

## THE ORIGIN OF THE SON OF MAN CONCEPT: A STUDY IN THE CHRISTOLOGICAL TITLE

T. KITAI HAHN\*

### ◇ CONTENTS ◇

- A. Extra-canonical Source.
  - I. Oriental Hellenistic Religion
    - a. Babylonian Sources
    - b. Iranian Redemption Myth
  - II. The Similitudes of Enoch
- B. Canonical Source.
  - III. The Book of Ezekiel
  - IV. The Book of Daniel
- C. Conclusion

The Son of Man concept is one of the most important concepts in the range of New Testament studies. In this paper we give consideration to the question of the antiquity and original import of the Son of Man concept: Where does this Son of Man concept arise? Jesus does not mention its specific provenance so that its origin must be ascertained by examining His mode of use. This proves to be difficult task which has given rise to diversities of opinion.

#### I. Oriental Hellenistic Religion

I. The modern *religionsgeschichtliche* school sought its ultimate source in grandiose Oriental mythology or in Hellenistic syncretism, relying chiefly upon recently discovered documents of Manichaean and Mandaean origin.<sup>1)</sup> There is an impressive array of prominent names among those who hold this line of contention. According to Hertlein, Bousset, Reitzenstein, Winckler, Gunkel, Jeremias, Gressmann et al.<sup>2)</sup> and more recently R. Bultmann

\*副教授

1) *Vide* W. Mason, *Jesus the Messiah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946), p. 24. Also O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 143.

2) Cf. A. J. B. Higgins, *New Testament Essays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), p. 121.

there lies, behind the New Testament Son of Man concept the Oriental-Hellenistic conception of the *Urmensch*, ἄνθρωπος, Primordial Man, commonly a pre-Christian Gnostic conception of a Heavenly Man, in some forms an apotheosis of the mythological *Urmensch* occasionally called εἰκων or Image or υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, υἱὸς θεοῦ, δεύτερος θεοῦ (as in Philo), or Redeemer which was as universal as the Logos concept.<sup>3</sup>

A. In Babylonian sources<sup>4</sup> Adapa (Recueli de Trav. 20:4), the son of Ea, presents a resemblance of the Son of Man (at least in name). The hero here is addressed as Zer Amiluti (3:12), being translated by Hommel (E. T., May, 1900, p. 341) as "spring of mankind" which he explains as "he from whose seed the whole of mankind is sprung" and compares it with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Schmidt thinks that this translation is impossible and takes it as "seed of men" and as zeru in 2 Recueli 36:48 distinctly a synonym of maru, "son." Thus Zer Ameluti or Zer Amiluti is an exact equivalent of אֲשַׁרְיָא בֶן, and whatever his relation to Ea, this Adapa is a mortal man---not a god---and is to be punished for his presumption.<sup>5</sup> This conclusion, however, is drawn from the mere inference of the applied phrase, for the phrase signifies "spring of mankind." Moreover, this *Urmensch* in the name Zer Ameluti "would be a naturally solitary personage, but this Adapa is regent over a populous region, dwells in a city and associates with bakers. The fact of his being anointed, as implying a degree of likeness to the Messianic figure, is beset with uncertainty".<sup>6</sup>

A reference is also made by Assyriologists to Sennacherib who called himself Adapa, "the god of a new age turned into man." But "this seems to be the language of pagan eschatology grandiloquently applied to himself by an Oriental monarch, and it is hardly possible to construct the Gospel concept of the Son of Man upon such mythological environments where the frame of reference is too general an experience."<sup>7</sup> Vos' view seems accurate as it reflects the definiteness of his insight and the solidarity of his argument supported by Biblical presuppositions.

3) Vide M. Black, "Pauline Doctrine of the Second of the Second Adam," *Journal of Theological Studies*, III (1954), 177.

4) This theory is mainly propounded by Hertlein and Winckler. For its source cf. N. Schmidt, "Son of Man," *Encyclopedia Biblica* (1954), p. 4709, and J. G. Vos, *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), pp. 228-229; also *Princeton Theological Review*, X (1912), 324-327.

5) Vide N. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 4709.

6) J. G. Vos, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

7) *Loc. cit.*

Next to Adapa, Marduk, the son of Ea, has been represented as the alleged prototype of the Son of Man. According to Winckler, Ea is called "the God Man" and therefore his son Marduk must have been called "the son of Man." His argument was based upon the words, *Ila Amelu* to mean "the God Man," and thus Jesus Adapa was figured under this title as "a Babylonian Christ," and that Jesus in dependence upon this, could have put into the Son-of-Man title the meaning: I am the Saviour.<sup>8</sup>

*Ila Amelu*, however, can with equal warrant be said simply to be "the God of mankind" and there is no shred of evidence to show that Marduk was actually called "the Son of Man." Again, this theory is gravitating toward inferential judgment rather than factual, and, as Vos aptly points out, Jesus Himself could not have found warrant "in such pseudo-resemblances to call Himself, in imitation of the Saviour character of Marduk, 'the Saviour'".<sup>9</sup>

The critical evaluation of this theory that the Babylonian mythological figure is the ancestor of the Son of Man in the Gospel may be summarized in the following words:

...There is nothing in it (Adapa or Marduk) to link it to the Son of Man conception. The whole figure of Adapa possesses so many, from the Biblical standpoint, uncongenial characteristics as to render its incorporation into Old Testament or Jewish eschatology difficult to conceive.<sup>10</sup>

B. The twin-sister of this Babylonian theory is the claim of Reitzenstein<sup>11</sup> and others that Hellenistic *Urmensch*, as occurs in Hermetic literature, in Philo and in Gnostic speculation, is the harbinger of the Son of Man in the New Testament, and finds its ultimate dependence upon the Persian and Iranian redemption myth.

According to this redemption myth, the Son of Man or apocalyptic Redeemer was to come among men *incognito*, and after considerable vicissitude of life and great sufferings on earth was to be revealed in his true character by a celestial exaltation or apotheosis. Reitzenstein thinks that this Iranian redemption myth was transmitted not by the channels of normal orthodox Zoroastrianism but through a filter-bed of Babylonian and Syrian mysticism, and that it has exerted a powerful influence upon the minds of the Eastern peoples bordering on Palestine from pre-Christian times. The essence of the Iranian redemption myth lies in the idea that the soul of the inner essence of man is a

8) Vide J. G. Vos, *Princeton Theological Review*, p. 326.

9) J. G. Vos, *Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, p. 229.

10) *Ibid.*, p. 229.

11) For the following outline of his speculative construction, see W. Manson, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-26, 237 ff.

divine nature which is imprisoned in a world of darkness and evil and which has to be liberated and restored to the world of light.

Man has this divine nature from a Primordial Man or Heavenly Man, who being sent forth from God at the pre-cosmic stage, was ensnared and overcome by the powers of darkness and was victimized by them to the extent that, though restored by the Father once more to original divinity in the realm of light, he left behind him in the world of chaos a part of his light-elements, from which in turn the soul, the spiritual part of man's being, is descended. The soul has to be redeemed in time; the ground on which its redemption rests is an event which is anterior to all time. His ultimate hope of redemption depends upon the Primal or God Man, whose deliverance and exaltation to God is the sign of man's final salvation. According to the developed myth, this Heavenly Man was rescued from the powers of darkness after his death, and the soul of man, which is part of his, will be saved by rising in reunion with him.

Further, Reitzenstein thinks, this redemption myth from its origin-point in the first man in the Iranian religion, *Gayomart*, acquired a redemptional significance<sup>12</sup> in Babylonia and Syria. The Primal Man became a Redeemer who has been redeemed himself, and in this form, uniting a revelation regarding the origin of man and the cosmos with a message of final redemption, found its way into Judaism and early Christianity. This Heavenly Man, he asserts, first appears in Judaism in Daniel, but his function is limited to his appearance at the end of history, but it acquired a more substantial form in I Enoch and IV Ezra, in the Gospel and the Pauline doctrine of Christ as one who pre-existed with God before the ages, and who is revealed as the Heavenly Man. Further he ventures the opinion that overtones of the myth entered Judaism with the idea of the Son of Man, and already in the time of Jesus, it was current doctrine that the Heavenly Man first descends into the world in his own person or in that of his messengers and shares the lot of mankind in order to exalt them to God as sharers of his own life.

12) S. Mowinckel also holds that *ἄνθρωπος* in most Gnostic speculations has "acquired a certain element of eschatological redeemer," due to the fact that his having already assumed this role in certain circles of Persian religion, especially of the Gayomartian sect. *He That Cometh* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956), p. 429. It should be noted here, however, as G. Quispel points out that "the oldest form of Gnostic myth is not concerned with Gayomart but with Sôphîp, Chokma, who brings forth the seven planets; and this goes back not to Persia but to the ps.-Platonic (sic) *Epinomis*." *The Jung Codex* (ed. by F. L. Cross, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1955), p. 76.

It is a bold assumption that the Primordial Man idea of the Iranian myth suggested or gave form to the Christian concept of the Son of Man. It is hardly conceivable that at the root of the Christian concept of the Son of Man lies the influence of Iranian religion which itself is influenced by Christianity.<sup>13</sup> It is hardly probable that such alien doctrine enabled the disciples of Jesus to surmount the stumbling block of the Cross, and revere this Son of Man as the Son of the living God.

Moreover, this theory contradicts the evidence of the Gospel tradition that Jesus attributed the graphic descriptions of the Son of Man to no one but to Himself. Furthermore, nowhere in the Gospels the Son of Man is given any kind of ontological or cosmological relation to the world or to humanity. Nowhere the Gospels mention that the soul or heavenly part of man's being appear as a nature descended or derived from the Son of Man, or redeemed by rising in reunion with Him. Nowhere in the Gospels does the Redeemer come before us *incognito* who has been himself redeemed.<sup>14</sup>

Admirable though Reitzenstein's ingenuity and cogency may be, his speculative construction finds no point of contact with early Christianity and results in indefensible contradictions. Although Cullmann suggests the indirect influence of the non-biblical idea of this figure,<sup>15</sup> it is again an inferential speculation, and has no bearings in any form on the Son of Man of the Gospel or on Daniel.<sup>16</sup>

In a similar line of thought with Reitzenstein, Bultmann, who champions the pervasive influence of Gnosticism upon Christianity, attributes the Son of Man concept to Gnosticism. For example, he identifies *ἄνθρωπος*, or *Urmensch* with the Logos in the Johannine Gospel. This Logos in its form "eines Zwischen-Wesens zwischen Gott und Welt," and it has not only cosmological but also soteriological function. Thus "er ist-

13) *Vide* W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

14) *Ibid.*, p. 248.

15) He says: "...the non-biblical idea of this figure (son of man) did not *directly* influence Jesus and the early Church....."

The connection between Jesus the Son of Man and the non-biblical Son of Man passes through Judaism." *op. cit.*, p. 138. W. Manson is also of the opinion that "while the Son of Man conception may have come to Daniel and the writer of Enoch from an Iranian source, to Jesus, its presence in Daniel made it part of Holy Writ, and, as much to be received and understood in the light of the context of all that is made known to him in his personal history concerning the Will of God." *op. cit.*, p. 185. cf. also Bultmann's view: "Es kann kein Zweifel sein, dass die synkretistische Apokalyptik des Judentums unter dem Einfluss der Gnostischen Mythologie steht." *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), p. 12.

16) *Vide* J. G. Vos, *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, p. 229; *Princeton Theological Review*, p. 325.

-in welcher Verkleidung auch immer--der σωτήρ."<sup>17</sup> And further:

Als Erlöser hat sich der Logos selbst in Menschengestalt in die niedere Welt begeben... In den christlich gnostischen Systemen ist der menschgewordene Erlöser mit Jesus identifiziert worden. Indessen ist der Gedank der Menschwerdung des Erlösers nicht etwas aus dem Christentum in die Gnosis gedrungen, sondern ist ursprünglich gnostisch; er ist vielmehr schon sehr früh vom Christentum übernommen und für die Christologie fruchtbar gemacht worden.<sup>18</sup>

His view, however, stands challenged not only from the Biblical standpoint but also in the impressive evidence of recently discovered Gnostic documents.<sup>19</sup> W. C. Van Unnik points out in *The Gospel of Truth and the New Testament*:

If Christ is mentioned as the Logos, the Saviour... these are not terms which could be described as specifically Gnostic, although they are sometimes found among the Gnostics. But they also occur in Valentinus' contemporary and fellow-citizen, his rival as a teacher, Justin Martyr, who was certainly no Gnostic.<sup>20</sup>

And "as far as *the Gospel of Truth* is concerned it is in my opinion not certain that we should here accept pre-New Testament influence."<sup>21</sup> Moreover, at least in the mid-second century there is no pre-Christian Gnostic redeemer,<sup>22</sup> and the text "contains nothing of what has frequently been considered the kernel of Gnostic mythology, viz., the journey of the soul to heaven or of the redeemed Redeemer."<sup>23</sup> Quispel also writes: There would appear to be good grounds for supposing that it was from Christianity that the conception of redemption and the figure of the Redeemer were taken over into Gnosticism. A pre-Christian redeemer and an Iranian mystery of redemption perhaps never existed.<sup>24</sup>

Thus in view of the foregoing critical considerations we must dismiss the speculative construction of foreign mythology and Hellenistic syncretism as an untenable theory and hold that the Son of Man concept of the Gospel has no link whatever with its Urmensch or ἄνθρωπος.

17) R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 10.

18) *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

19) Theos texts, apparently derived from a Gnostic library, were found at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt in 1945.

20) *The Jung Codex*, p. 101.

21) *Ibid.*, p. 125.

22) *Vide* A. J. B. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

23) W. C. Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-96.

24) G. Quispel, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

## II. The Similitudes of Enoch

Another significant theory has been expounded by R. H. Charles<sup>25</sup> and more recently by R. Otto<sup>26</sup> that the Son of Man concept finds its provenance in Enoch, especially in the Similitudes of Enoch (37-71).<sup>27</sup>

In the three great visions of Enoch the portrait of the Son of Man is many-faceted and has a more detailed and vast background than that of Daniel. The writer evidently takes up the Daniel passage and on this basis builds a picture of the Messiah of overpowering majesty--a pre-existent, super-natural being, endowed with angels, who shall confound the kingdom of the earth, sit on the throne of God, judge the living and the dead at the end of time.

The author of the Similitudes constantly applies "son of man" exclusively to the mysterious personality, and in a so-called interpolation in the Similitudes it is Enoch himself who is the son of man.<sup>28</sup>

The Son of Man makes his first appearance in 46:

And here I saw one who had a head of days.

And his head was white like wool.

And with him was another whose countenance had the appearance of a man.

And his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels.

25) Charles feels that nearly every book of the New Testament reflects the influence of the Book of Enoch. In fact its influence on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books taken together. *Vide* W. M. Ramsay, *The Christ of the Earliest Christians* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1959), pp. 33, 37.

26) Otto believes that the Similitudes was one of the key ideas of the book as a whole, and lays the main weight of his theory especially on 70-71. *Vide* his *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1951), pp. 159-261, esp. pp. 176-218.

27) The Book of Enoch was known largely through Ethiopic and Greek versions. Charles ascribes all the Ethiopic expressions to a common Greek original. Cf. P. Parker, "The Meaning of 'Son of Man'," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LX (1941), 152. Mowinckel also thinks that the Ethiopic text is a translation of Greek version. *Vide op. cit.*, p. 355. But the Similitudes is known to us through an Ethiopic text, and Schmidt feels "that a Greek version even of this part of the Enoch literature once existed may be inferred from Tertullian (de cultu feminarum 1:3) but whether the Ethiopic translation was made from it is uncertain.... In fact the first Ethiopic version might have been made by a Jew from the Aramaic. This could account for a number of Aramaism not so likely to pass through the medium of a Greek translation." Schmidt, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, pp. 4710-4711.

28) The English word "son of man" represents three different expressions in Charles's Latin translation of the text, viz., 1) *Filius hominis*--En. 46:2-4, etc. 2) *Filius viri*--En. 69:29, 71:14, etc. 3) *Filius prolis matris viventium*--En. 62:7, 9, 14, 63:11, 69:26 f, 70:1. 1) is the only one that is not applied to Enoch, and is first spoken quite informally by Enoch himself in 46:2, and three more times always pronominally: 46:3--the son of man who hath righteousness; 46:4--this son of man whom thou has seen; 48:2--that son of man was named. 2) and 3) are used not only for the Messiah but for Enoch himself in 60:10, 71:14, and Charles ascribes these used "either

And I asked the angel, who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man. Who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days.

And he answered and said unto me:

This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness.

With whom dwelleth righteousness,

And who revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden,

Because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him,

And who is pre-eminent before the Lord of Spirits.

And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen,

Shall remove the kings and the mighty from their seats,

And the strong from their thrones

And shall loosen the reins of the strong

And break the teeth of the sinners.

The figure here is represented as a figure of human appearance with the look of an angel. This Son of Man has righteousness with whom dwells righteousness; He will reveal all the treasures of that which is hidden; and He is further described as having been chosen by the Lord of Spirits. Although Sjoberg calls it "der ganz besondere himmlische Mensch" it does no more justify us in thinking of "a heavenly man" than the terms of Jeremiah's inaugural vision justify us in thinking of a "heavenly Jeremiah".<sup>29)</sup>

Furthermore this Son of Man is described as a figure of primordial time; he belongs to the *Urzeit* before creation. And further:

At that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days.

Yea, before the sun and the signs were created,

Before the stars of the heaven were made,

His name was named before the Lord of Spirits.<sup>30)</sup>

to ignorance or to a deliberate perversion," but Parker feels that apart from other considerations this is enough to throw grave doubt on a titular interpretation of the words. *Vide* Parker, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-153. For another linguistic point, T. W. Manson shows that Ethiopic version renders the Son of Man as WALDA EGUALA EMA HEYAU accompanied by the demonstrative pronoun, which represents the Greek definite article, and he observes that 1) while the Similitudes of Enoch have "that Son of Man" they do not have "that Elect One"; 2) in the Ethiopic Gospels Son of Man is regularly found without the demonstrative, because there the special meaning of the term is already firmly established and can be taken for granted. Then assuming that the Greek version is the original,  $\delta \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ , was used with the demonstrative, but not so in the case of  $\delta \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ . The explanation may be that the demonstrative is used to hint the special sense of that term son of man. *Vide* *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, p. 130.

29) *Vide* T. W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, p. 132.

30) En. 48:2f.

And further:

For this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before him,

Before the creation of the world and for ever more.<sup>31)</sup>

The further portrait of the Son of Man may be summarized as follows:<sup>32)</sup> He is the king of the new age, and to him belongs all the appurtenances of royalty;<sup>33)</sup> He is king of the *Endzeit*, i. e., the Messiah, the one to whom the dominion and the power and the glory will be given, who will usher in the kingdom of God;<sup>34)</sup> He is the judge of the *Endzeit*, the predestined judge from the beginning, not only over men but indeed over the angels, the demonic hosts, and all who have led the world astray.<sup>35)</sup>

In addition to the Similitudes of Enoch, Charles<sup>36)</sup> presents impressive lists to point out that a considerable amount of phrases, and ideas found in the New Testament were derived from it, referring to over 100 parables. He directed his efforts to show how the Book of Enoch has influenced the New Testament and how Jesus derived the idea of the Son of Man from Enoch. Among all these passages, however, only one is a direct quotation,<sup>37)</sup> and all the others are parallels in thought or phraseology. As Glasson has ably shown, Charles' parallels are unconvincing and by no means conclusive to link Enoch with the New Testament, and unable to prove that Jesus drew upon the Similitudes, and, in fact, "it cannot be admitted that the dependence of Jesus upon any part of Enoch is established."<sup>38)</sup>

Otto similarly maintains that "Jesus lived in the ideas of Enoch's apocalyptic tradition," and speaks of the Messianic tradition which Jesus himself clearly followed,

31) En. 48:6. In those passages Charles finds the evidence for the pre-existence of the Son of Man. But Manson objects to this: "A pre-existent Son of Man is one who exists before. Before what? The terms do not tell us. Nor do they tell us anything about the mode of the existence. ... They clearly support a doctrine of pre-mundane election... but pre-mundane election does not necessarily involve pre-mundane existence except as a project in the mind of God." *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, pp. 133, 136. Otto also says, "Taken strictly, the meaning is that he himself would not really exist until at the End. His existence is at first only that of the name... that would mean only an existence in the ordaining and creative idea of God." *op. cit.*, p. 188.

32) *Vide* J. Muilenberg, "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX (1960), 203-205.

33) En. 45:3; 47:3; 51:3; 61:2; 69:27, 29.

34) En. 48:10; 52:4. Here the Messiah is actually referred to.

35) En. 41:9; 55:4; 69:27f.; 47:3; 60:2; 71:7.

36) Cf. Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) pp. 180-181. Cf. 184-185. E. G., Rom. 9:5--En. 77:1; Matt. 26:24--En. 38:2; Luke 1:5--En. 46:5; Luke 18:7--En. 47:1-2; Luke 21:28--En. 51:2; Matt. 19:29--En. 40:9, etc.

37) In Jude, quotation from the opening verses of Enoch 1:5.

38) *Vide* T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent* (London: Epworth Press, 1947), pp. 72ff.

viz., that of Enoch's apocalyptic.<sup>39)</sup> Jesus belonged to circles in which a certain idea was fully developed:

The idea was that a powerful preacher alike of righteousness, the coming judgment, and the blessed new age, a prophet of the eschatological Son of Man, would be transported at the end of his earthly career to God; that he would be exalted to become the one whom he had proclaimed, in the literal sense that he himself would become the very one whom he had proclaimed. But that also meant that his activity during his earthly life was nothing else than the proleptic activity of this very redeemer.<sup>40)</sup>

Furthermore he attaches enormous importance especially to Enoch 71 where alone the identification is made, but it is obvious that the chapter speaks of Enoch himself, not any other mysterious personality. There is no Messiah in 6-36, and again we find no Messiah in 72-82. The Son of Man is found only in the Similitudes, and the teaching of these chapters is rather unique. The identification of Enoch with the Son of Man is found only in 71:14.

In order to solve the difficulty that in the main part Enoch appears to be distinct from the Son of Man he suggests a most ingenious solution. By conjecture only he says that the heavenly Son of Man is not a primordial man but the *fravashi* of Enoch. He maintains that the book is based on Iranian conceptions, and refers to the well-known Zoroastrian idea that every one has a heavenly counterpart, a *fravashi*. The counterpart of Enoch was united with his *fravashi*, thus becoming the Son of Man. He quotes J. H. Moulton's words, "The soul at death becomes immortal by union with the *fravashi*."<sup>41)</sup> It seems, however, that his suggestion makes the parallel with the New Testament even more difficult.

Since both Charles and Otto believe that Jesus took the conception of the Son of Man from Enoch they ascribe the Similitudes to pre-Christian dates. Charles decides on 95-79 B. C. or 70-64 B. C.,<sup>42)</sup> while Dalman refers to it as coming from the first Christian century.<sup>43)</sup>

39) R. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

40) *Ibid.*, p. 213. Cf. also his literary comparison between the preaching of Jesus and Enoch, *op. cit.*, pp. 382-387.

41) *Vide* R. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 390. Cf. also pp. 176-218, 388-392, 396-398.

42) Cf. also his dates on: En. 6-36---Pre-Macabean before 170 B. C.  
72-82---Before 110 B. C.  
83-90---Period of Judas Maccabaeus who died 161 B. C.  
91-104--95-79, or 70-64 B. C.

While the Roman period is preferred by Bousset, Gressmann, et al.

43) *Vide* G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 242. Further he notes, "It cannot be proved that they originated from a pre-Christian period," p. 243.

This question of date divides the opinion as to the book as a unity and whether the title Son of Man is to be thought of as canalised in a section of the work or meant to be understood throughout the book. That the text has suffered numerous interpolations is universally admitted,<sup>44)</sup> and it has been suggested that there are five different sources to account for the diverse structure of the Similitudes: 1) sources which speak of the Son of Man; 2) of the Elect One; 3) passages from a lost apocalypse of Noah; 4) 56:5-57:3a; 5) 71 or 70-71. Since the whole texture of the book is excessively loose it is impossible to get a clear idea of the teaching on account of inconsistent elements present in it. This makes it also difficult to accept their genuineness.<sup>45)</sup>

Many scholars refuse to accept Enoch as the source of the Son of Man concept. T. W. Manson affirms, "When Jesus quotes he quotes from Daniel, not Enoch."<sup>46)</sup> V. Taylor says, "In all His references to the Son of Man there is no certain trace of dependence upon the ideas of Enoch."<sup>47)</sup> Cadoux thinks that "it must be maintained that the likelihood of Jesus having drawn from the Book of Enoch is very slight."<sup>48)</sup> Curtis also writes that "we have no evidence either that He knew and valued the Enoch vision or that His hearers knew and were moved by it."<sup>49)</sup>

In view of the foregoing considerations then, in summary, we may dismiss the theory of Enochian source on these grounds:

- 1) The pre-Christian date of the Similitudes is uncertain.<sup>50)</sup>
- 2) They have not come alive to us from the Dead Sea caves in any of the fairly extensive Greek fragments so far discovered, the fact of which increases the strong

44) *Vide* T. F. Glasson, *op. cit.*, p. 27. Note also that Brono Bauer (kritik d. Gesch. I 402, 1841) first called the attention to the now generally recognized secondary character of 70, 71 and suggested that the Son of Man passages were interpolated. *Vide* N. Schmidt, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, p. 4711.

45) Cf. R. Bultmann, E. Stauffer et al. still accept the authenticity of the Ethiopian Enoch without question.

46) T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1951), p. 229.

47) V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London: Macmillan, 1937), p. 26.

48) C. J. Cadoux, *The Historic Mission of Jesus* (London and New York: Harper & Brothers, n. d.) p. 99. *Vide* M. Jas, "Enoch et le Fils de l' Homme," *La Revue Réformée*, XXX (1979), pp. 107-109 where he presents the most recent data on the issue.

49) A. Curtis, *Jesus Christ the Teacher* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1945), p. 142.

50) The strongest argument for the post-Christian date of the book is especially based on these passages: 62:7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27; 70:1; 71:17 where in addition to calling the Messiah "Son of Man" he is also called "Son of woman".

suspicion of Christian interpolation into the original Jewish text.<sup>51)</sup>

3) There is no proof so far that Jesus read them and knew them.<sup>52)</sup>

4) Certainly Jesus was familiar with Daniel, and the "coming with the clouds" in many New Testament passages which reflect the Daniel passage is totally absent from Enoch.<sup>53)</sup>

### III. The Book of Ezekiel

The third possible source to be considered is found in one of the canonical writings, the book of Ezekiel. W. A. Curtis and others,<sup>54)</sup> and more recently G. S. Duncan, support the view that the source of Jesus' self-designation was derived from Ezekiel where the portrait of the Son of Man appears primarily as a prophet. There are indeed more than 90 instances<sup>55)</sup> of the term  $\text{בן אדם}$  as used by God in addressing him. In the opening vision<sup>56)</sup> Ezekiel, realizing his insignificance as a child of man in the presence of the glory of the Most High, falls down upon his face, but being summoned by God to stand upon his feet he becomes possessed with the Spirit of God. As God turns his "manhood" from weakness into strength, from frailty into dignity with accompanying responsibility, he becomes a prophet of God, a chosen vessel for the transmission of the divine Word and Spirit.<sup>57)</sup>

51) Cf. R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956), p. 98. Cf. O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

52) Cadoux affirms: "We have absolutely no evidence... to show he (Jesus) had ever read Enoch or that it was known among those with whom he mixed." *Op. cit.*, p. 99. T. F. Glasson says, "The idea that Jesus, having read a book in which certain things were said about Enoch, decided to play the part Himself surely cannot be the key to the understanding of His mind." *Op. cit.*, p. 49. *Vide* also G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1974), p. 149.

53) *Vide* J. G. Vos, *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, p. 232.

54) E. g., E. A. Abbott, *The Son of Man* (Cambridge: University Press, 1910), pp. 82-107. By presenting the parallels between Ezekiel and Jesus, he attempts to show that Jesus in calling Himself 'the Son of Man' had Ezekiel's appellation in view. Cf. also T. Walker's theory that we must differentiate two classes of passages in which Jesus uses the title: in one class the title refers to the apocalyptic Son of Man as conceived by Enoch, with whom Jesus does not identify Himself, but in whom He Himself has faith; in the other class it is borrowed from the book of Ezekiel. Referred by H. G. Hatch, *The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus* (London: S. P. C. K., 1939) p. 58.

55) Ezekiel 2:3-5; 3:4, 5, 10, 11, 17, 25, 27; 4:16; 11:15, 19; 12:1, 2; 16:2; 17:2; 20:3, 4; 21:9; 34:2 ff. etc.

56) Ezekiel 2:3-5: "Son of Man stand upon thy feet and I will speak with thee... Son of Man I send thee to the children of Israel to nations that are rebellious..." etc.

57) G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), pp. 145-146.

Thus being equipped with the divine power he is burdened with a two-fold mission and is called to this prophetic service as the Son of Man "as if his personal name on earth had been exchanged in heaven's use for a name which identified him as a man with humanity at large to whom through Israel his message was addressed."<sup>58)</sup>

This Son of Man is not merely a prophet to the House of Israel, to the City and to the Temple, but also to the people beyond national ambit--to the children of men in every nation in Tyre, Babylon, Egypt and others. The message he has to publish is for men as men rather than for Jews as Jews. The prophetic intention of the Son of Man thus becomes universal as well as particular:

Israel's birthright and privilege have been forfeited. A man is needed, a child of humanity is burdened with the misery and evil of mankind. Impartially he is moved to view all nations and to cast the net of judgment over all. Again and again this Old Testament son of man is commanded to 'judge' both Israel and its prosperous enemies.<sup>59)</sup>

And Duncan maintains that in these two aspects of Ezekiel's conception of himself as "Son of Man" Jesus finds special meaning for Himself:

In the discharge of His mission as the Son of Man Jesus speaks and acts with an awesome sense of the powers of judgment and salvation with which God has entrusted Him. He represents in Himself the climax of all God's purposes for man--not merely is His own personal life transfigured by the power of the Spirit of God, but He is one through whom God reveals His purposes both for Israel and for the whole family of mankind. It is in the light of Ezekiel's reminders of the way in which God deals with man--lifting him up from the ground, making known to him His will, filling him with His Spirit, and commissioning him to be His servant for the establishment of His kingdom throughout His whole creation--that we ought to seek to interpret the thoughts of Jesus regarding the Son of Man.<sup>60)</sup>

Having adopted this view Duncan discards the apocalyptic association of the Son of Man, and in this line of thinking he must admit that the apocalyptic hope of the final consummation of the Kingdom of God becomes quite alien to the thought of Jesus. He says concerning the use of Daniel 7:13 by Jesus: "Its significance rather lies in its triumphant assurance that the consummation of world-history is bound up with the fulfillment of God's purposes for man."<sup>61)</sup> And further:

...We need not be surprised if Jesus, recognizing Himself to be, in a most truly spiritual sense, the Man in whom God's ideals and purposes for men were to be fulfilled should have dared to believe that this and all such Scripture references to exaltation and authority, whether on the part of the Son of Man or some other such figure, were to be fulfilled in Himself.<sup>62)</sup>

58) A. Curtis, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

59) *Ibid.*, p. 140.

60) G. S. Duncan, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

61) *Ibid.*, p. 137.

62) *Ibid.*, p. 191.

This theory, however, is open to the following objections:

1) It is difficult to find much force for its argument from the frequency of the term in Ezekiel as compared to Dan. 7:13.<sup>63)</sup>

2) It does not offer a proper explanation for the extraordinary affirmation of the Gospel which it claims to start, viz., the places where Jesus as the Son of Man already in His ministry is accompanied by the supernatural activity which He freely dispenses. In Mark 2:10, e.g., the Son of Man who dispenses the power of forgiveness of sin is more than a simple prophet who is called to the service of God; it is not enough to say that he was just a prophet, and no more.<sup>64)</sup>

3) Jesus' scant references to the Spirit are in surprising contrast to the frequent association in Ezekiel of the "son of man" and the Spirit.<sup>65)</sup>

4) In the face of evidence in the New Testament it is impossible to relegate the apocalyptic Son of Man to the periphery.

5) When Jesus refers to the Old Testament on two occasions, Matt. 24:30 and Matt. 26:64, there is an unmistakable echo of Dan. 7:13, not Ezekiel.<sup>66)</sup>

#### IV. Danielic Source

There can be no doubt then that Danielic source is the natural place where the origin of the Son of Man concept is to be sought. It is confirmed by the fact of Jesus' profound intimacy with Daniel<sup>67)</sup> and His verbatim reference to Daniel 7:13 in His apocalyptic discourse.<sup>68)</sup> Besides Reformed theologians there are many others who adhere to this position.

In chapter 7 of Daniel, four great beasts are seen to arise from the sea, not simultaneously but one after another. Beginning with verse 9 it presents a majestic scene of judgment. The judgment is pronounced that the beast slain, and the body of the be-

63) Vide A. J. B. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

64) Cf. R. H. Fuller, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-102. Also J. McNaugher, "The Son of Man," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXVII (1931), p. 124.

65) Vide A. J. B. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

66) G. Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 257. C. H. Dodd points out that Ps. 8, Ps. 80 and Dan. 7 are the only three passages which can be proved to have been employed for testimonies; that Ezekiel is based on primary source of testimonies (p. 117).

67) Cf. several reminiscences of Daniel are said to be found in the teaching of Jesus; Mark 4:32--Dan. 4:11-12; Luke 20:18--Dan. 2:34; Luke 12:12:32--Dan. 7:27, etc.

68) Matt. 24:30 (Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27) and Matt. 26:64 (Mark 14:62).

asts are destroyed and given to the burning of fire. Then the climax of vision comes in the introduction of the heavenly figure like a son of man who comes with the clouds of heaven:

I was looking in the visions of the night and lo! with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came up to the One advanced in the days,<sup>69)</sup> and they brought him near before Him. And there was given to him rule and honour and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and tongues should do him reverence; his rule is an age-long rule which will not pass away, and his kingdom one that will not be destroyed.<sup>70)</sup>

The text does not say that this heavenly figure is a man but only that he is like a man, and not like a beast or some other creature. But his coming is accompanied by the clouds of heaven which is indicative of Deity.<sup>71)</sup> Evidently the reason for employing the term ? here is to stress the distinction between the heavenly figure and the beasts<sup>72)</sup>: this heavenly being was in human form.

69) "...i. e., in years. The thought is similar to that of the Latin phrase *aetate proventus*. Thus, the One who sits upon the throne is a venerable person, an old man, who inspires veneration and is a majestic figure. It is such a form that is employed to symbolize the presence of God in judgment." E. J. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel* (Delft: Uitgeverij van Keulen, 1954), p. 37.

70) Daniel 7:13-14.

71) E. J. Young, *op. cit.*, p. 38; *The Prophecy of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1953), p. 154. Keil also says "The clouds are the veil or the 'chariot' on which God comes from heaven to execute judgment against His enemies.... This passage forms the foundation for the declaration of Christ regarding His future coming." Keil and Delitzsche, *Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1955), pp. 235-236. Cf. Ps. 18:10-18; 97:2-4; 104:3; Isa. 19:1; Nah. 1:3. Cf. also an interesting interpretation of R. Joshua be Levi, one of the most highly esteemed masters of the Haggadah in the first half of the Third Century. In an effort to remove the difficulty in the two apparently opposite representations of the Messiah's coming, he harmonized Zech. 9:9, "Behold, thy King cometh unto thee... lowly, and riding upon an ass," with Daniel 7:13, "Behold, with the clouds of heaven came one like a human being," thus: If they (Israel) are worthy, "with the clouds of heaven," and if they are not worthy, "lowly, and riding upon an ass." As cited by G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. II (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), pp. 334-335. J. A. Emerton who adopts Bentzen's thesis associates the Son of Man with Baal the storm-god from the Ugaritic texts, for there Baal is frequently spoken of as flying on the clouds. "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n. s. IX (1958), 232. Cf. also p. 242.

72) Calvin comments: "He appeared to him as the Son of Man, as Christ had not yet taken upon him our flesh.... Irenaeus says: This was a prelude (*proeludium*). The French *une approche et entree*. He uses a word which we cannot translate into French. Tertullian: *Tunc praeluxit Filius Dei humanitate sua*.... This was a symbol, therefore, of Christ's future flesh, although that flesh did not yet exist." *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel*, Vol. II (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948), p. 41. But it is difficult to say whether Calvin's interpretation is correct or not, but it may be an allusion to the humanity of the heavenly figure. Vide E. J. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*, p. 139. J. P. Lange says: "The prophet... holds fast to the distinction between a wholly human appearance and the vision he has seen, and indicates this by the partial of comparison, which points out that he intends to represent a really supernatural, but still humanlike personage." *Commentary on Ezekiel and Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, n. d.), p. 157.

Opinions, however, are divided as to the interpretation of this divine figure. Schmidt<sup>73</sup> et al.,<sup>74</sup> identifies him with the angel Michael, "the representative on high of the Jewish nation," or "the guardian angel of Israel." He points out that the angels are constantly introduced as having the appearance of man (Dan. 8:5; 10:16; 10:18, etc.); that the only angelic representative of Israel is Michael (Dan. 10:21; 12:1).<sup>75</sup> This interpretation, however, seems to be a rather far-fetched conjecture. If this divine figure is represented by the guardian angel of Israel, in that case the world-power likewise would have been represented in the vision by their guardian-spirits,<sup>76</sup> and the text here provides no clue to such an interpretation.

A more common interpretation is that this divine figure represents the people of the saints of the Most High--the kingdom--not the personal Messiah. Appeal is made to verses 18 and 27 where it is said that the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom and possess it forever and ever. This view has been adopted by a long line of expositors of which T. W. Manson<sup>77</sup> is the foremost champion with a combined interpretation that Jesus applies it to Himself in the same corporate sense.<sup>78</sup> Those who agree with Manson that the Danielic figure is a corporate symbol are many. But there is very little qualified acceptance of his suggestion that it also holds for Jesus' own use of the Son of Man.<sup>79</sup> As Taylor suggests, "It is still a hypothesis open to discussion, and is perhaps not capable of demonstration."<sup>80</sup>

73) N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth* (New York: Macmillan, 1907), p. 100. He also cites Viktor Rydberg, *Bibels Lära om Kristus* (5th ed. 1893) where this Swedish scholar identifies the heavenly figure as Michael and the Messiah in one person not yet separated. *Vide* p. 101, note 1.

74) For a fuller list cf. H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1959), p. 63, note 2.

75) *Vide* N. Schmidt, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, p. 4710.

76) *Vide* J. G. Vos, *Princeton Theological Review*, p. 328.

77) *Vide* T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 227; *Studies*, p. 144. Here he says, "The people of the saints of the Most High is the actualization in history of the Israelite ideal. In other words, the Son of Man is... an ideal figure and stands for the manifestation of the kingdom of God on earth in a people wholly devoted to their heavenly king." He holds this communal interpretation for Enoch also.

78) It is also strongly supported by C. J. Cadoux, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-103.

79) Taylor and Cullmann, e. g., have a different orientation of the interpretation. V. Taylor, *Life and Ministry of Jesus* (London: Macmillan, 1955), p. 75. "A communal element is a vital clue to his mission." Cullmann sees in Dan. 7:13 and Jesus' use of the Son of Man a collective sense, but with the individual aspect more prominent. *Christology of the New Testament*, p. 159; *The Early Church*, ed. by A. J. B. Higgins (Phila.: Westminster Press, 1956), p. 130.

80) V. Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 71.

So far as the Danielic interpretation goes, Manson maintains that this phrase "like a son of man" is not to be understood literally, but as an ideogram, meaning the "people of the saints of the Most High," and the figure of the Son of Man explicitly represents it.<sup>81</sup> Thus the heavenly being here is a corporate symbol and is identified with the saints of the Most High, not the personal Messiah.

This theory, however, is open to the following objections<sup>82</sup>:

1) The saints no doubt have connections with the kingdom. The kingdom, however, belongs to the saints in a subordinate sense, not in an ultimate sense.<sup>83</sup> In verse 14 we read: "There was given him, dominion, and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away. And his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. There is a clear distinction made between the "one like a son of man" and the kingdom he receives. That all people are to serve Him seems to indicate a religious worship. How could people worship a kingdom in itself? It is the ruler of the kingdom that they worship."<sup>84</sup>

2) Corporate language is present in the context but even where corporate language is present there may still be a reference to individuals.<sup>85</sup> We find the saints themselves mentioned in verse 21; if they are introduced in person, they cannot also be represented by the Son of Man.

3) The figure stands apart so that we cannot identify the figure with the saints of the Most High. He shares in the sovereignty<sup>86</sup> and glory with the saints of the Most High which shows an association with the Ancient of Days. The presentation of the coming with the clouds of heaven seems to indicate this, for this symbolism is a unique vehicle of theophanic advent. Nowhere in the Scripture is such exalted language used for mere men but always for God Himself. This feature, however, does not suit the

81) *Vide* T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 212, 229.

82) Cf. C. C. McCown's four objections as cited by A. J. B. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

83) *Vide* N. Stonehouse's class lecture at Westminster Seminary.

84) *Vide* E. J. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies*, p. 40.

85) *Vide* O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, p. 159. Also G. Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 242. He makes note that from the first Christian century there are only two Jewish writings known which deal with Dan. 7:13: The Similitudes of Enoch and 2 Esdra, and they both agree in regarding the expression "one like a son of man" as an individual.

86) G. Dalman suggests that Jesus adapted the idea of the sovereignty of God from Daniel. *op. cit.*, p. 258.

people of Israel which is not of celestial origin.<sup>87)</sup>

4) The personal Messianic interpretation further finds in its favor the usage of Jesus during His ministry on earth.

There is, of course, an element of truth in Mason's theory viewed in the broad context of the whole Scripture. The head of the kingdom is not in isolated glory and not without people. But his contention goes too far at the expense of the prominent individual aspect of the Son of Man. It seems much less difficult to interpret it as a personal Messiah than in a corporate sense.

It becomes evident then that this figure is a supernatural, transcendental figure--He is an individual.<sup>88)</sup> If we are to do justice to this divine figure's relationship with the Most High, He appears to be the figure of the Messiah,<sup>89)</sup> and his pre-existence is implied in the descent from heaven.<sup>90)</sup> Furthermore, the choice of a human figure seems to indicate a place of dignity and dominion over the beasts.<sup>91)</sup>

### C. Conclusion

In the light of the foregoing, there is no doubt that Jesus identified Himself with the heavenly figure in Daniel when He called Himself the Son of Man. As C. F. D. Moule claims,<sup>92)</sup> even from the linguistic point of view, the Son of Man refers to Daniel's "Son of Man". This figure is a supernatural being with dignity, transcendence, glory and majesty. When the source of His appellation is attributed to Daniel, the Divinity of Jesus at the Messiah becomes palpable as He laid claim both to messianic dignity and to a messianic role.

87) H. Bavinck says: "De menschenzoon komt niet de wolken des hemels en plaatst zich voor den Ouden van dagen, maar het volk der heiligen is op aarde, lijdt en ziet veilangend naar de verlossing uit." *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, Vol. III (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1929), pp. 226-227.

88) Vide I. H. Masshall, *The Origins of New Testament Christology* (Donwers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1977), p. 67. Cf. M. J. Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme Avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Fils, 1931), pp. 64-66. He says, "Le peuple doit d'autant plus être exclu ici qu'il crée une équivoque, la phrase qui termine devant s'entendre du peuple d'après la construction, main de Dieu pour le sens...."

89) Vide J. Calvin, *op. cit.*, p. 40. Cf. G. Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

90) J. G. Vos, *Princeton Theological Review*, p. 328.

91) Vide N. Stonehouse's class lecture. Cf. Ps. 8. Also Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 66. "...On prétend donc que les bêtes représentent quatre peuples, le peuple d'Israël ayant seul le privilège d'être représenté par un homme, comme étant seul élevé au-dessus des instincts charnels des nations."

92) C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 13.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, E. A. *The Son of Man*. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.
- Bavinck, H. *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*. Vol. III. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1929.
- Black, M. "Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *Journal of Theological Studies*, VII (1954).
- Bultmann, R. *Das Evangelium des Johanness*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.
- Cadoux, C. J. *The Historic Mission of Jesus*. New York and London: Harpers, n. d.
- Calvin, J. *Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Charles, R. H. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Enoch*. London: S. P. C. K., 1917.
- Cross, F. L. (ed.). *The Jung Codex*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1955.
- Cullmann, O. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Phila.: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Curtis, W. A. *Jesus Christ the Teacher*. London, New York, Toronto: Harper & Brothers, n. d.
- Dalman, G. *The Words of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- Duncan, G. S. *Jesus Son of Man*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949.
- Emerton, J. A. "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n. s., IX (1958), 225-242.
- Evans, M. G. "The Title 'the Son of Man,'" *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LVII (1900), 680-695.
- Fuller, R. H. *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc. 1959.
- Glasson, T. F. *The Second Advent*. London: Epworth Press, 1947.
- Hatch, H. G. *The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus*. London: S. P. C. K. 1939.
- Higgins, A. J. B. *Jesus and the Son of Man*. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Essays* (Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson). Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Jas, M. "Enoch et le Fils de l'Homme," *La Revue Réformée*, XXX (1979), 105-119.
- Keil and Delietzsche. *Commentary on Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Ladd, G. E. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans

- Publishing Co., 1974.
- Lagrange, M. J. *Le Judaisme Avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Co., 1947.
- Manson, T. W. *The Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1951.
- Manson, W. *Jesus the Messiah*. Phila.: The Westminster Press, 1946.
- Marshall, I. H. *The Origins of New Testament Christology*. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1977.
- McNaugher, J. "The Son of Man," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXVIII (1931), 90-104.
- Moore, G. F. *Judaism*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Moule, C. F. D. "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Christological Terms," *Journal of Theological Studies*, X (1959), 247-263.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Mowinckel, S. *He That Cometh*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.
- Muilenberg, J. "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX (1960), 197-209.
- Otto, R. *The Kingdom of God the Son of Man*. London: Lutteworth Press, 1951.
- Parker, P. "The Meaning of the Son of Man," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LX (1941), 151-157.
- Rowley, H. H. *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires and the Book of Daniel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1959.
- Schmidt, N. *The Prophet of Nazareth*. New York: Macmillan, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man," *Encyclopedia Biblica* (ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black), 1914, pp. 4705-4740.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man in Recent Research," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLV (1926), 326-349.
- Schweizer, E. "The Son of Man," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX (1960), 119-129.
- Stonehouse, N. *Class Lectures at Westminster Theological Seminary*.
- Taylor, V. *Jesus and His Sacrifice*. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*. London: Macmillan, 1955.
- Vos, J. G. *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Young, E. J. *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*. Delft: Unitgeverij van Keulen, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Prophecy of Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

## NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD?

N. H. GOOTJES \*

## I

Does natural knowledge of God, here taken in the broad sense of knowledge about God that somehow can be found outside Scriptural revelation, exist?

The importance of this issue can be seen in *Melancthon's* handling of the doctrine of God. Melancthon wrote about it in his most important dogmatical work, which he called *Loci Communes*, i. e. fundamental notions. This book can be considered as the first Protestant dogmatic theology. It has an interesting history, which here is recalled briefly, since it is important for the matter under hand.<sup>1)</sup>

As a very young man Ph. Melancthon (1497~1560) came to Wittenberg (1519) to become a professor of philosophy. Here he came strongly under the influence of M. Luther. The result was, that in his *Loci Communes* (1521) he tried to give a systematic survey of the main points of Luther's thoughts. It is remarkable that this first edition did not contain a doctrine of God. Melancthon declared that we had better adore the mysteries of the Godhead, instead of examining them. In the same context he rejected the influence of the Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle which undermined the Christian doctrine.<sup>2)</sup> In this rejection Melancthon shows himself to be a good pupil of Luther, who also speaks very negatively of philosophers.<sup>3)</sup>

But this all is radically changed in the third, final version (1543). Since 1527 Melancthon was no longer under the direct influence of Luther, because he accepted a post as a professor in Jena. Also he went back to his philosophical studies. Now the *Loci Communes* contain an extensive treatment of the doctrine of God.

A reminiscence of the first edition is the warning that with the being of God we must not judge on the basis of human thinking, but out of the Word of God. However, this do-

## \*助教授

- 1) The following is based on F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, Halle 4, 1906, pp. 782-794, 842-863.
- 2) Quotations in: Loofs, p. 784.
- 3) Quotations in: R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte IV/I*, Darmstadt 6, 1959 (reprint of the 4. edition), p. 75 f.