

Chapter 11

THE PARABLES OF ENOCH AND THE JOHANNINE SON OF MAN

Francis J. Moloney

There is increasing interest in the Johannine Son of Man. A number of monographs,¹ major sections in studies of the Son of Man in the New Testament,² and a steady flow of scholarly articles³ have generated a Johannine Son of Man

1. See F. J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man* (BibSciRel 14; Rome: LAS, 1976). A revised edition containing a review of the response to my original study, and an assessment of some subsequent scholarship from 1976 to 1978, appeared with the same publishers, in 1978. A second edition, containing a review of Johannine Son of Man scholarship from 1978 to 2005, appeared in 2007. The 1978–2005 review first appeared as “The Johannine Son of Man Revisited,” in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. Van Belle, et al. (BETL 184; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), pp. 177–202. All page references to this survey will be to the easily available *The Johannine Son of Man* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007 [2nd edn.]), pp. 257–82. See further, C. Panackel, *ΙΑΟΥ Ο ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΟΣ (Jn 19,5b): An Exegetico-Theological Study of the Text in the Light of the Use of the Term ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΟΣ. Designating Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Greg 251; Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1988); R. Rhea, *The Johannine Son of Man* (ATANT 76; Zurich: Theologische Verlag, 1991); D. Burkett, *The Son of Man in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSS 56; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); M. M. Pazdan, *The Son of Man. A Metaphor for Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991); M. Sasse, *Der Menschensohn im Evangelium nach Johannes* (TANZ 35; Tübingen, Basel: Francke Verlag, 2000); B. E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John* (WUNT 2.249; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

2. See, for example, the important studies of Jan-A. Buhner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium: Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der johanneischen Sendungschristologie sowie ihre traditionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (WUNT 2.2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977), pp. 374–99, 422–29; B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1983), pp. 145–57; D. R. A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 79–111; J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 337–73; W. Loader, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues* (BBET 23; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992 [2nd edn.]), pp. 82–92, 107–21; J. Mateos and F. Camacho, *El Hijo del Hombre: Hacia la plenitud humana* (En los orígenes del Cristianismo 9; Córdoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1997), pp. 159–86, 203–09; R. E. Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, ed. F. J. Moloney (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2003), pp. 252–59.

3. See, for example, the following studies in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle*, ed. R. Pesch, R. Schnackenburg, and O. Kaiser (Freiburg: Herder, 1975): S. Smalley, “Johannes 1,51 und die Einleitung zum vierten Evangelium,” pp. 300–13; E. Ruckstuhl, “Abstieg und Erhöhung des johanneischen Menschensohns,” pp. 314–41; C. K. Barrett, “Das Fleisch des

discussion. The discussion is now enriched by the proposal that the *Parables of Enoch* (= 1 Enoch 37–71) may have influenced the use of “the Son of Man” in the New Testament.⁴ The following study opens with a reflection upon the different results that flow from different approaches to the text. On the basis of that reflection, I will assess the 13 Johannine Son of Man sayings, with particular attention devoted to Jn 1:51; 3:13, 6:62 (possible ascent and descent passages) and 5:27 (the Son of Man as Judge). However, the complexity of all 13 Son of Man sayings (1:51; 3:13–14; 5:27; 6:27, 53, 62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23, 34; 13:31–32) must be kept in mind *at all times*. Possible links with the Enochic Son of Man will be considered in this assessment.

Diachrony and Synchrony

In all sound criticism, the unavoidable *diachronic* question must be raised: what is the origin of the Johannine use of “the Son of Man”? There is broad general consensus that several of the Johannine sayings (3:14; 8:28; 12:32–34)

Menschensohnes (John 6:53),” pp. 342–54; J. Riedl, “Wenn ihr den Menschensohn erhöht habt (Joh 8,28),” pp. 355–70; Schnackenburg, “Die Ecce-homo-Szene und der Menschensohn,” pp. 371–86. See further, P. Borgen, “Some Jewish Exegetical Traditions as Background for the Son of Man Sayings in John’s Gospel,” in *L’Évangile de Jean, Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. M. de Jonge (BETL 44; Gembloux: Duculot, 1977), pp. 243–58; J. Coppens, “Le Fils de l’homme dans l’Évangile johannique,” *ETL* 52 (1976), 21–81; J. P. Brown, “The Son of Man: ‘This Fellow’,” *Bib* 58 (1977), 361–87; M. Pamment, “The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel,” *JTS* 36 (1985), 56–66; J. Painter, “The Enigmatic Johannine Son of Man,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et al. (3 vols.; BETL 100; Leuven: University Press – Peters, 1992), 3:1868–87; W. Loader, “The Central Structure of Johannine Christology,” *NTS* 30 (1984), 188–216; W. Roth, “Jesus as the Son of Man: The Scriptural Identity of a Johannine Image,” in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*, ed. D. W. Groh and R. Jewett (Lanham: University of America Press, 1985), pp. 11–26; C. Ham, “The Title ‘Son of Man’ in the Gospel of John,” *Stone Campbell Journal* 1 (1998), 67–84; F. Fernández Ramos, “El hijo del hombre en el cuarto evangelio,” *Studium Legionense* 40 (1999), 45–92; W. Wink, “‘The Son of Man’ in the Gospel of John,” in *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition*, ed. R. T. Fortna and T. Thatcher (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), pp. 117–23; J. Ashton, “The Johannine Son of Man: A New Proposal,” *NTS* 37 (2011), 508–29.

4. My main source of access to the current debate has been an early version of the outstanding *Forschungsbericht* from D. L. Bock that now appears in this volume, and G. Boccaccini, “The Enoch Seminar at Camaldoli: Re-entering the Parables of Enoch in the Study of Second Temple Judaism and Christian Origins,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, pp. 3–16. On the social setting, and the debate over the dating of the *Parables of Enoch*, see the essays in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, pp. 363–512. Correspondence with J. Charlesworth has also enriched my awareness of the debate. My access to 1 Enoch is via the translation of E. Isaac in the *OTP* 1:13–89, M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A new edition in the light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, with the assistance of E. Ullendorf (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), and G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2004). Citations from 1 Enoch in what follows are from the Nickelsburg–VanderKam translation. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch, 6, confidently assert: “At the very least, the description of the Chosen One/son of man (if not the entire book) is presumed in the Gospel traditions about Jesus, the Son of Man.”

parallel the Synoptic Passion predictions (see Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34, and parallels). But there is more to the Johannine Son of Man than the cross, and the majority of scholars, especially in the light of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in 1:51, 3:13, and 6:62, find background to this figure in "heavenly man" speculation or early Gnostic thought, but not in the *Parables of Enoch*. Jan-A. Böhner and J. Ashton do make use of the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch*. Ashton is aware of the possibility that they may be "Christian" (especially 1En 71:14).⁵ With the help of *1 Enoch* and other Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic material, they suggest the Johannine Son of Man reflects a tradition of a Son of Man who is from above, and who ascends and descends.⁶

This position is linked with a presupposition that "[a]mong the many puzzles presented by the Fourth Gospel one of the most intriguing is the paradoxical contrast between the titles 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man.' 'Son of God,' originally at any rate, indicates a human being, the Messiah; whereas 'Son of Man' points to a figure whose true home is in heaven."⁷ In the Synoptic tradition the suffering of the Son of Man is a development that took place in the early Church, part of its apologetic for the death of Jesus. It was not part of original Son of Man language and its use. Behind this position lies a widespread (although nuanced) acceptance of Bultmann's claim, based upon a reading of Dan 7 and other Jewish apocalyptic material, that the Synoptic use of "the Son of Man" had its origins in an original Jewish notion of a heavenly and apocalyptic figure. This end-time figure (originally other than Jesus) was identified with Jesus in early Christian tradition, and eventually applied to his human experience, and to his suffering.⁸ Eventually, Böhner,

5. See, for example, Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 358-60.

6. See Böhner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 361-62 (Böhner devotes no attention to the dating of the *Parables of Enoch*, but simply uses them without discussion in his construction of the Jewish apocalyptic background of [among many elements in the Fourth Gospel] the Johannine Son of Man). Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 348-56, makes the case for a heavenly ascending and descending Son of Man on the basis of his exegesis of Jn 3:13 (see below). Like Böhner (who influences his work), Ashton also sees Jewish apocalyptic as the essential background to the Johannine Son of Man. He makes reference to *1 Enoch* (see p. 354, n. 56), but is cautious about the use of this source and *4 Ezra* 13 because "both writings are roughly contemporary with the Fourth Gospel" (p. 346, n. 28). Reynolds, *Son of Man*, p. 42, takes a similar position, and then proceeds to make copious use of the *Parables of Enoch* in his interpretation of the Johannine Son of Man. For the apocalyptic Son of Man, see Böhner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 374-79, 422-29; Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 368-73; and Reynolds, *Son of Man*. These significant studies make an important contribution to the *diachronic* question, but in my opinion fail when tested against the *synchronic* use of Johannine Son of Man sayings, both within their contexts and across the narrative as a whole. See, for example, Böhner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 385-99, who only considers 5:27 (to make the connection with the Danielic Son of Man as a heavenly figure), 1:51, and 3:13 (for the ascent and descent motif). Similarly (influenced by Böhner), Ashton, pp. 336-73, only devotes detailed attention to 1:51, 3:13, and 5:27. It should be noted that only the problematic *1 Enoch* 71 is used for this ascent-descent motif. The only place where ascent and descent is clearly stated in the *Parables of Enoch* is in *1 Enoch* 42:1-2 where "wisdom" ascends and descends. In *1 Enoch* 71:1 the spirit of Enoch is "taken away" and "ascended into heaven."

7. Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 337. See also Reynolds, *Son of Man*, p. 223.

8. See especially R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel

Ashton, Reynolds⁹ and others have transferred a sophisticated rereading of Bultmann's understanding of Jesus and the Son of Man, as recorded in the Synoptics, into the Johannine use of the expression.¹⁰

However, a minority position, which I adopt, also starts from Dan 7, but claims that already in that context, the "one like a son of man" in 7:13 is to be identified with the holy ones of the Most High of vv. 21-25.¹¹ Their preparedness to experience suffering and even death at the hands of the enemies of Israel (and thus enemies of God [see Dan 7:3-8, 21-25]) will lead to final vindication (vv. 14, 27).

A possible reinterpretation of Daniel 7 probably took place in Second Temple Judaism. Indeed, in the light of the *Parables of Enoch* (especially 1En 46) and 4 Ezra 13, it was probably a minority reinterpretation.¹² Here we must

(2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1952-55), 1:28-32; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT 83; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 13-53; H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1965); N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1967), pp. 164-202. For a concise summary of this debate, see F. J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), pp. 212-13.

9. See esp. Reynolds' chapter in the present book.

10. The majority opinion is that the Johannine Son of Man is some form of "heavenly figure." This position has now been argued with great consistency and skill by Reynolds, *Son of Man*. After identifying the apocalyptic characteristics of the Son of Man in Dan 7 and subsequent Jewish and Christian literature that depends upon that passage, he traces these characteristics across all the *Johannine Son of Man* passages. This excellent work shows that the Johannine Son of Man belongs to the ongoing influence of Dan 7 for the interpretation of Jesus' work and person. Most recently, Ashton, "Son of Man," pp. 508-29, speculates that the ascent in Jn 3:13 reflects an authentic memory (associated with the transfiguration) that Jesus ascended into heaven and was there invested with the authority of the Son of Man, and returned to exercise that authority. The exclusion of all other ascensions in 3:13a developed in an anti-synagogue debate with those who argued that Moses had ascended to receive the Law.

11. See S. Chialà, "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, p. 158: "On the basis of the author's own interpretation of the vision in the verses that follow, we can be certain that here the expression *bar 'enosh*, the Aramaic equivalent of *ben 'adam*, simply means 'man,' 'being in human form,' and is meant to be a symbol for the 'people of the holy ones of the most high.'" However, when puzzling over the link between "the Son of Man" and suffering in Mark, he states: "Jesus' audience does not seem to be aware that the Son of Man must suffer, and that this is part of his function. There is in fact no mention of this either in the book of Daniel or in the Parables" (p. 163). But what was going on as Daniel was written and widely used? What is the situation of "the one like a son of man" in 7:13 and "the holy ones of the most high" in 7:27? Is the text not to be interpreted within its context? As is well known, J. J. Collins interprets "the one like a son of man" as the archangel Michael (see the documented summary in his "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, pp. 216-17). In 1 Enoch 37-71, the archangel Michael and the Son of Man are clearly distinguished (see, for example, 40:9; 54:6; 60:4-5).

12. For the case that neither 1 Enoch 37-71 nor 4 Ezra 13 are Christian, see Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man* (WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), pp. 85-96, 119-23. Each of these Second Temple apocalypses are interpretations of Daniel (see pp. 101-11, 123-26), but they are witnesses to *different interpretative traditions*. See also J. J. Collins, "The Son of Man in First Century Judaism," *NTS* 38 (1992), 448-66. This could also be said for the Christian tradition, based upon Jesus' use of "the Son of Man" as (among others) I am suggesting.

be aware of what might have happened with biblical and post-biblical traditions in the Second Temple period. Modern and contemporary scholarship – despite the many warnings we hear from all sides about the vagaries of popular religious culture and the importance of orality in transmission – continues to read the influence of one tradition on another as if the process was done in a library, or worse: with the cut and paste possibilities of a computer. If *1 Enoch* 37–71 is evidence of pre-Christian apocalyptic speculation, various uses of the Danielic “one like a son of man” must surely have been “in the air,” and influenced subsequent thought. But does this mean that there was only a single interpretation and a direct line from that tradition to another? Is it possible that not everyone regarded the Son of Man as an apocalyptic heavenly Judge?¹³

Jesus of Nazareth used the expression from Dan 7:13 in a way that differed from his apocalyptically interested contemporaries. The historical Jesus used an Aramaic expression that appeared in the Greek of the Gospels as “the Son of Man” (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) to explain – perhaps to himself as well as to his listeners – his unswerving commitment to a lifestyle and a message that necessarily led to his rejection by both Jewish and Roman authorities. Personalizing the Danielic “one like a son of man” as “the son of the man,” he believed that, like “the one like a son of man” / “the holy ones of the most high,” his openness to God, cost what it may, would lead to his vindication.

With this understanding, the Son of Man tradition in the Gospels did not begin with a heavenly apocalyptic figure received from Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic and then develop in early Christian tradition to accommodate a present and a suffering Son of Man as early apologetic for Jesus’ life and death. However significant the apocalyptic Son of Man is in *1 Enoch* 37–71 and *4 Ezra* 38, in earliest Christianity (another form of Second Temple Judaism) it developed in the other direction. It began with the suffering Son of Man (Jesus’ use of Dan 7:13–14) and was eventually shaped in a Christian preaching influenced by the Jewish apocalyptic tradition – into a heavenly, eschatological figure.¹⁴ For the Christians, the suffering Son of Man was also

13. See the fine survey of the variety of uses of “Son of Man” in Dan 7 and subsequent documents that depend upon Daniel (1 En 37–71, 4Ezra 13, 2Bar, 4Q246, Mk, Mt, Lk, Acts, and Rev) in Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 27–85.

14. This understanding was first articulated by C. F. D. Moule in his remarkable study, “From Defendant to Judge – and Deliverer: An Inquiry into the Use and Limitations of the Theme of Vindication in the New Testament,” first published in the predecessor of *NTS: Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* III (1952), 40–53, and republished as “Appendix I” in *The Phenomenon of the New Testament* (SBT 2.1; London: SCM Press, 1967). See further, Moule, “Neglected Features in the Problem of ‘the Son of Man’,” in *Neues Testament und Kirche: Festschrift für Rudolf Schnackenburg*, ed. J. Gnilka (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), pp. 413–28; *idem*, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge, CUP, 1977), pp. 11–22; M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background to the Term “the Son of Man” and Its Use in Mark’s Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1967), pp. 174–98; *idem*, “Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?” in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: CUP, 1979), pp. 155–68; Moloney, “The End of the Son of Man?” *DRev* 98 (1980), 280–90; N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992), pp. 291–97 (polemically).

the Son of Man on earth who would eventually come as Judge (see Mk 2:10, 28; 8:38; 13:24-27; 14:62). In the Jewish apocalypses, as exemplified by *1 Enoch* 37-71 and *4 Ezra* 13:1-58, the Son of Man was a mysterious hidden, pre-existent heavenly figure (see 1En 48:7; 62:7), who would come at the end of time as Judge (*passim*).¹⁵ The early Christians joined their contemporaries in an increasingly apocalyptic use of "the Son of Man," but that is not the way it was used by Jesus. The Johannine Son of Man sayings *have their origins* – either dependent or independent of the Synoptic tradition – in the association made by Jesus between the Danielic "one like a son of man" and his suffering and death as "the son of the man."¹⁶ As C. Moule provocatively claimed, "I conclude that 'the Son of Man,' so far from being a title evolved from current apocalyptic thought by the early Church and put onto the lips of Jesus, is among the most important symbols used by Jesus himself to describe his vocation and that of those whom he summoned to be with him."¹⁷ The Son of Man in Mark, Matthew, and Luke became increasingly associated with an apocalyptic agenda that is also reflected in the *Parables of Enoch* and may well be influenced by the that stunning composition.¹⁸

15. Daniel 7 continues to influence these Jewish apocalypses, as it continues to influence the developing Christian tradition. It is beyond this paper to take this issue further, but see Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, pp. 33-74; M. Casey, *Son of Man. The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), pp. 99-141; Chialà, "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression," pp. 153-78. Contrary to Reynolds, *Son of Man*, I am arguing that the Synoptic tradition is witness to a Jesus-based tradition and that the Fourth Gospel reinterprets that tradition, following the same trajectory, excluding any trace of an apocalyptic Son of Man. Despite its lateness, the Fourth Gospel retains the link with Jesus' crucifixion more powerfully than the Synoptics, as it is not lured into apocalyptic speculations. Ham, "Son of Man," argues that the 13 Johannine Son of Man sayings fit into the general pattern of the imagery found in Dan 7:13-14 and *1 Enoch* 37-71.

16. The dependence of the Johannine use of "the Son of Man" upon the Synoptic tradition has been argued by several scholars. See, for example, A. J. B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (London: Lutterworth, 1964); R. Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John," in *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday*, ed. R. J. Banks (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1974), pp. 186-204; Schnackenburg, "Der Menschensohn im Johannesevangelium," *NTS* 11 (1964-65), 123-37; *idem*, *The Gospel According to St John*, trans. Kevin Smyth, et al. (3 vols.; HTCNT 4.1-3; London: Crossroad, New York: Burns & Oates, 1968-82), 1:529-42; F. H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (London: SCM Press, 1967), pp. 257-313. None of these scholars adopt the above association between Jesus and the Danielic Son of Man as a suffering figure.

17. Moule, *The Origin of Christology*, p. 22.

18. The increasingly apocalyptic use of "the Son of Man" as the Synoptic tradition developed (Mk-Lk-Mt) is clearly shown by Chialà, "The Son of Man," pp. 163-68. Nevertheless, the majority of scholarship claims that it developed in the other direction – from apocalyptic to suffering. See, for example, L. K. Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," pp. 311-21, on the suffering Son of Man sayings in the Synoptic tradition. Also, see Walck's chapter in this book. He describes the Markan suffering Son of Man sayings: "These sayings are evidently a development of the early church" (p. 318). This is not reflected in the texts themselves.

For most scholars, the Son of Man in the Gospels was received from Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic as a heavenly figure. For some, myself included, the Son of Man tradition in the Gospels began with Jesus' own understanding of himself as a suffering figure whose unconditional trust in God would lead to vindication. Where one starts determines where one finishes! Among many, for example H. S. Kvanvig, "The crisis, challenge and foundation of Christian theology would accordingly be to unify this Son of Man theology with the violent fate of Jesus."¹⁹ On the contrary: the Christian theological use of "the Son of Man" began with Jesus' use of the expression to make sense of his oncoming suffering.

What John has done is reinterpret that suffering as exaltation and glorification. The apocalyptic Son of Man is not found in the Gospel of John,²⁰ however much the language surrounding that figure was "in the air" and may be found associated with the "johannization" of the expression. All of the future tenses in Johannine Son of Man sayings (see 1:51; 6:27, 8:28) point to Jesus' revealing mission (1:51), especially on the cross (6:27, 8:28, when read in association with 3:14; 6:53, 8:28; 12:23, 32-34). The expression "the Son of Man" refers only to the period of Jesus' life and death. The two sayings which associate the Son of Man with "glory" and "glorification" are tied to the cross by the use of "the hour has come" (Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα; 12:23), "now" (νῦν; 13:31), and the surrounding context (see 12:24 on the grain of wheat falling into the ground and dying, and 13:32 on glorification "immediately" [εὐθὺς]).

Contrary to widespread interpretation of my earlier work on the Johannine Son of Man, most recently by Benjamin Reynolds (and in the present collection), I do *not* claim that the expression in the Fourth Gospel "refers to his humanity."²¹ I argued that John uses the expression "the Son of Man" to speak of the revelation of the divine (i.e., God) in the events of the life of Jesus, especially the cross. "The Johannine Son of Man is the human Jesus, the incarnate *Logos*; he has come to reveal God with a unique and ultimate authority and in the acceptance or refusal of this revelation the world judges itself."²²

19. H. S. Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, p. 215. In this, I resonate with the sentiments of E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," in *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 82-107. Note especially his famous statement: "Apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology – since we cannot really class the preaching of Jesus as theology" (p. 102). See also pp. 103-04, 106-07.

20. Contrast the chapter by Reynolds in this volume.

21. Reynolds, *Son of Man*, p. 220. See his assessment of my work on pp. 3-5, 220-22.

22. Moloney, *Son of Man*, p. 220. For John, "the Son of Man" is the *locus revelationis* of God, not just a description of the human Jesus. It is not "who he is" but "what God does in and through him." Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 45-46, traces the "characteristic" of heavenly, pre-existent revealer in 1 Enoch's Son of Man (46:3; 48:2-3, 6; 51:3; 62:7), and argues that the Johannine Son of Man repeats that "characteristic" (*passim*). The revelation of God is not only found in Jewish apocalyptic literature – it is an all-pervasive biblical theme. See N. Brox, "Revelation," in *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*, 2:770-75. For the New Testament, see T.

Some contemporary scholarship looks beyond the diachronic questions and asks how any single expression or pericope serves the whole literary utterance (*synchrony*). This is a complex matter, as scholarly objectivity is more difficult. Interpreters, after a close analysis of the data, may decide that the roots of the Johannine use of "the Son of Man" are to be found in Jewish apocalyptic thought, the historical Jesus, the descending and ascending Gnostic heavenly man, the Philonic perfect man, an eschatological, divine, or some other form of "man" speculation that can be discovered in the ancient world. This background is then used to determine the meaning of the Johannine use of the expression.²³ In this approach, *background* determines *meaning*.²⁴

A theory concerning the historical development of the Johannine text should be adopted. For example, in his first contribution to reflection upon the Johannine Son of Man, B. Lindars espoused a two-edition history for the development of the Gospel, and located the Johannine Son of Man sayings within either the first or the second edition. He developed his understanding of the Johannine Son of Man Christology only on the basis of those sayings that belonged to the first edition.²⁵ Similarly, J. Painter has argued that the Son of Man passages in the Gospel of John were inserted into the Gospel at a later stage in the development of the Gospel, in a period of conflict between the Johannine community and the post-war synagogue. This polemic was one of the elements that generated a fragmentary use of an earlier Son of Man tradition.²⁶ In these approaches, the original *Sitz im Leben der Johanneischen Kirche* (the life-setting of the Johannine Church) plays an important role in determining meaning.²⁷

Holtz, "ἀποκαλύπτω," *EDNT* 1:130-32; P.-G. Müller, "φανερῶν," *EDNT* 3:413-414. See p. 414: "John is concerned precisely with concrete appearance and its value for knowledge in emphasizing God's salvific activity in the signs and words of the earthly and resurrected Jesus ... Indeed, Jesus is God's revealer in the larger sense, as the prologue (1:5, 16-18) already emphasizes." Use of the expression "the Son of Man" is part of this broader Johannine theme.

23. For a survey of these positions, see Moloney, *Son of Man*, pp. 222-24. For a succinct presentation of the figure of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 37-71, see J. C. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 37-71," in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Jewish Christianity*, ed. Charlesworth (The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 169-91, and the briefer surveys by A. A. Orlov, "Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, pp. 127-29; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come* (Grand Rapids, MI, and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 82-88. Copious reference to further discussion is found there.

24. This approach is the feature of Bühner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 374-99, 422-29; Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 337-73; *idem*, "Son of Man," pp. 510-24; Painter, "Enigmatic," pp. 1869-87; and Reynolds, *Son of Man*.

25. B. Lindars, "The Son of Man in the Johannine Christology," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley (Cambridge: CUP, 1973), pp. 43-60.

26. See Painter, "Enigmatic," pp. 1869-87.

27. This approach is also found in Ashton, *Understanding*. See, for example, his excursus on the structure of John 3 on pp. 374-77 and his reconstruction of John 7 on pp. 330-36. He never develops an overall theory of how and when these traditions developed, were gathered, edited or transposed by an Evangelist or an editor. But his approach to the text allows him to posit layers of tradition, and assess them accordingly. The same approach is a feature of his recent "Son of Man,"

I have no doubt that the Johannine text, as we have it now, was the product of a long history. I also agree that it is possible, and necessary, for the interpreter to devote attention to the tensions in the narrative that are best explained by the variety of religious and literary currents that played their part in generating the text. *Nevertheless, the best interpreter of the Johannine text is the Johannine text.* We must be clear about what we are doing as we approach a text. The archeological work required to unearth the background to a text, and the further critical work required to peel back the layers of tradition that have been placed side by side to form a complete narrative utterance, are essential elements of biblical scholarship. But equally "essential" is the interpretation of the text as we now have it.²⁸ Not all will agree with this hermeneutical stance, and I respect that. Yet, it appears to me that that such a finely crafted text as the Gospel of John, although not without its literary tensions, the product of some 70 years of storytelling somewhere in the early Church, was presented as a finished story of Jesus so that it might be understood *in terms of itself*.²⁹

Finally, one must recognize the interplay that goes on between the text and the reader, and also between the reader and the text.³⁰ It is only after acquiring familiarity with a text that one comes to establish what can be regarded as core arguments of a text, arguments that belong to the weave and warp of the narrative. John struggled to maintain an almost impossible balancing act. He told a dangerous story about the revelation of God, made visible in the incarnate *Logos*, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, sent from heaven, whose oneness with God was so intimate that what God was, the *Logos* also was (see 1:1-2). But he also wished to insist upon the truth that the *Logos* became fully human (1:14).³¹ The subsequent history of the reception of the

but an overall theory explaining how the Gospel of John resulted from the gathering and editing of these earlier traditions is still lacking. Reynolds, *Son of Man*, rightly assesses all the Son of Man sayings in their present form and context (see p. 2).

28. In this, I agree with J. Blank, *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Freiburg: Lambertus Verlag, 1964), p. 26: "Denn der Text selbst hat darüber noch etwas zu sagen, was in den 'Traditionen' noch nicht enthalten ist ... Die eigentliche Textauslegung beginnt doch erst, wenn die traditionsgeschichtlichen Bausteine beisammen sind." See also Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, p. 79.

29. See Brown, *Introduction*, p. 111, and the oft-attacked, but still valid, remarks of C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 1953), that whoever may have been responsible for the text as we have it "was not necessarily irresponsible or unintelligent" (p. 290). Dodd and Brown preceded the present interest in literary-critical readings. Anyone who has stood before Michelangelo's "David," listened to J. S. Bach, or experienced the performance of Shakespeare in the theatre, is aware that it is simply false to claim: "But as is true in any product of human art or ingenuity, John's Gospel is better understood if one's understanding also relates to the making of it" (Ashton, "Son of Man," p. 529).

30. This process, of course, is complex, and allows for a multiplicity of possible interpretations. See, among several, P. Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press, 1976).

31. For more detail, see Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), pp. 33-48.

Gospel of John tells how dangerous it was to tell the story of Jesus in this fashion. In antiquity it quickly became the favorite Gospel of the Gnostic sects.³² Modern scholarship reflects the result of this "balancing act." The author has been understood as either a Christian attempting to "baptize" Gnosticism, or as a Christian who is slipping off into naïve Docetism.³³

Ashton rejects a number of scholarly attempts to argue that, in John, the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* affirms Jesus' humanity. He summarily dismisses my work with the note: "Moloney's error is to take the christology of the incarnate logos as a kind of axiom from which everything else derives."³⁴ But why is this exegetical stance so wrong? Ashton's answer to that question would be interesting, and no doubt he has one. But it does not appear in his book; it is simply assumed as he adopts the historical-critical paradigm. The Prologue (1:1-18) sets the agenda for the Gospel of John.³⁵ It is the first page of the book, and the reader next plunges into a narrative that must stand or fall by the truth of what has been claimed for Jesus Christ in 1:1-18.³⁶ Ashton is no doubt correct to claim that the *Logos* should not be used as an axiom "from which *everything else derives*" (stress mine). But it is one of several *fundamental axioms* that must be used for an understanding of the Johannine Christology.³⁷

32. On this reception, see R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB 30; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), pp. 47-68. See also Moloney, "Raymond Brown's New *Introduction to the Gospel of John*: A Presentation and Some Questions," *CBQ* 65 (2003), 18-20.

33. Referring, of course, to the well-known debate between Bultmann ("Die Bedeutung der neuerschossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," *ZNW* 24 [1925], 100-46) and Käsemann (*The Testament of Jesus. A Study of John in the Light of Chapter 17*, trans. G. Krodel [London: SCM Press, 1965]).

34. Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 340, n. 11. As well as my insistence on the use of "the Son of Man" to focus upon Jesus' humanity as the locus for the revelation of God in history, he rejects the claims of Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 244, and Pamment, "The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel," pp. 56-66. Pamment does not argue for a focus on Jesus' humanity as a locus of revelation. She claims that the Johannine use of "the Son of Man" is not titular, but "as representing not what everyone is, but what man could and should be" (p. 58). See also W. Wink, "'The Son of Man' in the Gospel of John," pp. 117-23, and Mateos-Camacho, *El Hijo del Hombre*, pp. 159-86, 203-05, who make a similar claim. See also Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, pp. 145-57; Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, pp. 79-111; Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, esp. pp. 69-71, and Ham, "The Title 'Son of Man,'" pp. 67-84. These scholars are closer to my interpretation of the use of the expression to indicate the revelation of God in the human event of Jesus, rather than a presentation of a "perfect man." Rhea, however, argues that the title links the Johannine Christology with "the messianic expectation of the Mosaic-Prophet-Messiah, yet clearly distinguished from it" (*Johannine Son of Man*, p. 48; see the whole of pp. 21-48).

35. See especially C. K. Barrett, "The Prologue of St John's Gospel," in *New Testament Essays* (London: SPCK, 1972), pp. 27-48; M. Theobald, *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos: Studien zum Verhältnis des Johannesprologs zum Corpus des Evangeliums und zu 1 Joh* (NTAbh N.F. 20; Münster: Aschendorff, 1988).

36. As C. K. Barrett comments on Jn 1:1 (*The Gospel According to St John* [London: SPCK, 1978 (2nd edn.)], p. 156): "John intends that the whole of his Gospel be read in the light of this verse. The deeds and words of Jesus are the deeds and words of God; if this be not true the book is blasphemous." This claim can be made for Jn 1:1-18.

37. The formative role of Jn 1:1-18 for the Johannine Christological narrative is largely ignored in the generally more synchronic reading of Reynolds, *Son of Man*. The need to ignore 1:1-18 is explicitly argued by Ashton, "Son of Man," pp. 523-24.

The Johannine Son of Man Sayings

There are 13 Johannine Son of Man sayings (1:51; 3:13, 14; 5:27; 6:27, 53, 62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23, 34 [bis]; 13:31) and a reading of the Gospel that respects the overall theological tendency of the Gospel demands that all 13 be read synchronically. The meaning of the expression in any one of them should be guided by the meaning of the other 12. Three elements in the Johannine use of the Son of Man (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) influence majority scholarly opinion: its association with the verbs “to ascend” (ἀναβαίνω), “to descend” (καταβαίνω in 1:51; 3:13; 6:62), “to lift up” (ὑψόω in 3:14; 8:28; 12:32-34) and “to glorify” (δοξάζω in 12:23; 13:31-32). The Johannine Son of Man is glorified (12:23; 13:31-32) by his ascent into heaven (1:51; 3:13, 14; 8:28; 12:32). The heavenly figure returns to where he was before (6:62; see 3:13). Thus, the determining feature of the Johannine Son of Man is his glorification and ascent into and his descent from heaven. What he is able to do as a result of his descent to earth depends upon the heavenly origins of the Son of Man.³⁸

This majority view depends upon an apocalyptic use of “the Son of Man,” and one could look readily at the *Parables of Enoch* for its inspiration. In the context of current discussions, the Enochic use of “the Son of Man” lends solid support to this view. The advocates of the Johannine Son of Man as a “heavenly figure” focus upon four texts: 1:51, 3:13, 6:62, and 5:27. A brief analysis of these sayings shows that they can be understood without the support of speculation over a heavenly figure.

John 1:51

This passage has long been regarded as an intrusion into a series of initial confessions of faith, climaxing in the words of Nathanael to Jesus in 1:49. The problem is resolved by claiming that vv. 50-51 do not belong to this context, and that originally Nathanael's confession led directly into 2:1-11.³⁹

38. See, for example, Bühner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 385–99, 422–29; Painter, “Enigmatic,” pp. 1877–80; Loader, *Christology*, pp. 82–92, 107–21; Walck, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels,” pp. 331–32; Sasse, *Der Menschensohn im Evangelium nach Johannes*. Sasse rightly claims that there is a coherent Son of Man Christology in the Fourth Gospel, but insists, on the basis of the ascent–descent schema, that “Der Menschensohn selbst ist ein himmlisches Wesen” (p. 239 and *passim*). As such, Jesus, the Son of Man, is a unique giver of life. See my review of this study in *JTS* 53 (2002), 210–15. Burkett, *Son of Man*, pp. 38–75, sees the ascent–descent schema as the unanswered question in the Johannine Son of Man debate. He resolves it by claiming that it comes from Prov 30:1-4. Brown, *Introduction*, p. 259, links the Son of Man with Jewish Wisdom speculation (and possibly later Gnostic speculation, the Philonic and *Poimandres* portrayals [n. 90]). He summarizes the portrait as “preexistence with God, coming from heaven into this world, communication of revelation or divine knowledge, offer of spiritual food, producing division or self-judgment when some people accept and others refuse.”

39. See, for example, M.-É. Boismard, *Du Baptême à Cana (Jean 1,19-2,11)* (Paris: Cerf, 1956), p. 105; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29-29a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966–70), 1:88; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:320; R. Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs. A*

More convincing, however, has been the synchronic reading of 1:19–2:11 as a Christian rereading, on the basis of Ex 19:7–19 and the midrashic commentary on Exodus 19 in the *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael*, of the celebration of the Sinaitic gift of the “glory” (δόξα) of the Law at Pentecost. The four “days” of preparation (Jn 1:19–51) lead to the gift of the δόξα at Cana (2:11; see LXX Ex 19:11 [bis], 15, 16: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τριτῇ).⁴⁰ This reading respects both the possible Jewish world behind the text that produced 1:19–2:11 (*diachrony*), and the present literary unity of the text as we have it, once the traditions have been placed side by side (*synchrony*).

Once the overall context of revelation is established, via the link with the background of the Jewish celebration of Pentecost and the gift of the “glory” (δόξα) at Sinai, 1:51 is a promise of the revelation of the heavenly. Following a Jewish tradition that shifted the ascent and the descent of the angels in Gen 28:12 from the ladder to Jacob,⁴¹ the opening of the heavens promises the revelation of God, and the ascent and descent of the angels upon (ἐπὶ) the Son of Man indicates that this revelation will be seen (see v. 50: ὄψῃ; v. 51: ὄψεσθε). *The Son of Man is firmly upon earth*, and the angels ascend and descend upon him, communicating the revelation of the heavenly.⁴² It is not legitimate to claim that in 1:51 the Son of Man ascends and descends; the angels do.⁴³

Reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel (SNTSMS 11; Cambridge: CUP, 1970), pp. 179–89. Most recently, see Painter, “Enigmatic,” p. 1873.

40. See J. Potin, *La fête juive de la Pentecôte* (2 vols.; LD 65; Paris: Cerf, 1971), 1:46–70 (for the midrashic and other targumic texts, see 2:7–32).

41. Very influential for this suggestion is the work of H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* (Uppsala: Almqvist, 1929), pp. 33–42. See Moloney, *Son of Man*, pp. 26–28. More recently, see B. Schwank, “Jakobstraum (Gen 28,12) und christologische Erfüllung (Joh 1,51),” *Erbe und Auftrag* 81 (2005), 386–97.

42. See also Wink, “The Son of Man’ in the Gospel of John,” pp. 118–19. Notice my insistence on “the revelation of the heavenly.” The Son of Man is the *locus revelationis* among human beings. Bühner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 391–92, and Painter, “Enigmatic,” pp. 1873–77, reject this suggestion. Before Painter can do this, he makes some crucial diachronic decisions. In the first place, he disassociates 1:51 from its context, claiming that it is a fragment of a Son of Man Christology that never becomes a coherent whole within the Fourth Gospel. Second, he rejects the widely accepted link between the ascent and the descent of the angels upon the Son of Man with the parallel experience of Jacob in Gen 28:12, as interpreted in Jewish tradition. For Painter, 1:51 speaks of an enthroned heavenly Son of Man toward whom the angels move (see also Bühner, *Der Gesandte*, p. 392). Painter argues that, against the synagogue, this fragment from a Son of Man Christology affirms the heavenly origin of Jesus (see p. 1877). Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, pp. 82–85, also questions Odeberg’s use of Jewish midrashic interpretations, and asks what is meant by the ἐπὶ, in this passage. However, he concludes: “[T]his passage speaks of something that happens in connection with the earthly life of Jesus” (p. 84). Painter, “Enigmatic,” pp. 1873–75, points to the lack of “fulfillment” for the promise of 1:51 in the earthly sphere. Although overstated (i.e., the Gospel is a midrash on 1:51), Smalley, “Johannes 1,51 und die Einleitung zum vierten Evangelium,” in *Jesus*, 300–13, correctly points to the life, teaching, death, and resurrection as the fulfillment of 1:51.

43. For the apocalyptic “characteristics” of 1:51, see Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 89–103.

John 3:13-14

The only place in the Gospel of John where ascent and descent (*ἀναβαίνω* and *καταβαίνω*) are associated with the Son of Man is in 3:13. I have argued what follows in more detail elsewhere, but allow me to summarize my conclusions here.⁴⁴ One must look further into the story of the Gospel and the ancient world that produced this text for an explanation of the use of the ascent and descent theme in v. 13. A Jewish myth of the ascent of the great revealers, especially Moses, but claimed for other important figures in Israel's relationship with God (e.g., Enoch, Abraham, Isaiah), provides the background for v. 13a.⁴⁵ Aggressive statements from Jesus and the narrator across the Gospel, affirming that *no one* (*οὐδείς*) has access to the heavenly (see 1:18; 3:13; 6:46 [*οὐκ ἔτι τὸν πατέρα ἑώπακέν τις*]; 14:6) present the Johannine Jesus over against a Jewish tradition that claimed a human being could ascend into heaven and learn the secrets of God. The link between ascent and descent into and from heaven is a *topos* found across the ancient world, clearly present in Deut 30:11-12 and Prov 30:4, possibly also forming an intertext for Sir 1:3, 8, Prov 25:2-3, and WisSol 9:16-18.⁴⁶ "The main purpose of the *topos* is to reaffirm the great gulf that separates humans from the divine realm and the prerogatives of deity, such as immortality, superhuman knowledge, wisdom, and power."⁴⁷ For the author of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus of Nazareth is the unique revealer of God. *No other figure in human history* can claim to have ascended and descended to plumb the mysteries of the heavenly (e.g., the descriptions in 1En 39:3-5; 42:1-2; 71), but the Son of Man.⁴⁸

In 3:13 is not *primarily* about pre-existence or post-existence, ascent and descent. One does not have to worry about its relationship with the reference

44. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 270-73.

45. See Borgen, "Some Jewish Exegetical Traditions as Background for the Son of Man Sayings in John's Gospel," pp. 243-58; Bühner, *Der Gesandte*, pp. 374-85. See also Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 349-54. Ashton concludes on pp. 353-54: "The belligerent assertion that no one has ascended to heaven except Jesus finds a satisfactory *Sitz-im-Leben*, then, in a polemic against counter claims of unique privilege made on behalf of Moses by more 'orthodox' or conservative groups within the synagogue." He refers to 9:28: "You are his disciples, we are disciples of Moses."

46. See the extensive collection of this material from Mesopotamia, and various renditions of the Old Babylonian myths, in R. C. van Leeuwen, "The Background to Proverbs 30:4a," in *Wisdom, You are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. M. L. Barré (CBQMS 29; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), pp. 102-21. As has been mentioned, for Burkett, *Son of Man*, the Johannine Son of Man, and its association with the ascent-descent myth, has its roots in Prov 30:1-4 (see above, n. 12). Burkett also suggests that this background might explain the historical Jesus' use of "the Son of Man" (pp. 177-78).

47. See van Leeuwen, "The Background," p. 121.

48. The other side of the polemic, insisting that this did happen, is widely attested in Second Temple Jewish literature. Among others (e.g., Martls 2:9; 3:7-10; 2Bar 2:1-18; 3 Bar; *Life of Adam and Eve* 25-28), 1 Enoch 71 may well be in view here. For M. A. Knibb, "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, pp. 50-51, this widespread notion of an "otherworldly journey" has its biblical roots in Ezek and Zech 1-8.

to Jesus' ascent to the Father in 20:17, because there is none.⁴⁹ The words of Jesus depend upon a widespread literary *topos* to insist upon his uniqueness as the revelation of the heavenly. The first-person singular ("I") is replaced by the expression "the Son of Man," as in all Gospel traditions.⁵⁰ A promise, also using the expression "the Son of Man," was made to the first disciples in 1:51: if they were to believe, they would see the revelation of the heavenly in the Son of Man. That promise has now been further articulated in a statement of the same truth in 3:13, utilizing a traditional *topos* to indicate the uniqueness of the Son of Man. Only Jesus, the Son of Man, can claim to have plumbed the mysteries of the heavenly and to have made them known. Of course, this claim can only make sense because in the beginning he was turned in loving union with God (1:1-18. See 6:62).

The reader is aware of Jesus' "superhuman knowledge, wisdom, and power."⁵¹ In the light of current Enoch research, we can now possibly extend the source of this awareness of "superhuman knowledge, wisdom and power" (see, for example, 1En 42:1-2; 62:7). But the Son of Man of the *Parables of Enoch* is excluded in the statement that follows immediately: "For just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so also must the Son of Man also be lifted up, so that whoever believes in him may have eternal life" (Jn 3:14-15). This statement, following hard on the heels of verse 13, insists that Jesus, the Son of Man, must be physically lifted up on a cross and there be exalted. Anyone who believes that this moment of crucifixion / exaltation is the revelation of God will have eternal life. Together, verses 13-14 makes two closely related affirmations: Jesus is the unique revealer of the heavenly (v. 13; see 1:51), and that life-giving revelation takes place, enigmatically, on the cross (v. 14).⁵² Only a human being can be crucified, and the use of "the Son of Man" (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) in both v. 13 and v. 14 insists that the human Jesus, who came from heaven as the incarnate *Logos* (see 1:1-18), is the unique revelation of God among women and men, and this revelation can be seen in the crucified one: "They shall gaze upon him [revelation] whom they have pierced [crucifixion]" (19:37).⁵³ If the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch*

49. For this link, see Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 356, with reference to Bultmann, Barrett, Schnackenburg, and Brown. In rejecting any association with ascension in 3:13, I accept the reading of P66 75, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and others, that do not contain the words ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ in v. 13c. For the textual evidence and the discussion, see Moloney, *Son of Man*, p. 59.

50. On Jesus as the "speaker" in Jn 3:11-21, see the discussion in Moloney, *Son of Man*, pp. 42-46.

51. See van Leeuwen, "The Background," p. 121. On the basis of my hermeneutic, there is no point insisting that one cannot use the teaching of 1:1-18 to explain Jesus' use of the Son of Man because it was formed later in the tradition (see, for example, Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 353, n. 51; Painter, "Enigmatic," p. 1879, n. 46). The reader reads 1:1-18 first, and then arrives at 1:51, and subsequently 3:13-14.

52. See Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, pp. 147-50, 150-51; Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, pp. 88-90. Against Reynolds, *Son of Man*, p. 104, who remarks of vv. 13-14: "Each of them introduces a separate Son of Man theme."

53. See also 8:28: "When you have lifted up (ὀψώσῃτε) the Son of Man [crucifixion], then

was “in the air,” as the Fourth Gospel developed its Son of Man Christology, Jn 3:13-14 can be read as a Johannine polemic against the claims made for Enoch as the Son of Man.⁵⁴

John 6:62

Jn 6:62 raises the question of the ascent of the Son of Man: “Then what if you were to see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before.” The Second Temple Jewish background to the half-uttered rhetorical question is the same as 3:13: the necessary ascent into heaven of a revealer who otherwise would have no knowledge of the heavenly. An understanding of the complex grammatical structure of 6:62 goes part of the way to its clarification. The suppression of the apodosis, as here, and not the apodosis, amounts to an aposiopesis. A. T. Robertson writes: “Aposiopesis stands to itself since it is a conscious suppression of part of a sentence under the influence of strong emotion like anger, fear or pity.”⁵⁵

The point of Jesus’ terse and perhaps emotional half-question, however, is contained in his request if the disciples would believe if he were to ascend. He asks them if they would like “the Son of Man” to ascend “to where he was before” (ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον). For the Fourth Evangelist, there is no reason for Jesus to ascend, as other revealers are acclaimed as having done. *He comes from above*. He has been there before, and it is this that gives authority to his words as spirit and life (v. 63). Again, as with 3:13, the information provided in the prologue (1:1-18) lies behind the question that Jesus poses to the disciples. The question of 6:62 is not about the ascension of the Son of Man, but the rejection of the need for it. Again, as with 3:13, there may be some hostility between the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, and the use of “the Son of Man” in the *Parables of Enoch*. The earthly Son of Man has no need to ascend into heaven; he has been there before; he comes from there (see 1:1-18).

Ascent ideas like those found in the *Parables of Enoch* may well have played their part in these concise Johannine expressions. However, in terms of

you will know that I am he (γινώσσετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι: revelation).” Notice my insistence upon the use of “the Son of Man” as the *locus revelationis*.

54. For the “characteristics” of Jn 3:13-14 that come from the apocalyptic Son of Man, see Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 104–30. But here, as elsewhere, do these common “characteristics” make the Johannine Son of Man an apocalyptic figure? Charlesworth has argued also that Jn 3:13, which mentions the Son of Man, may be a polemic against the claim that Enoch is the Son of Man. See Charlesworth, “Did the Fourth Evangelist Know the Enoch Tradition?” in *Testimony and Interpretation: Early Christology and Its Judeo-Hellenistic Milieu, Studies in Honor of Petr Pokorný*, ed. J. Mrázek and J. Roskovec (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 223–39.

55. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923 [4th edn.]), p. 1203. See also BDF, p. 255, par. 482: “Aposiopesis in the strict sense, i.e. a breaking off of speech due to strong emotion or to modesty is unknown in the NT. On the other hand, aposiopesis takes the form of the omission of the apodosis to a conditional subordinated clause (protasis).” Both Robertson and BDF give Jn 6:62 as an example.

the narrative Christology developed by John, they do not point to a Johannine Son of Man as a heavenly figure who has come to earth, and who will return to heaven again. Indeed, in both 3:13 and 6:62 Jesus rejects the notion of his need to ascend and descend like Moses, Enoch, Abraham, and Isaiah. Informed of Jesus' origins in 1:1-18, the reading process from 1:51 to 3:13, read side by side with 3:14 and its reference to the crucifixion, suggests that in 3:13 Jesus reaffirms that the Son of Man is the unique revelation of the heavenly among women and men.⁵⁶ In 6:62 he refuses to conform to the expected model of a heavenly revealer. He will not "ascend" into heaven as he was there before all time (1:1-2). Any "ascent" behavior would respond to the disciples' all-too-human expectation, as judging "according to the flesh" (*κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*; see 6:63; 8:15) or judging "by appearances" (*κατ' ὄψιν*; see 7:24).

John 5:27

The only time the Son of Man is explicitly recognized as Judge in the Fourth Gospel is within the context of a significant presentation of realized eschatology: "The hour is coming *and now is* when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live. For as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself" (Jn 5:25-26). It is widely accepted that Jn 5:24-25 is one of the most explicit statements of the Johannine belief that judgment happens *now* as a result of the acceptance or refusal of the revelation of God that takes place in and through Jesus. It is within that context that the Johannine Jesus announces: "For as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself, and has given him authority to execute judgment, *because he is Son of Man*." This is no future apocalyptic appearance of the Son of Man, but the presence of the revelation of God in and through Jesus that brings about judgment *now*.⁵⁷

The influence of Dan 7:13-14 is obvious here, as has been claimed by all who have assessed the use of the anarthrous use of "Son of Man" in 5:27.⁵⁸ Again the presence "in the air" of the significant role of "the Son of Man" as Judge in the *Parables of Enoch* (esp. in 46:1-8 and 69:27-29), itself a reinterpretation of Dan 7:13-14, may have played its part in shaping these words of the Johannine Jesus. But, as is to be expected, the Johannine use of this judgment language must be interpreted in terms of both the context of Jn

56. I again draw attention to my insistence that the Johannine Son of Man is not simply the human Jesus (*pace* Ashton and Reynolds). It draws the readers' attention to "the unique revelation of the heavenly among women and men."

57. See Blank, *Krisis*, pp. 109-82. See p. 160: "Wenn das göttliche Lebensangebot im *vũn* der Gegenwart erfolgt, dann ist aber auch die *xplwıs* nicht etwas, das erst am Ende akut würde, sondern ihre Möglichkeit ist gleichfalls in der Gegenwart gegeben." See further, p. 161: "Richtig ist, dass der Menschensohnbegriff bei Johannes durchweg die Inkarnation einschließt [*pace* Ashton] und nicht nur eine Hoheitsaussage ist."

58. For a detailed comparison of the two texts, and the scholarly discussion, see Moloney, *Son of Man*, pp. 77-86, and Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 357-63. For the apocalyptic "characteristics" of 5:27, see Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 131-46.

5:19-30 and the theme of judgment in the Gospel as a whole. "The Son of Man is where revelation and judgment take place (see 1:51) among the men who will lift up the unique revealer on a cross (3:13-14). The Son of Man is the one who, consequently, will exercise all judgment (5:27). It is as Son of Man that Jesus appears upon the scene, a man among men."⁵⁹

The "lifting up" of the Son of Man

The claim that the Johannine Son of Man is a heavenly figure is supported when the Johannine use of the verb "to lift up" (3:14: ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ; 8:28: ὅταν ὑψώσῃτε; 12:32: καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς) is taken as a reference to ascension.⁶⁰ This interpretation would add three more "ascent" passages to the Johannine Son of Man. Ascension is certainly behind the meaning of the expression in Phil 2:8, where, as a result of the "emptying" (κένωσις), Jesus is exalted by God. But the broader context of the Johannine understanding of the death of Jesus,⁶¹ and the immediate context of the "lifting up" sayings

59. Moloney, *Son of Man*, p. 86. See pp. 77–86 (NB: "the Son of Man is where revelation and judgment take place"). Obviously, it could be claimed that the Johannine link between the human Jesus and the human figure of Enoch with the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 71:14 are related. But the documents are very different, and 71:14 comes as such a surprise that many suggest that it is an interpolation. A direct link is hard to argue. I am no Enoch scholar, and do not know Ethiopic, but I am struck by *1 Enoch* 60:10 where Michael addresses Enoch (or Noah?; but see v. 1) as follows: "Here, Son of Man, you wish to know what is hidden" (60:10). One does not have to wait until 71:14 for the identification of the Son of Man as a human being. I am aware that the Ethiopic (*walda sab*) in 60:10 is different from the *walda bēsi* in 71:14, but J. J. Collins, "The Son of Man in First Century Judaism," *NTS* 38 (1992), 455–57, links 60:10 with 46:3 and 71:14, concluding: "The Son of Man is the pre-eminent Righteous One in heaven, the supernatural double not of the individual Enoch but of all righteous human beings. In so far as Enoch is pre-eminent among righteous human beings he has a unique affinity with the heavenly Son of Man" (p. 457; see also *idem*, "Enoch and the Son of Man," pp. 221–22). Kvanvig ("Son of Man," pp. 197–98) rejects this suggestion. But 60:10 at least looks like the tradition of Ezekiel's use of "Son of Man" to address the lowly figure of the prophet (see Collins, "The Son of Man," p. 456). For the accepted position on chaps. 70–71, see Knibb, "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, p. 63: "Here it should simply be noted that the contrast with the view of chapters 37–69, where a clear distinction is made between Enoch and the Son of Man, and the fact that chaps. 70–71 come as something of a surprise after the end of the third parable in 69:29 point strongly to the view that chapters 70–71 are a secondary addition to the Book of Parables" (*italics mine*). For a view in defense of the identity between Enoch and the Son of Man, see Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, pp. 197–215. On the oneness between Enoch and the Son of Man as an explanation for the Johannine use of the title "to unify Jesus' terrestrial and heavenly origins, because it contains both elements," see p. 214, with reference to Painter, "Enigmatic." See the rejection of this identification, an alternative reading and interpretation of 71:14, and the insistence that *1 Enoch* 71 is a secondary addition, in J. J. Collins, "Enoch and the Son of Man," pp. 221–27.

60. See, among many, Painter, "Enigmatic," pp. 1877–80, 1883–84; Sasse, *Der Menschensohn*, pp. 79–156; Brown, *Introduction*, pp. 255–56.

61. On this, see Moloney, "Telling God's Story: The Fourth Gospel," in *The Forgotten God. Perspectives in Biblical Theology*, ed. A. A. Das and F. Matera (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002), pp. 107–22.

themselves, indicate that John uses it differently. We must allow John to be John. The Johannine use of this verb is one of several examples of words with "double-meanings" in this Gospel.⁶² In this case, the word can mean a physical "lifting up" on a stake, as Moses did with the serpent in the wilderness (3:14). But it can also mean "exaltation." For John, Jesus' crucifixion is his exaltation. It is there that he makes God known, reveals the glory (δόξα) of God, brings to perfection the task given him by the Father (4:34; 7:4; 13:1; 17:4; 19:28-30), and is himself glorified (13:31-32).⁶³

Proleptically preparing the reader for his unique interpretation of the death of Jesus, John uses "to lift up" (ὑψόω) to mean a physical lifting up which is, at the same time, Jesus' moment of exaltation. Unlike Phil 2:9, where the "exaltation" (ὑψωσις) is the result (διὸ καί) of Jesus' death on the cross (v. 8c), for John, Jesus' exaltation (ὑψωσις) takes place on the cross. In 3:14 Jesus insists that just as (καθώς) Moses lifted up the serpent, so also (οὕτως) the Son of Man must be lifted up.⁶⁴ There is no suggestion, either in Num 21:19 or in Jn 3:14, that the serpent detached itself from the stake and ascended into heaven. Interestingly, Gnostic reflection does have the snake ascend, but this is a fantastic speculation upon the Johannine text.⁶⁵ The close parallel drawn in the text between the "lifting up" of the serpent on a spear, and the "lifting up" of the Son of Man, must be respected.

A further "lifting up" text in the Johannine narrative appears in 12:32: "And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw everyone to myself." In a "footnote" to this passage, the Evangelist explains what he means by the use of "lifting up from the earth": "He said this to show by what death he was to die" (ποῖω θανάτῳ ἡμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν) (v. 33). If the best interpreter of the Johannine text is the Johannine text itself, credence must be given to these "footnotes" added to the text by the author.⁶⁶ Jesus' being lifted up is explained as the means by which he was to die: crucifixion (see also 18:32).⁶⁷

This leaves only 8:28: "when you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will realize that I am he" (ὅταν ὑψώσητε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώσεσθε

62. On the significance of these "double meanings," see among many, R.A. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Foundations and Facets: New Testament, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1983), pp. 152-65.

63. See Moloney, *John*, pp. 481-515; T. Söding, "Kreuzerhöhung. Zur Deutung des Todes Jesu nach Johannes," *ZTK* 103 (2006), 2-25.

64. See Charlesworth's extensive study of Jn 3:14 in *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol Became Christianized* (The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010). He argues that lifting up demands asking what is lifted up; serpent symbolism helps clarify the intent of the Fourth Evangelist.

65. See Hippolytus, *Ref.* V.12, 1-17, 13, esp. V.12, 6-12; 16, 4-6. These texts can be found in Werner Foerster and Robert McL. Wilson, eds., *Gnosis. A Selection of Gnostic Texts* (2 vols.; Oxford: OUP, 1972), 1:284-92.

66. I am borrowing the expression "footnote" from M. C. Tenney, "The Footnotes of John's Gospel," in *BS* 117 (1960), 350-64. See also the excellent survey of these "footnotes" by G. Van Belle, "Les paranthèses Johanniques. Un premier bilan," in *The Four Gospels 1992*, 3:1901-33.

67. See also Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, pp. 145-47.

ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι). This passage occurs within the context of Jesus' bitter conflict with "the Jews" at the Feast of Tabernacles (7:1–10:21). Jesus tells "the Jews" that they are to "lift up" the Son of Man. Does this mean they will crucify him, or send him upwards in his ascent into heaven? It could be argued that Jesus is ironically informing them that they will be responsible for his ascension,⁶⁸ but in the light of 3:14 and 12:32–33, and the context of anger and the desire of "the Jews" to eliminate Jesus (see 7:32, 45; 8:20, 59), Jesus is informing "the Jews" that his being "lifted up" in crucifixion will be a climactic revelation of God (τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι; see also 13:19). The Johannine use of ὑψώω should not be associated with ascension. It is a crucial part of the Gospel's theological understanding of the death of Jesus as a physical "lifting up" that is also his "exaltation."⁶⁹

Thus 1:51, 3:14, 8:28, and 12:32 should be removed from any discussion of the ascent–descent of the Son of Man. The following sayings do not call for a "heavenly" interpretation: 5:27 (the Son of Man as Judge), 6:27 (the Son of Man who will give a food that will not perish), 6:53 (the gift of the Son of Man, his flesh and blood), 9:35 (belief in the Son of Man), and 12:34 (the query from the crowd concerning the death of the Son of Man). Benjamin Reynolds has shown that apocalyptic "characteristics" are present in all these sayings, but underestimates the strength of the "Johannization" of those traditions. The Johannine cross is "exaltation" and "glorification" (see 1:51; 3:13–14; 6:27, 53; 8:28; 12:23; 13:31–32), but only a human being can be crucified. One never finds in the Fourth Gospel (contrast Mk 15:39; Mt 27:54) any link between the Son of God and the crucifixion.⁷⁰ This is a role reserved for the exalted and glorified human figure of the Son of Man.

The "glorification" of the Son of Man

Two Son of Man sayings are associated with glorification. On hearing of the arrival of the Greeks in 12:22, Jesus solemnly announces: "the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified" (ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; Jn 12:23). As Judas leaves the upper room to betray Jesus, it was night (13:30). "When he had gone out [v. 31a: Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν], Jesus

68. As is argued, for example, by Painter, "Enigmatic," pp. 1883–84. I regard such readings as something of a desperate measure to defend the indefensible. They do not allow John to be John. The tight link between the agents of the "lifting up" and the cross in 8:28 is poorly handled by Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 171–72. Were "the Jews" responsible for the ascension?

69. This was conclusively argued many years ago by W. Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannevangelium* (NTAbh 21.1–2; Münster: Aschendorff, 1970 [2nd edn.]). I have yet to see Thüsing's case systematically dismantled by those who argue that the "lifting up" means the ascension. But see now Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 117–27, who challenges Thüsing's thesis.

70. It is interesting to notice that already in Lk 23:47 ("Truly, this man was innocent") there is a movement away from an association of the Son of God with the cross. Reynolds, *Son of Man*, p. 221, following Bauckham, states that in John (with reference to 13:32) God is crucified. I find this affirmation exegetically indefensible, however attractive this idea may be theologically.

announces: ‘Now the Son of Man has been glorified, and God has been glorified in him’” (νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ; Jn 13:31bc). There is a similarity between these sayings. Do they refer to the final glorification of the Son, in his return to the place where he was before the world was made (cf. 17:1, 5)? The immediate contexts, and the broader context of the Gospel story itself, suggest that the glorification referred to in 12:23 and 13:31 points forward to Jesus’ “lifting up” (ὑψωσις) on the cross.

Comments from the narrator are crucial signposts in a narrative. In 2:22, after Jesus offers the sign of his death and resurrection as proof of his authority in the Temple (2:17-21), the narrator comments: “When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this” (v. 22). The death and resurrection of Jesus generate right memory and belief among the disciples. In 7:39 the narrator explains the gift of rivers of living water (7:37-38),⁷¹ adding: “Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified” (οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη; 7:39). There is to be a time in the future when Jesus will be glorified and the Spirit will be given. The theme of Jesus as king, important to the Johannine Passion narrative (see esp. 18:28-29, 16a; 19:16b-37), appears in the narrative in Jn 12:12-19, especially in the quotation of Zech 9:9 (12:15), but Jesus will exercise his kingship on the cross, and not in glorious acclamation. This is the point of Jesus’ initiative in finding an ass and mounting it for his entry into Jerusalem.⁷² The narrator again comments: “His disciples did not understand this at first; but when Jesus was glorified (ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη), they remembered that this had been written of him, and had been done to him (καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ).”

The gift of the Spirit, linked with the glorification of Jesus in 7:39, looks back to the right remembering and believing of the disciples in 2:22 after Jesus’ death and resurrection, and forward to the same experience, after Jesus is glorified, in 12:16. The gift of the Spirit at Jesus’ glorification will enable ignorant disciples to remember Jesus’ words and understand the Scriptures. There is a link between the death and resurrection of Jesus and the glorification. Most scholars look to 20:22 as the fulfillment of 7:59. But an earlier gift of the Spirit is found in 19:30. On the cross, Jesus has been declared a king (19:17-22), a symbol of his intimate possession that will not be torn apart has been offered (vv. 23-25a), and he has instituted a new family in the beloved disciple and his mother (vv. 25b-27). Jesus knows that everything is now finished (v. 28a: πάντα τετέλεσται), the Scriptures have been fulfilled (v. 28b: τετέλεσται). After receiving the vinegar (v. 29), he declares, “it is finished” (τετέλεσται; Jn 19:30a). The steady use of the related verbs τελειώω and τελέω make it clear that Jesus has brought to a perfect end the task the Father gave him (see 4:34:

71. Much scholarly discussion surrounds 7:37-38. The exegete must resolve serious textual problems associated with the punctuation of the passage, the “Scripture” referred to, as well as the interpretation. For a summary of the discussion, and my own view (the water flows from Jesus, not from the believer), see Moloney, *John*, pp. 255–57.

72. For more detail in support of this interpretation, see Moloney, *John*, pp. 350–51, 358–59.

τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον; 13:1: εἰς τέλος; 17:4: τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας).⁷³ His final action is described in v. 30b (καὶ κλῖνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα). Despite the widespread interpretation of these words as a euphemism for death (e.g., “gave up his spirit” [RSV]), that is not what the Greek says. The passage can also be translated: “he gave down (παρέδωκεν) the Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα).”⁷⁴ For the Fourth Gospel, the gift of the Spirit does not take place at Pentecost, but at the cross, at “the hour” of Jesus (see v. 27: ἀπ’ ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας).⁷⁵

The death of Jesus is the moment of glorification anticipated by his words in 12:23, announcing the hour of the glorification of the Son of Man. It will be the time and the place where sheep not of this fold will be gathered to the good shepherd (10:16), the scattered children of God will be gathered (11:52), the grain of wheat will fall and die, so that it might bear much fruit (12:24). On the cross the Son of Man will be lifted up (3:14; 8:28), to gather everyone to himself (12:32). As “the Jews” complain, “The world has gone after him” (v. 19), Greeks come to Jesus, is present in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover (v. 20; see 11:55; 12:1, 12). He turns toward his death and declares that “the hour has come” (ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα) for the Son of Man to be glorified (v. 23).

The first words of 13:31, the continuation of v. 30 that dramatically reports Judas’ departure into the night, are generally overlooked: “When he had gone out” (v. 31a). This temporal link between the departure of the betrayer and Jesus’ words in v. 31 is a first hint that the glorification of the Son of Man (v. 31b) is to be associated with his death. Reading 13:31-32 as part of the conclusion to the literary unit of 13:1-38, and not as the opening words of the first discourse (i.e., 13:31–14:31), heightens this association.⁷⁶ There can be no gainsaying the truth that the death of Jesus has been anticipated by his washing the feet of the disciples (13:5-15), the gift of the morsel, even to Judas (vv. 21-30). These gestures, with their accompanying teaching, demonstrate Jesus’ love for his own “until the end” (εἰς τέλος; Jn 13:1), and ask that they follow his example (v. 15), loving one another as he has loved them (vv. 34-35).

In the midst of prophecies of betrayal and denials (vv. 2, 10-11, 18, 21-30, 36-38) Jesus explains to his ignorant and failing disciples: “I tell you this

73. This is another example of John’s tendency to use different verbs to say the same thing, for the sake of stylistic variety (e.g., ἀποστέλλω-πέμπω; ἀγαπάω-φιλέω). For an important recent discussion of this issue, see F. T. Gignac, “The Use of Verbal Variety in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Transcending Boundaries: Contemporary Readings of the New Testament. Essays in Honor of Francis J. Moloney*, ed. R. M. Chennattu and M. L. Coloe (BibSciRel 187; Rome; LAS, 2005), pp. 191–200.

74. On this, see the important study of R. Kysar, “He Gave up the Spirit’: A Reader’s Reflection on John 19:30b,” in *Transcending Boundaries*, pp. 161–72.

75. On this “fulfillment” at the cross, see Francis J. Moloney, “The Gospel of John as Scripture,” *CBQ* 67 (2005), 454–68.

76. Most scholars disassociate vv. 31-38 from 13:1-30, and read 13:31–14:31 as the first (and probably oldest) section of the final discourse. But vv. 31-38 are not discourse. See Culpepper, “The Johannine *hypodeigma*: A Reading of John 13:1-38,” *Sem* 53 (1991), 133–52; Moloney, “A Sacramental Reading of John 13:1-38,” *CBQ* 53 (1991), 237–56; Jean-Noël Aletti, “Jn 13 – Les problèmes de composition et leur importance,” *Bib* 87 (2006), 263–72.

now before it takes place so that when it takes place you may believe that I am he (ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι).” Jesus both shows and tells the consummate perfection of his love for them before the event of the cross. He does this so that when the hour of the cross comes, they may recognize the revelation of God (ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι) in the crucified one (see also 3:13-14; 8:28). In 12:22-23 the arrival of the Greeks led to Jesus announcing that the hour of his glorification on the cross had come. In a parallel fashion, as Judas departs to betray him (v. 31a), Jesus announces that “now” the Son of Man is glorified. The glorification of Jesus on the cross is at hand, and he will make God known.⁷⁷

The glorification of Jesus (2:22; 7:39; 12:22), the Son of Man (12:23; 13:31), focuses upon the consummate human experience of Jesus of Nazareth, his death by crucifixion.⁷⁸ I suspect that a reader would be surprised to find – as the story draws to its close – a prayer of Jesus that asked: “Father, the hour has come, glorify *your Son of Man* so that *the Son of Man* might glorify you. Glorify *the Son of Man* in your own presence with the glory that *the Son of Man* had before the world was made” (see 17:1, 5).⁷⁹ The Son of Man glorifies God, and is himself glorified in the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth (2:22; 3:14; 7:39; 8:28; 12:16, 23, 32-34; 13:31-32).⁸⁰

Conclusion

Does my understanding of the Johannine Son of Man mean that the *Parables of Enoch* does not come into play? This is hardly the case. As B. Reynolds has shown, apocalyptic “characteristics” can be found across the Johannine Son of Man sayings. For example, the Enochic Son of Man comes as Judge (see 1En 46:4-6; 62:3-13; 69:27-29 [see Dan 7:13-14]), just as the Father “has given him authority to exercise all judgment, because he is Son of Man” (Jn

77. On the cross Jesus is glorified (v. 31b), and God is made known, that is, “glorified in him” (v. 31c). This action depends totally upon God, and it will take place “at once” (εὐθύς) (v. 32). For this interpretation of 13:1-38, see Moloney, *John*, pp. 370-91.

78. As Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, p. 110, rightly claims: “The glorification of the Son of man is related to a historical event.” See, most recently, N. Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: Das Verständnis der δόξα im Johannesevangelium* (WUNT 2.231; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), for an exhaustive study that links the Johannine use of δόξα with the death of Jesus. For a contrary position, see Painter, “Enigmatic,” pp. 1883-84. For Loader, *Christology*, pp. 107-21, it is both the cross and the return to glory by means of the ascension.

79. This would have to be acceptable if the description of John’s Son of Man Christology in Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 224-25, is accurate. As in all four Gospels, “the Son of Man” replaces “I” in Jesus’ speech, I have done so in v. 4, inserting “the Son of Man” where the Greek original identifies the “I” of Jesus with “the Son” of v. 1. If, for John, “the Son” equates to “the Son of Man,” this would be a legitimate reading of 17:1, 5.

80. For a denial of this position, claiming that the glorification of the Son of Man includes Jesus’ Passion and death, but is not complete until the glorious Son of Man returns to earth, see Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 190-213. I cannot find this in Johannine Son of Man texts, but it is Johannine (see 14:1-3, 18-21, 28-31; 17:1-5, 24-26).

5:27). The Enochic Son of Man brings "salvation" to the righteous (see 1En 48:4; 62:12-13; 71:17 [see Dan 7:22, 25-27]), just as "Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so much the Son of Man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have eternal life" (Jn 3:14-15; see 6:53-54; 8:28; 9:35-38; 12:31-33). The Enochic Son of Man is an object of worship (1En 48:5; 62:6, 9 [see Dan 7:27]) just as the man born blind, on being informed that the Son of Man is the one whom he sees and hears, exclaims, "Lord, I believe, and he worshipped him (προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ)" (Jn 9:35-38). The Enochic Son of Man is, among other things, the Messiah (1En 62:1-16), just as the crowds identify the Messiah with the Son of Man as they ask: "We have heard from the law that the Christ remains forever. How can you say that the Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?" (Jn 12:34).⁸¹

In my reading of the complex of 13 Johannine Son of Man sayings, there is a repetition of the Enochic theme of the Son of Man's role as revealer (see 1En 46:3). The explanation of the Danielic "one like a son of man" (Dan 7:13-14) in terms of the vindicated Holy Ones of the Most High (7:17-27) is not far from the *Parables of Enoch* 46-47, obviously dependent upon Daniel 7. However, the son of man in 1En 46:2-6 is not only the revealer (46:3), but also the eschatological Judge of "the kings and the mighty" (46:4-5). It is not the one like a son of man / Holy Ones of the Most High, therefore, who are vindicated in the *Parables of Enoch*, but "the righteous are vindicated by the Lord of the Spirits / the Head of Days" (47:3-4).

If the *Parables of Enoch* is pre-Christian, with its unique reinterpretation of the Danielic Son of Man, a dynamic rereading of "the Son of Man" was "in the air" and is continued in early Christian documents, including the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, it may have been one of the reasons for the ongoing persistence of the strange Greek translation of a Semitic expression placed on the lips of Jesus at the end of the "first Christian century."⁸² However, because of the growth of the Johannine tradition from the Jesus tradition, and the different development of the *Parables of Enoch* 37-71 as part of the widespread interest in apocalyptic by Second Temple Judaism, we should not speak of "dependence."⁸³ Much is shared, but one does not depend upon the other. I have suggested above that, in 3:13-14 and 6:62, John may be attempting to contradict apocalyptic traditions about ascending and descending revealers. These ideas are "in the air" and they are found in John, but they do not produce an apocalyptic Son of Man.

I have approached the Johannine Son of Man in light of the rebirth of interest in and the new consensus regarding the origin of the *Parables of*

81. For a summary presentation of the "characteristics" of the Enochic Son of Man, see Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 45-49. For their presence in the Johannine sayings, see pp. 215-16.

82. As Borsch, *Son of Man*, p. 265, comments as he opens his consideration of the Johannine Son of Man: "[W]e also think that the Son of Man traditions and themes were rapidly falling into disuse and, outside of their *living milieu*, were no longer well understood" (italics original).

83. See also, although on somewhat different grounds, Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," pp. 333-36.

Enoch after more than 30 years of teaching, writing, and reflection upon the Gospel of John. Important work has been carried out on the Johannine Son of Man in those years, but it remains clear where I differ from the majority of scholars who insist that the Johannine use of “the Son of Man” points to a heavenly figure and, most recently, an apocalyptic figure. On the one hand, I cannot accept that either $\psi\acute{\omega}\omega$ (3:14; 8:28; 12:32-33) or $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ (when used in association with δ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [12:23; 13:31]) refer to *both* the crucifixion and the return to heaven in glory by means of ascension or exaltation. On the other hand, I have become increasingly impressed by the narrative unity of the Johannine text and the subsequent need to interpret John in the light of John before asking diachronic questions.

The more I read the Fourth Gospel, the clearer it appears to me that its author could not use the name “Jesus” to speak of the pre-existent *Logos* (1:1-2). Not until the *Logos* becomes flesh (v. 14) can John introduce the name “Jesus Christ” (v. 17). Similarly, he uses the term “the Son,” and not “Jesus,” to speak of the one who returns to the glory that was his before the world was made (17:1, 5). The same must be said for the other expression used to speak of the function of the human event of “Jesus,” especially the cross: “the Son of Man.” My earlier work created the impression that the Johannine Son (of God) and Son of Man Christologies were to be radically separated.⁸⁴ This position misunderstands the unity of the Johannine Christology that should not be broken into separate compartments. *Jesus Christ* is the Son of Man, and he is *also* the incarnate *Logos*, the pre-existent, present and post-existent Son (of God).⁸⁵ Of course the Son of Man came from heaven because the *Logos* became flesh and his name was Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is “the Son of Man.”

Whatever influence the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch* may have had upon the Johannine use of the expression, in the end they are different in form and content. The *Parables of Enoch* is a major Second Temple Jewish apocalypse, and the Gospel of John is a Christian story focused on Jesus, the pre-existent *Logos*, the revelation of God in and through Jesus Christ, Son and Son of Man, who glorified God and is glorified by means of the cross (see 11:4). The Jewish apocalyptic thought present in the Fourth Gospel has been thoroughly “johannized.”⁸⁶ Only a human being can be crucified, and John does not hesitate to tell of the “lifting up” of the Son of Man. He never speaks of the crucifixion of the Son. Yet, on the other hand, John never speaks of the “sending” of the Son of Man. John does not use “the Son of Man” to focus his

84. See Moloney, *Son of Man*, pp. 208–20. Pazdan, *The Son of Man*, p. 80, claimed that I maintain “an absolute distinction between the two titles.” This impression needs the correction indicated by this essay.

85. On this, see Pazdan, *The Son of Man*, pp. 76–86; Reynolds, *Son of Man*, pp. 130, 222–23.

86. Reynolds’ fine work (*Son of Man*) devotes attention to the uniqueness of the Johannine use of the apocalyptic Son of Man. However, in my opinion the Johannine rereading of apocalyptic (Enochic?) traditions thoroughly realizes them, rendering the Johannine Son of Man a “present” figure. The weight given to the diachronic and synchronic determines our differing interpretations. For a similar critique of Reynolds’ work, see the review of the book by Jeffrey Staley in *CBQ* 72 (2010), 160–61.

readers' attention upon the humanity of Jesus, but upon the revelation of God that takes place in and through the human event of Jesus Christ.⁸⁷

The Johannine use of the expression "the Son of Man" came into the Fourth Gospel from the primitive tradition's adoption of Jesus' own use of the expression (see Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34 and parallels).⁸⁸ Its focus upon the human event of Jesus Christ, especially the cross, opens the door to the tendency, in both the Greek and the Latin Patristic traditions, to use the expression "Son of Man" to stress Jesus' humanity, and the "Son of God" to stress his divinity.⁸⁹ This is *not* the Johannine understanding of the two expressions, but the Fathers correctly caught the link between the Johannine use of "the Son of Man" for the presentation of the revelation of God in the human event of Jesus Christ, especially in his being "lifted up" on a cross (see 3:14; 8:28; 12:32; 19:5?).

87. Whatever one thinks of much of his analysis (e.g., the use of the Gnostic myth and the disappearance of the *Was* into the *Dass*), Bultmann's focus upon Johannine Christology as "revelation" that demands the response of faith remains true. See Bultmann, *Theology*, 2:49-92. He rightly claims: "Now it becomes clear that the Revealer is nothing but a definite historical man, Jesus of Nazareth" (p. 69). Bultmann wrongly claimed that John christianized the language of the Gnostic myth for this Christology (see p. 66). It is now clear that part of the process was the johannization of the language of Jewish apocalyptic, as Reynolds' word indicates.

88. See Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, pp. 155-57.

89. This distinction is already found in the Apostolic Fathers. See Ignatius, *Ephesians* 20.2; *Letter of Barnabas* 12.10 (see Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* [2 vols.; LCL; London: William Heinemann, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press]), 1:195 (Ignatius); 1:387 (*Barnabas*). For Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man," p. 189, n. 2, this is regarded as a "distinct break." Perhaps it would be better to speak of "continuity / discontinuity." See Pamment, "Son of Man," p. 56, n. 9.