

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1942

"The Son of Man" : a discussion of the term as found in Daniel VII, 13 and in the New Testament passages.

Mark Steege

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Steege, Mark, ""The Son of Man" : a discussion of the term as found in Daniel VII, 13 and in the New Testament passages." (1942). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 239.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/239>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

"THE SON OF MAN"

A thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Seminary

St. Louis, Missouri

by

Mark J. Steege

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Master of Sacred Theology

Approved:
W. Arndt
Theo. Lactich.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

THE VALUE OF EACH WORD IN THE SCRIPTURES

The value of each word of Scripture - Jeremia in the name of Christ - Difficulty in finding the meaning of our name. The value of the subject: Pages 1ff.

Chapter II

THE SON OF MAN

"THE SON OF MAN" equivalent - Their
A DISCUSSION OF THE TERM AS FOUND IN DANIEL VII, 13
AND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

BY

MARK J. STEEGE

Chapter III

THE SON OF MAN

How the title was used - Jesus used the title from the beginning of his ministry - In presence of friend and foe - With feelings of humiliation and exaltation - With regard to the Son of Man - Prophet, Priest, and King: Pages 30ff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

MESSAGES OF GRACE IN THE NAMES OF JESUS

The value of each word of Scripture - Sermons in the names of Christ - Difficulty in finding the meaning of one name, THE SON OF MAN - Importance of the subject: Pages 1ff.

Chapter II

THE SAVIOR FORMULATES A NEW NAME

Critics claim the name had no Aramaic equivalent - Their word carries weight - Dalman, Cremer, and Fiebig refute their claims: Pages 6ff.

Chapter III

JESUS' SELF-APPELLATION AND DANIEL'S PROPHECY

Jesus makes frequent use of the Old Testament - Some doubt as to the origin of His title - Two possible sources, viz. Psalm viii, 5 and Daniel vii, 13 - Messianic character of Daniel vii proven - Adaptability of the passage - Psalm viii discussed - The Psalm compared with the passage in Daniel as a source of the title - Daniel vii the real source of the title: Pages 13ff.

Chapter IV

JESUS' USE OF THE TITLE, THE SON OF MAN

False views discarded - Jesus used the title from the beginning to the end of His ministry - In presence of friend and foe - When speaking of humiliation and exaltation - With reference to His work as a Prophet, Priest, and King: Pages 35ff.

Chapter V

DIVERGENT VIEWS REGARDING THE MEANING OF THE TITLE

Substitute for the personal pronoun - Designating the ideal man - Concealing Christ's true identity - These views rejected - Connection found between the title and Daniel vii: Pages 46ff.

Chapter VI

THE SON OF MAN, THE ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR OF MANKIND

Full significance of this definition - Title stresses human and divine nature of Christ - Agrees with vision of Daniel - Agrees with Jesus' use of the title in passages foretelling His second Advent, His suffering and death, and in passages in which He refers to some power or right enjoyed as THE SON OF MAN - Humble station in life harmonized with Jesus' glory: Pages 57ff.

Chapter VII

THE WORLD REGARDS HER ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR: THE SON OF MAN
The Jews' opinion of Jesus and of His title - Their reaction to the title - The fault entirely their own - The opinion of the religious leaders - The opinion of the disciples before and after Pentecost - Their failure to use the title explained - The opinion of the world today: Pages 67ff.

Appendix I

A COMPLETE CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE OCCASIONS ON WHICH THE SAVIOR MADE USE OF THE TITLE

Appendix II

PASSAGES GROUPED ACCORDING TO CONTENT AND CONTEXT

Chapter V

DIVERGENT VIEWS REGARDING THE MEANING OF THE TITLE

Substitute for the personal pronoun - Designating the ideal man - Concealing Christ's true identity - These views rejected - Connection found between the title and Daniel vii: Pages 46ff.

Chapter VI

THE SON OF MAN, THE ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR OF MANKIND

Full significance of this definition - Title stresses human and divine nature of Christ - Agrees with vision of Daniel - Agrees with Jesus' use of the title in passages foretelling His second Advent, His suffering and death, and in passages in which He refers to some power or right enjoyed as THE SON OF MAN - Humble station in life harmonized with Jesus' glory: Pages 57ff.

Chapter VII

THE WORLD REGARDS HER ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR: THE SON OF MAN
The Jews' opinion of Jesus and of His title - Their reaction to the title - The fault entirely their own - The opinion of the religious leaders - The opinion of the disciples before and after Pentecost - Their failure to use the title explained - The opinion of the world today: Pages 67ff.

Appendix I

A COMPLETE CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE OCCASIONS ON WHICH THE SAVIOR MADE USE OF THE TITLE

Appendix II

PASSAGES GROUPED ACCORDING TO CONTENT AND CONTEXT

Appendix III

PASSAGES GROUPED ACCORDING TO THEIR USE IN THE PRESENCE OF THE DISCIPLES; THE MULTITUDE; AND INDIVIDUALS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

THE USE OF GRACE IN THE GOSPEL OF JESUS

The English word of the Bible is everywhere. Each word has its own history with the greatest of care is now being given to the translation the specific word which the meaning of the word in the original text gives to the passage in which it occurs. At times, it is truly impossible, for some Greek and Hebrew words have several shades of meaning that a vocabulary is to be compiled for a new translation, if the sense of the passage is to be fully expressed. But the fact that we are dealing with the Lord's word warrants the application of such care. It is a search for the best possible English word or phrase. The fact that God is speaking through the words is sufficient to warrant every word which He speaks to be carefully chosen. It is a search for the best possible English word or phrase. The fact that God is speaking through the words is sufficient to warrant every word which He speaks to be carefully chosen.

It is especially true of those portions of Holy Scripture which are of special importance. It is a search for the best possible English word or phrase. The fact that God is speaking through the words is sufficient to warrant every word which He speaks to be carefully chosen.

CHAPTER I

MESSAGES OF GRACE IN THE NAMES OF JESUS

Not a single word of the Bible is superfluous. Each word must be translated with the greatest of care in order to convey to the translation the specific sense which the presence of the word in the original text gives to the passage in which it occurs. At times, it is true, this is almost impossible, for some Greek and Hebrew words contain such a depth of meaning that a commentary is to be preferred to a mere translation, if the sense of the passage is to be fully expressed. Yet the fact that we are dealing with God's Word warrants the application of much time and effort to a search for the best possible rendition of each word or phrase. The fact that God is speaking to us makes us anxious to catch every word which He utters.

This is especially true of those portions of Holy Writ which tell us of Jesus, the Savior. Since we have not seen Him face to face and have not walked with Him on earth, since we have witnessed none of the things which He did for the salvation of this sin-cursed world, we

must depend wholly on the Scriptures for a revelation of Him. We know that they do not fully reveal Him. Nothing can. In heaven we shall see how incomplete the Bible picture is which we have of Him. But they reveal Him clearly enough that all men may come to faith in Him. The argumentation of Scripture is complete enough to meet any and every objection to His person and work. The revelation is clear enough to ward off any misconceptions of Him. The description is intimate enough to give Him a place in our inmost hearts. We would not willingly sacrifice a single word of this Bible picture. We cherish all that God has given us to reveal unto us His beloved Son.

How important in this respect are the names of Christ!
What truths they tell! Each has a meaning. Each has a lesson to teach. Each reveals our blessed Savior in one of many aspects. Each preaches a sermon, be it of His love, His devotion, His preeminence, His might and power, or His humility and meekness. In the Old Testament already we find the names Woman's Seed, Shiloh, Star, Tender Plant, Corner-Stone, Servant of the Lord, Branch, Desire of all nations, and Sun of Righteousness. To these the Savior adds His own, among them the name Shepherd, King, Judge, the Light of the world, the Bread of life, and the Redeemer. John calls Him the Word of Life, the Lamb of God, the Advocate of the Father, the Alpha and Omega. Peter refers to Him as the Son of the Living

Lord, the Savior. Paul speaks of Him as the First-Born before all creation and as the Head of the Church.

He was called Jesus before His birth, to call attention to the fact that He would save His people from their sins. He was called Christ or the Messiah, because He was "anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows," having received the Holy Ghost without measure. And He was called Lord, because dominion and principalities and powers were given unto Him. Yes, Christ's names are sermons in themselves!

But one name has caused difficulties. It has a hidden meaning which a mere translation does not reveal. We refer to the name by which Jesus spoke of Himself and which others either dared not or would not repeat after Him. Others called Him Rabbi, Lord, and Master. He called Himself THE SON OF MAN. But what is the meaning of this name? Why did Christ so consistently use it? Milligan tells us that "probably no other single phrase of the Gospels has called forth a greater variety of interpretations; nor can we be said even yet to have reached definite conclusions on many of the questions it raises."¹⁾

A study of the question reveals the truth of these words. It has been answered in hundreds of different ways by men of every faith. The modernist, the rationalist, the Pelagian theologian seem to speak as author-

1) Milligan: THE SON OF MAN, Expositor, New York, p.74

itatively, though by no means as correctly, on the subject as does the fundamentalist. How far, then, can we go in searching out the true meaning of Christ's self-appellation? How close can we come to a definite solution of the problem?

The subject is an interesting one. In the words of Robert Dick Wilson "no title of the Lord illustrates better the independence of the New Testament than the phrase 'THE SON OF MAN.' From the slender hints of the word in the Old Testament (Daniel vii, 13; Psalm viii, 5) the Lord appropriates for Himself a designation which is used in the Gospels eighty-four times and always of Himself and by Himself. Others called Him the Son of God; He called Himself THE SON OF MAN."¹⁾

The Expositor says of the title: "It must have been deliberately adopted by Jesus to express some truth He was particularly anxious to convey. When, however, we proceed to ask what that truth was, we are immediately surrounded by difficulties. Probably no other single phrase of the Gospels has called forth a greater variety of interpretations."²⁾

1) Robert Dick Wilson: Articles Showing Differences Between the New Testament, Koran, etc. Volume xix, Princeton Theological Review, page 427. 2) G. Milligan's article THE SON OF MAN, Expositor Vol. v. New York, 1902.

This fact, together with others already mentioned, such as the importance of the names of Christ in revealing Him to us, gives us every reason to devote some time to a discussion of the topic.

[Faint, mirrored text from the reverse side of the page, including a library stamp: "WILLIAMSON MEMORIAL LIBRARY CONCORDIA SEMINARY ST. LOUIS, MO."]

CHAPTER II

THE SAVIOR FORMULATES A NEW NAME

Strange as it may seem, many critics, among them especially Lietzmann and Wellhausen, have argued that Christ did not call Himself THE SON OF MAN. They base their arguments on the supposition that the Aramaic language in use in Palestine at Christ's time did not permit a construction which would have to be regarded as a title. They hold Christian, Greek-speaking circles responsible for the expression, claiming it was not used by Christ.

The Christian, naturally, has no difficulty in satisfying his own mind on this subject. The verbal inspiration of the Greek New Testament assures him of the fact that Christ most certainly did use the title. The presence of the title in the Greek is a clear indication for him that Christ also used the expression as a title in the language which He spoke.

However, those who deny the possibility of formulating any such title in the Aramaic are scholars of great reputation, including among others such men as Lietzmann, Wellhausen, Schweitzer, Weiss, Holtzman, and the writers

for several encyclopedias.

A. E. Rawlinson quotes Lietzmann as saying that in the language used by our Lord BAR-NASHA, the Aramaic form for THE SON OF MAN, was a mere periphrasis for "man" and, therefore, could not have been used as a title. There would have been no possibility of distinguishing in the Aramaic spoken in Palestine between the expression SON OF MAN and "man."¹⁾ This view was first held by Wellhausen and Holtzman, the latter attaching to his reasoning the merit of a discovery.

Discussing the term in the Jewish Encyclopedia, Hirsch says it "could have been understood only as substitute for a personal pronoun or as emphasizing the human qualities of those to whom it is applied."²⁾ The Encyclopedia Biblica is also negative. It takes the stand that there is no evidence whatever that BAR-NASHA was ever used as a Messianic title.

Weiss and Schweitzer, on the other hand, suggest that Jesus employed the title only in a futuristic sense, as applying to THE SON OF MAN coming with the clouds of heaven, a view which can be accepted as little as the others.

1) Rawlinson: "The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ," Appended Note III: On the Meaning and Use of the Title "SON OF MAN" in the Gospels, Page 245.

2) E. Hirsch, The Jewish Encyclopedia, sub: SON OF MAN.

Naturally, the word of these men carries weight. They have gained followers by the hundreds. The believing child of God is, of course, satisfied with the thought that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and that the term occurring so often in the Gospels could not possibly have been corrupted in the many and ancient manuscripts which we have at our disposal. Yet, in order to meet the opponents on their own ground, we must take our problem to eminent philologists, to men who are authorities in Greek and Aramaic, and permit them to decide the point.

Professor Gustav Dalman, one of the most eminent Aramaic scholars of modern times, has entered his protest against the reasoning of these negative critics. He points out that though BAR-ENESH in the Aramaic may designate "man," the terms BAR-ENASHA and BAR-NASHA cannot thus be translated. The term which is usually employed to designate man is ENASHA. Nothing remains, according to Dalman, but that Jesus employed the Aramaic BAR-ANASHA, an expression "which was not adaptable to common usage of the Palestinian Jews as a term for man."¹) He is quoted by Milligan as saying that the phrase SON OF MAN, determined as it is by two articles, is the product of great perplexity on the part of the Evangelists to reproduce the impression which THE SON OF MAN with the articles made in Aramaic, which was certainly equivalent to more than

1) Cf. Cremer's *Biblisch-Theologisches Woerterbuch der N.T. Graecitaet*, 1902, sub: HYIOS, page 1027.

"the man" as man. Milligan then continues: "Even if this were not the case, and SON OF MAN in Aramaic was equivalent to no more than "man" may we not again ask what reason there is that Jesus should not have imparted to the old phrase a new and original sense? On the whole we venture to think that no valid objection has been established against its Messianic reference, and how well this official sense suits the passages in which it occurs a hurried glance at them is sufficient to prove."¹⁾

The work which Dalman began was continued by Fiebig. Dalman had answered in part, stating that another word was used for man in Aramaic. But he did not concern himself about the question as to whether this term BAR-NASHA was not also used of man in general. Fiebig took over this work, according to Luthardt. He searched all writings which might shed light on the subject: Biblical Aramaic, Onkelos, Samaritan, Prophet Targum, Aramaic inscriptions, Zaubertext, the Sword of Moses, the Jerusalem and Babylonian targums, writings on Midrash, and others. He treats the terms ANASHA, ANASH, B'NE ANASH, BAR-ANASHA, and BAR-ANASH, giving examples of their use. The result is this: Dalman is right when he sees in the passages in question a nuance between "man" and SON OF MAN, but it is also true that BAR-ANASHA is used in the Talmud, the Midrash, etc. to denote "the man" or "a man"

1) Milligan, Op. cit. page 77.

and BAR-ANASH even means "some one." Even in the story of the creation the word BAR is used, showing that there is no thought of descent connected with it, but that the word is used merely as decoration as often in Hebrew and Aramaic. Yet Fiebig sees no reason for the assumption that the term was not used by Jesus or was used by Him at least in some instances as referring to mankind. He seeks to find out if the Greek expression is due to a mistranslation and proves conclusively that Matthew xii, 32; viii, 20; xi, 19; and Mark ii, 10. 27. 28 according to contents and context can refer only to Jesus the Messiah and not to a "man" or "the man" even though the term should allow of other interpretations. In no instance can it be proven that the Gospels have "translated" incorrectly.¹⁾

The fact that Cremer, who is himself no mean authority, agrees with the findings of Dalman, gives us ample proof for the fact that the negative critics are wrong in their claims that Christ could not have used an Aramaic expression which the Gospels would have been forced to render as they did. And if He could use the name, there is no reason for doubting that He did use it.

Some few, among them especially Lietzmann and Wellhausen, believe the title originated among Greek-speaking Christians after Christ's death. But their following

1) As quoted by Luthardt in the Theologisches Literaturblatt, 1901 and by Weinel in the Theologische Rundschau, 1902.

among men who know the Greek and Hebrew language is very small. And even these do not unhesitatingly accept their claims. Kaehler, for instance, in his Realencyklopaedie expresses the possibility that the passages may have been interpolated after Christ's death. He, however, feels compelled to add that should they be accepted as original, then it is clear "that with this expression Jesus dissociates Himself from sinful mankind."¹⁾

Generally speaking, the arguments of this group of critics are weak and decidedly un-Scriptural. Nebe, in calling attention to their claims, asks how it is that the Christians themselves never used the title in speaking of Christ.²⁾ If Christ Himself had not used it, its presence in the Scriptures could not easily be accounted for. This must become clear from a study of the Book of Acts and of the letters of the various Apostles. If they had regularly referred to Christ as THE SON OF MAN and had thus been responsible for the inclusion of the title in the Gospels we would have the right to expect a use of the title in their letters. The fact that Stephen is the only one whose reference to Christ as THE SON OF MAN is recorded, forces the conclusion also upon such as do not believe in verbal inspiration, that Christ called Himself THE SON OF MAN. As Rawlinson points out: "It is believed now by most

1) Christologie; Volume iv Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche. 2) Nebe, Denkschrift, 1860.

12

scholars that our Lord did use the expression."¹⁾ The fact that practically all of the works consulted on the subject take for granted that Christ used the expression, proves that Rawlinson is not misstating facts.

1) Opus cit. page 247.

CHAPTER III

JESUS' SELF-APPELLATION AND DANIEL'S PROPHECY

The Savior made it one of His purposes in life to prove that the Old Testament had testified of Him. "Search the Scriptures," said He to the Jews, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me," John v, 39. Time and again He referred His disciples to the prophecies of Scripture, not only to prove that He had fulfilled them, but especially, to point out that Moses and the prophets had written of Him. He showed His hearers that His work as a Prophet, Priest, and King, as well as His suffering, death, and burial, and His resurrection, had all been prophesied hundreds of years before He came to earth. The Jews should, therefore, have known Him when He appeared among them. They should have recognized His works as those of the Messiah. They should most certainly have received Him as their King.

We know that they refused to do so. But was there any reason for this? Was Christ Himself in any way responsible for their lack of faith in Him? Some writers actually say that He was. They claim that the name which Jesus gave Him-

14

self obscured His true identity. He called Himself THE SON OF MAN, a name which many Bible students believe was unknown to the Jews, inasmuch as it was not revealed in the Old Testament.

It is true, this name does not occur in the Old Testament in the form in which Jesus used it. We search in vain for the title in any of the Messianic prophecies. We must also admit that it was not a common title for the Messiah at the time of His appearance. For the Gospels indicate that Jesus was the only person to make use of it. His disciples never referred to Him as THE SON OF MAN.

That, at first, seems strange to us. Why should Jesus have chosen a name which had not been used by those who foretold His coming? Why should He, who so often referred to the Old Testament in proving His claims, have ignored the many names which Moses and the prophets used in referring to Him? These questions deserve an answer. However, the problem is not as great as the questions might seem to indicate.

The truth of the matter is that Jesus' self-appellation is found in the Old Testament, if not in the form in which Jesus used it, then at least in a form which would make it possible for Him to assume this title and by it to reveal Himself as the promised Messiah. In other words, when Jesus called Himself THE SON OF MAN, the Jews should have recognized the name as Messianic in character. That is the burden of our proof.

Expressions similar to the title which Jesus applied to Himself are found in two Messianic prophecies, namely, in Psalm viii, 5 (verse four in the English translations) and in Daniel vii, 13. Even a hasty examination of these two passages seems to point to the latter as the more logical source of the title. We, therefore, shall consider the passage in the Book of Daniel before we take up the Psalm. In Daniel vii, 13.14 we read:

"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like THE SON OF MAN came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

This passage is an interesting one. The language and contents indicate that it is of great importance. We can well imagine that it was carefully studied by the Jews, and that it was well known to them. If, then, we had the right without further argument to take for granted that the passage is Messianic in character, we would conclude that Jesus could have derived His name from this passage, without leaving the Jews in doubt concerning Himself.

The critics, however, argue that the passage in question is not Messianic in character. They tell us that the night visions which Daniel saw were but a manifestation of the

Jewish race. That is the explanation of Meinhold in the Strack-Zoeckler Commentary. Hirsch, writing for the Jewish Encyclopedia, tells us this "one like THE SON OF MAN" is "an angel with a human appearance." Schmidt speaks of Him as Michael, "the Guardian angel of Israel."¹⁾ Rawlinson says the expression refers to the "Jewish community, the people of the saints of the Most High."²⁾ Even Luthardt³⁾ and Delitzsch⁴⁾ find here no more than a symbol of the kingdom of the saints. They admit, however, that Christ is the Head of the kingdom mentioned.

We shall see what it is that causes critics to take this view when we study the remarks of Montgomery in the International Critical Commentary. In commenting on the verses in Daniel, he says: "However much a student, for one reason or another, may be inclined to find here a Messianic prophecy of a heaven-born Savior coming to the rescue and rule of his people, nevertheless the strict exegesis of the chapter does not bear this out. The accurate interpretation given later on (note this!) tells us in so many words what is symbolized by the vision. According to verse 18 it is the saints of the Most High, who shall receive the kingdom; and in verse 27 sovereignty and dominion...are given to the people of the saints of the Most High; i.e., both statements are intentional replicas of

1) Encyclopedia Biblica, 1907, Column 4710. 2) Op. cit. page 21. 3) Kompendium der Dogmatik. 4) Messianische Weiss.

verse 14."¹⁾

If this were true, that Daniel saw only a symbol of the Jewish race in this "one like THE SON OF MAN," Christ could not have taken His name from this passage. The title would then have been a misrepresentation. Yet nothing in the text or context forces us to accept this interpretation. In fact, a study of the passage together with its context and in the light of other prophecies of Scripture, not only permits but compels us to see the Messiah symbolized by this "one like THE SON OF MAN."

Let us first direct our attention to the context, especially verses 18. 22. and 27 of the seventh chapter of Daniel. For these verses seem to have influenced the critics in discarding the Messianic interpretation of the passage. These verses tell us that the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever; that judgment was given to them; yes, that the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to them. The critics argue that these saints must, therefore, be denoted by the CE-BAR-ENOSH, the "one like THE SON OF MAN."

However, the verses in question do not say that all people, nations and languages will serve the saints. Neither do they say that the saints will come in the clouds of heaven. On the contrary, verse 27 states that even when the saints receive the kingdom, all dominions will still serve the Most

1) ~~Critical and Exegetical~~ Commentary on the Book of Daniel.

High and not the saints.

Verse 28 should not be overlooked when studying this passage. It indicates that Daniel did not receive an interpretation of the entire vision. We conclude that the "one like THE SON OF MAN" was not identified at all by the angel. Most assuredly this being was not a personification of the saints. Thomson rightly states in the Pulpit Commentary: "In the present case there is nothing to indicate any reference to Israel personified."¹⁾ It is interesting to note in this connection that the Jews themselves never understood the passage in any other than a Messianic sense. They were led by these verses to look for the coming of the BEN DAVID, the Son of the David, which was one of the names they had given to the Messiah.

That this is the only correct view is seen more clearly from a study of the passage itself. Charles Boutflower correctly states with reference to verses 13 and 14: "What strikes us first in this description is the incomparable grandeur and solemnity of it. So grand a setting calls, surely, for a worthy subject. Who is it, then, we ask, who comes thus with the clouds of heaven in a manner befitting only the Deity? Who is it that is led by attendant ministers to be presented to the Ancient of Days and to receive from Him everlasting and world-wide dominion? No individual at all, answer the critics, but only the symbolic

1) Daniel, The Pulpit Commentary, New York.

representative of a race of supernatural beings, viz., of the saintly Israel transformed. Such an interpretation, when put before us, is so distressingly disappointing, since the surroundings so evidently call for some great one. Further we are conscious of a want of harmony in the interpretation of the next verse: 'All the peoples, nations, and languages' are to 'serve him.' Now to take the singular 'him' in a figurative collective sense when put in such close contrast with nouns of multitude, such as 'peoples' 'nations' and 'languages' is, to say the least, bad taste and doubtful criticism. And no less strange is it to assign a figurative meaning to 'him' and a literal meaning to 'the peoples, nations, and languages.'"¹⁾

Briggs adds the thought that "in this passage THE SON OF MAN is brought into contrast not so much with the wild beasts as with the little horn and if that be an individual, this must also be an individual and, therefore, the Messiah Himself."²⁾

Let it be further noted that the expression "coming in the clouds of heaven" indicates that this SON OF MAN comes down from heaven. This cannot be said of Israel, not even of the spiritual Israel, the Church of God. Though she owes her existence to God, she herself has not come from heaven. This can be said only of the Son of God or of

1) C. Boutflower: In and Around the Book of Daniel, p.58.

2) Briggs: Messianic Prophecies, p. 420.

one of the angels, though the latter view must here be ruled out, as we shall see.

A study of the Old Testament prophecies clearly indicates that the thoughts contained in Daniel vii, 13.14 agree with the teachings of many other passages which must be referred to God's Son. In Psalm cx, for instance, the Messiah is pictured as a mighty King, who shall rule over His enemies. The same thought is expressed in the Second Psalm. There the heathen are warned: "Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little," ii, 12. Isaiah, likewise, describes the Messiah as a powerful King, who has "broken the rod of His oppressor," ix, 5; who will "come with a strong hand, and His arm shall rule for Him," xl, 10. The prophecy concerning Christ's birth in Bethlehem can also be adduced here. In it Micah refers to Christ as the "ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," v, 2. Finally, Zechariah, who describes the meekness of Christ, also tells us that "His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth," ix, 10. All of these thoughts agree with the passage in the Book of Daniel which was cited above. Therefore, the "one like THE SON OF MAN" who was given "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him," whose dominion is an "everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away," is Jesus, the promised Messiah!

This is proven conclusively by the manner in which Christ Himself explained this passage. Having spoken of the signs which would precede His second coming into the world, He added: "And then shall appear the sign of THE SON OF MAN in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see THE SON OF MAN coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," Matthew xxiv, 30. He again referred to the passage in Daniel while testifying before the Sanhedrin concerning His heavenly origin, saying: "Hereafter shall ye see THE SON OF MAN sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven," Matthew xxvi, 64. The Sanhedrin at the time knew that He was speaking of Himself as THE SON OF MAN and for this reason accused Him of blasphemy. What more forceful argument than this could be adduced for the Messianic character of the passage in Daniel?

In this connection the words of Boutflower are highly significant. He says: "If the question be asked, How comes it that our modern critics cannot see what was so clearly seen by the ancient Jewish expositors? the answer is that their inability to recognize the Messiah in the vision of Daniel vii arises out of the estimate which they have already formed of Daniel's Book. To them it appears as a literary work of great power written more than 350 years after the times it describes. They therefore argue that if by "one like unto THE SON OF MAN" the writer had meant the Messiah he would have been sure to make the

angel say so when interpreting the vision of Daniel. To those of us, however, who see in the Book of Daniel, not a mere Jewish apocalypse, but genuine history, and who hold the belief that Daniel really saw the visions which He describes, this line of argument does not appeal."¹⁾

"Appeal" is hardly the word which we would use in this connection. If anything, Boutflower has been too lenient with the critics. For any one who believes the Scriptures to have been given by inspiration of God, and who sees in the New Testament a fulfillment of the Old, must accept the passage in Daniel as agreeing in content and meaning with the statements made by Christ concerning His return to glory.

Let the doubter and the critic consider the masterful argument of Martin Luther. This great scholar definitely rules out any one but Christ in the passage in Daniel by calling attention to the fact that eternal power was given unto this "one like THE SON OF MAN." And he argues from this that the passage must, of necessity, refer to the Son of God. For such power, says Luther, could not have been given unto an angel or any man. If God had given it to one of His creatures, what would He have for Himself? Luther says He would have nothing at all, having conferred all power upon another.²⁾

1) Op. cit. page 61.

2) Auslegung des Alten Testaments, Vol.iii, Column 1907.

In view of these facts the passage in Daniel must be considered a Messianic prophecy. And as such it is also received by many Bible scholars. It should be interesting to read the comments of at least a few of them. Hengstenberg states: "Daniel also recognizes the union of a human and superhuman nature in the Messiah (vii, 13.14). The Messiah appears with the clouds of heaven, as Lord of nature and omnipotent Judge. The fact that He is compared to the SON OF MAN, indicates that along with His humanity there is another side which reaches far beyond His merely human nature."¹) In Pusey's book, "Daniel, the Prophet," we read: "We see...one like THE SON OF MAN in heaven; like man, but not a mere man; man, but more than man...accompanied by angels to the throne of God, in that majesty which had, before Daniel in this place, been spoken of God only, coming with the clouds of heaven...Even before the Lord came, the description was recognized as relating to the Messiah. The passage was cited in the book of Enoch when affirming the pre-existence of the Messiah 'before the creation of the world and for ever,' that He was the Revealer to man, the Object of prayer, and would be to all nations the Stay, the Light of nations, the Hope of the troubled, the Righteous Judge, with Whom the saints should dwell for ever." In the words of Orelli "the personal portraiture, vii, 13, is opposed to every collective interpretation. Also the antithe-

1) Christology of the Old Testament, Edinburgh, 1864.

sis to the earthly powers requires that this divine kingdom now entering into visibility, should have its visible Head. And this can be no other than the long-expected Messiah appearing at the right time."¹⁾ Keil, who likewise accepts the Messianic interpretation of the passage in question, says: "The comparison (like a man) points especially to the fact that He is a heavenly or divine being in human form."²⁾ Our own Professor Stoeckhardt and with him most other Lutheran commentators consider the Messianic interpretation of Daniel vii the only correct one. Professor Stoeckhardt states: "He who appears in the clouds of heaven, is brought to God, the Ancient of Days, whose kingdom has no end, is without doubt the King, Messiah. The transitory kingdoms of the world and the eternal kingdom of Christ are contrasted with each other in this seventh chapter of Daniel. And Daniel sees Christ as 'one like THE SON OF MAN.'"³⁾

Now inasmuch as Daniel vii, 13.14 is a Messianic passage it may also be considered at least one source for the name which Christ gave to Himself. And a wonderful source, indeed! Think again of the inspiring picture in Daniel's vision! The Ancient of Days is seated on a throne, His garments white as snow, the hair of His head like pure wool, His throne like the fiery flame. A fiery stream, the symbol of God's holiness, issues and comes forth from before Him. Thousand thousands minister unto Him and ten thousand

1) The Old Testament Prophecy. 2) Biblischer Kommentar ueber den Propheten Daniel. 3) Lehre und Wehre 36, 282.

times ten thousand stand before Him. And suddenly one like THE SON OF MAN is brought before Him. He comes in the clouds of heaven, undoubtedly with a splendor like that of the Ancient of Days. And in the presence of the legions of angels and saints surrounding the throne of the Most High, He is crowned King of heaven and earth for ever and ever. If men had opened their spiritual eyes and had seen this picture of THE SON OF MAN as He walked on earth, would they have ignored and rejected Him as they did? Surely, the vision of Daniel deserves to be considered as a source of the title which Jesus, the Son of God, applied to Himself! As THE SON OF MAN of Daniel's vision He rises so high above the men who were at His side during His public ministry that they dare not call Him anything but the Son of the living God, the Holy One of Israel.

However, Daniel vii, 13.14 is not the only Messianic passage to be considered as a possible source of the self-appellation of our Lord. The expression THE SON OF MAN, referred to the Messiah, occurs also in Psalm viii, 4 (verse 5 of the original Hebrew text). And some commentators consider the Psalm verse an important source of the title. Dr. Walter A. Maier gives as one of the proofs of the Messianic character of Psalm viii the fact that the title THE SON OF MAN is used in verse four. He says in his mimeographed notes of 1926: "The subject of the psalm is given a name which in other passages of Scripture is reserved for Christ: BEN-ADAM 'THE SON OF MAN,' '(HO) HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU.'" Unfortunate-

ly Dr. Maier does not enlarge upon the statement. He does not state whether the name THE SON OF MAN is reserved for Christ in all passages of Scripture or merely in the New Testament. As a matter of fact, it is reserved for Him only in the New Testament. In the Old Testament, where BEN-ADAM is used as referring to Him in only two or three instances, it is used repeatedly to designate man, as in the Book of Ezekiel, where the term is applied to the prophet again and again. It is used also in Psalm lxxx, 17 (verse 18 of the Hebrew text), where, as Dr. Kretzmann points out, the reference is "either to the Church as personified in each believer, or to the great SON OF MAN, the Messiah, Himself; for the prophetic character of the psalm is very marked."¹⁾ However, because there is no definite proof of the correct interpretation of Psalm lxxx, it will be omitted from further consideration, for no argument as to the meaning of the title of Jesus could be derived from this psalm. The English text might give the impression that the name THE SON OF MAN is found also in Psalm cxliv, 3 (verse four of the Hebrew text). Here we have a statement very similar to Psalm viii, 4. We read: "Lord, what is man, that Thou takest knowledge of him! or the son of man, that Thou makest account of him!" Compare these words with the reading of Psalm viii, 4: "What is man that Thou art mindful of Him, and THE SON OF MAN that Thou visitest Him." Yet in the 144th Psalm the term is a trans-

1) Popular Commentary, Old Testament, Vol.ii, page 144.

lation of the Hebrew BEN-ENOSH, while in Psalm viii and in Psalm lxxx it is a translation of BEN-ADAM. Furthermore, Psalm cxliv is non-Messianic throughout and must, therefore, be dismissed from further consideration. However, what of Psalm viii? Dr. G. Stoeckhardt, a Lutheran theologian and exegete of the first rank, says in his book on "Ausgewahlte Psalmen": "The self-designation of Jesus as THE SON OF MAN is derived from Psalm viii as also from Daniel vii, 13.14." He gives his reason for considering the psalm passage as a source of the title when he says: "The name THE SON OF MAN occurs most frequently, as Cremer correctly emphasizes, in those passages of the Gospels where the majesty of Christ is opposed to His lowliness."

Now there is no denying the fact that THE SON OF MAN of Psalm viii must be identified with THE SON OF MAN of the New Testament passages. It is none other than Jesus, the promised Messiah, as will be shown later. Let us, however, get the general thought of Psalm viii, to see whether we must find in it a direct source of Christ's self-appellation. THE SON OF MAN is first of all pictured in His greatest humiliation. He is forsaken by God, made to be without God for a time, or, as the Septuagint has it, made a little lower than the angels. Then, suddenly, the thought changes. THE SON OF MAN is highly exalted, made the ruler of heaven and earth, and crowned with glory and honor. The last thought corresponds with the vision of Daniel. Christ is the ruler of nations, having dominion over the whole world. The first thought,

however, is not developed in the passage in Daniel. The prophet's vision does not especially focus our attention upon THE SON OF MAN as a man. Much less does it seek to impress us with the thought that THE SON OF MAN is a lowly man, forsaken by God. And for this very reason the passage in Daniel is to be preferred to the Psalm as a source of the title as it was used by Jesus. A study of the New Testament seems to indicate that when Jesus used the title, His purpose was not so much to call attention to His humiliation - a thought which is stressed in that portion of the psalm in which the expression THE SON OF MAN occurs - as to point to His hidden glory and thus to cause men to forget His humiliation. The people were too much inclined to stress the fact that Christ was a man. In fact, most of them thought of Him as being no more than a man. There was, then, no need for Jesus to point to His lowliness. Dr. Stoeckhardt also grants that He did not do so when calling Himself THE SON OF MAN. Jesus' intentions were rather to draw the attention of men away from the lowliness which they saw in Him to the glory which they could see only with spiritual eyes. This, however, was not the intention of the psalmist. He portrays Christ in His deepest humiliation as well as in His exaltation.

Yet to speak of Christ's purpose in using the title before the passages of the New Testament are studied in which the title occurs, would be out of place. This rather premature statement, that Christ used the title to remind men of His hidden glory, must wait for substantiation in a later chapter.

For the present we must content ourselves with a comparison of Psalm viii and Daniel vii, to determine which is the more likely source of Christ's name. The writer holds to the view that the passage in Daniel is the real source. And the best arguments which can be adduced here in favor of this view are the following:

1. There is nothing striking in the Hebrew expression BEN-ADAM as it is used in the Eighth Psalm. The English translation renders it: "What is man, that Thou art mindful of Him; and THE SON OF MAN that Thou visitest Him?" Man and THE SON OF MAN are used to denote one and the same person, and, as far as the Psalm is concerned, have about the same meaning. It is a case of parallelism so common in Hebrew poetry. How different it is with CE-BAR-ENOSH in Daniel vii, 13. The English renders it "one like THE SON OF MAN." Being compared with man He is at once found to be different than His fellow-men. The Hebrew expression in Psalm viii is a perfectly natural and common construction, found elsewhere in the Old Testament to denote mere man, as has already been shown. Not so the Aramaic expression in Daniel vii, 13. And if the Greek title is taken into consideration, it, too, is striking and unnatural. HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU could be considered a natural circumscription for the word "man"; not so the title as it occurs in the Gospels, where it is always written with the article.¹⁾

1) In John v, 27 Jesus does not use the title and, therefore, the article is missing.

There is, then, a closer relationship between the Greek title and the expression as it is found in Daniel, than there is between the title and the expression recorded in Psalm viii.

2. Christ did not speak Hebrew. He spoke Aramaic. It would seem, then, that the portion in Daniel, which was written in Aramaic, would be a closer source of the title, if the context permitted this, than would a passage written in the Hebrew language. It could be argued, of course, that targums or translations of the Hebrew were used by the Jews long before Christ came to earth, and that an Aramaic translation of Psalm viii might have been in existence in His day. That, however, would be mere supposition. For the targums which we know today were of much later origin. The Jews in the days of Christ at least heard the Hebrew text read in the synagogs and in the temple. And they recognized the superiority of the Hebrew text over the running commentary of the Aramaic translations.

3. Possibly the best reason for preferring Daniel vii, 13 as the real source of Christ's self-appellation is the fact that the Savior definitely referred to the passage in Daniel in many of the SON OF MAN passages, namely, in those in which He speaks of His second coming. A list of these will be included in another chapter of this work and, therefore, is not given here. A few references, however, should be given. In Matthew xxiv, 30 we read: "They shall see THE SON OF MAN coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." The whole 24th chapter of Matthew, as well as Mark

xiii and Luke xxi, is worthy of consideration. Especially important is Matthew xxvi, 64: "Hereafter shall ye see THE SON OF MAN sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." These passages are so definitely in accord with the prophecy of Daniel that the close relation of the title to this prophecy cannot be doubted.

The Savior, of course, also quoted from the Eighth Psalm. And His quotations prove that the Psalm is Messianic in character, that it speaks of Him from beginning to end. In Matthew xxi, 15.16 the Savior quotes the second verse of the Psalm, saying: "Have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise?" and with this quotation proves His right to accept the praise of the little children. In I Corinthians xv, 24ff He directs the Apostle Paul to refer the sixth verse of the Psalm to Himself, showing that all things are put under His feet. And in Hebrews 11, 6ff we have a clear exegesis of the teaching of the last portion of the Psalm, declaring it to be a reference to Christ. But nowhere is this Psalm directly quoted in connection with the title THE SON OF MAN. Therefore, while the Messianic character of the Psalm dare not be overlooked, it seems best to regard Daniel vii as the real source of Christ's title. The writer believes that, at best, the Psalm may be considered an indirect source of Christ's name, possibly causing its use in the passage in Daniel. It should not be linked directly with the New Testament use of the title. The real source of that title is Daniel vii, 13.

3

That is not only the firm conviction of the writer. It is the opinion of practically all of the commentators whose works have been consulted by him, if they at all speak of the source of the title. It may interest the reader to note a few of the statements made by them. Orelli, whose work has already been quoted, states with reference to Daniel vii: "That this chapter is the proper source of a certain New Testament phrase, i.e., of the name which Jesus was fond of applying to Himself according to the four Gospels, scarcely needs remark. That He chose the appellation SON OF MAN in allusion to Daniel vii, 13 follows from the sayings of Jesus in which He expressly refers to this passage, like Matthew xxiv, 30."¹⁾ Dr. Kretzmann states in his Popular Commentary: "It is on the basis of this passage (Daniel vii, 13) which describes the formal inauguration of the Messiah as King of His eternal kingdom, that Jesus applied the name SON OF MAN to Himself so frequently in the Gospels."²⁾ Keil agrees, stating that Jesus calls Himself THE SON OF MAN to designate Himself as the Messiah and refers back to Daniel vii, 13.³⁾ Rawlinson quotes Dalman as saying that "in view of the obvious reference by Jesus to Daniel vii, 13 in His apocalyptic discourse, Matthew xxiv, 30 and in His testimony before the Sanhedrin,

1) The Old Testament Prophecy. 2) Popular Commentary of the Bible, Old Testament, Vol. 11. 3) Biblischer Commentar ueber den Propheten Daniel.

Matthew xxvi, 64 it can scarcely be doubted that Daniel vii, 13 was the source from which He took the self-designation."¹⁾ Beckwith is in doubt as to the origin of the title, stating that obscurity veils the origin of the term. But he, too, does not even take the Psalm into consideration. He wavers between Enoch and Daniel.²⁾ Schmidt, one of the higher critics whose conclusions cannot always be trusted, correctly states that "Daniel vii, 13 is the earliest passage in Aramaic literature where the term SON OF MAN occurs."³⁾ Even Robinson in his Greek and English Lexicon, in defining the term HO HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU, states that THE SON OF MAN is a proper noun for the Messiah, "used by Jesus of Himself in allusion to Daniel vii, 13." Milligan, therefore, seems to be correct in stating that "on one point there is a steadily growing consensus of opinion, namely, that the origin of the phrase is to be sought in the apocalyptic vision of Daniel vii."⁴⁾ And Meyer boldly asserts with reference to the title in his comments on Matthew xiii, 20: "It is not founded on Psalm viii, 5, still less on Ezekiel, which has nothing to do with the Messianic idea. But it is to be traced solely to the impressive account of that prophetic vision, Daniel vii, 13, so familiar to the Jews." He goes on to say that as often as Jesus, in speaking of Himself, uses the words THE SON OF MAN, He means nothing else than THE SON OF MAN in the

1) New Testament Doctrine of the Christ. 2) Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia, Vol.xi. 3) Encyclopedia Biblica. 4) Expositor.

prophecy of Daniel.¹⁾ The same view has been held by men as early as the fourth and fifth century, among them Epiphanius and Theodoretus, and by men in our own church and others to the present day.

Together with the New Testament passages in which the title occurs this passage in Daniel will, therefore, help us to arrive at the true meaning of the appellation as it was used by the Savior. It will help us to find the hidden glory of the title and will at the same time indicate to us why the Lord so often used it in speaking of Himself.

1) Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS' USE OF THE TITLE, THE SON OF MAN

The goal before us will become more clearly visible as we proceed. Finding the source of Christ's strange name in the prophecy of Daniel already gives us a hint as to its meaning. But we cannot reach a definite conclusion as to the hidden meaning of the name as it was used by Christ until we have carefully examined the New Testament passages in which the name appears.

If in our study of these New Testament passages we were to find that Jesus used the name only when stressing His humanity, we would, no doubt, conclude that the title with which we are dealing contained no hidden meaning at all, but was a name which any other person at that time might have used. If, on the other hand, it could be proven that Jesus used the title merely to call attention to the great difference between Himself as a man and other men, we would, no doubt, understand the title to mean "the man above all other men," or "the ideal man," or "the representative of the human race." These views have been held and are still held by a number of critics today.

Some even go so far as to say that the title was merely a substitute for the personal pronoun. Others, in developing their theories concerning the meaning of the name, simply eliminate all passages which do not harmonize with their particular view, the one group discrediting all eschatological passages, the other considering these the only genuine passages of Scripture.

But all such views are unworthy of one who believes, as does the writer, that the Scriptures are the verbally inspired Word of God. Every one who considers the Scriptures authoritative, must permit them to speak for themselves. And every word of testimony must be heard before any conclusions are reached. It will not do to grasp at some plausible explanation which might, indeed, harmonize with a few of the eighty-four passages in which the title SON OF MAN occurs.¹⁾ We must rather examine them all and on the basis of our findings seek to reach a conclusion as to the meaning of this name of Christ which will be in harmony with the Savior's own use of it in the many statements which have been preserved for us in Holy Writ.

1) In the best Greek texts the title HO HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU occurs 81 times, other manuscripts having this reading also in Matthew xviii, 11 (which the Expositor's Greek Testament calls an interpolation from Luke xix, 10); Matthew xxv, 13 (where it is hardly genuine); and Luke ix, 58. Included in this list of 81 passages is John ix, 35, where the English

We are, of course, concerned especially with the Savior's own use of the title. Yet that eliminates only four passages from our consideration, for in all but four instances the expression was used by Christ, the only exceptions being John xii, 34a.b, where the people repeated the title which Jesus had just used, and Luke xxiv, 7, where the angel reminded the disciples of the promise which Jesus had given them and quoted His own words.¹⁾ In addition, Acts vii, 56 should be listed as an exception, where Stephen makes use of the title. For here we are interested in Jesus' own testimony.

When considering His testimony we note, first of all, that

translations read Son of God. This is due to the fact that some Greek texts have this wording, others, however, reading the title $\text{HO HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU}$. The latter reading is also noted by the British and American revised versions in their marginal references. In John v, 27 the translations indicate a use of the title. In the Greek text, however, the article is not used as it is in all pertinent passages. And the Expositor's Greek Testament rightly condemns all interpretations of this passage which seek to find in it a use of the familiar self-appellation of Jesus. Naturally, this passage is not included in the 84 Gospel texts. Another passage not included is Mark xiii, 34, where the expression has been supplied by the translators. In addition to the 84 Gospel texts we may also list Acts vii, 56.

1) See Appendix I.

He already made use of the title at the very beginning of His ministry. Shortly after He had brought Nathanael to faith in Himself as the Messiah, He said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see the heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon THE SON OF MAN," John 1, 51. Jesus also continued calling Himself by this name to the very end of His life. Our last record of its use is in Matthew xxvi, 64 (compare Mark xiv, 62; and Luke xxii, 69), where in His trial before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin He said: "Hereafter shall ye see THE SON OF MAN sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." More than that, Jesus indicated that the name would be applicable to Him even after He had entered into glory. For, when speaking to His disciples in the spring of the year thirty, He said: "Nevertheless when THE SON OF MAN cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" Luke xviii, 8. From this it should be clear that the title was definitely related to His Messianic office. He used it as soon as He had entered His public ministry and He referred to Himself as THE SON OF MAN in connection with His very last act as the Savior. It is also evident that Jesus had a very definite purpose in mind in making use of the title or He would not have used it with such frequency from the beginning to the end of His ministry. Its use must have been included in God's predetermined plan for His Savior Son's activity here on earth.

It is also significant to note that Jesus used the

title in the presence of both friend and foe. This proves, on the one hand, that His purpose was not to obscure His true identity, as some imagine,¹⁾ for He used the name more often in the presence of His disciples than anywhere else. He used it already when calling Nathanael to discipleship in the spring of the year 27. On that occasion He was with none

1) G. Milligan, for instance, states in the Expositor, Vol. V, page 78: "The natural conclusion seems to be that the title while corresponding to Jesus' own inner sense of His Messianic dignity, was intended to conceal that dignity from the people until such time as they were prepared to receive it. It served, in fact, the purpose of an incognito, and was, as Beyschlag calls it, 'a title which was no title,' allowing the Person of Jesus to recede as far as possible, in the first instance at any rate, behind the Divine Kingdom He had come to establish." Kaehler, in his Realencyklopaedie, Vol. IV, doubts whether Jesus at any time clearly revealed Himself. He says the Savior's prime purpose was to teach and instruct men and that He was not concerned about His own glory. In an article entitled "Menschensohn" in the Kirchliches Handlexikon, Vol. IV, a similar statement is made. We translate: "That the expression (THE SON OF MAN) could not have been a common designation for the Messiah, can be deduced with certainty from Matthew xvi, 13.16 and John xii, 34, as well as from the fact that Jesus made every effort to avoid any public declaration concerning His Messiahship."

but those who would be His most intimate companions. And these companions had already come to faith in Him as the promised Messiah. There was, then, no need for the use of some secret name which would hide Jesus' true identity from them. He had nothing to hide. They already knew who He was. He wished rather to increase their knowledge of Him and to permit them to see more clearly into the mystery of His person. He, therefore, told them that in the future they would see greater things than they had already witnessed. And to give them a foretaste of what they would see He told them at once that He was THE SON OF MAN.

From that time forth He often used the same expression when alone with them. He did so when explaining to them the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matthew xiii, 37.41); when instructing and sending forth the twelve on their mission tour of Galilee (Matthew x, 23); when inquiring of them how the multitude had received Him and what they thought of His person (Matthew xvi, 13); then again, on the way down from the Mount of Transfiguration (Matthew xvii, 9.12); and especially when He foretold His suffering and death. He even used this name at the supper table on the night of His betrayal and later in the Garden of Gethsemane (Matthew xxvi, 24.45; John xiii, 31). Surely those who claim that He used the name to hide His true identity cannot uphold their claims in the light of these facts. If that had been His purpose, He would not so often have called Himself THE SON OF MAN in the presence of His disciples.

On the other hand, Jesus could not have intended by means of the title to give His disciples some secret revelation of Himself. For if this had been the case, He would not have used it so repeatedly in the presence of the Scribes and the Pharisees, and especially not before the Sanhedrin at a time when only one disciple, John the Beloved, was present (Matthew xxvi, 64).

An examination of all passages in question reveals the fact that He used the title THE SON OF MAN on at least eleven different occasions when addressing the multitudes and on no less than five different occasions when speaking to individuals, most of whom were not disciples at the time Christ spoke to them. No less than 35 of the 84 Gospel texts in which the title occurs belong to this group. Thus, when healing the paralytic, Jesus addressed the Pharisees and said: "That ye may know that THE SON OF MAN hath power on earth to forgive sins.." etc. Matthew ix, 6. Again, when the Pharisees upbraided Jesus for permitting His disciples to pluck corn on the sabbath day He countered: "THE SON OF MAN is Lord even of the sabbath day," Matthew xii, 8. Especially notable was the occasion on which the Pharisees tried to stone Jesus after His dispute with them, recorded in John viii, 28, as well as Christ's use of the title before the Sanhedrin on the night of His trial before the highpriests Caiaphas and Annas. Individuals were mentioned above. They were Nicodemus, who came to Jesus by night, John iii, 13.14; a certain scribe who wished to become a disciple, Matthew viii, 20; the man born blind whom Jesus

healed in Jerusalem, John ix, 35; the publican, Zacchaeus, after his conversion, Luke xix, 10; and Judas, the betrayer, whom Jesus vainly sought to bring to repentance with the words: "Judas, betrayest thou THE SON OF MAN with a kiss?" Luke xxii, 48. Surely such a use of the title clearly proves that Jesus did not merely have His disciples in mind when using it. If He used it to teach a truth, that truth was taught to His foes as well as to His friends.

A third conclusion which is forced upon us as we examine the passages in which Christ made use of the title, is that it cannot be limited either to the days of His humiliation or of His exaltation. For He used the name not only when foretelling His return to earth in all His glory to judge the quick and the dead, but also when speaking of His suffering and death. Milligan ably expresses this thought in the Expositor, saying:

"The title touches both poles, the glory and the humiliation, or perhaps we should rather say, it unites them, for it was, as we have already seen, through humiliation that the true Messianic glory was reached. And Christ's favorite designation becomes thus a brief compendium of the central truth of His whole Gospel, glory through shame, life through death."¹⁾

Both humiliation and glory are in harmony with the name.

For the sake of completeness a few references are again in order. The lowliness of THE SON OF MAN is evident from the fact that He "hath not where to lay His head," Matthew

1) Op. cit. page 79.

viii, 20 (Luke ix, 58); that He shall be "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," Matthew xii, 40; that He will be "betrayed to be crucified," Matthew xxvi, 2; and "must be delivered into the hands of sinful men," Luke xxiv, 7; for He "came not to be ministered unto but to minister," Matthew xx, 28 (Mark x, 45).

The glorification of THE SON OF MAN is just as clearly evident from passages in which He tells us that He "shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels," Matthew xvi, 27; that He "shall sit in the throne of His glory," Matthew xix, 28; and shall come "in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," Matthew xxiv, 30. These passages, of course, refer to a glory which would be Christ's in the future. It is well, therefore, to note especially John iii, 13, where we read of the glory which was His as THE SON OF MAN even while He was on earth. For He said to Nicodemus: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even THE SON OF MAN w h i c h i s i n h e a v e n ."

The meaning of the title THE SON OF MAN must, therefore, be one which will apply equally well to Christ's state of humiliation and exaltation. It cannot simply refer to His human nature, nor can it entirely and in every respect separate Him from the whole human race.

Finally, we note that Jesus spoke of Himself as THE SON OF MAN in connection with practically every phase of His redemptive work. He was THE SON OF MAN whether carrying on the

work of a prophet, a priest, or a king.

It was as a prophet, for instance, that He spoke of Himself in the parable of the sower, saying: "He that soweth the good seed is THE SON OF MAN," Matthew xiii, 37.

It was as a priest that He came "to seek and to save that which was lost," Luke xix, 10 (Cp. Matthew xviii, 11; Luke ix, 56). As a priest He offered Himself as the supreme sacrifice. And all of the passages which speak of Him suffering and dying as THE SON OF MAN might here be adduced. Three of these passages should suffice, Matthew xii, 40: "So shall THE SON OF MAN be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth"; John iii, 14: "So must THE SON OF MAN be lifted up"; and Mark viii, 31: "THE SON OF MAN must suffer many things."

THE SON OF MAN also intercedes for us as our great High Priest and confesses us "before the angels of God," Luke xii, 8. As such He is "Lord even of the sabbath day," Matthew xii, 8; and as such He has "power on earth to forgive sins," Matthew ix, 6.

But THE SON OF MAN is especially a mighty king, who is now "sitting on the right hand of power," Matthew xxvi, 64; who "shall send forth His angels and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend," Matthew xiii, 41; who on the last day shall come "in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," Matthew xxiv, 30; and shall at His coming be ashamed of those who in this life are ashamed of Him, Mark viii, 38. It seems, then, that we can say anything of Jesus as THE SON OF MAN which applies to Him as the Christ.

Here, then, we have a title which was used by the Savior as Savior from the beginning to the end of His ministry and may be applied to Him even as judge of the earth. It is a title which applied to Him equally well when He dealt with His disciples and with those who opposed Him. It is a title which was not out of place while the Savior was still in the state of humiliation, nor will it be out of place when He comes in the glory of His Father. It is finally a title which refers to Him as our Prophet, Priest, and King.

But what was Christ's purpose in using the name? What meaning may we attach to it? What, if anything, did the title reveal to those who heard it? These are the questions which we must seek to answer.

CHAPTER V

DIVERGENT VIEWS REGARDING THE MEANING OF THE TITLE

We are, of course, too far removed from the days of Christ and His Apostles to ask any important question dealing with theology which has not been asked and answered countless times in the space of the last nineteen hundred years. In all ages of these New Testament times men have busied themselves with the Holy Scriptures and have asked and sought to answer questions dealing with every kind of theological problem.

Accordingly, questions dealing with Christ's self-appellation have also been asked and answered hundreds of times. The name was too striking and far too singular to have escaped the close scrutiny which the early Church gave to the Scriptures. Ever and again a hidden meaning was sought in the name THE SON OF MAN. And many a plausible explanation was given by Bible scholars. But each age also had its critics who made light of the whole matter by stating that there was nothing in the name but the thought which it seems at first to express, namely, that Jesus was the son of a man, a member of the human race.

It should not be difficult for us to decide against this latter view. Our discussion thus far has surely convinced us that such a hasty brushing aside of all difficulties, such a degradation of the title THE SON OF MAN to a mere substitution or periphrasis for the personal pronoun, is both unscientific and un-Scriptural.

The Scriptures and the writings of learned scholars must convince the reader that the name which Jesus used in referring to Himself had a deeper, hidden meaning. Christ would not have used it so consistently and would not have placed the emphasis upon it which He did, if He had not wished the Christian Church to take special note of it. Again, the Christian Church and her theologians would not have taken special note of it, had it appeared unworthy of such attention. The voice of the Bible scholars, students, and critics with regard to the title THE SON OF MAN should, therefore, be heard.

But so divergent are the views of those who have ventured an explanation of the title, that it is difficult to believe that all of them have been based on a careful study of the Scriptures. In fact, some of the statements are so contrary to the clear teachings of God's Word that they are best refuted by merely quoting them.

One such statement has already been referred to. It is the claim of Colani and others that Jesus used the expression as a substitute for the personal pronoun "I." Such opinions do not deserve to be considered as honest efforts

on the part of these men to understand Jesus' use of the expression THE SON OF MAN. But the opinions expressed by a number of other writers are almost as absurd. Bousset, for instance, says that Jesus "never overstepped the limits of the purely human."¹⁾ Beckwith explains the title as meaning "one who is exempted from no position or lot which belongs essentially to his fellow-men."²⁾ The term "could have been understood only as a substitute for a personal pronoun or as emphasizing the human qualities of those to whom it is applied," says Hirsch.³⁾ And Schmidt concludes that Jesus showed men what man's powers truly are.⁴⁾

To what folly such commentators are driven when they seek to explain the passages in which the title occurs, will be seen from the following. Schmidt, whose article in the Encyclopedia Biblica was referred to above, says with reference to Matthew ix, 6 ("THE SON OF MAN hath power on earth to forgive sins") that Jesus merely extended forgiveness of sins, which any man can do. He explains Matthew viii, 20 ("The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but THE SON OF MAN hath not where to lay His head") by saying that nature cares for the beasts but man is driven from hearth and home for his convictions. And worst of all, he believes that Jesus called Himself Lord of the sabbath day

1) Cp. Berkhof's article, Princeton Theological Review, Vol. xxv, page 85. 2) The New Schaff Herzog, Volume xi.
3) Op. cit. 4) Encyclopedia Biblica.

because He did not think much of the law and made no scruples over it, seeing that the prophets criticized it so often.

Another view, not as extreme as those cited above, is that Jesus used the expression THE SON OF MAN to point to Himself as "the ideal man," "the man kat exochen." Huetius was the first to suggest this explanation. He is followed by Hofman, who sees in THE SON OF MAN the goal of the history of man begun in Adam.¹⁾ Neander believed that Jesus realized that He belonged to mankind and in His human nature had done so much for man, and that He used the title for this reason.²⁾

It must, however, be admitted by every student of God's Word that views like these obscure the teachings of Scripture that THE SON OF MAN was and is and ever will be true God, one in essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit. To doubt this truth is to doubt the infallibility of God's Word. To argue that Jesus thought of Himself as a mere man and for this reason used the title THE SON OF MAN is possible only for the higher critics, who approach even the clearest passage of Scripture with suspicion and often with unbelief.

In fact, it is difficult to believe that even unbelieving Bible scholars could be guilty of making such statements. Scripture, however, reminds us that this is not only possible but is to be expected because the world by wisdom does not know God and the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God. It follows that the person who approaches

1) Kirchliches Handlexikon, Vol. IV. 2) Nebe: Denkschrift, p. 23.

the Scripture truths with an unbelieving heart will always be deluded. Faith must accept what reason cannot solve.

Those who wish to be assured that Jesus did not think of Himself as a mere man need but turn to Matthew xvi, 13-17, where, as Dr. Pieper points out, Jesus conducts a catechesis with His disciples on the term THE SON OF MAN and, discarding all false views of the people, establishes the only correct view, namely, that THE SON OF MAN is the Son of the Living God.¹⁾ Those who do not accept Him as such are unbelievers in the worst sense of the term, who, according to Christ's own word, "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on" them, John iii, 36.

We must, of course, guard against calling every one an unbeliever and a heretic who sees in Jesus' self-appellation no more than a revelation of His true humanity. The higher critics mentioned above, who look upon the title as a proof of the fact that Christ was a true man, show their true nature when they refuse to admit that He was more than a man. Not all, however, who understand the title as they do, are satisfied with the conclusions which they reach, that Jesus thought of Himself as a man and no more. Gremer, for instance, shows clearly in his Reallexikon that Christ is the only Son of God. He admits that He was the Messiah who had been promised in the Old Testament. Loeber, the author of a Lutheran dogmatical work, naturally does the

1) Pieper: Christliche Dogmatik, Volume II, page 75.

same. Yet neither considers the title HO HYIOS TOU AN-THROPOU as Messianic in character. Cremer claims there is no passage which makes us believe that Jesus, by using the term, wished to show a difference between Himself and other men.

But their views cannot stand when we recall how careful the Evangelists were to make Jesus' self-appellation appear as a title in the Greek, though this meant a forcing of the Greek language, and how careful they were to record the title again and again. Later it will also be shown that the Jews who heard Christ speak of Himself as THE SON OF MAN for the most part attached more to His words than the thought that He was a member of the human race.

It is heartening to note in this connection, that most of the Bible scholars whose writings have been consulted see far more than the merely human both in Christ and in His name THE SON OF MAN, even though they do not all agree and the conclusions which some of them reach seem to be somewhat beside the mark.

Of these Vincent seems most hesitant to state definitely that the title reveals Jesus to be the Messiah. He says: "SON OF MAN is an expression of Christ's self-consciousness as being related to humanity as a whole: denoting His real participation in human nature and designating Himself as the representative man...While the human element was thus emphasized in the phrase, the consciousness of Jesus, as thus expressed, did not exclude His divine nature and claims,

but rather regarded these through the medium of His humanity." He adds, however, that "Christ's humanity can be explained only by His divinity. A humanity so unique demands a solution. Divested of all that is popularly called miraculous, viewed simply as a man, under the historical conditions of His life, He is a greater miracle than all His miracles combined."¹⁾ Bernard is more definite in ruling out the thought that there is even a hint of a Messianic claim in Jesus' use of the title. Yet he is bold to say: "Even in Mark 11, 28 ("THE SON OF MAN is Lord also of the sabbath day") the title THE SON OF MAN implies something more than man in general or Son of Man of the Psalter. Undoubtedly the emphasis is on the word man, but it rests also on the uniqueness of Him who was in such special relation to humanity that He could and did call Himself THE SON OF MAN...Jesus used it (the title) of Himself with the implication that in Him was the fulfilment of the vision of Daniel vii, 13. He was conscious of an infinite superiority to the sons of men among whom His kingdom was to be established. He did not call Himself the Christ, although He did not deny when pressed that He was the Christ, John iv, 26; v, 39; viii, 28; x, 25. He preferred to use a greater and more far-reaching designation of Himself. He was not only the Deliverer of the Jewish people. He was the Deliverer of humanity at large, being THE SON OF MAN who had come down from heaven. He took over the phrase from Jewish

1) Vincent, Word Studies, Volume I

Apocalyptic but He enlarged its meaning. It is a title which properly understood, includes all that Christ connoted; but unlike the title Messiah it doesn't suggest Jewish particularism...It represented Him as the future Judge of men, and as their present Deliverer, whose Kingdom must be established through suffering, and whose gift of life was only to become available through His death."¹⁾

Milligan, on the other hand, states that the title, "while corresponding to Jesus' own inner sense of His Messianic dignity, was intended to conceal that dignity from the people until such a time as they were prepared to receive it."²⁾

The writer was at first impressed with this view. For Jesus did at times conceal truths from the Jews. We recall that He forbade Peter, James, and John to speak of His transfiguration until after His resurrection, that He taught the people in parables that the unbelievers among them might hear and yet not understand, that He told the disciples that many truths would not be revealed unto them until after His ascension.

Yet it was not Jesus' purpose to conceal His Messianic dignity by means of the title THE SON OF MAN. For many of the passages in which the Savior uses the self-appellation point to the glory which is His as the Son of God. The truths expressed in such passages would then reveal what

1) International Critical Commentary, Volume xxix, pages cxxiii, ff. 2) Op. cit. page 78.

the name was used to conceal.

Furthermore, when it is borne in mind that Jesus used the title also when alone with His disciples, as has already been shown, it will become clear that He did not wish to conceal His identity by means of this name. For the disciples realized from the beginning that He was "the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ," John 1, 41. Finding Jesus they had found Him "of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write," John 1, 45. Nathanael voiced the thought of all when he said: "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel," John 1, 49.

In this connection the words of Meyer are worthy of note. Commenting on Matthew viii, 20 he says: "We must avoid ascribing to this self-designation any purpose of concealment, all the more that Jesus so styles Himself in the hearing of His disciples."¹⁾

Orelli comes very close to the truth. For though he, too, states that "this simple appellation was pre-eminently adapted, in accordance with the intention of Jesus to conceal His eminence," he adds that it was adopted "to reveal to instructed eyes the divine greatness of His person. To the receptive disciples it implied that He was the Messiah, while claiming to be more than the national Messiah whom the Jews expected in those days."²⁾

1) Meyer: Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, 1877. 2) The Old Testament Prophecy, 1885.

However, also this view is not quite correct. For Jesus' hearers were mostly Jews. They knew the Old Testament Scriptures or at least could refer to them. And in these Scriptures they could find a fairly complete revelation of Him who so often referred to Himself as THE SON OF MAN. In fact, this very title was to encourage them to search the Scriptures, that in them they might find the person and work of THE SON OF MAN revealed.

The comment on this subject in the commentary of Mc. Clintock and Strong is worthy of note. There we read: "It is remarkable how, when acquiescing in His right to be acknowledged by others in the most peculiar sense the Son of God He sometimes immediately after substitutes for this the wanted designation THE SON OF MAN as if to show that what belonged to the Son of God might equally be affirmed of THE SON OF MAN." That is true. THE SON OF MAN was none other than the Son of God. Yet Jesus made much of the fact that He was also a man. If He had remained the Son of God and had not become THE SON OF MAN, the world would still be without a Savior. It is as the God-Man that we have learned to know and worship and love Him.

Rawlinson, whose work has already been referred to, reveals his own and to some extent the writer's thoughts in the matter when he says: "F. Tillmann, who appears to have written the least unsatisfactory monograph on the subject, sums up his conclusions as follows: 'The name SON OF MAN is a title of the Messiah, just as much so as the names

"Son of David," "the Anointed," etc. Jesus decided in favour of this name because it best expressed what He was and what He meant, and because it gave least support to the political and national hopes which His people attached to the person of the Messiah. If we ask further as to the specific content of this name as applied to the Messiah, the reference, implied in it, to the prophecy in Daniel gives the key: THE SON OF MAN is the divine-human Bringer of Messianic salvation of the prophet's vision, He with whose coming begins the Kingdom of God upon earth.¹⁾

The important thought in this quotation is that Jesus wished men to think of Him as THE SON OF MAN of Daniel's vision. That seems to be the only correct solution of the whole problem. The passage in Daniel dare not be ignored if the true meaning of the title is to be arrived at. And it is encouraging to note that the passage in Daniel has not been ignored by those who have made a study of the subject, including Boutflower, Keil, Meyer, Nebe, Bernard, Delitzsch, and Kretzmann, whose views have already been set forth.

What has been said ought, therefore, convince the reader that a thorough study of the title THE SON OF MAN substantiates the fact that there is a connection between the oft-used name of Jesus and Daniel vii. We are, therefore, ready to draw the proper conclusions regarding the meaning of the name which Jesus used in describing Himself to His hearers.

1) Op. cit. page 249.

CHAPTER VI

THE SON OF MAN, THE ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR OF MANKIND

The heading of this chapter reveals the writer's own view with regard to the meaning of Christ's self-appellation.

THE SON OF MAN, it seems, is none other than the all-glorious Savior of mankind. That means more than that THE SON OF MAN and the Savior are one and the same person. It means that the title THE SON OF MAN expresses the truth that Jesus is the all-glorious Savior of mankind.

The word Savior in itself is already quite a comprehensive term. It covers the entire work of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, the work which He performed while He was here on earth and is still performing for the salvation of mankind. Saving the world was really His one and only purpose in coming to earth. AND THE TITLE THE SON OF MAN DIRECTS OUR ATTENTION TO THIS WORK.

In order to be a Savior He had to be a man. For man had sinned. Man had come short of the glory of God. Man had failed to render the implicit obedience demanded in God's holy Law. Man had become a debtor unto the Law. Man had become guilty in God's sight and deserved to be punished.

Man, therefore, needed a substitute. How logical, then, that THE SON OF MAN should be his substitute. How clearly the Savior indicated by His use of this title, which so definitely speaks of His true human nature, that He was qualified to take man's place! It was perfectly natural for Him as THE SON OF MAN to come "eating and drinking," Matthew xi, 19, to "suffer many things," Mark ix, 12, and to be laid to rest "in the heart of the earth," Matthew xii, 40. Because He was a man, the chief priests, scribes, and elders thought they had a perfect right to reject Him and later to crucify Him even as they would have rejected and crucified any other man who would have dared to rise up against them and call them sinners. And all this had to come to pass that the world might be saved.

But the Savior had to be more than man. He had to have power over death and the devil, power to open the gates of heaven to His followers, power to wrest them out of the hands of Satan, power to judge them worthy of everlasting life for His name's sake. And this fact is also expressed in the title THE SON OF MAN and in many of the passages in which it is used. As THE SON OF MAN He had "power on earth to forgive sins," Matthew ix, 6. As such He was "Lord even of the sabbath day," Matthew xii, 8, and as such He will come "in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," Matthew xxiv, 30. This SON OF MAN is the same whom Daniel saw in his vision: The Lord God, to whom are given "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people,

nations, and languages should serve Him," whose "dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away," Daniel vii, 14.

In these words of Daniel the reason is also given for calling THE SON OF MAN the ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR. The prophet saw the Savior in His most glorious office as Judge and King, enjoying the glory which He earned by His every saving act. In this sense the title THE SON OF MAN expresses more than the Old Testament title MESSIAH. The Messiah was the promised One, who would be anointed to be Prophet, Priest, and King. THE SON OF MAN, however, is this Prophet, Priest, and King come at last to the glory which was His. The writer sees in the title a constant pointing forward and upward to glory. While Jesus walked on earth He so often appeared to be no more than a man. But especially at such times He reminded His disciples and the Jews in general of Daniel's vision. Each time He used the title He was as much as saying: You see me now a man among men. But the day will come when you will see me enthroned in highest heaven.

Keil states with reference to Christ's use of the title: "Accordingly, when Jesus speaks of Himself as THE SON OF MAN, He not only wishes to say that He is the Messiah, but wishes to designate Himself as the Messiah described in the passage in Daniel."¹⁾ Fausset adds the thought that "this title is

1) *Biblischer Kommentar ueber den Propheten Daniel*, 1869.

always associated with His coming again, because the kingdom that then awaits Him is that which belongs to Him as the Saviour of man, the Restorer of the lost inheritance." Briefly stated, the title THE SON OF MAN signifies the all-glorious Savior of mankind. With this view all passages in which the term occurs as a title also seem to agree.

One of the largest groups of these passages is that in which Christ speaks of His second coming to earth. We need quote but a few of them, for the same thought is expressed again and again.

The first recorded reference of Christ to the second coming of THE SON OF MAN is Luke xii, 40: "Be ye, therefore, ready also; for THE SON OF MAN cometh at an hour when ye think not." He spoke these words while preaching to the disciples and the multitude in Galilee in the autumn of the year 28. The second reference, in which the judgment is at least implied, is Matthew xiii, 41: "THE SON OF MAN shall send forth His angels and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." These words were spoken to the disciples alone in the autumn of the same year. In the summer of 29 He spoke more clearly of His coming, saying to His disciples: "THE SON OF MAN shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works," Matthew xvi, 27. It is worthy of note that this plain reference to glory was made by the Savior immediately after He had predicted His suffering and death. It bears out the statement

made above, that Jesus used the title especially when men saw Him in lowliness, appearing to be no more than a man. As His references to suffering became more clear and numerous, His predictions of a glorious return to earth also increased, until in the last week of His life we can count no less than ten recorded instances in which Jesus spoke of Himself as THE SON OF MAN.¹⁾ The entire group of passages in which the second coming is referred to comprises more than one fourth of the 84 passages in which the title occurs in the four Gospels.²⁾

In all of these passages we have the direct fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy. THE SON OF MAN receives divine power and glory, "that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him," vii, 14. The passages in the New Testament, it is true, refer especially to the fact that Jesus will come to judge. But to judge men is an act of a ruler. It is a right which is enjoyed only by those in authority. The entire scene described in the prophecy of Daniel is thus referred to by Christ when speaking of His return to earth on the last day. On that day we shall see the all-glorious Savior reigning over the whole earth even as He foretold it when calling Himself THE SON OF MAN.

1) They are the following: Matthew xxiv, 27, 30a, 30b (Cf. Mark xiii, 26; Luke xxi, 27), 37, 39, 44; xxv, 13, 31; Luke xxi, 36; and Matthew xxvi, 64 (Cf. Mark xiv, 62; Luke xxii, 69). 2) See Appendix II for all references.

In another large group of passages in which Christ calls Himself THE SON OF MAN, He speaks of His suffering and death. In this, as in the first group mentioned, we find a constant repetition of thought, so that a few passages will clearly reveal the thought of them all. In Matthew xii, 40 we read: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall THE SON OF MAN be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The prediction was made in Galilee in the autumn of the year 28 in the presence of the multitude. In the summer of the following year, while journeying through the region of Caesarea Philippi, Jesus told His disciples that He would be put to death, saying: "THE SON OF MAN must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed," Mark viii, 31. This first definite prediction was followed by others until the time came that Jesus should suffer, as is indicated in the words: "Ye know that after two days is the feast of the Passover, and THE SON OF MAN is betrayed to be crucified," Matthew xxvi, 2.

Into this group we must also place such passages as Luke xxii, 48: "Judas, betrayest thou THE SON OF MAN with a kiss?"; John viii, 28: "When ye have lifted up THE SON OF MAN, then shall ye know that I am He"; and Luke vi, 22: "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for THE SON

OF MAN's sake."

It might be argued that this group of passages rules out the thought that the SON OF MAN is the all-glorious Savior of mankind. Yet what was Christ's purpose in suffering? Was He the victim of circumstance? a martyr whose cause was lost when He died? A thousand times, No! The suffering Savior was in full command of the situation. No man took His life from Him. He laid it down of Himself. He went into death that by it He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. As a true Savior He was paving the way for His followers, defending them against their arch-enemy, establishing His kingdom, so that the gates of hell could not prevail against it.

A Christian has no time for the sickly-sentimental thoughts so often expressed with reference to Christ's suffering and death. He sees no defeat in the cross, no weakness in the agonizing cry of the Savior, no shame in the grave. To him Christ crucified is "the power of God and the wisdom of God." By His victorious struggle on the cross THE SON OF MAN showed His true nature as the all-glorious Savior of mankind, before whom even the devils in hell must tremble.

A third group of passages to be considered are those in which Jesus refers to some power or right which He enjoyed as THE SON OF MAN while living on earth. For instance: "THE SON OF MAN has power on earth to forgive sins," Matthew ix, 6 (Cf. Mark ii, 10; Luke v, 24). And again, "THE SON OF MAN is Lord even of the sabbath day,"

Matthew xii, 8 (Cf. Mark 11, 28; Luke vi, 5). Note also the passage: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which THE SON OF MAN shall give unto you," John vi, 27; and John vi, 53: "Except ye eat the flesh of THE SON OF MAN and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." These passages, especially, point to the correctness of the view that with His title THE SON OF MAN Jesus wished to call attention to Himself as the all-glorious Savior of mankind. As a Savior He had the right to forgive sins, to make and unmake laws when they had served their purpose in His plan of salvation, and to grant a place in His kingdom to those who believed in Him.

Finally, this meaning is not out of harmony with Matthew viii, 20 (Cf. Luke ix, 58), where we read: "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but THE SON OF MAN hath not where to lay His head." Meyer points out in the comments on this passage that also in these words Jesus describes Himself as the all-glorious Savior of mankind when referring to Himself as THE SON OF MAN. He is not especially describing Himself as the lowly, self-humbling servant of humanity. The main point is the contrast as seen from the fact that He who is THE SON OF MAN of the prophet's vision has not where to lay His head.

If Christ had shown Himself as an earthly King and not as the Savior, such a situation would have been degrading, to say the least. But it corresponds fully with His spir-

itual kingdom, in which exaltation follows upon humiliation and glory comes through shame.

If Jesus' kingdom had been of this world, His servants would have provided Him with a palace and a throne. They would have fought His cause and put His enemies to flight. His heavenly Father would have sent Him legions of angels to be with Him always and to carry out His every wish and command. But the all-glorious Savior needed no earthly pomp and show. His kingdom was invisible and spiritual and, therefore, was far superior to anything which this world could attain to or offer. In His kingdom the angels of God ascended and descended upon THE SON OF MAN as Jesus said they would. Meyer correctly states with reference to this passage (John 1, 51) that the angels ascended and descended upon THE SON OF MAN as soon as He began His Messianic work. He then continues: "In this weighty word He furnishes His disciples with the key for the only correct understanding of that work, angels ascending and descending, Cf. Genesis xxviii, 12, a symbolical representation of the uninterrupted and living intercourse subsisting between the Messiah and God, an intercommunion which the disciples would clearly and vividly recognize, or, according to the symbolical form of thought, would see as a matter of experience throughout the ministry of Jesus which was to follow."¹) Matthew viii, 20 must, therefore, be compared with John i, 51 that the true

1) Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Gospel of John, 1877.

glory of the Savior may appear even while He walks on earth with no place to lay His head. Because His kingdom was spiritual, He could be a friend of publicans and sinners. Because He was the all-glorious Savior He did not need the praise of men and the good will of the Sanhedrin. His glory was so great, so perfect, that no sinner could mar it and no doctor of theology could add to it. It was not a glory which could be seen. Luther, whose eye caught much of the glory of Jesus which others did not see, says of John 1, 51: "We see the heavens standing open only with our spiritual eyes."¹⁾ Zechariah, therefore, correctly describes Zion's King as meek and lowly. But He was, nevertheless, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, the all-glorious Savior of mankind.

He, therefore, spoke of Himself as THE SON OF MAN. He wanted His hearers to think of Him as Daniel had described Him, coming in the clouds of heaven. The name which seemed to call attention to His lowliness, was, because of its reference to Daniel vii, 13, to remind them ever and again of His hidden glory, a glory which was His as their Savior, a glory which will be seen by all the earth when He comes again to judge the quick and the dead and to take His followers unto Himself in heaven.

1) Luther's Works, St. Louis edition, Volume VII, Column 1763

CHAPTER VII

THE WORLD REGARDS HER ALL-GLORIOUS SAVIOR: THE SON OF MAN

What the people of Christ's day thought of the title which He used so frequently is a question which is possibly more interesting than important. Yet it deserves an answer.

We know, of course, without seeking it, what the answer is likely to be. We know that the Jews, as a nation, never thought of Jesus as anything but a man. We are, therefore, not surprised at the answer which the disciples gave to Jesus' question: "Whom do men say that I THE SON OF MAN am?" Matthew xvi, 13. The answer is plain enough: "Some say Thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets." Each of these opinions indicates that the people recognized Jesus to be a man "sent from God," as Nicodemus expressed it, but each very definitely placed Jesus wholly into the pale of humanity.

It seems, however, that Jesus' constant use of the title THE SON OF MAN ought to have made some impression upon the multitudes which a study of the passages in question in their context might reveal. The question seems interesting enough to warrant a search for an answer.

We begin with Jesus' first recorded use of the title in the presence of the multitudes. It was at the healing of the man sick of the palsy, which took place in Capernaum in the spring of the year twenty-eight. At that time Jesus had said: "That ye may know that THE SON OF MAN hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith He to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house." The miracle, together with Christ's words, is recorded by all three Synoptists (Matthew ix, 6; Mark ii, 10; Luke v, 24). But none of the three indicate that Jesus' title made any impression whatever upon the people. Their sole comment was: "We never saw it on this fashion," Mark ii, 12, and "We have seen strange things today," Luke v, 26. What they saw - the miracle - was far more important to them than what they heard - that THE SON OF MAN could forgive sins.

A month or two later Jesus was returning from Jerusalem to Galilee. On the way His disciples began to pluck corn that grew beside the beaten path and to eat it. The result was that the Pharisees objected inasmuch as it was the sabbath day. They claimed that the disciples were doing unnecessary work. It was then that Jesus used the title a second time in public, saying: "THE SON OF MAN is Lord even of the sabbath day." Again the statement is recorded by the three Synoptists (Matthew xii, 8; Mark iii, 28; Luke vi, 5), but each Evangelist breaks off the thought with Jesus' words. No indication is given as to the Pharisees' reaction to the

use of the title. It seems right to infer that no important comment was made on this occasion.

The third instance in which Jesus called Himself THE SON OF MAN, counting only those in which the title was used in public, was in the sermon on the mount, Luke vi, 22. But here, again, we have no response whatever from the people. The same is true of the fourth case in question (Matthew xi, 19; Luke vii, 34) and of the fifth and sixth (Matthew xii, 32. 40; Luke xi, 30) yes, also of the seventh, eighth, and ninth (Luke xii, 8. 10. 40). In each of these instances the title was used in a longer discourse of Jesus and no mention is made of how the people responded to its use.

We find the tenth recorded use of the title in public in Christ's dissertation on the Bread of Life, John vi, 26ff, (Cf. especially verses 27. 53). Here, finally, we note a definite reaction. After the people had heard this sermon in which Jesus called Himself the Bread of Life and definitely referred to Himself as THE SON OF MAN, they said: "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" verse 42. Clearly, they had not been led by Jesus' words to accept Him as the Messiah. On the contrary, after this sermon of Jesus "many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him," verse 66.

Omitting a few passages¹⁾ we turn to John xii, 20ff. (Cf.

1) The passages omitted shed no light on the subject, since no response is recorded. For a full list see Appendix III.

7

especially verses 23. 34) where Jesus' discourse held on Tuesday of Holy Week is recorded. Here we find the most definite reaction of the people to Christ's use of the title. They said: "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever; and how sayest Thou, THE SON OF MAN must be lifted up? Who is this SON OF MAN?" Their words seem to indicate that they imagined Christ and the SON OF MAN to be one and the same person, but that His statement: THE SON OF MAN must be lifted up, had confused them on this point. They argued that if THE SON OF MAN must be lifted up He could not be the Christ. It goes to show what a hazy knowledge they had of the most important revelations of their Old Testament Scriptures and how little they had searched the Scriptures which so clearly testified of Christ! So meagre was their knowledge that on Sunday of Holy Week they cried: "Hosanna to the Son of David," and on Friday of the same week: "Crucify Him!" And this because they had not permitted the truths of Scripture to take hold of them. They were content to follow their leaders and, following them, to perish.

It is true, they were more impressed by Jesus than were their leaders. They were curious to see His miracles and marvelled at many of them. But most of them did not come to faith in the Miracle-Worker. They flocked to hear His sermons and marvelled at His courage and boldness, for He spoke to them as one having authority. But most of them did not believe the Word which He preached.

Naturally, then, His self-designation as THE SON OF MAN,

if it made any impression upon them, did not cause them to think of Him as the all-glorious Savior of mankind whom God had promised. All the glory hidden in and suggested by this name was lost to them. THE SON OF MAN had come unto His own. But His own received Him not. The fault was entirely their own, not Christ's. Berkhof is right when he says: "The people may not have understood, and most likely did not understand, the true significance of the title, but they could hardly fail to notice that it was a self-designation on the part of Jesus. Could they misunderstand Him, when He said in curing the paralytic: 'But that ye may know that THE SON OF MAN hath power on earth to forgive sins...I say unto thee Arise,' etc. And surely His word to the scribe: 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but THE SON OF MAN hath not where to lay His head,' would hardly apply to THE SON OF MAN appearing in Glory. Moreover Jesus' assertion of His present Messiahship in Mark xiv, 61. 62 is about as definite as anyone could wish."¹⁾

Indeed, the people should have understood the words of Jesus. They should have believed in Him. They had seen and heard Him whom all the prophets had desired to see. But they turned away from Him and waited for the earthly Messiah whom their leaders had promised them, the Messiah who never came and never will come. It is doubtful that the Jews still look for His coming today. But they do have the secret hope

1) Christ in the Light of Eschatology, Princeton Review, Vol. XXV.

7

that the day of their reestablishment as a great and glorious nation will come. And we know their hopes are vain.

But what shall we say of the leaders of the Jews, the chief priests, the scribes, and elders, the theologians of Christ's day? Let no one say they did not know the Scriptures! They knew every Messianic passage and had very definite views regarding the Messiah who was to come. But their carnal hopes and hates caused them so to construe all the promises of God that they looked for a Messiah who would help them to realize their hopes for a world kingdom and would satisfy their hatred toward their oppressors.

Even the prophecy in Daniel vii, 13. 14 was reduced to a mere earthly promise that the Messiah would reign on earth and that His people would reign with Him. Strangely enough, they held to the belief that the Messiah would be God's Son. This much of the prophecies of God they accepted. They fully believed that God would send His own Son, "one like unto THE SON OF MAN," to rule over all the earth and especially over His people. But they refused to believe that the prophecy of Daniel was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth.

This is clear from the account of Christ's last trial before the Sanhedrin, as it is recorded by the Evangelist Saint Luke. We read: "And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led Him into their council, saying, Art Thou the Christ? tell us. And He said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: And if I also ask you, ye will

not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall THE SON OF MAN sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art Thou then the Son of God? And He said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of His own mouth," Luke xxii, 61-71 (Cf. Matthew xxvi, 63ff; Mark xiv, 61ff.).

Let it be noted that on the strength of this testimony of Jesus the Sanhedrin condemned Him as a blasphemer. It should, therefore, be clear that they understood the reference to Daniel's prophecy in Jesus' prediction concerning His session at God's right hand. It should also be clear that they believed Daniel's SON OF MAN to be the Son of God. Their fatal error lay in this that they rejected Him who was in truth THE SON OF MAN, and, therefore, God's own Son. By considering Him a blasphemer, instead of hailing Him as the all-glorious Savior of mankind, they closed the door of heaven to themselves and to the millions of their children who today yet walk in the error of their fathers. The tragedy of it is that THE SON OF MAN must be ashamed of them and of all who follow them in unbelief when He comes again to judge the living and the dead.

Thank God, this need not be said of all Jews living at Christ's time. Levi, the publican, Peter, James, and John, fishermen of Galilee, Nathanael, an Israelite in whom there was no guile, and many others followed Him wherever He went. Let us also hear their testimony. What have they to say of

74
to disciples

Him who called Himself THE SON OF MAN?

If we were to confine our answer to this question to the statements made by the disciples in connection with Christ's use of the title THE SON OF MAN, we could do so in a few words. For though there are no less than thirty-four recorded statements of Jesus (forty-eight passages, if all parallel accounts are included), in which He called Himself THE SON OF MAN in the presence of His disciples, the records of the Evangelists tell us of the reaction of the disciples to only five of these statements.

On three occasions Jesus told His disciples that THE SON OF MAN would suffer and die and would rise again on the third day. After the first announcement (Mark viii, 31; Luke ix, 22), Peter rebuked Him, saying: "Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee," Matthew xvi, 22. After the second prediction (Matthew xvii, 22; Mark ix, 31; Luke ix, 44), the Evangelist tells us "they (namely, the disciples) understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask Him," Mark ix, 32. And after the third (Matthew xx, 18; Mark x, 33; Luke xviii, 31), the reaction was about the same: "They understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken," Luke xviii, 34. *suffering*
7

We note a similar reaction to Christ's words spoken to Peter, James, and John as they descended from the mount on which Jesus had been transfigured. When He said: "Tell the vision to no man, until THE SON OF MAN be risen again from

the dead," Matthew xvii, 9, the three disciples questioned "one with another what the rising from the dead should mean," Mark ix, 10.

Here, then, are four instances in which Jesus called Himself THE SON OF MAN. In each instance the disciples were puzzled. They did not understand the meaning of Jesus' words and were afraid to ask Him for an explanation. But what was it that perplexed them? the fact that He called Himself THE SON OF MAN? By no means! They understood the title perfectly. They had often heard it and had never before been perplexed. What they could not understand was that THE SON OF MAN had to suffer and die. For they believed THE SON OF MAN to be none other than the Son of God. We turn for proof to that important passage, Matthew xvi, 13ff, in which Jesus conducts a catechesis on the meaning of His title. He asks the question: "Whom do men say that I, THE SON OF MAN, am?" The answer is: "Some say that Thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets." His next question is: "But whom say ye that I am?" It is Peter, of course, who answers for them all: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus, reading Peter's inmost thoughts, knew that he spoke the conviction of his heart: that THE SON OF MAN was true God, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost. He, therefore, said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven."

Need we prove that the other disciples shared Peter's faith?

Did not Nathanael call Him the Son of God, the King of Israel, (John 1, 49)? Did not Philip say: "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets, did write," (John 1, 45)? Andrew's first conversation with Jesus had convinced him that he had found "the Messias," (John 1, 41). Even doubting Thomas was bold to call Him "my Lord and my God," (John xx, 28). Clearest of all is the confession of John, the beloved, who by inspiration of the Holy Ghost recorded these confessions of the other disciples. He proves his own faith in the prolog of his Gospel, saying: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God...And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth," (John 1, 1.14). The same disciple addresses all of his readers at the close of his Gospel, saying: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through His name," (John xx, 30.31). And he brings his book of Revelation to a close with the words: "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus," (Revelation xxii, 20).

That brings us back again to Christ's title THE SON OF MAN, which is so often connected with His second coming. What has already been said proves that the disciples identified THE SON OF MAN with the Son of God. But nothing has as yet been said

about how the disciples understood the title. Did they catch its hidden meaning? Did they note its reference to Daniel vii, 13. 14? It seems correct to believe that they did. For they constantly looked for Christ to establish His kingdom. They expected Him to rule, as Daniel had said He would. They, therefore, wanted Him to bring down fire from heaven to consume the Samaritans who would not give Him room in their city. James and John wanted a place, one on His right hand and one on His left, in His kingdom. Up to the last day of His earthly sojourn each of them strove to be the greatest in His kingdom. And Judas, the traitor, seems to have gotten the place of honor next to Jesus at the last supper. Because the disciples expected Christ immediately to establish His kingdom, they could not understand why He promised to reveal Himself unto them and not unto the world. They did not see how He could remain hidden when ruling over all the earth.

Naturally, their ideas were not entirely correct. Their views were still hazy, earthly. Their knowledge was not complete. For one thing, they could not harmonize Christ's prediction of suffering and death with His appearance as THE SON OF MAN. They needed the gift of the Spirit to guide them into all truth. He, later, would show them the place which suffering had in Christ's plan of salvation.

When the Holy Spirit did enlighten them on Pentecost, all their questions were answered. Their false hopes of an earthly kingdom were forgotten. They directed their attention in-

stead to THE SON OF MAN who would come again in the clouds of heaven as they had seen Him ascend into heaven. Their goal in life was now to gather unto Him a large number of believers, who with them would rejoice at the day of His coming. They firmly believed that after His ascension He had sat down at the right hand of God that He might fill all things. They believed that He would be with them always, that He would give them the words which they should say in defense of His Gospel, and that His signs would follow them. They, therefore, preached the word of God with boldness.

Then came the day that Stephen, one of their number, was put on trial because of His preaching. In the midst of that trial the Lord gave him and all of the disciples an added assurance of the correctness of their teaching by permitting the martyr a glimpse into heaven. "Behold," said he, "I see the heavens opened, and THE SON OF MAN standing on the right hand of God," Acts vii, 56. Here was their proof that the Lord had kept also this saying of His: "Hereafter shall ye see THE SON OF MAN sitting on the right hand of power," Matthew xxvi, 64. Paul also saw Jesus in heaven when, as Saul the persecutor, he made his way toward Damascus to take the Christians captive. And years later, when the Church had suffered violence and persecution, when Peter and Paul and other Apostles had joined the large throng of martyrs of the cause of Christ, the Apostle John, himself an exile for the Gospel's sake, was taken in the spirit into heaven and "looked, and behold, a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like

unto THE SON OF MAN, having on His head a golden crown," Revelation xiv, 14. THE SON OF MAN was Lord of lords and King of kings. Who will say, then, that the Apostles and Evangelists did not know THE SON OF MAN and the glory of His name? Their words cannot be misunderstood. They confessed THE SON OF MAN openly and boldly as the all-glorious Savior of mankind.

A difficulty seems to arise at this point. If the disciples fully understood Christ's use of the name after the Holy Ghost had come upon them, if they saw in it a revelation of His glory, why did they and the Christian Church of the first century make no use of the title? The question deserves an answer and, in the opinion of the writer, can be answered in a satisfactory manner.

First of all, it must be remembered that an argument from silence is no proof. The mere fact that the disciples are not quoted as saying anything about Jesus as THE SON OF MAN does not yet rule out the possibility that they made use of the name or at least referred to it at times. Undoubtedly the Apostles who labored in Palestine were called upon by Jewish converts to explain why Jesus had thus spoken of Himself. And, having been given a full understanding of His words through the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, they were also able to do so. That Jewish converts would be induced to ask about the name is the more likely since the Holy Ghost saw to its inclusion in eighty some passages of Holy Writ. Since it fitted in with a complete revelation of Jesus

as the Savior, it was not to be ignored or forgotten.

In the second place, it should be remembered that Jesus used the name to direct the attention of His hearers away from what they thought Him to be. He appeared to be no more than a man. The name THE SON OF MAN was, therefore, to remind them of the fact that He was more than a man, that He was THE SON OF MAN of Daniel's vision, the ruler of heaven and earth. Had it not been for His earthly appearance the Jews might not have placed Him on a level with themselves. But since they did, it was necessary for Christ to correct them at every turn. And this He did by His constant use of the title.

Today no one sees Him as a man. Neither did the Jews in the days of the Apostles. There was, therefore, no danger that any one who heard the Apostles speak of Jesus would be so impressed with His humanity that he could not see the deity in Him. And so it was perfectly natural for the disciples to continue calling Him Jesus Christ as they had always done, instead of adopting the name which He alone had used in the days of His flesh. On the last day, when men see Him again, He will again be THE SON OF MAN, as He was to Stephen.

Some may think it strange that the Apostle Paul never used the title. But it is not strange at all. It must be remembered that Paul was for the most part the Apostle to the Gentiles, the Greek-speaking people of the world. In their language, as has already been noted, the title THE SON OF MAN (HO HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU) was clearly a transliteration of the Aramaic title used by Jesus. It was unusual in its

construction. And the Aramaic original was not known to the people to whom Paul preached. There was, therefore, no need for Paul to introduce the title into his epistles. So much for the use of the title by the followers of Christ. They knew that Jesus had used it in referring to Himself. They knew its hidden meaning, its reference to Daniel vii, 13. But they had no cause to make use of it themselves. To them THE SON OF MAN was the all-glorious Savior of mankind. And as such they preached Him to a perishing world.

THE SON OF MAN is still the all-glorious Savior of mankind. And though the majority of men of our day are as little inclined to believe in Him as were the Jews who saw Him in the days of His flesh, though the rationalists of Germany deny His pre-existence and the modernists of our own country, with Fesdick at their head, speak of Him as "the humane New Testament prophet Christ," His followers still number many millions. As sinners they take comfort in the fact that He was a true man in every respect, who, therefore, could be their substitute. But they rejoice especially in the fact that as THE SON OF MAN He is their all-glorious Savior. As such they believe in Him and await His second coming in glory.

That Advent day will be a day of victory for the Christian Church on earth, for on that day the whole world will realize at last that THE SON OF MAN is God's own Son, before whom "every knee must bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," Philipians ii, 10. Then however, it will be too late to come to faith in Him. Then

the King will come to judge and not to save. But those who believe in Him now will on that day escape the just judgment of the world and will inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. For that day of victory the Christian Church has prayed since the days of St. John the Divine, saying with him: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." Yes, come Thou SON OF MAN. Come, show unto us all, believers, and unbelievers, the glory of Thy name, who livest with the Father and the Holy Spirit ever one God, world without end. Amen.

APPENDIX I.

A COMPLETE CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE OCCASIONS ON WHICH CHRIST MADE USE OF THE TITLE.

A list of this kind is interesting because it shows at a glance when and where Christ spoke of Himself as THE SON OF MAN. It proves the statement made in Chapter IV, that Jesus used the title from the beginning to the end of His public ministry. It will be noted that the first date given is February A.D. 27 and the last is April 9, A.D. 30. The list also shows that the Lord used the title in every part of the Holy Land, in the cities of Jerusalem, Jericho, Capernaum, and Caesarea Philippi, in the provinces of Galilee, Perasa, and Judaea, on the Mount of Transfiguration and on the Mount of Olives, in the temple and on the beaten path through fields of corn. Finally, the list shows that the title THE SON OF MAN was recorded by each of the Evangelists. It occurs 32 times in the Gospel of St. Matthew, 14 times in the Gospel of St. Mark, 26 times in the Gospel of St. Luke, and 12 times in the Gospel of St. John, 84 times in the four Gospels. It occurs only once more in the New Testament, namely, in Acts vii, 56. In Revelation xiv, 14 the full title is not used.

	TIME	PLACE	MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE	JOHN
1.	February A.D.27;	The Jordan				1,51
2.	April 27;	Jerusalem				3,13.14
3.	Jan.-April 28;	Capernaum	9,6	2,10	5,24	
4.	April - May 28;	On way to Galil.	12,8	2,28	6,5	
5.	Summer 28;	(On a mount near Capernaum			6,22	
6.	Summer 28;	Peraea, Galilee	11,19		7,34	
7.	Autumn 28;	Galilee	12,32.40		11,30	
8.	Autumn 28;	Galilee			12,8.10.40	
9.	Autumn 28;	Near Capernaum	13,37.41			
10.	Autumn 28;	Lake of Galilee	8,20		9,58	
11.	Winter 29;	Galilee	10,23			
12.	Spring 29;	(The synagog in Capernaum				6,27.53
13.	Spring 29;	Capernaum				6,62
14.	Summer 29;	Caesarea Philip.	16,13			
15.	Summer 29;	" "		8,31	9,22	
16.	Summer 29;	" "	16,27.28	8,38	9,26	
17.	Summer 29;	(Mt. of Transfig. Caesarea Philip.	17,9.12	9,9.12		
18.	Autumn 29;	Galilee	17,22	9,31	9,44	

	TIME	PLACE	MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE	JOHN
19.	Autumn A.D.29;	(A home in Capernaum	18,11			
20.	Autumn 29;	Samaria			9,56	
21.	October 29;	(The temple in Jerusalem				8,28
22.	November 29;	Jerusalem				9,35*
23.	Feb.-March 30;	Peraea			(17,22,24,26. 30; 18,8	
24.	Feb.-March 30;	Peraea	19,28			
25.	March 30;	Peraea	20,18	10,33	18,31	
26.	March 30;	Peraea	20,28	10,45		
27.	March 30;	Jericho			19,10	
28.	April 4, 30;	(The temple in Jerusalem				12,23.34a.b
29.	April 4, 30;	Mount of Olives	24,27.30a.b. (37,39.44;	13,26	21,27.36	
30.	April 4, 30;	Mount of Olives	25,13.31 26,2			
31.	April 6, 30;	(The Upper Room in Jerusalem	26,24a.b	14,21a.b	22,22	13,31
32.	April 6, 30;	Gethsemane	26,45	14,41		
33.	April 6, 30;	Gethsemane			22,48	
34.	April 7, 30;	(High Priest's palace in Jerusalem	26,64	14,62	22,69	
35.	April 9, 30;	(Jesus' grave at Jerusalem			24,7	

* The Greek text has the title HO HYIOS TOU ANTHROPOU.

APPENDIX II.

PASSAGES GROUPED ACCORDING TO CONTENT AND CONTEXT

The passages in which the title THE SON OF MAN occurs are, for the most part, quite easily grouped as follows: 1. Passages dealing with Christ's second coming to earth and His final judgment; 2. Passages in which He speaks of His suffering, death, and burial; and 3. Passages in which Jesus refers to some power or right which He enjoyed as THE SON OF MAN while living on earth. Such a grouping is here made with remarks of commentators when the passage in question calls for remarks.

1.

Passages Dealing with Christ's Second Coming to Earth and His Final Judgment.

Matthew x, 23: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till THE SON OF MAN come." (Meyer: "Your sphere is large enough to admit of your retreating before persecution in order to save others. You will not have accomplished in all of the towns your mission associated as it will be with such flights from town to town until THE SON OF MAN comes. Jesus means neither more

nor less than His second coming." Luther: "Do not worry; I will be there with My Advent, before it comes to pass that the Word no longer can find a place.")

Matthew xiii, 41: "THE SON OF MAN shall send forth His angels and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity."

Matthew xvi, 27: "For THE SON OF MAN shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works."

Matthew xvi, 28: "Verily, I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see THE SON OF MAN coming in His kingdom." (Expositor: Crux interpretum. Meyer incorrectly: "In His kingdom, i.e., as a King in all His regal authority. He shows nearness of His coming." Luther correctly: "Through Me death is swallowed up in victory, so that also some who are standing here will die, or rather, fall asleep, without death, inasmuch as they will not feel the power of death." Christ is speaking of His second coming. The difficulty merely attaches to His statement that some of the disciples would not taste of death till He came.)

Matthew xix, 28: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when THE SON OF MAN shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Matthew xxiv, 27: "As the lightning cometh out of the east,

and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of THE SON OF MAN be."

Matthew xxiv, 30a: "And then shall appear the sign of THE SON OF MAN in heaven."

Matthew xxiv, 37: "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of THE SON OF MAN be."

Matthew xxiv, 39: "And knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of THE SON OF MAN be."

Matthew xxiv, 44: "Therefore be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not THE SON OF MAN cometh."

Matthew xxv, 13: "Watch therefore for ye know neither the day nor the hour when THE SON OF MAN cometh."

Matthew xxv, 31: "When THE SON OF MAN shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory."

Luke xii, 8: "Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him shall THE SON OF MAN also confess before the angels of God."

Luke xii, 40: "Be ye therefore ready also; for THE SON OF MAN cometh at an hour when ye think not."

Luke xvii, 22: "And He said unto His disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of THE SON OF MAN, and ye shall not see it." (Expositor: "Not past days in the time of discipleship but days to come." Meyer: "The time of the Parousia is not yet at hand.")

Luke xvii, 24: "For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part,

- under heaven: so shall also THE SON OF MAN be in His day."
- Luke xvii, 26: "And as it was in the days of Noe so shall it be also in the days of THE SON OF MAN."
- Luke xvii, 30: "Even thus shall it be in the day when THE SON OF MAN is revealed."
- Luke xviii, 8: "Nevertheless when THE SON OF MAN cometh shall He find faith on earth?"
- Luke xxi, 36: "Watch ye therefore and pray always that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass and to stand before THE SON OF MAN."
- Mark viii, 38 (Luke ix, 26): "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of Me and of My words in this adulterous and sinful generation: of him also shall THE SON OF MAN be ashamed when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels."
- Matthew xxiv, 30b (Mark xiii, 26; Luke xxi, 27): "And they shall see THE SON OF MAN coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."
- Matthew xxvi, 64 (Mark xiv, 62; Luke xxii, 69): "Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said, Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see THE SON OF MAN sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven."

Twenty-eight passages are included in this first group, fifteen of them from Matthew's Gospel, eleven from Luke's, three from Mark's, these being recorded also by Matthew or Luke, and none from the Gospel of John.

2.

Passages in which Jesus Speaks of His Suffering, Death,
and Burial.

Matthew xii, 40: "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall THE SON OF MAN be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Matthew xxvi, 2: "Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and THE SON OF MAN is betrayed to be crucified."

Luke vi, 22: "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for THE SON OF MAN's sake."
This passage is included here because the suffering of the Master is reflected in the suffering of His servants.

Luke xi, 30: "For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also THE SON OF MAN be to this generation." Jesus' burial is here referred to.

Luke xxii, 48: "Judas, betrayest thou THE SON OF MAN with a kiss?"

John iii, 14: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must THE SON OF MAN be lifted up."

John viii, 28: "Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up THE SON OF MAN, then shall ye know that I am He."

Matthew xvii, 9 (Mark ix, 9): "Tell the vision to no man, until THE SON OF MAN be risen again from the dead."

Matthew xvii, 12 (Mark ix, 12): "But I say unto you, That Elias is come already and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed, Likewise shall also THE SON OF

MAN suffer of them."

Matthew xx, 28 (Mark x, 45): "THE SON OF MAN came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many."

Matthew xxvi, 24b (Mark xiv, 21b): "Woe unto that man by whom THE SON OF MAN is betrayed!"

Matthew xxvi, 45 (Mark xiv, 41): "Behold, the hour is at hand and THE SON OF MAN is betrayed into the hands of sinners."

Matthew viii, 20 (Luke ix, 58): "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but THE SON OF MAN hath not where to lay His head." This, too, was a part of His suffering, that He was despised and rejected of men.

Matthew xi, 19 (Luke vii, 34): "THE SON OF MAN came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." Mockery was also a part of His lot.

Matthew xii, 32 (Luke xii, 10): "Whosoever speaketh a word against THE SON OF MAN, it shall be forgiven him." The Savior thus humbled Himself.

Mark viii, 31 (Luke ix, 22): "And He began to teach them that THE SON OF MAN must suffer many things and be rejected of the elders and of the chief priests and scribes and be killed and after three days rise again." x

Matthew xvii, 22 (Mark ix, 31; Luke ix, 44): "THE SON OF

MAN shall be betrayed into the hands of men."

Matthew xx, 18 (Mark x, 33; Luke xviii, 31): "THE SON OF MAN shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes

and they shall condemn Him to death."

Matthew xxvi, 24a (Mark xiv, 21a; Luke xxii, 22): "THE SON OF MAN goeth as it is written of Him."

Three other references might be added to this group according to content. But in these the title was not used by the Savior. They are John xii, 34a.b, where the title is repeated by the people, and Luke xxiv, 7, where God's angel reminds the women of Jesus' promise. If these three passages are not considered, we find that thirty-four passages are included in this second group, thirteen taken from Matthew, ten from Luke, nine from Mark, these being recorded also by Matthew or Luke, and two from John.

3.

Passages in which Jesus Refers to Some Power or Right which

He Enjoyed as THE SON OF MAN while Living on Earth.

Matthew xiii, 37: "He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is THE SON OF MAN."

Matthew xvi, 13: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi He asked His disciples saying, Whom do men say that I THE SON OF MAN am?" The question indicates Jesus' right to expect and demand faith in Himself. He had the right to be called the Son of the Living God, as Peter correctly stated.

Matthew xviii, 11: "For THE SON OF MAN is come to save that which was lost." This passage was previously referred to as an interpolation from Luke xix, 10, since many copyists and manuscripts omit it. If it should be genuine, it belongs in this third group.

Luke ix, 56: "For THE SON OF MAN is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them."

Luke xix, 10: "For THE SON OF MAN is come to seek and to save that which was lost."

John i, 51: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see the heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon THE SON OF MAN." Luther: "When Christ became man and began His public ministry, the heaven was opened and from that time forth has never been shut." Meyer: "A symbolical representation of the uninterrupted and living intercourse subsisting between the Messiah and God."

John iii, 13: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even THE SON OF MAN which is in heaven."

John vi, 27: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which THE SON OF MAN shall give unto you; for Him hath God the Father sealed."

John vi, 53: "Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of THE SON OF MAN and drink His blood, ye have no life in you."

John vi, 62: "What and if ye shall see THE SON OF MAN ascend up where He was before?"

John ix, 35: "Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when He had found him, He said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God (Greek text: THE SON OF MAN)?" Jesus' question indicates His right to demand faith in Himself.

John xii, 23: "The hour is come, that THE SON OF MAN should be glorified."

John xiii, 31: "Now is THE SON OF MAN glorified, and God is glorified in Him."

Matthew ix, 6 (Mark ii, 10; Luke v, 24): "But that ye may know that THE SON OF MAN hath power on earth to forgive sins,"

Matthew xii, 8 (Mark ii, 28; Luke vi, 5): "THE SON OF MAN is Lord even of the sabbath day."

Nineteen passages are included in this third group, five of them taken from Matthew, four from Luke, two from Mark, these being recorded also by Matthew or Luke, and eight from John.

It is interesting to note from this grouping of texts that Mark records the title more often in connection with Christ's suffering, while John records it mostly in passages dealing with His rights and powers. In the case of Matthew and Luke the difference is so slight that no inference can be made.

APPENDIX III.

PASSAGES GROUPED ACCORDING TO THEIR USE IN THE PRESENCE OF THE DISCIPLES; THE MULTITUDE; AND INDIVIDUALS.

Reference has already been made to the fact that Jesus used His title THE SON OF MAN in the presence of friend and foe: In the company of His disciples; in the presence of the multitude; and also when dealing with individuals. In the following list the references are given together with the occasions on which Jesus used the title in the presence of each group.

A. ⁸

Jesus Calls Himself THE SON OF MAN in the Presence of the Disciples.

1. At the call of Nathanael to discipleship, John 1, 51.
2. When explaining the parable of the wheat and the tares,
Matthew xiii, 37. 41.
3. When instructing and sending forth the Twelve, Matthew x, 23.
4. After the discourse on the Bread of Life, John vi, 62.
5. In His catechesis on the title THE SON OF MAN, Matthew xvi, 13.
6. In His first prediction of His suffering and death, Mark
viii, 31; Luke ix, 22.

- x
7. On the descent from the Mount of Transfiguration,
Matthew xvii, 9. 12; Mark ix, 9. 12.
 8. In His second prediction of His suffering and death,
Matthew xvii, 22; Mark ix, 31; Luke ix, 44.
 9. In a discourse in a house at Capernaum, Matthew xviii, 11.
This is considered an interpolation from Luke xix, 10.
 10. While passing through Samaria, after James and John had
asked Him to call down fire from heaven, Luke ix, 56.
 11. While teaching the disciples in Peraea, Luke xvii, 22.
24. 26. 30; xviii, 8.
 12. In another instruction period in Peraea, Matthew xix, 28.
 13. In His third prediction of His suffering and death, Mat-
thew xx, 18; Mark x, 33; Luke xviii, 31.
 14. After James and John had asked for the places of honor in
His kingdom, Matthew xx, 28; Mark x, 45.
 15. In His discourse on the Mount of Olives on Tuesday of Holy
Week, Matthew xxiv, 27. 30a. b. 37. 39. 44; xxv, 13. 31;
Mark xiii, 26; Luke xxi, 27. 36.
 16. After the discourse on the Mount of Olives, Matthew xxvi, 2.
 17. At the last passover meal, Matthew xxvi, 24a. b; Mark xiv,
21a. b; Luke xxii, 22; and after Judas had left, John
xiii, 31.
 18. In the Garden of Gethsemane, Matthew xxvi, 45; Mark xiv, 41.
 19. At the grave. Here the angel repeated Christ's words,
Luke xxiv, 7.

(B.) (4)

Jesus Calls Himself THE SON OF MAN in the Presence of
the Multitude.

1. At the healing of the paralytic, Matthew ix, 6; Mark
ii, 10; Luke v, 24.
2. After the disciples had plucked ears of corn on the sab-
bath, Matthew xii, 8; Mark ii, 28; Luke vi, 5.
3. In the sermon on the mount, Luke vi, 22.
4. In His discourse subsequent to the coming of messengers
from John the Baptist, Matthew xi, 19; Luke vii, 34.
5. After the healing of the demoniac, Matthew xii, 32. 40;
Luke xi, 30.
6. In a discourse in Galilee, Luke xii, 8. 10. 40.
7. In a discourse on the Bread of Life, John vi, 27. 53.
8. In a public prediction of His death and resurrection,
Mark viii, 38; Luke ix, 26; Matthew xvi, 27. 28.
9. In a public dispute with the Pharisees, John viii, 28.
10. While teaching in the temple on Tuesday of Holy Week,
John xii, 23. The people repeat the title, John xii,
34a. b.
11. In His trial before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, Matthew
xxvi, 64; Mark xiv, 62; Luke xxii, 69.

(C.)

Jesus Calls Himself THE SON OF MAN in the Presence of
Individuals.

1. In His talk with Nicodemus, John iiii, 13. 14.
2. In answering a certain scribe who wished to become His

disciple, Matthew viii, 20; Luke ix, 58.

3. When revealing Himself to the man born blind whom He had given sight, John ix, 35 (See Greek text).
4. In the home of Zaccheus after his conversion, Luke xix, 10.
5. In the Garden of Gethsemane when Judas betrayed Him, Luke xxii, 48.

A study of this kind should convince anyone that Jesus did not use His title for the benefit of any one group, intending, for instance, to conceal His identity from His hearers, or to give His disciples some secret revelation of Himself. The argumentation based on this study is fully set forth in Chapter iv and need not be repeated here.

We note in closing that Jesus used the expression one or more times on nineteen different occasions in the presence of His disciples, on eleven different occasions in the presence of the multitudes, and on five different occasions in the presence of individuals, on thirty-five occasions in all, as is indicated in Appendix I. It will be seen from this that every effort has been made to keep the entire work in full agreement also in mechanical details. As a careful workman, the writer has earnestly tried to build upon the foundation of the Holy Scriptures, avoiding the wood, hay, and stubble of man's knowledge and learning, choosing only the gold, silver, and precious stones of God's Holy Word, that all glory may be the Lord's, Whose Word shall endure forever. An important portion of that Word is the name of the all-glorious Savior:

THE SON OF MAN

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beckwith, C. A. THE SON OF MAN. Volume xi of the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, New York, 1911.
- Berkhof, L. Christ in the Light of Eschatology, Princeton Theological Review, Volume xxv.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. International Critical Commentary, New York, 1929.
- Boutflower, C. In and Around the Book of Daniel, London, 1923
- Brenner, L. Der Menschensohn, Lehre und Wehre, Volume liii, St. Louis, 1907.
- Briggs, C. A. Messianic Prophecy, New York, 1891.
- Bruce, A. B. The Synoptic Gospels, The Expositor's Greek Testament, New York.
- Cremer, H. Biblisch-Theologisches Woerterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Graecitaet, Gotha, 1872. Also the ninth edition, Gotha, 1902.
- Delitzsch, F. Messianische Weissagungen, Berlin, 1899.
- Dods, M. The Gospel of St. John, The Expositor's Greek Testament, New York.
- Fausset, A. R. Critical and Explanatory Commentary on the Old Testament, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary, Hartford.
- Fiebig Quoted in Beweis des Glaubens under Miscellen. Here his work: Der Menschensohn, is reviewed, Guetersloh, 1902.

- Hengstenberg, E. Christology of the Old Testament, translated by J. Martin, Edinburgh, 1864.
Die Authentie des Daniel.
- Hirsch, E. THE SON OF MAN, Volume xi of the Jewish Encyclopedia, New York and London, 1907.
- Johns, I. N. The Reference Passage Bible, Alpha Publishing Company, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1902.
- Kaehler, M. Christologie, Volume iv, Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Leipzig, 1898.
- Keil, C. F. Biblischer Kommentar ueber den Propheten Daniel, Leipzig, 1869.
- Kirchliches Handlexikon Menschensohn, Volume iv, Leipzig, 1894.
- Kretzmann, P. E. Popular Commentary of the Bible, St. Louis, 1921.
- Loeber, C. Evangelisch Lutherische Dogmatik, St. Louis, and Leipzig, 1893.
- Luthardt, C. E. Kompendium der Dogmatik, Leipzig, 1893.
Review of Fiebig's Der Menschensohn in Theologisches Literaturblatt, Leipzig, 1901.
- Luther, M. Auslegung des Alten Testaments, Volume iii.
Auslegung des Neuen Testaments, Volume vii, St. Louis, 1894.
- Mc. Clintock and Strong Cyclopedia of Biblical Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Volume ix: THE SON OF MAN, New York, 1894.

- Meinhold, J. Das Buch Daniel, Strack-Zeackler Commentary, Neerdlingen, 1859.
- Meyer, H. A. W. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, Matthew and John, Edinburgh, 1877.
- Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch ueber die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas, Goettingen, 1860.
- Milligan, G. THE SON OF MAN, Expositor, New York, 1902.
- Montgomery, J. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, International Critical Commentary, New York, 1927.
- Nebe, Ueber den Begriff des Mannes HO HYIOS TON ANTHROPOU, Dankschrift des Herzoglich Wessauischen evangelisch-theologischen Seminars zu Herborn, Herborn, 1860.
- Ottle, S. Das Buch Daniel, Strack-Zeackler Commentary, Neerdlingen, 1860.
- Orelli, C. The Old Testament Prophecy, translated by J. Banks, Edinburgh, 1885.
- Piaper, P. Christliche Dogmatik, Volume II, St. Louis, 1917.
- Pusey, E. B. Daniel the Prophet, New York, 1885.
- Rawlinson, A. The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, London, 1886.
- Robinson, E. Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, New York, 1876.

- Schmidt, N. THE SON OF MAN, Encyclopedia Biblica,
London, 1907.
- Stoeckhardt, G. Christus in der alttestamentlichen Weis-
sagung, Lehre und Wehre, Volume xxxvi to
xxxviii, St. Louis, 1890 to 1892.
Ueber Ausgewaehlte Psalmen.
- Thayer, J. H. Greek and English Lexicon of the New
Testament, New York, 1889.
- Thomson, J. E. Daniel, The Pulpit Commentary, New York.
- Vincent, M. R. Word Studies in the New Testament, New
York, 1905 and 1906.
- Weinel, H. Das Leben Jesu, Theologische Rundschau,
Tuebingen and Leipzig, 1902.
- Wilson, R. D. Articles showing difference between the
New Testament, Koran, etc. Volume xix,
Princeton Theological Review.
- Bibles:
Nestle's Greek New Testament, Stuttgart, 1923
The King James Version
The British Revised Version
The American Revised Version
Biblia Hebraica, Leipzig, 1896.