both in his own parallel to Mark (Lk. 21). The general theme of the entire context is the 'Day of the Son of Man', a day of his sudden Coming, a Day of judgment unescapable, for which one must prepare by sincere repentance. For the evangelists the equivalence "The Son of Man — Jesus redivivus" is a matter of course. Their writings are certainly of later date than the utterances of Paul himself and of others referred to in 1 Thess. 1 10 and 4 15-17, wherein his converts are reminded how he had taught them to wait for God's Son from heaven, "even Jesus who delivereth us from the wrath to come". The doctrine is assured by "a word of the Lord", probably uttered by the Spirit through some Christian 'prophet', that



The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God.

We also have a reminder in 2 Cor. 5 10, and (if the reading be correct) in Rom. 14 10 also, that we must all "stand before the judgment seat of Christ" to receive the due reward of our deeds. Paul eschews the term, but the belief is primitive and general. Why, then, should not the very earliest Gospel sources reflect it in the "favorite self-designation"?

But it is at least worthy of our notice that in the utterances themselves the assumed equivalence is conspicuously absent.<sup>5</sup> Jesus speaks objectively and in the third person of "the Son of Man" as the agent of the divine judgment. In all these warnings to Repent, because of the Coming, the Day, the Judgment, of the Son of Man, there is no suggestion that Jesus thinks of himself as the Coming One. Indeed in such utterances of similar warning as Mt. 5 25 f. — Lk. 12 58 f., where the title "Son of Man" does not appear, it is much more natural to think of God as Judge. This is apparently the case, so far as the saying itself is concerned, in Mt. 10 32 f. — Lk. 12 8 f. For here Jesus himself (Luke "the Son of Man") is present, not as Judge, but as Witness on behalf of those who have loyally confessed him on the earth. The inference would seem to be that while Jesus availed himself of expressions common to the current apocalyptic eschatology, such as "the Day", the "Coming", the "Sign" of the "Son of Man", he left the question of his own relation to this Coming One quite open, at least in his public exhortations to repentance.

Since there is no need to suppose that Jesus intended in these four utterances any such identification of his own personality with "the Son of Man" as the evangelists assume, and the linguistic objection appears not to be sustained, there can be no good reason for questioning their authenticity. The case is far otherwise with the other four occurrences of 'double tradition'. Apart from the fact that all four are conspicuously open to the objection that they violate the principle of "reserve", they are individually subject to other adverse considerations.

<sup>5</sup> Lk. 17 25 is not in the source.

(1) The logion "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head" (Mt. 8 20 — Lk. 9 58) may well be a proverbial saying, used in the sense of the parallel utterance of Tiberius Gracchus regarding Rome's homeless veterans. It is difficult to conceive it in the mouth of Jesus, whose experience of generous hospitality both for himself and his disciples makes him promise them repeatedly (Mt. 10 11 — Lk. 10 5-7; Mk. 10 30) a kindly reception, and who refers afterward to their having received it (Lk. 22 35). The utterance seems improbable in Jesus' mouth because contrary to fact. But even at the early period of the Second Source we must allow for an occasional 'winged word' being ascribed to Jesus without better reason than resemblance in some catchword such as "Son of Man". The expression is here used, of course, in antithesis with the animal creation.

(2) The contrast of the mode of life of "the Son of Man" with that of John the Baptist (Mt. 11 10 — Lk. 7 34) is generally recognized as exhibiting one of the unhistorical occurrences of the title, for reasons already set forth.

(3) In the same context the title recurs again in the saying which makes "the Son of Man" a sign to "this generation" as Jonah had been to the Ninevites (Mt. 12 40 — Lk. 11 30). The "sign of the Son of Man" seems to have been a conception of current Jewish apocalypse. Whether connected with this expectation or not the present demand was met in various ways in early Christian apologetic (cf. Mt. 21 23-32 and parallels, Jn. 2 18-22; 6 30 ff.). The Q context which denounces the "evil and adulterous generation" that seeks this "sign" (Mt. 12 38-42 — Lk. 11 29-32), makes it probable that the discourse in its original form referred to a double insensibility. The evil generation had been deaf to a two-fold appeal. God had sent the Baptist like a second Elijah, warning of judgment to come and summoning to repentance, but in vain. The Ninevites at the threat of Jonah "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed" had repented in sackcloth and ashes. But the Pharisees and scribes, though they saw all the people and the publicans baptized with the baptism of John, did not even repent themselves afterwards, at this evidence of divine forbearance (Mt. 21 31 f. — Lk. 7 30 f.). Therefore in the day of judgment the Ninevites would put them

to shame. This, however, was but the first count in the indictment. The scribes had further sinned against the Spirit when, witnessing the "glad tidings" of mercy and forgiveness proclaimed by Jesus and corroborated by "the Spirit of God" visibly expelling the powers of darkness, they had objected, "He casteth out by Beelzebub". The gentle voice of mercy and tenderness, wooing the erring to return in this "glad tidings to the poor", was the very voice of "the Wisdom of God", whose loving condescension in going forth to seek and to save the lost is justified by her children. This is a greater 'wisdom' than Solomon's. Therefore the Queen of the South, who came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon would in the day of judgment put to shame those who had despised it. God has sent "prophets and wise men", but Israel has rejected both. In this double condemnation it cannot be "the Son of Man" who was originally set in parallelism with Jonah as the proclaimer of judgment to come. It can only have been (as elsewhere in Jesus' replies to the demand for a sign) John the Baptist, the forerunner of the judgment day, turning Israel to repentance "in the spirit and power of Elijah". Solomon, not Jonah, stands in parallelism with Jesus. We therefore owe the introduction of the title "the Son of Man" in Mt. 12 40 = Lk. 11 30 to a misunderstanding. The author of the Source in the form in which it lay before Matthew and Luke, certainly a Greek document, though probably translated from an Aramaic original, has endeavored to adjust the saying from a form like that of Mt. 16 4 or Mk. 8 12, where no mention is made of "the Son of Man", to a form consistent with his own idea of "the sign of the Son of Man". Even so Matthew and Luke take different views of the meaning.

(4) The last of the four occurrences of the title in Q is in the context already brought into connection with the preceding. In the discourse just described as a denunciation of the "evil and adulterous generation" which had rejected both forms of the divine appeal, warning of judgment or assurance of forgiveness, Jesus calls it a "blasphemy of the Spirit" to ascribe his works of beneficence to collusion with Beelzebub, because the power is not his own, but "the Spirit of God". Were they

speaking against him as a mere son of man (that is, a man like other men) this would be pardonable. But the sin of the scribes cannot be forgiven, because this is the last and Great Repentance, and they have used their power as holders of the key of knowledge to hinder those who were just entering the kingdom. They cannot frustrate the work of God, but they do cut themselves off from all part in the coming redemption. In this case we have perhaps a historical use of the generic term "a son of man"; but the context itself makes clear the fact that no title is intended. The term has simply its ordinary sense, a human being, a mere mortal, as opposed to "the Spirit of God".

The result of this individual study of the eight occurrences of the title Son of Man in Q is quite striking. Four, which all belong to the same type, that is, objective warnings of the Day, or the sudden Coming, of the heavenly Judge, we have no reason to question; for they go no further than the utterances of the Baptist, save that they bring "the Coming one" of whom John speaks into relation with the figure of Dan. 7 13 and later apocalyptic writers, by use of the special term "the Son of Man". The other four occurrences are of different types. All are subject to the historical objection that they could not have been employed as represented in the Source without provoking opposition such as does not appear to have been actually raised until the last days of the ministry, when Jesus faced it and suffered the consequences. Individually they show that they do not fit the contexts in which they occur. On the contrary they can be easily accounted for as extensions of the actual usage of Jesus in accordance with the prepossessions of the evangelist.

In passing to the fourteen occurrences of Mark we must be prepared to find on the one hand a certain proportion of authentic instances (whether from oral tradition or written sources, including among the latter some form of the Second Source), and on the other hand an extension due to the evangelist himself, in the same line as that already observed in Q. For if the example were once set, whether in Q or elsewhere, there would be every reason to expect later evangelists to follow

it, seeing all were thoroughly imbued with the idea that Jesus, even in the days of his flesh, had all the attributes of the heavenly dispenser of divine justice. It is of course no more than a coincidence, but certainly a significant coincidence, that again in Mark one-half the total number of occurrences, or seven in all, belong to a single group or type, for which we have every reason to posit some authentic and historical utterance, whereas the other half give evidence in various ways of being due to extensions on the part of the evangelist of earlier usage.

The seven occurrences characteristic of Mark are all distinguished by their common reference to the Betrayal, and are usually couched in the Isaian terminology employed by Paul (Rom. 4 25; 8 32), which speaks of the Servant as "delivered up" (*παρέδθη*; not *προέδόθη*, as would be appropriate for betrayal). The prediction is first made in Mk. 8 31 = Lk. 9 22, in this single instance the language (*ἀποδοκιμασθήναι*) reflecting Ps. 118 22 rather than Is. 53 6 LXX. (*κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν*). It is repeated in Mk. 9 31 and 10 33, referred to as a prophecy of Scripture in 9 12 and 14 21a, and as fulfilled by Judas in 14 21b and 14 41f. In all these cases, as also in 3 19 and 14 18, where the betrayal is spoken of without the title Son of Man, the verb employed is the Isaian *παρέδοσθαι*. It seems reasonable to infer that the prediction is derived from some source in which Jesus' career was brought into parallelism with the work and fate of the Isaian 'Servant of Jehovah'; for in Mark itself no such parallel is attempted, though it can be traced in certain elements of the underlying material and is a distinctive theme of Luke. Whatever the source, it is not permissible to set aside such a series of occurrences as having no historical foundation. There is the less occasion for such radical scepticism from the fact that every one of the seven employments is represented as occurring in discourse addressed privately to the Twelve, and either at the revelation of Caesarea Philippi or later. It can at least be set down as one of the characteristics of Markan usage that wherever this evangelist has occasion to place in Jesus' mouth a reference to his anticipated fate he prefers to introduce the title "Son of Man" along with phraseology which recalls the classic passage of Is. 53 6 LXX.

Of the remaining seven Markan occurrences three merely reproduce in substance an utterance which we have already had occasion to consider in studying the usage of Q, and have pronounced beyond reasonable objection on the score of authenticity. In Mk. 13 26 we have the same impersonal, objective assurance of the Coming of the Son of Man in the conventional terms of current apocalypse as in the Q eschatology of Lk. 17 20-27 and parallels. The same prediction is made in similar terms in Mk. 8 38 and 14 62. To the evangelist Mark these are of course so many "self-designations of Jesus". But inherently they carry no such implication. As to their probable basis of fact we must enquire later.

There remain four occurrences of the title in Mark which we have good reason to regard as due to the evangelist himself for reasons which would naturally commend themselves from his point of view.

In Mk. 1 40-43 we have a section which corresponds in general bearing with the Q discourse already described, that is, the discourse à propos of the coming of the messengers from John to ask "Art thou He that should come?", when Jesus rebukes the Pharisees and scribes for their captious objections to his message of mercy and his genial mode of life. In Mark as in Q Jesus vindicates both his message of "glad tidings to the poor", and his freedom from the fasts and Sabbaths of Mosaism by appeal to his mighty works. The chief difference is that whereas in Q "the works of the Christ" are appealed to as evidences of the present operation of the divine Spirit, a proof that the power of the "strong man armed" is broken, in Mark Jesus is himself the Stronger one. He proves his own power by miracle, and thus defends his own superhuman authority. He pronounces sins forgiven, not as in Lk. 7 36-50 because he sees the effects of the divine Spirit on the penitent, but because as "Son of Man" he is himself endowed with this authority even while still "on earth". Finally he substantiates it by a word of power (Mk. 2 5-10). Similarly his disregard of fasts and Sabbaths is sustained by the bald declaration that "he is the Son of Man" (Mk. 2 28; verse 27, wanting in Daceffit and Matthew and Luke, is not part of the authentic text). As

we have seen, Q also, in two instances, both unhistorical, uses the title Son of Man in the discourse on John as Elias. But Mark has carried this extension further. The representation is not only incompatible with Jesus' reserve on the question of his personality, but is almost diametrically opposed to his authentic teaching as regards appeal to "signs". It is certainly in Q rather than in Mark that we get the real appeal of Jesus to the "mighty works". To Jesus these were not proofs of his personal authority as Son of Man on earth, but evidences of the present working of "the Spirit of God" which confirmed the "glad tidings". In Q "the works of the Christ" are those of the Isaian Servant. He does them in fulfilment of the calling Is. 42 1-4.

In Mk. 9 9, the command of secrecy until after the resurrection, and 10 45, a contrast of the self-abasement of the Servant as against the self-seeking of the Twelve, the context would naturally suggest to an evangelist imbued with the idea that Jesus used this title as a "self-designation" that it was more appropriate than the simple personal pronoun. In Mt. 11 19 — Lk. 7 34 and Lk. 19 10 we have examples of the schematic employment exhibited in Mk. 10 45. These examples themselves may have lain before the eyes of Mark in the Second Source.

We must therefore pass the same verdict on the usage of our second evangelist as on that of his predecessor. Half his employments of the title go back to an authentic utterance of Jesus, the nature of which is still to be studied. Of the remainder three represent an authentic utterance already represented in Q, four seem to be extensions of earlier use on the evangelist's own responsibility.

In considering the "single tradition" of Matthew and Luke respectively we must of course anticipate the same sort of phenomena as hitherto. Each evangelist has doubtless a certain amount of Second Source material which escapes classification under the symbol Q merely because one of our two witnesses omitted it, whether through preference of a Markan parallel, or merely because it seemed unsuited to his purpose. Such source-material must be brought if possible into relation with utterances of the same type already considered, but must above

all be sharply distinguished from material which shows the evangelist's own usage, if such there be.

In the case of Luke we may acknowledge at once our inability to detect any distinctive usage of the evangelist's own. There are eight occurrences of the title in Luke where the parallels do not record it and one in which Luke has the support of Mark but not of Matthew, who in this case uses the personal pronoun. This last is simply the prediction of Mk. 8 31 — Lk. 9 22, "The Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected". Here the Matthean parallel, Mt. 16 21 makes a new beginning: "From that time Jesus began to show to his disciples that he must suffer", etc. After having begun in this way had Matthew written "the Son of Man must suffer" it would have seemed to imply a distinction between "Jesus" and "the Son of Man". Instead of this he recasts Mk. 8 31 (— Q Mt. 10 32f. — Lk. 12 8f.) in a way to remove all ambiguity: "For the Son of Man is about to come in the glory of his Father", etc. The omission is therefore probably intentional. At all events the title stood originally in Mark. Luke did not interject it. The eight instances, however, in which Luke stands alone are equally far from showing any disposition on this evangelist's part to introduce employments of the title on his own account, in the interest of a conception of his own. Once (Lk. 6 22) he speaks of obloquy endured "for the Son of Man's sake" where the Matthean parallel (Mt. 5 11) is probably truer to the source (Q) in writing "for my sake". Wellhausen suspects a translation error "*men* will cast upon you an evil name". More probably the change is a stylistic improvement of Luke. The obloquy was endured because of the disciples' faith in Jesus as "the Son of Man" (cf. Hegesippus ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* II, xxiii. 13). We may suspect a similar stylistic improvement in the promise of Jesus to acknowledge before the heavenly Judge those who have acknowledged him before earthly judges (Lk. 12 8 — Mt. 10 32). The Matthean parallel has simply the personal pronoun "I will confess", where Luke writes "The Son of Man will confess". In both these cases, it is true, the substitution could be ascribed to the precanonical evangelist, though in that case we should expect to find it in Matthew as well as Luke. In any case



the original meaning of the saying seems to ascribe to Jesus the function of witness, rather than judge, at the heavenly tribunal. "I will confess" is therefore more likely to be original, especially as the tendency of Matthew is to multiply occurrences.

A further group of three occurrences in the Lukan 'single tradition' (Lk. 17 22, Desire for "one of the days of the Son of Man"; 18 8, "If the Son of Man came would he find the faith on the earth?"; and 21 36, "Watch, so as to stand before the Son of Man") belong to the class already described as characteristic of a part of the Q material, and as probably reflecting an actual usage of Jesus. They are mere general, impersonal, references to the Day, or the Coming, of the Son of Man, the expected agent of divine retribution. "One of the days of the Son of Man" in Lk. 17 22 is shown by the context to be probably a mistranslation for "the Day of the Son of Man", which is the object of longing as usually represented in the Source. Lk. 18 8 should be rendered as above. The meaning is: An immediate coming to judgement would give no opportunity for the proclamation of the Gospel, which must, according to the accepted view (Mk. 13 10; Acts 1 6-8), precede the consummation. Lk. 21 36 merely summarises editorially Mk. 13 33-37. The evangelist uses the title in a perfectly appropriate way in referring to the Coming. These three occurrences, accordingly, display no distinctive conception introduced by Luke. They merely show his acceptance of the idea of Q that Jesus employed the conventional term as a self-designation in the current sense, viz, the Agent of divine retribution.

Two occurrences in what would appear to be the Lukan 'single tradition' really represent in slightly different location the Marcan references to the Betrayal of "the Son of Man" already spoken of. Thus Lk. 22 48, "Betrayest thou (*παραδίδως*) the Son of Man with a kiss?", is simply repeated from Lk. 22 32 and is the true equivalent, so far as source is concerned, of Mk. 14 21 = Mt. 26 24. Again Lk. 24 7 is the reminder from the two angels at the tomb, of Jesus' prediction "when he was yet in Galilee, how that the Son of Man must be delivered up (*παραδοθήναι*) into the hands of sinful men"; in other words it simply repeats Mk. 9 31 = Mt. 17 22 = Lk. 21 27. These two

occurrences may possibly strengthen somewhat the claim of this Marcan use to rest upon pre-Markan tradition. They certainly confirm the evidence of Lk. 6 22 and 12 8 to a slight tendency on the part of our third evangelist to introduce the title for stylistic reasons, though he makes no change in the sense it bears in his sources. But they furnish no new instance for the usage of Jesus. They merely add to the evidence of the previously noted Marcan occurrences which show a certain disposition to use the title "the Son of Man" in connection with the prediction of Jesus that he would be "delivered up" (*παράδοθήσεται*).

Finally we have one occurrence in the Lukan 'single tradition' of what we have called the schematic use illustrated in the Q material by the summary: "The Son of Man came eating and drinking" (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34), and in Mark by the summary: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister" (Mk. 10 45 = Mt. 20 28). The declaration of Lk. 19 10 "The Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost" has precisely the same schematic character as the Q utterance. Unfortunately we have no more means of proving derivation from the Second Source in the case of Lk. 19 10 than in the case of Mk. 10 45. Both might be due to this Source, but in neither case have we the means of proving it; because our means of identification disappears in the case of what Mark has drawn from it, just as it does in the case where Luke has drawn from it without the coincident support of Matthew and non-support of Mark. If the story of Zacchaeus (Lk. 19 1-10), which winds up with the formula "the Son of Man came", be attributed to the Second Source (to which the present writer sees no insuperable objection) it must be by other reasoning than the usual application of the mechanical formula: Mt+Lk-Mk-single-tradition = Q.

Thus the eight occurrences of the title in the 'single tradition' of Luke furnish no single instance of employment in any other mode or connection than those already illustrated in the usage of Q and Mark. Some corroboration of the evidence of these earlier sources is furnished by them. They also show a slight tendency to increase the number of instances by stylistic

extension on the part of the evangelist. But for reliable evidence as to the actual usage of Jesus we must fall back upon Q and Mark; and even in these oldest sources we must distinguish between the usage representing authentic tradition, and the usage of the particular writer.

Lastly we have to consider the nine occurrences in the 'single-tradition' material of Matthew. One of these, the insertion of the title in the question of Mk. 8 27, "Who do men say that I am?" to make the impossible form of Mt. 16 13: "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" (corrected in some texts to "that the Son of Man is", in Syr. Sin. to "What do men say concerning me that I am, saying, Who is this Son of Man?") is a clear case of editorial addition. Two other passages make similar extension of the Marcan use. Mt. 16 28 = Mk. 9 1 repeats the expression from the preceding verse (Mt. 16 27 = Mk. 8 38) transforming the Marcan phrase "till they see the kingdom of God come with power" into "till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom". Similarly Mt. 26 2 interjects it in the parallel to Mk. 14 1, by anticipation of 26 24 f. = Mk. 14 21. In these two cases we have again quite certainly editorial extensions. The three together show the usual disposition to multiply instances, but the last two have slight bearing on the problem of the usage of Jesus, because we already have evidence for both types of employment. We know that Mark systematically uses this phraseology with reference to the Betrayal. We also know that Jesus did employ the term with reference to the Day of Jehovah, the Coming of his agent for the 'restoration of all things' (*ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*). Similar considerations apply in two other occurrences of the Matthean 'single-tradition'. (1) Mt. 24 30, where in transcribing Mk. 13 25 f. our evangelist interjects (after the prediction of wonders in the heavens introducing the promise "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming with clouds") the supplement "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven". This is clearly Matthew's own addition, showing his idea of the 'sign of the Son of Man'. Still employment of the term in such an objective, impersonal way would not conflict with what we have seen must have been true of the usage of Jesus. There is also (2) a reference to

the Coming of the Son of Man in the same impersonal, objective way in Mt. 10 23, where the disciples are assured that there will be no need to flee to foreign cities because "the cities of Israel" will afford them refuge "till the Son of Man be come". These two instances of Matthean 'single-tradition' are probably the evangelist's own. But they do not conflict with the acknowledged usage of Jesus.

From these five instances out of the nine of Matthean 'single tradition' very little is to be gained beyond a minimal corroboration of points already established. It does appear, however, that our first evangelist has a decided propensity for the term, even going so far in Mt. 26 2 as to transform the mere note of time of Mk. 14 1 into a prophecy placed in the mouth of Jesus which embodies the mysterious "self-designation". This propensity is further exemplified in Matthew's transcription of Mk. 8 38 = Mt. 16 27. To Mark's reference to the Coming of the Son of Man "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" Matthew makes the supplement based on Ps. 62 13 (cf. *Enoch* lxiii. 9): "And then shall he render unto every man according to his work". When we pass to the remaining four occurrences of the title in Matthean 'single tradition' it will be seen how typically this addition represents the Matthean conception of Jesus as "the Son of Man".

This final group of distinctively Matthean occurrences is instructive. Not because it has any claim to represent the usage of Jesus, for in every case the material of the context can be shown by the stereotyped phraseology no less than the highly characteristic motive to be the handiwork of the evangelist himself. But the smaller its claims to historicity the more instructive as to redactional usage. This group of utterances placed by 'Matthew' in the mouth of Jesus is typical of the gradual building up of the impressive total on which a large part of insufficiently critical inference has been based. When analyzed as to the respective proportion of authentic tradition and redactional usage these eighty-one occurrences of the "self-designation" make a different impression. Lukan usage merely repeats that of Q. Matthean usage is characteristic in the highest degree of the special interests of the Palestinian Gospel

of neo-legalism. This evangelist imports into the usage of Jesus the apocalyptic sense of the term in *Enoch*, with special predilection for the apparatus of the "throne of glory" (this element appears in every one of the four), and the pronouncing of the eternal verdict from the heavenly judgment seat. Matthew emphasizes to the utmost the rewards of eternal blessedness in the kingdom prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world, and the punishments of eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels which are to be the lot particularly of the teachers and workers of "lawlessness". Matthean usage is therefore a very definite fact, and one which merits comparison with the special nature of the compilation as a whole.

The so-called Gospel according to Matthew has specially in view the "teaching all men everywhere to obey all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded" (Mt. 28 20). Its general structure is like that of the Torah, five bodies of precept, each closing with a special formula (Mt. 7 28; 11 1; 13 53; 19 1 and 26 1) and prefaced by a narrative setting. These are drawn in most cases principally from Mark, though in the case of the third (11 2—12 45) principally from the Second Source. A prologue (1 1—2 23) and an epilogue (26 1—28 20) form an external historical framework. This general structure of Matthew justifies the designation 'Gospel of neo-legalism'. But in addition every one of its five bodies of teaching closes with a more or less direct forecast of the judgment of the Son of Man, with its reward for the righteous and penalties of eternal torment for the wicked. The fullest and most typical of these is that which brings the entire public ministry to a vivid close with the parable (recognized by even so conservative an interpreter as W. C. Allen in the *International Critical Commentary*, as the handiwork of the evangelist himself) of "the Son of Man" sitting upon "the throne of his glory" and administering the divine justice upon "all nations" according to their works, "as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats" (Mt. 25 31-46).

(1) A similar picture, warning of the fate of the "false prophets" (known by their lack of "good fruits" and destined to be "hewn down and cast into the fire") is prefixed to the closing parable of the first discourse (Mt. 7 13-23), the Lukan

parallel (Lk. 6 43-45; 13 23-27) showing that Matthew is here combining two Q discourses into a special warning against the teachers of "lawlessness". The specific title "Son of Man" does not here occur, but the description by which Jesus is made to speak of himself as sitting on the heavenly judgment seat is identical with that used elsewhere.

(2) The brief promise of reward in heaven which closes the Charge to the Twelve in Mt. 10 40-42 also lacks specific mention of "the Son of Man", but corresponds for substance with the fuller promise of the final parable (25 31-46).

(3) The Teaching in Parables (Mt. 13 1-52) expands the corresponding Marcan discourse (Mk. 4 1-34) by the addition of a group of three brief parables all concerned with heavenly reward. These are: Treasure-trove (13 44), The Pearl of great Price (13 45f.), and The Sorting of the Fish (13 47-50). The picture painted in this seventh and closing parable should be compared with that of the final judgment at the end of the fifth and closing discourse (13 49f.; cf. 41-43; 22 13; 25 30, 41 and Lk. 13 28f.):

So shall it be in the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.

Besides this expansion by additions to the Marcan group at its close and one (the Leaven, 13 33) which the Lukan parallel (Lk. 13 20f.) suggests was a companion parable in Q to that of the Mustard-seed, the total being thus raised to seven, Matthew has a great expansion of the parable of the Patient Husbandman (Mk. 4 26-29), transforming it into The Wheat and the Tares (Mt. 13 24-30), a companion-piece to The Good and Bad Fish and The Sheep and the Goats. Besides the parable itself a long and detailed Interpretation of the Parable (13 36-43) is also added in 'Matthew's' characteristic phraseology, ending:

As therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire; so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling and them that do

lawlessness, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

(4) The discourse on Church-administration (Mt. 18) ends with the parable of the Unforgiving Debtor, whose "lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due". The application is: "So shall also my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts" (cf. the supplement Mt. 6 14f.).

(5) The final discourse, three chapters in length (Mt. 23-25), is all concerned with eschatology, and supplements Q material, urging prompt repentance in view of the coming judgment (25 1-13; cf. Lk. 13 25; Mk. 13 35-37 and 25 14-20 = Lk. 19 12-25). It closes with the sublime picture of the Son of Man sitting on the heavenly judgment seat and pronouncing sentence on all nations (25 31-46) to which reference has already been made. With these five endings of the 'Sermons' of Matthew should be compared his supplements to the Q parables of the Great Supper (Mt. 22 1-14 = Lk. 14 16-24) and the Talents (Mt. 25 14-30 = Lk. 19 12-27). No doubt will remain as to Matthean 'tendency'. Comparison of the phraseology of the three most peculiarly Matthean of the four (Mt. 13 37, 41 and 25 31) will explain the variation from Lukan phraseology in the case of the fourth (Mt. 19 28 = Lk. 22 29f.). In this case the Second Source spoke of "thrones of judgment", but not of "the Son of Man".

This survey of the 'single-tradition' material of Matthew in which his four individual employments of the title Son of Man are found, always in connection with mention of the "throne of glory" and usually of the "angels" who execute the sentence, should be conclusive as to the distinctive usage of this evangelist. They manifestly represent an extension of the evangelist's own in the direction already evidenced in Q. According to 'Matthew' Jesus in his public utterances, and from the very outset, spoke of himself freely as the agent of the divine judgment of mankind. He not only referred objectively to the Day of the Son of Man, the Coming of the Son of Man, and the like, but used the

title as a "self-designation" about which there was no mystery whatever. In his opening discourse he said in so many words (Mt. 7 22):

Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work lawlessness.

This is not merely an explicit reversal of the principle enunciated in Mk. 9 38-40, it not merely denies the toleration expressed by Mark for the professed Christian teacher and wonder-worker unless he be sound on the issue of "lawlessness" vs. "good works", but is itself embodied in a manifest editorial recast of the Q material of Lk. 13 26f. Matthew applies the Q saying to the case of Christian "false prophets" whose pretensions are based on professions of loyalty and gifts of the Spirit, but who have not the indispensable guarantee of good works. In the original form (Lk. 13 28-30) it was addressed to those who count on admission to the messianic kingdom because of a mere outward association or racial connection with the "Master of the house" (who in the parable exercises the functions of the Son of Man; cf. Mt. 25 11f. with Lk. 13 25). The Q phrases "weeping and gnashing of teeth", "cast forth without" are appropriate to this connection. Matthew has stereotyped them into a regular refrain. In reality they carry out the sense of the answer, "I know you not whence ye are". The Q original is equivalent to the Baptist's warning not to begin to say "We are Abraham's seed" (Mt. 3 9 = Lk. 3 8). The meaning is "If you work iniquity (*ādūciā*) it makes no difference whether you are from Jerusalem, and descendants of the Patriarchs, or from the ends of the earth". Again we have a clear instance of editorial recasting of Q by 'Matthew', showing his special antipathy and exhibiting in its true colors his idea of how Jesus used the conception (and consequently the title as well) of "the Son of Man". It shows us little of the actual usage of Jesus, but much of the presuppositions which led to a gradual extension of the term into Gospel usage in the later period of Synoptic tradition.



Our survey of all the occurrences of the title *Son of Man* in Synoptic tradition is now complete. All may be classified in a small number of groups according as they represent actual tradition, or extensions of the transmitted usage in accordance with certain definable prepossessions of the particular writer. The 'single tradition' of 'Matthew' exhibits a very marked extension on the part of this particular evangelist. 'Luke' merely adds slightly to the number of occurrences by occasional stylistic employments. Mark and the Second Source alone offer employments from which some fairly reliable inferences may be drawn as to the real usage of Jesus. In each case we have one mode of employment which may be regarded as belonging to the tradition rather than to the writer himself because it occurs with such frequency, is supported by the testimony of other writers, and is not attributable to any particular idiosyncrasy of the writer.

(1) In the Q material as well as in all later and dependent tradition (including Mark) we find evidence which it would require arguments more cogent than any known to the present writer to set aside, that Jesus made use of current expressions such as the Day, or the Coming, of the Son of Man, with reference to the agent of divine retribution predicted by John the Baptist in the phraseology "He that cometh after me to purge his threshing floor", or more briefly "He that should come". But this alone will hardly account for the difference between the usage ascribed by the sources to John and that ascribed to Jesus, who alone is represented as using the title "*Son of Man*". Possibly the writer of the Second Source might be held responsible for this identification of the figure of Dan. 7 13 with the Baptist's 'Coming one'. But this supposition seems unnecessarily violent in view of the possibility made so apparent by Dalman that *Bar nasha* could have been used, even if it had not yet come to be widely used, in the sense: "the heavenly champion of Israel predicted by Daniel". At least the testimony of the Gospel sources beginning with Q is very strong that Jesus himself habitually referred to this 'Coming one' as "the *Son of Man*". But they also indicate "plainly enough" that he "avoided any messianic self-designation". The references are

impersonal and objective. They carry in substance the message: "Be ye ready for the Coming of the Son of Man; for the time of judgment and the visitation of Israel is near, of which John gave warning in the spirit and power of Elijah". It seems more reasonable, therefore, to ascribe this identification of the Coming one of the Baptist (the Angel of the Covenant of Ex. 23 20f. and Mal. 3 1—4 1) with the Son of Man of Dan. 7 13 to no other than Jesus himself.

(2) The usage of Mark has also a typical employment of the title Son of Man which gives evidence of being traditional rather than the outgrowth of the evangelist's own prepossessions. The fact that Mark alone has no fewer than seven instances of prediction by Jesus of his betrayal, in all of which he uses the title "Son of Man", six times out of the seven in conjunction with the Isaian and Pauline term *παράδοθῆναι*, while the single tradition of Matthew and Luke adds three further instances, strongly suggests an actual utterance of Jesus predicting this betrayal. Whether the connection of it with the fate of the suffering Servant of Is. 53 ε LXX as in I Cor. 15 3; Rom. 4 25 and elsewhere is due to Jesus himself, rather than to the earliest believers, seems much more doubtful. The evidence of Marcan usage (together with the extensions in Mt. 26 2 and Lk. 22 48 and 24 7) makes it highly probable that at a very early date (though probably later than Paul) the association became habitual. Consequently when the "delivering up" was spoken of the term naturally employed in conjunction with it would be "the Son of Man".

The characterization of this special usage as "Marcan" over against that of Q does not by any means imply that it was absent from the Second Source. On the contrary it may very well be derived by Mark from the Second Source, though in that case it would not appear in Q, because the definition of Q is "coincident material of Matthew and Luke *not contained in Mark*". The consecutive story of Mark does however, fortunately, enable us to bring the utterance into connection with a definite and specific occasion. It was when Jesus set his face at Caesarea Philippi to go up to Jerusalem, braving a probable martyrdom, that he began to predict this "delivering up", though the earlier

references speak not of Judas, but of the Jewish authorities as those who will "deliver up the Son of Man". It is only in "that same night in which he was delivered up" (*ἡ παραδίδοτος*, I Cor. 11 23) that one of the Twelve is named as the agent.

The curious thing about this usage, which habitually associates the term "Son of Man" with references to the "delivering up", is that Son of Man is almost the last expression we should expect to be so used. The title to be expected in the Marcan group of references is "the Servant", a title which we only know from a few passages in the Petrine speeches of Acts (2 13, 26; 4 27, 30) and half a dozen occurrences in patristic writings from 95 to 195 A. D., *particularly in passages relating to the sacrament, or the sacrificial death of Jesus*. It must therefore have once had a certain currency; but this it subsequently lost, the form "Thy elect (or "beloved") Servant" becoming "The elect (or "beloved") Son". In Isaiah it is the 'Servant' who is "delivered up". The 'Son of Man' is not an Isaian term, and the use of it which we have found to be most surely attributable to Jesus is as remote as possible from those connected with the "delivering up". Is there any way in which this paradoxical Marcan use can be accounted for?

The ordinary reply to this question pleads the value of paradox itself. Jesus is supposed to have aimed at this very contrast. The heavenly Champion of Israel who obtains their vindication and eternal dominion over wicked oppressors is the very same as he whom they rejected and delivered up. The plea would be cogent if applied to those who looked back from after the resurrection; but for Jesus it was first of all imperative to teach the doctrine of the Servant. The Synoptic writers might well effect in their minds this combination; but it does not seem to represent very well the mind of Jesus. The attitude of Jesus toward his own fate is surely that of the Servant, obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. He goes to meet it not as one who understands, and confidently treads the path to victory, but as one who in faith accepts the cup extended by the Father, trusting though he slay him. It does appear, however, and that not by the testimony of Mark alone, but by the coincident testimony of Q, of Mark,

and of one of the "faithful sayings" of the primitive Church (II Tim. 2 11-13) that in connection with this same prediction of "delivering up" Jesus also gave assurance of vindication for his cause, and for all who maintained their loyalty to it in spite of "trials". This vindication would be *in the Day of the Son of Man*.

For the promise of this ultimate divine vindication is historically indissociable from the prediction of the "delivering up". Even if Mark had not so explicitly made the connection in 8 34—9 1 we should have been obliged to infer something of the kind in order to account for the facts of the later story. The "faithful saying" of II Tim. 2 11-13 parallels Lk. 22 28-30, suggesting the farewell Supper as the true historical occasion. In Mk. 8 38 it is made part of the warning of the cross. But here the Roman evangelist shows clearly his use of a tradition coincident with the Second Source if not of the Second Source itself. The same promise is not only repeated by the later Synoptists in transcribing Mark (Mk. 8 38 — Mt. 16 27 — Lk. 9 44) but independently in Mt. 10 32f. — Lk. 12 8f. This Q form of the promise which Mark brings into direct connection with the prediction of the "delivering up" (thus as it were marking the beginnings of the equivalence "The Servant — the Son of Man") has so much to do with the origins of Marcan usage that we may take the liberty of placing the Matthean and Lukan forms in parallel columns:

## Mt. 10 32f.

Whosoever then shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven.

## Lk. 12 8f.

Everyone who shall confess me before men, the Son of Man will also confess him before the angels of God. But he who has denied me before men shall be denied before the angels of God.

Here the reference is manifestly to the scene of Dan. 7 13. Our two witnesses differ as to whether the Second Source used the title Son of Man or not. To both of them that is a matter of indifference because in their view "the Son of Man" was a

"favorite self-designation of Jesus". Matthew's complete recast of Mk. 8 38—9 1 (= Mt. 16 27f.) shows clearly enough his idea of the promise. Jesus himself sitting on the throne of glory will render the verdict, as depicted in the parables (see above, p. 170). In Luke this is quite uncertain. The idea may be only "I will witness at God's judgment seat, for those who have witnessed for me in the face of earthly judges"; but as regards the extent of Jesus' use (not the content) Luke takes the same ground as Matthew and Mark. All three probably represent in this the usage of the Second Source. But why should the Second Source introduce the term if it was not in reality characteristic of Jesus? Two phenomena, typical respectively of the Q usage and that of Mark, are worthy of our attention at this point, and may throw some light upon the question.

1. We have already called attention to the distinction to be drawn between a group of occurrences in Q which appear to represent authentic tradition, and others which we have good reason to believe are extensions due to a preconception of the precanonical evangelist. Jesus probably referred to the divine judgment of which the Baptist had forewarned as "the Day of the Son of Man". He probably did not draw the comparison between his own mode of life and that of the herald of judgment in the form: "John came ... the Son of Man came". In this respect the report of Q is probably misleading; for, as Harnack puts it, he had just before, in the same discourse "plainly enough avoided any messianic self-designation". The Source is therefore to some extent at odds with itself. What can account for this inner discrepancy?

The great Q discourse Mt. 11 2—12 45, when compared with its Lukan parallels shows as its principal motive condemnation of the Jewish leaders for their rejection of "the Christ" in spite of the correspondence of his ministry *with that foretold in Isaiah of the rejected and suffering Servant of Jehovah*. This is the point of the "avoidance of any messianic self-designation" in Jesus' reply to the question of John, who is told in substance to observe how the Isaian prophecy of the "consolation of Israel" is being fulfilled, and not to be stumbled if he sees no

sign of the Coming one he himself had predicted (Mt. 11 2-6; cf. Is. 35 3-6; 26 14 (the heathen say: "they are dead, they shall not live"), 19; 61 1f.). But the answer to John serves as a mere introduction to the main discourse, which takes up again the question of "the works of the Christ". And what they signify with reference to his own mission and personality. John had been near to "stumbling" because the works of the Servant were *not* what he had looked for in the Coming one. The actual "stumbling" of the scribes and Pharisees at this same work of blessing and grace among "the poor" is for Q the fulfilment of the divine "decree" (*εὐδοκία*) to hide these things from the wise and prudent and reveal them unto babes (Mt. 11 25-27 = Lk. 10 21f.; cf. Is. 29 9-14). For Q Jesus incarnates that "Wisdom of God" who is justified by her children, the "babes", or "little ones" of Is. 29 23f. (Mt. 11 19ff. = Lk. 7 34ff.). This is the Son who makes known the Father. His career is summed up by "Isaiah the prophet" when he gave his description of "the Servant whom I have chosen; the Beloved on whom I fixed my choice" (Mt. 12 17-21; cf. Mk. 1 2-4, 10f. and parallels). Such is the fundamental Christology of the Second Source. Its Christ is the Servant-Son of Dt.-Isaiah and Wisdom of Solomon.

The Q fragments come in different order in Matthew and Luke, and there are sections probably belonging to Q which only one of the two has embodied, but in whatever order restored, and however fragmentarily, it is manifest that the conception of "the Son" which to the author's mind corresponds with the real ministry of Jesus is that of the Isaian Servant. This is the great truth which the Baptist is encouraged to see, while Pharisees and Scribes remain wilfully blind to it. Jesus may, or may not be the Coming one whom John has looked for. He *is* the Servant-Son. The unhistorical use of "Son of Man" in Q, representing an extension on the redactor's part of the authentic, reflects the paradox above referred to. The writer thinks that Jesus could have said to the crowd "I decline to admit that I am the Coming one of John; however I freely acknowledge that I am the Son of Man". His own material reverses this. It implies that Jesus would have said: "You can see for yourselves if you do not resist the witness

of the Spirit, that my works are the works of the Servant. If that be your 'Coming one' be it so.

2. Curiously enough the same impression is made by the typical usage of Mark. It is the title "the Servant" which would be appropriate in all the instances which refer to the "delivering up". "Son of Man" offers an unexplained paradox. True we have the latter title in its proper sense where Jesus answers the challenge of the high priest to say whether he is "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed": "I am: and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven". But the story of the Trial before the Sanhedrin (Mk. 14 55-64) belongs to those elements of the second Gospel which are most obviously redactional. The parallel in 15 1-5 is more historical. This occurrence should therefore be classed with Mk. 2 10 and 28 as one of the extensions of the evangelist. Only, no new content is imported into the title. In Mk. 14 62 as in 13 28 the evangelist merely reproduces the authentic use of Q (Mt. 24 37 ff. — Lk. 17 28 ff.).

But we have already seen reason to believe that the group of occurrences in Mark which speak of the "delivering up" of the Son of Man represent some older tradition. Just as in Mk. 1 11 and parallels "Son" is clearly substituted for "Servant" (cf. Mt. 12 18) so in this extensive group "Son of Man" seems to be used as in Q to mean the one who is now the Servant but will soon be manifested as the Coming one predicted by John. Now Mark shows little interest in the Isaian prophecy. It is only Luke who dwells upon the correspondence between the fate of Jesus and the predictions of Is. 53. It is therefore less probably our Mark than some source common to Mark and Luke which underlies the predictions of martyrdom in Mk. 8 31; 9 31; 10 33, the schematic statement in 10 45 with its counterpart in 14 24, and the references to prophecy in 9 12 (a doubtful passage) and 14 21. In the last named verses it is peculiarly infelicitous to use "the Son of Man" in referring to predictions which speak of the Servant, while no such prediction is anywhere made of "the Son of Man". Should not this peculiar use in Mark of the one title where we should most expect the other be placed alongside of the similar phenomenon in Q?

The typical Marcan usage just referred to appears to rest on earlier authority; but does it go back to Jesus himself? The fact that Paul refers to the prediction of Isaiah not as if Jesus had himself so declared, but merely as a primitive doctrine of the Church based upon "Scripture" (I Cor. 15 3) is rather opposed to this. But, as we have seen, it is impossible to hold that Jesus did not claim to be "the Christ". On the contrary it would be impossible without this to understand how the earliest witnesses came to think of his employment of the apocalyptic term Son of Man as a *self*-designation.

With the advancing shadow of the cross Jesus was driven to sustain both his own faith and his disciples' by increasing the proportionate emphasis on the transcendental aspect of the messianic hope, thus making the equivalence Son of David — Son of Man more and more unavoidable. He expressed his fearless confidence in the "good pleasure" (*εὐδοκία*) of the Father to give the Kingdom to his little flock. How, then, if not through their Leader? And if through a martyred Leader how otherwise than at the judgement seat of the Ancient of Days? The oldest Source records this unconquerable faith of Jesus through its version of the institution of the Supper, a version all the more significant from its complete independence of the Pauline (I Cor. 11 23-26) as well as the Marcan form (Mk. 14 22-26). The Q passage Lk. 22 28-30 — Mt. 19 28 records an interpretation of the bread and wine of the Covenant, supported, as we have seen, by allusions in I Cor. 6 3 and II Tim. 2 11-12, uttered in the same tone of heroic faith:

Ye are they that have endured with me in my trials; and I covenant (*διατίθημαι*) with you a kingdom, even as my Father covenanted with me (*διέθετό μοι*); that ye shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Connection with Q has been denied to this passage on the ground that it is not in the spirit of the Second Source. Even were this true it would not affect the claim to authenticity, since the attestation is the same as for Q. In reality the objection rests on no better foundation than failure to recognize



an allusion to the "thrones of the house of David" of Ps. 122 4f. which was self-evident to Andreas of Caesarea. The words are of course symbolic, uttered in a tone of defiant exaltation in the face of death, intelligible only by reference to the scripture passages whose phraseology they adopt (II Sam. 9 7, 10, 13; Ps. 122 4f.). The Christology they reflect is that of the Son of David (cf. Acts 15 16-18; Didaché ix.). But their testimony cannot be set aside. Corroborated by that of the cross itself it shows that Jesus did perish as "King of the Jews".

We have indeed no need to show that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom was not "according to the things of men". Nevertheless, from Caesarea on, the hope of it was irrevocably linked to his own fate. Moreover it was to be given by God, not conquered by men. How else, then, can we imagine Jesus reassuring the Twelve that his own impending death would not frustrate God's design, if not by his pointing to the classic prophecy, where in vision Daniel sees the representative of down-trodden Israel brought to the heavenly judgment seat, not to dispense justice but to seek it, one "like unto a Son of Man" receiving on behalf of Jehovah's little flock "the everlasting dominion which shall not pass away". On the testimony of Mark we may well believe that Jesus himself in these days of preparation for the great tragedy spoke among his intimates those reassuring words pointing to the vision of Daniel which in due time were to be recalled as proof that all his earlier impersonal references to the coming of the Son of Man were mysterious "self-designations". The Matthean version of this same promise of reunion in the glories of the New Jerusalem, when compared with the simplicity of the Lukan form, is typical of the advance of apocalyptic Christology in the period of neo-legalism:

Ye who have followed me, in the Regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

*Note.* It is regrettable that the article "Did Jesus call Himself Son of Man?" in *The Journal of Religion* for September, 1922 should have appeared too late for consideration here. The author, Dr. Carl Patton, answers his own question in the negative.