

Note: This Work has been made available by the authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research and may not be copied or reproduced except as permitted by the copyright laws of Canada without the written authority from the copyright owner.

Reynolds, Benjamin E. *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2008.

Benjamin E. Reynolds

The Apocalyptic Son of Man
in the Gospel of John

Mohr Siebeck

BENJAMIN E. REYNOLDS, born 1977; 2003 M.Div.; 2005⁸ Th. M. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary; 2007 PhD at Aberdeen; currently Honorary Research Fellow at the University of Aberdeen.

ISBN 978-3-16-149726-1

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2008 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nägele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For my dearest Lizzie

Preface

This work is a revised version of my doctoral thesis completed at the University of Aberdeen in 2007. In the early stages of my doctoral research on the Gospel of John, when the words 'Son of Man' first came up in discussion with my supervisor, my initial response was to avoid them at all costs. Thankfully, I did not and since then I have had the opportunity to wade into the midst of this perennial New Testament problem. It has proven to be a fruitful experience of research and learning.

This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance, advice, and encouragement of numerous people. I would like to thank my thesis examiners Dr Catrin H. Williams and Dr Peter J. Williams for their critiques and penetrating questions. They challenged me at a number of points and helped me to clarify my argument, for which I am grateful. I am also grateful to Dr Simon Gathercole for his excellent supervision and direction, and more importantly, for his friendship. Joey Dodson and Preston Sprinkle deserve many thanks for reading and critiquing the bulk of this thesis at various stages of writing. Thanks to their watchful eyes some of what they read is mercifully not included here.

I would also like to express my appreciation to those who read parts of the manuscript over the past few years: Andy Angel, Ruth Edwards, Robert Gundry, Karen Jobes, and Howard Marshall. I am especially grateful to Karen Jobes, who has never ceased to be encouraging. If it had not been for her initial encouragement, I may never have pursued biblical studies in the first place.

I also received some valuable criticism from those who heard portions of this work during earlier stages of writing. I am grateful to those who heard an earlier draft of chapter 6 at the Annual Seminar on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament in 2006. I want to express my appreciation to Steve Moyise for hosting the seminar, to Elizabeth Harris for our lively debate, to Maurice Casey for his provoking questions and interest in my thesis, and to Wendy Sproston North for her affirmative comments. I would also like to thank the Johannine Seminar at the 2006 British New Testament Society Conference in Sheffield for helping me to clarify my thoughts on chapter 4. I am also grateful to the University of Aberdeen New Testament Seminar (2004–2007) for their feedback on various por-

tions of my work, and particularly to Francis Watson for his helpful comments.

I am also grateful to Prof. Jörg Frey for accepting my thesis for publication in the WUNT Series II and to Henning Ziebritzki, Tanja Mix, and the editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck for their quick and proficient assistance in guiding me through the preparation of the manuscript for publication.

I also would like to express my appreciation to Brian and Nicole Lugioyo for their translation help and more significantly for their friendship before, during, and after our time in Aberdeen. We look forward to the years ahead.

I could not have completed my doctoral study without financial support. I would like to thank the Panacea Society for two generous grants (2005–2006 and 2006–2007) and also to my grandfather Philip Reynolds for his seemingly boundless generosity.

My parents Roger and Melissa Reynolds and my parents-in-law Don and Joan Fothergill have been behind me from the beginning and have encouraged us along this journey in numerous ways. Their visits with us in Aberdeen are cherished memories.

And most importantly, I want to thank my wife Lizzie, to whom this study is dedicated. You are my best friend. Thank you for all your love, support, encouragement, and sacrifice during this whole process. I could not have done this without you...nor would I have wanted to. Thanks for filling my gaps. How I love you.

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	VII
----------------------	-----

<i>Introduction: The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John</i>	1
---	---

1. Previous Research on the Son of Man in the Gospel of John	2
1.1. 'Son of Man' and Jesus' Humanity	3
1.2. The Son of Man as Human and Divine.....	5
1.3. 'Son of Man' as equivalent to 'Son of God'	6
1.4. The Son of Man as a Heavenly Figure	7
1.5. Conclusion to History of Research.....	9
2. Defining 'Apocalyptic', 'Apocalypse', and 'apocalyptic Son of Man'.....	10
2.1. Defining 'Apocalyptic'	10
2.2. Defining 'Apocalypse'.....	13
2.3. A 'mystical Son of Man'?.....	17
3. A 'Son of Man Concept'?	18
4. Structure of the Study and Criteria for Identifying the Presence of the Danielic Son of Man	19

Part One:

The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Interpretations of this figure in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and Early Christianity

Chapter 1: The 'One Like a Son of Man' in Daniel 7:

<i>Aramaic Daniel and the Earliest Greek Versions</i>	27
1. Aramaic text of Daniel 7	28
1.1. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Beasts	28
1.2. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Ancient of Days	29
1.3. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Holy Ones of the Most High	31
1.4. Conclusion.....	33
2. The Earliest Greek Versions of Daniel 7	33
2.1. The Old Greek Text of Daniel 7.....	34

2.1.1. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Ancient of Days	35
2.1.2. Messianic Implications	37
2.1.3. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Holy Ones.....	38
2.1.4. Conclusion.....	38
2.2. The Theodotion Text of Daniel 7	39
2.2.1. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Ancient of Days	39
2.2.2. The 'One Like a Son of Man' and the Holy Ones.....	39
2.2.3. Conclusion.....	39
3. Summary of Daniel 7 in Aramaic and Greek	40

Chapter 2: The 'One Like a Son of Man' in Jewish Apocalyptic Interpretation.....

1. The Similitudes of Enoch (<i>1 Enoch</i> 37–71)	41
1.1. Influence of Daniel 7	43
1.2. One Figure, Four Designations	44
1.3. Characteristics of the Enochic Son of Man.....	45
1.3.1. Heavenly, Preexistent, and Revealer of Heavenly Secrets ..	45
1.3.2. Royal and Messianic	46
1.3.3. Judgment and Salvation	46
1.3.4. Recognized	47
1.3.5. Similarities with God.....	47
1.3.6. His Dwelling with the Righteous.....	48
1.3.7. Servant	48
1.3.8. Human.....	48
1.4. Conclusion.....	49
2. <i>4 Ezra</i> (<i>2 Esdras</i>)	49
2.1. Influence of Daniel 7	50
2.2. The Characteristics of the Man from the Sea in the Vision and Interpretation.....	51
2.2.1. My Son	51
2.2.2. Messiah	52
2.2.3. Judgment and Salvation	52
2.2.4. Similarities with God	53
2.2.5. Preexistence.....	54
2.2.6. Recognized	54
2.2.7. Gathering the Righteous.....	54
2.3. Conclusion.....	55
2.3.1. Vision and Interpretation	55
2.3.2. Vision as Originally Independent.....	55
3. <i>2 Baruch</i> (<i>Syriac Baruch</i>).....	56
3.1. Influence of Daniel 7	57
3.2. <i>2 Baruch's</i> Messiah	57

3.3. Conclusion.....	59
4. Summary of the Jewish Apocalyptic Interpretation	60
EXCURSUS: 4Q246 (4QapocrDan ar).....	61
1.1. Similarities with Daniel	62
1.2. The ‘Son of God’ Figure.....	62
1.3. Conclusion.....	64

Chapter 3: The ‘One Like a Son of Man’ in Early Christian Interpretation.....

1. The Gospel According to Mark	66
1.1. The Influence of Daniel 7	66
1.2. The Son of Man’s Authority	67
1.3. Judgment and the Son of Man’s Coming.....	68
1.4. Characteristics of the Markan Son of Man	68
2. The Gospel According to Matthew.....	70
2.1. The Influence of Daniel 7	70
2.2. The Son of Man in Matthew	70
2.3. Characteristics of the Matthean Son of Man.....	72
3. The Gospel According to Luke.....	73
3.1. Influence of Daniel 7	74
3.2. The Son of Man in Luke	74
3.3. Characteristics of the Lukan Son of Man	75
4. Acts of the Apostles.....	77
4.1. Influence of Daniel 7	77
4.2. Two Questions.....	78
4.3. Characteristics of the Son of Man in Acts	80
5. Revelation.....	81
5.1 Influence of Daniel 7	81
5.2. The Coming One – Rev 1.7.....	81
5.3. The Human-Like Figure among the Lampstands – Rev 1.13	81
5.4. The Human-Like Figure Seated on the Cloud – Rev 14.14.....	81
5.5. Characteristics of the Son of Man Figure in Revelation	84
6. Summary of the Early Christian Interpretation	85

Part Two:

The Son of Man in the Gospel of John

<i>Chapter 4: The Apocalyptic Introduction of the Johannine Son of Man – John 1.51</i>	89
1. ‘Apocalyptic Son of Man’ Characteristics in John 1.51	90

1.1. The Recognition of the Son of Man	90
1.2. The Son of Man as the Messiah	91
1.3. The Son of Man as a Heavenly Figure – Heaven Opened	92
2. The ‘Johannized’ Son of Man	96
2.1. The Son of Man as Heavenly Mediator – Gen 28.12	96
2.2. The Realized Johannine Son of Man in Comparison with the Future Son of Man of the Synoptic Sanhedrin Sayings	99
3. Conclusion.....	101
 <i>Chapter 5: The Ascent-Descent and Lifting Up of the Son of Man</i>	
– John 3.13–14	104
1. The Ascent-Descent of the Son of Man – John 3.13	104
1.1. The Son of Man Reveals Heavenly Things.....	104
1.2. The Heavenly Son of Man as Heavenly Figure and Preexistent..	106
1.2.1. The Descent of the Son of Man	106
1.2.2. No One Has Ascended	107
1.2.3. The Use of εἰ μὴ in 3.13	108
1.2.4. The Son of Man’s Ascent.....	111
1.3. ‘Apocalyptic Son of Man’ Characteristics in 3.13	116
2. The Son of Man Must Be Lifted Up – John 3.14	117
2.1. The Meaning of ὕψω	117
2.2. Moses and the Bronze Serpent: Num 21.4–9.....	117
2.3. The Johannine Comparison.....	119
2.4. ‘Lifting Up’ in the Gospel of John	122
2.5 ‘Apocalyptic Son of Man’ Characteristics Man in 3.14.....	127
3. Conclusion to the Son of Man Sayings in 3.13 and 14.....	128
3.1. The ‘Johannized’ Apocalyptic Son of Man	128
3.2. ‘Son of Man’ and ‘Son of God’ in the Gospel of John.....	129
 <i>Chapter 6: The Son of Man as Apocalyptic Judge – John 5.27</i>	
1. ‘The Son of Man’ or ‘a son of man’?	132
1.1. Grammatical Evidence for Definiteness?	133
1.2. Contextual Evidence for Definiteness: Jesus, Judgment, and Humanity.....	135
2. The Apocalyptic Son of Man in John 5.27.....	137
2.1. The Johannine Son of Man and the ‘One Like a Son of Man’	137
2.1.1. The Verbal Link between Daniel 7.13–14 and John 5.27..	137
2.1.2. The Judgment Theme in Daniel 7 and John 5	139
2.2. The Son of Man’s Apocalyptic Role in Resurrection.....	140
2.3. Other ‘Apocalyptic Son of Man’ Characteristics in John 5: Recognition, Similarities with God, Salvation	142

2.4. The ‘Johannized’ Son of Man	144
3. ‘Son’ and ‘Son of Man’	145
4. Conclusion	145
 <i>Chapter 7: The Life-Giving Son of Man – John 6.27, 53, 62</i>	147
1. The Son of Man as Life-Giver – John 6.27	148
1.1. The Son of Man and Life-Giving Food	148
1.2. The Sealing of the Son of Man	150
1.3. The Timing of the Gift of Life	151
2. Bread from Heaven – John 6.53	152
2.1. The One Descending from Heaven	153
2.2. Similarities with God	154
2.3. Eating the Flesh and Drinking the Blood of the Son of Man	155
2.4. Son of Man, Salvation, and Judgment	159
3. The Son of Man’s Ascent and Preexistence – John 6.62	159
4. Conclusion	161
 <i>Chapter 8: The Lifted up and Recognized Son of Man – John 8.28</i>	162
1. Jesus’ Origin and Identity in John 7 and 8	163
2. ‘Apocalyptic Son of Man’ Characteristics in John 8.28	165
2.1. The Son of Man’s Origin	165
2.2. The Son of Man’s Relationship with God – I Am	165
2.3. The Son of Man’s Shared Action with God – Judgment	168
2.4. The Recognition of the Lifted Up Son of Man	169
2.4.1. What They Will Know – Jesus’ Identity	170
2.4.2. The Lifting Up	171
2.4.3. The Timing of the Knowledge	172
2.4.4. The Result of the Knowledge	173
3. Conclusion	174
 <i>Chapter 9: Belief in the Son of Man – John 9.35</i>	175
1. The Healing, Controversies, and Jesus’ Question	176
2. ‘Apocalyptic Son of Man’ Characteristics in John 9.35	179
2.1. Recognizing the Son of Man	179
2.1.1. Sight and Hearing	179
2.1.2. Belief as the Ultimate Johannine Recognition	180
2.2. The Son of Man is Worshipped	181
2.3. The Son of Man and Judgment	182
2.3.1. ‘For Judgment I have come into the World’	183
2.3.2. Non-apocalyptic Judgment?	184
2.4. The Son of Man as a Heavenly Figure and Preexistent	186

2.5. The Son of Man's Authority	186
3. 'Son of Man' and Jesus' Humanity in John 9.35?.....	187
4. Conclusion.....	188
 <i>Chapter 10: The Glorification and Lifting Up of the Son of Man</i>	
– John 12.23, 34	190
1. The Glorification of the Son of Man.....	191
1.1. The Son of Man's Hour of Glorification as Death, Resurrection and Return	192
1.1.1. The Son of Man's Hour.....	192
1.1.2. The Son of Man's Glorification	193
1.2. Glorification as an 'Apocalyptic Son of Man' Characteristic	194
2. The Hour of Glorification as Judgment	196
3. The Hour of the Son of Man's Glorification and the 'Lifting Up'	198
3.1. The Relationship Between His Glorification and 'Lifting Up'	198
3.2. 'If I am Lifted up from the Earth'	199
4. The Son of Man and the Messiah	200
5. Conclusion.....	203
 <i>Chapter 11: The Glorification of the Son of Man and God</i>	
– John 13.31–32.....	205
1. Now is the Son of Man Glorified	206
1.1. The Glorification of the Son of Man in John 13 as more than the Cross	206
1.2. Present and Future Aspects of the Son of Man's Glorification ...	207
2. 'Apocalyptic Son of Man' Characteristics in John 13.31–32	211
2.1. Glory and the Apocalyptic Son of Man	211
2.2 The Heavenly Significance of the Son of Man's Glory	211
2.3. Similarities between the Son of Man and God.....	212
3. Conclusion.....	213
 <i>Conclusion</i>	
1. The Danielic son of man in Jewish Apocalyptic and Early Christian Interpretation	214
2. The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John.....	215
3. The Distinctive Features of the Johannine Son of Man.....	216
3.1. The Johannine Son of Man and the Realized Eschatology of John's Gospel	216
3.2. The Johannine Son of Man and Salvation	218
3.3. The 'Lifting Up' and Ascent-Descent Language	219

4. The Significance of the Apocalyptic Son of Man for Johannine Christology.....	220
4.1. The Son of Man and Jesus' Humanity.....	220
4.2. 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God'.....	222
4.3. Johannine Son of Man Christology and an Apocalyptic Background.....	223
5. Some Implications of an Apocalyptic Son of Man in John.....	225
5.1. John and the Synoptics.....	225
5.2. The Genre of the Gospel of John.....	226
5.3. The Apocalyptic Son of Man and Docetism.....	227
<i>Appendix: Tabular Representation of the Apocalyptic Characteristics ..</i>	229
<i>Bibliography.....</i>	255
<i>Index of References.....</i>	279
<i>Index of Authors.....</i>	300
<i>Index of Subjects and Key Terms.....</i>	306

Introduction

The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John

Jesus' titles in the four Gospels have played an important part in discussions of early Christology,¹ and while Jesus' titles are not the only way in which New Testament Christology can be approached,² they communicate some of what the early Christians believed about Jesus. The title 'Son of Man' is one of these Christological titles, and its origin and meaning have continued to vex NT scholarship. From where does this title originate? What did it mean to the people of first century Palestine? Was 'Son of Man' thought of as a title before the Gospel writers used it? What did it mean to Jesus? Was there such a thing as an established 'Son of Man concept'? Does 'Son of Man' refer to the 'one like a son of man' from Dan 7.13–14 or does it mean 'a human being' or 'one like me'? The issues illustrated by these questions constitute what is called the Son of Man problem. Although scholars have even debated whether or not the Son of Man problem can be solved,³ the questions concerning the Son of Man sayings never cease to be asked in NT scholarship.⁴ The meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

¹ O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall, trans.; London: SCM, 1959); F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (H. Knight and G. Ogg, trans.; London: Lutterworth, 1969); J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM, 1989²). Cf. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (J.E. Steely, trans.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1970); L.W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

² See R. Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

³ A.J.B. Higgins, 'Is the Son of Man Problem Soluble?' in E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in honour of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969) 70–87; M.D. Hooker, 'Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?' in E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979) 155–68; D. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTS.MS 107; Cambridge: CUP, 1999).

⁴ See most recently A.R. Angel, *Chaos and the Son of Man: The Hebrew Chaoskampf Tradition in the Period 515 BCE to 200 CE* (LSTS 60; London: T&T Clark, 2006) and M. Casey, *The Solution to the Son of Man Problem* (LNTS 343; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

ἀνθρώπου for the historical Jesus is a question that will continue to be debated.⁵

On the other hand, the Son of Man sayings in John's Gospel are often neglected in the Son of Man debate, mainly because the Gospel of John is not considered historical.⁶ Although the Gospel of John may not hold the key to the Son of Man problem, the Johannine use of the 'Son of Man' title is important for Johannine Christology. For this reason, the following study is unconcerned with the Son of Man problem. Rather, it is an attempt to examine the portrayal and interpretation of the Son of Man title within the framework of John's Gospel and to determine the significance of the title for Johannine Christology.

1. Previous Research on the Son of Man in the Gospel of John

Compared to the study of the Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels, the study of the Johannine Son of Man is a relatively recent development in critical scholarship. As recently as forty years ago, introductions to studies of the Johannine Son of Man noted the dearth of published secondary literature.⁷ Since that time, the situation has changed significantly with a no-

⁵ For further study on the Son of Man problem see Burkett, *Debate*.

⁶ H.E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (D.M. Barton, trans.; London: SCM, 1965); Hahn, *Titles*, 15–67. In Casey's first book on the Son of Man, John 1.51 and 5.27 are the only Johannine sayings discussed (M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* [London: SPCK, 1979] 197–99; cf. M. Müller, *Der Ausdruck "Menschensohn" in den Evangelien. Voraussetzungen und Bedeutung* [Leiden: Brill, 1984]). See M. Casey, *Is John's Gospel True?* (Routledge: London, 1996); M.M. Thompson, 'The Historical Jesus and the Johannine Christ', in R.A. Culpepper and C.C. Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996) 21–42. Note the recent discussions of the historicity of John in F.J. Moloney, 'The Fourth Gospel and the Jesus of History', *NTS* 46 (2000) 42–58; C.L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downer's Grove: InterVarsity, 2001); P.N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered* (LNTS 321; London: T&T Clark, 2006); P.N. Anderson, F. Just, T. Thatcher (eds.), *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: A Critical Appraisal of Critical Views* (Atlanta: SBL, 2007).

⁷ R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (3 vols.; Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1967) 1.529; S.S. Smalley, 'The Johannine Son of Man Sayings', *NTS* 15 (1969) 278–301; B. Lindars, 'The Son of Man in the Johannine Christology', in B. Lindars and S.S. Smalley (eds.), *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule* (Cambridge: CUP, 1973) 43–60; R. Maddox, 'The Function of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John', in R. Banks (ed.), *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 186–204; F.J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 14; Rome: LAS, 1978²) 1. Cf. H. Dieckmann, '„Der Sohn des Menschen“ im Jo-

table growth in the secondary literature during the late 1960s and 1970s, and this growth resulted in numerous opinions on both the origin and the meaning of John's Son of Man. Scholars who generally agree on the origin of the Johannine use of the title do not always agree on its Christological meaning.

The following survey of previous scholarship on the 'Son of Man' in the Gospel of John has been arranged according to four broad Christological categories: (1) the title 'Son of Man' as highlighting the humanity of Jesus; (2) 'Son of Man' as a sort of divine-Man, drawing attention to both Jesus' humanity and divinity; (3) 'Son of Man' as synonymous with 'Son of God'; (4) 'Son of Man' as a heavenly or divine figure. For the purposes of clarity and succinctness, each category is represented by a single scholar, but subcategories and nuances within these Christological categories are also noted.

1.1. 'Son of Man' and Jesus' Humanity

The Johannine use of the expression 'Son of Man' is commonly understood by not a few scholars as a reference to Jesus' humanity. One of the more influential proponents of this view is Francis J. Moloney, who wrote the first major English monograph on the Son of Man in the Gospel of John. In a conscious attempt to avoid placing too much emphasis on the possible origins of the title 'Son of Man',⁸ Moloney concentrates primarily on the narrative context of the Son of Man sayings and the Christology of the Gospel of John. As the first study of its kind, it provides an excellent examination of the Johannine Son of Man sayings in their context. Throughout his thesis, Moloney argues that the Son of Man is the unique revealer of God who has come down from heaven and whose revelation causes people to judge themselves. However, Moloney understands this revelation to take place through the Son of Man as a human among humanity. This understanding leads him to conclude: 'The Johannine Son of Man is the human Jesus, the incarnate Logos; he has come to reveal God with a unique authority and in the acceptance or refusal of this revelation the

hannesevangelium', *Scholastik* 2 (1927) 229–47; F.J. Moloney, 'The Johannine Son of Man Revisited', in G. Van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz (eds.), *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar* (BETL 184; Leuven: Leuven University, 2005) 177–202.

⁸ See Moloney's comments in 'A Johannine Son of Man Discussion?' *Salesianum* 39 (1977) 93–102: 'Very often scholars – perhaps under the spell of the debate over the Synoptic Son of Man – delve into the background of John's use of the term. This is a legitimate and necessary course of research, but it pays too little attention to the Christology involved in the "putting together" of the various elements which may have formed the text as we have it now.'

world judges itself.⁹ For Moloney, Jesus' humanity is so much the meaning of the expression 'Son of Man' that he can say that the title is 'entirely dependent upon the incarnation'.¹⁰

Although Moloney does not focus on the possible origins of the Son of Man title in his study, he does contend that the 'one like a son of man' from Daniel 7 stands in the background, but he understands this background as having been reinterpreted by John via the Synoptic portrait of the Son of Man.¹¹ Other scholars who argue that the Johannine use of 'Son of Man' highlights Jesus' humanity find the background for this meaning in Psalms 8 and 80, Ezekiel, and/or the Wisdom tradition.¹² Rather than seeing a reference to Jesus' humanity, some scholars maintain that the title draws attention more specifically to Jesus' earthly life and ministry,¹³ to his representative or ideal humanity,¹⁴ or his role as a human prophet.¹⁵

⁹ Moloney, *Johannine*, 220; *idem*, 'Revisited', 200.

¹⁰ Moloney, *Johannine*, 213; cf. 180–81. See also E.A. Abbott, "The Son of Man" or Contributions to the Study of the Thoughts of Jesus (Cambridge: CUP, 1910) 407–563 [§3374–§3477]; E.M. Sidebottom, 'The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel', *ExpT* 68 (1957) 231–35, 280–83; *idem*, 'The Ascent and Descent of the Son of Man in the Gospel of St. John', *ATHR* 39 (1957) 115–22; *idem*, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in Light of First-Century Thought* (London: SPCK, 1961); E. Ruckstuhl, 'Die johanneische Menschensohnforschung 1957–1969', in J. Pfammatter and F. Furger (eds.), *Theologische Berichte 1* (Zurich: Benziger, 1972) 171–284; *idem*, 'Abstieg und Erhöhung des johanneischen Menschensohns', in R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg (eds.), *Jesus und der Menschensohn. Für Anton Vögle* (Freiburg: Herder, 1975) 315–41; J. Coppens, 'Le fils de l'homme dans l'évangile johannique', *ETL* 52 (1976) 28–81; C. Colpe, 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', *TDNT*, VIII.400–81; D.R.A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 79–111; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, 'Son of Man', *ABD* 6.137–50; Casey, *Solution*, 274–313.

¹¹ Moloney, *Johannine*, 220.

¹² See Abbott, *Son of Man*, 427, 464–74; Sidebottom, 'Son of Man', 232, 234; *idem*, 'Ascent', 117; *idem*, *Christ*, 84–96; R. Rhea, *The Johannine Son of Man* (ATHANT 76; Zürich: Theologischer, 1990) 70.

¹³ E. Kinniburgh, 'The Johannine "Son of Man"', *SE* 4 (= TU 102) (F.L. Cross, ed.; Berlin: Akademie, 1968) 64–71; B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984; first pub. London: SPCK, 1983) 145–57. J.L. Martyn (*History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003³] 125–36) seems to understand 'Son of Man' to refer to Jesus' existence on earth based on his positive quotation of E. Käsemann (*The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* [G. Krodel, trans.; London: SCM, 1968] 13), but Martyn's view must be understood within the context of his 'two-level drama'.

¹⁴ C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 1953, 1968) 43–44, 243; Smalley, 'Sayings', 278–301; M. Pamment, 'The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel', *JTS* 36 (1985) 56–66; F.F. Ramos, 'El hijo del hombre en el cuarto evangelio', *Studium Legionense* 40 (1999) 45–92. See also W.H. Cadman, *The Open Heaven: The Revelation of God in the Johannine Sayings of Jesus* (G.B. Caird, ed.; Oxford: Blackwell,

As we will see throughout the course of this study, there are a number of difficulties faced by the view that the title 'Son of Man' in the Gospel of John emphasizes Jesus' humanity. Most significantly, the scholars who hold this view are often silent about Jesus' humanity in John 9.35 when Jesus asks: 'Do you believe in the Son of Man?' Another difficulty involves the Son of Man's ascent and descent. For, how can the Son of Man descend from heaven if the title is concerned with Jesus' humanity or earthly life? The Gospel of John seems to indicate that there is some sort of heavenly or divine aspect to this figure (cf. 3.13).

1.2. *The Son of Man as Human and Divine*

Some scholars have rightly recognized the heavenly connotation of the 'Son of Man' title in the Gospel of John, but they also claim that the title retains a human implication.¹⁶ In a lengthy article, the French scholar Théo Preiss argues that 'Son of Man' is the unifying feature of Johannine Christology and is synonymous with 'Son'. However, Preiss maintains that *le sens primitif* of 'Son of Man', along with an 'inclusive' or representative aspect of the title, signifies that the Johannine Son of Man is the divine Man.¹⁷ It is the Johannine Son of Man's representation of humanity in heaven before God that indicates his divine and human nature.¹⁸ Preiss states: 'En tant que Fils de l'Homme préexistant, il est non seulement chef des anges, de toute la création, il est l'Homme divin, le seul homme qui mérite ce nom!'¹⁹

Preiss and others who insist that 'Son of Man' in the Gospel of John communicates a divine and human aspect of this figure correctly recognize the divine connotation of the title.²⁰ On the other hand, this view still main-

1969) 41; W. Wink, "The Son of the Man" in the Gospel of John', in R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher (eds.), *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001) 117–23. Cf. Abbott, *Son of Man*, 427.

¹⁵ Rhea, *Johannine*, 36, 43; J. Guillet, 'Le Fils de l'homme: Titre eschatologique ou mission prophétique?' *RSR* 88.4 (2000) 615–38. A fifth human category could include the view of Müller (*Ausdruck*, 247–60), who maintains that the expression 'Son of Man' originally functioned as a paraphrase for the speaker. Cf. Hare, *Son of Man*, 79–111.

¹⁶ Sidebottom ('Son of Man', 283), Nickelsburg ('Son of Man', 146–47), Ramos ('Hijo, 52, 68), and Wink ('Son of the Man', 123) argue primarily for the human meaning of 'Son of Man' but allow for some sort of divine meaning.

¹⁷ T. Preiss, 'Le fils de l'homme dans le IV^e Évangile', *ETR* 28 (1953) 7–61. See also T. Preiss, *Life in Christ* (H. Knight, trans.; SBT 13; London: SCM, 1954) 43–60.

¹⁸ Preiss, 'Fils de l'homme', 17–18.

¹⁹ Preiss, 'Fils de l'homme', 58.

²⁰ Dieckmann, 'Sohn des Menschen', 242, 247; J. Héring, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue. Étude sur l'espérance de Jésus et l'apôtre Paul* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1959²) 254–57; F.H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: West-

tains that 'Son of Man' has a human nuance. As mentioned above, this human meaning has a number of difficulties that will be addressed in the course of this thesis.

1.3. 'Son of Man' as equivalent to 'Son of God'

A third understanding of John's use of 'Son of Man' explains the title as equivalent to 'Son of God'.²¹ The most substantial argument for this synonymy between the titles 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God' is made by Delbert Burkett.²² Focusing on the ascent-descent theme, Burkett asserts that Prov 30.1–4 serves as the background for the Johannine Son of Man sayings because of the combination of the words 'ascend' and 'descend' in the passage. Based on re-vocalization of the Hebrew text and some help from the Greek version of Proverbs, Burkett posits that Prov 30.1–4 presents the words of a father ('the Man'), whom Burkett understands as God, to his son ('the son of the Man') who is thus 'the Son of God'. He translates Prov 30.1 and 30.4 as follows:

Store up my words, my son, receive the oracle [דְּבַרִי אָגִיד בְּיָדֶיךָ הַמְשִׁיאָ] says the Man to Ithiel ('God is with me') [נִאֲמָם הַנְּבִיר לְאִיְהוֹאֵל], to 'God is with me so that I am able' [לְאִיְהוֹאֵל וְאֶבֱל]...Who has ascended to heaven and descended? Who has gathered wind in his garments? Who has wrapped water in a mantle? Who has established all the ends of the earth? What is his name and what is his son's name? For you know.²³

Burkett then argues that in Prov 30.4 only God and his son ('the son of the Man') can accomplish the ascent and descent.

For Burkett, John 3.13 is 'the key to understanding the origin and meaning of the expression "the Son of the Man" as it is used in the Fourth Gospel',²⁴ and he claims that Jesus' statement about ascent and descent in John 3.13 is a reference to the 'Son of the Man' in Proverbs 30 (cf. Gen 28.12;

minster, 1967); E. Harris, *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist* (JSNT.S 107; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994) 116–29. Cf. C. Ham, 'The Title "Son of Man" in the Gospel of John', *Stone-Campbell Journal* 1 (1998) 67–84; J.F. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (SNTS.MS 111; Cambridge: CUP, 2001).

²¹ Some of the scholars who contend that 'Son of Man' draws attention to Jesus' humanity have not found this view to be incompatible with synonymy between the titles 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God'. See Dieckmann, 'Sohn des Menschen', 246–47; Preiss, 'Fils de l'homme', 9, 13, 18; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 244; Sidebottom, 'Son of Man', 283; Cadman, *Open Heaven*, 41; Wink, 'Son of the Man', 120. Cf. Borsch, *Son of Man*, 258.

²² D. Burkett, *The Son of the Man in the Gospel of John* (JSNT.S 56; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991). Burkett has been followed by H. Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

²³ Burkett, *Son of the Man*, 51. The Hebrew listed is from the BHS. Burkett makes some emendations to the text and re-vocalizes some of the letters.

²⁴ Burkett, *Son of the Man*, 76.

Isa 55).²⁵ Because Burkett understands ‘the Man’ of Prov 30.1–4 as God, he maintains that the titles ‘Son of *the* Man’ and ‘Son of God’ are synonymous.

It is worth noting briefly two of the difficulties with Burkett’s position. Even if his exegesis of Prov 30.1–4 is correct and if there is some connection with the ascent and descent in John 3.13, Burkett is unable to show the relevance of Proverbs 30 for the rest of the Son of Man sayings in the Gospel of John.²⁶ Secondly, Burkett dismisses Dan 7.13–14 and 4 Ezra 13 as possible backgrounds for the ‘Son of Man’ title on the grounds that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is not found in either of these texts, but neither is the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου found in the Greek text of Prov 30.1–4.²⁷

Although Burkett’s argument for synonymy is more complicated than some and is based on a distinctive background, he is not alone in arguing that the Gospel of John’s Son of Man Christology is equivalent to its Son of God Christology.²⁸ Those who equate the titles ‘Son of Man’ and ‘Son of God’ correctly recognize the heavenly nature of the Johannine Son of Man, but although ‘Son of Man’ and ‘Son of God’ are found in similar contexts and their meanings may overlap, the two titles have different implications that will become more obvious as this study progresses.

1.4 The Son of Man as a Heavenly Figure

The final category to discuss includes those scholars who maintain that the Johannine Son of Man is a heavenly or divine figure. In the most recent monograph on the Johannine Son of Man, Markus Sasse grounds the Son of Man Christology in the situation of the Johannine community and argues that it was important for their identity, especially as an answer to Jewish accusations of ditheism and as an answer to questions about Jesus’ identity and death.²⁹ Against this background, Sasse argues that the Johan-

²⁵ Burkett, *Son of the Man*, 49–50.

²⁶ See a similar critique by R. Bauckham, Review of Delbert Burkett, *The Son of the Man in the Gospel of John*, *EvQ* 65 (1993) 266–68.

²⁷ The Hebrew word that Burkett translates as ‘the Man’ is הַאֲדָמָה and not אֱדָמָה or אָדָם. In the Greek text of Proverbs, the word used is ὁ ἀνὴρ.

²⁸ See E.D. Freed, ‘The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel’, *JBL* 86 (1967) 402–9; A.J.B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964) 153–84, 202; R. Schnackenburg, ‘Der Menschensohn im Johannesevangelium’, *NTS* 11 (1964–65) 123–37; *idem*, *Gospel*, 1.527–42, 1.543–57; S. Kim, ‘The ‘Son of Man’’ as the Son of God (WUNT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983); R.E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (F.J. Moloney, ed.; New York: Doubleday, 2003). Cf. M.C. de Boer (*Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus* [CBET 17; Kampen: Pharos, 1996] 102–5, 147–217) who seems to affirm some sort of synonymy between ‘Son of Man’ and ‘Son of God’.

²⁹ M. Sasse, *Der Menschensohn im Evangelium nach Johannes* (TANZ 35; Tübingen, Basel: Francke, 2000).

nine Son of Man is a heavenly figure whose primary functions are life-giving and judgment. He argues further that the 'Son' Christology is the dominant Christology of the Gospel and that 'Son of Man' interprets 'Son' and often serves as a corrective to incorrect Christological understanding.³⁰

In distinction from the current study, Sasse understands the origin of the Johannine Son of Man to derive from a number of backgrounds. For example, the Son of Man's function as judge derives from Daniel 7, the 'lifting up' sayings from the 'martyr-theology', and the ascent-descent sayings from OT theophanies.³¹ In order to describe the Son of Man figure as heavenly, Sasse maintains that the origin of the Johannine Son of Man is found in these various traditions, rather than focusing primarily on the Danielic and apocalyptic background of 'Son of Man'.

Further, Sasse does not argue for a thoroughgoing apocalyptic Son of Man in John's Gospel. His argument that the Johannine Son of Man is a heavenly figure depends almost solely upon the Son of Man sayings in 3.13 and 6.25–59.³² Sasse relegates the 'lifting-up' and glorification sayings to one chapter and gives little discussion to 8.28 and 13.31–32. In addition, his chapters on 1.51, 5.27, and 9.35 are noticeably slim. The apocalyptic background of the Johannine Son of Man is more evident in each of the Johannine Son of Man sayings than Sasse's discussion indicates.

As with Sasse, some other scholars make a case for a heavenly Son of Man by combining traditional apocalyptic works (i.e., Daniel 7, the Similitudes of Enoch, and 4 *Ezra*) with other backgrounds that have a different center of gravity (e.g., Wisdom traditions,³³ Moses' Sinai ascent,³⁴ etc.³⁵). There are other scholars, however, who locate the origin of the heavenly

³⁰ Sasse, *Menschensohn*, 247, 258–62.

³¹ Sasse, *Menschensohn*, 173–74, 241. Sasse neither sufficiently explains nor defends this 'martyr-theology'.

³² Together his chapters on John 3.13 and 6.25–59 take up 134 pages of the 166 total on the Johannine Son of Man sayings.

³³ H.-M. Dion, 'Quelques traits originaux de la conception johannique du Fils de l'Homme', *ScEccl* 19 (1967) 49–65; R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (SNTS.MS 21; Cambridge: CUP, 1973) 224–41.

³⁴ P. Borgen, 'Some Jewish Exegetical Traditions as Background for Son of Man Sayings in John's Gospel (Jn 3, 13–14 and context)', in M. de Jonge (ed.), *L'Évangile de Jean* (Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot, 1977) 243–58.

³⁵ J.-A. Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium* (WUNT 2.2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977) 374–99, 422–29; W. Roth, 'Jesus as the Son of Man: The Scriptural Identity of a Johannine Image', in D.E. Groh and R. Jewett (eds.), *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985) 11–26.

Son of Man mainly in apocalyptic literature,³⁶ but they make this argument on the basis of a relatively few Johannine Son of Man sayings, namely 1.51; 3.13; and/or 5.27.³⁷ Although the heavenly nature of the Johannine Son of Man has been correctly recognized by these scholars, they fail to see 'Son of Man' as either originating principally in apocalyptic literature or that the apocalyptic depiction of the Johannine Son of Man is apparent in each of the Johannine Son of Man sayings and not only in a few of them.³⁸

1.5 Conclusion to History of Research

Previously, the argument for the Johannine Son of Man's apocalyptic nature has largely depended upon a few Son of Man sayings (1.51; 3.13; and/or 5.27). Further, those who focus mainly on John 5.27 point to the theme of judgment in Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch* 62 and 69 as the main evidence for an apocalyptic background. This argument is a weak support on which to hang the entire claim that John's Son of Man is apocalyptic. Some, like Burkett, who disagree with the idea of an apocalyptic Son of

³⁶ S. Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Methodengeschichte der Auslegung des 4. Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957); J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: OUP, 1991) 337–73; J. Painter, 'The Enigmatic Johannine Son of Man', in F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden (eds.), *Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neiryck* (BETL 100; 3 vols.; Louvain: Peeters, 1992) 1869–87. Almost simultaneously with Schulz, Ch. de Beus ('Het Gebruik en de Betekenis van de Uitdrukking „De Zoon des Mensen” in het Evangelie van Johannes', *NedTT* 10 [1955–56] 237–51) made the case that the Son of Man title is primarily a messianic title with no obvious earthly or heavenly aspects, but he hinted at the figure's heavenly origin by highlighting the eschatological role of the Son of Man based upon Dan 7.13.

³⁷ Maddox ('Function', 186–204) is an exception. He addresses each of the Son of Man sayings equally, but he argues that 'Son of Man' has assimilated to 'Son', although he does not think that the assimilation is complete. Uniquely, J.H. Ellens ('Exegesis of Second Temple Texts in a Fourth Gospel Son of Man Logion', in I. Kalini and P.J. Haas [eds.], *Biblical Interpretation in Judaism and Christianity* [LHBOTS 439; London: T&T Clark, 2006] 131–49) argues that the phrase 'Son of Man' originally referred to an eschatological judge as in the Similitudes of Enoch, but that the Gospel of John has reinterpreted the phrase to indicate Jesus' role as savior rather than judge. A puzzling aspect of Ellens' theory is his claim that 'Son of Man' was interpolated into the Gospel at a later stage, but he asserts that the interpolation occurred because a 'proper gospel, even at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second century' could not have been written without the phrase 'Son of Man' (138). Yet, Ellens fails to explain how the first edition of the Gospel appears to have been written without the phrase.

³⁸ One scholar who does not fit easily into these four categories is M.M. Pazdan, *The Son of Man: A Metaphor for Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991). She argues that 'Son of Man' functions as a metaphor for Jesus in the Gospel of John and is related to the other titles.

Man, have only argued against the connection between Daniel 7 and John 5.27 in order to refute the apocalyptic nature of the Johannine Son of Man. What will be argued in the rest of this study is that the Johannine Son of Man is apocalyptic and that the evidence of this can be found *throughout* the Son of Man sayings, not merely in 1.51, 3.13, and/or 5.27. In addition, the Son of Man in John is connected with more apocalyptic texts than simply Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch* 62 and 69.

A need exists for a study that thoroughly investigates the possible relationship between the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7, the interpretations of the Danielic figure, and the Johannine Son of Man. Although it is not completely new to suggest that the Son of Man in John has a Danielic or an apocalyptic background, surprisingly, no one has written a study similar to Morna Hooker's excellent examination of the Son of Man in Mark.³⁹ This deficiency becomes all the more important now considering the increased interest in apocalyptic literature over the last twenty years.⁴⁰ Against this backdrop of recent scholarly work on apocalyptic literature, a thorough assessment of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John with regard to the interpretations of the Danielic son of man⁴¹ should provide a constructive and valuable area of study, especially considering recent resistance to an apocalyptic Son of Man in John's Gospel.⁴²

2. Defining 'Apocalyptic', 'Apocalypse', and 'apocalyptic Son of Man'

2.1. Defining 'Apocalyptic'

Before going further, it will be necessary to clarify the meaning of the term 'apocalyptic' and the phrase 'apocalyptic Son of Man' as used in this study. The word 'apocalyptic' is often used loosely in scholarship, which

³⁹ M.D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in St Mark's Gospel* (Montreal: McGill University, 1967).

⁴⁰ This can be seen in the work of G. Boccaccini, J.J. Collins, G.W.E. Nickelsburg, C. Rowland, P. Sacchi, J. VanderKam and others, in the annual Enoch Seminar organized by G. Boccaccini, and in the recent ten year celebration of the Society of Biblical Literature Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group (see A.D. DeConick [ed.], *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* [Symposium 11; Atlanta: SBL, 2006]).

⁴¹ 'Son of Man' will not be capitalized in the phrase 'Danielic son of man' because it is not used as a title in Daniel; however, in reference to John, where the use of the expression is titular, 'Son of Man' will be capitalized.

⁴² See especially Burkett, *Son of the Man*, 38–45; Rhea, *Johannine*, 35–39, 47; Hare, *Son of Man*, 83, 92.

leads to a blurring of its meaning.⁴³ Some of the confusion has been caused by the term's use in English as both a noun and an adjective, with the noun use most likely being a derivation of the German term *Apokalyptik*.⁴⁴ Adding to the complexity, the English noun 'apocalyptic' has been used to designate apocalypses (apocalyptic genre), apocalypticism (apocalyptic eschatology), and apocalyptic tradition.⁴⁵ Elucidating these issues is beyond the scope of this study, but the defining of terms is not, especially since our concern is with the adjectival use of the term 'apocalyptic' and its relevance for the Son of Man in the Gospel of John.⁴⁶

In general discussions concerning 'the Son of Man', the term 'apocalyptic' most often refers to the 'one like a son of man' from Daniel 7 and/or the interpretations of this figure found in Jewish apocalypses, particularly the Similitudes of Enoch and 4 *Ezra*. Some of the Synoptic Son of Man sayings have been referred to as 'apocalyptic Son of Man' sayings.⁴⁷ These 'apocalyptic Son of Man' sayings form the third group of Synoptic Son of Man sayings, which are also called the 'coming' sayings, 'heavenly' sayings, or 'glorification' sayings, and have been more readily traced back to Dan 7.13 (Mark 13.26; 14.62; Matt 24.30; 25.31; 26.64; Luke 21.27; 22.69).

With regard to the Johannine Son of Man, the term 'apocalyptic' has been used in two different ways, either as synonymous with future eschatology or as related to the Jewish apocalypses of Daniel, 1 *Enoch*, and/or 4 *Ezra*. Elizabeth Kinniburgh understands 'apocalyptic' primarily as a refer-

⁴³ See J.R. Davila, 'The Animal Apocalypse and Daniel', in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 35–38.

⁴⁴ See D.C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNTS.MS 88; Cambridge: CUP, 1996) 23–31.

⁴⁵ G. Boccaccini, 'Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship', in J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Mysteries and Revelation: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSP.S 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991) 33–50; J.J. Collins, 'Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (London: T&T Clark, 2003) 44–52.

⁴⁶ Confusion in the meaning of 'apocalyptic' has also possibly arisen because of the popular use of the term to refer to world disasters and to cataclysmic events or language (see 'Next Stop Iran?', *The Economist*, February 10–16, 2007, 13: the 'apocalyptic speeches' of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the president of Iran; 'The politics of the Iraq War: Showcasing disunity', *The Economist*, February 10–16, 2007, 48: 'heavily armed apocalyptic factions'. Also note the movie titles 'Apocalypse Now' and 'Apocalypto').

⁴⁷ N. Perrin, 'The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition', in *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974 [orig. *Biblical Research* 13 (1968) 1–23]) 57–83; Higgins, *Jesus*, 15; A. Yarbro Collins, 'The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings', in B.A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 220–28.

ence to future eschatology in the Gospel of John, and on the basis of a completely realized eschatology in John, she argues that the Johannine Son of Man is not apocalyptic.⁴⁸ While the term 'apocalyptic' does have an eschatological connotation, this does not require that it refer to the end of the world or to future eschatology.⁴⁹ The fate of the wicked and the righteous is often a concern of apocalypses, but their fate is not always connected to the end of history.⁵⁰ Although the phrase 'apocalyptic Son of Man' is used by some to indicate a purely eschatological figure, the following discussion will explain why this definition of 'apocalyptic' will not be used in this study.

As with general discussions on the 'Son of Man', the more common use of the term 'apocalyptic' in Johannine studies is with reference to the Jewish apocalypses. Although Douglas Hare disagrees with defining the Johannine Son of Man in apocalyptic terms, he uses the word 'apocalyptic' to indicate a link with the Jewish apocalypses, in particular the book of Daniel. He states: 'The nonapocalyptic nature of John's vision of truth suggests that he would not have found the Danielic apocalypse particularly congenial.'⁵¹ Those who allow for an apocalyptic background to the Son of Man in John's Gospel also understand the word 'apocalyptic' to indicate the son of man figures in Jewish apocalypses.⁵² Therefore, the understanding of the majority of scholars who use the phrase 'apocalyptic Son of Man' in discussions of the Johannine Son

⁴⁸ Kinniburgh, 'Johannine', 70. See also Ramos, 'Hijo', 51, 77–78.

⁴⁹ See C. Rowland, 'Apocalyptic, Mysticism and the New Testament', in H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 405–30 at 422.

⁵⁰ See J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998²] 6, 9–12; *idem*, 'Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death', in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2001) 75–97; *idem*, 'Response: The Apocalyptic Worldview of Daniel', in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 59–66; Davila, 'Animal Apocalypse', 36–37.

⁵¹ Hare, *Son of Man*, 92. See also the negative views of R. Leivestad, 'Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man', *NTS* 18 (1972) 243–67; J. Schmitt, 'Apocalyptique et Christologie Johannique', in *Apocalypses et théologie de l'espérance. Congrès de Toulouse (1975)* (LD 95; Paris: Cerf, 1977) 337–50; Burkett, *Son of the Man*, 16–20, 38–45; *idem*, *Debate*, 22–33, 68–81, 97–120; Rhea, *Johannine*, 69; Ramos, 'Hijo', 51.

⁵² See J.H. Bernard, *A Critical Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to John* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928) 1.cxxx–cxxxii; de Beus, 'Gebruik', 237, 240; Preiss, 'Fils de l'homme', 8–9; Smalley, 'Sayings', 281–85, 301; Maddox, 'Function', 197 n. 3, 200 n. 3, 202 n. 4, 203; Painter, 'Enigmatic', 1872; Sasse, *Menschensohn*, 242, 247. Note that Painter sees the apocalyptic aspect of John's Gospel as dualistic ('Enigmatic', 1871 n. 10; *idem*, 'Theology, Eschatology and the Prologue of John', *SJT* 46 [1993] 27–42; cf. Martyn, *History*, 130–36; Schmitt, 'Apocalyptique', 337; Ashton, *Understanding*, 383–406). Such dualism is not necessarily apocalyptic.

of Man employ the phrase to indicate that this figure has an origin in or shows similarities with the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7 and/or the interpretations of this figure in Jewish apocalypses. This adjectival use of 'apocalyptic' is in accord with recent scholarship on apocalyptic literature in that the meaning of the adjective 'apocalyptic' should be grounded in the meaning of the literary genre of 'apocalypse'. John Collins states: 'The term "apocalyptic" refers first and foremost to the kind of material found in apocalypses. To use the word in any other way is to invite terminological confusion.'⁵³

2.2. Defining 'Apocalypse'

Since our definitions of 'apocalyptic' and 'apocalyptic Son of Man' are dependent upon a definition of 'apocalypse', a definition of the literary genre of apocalypse is necessary to further clarify the adjectival use of 'apocalyptic'.⁵⁴ The most significant contribution to the definition of 'apocalypse' was developed by the Society of Biblical Literature Genres Project. The definition, which will be our starting point for understanding the term 'apocalypse', states that an apocalypse is:

a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another supernatural world.⁵⁵

There have been various critiques and emendations made to this definition. Of special interest to this study are the criticisms raised by John Ashton, who cogently argues for a connection between the Gospel of John and apocalyptic genre. In his book, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, Ashton highlights the similar emphases on revelation both in apocalypses and in John's Gospel, but at the same time, he notes the differences that exist between the Apocalypse of John and the Gospel of John, arguing that the Gospel is not a true apocalypse but 'an apocalypse – in reverse, upside

⁵³ Collins, 'Genre', 27; *idem*, 'Prophecy', 46. See also, K. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (SBT 22; London: SCM, 1972) 20, 35; Russell, *Divine Disclosure*, 6; Davila, 'Animal Apocalypse', 37. Cf. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 35, 40–41. *Contra* R.E. Sturm, 'Defining the Word "Apocalyptic": A Problem in Biblical Criticism', in J. Marcus and M.L. Soards (eds.), *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (JSNT.S 24; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989) 17–48.

⁵⁴ There is general agreement concerning which texts are considered apocalypses (see C. Rowland, 'Apocalyptic Literature', in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, SSS [Cambridge: CUP, 1988] 170–89).

⁵⁵ J.J. Collins, 'Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre', *Semeia* 14 (1979) 1–20 at 9; *idem*, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 4–5.

down, inside out'.⁵⁶ As such, his criticisms and proposed definition of 'apocalypse' are an attempt at distancing the Gospel of John from the genre of 'apocalypse' as defined by the SBL Genres Project. Ashton defines an apocalypse as:

a narrative, composed in circumstances of political, religious, or social unrest, in the course of which an angelic being discloses heavenly mysteries, otherwise hidden, to a human seer, either indirectly, by interpreting a dream or vision, or directly, in which case the seer may believe that he has been transported to heaven in order to receive a special revelation.⁵⁷

Ashton's first critique is that the term 'transcendent' in the SBL definition is 'misleading'.⁵⁸ While the term is definitely unclear on its own, Ashton appears to identify the term with the content of the revelation. However, in the original description of the SBL definition, Collins clarifies that 'transcendence', which he sees as the 'key word' of the definition, is meant to indicate the mediation of the revelation by an otherworldly being and to point to the world beyond this one.⁵⁹ Although the *content* of the revelation recorded in an apocalypse may not be transcendent as Ashton stresses,⁶⁰ this does not negate the transcendent *manner* of such revelation.

Secondly, Ashton thinks that the theme of eschatology 'is not a necessary feature of apocalyptic writing'.⁶¹ This view depends upon an understanding of eschatology as explicitly referring to end-time judgment. While Ashton is correct that not all apocalypses refer to the end of the world, apocalypses do share a concern for the fates of the wicked and/or the righteous (i.e., personal eschatology), even when a final judgment is not mentioned.⁶² Collins explains that the phrase 'eschatological salvation' in the SBL definition refers to afterlife and not necessarily to end-time judgment.

⁵⁶ Ashton, *Understanding*, 405.

⁵⁷ Ashton, *Understanding*, 385–86; see more fully 337–406. It should be noted that both of these definitions of 'apocalypse' do not reflect Martyn's understanding of a 'two-level drama' being 'at home in the thought world of Jewish apocalypticism' (*History*, 130; also Schmitt, 'Apocalyphtique', 337). A drama taking place in heaven and on earth is not evident in all apocalypses (e.g., *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*). Even the *Similitudes of Enoch* does not have a two stage drama between heaven and earth in the way Martyn describes.

⁵⁸ Ashton, *Understanding*, 385.

⁵⁹ Collins, 'Introduction', 10.

⁶⁰ Ashton, *Understanding*, 385. See M.E. Stone, 'Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature', in F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, and P.D. Miller, Jr. (eds.), *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976) 414–54; D. Hellholm, 'The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John', *Semeia* 36 (1986) 13–64.

⁶¹ Ashton, *Understanding*, 385. See also Rowland, *Open Heaven*, esp. 23–72; *idem*, 'Apocalyptic,' 405–30.

⁶² See the chart in Collins, 'Jewish Apocalypses', 28; also, 'Apocalyptic Eschatology', 75–97.

He says: 'personal afterlife is the most consistent aspect of apocalypses, and it ensures the definitive and transcendent character of that eschatology'.⁶³ Thus, to remove all eschatological concepts from a definition of 'apocalypse' seems unwise and not entirely accurate.

In his third critique, Ashton desires to see a clearer distinction between apocalypses and prophecy, referring to the 'rather wavy line separating prophecy and apocalyptic'. However, the SBL definition does differentiate between prophecy and apocalypses, if one considers that prophecy is rarely mediated, often coming directly from God to the prophets. Further, the content of prophecy typically involves a prophetic commissioning or oracles of judgment rather than a revealing of heavenly mysteries.⁶⁴

Ashton also criticizes the lack of reference to the social context in which apocalypses were written.⁶⁵ In contrast, Collins has pointed out that discerning the social setting of the apocalypses is too difficult, since it is possible that apocalypses may not have been written in situations of unrest.⁶⁶ He agrees with the suggested amendment by Adela Yarbro Collins, which addresses the functional aspect of apocalypses without narrowly defining their social context. Her amendment states that an apocalypse is 'intended to interpret present earthly circumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority'.⁶⁷ While this amendment is more general, it allows us to say what is known about the context and purpose of apocalypses without saying more than what is or can be known.

Ashton's final two critiques are that the SBL definition is too broad and would include the Gospel of John and that a definition of 'apocalypse' should include the mode of revelation, such as visions, dreams, and/or states of rapture or ecstasy. Regarding the breadth of the definition, it is not clear that the Gospel of John fits as 'snugly' into the SBL definition as

⁶³ Collins, 'Introduction', 9.

⁶⁴ Cf. L.L. Grabbe, who contends that 'apocalyptic' is a sub-genre of 'prophecy' ('Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak [eds.], *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* [London: T&T Clark, 2003] 107–33). See Collins' response ('Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak [eds.], *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* [London: T&T Clark, 2003] 44–52).

⁶⁵ A similar critique was made by Hellholm who suggested adding the following statement to the SBL definition: 'intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation by means of divine authority' ('Problem', 27).

⁶⁶ Collins, 'Genre', 33; Rowland, 'Apocalyptic Literature', 170–89.

⁶⁷ A. Yarbro Collins, 'Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism', *Semeia* 36 (1986) 1–11 at 7.

Ashton claims.⁶⁸ There are obvious similarities, but this does not mean that the definition is too broad. On the other hand, Ashton may be correct to include a reference to the mode of revelation in apocalypses. By doing so, he helps to explicate further the differences between 'prophecy' and 'apocalypse'. At the same time, it must be noted that not all revelation in apocalypses is made known through visions, dreams, or heavenly ascents. For instance, there are sections of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* where angels reveal heavenly mysteries apart from these modes of revelation. Neither Ezra nor Baruch ascends to heaven to see heavenly things; rather angels answer their complaints and questions (cf. *4 Ezra* 3–4).

Keeping in mind Ashton's critiques and adopting the emendation of Yarbrow Collins, the following revision of the SBL definition of 'apocalypse' will be used throughout this study. An apocalypse is:

a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient often through visions, dreams, or an ascent to heaven, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another supernatural world, and an apocalypse is intended to interpret present earthly circumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.

Since the best way for defining the adjectival use of the word 'apocalyptic' is to align it with a literary type, this study of the apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John will define 'apocalyptic' in accordance with the above definition of 'apocalypse'.⁶⁹ Therefore, the phrase 'apocalyptic Son of Man' will be used to indicate the figure of the 'one like a son of man' found in the Jewish apocalypse of Daniel and the interpretations of that figure found in the later Jewish apocalypses (i.e., the Similitudes of Enoch, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*).⁷⁰ To define 'apocalyptic Son of Man' in this way is nothing extraordinary since it is the common understanding of the phrase, especially in discussions of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John. By defining 'apocalyptic Son of Man' in this way, we are in doing so in agreement with the majority of scholars who have argued both for and against this view of the Johannine Son of Man.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Ashton, *Understanding*, 386.

⁶⁹ See Koch, *Rediscovery*, 35; Collins, 'Genre', 27. However, care must be taken not to define automatically everything within apocalypses as 'apocalyptic', since some of these features may not be found solely in apocalypses. See Hellholm, 'Problem', 23–24; Stone, 'Lists', esp. 435–39.

⁷⁰ The specific characteristics and features of this apocalyptic Son of Man will be fleshed out in the coming chapters.

⁷¹ See notes 51 and 52 above. However, although the question of the genre of John persists, this study is not ultimately concerned with the question of whether or not the Gospel of John is an apocalypse. The concern lies with what is meant by describing

2.3. A 'mystical Son of Man'?

One further area for discussion is the relationship between 'apocalyptic' and 'mystical', or 'apocalypticism' and 'mysticism'. J.J. Kanagaraj has argued that there is 'mysticism' in the Gospel of John, and he contends that this 'mysticism' has its basis in the Merkabah mysticism of Rabbinic Judaism, which he maintains was extant in 'pre- and post- 70 apocalyptic'.⁷² Some of the elements found in apocalypses and in Merkabah mysticism do appear to be similar,⁷³ but most of these features can be drawn directly from Isaiah 6, Ezekiel 1, and Daniel 7. Thus, it cannot be confidently stated that 'Merkabah mysticism is integral in various degrees to the apocalyptic visions current in the first century CE'.⁷⁴ What can be said is that Merkabah mysticism may have developed from the apocalypses and apocalyptic tradition and not that Merkabah mysticism is present in first century apocalypses.⁷⁵ For instance, the goal of Merkabah mysticism is significantly different than that of the apocalypses. G.G. Scholem states:

something, namely the Son of Man, as 'apocalyptic'. At the same time, this discussion does raise implications for the genre of John's Gospel, implications which will be addressed briefly at the conclusion of this study.

⁷² J.J. Kanagaraj (*'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background* [JSNT.S 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998] 149) seems to be using the term 'apocalyptic' here in the broader sense of apocalyptic tradition or apocalypticism.

⁷³ Kanagaraj (*Mysticism*, 149) notes the similar interest in heavenly ascent, the glory of God on the throne, 'angelic entourage, heavenly hymn, worship with the angels in heaven, the transformation and commissioning of the visionary'.

⁷⁴ Kanagaraj, *Mysticism*, 149. P. Schäfer ('The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism' in *Hekhalot-Studien* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988] 277–95) contends that Merkabah mysticism is even post-Rabbinic.

⁷⁵ I. Gruenwald states: '...certain apocalyptic modes of expression and thought were adapted by the Merkabah mystics' (*Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism* [Leiden: Brill, 1980] 13); and again: 'apocalypticism...paved the way for the experiences and literature of the mystical circles from the time of the Tannaim onwards' (28). See also C.R.A. Morray-Jones, 'Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition', *JJS* 43.1 (1992) 1–31. Cf. A.D. DeConick ('What is Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism?', in A.D. DeConick [ed.], *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* [Symposium 11; Atlanta: SBL, 2006] 1–24; *idem*, *Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature* [JSNT.S 157; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001], esp. 49–67) who combines Jewish and Christian apocalypses, Nag Hammadi literature, and *merkabah* and *hekhlat* texts under the umbrella of 'mysticism'. She seems to understand the SBL definition of an apocalypse as primarily linear (i.e., eschatological) and thus defines 'the mystical tradition' as a "'vertical" dimension of Jewish apocalyptic thought running perpendicular to the eschatological' ('Early Jewish', 21; also J.E. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* [NTOA 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995] 1). As noted above, apocalypses clearly have a vertical element embedded in the otherworldly revelation that is revealed.

'God's pre-existing throne, which embodies and exemplifies all forms of creation, is at once the goal and theme of [the Jewish mystic's] mystical vision'.⁷⁶ Kanagaraj even admits that 'in apocalyptic the vision of God is nowhere regarded as an unqualified goal to be pursued as it is in Merkabah mysticism'.⁷⁷ As we have seen, apocalypses are more concerned with the fate of the righteous and the wicked than with dwelling on the appearance of the heavenly throne. Visions of the heavenly throne are not found in all of the apocalypses (e.g., *4 Ezra*,⁷⁸ *2 Baruch*, the Book of the Heavenly Luminaries). Merkabah mysticism may have originated from apocalyptic tradition and apocalypses, but this does not mean that Merkabah mysticism was present in the first century. The apocalyptic Son of Man, therefore, is grounded in the apocalypses and apocalyptic tradition and not Merkabah mysticism.

3. A 'Son of Man Concept'?

There was an assumption in older scholarship that some sort of a unified portrayal of the Danielic son of man existed in Jewish apocalyptic interpretation.⁷⁹ This common interpretation, often referred to as the 'Son of Man concept', was rightly criticized by Norman Perrin and others. Perrin states: 'There is no sufficient relationship between the use of Son of man in I Enoch and IV Ezra for us to suppose that they are both reflections of a common conception.'⁸⁰ Perrin's criticism is correct in that there is no

⁷⁶ G.G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1955³) 44. Cf. C. Rowland, 'The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature', *JSJ* 10 (1979) 137–54; Schäfer, 'Aim and Purpose', 293.

⁷⁷ Kanagaraj, *Mysticism*, 116.

⁷⁸ Although there is reference to God's throne in Ezra's prayer, Ezra does not have a vision of it (8.19–22).

⁷⁹ See Tödt (*Son of Man*, 22–31) who has a chapter entitled 'The Transcendent Sovereignty of the Son of Man in Jewish apocalyptic literature'. Also S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (G.W. Anderson, trans.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1961) 415–37; Cullmann, *Christology*, 137–52; Borsch, *Son of Man*, 55–88. Cf. H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895) 323–35. Recently, see G. Nebe, 'The Son of Man and the Angels: Reflections on the Formation of Christology in the Context of Eschatology', in H.G. Reventlow (ed.), *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSOT.S 243; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997) 111–31.

⁸⁰ N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1967) 172. Also Casey, *Son of Man, passim*; D. Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 151–70. Lindars (*Jesus*, 3–8) calls the 'Son of Man concept' 'a modern myth' and 'a hypothetical reconstruction'.

unified interpretation of the Danielic figure that can be called a ‘Son of Man concept’, but although there may not be a single unified interpretation, common features do seem to exist between the various interpretations of the ‘one like a son of man’. John Collins, Adela Yarbro Collins, and Thomas Slater each argue that the interpretations of the Danielic son of man were understood to have some common characteristics in the first century.⁸¹

Delbert Burkett recently attempted to refute this idea of common features proposed by Collins, Yarbro Collins, and Slater, stating: ‘When we focus specifically on elements of these messianic portraits that come directly from Daniel 7.13, we find not a single interpretation but a diversity of perspectives.’⁸² Burkett understands Daniel 7 to have been used in different ways by interpreters who were explaining or describing the Messiah. He says, ‘These distinctive uses of Daniel 7.13 make it difficult to infer that authors of the first century shared a unified interpretation of this passage, beyond identifying the one like a son of man as the Messiah.’⁸³ But can such a distinction really be made between the Messiah figure and the ‘one like a son of man’ if these interpretations depict one figure as both Son of Man and Messiah? Who is to say that the figure should be called ‘Messiah’ or ‘Son of Man’? One can just as easily say that the ‘one like a son of man’ was interpreted messianically as that the Messiah is portrayed as the Danielic son of man.⁸⁴ Burkett, like Perrin, Casey, and others, is correct to highlight the diversity of interpretation concerning Daniel 7, but at the same time, common characteristics of the ‘one like a son of man’ may exist in these varied interpretations.

4. Structure of the Study and Criteria for Identifying the Presence of the Danielic Son of Man

Part 1 of this study will begin by examining the figure of the ‘one like a son of man’ in the book of Daniel and the Jewish apocalyptic and early Christian interpretations of that figure. Chapter 1 will include an examina-

⁸¹ J.J. Collins, ‘The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism’, *NTS* 38 (1992) 448–66; Yarbro Collins, ‘Apocalyptic’, 220–21; T.B. Slater, ‘One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism’, *NTS* 41 (1995) 183–98. See Nickelsburg, ‘Son of Man’, 141; Martyn, *History*, 131 n. 202. Cf. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 30–31.

⁸² Burkett, *Debate*, 113–14. See even more recently, Casey, *Solution*, 82–115.

⁸³ Burkett, *Debate*, 114, cf. 120. Burkett seems to have traded a ‘Son of Man concept’ for a ‘Messiah concept’.

⁸⁴ See W. Horbury, ‘The Messianic Associations of “The Son of Man”’, in *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (London: T&T Clark, 2003) 125–55.

tion of the Aramaic text of Daniel 7 in its final form in order to highlight the characteristics and functions of the 'one like a son of man'. Then the two Greek versions of Daniel 7, the Old Greek and Theodotion, will be assessed and differences of interpretation with regard to the son of man figure will be noted. In chapters 2 and 3, the interpretations of the Danielic figure in Jewish and Christian literature during the period prior to and roughly concurrent with the Gospel of John will be investigated. Three criteria will be used to determine which works should be examined. (1) Jewish apocalyptic and early Christian works that fall within the general time frame of 150 B.C. and A.D. 100 will be considered.⁸⁵ (2) Are there clear verbal allusions to Daniel 7? (3) Is there a figure that is described in terms reminiscent of Daniel 7?⁸⁶ These questions will be asked whether or not the phrase 'son of man' is used.

The Similitudes of Enoch and 4 *Ezra* are examples of texts which meet these criteria because of their obvious allusions to the son of man figure and other features of Daniel 7.⁸⁷ Although the date of the Similitudes of Enoch is often questioned,⁸⁸ it speaks of a figure equivalent to the Ancient of Days whose head is white like wool (46.1) and of another figure who is like a human being and is called 'that son of man' (46.1–2). In the late first century work of 4 *Ezra*, following Ezra's vision of the fourth beast of Daniel 7 (4 *Ezra* 11–12; esp. 12.11), Ezra has a 'dream of the night', in which he sees a human-like figure that comes up from the sea and flies with the clouds of heaven (13.1–4). Similarly, 2 *Baruch*, Matthew, Mark, Luke-Acts, and Revelation meet the dating criteria, contain verbal allusions to Daniel 7, and speak of a figure reminiscent of Daniel 7.

It is unclear and much debated whether 4Q246 should be considered as an interpretation of the 'one like a son of man'. Daniel 7 and 4Q246 share verbal similarities, particularly between 4Q246 2.5 and Dan 7.27 (מלכותה של מלכות עלם) and between 4Q246 2.9 and Dan 7.14 (שלטתה של מלכות עלם). 4Q246 also mentions a mysterious figure called 'Son of God' and 'Son of the Most High'. Although there is no consensus on whether or not this fig-

⁸⁵ The *terminus a quo* reflects the commonly understood date by which the book of Daniel is agreed to have been in existence (see J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993] 24–38). The *terminus ad quem* is intended to include the late first century or early second century date typically given for the Gospel of John (see Brown, *Introduction*, 206–15).

⁸⁶ See Casey, *Son of Man*, 5. Cf. G.K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984) 43–44 n. 62; Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 154–57, 160–62.

⁸⁷ Casey, *Son of Man*, 99–100, 122; U.B. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972) 38–43, 120–22; Collins, *Daniel*, 79–84; Beale, *Use of Daniel*, 313–18.

⁸⁸ See chapter 2.

ure should be understood as the Danielic son of man, 4Q246 will be examined as a possible interpretation of the Danielic son of man in an excursus to chapter 2.

Works that do not meet the criteria include Hebrews 2.6, which although it uses the phrase υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, is a quotation of Psalm 8. The *Epistle of Barnabas* likewise uses the phrase ‘son of man’, but the epistle’s lack of Danielic allusion in the context of 12.10 and its questionable date⁸⁹ disqualify it from discussion. The son of man saying in *Gos. Thom.* 86, although parallel to Matt 8.20 and Luke 9.58, appears to indicate ‘humanity’ in general and gives no indication of Danielic allusion.⁹⁰ The statement of Rabbi Akiba concerning the thrones of Dan 7.9 being for David and for the Lord is ineligible on the basis of its post-A.D. 100 date (*b. Sanh.* 38*b*; *b. Hag.* 14*a*). Ezekiel the Tragedian makes reference to Moses being seated on a throne, but this text does not indicate any verbal allusion to Daniel 7 that would suggest that Moses is intended to be the son of man figure.⁹¹ In

⁸⁹ R.A. Kraft (*The Apostolic Fathers: A Translation and Commentary. Barnabas and the Didache* [Vol. 3; New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965] 42–43) dates the text between A.D. 70 and 135. K. Wengst (*Schriften des Urchristentums. Didache, Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* [München: Kösel, 1984] 114–15) argues for A.D. 130 to 132. The date A.D. 115 is taken by B.A. Pearson, ‘Cracking a Conundrum: Christian Origins in Egypt’, *Studia Theologica* 57 (2003) 61–75. A.D. 96–98 is maintained by P. Richardson and M.B. Shukster (‘Barnabas, Nerva, and the Yavnean Rabbis’, *JTS* 34 [1983] 31–55) and J. Carleton Paget (*The Epistle of Barnabas* [WUNT 2.64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994] 9–30).

⁹⁰ Logia 83–88 seem to involve various references to humanity, with Adam mentioned in logion 85. This grouping may suggest that *Gos. Thom.* 86 reflects the human meaning of ‘son of man’ that was common among the early church fathers (Ignatius, *Ephes.* 20.2; Justin, *Dial.* 100.3–4; Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* 3.10.2; 16.3, 7; 17.1; 18.3–4; 19.1–2). See R. Doran (‘The Divination of Disorder: The Trajectory of Matt 8:20//Luke 9:58//*Gos. Thom.* 86’, in B.A. Pearson [ed.], *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991] 210–19) for a similar understanding of logion 86. Cf. H. Koester, ‘Introduction’, in B. Layton (ed.), ‘Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7’, *The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Volume 2* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 42–43).

⁹¹ The argument that there is a reference to Daniel 7 in the *Exagogue* has been made by P.W. van der Horst (‘Moses’ Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist’, *JTS* 34 [1983] 21–29) and H. Jacobson (*The Exagogue of Ezekiel* [Cambridge: CUP, 1983] 91). The primary evidence given for the Danielic connection is Moses’ approach to the throne and the bestowal of authority upon him; however, W.A. Meeks (*The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* [NovT.S 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967] 100–175) has highlighted the wide-ranging traditions that considered Moses as king and priest (*Jub.* 1.4, 26; *4 Ezra* 14.3–5; *2 Bar.* 4.2–7; cf. Ezek. Trag. 87–89). Further Moses’ kingship was already hinted at in Ezek. Trag. 36–38, 40 (see Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 153). The nearest parallels to Moses’ dream in the *Exagogue* are Exodus 24 and Psalm 110.1, with numerous others listed by Jacobson and van der Horst (Gen 15; 37.9; 41; 49.10; Ps 45.7; 147.4; Esth 5.1–2; *1 En.* 18.8; 25.3; *T. Levi* 2–5; *Apoc. Ab.* 11–12; *Sib. Or.* 5.414–15).

addition, the *Testament of Abraham* will not be considered in this survey because it lacks clear allusions to Daniel 7.⁹²

The works that meet the three criteria, thus showing a connection to the 'one like a son of man' from Daniel 7, will be analyzed in order to determine any similarities and differences between the various interpretations of this figure. At the conclusion of the examination of each work, any similar characteristics of the figure will be summarized, and similarities and differences between interpretations will be noted. This is not an attempt to reconstruct a 'Son of Man concept', but rather recognition that there may be common features in the interpretations of the Danielic son of man.

In Part 2 of this study, the Gospel of John will be considered in its final form. Much previous scholarship on the Gospel has attempted to ascertain the various levels of redaction and literary development.⁹³ This is even true with regard to the Johannine Son of Man sayings,⁹⁴ but scholars have recently acknowledged the value of examining the final form of the Gospel of John.⁹⁵ For the sake of convenience the evangelist will be referred to as John.⁹⁶

Recently, J. Heath ('Homer or Moses? A Hellenistic Perspective on Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel Tragicus', *JJS* 58 [2007] 1–18) highlights the similarities between Ezekiel's Moses and images of Homer enthroned with a scepter.

⁹² P.B. Munoa, III (*Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* [JSP.S 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998]) argues for Daniel 7 as background for the judgment scene in the *Testament of Abraham*. Munoa's position is based primarily on a structural parallel between the two texts: Adam as equivalent to the Ancient of Days, Abel to the 'one like a son of man', the twelve tribes of Israel to the saints of the Most High, and the master to the Most High (43–81). These parallels, especially between Adam and the Ancient of Days, are not persuasive (see D.C. Allison, Jr., *Testament of Abraham* [CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003] 245 n. 17; 281; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005²] 326 n. 106. Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, 'Eschatology in the Testament of Abraham: A Study of the Judgment Scenes in the Two Recensions', in G.W.E. Nickelsburg [ed.], *Studies on the Testament of Abraham* [SBL.SCS 6; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976] 23–64).

⁹³ R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (G.R. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare, and J.K. Riches, trans.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976); M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean. Synopse des quatre évangiles* (Paris: Cerf, 1977³); R.E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John [I–XII, XIII–XXI]* (AB 29, 29A; New York: Doubleday, 1966–70) xxxiv–xxxix.

⁹⁴ Painter, 'Enigmatic', 1873; de Boer, *Johannine Perspectives*, 147–217; Ellens, 'Exegesis', 138–46.

⁹⁵ Brown, *Introduction*, 62–69; H. Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 1–5; A.T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St John* (BNTC; London: Continuum, 2006) 1–3. See also Burkett, *Son of the Man*, 14; Moloney, 'Revisited', 201.

⁹⁶ For discussions of authorship issues in the Gospel, see O. Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle: Its Place in Judaism, among the disciples of Jesus and in Early Christianity*. A

The approach in Part 2 will be different from that of Part 1, namely the three criteria will no longer be used. First, we know that the Gospel of John fits within the date set for the first criterion. Second, although the Johannine Son of Man may share characteristics or features with the figure described in Jewish apocalypses (themselves significantly influenced by Daniel 7), there are no *clear* verbal allusions to Daniel 7 or any *obvious* descriptions of a figure reminiscent of Daniel 7 apart from John 5.27 (criteria 2 and 3).⁹⁷ Therefore, chapters 4–11 will involve an exegetical examination of the Johannine Son of Man sayings and their narrative context. The characteristics of the Johannine Son of Man will be compared with any common characteristics that may emerge in the examination of the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7 and the interpretations of this figure (Part 1). If a common set of characteristics emerges and if the Johannine Son of Man also shares these characteristics, it may then be determined appropriate to describe the Son of Man in John’s Gospel as an apocalyptic figure, even if there may be no unmistakable influence from Daniel. The depiction of the Johannine Son of Man with apocalyptic characteristics and features that are also used to describe the ‘one like a son of man’ in Jewish apocalypses would allow for the adjective ‘apocalyptic’ to be applied to the figure in John.

Any similarities that can be noted in the apocalyptic interpretations of the ‘one like a son of man’ may not indicate a ‘Son of Man concept’, which has been rightly rejected by scholarship, but they may suggest that the Johannine Son of Man is more closely associated with the Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels than is typically accepted. They may also suggest that the apocalyptic characteristics of the Johannine Son of Man may add to a broader understanding of the function of the Son of Man title within Johannine Christology.

Study in the Origin of the Gospel of John (J. Bowden, trans.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976); R.E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (J. Bowden, trans.; London: SCM, 1989); and recently R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

⁹⁷ See Casey, *Son of Man*, 163, 197–99.