

less-more”의 관계 곧 구약은 예수 그리스도 안에서 하나님의 계시가 덜 나타났던 때 이고 신약은 계시가 더 나타났다는 이 견해가 칼빈의 입장이었고 우리의 입장인 것이다.

그러므로 신구약의 관계는 어느 하나가 다른 하나를 이해하지 못하고는 이해되지 않는 불가분리의 관계이다. 우리는 이 관계가 그리스도적으로 되어있음을 분명히 알아야만 할 것이다.

□ 교수논단 □

The Background and Terminology of Jesus' Self-Designation “the ‘Son of Man’”

김 세 윤

〈아세아연합신학대학 부교수·신약신학〉

As it is well known, a figure described as being כְּבֶרֶךְ אָדָם (or its equivalents) appears in three Jewish apocalyptic books: Dan 7; 1En 37-71; and 4Ezra 13. The latter two clearly show the influence of Dan 7. In Dan 7.13 Daniel sees in a vision the figure coming with (or upon—LXX) the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days. This figure, having been presented to the Ancient of Days, receives dominion, glory and kingdom. The phrase “son of man” is clearly no title here: Daniel does not see “the Son of Man” but one “like a son of man”. It is rather a descriptive, pictorial phrase which expresses that the figure Daniel sees is like a man, has a human form or likeness. The accompaniment of the clouds in his appearance, however, indicates that he is a divine figure. For in the Old Testament clouds regularly accompany theophany¹⁾ So, the figure Daniel sees is a deity appearing

in human form or likeness.

As the various Oriental myths and the Gnostic anthropos-myth are now shown to be no source of this figure in Jewish apocalyptic literature,²⁾ the Canaanite myth of the two deities-El and Baal-is appealed to as the possible source of the idea of the two deities-the Ancient of Days and the one "like a son of man" in Dan 7.³⁾ But even this hypothesis is not without difficulties, as the parallels between the Canaanite myth in the Ugaritic texts and the descriptions of Dan 7 are by no means unequivocal.⁴⁾ Moreover, it is difficult to imagine how the author of Daniel came to know the myth.⁵⁾

For us, it seems best to see the origin of the figure within the

1) Among about 100 passages in which clouds are mentioned in the OT, Feuillet reckons that about 30 refer to a purely natural phenomenon and the rest to theophanies. He notes also that in angelophany clouds are absent. See F. Feuillet, "Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique", *RB* (1953), 187f.; also J.A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery", *JTS* 9(1958), 231f.; Colpe, *ThWb* VIII, 420f. See also my book, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (1981), 205-216, for the pattern of the OT and Jewish apocalyptic stories of heavenly visions that describes a divine figure appearing in a vision as being "like a (son of) man" and a human figure exalted in heaven as being "like God or a son of God". This pattern also leads us to understand the figure כֶּבֶד אֱלֹהִים as a divine figure.

2) See Colpe, *ThWb* VIII, 408ff.; U.B. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (1972), 30ff.

3) Emerton, *op. cit.*, 225-242; Cople, *ThWb* VIII, 415-419.

4) See Colpe, *ThWb* VIII, 417ff.; cf. also Müller, *Messias*, 34.

5) Emerton has a considerable difficulty in making it plausible that the influence of the myth, having entered into the Jewish cultus after their settlement in Canaan or David's capture of Jerusalem, lived on in the Jewish cultus (*op. cit.*, 240ff.). If Emerton is right, it is surely strange that the myth of two deities, after a long time of hibernation, should suddenly surface in Daniel—precisely in Daniel

Old Testament-Jewish tradition of theophany. As early as 1920 O. Procksch saw the literary links between the vision of God as דְמוּת כְּמֵרָאָה אֱלֹהִים in Ezek 1 and the vision of Dan 7 and perceived the figure כֶּבֶד אֱלֹהִים in Dan 7.13 as the hypostatization of the mirror-image of God in Ezek 1.⁶⁾ A. Feuillet developed this suggestion by drawing out the literary and theological links between Ezek 1 and Dan 7. His conclusion is that the figure כֶּבֶד אֱלֹהִים in Dan 7 is "a kind of manifestation of the invisible God" and "the son of man in Daniel clearly belongs to the category of the divine and is a kind of incarnation of the divine glory, with the same title as the human form seen by Ezekiel (1.26)."⁷⁾ M. Black also sees Dan 7.9-13 as standing within the theophanic throne-vision tradition of 1Ki 22.19-22; Isa 6; Ezek 1;8;10, and concurs with Feuillet in understanding the "son of man" figure in the light of Ezek 1.26ff. He goes on to trace the development of the "son of man" tradition in the throne-visions through 1En.⁸⁾ H.R. Balz also takes up the suggestion of O.

which is so uncompromising with heathen cultus! Cf. Colpe, *ThWb* VIII, 418.

6) O. Procksch, "Die Berufungsvision Hesekiels", *BZAW* 34, K. Budde FS (1920), 149f.; "Der Menschensohn als Gottessohn", *Christentum und Wissenschaft* 3(1927), 432f.; *Theologie des AT* (1950), 416f. Independently of Procksch, other scholars also have noted many similarities between Ezek 1 and Dan 7: see, e.g., J. Bowman, "The Background of the Term 'Son of Man'", *ExpT* 59(1948), 258; R.B.Y. Scott, "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds", *NTS* 5(1958/59), 129. The former (285f.) notes also the influence of Ezek 1 and Dan 7 upon the Similitudes of En and on *merkabah* mysticism.

7) Feuillet, "fils", 190.

8) Black, "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man': A Study in Tradition-History", *Jews, Greeks and Christians*, W.D. Davies FS (1976), 56-73.

Procksch, calling it "einen entscheidenden, bisher wenig beachteten Neuansatz". Through a) an analysis of the theophany visions in Ezek 1:8-11;40:43; Dan 7; 4Ezra 13; and b) an observation of the tendency in the Old Testament-Judaism to hypostatize God's functions and attributes (like wisdom, word, glory), split them off from God and then personify and deify them; and c) an observation of the Jewish speculations about a heavenly mediator figure like the metatron, Balz comes to the conclusion: The figure כְּבוֹד אֱלֹהִים in Dan 7 is an *Abspaltung* of the glory of God in the theophany of Ezek 1. The vision tradition of Ezek 1 provided the decisive material for this development, and Ezek 8-11; 43 provided an independent, messianic, priestly figure. The author of Dan 7.1-14 took a further decisive step by forming from the glory of God appearing in human form and his agent, the priestly representative, two glorious heavenly beings in visionary language: the Ancient of Days and a man-like figure. Balz shows also the further development of the "son of man" tradition in the books of Enoch (1En, 3En, and Slavonic En <=2En>).⁹⁾

However, the most exhaustive study on the tradition of the throne-vision of Ezek 1 has been made by C.C. Rowland in his Cambridge dissertation under the title *The Influence of the First Chapter of Ezekiel on Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (1974). First of all, he examines the descriptions of theophanies on the heavenly chariot (מִרְכָּבָה) in 1 En 14; Dan 7; Apoc Abr 17f.; 4QS1; Rev 4; and Gnostic literature in order to establish the

9) H.R. Balz, *Methodische Probleme der neutestamentlichen Christologie* (1967), 80-106.

widespread influence of the throne-vision of Ezek 1. Then he traces the development of the motif in Ezek 1.26ff. of God appearing in human form in Ezek 8.2; Dan 7.13; 10.6; Rev 1.13ff.; Apoc Abr; Similitudes of En; Test Abr; and the Targumic-rabbinic tradition on Gen 28.12. His conclusion is that Ezek 1 provided a quarry for the material of Dan 7;¹⁰⁾ and that the figures appearing in Ezek 8.2; Dan 7.13; 10.6 are aspects of God's self-revelation which are hypostatized into independent divine beings rather like wisdom.¹¹⁾ In the Targumic-rabbinic tradition on Gen 28.12 which speaks of the image of Jacob as engraved on the throne of God and angels descending to look at Jacob on earth in order to come to know the image engraved on the throne, Rowland sees "identity between the engraved on the throne of glory and the human form mentioned in Ez 1.26f."¹²⁾ and also a connection between Ezek 1.26f. and Gen 1.26f.¹³⁾ Rowland's examination of the *merkabah* mysticism in the Tannaitic sources also shows the influence of the tradition of Ezek 1.¹⁴⁾ Most interesting for our purpose here is the tradition that R. Elisha b. Abuyah (*alias* Acher), who entered the heavenly paradise along with three other rabbis, seeing the enthroned *metatron*, exclaimed if there were two powers in heaven (Hag 15a).

This apocalyptic tradition which is concerned with the appearance of God in human form and the gradual hypostatization of that

10) Rowland, *Influence*, 100.

11) *Ibid.* 101.

12) *Ibid.*, 148.

13) *Ibid.*, 150.

14) *Ibid.*, 159-238.

form or glory of God into a heavenly figure "like a man" (כבר) finds its counterpart in wisdom literature in the tradition of presenting the hypostatized and personified Wisdom/Logos as the bearer of theophany, i.e. as the agent that shows God (or his image) in theophany. The designation of Wisdom and Logos as the *εἰκών* of God seems to be rooted in this tradition.

Despite some criticisms,¹⁵⁾ this supposition that the heavenly figure כבר אנש in Dan 7; 1En 37-71; 4Ezra 13 is a product of the hypostatization of the יהוה appearing in דמות כבוד appearing in Ezek 1. 26ff.; 8. 2ff. seems to be the best explanation available for the rise of the figure in the apocalyptic literature. This development culminates in Judaism in the conception of the *metatron* in 3En, in which the other line of development of the same theophany-vision tradition, namely the conception of Wisdom/Logos as the *Theophanieträger*, is conflated with the apocalyptic line of the heavenly figure כבר אנש.¹⁶⁾

This means that the figure כבר אנש in Dan 7.13 is to be understood not as a human figure but rather as a heavenly, divine figure. In the interpretation of the vision in the same chapter of Dan, he seems to be identified with the "saints of the Most High" (vs. 18, 22, 27).¹⁷⁾ However, just as in the interpretation of the four beasts there is an oscillation between the individual understanding as kings (v.17) and the collective understanding as kingdoms (vs. 23ff.), so there may well be such an oscillation

15) See, e.g., Müller, *Messias*, 34f.

16) See my book, *Origin*, 219-223, 245f.

17) Theories of redactional history in Dan 7 are irrelevant to our inquiry in so far as we are concerned with Dan 7 as it was found by Jesus and his contemporaries, i.e. Dan 7 as it now stands.

also in the interpretation of the figure כבר אנש. If so, just as the four beasts are both the symbols and the representatives of four empires, so the figure כבר אנש is both the symbol and the representative (or the head) of the "saints of the Most High".¹⁸⁾ Since C.H.W. Brekelmans¹⁹⁾ has demonstrated against M. Noth²⁰⁾ and his followers that in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature and in the Qumran literature קדשים is used both for angels and for the people of God (cf. also Ps 34. 10; Dt 33. 3), the "saints of the Most High" in Dan 7, as the context demands, seems to refer to the eschatological people of God.²¹⁾ M. Black, therefore, goes so far as to say that "what Daniel was contemplating was nothing less than the *apotheosis* of Israel in the End-time".²²⁾

Now, the question is whether there was an apocalyptic Son of Man messianism at the time of Jesus. Against the older assumption that there was in the pre-Christian Judaism an expectation for the Son of Man as the messiah, it has been rightly made clear recently that before the New Testament there was no such messianic title as "the Son of Man."²³⁾ However, this does not exclude the

18) So I.H. Marshall, "The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate" *Evangelical Quarterly*, XVII (1970), 85(n.24).

19) C.H.W. Brekelmans, "The Saints of the Most High and Their Kingdom", *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14(1965), 305-26.

20) M. Noth, "Die Heiligen des Höchsten", *Gesammelte Studien zum AT* (1957), 274-90.

21) So C.F.D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (1977), 13f.; H. Gese, "Der Messias", *Zur biblischen Theologie*, 138; A. Deissler, "Der 'Menschensohn' und 'das Volk des Heiligen des Höchsten' in Dan 7", *Jesus und der Menschensohn*, A. Vögtle FS(1975), 81-91. (This last book will be abbreviated henceforth as: *Menschensohn*).

22) Black, "Throne-Theophany", 62.

23) Moule, *Origin*, 11; also his article, "Neglected Features in the

possibility that before the New Testament the heavenly figure מֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיִם in Dan 7 was already conceived of as the heavenly messiah and identified by different Jewish apocalyptic groups with personalities like Enoch (1En 71; cf. Abel in Test Abr Rec A XI^f.; Melchizedek in 11Q Melch 10ff.) who were believed to have been exalted to heaven and to be coming again to earth as judges and saviours at the end.²⁴ But the undisputed examples of this sort of conception, namely the Similitudes of Enoch and 4Ezra 13, are, at least in their present version, later than the New Testament Gospels.²⁵ Moreover, seeing the difference between the

Problem of 'the Son of Man', *NT und Kirche*, R. Schnackenburg FS (1974), 419f.; R. Leivestad, "Phantom" 49ff.; "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man", *NTS* 18(1971/72), 243-267; Marshall, "The SM", 73, Colpe, *ThWb* VIII, 407; B. Lindars, "Re-Enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man", *NTS* 22(1976), 58; E. Schweizer, "Menschensohn und eschatologischer Mensch im Frühjudentum", *Menschensohn*, 101ff.; J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean* (1979), 153ff.

24) Cf. Black, "Throne-Theophany", 73; Lindars, "Re-Enter", 58; O. Michel, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum NT* II/2, 1154f. See Billerbeck I, 486 for messianic interpretation of Dan 7.13 among rabbis.

25) Cf. J.C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch", *NTS* 14(1967/68), 551-65; Leivestad, "Phantom", 52f.; J. Milik, "Problème de la littérature à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumran", *HTR* 64(1971), 373-78; Moule, "Features", 416; Fitzmyer, *op. cit.*, 159f. (n.62). But cf. also Black, "Throne-Theophany", 72f.; W.G. Kümmel, *ThR* 45(1979), 64-70. In this connection it is noteworthy to ascertain with Leivestad, "Phantom", 52f. that although the Enoch literature was very popular among the Jewish and Christian circles so that many fragments are preserved in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew and many quotations from and allusions to it are found in so many Jewish and Christian writings, "es gibt aber m.W. überhaupt kein einziges Zitat aus den Bilderreden in der ganzen jüdischen und christlichen Literatur". Those who advocate the pre-Christian origin of the Similitudes usually argue that it does not show Christian influence. But this is an inadequate argument. Why could there not be a post-Christian Jewish book which bears no Christian influence?

conception of "the Son of Man" in the New Testament and those of the Similitudes and 4Ezra 13, T.W. Manson has said: "We have no good reason to suppose that he (sc. Jesus) was aware of any other Son of Man than the Danielic".²⁶

In this connection, 4QpsDan A^a (=4Q, 243) is most interesting. Part of the text has been restored and published by J.A. Fitzmyer as follows:²⁷

(Col. I)

[But your son]⁷ shall be great upon the earth, ⁸[O King! All (men) shall] make peace, and all shall serve [him. He shall be called the son of] the [G]reat [God], and by his name shall he be named.

(Col. II)

¹He shall be hailed (as) the Son of God, and they shall call him Son of the Most High (וְכָרַע עֲלֵיָּו). As comets (flash) to the sight, so shall be their kingdom. (For some) year[s] ²they shall rule upon ³the earth and shall trample upon people, city upon ci[t]y, ⁴(*vacat*) until there-
arises the people of God, and everyone rests from the sword.

26) T.W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels" *Studies in the Gospels and the Epistles* (1960), 143. Cf. also Moule, "Features", 416f.; *Origin*, 12f.; Marshall, "The SM", 81. In our opinion J. Theisohn's recent study on the "Son of Man" figure in the Similitudes confirms this view. Investigating the influence of the Similitudes on the Synoptic Gospels, he is able to ascertain only in what he considers to be the Matthaean redactional phrases in Mt 19.28; 25.31f. and in Mt 13, 40-43; 13.49f. an influence of the Similitudes (*Der auserwählte Richter* (1975), 149-205). The phrases seem capable of being explained without reference to the Similitudes. However, even if Theisohn is right on this point, the influence is very marginal indeed.

27) J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the NT", *NTS* 20 (1973/74), 393. This article now appears in his volume of collected essays, *A Wandering Aramean* (1979), 84-113. Here the reference is made to the article in *NTS* 20. I am grateful to Prof. P. Stuhlmacher for drawing my attention to this text.

The text is said to be a two-columned fragment of nine lines, in which the first third of the lines of col. I is missing (the text having been torn vertically) while col. II is preserved intact. Fitzmyer describes the content of the lines 1-6 of col. I as follows:

The text begins with a fragmentary narrative sentence: When something happened, someone fell before the throne. The fallen person seems to address the enthroned person, a king, using the second singular independent personal pronoun and pronominal suffixes(-k). The enthroned king seems to be described as shaken by the evils that are to come (described in lines 4-6 of column I); among them are references to "the king of Assyria" and to "Egypt".²⁸⁾

Fitzmyer describes also the content of the lines 5-9 of Col. II as follows:

Its/his rule is then extolled: respite from war, everlasting rule, paths of truth and peace with all cities in submission. For the Great God is/has been with it/him, and He will now subject all enemies to it/him.²⁹⁾

While (according to Fitzmyer) J.T. Milik interprets the text in a historical sense and sees the titles "the Son of God" and "Son of the Most High" as referring to the Seleucid king Alexander Balas, Fitzmyer interprets the text apocalyptically and sees the titles as referring "to the son of some enthroned king, possibly an heir to the throne of David" who is expected to come.³⁰⁾ Since the full text has not yet been published and since it has many *lacunae*, even Fitzmyer makes his suggestions with extreme caution. In this situation, we have to wait for the publication of

28) *Ibid.*, 391f.

29) *Ibid.*, 392.

30) *Ibid.*, 393.

the full text and also for closer studies by competent scholars.

However, we feel stimulated both by the language and the content of the text to see it as a new interpretation and application of Dan 7 in the apocalyptic sense.³¹⁾ Are not "the king of Assyria" and "Egypt" which are named among the evils to come and predicted to rule tyrannically upon the earth in this text equivalents to the four beasts and their kingdoms in Dan 7? Do not "the Son of God" and "Son of the Most High (עליון)" here refer to the heavenly figure "like a son of man" who is identified with "the saints of the Most High (עליון)" in Dan 7. 13ff.? Are not "the people of God" here "the saints of the Most High" in Dan 7.18ff.? Do we not have here an identification of the individual "the Son of God"/"Son of the Most High" and the collective "the people of God,"³²⁾ and are we not then to see "the Son of God"/"Son of the Most High" as the inclusive representative (or the head) of "the people of God", just as the "son of man" is the inclusive representative of "the saints of the Most High" in Dan 7? Does not the text predict that "the Son of God"/"the people of God" will be given the everlasting kingdom and that all men and nations will be subjected to him/it and serve him/it, just as Dan 7 does concerning the "son of man" and "the saints of the Most High"?

If all these are true, then we have here an interpretation of the heavenly figure "like a son of man" in Dan 7.13 as the Son of God, and therefore probably a messianic interpretation of the figure. If Fitzmyer is right in his conjecture that the words of

31) So Stuhlmacher (oral communication).

32) Cf. M. Hengel, *Der Sohn Gottes* (2 1976), 71.

the text are addressed to a Davidic king, the text may be interpreting Dan 7.13 in terms of the tradition of 2Sam 7.12ff. and the heavenly figure “like a son of man” in terms of the messiah, the end-time Davidic king who is to be made God’s son.³³⁾ This seems to be made plausible by another document from the same cave of Qumran, namely 4Q Flor 1.1-13, which proves that the tradition of 2Sam 7.12ff. was alive in the Qumran community. Then this is the only certain messianic interpretation of Dan 7.13 so far identified in pre-Christian Judaism. Since the text is dated to the last third of the first century B.C. on paleographic grounds,³⁴⁾ may it not be that the messianic interpretation of Dan 7.13 was just coming into being at the turn of the ages and was later developed into the messianic conceptions of the Similitudes of Enoch and 4Ezra 13 and also of the rabbis?

It is also very interesting to note some variant readings in the different Greek texts of Dan 7.13f.³⁵⁾ Papyrus 967 (Cologne) reads

33) Fitzmyer denies that 4Q psDan A^a speaks of a messiah or that the titles “the Son of God”/“Son of the Most High” refer to the messiah, on the ground that there is no reference to משיח in the text or that there is no indication that the figure addressed with these titles was regarded as an anointed agent of God (*op. cit.*, 391, n.2—here criticizing A.D. Nock’s messianic interpretation of the titles), 393; again in his “Addendum” to the article in his book, *Aramean*, 106). But we find this argument difficult to understand. If the two presuppositions of Fitzmyer are correct, namely that the text has an apocalyptic setting and that it is addressed to a Davidic king, we would have thought that the figure referred to with the titles has to be seen as the end-time heir to the Davidic throne—i.e. the messiah. Do not the expectation of the text for “the people of God” in/with him to triumph over the evil forces at the end and the expectation of universal peace support this conclusion? So P. Stuhlmacher and O. Betz (oral communication).

34) Fitzmyer, *op. cit.*, 391.

35) I am grateful to Prof. M. Hengel for drawing my attention to these LXX texts.

in vs. 13f.:

¹³ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν(ν) παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτῷ.
¹⁴καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία βασιλική καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα λατρε(ύ)ουσα αὐτῷ.....³⁶⁾

According to this reading, Daniel, having seen thrones set and the Ancient of Days sitting (ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθητο ...v.9), now saw a heavenly figure coming on clouds of heaven. This figure is described first as having been “like a son of man”. At first sight the verb παρῆν makes us wonder whether ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν refers to the Ancient of Days or a third figure “like the Ancient of Days”. But the twice repeated αὐτῷ in v.14 rules out the possibility that the phrase refers to the Ancient of Days (who, besides, is referred to in v.9 not in the descriptive way ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν but absolutely παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν. It makes it also highly improbable that the phrase refers to a third figure. For, if a third figure is here in view, then the αὐτῷ in v.14 would refer to this figure ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν and then the figure ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου would be left hanging in the air. So we must conclude that the heavenly figure “like a son of man” is described also as having been “like the Ancient of Days”. That is, Daniel saw, besides the Ancient of Days, a heavenly figure “like a son of man and like the Ancient of Days”. Then Daniel saw the angelic attendants approaching him (N.B. intr. προσήγαγον+dat. αὐτῷ³⁷⁾). He saw

36) See A. Geissen ed., *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 5-12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco, sowie Esther Kap. 1, 1a-2, 15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967*, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen Bd 5 (1968), 108, 110.

further the kingly authority being given to him and all the nations serving him.

The reading of Codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla is very similar to this:

¹³ ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφέλων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ.
¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἵνα καὶ τιμὴ βασιλική, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα λατρεύουσα αὐτῷ...³⁷⁾

In this reading, at first sight, the position of the verbs ἦρχετο and παρῆν seems to indicate, even more strongly than Papyrus 967, that ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου and ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν are two separate figures, the latter referring either to the Ancient of Days or a third figure "like the Ancient of Days". But as in Papyrus 967 the twice repeated αὐτῷ in v.14 rules out the possibility that ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν refers to the Ancient of Days or a third figure "like the Ancient of Days". So, as in Papyrus 967, we have to conclude here also that the heavenly figure coming on the clouds of heaven is described as having been "like a son of man" and "like the Ancient of Days". If παρῆν retains the force of the result of the action "coming", it, placed parallel to ἦρχετο, may imply that the heavenly figure, when in the process of coming, was seen "like a son of man", but, on arrival, was seen "like the Ancient of Days". As in Papyrus 967, here also the

37) Cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, s.v.2.

38) See J. Ziegler ed., *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco. Septuaginta*, Göttingen edition, Vol.XVI pars 2 (1954), 169f. This reading (*sine* ✕ and the second αὐτῷ in v.14) is given as original in A. Rahlfs ed., *Septuaginta* (1935). But Ziegler gives a different reading reconstructed from the witnesses of Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Cyprian in a complicated way.

angelic attendants are said to have come to be by (or around) him.

These readings of Papyrus 967 and codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla thus clearly depart from the MT, Theodotion and the text cited by Justin Martyr which all speak of the heavenly figure as having been simply "like a son of man" and of his having been brought to the Ancient of Days (by the angelic attendants). Then Papyrus 967 and Codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla must be seeking to stress the similarity of the figure כְּבֶרֶךְ אֱנוֹשׁ to the Ancient of Days. In v.9 the Ancient of Days has been described in analogy with an old man with wool-white hair and white raiment sitting on the *merkabah* throne of flames rather like God appearing דְּמוּת כְּמֵרָאָה אֱדָם in Ezek 1.26. That is, the Ancient of Days has been described as having been "like a man". Likewise, the figure in v.13 is described first as having been "like a (son of) man". But then a further description "like the Ancient of Days" is added, and it is added quite clearly in order to stress that the figure appeared awe-inspiringly glorious and divine like the Ancient of Days, as well as having the human contours. For Codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla and Papyrus 967, then, the figure in v.13 and the Ancient of Days appeared the same: like man and like God. Furthermore, the manuscripts present the figure in v.13 as having been approached and surrounded by the thousands of angelic beings who stood before the Ancient of Days (v.10). Here they seem to present a scene of heavenly assembly in which the figure in v.13 came to stand (or sit—cf. *θρόνοι* in v.9) beside the Ancient of Days sitting on the chariot-throne, surrounded by

39) Cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, s.v. 1a.

the thousands of angelic beings, and receive the kingly authority and honour from him. Then Codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla and Papyrus 967 must be understanding the relationship between the Ancient of Days and the divine figure in v.13 in terms of the divine sonship of the latter ("son" being a relational concept⁴⁰). For a being "like the Ancient of Days" who stood (or sat) beside the Ancient of Days himself and were surrounded by the serving angels can only be designated as the son of the Ancient of Days, i.e. the Son of God.⁴¹

We may note here also that the phrase in v.14 *ἐξουσία βασιλική* according to Papyrus 967 or *τιμὴ βασιλική* according to Codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla (i.e. Origen's addition) could suggest an identification of the heavenly figure in v.13 with the messiah.⁴²

Papyrus 967 transmits a LXX text (0') which is pre-Hexapla,

40) See G. Fohrer, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, ThWb VIII, 346ff.; C. Colpe, "Gottessohn", RAC, 89, Lieferung (1981), 32ff.

41) So M. Hengel (oral communication). J. Lust, "Daniel 7.13 and the Septuagint", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (1978), 64-69, maintains that in Dan 7.13 according to Papyrus 967 and Codices 88-Syro-Hexapla the "son of man" and the "Ancient of Days" are identified as one and the same, both being symbols for God. But this strange conclusion founders, first of all, upon his own insistence that the two *ὄς* in Dan 7.13 of these versions must have the same, comparative meaning: Daniel sees *not* "the 'one like a son of man' appearing 'as the Ancient of Days'" (Lust, p.65), but one "like a son of man" and "like the Ancient of Days". Lust's theory might be valid if Daniel, having seen the *παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν* in v.9, had said in v.13: "I saw... the Ancient of Days coming... like a son of man." But evidently this is not the case. Furthermore, Lust's interpretation hardly fits in with what is said about the figure in v.13 in the subsequent verses. If it is God(=the "Son of Man"=the "Ancient of Days"), can it be said, for example, in v.14 that God "was given a kingly authority"?

42) So Hengel (oral communication).

and A. Geissen, who has recently edited the Cologne part of the Papyrus, suggests that it was written in the second century or not later than the first half of the third century.⁴³ The Hexapla reading of *ἐξουσία καὶ τιμὴ βασιλική* is witnessed also by Justin.⁴⁴ So, it may be justified to say that at the latest in the second century A.D. there were people who interpreted the heavenly figure in Dan 7.13 as the Son of God and as the messiah. Since in view of their dates we cannot for sure infer from Papyrus 967 and the Hexapla texts the interpretation of Dan 7.13f. in the first half of the first century A.D. or earlier, for us their significance seems to lie not so much in suggesting that there really *existed* an interpretation of the heavenly figure in Dan 7.13 as the Son of God and as the messiah in pre-Christian Judaism, as in showing that the theophany scene of Dan 7 was such that the heavenly figure appearing in it (v.13) *could* be interpreted as the Son of God and as the messiah.

Thus 4Q psDan A^a suggests the possibility that there was a messianic interpretation of the heavenly figure in Dan 7.13 at the turn of the ages, and the Similitudes of Enoch and 4Ezra 13 suggest that it was developed into a full messianic conception shortly after or contemporarily to the New Testament. However, since, as we judged earlier, the Similitudes and 4Ezra 13 are later than the New Testament, we cannot speak of a wide-spread

43) Geissen, *op. cit.*, 18. Lust, *op. cit.*, 62-69, believes that Papyrus 967 being one of the earliest mss of the LXX we possess, the LXX text presented by A. Rahlfs (1935), which is close to it and its related texts (codices 88-Syro-Hexapla), is original and also that it is based on a presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Aramaic text in the MT.

44) See Ziegler, *op. cit.*, 170. He also cites Tertullian's witness: *potestas regia*.

or well-known messianic interpretation of Dan 7.13ff. during the first half of the first century. At the time of Jesus the messianic interpretation must have been at most a marginal phenomenon, restricted to some groups like the one in Qumran.⁴⁵⁾ This conclusion is suggested not only by the situation of literary provenience but also by Jesus' "messianic secret". For, as R. Leivestad argues,⁴⁶⁾ the supposition of a firmly established apocalyptic conception of the Son of Man as the coming messiah before the New Testament and Jesus' use of it for himself would contradict his avoidance of applying messianic titles to himself or of adopting for himself the characteristics of the messiah which were components of the messianology of his time. It could be that Jesus himself started to interpret the heavenly figure כִּבְרַ אֱנֹשׁ in Dan 7.13 as the Son of God and as the messiah, independently of any prior tradition.⁴⁷⁾ Or, it could be that taking a hint from the Qumran kind of interpretation, he saw his messianic task in

45) So I.H. Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man in Recent Discussion", *NTS* 12 (1965/66), 350; "The SM", 73; M.D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (1967), 48; "Is the Son of Man Problem really Insoluble?", *Text and Interpretation*, M. Black FS, ed. E. Best & R. McL. Wilson (1979), 155f.; Balz, *Probleme*, 61-112. Cf. also J. Theisohn, *Richter*, 151; Billerbeck I, 486.

46) Leivestad, "Exit", esp. 255f. However, he goes too far when he also disputes that Jesus used the designation to express his eschatological, saving function which can only be described as "messianic". When he goes on to deny Dan 7 as the source of Jesus' self-designation after rightly rejecting the notion of an apocalyptic "the Son of Man" tradition in Judaism of NT times, the question arises: from whence then did Jesus take the designation? Or what was in his mind when he used the unique "the 'Son of Man'" as his self-designation? On this question Leivestad suggests that with it Jesus could have referred to Ezekiel or understood himself as the representative of mankind. But apparently he himself is not convinced about it ("Phantom", esp. 99ff.).

47) Cf. chweizer, "eschatologischer Mensch", 102.

terms of the heavenly figure כִּבְרַ אֱנֹשׁ/the Son of God. Both 4Q psDan A^a and Papyrus 967 (Cologne) and the Hexapla texts of the LXX show how such an interpretation could spontaneously be developed from the description of the theophany in Dan 7. If so, is there any reason why Jesus could not have developed it independently of any knowledge of the tradition embodied, e.g., in 4Q psDan A^a?

Here we have to discuss also the fragments of a Jewish apocryphon cited by Origen in his *Comm. in Ioann.* II.31 (25) under the title *προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ*.⁴⁸⁾ J.Z. Smith translates it as follows⁴⁹⁾

I, Jacob, who am speaking to you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit. Abraham and Isaac were created before any work. But I, Jacob, whom men call Jacob but whose name is Israel, am he who God called Israel, i.e. a man seeing God, because I am the firstborn of every living thing to whom God gives life...

And when I was coming up from Syrian Mesopotamia, Uriel, the angel of God, came out and said that I had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob. He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me saying that his name and the name of him that is before every angel was to be above mine. I told him his name and what rank he held among the sons of God: "Are you not Uriel, the eighth after me and I Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain

48) See the Text in A.M. Denis ed., *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca* (1970), 61. I am grateful to Prof. M. Hengel for drawing my attention to the potential significance of this text for my thesis.

49) J.Z. Smith, "The Prayer of Joseph", *Religions in Antiquity*, Essays in Memory of E.R. Goodenough, ed. J. Neusner (1968), 256.

among the sons of God? Am I not Israel, the first minister before the face of God? And I called upon my God by the inextinguishable name.

Clearly the text shows many Old Testament and Jewish motifs blended together and also some resemblance to different Hellenistic (Gnostic) traditions. It is beyond the scope of this study to analyze them in detail. For it readers are referred to the fine study of J.Z. Smith.⁵⁰⁾ Here we are interested just in affirming that the Prayer of Joseph stands within the Jewish tradition of *merkabah* mysticism and may well have a *traditionsgeschichtliche* link to Dan 7.

In this text Israel is called "the archangel of the Power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God", "the first minister (λειτουργός) before the face of God" and "a man seeing God" (ἀνὴρ ὁρῶν θεόν). These descriptions place Israel nearest to God surrounded by the angelic hosts (=the sons of God) in the heavenly court. This picture of Israel is then very close to that given in the *merkabah* text of the Coptic Codex II from Nag-Hammadi, which, describing the heavenly throne presents "a firstborn whose name is Israel, the man who sees God", near to Sabaoth, surrounded by cherubim and seraphim.⁵¹⁾ Thus these texts present the angel Israel in the same way as codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla and Papyrus 967 of the LXX present the heavenly figure ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν in Dan. 7.13. Since the heavenly figure in Dan 7.13 is the symbol and the inclusive representative (or the head) of the people of

50) *Ibid.*, 267-94. I am much indebted to Smith for some material presented here, although my concern is somewhat different from his.
51) See the note 57 below.

God (= "the saints of the Most High") in Dan 7, he could have been identified with (Jacob-) Israel who as the *Stammwater* of the nation Israel is the symbol and the inclusive representative (or the head) of the nation Israel.

Another interesting idea in the Prayer of Joseph is the descent and incarnation of the angel Israel in the body of Jacob. As J.Z. Smith rightly points out,⁵²⁾ this idea echoes the Jewish Wisdom theology. According to Sir 24, when Wisdom wandered all over creation and nations in search for a dwelling place, she was told by God (ὁ κτίσας με κατέπαυσεν τὴν σκηνὴν μου):

Ἐν Ἰακώβ κατασκήνωσον

καὶ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κατακληρονομήητι (Sir 24.8).

As it is well known, this describes the acceptance of the Torah by Israel which is identified with Wisdom (Sir 24.23). It is not said here that Wisdom is incarnate in Jacob. So, besides the idea of Wisdom, who stands beside God (Prov 8.30) or indeed shares the throne of glory with him (Wis 9.4, 10), descending to tabernacle in Jacob-Israel, the widespread tradition on Gen 28.12 concerning the image of Jacob engraved on the throne of God and angels descending to look at Jacob on earth and ascending to inform their colleagues about it seems to be reflected in the Prayer of Joseph where the angel Israel's descent and tabernacling in Jacob is spoken of.⁵³⁾ The latter tradition seems to be further developed in rabbinic *merkabah* mysticism into the doctrine attributed to the third century R. Simeon b. Lakish that the Patriarchs are the *merkabah*.⁵⁴⁾ The real concern of this tradition seems to be made more

52) J.Z. Smith, *op. cit.*, 282f.

53) *Ibid.*, 284ff.

54) Gen. R. 47.6; 68.12; 69.3; 82.6. Cf. Zohar I. 173b.

explicit in Zohar I.150a which introduces "another interpretation" of Yahweh's standing over Jacob in the Bethel vision (Gen 28. 13) as follows: "the Lord was standing over him, to wit, over Jacob, so as to form the Divine Chariot, with the community of Israel, embodied in Jacob, as the uniting link in their midst, between the right and the left."⁵⁵ Thus all these traditions that speak of Israel on God's throne seem to be concerned not just with the glorification of Jacob-Israel but with the destiny of the nation Israel embodied in their *Stammvater* Jacob-Israel. In the Prayer of Joseph Jacob-Israel is said to have been reminded of his original state in heaven before his descent and incarnation on earth, and upon this information there broke up a wrestling between Jacob-Israel and Uriel. This seems to reflect the Hellenistic (Gnostic) motif of the objectified drama of the heavenly journey of the soul.⁵⁶ Taking up this pattern, the Prayer of Joseph seems to depict the ascent of Jacob-Israel to his original heavenly state. This is probably an expression of the hope of Israel to be elevated, embodied in their *Stammvater* Jacob-Israel, to heaven as God's children, which is their destiny as God's people.

This appears to be confirmed by the afore mentioned text from Codex II of Nag-Hammadi, "the Coptic-Gnostic Text without Title". In plate 153 God's *merkabah*-throne is described, which is borne by cherubims and surrounded by seraphims. Here it is said that God the Sabaoth created "an angel-church" (ἐκκλησία) and a firstborn, who is called 'Israel', i.e. 'the man who sees God', and another 'Jesus Christ' who is like the saviour (σωτήρ), who

55) *The Zohar* II, tr. H. Sperling and M. Simon (1949), 81.

56) Cf. J.Z. Smith, *op. cit.*, 287ff.

is above in the eighth (heaven) where he sits upon the throne of glory at his right hand" (153.20-28).⁵⁷ Here the familiar Jewish motif of the angel Israel upon (or beside) the throne of God and the New Testament idea of the exalted Christ sitting at the right hand of God are mixed. But what strikes us here is the fact that together with these motifs there is also the idea of the church standing beside the throne of God as an angel. This Gnostic text therefore seems to take up the motif of the Jewish *merkabah* texts concerning the elevation of Israel and replace it with the elevation of the church together with Jesus Christ to the heavenly throne. On the Jewish side, Philo confirms our interpretation of the real concern of the *merkabah* texts that speak of Israel on (or beside) the heavenly throne. In *Conf. Ling.* 146 he says:

But if there be any as yet unfit to be called a son of God, let him press to take his place under God's firstborn, the Logos, who holds the eldership among the angels, an archangel as it were. And many names are his, for he is called "the Beginning" and the Name of God and His Word and the Man after His Image and "He that sees", that is, Israel.

In this text which is very close to the Prayer of Joseph,^{57a} Philo exhorts people to make themselves included, as it were, in Israel, God's firstborn, an archangel, ὁ ὁρῶν, in order to be called sons of God, that is, in order to participate in (the heavenly) Israel's divine sonship (cf. also *Conf. Ling.* 147f.).

Thus, the real concern of all these texts which are all parts of

57) See A. Böhlig—P. Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II vom Nag Hammadi* (1962), 52-55.

57a) In my book, *Origin*, 245, I have suggested that Philo here reflects the *merkabah*-vision tradition like Dan 7. 9ff. and the Targumic-rabbinic tradition on Gen 28.12.

the *merkabah* vision tradition seems to be the affirmation of Israel as God's people (as his children), ideally already standing (embodied in their *Stammvater* Jacob-Israel) in the closest possible fellowship with God, and the hope for this to be made a full reality in heaven, that is, the hope for "*apotheosis* of Israel" (to put it in the words of M. Black).

As our sketchy survey above suggests, Dan 7.13ff. may well have been one of the factors that gave rise to this tradition, and especially the identification of the heavenly figure *כבר אֱנֹשׁ* standing beside the throne of God (or sitting on the throne next to that of God—see v.9) with the (eschatological) people of God may well have contributed to the tradition of the vision of Israel (and the nation Israel in him) sitting on God's throne or standing in front of it.⁵⁸⁾

This seems to be supported by Midr. Ps 2.9 (on 2.7). Here, before the messianic interpretation of Ps 2.7, an interpretation is given that takes the verse to mean that the children of Israel are declared to be sons of God. For this Dan 7.13f. is used as a proof-text along with Ex 4.22; Isa 42.1; 52.13; Ps 110.1. Ex 4.22 is the text which stands behind all those *merkabah* texts that speak of Israel on (or beside) the heavenly throne as the "firstborn". Isa 42.1 and 52.13 speak of God's exalting or appointing his "servant" Israel.⁵⁹⁾ Ps 110.1 and Dan 7.13f. speak of

⁵⁸⁾ This is missed by J.Z. Smith.

⁵⁹⁾ Cf. K. Elliger, *Deuterocesaja* BK XI.1 (1978), 203, on Isa 42.1: "Der Erwählte, für den Jahwe sich in freier Wahl entschieden hat (רצוה perf.), den ergreift er jetzt (אֶתְמַךְ impf.) vor versammeltem Rat und setzt ihn damit als seinen 'Knecht' ein, wobei er nun dessen Auftrag bekannt gibt."

God's exalting "my lord" and one *כבר אֱנֹשׁ* respectively to his right hand or to a heavenly throne next to his. And finally Ps 2.7 speaks of Yahweh's setting his anointed king on Zion and declaring him as his son before the whole world. Midr. Ps 2.9 seems to interpret the "king" in Ps 2.7 and "my lord" in Ps 110.1 in terms of Israel because the "king" or "lord" is their inclusive representative or head, just as it interprets the figure *כבר אֱנֹשׁ* in terms of Israel because the figure is their inclusive representative or head in Dan 7. Thus here in Midr. Ps 2.9 we seem to have all the essential building material for the *merkabah* texts which speak of Israel as the firstborn (or the son) of God, as archangel or the first minister of God, and as being exalted to (or beside) the heavenly throne. If we are right in connecting Midr. Ps 2.9 materially with the *merkabah* texts concerning Israel, it confirms our interpretation that in the latter "Israel" stands not simply as an individual but as the *Stammvater* and embodiment of the nation Israel and that the real concern of the latter is therefore the elevation of the children of Israel to divine sonship. If so, it is significant for our purpose that Dan 7.13f. finds its place here in this context, next to Ex 4.22; Isa 42.1; 52.13; Ps 2.7; and 110.1. Does not this suggest that along with all these texts and other texts like Gen 28.12, Dan 7.13ff. also contributed to the rise of the tradition about Israel exalted to the heavenly throne? Does not this suggest that the identification of the figure *כבר אֱנֹשׁ* sitting on a heavenly throne next to God's with the people of God in Dan 7.13ff. could have led to the identification of the figure *כבר אֱנֹשׁ* with Jacob-Israel, the *Stammvater* of God's people Israel, and then caused the speculation on the angel Jacob-

Israel sitting on (or standing by) God's throne, at least as much as (if not more than) Isa 42.1; 52.13; Ps 2.7; 110.1; Gen 28.12 did? At any rate, it is highly significant for our purpose that Dan 7.13f. is interpreted to mean the elevation of the children of Israel to divine sonship.

J.Z. Smith suggests for the Prayer of Joseph "a possible first century dating and an Alexandrian provenance".⁶⁰ M. Smith also sees it as originating probably from the first century, although he seems to hold to its Palestinian provenance.⁶¹ While it is not easy to decide as to where it originated, the parallelism of terms and motifs between it on the one hand and Philo and the Targumic-rabbinic tradition on Gen 28.12 which appears to be reflected also in Jn 1.51⁶² on the other hand seems to suggest that at least some of its elements, if not the whole, could originate in the first century A.D.

This means that it was quite possible in the first century to interpret Dan 7.13ff. in terms of a vision of the divine counsel (רִצְוֹ/רִצְוֹ) concerning the destiny of God's people, which is quite in accordance with the intention of Daniel.⁶³ What was shown to Daniel in a vision was the divine counsel which already existed ideally in heaven but was yet to be unfolded or made reality on

⁶⁰ J.Z. Smith, *op. cit.*, 255 (n.1).

⁶¹ M. Smith, "The Account of Simon Magus in Acts 8", *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume II* (1965), 748f. Here M. Smith remarks also that the Prayer of Joseph was part of apocalyptic literary tradition like Jubilees and Enoch. He uses it for his conclusion: "The belief that a particular individual might be a supernatural power come down to earth and appearing as a man, was reasonably common in first century Palestine".

⁶² See my book referred to in n. 84 below.

⁶³ See the next note.

earth at the end-time, and it concerned the elevation of God's people, embodied in their head (the Son of God), to the heavenly throne, so that they might enjoy the closest possible fellowship with God as his sons.⁶⁴ Was this interpretation then well known at the time of Jesus,⁶⁵ and was he inspired by it to understand his mission in terms of the realization of this divine counsel? Or did he independently come to such an interpretation? It is a moot question. At any rate, however, the Prayer of Joseph and its related texts strengthen the conclusion that has been drawn from

⁶⁴ In a theophany vision a prophetic or apocalyptic seer is taken into the assembly before God's throne and there he sees the happenings and hears the divine counsel (רִצְוֹ/μυστήριον) which is to be unfolded (or realized) on earth (Am 3.7; Jer 23.18,22). See, e.g., H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 1-12*, BK (1972), 236f.; G. Bornkamm, *μυστήριον*, *ThWb IV*, 820-23; P. Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium I* (1968), 76-82; my book, *Origin*, 94ff. That Daniel is familiar with this tradition and has it as his background in ch.7 is suggested by his definition of רִצְוֹ (the Aramaic equivalent to רִצְוֹ/μυστήριον) in 2.28-30, 47, i.e. in the context of 2.28-49 which stands in a close connection with ch.7 (cf. esp. 2.44f. with 7.9ff.). H. Gese, "Die Weisheit, der Menschensohn und die Ursprung der Christologie as konsequente Entfaltung der biblischen Theologie", *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 44(1979), 95, suggests that in Dan 7 the "Son of Man" is taken into the heavenly council and receives רִצְוֹ "like Isaiah or Ezekiel". But this is not so. It is Daniel the seer who is taken into the heavenly council and sees the scene of the figure בְּכֹרֵי אֱנֹשׁ.

⁶⁵ In the Similitudes of Enoch the "Son of Man" (as "the Righteous One" and "the Elect One") figures as the head of "the righteous ones" and "the elect ones", and in ch. 62 it is said: "the Lord of the spirits seated him on his throne of glory"; "the righteous and elect will be saved on that day"; and, the Lord of the spirits dwelling over them, they will have table-fellowship with "that Son of Man" for ever and will be clad with the clothes of glory. Here is then a similar interpretation of Dan 7.13ff. in terms of the people of God elevated to heavenly bliss, embodied in their head "that Son of Man" enthroned in heaven, although the terminology "son/sons" is not explicitly used as in the texts we have observed in this section.

4Q psDan A^a and Papyrus 967 and Codices 88 and Syro-Hexapla versions of the LXX: at the time of Jesus it was quite possible to interpret the heavenly figure כְּבֹר אֱלֹהִים in Dan 7.13 as the Son of God and as the embodiment of God's people (=the sons of God) and the vision in Dan 7.13ff. in terms of the elevation of God's people as embodied in their head, the Son of God, to divine sonship.

Now it is important to note with C.F.D. Moule⁶⁶ the significance of the definite article in the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. It is generally agreed that the phrase represents the translation of an Aramaic original. In Dan 7.13, to which some sayings of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Gospels directly allude, the phrase כְּבֹר אֱלֹהִים appears. Moule observes that apart from the one apparent exception in 1QS 11.20 there is no occurrence in pre-Christian Hebrew literature in which the phrase "son of man" (singular) appears with the definite article.⁶⁷ In his recent survey J.A. Fitzmyer affirms that the instances of כְּבֹר אֱלֹהִים in pre-Christian Aramaic are not many as they are in the rabbinic writings belonging to the late phase of Aramaic.⁶⁸ All the pre-Christian instances of the phrase that Fitzmyer cites show the indefinite form כְּבֹר אֱלֹהִים (or כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ).⁶⁹ But in the Gospels the phrase is always with the definite article (the one exception being Jn 5.27). So, behind this unusual and uniform ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Gospels, according to Moule, there must stand an Aramaic expression

66) Moule, "Features", 419ff.; *Origin*, 11ff.

67) *Ibid.*, 16.

68) J.A. Fitzmyer, "The NT Title 'Son of Man' Philologically Considered", *Aramean*, 147, 153.

69) *Ibid.*, 147f.

(probably כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ) which meant not simply "son of man" but "the Son of Man" or "that Son of Man".⁷⁰

G. Vermes has suggested, however, that in Palestinian Aramaic both the definite (or the emphatic) כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ and the indefinite (or the absolute) כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ meant much the same: "a human being", "one" or "someone", and could be used even as a circumlocution for "I".⁷¹ Criticizing Vermes for using late (and often non-Palestinian) material, Fitzmyer denies that in the first century Aramaic כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ was used as a circumlocution for "I".⁷² J. Jeremias and C. Colpe also dispute it, and, instead, they think that even where the phrase is used to refer to the speaker himself its generic sense is present (—in this case it would have the sense: "the (or a) man, therefore also 'I', 'the (or a) man as I'"⁷³). Furthermore, Fitzmyer argues that while the emphatic state of the noun loses its definite meaning in the late Aramaic and although examples of this shift can already be detected in Biblical and Qumran Aramaic, "the emphatic state by and large still expresses determination" in the Aramaic of Jesus' time.⁷⁴ C. Colpe believes that the form כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ lost its definite meaning at

70) Moule, *Origin*, 13.

71) G. Vermes, "The Use of כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ/כְּבֹר אֱנוֹשׁ in Jewish Aramaic", in M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (1947) 310-28; *Jesus the Jew* (1973), 163ff., 188ff.

72) Fitzmyer, in his review of M. Black's book and G. Vermes appendix in *CBQ* 30(1968), 426f.; "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the NT", *NTS* 20(1973/74), 396f.; "Methodology in the Study of the Aramaic Substratum of Jesus' Sayings in the NT", *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*, ed. J. Dupont (1975), 92ff. (These two articles are reprinted in his book, *Aramean*, as chs 4 and 1 respectively); "the NT title 'Son of Man'...", *Aramean*, 149ff.

73) Jeremias, *Theologie*, 248f. (n.21); Colpe, *ThWb* VIII, 406.

74) Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 30 (1968), 427.

the time of Jesus. However, he agrees that in the case of **בר אנשא** behind *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in the New Testament "a certain stress could lie on the determination", although the definite meaning could not have been discerned by all hearers.⁷⁵⁾ Fitzmyer affirms still more positively the distinctiveness in the emphatic state behind *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in the Gospels:

It is not at all certain that the Aramaic emphatic state was moribund in first-century Palestine as it is sometimes supposed to have been. There are clear instances of the emphatic state in Qumran literature. But in any case, the arthrous Greek phrase could be an attempt to translate the emphatic state of the Aramaic; but it may be something more. I suspect that it was deliberately fashioned to carry the nuance of a title.⁷⁶⁾

That the significance of the definite meaning in **בר אנשא**, as used by Jesus, was not missed by his followers appears to be proved by the uniform rendering of it with the definite *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in the New Testament. It is highly significant, first, that for the self-designation of Jesus in the Gospels the Aramaic phrase is not rendered idiomatically (*τις* or *(ὁ) ἄνθρωπος*) but invariably in the definite and literal form: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*.⁷⁷⁾ Now, since the sayings of Jesus must have been translated from Aramaic into Greek by more than one person, it is highly significant that the *various* translators should *all* render his self-designation **בר אנשא** *unusually* and yet *uniformly* with *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*—in complete agreement with one another. This is all the more significant because *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* was no part of

75) Colpe, *ThWb*, VIII, 407.

76) Fitzmyer, "The NT Title 'Son of Man'...", *Aramean*, 154.

77) Cf. M. Hengel, "Zwischen Jesus und Paulus", *ZThK* (1975), 202f., who also speaks of the "unusual" and "uniform" rendering.

the kerygmatic language of the early church. This clearly suggests that they (who must have known Aramaic well) perceived something unusual and special in Jesus' use of **בר אנשא**.⁷⁸⁾ It is also noteworthy that in Heb 2.6 and in Rev 1.13 and 14.14 the anarthrous *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is used to refer to Jesus. Of course, the anarthrous form is given to them by Ps 8.5 and Dan 7.13 which they quote respectively. But since it is likely that the authors of Hebrews and Revelation knew Jesus' self-designation (if they were not actually inspired by it to use Ps 8.5 and Dan 7.13), they could have used the definite form. The fact that they nevertheless did not, seems to suggest that they also perceived something special in Jesus' self-designation and therefore they found it unsuitable for their purpose.⁷⁹⁾ Thus it seems to suggest that the definite form was not suitable for use outside Jesus' self-designation.

So it is very likely that with the unusual and uniform *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* our Gospels faithfully convey the sense of something unusual that Jesus intended with his self-designation **בר אנשא**. What was then his intention? Or, to what was he referring with the emphatic form? Since in the sayings of "the 'Son of Man'" Dan 7.13 is often alluded to, he could have referred only to the figure **כבר אנש** (LXX: *ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*).⁸⁰⁾ In other words, when Jesus designated himself as "the Son of Man", he was doing so in reference to the Danielic figure "like a son of man". The Similitudes of Enoch provides a good parallel to this: when from 1En 46.2 onward it prefaces the expression "son of man"

78) Cf. Hooker, "Insoluble?", 157.

79) Cf. Schweitzer, "eschatologischer Mensch", 101.

80) Moule, "Features", 419ff.; *Origin*, 13ff.

with a demonstrative which is generally understood to be the Ethiopic rendering of the Greek article, it refers to "another being whose countenance had the appearance of man" in 46.1.⁸¹⁾ So, with the self-designation "the Son of Man" Jesus was in effect saying: "I am the 'Son of Man' whom Daniel saw in a vision".⁸²⁾ That is, he is claiming to be the heavenly, divine being who appeared to Daniel כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ in a vision. So, it may correspond better to Jesus' intention in his unique self-designation if we render ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου "the 'Son of Man'".

However, since some Aramaists argue that כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ could also have been understood by Jesus' contemporaries like its indefinite form, it is possible that some undiscerning hearers of Jesus failed to perceive in the definite form of his self-designation a reference to the heavenly figure כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ in Dan 7.13 and understood it merely as his way of referring to himself as a member of humanity. In fact, Jesus may have used the self-designation with the dual purpose of revealing his identity discreetly to those who had ears to hear and hiding it from those who had no ears to hear.

81) So Moule, *Origin*, 15.

82) Cf. Moule, *Origin*, 14: "Jesus is alluding to 'the (well-known, Danielic) Son of Man'. Similarly also Marshall, "Synoptic SM", 71: "that well-known manlike figure of apocalyptic tradition". But in view of what has been observed above, the emphatic word "well-known" is not justified. To suggest that the manlike figure in Dan 7.13 must have been well-known among Jesus' hearers, Moule (*Origin*, 16) appeals to the statement of Josephus that Dan was a popular book (*Ant.* x. 267f.). But is it not significant that Josephus nevertheless does not refer to the figure? The wondering of Jesus' hearers: τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; (Jn 12.34) seems to convey the situation accurately: the messianic hope originating from Dan 7.13 being at most marginal, Jesus' self-designation as "the 'Son of Man'" was not immediately understandable to ordinary people.

With "the 'Son of Man'" then Jesus intended to reveal himself to be the divine figure who was the inclusive representative (or the head) of the eschatological people of God, i.e. the Son of God who was the head of the sons of God.⁸³⁾ 4Q psDan A^a beautifully confirms this view with its interpretation of the heavenly figure כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ as "the Son of God"/"Son of the Most High". Likewise, Jesus saw the heavenly figure as "the Son of God" and understood his mission in terms of "the 'Son of Man'"/the Son of God. The LXX texts which we observed above also support this view. What was shown to Daniel in a vision was the divine counsel which already existed ideally in heaven but was yet to be made reality on earth at the end-time. The divine counsel concerned the destiny of God's people, their elevation, embodied in their head the Son of God, to divine sonship, so that they might share in God's glory and kingly rule as his children. The Prayer of Joseph and its related texts, Philo's *Conf. Ling.* 146, and Midr. Ps 2.9 which we examined above, all make the view plausible that Jesus interpreted the theophany vision in Dan 7 in this way. If so, with "the 'Son of Man'" then, Jesus meant to reveal himself as the one who would realize this divine counsel on earth. That is, with "the 'Son of Man'" he intended to reveal his mission in terms of gathering or, as it were, creating, God's eschatological people who, represented or embodied in him as their head, would be elevated (or made) God's sons.

To express this "messianic" task of his while avoiding misun-

83) See G. Fohrer and E. Lohse, *viós*, *ThWb* VIII, 347-363, for the OT/Jewish tradition that designates Israel or the righteous and wise Israelites (=the ideal Israel) as the son(s) of God. See also Hengel, *Sohn*, 35ff., 68ff.; Colpe, "Gottessohn", 34ff.

derstanding that was likely to arise with a "messianic" movement, this designation "the 'Son of Man'" was not only admirably suitable, but was perhaps the only possible one.⁸⁴⁾

84) The author has attempted to demonstrate the thesis here submitted through an exegesis of "the 'Son of Man'" sayings in the Gospels in his book, *"The 'Son of Man' as the Son of God"*, WUNT, 1. Reihe (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983). Cf. Marshall, "Synoptic SM", 350f., who arrives at the conclusion very similar to ours. W.G. Kümmel, "Das Verhalten Jesus gegenüber und das Verhalten des Menschensohnes: Markus 8, 38 par und Lukas 12, 8f. par Matthäus 10, 32f.", *Menschensohn* 224, consents to Marshall's conclusion. See further O. Procksch, "Der Menschensohn als Gottessohn"; E. Lohmyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (1936), 35, who in one way or other see Jesus' filial consciousness in his self-designation as "the 'Son of Man'". Cf. also Higgins, *Jesus*, 202, 207f.

□ 학우논단 □

「생명의 양식」 교육課程의 分析과 評價

나 삼 진 (1년)

— 차 레 —

序 論

I. 敎團의 敎會教育論

1. 敎團 敎育理念 制定의 背景
2. 敎團 敎育理念과 目的

II. 敎育課程 作成의 基礎로서의 敎會教育目的과 그 範圍

1. 敎育神學者들의 敎會教育 目的論
2. 敎會敎育의 範圍
3. 敎材評價의 기준과 方法

III. 「생명의 양식」敎育課程의 分析

1. 유년부 敎育課程
2. 중·고등부 敎育課程

IV. 「생명의 양식」敎育課程의 評價

1. 「생명의 양식」敎育課程의 특징
2. 유년부 敎育課程의 評價
3. 중·고등부 敎育課程의 評價
4. 結論的인 提案—敎團敎育의 새 地平

참고문헌록