

## SON OF MAN

G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 6:137-142.

[Heb *ben }aœdaœm*; Aram *bar }eΣnaœs*; Gk (*ho*) *huios (tou) anthroœpou*]. A Semitic expression that typically individualizes a noun for humanity in general by prefacing it with "son of," thus designating a specific human being, a single member of the human species. Its meaning can be as indefinite as "someone" or "a certain person." Used in Dan 7:13-14 to describe a cloud-borne humanlike figure, the expression—or at least the figure so designated in Daniel—became traditional in some forms of Jewish and early Christian speculation which anticipated a transcendent eschatological agent of divine judgment and deliverance. In the NT that agent is almost universally identified with the risen Jesus. This survey will treat Jewish and Christian texts that use the term "son of man," as well as texts that develop and elaborate the tradition in Daniel 7 without retaining that expression.

---

### A. The OT Apart from Daniel 7

1. In Poetic Parallelism
2. Ezekiel
- B. Early Jewish Texts
  1. Daniel 7
  2. The Parables of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 37-71)
  3. Wisdom of Solomon 1-6
  4. *4 Ezra* 11-13
  5. *2 Baruch*
  6. Reconstruction of the Tradition
- C. The New Testament
  1. The Document "Q"
  2. The Gospel according to Mark
  3. The Gospel according to Matthew
  4. Luke-Acts
  5. The Fourth Gospel
  6. Paul and the Pauline Tradition
  7. The Book of Revelation
  8. *2 Peter*
  9. Summary of NT Evidence
  10. The Historical Jesus and the Son of Man

---

### A. The OT Apart from Daniel 7

With the exception of Daniel 7 (see below), the singular *ben adam* occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in poetic parallelism and in the book of Ezekiel.

**1. In Poetic Parallelism.** It appears fourteen times, in synonymous poetic parallelism, always in the second half, as an emphatic counterpart to words designating “man” or “human being” (usually *is, enas, geber* (Num 23:19; Isa 51:12; 56:2; Jer 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43; Ps 8:5—Eng 8:4; 80:18—Eng 80:17; 146:3; Job 16:21; 25:6; 35:8). The emphasis in some of these texts is on human beings’ difference from God, as well as their mortality and undependability (cf. 1QS 11:20; 1QH 4:30). This appears to undercut the common assertion that *ben adam* is in itself a “lofty” designation for human beings. An evident exception is Ps 8:5 (cf. Ps 80:18), but the point is precisely the paradox that God “is mindful of” man and crowns “the son of man” like a king. This text is noteworthy, nonetheless, because its combination of Gen 1:26–28 with the version of the Eden story behind Ezek 28:12–18—where the first man appears to have been a king—makes it particularly apt to be conflated, in Christian tradition, with Dan 7:13–14 (see below C.6.b, e).

**2. Ezekiel.** Ninety-three times in Ezekiel, God addresses the prophet as “son of man” (Heb *ben adam*). Interpreters disagree as to whether the expression emphasizes the prophet’s mere human status before God or his lofty privilege as *the* man singled out from the rest of the people to be addressed by God and sent as the divine messenger.

## **B. Early Jewish Texts**

Paradoxically, a generic term meaning “human being” develops a theological aura and, eventually, a set of highly technical meanings. At the root of this development is the single occurrence of *bar enash* in Daniel 7, a text almost unequaled for its influence on both Jewish and Christian messianic speculations in the crucial period up to 100 C.E.

**1. Daniel 7.** Broad consensus sees this chapter as the product of a complex history of tradition with deep roots in non-Israelite mythology. Opinions differ widely, however, on the details of the tradition’s history. Where in the ANE are its mythic roots to be found? Was the Israelite form of the text created in one piece? If not, where are the literary seams, and when should one date the creation of the earlier stage or stages? The present discussion will focus on the whole of Daniel 7 as an intelligible unit that dates in its present form and context from the time of the Jews’ persecution by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (167–164 B.C.E.) and will emphasize elements that illuminate later Jewish and Christian developments of the tradition.

Daniel 7 divides into two major parts: Daniel’s vision (vv 1–14) and its angelic interpretation (vv 15–27). As elsewhere in Daniel 7–12, action occurs on two levels, earth and heaven, both of which are described with strong mythic imagery. Essential to the action is a

conflict between the chaotic forces, depicted as fearsome beasts that arise from the primordial deep, and the divine King and his heavenly entourage. The beasts are interpreted as kingdoms (v 17 LXX—MT v 23), and the conflict is for sovereignty over the earth.

The vision focuses on the fourth beast and the blasphemies spoken by its eleventh horn (vv 7–8). The situation is resolved when the white-haired Deity (“the Ancient of Days”) convenes the heavenly court for judgment (vv 9–12). The beast is condemned and slain, and its body is destroyed and given over to be burned; dominion is taken away from the other three beasts. The heavenly action concludes when “one like a son of man” is conveyed to the courtroom, where he is presented to the Ancient of Days and is given eternal and indestructible “dominion, glory, and kingship” over “all peoples, nations, and languages” (vv 13–14).

According to the angel’s interpretation, which picks up key words and phrases in the vision, the enthronement of the “one like a son of man” means that “the holy ones of the Most High” or “the people (*am*) of the holy ones of the Most High” will be given “kingship and dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven” forever (vv 18, 22, 27).

Although scholars debate the meaning of almost every element in the vision and interpretation, the following seems the best explanation. “Son of man” is not a formal title, but a designation used in a simile (“*one like a son of man*”), quite possibly to contrast the cloud-borne figure with the beasts. But although this figure has the appearance of a human being, it is, in fact, a heavenly figure (cf. Dan 9:21; 10:5 and in Ezek 1:26 of God), one of the holy ones, who is the patron of the suffering people of the holy ones of the Most High. The relationship of this heavenly figure to suffering righteous Israel is analogous to the relationship between the angelic prince Michael and “your people” in Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1, although in the latter passages Michael has a judicial function not possessed by the one like a son of man. The heavenly enthronement of the one like a son of man will involve Israel’s earthly supremacy over all the nations (cf. 1QM 17:5–8).

Although the one like a son of man is never called “king” or “anointed one” (messiah), this heavenly figure is given royal powers and prerogatives (“dominion, glory, and kingship”), and all nations will “serve” him and the people of the holy ones. This terminology repeats the ideas expressed in Dan 2:44; 3:29; 4:1–3, 34–35; 5:19–21; 6:26. Like chaps. 2–6, this vision and its interpretation depict a conflict between earthly kings and the divine Monarch and the latter’s ultimate triumph and sovereignty. Different from those chapters, here the bearer of that sovereignty is the enthroned heavenly patron of the people of God who have suffered at the hands of the kings, who have rebelled against heaven—notably Antiochus IV (cf. chap. 3 and 4:27).

Especially significant for subsequent Jewish and Christian interpretations of the tradition is the sequence of events in the vision. The judgment of the fourth beast and his destruction are functions of the heavenly court (v 11); only after this has happened and after a clear break and transition in the text (v 13a), do we hear of the appearance, presentation, and enthronement of the one like a son of man.

The closest known analogies to this chapter's mythic imagery are in Canaanite and Mesopotamian sources. The description of the heavenly court in vv 9-10 and the presentation of one like a son of man also have an earlier, 3d century B.C.E. Israelite counterpart in *1 Enoch* 14:8-24, where Enoch is transported to the heavenly throne room to be commissioned as a prophet.

**2. The Parables of Enoch** (*1 Enoch* 37-71). This major section of the corpus known as *1 Enoch* attests a crucial step in the development of the tradition in Daniel 7. Although these chapters also transmit and rework traditional material from *1 Enoch* 1-36, their uniqueness within the Enochic corpus lies in a series of heavenly tableaux that depict an unfolding drama whose protagonist is a transcendent figure known as "the righteous one," "the chosen one," "the anointed one," and "this/that son of man," who functions as champion of "the righteous and the chosen" and as judge of their antagonists, "the kings and the mighty."

The date of these chapters is disputed. Some scholars argue that the Parables are post-Christian, and even of Christian origin, while others point to a few details that suggest composition in the late 1st century B.C.E. However one dates the Parables in their present form, their traditions about the heavenly deliverer differ from Daniel 7 in distinctive ways that are paralleled in other Jewish texts and in NT gospel traditions about the son of man.

The Parables' portrait of this agent of deliverance draws much of its language and imagery from three biblical sources or traditional interpretations of these sources. The basic texts are: Daniel 7; Isaiah 11 and Psalm 2; Isaiah 42, 49, and 52-53. Through the use and elaboration of this material, the author has created a composite figure whom he considers to be the referent in texts about the heavenly one like a son of man, the Davidic king, and Second Isaiah's servant of the Lord.

The identification of these figures with one another is understandable; for all their differences, their characteristics and functions can be seen to be compatible and complementary. According to Psalm 2, the Davidic king, the Lord's anointed and son, will exact divine judgment on the rebellious kings and rulers of the earth, whose kingdoms will be given to him as his "inheritance" and "possession." Isaiah 11 emphasizes the royal function of judgment. In Second Isaiah, the servant of the Lord has traits elsewhere ascribed to the Davidic

king. The Spirit of the Lord rests on him so that he is an agent of justice for the lowly (Isa 42:1-4; cf. Isa 11:2-5). His word is likened to a weapon (49:2; cf. 11:4). He is God's chosen one and servant (42:1; cf. Ps 89:3, 19-20; [4, 20-21 Heb]). He is exalted (52:13-15) in the presence of kings and rulers (ibid.; cf. 49:7), although they are not his opponents as in Psalm 2. In Daniel 7, after the judgment that destroys or neutralizes opposing monarchs and kingdoms, the heavenly one like a son of man is enthroned as the bearer of God's royal power and dominion. That Second Isaiah and the author of Daniel 7 ascribed, respectively, to the servant of the Lord and the one like a son of man the status and some of the functions traditionally attributed to the Davidic king is not surprising; this king is of marginal significance in Second Isaiah (Isa 55:4-5, "witness, leader, commander," and contrast 45:1, Cyrus, the Lord's anointed) and is not even mentioned in Daniel.

The first Parable (*1 Enoch* 37-44) begins by anticipating the appearance of "the Righteous One" (38:2). Here and in chaps. 52-53, this epiphany recalls the theophany in *1 Enoch* 1-5, and this indicates that the Righteous and Chosen One will function as the agent of God's judgment (38:3). "Righteous One" is a title of the servant in Isa 53:11. In *1 Enoch* 38, as throughout, the opponents are the kings and mighty, the exalted and powerful, who possess the earth and oppress the righteous and chosen. In chap. 39, Enoch sees the dwelling of the Chosen One of righteousness and faith (cf. Isa 11:5) in the heavenly court, among the angels and holy ones (cf. Daniel 7).

In the second Parable, chap. 46 takes up the tradition in Daniel 7. Enoch sees one who has "a head of days" (hereafter he is called "the Head of Days") and with him, one who has the appearance of a man and a gracious face like the angels. The term "son of man" is introduced. Here and throughout the Parables (with the exception of 69:27), the term is qualified: "this/that son of man" or "the son of man who ... ," but, as is often the case in Ethiopic, which has no definite article, the demonstratives, "this" and "that," very likely reproduce the article in the earlier Greek form of the Parables. Thus, the text refers back to a known "son of man," the one already introduced. But even if this definite usage does not indicate a traditional *title* received by this author, chaps. 46-47 leave no doubt that the *figure* is derived from Daniel 7, or, less likely, a common tradition. Because the whole of the Parables is set in heaven and because the narrative begins with the son of man already in the presence of the Deity, no mention is made, as in Daniel, of the son of man coming with the clouds of heaven.

In chap. 47 the heavenly court is seated (cf. Dan 7:10) not for judgment, but for intercession. Then a new scene unfolds. Among the many, inexhaustible fountains of wisdom (48:1; 49:1), the seer witnesses the naming of the son of man, which is described in the language of the servant's call in Isaiah 49 (*1 Enoch* 48). However, in a major difference from Isa 49:1, this naming is traced back not to the

womb, but before the creation of the heavenly luminaries (48:3, 6; cf. 62:7, “from the beginning”). From that time, the son of man was hidden with God, but now God’s wisdom has revealed him to the righteous, holy, and chosen ones. This language of heavenly, hidden preexistence and subsequent limited revelation indicates that the author’s description of this unique heavenly figure has been influenced by Jewish speculations about Wisdom’s preexistence, role in creation, and earthly embodiment in the Torah and its exposition (cf. Prov 8; Sir 24; Bar 3:9–4:4; and in the Parables, *1 Enoch* 42). Although the son of man is not identified as Wisdom, aspects of the Wisdom myth have colored the Parables’ eclectic portrait of this heavenly figure. The description is further complicated in 48:8–49:4. Reference to “the kings of the earth” (the term occurs only here in the Parables) who “have denied the Lord of Spirits and his anointed one” (48:8, 10) recalls Ps 2:2. Then speaking of the Chosen One who stands before the Lord (cf. Dan 7:13), the author takes up the theme of two parallel passages in Isa 11:2–3 and Isa 42:1 and conflates their imagery in order to describe the spirit that will enable the Chosen One to judge rightly (*1 En.* 49: 1–4).

This judgment, anticipated again in 51:3; 55:4, is described in chaps. 62–63. This lengthy passage is a traditional reworking of Isa 52:13–53:12 (see below, B.3), and it also incorporates royal language and the term “son of man.” The Lord places the Chosen One on the divine throne of glory (a Davidic royal term). As in Isaiah 52–53, the exaltation takes place in the presence and to the astonishment of the kings, who recognize the Chosen One and confess their sins. Different from Isaiah, here the kings and mighty are to be judged and condemned by the exalted one, who will slay them with the word of his mouth (62:2; cf. Isa 11:4 and its application to the Davidic heir in *Ps. Sol.* 17:27, 39). With this scene the heavenly drama of judgment reaches its climax. Vindication comes for the persecuted righteous and chosen, when their heavenly champion condemns their oppressors. Thereafter they will enjoy eternal life in the presence of the son of man and the Lord of Spirits (62:13–16).

The Parables reflect the creative development and mutual modification of complementary traditions. Daniel’s heavenly figure is here described in language taken from Davidic royal oracles and Deutero-Isaianic texts about the servant of the Lord. He is not, however, the bearer of God’s eternal reign, as in Daniel 7. He is seated on the divine throne of glory in order to execute judgment (cf. 69:27–29). It is in order to describe this function, which Daniel does not attribute to the “one like a son of man,” that this author employs language from the servant passages and royal oracles. Conversely, the humanity of the Davidic king is replaced by the transcendence of the heavenly son of man, and the human suffering experienced by the servant (Isa 50:6–9; 52:13–53:12)—and in some royal Psalms by the

king—is here a characteristic of the righteous and chosen ones, the earthly clients of the heavenly Righteous One and Chosen One.

These developments reflect an ongoing tradition. With the Exile and the demise of the Davidic dynasty, Second Isaiah reshaped older traditions about king and prophet and applied them to the servant, a mysterious figure who personified Israel and also stood against the nation. The largely nonhistorical and mythical language of the servant passages lent itself to an interpretation about heavenly and cosmic exaltation and judgment, which could easily be co-opted into a dualistic, apocalyptic world view. Thus, the pseudonymous author of the Parables, standing in the apocalyptic traditions of *1 Enoch* 1–36, could conflate another part of his apocalyptic heritage, the heavenly enthronement scene in Daniel 7, with the royal traditions in Second Isaiah and their Davidic antecedents in Isaiah 11 and Psalm 2.

A dualism between earth and heaven and a revelation of the heavenly world are essential to the Parables, as they are to the rest of *1 Enoch*. These chapters profess to be a revelation of the hidden parts of heaven and earth, based on a journey to these remote regions. Central to the revelation are the events, places, and personages involved in the great judgment that will adjudicate the evils and injustices experienced by the author's community—the righteous and the chosen. In particular, the seer brings to his people the knowledge that they have a heavenly champion and vindicator. He is hidden from their eyes, but not from their knowledge, and essential to their righteousness is their belief that he exists in a heavenly realm that prepares for judgment and that he will appear in order to bring vindication and execute judgment. At that time, the kings and mighty who oppress them will see what hitherto they have neither seen nor believed: in the face of the Chosen One they will see the chosen ones whom they have persecuted; they will acknowledge the reality of the realm from which he came; they will recognize the inevitability of their own judgment.

In their present form, the Parables provide one final twist to the drama of the son of man. Chap. 71 recapitulates earlier traditions about Enoch's ascent (especially the commissioning scene in *1 Enoch* 14–16 and the journeys in 17–36) and conflates them with Daniel 7. Enoch is greeted by the Lord of Spirits, who identifies him as the protagonist in his own visions. He is the son of man born for righteousness. This turn of events is totally unexpected. Previously, there has been no hint that the heavenly deliverer had an earthly existence, much less that Enoch had been seeing visions about himself. The text is probably an addition to an earlier form of the Book of Parables, but an addition with important parallels.

**3. Wisdom of Solomon 1–6.** In this text from around the turn of the era, an author posing as Solomon admonishes the kings and rulers of the earth to practice justice because God rewards

righteousness and punishes wickedness. Central to his exposition is the case of an unnamed righteous one, a typical figure who is persecuted and put to death by rich and powerful opponents, but vindicated in the heavenly court, where he stands among the angels and condemns his persecutors. The two scenes that depict his persecution and exaltation (chaps. 2 and 5) are cast in the language of Isaiah 52–53, and significant parallels to the judgment scene in *1 Enoch* 62–63 and to *1 Enoch* 46 indicate that Wisdom and the Parables present variants of a common exegetical tradition, which conflates the Isaianic servant passage with material from Isaiah 14 and identifies the kings of Isaiah 52–53 with the royal figure who storms heaven and is cast down to earth.

Also significant for a comparison with the Parables are elements in Wisdom that reflect royal traditions. The framework in Wisdom 1–6 addresses the kings and rulers in language closely paralleled in Psalm 2 (cf. 1:1; 5:23; 6:1, 11 with Ps 2:2, 10 and cf. 4:18 with Ps 2:4), and the expression “son of God” is used of the righteous one (Wis 2:16, 18; 5:5) as it is of the king in Ps 2:7. In 9:9–17, speaking autobiographically, “Solomon” associates right judgment and kingship with the knowledge and understanding of God’s counsel which is mediated by the descent of heavenly Wisdom, the holy spirit, which is present at God’s throne of glory (cf. Isa 11:2–5), and in 1:6–11 wisdom is God’s agent for the right judgment of all people (cf. *1 Enoch* 49:3–4; 51:3).

These parallels to *1 Enoch* 37–71 notwithstanding, Wisdom never uses the term “son of man” of the righteous one. Possible evidence of the influence of Daniel 7 may be found in Wis 3:8, which alludes to the exaltation of the righteous typified in chap. 5, construing it as governing or judging (*krinein*) nations and ruling over peoples (cf. Dan 7:14, 27).

In light of the aforementioned parallels, the differences between Wisdom and the Parables are especially significant. In Wisdom the protagonist is the persecuted one, who has been exalted as judge or accuser of his own persecutors; he is not a transcendent champion of the persecuted righteous. He is, moreover, a type of the many persecuted righteous and not a unique figure who is identified with Daniel’s one like a son of man (note the plurals in Wis 3:8). In this respect, the tradition is logically prior to the form in the Parables, for it is identifiably closer to the Deutero-Isaianic source about the persecuted and vindicated servant. Nonetheless, the Solomonic author appears to have known an Enochic context for these traditions. Thus, 4:10–15 cites Enoch as the righteous one par excellence (does this presuppose *1 Enoch* 71 and its identification of Enoch with the son of man?), and the structure of the text—including its argument against those who deny the possibility of immortality and postmortem judgment—parallels *1 Enoch* 102–4.

The Parables and Wisdom parallel one another both in their use of Davidic material and in their failure to apply it to a future Davidic king. Although the author of Wisdom claims to be the son of David, addressing the (potentially) unjust rulers of the earth, his expected agent of ultimate justice will not be a Davidite. He is described as Second Isaiah's servant of the Lord, the righteous one who will condemn his own persecutors. Nonetheless the Greek author plays on the parallels between the LXX word *pais* ("servant, child") and the royal title "son" (Ps 2:7; cf. Ps 110:4 LXX, "out of the womb before the morning star I begat you" and *1 En.* 48:3 of the servant figure), and he applies language from Ps 2:4, 9 to the fate of the righteous one's antagonists (4:18-19). The author of the Parables also does not expect justice from a Davidic ruler and he applies the Davidic oracles to the servant figure. In this case, however, the Chosen One is not one of many who vindicate themselves; he is identified with the unique heavenly son of man in Daniel 7, who will appear, however, not after the judgment, but as its agent. That Wisdom and the Parables offer variants on a common tradition is crucial for our understanding of NT son of man traditions.

**4. 4 Ezra 11-13.** This text from the end of the 1st century C.E. makes no reference to a figure called "son of man," but the two visions in chaps. 11-12 and 13 parallel Daniel 7 and describe in two different ways the coming of the anointed one.

In the first of these visions, the Roman Empire and its kings are opposed and judged by the Davidic king. In the vision (11:1-12:3), an eagle comes up out of the sea (11:1; cf. Dan 7:1) and is opposed by a lion who indicts it for deceit, injustice, and oppression of the meek, which constitute insolence against the Most High (11:36-43; cf. Dan 7:8, 25). For this it is condemned and its body burned (11:44-12:3; Dan 7:11). In the interpretation (12:4-39), the eagle is identified as "the fourth kingdom which appeared to your brother Daniel" (12:11; cf. 11:39), which will arise on earth (12:13; cf. Dan 7:23); the lion is said to be the anointed one who will arise from the posterity of David and denounce the kings represented by the eagle's wings, destroy them, and deliver the remnant of Israel.

Chap. 13 recounts a second vision and interpretation, which corresponds to Dan 7:13-14. The winds stir up the sea (13:1; cf. Dan 7:2) and "something like the figure of a man" comes up out of the heart of the sea and flies with the clouds of heaven (13:3; Dan 7:13). The voice that issues from his mouth melts all who hear it (13:3b-4). When he is attacked by a multitude, he carves out a mountain, and standing upon it, he sends from his mouth a stream of fire that burns up all who have gathered against him (13:5-11). Then he gathers the remnant (13:12-13). According to the interpretation (13:21-58), the man is the one "whom the Most High has been keeping for many ages" to "deliver his creation and direct those who are left" (13:26). He is

“my son” (13:32, 37, 52), who is hidden (v 52) but will be revealed (v 32) and will stand on top of Mount Zion to reprove the nations for their ungodliness, destroying them by the flame of the Torah (13:33–38).

Although the form of *4 Ezra* 13 and the image of the cloud-borne man parallel Daniel 7, crucial elements in chap. 13 differ from Daniel 7 and agree with the Parables of Enoch and their use and modification of Davidic oracles and, probably, Deutero-Isaianic servant motifs. Like the anointed one in *4 Ezra* 11–12, the man appears not to rule, but rather to execute judgment and deliver the righteous. The manner of this judgment by a fiery blast is reminiscent of Isa 11:4 and the use of this passage in *1 En.* 62:2 (cf. 49:3–4; cf. also *Ps. Sol.* 17:39, 41). Other motifs recall Psalm 2. The man’s title is “my son” (*Ps* 2:7), and he judges the nations who have gathered against him at Mount Zion (*Ps* 2:1–2, 6; cf. *1 En.* 48:8, 10). A parallel to the Parables’ use of servant material also seems likely. Like the Chosen One of *1 Enoch*, “my son” has been kept for many ages and hidden and will be revealed (13:26, 52, 32; cf. *1 En.* 48:3, 6–7; 62:7 and vv 1–3). Like the Chosen One, he will gather the righteous (13:26, 39; *1 En.* 48:7; cf. Isa 49:6, 8–9). Different from the Parables, *4 Ezra* 13 does not use the titles “the Chosen One” and “the Righteous One” and depicts no recognition scene to correspond to *1 Enoch* 62–63 and Isaiah 52–53. Although there is no enthronement as such, the man on the clouds has the office of executing divine judgment.

The stages of tradition in *4 Ezra* 11–13 are complex and difficult to trace. In their present form, the two visions refer to the Davidic messiah (cf. *4 Ezra* 7:28–29, “my son, the anointed one”). To this end, chap. 13 has domesticated cosmic elements of a vision that described a transcendent deliverer and judge. Precisely how this vision was related to Daniel 7 is debated. *4 Ezra* 12:11 mentions the vision in Daniel 7, but chap. 13 could know a source behind Daniel. In any case, similarities between chap. 13 and the combined son of man, messianic, and servant elements in the Parables suggest that at least one source was closely related to the Parables, if not identical with them.

**5. 2 *Baruch*.** This apocalypse, which is roughly contemporary with *4 Ezra*, presumes the messianic identification of the central figure in Daniel 7 and his judicial functions. In chaps. 36–39, the last leader of the fourth kingdom will be taken to Mount Zion, where “my anointed one” will convict him and put him to death. A scenario like *4 Ezra* 13 is presumed. Both this text and chaps. 29–30 speak of the revelation, or glorious appearance of “my anointed one,” thus suggesting a transcendental figure. Chaps. 53–74 make “my anointed one” the agent of a universal judgment, and the image of the lightning (53:9, 12) recalls the gospel logion in C.1.a below. Of importance in all of these texts from *2 Baruch* is the ubiquity of the title “my anointed one,” which is missing in Daniel 7 and rare in *1 Enoch*, and the

transcendental character of this figure, which is foreign to the biblical texts about the king.

**6. Reconstruction of the Tradition.** The evidence presented here indicates that the idea of a transcendent judge and deliverer was a known element in Jewish eschatology by the latter part of the 1st century C.E. The texts in question attest a common model that was composed of elements from Israelite traditions about the Davidic king, the Deutero-Isaianic servant/chosen one, and the Danielic “son of man.” The model surely existed apart from these texts, and, in order to posit belief in such a transcendent savior figure in any given case, we need not presume that any one of the texts was known and used as a literary source. For the modern critic, however, the texts serve as extant testimonies and expressions of the belief. The texts and their sources in the Hebrew Scriptures do not represent successive developments in a single continuous process. The tradition was fluid and its components interacted with one another in different ways. The transcendent deliverer was often identified with Daniel’s one like a son of man, although he was not always called “son of man.” In *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, e.g., royal and messianic terminology predominated. In other cases not discussed here (Dan 12:1 and the Qumran texts about Melchizedek), a different kind of transcendent savior was envisioned without employing the imagery and terminology of Daniel 7. (See ESCHATOLOGY.) Common to all of these texts is an emphasis on the judicial functions of the exalted one—an element foreign to Daniel 7 but central to the Davidic texts and taken over into Second Isaiah.

The creative milieu for these traditions were situations of persecution or suffering, as is clear in Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch*. Although *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* do not mention persecution, the nation’s suffering after the events of 70 C.E. is the omnipresent context in these works, and Roman injustice is singled out in *4 Ezra* 12:40–43 and is generalized in *2 Bar.* 72:4. In *Wisdom* 2 and 5, the persecution and vindication of the righteous one are in focus. In all of these texts, kings, princes, or the rich and powerful are the source of suffering, and thus the royal prerogative and function of judgment is understandably ascribed to the respective protagonists. A similar situation provides the context for parallel speculation about a Davidic messiah in *Ps. Sol.* 17.

The dating of the son of man-servant-messiah tradition is difficult because its clearest attestation is in the Parables, which are notoriously difficult to date. Nonetheless, the evidence in *4 Ezra* 13 indicates that something very close to the tradition in the Parables was known and substantially domesticated by the end of the 1st century. An earlier date is indicated by the *Wisdom of Solomon* (ca. 40 C.E. at the latest) and its modified form of the conflation of servant and messianic traditions. Thus the conflated tradition attested in the Parables appears to have been extant early in the 1st century C.E. This

hypothesis provides a context for the study of NT son of man traditions.

### **C. The New Testament**

The term “son of man” occurs in the NT, with four exceptions (Acts 7, Hebrew 2, and Revelation 1, 14), only in the gospels, and there always on the lips of Jesus. With one exception (John 5:27), the gospels always use the definite article (“*the* son of man”), thus introducing the term as a known quantity, even in contexts where it has not been previously defined. Modern scholarship has raised a plethora of questions about the usage in the gospels. How does one classify the sayings? What are the various connotations of the term? To what extent does the usage reflect the Jewish traditions in Daniel, *1 Enoch*, *4 Ezra*? Was there, in fact, a concept of a son of man figure prior to the gospel traditions? Did the historical Jesus use the term, and if so, which sayings are genuine and was Jesus referring to himself or another figure?

Since the term’s use or nonuse by the historical Jesus has been very much at the center of the discussion, extensive debates have revolved about the philological issue. How was the Aramaic term *bar enash* used in 1st century Palestine? If Jesus used it, could he have meant, simply “I,” “me,” or “this man”? If so, then one need not assume that his use of it implied a messianic allusion to the figure of Daniel 7.

The present discussion will build on the treatment of the Jewish texts provided above, with two questions particularly in focus. To what extent do the NT son of man texts reflect the conflated traditional developments described above, in their imagery and in the status and functions they ascribe to “the son of man”? Are there NT texts that do not use the expression, but appear to reflect these traditional developments? Such a study and classification of the texts may also help historical queries about earlier forms of the sayings that may be attributed to the historical Jesus.

Since the investigation is textually oriented, primary consideration must be given to the contexts and functions of the passages in the documents that presently contain them. Only in the case of “Q,” the hypothetical source of the material common to Matthew and Luke, are the texts discussed with reference to an antecedent context, although the present contexts in Matthew and Luke are also discussed.

**1. The Document “Q.” a. Matt 24:26-27; 37-39 = Luke 17:22-37.** The son of man’s epiphany is compared to the flashing of lightning and to the coming of the flood in the days of Noah. This double comparison emphasizes the universal dimensions of the son of man’s appearance and the sudden and unexpected character of the

judgment it will bring. Both the Matthean–Lukan comparison with Noah and the additional Lukan comparison with Lot (which could be original; cf. Sir 16:7–8; Wis 10:4–7; 2 Pet 2:4–10) indicate that a few righteous will be saved, but the saying emphasizes the damning judgment that will fall on the majority of humanity. Although the comparison with lightning recalls the heavenly setting of the scene in Dan 7:13–14, the association of judgment with the son of man and the analogy of the days of Noah parallel the Enochic form of the tradition, for which the flood/final judgment typology is commonplace. The verb “revealed” in Luke 17:30 is not typically Lukan and may be original to the saying. The verb is used in *1 En.* 48:7; 62:7 of the present time and in *2 Bar.* 29:3; 39:7 and *4 Ezra* 7:28; 13:32 of the future. The idea is consonant with the public manifestation indicated by the comparison with the flood and the judgment of Sodom and recalls the judgment scenes in *1 Enoch* 62–63, *4 Ezra* 7 and 13, and *2 Baruch* 40 and 72.

**b. Matt 24:43–44 = Luke 12:39–40.** Like the previous saying, this logion emphasizes the sudden, unexpected nature of the son of man’s coming, here compared to a thief’s break-in. Thus, although judgment is not mentioned as such, the admonitory function of the saying indicates that judgment rather than Israel’s salvation and exaltation (Daniel 7) is associated with the coming of the son of man. Knowledge of the saying is widely attested in the NT. It may well be reflected in Mark 13:32–36, which occurs shortly after the reference to the coming of the son of man in 13:26–27 (cf. Matt 24:42). On the tradition in Paul, Revelation, and 2 Peter, see below, C.6.a, C.7, C.8.

**c. Matt 10:32–33 = Luke 12:8–9; cf. Mark 8:38 (below).** These passages and their contexts emphasize the ultimate consequences of human confession or denial of Jesus, probably in courts of law. The preceding context in both Matthew and Luke (and hence Q) anticipates the final judgment when secret words will be publicly manifest. Physical death is contrasted with eternal destruction, and divine protection is promised to those who do not fear to give up their lives (cf. Mark 8:34–37). The one who “has authority to cast into Gehenna” (Luke 12:5; Matt 10:28) would seem to be God, but the idiom appears in Daniel 7, and in *1 Enoch* the son of man is the agent of the judgment that condemns to Sheol. Luke 12:8–9 and its Markan parallel agree against Matt 10:32–33 in their reference to the son of man. He is a future judicial figure in the heavenly court, whose function is specifically related to Jesus; he will respond in kind to human responses to Jesus. Presumed is the Enochic formulation: the son of man is the heavenly vindicator of the wronged righteous. Matthew’s use of “I” rather than “the son of man” could be due to the evangelist’s redaction based on his identification of the son of man with Jesus. Alternatively, it could reflect the earliest form of the saying, or at least a pre-Matthean variant that identifies the heavenly vindicator with the righteous one, as in Wisdom 2 and 5. The original verb in the second

part of the saying is uncertain. “Ashamed” (Mark 8:38) is a verb that is used in judicial contexts to mean “lose one’s case,” and the noun “shame” occurs in *1 En.* 62:10; 63:11 in connection with the son of man’s condemnation of the kings and the mighty. However, the use of “deny” in Mark 8:34 may reflect knowledge of the version of the saying in Q, where that verb occurs, and its omission in Mark 8:38 could be an attempt to avoid application to Peter (cf. 14:68, 70). Mark’s reference to the “Father” and the “angels” has parallels in the Matthean and Lukan versions of the Q saying respectively.

**d. Matt 19:28 = Luke 22:28-30.** In the future, Jesus’ disciples will be enthroned with the son of man to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Although only Matthew mentions “the son of man,” Luke’s statement that “my Father has assigned me the kingdom” and the reference to enthronement parallels the wording of Daniel 7. It is uncertain whether judging (*krinein*) here connotes judicial functions (*1 Enoch*) or ruling (as in Daniel), or both. Important, however, is the relationship between one’s association with Jesus and one’s future exaltation with the son of man, which parallels C.1.c, above.

**e. Matt 12:38-42 = Luke 11:29-32.** Luke’s reference to the son of man being a sign like Jonah is usually regarded as more original than Matthew’s explicit reference to the son of man’s death and resurrection (which reflects the passion predictions). Different from C.1.c and d, the son of man is identified as Jesus the prophet, who is compared to Jonah and wise Solomon. Unlike their preaching and teaching, Jesus’ preaching is rejected in his own time. As in C.1.c, this rejection will have consequences at the final judgment, when the obedient Queen of the South and the penitent inhabitants of Nineveh will condemn the wicked of Jesus’ generation. The term “son of man” may be used here of the earthly Jesus because he is expected to be the one who will preside over the final judgment. In such a case, another element in C.1.c is present, although the rejection that will be punished is here located in Jesus’ earthly ministry rather than in the postresurrection community. The reference to “the wisdom of Solomon” is noteworthy; the book of that name recounts the career of the rejected and vindicated sage, using as a pattern the Isaianic tradition that *1 Enoch* applies to the exaltation of the son of man (above, B.3).

**f. Matt 11:16-19 = Luke 7:31-35.** As in the previous saying, “this generation” is criticized for rejecting the prophetic ministry of Jesus, the son of man. Indeed, they have rejected both the stern preaching of John and the joyous proclamation of forgiveness announced by the son of man. The wrongness of this rejection will become evident when “wisdom is vindicated.” The motif recalls both Wisdom 2 and 5, whose rejected and vindicated protagonist is the spokesman of Wisdom, and the Parables of Enoch, whose exalted protagonist has some of the characteristics of preexistent Wisdom.

Paradoxically, the son of man's ministry is characterized by the reconciliation of sinners in contrast to John's announcement of the kind of judgment that the Parables of Enoch associate with the son of man.

**g. Matt 12:32 = Luke 12:10.** This free-floating logion also refers to opposition to the human Jesus, the son of man, but it contrasts such words against Jesus in his ministry with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the postresurrection situation. In Matthew the logion precedes the saying about the sign of Jonah and is compatible with it because the sign of the son of man is his resurrection. In Luke, it is also compatible with its context because the son of man's future judicial functions relate to confession and denial in the postresurrection situation (cf. Mark 13:9-11).

**h. Matt 8:20 = Luke 9:58.** "Son of man" here is sometimes taken as a surrogate for "I," but at the very least, a contrast is indicated between Jesus the human being and the animals. This could imply the contrast evident in Dan 7:3, 13 and, thus, also Jesus' future status as son of man. Perhaps more to the point is Ps 8:4-8. Ironically, the son of man, who has been given glory and honor as well as dominion over the beasts of the field and the birds of the air, does not have the shelter they possess. If other NT applications of Ps 8:4-8 to Jesus' future power indicate traditional usage (below, C.6.b), the present text may imply an ironic contrast between present lowliness and future glory. In its Lukan context, the saying follows Jesus' rejection by inhospitable Samaritans, but it is uncertain whether Q understood Jesus' homelessness as a result of his rejection.

**i. Matt 4:1-11 = Luke 4:1-13.** Although the title here associated with Jesus is "son of God," Satan's offer to give Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and their glory or power is phrased in the language of Dan 7:14. The verb *paralambanein* ("take along") is typically applied to the accompanying, interpreting angel in journey visions, and the idea here may be that Satan disguises himself as a member of the heavenly court and offers Jesus the prerogatives of the eschatological son of man. The close connection between "son of man" and "son of God" occurs in other texts (see below).

**j. Summary.** Texts in this early stratum associate the son of man with the coming judgment. In 1.a, b, in their Q form, this future figure was not specifically connected with Jesus. In the remainder of the texts, human reactions to Jesus are a touchstone for the future judgment, although in 1.c, d it is not certain that the original form of the saying identified future son of man as the exalted Jesus. In 1.e-h the term "son of man" is used of Jesus in his earthly ministry. The double usage, with reference to Jesus' earthly and future activities, will be fixed in Mark.

**2. The Gospel according to Mark. a. The Son of Man in the Future. (1) Mark 8:38.** Like its parallel in Q (C.1.c; cf. C.1.d, e, f), this text envisions the son of man as the future judicial functionary who will

act in accordance with human reactions to Jesus. In context it follows Peter's confession of Jesus and his rejection of Jesus' announcement that "the son of man" must suffer and die. This is a reminder that Mark's various usages of "son of man" cannot be dissociated from one another. The major elements in v 38 ("comes, glory, Father, angels")—all missing in the Q parallel—have counterparts in Mark 13:26–27, 32 (see C.2.a.3), which may indicate Markan redaction (but see below, C.6.a).

**(2) Mark 14:62.** In context, this reference to the future son of man parallels Mark 8:27–29. Different from Simon, who confessed Jesus as messiah, Caiaphas has cynically asked about Jesus' status as the messiah (v 61). His implied rejection, which will be explicit in v 63, leads to the threat that Caiaphas and his court "will see" the enthroned son of man as their judge. Although Daniel 7 is the source of the idea that the clouds of heaven will convey the son of man (here from the heavenly throne room rather than to it), other elements in the description parallel the tradition in the Parables of Enoch and Wisdom 2, 5. The son of man is also the messiah (v 61), seated at God's right hand (Ps 110:1). He will be seen (*1 Enoch* 62) by those who have rejected him (Wis 5:1–2) not only as messiah but as God's son (Wis 2:16–20; 5:5).

**(3) Mark 13:26–27.** The context is a description of the end time. When *false* messiahs have been proclaimed, the son of man will appear on clouds, as predicted in Dan 7:13–14, but coming from heaven, with the power and glory he has received there (Dan 7:14). Although the judicial function described in *1 Enoch* is not explicit, the influence of that tradition is suggested by two elements not found in Daniel 7. Certain unnamed persons "will see" the son of man, who will send angels to gather "the chosen ones" (cf. *1 Enoch* 51; 61:2–5; 62:14–15).

**b. The Son of Man on Earth.** Mark's gospel reflects the semantic ambiguities in the term "son of man" and plays on these ambiguities, referring to Jesus the man.

**(1) Mark 2:1–12.** With an evident allusion to Dan 7:14, Jesus makes the paradoxical claim that in the present, on earth, this human being possesses divine "authority," which tradition said would be given in the future to the glorified heavenly "son of man." Different from Daniel, this authority involves not political dominion over the nations, but the forgiveness of sins. Thus Jesus exercises divine judgment, but the formulation differs from *1 Enoch*, where the son of man *punishes* sinners and saves the righteous. Both the emphasis on forgiveness and the scribes' opposition to this aspect of Jesus' ministry recall the Q saying about John and the son of man (C.1.f), and the opponents' rejection of the son of man's authority parallels other son of man texts in Q and Mark.

**(2) Mark 2:23-28.** This story repeats the paradox in Mark 2:1-12. As son of man, Jesus states what is permissible (*exestin*, the verb from which *exousia* “authority” is derived) on the divinely created sabbath.

**c. The Son of Man who Dies and Rises** (8:31; 9:9-12, 31; 10:33-34, 45). These passages predict the events that constitute the climax of Mark’s gospel (cf. 14:21, 41), in each case using verbs that occur in Second Isaiah’s last servant passage (52:13-53:12). The pattern of suffering and vindication will be embodied in chaps. 14-16 in a literary genre whose prototype is found in the recasting of Isaiah 52-53 in Wisdom 2 and 5. The use of the term “son of man” in these predictions again plays on the ambiguity of the expression. Jesus the man will be vindicated in his resurrection and will then appear as the glorified son of man. The term is further legitimated in the present usage because of the traditional conflation of servant and son of man materials in the Parables of Enoch. Mark identifies the vindicator with the persecuted one, as in Wisdom, but he parallels the Enochic form of the tradition by using the term “son of man” as a designation for the unique future champion of the chosen.

**d. Summary.** Mark uses “son of man” both as a designation for the human Jesus and in its traditional specific sense to denote his future status as the exalted messianic judge. Bridging the two usages are the formulas that describe the death and resurrection of Jesus; the suffering man will become the exalted son of man when the rejection that led to his death is overcome in the vindication constitutive in his resurrection. In the future as son of man, he will participate in the judgment of those who rejected him in his lifetime or during the time of the church. The purposeful ambiguity of the expression, which is an integral part of Mark’s plot, is evident in the author’s decision never to use “son of man” as the predicate of the verb “to be,” as he does with the titles “son of God” and “messiah.” Jesus is never said to be the one who “is the son of man.” The lack of such explicit identification allows the ambiguity of the term to stand, and thus perpetuates the mystery of Jesus’ identity among the human characters in the story in spite of his use of the term.

**e. Son of Man and Son of God.** Mark’s theology has a peculiar terminological twist. Jesus the son of man is also son of God. The relationship of the two terms is evident in Mark 8:38, which refers to God as the Father of the son of man. Although the title “son of God” may well be a messianic designation derived from Psalm 2 (see Mark 1:11, where it is conflated with servant language also used in *1 Enoch* 49:4), its use by demons designates him as a unique divine being. Because he is such, he can forgive sins, rule the sabbath, and exercise God’s power to still the sea (4:35-41). But son of God is not simply contrasted to son of man, as Jesus’ divine status is contrasted to his human status. In the tradition of the Parables, the son of man who will

judge is a preexistent heavenly being with some of the characteristics of divine Wisdom. Between such a preexistence, which Mark presumes for the son of God, and the future glory which he attributes to the exalted son of man, Mark posits an earthly incarnation as the son of man, Jesus of Nazareth. But like the righteous one in Wisdom 2 and 5, this man is shown to be son of God by obediently submitting to God's will in the human fate of death (Mark 15:39; cf. Wis 2:12-20; 5:1-5). Mark's three stage pattern of preexistence, incarnation, and exaltation results from his overlaying of two related patterns: *Enoch's* preexistent and exalted son of man, and Wisdom of Solomon's persecuted and exalted righteous man/son of God. This overlaying of patterns appears to have been present also in Q, which presented Jesus as Wisdom's persecuted spokesman who would also be the exalted son of man.

**3. The Gospel according to Matthew. a. Matt 13:24-30, 36-43.** In this parable and its interpretation, judgment is the purpose of the son of man's parousia (explicating Mark 13:26-27 = Matt 24:30-31), and the son of man is identified with the earthly Jesus. The notion that the righteous will "be sown" as seed (contrast Mark 4:1-20 = Matt 13:1-23, where the unnamed sower sows the word of God) recalls similar terminology in *1 Enoch* 62:8 (see below). In the eschatological part of the parable's interpretation (13:41-43), the son of man dispatches his angels not to gather his chosen ones (Mark 13:27; cf. in the parable, v 30), but to gather the wicked and cast them into hell (cf. *1 Enoch* 62-63 and the discussion of C.1.c above). The positive side of judgment is present in the interpretation in v 43—a democratizing of the exaltation of the wise in Dan 12:3. The language describing the harvest parallels John's preaching in Matt 3:11-12 and thus ascribes to the baptist a proclamation about the future activity of the son of man as the judge.

**b. Matt 25:31-46.** This extensive description of the great judgment is rooted in Daniel 7: The central figure is the son of man who comes in his glory. The scene, however, is closely related to the tradition attested in *1 Enoch* 62-63 and Wisdom 2 and 5. As in the Parables, the son of man is a royal figure ("the king," vv 34, 40) who is seated on "the throne of his glory" (v 31; cf. the Parables of Enoch) for the purpose of judgment. In this judgment the nations recognize in the enthroned one the little ones whom they had helped or maltreated on earth, and on the basis of these actions they are granted eternal life or consigned to eternal punishment (cf. *2 Baruch* 72). The passage is a hybrid of the forms of the tradition in the Parables and Wisdom. As in the former, the son of man is the champion and avenger of the persecuted little ones. As in Wisdom, there is a kind of identification between the persecuted ones and the exalted one: "what you have done to the least of these, you have done to me" (vv 40, 45). In its focus on the judgment of those who have responded to Jesus' persecuted alter egos in the world, this text complements the Q and

Markan tradition about the son of man's eschatological judicial functions vis-à-vis those who have confessed or denied Jesus under duress (see above).

**c. Other Passages about the Son of Man in the Future.**

Matthew's editorial work also reflects his interest in the future activity of the son of man. Although it is possible that he changed "son of man" to "I" in the Q logion in 10:32-33, he has changed Mark's "I" to "son of man" in 16:13, and in 16:28 he has altered Mark 9:1 to refer to the son of man's coming in his kingdom. Other additions define the son of man as judge. According to 16:27 (= Mark 8:38), the son of man will "render to each according to his deeds." In 10:23, he concludes Markan material about the disciples' persecution by promising that the son of man's parousia will cut it short. The juxtaposition parallels the Q saying about confession, denial, and the judgment, which follows in vv 32-33.

**d. The Son of Man Exalted before the Parousia** (26:64; 28:16-20). In Mark 13:26 and 14:62, Jesus predicts the future coming to earth of the enthroned son of man without indicating when the enthronement will take place. Matthew defines this more closely in 26:64, where Jesus informs Caiaphas that "hereafter (*ap} arti*) you will see the son of man ..." (cf. Luke 22:69). The time of the enthronement is made explicit in 28:16-20. By the time he commissions the eleven in Galilee, the resurrected Jesus has already been "given all authority in heaven and on earth" (Dan 7:14), something he earlier refused, when Satan offered it to him.

**e. Summary.** Much more than Mark, Matthew emphasizes Jesus' identity and functions as son of man. The combination of Markan and Q traditions creates a relatively large number of references to Jesus' earthly activity as son of man, and Matthew's redactional touches and unique passages employ the language and imagery of Daniel 7 and the Parables of Enoch in order to allude to or describe Jesus' postresurrection exaltation and, notably, his future function as judge.

**4. Luke-Acts.** Luke, like Mark and Matthew, uses the term "son of man" in connection with Jesus' ministry, his death and resurrection, and his future eschatological activity, and with reference to each of these, Luke shows some predilection for the term.

**a. The Ministry of the Son of Man.** In his use of Mark 2:10, 28 (at 5:24; 6:5) and in his placement and redaction of some of the Q traditions (about the Baptist and the son of man, the son of man's homelessness, the sign of Jonah, and words against the son of man), Luke depicts Jesus' ministry as the activity of the son of man which leads to opposition and rejection. In a similar vein, Luke moves the material from Mark 10:35-44 to Luke 22:24-27, and revises Mark 10:45 to describe not the death of the son of man, but Jesus' mission, in his ministry, to seek and save the lost (19:10).

**b. The Death and Resurrection of the Son of Man.** Of Mark's sayings about the son of man's death and resurrection, only 9:9, 13 have been dropped. The second of these references reappears, however, in 17:25, where it is incorporated into the eschatological timetable that will culminate with the days of the final revelation of the son of man. The death-resurrection formula is also inserted into each of the three stories in chap. 24 to vindicate Jesus' predictions; the term "son of man" is used in the first instance (v 7), while messiah (Christ) occurs in v 26.

**c. The Son of Man in the Future.** The future judicial functions of the son of man are essential to Luke's eschatology, as is evident in his use of tradition and the details of his redaction and composition. Throughout, he admonishes the church to act with an awareness of the connection between its present existence and its future accountability to the son of man. The beatitude in 6:22 promises heavenly reward to those who are rejected not "for my sake" (cf. Matt 5:11, the Q parallel) or "for my sake and the gospel's" (Mark 8:35; 13:9-10), but for the sake of the one who will be identified as the eschatological judge—the son of man (cf. the parallel Markan and Q traditions at Luke 9:26; 12:8). Warnings about indifference concerning the time of coming of the son of man are expressed in the Q sayings in 12:35-38; 39-40; 41-48. The second of these speaks explicitly of the son of man's coming. The first and third are partly paralleled in Mark 13:32-37, which comments on the time of the coming of the son of man. Luke 17:20-18:8 is held together by the common theme of the coming of the kingdom and the end (cf. also 17:1, 7, 12). First, Jesus disclaims the possibility of apocalyptic calculation (17:20-21). Then after the Q tradition about the suddenness of the son of man's revelation (vv 22-37), Luke inserts a parable that promises speedy vindication to God's chosen ones (18:1-8). The placement of 18:8b indicates that the son of man will be the agent of that vindication and the judge who will look for faith on earth. In chap. 21 (= Mark 13), Luke announces the glorious coming of the son of man (vv 27-28 = Mark 13:26-27) and defines the gathering of his chosen ones as "your redemption." In vv 34-36, which replace Mark's ending to the section (cf. 13:32-37), traditional material (see below, C.6.a) has a Lukan nuance that recalls 18:1-8. The promise of redemption for the chosen ones is qualified with an admonition to be ready to "stand before the son of man," the judge.

**d. The Present Exaltation of the Son of Man.** Like its Matthean counterpart, Luke's version of Jesus' statement to Caiaphas specifies that "henceforth" (*apo tou nun*) the son of man will be enthroned (22:69; cf. Matt 26:64). Different from Matt 28:16-20, Luke documents the enthronement not in the account of Jesus' commissioning of the eleven (24:44-49), but in Acts, in two stages. First, drawing on Dan 7:13-14 and its typical NT revision, Luke

compares Jesus' ascent on a cloud with his return on a cloud (Acts 1:9-11). Secondly, Stephen's vision reveals that Jesus' enthronement as son of man is an accomplished fact (Acts 7:55). The threat implicit in the Caiaphas scene recurs. Stephen's revelation vindicates the preaching that led to his trial and triggers his condemnation to death for the sake of the one he has revealed to be son of man.

**e. Jesus as the Chosen One and Righteous One.** Although we must be cautious in our conclusions about early Christian applications of multiple titles to Jesus, Luke-Acts is especially noteworthy for its combination or interchanging of son of man, messianic, and servant terminology and imagery. Simeon, who awaits "the Lord's anointed one," blesses Jesus as "the light of the nations" (Luke 2:25-32; cf. Isa 49:6; *1 En.* 48:4, 10). In the crucifixion scene, Luke replaces Mark's "the anointed one, the King of Israel" with "God's anointed one, his Chosen One" (Mark 15:32; Luke 23:35). The voice at the transfiguration designates Jesus as "my Son, my Chosen One" (9:35), a messianic-servant conflation that differs from Mark's "my beloved Son" (9:7). In Acts the crucified and resurrected Jesus is three times designated as "the Righteous One" (3:14; 7:52; 22:14), a term applied to the son of man in Enoch and the persecuted protagonist of Wisdom 2 and 5. A nontitular use occurs in the centurion's confession (23:47; cf. Matt 27:4, 19, 24). This usage should not obscure Luke's interest also in Jesus' status as the anointed one who has entered his glory (see 23:42; 24:26; Acts 2:36).

**5. The Fourth Gospel.** John's use of "son of man" is an integral part of his whole, many-faceted view of Jesus. Although the term occasionally appears where one might expect "son of God," it is usually accompanied by elements familiar from the Jewish traditions or the Synoptic son of man passages. It is associated with judgment and with Jesus' humanity and his death. Most striking are the uses of the verbs *hypsoun* ("lift up, exalt"), which John uses only in conjunction with "son of man," and *doxazein* ("glorify"), which he applies to Jesus mainly in connection with his proper name or the term "son of man." Both verbs denote a status traditionally ascribed to the son of man in the future, but both are also used of the servant of the Lord in the LXX of Second Isaiah. This tendency to make "son of man" the subject of verbs that Second Isaiah applies to the servant parallels the Synoptic tradition and especially its passion predictions (above, C.2.c). Thus, in his use of the conflate Jewish tradition, John, like the other evangelists, employs the Enochic term "son of man" but also uses the notion in Wisdom 2 and 5 that the exalted one is identical with the persecuted one. John's special nuance is the use of verbs that interpret Jesus' death as his exaltation. The idea parallels Wisdom, and it also replaces the Synoptic notion of a future glorious parousia of the son of man. For John, as for Mark, a tension exists between Jesus' identity as son of

God and son of man, but in John, Jesus' heavenly preexistence is explicit both to the reader and in Jesus' public discourse.

**a. John 1:43-51.** The strangeness of the comparison of Jesus with Jacob's ladder (Gen 28:10-17) should not obscure the close connection between this passage and Synoptic references to the son of man, in particular the accounts of Peter's confession and Caiaphas' rejection of Jesus. Nathaniel identifies Jesus as "son of God" and "King of Israel" (messiah) and Jesus responds with a reference to "the son of man." As in Mark 14:62 = Matt 26:64, he refers to heaven and what "you will see" (*opsesthe*); "the angels" add another traditional son of man detail. John's unique touches are these: the exalted son of man will not come on a cloud at the eschaton; in the time after the ascension/exaltation, when greater things happen (cf. 14:12), the angels will minister to the church because of the activity of Jesus, the son of man. The title may imply the death/exaltation of Jesus and its corollary, his humanity.

**b. John 3:13-16.** The parallelism in v 14 indicates the centrality of Jesus' crucifixion, but the ambiguous verb *hypsoun* expresses the paradox that the lifting of Jesus on the cross is his exaltation to the place from which he came (v 13). This paradox, that the son of man is also the heavenly son of God (cf. 1:49, 51) is expressed in v 16. The verb *dei* ("it is necessary") prefacing a statement about the death/exaltation of the son of man parallels the formulation of the Synoptic predictions about the necessity of the son of man's death and resurrection (Mark 8:31 par.; Luke 24:7, 26).

**c. John 5:25-29.** This double tradition again identifies Jesus as both son of God and son of man and ascribes to both the uttering of the voice that will raise the dead. If v 26 states that the Father has "granted" (*edoæken*) his son to have life, v 27 employs the language of Dan 7:14; he has also "given him authority ... because he is the son of man." Like the traditional extension of Daniel 7 in *1 Enoch* and the Synoptics, it is the authority to execute judgment (vv 27-30).

**d. John 6:27, 53, 62.** In the present form of this complex chapter, which is marked by repetitions, developments in the tradition, and redaction, the following data are relevant. The "son of man" is the functionary of "the Father," and the terms are almost juxtaposed in v 27. He is the one who gives "food" for life (v 27), and is also the "bread" of life itself that has descended from heaven (vv 35-38). The "bread" that he gives is unexpectedly identified in vv 51-56 as the "flesh" (and "blood") of the "son of man." This may be a legitimate exposition of v 27 (Jesus *qua* man gives his life; cf. 3:14-16). The wording of v 62 recalls Synoptic passages about seeing the exalted son of man. Here the ascent that will be seen is the return of the son of man/son of God to his former glory.

**e. John 8:28.** As in 3:14, Jesus describes his crucifixion with the verb *hypsoun*, whose ambiguity is evident in the fact that those who

lift up the son of man will learn from that who he is. Close at hand is Wisdom 5, where persecutors see the one whom they denied and put to death exalted among the sons of God and ready to condemn them. Jesus' identity as the heavenly one is clear in the context here, and his function as judge is mentioned (v 26).

**f. John 9:35.** Here alone in John, the son of man is the object of belief, and some mss read "son of God." The reference to judgment in v 39 is consonant with the term "son of man," and the point may be, "Do you believe that this man is the expected son of man?" As in 5:27, with its reference to judgment, the importance of Jesus' identity as the "son of man" is indicated by the term's syntactical function as predicate of the verb "to be."

**g. John 12:23-41.** This passage is a remarkable Johannine reformulation of Synoptic passion material. Verses 23, 25-26 recall Mark 8:31, 34, 35, 38. Verses 27-29 are a Johannine reformulation of the Synoptic Gethsemane tradition, and possibly the long reading attested in some mss of Luke 23:43-44. Although the allusion to the cross in 12:32-33 need not reflect the saying in Mark 8:34, the verb *dei* ("must") in John 12:34 parallels Mark 8:31, as it did in John 3:14. A typical Johannine feature running through the passage is the interpretation of Jesus' crucifixion as the exaltation/glorification of the son of man, which the Synoptics see as separate events. The conflated citation of Isa 53:1 and 6:9-10 (vv 38-40) adds another Johannine nuance. The former passage, which begins Isaiah's description of the suffering of the servant, follows the description of the servant's exaltation (*hypsoun*) and glorification (*doxazein*). The quotation of Isaiah 6 allows John to equate the servant's glory with the glory of the son, which the prophet saw in his inaugural vision. Now, as then, the people do not believe.

**h. John 13:31.** This last Johannine reference to the son of man employs the verb "glorify" four times in a way that parallels the servant passages in Isa 53:12 and 49:3. As earlier, the glorification is Jesus' crucifixion.

**6. Paul and the Pauline Tradition.** The term "son of man" never occurs in the writings of Paul; the Semitic expression would not have been understood by Paul's gentile audience. Nonetheless, at least two Pauline passages appear to reflect knowledge of Synoptic son of man traditions.

**a. 1 Thessalonians.** This earliest of Paul's extant writings is dominated by the expectation of the parousia of Jesus, who is called variously "Lord" and "Son." Several passages indicate the judicial nature of the parousia or of Jesus' functions in connection with it, and in some cases, the language or imagery parallels Synoptic son of man traditions.

According to 1:10, Jesus will come from heaven as the divine vindicator to rescue Christians from the coming wrath. In 2:19-20, Paul

focuses on his own judgment (cf. 1 Cor 3:13–15; 4:1–5). When he stands “in the presence of (*emprosthen*) our Lord Jesus Christ at his parousia” (cf. Luke 21:36), the Thessalonians will be the cause for his hope and joy, his crown of boasting and his glory (cf. Wis 5:16). The references to blamelessness (cf. Jude 24–25) and holiness in 3:13 (cf. 5:23) indicate that judgment will be effected “in the presence of (*emprosthen*) God and our Father at the parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his holy ones” (cf. the wording of Mark 8:38, and see also Did. 6:6–8).

With the death of some of the Thessalonians, Paul found it necessary to augment his preaching about the parousia by integrating reference to the resurrection into his eschatological scenario (4:13–18). A creedal formula about Jesus’ resurrection from the dead is Paul’s basis for his proclamation of the Christian’s resurrection, and an appeal to “a word of the Lord” (4:15) introduces a brief description of the parousia, which places the resurrection in the context of events that are mentioned in Mark’s description of the coming of the son of man (13:26–27) and Matthew’s elaboration of the passage (24:31): the voice of an archangel; the trumpet of God (Matthew); Jesus’ descent from heaven; and the Christians being caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.

This Pauline description is followed immediately by an admonition to vigilance, which also has echoes of Synoptic tradition (5:1–11). The comparison of the day of the Lord with a thief recalls Matt 24:43–44 = Luke 12:39–40. The vocabulary in 1 Thess 5:3, 7 and the admonition to pray constantly (v 17) occur in Luke’s ending to the “Synoptic apocalypse” (21:34–36), with its warning to be watchful in order to be able to stand before the son of man. The imagery about sleeping and watchfulness is typical of several Synoptic passages about the parousia. Paul’s comparison to a woman’s birth pangs parallels the metaphor in Mark 13:8 and, more closely, the simile in *1 En.* 62:4.

**b. 1 Cor 15:23–28.** As in 1 Thessalonians 4, Paul argues from Christ’s resurrection to the Christians’ resurrection at the time of the parousia. Verses 23–28 describe events leading to the parousia and resurrection, employing language from a royal Psalm (Ps 110:1) and from two biblical texts that speak of “son of man,” namely, Dan 7:14 and Ps 8:7 (cf. the conflation of Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:14 in Mark 14:62). Until the parousia, Christ is occupied with the destruction of “every rule (*archeæ*) and every authority (*exousia*; cf. Matt 28:16) and power (*dynamis*).” When he has finished this, Christ will deliver the kingdom (*basileia*) to God. The vocabulary is Daniel’s with *dynamis* paralleled in Mark 13:26. Paul’s special nuance is to interpret the Danielic nouns to refer to angelic powers (cf. Matt 24:29). He develops this theme first in the words of Ps 110:1; the resurrected Christ is in the process of

placing “all his enemies under his feet.” Then he brings in language parallel to Ps 8:7. The reigning Christ is “subjecting all things under his feet” (cf. Eph 1:21–22)—something the psalmist attributes to “man” and “the son of man,” whom God has crowned with honor and glory. Different from Daniel 7, the enthronement here envisioned is temporary; final kingly rule will belong to God. The language of v 24 suggests the reversal of Dan 7:14; the enthroned Jesus will give back what was given to the son of man. Also different from Daniel 7, but like *1 Enoch*, the judicial function of subduing of evil powers is attributed to the exalted one and does not occur before his enthronement. The subduing of death, i.e., Jesus’ association with the final resurrection, parallels 1 Thess 4:14–16, as well as *1 Enoch* 51 and 62. That God is here called “Father” (v 24) is consonant with the gospel son of man traditions that speak of God in these terms. In his argument about the resurrection body (vv 35–44), Paul’s reference to “sowing” and “raising” parallels *1 Enoch* 62:8.

**c. Other Pauline Texts about Jesus the Judge.** 1 Cor 3:10–14; 4:1–5 emphasize that Paul and Apollos will be judged for their ministry. The first passage, with its reference to judgment by fire, reflects a Jewish judgment tradition like that in *Testament of Abraham* 12–13. The references to revelation and disclosure, not specifically found in the *Testament of Abraham*, are picked up again in 4:1–5, which has some remarkable terminological parallels with Luke 12:2–9, 39–46 = Matt 10:26–32; 24:42–51, where the relevant language is related to judgment and appears in the context of sayings about the son of man.

2 Cor 5:10 explicitly asserts the judicial functions of Christ, before (*emprosthen*) whose tribunal (*beaema*) all must appear to receive what they deserve for their good and evil deeds. The passage provides a context for Rom 2:1–16, which emphasizes that God is the righteous judge of human deeds and the secrets of the heart (v 16; cf. 1 Cor 4:5), but indicates that Jesus will be the agent of that judgment (v 16).

**d. 2 Thess 2:1–12.** This Pauline or Deutero-Pauline text about the parousia of “our Lord Jesus Christ,” like its counterpart in 1 Thessalonians 4–5, employs the Synoptic tradition known from Mark 13. Here the transcendent messiah is depicted like the Man from the Sea in *4 Ezra* 13. In a formulation unique to this passage, the fiery blast from his mouth destroys the man of lawlessness, a satanic incarnation whose claims to deity recall texts about rebel kings in Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28, and whose performance of signs and wonders is paralleled in the descriptions of the false prophets in Mark 13. A similar confrontation is described in the latter chapters of Revelation (see below).

**e. Heb 2:5–9.** In this text and its context, the author reinterprets the exposition of Ps 8:7 in 1 Corinthians 15. Nothing is

excepted from Jesus' authority (2:8; contrast 1 Cor 15:27). Whether this author believes that this authority is already in place for the exalted Christ is not clear. The "not yet" of the tradition, different from 1 Corinthians 15, refers to the incarnation and the passion of the preexistent Jesus, who "for a little while" was made lower than the angels, but whom God has seated at his right hand (Ps 110:1), crowned with honor and glory, and set over all things. Hebrews is remarkable both for its agreements with and differences from the Synoptic tradition. Son of man designates the human existence of the preexistent Wisdom, who is also son of God (1:1-4), but the author never refers to the coming judge as such.

**7. The Book of Revelation.** The risen and exalted Jesus, who dominates the action in this apocalypse, is a composite figure who parallels the Chosen One in the Parables of Enoch and the Man from the Sea in *4 Ezra* 13 and draws on the same biblical traditions that underlie the two Jewish texts.

In 1:7 he is presented in the imagery of Dan 7:14, but it is immediately clear that the glorious one who will come with the clouds is the persecuted one who will be seen by his enemies. The idea is conveyed through the language of Zech 12:10, which is used both at the conclusion of John's passion narrative and in the Matthean elaboration of Mark's description of the son of man's parousia (Matt 24:30 = Mark 13:26; cf. *Ep. Barn.* 7:9-10).

Although the description of the risen one in 1:12-16 recalls the angel in Daniel 10, the analogy, "one like a son of man" (v 13) suggests the figure in Dan 7:13. Elements in the letters that he dictates draw on traditional messianic language and Synoptic son of man traditions. The sword that issues from his mouth (1:16, 2:12, 16) is an element drawn from Isa 11:4 which recurs in *1 Enoch* 62:2 and *4 Ezra* 13:4, 10-11. His status as the son of God who will rule the nations with a rod of iron (2:18, 27) is also messianic, and the language derives from Ps 2:7-8, a text used in *1 Enoch* 48, *Wisdom* 2 and 5, and *4 Ezra* 13.

The letter to Sardis draws on the Synoptic tradition that compares the Day of the son of man to a thief (3:3; Matt 24:43-44 = Luke 12:39-40; cf. 1 Thess 5:1-7), and Rev 3:5, 8 reflect elements of both the Matthean and Lukan wording of the Q tradition about confessing and denying (Matt 10:32-33; Luke 12:8-9).

The scene in chap. 5 is a reshaping of Dan 7:13-14, with some remarkable differences. The Lion of Judah (5:5) recalls the Davidic messiah of *4 Ezra* 12, but he is quickly defined as the Lamb who was slain (5:6, 12). Although much debate has centered on the meaning of this image and its parallel in John 1:29, an appeal to Isa 53:7, 11 is supported by the traditional conflation of son of man, messianic, and servant language in the Jewish and Christian texts already cited. The lamb stands before God's throne as the Chosen One does in *1 Enoch*

49:2 (cf. Wis 5:1; Acts 7:55). According to 5:7-12, the taking of the scroll from God's right hand (cf. Ps 110:1) is related to the Lamb's receiving of power, might, honor, and glory (cf. Dan 7:14). Hereafter one hears about "him who sits on the throne and the Lamb" (5:13; 6:16; 7:9, etc.). Thus, the Lamb's relationship to God parallels that of the Lord of Spirits and the Chosen One in *1 Enoch* and God and God's anointed in Psalm 2.

Reference to the royal psalm recurs in 11:15, 18; 12:5, 10, although the last verse associates with God and his anointed one the power, kingdom, and authority which are delegated to the one like a son of man in Daniel 7.

Revelation 13 returns to Daniel 7 and the beast who rises from the sea, but the opponent of the two beasts of chap. 13 is the Lamb on Mt. Zion, the son of God—the Lord's anointed mentioned in Ps 2 and also placed on Mt. Zion in *4 Ezra* 13. Jesus' messianic status is again explicit in the vision in 19:11-21, where the imagery of Psalm 2 and Isaiah 11 recurs. He is seated, not on a throne, but on a horse, ready for battle against the kings of the earth. Functionally, this is the equivalent of the Parables' description of the Chosen One, who is seated on the throne of glory in order to judge the kings and the mighty (also a cliché in Revelation).

According to Revelation 20, Christ and those beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the word of God (cf. "for me and the gospel ... me and my words," Mark 8:35, 38) will be enthroned with Christ for a thousand years, after which the judgment will take place in a court that is described like the tribunal in Dan 7:10. The book concludes with the promise with which it began: the exalted one is coming to commence the events already described (22:20).

Much more than any of the other NT texts, Revelation emphasizes Jesus' functions as ruler (whether in the present, in the millennium, or afterward), and in this sense John returns to Daniel 7. Nonetheless, the Jewish and early Christian developments of the tradition are evident in the importance that John assigns to the coming judgment as the resolution of the present crisis, and in the judicial functions that he ascribes to the exalted Jesus.

**8. 2 Peter.** Belief and disbelief in the parousia of Jesus is a central problem in this text. In 1:16-21, the guarantee of this parousia is the glorious vision which the Synoptics describe as a transfiguration. Here Peter seems to depict the event as the postresurrection exaltation of the son of man; Jesus "received honor and glory" (cf. Rev 5:12). A divine oracle "from heaven" announcing Jesus as "my son" and the location of the event on "the holy mountain" recall motifs from Ps 2:4, 6, 7. 2 Peter 2 alludes to the Enochic story of the rebel angels and the flood/final judgment typology (cf. 3:5-7), and the successive references to Noah and the Flood and Lot and Sodom recall Luke's version of the Q saying about the days of Noah and the day of the son

of man. The reference to the sudden appearance of that day (3:10) reflects the Synoptic saying about the thief, also cited in 1 Thessalonians 5 and Revelation 3. Knowledge of the context of the son of man saying in Mark 13 may be indicated in chaps. 2 and 3, in the warnings about false teachers and prophets in the last times, and in 3:5-7, which appears to know the logion in Mark 13:31.

**9. Summary of NT Evidence.** In a wide variety of ways, NT texts evidence knowledge of the forms, themes, and confluences in Jewish traditions about the son of man. Often taken for granted is the Jewish interpretation that identified the heavenly figure in Daniel 7 as God's anointed one and, sometimes, God's servant. The gospels usually echo the language of Daniel rather than *1 Enoch*, although occasionally the Enochic form of the text is especially evident (e.g., Matthew 25). Outside of the gospels, one finds in many places the belief in an eschatological parousia of the transcendental messiah, which is most probably traceable to a conflated tradition from which the Danielic and Enochic term "son of man" has disappeared.

Perhaps the most remarkable fact about the NT son of man traditions is their consistent ascription of judicial functions to the exalted Jesus. In spite of the frequent use of Danielic language and imagery, these texts, with the exception of Revelation, do not emphasize the Danielic motif of "kingship," much less an eternal reign. Constitutive and central is Jesus' role as judge (or, occasionally, witness), an element introduced into the tradition from non-Danielic, albeit royally oriented sources. This judicial element, more than any other, identifies the NT texts as derivative from the conflated Jewish traditions.

Most of the gospel texts about the exalted eschatological son of man presume that this figure is identical with the risen and exalted Jesus. Reference to the earthly Jesus as "son of man" reflects a complex process of speculation. The Wisdom-*1 Enoch* parallels, and perhaps the identification of Enoch as son of man, allowed one to find for the future son of man and exalted servant an earthly existence as the persecuted one. By the same token, the Enochic idea that the future son of man/Chosen One had an existence before creation allowed Christians—different from the author of the Parables—to posit the descent, suffering, and death of the preexistent son of man. This viewpoint was further facilitated by other Christian speculation about Jesus as the incarnation of heavenly Wisdom. The complexity of these speculations is further attested in Phil 2:6-11, which imposes the myth of descending and reascending Wisdom (cf. *1 Enoch* 42) on the story of the suffering and exalted servant of the Lord.

These complexities in early Christian speculations about Jesus are consonant with the manner in which Jewish traditions had already spun out many variations, reinterpretations, and confluences of basic texts, themes, and mythic patterns. The early Church's constitutive

faith in the resurrected and exalted Christ led its teachers to conflate further what they saw to be compatible traditions in their Jewish heritage. Of this process of developing christology, we have only remnants and hints. Attempts to reconstruct this history must consider the possible extent to which the origins of Jesus' identity as "the Christ" may have been influenced by the traditions about a transcendent son of man-servant-messiah described above, which would have functioned as an interpretation of the Easter experience in the primitive Church.

**10. The Historical Jesus and the Son of Man.** For all of the reasons developed and reiterated by modern NT scholarship, we can never be certain whether and to what extent Jesus of Nazareth made reference to "the son of man." Nevertheless, several observations follow from the present exposition:

a. Some of the traditions about the exalted son of man found in Q and Mark seem to be attested very early in Paul.

b. With a few exceptions, gospel traditions about the exalted son of man assume, in their present context, an identification with the risen Jesus.

c. Texts that describe the opposition to Jesus (whether the rejection of his message or his condemnation to death) with reference to the son of man indicate that the variants of the tradition now found in Wisdom 2 and 5 and the Parables of Enoch were being read in light of one another. The suffering righteous one will be exalted as unique son of man; the son of man had an earthly existence that was characterized by rejection and that culminated in violent death.

d. In the light of this clear tendency to identify the son of man with Jesus, one must consider carefully whether texts like C.1.a, b and possibly C.2.a.3 may be traced back to Jesus. The fact that the last of these assumes an identification with Jesus in its Markan context and that Paul reads all of these as references to Jesus should not obscure the fact that in no case does the gospel form of the saying itself necessitate such an identification. This is in striking contrast to those sayings which clearly refer to the rejection or death of Jesus the son of man, to the church's persecution for his sake, or, probably, to the apostles' future association with the glorified son of man.

e. It is far more problematic to maintain that any of the sayings which identify Jesus as the son of man are genuine sayings of Jesus. To accept them as genuine more or less in their present form, one must posit that Jesus cast himself in the role of the suffering prophet or sage and, more important, that he believed that his vindication from death would result in his exaltation to the unique role of eschatological judge. Alternatively, one could expunge the term "son of man" as a secondary Christian interpretation of a genuine saying in which Jesus cast himself in the role of a rejected and suffering servant who anticipated vindication. Such a self-understanding is evident in a

number of Qumran hymns ascribed to the Teacher of Righteousness, but neither in these hymns nor in this hypothetical interpretation of the gospel logia does the speaker anticipate for himself the unique eschatological status attributed to the central figures in the Parables of Enoch and 4 Ezra.

### **Bibliography**

- Borsch, F. H. 1967. *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. Philadelphia.
- Casey, M. 1979. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London.
- Collins, J. J. 1977. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. HSM 16. Missoula, MT.
- Colpe, C. 1981. Neue Untersuchungen zum Menschensohn-Problem. *TRev*, 354-71.
- Coppens, J. 1981. *Le fils de l'homme néotestamentaire*. Vol. 3 in *La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal*. BETL 60. Leuven.
- . 1983. *Le fils d'homme vétéro- et intertestamentaire*. Vol. 2 in *La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal*. BETL 61. Leuven.
- Donahue, J. R. 1986. Recent Studies on the Origin of "Son of Man" in the Gospels. *CBQ* 48: 584-607.
- Higgins, A. J. B. 1964. *Jesus and the Son of Man*. Philadelphia.
- . 1980. *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus*. SNTSMS 39. Cambridge.
- Hooker, M. D. 1967. *The Son of Man in Mark*. Montreal.
- Kim, S. K. 1983. *The "Son of Man" as the Son of God*. WUNT 30. Tübingen.
- Kvanvig, H. S. 1987. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen.
- Lindars, B. 1983. *Jesus Son of Man*. London.
- Marshall, I. H. 1970. The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate. *EvQ* 42: 67-87.
- Messel, N. 1922. *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch*. BZAW 35. Giessen.
- Moloney, P. J. 1978. *The Johannine Son of Man*. 2d ed. Biblioteca di scienze religiose 14. Rome.
- Müller, M. 1984. *Der Ausdruck "Menschensohn" in den Evangelien*. ATDan 17. Leiden.
- Müller, U. B. 1972. *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offerbarung des Johannes*. SNT 6. Gütersloh.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., Jr. 1972. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. HTS 26. Cambridge.
- Perrin, N. 1974. *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*. Philadelphia.
- Sjöberg, E. 1946. *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*. Lund.

- . 1955. *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*. Lund.
- Stone, M. 1968. The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra. Pp. 295–312 in *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner. SHR 14. Leiden.
- Theisohn, J. 1975. *Der auserwählte Richter*. SUNT 12. Göttingen.
- Tödt, H. E. 1965. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Trans. D. M. Barton. Philadelphia.
- Walker, W. O., Jr. 1983. The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments. *CBQ* 45: 584–607.