

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1958

### The Paradoxical Content of the Title Son of Man

Arno M. Klausmeier

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_klausmeiera@csl.edu

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



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Klausmeier, Arno M., "The Paradoxical Content of the Title Son of Man" (1958). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 566.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/566>

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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE PARADOXICAL CONTENT OF THE TITLE  
"SON OF MAN"

---

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of New Testament Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Arno M. Klausmeier

June 1958

Approved by:

Walter A. Schabelmann,  
Advisor

E. L. Lusk  
Reader

CHAPTER I

"SON OF MAN" AS A PARADOX

The problem with **TABLE OF CONTENTS** will be occupied as

Chapter		Page
I.	"SON OF MAN" AS A PARADOX . . . . .	1
II.	"SON OF MAN" IN THE OLD TESTAMENT . . . . .	4
III.	"SON OF MAN" IN INTER-TESTAMENTAL TIMES . . . . .	14
IV.	"SON OF MAN" IN OUR LORD'S USAGE . . . . .	27
V.	THE "SERVANT" OF ISAIAH AND ITS ADDITIONS TO THE CONTENT OF THE TERM "THE SON OF MAN". . . . .	45
VI.	SOME CONCLUSIONS AND SOME FURTHER QUESTIONS . . . . .	55
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>	<b>57</b>

from complete, and, hence, far from accurate, has kindled this author's interest. The paradoxical, always an intriguing approach, has further stimulated this study.

The Gospel of Mark was chosen for special consideration for two reasons: its priority is generally granted by most modern scholars; and its structure and theology, if not determined by Mark's doctrine of the "son of Man," are definitely in a relation of the problem of the paradoxical content of the title "son of Man." The fact that Mark includes a representative sample of the various contexts in which the title occurs in the four Gospels keeps this limitation from hindering the understanding of the phrase the "son of Man."

## CHAPTER I

### "SON OF MAN" AS A PARADOX

The problem with which this thesis will be occupied is the determination of the content of the title "Son of Man" and demonstrating the sources of this content. An investigation of this sort will prove that the content of "Son of Man" is anything but simple; it is paradoxical. Since this title is Jesus' favorite self-designation, writer and reader are justified to expect growth in the "knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ."

An incipient awareness that the popular interpretation of "Son of Man" as referring to the humanity of Christ is far from complete, and, hence, far from accurate, has kindled this author's interest. The paradoxical, always an intriguing approach, has further stimulated this study.

The Gospel of Mark was chosen for special consideration for two reasons: its priority is generally granted by most modern scholars; and its structure and theology, if not determined by Mark's doctrine of the "Son of Man," are definite aids to a solution of the problem of the paradoxical content of the title "Son of Man." The fact that Mark includes a representative sample of the various contexts in which the title occurs in the four Gospels keeps this limitation from hindering the understanding of the phrase the "Son of Man."

Since the form and a good bit of the content of this title are taken from the Book of Daniel, the Danielic usage of "Son of Man" must be examined first. The Book of Enoch, which amplifies the picture of the "Son of Man" drawn in Daniel, is the next source of information. Enoch, representative as it is of the Messianism current at the time of Christ, sheds considerable light on this important area. The "paradoxical content" of this title becomes apparent when Jesus' own use of "Son of Man" is considered, and a study of His "Son of Man" Verba indicates the source of the content which, in addition to the references in Daniel and Enoch, inform the "paradox." This source, the "Servant Songs" of Isaiah, chapters 40 to 66, is the final area of investigation.

The sources of data, in addition to the texts of Daniel, Enoch, Mark, and Isaiah, include commentaries, theologies of the two Testaments and histories of Jewish religion. Works treating the life of our Lord and His mission and Messianic consciousness were also consulted.

The results of this small study, which could never propose to be final or definitive, indicate that, while the form of the title "Son of Man" was based on the Book of Daniel and its extensions in the Book of Enoch, our Lord's use of the term indicates an additional content. The nature of the total content of "Son of Man" on the lips of Jesus is paradoxical; the "Son of Man" is the transcendently triumphant eschatological figure of Daniel and Enoch, but He is also the immanently

despised eschatological figure of Isaiah, chapters 40 to 66. As "Son of Man" He goes the way of the Cross, that paradox which sets Christianity apart from philosophy, with its inevitable process of mediation.<sup>1</sup> In the Cross of the "Son of Man" lies "the wisdom of God in a mystery."<sup>2</sup>

Vexilla Regis prodeunt;  
Fulget Crucis mysterium,  
Qua vita mortem pertulit,  
Et morte vitam protulit.

---

<sup>1</sup>Søren Kierkegaard, The Journals, in A Kierkegaard Anthology, edited by Robert Bretall (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946), p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>1 Corinthians 2:7. All quotations in this thesis from the canonical Scriptures are from the Authorized Version.

## CHAPTER II

### "SON OF MAN" IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The phrase "Son of Man" occurs reasonably often in poetic sections of the Old Testament (Num. 23:19, Is. 51:12, 56:2, Jer. 49:18,33, 50:40, 51:43, Ps. 8:5, 80:18, 146:3, Job 16:21, 25:6, 35:8) in poetic parallel with "man."<sup>1</sup> In these instances the phrase  $\square \uparrow \text{N} \text{ } \uparrow \text{ } \uparrow \text{ } \uparrow$  means "man qua man," and, in this general usage, refers quite simply to man as a creature. Although Feine<sup>2</sup> asserts that Jesus interpreted Psalm 8:5 Messianically in Matthew 21:16, His interpretation of the Psalm marks a legitimate extension of the phrase in Psalm 8:5, where it is still merely a poetic parallel for "man."

The largest number of occurrences of the phrase  $\square \uparrow \text{N} \text{ } \uparrow \text{ } \uparrow \text{ } \uparrow$  is in the Book of Ezekiel, where it is used eighty-nine times, most generally in the nominative of address to the prophet. In view of the total context of the book, there is general agreement among commentators that the phrase stresses "man" in his creatureliness as opposed to the high majesty of God. Thus in Ezekiel 2:1 the phrase "Son of Man" follows hard on the heels of the prophet's vision at the River Chebar of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Gustav Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated by D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 235.

<sup>2</sup>Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (vierte, neu bearbeitete Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922), p. 66.

transcendent God. In this context it is clear that the term "Son of Man" is God's address to His creature.

By far the most striking Old Testament occurrence of the phrase "Son of Man" is found in Daniel 7:13:

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.<sup>3</sup>

Rutz<sup>4</sup> quotes Feine, Haeverick and Zoekler to the effect that the coming "with the clouds" would seem, on the basis of parallels (e.g. Is. 19:1, Ps. 97:2, 104:3, Nahum 1:3), to indicate that "the 'one like the Son of Man' ought to be God."<sup>5</sup> The aura of divinity is certainly present in the picture of this "Son of Man," Rutz adds, since the "glory" of Jaweh is paralleled by "clouds" in I Kings 8:10f. and Ezekiel 10:3.<sup>6</sup> Oepke, however, takes a contrary view.<sup>7</sup>

Montgomery<sup>8</sup> emphasizes, on the basis of the comparative particle  $\text{כִּי}$ , that the "Son of Man" is not a real entity, but, in line with parallels in Daniel (8:15, 10:16 and 10:18),

<sup>3</sup>Daniel 7:13.

<sup>4</sup>Karl William Rutz, "The Son of Man in Daniel" (unpublished term paper in Mr. Rutz's possession), pp. 2f.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, in International Critical Commentary, edited by S. R. Driver, A. Plummer and C. A. Briggs (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 318.



merely resembles a man. However, Zoeckler disagrees, insisting that "der Menschensohn ist eine in Wahrheit uebermenschliche, aber dabei noch menschenartige Persoenlichkeit."<sup>9</sup> This problem would seem to be impossible to solve with finality since definitions of "reality" are not universal.

The question involved in an interpretation of this "Son of Man" are somewhat complex. The term has been interpreted Messianically, but this view has met with considerable opposition. "Son of Man" has been variously interpreted as referring to one person, but this "personal" interpretation has been contested by scholars who maintain that the "Son of Man" is a corporate entity or a community. Other commentators interpret "Son of Man" as a mythological-apocalyptic figure. Each of these interpretations may again be divided into Messianic and non-Messianic interpretations. A quick survey of representative views will indicate the complexity of the Danielic "Son of Man."

The "collective" or "communal" interpretation is championed by Cadoux,<sup>10</sup> Klausner,<sup>11</sup> Buechsel,<sup>12</sup> et al. This view

---

<sup>9</sup>O. Zoeckler, Der Prophet Daniel in Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von J. P. Lange (Bielefeld und Leipzig: Belhagen und Klasing, 1870), p. 142.

<sup>10</sup>Cecil John Cadoux, The Historical Mission of Jesus (New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.), p. 92.

<sup>11</sup>Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 229.

<sup>12</sup>Friedrich Buechsel, Jesus, Verkuendigung und Geschichte (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1947), p. 205.

receives its best support from the close correspondence between the "Son of Man" and the "saints of the Most High."<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, virtually all Messianic interpretations are "personal."<sup>14</sup> Klausner, an exception to this generalization, insists that "the entire people of Israel is the Messiah that will exercise everlasting dominion throughout the world."<sup>15</sup>

While the "corporate" or "communal" and the "personal" interpretations seem to be diametrically opposed to each other, there is no reason why one should be correct to the exclusion of the other. Heinisch<sup>16</sup> stresses the close connection between the nation or people and their king, for which he finds analogies among the earthly kingdoms. Cadoux<sup>17</sup> brings a telling clue to light when he mentions the Hebrew affinity for lumping an individual and a group together quite indiscriminately. Thus the "Son of Man" in Daniel may well be the redeemed community with its leader; thus "Son of Man" may be "personal" and "communal" simultaneously.

The question whether this "Son of Man" is Messianic or not is complicated by the very fact that our Lord chose its

---

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Daniel 7:13-28.

<sup>14</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 60.

<sup>15</sup>Klausner, op. cit., p. 230.

<sup>16</sup>Paul Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by Rev. William Heit (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950), p. 325.

<sup>17</sup>Cadoux, loc. cit.

form as His favorite self-designation. If the Danielic passage is viewed in abstracto it will probably be interpreted as non-Messianic. On the other hand, an a posteriori interpretation, which will stress Jesus' use of the phrase, will, in all likelihood, be a Messianic interpretation.

Thus Buechsel<sup>18</sup> and Schuerer<sup>19</sup> are among those who agree that Daniel portrays a non-Messianic figure, if by "Messianic" a personal Messiah is indicated. Similarly Klausner<sup>20</sup> terms this passage as Messianic in terms of the "saints of the Most High," rather than in terms of a personal Messiah. On the other hand, the commentators who lay considerable stress on Jesus' own use of the term are almost forced to interpret Daniel as referring to the personal Messiah.

Klausner,<sup>21</sup> despite his conviction that Daniel chapter 7 refers to the "saints of the Most High," admits that a Messianic interpretation soon arose in Jewish circles. Buechsel<sup>22</sup> is ready to grant that it was applied to the Messiah already before the time of Jesus, and Charles<sup>23</sup> states more precisely

---

<sup>18</sup>Buechsel, loc. cit.

<sup>19</sup>Emil Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, authorized translation (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), II, 137.

<sup>20</sup>Klausner, loc. cit.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Buechsel, op. cit., p. 206.

<sup>23</sup>R. H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 61.

that "Daniel 7:13 . . . was from the first century B.C. onward interpreted messianically. [sic]" Haeverick<sup>24</sup> points out that some Jewish rabbis called the Messiah "der Umwoelkte," an obvious allusion to Daniel 7:13.

Thus, no matter how Daniel is dated, the differences of opinion regarding the questions of "personal" or "communal" and "Messianic" or "non-Messianic" depend on the scholars' approach. An approach which isolates Daniel and then moves to the time of Christ will almost inevitably produce a "communal" and "non-Messianic" interpretation, while an approach that stresses Jesus' application of the phrase to Himself will almost inevitably be "personal" and "Messianic." A late dating of Daniel, possibly a second century B.C. date,<sup>25</sup> will considerably simplify the problem, since then less time intervenes between the date of Daniel and the time of Christ.

The so-called "mythical" interpretation, advanced by Lietzmann<sup>26</sup> and very fully presented by Otto,<sup>27</sup> sees in the "Son of Man" an "Urmensch" with close parallels in contemporary oriental religions. Kittel's<sup>28</sup> view that the "Son of

---

<sup>24</sup>Heinrich Andreas Christoph Haevernick, Commentar ueber das Buch Daniel (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1832), pp. 242-245.

<sup>25</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>26</sup>Hans Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, translated by Bertram Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 364.

<sup>27</sup>Rudolph Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), passim.

<sup>28</sup>Rudolph Kittel, Die Religion des Volkes Israel (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921), p. 180.

"Man" is neither a person nor the Jewish nation, but rather "an angelic being," represents a similar and related interpretation.

In summary, Daniel 7:13 represents the "Son of Man" as a heavenly being in human form who is closely identified with the redeemed community. He is a figure of cosmic dimensions, intimately linked up with God's plan for His Kingdom. His personality includes the communal personality of the "saints of the Most High," but is nonetheless distinct; he is one who comes in divine glory, but is still distinct from the "Ancient of Days."

To understand the figure of the "Son of Man" is to understand his functions. The following verse describes his glory and his task:

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.<sup>29</sup>

Chapter two of Daniel sheds light on the donation of a kingdom to the "Son of Man." In Daniel 2:37ff. God, who can be equated with chapter seven's "Ancient of Days," gives a kingdom to Nebuchadnezzar. Here a kingdom is given to the "Son of Man." The word "kingdom," as Rutz<sup>30</sup> mentions, is used in the Book of Daniel both of kings, to whom the rule is given (Dan. 4:19, 6:27, 7:6,12,26,27), and of God, who rules (Dan. 3:33, 4:31, 6:27). Whereas the kingdoms of this

---

<sup>29</sup>Dan. 7:14.

<sup>30</sup>Rutz, op. cit., p. 9.

world are ephemeral, and are taken away by the same God Who gives them, the kingdom of the "Son of Man" is "one that shall not be destroyed," and his "dominion is an everlasting dominion."<sup>31</sup> From this evidence, and since the kingdom of the "Son of Man" is described in terms applied to God's own rule (4:33), Rutz<sup>32</sup> concludes that the "Son of Man" is either God Himself or else God's representative ruler. In view of the sharp distinction between the "Son of Man" and "God" or "the Ancient of Days,"<sup>33</sup> the latter possibility seems questionable.

The donation of a kingdom to the "Son of Man" is further explained in Daniel 7:17 and 18, where the four kingdoms of the four kings, temporal as they are, are superseded by the kingdom which "the saints of the Most High" receive. The reception is but the obverse of the donation of the kingdom to the "Son of Man," and the eternal character of the kingdoms is common to both. However, as has been stated above,<sup>34</sup> the impossibility of drawing an absolutely clean line between the "Son of Man" and "the saints of the Most High" is indicated by the Jewish approach to individual-community relationships.

---

<sup>31</sup>Dan. 7:14.

<sup>32</sup>Rutz, loc. cit.

<sup>33</sup>The "Son of Man" "came to the Ancient of days [sic]," and "they brought him near before him [i.e., the Ancient of days]," cf. Dan. 7:13.

<sup>34</sup>Supra, p. 7.

The exact nature and exact limits of this relationship are undetermined. It is possible, to be sure, that verses seventeen and eighteen are a commentary on the vision of verse thirteen, but this observation also falls under the general rubric that the existence of the individual apart from his community is not characteristically Hebraistic.

To return to verse fourteen, the donation of glory is, in Danielic usage (cf. 2:6,37, 5:18) closely connected with royal prestige, and is frequently given as a gift.<sup>35</sup> Thus this "glory" has definite regal implications, as does the notice that "all people, nations, and languages . . . serve him."<sup>36</sup> Since the "Son of Man" receives the donations of God's rule, the universality of that rule, already underlined by God's ability to give and to take away kingdoms, is posited of the "Son of Man."<sup>37</sup> The kingdom of the "Son of Man" is, in conclusion, God's own universal and absolute rule (cf. 7:27). This rule is again closely linked with the rule of the "saints of the Most High."

The Old Testament usage of the term "Son of Man," in summary, indicates man in his humanity as opposed to God in His divinity (Psalms, Nahum, Ezekiel). While the humanity of the "Son of Man" is still rigorously maintained in the Book of

---

<sup>35</sup>Rutz, loc. cit.

<sup>36</sup>Dan. 7:14.

<sup>37</sup>Supra, pp.10f.

Daniel, he is certainly more than an ordinary human being, more than a prophet. Although he stands in close proximity to the "Ancient of days," he is also closely related to the "saints of the Most High." An eschatological figure who replaces the kingdoms of this world, the "Son of Man" rules the eternal and universal kingdom which he has received from the "Ancient of days."

The Book of Daniel, being this work as by no means a minor, its study of prophetic Daniel indicates that the book of Daniel carries a great deal of expected to shed considerable light both on the general eschatological expectation with which our Lord had to deal and also on the use of the phrase as his favorite self-designation.

The Book of Daniel, now best preserved in the Syriac version, has been variously dated between the second century B.C. and the third century A.D. The portion of the book which is most informative for the phrase "Son of Man" is chapters 7 to 12, which both Eastman<sup>1</sup> and Terence<sup>2</sup> offer as an excellent study. This portion of Daniel is generally given the name "The Parable," since it is composed of a series of visions. Eastman calls it "The eschatological book,"<sup>3</sup> and states that it was probably set into its final form by an

<sup>1</sup> Eastman, *The Book of Daniel and Its Interpretation for the Living Church* (Philadelphia: J. C. Lippincott, 1907), p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Carter Terence, *Eschatological Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926), p. 110-111.

<sup>3</sup> Eastman, op. cit., p. 110.



## CHAPTER III

### "SON OF MAN" IN INTER-TESTAMENTAL TIMES

The most important single document for an understanding of the term "Son of Man" in Jewish religious thought and expectation at the time of Christ is the Book of Enoch. Although the matter of dating this work is by no means simple, the range of proposed dating indicates that the Book of Enoch certainly might be expected to shed considerable light both on the type of Messianic expectation with which our Lord had to deal and also on His use of the phrase as His favorite self-designation.

The Book of Enoch, now best preserved in the Ethiopic version, has been variously dated between the second century B.C. and the first century A.D. The portion of the book which is most informative for the phrase "Son of Man" is chapters 37 to 71, which both Kautzsch<sup>1</sup> and Torrey<sup>2</sup> define as an essential unity. This portion of Enoch is generally given the name "The Parables," since it is composed of a series of visions. Kautzsch calls it "Das messialogische Buch,"<sup>3</sup> and states that it was probably put into its final form by an

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900), II, 223.

<sup>2</sup>Charles Cutler Torrey, Apocryphal Literature (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), pp. 110-114.

<sup>3</sup>Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 220.

editor other than the author or editor of the rest of the book.<sup>4</sup>

The earliest dating given the book is a range from 167 to 64 B.C., advanced by Clemen and noted by Kautzsch.<sup>5</sup> Charles likewise grants a century-long span of possible dating: "the first century B.C.,"<sup>6</sup> but is ready to grant the possibility of narrowing this estimate to between 95 and 64 B.C.<sup>7</sup> Torrey<sup>8</sup> proposes a date within the first decade of the first century B.C. on the basis of internal evidence. Hoelscher<sup>9</sup> is satisfied to limit the possibilities to the first century B.C., but does not become dogmatically absolute. Klausner,<sup>10</sup> again making reference to historical evidences, prefers to date chapters 37 to 71 at the time of Queen Salome Alexandra, i.e., 70 to 68 B.C. An even later dating is advanced by Bissel,<sup>11</sup> who, on the basis of the divine name, angelology, eschatology,

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 224.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>R. H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 57.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 224.

<sup>8</sup>Torrey, op. cit., p. 114.

<sup>9</sup>Gustav Hoelscher, Geschichte der israelitischen und juedischen Religion (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1922), p. 189.

<sup>10</sup>Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 227.

<sup>11</sup>Edwin Cone Bissel, The Apocrypha of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), p. 666.

etc., refers the work to a period around the time of Herod the Great [i.e., 37 B.C.] at the very earliest. While Kautzsch<sup>12</sup> mentions that internal evidence [e.g., references to the Pharisees, Sadducees and Hasmoneans] allows the possibility of dating chapters 37 to 71 between 37 and 4 B.C., but lack of definite allusion to the Romans indicates a terminus ad quem of 64 B.C. Buechsel<sup>13</sup> states skeptically that it is not certain that this portion of Enoch can be dated earlier than the time of Christ. Paul Volz<sup>14</sup> is quite ready to grant that this section of Enoch can be dated between 50 B.C. and 50 A.D.

With this range of dating it is hard to underestimate the relevance of a study of the "Parables" of Enoch. The "Son of Man" is the leading figure in this portion of the book, both under that term and in various parallel epithets, such as "the chosen one" (39:6, 40:5, 45:5f., 46:3, 49:2,4, 51:3, 52:6,9, 53:6, 55:4, 61:5,8, 62:1),<sup>15</sup> and "the chosen one of righteousness and faithfulness" (39:6),<sup>16</sup> in which the element of

---

<sup>12</sup>Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 231.

<sup>13</sup>Friedrich Buechsel, Jesus, Verkuendigung und Geschichte (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1947), p. 206.

<sup>14</sup>Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der juedischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934), p. 185.

<sup>15</sup>Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im spaet-hellennistischen Zeitalter, edited by Hugo Gressmann (Third edition; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926), p. 263.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

"choice" is referred by Kautzsch<sup>17</sup> to a double tradition parallel to the two angeli interpretes. The title "the righteous one" appears often (38:2,3, 53:6; cf. 46:3 and 71:14),<sup>18</sup> and the epithet "the anointed" or "the Messiah" is applied to the supernatural figure in chapter 48:10 and chapter 52:4.<sup>19</sup> The Enochic "Son of Man" is "the bearer of God's spirit" (49:3),<sup>20</sup> "hidden" by God (48:6, 62:7) since he belongs to the heavenly world, but revealed to the righteous.<sup>21</sup>

The fact that this "Son of Man" is an apocalyptic eschatological figure can be seen in the fact that he is "enthroned" (62:2,3,5, 69:27,29), possibly on God's throne (62:2).<sup>22</sup> One of the chief considerations against the interpretation of the "throne" in chapter 62:2 is the uncertainty of the text in chapter 51:3 and chapter 55:4.<sup>23</sup> Sjoeborg<sup>24</sup> states, however, that, whether or not this is God's throne, it must still be said that the "enthronement" of the "Son of Man" shows that

---

<sup>17</sup>Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 227.

<sup>18</sup>Bousset, op. cit., pp. 262f.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 263.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Erik Sjoeborg, Der Menschensohn im aethiopischen Henochbuch (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 115.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 66f.

he has assumed an activity and function of God. Charles<sup>25</sup> seems to infer a similar interpretation when he mentions the Enochic "Son of Man" as an example of the Messiah's jurisdiction entrenching on the divine.

The enthroned "Son of Man" judges in God's stead, for the day of the great judgment becomes the day of the "chosen one" (61:5, 51:3).<sup>26</sup> As judge he judges the angels (55:4, 61:8f.), especially the company of Azazel.<sup>27</sup> The kings of the earth stand before him in trembling (62:1ff., 63:3), and when the "chosen one" assumes his throne all creatures fall down before him (48:5).<sup>28</sup>

Since the concept of a final great judgment is generally associated with a judgment to salvation and to damnation, it is interesting to note that, while the "Son of Man" judges sinners (69:27ff., 49:4, 62:3, chapter 52, 62:10, 48:10, 62:11; cf. 63:1, 63:10, 53:3ff., 54:1f., 48:9, 45:3, 38:1,3), it is not explicitly stated that he judges the righteous, although some would adduce chapter 45:3, chapter 61:8f. and chapter 62:3 to this effect.<sup>29</sup> Sjoeborg<sup>30</sup> grants that the "Son of Man"

---

<sup>25</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 76.

<sup>26</sup>Bousset, op. cit., pp. 263ff.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Sjoeborg, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>30</sup>Sjoeborg, op. cit., p. 79.

redeems sinners, but he does not redeem them from sin. Nevertheless, the "Son of Man" is in close connection with the redeemed, for both bear the titles "chosen" or "elect" and "righteous."<sup>31</sup> In this connection Sjoeborg<sup>32</sup> insists that the "Son of Man" is not a mere personification of the righteous community, as Holtzmann<sup>33</sup> states. Charles is at pains to differentiate between the Danielic figure, whom he interprets communally, and the "Son of Man" in Enoch, whom he sees as "the supernatural Messiah."<sup>34</sup>

The supernatural character of the "Son of Man" in Enoch is particularly apparent in the fact that he is not born, but rather is an angelic being.<sup>35</sup> This angelic character is deduced by Feine<sup>36</sup> from the fact that the "Son of Man" is "clothed with might and majesty." Sjoeborg<sup>37</sup> is not content to give the "Son of Man" merely angelic status, but insists that he is above even the angels. This seems to be documented in part by the fact that he judges the angels.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 97-101, passim.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>33</sup>O. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), I, 88.

<sup>34</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 85.

<sup>35</sup>Bousset, op. cit., p. 263.

<sup>36</sup>Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (vierte, neu bearbeitete Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922), p. 61.

<sup>37</sup>Sjoeborg, op. cit., p. 94.

<sup>38</sup>Supra, note 27.

Bousset<sup>39</sup> bases a rather highly developed doctrine of the pre-existence of the "Son of Man" on chapter 46:1. The "name" of the "Son of Man" is certainly pre-existent (48:3), and his "hiddenness" or "hiding" after his creation (cf. 62:6) indicates to Bousset<sup>40</sup> that he pre-existed before the world began.

The doctrine of the pre-existence of the "Son of Man" is the chief point of departure for those who see an "Urmensch" behind the figure of Enoch's "Son of Man." Thus Volz<sup>41</sup> is ready to posit a "primordial man" behind the figure in both Daniel and Enoch, and Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel<sup>42</sup> agree with Volz, although they do not argue from comparative religions, as, for example, Rudolph Otto does.<sup>43</sup> Probably the safest conclusion will agree with Buechsel, who makes the Iranian or general Near-Eastern source of the figure in Enoch an "open question."<sup>44</sup> At this point it must be noted that the figure in Enoch has been connected with Joel 2:32, 3:14-16 and

---

<sup>39</sup>Bousset, op. cit., p. 263.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Volz, op. cit., pp. 189f.

<sup>42</sup>Rudolph Knopf, Hans Lietzmann and Heinrich Weinel, Bin-  
fuhrung in das Neue Testament (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann,  
1949), pp. 220, 301.

<sup>43</sup>Rudolph Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn (Muenchen:  
C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), passim; Cecil John  
Cadoux, The Historical Mission of Jesus (New York: Harper &  
Brothers, n.d.), p. 93.

<sup>44</sup>Buechsel, op. cit., p. 207.

Zechariah 14 in the canonical Scriptures.<sup>45</sup>

In the area of dependencies, the Danielic "Son of Man" dare not be overlooked as a primary source for Enoch's portrayal. Although Schuerer<sup>46</sup> interprets Daniel's "Son of Man" communally, he connects the personal figure of Enoch with chapter seven of Daniel. Hoelscher<sup>47</sup> states that the figure of the "Son of Man" in Daniel, there a symbol of the community, is applied to the Messiah by the "Parables" of Enoch.

The discussion of Enoch's interpretation of Daniel's "Son of Man" raises the related and paramountly important question whether Enoch uses "Son of Man" as a title, and, if so, whether this is a Messianic title, and, if so, whether it refers to a personal Messiah.

Volz sees the term "Son of Man" as a "formal eschatological title,"<sup>48</sup> and Bousset<sup>49</sup> sketches the inevitable development from the simple word "man" to the title "the Man" in the following terms: the descriptive and limiting definite article makes of "man" "that man," and, once this stage of development is reached, the ultimate result is nothing less than a

---

<sup>45</sup>John Bright, The Kingdom of God (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953), p. 168.

<sup>46</sup>Eilil Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, authorized translation (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), II, 158.

<sup>47</sup>Hoelscher, op. cit., pp. 192f.

<sup>48</sup>Volz, op. cit., pp. 186f.

<sup>49</sup>Bousset, op. cit., p. 266.



title. This general rubric would tend to invalidate the conclusions of B. D. Erdmans, H. Lietzmann and J. Wellhausen<sup>50</sup> that it means, and can mean, no more than "man." However it is not clear whether the "development" outlined by Bousset was immediate or gradual; therefore the conclusion must remain somewhat in suspension.

The question of an explicit Messianism in the term "Son of Man" in Enoch is not simply answered. The fact that degrees of Messianity are possible would admit the implicit presence of elements in the phrase that our Lord could develop even beyond whatever stage it had reached before His day. But this problem suffers from the same problem which besets the solution of the "personality" of the Messiah in Daniel.<sup>51</sup>

Kautzsch<sup>52</sup> presupposes the Messianic content of the "Son of Man" in Enoch, as do R. Otto,<sup>53</sup> Paul Volz,<sup>54</sup> Friedrich Buechsel,<sup>55</sup> Schodde<sup>56</sup> and even the modern Jewish scholar Klausner, who calls the "Parables" of Enoch "an essentially

---

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Sjoeberg, op. cit., p. 40.

<sup>51</sup>Supra, pp. 7f.

<sup>52</sup>Kautzsch, op. cit., pp. 222f., 227f.

<sup>53</sup>Sjoeberg, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>54</sup>Volz, op. cit., p. 187.

<sup>55</sup>Buechsel, op. cit., p. 206.

<sup>56</sup>George H. Schodde, The Book of Enoch (Andover: Warren P. Draper, 1911), p. 50.

Messianic document."<sup>57</sup> Sjoeborg summarizes huge blocks of critical scholarship when he concludes thus:

Meistens akzeptiert man jedoch heute den Menschensohn als einen juedischen, in den apokalyptischen Kreisen gebrauchten Messiasnamen, und findet ihn durch I Hen. 37-71 [sic] belegt.<sup>58</sup>

He goes on to credit this general opinion to the observation of Charles that the "demonstrative reproduces, in all cases, the Greek definite article."<sup>59</sup> The fact that this view presupposes a Greek original may well lie behind the more cautious remarks of Taylor that this is "a moot point."<sup>60</sup> Nonetheless, Sjoeborg is positive: "Es steht also fest: aus allgemeinen Gruenden kann die Ansicht Charles' [sic] nicht widerlegt werden."<sup>61</sup>

The questions of the currency of the Book of Enoch and of its Messianic or non-Messianic interpretation are closely interwoven. For this reason, and because of the difficulties involved, there is an almost irreconcilable variety of interpretations. Some scholars say that Enoch was current and was interpreted Messianically,<sup>62</sup> others grant its currency, but

---

<sup>57</sup>Klausner, op. cit., p. 289.

<sup>58</sup>Sjoeborg, op. cit., p. 41.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 45.

<sup>60</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (London: The Macmillan Company, 1952), pp. 119f.

<sup>61</sup>Sjoeborg, op. cit., p. 41

<sup>62</sup>Knopf, et al., op. cit., pp. 300f.

deny its Messianic interpretation,<sup>63</sup> and yet others state that, apart from its connection with Enoch, the term "Son of Man" could not have been understood at all.<sup>64</sup> Charles<sup>65</sup> cautiously grants the possibility of the currency of Enoch on the basis of parallels with Jer. Taanith. Volz,<sup>66</sup> on the other hand, is adamantly opposed to granting its general currency. The argument that Enoch represents merely a faulty interpretation of Daniel chapter 7<sup>67</sup> is quite convincingly refuted by the observation of Bousset<sup>68</sup> that the pre-existence of the Enochic "Son of Man" is possible only from the phrase itself, which has its origin in Daniel. But no matter whether the Danielic figure was properly or improperly understood by Enoch, the fact remains that a "belief in that heavenly man existed, and, in the apocalyptic context, was sufficiently expressed by the simple 'the Man.'"<sup>69</sup>

While any reference to Jesus' use of the term may be proleptic, it is nevertheless interesting to note that, although

---

<sup>63</sup>Peine, op. cit., p. 61; Cadoux, op. cit., p. 98.

<sup>64</sup>Sjoeberg, op. cit., pp. 57, 59.

<sup>65</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 93.

<sup>66</sup>Volz, op. cit., p. 188.

<sup>67</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 93.

<sup>68</sup>Bousset, op. cit., pp. 266f.

<sup>69</sup>Sjoeberg, op. cit., p. 59, this author's translation.

Moore, Manson and Cadoux<sup>70</sup> doubt the likelihood of Jesus' acquaintance with Enoch, Kautzsch<sup>71</sup> insists that Enoch is representative of contemporary Jewish folklore, and Baldensperger<sup>72</sup> states categorically that He took His "Son of Man" from folklore. The objection that the "Son of Man" references in the Book of Enoch are Christian interpolations is well refuted by Kautzsch,<sup>73</sup> who calls attention to the fact that, if this were the case, the interpolator did not take advantage of this opportunity to introduce a more complete Christian dogmatics into Enoch; if it is argued that the interpolator attempted a casual intrusion, this argument falls when it is seen that the title was current enough already at Jesus' time not to demand explanation as a new departure. An additional argument against this proposed Christian interpolator is the fact that Judaism after the time of Christ banned "all the great Jewish apocalypses which were written before 10 A.D., and which carried on the mystical and spiritual side of religion as opposed to the legalistic."<sup>74</sup>

In summary, the teaching of the Book of Enoch regarding

---

<sup>70</sup>Cf. Cadoux, op. cit., p. 99.

<sup>71</sup>Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 233.

<sup>72</sup>Quoted by Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 232.

<sup>73</sup>Kautzsch, loc. cit.

<sup>74</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 44.

the "Son of Man," which Bissel<sup>75</sup> and Torrey<sup>76</sup> see as no essential addition to the Old Testament's previous doctrine, does, at least, show a clarification of the Danielic portrayal of the apocalyptic Messiah whose title was chosen by our Lord as His favorite self-designation. Enoch's "Son of Man" is also called "the chosen one," "the chosen one of righteousness and faithfulness," "the righteous one," "the anointed" or "the Messiah," and, as "the bearer of God's spirit," he is both "hidden" by God and revealed by Him as the "enthroned" judge, who, acting in God's stead, judges angels and kings; the "Son of Man" brings the world kingdoms to a trembling halt, judges sinners and stands in the closest proximity of the "chosen" or "elect" and "righteous" community. As the "man," he stands before men in a divine confrontation.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Bissel, loc. cit.

<sup>76</sup>Torrey, op. cit., p. 111.

<sup>77</sup>Bright, op. cit., pp. 170f.

## CHAPTER IV

### "SON OF MAN" IN OUR LORD'S USAGE

The term "Son of Man" occurs some eighty times in the New Testament,<sup>1</sup> and, except for Acts 7:56, it occurs only as a self-designation in the mouth of Jesus Himself.<sup>2</sup> John 13:24, in which the term is used by "the people," is not an exception, since it is manifestly an indirect quotation of Jesus' own claim.<sup>3</sup>

For the purposes of this paper the Gospel of Mark has been singled out for special consideration since it epitomizes the general synoptic doctrine of the "Son of Man" and particularly since, in modern times, the second Gospel has assumed a definite place of priority in the study of the Jesus of the Gospels.<sup>4</sup>

The occurrences of the term "Son of Man" in Mark, as well as in the other Gospels, fall into three groups. Franzmann<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Martin H. Franzmann, Basileia tou Theou (Saint Louis: Concordia Seminary Print Shop, 1956), p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>August Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium nach seinen Quellenwerthe (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1867), pp. 1f.: cf. Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (London: The Macmillan Company, 1952), pp. 1-25 for a history of Markan interpretations.

<sup>5</sup>Franzmann, op. cit., pp. 69-72, passim.

labels the three thus:

1. "Son of Man" in eschatological contexts (Mk. 8:38, 13:26, 14:62)
2. "Son of Man" in humiliation and Passion contexts (Mk. 8:31, 9:31, 10:33, 10:45, 9:12, 14:21)
3. "Son of Man" in contexts which speak of the present authority of Jesus (Mk. 2:27f.)

To this list Mark 9:9 may be added as "eschatological," Mark 14:41 as "humiliation and Passion," and Mark 2:10 as "present authority." Hunter<sup>6</sup> divides the Markan passages similarly under the following heads: (1) exaltation, (2) humiliation and (3) statements of a quite general nature.

The "eschatological" group are the following:

Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and 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.<sup>7</sup>

And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of Man were risen from the dead.<sup>8</sup>

And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory.<sup>9</sup>

And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>A. M. Hunter, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1948), pp. 43f.

<sup>7</sup>Mark 8:38.

<sup>8</sup>Mark 9:9.

<sup>9</sup>Mark 13:26.

<sup>10</sup>Mark 14:62.

In Mark 8:38 there can be little doubt that our Lord intended His hearers to recall the Danielic "Son of Man."<sup>11</sup> The "glory of His Father" and His coming "with the holy angels" is strongly reminiscent of Daniel. Taylor<sup>12</sup> indicates that this passage betrays close parallels with Enoch 51:8 and 52:2, where the "chosen one" is placed "on the throne of glory" or "on the throne of his glory," from which he judges the righteous, kings and mighty men. Another interesting parallel is Enoch 63:11, where the "Son of Man" judges those who have "belied the Lord of the Spirits and His Messiah." Cadoux's<sup>13</sup> note that "being ashamed of the 'Son of Man'" includes being ashamed of him is in line with the "communal" interpretation of the "Son of Man" in Daniel and Enoch.<sup>14</sup>

In Mark 9:9 the Resurrection is, in a real sense, eschatological, but this passage might also fit under the heading of "Passion," since the Resurrection presupposes the Cross.

In Mark 13:26 the "clouds" and "power and glory" again hark back to the figure of Daniel 7, where the "Son of Man" comes as the divinely invested judge.<sup>15</sup>

In Mark 14:62 the combination of the "right hand of power,

---

<sup>11</sup>Cecil John Cadoux, The Historical Mission of Jesus (New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.), p. 99.

<sup>12</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 383.

<sup>13</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 229.

<sup>14</sup>Supra, chapters II and III.

<sup>15</sup>Supra, chapter II.



and coming in the clouds of heaven" with the statement "I am," with all the divine implications of this phrase,<sup>16</sup> is seen by Cadoux as "an exception to the general privacy" with which Jesus used the term "Son of Man."<sup>17</sup> Nonetheless, Cadoux<sup>18</sup> characterizes this answer before the High Priest as a direct avowal of Messianity based on Daniel chapter 7.

These "eschatological" references make it quite clear that Jesus, if He did not intend to assume the role of Judge,<sup>19</sup> certainly used terminology with which He applied the pictures of Daniel and Enoch to Himself.

The passages which speak of the "present authority" of Jesus are but two in number:<sup>20</sup>

But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy),<sup>21</sup>

Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.<sup>22</sup>

Mark 2:10 especially indicates Jesus' own conviction that He is the Messiah who brings God's rule.<sup>23</sup> Although these passages

---

<sup>16</sup>Exodus 2:14.

<sup>17</sup>Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 59, 293.

<sup>19</sup>Thus Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

<sup>20</sup>These passages are examined at this point, contrary to the order given above, for reasons of continuity.

<sup>21</sup>Mark 2:10.

<sup>22</sup>Mark 2:28.

<sup>23</sup>Luke 5:21 indicates that the Jews knew forgiveness to be a divine prerogative, cf. Ps. 103:3.

pose exegetical problems, they do not play an important part in determining the content of the title "Son of Man," and may be dismissed as "statements of a quite general kind."<sup>24</sup>

The passages in which the humiliation and Passion of the "Son of Man" are treated are of vital importance for an understanding of the content of the title. They are the following:

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.<sup>25</sup>

And he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how that it is written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at naught.<sup>26</sup>

For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of Man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day.<sup>27</sup>

Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles,

and they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him; and the third day he shall rise again.<sup>28</sup>

For even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.<sup>29</sup>

The Son of Man indeed goeth, as it is written of him:

---

<sup>24</sup>Supra, note 6.

<sup>25</sup>Mark 8:31.

<sup>26</sup>Mark 9:12.

<sup>27</sup>Mark 9:31.

<sup>28</sup>Mark 10:33f.

<sup>29</sup>Mark 10:45.

but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.<sup>30</sup>

And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.<sup>31</sup>

For the purposes of this paper a summary of the exegetical possibilities of the term "Son of Man" will suffice, since the content of the title is the concern of this thesis. Vincent Taylor<sup>32</sup> gives the following outline of interpretations:

1. Man in general
2. The collective community
3. "I who speak" was changed to "Son of Man" by later tradition
4. The "Ideal man"
5. Used by Jesus as a challenge for reflection, and, after Caesarea Phillipi, used to explain the coming Passion.

The first interpretation is probably the simplest and most natural, and Feine<sup>33</sup> attests the fact that the Greek and Latin fathers applied it, ever since the second century, to the human descent of Jesus. Buechsel<sup>34</sup> agrees that it is merely "man," and Feine<sup>35</sup> mentions with approval Baur's observation that

---

<sup>30</sup>Mark 14:21.

<sup>31</sup>Mark 14:41.

<sup>32</sup>Taylor, op. cit., pp. 197f., passim.

<sup>33</sup>Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (vierte, neu bearbeitete Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922), p. 57.

<sup>34</sup>Friedrich Buechsel, Jesus, Verkuendigung und Geschichte (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1947), pp. 202f.

<sup>35</sup>Feine, loc. cit.

Jesus used this particular term in express opposition to the Jewish interpretation of a political-nationalistic "Son of Man."<sup>36</sup> Taylor, however, modifies this extreme view by stating emphatically that Jesus did not use "Son of Man" merely to avert revolution.<sup>37</sup>

The position that "Son of Man" merely stresses the humanity of Jesus is violently opposed by Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel,<sup>38</sup> Duncan,<sup>39</sup> et al. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the term "Son of Man" has no reference whatsoever to Jesus' humanity. (He did not by-pass the primary linguistic fact that "Son of Man" does mean man, but rather built a fuller conception on this basis. After all, Jesus "war kein griechischer Philosoph und kein moderner Humanist, und er redete nicht zu Philosophen und zu Humanisten."<sup>40</sup>

The interpretation that "Son of Man" refers to the redeemed community is not without relative merit, especially in the light of the strong communal overtones in both Daniel and

---

<sup>36</sup>Infra, pp. 38ff.

<sup>37</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 123.

<sup>38</sup>Rudolph Knopf, Hans Lietzmann and Heinrich Weinel, Einfuehrung in das Neue Testament (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1949), p. 301.

<sup>39</sup>George S. Duncan, Jesus, the Son of Man (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), p. 136, quoted by John Fritz, "The New Testament Concept of the Son of Man" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1950), p. 2.

<sup>40</sup>Anon., quoted by Feine, op. cit., p. 65

Enoch.<sup>41</sup> However, it must be understood that the redeemed community's essence depends on the Redeemer; the community is the "Son of Man" only by theological metonymy, for their redemption is dependent on Jesus as the "Son of Man," as He identifies Himself with His people.

The view that the phrase "Son of Man" is merely "a modest and indirect designation of Himself"<sup>42</sup> may be correct in the sense that Jesus' hearers did not, nor were they intended to, fully understand each use of the phrase. It is demonstrable, however, that Jewish speech allowed the use of the third person in place of the first person.<sup>43</sup> Cadoux,<sup>44</sup> however, calls attention to the following passages, in which there is a difference between "I" and "Son of Man": Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26 (cf. Matthew 16:27), Luke 12:8, Matthew 10:32, 19:28, Luke 22:28-30, Mark 14:62 and Matthew 25:31-46). This evidence would argue against the theory that the "Son of Man" loci in the Gospels are later dogmatic applications by the Church.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Supra, chapters II and III.

<sup>42</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>43</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 57; cf. Heinrich Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), I, 316.

<sup>44</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 100.

<sup>45</sup>Thus G. Volkmar, W. Brandt and H. L. Dort; similarly Harold A. Guy, The Origin of the Gospel of Mark (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), p. 113; Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel, op. cit., p. 302.

Hoskyns and Davey<sup>46</sup> admit that the evangelists do "theologize," but they do not impose their interpretation on history, but rather are controlled by history. Jesus' own consciousness of the necessity imposed upon Him by the Old Testament, which must have come to light in original and genuine "Son of Man" dicta, is the ultimate cause behind the "theologizing" of the Evangelists.<sup>47</sup> Thus it is true that Jesus used the term "Son of Man" to veil His claims,<sup>48</sup> but the phrase is more than mere modesty, it is theology.

The interpretation that "Son of Man" has reference to an "Ideal Man" might well be possible, especially in the light of the apocalyptic expectation, but this stress cannot be defensibly elevated to the position of a complete explanation of Jesus' use of the phrase.<sup>49</sup> This emphasis may have been present in the mind of Jesus, however, and Mark's temptation account<sup>50</sup> may be colored by this idea.

The interpretation which commends itself especially within the context of this paper is the suggestion of Taylor above,<sup>51</sup> that, while the term "Son of Man" was not too generally

---

<sup>46</sup>Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1931), pp. 114f.

<sup>47</sup>Cf. Feine, op. cit., p. 63.

<sup>48</sup>Infra, pp. 42f.

<sup>49</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 63.

<sup>50</sup>Mark 1:12, ". . . and was with the wild beasts."

<sup>51</sup>Supra, p. 32.

current as a Messianic title,<sup>52</sup> Jesus used it as a challenge to reflection. After Caesarea phillipi, however, it is interpreted in terms of suffering. Thus Peter's monumental confession, "Thou art the Christ,"<sup>53</sup> calls forth the "Passion" sayings of the "Son of Man."

The centrality of this confession is noted by Feine<sup>54</sup> as the point of departure for Jesus' teaching the disciples of His death and future glory.

A very probable explanation of this shift has been proposed by positing a so-called "Messianic Secret" which dictated the structure of Mark's Gospel, a theory that is not impossible to defend. It was first advanced by Wilhelm Wrede in 1901 in his Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Markusevangelium, and since then has been adopted, with minor modifications, by numerous scholars.<sup>55</sup> The theory lays great stress on the fact that demons are silenced (Mark 1:25, 34, 3:11f.), that silence is enjoined after notable miracles (Mark 1:44, 5:43, 7:36, 8:26), and that silence is commanded after Peter's confession (Mark 8:30) and again after the Transfiguration (Mark 9:9). The withdrawal from the crowds (Mark 7:24, 9:30) and the private instruction on "the mystery of the kingdom," on Messianic

---

<sup>52</sup>Supra, chapter II.

<sup>53</sup>Mark 8:29.

<sup>54</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 66.

<sup>55</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 123, mentions Lightfoot, Dibelius, Bultmann, Schniewind and Lohmeyer.

suffering, and on the Parousia (Mark 4:10-12, 8:31, 9:31, 10:33f., 13:3-37) are also adduced to support this theory.<sup>56</sup> Taylor<sup>57</sup> notes that the "Secret" can be seen to lie behind almost every narrative (e.g., the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Entry into Jerusalem, and the Trial Scenes.)

Many noted scholars, however, oppose the "Messianic Secret"<sup>58</sup> along the following general lines:<sup>59</sup>

1. Jesus could never have been confessed as Messiah after the Resurrection unless He had been recognized as such before.
2. The Crucifixion would be unintelligible unless Christ had been condemned as a Messianic pretender.
3. The first preachers of the Cross would not have incurred odium for preaching a crucified Messiah.

These arguments are not altogether convincing. The argument that Messianic recognition had to be complete before the Resurrection fails to consider the instruction which began right after Caesarea Phillipi.<sup>60</sup> The fact that the disciples still had their misunderstandings even after the Resurrection<sup>61</sup> similarly tends to invalidate the first objection. Lohse<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 122.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

<sup>58</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 122, mentions Juelicher, J. Wiess, Schweitzer, Sanday and Rawlinson.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., pp. 122f.

<sup>60</sup>Mark 8:31.

<sup>61</sup>Acts 1:6.

<sup>62</sup>Eduard Lohse, Mark's Witness to Jesus Christ (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), p. 57.



notes that the disciples were explicitly told to wait with a proclamation of the "Son of Man" until after the Resurrection; thus only those who believed in Him as a crucified Messiah and risen Savior could confess His Messianity. The post-Resurrection appearance to the Emmaus disciples was characterized by a rebuke for not believing previous instruction and a still more complete answer to the question "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things?"<sup>63</sup>

The argument that the Crucifixion would have been unintelligible unless Christ had been condemned as a Messianic pretender loses its weight when it is seen that current Messianism expected either a Davidic King or an apocalyptic figure with no possible overtones of suffering.<sup>64</sup>

The third argument seems to fail to realize that, although the "Secret" did remain partially secret up to and after the Crucifixion, it was also revealed, in part, to the disciples after Caesarea Phillipi.<sup>65</sup>

In order to more fully understand the "Secret" it is important to see that Jesus' Messianism, as expressed in the phrase "Son of Man," cut athwart the popular conceptions of the expected Messiah,<sup>66</sup> and that our Lord's use of "Son of

---

<sup>63</sup>Luke 24:25-27.

<sup>64</sup>Infra, pp. 39ff.

<sup>65</sup>Supra, note 62.

<sup>66</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 139.

Man" "must have been an enigma, not only to the people generally, but also to His immediate disciples."<sup>67</sup>

The contemporary expectation envisaged, on the basis of Psalm 2, Isaiah chapters 9 and 11, et al., a political Messiah<sup>68</sup> with an army at his back who would confound the heathen and restore Israel.<sup>69</sup> The picture of a "Gegner, Sieger, Richter"<sup>70</sup> was generally identified with a Davidus-redivivus.<sup>71</sup> Charles is hardly exaggerating when he says that the Jewish people did not expect a "Prince of Peace," but a "Man of War,"<sup>72</sup> a military leader.<sup>73</sup> Even though the spiritual aspect of Messianism did survive in part, the political hopes were pinned on an earthly Messiah ben Joseph and a spiritual Messiah ben David,<sup>74</sup> a dualism which, nonetheless, expected great things of both Messiahs.

---

<sup>67</sup>R. H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 93.

<sup>68</sup>Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 108.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., p. 107.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 103.

<sup>72</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 89.

<sup>73</sup>Max Reich, The Messianic Hope of Israel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1940), p. 109.

<sup>74</sup>Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 11.

The other broad area of Messianic expectation was that current in apocalyptic circles, based on the figure in Daniel. But the Danielic and Enochic Messiah was still a figure of transcendent glory, who casts kings from their thrones to set up a kingdom for the redeemed community. In the light of the political decline of the Jewish nation during inter-testamental times, it is easy to understand how political hopes and longing for national independence would give "Son of Man" a definite political cast.<sup>75</sup>

If one thing is certain it is this: the expected Messiah was not a suffering Messiah. Taylor<sup>76</sup> states that the concept of a suffering Messiah in current expectations is a moot point, but Cadoux,<sup>77</sup> Schuerer,<sup>78</sup> and Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel<sup>79</sup> state definitely that such a concept would have been quite unthinkable to Judaism. The Danielic picture sees no possibility that the "Son of Man" suffer,<sup>80</sup> and even though the Messiah ben Joseph dies in his battle with Gog and Magog,<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Reich, op. cit., pp. 26f.

<sup>76</sup>Taylor, op. cit., pp. 119f.

<sup>77</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 187.

<sup>78</sup>Emil Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, authorized translation (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), II, 187.

<sup>79</sup>Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel, op. cit., pp. 304f.

<sup>80</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 66.

<sup>81</sup>Klausner, op. cit., p. 11.

he does not suffer, nor is his death devoid of the glory of a military leader who dies in heroic battle. The concept of a suffering Messiah in the Targums has been roundly refuted,<sup>82</sup> and the idea of a crucified Messiah is absolutely absent in the expectation of Jesus' day; in fact, it is virtually unthinkable.<sup>83</sup>

Against this background of popular expectation Jesus' Messianic claims are certainly radical. He is anything but a popular hero,<sup>84</sup> whether this be the royalistic-political "David" or the apocalyptic "Son of Man."<sup>85</sup> Thus He does not set up an earthly kingdom,<sup>86</sup> nor does He come to satisfy those who scanned the skies with eager eyes for the heavenly "Son of Man." He rather comes the downward way, the Via Crucis.<sup>87</sup> Thus the prospect of the Cross, present already at the Baptism by John,<sup>88</sup> transfuses Jesus' Messianism with the concept of suffering, and makes the Cross a stumbling-block.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., pp. 405f., passim.

<sup>83</sup>Charles, op. cit., pp. 77f.

<sup>84</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 55.

<sup>85</sup>John 6:15.

<sup>86</sup>Acts 1:6ff.

<sup>87</sup>W. C. Allen, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (London: Rivingtons, 1915), p. 29.

<sup>88</sup>Infra, chapter V.

<sup>89</sup>Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der Juedischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926), p. 189; John Bright, The Kingdom of God (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953), pp. 207f.

When Jesus uses the title "Son of Man" He is, indeed, claiming Messiahship for Himself,<sup>90</sup> since the form of the phrase, indicated by Daniel and Enoch, is positively Messianic.<sup>91</sup> Weizsacker, L. Th. Schulze, B. Weiss, E. Holsten and W. Baldensperger are all mentioned by Feine<sup>92</sup> as agreeing that the term "Son of Man" lies at the very heart of Jesus' Messianic self-awareness.<sup>93</sup>

However, in His mouth this phrase is a riddle<sup>94</sup> which opens or conceals His claims, depending on the audience.<sup>95</sup> Allen<sup>96</sup> states that Jesus' use of "Son of Man" was an intentional veiling of His claim to Messiahship, intended to prevent false claims from being read into His assertions of Messianity, and Bright<sup>97</sup> uses a similar argumentation. It is of note that Sjoeborg<sup>98</sup> quotes R. Otto, N. Johansson and Werner

---

<sup>90</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 58; Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel, op. cit., p. 334, Buechsel, op. cit., p. 194.

<sup>91</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 99.

<sup>92</sup>Feine, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>93</sup>This can be deduced from the fact that "Son of Man" is Jesus' favorite self-designation.

<sup>94</sup>Buechsel, op. cit., p. 203.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 204.

<sup>96</sup>Allen, op. cit., p. 31.

<sup>97</sup>Bright, op. cit., p. 199.

<sup>98</sup>Erik Sjoeborg, Der Menschensohn im aethiopischen Henochbuch (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 102.

to the effect that the "hiddenness" of the Enochic "Son of Man"<sup>99</sup> is echoed in the "Messianic Secret."

Thus the paradox of the "Son of Man" lies in the fact that the transcendent figure comes to suffer and to die.<sup>100</sup> The "secret" of the "Messianic Secret" is likewise the suffering and death.<sup>101</sup> Just as there is a gap between the present status of the "Son of Man" and his future glory,<sup>102</sup> so the "Messianic Secret" is dictated by the "already-but-not-yet" character of a Messiahship fully clear only after the Resurrection.<sup>103</sup>

In terms of the content of the title "Son of Man," this small study of the Gospel of Mark indicates that, although the form of the phrase is dictated by Daniel chapter 7 and the Book of Enoch, and although the content of the transcendent eschatological glory of the "Son of Man" is also taken from these sources, the paradox of the "Son of Man," his achievement of glory through suffering and death, indicates another source of the content of the phrase. The eschato-

---

<sup>99</sup>Supra, chapter III.

<sup>100</sup>Bright, op. cit., pp. 200, 202; Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel, op. cit., p. 302; Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 97f.

<sup>101</sup>A. W. F. Blunt, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944), p. 55.

<sup>102</sup>Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel, loc. cit.; Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 317.

<sup>103</sup>Taylor, op. cit., pp. 122f.

logical passages in Mark use the term "Son of Man" with the content of Daniel and Enoch; the theme of suffering as a means of attaining this glory must have its source elsewhere.

#### THE CONTEXT OF THE TERM "SON OF MAN"

The content of the title "Son of Man" can be only partially explained on the basis of the figure in Daniel chapters 7 and 8 and of Enoch. It is true that these sources explain the use of "son of man" in eschatological contexts, but they do not explain the suffering occurrence. Thus the use of "son of man" should go the downward way to the death of Jesus. It can be explained only if there is another source.

The clues for our investigation of the sources of this eschatological content are immediately forthcoming after a careful examination of the "son of man" passages in Mark. In Mark 8:31 Jesus says, ". . . and how it is written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at naught." In Mark 9:31 He says of himself, "The son of man shall be delivered up, and shall be crucified, and shall die after three days." These two passages clearly by reference to the "son of man" in Daniel or Enoch, show, as has been stated above, suffering is a necessary part of the "son of man" in these sources. The eschatological content of the phrase "son of man" goes beyond Daniel and Enoch.

The latter reference in Mark, in which Jesus speaks of a

## CHAPTER V

### THE "SERVANT" OF ISAIAH AND ITS ADDITIONS TO THE CONTENT OF THE TERM "THE SON OF MAN"

The content of the title "Son of Man" can be only partially understood on the basis of the figure in Daniel chapter 7 and the Book of Enoch. It is true that these sources explain our Lord's use of "Son of Man" in eschatological contexts, but they do not explain the Passion occurrences. That the heavenly "Son of Man" should go the downward way to the death of the Cross can be explained only if there is another source.

The clues for our investigation of the sources of this paradoxical content are immediately forthcoming after a careful consideration of two "Son of Man" passages in Mark. In Mark 9:12 Jesus says, ". . . and how it is written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at naught." In Mark 14:21 He says of Himself, "The Son of Man indeed goeth as it is written of him . . . ." These two passages cannot be references to the "Son of Man" in Daniel or Enoch, since, as has been stated above, suffering is never posited of the "Son of Man" in these sources. The paradoxical content of the phrase "Son of Man" goes beyond Daniel and Enoch.

The latter reference in Mark, in which Jesus speaks of a



"written" source of His obligation, has caused many scholars to see the source in the "Servant Songs" of Isaiah, chapters 40 to 66. The first appearance of our Lord in the Gospel of Mark, at His Baptism in chapter 1:10f., has been seen by many scholars as a definite proof of the importance of the "Servant Songs" in the consciousness of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> The phrase "This is my beloved Son" is seen as a direct allusion to Isaiah 42:1, especially on the basis of the words *παῖς* and *υἱός* and the *ἀγαπητός-μονογενής-ἐκλεκτός* complex.<sup>2</sup> The radical importance of the Voice from Heaven for Jesus' ministry is noted by Cadoux, who goes so far as to state that "the apocalyptic ideas were in all probability secondary to Jesus' filial consciousness and the conviction that He came, not to be served, but to serve."<sup>3</sup> Taylor agrees with Cadoux that "Sonship" and "Servantship" combine to form "the true explication" of Jesus' Messianic consciousness.<sup>4</sup> Even the modern Jewish scholar

---

<sup>1</sup>H. J. Holtzmann, Die Synoptiker, in Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901), p. 114; Erick Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium (vierte, ergaenzte Auflage; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950), p. 9; James Denney, The Death of Christ (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1907), pp. 16, 48; Oscar Cullmann, Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments (Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948), pp. 11-13; Julius Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Markus, in Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), p. 47f.

<sup>2</sup>Cullmann, op. cit., loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>Cecil John Cadoux, The Historical Mission of Jesus (New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.), p. 53.

<sup>4</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (London: The Macmillan Company, 1952), p. 119; Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 52ff., passim.

Klausner readily admits that the Servant Poems were "intentionally" used by our Lord to portray His Missions.<sup>5</sup> Similarly Grant expresses the view that Mark, in planning his Gospel, actually centers the Messianism of the book in the Baptism narrative.<sup>6</sup> The close proximity of the narrative of the temptation argues for the thesis that the claim of Jesus for Himself is involved in the Baptism narrative.<sup>7</sup>

Within the Gospel of Mark itself lies a passage which sheds considerable light on Jesus' own evaluation of the importance of His Baptism and the direction in which it led Him. In Mark 10:38 and 39, after the decisive event of Caesarea Phillipi, Jesus speaks of drinking a "cup" and being baptized with a "baptism." Hunter is no doubt correct when he sees here a reference, though hidden, to Jesus' suffering and death.<sup>8</sup> Cullman sees in Mark 10 also a reference to Jesus' Baptism by John the Baptizer.<sup>9</sup> Manson,<sup>10</sup> Klostermann<sup>11</sup> and

---

<sup>5</sup>Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 162.

<sup>6</sup>Frederick C. Grant, The Earliest Gospel (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943), p. 155.

<sup>7</sup>Petrus Dausch, "Das Markusevangelium," in Die drei aelteren Evangelien, in Die heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments, edited by Fritz Tillmann (vierte, neu bearbeitete Auflage; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), II, 371.

<sup>8</sup>Archibald Hunter, The Words and Works of Jesus (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 96f.

<sup>9</sup>Cullmann, op. cit., p. 14.

<sup>10</sup>T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953), p. 64.

<sup>11</sup>Klostermann, op. cit., p. 11.

Fuller<sup>12</sup> similarly see the Baptism as a prelude to the Cross, a prelude whose key is sounded by the Servant Songs. The incidental remark of Cadoux that the fate of John the Baptizer "threw an ominous shadow across Jesus' path"<sup>13</sup> may indicate again how Jesus' whole mission was carried out under the rubric spoken by the Voice from Heaven. Thus Taylor sees all the passion prophecies as evidences of Jesus' filial awareness.<sup>14</sup>

Although the "Servant Songs" of Isaiah have been treated thus far as an organized whole, it must be said that the complexities of this body of prophecy cannot be overlooked. The scholars are by no means agreed on the limits of the "Songs," nor do they agree on the number of "Songs."<sup>15</sup> The numerous interpretations of the person of the "Suffering Servant" are myriad,<sup>16</sup> and Rowley's recent remark that scholars are no

---

<sup>12</sup>Reginald H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 53, 56ff., 86-88.

<sup>13</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 189.

<sup>14</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 124.

<sup>15</sup>Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929), pp. 287-307 lists the following seven songs: 42:1-4, 42:5-9, 49:1-6, 49:7, 49:8-13, 50:4-10, 52:13-53:12; H. P. Chajes, Markus-Studien (Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1899), p. 2 lists the following four songs: 42:1-7, 49:1-6, 50:4-11, 52:13-53:12; C. R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), pp. 117-127 lists the following four songs: 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12.

<sup>16</sup>North, op. cit., passim; H. H. Rowley, "The Servant of the Lord," in The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 1-57.

nearer a concensus of interpretation today than they were when the era of critical scholarship opened is still pertinent.<sup>17</sup> It will be sufficient in this paper to ignore the complexities of this problem and treat the "Servant Songs" quite uncritically, and simply adduce verbal and real parallels between the "Servant Songs" and the Danielic and Enochic "Son of Man."

At least eighteen such parallels are readily adduced.<sup>18</sup> Probably the most important passage in Mark is chapter 10:45: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Hunter,<sup>19</sup> Blunt,<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Rowley, op. cit., p. 3.

- <sup>18</sup>Is. 53:2 "a root out of dry ground" and Mk. 6:3  
 Is. 42:2 "He shall not cry . . ." and the "Messianic Secret"  
 Is. 42:3 "bruised reed, smoking flax" and our Lord's seeking the "lost" and "sinners"  
 Is. 50:5 "I was not rebellious" and Mk. 14:36  
 Is. 50:6 "gave my back to the smiters" and Mk. 14:65, 15:19  
 Is. 53:7 "like a lamb led to slaughter" and Mk. 14:41f.  
 Is. 42:6f., 49:6 "light" and Mk. 4:21  
 Is. 61:1 "meek, brokenhearted, captives, and bound" and Mk. 6:1ff.  
 Is. 62:2 "the acceptable year of the Lord" and Mk. 1:15  
 Is. 49:4 and the downward way of Jesus in Mark  
 Is. 49:2 "hid me in His quiver" and the "Messianic Secret"  
 Is. 53:7 "he opened not his mouth" and Mk. 14:61  
 Is. 61:10 "bridegroom" and Mk. 2:19f.  
 Is. 53:3 "despised and rejected" and Mk. 9:12  
 Is. 53:12 "divided his spoil with the strong" and Mk. 3:27  
 Is. 53:12 "numbered with the transgressors" and Mk. 15:27  
 Is. 53:9 "with the rich" and Mk. 15:43ff.  
 Is. 53:8 "he was taken" and Mk. 2:20

<sup>19</sup>Archibald Hunter, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (London: SCM Press, 1948), pp. 45, 106.

<sup>20</sup>A. W. F. Blunt, The Gospel according to Saint Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944), p. 78.

Cadoux<sup>21</sup> and Franzmann<sup>22</sup> represent only a small segment of the scholars who center the interpretation of Mark 10:45 squarely in the figure of the "Suffering Servant."

The possible communal interpretation of the "Servant" is taken by Cadoux as another possible point of contact between the Isaianic figure and Daniel's "Son of Man."<sup>23</sup> As we have seen above,<sup>24</sup> the "Son of Man" in Daniel is closely associated with the redeemed community, "the saints of the Most High." Bright lists Is. 41:8, 43:10, 44:21, 45:4 and 42:19 as passages in which the "Servant" is the nation, as well as Is. 49:3,5, 44:1, 51:1,7 and 42:1-7 in which the "Servant" is the remnant.<sup>25</sup> Thus the very fluidity of both "Son of Man" and "Suffering Servant" would seem to indicate a certain compatibility which would at least prove no obstacle to our Lord's fusion of the two in His self-designation as "Son of Man."<sup>26</sup>

Lohmeyer's admission that scholars cannot any more differentiate between the "Son of Man" tradition and the "Suffering

<sup>21</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 38, 157.

<sup>22</sup>Martin H. Franzmann, "A Ransom for Many: Satisfactio Vicaria," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXV (July, 1954, 499ff.

<sup>23</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 101, 307.

<sup>24</sup>Supra, pp. 6f.

<sup>25</sup>John Bright, The Kingdom of God (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953), p. 150.

<sup>26</sup>Gustav Hoelscher, Geschichte der israelitischen und juedischen Religion (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1922), p. 124; Cadoux, op. cit., p. 53.

Servant" tradition as the source of various Verba Christi<sup>27</sup> indicates how complete this fusion is in our records. Manson,<sup>28</sup> Cadoux,<sup>29</sup> Charles<sup>30</sup> and Feine<sup>31</sup> are a mere sampling of the ranks of scholars who agree that our Lord's "Son of Man" received its unique content from both sources.

Another interesting similarity between the "Son of Man" in Daniel and Enoch and the "Suffering Servant" in Isaiah is the fact that, just as the "Son of Man" virtually assumes the prerogatives of God,<sup>32</sup> so our Lord's "quasi-identification of himself [sic] with the Deutero-Isaianic Servant of God . . . carried with it the implication that his [sic] own activities are virtually the activities of God Himself."<sup>33</sup>

Although it is an admittedly tenuous argument, the fact that the "Suffering Servant" was not generally regarded as Messianic at the time of Christ,<sup>34</sup> but was diametrically

---

<sup>27</sup>Ernst Lohmeyer, Gottesknecht und Davidsohn (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), p. 113.

<sup>28</sup>Manson, op. cit., p. 64.

<sup>29</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 100f., 112, 151.

<sup>30</sup>R. H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 91.

<sup>31</sup>Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (vierte, neu bearbeitete Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922), pp. 58, 66.

<sup>32</sup>Supra, pp. 10ff.

<sup>33</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 38.

<sup>34</sup>Charles, op. cit., p. 77.

opposed to the contemporary political hopes,<sup>35</sup> would seem to lend itself to Jesus' use of the "Servant Songs" in His intentional disavowal of contemporary messianism.<sup>36</sup> The fact that some scholars use the term "Messianic" in connection with the "Servant"<sup>37</sup> does not detract from this argument, since they see the sufferings of the "Servant" applied to the Jewish people.<sup>38</sup>

It is precisely at this point, i.e., the necessity of the "Son of Man's" suffering to attain His glory, that the combination of the "Son of Man" of Daniel and Enoch and the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah is most apparent.<sup>39</sup> Bright underscores the fact that the victory of the "Son of Man" is possible only through suffering and cross.<sup>40</sup> Cadoux similarly stresses the following parallels between "Son of Man" and "Suffering Servant":

Corresponding to the humiliation and suffering of the Servant is the war which the Fourth Beast makes upon "the saints," i.e., upon the "Son of Man" (Dan. 7:7f., 19, 21, 23-25); corresponding to the everlasting kingdom

---

<sup>35</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 53.

<sup>36</sup>Supra, pp. 33ff.

<sup>37</sup>Emil A. Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, authorized translation (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), II, 650ff.; Cadoux, op. cit., p. 187, note 1; Max Reich, The Messianic Hope of Israel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1940), p. 112.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>Supra, pp. 46ff.

<sup>40</sup>Bright, op. cit., pp. 202, 214.

given by God to the "Son of Man" is the Servant's final victory and vindication (Is. 62:1,4, 66:6b,7-9, 53:10-12.)<sup>41</sup>

Just as the "Son of Man" must suffer to be glorified, so the "Servant" finds victory beyond suffering and the Cross.<sup>42</sup>

One final argument, again admittedly tenuous, for the possibility of our Lord's fusion of the apocalyptic figure of the "Son of Man" in Daniel and Enoch and the figure of the "Servant" in Isaiah is the fact that there are demonstrable parallels between Enoch and Isaiah chapters 40 to 66. Thus Schodde says that Enoch 45:4, 56:3, 48:6, 49:4, 51:3, 55:4, 61:8, 69:27, 71:17, etc., which refer to the "Son of Man," make of the Enochic figure " . . . in reality a 'servant of God' (Is. 40-66)."<sup>43</sup> Sjoeborg connects even Isaiah chapters 1 to 39 with the Book of Enoch (Enoch 49:3 and Is. 11:2),<sup>44</sup> and sees in Enoch 48:3 a parallel to Isaiah 49:1 and possibly 45:3.<sup>45</sup> Kittel<sup>46</sup> finds parallels with Enoch in both Isaiah chapters 1 to 39 and 40 to 66 as follows: Enoch 46:4 and Isaiah 52:15, Enoch 48:4 and Isaiah 42:6 and 49:6, Enoch 46:3

---

<sup>41</sup>Cadoux, op. cit., p. 101.

<sup>42</sup>Bright, op. cit., pp. 148, 267f.

<sup>43</sup>George H. Schodde, The Book of Enoch (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1911), p. 51.

<sup>44</sup>Erik Sjoeborg, Der Menschensohn im aethiopischen Henochbuch (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 98.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>46</sup>Rudolph Kittel, Die Religion des Volkes Israel (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921), p. 188.



and Isaiah 42:6 and 11:3. Enoch 52:6-9 and its description of the peaceful age ushered in by the "Son of Man" is a very close parallel to Isaiah 2:4. The Enochic figure is "the Light of Nations," a close parallel to Isaiah 42:6.

In conclusion, the content of our Lord's self-designation, "Son of Man," which cannot be fully derived from Daniel and Enoch, is derived from the picture of the "Suffering Servant" in Isaiah chapters 40 to 66. The eschatological glory of the Danielic-Enochic "Son of Man" and the necessity of suffering and death of the Isaianic "Suffering Servant" are both sources for our Lord's "Son of Man." Here lies the paradox: the "Son of Man's" way to glory is the way of the Cross.

The eschatological and theology of the Gospel of Mark, as well as Mark's exaltations of another "suffering" source of the content of the title, leads to the conclusion that another source must be found. The general observation that the whole of Jesus' Ministry is highly colored by the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah, chapters 40 to 66, coupled with the fact that the "Son of Man" sayings of the Vin d'Arles show a heavy dependency on this source leads to the conclusion that these "sayings" form the secret pole of the paradox.

The mere fact that our Lord's favorite self-designation is not in paradoxical form would possibly lead to a better understanding of the nature of His confrontation of man and man's response in faith and life.

The relationship between the "Son of Man" and the redeemed

## CHAPTER VI

### SOME CONCLUSIONS AND SOME FURTHER QUESTIONS

The title "Son of Man" in our Lord's usage receives its form and one pole of its paradoxical content from Daniel and Enoch, where the "Son of Man" appears as the transcendent eschatological figure deputized by God to judge men and angels and to establish God's eternal and universal Kingdom. This source helps explain Jesus' use of the title "Son of Man" in eschatological contexts in the Gospels, but does not explain the other pole of the paradox, His humiliation and Passion.

The structure and theology of the Gospel of Mark, as well as Markan indications of another "written" source of the content of the title, leads to the conclusion that another source must be found. The general observation that the whole of Jesus' Ministry is highly colored by the "Servant Songs" of Isaiah, chapters 40 to 66, coupled with the fact that the "Son of Man" sayings of the Via Crucis show a heavy dependency on this source leads to the conclusion that these "Songs" form the second pole of the paradox.

The mere fact that our Lord's favorite self-designation is cast in paradoxical form would possibly lead to a better understanding of the nature of His confrontation of man and man's response in faith and life.

The relationship between the "Son of Man" and the redeemed

55

"sons of men" seems to mark out an area for further study of the incorporative formulae in the New Testament (e.g., the prepositions εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί, the σύν-compounds, the concept of κοινωνία, et al.). The implications of "Son of Man" for an understanding of the Pauline "Adam-Christ" theology would also be rewarding.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W. C. The Gospel according to Saint Mark. London: Rivingtons, 1915.
- Bible, Holy. Authorized Version.
- Bissel, Edwin Cone. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- Blunt, A. W. F. The Gospel according to Saint Mark. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. Die Religion des Judentums im spaethellen-nistischen Zeitalter. Third edition. Edited by Hugo Gressmann. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926.
- Bright, John. The Kingdom of God. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Buechsel, Friedrich. Jesus, Verkuendigung und Geschichte. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1947.
- Cadoux, Cecil John. The Historical Mission of Jesus. New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Chajes, H. P. Markus-Studien. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1899.
- Charles, R. H. Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments. Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948.
- Dalman, Gustav. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Dausch, Petrus. "Das Markusevangelium," Vol. II in Die drei aeiteren Evangelien. Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments. Edited by Fritz Tillmann. Vierte, neu bearbeitete Auflage; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuch-handlung, 1932.
- Denney, James. The Death of Christ. New York: A. C. Arm-strong & Son, 1907.
- Feine, Paul. Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Vierte, neu be-arbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buch-handlung, 1922.

- Franzmann, Martin H. Basileia tou Theou. Saint Louis: Concordia Seminary Print Shop, 1956.
- Franzmann, Martin H. "A Ransom for Many: Satisfactio Vicaria," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXV (July, 1954), 498-515.
- Fritz, John. "The New Testament Concept of the Son of Man." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, 1950.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- Grant, Frederick C. The Earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943.
- Gressmann, Hugo. Der Messias Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1929.
- Guy, Harold A. The Origin of the Gospel of Mark. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954.
- Haevernick, Heinrich Andreas Christoph. Commentar ueber das Buch Daniel. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1832.
- Heinisch, Paul. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by Rev. William Heidt. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950.
- Hoelscher, Gustav. Geschichte der israelitischen und juedischen Religion. Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1922.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich. Die Synoptiker. In Commentar zum Neuen Testament. Tuebingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901.
- Holtzmann, O. Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie. I. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn and Noel Davey. The Riddle of the New Testament. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1931.
- Hunter, Archibald. The Gospel according to Saint Mark. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1948.
- Hunter, Archibald. The Words & Works of Jesus. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Kautzsch, E. Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. II. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900.

- Kierkegaard, Søren. The Journals, A Kierkegaard Anthology. Edited by Robert Bretall. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- Kittel, Rudolph. Die Religion des Volkes Israel. Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer, 1921.
- Klausner, Joseph. The Messianic Idea in Israel. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.
- Klostermann, August. Das Markusevangelium nach seinen Quellenwerthe. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1867.
- Klostermann, Erich. Das Markusevangelium. Vierte, ergaenzte Auflage. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950.
- Knopf, Rudolph, Hans Lietzmann and Heinrich Weinel. Einfuehrung in das Neue Testament. Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1949.
- Lietzmann, Hans. The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Translated by Bertram Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Gottesknecht und Davidsohn. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.
- Lohse, Eduard. Mark's Witness to Jesus Christ. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Manson, T. W. The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.
- Montgomery, James A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Vol. XIX of The International Critical Commentary. Edited by S. R. Driver, A. Plummer and C. A. Briggs. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- North, C. R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Otto, Rudolph. Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Reich, Max. The Messianic Hope of Israel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1940.
- Rowley, H. H. "The Servant of the Lord," The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

- Rutz, Karl William. "The Son of Man in Daniel." Unpublished term paper in Mr. Rutz's possession.
- Schniewind, Julius. Das Evangelium nach Markus. Vol. I in Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.
- Schodde, George H. The Book of Enoch. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1911.
- Schurer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. I. Authorized translation. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.
- Sjoeberg, Erik. Der Menschensohn im aethiopischen Henochbuch. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel according to Saint Mark. London: The Macmillan Company, 1952.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. Apocryphal Literature. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
- Volz, Paul. Die Eschatologie der juedischen Gemeinde in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934.
- Zoeckler, O. Der Prophet Daniel, Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von J. P. Lange. Bielefeld und Leipzig: Belhagen und Klasing, 1870.