

NEW TESTAMENT ESSAYS

STUDIES IN MEMORY OF
Thomas Walter Manson
1893-1958

sponsored by
PUPILS, COLLEAGUES
AND FRIENDS

edited by
A. J. B. HIGGINS
*Lecturer in New Testament Language
and Literature in the University
of Leeds*

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 1959

Published by the University of Manchester at
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
316-324 Oxford Road, Manchester 13

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

SON OF MAN—FORSCHUNG SINCE 'THE TEACHING OF JESUS'¹

by

A. J. B. HIGGINS

A COMPLETE survey of the bewildering mass of material on the Son of Man problem which has been produced during the quarter of a century since the publication of Professor Manson's book is impossible here. In the far from easy task of selection some names and even some not insignificant contributions to the subject have perforce been omitted. What is attempted is a sketch of the main lines of discussion of a topic which has been uppermost in my mind since my interest in it was first aroused by Dr. Manson's book and by his lectures in the Faculty of Theology in Manchester University—a topic to which I hope to return on a later occasion. Much less is it within the scope of this paper to review the progress of the debate on the whole problem of the eschatological teaching of Jesus, of which the Son of Man question, however important in itself, is but an integral part.² A few remarks will suffice. Schweitzer's 'thorough-going' (*konsequent*) eschatology, which he still retains (see his introduction to the third edition (1954) of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*) has been revived by M. Werner in *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (1941, 2nd edn., 1954; Eng. trans. (in a shortened form), *The Formation of Christian Dogma* (1957)), who is opposed by W. Michaelis in *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung* (1942), especially pp. 58 ff. To the latter should now be added H. Schuster's important article, 'Die konsequente Eschatologie in der Interpretation des neuen Testaments, kritisch betrachtet', *ZNTW* 47 (1956), 1-25. The whole question is fully discussed by W. G. Kümmel in *Promise and Fulfilment* (1957). Even C. H. Dodd (in *The Coming of Christ* (1951)) has modified his earlier thesis of 'realized eschatology' by allowing for the parousia of the Son of

Man (beyond history) and by distinguishing this from the resurrection as an event within history.³

Dr. Manson followed up his now well-known examination of the Son of Man sayings in the Synoptic Gospels in *The Teaching of Jesus* (211 ff., 263 ff.) with *Son of Man* (1950) and with a summary of his conclusions in *The Servant-Messiah* (1953), 72-4, on which the following outline, with some use of his own language, is based.

(1) '“Son of man” is a symbol, an apocalyptic counter.'

(2) 'Jesus took it from the book of Daniel. We have good evidence that he knew of the Danielic Son of man, and no reason to think that he knew of any other.'

(3) In Daniel 'Son of Man' is not a Messiah but a symbol for '“the people of the saints of the Most High”, who are to receive the coming kingdom.'

(4) 'The “receiving of the kingdom” is a comprehensive term for the vindication of Israel and the fulfilment of the promises made to the dynasty of David. The “people of the saints of the Most High” is the actualization in history of the Israelite ideal. So the Son of man idea in Daniel links the Davidic hope to the Israelite ideal.'

(5) The answer of Jesus to the questions: 'How does the kingdom come to the Son of man? and, What is the Israelite ideal?' is to define Son of man in terms of the Deutero-Isaianic Servant of the Lord.

(6) This definition is worked out especially in the Son of man sayings, in 'the closely parallel sayings on the task of the disciples', and in the ministry of Jesus.

(7) Not only the Messiah but Israel, or a believing remnant within Israel, must be the Servant.

(8) The Messiah is the embodiment not only of the Israelite ideal, but of the true Israel. Here the Hebrew conception of corporate personality and of oscillation⁴ between the pluralistic and individualistic understandings of the social group makes possible 'the transition from Son of man as a name for the people of the saints of the Most High to Son of man as a messianic title'.

(9) 'The kingdom of God is God's kingdom', and it has come to Israel in Jesus as the realization of the Israelite ideal.

The salient points then are: (a) The Son of Man in the Gospels is of apocalyptic origin; (b) Jesus derived the term and its meaning

from the book of Daniel; (c) the Danielic figure is a corporate one; (d) Jesus understood Son of Man in terms of the suffering Servant; (e) the Son of Man in the Gospels is a corporate as well as an individual conception.

A preliminary question, however, is that of the origin of the Son of Man conception in Judaism. In a sense this may be regarded as lying outside the problem of the significance of the figure in the Synoptic Gospels, especially if the non-apocalyptic view of its provenance is adopted. But the question of ultimate origins is also strictly irrelevant if Dr. Manson's opinion is followed that there is 'no reason to think that he [Jesus] knew of any other' Son of Man than the Danielic.⁵ If, however, a wider view is adopted, the two questions are intimately connected: it is possible that Jesus was influenced by current Jewish ideas of the Son of Man which retained, though in a considerably modified form, the marks of their foreign origin.

Bousset, von Gall, Gressmann, Reitzenstein and others have found the ultimate source of the Son of Man in oriental and Hellenistic conceptions of the *Urmensch*, *Anthropos*, or primordial man, particularly in its Gnostic form of the Redeemer. Among recent surveys may be mentioned those of H. L. Jansen,⁶ W. Manson,⁷ and especially S. Mowinckel who provides copious references to the vast literature.⁸ The last named holds that the fact that the *Anthropos* in most Gnostic systems has 'acquired a certain element of the eschatological redeemer' is due to his having already assumed this role in certain circles of Persian religion, and with earlier scholars points especially to the Gayomartian sect (p. 429). R. Bultmann, the indefatigable champion of the theory of pervasive Gnostic influence in Christianity, attributes the Christian Redeemer-conception to Gnosticism.⁹ But the Gnostic texts found at Nag Hammadi in 1945 suggest that such ideas may need at least some revision: there is no 'pre-Christian Gnostic redeemer' in the mid-second-century *Gospel of Truth* (edited by M. Malinine, H. C. Puech and G. Quispel as *Evangelium Veritatis* (1956)). G. Quispel writes: 'There would appear to be good grounds for supposing that it was from Christianity that the conception of redemption and the figure of the Redeemer were taken over into Gnosticism. A pre-Christian redeemer and an Iranian mystery of redemption perhaps never existed.'¹⁰ Further, he believes the texts show that Gnostic speculations about the

Heavenly Man are traceable to heterodox Jewish traditions about Adam. Certainly the idea of the Man was not strange to Judaism with its belief in the creation of man in the divine image.¹¹ But it would be as unwise to over-emphasize the importance of Judaism as it would that of Christianity.¹²

Another aspect of the problem is the relationship between the Son of Man and the Messiah. Mowinckel sharply distinguishes the derivation of the Son of Man from the oriental *Urmensch* and that of the Messiah from the Israelite adaptation of oriental kingship: the Son of Man is not connected with the king. A. Bentzen¹³ represented a different school of thought and found a closer connection in the Old Testament between the two figures than Mowinckel does. He pointed to Gen. 1 and Ps. 8 as parallels, and in Ps. 8 (also Ps. 80:18) the king is called Son of Man. H. Riesenfeld,¹⁴ with Bonsirven and Küppers, conflates the Son of Man and the Messiah, asserting that the differences between them are often exaggerated at the expense of the similarities. Mowinckel answers Riesenfeld's view that the transcendent and divine features of the Son of Man are derived, like those of the Messiah, from oriental royal ideology, in *He That Cometh*, 467.

A. Feuillet¹⁵ has taken a completely different line by attempting to account for the Jewish Son of Man figure (as it appears in Daniel) without recourse to foreign influence. He describes the figure as a kind of visible manifestation of the invisible divine glory in human form like that in Ezek. 1:26, by which it is influenced (p. 187), and as the result of the influence of sapiential literature on the prophetic conception of the Messiah through the divine hypostasis Wisdom. This hypothesis of 'sapiential Messianism' is examined by J. Coppens and rejected:¹⁶ the figure of Wisdom is too closely bound up with the being of God to be a prototype of the Son of Man, who is distinct from God.

T. F. Glasson, who deprecates the *Urmensch* and similar theories, finds the origin of the Son of Man figure in Dan. 7 in the very similar vision of Enoch in 1 En. 14.¹⁷ He does not mean to suggest that the writer of Dan. 7 made the identification with Enoch, but he points to the identification of the Son of Man and Enoch in 1 En. 71.

The *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 En. 37-71) show, in the opinion of many scholars, that in the time of Jesus certain Jewish apocalyptic circles cherished hopes in the coming of a Son of Man, a celestial

figure, to deliver the righteous (Israelites) and to execute judgment on the wicked. Whatever view is adopted about the origin of this conception and the body of ideas bound up with it, various opinions have been held as to the indebtedness of Jesus to them.

There are still occasional attempts to support the hypothesis that Jesus owed little or nothing to apocalyptic and that his use of the title Son of Man is based primarily on Ezekiel.¹⁸ Pierson Parker¹⁹ holds that the title as used by Jesus (and his predecessors) 'carried no messianic implication at all', was drawn from Old Testament passages other than Dan. 7:13, such as Dan. 8:17 and numerous occurrences in Ezekiel where Son of Man simply means 'man', and denotes prophetic leadership. According to W. A. Curtis (*Jesus Christ the Teacher* (1943)), Son of Man was not a current Messianic apocalyptic title, otherwise Jesus would have discouraged its use as he did that of the term Messiah. The expression has no Messianic meaning in the Old Testament, not even in Dan. 7:13, where what we have is 'one like a son of man'. Jesus' use of the term therefore cannot be Messianic, but denotes himself as representative, typical, or true man. *Ben 'ādhām* in Ezekiel (nearly a hundred times) is regarded as the main source of the self-designation of Jesus, and this was fundamentally prophetic in intention. G. S. Duncan's book *Jesus, Son of Man* (1947) is perhaps the most notable recent work on these lines. Its subtitle, 'Studies Contributory to a Modern Portrait', is reminiscent of Harnack and the writers of the 'liberal' lives of Jesus, and although Duncan allows more content to the concept of Messiahship than did Harnack, he portrays Jesus as primarily a prophetic Son of Man and as having derived the title and his understanding of it from Ezekiel. The apocalyptic associations of the Son of Man are therefore discarded; the apocalyptic hope of the final consummation of the kingdom of God is said to be quite alien to the thought of Jesus; and the parousia is interpreted in the sense of the future aspect of his one coming which has taken place because the kingdom of God has come in him. Of the use of Dan. 7:13 by Jesus before the high priest Duncan writes that

we need not be surprised if Jesus, recognising Himself to be, in a most truly spiritual sense, the Man in whom God's ideals and purposes for men were to be fulfilled, should have dared to believe that this and all such Scripture references to exaltation and authority, whether on the

part of the Son of Man or some other such figure, were to be fulfilled in Himself (p. 191).

It is questionable whether the apocalyptic Son of Man can be relegated to the periphery in this way, and if Jesus borrowed from Ezekiel, his scant references to the Spirit are in surprising contrast to the frequent association in Ezekiel of the 'son of man' and the Spirit. Nor is there much force in Duncan's argument from the frequency of the term in Ezekiel as compared with the 'one phrase in Daniel vii:13' (p. 145, n. 3). A similar position is adopted by J. Y. Campbell.²⁰

There is no purely *philological* obstacle to the belief that *bar nāšā'*, represented in the Gospels by Son of Man, could be a title, although in early Palestinian Aramaic, but not very commonly, it means 'a man', much as *ἄνθρωπος* became a title in Gnosticism.²¹ J. Y. Campbell ('The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man', JTS 48 (1947), 145-55) suggested that Jesus used it of himself but not as a title, and in the form *hahū' bar nāšā'* as a more distinctive equivalent of *hahū' gabhrā'*, 'this man' or 'I', which would account for the Greek *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*.²²

There is still to be found the opinion that Jesus did not allude to himself as Son of Man at all. According to F. C. Grant in *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (1940) the Son of Man Christology is a creation of the early church, and the coexistence of different Christologies—Messiah, Son of David, Son of Man—militates against any one of them having originated with Jesus.²³

R. Bultmann opens his *Theology of the New Testament* (i (1952)) with often quoted words: '*The message of Jesus* is a presupposition for the theology of the New Testament rather than a part of that theology itself'. His message was of the imminence of the reign of God, whose dawning was manifest already in his own words and works. Now is the time for *decision*, for soon will come the judgment exercised by God or by his representative the Son of Man who will arrive on the clouds of heaven. Jesus, although in his own person the sign of the times, did not demand belief in himself or declare himself Messiah. He came as a prophet or rabbi without any Messianic consciousness whatever, either of the political Davidic or the apocalyptic Son of Man variety, and points ahead to the Son of Man as another than himself (p. 9). Bultmann sharply distinguishes between sayings which allude to the Son of Man's passion, death, and resurrection and those which refer

to his parousia. The two groups had originally no connection with one another, for the passion sayings say nothing of the parousia and the parousia sayings nothing of the death and resurrection of the Son of Man. The latter are judged to be the older, and probably authentic utterances of Jesus; the former, unrepresented in Q, are probably creations of the Hellenistic church which had lost the meaning of the expression Son of Man and identified the figure with Jesus. We have here an illuminating and crucial example of the significance of the opening sentence in Bultmann's book.²⁴ T. F. Glasson in *The Second Advent* (1945), on the assumption that Jesus did not think in apocalyptic terms at all, though he regarded himself as Son of Man, reinterpreting Dan. 7 in terms of the Suffering Servant, reaches a result diametrically opposed to Bultmann's, for it is those very parousia sayings, accepted by Bultmann as genuine, which he pronounces unauthentic. A different explanation of the apparent reference of Son of Man sayings to another person than Jesus himself is that of J. Schniewind,²⁵ to whom they are part and parcel of Jesus' own Messianic secret—he is the hidden Messiah on earth.

The only direct available evidence for the existence of Son of Man as a Messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism is Dan. 7 and 1 En. 37-71. According to Mowinckel Dan. 7 itself is directly important evidence for belief in an individual Son of Man about 200 B.C., which it reinterprets in a corporate sense.²⁶ The *Similitudes of Enoch* show that, though of a different origin from the Messiah, this Son of Man in certain apocalyptic circles had come to be regarded as the Messiah,²⁷ The more usual view is that the figure in the *Similitudes* is an individualization of the corporate figure symbolic of 'the saints of the Most High' in Dan. 7. Thus, for example, J. W. Bowman, while admitting the possibility of influence from other sources, is content with Dan. 7 as the origin of the Son of Man in 1 En.²⁸ Among recent writers who assume Son of Man to have become a Messianic title before the time of Jesus, at least in certain circles, may be mentioned N. Johansson,²⁹ W. Manson,³⁰ J. W. Bowman,³¹ E. Sjöberg,³² W. F. Albright,³³ R. Bultmann,³⁴ R. Leivestad³⁵ and O. Cullmann.³⁶ That the term was not a Messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism is held, among others, by Pierson Parker,³⁷ H. H. Rowley,³⁸ M. S. Enslin³⁹ and R. H. Fuller.⁴⁰ This attitude is largely determined by doubts concerning the common assumption of a pre-Christian

date for the *Similitudes of Enoch*. The most severe depreciation of them in recent years is that of J. Y. Campbell,⁴¹ who points to the late date of the manuscripts, none of which is earlier than the sixteenth century, and regards the work as quite valueless as evidence for Jewish ideas about the Son of Man; the title may be the work of Christian interpolators. More recently doubts about the pre-Christian date of the *Similitudes* have been expressed by C. H. Dodd⁴² and R. H. Fuller.⁴³

The majority of critics continue to regard the Son of Man in the Gospels as of apocalyptic origin and to attribute the usage to Jesus himself. But there remains a sharp cleavage of opinion as to whether Dan. 7 or 1 En. is the source from which he drew.

Those who agree with Dr. Manson that Dan. and not 1 En. is the source of the self-designation of Jesus, and that the Danielic figure is a corporate symbol are, of course, numerous. But there is very little unqualified acceptance of his suggestion that Jesus' own use of the term Son of Man is also corporate. C. J. Cadoux in *The Historic Mission of Jesus* (1941), especially 90-103, wholeheartedly adopted the thesis.⁴⁴ M. Black thinks that 'the communal meaning is not only possible, but highly probable, and may be the true one, but it is doubtful if, in any case, it is the only one. . . .'⁴⁵ The disagreement on this point is in some cases complete. C. C. McCown⁴⁶ brings forward four objections. (1) No Gospel passage suggests that Jesus and his followers, forming a corporate entity, are described as Son of Man; (2) the Son of Man in 1 En. was probably known to them; (3) 'the increasing popularity of angelology and hypostatization looks toward an individualizing of such figures rather than the more abstract corporate use of the terms'; (4) there is no need to look beyond the ideas of the guardian angel or the *fravashi* to explain the conception. E. Percy⁴⁷ rejects Dr. Manson's theory without discussion. E. Sjöberg⁴⁸ sees in Dr. Manson's hypothesis an unjustifiable conclusion drawn from the (mistaken) corporate interpretation of Dan. 7 and from his opinion that Jesus drew from the passage directly without reference to contemporary Jewish exegesis of it.⁴⁹

On the other hand, it is recognized by some of those who cannot accept the theory as Dr. Manson states it that it contains valuable elements of truth. R. N. Flew emphasizes the value of the connection of the remnant idea with that of the Messiah in Dr. Manson's treatment.⁵⁰ V. Taylor in *Jesus and His Sacrifice*

(1943), 29, did not think it necessary to discuss the societary view because Dr. Manson himself holds that Jesus came to restrict the title to himself. Later, however, in a valuable treatment of the question, he made two important points. (1) 'Apart, therefore, from discussions concerning "the Son of Man" a communal element in his teaching is a vital clue to his mission. If this is so, the significance of the title, important and revealing as it is, is not a decisive issue. The thing signified, and not the name, is the primary consideration. The value of the collective interpretation is that it names the community otherwise implied.'⁵¹ (2) He suggested that, even if the communal interpretation is not conclusive, it is possible that the early church applied to the second coming of Christ parousia sayings which, belonging to the earlier period of the ministry, originally referred to the elect community as the Son of Man.⁵² This should be taken in conjunction with Taylor's earlier article 'The "Son of Man" Sayings Relating to the Parousia' in ET 58 (1946), 12-15, the thesis of which is summarized in general terms in *The Interpreter's Bible* vii (1951), 118 f.; cf. also his *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (1952), 383 f.; *The Names of Jesus* (1953), 33 f. H. H. Rowley seems to be thinking on somewhat similar lines when he remarks that it is in passages concerning the future coming of the Son of Man that 'the collective understanding of the phrase is attended with the least difficulty'.⁵³ J. W. Bowman is impressed by the corporate understanding of the term Son of Man but, denying the presence of apocalyptic eschatology in the thought of Jesus, he regards it as referring to Jesus and the church which it was his 'intention' to establish.⁵⁴ Cullmann sees both in Dan. 7:13 and in Jesus' use of the phrase Son of Man a collective sense, but with the individual aspect more prominent.⁵⁵ Finally, the view supported by Mowinckel (mentioned earlier) that in Dan. 7 we have a corporate interpretation of an individual Son of Man who was an object of belief before the time of Jesus, invites the question whether (if it is accepted) Jesus would have been more likely to appeal directly to the scriptural passage to the neglect of the supposed current belief than to the latter itself. Perhaps both motives should be allowed for, and if so we should have a reasonable explanation of the variation between the personal and collective uses of the term Son of Man. In any case it is probably a mistake to regard Dan. 7 as the sole source of the title in the Gospels.

R. Otto's once widely influential book⁵⁶ offered suggestions concerning the Son of Man problem which, while ingenious, have not commended themselves to most scholars. Otto is to be classed with the supporters of 1 En. as the direct source of Jesus' self-designation. According to him Jesus was a charismatic preacher of the imminence of the Kingdom of God who was so influenced by Persian ideas mediated in Galilee through the Enochic literature that he came to think of his mission in terms derived from its teaching. Enoch was 'a prophet of the eschatological Son of Man', who 'would be exalted to become the one whom he had proclaimed' (p. 213).

But although he himself was the future Son of Man, he did not proclaim himself as the Son of Man . . . Similarly Jesus knew himself to be the 'filius hominis praedestinatus'; therefore he summoned, worked, and acted as the one upon whom the choice had fallen; he worked proleptically with the powers of the Son of Man, with divine commission and divine anointing; but he did not deliver teachings in regard to his being the Son of Man, any more than did Enoch (p. 219).

The basis of this theory is 1 En. 71:14, where alone in the *Similitudes* is Enoch identified with the Son of Man who, Otto tentatively conjectured, is the *fravashi* or heavenly counterpart of Enoch. Rowley's comment is worth quoting. 'My difficulty with Otto's view is that if 1 Enoch identifies Enoch with the Son of Man, and if 1 Enoch influenced our Lord's assumption of the title Son of Man, the implied identification of Himself with Enoch might have been expected to leave some trace in the Gospels.'⁵⁷ More serious for Otto's whole hypothesis is the problem of the relation of chapter 71 to the rest of the *Similitudes*.⁵⁸ Other writers who find in 1 En. the source of the Son of Man in the Gospels are N. Johansson (*op. cit.*, 183 f., 301), C. C. McCown (*op. cit.*, 9) and E. Stauffer (*New Testament Theology* (1955), 108-11 (in addition to Dan. 7)). But opponents of this derivation are many, and include C. J. Cadoux (*op. cit.*, 98 f.), V. Taylor (see last footnote), T. F. Glasson (*op. cit.*, 45 ff.), J. W. Bowman (*The Religion of Maturity* (1948), 255-7), and J. W. Doeve (*Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (1954), 136).

Others allow the possibility of knowledge among Jesus and his followers of current ideas about a future superhuman judge and ruler, without necessarily direct dependence on 1 En. J. Lowe⁵⁹

thinks 'Enoch or something like it' in addition to Daniel is presupposed by Gospel usage. M. Goguel⁶⁰ thought the expression 'this Son of Man' in 1 En. points to an already known but not common conception. Similar views are held, among others, by E. Percy⁶¹ and E. Sjöberg.⁶²

E. Lohmeyer⁶³ dealt with the Son of Man question as part of his theory of two centres of primitive Christianity: the Son of Man (and Kyrios) Christology was characteristic of Galilean belief, that of the Messiah belonged to Jerusalem. Of this Bultmann provides a brief critique (approved by Percy, *op. cit.*, 244, n.) in his *Theology of the New Testament* i (1952), 52 f.: the two titles do not imply two different types of Christology. Cullmann (*op. cit.*, 168) judges that Christologies cannot be differentiated in this way on a geographical basis.

Those who, with Dr. Manson, believe that Jesus invested the Son of Man title (derived from Dan. 7) with traits of the Suffering Servant are too numerous to mention. But there is a lack of agreement as to whether Jesus was original in this or whether Judaism was already familiar with the idea of a suffering Son of Man. While the great majority of supporters of originality think of Dan., R. H. Charles⁶⁴ and, in our period, Otto⁶⁵ have traced the thought of Jesus to a synthesis of the Servant conception and the *Enochic* Son of Man. Protagonists of the other view include some who find a suffering Son of Man already in the Old Testament. Thus W. D. Davies⁶⁶ thinks that Dan. 7:21, 25 points in this direction because the Son of Man represents the persecuted saints of the Most High. A similar view is adopted by C. H. Dodd⁶⁷ and C. F. D. Moule.⁶⁸ This kind of exegesis is rejected by H. H. Rowley who writes that there is no thought of a suffering Son of Man because the 'saints suffered before the appearance of the Son of Man, for this is a figure for the saints only after they are invested with power'.⁶⁹ More commonly, however, it is 1 En. 37-71 to which appeal is made: a suffering and dying Son of Man is conceived after the pattern of the Servant. The most notable recent attempt to support this thesis is that of J. Jeremias.⁷⁰ J. Héring⁷¹ signified his rejection of such ideas, but the most thorough refutation is that of Sjöberg.⁷² Mowinckel, following Sjöberg, adduces impressive and cogent arguments against the supposition that pre-Christian Judaism cherished any belief in a suffering and dying Son of Man.⁷³ In Mowinckel's opinion such

a supposition is due to misuse of verbal similarities.⁷⁴ To illustrate the almost confusing variety of opinions on this question it is sufficient to refer to the fact that while C. R. North finds no evidence that the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* is to suffer, he yet sees there a real identification of the Son of Man and the Servant.⁷⁵ W. Manson, in his valuable study *Jesus the Messiah* (1943), appears at times almost to equate Son of Man and Servant in pre-Christian Judaism, but does not intend actually to do so. He writes:

In Biblical and Jewish belief the ideas Son of God, Servant of the Lord, and Son of Man, however separate they may have been in origin, had come to signify only variant phases of the one Messianic idea, and approaches to an actual synthesis of the features of all three had already taken place in I Enoch. . . . The sufferings of Jesus are predicted in the form of a dogma relating to the Son of Man. But this dogma is not only not derivable from Jewish apocalyptic tradition but stands in extreme paradoxical relation to it. That the Son of Man enters on his heavenly glory through humiliation and self-sacrifice was an idea which despite Isa. liii had not entered into the Messianic calculations of Judaism.⁷⁶

Some scholars have denied to the thought of Jesus any association of the ideas of the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Of these two concepts in his teaching H. B. Sharman writes that 'they create the impression of two foci that do not belong to the same ellipse', and that 'the Son of Man has no kingdom and the Kingdom of God has no Son of Man'.⁷⁷ Although the question cannot be pursued here, a strong case can be made out for the opposite view that the association of the two ideas belongs to the earliest stratum of the tradition, and to the thought of Jesus himself.⁷⁸ In fact, it is difficult to imagine anything else if he was dependent on Dan. 7.

This survey may conclude with another topic in some ways germane to the connection between the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Was Jesus, in thinking of himself as the Son of Man, concerned primarily with the future, in view of the fact that in Judaism the Son of Man is an entirely eschatological figure? R. H. Fuller regards Jesus as exercising proleptically the functions of the eschatological Son of Man in his earthly ministry viewed as the Kingdom in action in advance of its full coming. Jesus is the Son of Man designate: he 'is not yet the Son of Man (which is essentially a triumphant figure). But he acts as the one destined to be the triumphant Son of Man already during his ministry and

humiliation. The Kingdom and the Son of Man "spill over" or "jut out", as it were, on to this side of the cross, yet the cross itself remains the decisive event which sets both in motion'.⁷⁹ J. Héring denies to Jesus any Messianic claim, while yet holding him to have looked to the coming of the Son of Man of Dan. and 1 En. and to his future identity with him.⁸⁰ Théo Preiss appeals to the idea of the Messianic secret: the use by Jesus of the term *bar nāšā'* forms part of this, serving both to indicate and to conceal the mystery of his person as the Son of Man who will be revealed in glory only at the parousia.⁸¹ Sjöberg does the same. If Jesus claimed to be the Messiah-Son of Man, it was as *hidden*, since he appeared on earth before the *Endzeit*, when alone the Son of Man is fully revealed.⁸² That Jesus appeared as Son of Man before the *Endzeit*, to which that figure properly belongs, is stressed by Cullmann in his important chapter on the title in *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*. He emphasizes the originality of the thought of Jesus about himself as the eschatological Son of Man already present on earth, a thought which finds its explanation in his transference of Jewish eschatological conceptions into the present, for in his teaching the *Endzeit* has already arrived.

NOTES

¹ 1931, 2nd edn., 1935; cf. also 'Mark ii. 27 f.', *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 11 (in honorem A. Fridrichsen, 1947), 138-46; *The Church's Ministry* (1948), 18 ff.; *The Beginning of the Gospel* (1950), 23; 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels', *BJRL* 32 (1950), 171-93 (cited as *Son of Man*); 'Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret', *Studies in the Gospels* (essays in memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham, 1955), 209-22. Recent surveys of the Son of Man problem include: N. Schmidt, 'Recent Study of the Term "Son of Man"', *JBL* 45 (1926), 326-49; A. S. Peake, *The Servant of Yahweh* (1931), 220-37; H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus Transfiguré* (1947), 307-13; C. C. McCown, 'Jesus, Son of Man: a survey of recent discussion', *JR* 28 (1948), 1-12; Bauer-Armdt-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, etc. (1957), 842 f.

² See e.g. A. N. Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* (2nd edn., 1950); G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future* (1954) and *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (1957); J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (1954); J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (1957). See the useful articles on New Testament eschatology by C. K. Barrett in *SJT* 6 (1953), 136-55, 225-43, and G. R. Beasley-Murray in *ET* 64 (1953), 312-16; also E. Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte* (*BZNW* 22 (1957)), with which cf. O. Cullmann, 'Parusieverzögerung und Urchristentum', *TLZ* 83 (1958), 2-12.

³ Aspects of the Son of Man question not treated here include the use of the term in the Fourth Gospel (cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (1953), 241 ff.; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (1955); R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel* (1956); S. Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium* (1957); also E. M. Sidebottom, 'The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel', ET 68 (1957), 231-5, 280-3); 'Man' in St. Paul (cf. E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (1955), 111, O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (1957), 169-86, who continues with a discussion of Son of Man in the rest of the New Testament, including the Fourth Gospel (186-93). I am indebted to Dr. Cullmann for kindly allowing me to see the proofs of part of his book before publication); the survival of the title in early Judaistic Christianity (H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums* (1949), 78-82; E. Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 328; O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, 194 f.). The connection between the Son of Man and Enoch has been much discussed. In addition to the literature referred to in the course of this paper may be mentioned C. P. van Andel, *De Structuur van de Henoch-Traditie en het Nieuwe Testament* (1955). No reference is made to the Qumran documents in which the title Son of Man has not been found. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, 143, calls attention to the possible presence of the idea of the Second Adam in 1 QS 4, 23. The suggestion of some scholars (e.g. M. Black in SJT 6 (1953), 8; F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956), 103) that the Qumran community's self-identification with the Servant of the Lord in 2 Isa. (1 QS 8, 1 ff.) may be extended to include also the symbolic Son of Man figure in Dan. 7 (cf. CD xx, 8 (IX, 33B)) is doubtful because it rests on inferences only, and these in turn depend on a view of the relation between the two passages which is not demonstrable.

⁴ Dr. Manson admits in *Son of Man*, 190, that he allowed insufficient weight to this in *The Teaching of Jesus*.

⁵ *The Servant-Messiah*, 72.

⁶ *Die Henochgestalt. Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (1939), 86 ff. His suggestion that the Son of Man is a kind of Jewish counterpart to the Babylonian-Chaldaean god of wisdom Ea-Oannes is rejected by N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes* (1941), 297.

⁷ *Jesus the Messiah* (1943), 174 ff.

⁸ *He That Cometh* (1956), 420 ff.; but his whole long treatment of the Son of Man (346-450) deserves the closest attention.

⁹ E.g. *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (1950), 10 f.

¹⁰ *The Jung Codex: three studies* by H. C. Puech, G. Quispel and W. C. van Unnik translated and edited by F. L. Cross (1955), 78.

¹¹ Cf. O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (1957), 144.

¹² Cf. M. Black in SJT 7 (1954), 177: 'The ubiquity of the conception [of the Heavenly Man-Redeemer] in the middle and further East from the second century A.D. onwards in so many forms is difficult to explain as due entirely to Christian influence.'

¹³ *King and Messiah* (1955), 43.

¹⁴ *Jésus Transfiguré* (1947), 62-4; 'Behind the Son of Man as well as behind the Messiah there is the idea of the king', in his essay 'The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology', *The Background of the New Testament*

and its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (in honour of C. H. Dodd, 1956), 86.

¹⁵ 'Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique', RB 60 (1953), 170-202, 321-46.

¹⁶ 'Le messianisme sapientiel et les origines littéraires du Fils de l'homme daniélique', *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* [H. H. Rowley Festschrift], ed. M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas (*Supplements to VT* 3 (1955)), 33-41.

¹⁷ *The Second Advent* (1945), 14 ff. This suggestion is accepted by J. W. Bowman, *The Religion of Maturity* (1948), 225.

¹⁸ Cf. earlier E. A. Abbott, *The Son of Man* (1910) and D. Völter, *Die Menschensohn-Frage neu untersucht* (1916). J. Christensen in an article on Mark 14:21 (*ἄναγισ*) in *Studia Theologica* 10 (1957), 28-39, calls attention to the neglect of Ezek. 12 and its theme of 'departure', and thinks that both Ezekiel and apocalyptic must be taken into account.

¹⁹ 'The Meaning of "Son of Man"', JBL 60 (1941), 151-7.

²⁰ 'Son of Man', *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. A. Richardson (1950), 231 f. For a critique of the Ezekielic view see R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (1954), 99-102; cf. T. W. Manson, *Son of Man*, 172 f., and E. Percy, *Die Botschaft Jesu* (1953), 256 f.

²¹ Cf. E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (1946), 40 ff.; M. Goguel, *Jésus* (1950), 246 f.; S. Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, 346 f.; O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, 139 f.

²² But unfortunately for this theory *hahû' bar nāsā'* is nowhere found; cf. M. Black in ET 60 (1948), 34.

²³ See especially 64-6, 153-60, and for other names C. C. McCown in JR 28 (1948), 6; also now J. Knox, *The Death of Christ* (1958).

²⁴ In a third category of sayings which concern the Son of Man's earthly activities it is a matter of mistranslation of the Aramaic where it means 'man' or 'I'. For criticism of Bultmann's differentiation of two main groups of Son of Man sayings see E. Percy's remarks in *Die Botschaft Jesu* (1953), 245-9, especially the statement (p. 247): 'ihr [the primitive church] war aber der Tod und die Erhöhung Jesu als Voraussetzung seiner Wiederkunft als der "Menschensohn" bekannt. Für sie gab es deshalb kein Bedürfnis, die Parusie Jesu mit seinem Hingang durch den Tod und die Himmelfahrt zu verbinden, und die Überlieferung der Parusieworte ist selbstverständlich von dem Bedürfnis der christlichen Gemeinde nach Belehrung und Ermahnung bestimmt.' Cullmann, *op. cit.*, 159, thinks Bultmann's hypothesis creates more difficulties than it solves. G. Bornkamm, *Jesus von Nazareth* (2nd edn., 1957), 160 ff., 206 ff., agreeing with Bultmann's view of the parousia sayings, attributes the use of Son of Man as a self-designation of Jesus to the creativity of Christian prophets in the early Palestinian church.

²⁵ *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (1956), 55, 120, 174.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, 352.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, 360-2.

²⁸ *The Religion of Maturity* (1948), 225.

²⁹ *Parakletoi* (1940), 101.

³⁰ *Op. cit.*, 102, who also refers to a certain synthesis of features in the Son of

Man derived from the Davidic Messiah and the Servant (99, 101, 173 f.).

³¹ *The Intention of Jesus* (1945), 109, 127 f.

³² *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (1946), 140 ff.

³³ *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (2nd edn., 1946), 292.

³⁴ *Theology of the New Testament* i (1952), 52 f.

³⁵ *Christ the Conqueror* (1954), 9.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, 140 ff.

³⁷ *Op. cit.*, 151-3.

³⁸ *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), 29 f., 56 f.; *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), 80-2.

³⁹ *The Interpreter's Bible* vii (1951), 113.

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, 98, 106, 108.

⁴¹ *JTS* 48 (1947), 145 ff.

⁴² *According to the Scriptures* (1952), 116; *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (1953), 242 f.

⁴³ *Op. cit.*, 98; cf. also T. F. Glasson, *op. cit.*, 57 ff., and A. J. B. Higgins, *The Christian Significance of the Old Testament* (1949), 150-3, though I now feel the view there expressed requires reconsideration.

⁴⁴ For earlier advocates of the corporate interpretation in various forms see Cadoux's book, 100, n. 2.

⁴⁵ 'The "Son of Man" in the Teaching of Jesus', *ET* 60 (1948), 32-6 (33). F. V. Filson in *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* (1956), 142, goes no further than to allow the possibility of the collective meaning alongside the predominant personal reference.

⁴⁶ *JR* 28 (1948), 9.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, 239, n. 1; cf. A. Feuillet, *op. cit.*, 344: 'relève de la haute fantaisie'.

⁴⁸ *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien* (1955), 241, n.

⁴⁹ Cf. also H. Roberts, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (1955), 32; W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment* (1957), 46.

⁵⁰ *Jesus and His Church* (2nd edn., 1943), 54 f.; cf. T. F. Glasson, *op. cit.*, 54 f.

⁵¹ *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* (1954), 75.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 73.

⁵³ *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), 115; cf. *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), 81, n. 4; *The Unity of the Bible* (1953), 125, n. 1.

⁵⁴ *The Intention of Jesus* (1945), 165 ff.; *The Religion of Maturity* (1948), 235 ff.

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, 159; cf. *The Early Church*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (1956), 130.

⁵⁶ *Reichgottes und Menschensohn* (1934), Eng. trans. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (1938, 2nd edn., 1943); there is a valuable critique by C. F. Evans in *ET* 65 (1954), 303-6.

⁵⁷ *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), 56, n.

⁵⁸ Among recent discussions of chapters 70 and 71 in relation to the *Similitudes* and the consequent connection between Enoch and the Son of Man see P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (1934), 21, 25; J. Bowman, *ET* 59 (1948), 287; M. Black, *ET* 60 (1948), 12-14, also *JTS*, new series 3 (1952), 4-10 (the chapters represent an older Son of Man-Enoch tradition, integral to 1 En., 'out of which the *Similitudes* have grown, by a re-writing of the Enoch legend in support of a doctrine of a supernatural Messiah,

foreign to the original conception of 1 Enoch' (8)); H. Bietenhard, *Die himmische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (1951), 146 ff.; Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, 437 ff. (it is 'inconceivable' that chapter 71 depicts Enoch as becoming one with the Son of Man (444), as Sjöberg, who thinks it does, himself admits (*Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (1946), 187)); E. Percy, *op. cit.*, 256-9; T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 228 f., and *Son of Man*, 176 ff. Dr. Manson's opinion (reached independently of Messel's earlier collective view) is that the Son of Man in 1 En. is collective as in Dan. 7 except for chapters 70 f., in which Enoch becomes the nucleus of the elect community and the first historical actualization of the Son of Man who is not so much 'pre-existent' as 'an idea in the mind of God' (*Son of Man*, 188 f., to which Sjöberg replies in *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien* (1955), 45, n. 2). For criticism of Otto's theory in general see, e.g. V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (1943), 26 f.; W. Manson, *op. cit.*, 119 f.; T. F. Glasson, *op. cit.*, 48 ff.

⁵⁹ JTS 47 (1946), 81 f.

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.*, 248.

⁶¹ *Op. cit.*, 257.

⁶² *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien* (1955), 242.

⁶³ *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (1936), followed by F. C. Grant, *op. cit.*, 54, and in *The Interpreter's Bible* vii (1951), 641, 849.

⁶⁴ *The Book of Enoch translated* (2nd edn., 1912), 306.

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*, 244 ff.

⁶⁶ *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1948), 280, n. 1.

⁶⁷ *According to the Scriptures* (1952), 117, n. 2.

⁶⁸ *Bulletin* 3 (1952) of the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, 40 ff.

⁶⁹ *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), 62, n. 2.

⁷⁰ *The Servant of God* (1957), 58 ff., translated from art. *παῖς θεοῦ* in TWNT; cf. *Aux Sources de la Tradition chrétienne* [M. Goguel Festschrift] (1950), 113 ff.; also W. D. Davies, *op. cit.*, 279 f.

⁷¹ *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue* (1937), 80, n.

⁷² *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (1946), 116 ff., cf. also his *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien* (1955), 70 f., 257.

⁷³ *Op. cit.*, 410 ff.; neither was there any conception of a suffering and dying national Messiah, 325 ff.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 366, n. 3.

⁷⁵ *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (2nd edn., 1956), 7 f.

⁷⁶ *Jesus the Messiah*, 110, 116.

⁷⁷ *Son of Man and Kingdom of God* (1944), 89; cf. H. A. Guy, *The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things'* (1948), 81.

⁷⁸ Cf. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, 66, 113; J. W. Doeve, *op. cit.*, 119 ff.

⁷⁹ *Op. cit.*, 107 f.

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*, 96 ff.

⁸¹ *Le fils de l'homme* (1951), 44 f.

⁸² *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien* (1955), 218 f.