

馬可福音補充教材 Mark Supplementary Material

一、	專有名詞 (Special Nouns)	1
1 ·	文士 SCRIBES	1
2 ·	法利賽人 PHARISEES	5
3 ·	撒都該人 SADDUCEES	9
4 ·	希律黨人 HERODIANS	12
5 ·	安息日 SABBATH	13
6 ·	神子 SON OF GOD	17
7 ·	人子 SON OF MAN	24

一、 專有名詞 (Special Nouns)

有關專有名詞，如果沒有時間閱讀所有資料，請特別注意加亮區 · If you don't have time to read everything, please read just the highlighted sections.

1 · 文士 SCRIBES

In Second Temple Judaism the scribes were a class of professional exponents and teachers of the law.

1. Background
2. Scribes and Pharisees
3. Work of the Scribes
4. Scribes in the Gospels
5. Jesus and the Scribes

1. Background.

In ancient Near Eastern civilizations the highly prized skill of writing made the scribes significant members of the community, especially as political advisors, diplomats and experts in the ancient sciences and mysteries, including astrology.

In Israel's history we find that scribes began as recorders and copyists of official data (2 Kings 12:10) and formed themselves into guilds (1 Chron 2:55). They came to hold high political office (1 Kings 4:3; 2 Kings 18:18; 25:19; 1 Chron 27:32; 2 Chron 26:11; Is 22:15) and became the heirs of the priests and Levites as interpreters of the law (2 Chron 34:13; Ezra 7:12) because of their familiarity with and understanding of the Scriptures (1 Chron 27:32).

In exilic times the scribes emerged as wise men of understanding (see Proverbs) as the Jews in a foreign land depended on them for interpreting the Torah in a new situation. Baruch was a scribe taking down Jeremiah's dictation (Jer 36:4, 18), collecting the prophet's sayings (Jer 36:32) and acting as his representative (Jer 36:6 - 15).

From the fourth century B.C. Ezra, the priest and scribe, embodied all that was expected of a scribe in that period (Ezra 7:6 - 26; Neh 8:1 - 9). By about 180 B.C, when Jesus ben Sirach, a scribe who probably had a school in Jerusalem (Sir 51:23), assembled his book, the scribes were a well-developed and distinct class of high social status alongside the priesthood (Sir 38:24 - 39:11; *Jub.* 4:17 - 25). In the crisis perpetuated by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the reputation of lay scribes rose as they were zealous for the law to the point of martyrdom (2 Macc 6:18 - 31), while the priestly scribes succumbed to Hellenism.

After the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the most respected scribes settled at Jamnia as well as Lydda (*m. Roš Haš.* 1:6; 4:1 – 2). In Judaism the learned were also known as elders, experts, sages and scholars. The Mishnah says that they were to be “deliberate in judgement; raise up many disciples and make a fence around the Torah” (*m. 'Abot* 1:1).

1.1. Leading Scribes. Little of historical value is known about individual scribes before A.D. 70, the most famous pair being Hillel and Shammai (*m. 'Abot* 1:1 – 18). Hillel came to Palestine from Babylon and, because of his poverty, hired himself out as a day laborer. His kindness and gentleness characterized his school and the leniency of his decisions (*b. Sabb.* 30b – 31a; *b. Soṭa* 48b). He drew up seven hermeneutical principles in order to establish the harmony between Scripture and tradition (*t. Sanh.* 7:11).

Shammai, a native of Judea, is said to have been more stringent than Hillel in his interpretation of the law. Even though both agreed on the need to fulfill the letter of the law, the two schools met to discuss their differences (*m. Sabb.* 1:4 – 11).

As the regulations of the scribes were intended to be applicable throughout the Jewish community, the most respected authorities lived and worked in one place to reach common conclusions.

After the fall of Jerusalem (*see* Destruction of Jerusalem), Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, who lived mainly in Jamnia, was the most distinguished scribe. Another celebrated scribe, well known in the NT, was Gamaliel I, who, according to Acts 5:34 – 39; 22:3, taught Paul.

1.2. Lifestyle. Some scribes came from the priestly aristocracy (*m. 'Abot* 3:2; *m. Seqal.* 8:5). Others were ordinary priests (*m. 'Abot* 2:8) or members of the lower orders of clergy (*b. 'Arak.* 11b). The vast majority of scribes came from every other section of society, some supporting themselves by carrying on a trade. The literature gives evidence of a commander of the temple fortress, a wine merchant, a carpenter, a leather worker, a flax comber and a day laborer being scribes. For economic reasons even the most respected rabbis undertook writing and copying of Scripture (*b. Giṭ.* 67a).

With the need to spend time studying the law and with no set fee for giving instruction, even the most respected of these scribes could be poor and depended on gifts from their students, funds from the distribution to the poor and the temple treasury (*b. Yoma* 35b; *b. Ned.* 49b – 50a). Also, it was meritorious to show hospitality to a scribe, to give him a share of one's property or to run his business for him (*b. Ber.* 34b). Scribes were also exempt from taxes (*m. 'Abot* 3:5). On the other hand, some scribes were over-zealous in receiving this kindness (Josephus *J.W.* 1.29.2 §571). Others, with many pupils, were very wealthy (*b. Ketub.* 67b).

2. Scribes and Pharisees.

Along with the chief priests, these two groups are often associated in the Gospels. Some have denied that there is any relationship between them. Others have understood the scribes to be the Pharisees learned in the law or an elite amongst them. The phrase “scribes of the Pharisees” (Mk 2:16; Acts 23:9) indicates the probability that scribes were associated with various sects and associations within first-century Judaism.

3. Work of the Scribes.

In relation to their knowledge of the Scriptures the scribes occupied themselves with a number of tasks (Sir 38:24 – 39:11).

3.1. Interpretation and Preservation of the Law. On the basis of existing regulations and by recourse to ancient customs which had become binding as common law (Mk 7:5 – 8), the scribes applied the general instructions of the Torah to daily living and even extended the law to theoretical situations to build a safety fence against inadvertent breaches (*m. Hor.* 1:5). In turn, the findings of the scribes, related mainly to festivals, prayers,

cleanness and uncleanness (*see* Purity) and the temple, became common law (*m. Sabb.* 1:1 – 24:5; *m. Hag.* 1:8; *m. Ned.* 4:3). In some places writing down the tradition of the scribes is forbidden (*b. Sabb.* 115b; *b. Git.* 60b), so continuous study was required to maintain a working knowledge of the traditions.

3.2. Teaching the Law. Instruction usually began at an early age (Josephus, *Life* §9; *b. Git.* 58a). A student was expected to give allegiance to his teacher above that of his parents and, certainly after the NT period, teachers were generally addressed as “my lord” or “master” (*rabbi*). A student was expected to reproduce every word and expression of his teacher. In NT times teaching took place “in the temple,” probably in rooms associated with the main building (cf. Mk 14:49). In other centers instruction took place in “houses of instruction” (*Sir* 51:23; *m. Ber.* 4:2; *m. Ter.* 11:10), which sometimes may have been the home of the scribe (*m. Abot* 1:4). The scribe sat on a raised area and the pupils on rows of benches or on the floor (Acts 22:3). The scribe posed questions for the students to answer. The teacher repeated his material over and over so it could be memorized. When the student had mastered the material and was competent to make his own decisions, he was a nonordained student. When he came of age (*b. Soṭa* 22b says forty years of age), he could be received into the company of scribes as an ordained scholar.

3.3. Scribes as Lawyers. Any Jew could be asked to judge a case by a community (*b. Sanh.* 3a). But where there was a scribe he would invariably be chosen for a judicial office (*Sir* 38:33), and some were members of the Sanhedrin. Aside from these major functions the scribes also attended to the following tasks.

3.4. Scribes as Theologians. Some scribes gave more attention to studying and elaborating the doctrine in the text of Scripture rather than its legal elements. While preaching was not restricted to specific people, these scribes were well qualified to speak in the synagogues.

3.5. Scribes as Guardians of Tradition. The significance of the scribes in Jewish society was also associated with their being guardians of an esoteric tradition (Lk 11:52). They considered secrecy necessary because Scripture was silent on the reasons for many laws (*b. Sanh.* 21b), because of the offense of some stories (*m. Meg.* 4:10), because the teaching might be misused (e.g., amelioration of purity laws, *b. Ber.* 22a) and because genealogical traditions might discredit public figures (*b. Qidd.* 70b). According to the Mishnah this secret knowledge also included the story of creation and the vision of the chariot (*m. Hag.* 2:1; *see* Heavenly Ascent). From the description of such things in the apocalyptic writings (*1 Enoch* 69:16 – 25; *2 Esdr* 6:38 – 56) as well as direct evidence (*2 Esdr* 14:45 – 48; *As. Mos.* 1:17 – 18), it seems that these writings contain the theological constructions and teachings of the scribes.

3.6. Scribes as Curators of the Text. Copying Scripture was considered divine work (*b. Soṭa* 20a), and temple funds may have been used to pay for corrections in scrolls (*b. Ketub.* 106a). Even though the sacred text was known by heart, a written edition had to be set before the copyist (*b. Meg.* 18b), who would read aloud the text as he worked (*m. Meg.* 2:2). The Qumran scriptorium may have been modelled on something similar in the Jerusalem temple.

4. Scribes in the Gospels.

“Scribe” occurs fifty-seven times in the Synoptic Gospels (and Jn 8:3 in some MSS). Twenty-one times they are mentioned with the chief priests and eighteen times with the Pharisees. The scribes are depicted as scholars and teachers of Scripture, the custodians of Jewish traditions, the major opponents of Jesus and heavily involved in his trial.

4.1. Mark. The scribes, mentioned twenty-one times, are the chief opponents of Jesus in this earliest Gospel and appear throughout the Gospel. In the first report of Jesus’ teaching, his teaching with authority is contrasted with that of the scribes (Mk 2:22). Unlike the scribes, Jesus did not appeal to tradition but acted as having an authority direct from God.

cf. *confer*, compare

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

Mark depicts the scribes as opposing Jesus in a number of ways. When the Pharisees are mentioned with the scribes they are questioning Jesus' understanding of the law. They ask why he contaminates himself by eating with sinners and tax collectors (Mk 2:16; *see* Taxation) and why he eats with defiled hands (Mk 7:5). The scribes also question the identity and credentials of Jesus (Mk 2:6; 3:22; 11:27) and so provide a foil over against which Mark highlights the identity, teaching and powerful authority of Jesus. On learning of Jesus cleansing the temple they seek to destroy him (Mk 11:18; 14:1, 43) and are involved in his condemnation (Mk 15:1). While he is on the cross the scribes mock Jesus (Mk 15:31). Indeed, in predicting his death, Jesus twice mentions the scribes as some who will be involved (Mk 8:31; 10:33). One scribe, however, who questions and approves Jesus' answer is said not to be far from the kingdom of God (Mk 12:28 – 34).

Part of Jesus' teaching is his criticism of the scribes (Mk 12:35 – 40) and his highlighting the new understanding of Scripture in the light of his coming (Mk 9:11 – 13). He says they do not understand who he is (Mk 12:35 – 37). The scribe is the antithesis of a disciple (Mk 3:15; 6:7; 8:29; 9:35; 10:31, 43 – 44) in that scribes like to go about in splendid clothes (*stolai*, cf. Mk 16:5) and, even though they do not have authority (Mk 1:22), they desire recognition and positions of honor in the synagogue and at feasts (Mk 12:38 – 39). They also exploit the poor to support their religion (Mk 12:40; *see* 11:17 – 18). In showing the scribes also in conflict with the disciples (Mk 9:14), Mark may be conveying to his readers the message that they will continue to face opposition in the same areas as Jesus.

4.2. Matthew. The scribes play a more important role in Matthew than in the other Gospels. The Pharisees, chief priests, elders of the people and the scribes are brought together to represent Jewish opposition to Jesus and, in leading the people astray, they carry responsibility for the fate of Jesus (Mt 2:4; 23:1 – 39; 26:57; 27:19 – 26, 41).

One aspect of Matthew's complex presentation of the scribes is the desire to rehabilitate them, apparent in his omission of material where his sources have them portrayed negatively (e.g., Mt 12:24 par. Mk 3:22). Also, when the scribes are depicted negatively, they are always associated with another group, especially with the Pharisees (e.g., Mt 5:20; 23:2 – 29) but also with the chief priests (e.g., Mt 16:21; 27:41) and elders (Mt 16:21). However, Matthew's antagonism is probably only toward the scribes of the Pharisees, for he makes a distinction between the scribes of the Pharisees and other scribes (Mt 7:29 par. Mk 1:22). And, in chapter 23, where Matthew is most vicious in his attack on the scribes and Pharisees, he reverts to calling them Pharisees in verse 26 (*see also* Mt. 12:24 par. Mk 9:34; Mt 22:34 – 36 par. Mk 12:28; Mt 22:40 par. Mk 12:32 – 34; Mt 9:11 par. Mk 2:16).

Matthew also treats scribes positively (Mt 23:2), and the terms “scribe” and “disciple” of Jesus are interchangeable (cf. Mt 8:19 and 21), though disciples are not to use the title “rabbi” (Mt 23:8). Like the students of the traditional scribe, a disciple of Jesus is to leave his family (Mt 8:21 – 22), follow Jesus wherever he goes (Mt 8:19 – 20) and have a righteousness—set out in the Sermon on the Mount (cf. Mt 7:29)—that exceeds the pharisaic scribe (Mt 5:20). Such a Christian scribe will gain new understanding of the secrets of the kingdom of heaven as well as treasuring “old things” through the teaching of Jesus (Mt 13:11, 52), which he is to do and teach (Mt 5:19). In 23:34 Matthew seems to be warning the Christian scribe of the impending dangers of being a disciple of Jesus (cf. Mt 5:10 – 12).

4.3. Luke. Luke also uses *nomikoi* (“lawyers” : Lk 7:30; 10:25; 11:45, 46, 52; 14:3) and *nomodidaskaloi* (“teachers of the law” : Lk 5:17; Acts 5:34) for the scribes.

In Luke 11:37 – 54, the first of two series of criticisms, Luke softens the criticism by omitting (cf. Mt 23:23 – 36) references to the scribes until Luke 11:45. The second series of criticisms of the scribes, following an attack on their theology (Lk 20:41 – 44), is in the form of a warning to the disciples to beware of the cruelly selfish lifestyle of the scribes (Lk 20:45 – 47). Also, following his tradition, Luke shows the scribes antagonistic

to Jesus' ministry (Lk 5:21 par. Mk 2:6; Lk 5:30 par. Mk 2:16; Lk 14:1 – 6; Lk 20:1 par. Mk 11:27). Furthermore, Luke shows the scribes among those attempting to destroy Jesus (Lk 19:47 par. Mk 11:18; Lk 22:2 par. Mk 14:1; Lk 22:66 par. Mk 15:1) and into the hands of whom Jesus expected to be delivered (Lk 9:22 par. Mk 8:31).

There are a number of passages where Luke removes criticism of the scribes (e.g., Lk 20:47 par. Mt 23:15; Lk 4:32 par. Mk 1:22) or softens an attack by using the term “ruler” (Lk 23:35 par. Mk 15:31), “someone” (Lk 9:57 par. Mt 8:19) or by including the Pharisees in criticism (Lk 5:21 par. Mk 2:6; Lk 5:30 par. Mk 2:16). In fact Luke only once mentions the scribes alone in a criticism of their lifestyle (Lk 20:46). This probably means that Luke does not single out the scribes as being especially antagonistic to Jesus or any more worthy of Jesus' censure than any of the other Jewish rulers. On the other hand, Luke has Jesus compliment a lawyer on his knowledge of the law (Lk 10:25).

5. Jesus and the Scribes.

Embedded in the traditions about Jesus generally held to be reliable is a contrast between the teaching and lifestyle of Jesus and the scribes. In his teaching Jesus is not only critical of the Jewish traditions (Mk 7:1 – 23), but also in his teaching he placed himself above, not under, the Torah (Mk 2:23 – 28; 10:9; cf. Deut 24:1 – 4). So while Jesus was addressed as a rabbi or teacher, his teaching was recognized to be authoritative in that it was charismatic rather than dependent on tradition or the Scriptures (cf. Mk 1:22). In contrast to pupils of scribes choosing their own teachers, Jesus selected his own students (Mk 1:17; cf. Jn 15:16). As with a student of a scribe, Jesus' disciples were expected to place their relationship with Jesus above all other relationships. As with some scribes Jesus is depicted as being poor and dependent on others for his support (Mt 8:20 par. Lk 9:58; Lk 8:1 – 3).

Numbered among the opponents of Jesus are the scribes. One reason for the scribes' disapproval of Jesus was his claim to speak and act for God (Mk 2:7). This not only provoked jealousy among the scribes but, among those including Sadducean scribes in the Sanhedrin, concern for the delicate peace with Rome being disturbed by the popular excitement Jesus caused (Mk 11:15 – 19). Jesus further discredited himself in the eyes of the pharisaic scribes because of his frequent association with less desirable elements of society (Mk 2:15 – 17).

In turn Jesus criticizes the pharisaic scribes in particular for their hypocrisy in knowing the Scriptures and how to enter the kingdom of God yet, by placing insurmountable legal burdens on people, preventing them from entering it. They also live a lifestyle which the disciples are warned not to follow (cf. Mt 23:1 – 36 par. Lk 20:45 – 47). At least those scribes who were members of the Sanhedrin shared the guilt of handing Jesus over to be crucified. Yet there is evidence that Jesus found some of the teaching of the scribes acceptable (Mk 9:11 – 13), and it is reported that on one occasion Jesus complimented a scribe for his understanding of Scripture (Mk 12:34).

1

2 · 法利賽人 PHARISEES

Although the name of the Pharisees and the main sources about them have been known for about two thousand years, scholars are only now beginning to reconstruct the group's aims and history. From the rise of critical scholarship on this matter in the nineteenth century until the 1960s, there was a growing consensus on some issues and growing disagreement on others. It was broadly agreed, for example, that the Pharisees formed the core of the rabbinic movement, so that first-century Pharisaic perspectives could be read out of rabbinic literature—even though that was admittedly published only in the third to sixth centuries and later. Most scholars also held that the Pharisees dominated Jewish society, having supplanted the priests, who had long since ceased to be effective leaders. The Pharisee-sages were the authorized

¹Porter, S. E., & Evans, C. A. (2000). *Dictionary of New Testament background : A compendium of contemporary biblical scholarship* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

teachers of Jesus' time, exercising their influence through the Sanhedrin, the synagogues (held to be Pharisaic institutions, over against the temple) and the schools.

1. Origins and Sources
2. Josephus
3. New Testament Evidence
4. Rabbinic Literature
5. Conclusion

1. Origins and Sources.

If these points were agreed upon, disagreement proliferated on most other matters. The origin of the Pharisees was variously traced to conflicts between high priests in Solomon's time (1000 B.C.), to the early postexilic period (500 B.C.) or to the **Hasmonean era (c. 150 B.C.)**. Even though the majority of scholars preferred the last option, they disagreed widely about the circumstances of and reasons for the Pharisees' emergence and about the group's relation to the Asideans described in 1 and 2 Maccabees (1 Macc 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc 14:6). The name of the Pharisees similarly was much debated: even though most critics (not all) traced it to the Hebrew *p'rûšîm* of the rabbinic literature, they did not agree about the meaning of this word's root ("separation," "consecration," "secession," "interpretation," "specification"); perhaps it means something else altogether: Persian! Even more vigorous debates occurred over the questions: whether the Pharisees had an interest in apocalypticism and wrote such literature; how much they were involved in the political life of the nation or endorsed a political program (pacifism? militancy?); their connection with the rebels; and above all, whether they were a progressive reforming movement or a virtual establishment trying to protect its narrow, legalistic traditions.

An important change occurred in scholarship on the Pharisees in the 1970s, with the work of J. Neusner and E. Rivkin. In various articles and books, both critics made the observation that any sound historical results would need to proceed from a prior, disciplined analysis of the best sources. The only sources that name the Pharisees and have some claim to independent knowledge of the group are the works of the first-century priest Flavius Josephus; the NT texts, especially the Gospels; and the early rabbinic literature. One needs to understand each source collection's portrait of the Pharisees in context before proceeding to historical reconstruction. Much of the debate of the preceding decades stemmed from seemingly arbitrary choices of sources: many scholars assumed that certain apocalyptic texts were Pharisaic, whereas others thought them anti-Pharisaic; some used the Dead Sea Scrolls, on certain assumptions about those texts' authors and opponents, whereas others did not. And even among those who used Josephus, the NT and the rabbinic literature, some arbitrarily gave more weight to one of these than to the others.

Neusner and Rivkin were both experts in rabbinic literature, but they also undertook to analyze the Pharisees in other sources in order to be true to their avowed methods. Even though they came to radically opposite conclusions, they sealed the methodological agenda for coming decades. Neusner in particular showed that even what had been agreed upon by previous scholarship, the easy Pharisee/rabbi tandem, could not be sustained. He and his students, among others, have now undermined the old consensus with the following arguments: that synagogues before A.D. 70, of which not many have been found, were not Pharisaic institutions; that the rabbinic movement was a coalition of groups, not the Pharisees alone, between 70 and 200; that rabbinic literature reflected the particular concerns of its authors in particular social circumstances; and that many other Jews did not recognize the earlier rabbis without further ado—they took different views. The degree of the Pharisees' influence in pre-70 society remains a matter of debate, but the general trend today is to minimize that influence over against the old consensus.

Because we have no surviving text written by a committed Pharisee and no archaeological finds that mention Pharisees, the reconstruction of their aims and views must depend on the writings of the third parties mentioned. Because none of these outsiders was primarily interested in explaining who the Pharisees were, we must be careful to interpret their evidence against their motives and larger contexts.

2. Josephus.

c. circa, about (with dates); column
NT New Testament

Josephus, a representative of the priestly aristocracy, wrote the *Jewish War* in the late A.D. 70s to persuade Greek readers that the recent Jewish loss to Rome (A.D. 66–74) was not a defeat of the Jewish God and that most Jews had no desire to revolt (*see Jewish Wars with Rome*). In recounting earlier history as evidence of the Jews' good citizenship, Josephus mentions the Pharisees incidentally as a destructive force, because of the inordinate power they wielded under the Hasmonean queen Alexandra (Josephus *J.W.* 1.5.2 §§110–14) and later under Herod (Josephus *J.W.* 1.29.2 §571). When the revolt against Rome finally broke out, however, the most eminent Pharisees joined with the temple authorities in trying to dissuade the revolutionaries, but they were all equally unsuccessful (Josephus *J.W.* 2.17.3 §411).

Describing the Jews' philosophical traditions in this same work, Josephus devotes the greatest attention to the Pythagorean-like Essenes but includes brief mention of the Pharisees. He says that they, in contrast to the Sadducees, believe in life after death, judgment and fate or providence (Josephus *J.W.* 2.8.14 §§162–66).

In the *Antiquities of the Jews/Life*, completed fifteen to twenty years after the *War*, Josephus offers a primer in Judean history and culture, with an appendix portraying his own life and character. He describes the Judean constitution as priestly and aristocratic: the proper form of government is through the priestly senate; monarchy is to be avoided, and democracy is ill advised (apparently) in view of Josephus's general disdain for the fickleness of the masses.

Antiquities expands *War*'s narrative for the period from the Hasmoneans to the revolt by six times (Josephus *Ant.* 13–20; *Life*), so it includes a good deal more information than did *War* about the Pharisees. In both the narrative accounts and Josephus's editorial comments, the Pharisees appear as the most influential of the Jewish parties, even though they do not officially control the organs of power, which are centered in the temple. Every time Josephus mentions the Pharisees' activities, under the Hasmonean prince John Hyrcanus, Queen Alexandra, Herod the Great or himself as commander of Galilean forces in the revolt, he caustically repudiates them: they allegedly use their vast popular support to cause problems for the proper leaders—that is, for Josephus and other aristocrats (Josephus *Ant.* 13.10.5, 15.5–16.6 §§288, 400–432; 17.2.2 §§41–45; *Life* 38–39 §§189–98).

In his descriptions of the Pharisees' views, Josephus continues to mention their doctrine of the afterlife, which he claims endears them to the masses, and he also introduces their special extrabiblical tradition “from the fathers” (Josephus *Ant.* 13.10.6 §§297–98; 18.1.3–4 §§12–17). Throughout his works, Josephus repeats that the Pharisees have the reputation for being the most precise of the schools in their interpretation of the laws (Josephus *J.W.* 1.5.2 §110; 2.8.14 §162; *Ant.* 17.2.4 §41; *Life* 38 §191), though this priest-expert is not willing to concede that they are legitimate teachers of the constitution.

Scholars who wish to challenge the old consensus view of the Pharisees' virtual hegemony in Judean society with the argument that they actually had little influence before A.D. 70 must explain Josephus's portrayal in some way. The most common solution is to propose that Josephus exaggerated their power in his *Antiquities* (completed in A.D. 93) because he was trying then to throw in his lot with the new rabbinic movement at Yavneh in Judea, which was allegedly grounded in the surviving Pharisees. Thus Josephus drew attention to the Pharisees' power in order to alert the Romans to the importance of this group, to make a bid for Roman support of them as the new power brokers in postwar Judea.

The problems with this theory are legion, however. As we have seen, Josephus does not speak positively of the Pharisees' power but complains about it from his aristocratic perspective. It is far from clear why Roman authorities (which ones?) should have persevered through the long biblical paraphrase (Josephus *Ant.* 1–11) to reach the sections concerning Pharisees at the time of the Hasmoneans and Herods, understood these sections as praise or understood that these Pharisees were to be identified with the rabbinic movement in Judea. And we have seen that scholarship on early rabbinism has denied that it was exclusively Pharisaic. It is not so easy to dismiss Josephus's complaints about the Pharisees' great influence with the people. And the Gospels, from quite different perspectives, tend to agree about that influence.

3. New Testament Evidence.

J.W. Jewish Wars

Ant. Antiquities of the Jews

The NT authors use the Pharisees mainly as a negative foil for Jesus, but there are considerable differences among them. Paul is the only writer known to us who lived as a Pharisee (Phil 3:5), so we might hope to find traces of his Pharisaic past in what he writes as a Christian—for example, in his apocalyptic orientation toward the imminent end of this evil age. But because his writings are conditioned by his encounter with the risen Christ and he dismisses his Pharisaic past as “dung” (Phil 3:8), it is hazardous to make inferences about Pharisaism from them. Paul’s expert biblical knowledge doubtless comes from his former life as a Pharisee; he cites allegiance to the Pharisees as if it were a token of superior legal training (Phil 3:5). Since other sources include belief in resurrection or some sort of afterlife and spiritual powers among Pharisaic beliefs, these features of Paul’s worldview probably also continue from his past as a Pharisee.

Of the Gospels, Mark and John portray the Pharisees as key elements of the cosmic battle between Jesus and the evil spirits. Lumped together in a scarcely differentiated Jewish leadership, they are presented as hostile to Jesus from the outset and in league with the devil (Mk 3:6, 19–30; Jn 8:13, 22, 44). For historical purposes it is noteworthy that the Pharisees appear in both texts as the most prominent Jewish group in Jesus’ environment. And Mark, among the minor distinctions that it retains, shows them as preoccupied with issues of purity, tithing and legal interpretation (Mk 2:1–3:6). This Gospel also attributes to them a special extrabiblical tradition that Jesus denounces as a merely human accretion to the divine law (Mk 7:5–8).

Matthew often couples the Pharisees with the Sadducees, even with the chief priests, to portray them all as the leadership of old Israel (Mt 3:7; 16:1, 6), the ones from whom the kingdom will be taken away (Mt 8:12; 21:43–45). His linking of the Pharisees and Sadducees as partners is historically problematic in view of what other sources say about the typical hostility and class differences between these two groups (Josephus *Ant.* 13.10.6 §298; Acts 23:7–9). Within Matthew’s portrayal tensions remain, however, perhaps partly as a result of Matthew’s conflicting sources. The Pharisees are both “blind guides” whose teachings are harmful (Mt 15:14; 16:11–12) and those who “sit on Moses’ seat,” whose teachings should be observed even while their practices are eschewed (Mt 23:2–3). Matthew introduces specific remarks about the Pharisees’ wearing of phylacteries (small boxes containing Scripture portions, ancient examples of which have been found) and fringes (corner tassels on men’s shirts), and also about their concern for tithing (Mt 23:5, 23). Like Mark and John, this Gospel assumes their prominence in Galilean-Judean life.

So does Luke-Acts. Luke’s portrayal of the Pharisees recalls portraits of the Sophists in Hellenistic texts. They are the respected teachers of the common people who come out to scrutinize Jesus’ activities (Lk 5:17). Though sometimes critical of him, they nevertheless address him respectfully as a fellow teacher, regularly invite him to dinner and even try to help him when he is in trouble (Lk 7:36; 11:37; 13:31; 14:1; 19:39). Jesus is much more strident in his critique of them for typical sophists’ faults—allegedly for being money-hungry, complacent and ineffective in bringing about real change (Lk 11:39–44; 12:1; 16:14–15; 18:9–14). The Pharisees of Luke remain outside Jerusalem and so are sharply distinguished from the Sadducee-related temple authorities, who immediately plan to kill Jesus upon his arrival (Lk 20:47).

In Acts this openness continues at first, especially in the person of Gamaliel, an influential member of the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:33–39). But with the execution of Stephen, Acts presents a galvanizing Jewish opposition to the Christian “Path” (Acts 8:1–3). Some Pharisees convert, and they remain zealous for the precise observance of Torah (Acts 15:5). Acts claims that the Pharisees are the most scrupulously precise of the schools (Acts 22:3; 26:5). When he is brought before the Sanhedrin, Acts’ Paul is able to make clever use of the Pharisees’ famous opposition to the Sadducees on the issue of resurrection (and angels, the author notes) to deflect the charges against him.

4. Rabbinic Literature.

Rabbinic literature is complex and multilayered. It was written in Hebrew and Aramaic from the third to the sixth centuries A.D., in Galilee and Babylonia. Because this literature mentions among its founding figures some men who are elsewhere connected with the Pharisees, especially Hillel and Shammai, as well as the family of Gamaliel, scholars have traditionally more or less identified the Pharisees with the rabbis. Those who liked what they found in rabbinic literature saw the Pharisees as a progressive party committed to making the Torah practicable for everyone. Those who were baffled and alienated by rabbinic style

found support for their view of the Pharisees as petty legalists. Curiously, when these texts refer to a group called the *p^erûšîm* (Heb), more often than not the tone is unfavorable (e.g., *m. Soṭa*. 3:4); the rabbis do not call their own forebears *p^erûšîm*. Scholars disagree, also for linguistic reasons, on the extent to which these *p^erûšîm* should even be identified with the Pharisees (Gk *Pharisaioi*) of Josephus and the NT.

Neusner's work on the various rabbinic compositions pointed out that because each of these rabbinic texts had its particular historical context and reasons for being written and because it used highly stylized presentations of rabbinic opinion to support these aims, one could only distill information about the Pharisees before A.D. 70 by applying thoroughgoing suspicion and rigorous logic. In a monumental study, he distinguished layers of oral tradition going back to the first consolidation of a rabbinic group at Yavneh (Jamnia) after the Judean revolt. He argued that the few surviving traditions about likely Pharisees before A.D. 70 portray them as a small association concerned with applying priestly codes of purity to their own table fellowship. Neusner's more recent work on rabbinic literature has made it even more difficult to abstract reliable information about the first-century Pharisees from rabbinic literature; he focuses increasingly on the ways in which the aims of the final authors have decisively shaped those texts.

The general trend today is to see early rabbinic literature as the product of a small elite that gradually came to exert influence over larger circles of Jews toward the end of the second century A.D. That elite claimed notable Pharisees among its founders, but it also took over the role of temple-related teaching. It probably originated not simply among the Pharisees but in a coalition of priests, scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and others who survived the destruction of the temple. Rabbinic literature should no longer be used, therefore, as transparent evidence for the Pharisees.

5. Conclusion.

Reconstruction of the historical Pharisees turns mainly on the use of these three bodies of literature. The most vigorously contested issue concerns the degree and manner of the Pharisees' influence over the Judean-Galilean populace in the time of Jesus and Paul. But all three source collections, although they understand the Pharisees differently, support the conclusions that: they were a lay, not priestly, association who were thought to be expert in the laws; they were in a sociological sense brokers of power between the aristocracy and the masses; they promoted their special living tradition in addition to the biblical laws; they were interested in issues of ritual purity and tithing; and they believed in afterlife, judgment and a densely populated, organized spirit world.

Few critics today, however, would make the confident statements that characterized scholarship of a generation ago concerning the meaning of the Pharisees' name (separatists, the consecrated, Persians, specifiers), the date and circumstances of their origin (in Ezra's time, after the Maccabean revolt, from the Hasidim), the degree of their involvement with apocalypticism and their political platform. It is plausible that the Pharisees emerged from the turmoil following the Maccabean revolt, but no more can be said at this point.

2

3 · 撒都該人 SADDUCEES

The Sadducees were a group of Jews that arose sometime during the Maccabean period and disappeared sometime in the first two centuries of the common era. The Hebrew is *šadûqi'*, so that they have often been related to *šadoq*, David's high priest; however, there is little justification for this connection. Josephus and the rabbinic texts often place them in opposition to the Pharisees. We know relatively little about the Sadducees, and all of the documents we now have suggest that they were much less important than the Pharisees. However, because we do not have any Sadducean documents, all of our information comes from texts written by people

Heb Hebrew

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

Gk Greek

²Porter, S. E., & Evans, C. A. (2000). *Dictionary of New Testament background : A compendium of contemporary biblical scholarship* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

who were not Sadducees and some of whom actively opposed them. Josephus, the Gospels and Acts and the rabbinic texts provide our information about the Sadducees.

1. Beliefs
2. Place in Jewish Society
3. Exegetical Traditions

1. Beliefs.

Josephus identifies the Sadducees as one of the three varieties of Judaism that existed during the Maccabean period and enumerates their beliefs in four places (Josephus *J.W.* 2.8.14 §164; *Ant.* 13.5.9 §173; 13.10.6 §293; 18.1.4 §§16 – 17); however, not one element of the Sadducean system of beliefs so impressed Josephus or his source(s) that it immediately came to mind when he wrote about the Sadducees. Josephus tells us that the Sadducees (1) rejected the concept of fate and accepted the idea of free will, so that God could not be held responsible for evil, (2) did not believe that the soul exists after death and (3) did not believe that there were rewards and punishments after one died. Josephus also mentions that the Sadducees observed nothing apart from the law and that they considered it a virtue to dispute with their teachers. He further states that the Sadducees did not have the support of the masses, that they only enjoyed the “confidence of the wealthy” (Josephus *Ant.* 13.10.6 §297), and that only a few men of the “highest standing” know the Sadducean doctrines (Josephus *Ant.* 18.1.4 §17). He claims that the Sadducees were “boorish” (Josephus *J.W.* 2.8.14 §166) and “more heartless” than other Jews (*Ant.* 20.9.1 §199). He claims that the Sadducees frequently accepted Pharisaic doctrine. He names only one high priest, Ananas, as a Sadducee.

The NT considers the Sadducees’ rejection of resurrection as their primary characteristic, for the issue of resurrection was central to the early church. The Gospel of Mark does not place the Sadducees in opposition to the Pharisees, and Matthew often places them together as if they were two similar groups. Luke mentions the Sadducees only in his discussion of resurrection. John does not mention the Sadducees. Only in Acts do we find the two groups disagreeing; however, the disagreement centers only on the issue of resurrection. While some Sadducees seem to be attached to the temple, the NT does not equate them with the priests, or the priests with them.

The Mishnah contains several passages in which the Sadducees disagreed with the Pharisees, frequently over matters of purity: *Yadayim* 4:6, whether or not Scripture renders the hands unclean; whether or not the bones of an ass or the high priest are clean; *Yadayim* 4:7, whether or not certain types of water are unclean; *Parah* 3:7, the importance of the setting of the sun in rendering one clean; *Niddah* 4:2, the state of cleanness of Sadducean women. They also disputed some matters of civil law: *Yadayim* 3:7, whether or not a slave’s master is responsible for the damage caused by the slave and *Makkot* 1:6, whether or not a false witness is executed only when the one against whom he testified is executed. The Mishnah contains only one reference to a disagreement concerning a matter of holiday law: *Erubin* 6:1 suggests that the Sadducees hold their own views concerning the *erub*, the establishment of the sabbath limit. Tosefta records disputes only on matters of purity.

The early midrashim add some new information. *Sipre Numbers* 112 takes Numbers 15:31, “for he despised the word of Yahweh,” as a reference to the Sadducees; this is our earliest reference in the rabbinic texts to the position that some accepted that the Sadducees did not follow the Word of God. *Sipre Deuteronomy* 190 contains a story about a Sadducean high priest who did not burn the incense on the Day of Atonement in accordance with the sages’ rules.

The Babylonian Talmud contains a number of references to the Sadducees; however, the medieval censors often replaced the words “Gentiles” and “heretics” with “Sadducees.” The following are those passages

J.W. Jewish Wars

Ant. Antiquities of the Jews

NT New Testament

in which the reference to the Sadducees is not suspect. (*Erubin* 68b concludes that the Sadducees should be equated with Gentiles in matters of the sabbath limit, for neither know rabbinic law. *B. Yoma* 19b informs us that the Sadducean high priests who offered incense on the Day of Atonement were afraid of the Pharisees and generally followed the rulings of the latter. The high priest who ignored Pharisaic tradition when he offered the incense soon died.

B. Niddah 33b informs us that if the attitude of a Sadducean woman is unknown, she is considered to have followed the rules concerning her menstrual period to which all other Israelite women adhere, that is, the Pharisaic/rabbinic injunctions. The Sadducean view concerning the importance of the sun's setting in matters of cleanness is discussed on *b. Yoma* 2b, *b. Hagiga* 23a and *b. Zebahim* 21a.

On *b. Yoma* 4a the Sadducees are excluded from the "students of the sages" and "the students of Moses." *b. Hagiga* 16b and *b. Makkot* 8b refer to the matter of the execution of the false witness. On *b. Baba Batra* 1 15b we learn that the Sadducees and the Pharisees disagreed concerning a daughter's right of inheritance in certain circumstances. On *b. Sanhedrin* 52b, R. Joseph, a third-generation Babylonian Amora, refers to a Sadducean court; however, he had no firsthand knowledge of the court system in the first century. *B. Menahot* 65a tells us that the Sadducees believed that individuals, and not the community, should pay for the daily offering. *B. Horayot* 4a and *b. Sanhedrin* 33b discuss a court that incorrectly ruled according to Sadducean law.

B. Sanhedrin 90b refers to the Sadducees' rejection of resurrection. The Palestinian Talmud does not add any new information, except that a Boethusian high priest lights the incense incorrectly.

The *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan* version A, 5 states that Antigonus of Soko had two disciples who "arose and withdrew from the Torah" forming two groups: the Sadducees and the Boethusians. The Sadducees derive their name from Zadok, one of the disciples, and the Boethusians take their name from Boethus, the other disciple. The split was over the issue of resurrection. We are further told that "they," the Boethusians and/or Sadducees, used silver and gold vessels not because they were ostentatious, but because it was Pharisaic tradition to inflict themselves in this world, hoping to receive a reward in the world to come. *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan* version B contains a shorter version and omits the reference to the gold and silver vessels.

2. Place in Jewish Society.

Based on Josephus' remarks with a slight nod to the *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, scholars have often claimed that the Sadducees were the priestly aristocracy of Jewish society; however, Josephus named only one Sadducean priest, and the rabbinic texts know many priests who were Pharisees. Also, the NT sometimes connects Sadducees with the temple, at times implies that the Pharisees acted in concord with the priests and also indicates that the priests acted on their own. Josephus alone argues that the Sadducees influenced the aristocracy, although he pictures the Pharisees as politically influential at times. But this is as much to underscore the support that the Pharisees have with the populace as to provide us information about the Sadducees.

Scholars have made a good deal about the opposition between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; however, the disputes are few and limited to minute details of law. We have no information about the matters they agreed upon, which given what we have must have been extensive. The Gospel writers do not draw clear and consistent distinctions between the two groups, which suggests that from the outside they must have looked similar. The earliest rabbinic texts suggest that the groups differed over small details of purity law, civil law and sabbath law. The further removed in time we get from the first century, the more extensively these disputes are detailed. Newly published materials from Qumran have brought to light a few parallels between the legal positions at Qumran and those assigned to the Sadducees in the rabbinic documents. But one cannot claim a clear relationship between Qumran and the Sadducees or even that both reflect priestly law.

3. Exegetical Traditions.

Following Josephus, many have argued that the Sadducees were biblical literalists, but we have no evidence for that other than Josephus' s claim that they held that resurrection was not a biblical concept. The few exegetical comments assigned to them do not make them biblical literalists; but again, we have little evidence about them. While one may claim that they rejected the Pharisaic or some of the Pharisaic scriptural interpretations and legal exegeses, one must also assume that like those at Qumran, the Pharisees and the early Christians, the Sadducees had their own exegetical traditions, some of which probably deviated quite a bit from the literal meaning of the biblical text, as did many of the exegetical remarks of all of the other Jews from whom we have information (*see* Biblical Interpretation, Jewish).

3

4 · 希律黨人 HERODIANS

The Herodians were influential persons who were partisans of the Herodian dynasty. They are mentioned three times in the NT, dealing with two incidents where they joined with the Pharisees in their opposition to Jesus. The first incident took place in Galilee immediately after Jesus healed the man with the withered hand, and the Herodians and the Pharisees sought to destroy Jesus (Mk 3:6). The second episode was in Jerusalem when the Pharisees and the Herodians tried to incriminate Jesus regarding the lawfulness of paying taxes to Caesar (Mt 22:16 Mk 12:13). The Herodians are not mentioned in Luke or John.

The origin of the name has been debated. Some think that the ending of their name reflects the Latin suffix *-ianus* which is appended to adjectives, thus making it a substantive meaning that they were of the household of Herod, that is, domestic servants. Others think that it is a Greek suffix meaning that they were officers or agents of Herod. However, in the Gospel narratives they are not portrayed as either domestic servants or officers of Herod but as influential people whose outlook was friendly to the Herodian rule and consequently to the Roman rule upon which it rested.

The issue comes to the forefront in Mark 8:15 and Matthew 16:6 where in Mark we read of the “leaven of Herod” and the Matthean parallel refers to the “leaven of the Sadducees.” This problem becomes more critical if the secondary Markan reading, “leaven of the Herodians” ($\rho^{\delta 5}, \theta \mathbf{F}^{1,13}$), is the correct one. The problem with this passage is not the interpretation but the question of whether the Sadducees and the Herod(ians) are the same? At first this seems impossible because Herod the Great tried to discredit the Hasmonean house. Furthermore, he and his grandson Agrippa I never selected a high priest from among the Sadducees, who were pro-Hasmonean, but rather from the house of Boethus. However, a reversal of this policy occurred between Herod' s son Archelaus' s deposition in A.D. 6 and Agrippa I' s acquisition of Judea in A.D. 41. At that time most of the high priests came from the Sadducean house of Annas because the province of Judea was not under Herod' s rule but under direct Roman rule of the prefects. It seems probable, then, that the Boethusians, being pro-Herodian, were really the Herodians and the Sadducees were pro-Hasmonean. Actually, later rabbinic sources used the Boethusian name interchangeably with that of the Sadducees (*Menah* 10.3). It may well be that the Sadducees and the Herodians would have been close if not identical religiously and economically. Thus, the Herodians were politically affiliated with the Herodian house, but they were religiously and economically affiliated with the Sadducees. However, the political distinctions between the Sadducees and Herodians were blurred with the marriage of Herod Antipas and Herodias (a Hasmonean on her mother' s side). It could be that Herod Antipas married Herodias to gain Sadducean support. Hence, the Herodians and the Sadducees would have been on the same side politically against the Pharisees, the Herodians being pro-Herodian government while the Pharisees were both anti-Hasmonean and anti-Herodian. This is borne out in Mark 8:15 and Matthew 16:6, 12 where the Pharisees and the Sadducees/Herodians are contrary parties opposing Jesus.

³Porter, S. E., & Evans, C. A. (2000). *Dictionary of New Testament background : A compendium of contemporary biblical scholarship* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

In summary, the Herodians were theologically in agreement with the Sadducees and politically both of these parties would have been the opposite of the Pharisees who were anti-Hasmonean, anti-Herodian and anti-Roman. The Pharisees looked for a cataclysmic messianic kingdom to remove the rule of the Herods and Rome, whereas the Herodians wanted to preserve the Herodian rule. However, the Herodians and the Pharisees worked together to oppose Jesus, because he was introducing a new kingdom (*see* Kingdom of God) that neither wanted.

4

5 · 安息日 SABBATH

The English “sabbath,” like the Greek *sabbaton*, is a transliteration of the Hebrew *šabbāt*. The term designates the seventh day of the Jewish week, a day marked by the cessation of work and by religious and ceremonial observances. All four Gospels depict Jesus in conflict with his contemporaries on matters of sabbath observance. The traditions, rooted in Jesus’ ministry, are used to accentuate themes central to each Evangelist.

1. Sabbath Law
2. Sabbath in the Gospels
3. Sabbath in Acts and the Epistles

1. Sabbath Law.

A prohibition of work on the sabbath is found in the Decalogue (Ex 20:8–11; Deut 5:12–15) and several other OT texts (e.g., Ex 31:12–17; 35:2), and its transgression is treated in the law codes as a capital offense (Ex 31:14–15; 35:2; cf. Num 15:32–36). Different motivations for the interruption of normal activities on the seventh day are given. The Israelite community was to be allowed to rest (the emphasis of Deut 5:12–15; cf. Ex 23:12); but the day was also to be considered holy (Ex 20:8; Deut 5:12), a portion of the Israelites’ time which was consecrated to Yahweh (Ex 20:10; 35:2) just as the tithes of their produce was to be reserved for him. Israel’s observance of the sabbath was to be a sign of its special covenantal relationship with Yahweh (Ex 31:12–17; Ezek 20:12, 20), an imitation of God’s own rest after the completion of his creative work (Gen 2:2–3; Ex 20:11) and a reminder of the relief God granted his people in delivering them from slavery in Egypt (Deut 5:15). Those whose vision failed to extend beyond their pursuit of business naturally found the interruption an irritation to be evaded (Amos 8:5; cf. Jer 17:19–27; Neh 13:15–22). For Yahweh’s faithful, however, the day’s observance was a delight (Is 58:13–14).

In the Second Temple period (515 B.C.–A.D. 70) the words of Scripture became the object of interpretation by legal experts (*see* Scribes). Their goal was to spell out the duties of God’s people by defining the terms and limits of God’s revealed commands. The sabbath provided a significant challenge since, from this point of view, the faithful needed to know precisely what constituted the “work” which was to be avoided if the command was not to be transgressed. Lists were drawn up (*Jub.* 2:29–30; 50:6–13; CD 10:14–11:18). Scripture itself provided some guidelines. Fires were not to be lit (Ex 35:3). Burdens were not to be carried (Jer 17:21–22), though from this point of view the term “burden” now needed legal definition. Similarly, a general prohibition of travel could be derived from Isaiah 58:13 (and see Ex 16:29). When such a prohibition took on the force of a legal statute, it became necessary to define the limits of a legitimate journey (cf. a “sabbath day’s journey,” Acts 1:12). That sowing and reaping are forbidden could be based on Exodus 34:21 (cf. Ex 16:25–30).

Further problems arose when the prohibition of work on the sabbath was perceived to conflict with

⁴Green, J. B., McKnight, S., & Marshall, I. H. (1992). *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (317). Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

OT Old Testament

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

cf. *confer*, compare

c. circa, about (with dates); column

Jub. Jubilees

CD Cairo (Genizah text of the) *Damascus Document/Rule*

other commands or with considerations of practicality or prudence. The principle that the prohibition may be disregarded when human life is in danger became well established (see 1 Macc 2:29–41). The service of the temple was conceded to take precedence over the sabbath (cf. Num 28:9–10; 1 Chron 23:31), as was circumcision. The extent to which considerations of practicality were allowed to influence sabbath regulations varied considerably with different interpreters. [S. Westerholm]

Sabbath law was interpreted very strictly at Qumran. According to the *Damascus Document* (esp. CD 10:14–11:18), prohibitions included walking further than 1,000 cubits (CD 10:21), wearing perfume (CD 11:9–10), lifting a stone or dust at home (CD 11:10–11), aiding an animal in giving birth (CD 11:13) or lifting an animal that has fallen into a pit (CD 11:13–14). On this latter point, compare Jesus' remark in Luke 14:5. The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* from Masada and from Qumran's Cave 4 present heaven itself and its angelic liturgies in a sabbath framework. The *Temple Scroll* (11Q19) adds several interesting features pertaining to sabbath law and calendar. [C. A. Evans]

Jewish observance of the sabbath was well known and distinctive in the ancient world. It called forth both admiration (Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.39 §282; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.21) and scorn (Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.2 §20–21) from outsiders and led, for example, to the excusal of Jews from service in foreign military forces (Jews would neither march forbidden lengths nor carry arms on the sabbath; see Josephus *Ant.* 14.10.12 §226–27). With laws whose scriptural background seemed clear, and with customs long and widely established, many Jews could be expected to comply. It can also be seen, however, that questions of proper observance were often a matter of interpretation. The various religious parties of Jesus' day not infrequently differed in their practice. And though each group doubtless pressed on others the claims of its interpretation to represent the will of heaven, such claims in our period were terrestrially unenforceable.

Positively, Jews met in synagogues on the sabbath day for prayer, Scripture readings and edifying discourses. The welter of prohibitions may strike the outsider, and surely struck the half-hearted, as a burden grievous to be borne; still, it should not be doubted that faithful Jews continued to find in their observance an occasion for joy.

2. Sabbath in the Gospels.

2.1. Mark. Jesus is said to have participated in synagogue services on the sabbath in Mark 1:21; 3:1 and 6:2. Instances of sabbath observance may be noted in Mark 1:32 (the people wait until sabbath is over to carry the sick to Jesus) and Mark 16:1 (the women wait until sabbath has passed before attending to the body of Jesus). Interestingly, Mark connects no queries with the sabbath healings reported in Mark 1:21–28 and 29–31. In the latter case, Jesus is depicted among friends; in the former, he is in the synagogue. That not every record of a sabbath healing is linked with a dispute suggests that Jesus' activities were not in flagrant transgression of existing formulations of sabbath law and that, perhaps in the initial stages of his career, public enthusiasm may have silenced whatever private compunctions may have been felt. That objections are recorded on other occasions suggests that healing was liable to be construed as work and that in the absence of a life-threatening situation the scrupulous might well find cause for offense.

The issue in Mark 2:23–28 appears more clear-cut. Though gleaning in the fields of another was expressly permitted by pentateuchal law (Lev 19:9–10; 23:22), such activity on the sabbath breached the prohibition of sabbath reaping. Since the prohibition has a scriptural base (Ex 34:21; cf. 16:25–29), it is hazardous to apply the claim here that Jesus merely challenges scribal additions while conforming to scriptural commands. Nor does the defense of the disciples' activity in Mark 2:25–28 follow that tack (David's transgression, cited as a precedent, was clearly of pentateuchal law). Rather a precedent is cited from Scripture (1 Sam 21:1–6) for activity which, on the strict application of scriptural commands, was "not lawful."

The force of the illustration has been differently construed. (1) Some see the point of the comparison in the hunger felt by both Jesus' followers and those of David. The point would then be that, though the

esp. especially

Ag. Ap. Against Apion

Vit. Mos. De Vita Mosis

Ant. Antiquities of the Jews

sabbath prohibitions insisted on by Jesus' opponents are valid in principle, they must yield to the higher claims of human need. But Mark makes no mention of the disciples' hunger, as he would surely have done if hunger had been the crux of the defense. Nothing suggests that their need was so extreme as to legitimate the transgression of the law. And indeed the unlawfulness of what David did is explicitly mentioned (Mk 2:26) in the defense of the disciples' activity. The point can hardly be that when the extenuating circumstances are taken into account, nothing unlawful has been done.

(2) Others note that the illustration records the behavior of David and suggest that Jesus is tacitly claiming a similar right as David's son, the Messiah, to somehow transcend the law. But the necessary implication of this view is that David was entitled by his calling or office to transgress divine commands applicable to other people, a point which neither scriptural law nor its later interpreters would concede.

(3) Most likely is the view that the example illustrates how Scripture itself countenances the breaking of the law strictly construed and thus calls in question the facile identification of God's will with a rigid interpretation of the terms of the law. Verse 27 (perhaps an independent logion introduced here because it was felt appropriate; so at least the new introduction and the absence of the logion from the parallels in Matthew and Luke may suggest) can be construed as advancing the previous argument on either the first or third reading given above. The divine origin of the sabbath is granted on either reading. Following interpretation (1) above, the logion represents a fresh insistence that humanitarian concerns must take priority over sabbath commands. In the case of the third interpretation proposed above, the point would now be that God's design in giving the sabbath for his people's good is overthrown when human behavior is subjected to rules developed in the casuistic interpretation of the law.

Finally, Mark 2:28 clearly and remarkably insists on Jesus' superiority as Son of Man over the sabbath law. It is not evident whether the verse is intended to represent a claim on Jesus' own lips or one added by the Christian community as a commentary on the preceding episode.

According to Mark 3:1–6 a healing performed by Jesus on the sabbath was found objectionable and occasioned the plotting of Pharisees and Herodians (*see Herodian Dynasty*) against his life. For his part Jesus is said to be grieved by the attitude of those more concerned with the niceties of the law than with the well-being of a person (Mk 3:5). The defense of Jesus' activity given in Mark 3:4 is striking. No attempt is made to show that the healing does not overstep the command prohibiting "work." The interpretation of the terms of the command, by which the legal experts of contemporary Judaism defined the divine will, is not here an issue. Rather, the Markan Jesus insists that God can hardly be offended or his will transgressed by the doing of good and the restoring of health on the sabbath (regardless, apparently, of whether or not the deed may be construed as "work"). God's will is rather disobeyed when evil is done or life "killed." It is debated whether the "evil" intended is that of leaving unperformed the miracle of healing or the active plotting against Jesus' life in which, according to the pericope, his opponents were involved on the sabbath.

It seems unlikely that sabbath observance was a significant issue for the Second Evangelist or the community for which he wrote. The two relevant episodes do not appear to focus on the community's need of either guidance or a defense for its sabbath behavior. Rather, the first incident celebrates the authority of the community's Lord over the institutions of Israel's law; the second is clearly meant to account for the hostility which Jesus' ministry aroused.

2.2. Matthew. For Matthew and his community, on the other hand, proper sabbath observance may well have remained an issue. Admittedly, the prayer in Matthew 24:20 (that the community's flight might not occur on the sabbath) does not point unambiguously in that direction. Even a Christian congregation not observing the sabbath would be exposed to hardship and danger if its people attempted to flee on that day in a Jewish environment. Nor does Matthew's Gospel preserve instances of sabbath conflict or discussions of proper sabbath behavior not found in Mark. But the parallels to Mark 2:23–28 and 3:1–6 in Matthew 12:1–14 show differences designed apparently to show that the sabbath command, when properly interpreted, had not been transgressed. Its continuing relevance may therefore be implied.

Perhaps the explicit reference to the hunger of Jesus' disciples (Mt 12:1) is intended to provide a humanitarian legitimation for their behavior. Matthew 12:5 adds an illustration from the Torah (cf. Num 28:9–10) by which priests violate the sabbath law without incurring guilt. Verse 6 then at least claims that the coming of the kingdom ("something greater than the temple") in the person of Jesus causes the sabbath

laws to pale in significance. But perhaps the legal argument is implied that the activity of those in the service of the kingdom, like that of priests in the temple, takes precedence over sabbath laws. In verse 7 a favorite Matthean OT citation (Hos 6:6) is repeated, indicating that sabbath laws are to be interpreted in such a way that divine mercy is emphasized rather than strict conformity with ritual prescriptions.

In the second pericope (Mt 12:9–14) verse 12 preserves but a fragment of the argument of Mark 3:4. The main emphasis in the Matthean account falls rather on a logion shared with Luke (Lk 14:5) which Matthew introduces here. Though the stricter construction of the law forbade the drawing up on the sabbath of an animal from a pit (CD 11:13–14; *t. Sabb.* 14:3), the logion assumes that in ordinary practice compassion prevailed and assistance was given. This being the case, no objection should be raised when a human being (who is, after all, worth far more than a sheep) is healed on the holy day. Proper sabbath observance does seem here to be a concern, but priority is given to claims of compassion over strict adherence to sabbath rules.

2.3. Luke. In the two conflict pericopes common to the three Synoptic Gospels, Luke (Lk 6:1–5, 6–11) follows Mark quite closely without the Matthean additions. But two new instances of controversy arising from sabbath healings are recorded. In Luke 13:10–17 the ruler of the synagogue objects to the healing of a woman with a chronic deformity. Work is allowed, he says, on six days of the week, and healings are then in order. There is therefore no need to desecrate the sabbath with such activity. The Lukan Jesus finds the objection hypocritical, noting that domestic animals are commonly “unbound” and led to water on the sabbath. Far more justified, surely, is the “unbinding” of a daughter of Abraham from a satanic affliction. Jesus’ opponents are said to have been shamed by the response and the crowd delighted by the whole episode. In Luke 14:1–6 a variant of the argument presented in Matthew 12:11–12 is presented and leaves potential objectors speechless. The sabbath discussions in Luke seem designed to show compassion on the part of Jesus, the ready acceptance it meets from the crowds and the speechless shame to which opponents are reduced.

2.4. John. Johannine irony is undoubtedly to be seen in John 19:31 (cf. Jn 18:28), where punctilious sabbath observance is grimly juxtaposed with the crucifixion of God’s Son. Sabbath healings lead to disputes in John 5 and 9; the former is recalled in John 7:22–23. In no case does the Evangelist evince a concern for guiding the sabbath behavior of his readers. In John 5 offense is first raised when, at Jesus’ command, a pallet is carried on the sabbath (Jn 5:10) and exacerbated when it is learned that Jesus has healed on that day (Jn 5:15–16). Remarkably, the Johannine Jesus concedes that he “works” on the sabbath (Jn 5:17)—precisely what the law prohibits—but claims that he is merely acting as God his Father does. The charge that Jesus breaks the sabbath is thus conceded (Jn 5:18), but the interest of the Evangelist is rather on the christological claim to which it leads.

In John 7:22–23 the unreasonableness of Jesus’ opponents seems the point: they permit sabbath circumcision but object to the restoration of a man’s health. Similarly, in John 9 the sabbath healing gives the Evangelist the opportunity to show Jesus’ opponents as blind to the manifest workings of God in their midst (Jn 9:30–33), a blindness induced by their insistence that a divine representative must conform to the niceties of the old code (Jn 9:16). The memory of sabbath disputes aroused by Jesus is preserved in John, but it becomes the starting point for the pursuit of favorite Johannine themes: the divine sonship of Jesus and the necessity of faith in him.

2.5 Conclusion. As we have seen, sabbath controversies are found in Mark (Mk 2:23–28; 3:1–6), in material common to Matthew and Luke (Mt 12:11–12 par. Lk 14:5), in material unique to Matthew (Mt 12:5–7) and Luke (Lk 13:10–17; the incident of Lk 14:1–6), and in John (Jn 5; 7:22–23; 9). Furthermore, the authenticity of crucial logia (Mk 2:27; 3:4, etc.) is widely conceded. At the roots of the Gospel tradition, then, are memories of opposition to Jesus’ sabbath behavior aroused among his contemporaries.

Opponents saw the divine will as requiring conformity with the terms of Torah’s statutes as interpreted by legal authorities. Hence activities which could be construed as the “work” which Torah forbade were to be avoided unless extenuating circumstances (as defined by the legal experts) could be found to legitimate the activity. Jesus’ behavior (and, according to one story, that of his disciples) was found to violate this stricture. The basic line of Jesus’ defense as portrayed in the Gospels shows a different approach to the

understanding of the divine will. No more than Jesus allows the terminology of Deuteronomy 24:1–4 to define the propriety of divorce (Mk 10:1–12) or the terminology of scriptural law to define norms for oaths (Mt 5:33–36), does he allow that the divine will for the sabbath rests in the proper interpretation of the word “work.” When opposed he does not reply by arguing that, counter to his opponents’ claims, “work” has not been done nor the command transgressed. He insists that doing “good” can never be wrong on the sabbath (Mk 3:4—a criterion quite different from the question whether or not “work” has been done), that compassion is a better guide to proper behavior than rules defined by legal experts (Mt 12:10–11), that God’s intentions with the sabbath are distorted when humans are subjected to a rigid code (Mk 2:27). Implicit in each case, and explicit at various points in the Gospel narrative, is the claim that Jesus has authority to interpret the divine will.

Only for Matthew is it likely that proper sabbath observance remained an issue. Only in this Gospel is it likely that the relevant pericopes were intended to provide guidance in the matter. In the other Gospels the traditional material serves other ends. Sabbath discussions provide the opportunity to highlight Jesus’ authority, his compassion and the nature of his opposition. [S. Westerholm]

3. Sabbath in Acts and the Epistles.

3.1. Sabbath in Acts. Christian observance of the sabbath is presupposed in the book of Acts. Paul is portrayed as routinely entering synagogues on the sabbath, in order to preach the Christian gospel (e.g., Acts 13:14, 42, 44; 17:2 [“as was his custom”]; 18:4). There is no direct evidence that the sabbath had been abrogated by early Christians (Turner, 135–37), though the gathering “on the first day of the week” (Acts 20:7–12) may suggest that Christians had begun gathering on Sunday, in addition to attendance of the synagogue on Saturdays.

3.2. Sabbath in the Epistles. There are very few references to the sabbath in the NT epistles.

3.2.1. Paul. In Colossians 2:16 Paul urges his readers not to allow themselves to be judged “in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a sabbath” (RSV). The meaning of this verse is disputed; it does not necessarily teach that Christians should not assemble on the sabbath.

In 1 Corinthians 16:2, Paul commands the Christians of Corinth, “On the first day of every week [*mian sabbatou*], each of you is to put something aside and store it up, as he may prosper, so that contributions need not be made when I come” (RSV). This passage may presuppose Christian assembly on Sunday (as possibly in Acts 20:7–12), but it is not clear that assembly is in fact in view. In any case, nothing is said directly concerning observance of the sabbath.

3.2.2 Hebrews. The author of Hebrews admonishes Jewish Christians to enter God’s “rest” (Heb 3–4). The author infers from Scripture and Israel’s history that “there remains a sabbath rest [*sabbatismos*] for the people of God” (Heb 4:9). The reference here is not to weekly sabbaths or to any particular holy day, but to the eschatological fulfillment of God’s will. At this time all believers will enter God’s rest, or sabbath. [C. A. Evans]

5

6 · 神子 SON OF GOD

This is arguably the most significant christological title in the NT. “Son of God” or its equivalents (“the Son,” “my Son,” etc.) occur more than 124 times in the NT, and may be the foremost **christological** category in each of the Gospels. The NT characteristically describes Jesus’ relationship to God in terms of **divine sonship**. The concept itself carries a variety of meanings, including **commissioning to special work, obedience, intimate fellowship, knowledge, likeness and the receiving of blessings and gifts.**

1. Divine Sonship in the OT, Judaism and Hellenism
2. Divine Sonship in the Life and Ministry of the Historical Jesus
3. Divine Sonship in the Christology of the Gospels

NT New Testament

⁵Porter, S. E., & Evans, C. A. (2000). *Dictionary of New Testament background : A compendium of contemporary biblical scholarship* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

1. Divine Sonship in the OT, Judaism and Hellenism.

The notion of divine sonship appears in the OT with regard to three persons or groups of persons: *angels* (Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; Dan 3:25), *Israel* (Ex 4:22 – 23; Hos 11:1; Mal 2:10) and the *king* (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 89:26 – 27). When used of Israel and the king sonship emphasizes belonging in a special way to God, election to perform the service of God (i.e., to obey God) and the experience of God’s love, mercy, protection and gifts.

Although there are relatively few OT references to the king as son of God, this usage stands closer to the meaning of the title in the NT than do references to angels or even to the people as a whole. There are two emphases in the divine sonship of the king which set it apart from the sonship of the people. First, the king in his capacity as son of God exercises authority over both the people of Israel and the nations (see esp. Ps 2). Second, the divine sonship of the king has its basis in the covenant God made with David in 2 Samuel 7:4 – 17 (cf. Ps 89:19 – 45), thereby (1) restricting royal divine sonship to descendants of David, (2) laying the foundation for relating the concepts of Son of David and Son of God, and (3) infusing the notion of royal Son of God with the ideas of immutable divine promise, decree and covenant.

It is clear that the OT does not speak explicitly of the Messiah or of a specifically messianic figure as Son of God. This seems generally to be the case in post-biblical Palestinian Judaism as well. The expression refers to angels (*1 Enoch* 69:4 – 5; 71:1; *Jub* 1:24 – 25) and miracle workers (esp. Honi the circle-drawer [*b. Ta’an.* 24b; *b. Ber.* 17b; *b. hul.* 86a] and Hanina ben Dosa [*m. Ta’an.* 3:8]; see Vermes), but many passages that once were cited as evidence for the messianic use of Son of God have been discounted as later interpolations or mistranslations of the word for “servant.”

There are three passages in the literature from Qumran (see Dead Sea Scrolls), however, which may connect the idea of Son of God to the Messiah: 4QFlor 1:10 – 14 applies 2 Samuel 7:11 – 14 to the Messiah; 1QSa 2:11 – 12 could be read in terms of God begetting the Messiah; and 4QpsDan A^a (=4Q246) is reported to read “he shall be hailed as the Son of God, and they shall call him Son of the most High” (Fitzmyer). In spite of the sparsity of references which relate the Messiah to divine sonship, the observations that (1) messianic hope in the period was almost always linked to an ideal Davidic king (who in the OT is described as Son of God) and (2) some NT statements seem to assume a connection between Messiah and Son of God (e.g., Mk 14:61; Mt 16:16) suggest that the Messiah as Son of God was not totally foreign to Palestinian Judaism. Yet the Messiah was not understood primarily in terms of Son of God.

The consideration that Son of God was not a typical messianic designation in Palestinian Judaism and that Hellenism was acquainted with descriptions of heroes, philosophers, rulers and miracle workers who were designated sons of god has led many historians to argue for the Hellenistic origin of the title as applied to Jesus. These historians claim that Hellenistic Christians were responsible for the confession of Jesus’ divine sonship, and that they understood Jesus to be Son of God along the lines of the “divine man” (*theios anēr*; see Divine Man/Theios Aner), a heroic miracle-worker. This understanding of the origin of the title in christology is today generally rejected, since (1) the Hellenistic concept stands in tension with the NT emphasis on the uniqueness of

1 Enoch Ethiopic *Enoch*

Jub *Jubilees*

b. Babylonian Talmud

Ta’an. *Ta’anit*

Ber. *Berakot*

hul. *Hullin*

m. Mishna

4QFlor *Florilegium* or *Eschatological Midrashim* from Qumran Cave 4

1QSa Appendix A, *Messianic Rule*, to 1QS from Qumran Cave 1

4Q246 (see 4QPs DanA^a)

Jesus' divine sonship as well as with the NT insistence that the divine sonship of Jesus involves primarily suffering and death (*see* Death of Jesus) rather than the performance of miracles (*see* Miracles, Miracle Stories); (2) the notion of "divine man" was not as pervasive or uniform as once thought; and (3) there is no explicit connection in Hellenistic sources between "divine man" and persons held to be "sons of the gods." It is thus preferable to look to the OT and Palestinian Judaism for the religious background to the divine sonship of Jesus.

2. Divine Sonship in the Life and Ministry of the Historical Jesus.

The issue of divine sonship in the thinking and ministry of the historical Jesus revolves around two questions: Did Jesus consider himself to be the Son of God; and if so, how did he understand this role?

2.1. Did Jesus Consider Himself to Be the Son of God? According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus understood himself and his mission according to divine sonship and clearly implied that he was the Son of God. Yet there are two sets of data that may challenge the historicity of the Gospel accounts at this point.

The first challenge comes from the almost total absence in literature from Palestinian Judaism of a connection between messianic expectations and the title Son of God. This observation has led to the conclusion that neither Jesus nor his contemporaries would have thought of the Messiah in terms of Son of God, and that the christological confession of divine sonship must have arisen with the Hellenistic church, which was responsible for introducing its confession into the traditions of Jesus' earthly ministry. But we noted above that although specific references are few, there is reason to believe that the Messiah was in fact sometimes understood in terms of divine sonship.

The second challenge involves statements in the NT which may be understood as linking the divine sonship of Jesus to his resurrection/exaltation, thereby suggesting that Jesus became Son of God at that point (*esp.* Acts 13:33; Rom 1:3 – 4). Many scholars have argued that this was the original understanding of the divine sonship of Jesus and that the early church gradually pushed the inauguration of Jesus' status as Son of God back to the Transfiguration, then to the baptism and finally to either virginal conception (*see* Birth of Jesus) or pre-existence (*see* Logos).

Virtually everyone agrees that Romans 1:3 – 4 reflects an early creed that Paul has included in order to establish a point of theological contact between himself and his Roman readers. It is often claimed, furthermore, that the pre-Pauline formula lacked the phrase "in power," and thus signified that Jesus became Son of God at the resurrection. By adding this phrase Paul has transformed the meaning of the statement so as to imply that Jesus had been Son of God all along, and that at the resurrection he became Son in a new sense. But some scholars (e.g., Dunn) have argued that "in power" may have been part of the pre-Pauline formula. Moreover, even if the original formula lacked this phrase, it is possible to construe *oristhentos* of verse 4 as "designated" (so RSV) rather than "appointed," thus indicating that in the resurrection God declared Jesus to be what he had been during his earthly ministry. But ultimately the interpretation of this verse turns on prior decisions regarding the connection of Messiah with the Son title in earliest Christianity. Those who deny such a connection see a dichotomy between the earthly Jesus as Son of David and his post-resurrection status as Son of God, while those who affirm the connection between Son and Messiah argue that Davidic sonship implies divine sonship.

Acts 13:33 represents a similarly ambiguous case. On the surface this quotation from Psalm 2:7 seems to intimate that Jesus was "begotten" as Son of God at the resurrection. But it is possible to maintain with Marshall that both the flow of thought in Paul's sermon and the analogy with Wisdom 2:13 – 18 indicate that Psalm 2:7 was employed not to establish Jesus' divine sonship on the basis of his resurrection, but rather to prove that in the resurrection God confirmed the righteousness (*see* Justice, Righteousness) of his obedient Son. Thus, the passage links sonship to the obedience of the earthly Jesus and not to the event of the resurrection. We

conclude, then, that there is no firm evidence in the NT for the view that Jesus entered into his role as Son of God at the resurrection.

Virtually all critics agree that Jesus addressed God as *Abba*, “Father,” and typically referred to God by this designation when teaching his disciples. These phenomena are firmly embedded in the earliest strata of Gospel tradition, and throughout the Synoptic Gospels it is almost exclusively the way Jesus speaks of God and his relationship to God. This does not necessarily imply, however, that every reference to “Father” in our Gospels was spoken by the historical Jesus; the wide disparity in the number of occurrences in the four Gospels suggests that at points the Evangelists may have inserted the designation into traditions they inherited.

Scholarly debate has focused on those passages in which Jesus refers to himself as the Son. A strong claim for authenticity can be made especially for Mark 13:32; 12:6; and Matthew 11:27/Luke 10:22. In the case of Mark 13:32 it is unlikely that the early church would have created a saying which asserted the ignorance of Jesus. The objections raised to the authenticity of the parable of the tenants (Mk 12:1 – 12) are not convincing. The fact that the parable contains some allegorical elements does not necessarily exclude it as coming from Jesus; and the argument that it contradicts Jesus’ reticence to speak publicly about his sonship fails to take seriously the oblique nature of this reference to the “son.” The reference to the “sending” of the son in this passage does not suggest pre-existence (as in Paul), but points rather to the calling, mission and eschatological significance of Jesus. A more difficult passage is Matthew 11:27/Luke 10:22 (*see* Wisdom). In the face of claims that this statement reflects a relatively late—even Johannine—christology, Jeremias has successively argued that its language, style and structure reflect Semitic usage and that the relationship between Father and Son found here accords with Jesus’ statements regarding the Father encountered throughout the Synoptic Gospels.

A focus on these three statements does not imply that other passages in which Jesus speaks of himself as the Son have no historical validity. Bauckham has argued for the historical value of many of the Son sayings in the Fourth Gospel, following Cullmann’s hypothesis that behind much of the sayings material in this Gospel stands independent tradition passed on by the “beloved disciple” and preserved by the Johannine circle. Nevertheless, the task of assessing the historical character of Johannine material is extremely complicated, and it is therefore preferable to concentrate on the earliest strands of the Synoptic tradition.

2.2. How Did Jesus Understand His Divine Sonship? An examination of the authentic sayings of Jesus regarding the “Father” and the “Son” reveals the following emphases.

2.2.1. Personal Intimacy with the Father. It points to intimate personal fellowship between Jesus and God. Jesus experienced this intimate fellowship especially through prayer, and consequently addressed God in prayer almost exclusively as “Father” (Aramaic *’Abba*; Mk 14:36; cf. Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6). Jeremias has argued that Jesus was apparently the first Jew to address God in prayer as *’Abba* (Jewish prayers typically used the obsolete and formalized Hebrew term *’Abi*), and that *’Abba* was a term of familiarity and intimacy, having originally developed from the speech of children (“daddy”). Subsequent scholarship has been unable to contradict the claim that this prayer language of *’Abba* was original with Jesus. Although Jeremias’ employment of etymological considerations is questionable (Barr), his distinction between formal prayer speech, which suggests distance, and the more colloquial expression used to address earthly fathers bears the weight of critical scrutiny.

Jesus’ use of *’Abba* prompts the question as to how and when Jesus came to understand himself and his messianic role in terms of this intimate filial relationship with God. The attempt to reconstruct Jesus’ messianic self-consciousness is notoriously difficult. Nevertheless, the tradition itself suggests that Jesus may have become conscious of his divine sonship at the point of his baptism. In the earliest form of the baptism account the divine voice addresses Jesus directly in the second person: “You are my beloved Son” (Mk 1:11). If this experience did not initiate Jesus’ Son-consciousness, it confirmed and informed it.

2.2.2. Obedience to the Will of God. This reference to the baptism leads to a second emphasis: Absolute obedience to the will of God understood in terms of the Suffering Servant (*see* Servant of Yahweh). The divine speech at the baptism accentuates obedience: “With you I am well pleased.” Moreover, the heavenly voice

alludes to Psalm 2:7 and Isaiah 42:1, thereby bringing together the concepts of divine sonship and the Servant of Yahweh. Thus, divine sonship is defined in terms of obedience, and obedience is described in terms of the image of the Servant. Although intertestamental Judaism sometimes connected the Messiah with the Servant of Yahweh, it failed to link vicarious suffering of the Servant to the Messiah. But there is no doubt that Jesus made this connection, and he seems to have based the connection on his understanding of his role as Son of God. Jesus' construal of his divine sonship in terms of obedient submission to suffering and death emerges also in his prayer in Gethsemane (Mk 14:32 – 42).

2.2.3. The Unique Son of God. The foregoing implies a further emphasis in Jesus' speech involving his divine sonship: it is exclusive. Jesus is Son of God in a unique sense. In his capacity as Son of God Jesus has the power to bring his followers into an experience of divine sonship, but Jesus consistently distinguishes between the sonship of disciples and his own sonship. He speaks of "my Father" and "your Father," but never "our Father" (the "our" of the Lord's Prayer [Mt 6:9] is what the disciples are to say).

It is clear that in the authentic statements from the Synoptic Gospels Jesus did not speak of his divine sonship in terms of pre-existence or focus on ontological realities (such as his divine "nature"). Rather, Jesus emphasized the elements of personal relationship and active function.

3. Divine Sonship in the Christology of the Gospels.

Although there is wide disparity in the number of occurrences of "Son (of God)" and "Father" in the four Gospels, each of the Gospels gives significant attention to Jesus' divine sonship, and may in fact present "Son of God" as the pre-eminent christological title.

3.1. Mark. "Son (of God)" appears in Mark's Gospel only eight times and "Father" (referring to God) only four. Yet these titles surface at crucial points in Mark and play a role in the christology of the Gospel that surpasses their few occurrences (*see* Mark, Gospel of).

Scholars have generally recognized the importance of this title for Mark's christology, but they have assessed its function differently. Many authorities have linked the title to the concept of divine man, described above, arguing that in this Gospel Jesus became Son of God at his baptism when the Spirit descended upon him, thus providing him with divine power according to which he performed miracles and exorcisms. There is, however, a division among scholars who hold this divine man theory: some maintain that the Evangelist himself espoused such a christology, while others contend that Mark presented this portrait of Jesus as divine man only to correct it by presenting Jesus above all as the suffering Son of man. Indeed, scholars such as Perrin have argued that because the title Son of God could be linked to the divine man concept which Mark himself rejects, Mark has subordinated this title to that of Son of man (*see* Son of Man), which unambiguously points to Jesus' suffering and death.

The difficulties of employing the concept of divine man in NT christology were discussed above. In addition to these problems it should be observed that Mark gives unqualified approval to the title Son of God, and understands this title primarily in terms of Jesus' obedient suffering and death. There is no evidence that Mark holds Son of God and Son of man in tension, nor that he gives prominence to the latter over the former.

Mark indicates the importance of this title for his christology by placing it within the general heading to the Gospel (Mk 1:1). The specific meaning of Jesus' divine sonship begins to come to expression in the account of the baptism (Mk 1:9 – 11), where the heavenly voice declares, "You are my beloved Son, with you I am well pleased." This pericope indicates that God views Jesus primarily in terms of divine sonship and that Jesus' role as Son of God involves especially obedience to his Father. As mentioned above, the heavenly declaration alludes to Isaiah 42:1 and thus links the divine sonship of Jesus to his role as the Suffering Servant of Yahweh.

God makes this announcement to Jesus alone; at this point in the narrative only God and Jesus are aware that Jesus is Son of God. In Mark 3:11 and 5:7 the demons address Jesus as "Son of (the Most High) God" (cf. Mk 1:24, 34), which seems to indicate they were privy to the divine communication at the baptism. Nevertheless, Jesus does not wish his divine sonship to be publicly announced and consequently commands the demons to be

silent. The observation that Jesus also commands silence from those who were healed (Mk 1:43 – 44; 5:43; cf. 7:24) suggests the reason for this messianic secret. The Markan Jesus does not wish to be proclaimed as Son of God until it is clear his divine sonship involves not spectacular miracles but suffering and death. Hence, the secret of Jesus' divine sonship is revealed only gradually.

In Mark 9:7 the divine communication originally voiced at the baptism is repeated in the presence of the inner circle of the disciples, but they will not understand what it means until after the resurrection (Mk 9:9 – 13). In Mark 12:6, in the course of the parable of the tenants, Jesus speaks of the sending of a “son”; the religious authorities apparently understood Jesus to be referring to himself, since at the trial before the Sanhedrin they accuse him with the question “Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?” (Mk 15:39; cf. 12:12). Yet they remain ignorant of Jesus' identity as Son of God, for they reject the very idea as a blasphemous claim (*see* Trial of Jesus).

It is only in Mark 15:39 that the secret of Jesus' status as Son of God is fully revealed to humans. As the centurion faces the cross he declares, “Truly this man was the Son of God.” By bringing his Gospel to a climax with this christological confession at the cross, Mark indicates that Jesus is first and foremost Son of God, and that Jesus is Son of God as one who suffers and dies in obedience to God (cf. Mk 14:36). Yet this title relates not only to Jesus' earthly mission, but also to his resurrection (Mk 12:10 – 11; cf. 9:9) and Second Coming (Mk 8:38; 13:32); for Mark emphasizes that it is precisely Jesus crucified as Son of God who is raised (Mk 16:6) and will return in glory (Mk 14:61 – 62).

3.2. Matthew. Although various scholars have seen Matthew' s focus in different titles, many today would argue that Son of God is the pre-eminent christological title in Matthew (*see* Matthew, Gospel of). The First Evangelist retains virtually all of Mark' s statements regarding the sonship of Jesus and the fatherhood of God, while adding ten references to Jesus as Son (of God) and forty references to God as Father. According to Matthew' s Gospel, Son of God is the only adequate christological confession, and one can come to this understanding of Jesus solely through divine revelation (Mt 16:13 – 17; cf. 27:51 – 54).

Although Matthew begins by connecting Jesus' divine sonship to his virginal conception (Mt 1:18 – 25), he does not develop the notion of the divine nature of Jesus, but focuses instead on more functional aspects of Jesus' sonship. In this Gospel Jesus is Son of God primarily in the sense that he perfectly obeys the will of his Father, especially the will of God that the Messiah must suffer and die.

The emphasis on obedience to the will of the Father appears already in the baptism narrative (Mt 3:13 – 17). As in Mark, the heavenly voice expresses divine approval. But Matthew goes beyond Mark in stressing the obedience of Jesus: Jesus submits to baptism “to fulfill all righteousness” (Mt 3:15; *see* Justice, Righteousness); and immediately after the baptism Jesus is tempted in his capacity as Son of God, and as Son of God he refuses to yield to Satan' s temptations (Mt 4:1 – 11; *see* Temptation of Jesus). Here Jesus is tempted to manifest his divine sonship through the performance of spectacular signs, but chooses instead to demonstrate his sonship through submission to the Father' s will.

This reference to temptation indicates that the Matthean Jesus struggles with the will of God regarding the nature of his messianic role. In Matthew 16:22 – 23 Peter assumes the role of Satan in that he, like Satan in the wilderness temptations, would turn Jesus aside from obedience to the Father' s will for the Messiah and would encourage Jesus to construe his sonship in ways other than obedient suffering and death. In Gethsemane Jesus voices his desire to avoid the “cup” of suffering, but as Son of God he yields to the will of his Father (Mt 26:39, 42; *see* Gethsemane). Indeed, Matthew presents the event of the crucifixion as the ultimate temptation for Jesus as well as the climactic expression of his sonship. Jesus is condemned to death on the charge that he claimed to be the Son of God (Mt 26:63). Twice the passers-by tempt Jesus to demonstrate his divine sonship by the sign of coming down from the cross (Mt 27:40, 43). But, as in his earlier temptations, Jesus refuses to yield to such appeals and dies as the righteous one who places his trust in God (Mt 27:43). In response to the

obedience of Jesus his Son, God himself provides the signs (Mt 27:51 – 53), which prompt the centurion to declare, “Truly this was the Son of God” (Mt 27:54).

In addition to this focus on obedience to the will of God, there are three related dimensions to Jesus’ divine sonship in Matthew: (1) As Son of God, Jesus knows the Father and his will and has unique authority to interpret that will (Mt 5:17 – 48; 7:28 – 29; 11:25 – 27). (2) Because Jesus is Son of God his disciples also become sons of God who address God as “Father.” Their sonship, like his, is characterized above all by obedience to God’s will (Mt 12:50). (3) Because Jesus remained the obedient Son until the end, his Father has given him “all authority in heaven and on earth” (Mt 28:18); he now reigns as Son (Mt 28:19; 24:36) and will return in that capacity (Mt 10:32; 16:27; 25:31 – 46).

3.3. Luke. The divine sonship of Jesus receives relatively less attention in Luke than in the other Gospels. Luke’s allusions to Jesus as Son of God are for the most part taken over from tradition, and in fact Luke omits some references to Jesus’ divine sonship found in Mark (Mk 13:32; 15:39). Still, the concept plays a significant role in Luke’s Gospel. In fact, some scholars argue that it is the foremost christological title in this Gospel (e.g., Kingsbury).

Luke establishes the basic contours of Jesus’ divine sonship in three passages at the beginning of the Gospel. The annunciation to Mary highlights several dimensions of Jesus’ divine sonship (Lk 1:32 – 35). First, Jesus is Son of God as one who has been conceived by the Holy Spirit. Although Luke is moving toward understanding divine sonship in ontological terms (i.e., the divine nature of Jesus), he does little to develop his christology along these lines. Rather, Luke suggests that the conception of Jesus by the Spirit (*see* Holy Spirit) forms the basis of Jesus’ intimate personal relationship with God, a theme that stands at the center of the presentation of divine sonship throughout the Gospel (Lk 2:49; 10:21 – 22). Indeed, by having Jesus address God as “Father” on the cross, Luke indicates that even at that point in Jesus’ life his intimate fellowship with God continues unabated (Lk 23:34, 46). Second, as Son of God Jesus inherits the kingdom (*see* Kingdom of God) which God promised to the Son of David, thus pointing to transcendent rule and authority (cf. Lk 22:28 – 30). Third, as Son of God Jesus is holy, set apart for the special service of bringing salvation to the people of God (Lk 1:68 – 69; 2:11; 19:9 – 10).

The second key passage for understanding Jesus’ divine sonship is the genealogy (3:23 – 38). The genealogy begins by describing Jesus as the “supposed” son of Joseph, suggesting that he was not actually the son of Joseph, but Son of God through divine conception (Lk 1:32 – 35). But this statement also points to the mystery of Jesus’ divine sonship: God (Lk 3:22; 9:35), the devil (Lk 4:3, 9) and demons (Lk 4:41; 8:28; *see* Demon, Devil, Satan) address Jesus as Son of God, but humans do not. They suppose him to be son of Joseph (Lk 4:22), that is, he is explicable in purely human terms. Consequently, they tend to remain blind to his transcendent power and authority. Moreover, Luke traces the genealogy of Jesus through Adam to God (Lk 3:38), thus indicating that as God’s Son Jesus has power to bring all humanity to its destiny as sons of God.

The temptation narrative (Lk 4:1 – 13) demonstrates that Jesus’ divine sonship involves perfect obedience to the will of the Father (Lk 2:49; 23:47) and the exercise of authority over Satan and the forces of evil (Lk 10:17 – 19; 11:17 – 23; 13:11 – 17).

3.4. John. The Fourth Gospel places the divine sonship of Jesus at the center of its christology (*see* John, Gospel of). The Gospel speaks of “Son (of God)” twenty-nine times and refers to God as “Father” over a hundred times. Moreover, John expressly states that the purpose of his Gospel is to confirm his readers in the belief that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (Jn 20:31). Although John incorporates most of the main elements in the Synoptic presentation of Son of God, his portrait of Jesus’ divine sonship is distinct from that found in the Synoptic Gospels.

One of the points of distinction between the Synoptic portrayal of Jesus as Son of God and that of the Fourth Gospel involves the pre-existence of the Son. While the Synoptics nowhere describe Jesus’ sonship in terms of pre-existence, John begins his Gospel by linking the “Word” (*logos*), operative at creation, to the Son (Jn

1:1 – 18); and at subsequent points in the Gospel Jesus Son of God speaks of his pre-incarnate existence (Jn 8:56 – 58; 17:5, 24). Yet John relates Jesus' divine sonship primarily to his earthly functioning. This Gospel emphasizes that God *sent* his Son into the world (Jn 3:17; 10:36; 17:18), and that he has come from the Father (Jn 3:31; 6:33 – 42) and is about to return to the Father (Jn 13:1 – 3; 14:28; 16:28; 20:17). He thus reflects God's person and glory (Jn 1:14; 14:6 – 11).

Jesus' role as Son of God is characterized by the following elements. First, Jesus Son of God perfectly obeys the will of his Father (Jn 4:34; 5:30; 6:38; 7:28; 8:29); even his coming into the world reflects his obedience to the Father's will (Jn 8:42). Second, as Son of God Jesus shares the work of the Father (Jn 5:19; 9:4; 10:37), including those tasks belonging uniquely to God: giving life to the dead (Jn 5:21, 24; 6:40) and performing judgment (Jn 5:22, 27 – 29; 8:16). Indeed, Jesus says nothing except what he has heard from the Father (Jn 3:32 – 34; 12:49 – 50; 15:15) and does nothing except what he has seen the Father do (Jn 5:20; 8:38). The works he does are actually the Father's works performed through him (Jn 5:17; 9:4; 10:32). Third, as Son of God Jesus enjoys intimate fellowship with the Father. John describes this intimacy in spatial terms: "in the bosom of the Father" (Jn 1:18). Specifically, this relationship involves (1) "knowing" the Father and his will (Jn 4:22 – 23; 6:45 – 47; 8:55; 15:15); (2) sharing in all that the Father has (Jn 16:15); and (3) enjoying special access and influence with the Father (Jn 14:13 – 16). Fourth, the relationship between the Father and the Son is characterized by love: The Father loves the Son (Jn 3:35; 5:20; 10:17; 17:23) and the Son loves the Father (Jn 14:31). The Father expresses his love for the Son by giving to the Son all things (Jn 3:35; 13:3), especially those who come to the Son (Jn 6:37, 44, 65; 10:29; 17:2).

All of this implies that the divine sonship of Jesus is unique; he is Son of God in a sense not true of anyone else, even believers. John calls attention to this uniqueness by designating Jesus the "only" (*monogenēs*) Son (Jn 1:14, 18; 3:16) and by constantly employing the absolute forms "the Father" and "the Son." In John's Gospel the disciples are never called "sons," nor do they address God as "Father." Only once is God described as the "Father" of disciples (Jn 20:17), and there the distinction between "my Father" and "your Father" is emphasized.

The proclamation that Jesus is Son of God forces the decision of faith. Persons are called to believe that Jesus is the Son whom God has sent into the world, and the decision they make regarding this call to belief will determine the quality of their present existence as well as their eternal destiny (Jn 3:17 – 21, 36; 5:24; 11:26). Believing in the Son is the "work" which God requires. This belief involves, specifically, obeying the Son (Jn 3:36), coming to the Son (Jn 14:6) and honoring the Son (Jn 5:23). Such belief will result in salvation (Jn 5:34) and life (Jn 6:40, 47; 20:31).

6

7 · 人子 SON OF MAN

The person whose name was Jesus (perhaps more closely defined as "Jesus of Nazareth" or as "Jesus the son of Joseph" [Jn 1:46; 6:42] to make clear which holder of the name was meant) is known by various forms of words in the Gospels and the NT generally. To some extent these forms of words are interchangeable, but clearly some of them are used with specific functions and in specific contexts.

The phrase "the Son of man" (*ho huīos tou anthropou*) is such a form of words. It is the phrase used more frequently than any other (except "Jesus" itself) to refer to Jesus in the Gospels. It occurs in all four Gospels and only once outside them (Acts 7:56; Heb 2:6 [quoting Ps 8:5] and Rev 1:13; 14:14 [alluding to Dan 7:13] have "a son of man"). Within the Gospels it is found only in sayings ascribed to Jesus; the only clear exception is John 12:34a,b where the people quote Jesus' phrase back at him and ask to whom he is referring.

⁶Green, J. B., McKnight, S., & Marshall, I. H. (1992). *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (769). Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

This evidence shows that “the Son of man” functions as a self-designation of some kind; it never became a way for other people to refer to Jesus, and it thus played no part in the confessional and doctrinal statements of the early church, unlike “Christ,” “Lord” and “Son of God.”

1. Usage in the Gospels
2. Jesus and the Son of Man
3. Conclusion

1. Usage in the Gospels.

In what kind of situation is the phrase used? Why does Jesus sometimes say “I” and sometimes “the Son of man”? There is manifestly some flexibility in usage, as is seen by comparing:

Luke 6:22 with Matthew 5:11

Matthew 16:13 with Mark 8:27

Luke 12:8 with Matthew 10:32

1.1. The Gospel of Mark. Broadly speaking, we can trace a pattern in the Gospel of Mark, where the phrase occurs fourteen times (Mk 2:10, 28; 8:31, 38; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 13:26; 14:21a, b, 41, 62).

1.1.1. The Present Authority of Jesus. Jesus speaks of his authority to forgive sins (Mk 2:10) and of his lordship of the Sabbath (Mk 2:28). In both cases the context makes it clear that it is the authority of Jesus which is at issue; he exercises it there and then; and it is an authority which would normally belong to God or to somebody authorized by him. It is possible that the phrase might signify “human” in a generic sense (i.e., any particular member of the species; see further below), but it is doubtful whether a Greek reader would take this sense from the phrase.

1.1.2. The Suffering and Resurrection of Jesus. Jesus speaks of the impending suffering, death and resurrection of the Son of man in a series of predictions which emphasize that this must happen in accordance with the Scriptures; he speaks of the mission of the Son of man as being to serve others and to give his life as a ransom for many, and he speaks of himself as the Son of man in references to his impending betrayal and arrest (Mk 8:31; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14:21a, b, 41; see Predictions of Jesus’ Passion and Resurrection). The threefold repetition of the prediction in Mark is particularly impressive. The sufferings of Jesus are clearly linked to his role as the Son of man; they are not mentioned explicitly without some reference to him as the Son of man.

1.1.3. The Future Coming of Jesus. There are three references to a future coming of the Son of man “in clouds with great power and glory” to gather his chosen people and reject (literally “be ashamed of”) those who were ashamed of Jesus (see Apocalyptic Teaching); this coming is associated with his being seated on the right hand of God (Mk 8:38; 13:26; 14:62). Mark 13:26 and 14:62 are clearly reminiscent of Daniel 7:13 – 14 where a figure “like a son of man” comes with the clouds of heaven, appears before God and is given everlasting sovereign power and dominion (see Kingdom of God).

Allusions are also made to Psalm 11:1 and possibly to Zechariah 12:10. What is said in other passages in the OT about a future coming of God himself in judgment (Zech 14:5) is here attributed to the Son of man as his agent.

1.1.4. The Suffering, Vindicated and Authoritative Son of Man. With this background now coming into focus, it is possible to argue that for Mark the teaching which he attributes to Jesus identifies him as the figure prophesied by Daniel who will come as God’s agent to gather his people and act as judge. But already as a human figure Jesus acts with the authority which is inherent in this role. If we ask how the suffering and rejection of the Son of man fit into this picture, two (not necessarily exclusive) answers may be given. The first is that in Daniel 7 the Son of man is seen as the representative of “the saints of the Most High” who suffer defeat and oppression at the hands of their enemies (Dan 7:21, 25). The second is that the language used in Mark 9:12 and 10:45 and in the crucifixion narrative suggests that the Son of man undergoes the experiences of the “righteous sufferer” and the “rejected stone” in the Psalms (Ps 22; 69; 118:22) and the Servant of Yahweh

(Is 52:13 – 53:12; *see* Servant of Yahweh) who suffers but is vindicated by God (*see* Death of Jesus). Thus, not surprisingly, motifs from several OT passages which were regarded as providing the pattern for the destiny of Jesus are coalesced to give a picture of him as the suffering, vindicated and authoritative Son of man.

It also emerges that in Mark, Jesus prefers this way of describing himself to other possibilities. It is notable that, when Jesus is identified as the “Christ” (Mk 8:29 – 30; 14:61 – 62; and implicitly in 13:21 – 22; 9:41 is an exception), he responds by speaking of what “the Son of man” will do. This curious fact suggests that Jesus almost wishes to replace the concept of Messiah (or Christ) by that of the Son of man. The reasons for this are not clear (*see* Mark, Gospel of).

1.2. The Gospel of Matthew. The picture in the other two Synoptic Gospels is not markedly dissimilar. The phrase is used thirty times by Matthew.

Matthew takes over thirteen of the usages in Mark (Mt 9:6; 12:8; 16:27; 17:9, 12, 22; 20:18, 28, 24:30b; 26:24a, b, 45, 64) and adds it editorially four times (Mt 16:13; 16:28; 24:30a (?); 26:2). He shares it with Luke eight times (Mt 8:20 par. Lk 9:58; Mt 11:19 par. Lk 7:34; Mt 12:32 par. Lk 12:10); Mt 12:40 par. Lk 11:30; Mt 24:27, 37, 39, 44 par. Lk 17:24, 26, 30; 12:40), and it is found in passages peculiar to Matthew five times (Mt 10:23; 13:37, 41; 19:28; 25:31).

Matthew’s new uses of the phrase fall into the same general pattern as in Mark. In a series of sayings which he shares with Luke the Son of man is an object of derision for associating with sinners (Mt 11:19) and invites his followers to share his homeless situation (Mt 8:20). There is more detailed teaching on the future coming of the Son of man which will be unexpected and catastrophic for those who are not ready for him (Mt 24:27, 37, 39, 44). The saying, which compares the way in which people treat Jesus now with the way in which they will be treated at the judgment (Mk 8:38 par. Mt 16:27), appears a second time in an expanded form in Luke 12:8 – 9; but in the corresponding saying in Matthew (10:32 – 33) the verbal contrast between Jesus and the Son of man is dropped and Jesus speaks of himself in the first person throughout. (Similarly, Mt 5:11 speaks of persecution for the sake of “me,” whereas Lk 6:22 has “the Son of man.”) Another interesting fact is that a saying which in Mark 3:28 speaks of forgiveness being extended to the sons of men for their sins and blasphemies except against the Holy Spirit, appears in Luke 12:10 in the form that if a person speaks against the Son of man he will be forgiven but not if he speaks against the Spirit (*see* Holy Spirit). Matthew 12:31 – 32 combines these two sayings (by substituting “men” for “the sons of men” in the Markan saying). The way in which the Evangelists understood this saying is debated, but it seems probable that they saw a contrast between speaking against Jesus on earth, when people might be forgiven for not recognizing who he really was, and opposition to the Holy Spirit by people (possibly disciples) when there should be no doubt that to do so was to take sides against God.

In the teaching peculiar to Matthew the Son of man is especially understood as the coming savior (*see* Salvation) and judge (Mt 13:41; 19:28). In Matthew 10:23 Jesus tells his disciples that they will not finish the cities of Israel until the Son of man comes. Matthew may have seen this as a reference to the fall of Jerusalem (*see* Destruction of Jerusalem) understood as the coming of the Son of man in judgment.

The general tendency in Matthew is thus to emphasize the identity of Jesus as the coming Son of man and as a figure who is rejected on earth.

1.3. The Gospel of Luke. Luke uses the phrase twenty-five times. He has equivalents to nine of the texts in Mark (Lk 5:24; 6:5; 9:22, 26, 44; 18:31; 21:27; 22:22, 69). He has the ten texts from Q which he shares with Matthew (the eight texts listed above with Lk 6:22 and 12:8). This leaves six occurrences peculiar to Luke (Lk 17:22; 18:8; 19:10; 21:36; 22:48; 24:7). In these fresh sayings we hear of the Son of man’s mission to save the lost (Lk 19:10), his betrayal by Judas (Lk 22:48; cf. Mk 14:21b) and his sufferings and resurrection (Lk 24:7—a report of what Jesus had said earlier by the two angels at the tomb), and of his future coming (Lk 17:22; 18:8;

21:36). It is evident that the picture in Luke is very similar to that in the other Gospels. A notable omission by Luke is the ransom saying in Mark 10:45 (*see* Ransom Saying). There is a similar saying about “service” in Luke 22:27, but it does not use “the Son of man” nor the idea of ransom. Again there is no essential difference from the general picture given in Mark.

1.4. The Gospel of John. When we turn to the Gospel of John we get a picture with similarities and differences. The phrase is used thirteen times. We can readily find references that correspond to those of the passion and resurrection of Jesus in the other Gospels. But in John the reference is to the “lifting up” of the Son of man (*hypsōō*). The verb is ambiguous and can refer to “being lifted up” on a cross or to “being exalted” (Jn 3:14; 8:28; 12:34a, b). Jesus can thus refer to the final events in his life as the glorification (*see* Glory) of the Son of man (Jn 12:23; 13:31). Jesus also speaks of the authority to judge which has been committed to him as the Son of man (Jn 5:27), and of the power (*see* Authority and Power) of the Son of man to grant life (Jn 6:27). These functions are summed up in his appeal to the blind man who had been healed (*see* Healing) to believe in the Son of man (Jn 9:35). And the life-giving function also appears in the reference to eating the flesh of the Son of man (Jn 6:53), a phrase which doubtless reflects the language of the Last Supper (*see* Last Supper) but stresses the need for a spiritual partaking. Finally, there is the concept of the Son of man coming down from heaven (Jn 3:13) and ascending to where he formerly was (Jn 8:28); linked to this is the difficult saying about the angels ascending and descending on the Son of man (Jn 1:51).

2. Jesus and the Son of Man.

It is clear that the expression is used in much the same way in each of the Synoptic Gospels but that in John it is used in a wider manner. The crucial question is to what extent this usage corresponds with that of Jesus himself. We have already seen that the Evangelists can add the expression to their sources or subtract it from them. But much more far-reaching questions have been raised by modern scholarship concerning the origin of the phrase.

2.1. Son of Man and Messiah? Some scholars dispute whether Jesus expressed verbally any consciousness of being the Messiah or a messianic type of figure. It would follow that he could not have used “the Son of man” as a messianic self-designation. Or, it is claimed, Messiah and Son of man represent two different types of figure and, if Jesus identified himself as the former, he could not have identified himself also with the latter (*see* Christ).

Both of these claims are very doubtful. The evidence that Jesus acted in messianic ways is convincing: why otherwise did his followers recognize him as the Messiah? This makes the view that he could not have referred to himself in a messianic fashion most improbable. Further, while it is true that the traditional Jewish Messiah is an earthly figure, whereas the Son of man has transcendent features, the role assigned to the latter is messianic in that he is given dominion and authority as the representative of God’s people. This indicates, incidentally, that the claim that the Son of man is not associated with the kingdom of God in Judaism is without foundation.

2.2. Present and/or Future Son of Man? It has been observed that in those sayings where Jesus talks about the future activity of the Son of man, he is not necessarily talking about himself, and that in one or two sayings (Mk 8:38 par. Lk 12:8 – 9; Mk 14:62) there appears to be a distinction drawn between Jesus, presently active on earth, and the Son of man, active in the future at the last judgment. On the assumption that the early church would not have created such a distinction, it is argued that such sayings have strong claims to authenticity. It is then further argued that originally Jesus envisaged the Son of man as a figure distinct from himself. It then follows that sayings which identify Jesus as the Son of man must either be compositions by the early church or have had the phrase added to them at a later stage. If this argument is valid, it fits in with the view that Jesus did not refer to himself in messianic terms.

Despite the wide popularity of this view among scholars influenced by R. Bultmann, it cannot be upheld. Essentially, the claim is being made that the future Son of man sayings have been reinterpreted by the early church to refer to Jesus. But there are various arguments against this view.

The crucial sayings (Mk 8:38 par. Lk 12:8 – 9; Mk 14:62) can be interpreted much more naturally as sayings in which Jesus draws a contrast between himself as a figure whose authority is not recognized and the Son of man as a figure whose authority cannot be gainsaid. The apparently odd switch from the first person to the third person is to be explained by the incorporation of an allusion to Daniel 7:13 – 14.

The theory requires that the authenticity of a very large number of occurrences of the expression as self-designations of Jesus be surrendered for no better reason than that they stand in conflict with a couple of texts whose interpretation in terms of another coming figure is highly uncertain. The fact that in so many other texts “Son of man” cannot be other than a self-designation must seriously damage the claim that the “future” texts originally spoke of a figure other than Jesus.

2.3. Son of Man As a Self-Designation of Jesus. Two lines of argument raise the question whether Jesus could have used “the Son of man” as a title to refer to himself.

2.3.1. The Interpretation of Daniel 7. In the vision of Daniel there appear four great beasts like various animals and a figure “like a son of man.” This last phrase should undoubtedly be translated “like a man” (so NEB). The Aramaic phrase is used to designate a particular member of a species, and (as in Hebrew) “man” and “son of man” can be used interchangeably to refer to an individual. The force of *like* is that the figure is not a man but is like a man, just as the beasts are “like” different animals. In the interpretation of Daniel’s vision the beasts represent four kingdoms and (implicitly) the manlike figure stands for “the saints of the Most High,” the (faithful) people of Israel. It can therefore be argued that the manlike figure is a symbol for a collective entity. On the other hand, it is equally plausible that the manlike figure stands for the ruler of God’s people, just as the beasts appear to represent both kingdoms and their rulers. There is no doubt that in subsequent interpretation the manlike figure was regarded as a messianic individual. This is true of *1 Enoch* 37 – 71 and also of 4 Ezra 13 (where the actual phrase is not used, but the dependence on Dan 7 is clear). Nevertheless, it can be argued that in no sense is “a (son of) man” a title in Daniel 7.

2.3.2. Son of Man As an Aramaic Idiom of Self-Reference. There is a further idiom involving the use of the phrase “son of man.” It occurs in a number of Aramaic texts with the sense of “an individual man” but with some kind of reference to the speaker (*see* Languages of Jesus). The precise way in which this happens is debated.

(1) It has been argued that the phrase is used to make statements that are true of people in general and therefore of the speaker in particular (M. Casey). It is thus a kind of self-designation, but what is said is not true exclusively of the speaker. (For example, in the Palestinian Targum Cain says: “Behold thou hast cast me forth this day on the face of the ground, and from before you, Lord, it is not possible for the son of man [*bar nāš*] to hide.”)

(2) It has also been claimed that a speaker could use this expression to make statements that were true of himself in particular (G. Vermes). Against this interpretation it is argued that in every case cited a general or generic reference is possible. The idiom in fact seems to have arisen out of the use of the phrase to mean “a man” and hence “any man” to refer to the speaker, inasmuch as he is a man.

(3) However, there are cases where the reference is manifestly not to “everybody” but to people in a particular class, and therefore it is more accurate to say that it refers to such people, a group to which the speaker belongs (B. Lindars). (Thus: “When E. Hiyya ben Adda died ... R. Levi received his valuables. This was because his teacher used to say: ‘The disciple of *bar nāšâ* is as dear to him as his son.’ ” Here the expression plainly refers to the group of teachers.) It is suggested that the idiom was used as a form of self-reference in cases where the speaker wished to show modesty or to speak of matters (such as his own death) which were distasteful—in any case in sayings where he wished to avoid speaking directly in the first person.

2.4. Evaluating the Options. The current opinion seems to favor view (3) as the appropriate explanation of the idiom. Those who hold this view then argue that there are a number of sayings in the Gospels which can be understood as examples of this usage. Jesus says something which is true of himself inasmuch as it is true of a group of people to whom he belongs.

2.4.1. Analyzing the statements as idiomatic self-references, Casey, Lindars and Vermes (the three major scholars who have done work in this area) have each determined which Son of man sayings are authentic. Their results may be compared in the following table.

Vermes has the largest number of authentic sayings because he includes sayings that are true only of the speaker (Jesus). His selection, as with that of Casey and Lindars, is reached by rejecting the sayings which reflect the influence of Daniel 7. Casey and Lindars agree substantially in their more limited selection.

		Casey	Lindars	Vermes	Comments
Mark	2:10	*	*	*	
	2:28	*		*	
	8:31			*	(Mark only)
	8:38	*			
	9:9			*	
	9:12	*		*	
	9:31		*	*	(Lindars: core only)
	10:33			*	
	10:45	*	*	*	(Lindars v. 45b)
	14:21a,b	*	*	*	(Lindars v. 21a)
	14:41			*	
Matthew	8:20	*	*	*	(par. Lk 9:58 Q)
	11:19	*	*	*	(par. Lk 7:34 Q)
	16:13			*	(diff. Mk 8:31)
	26:22			*	
Luke	11:30		*	*	(par. Mt 12:40 Q)
	12:8	*	*		(diff Mt 10:32 Q)
	12:10	*	*	*	(diff. Mt 12:32 Q)
	19:10			*	
	22:48	*			
	24:7			*	

There are instances where the Casey/Lindars approach to the sayings is plausible. Mark 2:10 could mean that there is a class of people with authority to forgive, including Jesus. (But the people comment with surprise that no human can forgive sins; only God can do so.) In Mark 2:28 the Sabbath is made for humanity, and therefore people in general, including Jesus, have authority over it. In Matthew 11:18 Casey finds a group of people, including Jesus, who eat and drink with tax collectors (*see Taxes*) and sinners and who are attacked by the Pharisees. (But the text seems to be comparing two individuals.) In Matthew 8:20 Jesus says that there is a group of people, including his disciples and himself, who have no homes, and therefore a prospective disciple must expect the same situation. This is the most cogent example, but it must be observed that Jesus could be saying that, if he himself as a messianic figure is rejected, so too will his disciples be (cf. the identical argument in Mt 10:25b; Jn 15:18, 20b). The other examples lack all cogency.

2.4.2. The effect of the approach in question is to deny that Jesus thought of himself in terms of the Son of man of Daniel 7. According to Lindars, “it carried no christological meaning as such” (Lindars, 170). Jesus

remains a figure possessed of some authority, totally committed to his vocation, a prophet who believes that to speak against him is to speak against God, and by their response to him people will stand or fall at the last judgment.

However, the fact that the Lindars/Casey theory simply fails to work, in that it can credibly explain such a tiny handful of sayings, must raise serious doubts about it. There is more to be said for Vermes' s understanding of the sayings, according to which Jesus used the idiom to speak of himself with modesty or to avoid a direct reference to his own death.

2.5. According to C. Colpe some of the sayings are generic. That is, Mark 2:10 comments on the fact that Jesus, as a human, can forgive; in Matthew 11:18 – 19 John is contrasted with “a human,” namely Jesus. And in Matthew 8:20 Jesus says that even animals have dens but a human such as he, Jesus, has nowhere to lay his head (Colpe, 430 – 33). What appears to be essentially the same view is upheld by R. Bauckham who thinks that the phrase is used indefinitely rather than generically to mean “somebody, a person,” and that it could then be used as an oblique self-reference.

We are left with a problem in that the Aramaic usage remains unclear. But it is arguable that the sayings in the Gospels are evidence that the underlying Aramaic phrase could have been used on occasion to refer to the speaker only.

This leaves us with a number of sayings where the allusion to Daniel 7 is clear. J. Dunn has suggested that Jesus began by using the Aramaic idiom to refer to himself and then recognized in the use of the same phrase in Daniel 7 an allusion to the vindication which he expected from God. This led to the use of Daniel 7 on a broader scale in his sayings, and to the development of the term as a means of referring to himself as the authoritative messianic figure. Thus, in some sayings Jesus will simply have used a self-designation, but in others he was making a conscious allusion to Daniel 7. No doubt early Christians would have understood most if not all of his sayings as references to himself as the figure of Daniel 7. The point is that not all uses of the term would necessarily have conveyed the same sense on the lips of Jesus.

To adopt this position is not necessarily to claim that all occurrences of the phrase or all the texts in which it occurs are authentic sayings of Jesus as they stand. We have to reckon with the activity of the Evangelists in adding the phrase (and also in replacing it by a personal pronoun or other equivalent; see the examples cited above). It is also possible that similar activity took place even before the writing of the Gospels.

One particular problem is raised by Mark 3:28 – 29 and its parallels (Mt 12:31 – 33; Lk 12:10). It seems certain that we have two variant forms of the same basic saying. The hypothetical original said that there was forgiveness available for sins and blasphemies for/against “the son of man.” Mark' s tradition took this to mean forgiveness for humankind (collective use), but the Q tradition took it to refer to blasphemies against the man (Jesus). On this view, the Markan tradition understood the Aramaic phrase in a way that was probably not the meaning as originally intended, but, although the reference to blasphemy against Jesus dropped out, it was implicitly included in that the saying promised forgiveness of all blasphemies except those against the Spirit. In its Aramaic form, the saying probably did not refer to Jesus as “the [Danielic] Son of man,” and therefore the problem detected by modern readers as to what is the difference between speaking against the Son of man and against the Holy Spirit disappears. It is one thing to speak against Jesus under the humble appearance of a man, but it is another thing to speak against the manifest work of the Spirit (in Jesus or in anybody else).

3. Conclusion.

It emerges that two things happen in the Son of man texts.

3.1. Son of Man As Divine and Human. On the one hand, there is the phrase itself and the associations it would have for hearers and readers. In the Gospels as we have them, it points the reader to the figure in Daniel 7 who is a person with sovereign authority, a messianic figure, identified in *1 Enoch* and 4 Ezra with the Messiah, God' s Son and Elect One. Such a figure would be seen as in some sense divine in that he comes from heaven, and the description of him in Daniel 7 could be taken as an apotheosis, or “deification.” He would be

associated with the people of God, and in that sense the Son of man can be regarded as a corporate figure. (But the view that “Son of man” is a symbol for a corporate group which then becomes individualized in Jesus is to be rejected.) His associates are bound up with his destiny. But it must be emphasized that it is doubtful whether all of these associations would be present for the original hearers of Jesus and would have been intended by him every time he used the phrase. It is because of this dual origin of the phrase that it can be used to refer both to the humanity of Jesus and also to his divine origin. Jesus can use the term to refer to himself as a human over against God (Mk 2:10, 28), but also to indicate his divine origin. In the latter case “Son of man” is a veiled way of expressing his relationship to God (Kim).

3.2. The Son of Man’s Mission. On the other hand, this self-designation becomes the vehicle for teaching about the activity and fate of Jesus. He appears in the Synoptic Gospels as a figure of authority on earth who is not accepted by many people. He has a divinely ordained destiny, expressed in the Scriptures, which involves betrayal, rejection, suffering, death and resurrection. He has a future role in which he “comes” and brings salvation and judgment. In the Gospel of John there is greater stress laid on the fact that he comes from God and returns to be with him.

3.3. Son of Man As Jesus’ Self-Designation. When Jesus refers to his own role, he adopts this term rather than “Messiah” or “Son of God.” After the resurrection it never entered into Christian usage as a way of referring to Jesus or as a confessional term (not even in Jn 9:35 – 36 is it actually used by a believer; Acts 7:56 is a unique usage, probably a deliberate echo of Jesus’ own words). It was recognized as a self-designation, and it was replaced by other terms which expressed its significance with greater clarity. It was in any case a term which would not have been meaningful for non-Jews. Since modern readers on the whole do not pick up the original nuances of the term (whether as a self-designation or as an allusion to Dan 7), the example of the early church in not using it remains valid for today. There is indeed a grave danger of using “Son of man” as a means of referring to the humanity of Jesus, as opposed to his divinity (expressed by “Son of God”), whereas in fact the Danielic background suggests a figure closely associated with the Ancient of Days.

We may conclude that in Aramaic “Son of man” was not a title but a self-designation used in certain specific contexts. Jesus used it in this way. However, in Daniel 7 the phrase was used nontechnically to refer to somebody “like a man,” and hence the phrase came to be a means of reference to the person so described. Jesus took over this sense of the phrase, and thus identified his role with that of the figure in Daniel 7.

Consequently, the phrase came to be used as a title of dignity for Jesus, although the memory of the fact that the idiom was used as a self-designation prevented it from being taken over by his followers.⁷

⁷Green, J. B., McKnight, S., & Marshall, I. H. (1992). *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (775). Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.