

Harvard Theological Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HTR>

Additional services for *Harvard Theological Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Jesus as Son of Man

Benjamin W. Bacon

Harvard Theological Review / Volume 3 / Issue 03 / July 1910, pp 325 - 340
DOI: 10.1017/S0017816000014681, Published online: 03 November 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0017816000014681

How to cite this article:

Benjamin W. Bacon (1910). Jesus as Son of Man. Harvard Theological Review, 3, pp 325-340 doi:10.1017/S0017816000014681

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

JESUS AS SON OF MAN

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

In a discussion of the great christological passages of the Synoptic Gospels we have seen that the messianism of Jesus was pre-eminently ethical and religious. His attitude toward current expectations of Israel's redemption resembled that of the prophets in being critical rather than originative. He ethicized and spiritualized a hope which in its origins and in its undisciplined popular manifestations had little to differentiate it from the expectations entertained by heathen worshippers of their tribal or national divinities.

As regards the political hopes of the Zealot, or nationalist, party this is universally recognized. Jesus' prohibition of the application of the title Christ to himself (Mk. 8 30)¹ is commonly explained as due to his unwillingness to be understood to claim messiahship in the political sense.

As regards the Pharisaic, or pietistic, type of messianism, then largely affected by the apocalyptists, many influential critics are endeavoring to convince the modern world that Jesus' attitude was more sympathetic than critical. The apocalyptists since Daniel had given a transcendental turn to the ancient belief, and the Pharisees, once characterized by a more ethical and inward type of pietism, were now degenerating into a more formal legalism, while they enforced the burden of Mosaic requirements imposed by the scribes under penalty of exclusion from a share in the supermundane "world to come." This doctrine of a transcendental messianic "world to come" was an acknowledged innovation borrowed from apocalypse. The contention of J. Weiss and his school is that Jesus was fundamentally an *Apo-*

¹ Parallels are not cited where there is no evidence of independent tradition. In the reference Mk. 8 30 the earliest of the three embodiments of the tradition is appealed to. The fact that it is transcribed with slight modifications in Mt. 16 20 and Lk. 9 21 adds nothing to the force of Mark's evidence.

kalypniker, in full sympathy with this tendency, especially as represented in John the Baptist, the popularizer of the movement.

Our own attempt has been to show that Jesus' preaching of "the kingdom" involves no less truly a critical attitude toward the transcendental other-worldliness of the Pharisees than toward the worldliness of Sadducee or Zealot. We hold that with all his sympathy for the Baptist's revolt against hierocracy, with all his endorsement of the Baptist's warnings of the impending judgment, Jesus explicitly differentiated his message from that of John also, emphasizing his own milder, more mystical type of messianism. The germs of this may in fact be found in the older literature of Pharisaism, and in the kindred writings of the school of "wisdom."

Jesus' teaching, accordingly, regarding human destiny, as reflected in the messianic hope, goes deeper down and further back than Pharisaism. It is not identified with sect or party. It takes hold upon the ancient hope of Israel before it had suffered its special applications first to the institution of the Davidic monarchy, then to the post-exilic substitution of supermundane for nationalistic hopes. Jesus returns to the elementary principle of messianism, the old popular belief that Israel is (potentially) God's son. He agrees with the Pharisees that this ideal is to be realized by the son's "knowing" and "doing the will" of the Father. The difference lies partly in his conception of that "will"; for to the scribe and to his blind follower the Pharisee the will of God is a written precept to be obeyed; while to Jesus it is an inward disposition to be acquired. In this respect he approaches the wisdom-writers. The difference lies also in the result aimed at, which to the scribe and Pharisee is a reward added to the sonship, to Jesus the sonship itself with whatever of blessing that may entail (Q; Mt. 5 45, Lk. 6 35). In this respect he is more in antagonism than in sympathy with the apocalyptists, and again resembles those of the school of "wisdom," though himself not a man of the schools, but of the people.

If this interpretation of the messianism of Jesus be correct, it remains for us to explain how believers in his messiahship

should have given it the intensely transcendental and apocalyptic interpretation reflected in the earliest evangelic tradition. Both Paul and the Synoptists are saturated with the type of eschatology characteristic of the Synagogue. In both cases the messianic hope is pre-eminently transcendental. How can this be, if Jesus himself had not so taught? The answer in general terms will be that the belief in Jesus' messiahship did not spring from the utterances of his life-time, so much as from the ecstatic experiences of his followers after his death, and that these were conditioned upon the disciples' predetermined forms of thought. At first it was not even pretended that Jesus had made his own person and work the subject of his teaching. This we find only in the late theological gospel emanating from Ephesus, the headquarters of Paulinism. In all the earlier writings, whether historical or epistolary in form, the doctrine of Christ's person and work is avowedly based, not on his remembered teaching, but on psychological phenomena in the experience of Paul and others, principally after Jesus' death. And Paul was an out-and-out Pharisean apocalypticist.²

It is a highly significant fact that while our two ultimate witnesses, Paul and the evangelic tradition, are at one (as they could not fail to be) in their fundamental conviction that Jesus had been "manifested as the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1 4), or, in Petrine phrase, had been "made" by it "both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2 36), they differ widely in the titles by which they express their conception of his being and office. The title "Lord" is that which in Paul's use expresses the nature and function of the Christ. It is not peculiar to him, for we have just seen it employed in a typical Petrine passage. Neither is it of Pauline coinage; for we find Paul quoting even an Aramaic ejaculation of which it forms part (Maran atha, "Our Lord, come"), and the phrase "Jesus is Lord" is repeatedly referred to as expressing the consensus of

² The transfiguration story is expressly designed to carry back the Pauline transcendental conception of the messiahship into the earthly career of Jesus. But even in the Synoptic tradition it intervenes as a psychological anachronism, a rebuke of the twelve, which as yet they are incapable of understanding, for conceiving the messiahship of Jesus "after the things that be of men." In the Apocalypse of Peter it is frankly placed after the resurrection.

apostolic faith. Only indirectly and incidentally have we evidence even of Paul's acquaintance with the distinctively apocalyptic title Son of Man. His quotation from Psalm 8 in 1 Cor. 15 27, and his doctrine of "the heavenly man," make us suspect indeed that in his thinking he applied to Christ, in his own distinctive way, this apocalyptic title. But from his writings otherwise we should not so much as guess that the title had ever been applied to Jesus.

The evangelic tradition, on the other hand, displays it in a manner entirely peculiar to itself. The title "Son of Man" occurs in no New Testament writing, outside of those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and these are notoriously interdependent. If, as many maintain, its frequent occurrence in the gospels can be accounted for on no other theory than the usage of Jesus himself, our view of his eschatological teaching will require adjustment to the fact. But we shall also be required to account for its non-appearance outside the four interdependent evangelic writers. If, on the other hand, we advance some other theory to account for its occurrence here, our burden of proof will not be light. We shall not be suffered to reject the combined testimony of the four evangelists that Jesus applied the title to himself, unless we deal comprehensively with this question of the literary interdependence of the sources; for no careful student will admit that the common participation in this feature can be due to accidental coincidence. Let us face the situation. The peculiar term can only have pervaded the four gospels by transmission from some very early common source. Such a primitive common source, capable of affecting all by its use of the title Son of Man as a self-designation of Jesus, is the document Q, only the Gospel of Mark lying, as some hold, outside the range of its influence. No other source definitely known to us ever occupied a place primitive and authoritative enough to produce this result. If, then, this application of the title be a contamination of the primitive tradition rather than a true record of Jesus' usage and consciousness, the evidence for such a conclusion must be sought in the document Q.

This document has been restored more carefully by Harnack than by any predecessor in the field, from the coincident non-

markan material of Matthew and Luke. Harnack singles out the Thanksgiving to the Father (Mt. 11 25-27, Lk. 10 21-22) and the discourse on the Jews' Stumbling in Jesus (Mt. 11 2-11, 12-13, 16-19, Lk. 7 18-23, 31-35, 16 16) as the most important in all Q for their christological content.³ Having already discussed the significance of the former of these passages, we may now take the latter as our starting-point for a consideration of the question of the real origin and significance of the title Son of Man.

In Harnack's restoration the passage reads as follows: "For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, So, a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But Wisdom hath been justified by her children."

Harnack concludes his discussion of the christology of Q with a remark both just and significant: "Even with the most conservative application of psychological considerations it is apparent that Jesus' consciousness of sonship must have antedated his consciousness of messiahship, and paved the way for it." We take this to mean that of the two supposedly fundamental passages of Q⁴ Harnack himself recognizes the one distinguished by the use of the title "the Son" as more characteristic than that which employs the title the "Son of Man." Jesus unquestionably had the consciousness of sonship. He probably found in it the solution of the messianic hope cherished by the people. Did he infer from the present leadership imposed by circumstance upon the possessor of this consciousness such continued leadership in "the world to come" as current eschatology expected of the apocalyptic figure of the Son of Man? What ground have we for accepting the authenticity of the second title?

It is scarcely conceivable that in so old a source as Q the title Son of Man should be repeatedly placed in Jesus' mouth if it did not really belong in some way to his vocabulary. But this admission, while abandoning the philological line of argument of the Aramaists who maintain that in Aramaic the expression "the

³ Sprüche und Reden Jesu, p. 166.

⁴ In Harnack's Sprüche und Reden Jesu they are numbered 25 (Mt. 11 23-27, Lk. 10 21 f.) and 15 (Mt. 11 16-19, Lk. 7 31-35) respectively.

Son of Man," would be impossible, is by no means equivalent to an admission that Jesus applied the title to himself. For, first, it is not only probable but demonstrable that even our most ancient records, including Q itself, insert the title in many cases without authority, and, secondly, among the admittedly authentic instances of Jesus' own use of the term, there are several where the meaning is more characteristic of him if Son of Man is understood as applying to some other than his own glorified personality. We may take up these two propositions in order.

1. It is certainly remarkable that Harnack, in a footnote on the very same page on which occurs his classification of the discourse on the Stumbling of the Jews (Nos. 14, 15) with Jesus' Thanksgiving for his Revelation (No. 25) as the two most important christological passages of Q, expresses the following opinion on the occurrence of the title Son of Man in the former:

Of course in individual cases one is utterly without positive assurance that Jesus referred to himself as "the Son of Man" in sayings wherein Q represents him as so designating himself. It is more than doubtful, for example, that Jesus should have used the expression in No. 15;⁵ while earlier in the same discourse (No. 14, "Blessed is he that shall not be stumbled in me," etc.), he has quite manifestly avoided every messianic self-designation.

In other words, Harnack himself concedes the probable unauthenticity of the term in the passage which he advances as the most important! For we can only escape the linguistic argument of Lietzmann, Wellhausen, and N. Schmidt, that as a title "Son of Man" would be meaningless in the Aramaic spoken by Jesus, if we suppose that the etymologically colorless expression, equivalent to "human being," *homo*, *Mensch*, had acquired a more specific connotation through its application in Daniel and later apocalypses. Its employment, then, by Jesus would be either enigmatic, or distinctly messianic in the transcendental sense. Either employment would call public attention to his personality in a manner admittedly contrary to the policy of silence observed by himself and imposed upon his disciples (Mk. 8 30). Even those, accordingly, who maintain that this was Jesus' "favorite

⁵ The passage whose comparison of the coming of the Baptist with that of "the Son of Man" was quoted above.

self-designation" are cautious about admitting his employment of it otherwise than in the privacy of the apostolic circle, and subsequently to the revelation of the messiahship at Caesarea Philippi. The passage from Q regarded by Harnack as the most important manifestly meets neither of these conditions. Here, therefore, the occurrence of the title is certainly to be attributed to the redactor of Q. To him the appearance of Jesus in his work of preaching and healing in Galilee, contrasting as it did with the Baptist's warning of judgment, was the coming of the Son of Man. Jesus himself, if he really looked upon his work as fulfilling the expected coming of the Son of Man,⁶ could not have thus publicly declared it and at the same time retained the incognito which he imposed upon his disciples.

Since we are dealing with Harnack's discussion of the christology of Q, and since we are clearly within the range of his own conclusions when we infer from the passage under consideration that Q^r manifests a disposition to insert the title Son of Man without historical warrant, we may properly call attention here to a further significant observation of the same distinguished critic:

Christology as Q understood it gives a perfectly consistent and simple portrait. Q has no other conception than this: Jesus was the Messiah, ordained to divine sonship at his baptism, and all his sayings accordingly rest upon this background. If, however, the introductory narrative be removed in thought, an essentially different conception results (p. 169).

This comes very near to an admission of the contention of Wernle in the most thorough study applied to the question until Harnack's, that we must distinguish a Q¹ and a Q², attributing to the later hand (Q²) the introductory narratives relating to John the Baptist, together with some other elements.⁷ Manifestly, the two sections on Jesus' baptism by John, and on the stumbling of the Jews at John and Jesus, have in common not merely the trait of the Baptist's work, but the common purpose, not apparent in Q as a whole, of setting the personality of Jesus on the highest

⁶ On Jesus' idea of the Coming of the Son of Man, see below.

⁷ Wernle, *Synoptische Frage*, p. 226: "Diese zwei Stücke [the Baptist's discourse and the Temptation of Jesus] sehen überhaupt aus wie eine geschichtliche Einleitung, die nachträglich dem Werk vorgesetzt wurde."

plane. Here, if anywhere in Q, we must suspect secondary elements.

Besides the discount to be made on the score of this admitted *Tendenz* of Q² or Q¹, we must also ask consideration for the effect of a more general disposition of the times illustrated not only in Q, but from the Pauline epistles down to the period of the Oxyrhynchus Logia, namely, the disposition to attribute to Jesus "faithful sayings" or other current saws and apothegms having more or less affinity with his teaching, in particular "wisdom-sayings," such as that of Lk. 13 34-35, which in Mt. 23 37-39 is attributed directly to Jesus, with suppression of the actual derivation from "the Wisdom of God." The Oxyrhynchus logion "I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them," etc., is another plaint of the divine Wisdom, kindred to Baruch 3 37, similarly put in the mouth of Jesus. There is strong textual reason for so regarding Mk. 2 27 also, which appears neither in the parallels nor in the text, but is found as a rabbinic saying in *Joma* (fol. 85). To this category of aphorisms included among the sayings of Jesus from very early times because of resemblances of phraseology or content must, in our judgment, be reckoned at least one whose strongest title to the place it occupies is its employment of the expression "the Son of Man." It is the saying of Q: "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head" (Mt. 8 19-20, Lk. 9 57-58). The very mode of its employment here (in antithesis to the birds and beasts) is so different from any other of the employments attributed to Jesus, and the plaintive tone of self-pity so opposite to the grateful assurance of his hospitable reception in Mk. 10 29 f. (cf. Lk. 8 3, 10 38-42, 22 35), that we cannot regard the saying as authentic.⁸ It seems to be a current aphorism contrasting the helplessness of the individual human being, a waif and stray when left alone in the environment of nature, with the self-sufficiency of birds and beasts. Only by a play upon the expression "Son of Man" can it be applied to Jesus at all. Even were its authenticity admitted, there is the same reason in this case as in that of the saying contrasting

⁸ Against Harnack, who exclaims, apropos of the same, "Welch' ein Zeichen der Echtheit!" (p. 165).

Jesus' mode of life with the Baptist's for questioning its use of the title Son of Man under the circumstances described. It seems far more probable that this pendant to the warning against superficial discipleship (Mt. 8 21 f., Lk. 9 59 f.) has been taken up merely because of a misunderstanding of its untechnical use of the term "the son of man."

A third instance of Jesus' employment of the title Son of Man, adduced by Harnack in his reconstruction of Q, we are also compelled to reject as unauthentic, though it may possibly have stood in the source. Jesus is reported to have presented "the Son of Man" as "a sign to this generation in explanation of his offer of 'the sign of Jonah.'" Since it occurs in the same discourse as the instance first adduced, which Harnack himself considers doubtful on the ground that Jesus manifestly avoids making a public claim to messianic authority, it is difficult to see the consistency of maintaining the authenticity of this. However, we need not insist on this point, for it is easy to show independently that the explanation offered of "the sign of Jonah" is secondary and unauthentic.

We have at least four variant accounts of Jesus' answer to the demand for a sign from heaven. The oldest of our existing sources presents the enigma without any attempt at solution. Mk. 8 11, 12 (Mt. 16 1-4) treats it as simply a refusal to the unworthy people of their demand for an evidential miracle. Jesus "sighed deeply in his spirit and saith, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? Verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation." The addition, "no sign but the sign of Jonah," made in Matthew's transcript of this verse, is of course due to the influence, direct or indirect, of Q. Both forms of the Markan version agree, however, in representing that Jesus did not make a merely apparent refusal of the demand (which after all was ultimately to be granted), but made absolute the refusal of miraculous confirmation of his message. Both our first and our third Gospels, contrariwise, introduce explanations of the enigma calculated to mitigate the inconsistency of the refusal with their own disposition to find the chief evidences for their claims precisely in the miraculous element of Jesus' career, in particular the resurrection. The explanations given, however,

are inconsistent the one with the other. Critics are agreed that Matthew's interpretation of the sign of Jonah as the resurrection is too flagrantly contradictory of the context to be authentic. They are very generally disposed, however, to accept the explanation of Luke that the sign of Jonah is the person of Jesus.⁹ In reality we have only to place the two side by side in the identical context to see that both are guesses, Luke's only less inconsistent than Matthew's with the general bearing of Jesus' discourse. We give the context in a translation of Harnack's text of Q.

But he said, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and no sign shall be given it save the sign of Jonah.

<p>For like as Jonah was in the sea-monster's belly three days and three nights, so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights.</p>	<p>For like as Jonah was himself a sign to the men of Nineveh, so shall the Son of Man be to this generation.</p>
--	---

The men of Nineveh shall arise in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, because they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and lo, a greater matter than Jonah is here.

A glance at Mt. 21 23-32, which, if not also embodying material from Q, is at all events in substance a parallel to the story of the Galilean demand for a sign from heaven, will show that in Jesus' conception the great sign of the times was the repentance of the masses at "the baptism of John." It was to him a fulfilment of the promise (Mal. 4 6) of the great repentance to be wrought by Elias before the Day of Yahweh. In remaining callous to this movement of the publicans and sinners the scribes and Pharisees had rejected their sign "from heaven." Thus the two examples of the Ninevites and the Queen of the South condemn "this generation" for its rejection of the "wailing" of John and the "piping" of Jesus. It is compared to "children in the market-place" because it yields neither to threat nor to entreaty. Whether, then, we have in Mt. 11 and Mt. 21 duplicate traditions of the same incident, or parallel utterances of

⁹ Jn. 6 30 ff. combines these two.

Jesus on similar occasions, in either case they determine for us the sense of the answer unfavorably comparing the men of this generation to the men of Nineveh. It is only in the second member of the poetic comparison, that which compares them unfavorably to "the Queen of the South," that Jesus refers to his own preaching as "a greater matter" than the wisdom of Solomon.¹⁰ In the first member he refers to the preaching of *John the Baptist*. Both the interjected explanations of the sign of Jonah, therefore, Luke's as well as Matthew's, are incorrect; and, if incorrect, then certainly unauthentic. Jesus referred by this expression¹¹ neither to his own personality nor to his resurrection, but to "the baptism of John."

2. Dismissing those instances whose real bearing attests not an authentic use by Jesus of the title Son of Man in application to himself, but on the contrary a disposition on the part of transmitters of the tradition to multiply unauthentic instances, we come to a relatively small residuum whose first value is to explain the *Tendenz* observed. Jesus really did employ the phrase; otherwise the *Tendenz* would be inexplicable. But did he employ it in application to himself? A satisfying answer calls for consideration of every authentic instance without exception, first of all the undisputed occurrences in Q. They are as follows:

(1) Mt. 12 32, Lk. 12 10.¹²

(2) Mt. 24 27, 37, 39, Lk. 17 24, 26, 30.

The former passage is one of the principal bones of contention between Wellhausen and the critics who continue to maintain the priority of Q to Mark. In Wellhausen's view, comparison of the variants in Mt. 12 31, 12 32, derived respectively

¹⁰ Note the similar antithesis in Lk. 12 13-34, where Solomon appears as the rich and wise king of Ecclesiastes in contrast with the poverty of Jesus and his followers.

¹¹ Assonance between the names John and Jonah may have played a part.

¹² It is not apparent from Harnack's language in note 2 on p. 165 whether he regards this occurrence as "unsicher," as well as that in Lk. 12 8, where the parallel Mt. 10 32 has simply "I," or whether he holds to Mt. 12 32, Lk. 12 10 as certainly authentic. The former is designated by him No. 34^a the latter No. 34^b. His statement on p. 165 is: "Doch ist er [der Ausdruck Menschensohn] in Nr. 34 unsicher."

from Mk. 3 28 and Q (cf. Lk. 12 10), shows the priority of Mark to Q. He says:

In Mk. 3 28 we have: All blasphemies are forgiven *the sons of men*, except blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. In Q (Lk. 12 10) on the contrary: Utterances against *the Son of Man* are forgiven, only those against the Holy Spirit are not.

Were Wellhausen right, Q would be convicted in one more instance of introducing the title Son of Man with no better authority than a perversion of Mk. 3 28, thus increasing the probability that it is from later modification that the peculiar usage has pervaded gospel tradition.

But on this question we are constrained to take the view of Wellhausen's opponents. "Son of Man" is the original, "sons of men" the derived form. This is not a mere inference from the conclusion forced upon us by the evidences of Q's priority in all other instances of relation to Mark, it is apparent from the context of this particular discourse. According to all three reporters the utterance in question should explain the peculiarly heinous nature of the offence just committed (the declaration, "He casteth out by Beelzebub") which excepts it from even the divine pardon. According to Q (Mt. 12 32, Lk. 12 10) this is because, while seemingly directed only against Jesus, it had really assailed the Spirit of God. Because it is not Jesus personally who effects the healings and exorcisms, but "the Spirit of God," the offence is unpardonable. This is precisely the distinction which Mark, in accordance with the whole spirit of his gospel as shown in repeated instances, refuses to admit. The difference pointed to by Jesus between his exorcisms, performed "by the Spirit (Lk. finger) of God," without any assumption of special power or gift resident in himself, and the exorcisms of "your sons" (Mt. 12 27 f., Lk. 11 19 f.),—a vital element of the whole argument,—is omitted by Mark. The result—the intended result, so far as we can judge—is to make it appear that blasphemy of Jesus, by calumny of his works of power, is identical with blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, and hence unpardonable. In Q the offence is unpardonable because it is not against Jesus, but against the Holy Spirit. In Mark the offence is unpardonable because it is

against Jesus, and this is equivalent to an offence against the Holy Spirit. It is scarcely needful to indicate which of these two constructions of Jesus' utterance bears the stamp of originality and authenticity.

But the later Markan construction would have encountered an insuperable obstacle if the language of Q, "Whosoever blasphemeth the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him," had been left unchanged. The alteration in Mk. 3 28 to "All blasphemies shall be forgiven to *the sons of men*" is indispensable to Mark's conception, and hence was probably made for this reason.

Have we, then, by establishing in this instance the originality in Q of the title Son of Man, established its authenticity as a title applied by Jesus to himself? On the contrary, the whole force of Jesus' argument depends upon the distinction between his own personality as on a level with other men's, and the superhuman dignity of "the Spirit of God." In other words, the term Son of Man is used here not in the transcendental sense of apocalypse, but in the ordinary Old Testament sense of an every-day mortal as contrasted with God. The article, if the article was used in Jesus' utterance, would have to be understood as generic,—in German, *die Lästerung gegen den Menschen wird vergeben*, which in English must be rendered: "Blasphemy against a man can be forgiven." This, by all the evidence of context, is the real meaning of Jesus' saying. If there is application of a special title to Jesus himself in the passage of Q, it is not meant by Jesus, but is the importation of the compiler himself.

(3) The only other occurrences of the title Son of Man in Q stand in a single context, and unquestionably refer to the apocalyptic figure of the transcendental, Danielic, Deliverer. We give the passage in Harnack's reconstruction (No. 56):

If, then, they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness, go not forth; behold, he is in his chambers, believe it not. For as the lightning goeth forth from the east and shineth unto the west, so shall be the Coming of the Son of Man; wheresoever the carcase is, there will the vultures be gathered.

As were the days of Noah, so shall be the Coming of the Son of Man. For as men were in the days before the cataclysm, eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into

the ark, and knew not until the cataclysm came and swept them all away, so shall be the Coming of the Son of Man.

There will be two in the field; one shall be taken and one left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; one shall be taken and one left.

If there is any real ground in Q for regarding the title Son of Man as a "self-designation of Jesus," it must be found in these three connected occurrences of the phrase "the Coming of the Son of Man." Did Jesus mean by it his own return in glory; or did he refer to the Executioner of the divine judgment of whom John the Baptist had sounded the warning?

The general bearing of the teaching here in question is the same as of the apocalyptic chapter of Mark, into which parallel utterances have been taken up. Jesus deprecates resort to the casters of horoscopes and calculators of the end of the world and of the coming judgment. Vain and futile are their predictions. The coming of the Son of Man is a great divine event, comparable only to the mighty judgments visited on the earth in the days of Noah, or on the cities of the Plain in the days of Lot. What Old Testament writers refer to as the Day of Yahweh is now spoken of as the day of the coming of the Son of Man. We must certainly allow for the effecting in popular usage of an equivalence between the transcendental figure of Daniel (with the more recent apocalypses dependent on it) and the Coming One of John the Baptist. But there is no indication whatever that the equivalence, "Jesus is the Son of Man," had entered the mind of the speaker in the above discourse, or indeed any mind previous to that of the compiler of the Sayings. Until it can be shown (1) that Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah; (2) that he also considered this office to involve his return as executioner of the divine judgment in the coming of the Son of Man, the passage—the only one in which we have reason to think Jesus employed the title as applying to a transcendental figure—remains utterly without force to prove the contention in support of which it is adduced. The real evidence that Jesus entertained the fantastic dreams of apocalypse as applying to his own personality in a resurrected state thus reduces itself to nothing. There is evidence in plenty that the compiler of Q in the form employed by our evangelists had adopted the equivalence, "Jesus

is the Son of Man," and made no scruple of occasionally substituting the title for the personal pronoun where it seemed to him appropriate. There is here a possible explanation of the practice which has spread to all the gospels. There is no adequate evidence that Jesus ever applied the title to himself.

We have two possible criteria to determine whether this possible explanation of the spread of the usage is also the true one. (1) Mark, if at all dependent on Q, is admittedly so in a different sense and to a less degree than Matthew or Luke. We should expect, then, to find the title Son of Man less at home (so to speak) in Mark than in Q. (2) In Acts, especially in the speeches of Peter, we have by common consent a very early type of christology, if indeed we have not traces of a type of evangelic tradition wholly unaffected by Q. Let us briefly consider these two criteria.

(1) The facts regarding the Markan employment of the title are briefly summarized on p. xxxviii of the introduction to my commentary entitled *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, as follows: "The title Son of Man does not appear to characterize the fundamental elements of Mark (P). It occurs in editorial supplements derived from Q, and even then in an adapted sense." Space limitations of course preclude the citation here of the evidence on which this statement is made, but a reference to the individual instances as discussed in the volume quoted will suffice. The title does not appear from these to be indigenous to Mark, but an exotic. It occurs only in passages where there is independent evidence of the influence of Q.

(2) There is no occurrence of the title Son of Man throughout the Petrine speeches of Acts, though these are so largely concerned with the doctrine of Christ's humiliation and exaltation. As is well known, its only occurrence in the New Testament outside the four gospels is in the Speech of Stephen, Acts 7 56, recognized by Harnack and many others as derived from a different source. Even here it is not the words of the speech itself, but of its reporter, which suggest the equivalence, "The Son of Man is Jesus." On the theory that this was "the favorite self-designation of Jesus" the striking fact of its complete absence from the speeches of Peter in Acts remains as inexplicable as the equally unbroken silence of Paul.

We have reached the conclusion of our examination of the data. A just valuation of all the documentary evidence will at least compel us to admit a large discount from its *prima facie* impression. The alleged consensus of witnesses may easily reduce itself to the testimony of one, and the evidence of this one, the compiler of Q, is not altogether consistent with his own material or with the indirect evidence of others. Against it stands the incongruity of the conception with other teachings of Jesus, and the case with which the enthusiastic apocalypticism of the early church might pass from certain sayings about the "Coming of the Son of Man" to the equivalence, "Jesus himself is the coming Son of Man." The preponderance of evidence would seem to incline toward an origin for this equivalence not in the sane and sober mind of Jesus, but in the exalted and visionary expectations of a church on fire with momentary expectations of the end.