

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Canadian Journal of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_canadian-journal.php

The Old Testament and Some Aspects of New Testament Christology

A. J. B. HIGGINS

THE present study is intended to be an entirely objective examination of the origin of what may be called the "Son Christologies" in the NT—Son of David, Son of God, the Son—as seen against the background of the OT. These Christologies are of the greater interest in that they are held by some to have originated in the mind of the founder of Christianity himself. How far this may be true, and in what sense, it is the purpose of this paper to re-examine. The Son of Man, while not the subject of special and separate study here, belongs to another category of what may be called "intercessory" or "sacrificial" Christologies—the Servant of the Lord, the High Priest—and it serves as the focus of the Christologies to be discussed in this paper.

SON OF DAVID

Although the title Son of David does not itself appear in the OT, there are many passages which testify to Jewish belief that the Messiah would be of Davidic descent,¹ an expectation which was in full vigour shortly before and at the time of the rise of Christianity.² It is true that of the Synoptic Gospels it is in Matthew that the term is commonest.³ Otherwise it is used only in the Bartimaeus story (Mark 10:47f.; cf. Matt. 20:30f.; Luke 18:38f.). But the tradition of Davidic descent is not confined to such references. More important than Acts 13:22f. ("of this man's [David's] seed God has brought to Israel according to his promise a saviour, Jesus") are Rom. 1:3f.

concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared Son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness through his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ

and II Tim. 2:8

Remember Jesus Christ risen from the dead, of the seed of David.

Both these passages read like adaptations of an early creed. The tradition of Jesus' Davidic descent was current, then, before Paul wrote to the Roman church in the fifties. Although not prominent, it survived until the end of the first century, not only in II Tim. 2:8, but in the Jewish Christian elabora-

1. Ps. 89:3f.; 132:11f.; Isa. 9:6f.; 11:1; Jer. 23:5; 33:15, 17; Hos. 3:5; Amos 9:11f.

2. Cf. Pss. Sol. 17:23; John 7:42 (Mic. 5:2).

3. Matt. 1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 21:9, 15.

tions of the idea of Davidic sonship in the Apocalypse (3:7; 5:5; 22:15), and beyond.⁴

It is very difficult to accept the view that the passage about to be discussed was the creation of the Hellenistic church.⁵ Whether the Son of David Christology is the creation of the Palestinian community or of Jesus himself is the real question, the answer to which depends on the view adopted of Mark 12:35-36 (cf. Matt. 22:41-45; Lk. 20:41-44):

And Jesus answered and said, as he taught in the temple, How do the scribes say that the Messiah is the son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit,
 The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand
 Until I put thine enemies under thy feet.
 David himself calls him Lord, and how is he his son?

Even if this passage records an actual historical incident, in which Jesus points out that Messiahship depends on higher considerations than Davidic ancestry,⁶ it does not follow that Davidic ancestry is being denied, though it is certainly not being asserted. The real difficulty often urged against this passage as being anything else than a community formation is the use of Ps. 110:1. That this verse of the psalm was widely used in the early church is clear both from the quotations of it in Acts 2:34f. and Heb. 1:13, and from allusions to it in Mark 16:19; Acts 7:56; Rom. 8:34; I Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; I Pet. 3:22. A recent writer⁷ has asked whether, in the pericope with which we are concerned, Jesus, on the view that he took care to conceal his Messiahship from all but his closest followers, would have ventured to defend it openly against Jewish opponents. This is an acute observation. But it is difficult to take him seriously when he later remarks⁸ that the passage appears to be a defence of Jesus' Messiahship on the part of the church, based on a common acknowledgement of his non-Davidic descent. It must, therefore, it is argued, be earlier than Paul's assertion of Jesus' Davidic descent in Rom. 1:3. When may this hypothetical *volte-face*, from conviction of non-Davidic lineage to the strongly-attested belief in Davidic descent, be conjectured to have taken place? There is a strange reluctance in some quarters to allow the possibility that not only the primitive Christian community but its founder may occasionally have quoted the Jewish scriptures. The allusive nature of the saying, if it expresses the doctrinal belief of the church, is in striking contrast to the unmistakable clarity of early preaching and teaching, while it is in accord with the idiom of Jesus himself (cf. Luke 7:22f.).⁹ The conclusion up to this point is that the citation of the psalm is here rightly attributed to

4. Barn. 12:10; Ign. Eph. 18:2; 20:2; Rom. 7:3; Smyrn 1:1; Trall. 9:1.

5. According to this view the purpose of Mark 12:35-7 would be to demonstrate that Jesus was not so much Son of David as Son of God, R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (4th edn., 1958), p. 146.

6. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (2nd edn., 1935), p. 266, n. 2.

7. J. Knox, *The Death of Christ* (1958), p. 41.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 49.

9. V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (1955), p. 493; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (E.T., 1959), p. 131f.

Jesus, and that the wide use of it in the community tradition was first suggested by this fact.

It is not, I think, irrelevant here to call attention to the reply of Jesus to the high priest's question whether he was the Messiah. "I am, and you shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven" (Mark 14:62).¹⁰ Since this answer combines Dan. 7:13 and Ps. 110:1, the Messiah's session at God's right hand in Ps. 110:1 is described in terms of the Son of Man. The Son of Man intrudes itself into another Messianic concept. Is not the same intrusion to be assumed in Mark 12:35-7? In Mark 14:62 Jesus declares that it is as the Son of Man, and not as the [Son of David-] Messiah, that he will fulfil Ps. 110:1. The upshot is that if the authenticity of Mark 14:62 is accepted, that of Mark 12:35-7 must also be accepted. That he is Son of David Jesus does not deny, but he implies that the psalm will find its fulfilment in him as the Son of Man.¹¹

SON OF GOD

A Hellenistic origin is unlikely because of the early appearance of this Christology in the Pauline epistles. The most important instances are I Thess. 1:10 (very early fifties) and Rom. 1:4 (from a pre-Pauline liturgical formula). Is the Son of God Christology a creation of the early Palestinian church, or is it derived from its founder? Can a decision be reached on the basis of the OT background? In the OT, apart from angels as sons of God (Gen. 6:2; Job 1:6; 38:7), both Israel (Ex. 4:22f.; Isa. 1:2; Hos. 11:1), and the king are called God's son (II Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; 89:26f.). The question at first sight virtually amounts to a decision as to whether Ps. 2:7 was first regarded by Jesus as expressing his filial consciousness. If so, it would be natural to explain the Son of God Christology as derived ultimately from him. The alternative would be that the Palestinian church seized upon the psalm and from it, or with its help, evolved the Christology, for there appears to be no certain example of the use of Son of God as a Messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism which might have lain ready to hand.¹² Yet it

10. We are not here concerned with the strongly attested variant "Thou sayest that I am."

11. It is significant that the Lukan parallel (22:69) retains the fusion of the two concepts, while omitting the coming with the clouds. This omission is characteristic of the third evangelist's tendency to tone down apocalyptic ideas; he reports the session, but not the descent of the Son of Man. That it is a matter of descent and not of ascent, as it is now fashionable to believe (e.g., T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent* [1945], pp. 63-8; J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* [1957], p. 45), is confirmed by the fact that the coming with the clouds, omitted by Luke, is subsequent to the sitting at God's right hand; so rightly G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future* (1954), p. 259; *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (1957), pp. 90f.

It is, perhaps, worth adding that, on turning to Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 145, after completing this paper, I discovered that he concedes the possibility "dass der in Mk 12, 35-37 vorschwebende Gegensatz zum 'Davidsohn' in her Tat der 'Menschensohn' ist." Jesus could then have uttered these words, but of course, in Bultmann's view, with no reference to *himself* as Son of Man; cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (1954), pp. 262f.

12. Cf. G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (1902), pp. 272, 275; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (1953), p. 253; S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (1956), pp. 293f., 368; O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 279ff. Prof. D. N. Freedman, however, in a private communication from Jerusalem, kindly informs me that the (Davidic) Messiah is called the Son of God in unpublished Qumran material.

might have been expected that the Messiah, like the king, should occasionally be so called, in view of the fact that the Messianic hope arose out of the expectation of the fulfilment of the unrealized ideals of kingship.¹³

Right in the forefront, therefore, as a point of departure, stands Ps. 2:7: "Thou art my son, today I have begotten thee." Like Ps. 110:1, it was current in early Christian use, for it is quoted in Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; 5:5. Nor was this the only part of the psalm to be quoted. In Acts 4:25f. its first two verses are quoted as fulfilled in the hostility of Gentiles and Jews and of Herod and Pilate against Jesus, and in Rev. 12:5 and 19:15 its ninth verse is utilized in the manner of the Psalms of Solomon to illustrate the vengeance which the Messiah will wreak upon his enemies. Whether this Christian use of Psalm 2 is due entirely to the creativity of the church or to the known use of its seventh verse by Jesus himself, may turn out to be not the vital question as regards the genesis of the Son of God Christology. There is no evidence that he made any use of the psalm apart from verse seven, and even this is uncertain.

The voice at the baptism, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" (Mark 1:11; cf. Matt. 3:17; Luke 3:22), is customarily regarded as containing allusions to both Ps. 2:7 and Isa. 42:1 ("Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights"). The view, however, has been advanced, that only the latter passage is echoed, that *huios mou* in Mark 1:11 represents *pais mou* in Isa. 42:1, and that this clarification of the Hebrew took place on Hellenistic soil before Mark took over the tradition. This transition, it is urged, might indeed have been facilitated by reminiscence of Ps. 2:7, the second stage being the explicit quotation of the LXX version of this verse of the psalm in the "Western" text of Luke 3:22 ("Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee").¹⁴ According to this view, Ps. 2:7 is an excellent illustration of the creative role of the OT in the development of NT Christology.¹⁵ This view, however, labours under the disadvantage of removing from Palestinian to Hellenistic soil the possible influence of Ps. 2:7 as a factor in the emergence of the Son of God Christology. It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile this with the early appearance of this Christology in Paul.

The view that Isa. 42:1 alone is at the basis of Mark 1:11 would gain some support if the original reading in John 1:34 were *ho eklektos*; but it is by no means certain, despite its age, that this is the original text.¹⁶ It seems far more likely that the evangelist, who concludes his Gospel by stating that its purpose was to inspire belief in Jesus as the Son of God (20:31), should in its opening scenes record the forerunner John the Baptist as testifying to

13. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the Old Testament I* (1952), p. 50.

14. W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (1957), p. 81.

15. Cf. also the conclusions drawn from acceptance of the variant reading *eklektos* (for *huios*) in John 1:34, which is attested by Papyrus 5, Codex Sinaiticus (*primo manu*), the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac, an Old Latin ms. (e), and St. Ambrose; see the discussion of J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 61, n. 261, and p. 82; and O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 66, n. 3.

16. It may be remarked that the substitution of *huios* for *eklektos*, even if the latter is accepted as the true text, may not be anything more than a mere scribal alteration, all too easy for a copyist familiar with the Son of God title in the Fourth Gospel.

the Son of God. There is, therefore, much to be said in favour of the opinion that the usual text of John 1:34 independently confirms the Son of God Christology in Mark 1:11, expressed in terms of Ps. 2:7.

It is widely (though not unanimously) held that Son of Man was the self-designation of Jesus; but Son of God can hardly have been a self-designation at all. Even if the voice he heard at his baptism reflects his consciousness of sonship, this affords no more proof that he spoke of himself as the Son of God than does the temptation narrative in Q (Matt. 4:3, 6; Luke 4:3, 9). It is not in the Synoptics (apart from Matt. 27:43) but in the Fourth Gospel that Jesus calls himself the Son of God, implicitly in 5:25, 9:35 (variant reading), 11:4, and explicitly only in 10:36. But it is as "the Son" that the Johannine Jesus is characteristically depicted as referring to himself.¹⁷ There is no doubt that in the Fourth Gospel "the Son" is entirely interpretative. The same is true of the few Synoptic occurrences of this term. Mark has only one example: "But of that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven nor the Son, but the Father" (13:32, cf. Matt. 24:36). It can be conceded that, so far as limitation of Jesus' knowledge of the end is concerned, there can be little or no doubt of the genuineness of this logion. But this admission of ignorance on the part of Jesus has been reframed in an interpretative manner so as to represent him as calling himself the Son,¹⁸ quite in the Johannine style. This means that the interpretative use of "the Son" in the Johannine Gospel (16 times) and Epistles (8 times) already lay ready to hand in earlier tradition. This is confirmed by the Q logion in Matt. 11:27 (cf. Luke 10:22): "All things have been delivered to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father, nor does any one know the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son wishes to reveal him." It is hackneyed to call this saying, in the words of K. A. von Hase, "a meteor from the Johannine heaven" (cf. John 3:35; 17:2).¹⁹ There is no need to doubt its substantial genuineness,²⁰ but as with Mark 13:32, the Son Christology has determined its form in the tradition. Both sayings prove the pre-Johannine existence of this interpretative Christological title. The factor which has operated on the formulation of these Synoptic logia is the same one which produced the numerous instances of "the Son" in the Johannine circle, namely, the movement towards a Trinitarian theology which is expressed in the formula in Matt 28:19, where the nations are to be baptized in the three-fold name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Son of Man, whichever view is adopted as to its use by Jesus as a self-designation, at least already existed and lay ready to hand as a title in apocalyptic circles. The same cannot be said of "the Son." It has been noted

17. 3:17, 35f.; 5:19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26; 6:40; 8:36; 14:13; 17:1.

18. It is, therefore, unnecessary to suppose, with the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, I (1920), p. 396, and R. P. Casey ("The Earliest Christologies," *JTS*, n.s., 9 [1958], p. 267), that "the Son" here stands for "the Son of Man."

19. Quoted by Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 286, n.2.

20. As is done by, among others, Dibelius, Bultmann, and Bousset; see V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (1953), p. 63.

already that the pre-Christian use of Son of God as a Messianic name is open to doubt. When it comes to "the Son" the doubts become formidable indeed, for there is obviously no pre-NT precedent at all for its employment as a self-designation. I therefore find it impossible to agree with Dr. Vincent Taylor when he calls "the Son" Jesus' self-designation.²¹ Elsewhere he writes that "it is clear that, according to our earliest sources, Q and Mark, Jesus spoke of Himself as 'the Son' (Mk. i:11, xiii:32, Lk. x:22 = Mt. xi:27). . . It is a fact of importance that, if the genuineness of these sayings is accepted, Sonship has a dominical basis."²² But important though these sayings are, they are not the real evidence for Sonship. Having dealt with Mark 13:32 and the Q logion, we are left with the quotation of Ps. 2:7 in Mark 1:11, which displays a Son of God Christology associated with the quotation. To say that the Son of God Christology here exhibited is a creation of the Palestinian church is not tantamount to calling it a *creatio ex nihilo*. The dominical basis of the Son of God Christology does not rest on the authenticity of Mark 13:32, or of Matt. 11:27, or even of Mark 1:11. The genesis of the Christology does not depend on supposed self-descriptions of Jesus as Son of God, much less as "the Son," for which the evidence is tenuous in the extreme. The root is his consciousness of a special relationship to God as Abba, Father²³ (Mark 14:36; cf. Luke 11:2). It was this which led the Palestinian community to call their Lord the Son of God and the Son.²⁴ Ps. 2:7, as used in the baptism narrative (and also in that of the transfiguration, Mark 9:7, and parallels), was a potent, if secondary, factor in this process.

We have noted an intrusion of the Son of Man concept into that of the Davidic Messiah in the thought of Jesus. There appears to be a similar intrusion of this concept into that of the Son of God in the mind of the author of Hebrews in the catena of OT quotations in the first two chapters. That "intrusion" is again the correct term is justified by the prominence in Hebrews of the Son of God Christology (1:8; 4:14; 6:6; 7:3; 10:29). Ps. 2:7 is quoted twice, in 1:5 (followed by II Sam. 7:14) and in 5:5. The former quotation is introduced by the question, "To which of the angels did he ever say?" In 2:5f. we read:

For it was not to angels that God subjected the world to come, of which we speak. But someone testified somewhere,

What is man that thou art mindful of him,
or the son of man that thou visitest him?

21. *Ibid.*, p. 57.

22. *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (1958), p.149.

23. On "Abba," see T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (1949), p. 168; V. Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (1958), pp. 176-80; cf. O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

24. R. P. Casey, *op. cit.*, p. 267, concludes that the expression "Son of God" must be "a product of early Gentile Christian usage," on the ground that in Aramaic-speaking circles "*bara* [the Son] by itself would convey no meaning at all and *bar alaha* [the Son of God] would suggest an angel." But given the Christology, the Palestinian community was surely not incapable of expressing it by attaching new and deeper meanings to familiar terms.

The following verses make it clear that the author, in quoting Psalm 8, has in mind a Son of Man Christology, for the promise of sovereignty held out to man has been fulfilled in Jesus as the Son of Man. The second quotation is followed at once by Ps. 110:4.

So also Christ did not glorify himself to be made a high priest, but it was he who said to him,

Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee,
as he says also in another place,
Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

The result is, on the one hand, the intrusion of the Son of Man into the Son of God concept; on the other, the association of the idea of the Son of God with that of the High Priest. The importance of this association for our present purpose lies in the close affinities between the ideas of the Son of Man and the High Priest, and the possible source of the application to Jesus of Ps. 110:4.

In later Judaism certain figures, whose relationship to the apocalyptic Son of Man is somewhat obscure and need not concern us here, perform priestly functions. Enoch in Jub. 4:25 "burnt the incense of the sanctuary";²⁵ in II En. he performs mediatorial functions; in III En. the figure (Enoch-) Metatron occupies a throne of his own as "the Prince of the Presence" (xlviic 7), and in the Talmud intercedes in heaven for Israel.²⁶ The idea of a heavenly intercessor would not, therefore, appear novel or revolutionary to Jews. Is this, perhaps, partly the explanation of the sudden introduction, with no preamble, of the notion of the Christian Messiah as "a merciful and faithful high priest" in Heb. 2:17? On the other hand, Ps. 110:4 is not applied in Judaism to the Messiah.²⁷ That the *idea* of a Priest-Messiah was not unknown to Judaism is proved by the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and by the Qumran literature; but the NT conception is radically different and basically independent. It is, therefore, not enough simply to say that the writer of Hebrews was familiar with the (Jewish) idea, and desired to apply it to Jesus.

At what point are we to seek Christian origination? C. H. Dodd holds that the author of Hebrews himself is an innovator in his use of Ps. 110:4 (Heb. 5:6; 6:20; 7:17, 21), though "his argument rests upon secure grounds if he could count upon the general acceptance of the hundred-and-tenth psalm as being, in its entirety, a testimony to Christ."²⁸ But other NT books seem to reflect the same belief, though without recourse to this psalm. In John 17:19 Jesus "sanctifies" himself as both priest and sacrifice. Other possible allusions to the idea are Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 5:2; I Pet. 2:24; 3:18; I John 2:1. The possibility of a Johannine origin for the conception²⁹ remains open, as does the suggestion of T. W. Manson that Hebrews, so far

25. See H. Odeberg, 'Ενωχ, *TWNT*, 2 (1935), p. 554.

26. Bab. T., *Chagiga* 15a.

27. Cf. my article "Priest and Messiah", *VT*, 3 (1953), p. 324f.

28. *According to the Scriptures* (1952), p. 104.

29. Cf. O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 105, on Spicq's suggestion to this effect.

from being original, is anticipated by Rom. 3:21-6.³⁰ W. Manson went so far as to suggest that Ps. 110:4, "Thou art a priest for ever," belonged to a primitive confession.³¹ Without regarding this as anything more than a guess, the suddenness with which Jesus is called "a merciful and faithful high priest" in Heb. 2:17 at least gives the impression that the conception was not unfamiliar in Christian circles. The observation that other places in the NT outside Hebrews appear to reflect the same idea without using the term priest or high priest suggests that it was not based on Ps. 110:4. The author of Hebrews elaborates for the purpose of his argument a belief which was taken for granted, that the declaration in this verse did in fact refer to Jesus, since the psalm as a whole, and particularly verse 1, was held to do so. But can we go back further than this? If the doctrine of the high priesthood of Jesus is traceable independently of Psalm 110, what is its ultimate source?

I have elsewhere stated the opinion that the origin of this Christology is to be found "in speculations set in motion by the belief in the exaltation of the risen Messiah to the heavenly world."³² I should now wish to modify that opinion, and the nature of the modification is best indicated by the substitution of "Son of Man" for "risen Messiah."

In discussing the Son of David and the Son of God we have seen that Christologies which might appear at first sight to have arisen from Christian interpretation of passages from the psalms, turn out on closer examination to go back to Jesus himself. But the results are not exactly the same. The conclusion was reached, on the one hand, that Son of David in Christian use is due to Jesus' own borrowing from Ps. 110:1 and to the fact of his Davidic descent; on the other, that the Christologies expressed in the related titles Son of God and the Son, although community creations hastened by Messianic application of Ps. 2:7, are fully justified by, and gain impulse from, the special relationship which Jesus believed he enjoyed with God as Father.

The question of the origin of the High Priest Christology has, as we have seen, received varying answers. To these must be added Cullmann's argument³³ from the use by Jesus of Ps. 110:1 in Mark 14:62, that he may have viewed his own mission as a fulfilment of the true priesthood. Cullmann's thesis is as follows. In Mark 14:62, Jesus links together the Son of Man of Dan. 7 and the Messiah's session at God's right hand in Ps. 110:1. "Sitting at the right hand" is inseparably connected with the thought of the priest-king 'after the order of Melchizedek.' To the Jewish High Priest before him Jesus replies that he will be not an earthly Messiah, but the heavenly Son of Man, not an earthly but the heavenly High Priest. Just as before the earthly ruler Pontius Pilate he declares that his kingdom is not of this

30. "ΙΑΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," *JTS*, 46 (1945), pp. 1-10; *Ministry and Priesthood* (1958), p. 48, n. 16.

31. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1951), pp. 54, 108.

32. "Priest and Messiah," *VT*, 3 (1953), p. 336.

33. *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

world (John 18:36), so before the earthly High Priest he shows that his priesthood is of an entirely different order. This is an ingenious but unconvincing case as stated by Cullmann. Nevertheless, although Cullmann lays the main emphasis on the close connection between the sitting at God's right hand and the Melchizedekian priesthood, he does also equate the ideas of the Son of Man and the High Priest, and it is *here* that we may seek a solution, but in the sense that it is as Son of Man in his role as *intercessor*, rather than specifically as a priest, that Jesus envisaged his heavenly role. There is no Synoptic evidence that Jesus viewed the work of the Son of Man as in any way priestly. When he is reported as associating Dan. 7:13 with another passage, it is with the *first* verse of Psalm 110 that the association is made (Mark 14:62; Matt. 19:28; 25:31), not with the fourth. Although the author of Hebrews was to do so,³⁴ Jesus did not, so far as we know, associate these two parts of the psalm. Cullmann, therefore, reads into Mark 14:62 what is not there.

Although it is not very prominent, evidence is not totally lacking that Jesus viewed the role of the Son of Man as that of an intercessor or mediator. "Every one who confesses me before men, the Son of Man also will confess before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8; cf. Matt. 10:32). Would not intercession have been included by him among the functions of the Son of Man? In the *Similitudes of Enoch* the Son of Man is the judge of the wicked and the champion of the righteous. To him is given "the sum of judgement" (69:27; cf. John 5:22, 27), and this includes an assessment of righteousness (62:3); the Elect One "shall choose the righteous and holy" from among the resurrected ones (51:2). The Son of Man exercises all the prerogatives of the Lord of Spirits in condemnation and acquittal. Jesus, too, claimed that the Son of Man would act as judge, but *in relation to God as Father*, whose representative he is (Matt. 25:31ff.; Mark 8:38, cf. Matt. 16:27, Luke 9:26). This means that the intercession of the Son of Man may be inferred from the Synoptic records. The Son of Man is not said to "stand before" God, which is the regular expression for priestly intercession (*'amadh liph' nē YHWH, stēnai enantion [enanti, pro prosōpou] Kyriou*—Deut. 10:8; II Chron. 29:11; Jer. 15:1; Ezek. 44:15). Is this, it might be asked, the reason why it is not used of him? This can hardly be the case, for apart from Abraham's intercession for Sodom (Gen. 18:22), the same language is used by the prophets to describe their intercessory function (I Kings 17:1; 18:15; II Kings 3:14; 5:16; Jer. 18:20). Moreover, both Moses and Samuel, while performing priestly functions (Jer. 15:1) were regarded primarily as prophets (Moses—Deut. 18:15, 18; Acts 3:22; Samuel—I Chron. 9:22; 26:28; 29:29; Acts 3:24; 13:20). The Gospels depict Jesus in such a way that we must believe that he envisaged the intercessory role of the Son of Man from the prophetic rather than from the priestly point of view. If the view be correct that the Son of Man beheld by

34. This is at its clearest in Heb. 8:1; it is as High Priest that Jesus sits "at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven."

the protomartyr Stephen was standing at God's right hand as his advocate (Acts 7:56), the passage assumes quite extraordinary importance as supplying an explicit formulation of the intercessory (but not necessarily priestly) role of the Son of Man, which is all but lacking in the Synoptic tradition, and probably testifies to primitive doctrine.

The early church, therefore, had every justification for regarding its Messiah as an intercessor at God's right hand—"Christ Jesus . . . who is at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession on our behalf" (Rom. 8:34).³⁵ In I John 2:1f.—"We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the expiation for our sins"—the term Son of Man is not used; but the passage represents, in *hilasmos* ("expiation"), a transition from intercession or advocacy (*paraklētos*—"advocate") to *priestly* intercession and self-sacrifice, as in Heb. 7:25f.; 9:24–26. More striking is I Tim. 2:5: "There is one Mediator of God and men, (*the*) *Man* Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all" (*antilutron hyper pantōn*). This is a Hellenistic rewriting of the original Semitic form in Mark 10:45, viz., "*The Son of Man* came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many" (*lutron anti pollōn*). In the former passage the association of mediation and ransom is explicit. The Mediator is the *Man*. This comparatively late passage thus interprets a logion concerning the Son of Man, in which mediation or intercession is only implicit, by borrowing *mesitēs* ("mediator") from popular Greek speech. Moreover, "mediator of God and men" (*mesitēs theou kai anthrōpōn*) is the precise description of Michael as intercessor and high priest in the *Testament of Dan* 6:2. We are here very near to the thought in Hebrews of the High Priest who intercedes for men, having offered himself as a sacrifice (Heb. 7:25–27). If Mark 10:45 is (at least in substance) authentic, the source of this kind of thought is clear. But there is nowhere any hint that Jesus thought of the intercessory activity of the Son of Man as priestly, nor that he made any use of Ps. 110:4. It was the primitive community which did this. That the High Priest Christology was not actually based on Ps. 110:4 is shown by the appearance elsewhere in the NT of the same Christology, with no reference to the psalm; but the use of the verse was encouraged by the Christological use of the first verse of the psalm. The conclusion, therefore, would be that Ps. 110:4 did indeed encourage and support the belief in Jesus as a High Priest, but the idea itself arose from the teaching of Jesus about the Son of Man and his heavenly intercession, interpreted by the church as a priestly function.

I have spoken of the intrusion of the Son of Man concept into that of the Davidic Messiah in the thought of Jesus, and into that of the Son of God in the mind of the author of Hebrews. It may be suggested that the explanation is the use by Jesus of Son of Man as, in some sense, a self-designation. Although it was not customarily used by the church as a title for that very

35. That this statement is in all probability not Paul's own, but is derived from an earlier credal formulation, is strongly suggested by the sequence: Christ's death, resurrection, and heavenly session. For the idea of intercession in Judaism and in Christianity, cf. N. Johansson, *Parakletoi* (1940).

reason, yet its influence could not be avoided. This is clearest in the case of the High Priest idea. It is not without significance that the strongly Jewish Apocalypse actually describes the Son of Man in priestly language: "one like a son of man, clothed with a long robe and with a golden girdle round his breast."³⁶

36. Rev. 1:13.