

him and he turned to them and said, "Why do you ask me about the Son of Man?" But that is the only use of the term that is in any of the surviving literature until 100 years after the death of Christ. Then they find that from that time on in Christian literature it was said that Jesus was not merely Son of God but He is also Son of Man. Of course as you use it that way it means He is fully man. He is not only fully God; He is fully man. He is fully a human being just like any one of us is a human being.

Well does that explain why Jesus referred to Himself so many times as the Son of Man? It certainly is not what it seems in the Gospels, that He is fully a human being. That was perfectly obvious to people then. Here came what they took as a Galilean peasant. He taught. He gave them wonderful teachings. He refers to himself and he says the Son of Man. I'm a Man! Whoever doubted you're a man? Why keep harping on the fact that you're a man? Perfectly obvious. It must have considerable more meaning to it than that. Just what did He mean by it?

We find the word is used in Matthew 31 different times. The first 7 chs. of Matt. have no reference to it. Now I will hastily read you the references--the nine--between chs. 8 and 13. In ch. 8:20 (reading text) Here He is clearly referring to Himself--not to man in general. He is referring to himself, not stressing human nature. That doesn't enter into it particularly.

Mat. 9:6(reading text); 10:23(reading text); 11:19(reading text); 12:8(reading text); 12:32(reading text); 12:40(reading text); 13:37(reading text); 13:41(reading text).

We have thus all of nine occurrences in chs. 8-13. Then in chs. 14-26 we have 18 occurrences of this term in the words of Jesus in the book of Matthew. In fact there are 31 occurrences of it in Matthew; 14 in Mark; 25 in Luke; and either 13 or 12, I mentioned the difference there in number in the book of John, each of which is new and has no parallel in the other three synoptics. He certainly is not simply saying that He is a human being. That was obvious. Why does He call Himself the Son of Man?

Incidentally in the Greek it is literally the son of the man. It's seems funny that these modernist writers--I have found three or four of them who say in Greek this is a barbarism! The son of the man! I haven't been able to find out what they mean by that? I've asked two or three NT professors and they don't know because in Greek it says the kingdom of the heavens, the man of the sin, the man of the perdition. This use of two articles like that--the kingdom of the heavens--is common thru the NT. If you say this is a barbarism, well the whole NT must be in your particular viewpoint! Because the same thing is done with many other words. But it is certainly an usual way of speaking. As a rule in the OT where it speaks of the son of man the words would be more like just "son of man".