

EXOUSIA IN MARK'S GOSPEL

BY

SISTER MARY HELEN CARROLL, R.S.M., B.A.

A RESEARCH PAPER SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY OF
THE THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT, MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
OCTOBER, 1967

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary man is gravely concerned with the multiple authority crises which have arisen in societal groups everywhere. It is as though every man repeats the question originally addressed to Jesus Christ: "By what authority are you doing these things or who gave you this authority to do them?" (Mk. 11:28). The child to the parent, the student to the teacher, the employee to the employer: all echo in some fashion this basic question.

The institutionalized Catholic Church is no exception in this matter. The faithful of a parish demand an intelligent exercise of pastoral authority. The pastors turn to their bishops with the same plea. The bishops turn to each other and the Pope, ever seeking a better understanding of their relative authority. A Father DuBay on the west coast, a Father DePauw on the east coast, a noteworthy theology symposium in the middlewest, each affected by ecclesiastical authority, bring clearly into focus the problem of authority in today's Church. Each asks his respective organ of authority "By what authority are you doing these things or who gave you this authority to do them?" (Mk. 11:28).

Implicit in the question is a demand that individuals in positions of authority take the time to develop a genuine understanding of the authority they possess and then act on their newly found or, perhaps, newly realized knowledge.

The various documents issued by Vatican II, particularly

the Constitution on the Church, examine in very succinct fashion, the notion of authority in the Church. A recurring impulse evident in the document indicates that the Church looks to the Jesus of Scripture for an authentic basic expression of her twentieth century exercise of authority. It is clearly stated that "Bishops govern the particular Churches entrusted to them as the vicars and ambassadors of Christ", (Par. 27). Subsequently it is said that "...by divine condescension, the laity have Christ for their brother who, though He is Lord of all, came not to be served but to serve, (cf. Mt. 20:28). They also have for their brothers those in the sacred ministry who by teaching, by sanctifying, and by ruling with the authority of Christ so feed the family of God that the new commandment of charity may be fulfilled by all", (par. 32).

This instinctive realization which looks to Christ for model implementation of any basic attitude presupposes a fundamental appreciation of who Christ is. One possible source of information in this area is Sacred Scripture. Here the Church and her members can legitimately look for an authentic description of how Jesus understood Himself and how, on the basis of His self-understanding, He exercised His authority.

The particular problem to be considered in this paper is the portrait the author of the second gospel presents of Jesus precisely in His exercise of authority. Since Scripture is part of a living literary tradition and relies upon the ordinary tools of ex-

pression peculiar to its period, examination of extra-Markan material will furnish assistance in understanding the meaning of the text. Consequently selections from sacred and profane literature, some of which chronologically antedate and some of which are contemporaneous with the gospel text, will provide a basis for comparison and contrast.

CHAPTER I

EXOUSIA IN PROFANE AND SEPTUAGINT GREEK

A key term employed in the second gospel for authority is exousia. This Greek word is derived from exestin which means "it is free" in the sense that no obstacle stands in the way of an action or in the sense that an opportunity for activity exists.¹ Since Mark's gospel was written in a milieu strongly influenced by Greek culture, one could logically expect that its author would express himself in terms which conveyed meanings consonant with that culture. Further, since much recent scholarship has disclosed that many of the references to the Old Testament in the New Testament are based upon the Septuagint version, itself influenced by Greek culture, one can reasonably expect to see some continuity not only between the New Testament, Mark's gospel specifically,² and the Old Testament, but also between Septuagint and profane Greek vocabulary usage. Hence when the question "By what authority are you doing these things, or who gave you this authority to do them?" (Mk. 11:28) is addressed to Jesus, and the word used for authority is exousia, a problem arises. Does the term convey exactly the same meaning here as it does in Septuagint and profane Greek?

Selected texts from Plato and Aristotle will furnish comparison and contrast material from profane Greek; subsequently texts from writers contemporary to the authors of the New Testament will be employed.

In the Republic Plato reveals one understanding of exousia:

"If you could imagine anyone obtaining the power (exousia) of becoming invisible and never doing any wrong or teaching what was another's..."³ The statement indicates that the power spoken of here is: (1) acquirable, if it is to be somehow obtained; and (2) the source or root of a special mode of being, here the power of being invisible.

The Laws speaks of exousia as a permission which can be granted by one who governs a certain area: "Those only who have received permission (exousian) shall be allowed to write verses at one another..."⁴ The permission in this context is granted by the minister of education. Again, we see exousia viewed as acquirable and as the root of some mode of acting, specified here as public verse writing. The power to use publicly one's native capacity for writing poetry is granted to those who meet the state's standards.

Another use of the term appears in Plato's Gorgias.

Socrates says that "It would be hard on you if you alone were deprived of liberty (exousia) at Athens where every man is free to say what he will."⁵ The term here indicates a capacity rooted in man, the exercise of which can be curtailed. This liberty is specified in terms of each man saying "what he will."

Plato employs the term exousia not only for a capacity to act, rooted in person or state, but also to signify the special positions which bring powers of action. "...offices (exousia) are to be held by women as well as by men."⁶

In another context he states that "The proper office (exousias) of punishment is two-fold...to make better or make an example." Here he means simply the role and purpose of punishment.⁷

Further use of exousia appears in Plato's Republic. "You should see him when he has some great opportunity (exousias) of acting dishonestly..."⁸ In this selection a comparison between an oligarchical state and a citizen reveals that, just as the state though possessed of an honest exterior, given the chance, will indulge in evil, so too the citizen, though apparently upright, given the possibility, will turn to evil. Exousia here points to a combination of circumstances which allow activity of one sort or another.

The above quotations illustrate the various uses of exousia in Plato's writings. It can mean simply unspecified opportunity, or the root of some specific type of activity, which root is found properly in man or in the state. Further, it can designate the purpose or end of an action or the social position which empowers one to execute certain functions.

Aristotle, too, makes use of the term exousia to convey various related concepts. He speaks of it as a capacity native to man to secure some personal good when he states that "The happiness and well-being which all men manifestly desire, some have the power (exousia) of attaining, but to others, from some accident or defect of nature, the attainment of them is not granted."⁹

The position one occupies in society is also designated by

the same term. "Hence those in a position (exousia) which places them above toil have stewards who attend to their households while they occupy themselves with philosophy or politics."¹⁰

A further extension of exousia as position can be seen in designating the power deriving from one's position in society with the same term. "And if anyone is to be deprived of his power (exousia) let it be diminished gradually, not taken away from him all at once."¹¹ The total context here indicates that the power spoken of is political in nature. This advice is given to a tyrant in order to help him maintain his position. Basically, the tyrant must simulate as far as possible the conduct of a good king and, as the good king would, gradually decrease the power of any offensive individual he has placed in a position of authority.

In speaking of men who have the power to secure what they desire, Aristotle mentions the wealthy. "...rich men, being able to command (exousian) needless pleasures, do have an appetite for pleasures."¹² He indicates here a type of power which derives from some personal possession, in this case riches. The type of possession determines the kind and extent of authority exercised: in this case riches permit the pursuit of pleasure.

Another meaning for exousia appears in the Ethics. "Democracy is found chiefly in masterless dwellings (for here everyone is on an equality), and in those in which the ruler is weak and everyone has license (exousia) to do what he pleases."¹³ Exousia is used

in a pejorative sense here and conveys the notion of a native capacity do, as and what one desires.

As in Plato, so in Aristotle, exousia can designate a power, limited or unlimited, native to man; one that derives from his position in society or is in some manner obtainable; or one that derives from some specific possession, such as wealth. There is then a related use of the term in the writings of Plato and Aristotle.

Exousia is used in the same or related senses in literature whose composition occurs in periods closer to that of the writing of the New Testament. For example, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the last half of the first century B. C., used it for the concept of authoritative position or office of the state.¹⁴

Flavius Josephus, a Jewish author, also wrote in Greek at approximately the same time the New Testament documents were being prepared. His use of the term exousia parallels that found in other Greek sources. It can mean permission, (Antiquitates 20, 193), authority, (Vita, 72), right given or safeguarded by the law, (Antiquitates 4, 247), power of disposal, (Vita 348), power of the king, (Vita 112, Antiquitates 14, 302), and people in authority, (Bellum Judaicum 2, 350).¹⁵

The next task is to examine the use of the term exousia in the Septuagint and discover its particular meanings here. The findings will be valuable in determining the nature of exousia in Mark's gospel since, as was mentioned above, the New Testament writers in general and the author of the second gospel in particular

drew many of their quotations from the Old Testament from the Greek Septuagint.¹⁶

The move from profane Greek to the literature of the Old Testament is an interesting one. The term exousia is not the only word used to express the many facets of the concept of authority. This is partially due to the fact that the mode of expression natural to the Hebrew and Aramaic languages employed in the composition of some of the texts conveyed quite graphically the meaning of authority in figures of speech, not with a single word. For instance, the phrase "to be in the hands of someone" created the understanding that one was subject to another and that the superior possessed authority.¹⁷ "Then David said to God, 'I am in great distress; let us fall into the hand of the Lord, for his mercy is great; but let me not fall into the hand of man.'" (2 Sam. 24:14). (cf. 1 Chron. 29:12, 2 Chron. 20:6, Job 10:7)

Several other terms were also used to translate the various derivatives based on the Hebrew root mashal, which means to have power or dominate.¹⁸

Exousia is found, though infrequently, in the psalms. It occurs in Psalm 114:2: "Judah became his sanctuary, Israel his dominion (exousia)."¹⁹ Psalm 136:8-9 employs the term also: "the sun to rule (exousian) over the day... the moon and stars to rule (exousian) over the night...." The term as used in Psalm 114:2 simply designates the kingdom over which the Lord rules - His

sphere of power. The terms as employed in Psalm 136 refer to a capacity for guiding and watching over.¹⁹

The specification of the area governed as exousia appears again in 2 Kings 20:13²⁰: "...there was nothing in his house or in all his realm (exousia) that Hezekiah did not show them."

1 Machabees 6:11 also uses exousia to designate the use of power:²¹ "...I that was pleasant and beloved in my power (exousia). (The 'I' is Antiochus, the tyrant.)

Exousia appears again in 1 Machabees 10:6: "And he gave him authority (exousia) to gather together an army and to make arms". The basic notion here is that of a permission to operate freely within a certain sphere, namely that of forming an army.

Several texts in the second Book of Machabees also include exousia.²² Only one, however, uses it as a quality belonging specifically to God. "But the spirit of the almighty God gave a great evidence of his presence, so that all that had presumed to obey him, falling down by the power (exousias) of God were struck with fainting and dread" (2 Machabees 3:24). Here exousia may designate authority over human life and describes it as the proper possession of God. The text, however, does not rule out an interpretation which explains exousia as angelic powers.²³ This remains a moot point.

The Book of Ecclesiastes 3:8 indicates movement in a different direction: "No man has power to retain the spirit, or

authority (exousia) over the day of death...". The implication seems to be that there does reside a power outside man's grasp which does function in the 'day of death'. In a subsequent passage the answer is given: "...the righteous and the wise and their deeds are in the hand of God..."(9:1). In other words, it is God who possesses the exousia spoken of in 3:8.

The Book of Wisdom confirms this. The sacred writer speaks of the Lord's exousia as absolute with regard to life and death. "For it is thou, O Lord, that hast power (exousian) of life and death and leadest down to the gates of death and back again" (16:13).

Sirach also views God's exousia as unlimited. "The power (exousia) of the earth is in the hand of God"(10:4). God possesses the earth with all its potential.²⁴

Thus far it is evident that the Old Testament use of exousia agrees with its use in profane Greek. In the latter it designates a capacity for action which is native to man, received from another, or dependent upon one's material possessions. The term also specifies the office one holds and the purpose or role of an institution. In the Old Testament exousia designates also the power to act, bestowed by another or belonging to the essence of a being, and the sphere governed. Here, however, when exousia is used to characterise God's power, it takes on a new quality which derives from its possessor. It is without limit.

The Book of Daniel is of particular interest in its use of exousia. Here the term is also employed in both its ordinary sense and in reference to God. A listing of texts will make this evident.

Then King Nebuchadnezzar sent to assemble the satraps and prefects, and the governors, the counselors, the treasurers, the justices, the magistrates, and all the officials (exousion) of the provinces to come to the dedication of the image which King Nebuchadnezzar had set up. (3:2)

It has seemed good to me to show the signs and wonders that the Most High God has wrought toward me. How great are his signs, how mighty his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion (exousia) is from generation to generation. (4:2-3)

...for his dominion (exousia) is an everlasting dominion (exousia) and his kingdom endures from generation to generation. (4:34b)

And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion (exousia) is an everlasting dominion (exousia) which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed. (7:14)

And the kingdom and the dominion (exousia) and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions (exousai) shall serve and obey them. (7:27)

Many of the common understandings attached to the word exousia are evident in the texts. Verse two, in chapter three indicates its use for positions or offices which have operative functions in specific spheres of society. Daniel 7:27 shows that exousia, translated as dominion, is a shared reality; the kings of the earth all sub-

mit to the exousia of this people. It is, moreover, acquirable. In this context, the exousia is passed on to the "holy ones of the Most High".

The texts of Daniel 4:2-3, 4:34b, and 7:14 all introduce a new dimension. Exousia is associated in these texts with the Most High God and hence is everlasting because He is everlasting. Hence the kingdom or dominion surpasses the finite order.²⁵ It will have no end. Verses 99 and 100 identify this everlasting kingdom as a peculiar possession of God who is Most High. Subsequently, the seventh chapter, verse fourteen, indicates that this everlasting dominion is given to the son of man, a being whose precise nature is not evident. Verse twenty-seven of the same chapter states that this dominion is given to the holy ones of the Most High. Yet, in the very next phrase the retention of the singular possessive pronoun autou indicates that this same dominion still belongs to the Most High. The interesting element here is the fact that the exousia or dominion is an everlasting one and that God shares this everlasting exousia with the son of man and the holy ones of the Most High. The term expresses the "unrestricted sovereignty of God as the One who has the say, whose Word is power".²⁶

The multiple meanings attached to the term exousia in profane and Old Testament Greek are based upon a generic understanding of the word as a "possibility of doing something".²⁷

This possibility appears as limited, for example, in the political or familial spheres, or as unlimited when used in reference to God and the son of man. The term, however, seldom designates sheer possibility; most often it calls forth a very positive actualized concept of a definite authority to act in some specific manner, and more often than not, in a societal manner. Exousia is also applied to geographical areas under one's authority or to any other type of possession subject to the command of another.

EXOUSIA IN MARK'S GOSPEL

PART II

CHAPTER II

EXOUSIA IN MARK'S GOSPEL

The brief examination above of exousia in profane and Septuagint Greek provides some background for a consideration of it in Mark's gospel. First, an examination of specific texts which employ the word exousia will help establish some basic understanding of its Marcan usage. Secondly, a consideration of other events depicted in the gospel which depend upon Christ's possession of exousia will make evident some of the far-reaching implications of its reality. The single question which serves to guide and unify this consideration is clearly stated in Mark's gospel: "What is this? A new teaching! With authority he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him." (Mk. 1:27) The task at hand is to secure an answer within the Marcan context.

The first text which employs exousia reads thus:

And they went into Capernaum and immediately on the Sabbath he entered the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority (exousian) and not as the scribes.
(Mk. 1:21-22)

This section of Mark's gospel, along with the subsequent passage dealing with the exorcism, stands apart from many other sections of the gospel in that, along with the passion narratives it is based on very early tradition.

28

The authority of Christ is directly contrasted with that of the scribes. Jesus seems to speak spontaneously from an inward assurance of truth based on a penetrating sense of divine

inspiration. "It seems to the listeners that the voice of prophecy is once again alive in Israel."²⁹

As in so many other similar situations, what Jesus taught is not mentioned. We are simply informed of the impression he left on the people: they were amazed because he taught not as the scribes did, but as one who had authority. Why did they say this? Perhaps the answer will emerge if we consider the role of the scribe. The scribes as a group were not necessarily identified with the Pharisees or Sadducees. Many, however, belonged to the Pharisees.³⁰ As a group the Pharisees were orthodox Jews adhering firmly to tradition, but they were also reasonably receptive of new ideas. Because of this ability to assimilate and adjust to the new, the future of Judaism as a living religion rested largely with this group. (Their leading opponents, the Sadducees, contributed little to the Judaic theological development because of their fanatic devotion to existent tradition.³¹)

As one might expect, much of the development in Judaism originating from the Pharisees was influenced by the scribes, the religiously educated members whose main task was to teach and interpret Law. The latter were the teachers with Rabbinical training. In exercising this role the scribes touched upon all significant facets of Jewish life. They showed themselves to be men of the Law, moralists, theologians, spiritual directors and devotees of the intellectual life.³²

The term employed in Mk. 1:21-22 for scribes (grammateis) however, is not univocal in meaning. It can refer to the truly learned man, the scribe in the sense mentioned above, or simply to one who keeps records, or to an elementary or bible teacher. In the context of Mk. 1:21-22 it is probably the elementary teachers who are meant and not the Rabbis who possess full exousia.³³ The text here seems to indicate that the people thought Jesus had the authority which was bestowed upon a Rabbi in ordination. The institution of ordination at the time of Jesus implied that the one ordained received his full share in that wisdom which ultimately descended from Moses. This meant that a total communication of power had taken place and, antecedent to the destruction of the Temple, those possessed of this authority had great liberty in developing the law. It was only later (c. 200 A.D.) with the composition of the Mishna that teaching³⁴ became more uniform.

Since the passage under consideration belongs to very early oral tradition it is quite possible that the exousia spoken of here can be explained in terms of the language of the then existent Rabbinic tradition which recognizes a species of authority which empowers its possessor to lay down doctrines and decisions of binding force. It may well be that the scribes referred to here are, as mentioned above, inferior teachers who are not entitled to introduce fresh rules. In other words, they are not in possession of the exousia belonging to the Rabbis.³⁵ This distinction would

be well known to Jesus' audience and would provide an intelligible explanation for their response.

In another situation Jesus acts again as though he possesses an authority superior to that of the scribes. He condemns the practice of cleverly avoiding the obligation of caring for a parent by labeling 'Korban', that is, dedicated to God, any goods which would be useful to a needy parent. Jesus said, "...then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother, thus making void the word of God through your tradition which you hand on. And many such things you do." (Mk. 7:12f) Jesus' accusation is that the scribal tradition seems to have usurped the place of primacy belonging to Scripture. Though not recognized officially as possessing the authority proper to the scribes, Jesus dared to condemn their position.³⁶

In a later section of Mark's gospel, Jesus stated succinctly His attitude toward the whole of the Law. A scribe approached Him and asked:

Which commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered "The first is. 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one: and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' The second is this 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these.

The scribe agreed with Jesus and He in turn answered, "You are not far from the Kingdom of God." (Mk. 12:29-31, 34b) This

formulation introduces an attitude which permits a basic reinterpretation of the obligations of the various stipulations of the law. Up to this point, both commands had been heartily approved by the Rabbis. Here, however, Jesus focuses attention on them as the two guiding principles of the whole Law.³⁷

In another incident which appears immediately after the exclamation about Jesus' teaching, His authority is again questioned.

And immediately there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, "What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God." But Jesus rebuked him, saying, "Be silent, and come out of him!" And the unclean spirit, convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him. And they were all amazed, so that they questioned among themselves, saying, "With authority (exousia) he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him." (Mk. 1:23-27)

It is quite evident that Jesus casts out the evil spirit with a few simple words, and that His authority (exousia) is seen as the explanation for the event. The wonder evinced by the crowd is due to the fact that Jesus casts out the unclean spirit with only a word, no magical formula being employed. They sense the "uncanny or supernatural" in Jesus' personality.³⁸

It is worth comparing the above scene with others in the New Testament in which a demon is expelled. For instance, Mark 9 describes an episode in which the disciples had attempted to exorcise a devil in a young boy but could not. The father of the child then approached Jesus and said:

...I asked your disciples to cast it out, and they were not able. And...Jesus...rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to it "You dumb and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again." And after crying out and convulsing him terribly, it came out...And when he (Jesus) had entered the house, his disciples asked him privately, "Why could we not cast it out?" And he said to them, "This kind cannot be driven out by anything but prayer." (Mk. 9:18-29)

Though Jesus had commissioned the disciples to go forth and cast out devils, they were not always successful. They experienced limitations which are entirely foreign to the exercise of power Jesus manifests. The disciples are to realize that in their use of the power Jesus has given them they are not totally independent. Prayer or communication with God is an essential element in their activities.

Another incident narrated in the Acts of the Apostles sheds additional light on Jesus' authority.

Then some of the itinerant Jewish exorcists undertook to pronounce the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits, saying "I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul preaches." Seven sons of a Jewish high priest named Sceva were doing this. But the evil spirit answered them, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are you?" And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, mastered all of them, and overpowered them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. (19: 13-16)

Even though exorcised in the name of Jesus, the evil spirit refused to depart. In this case there seems to have been no legitimate sharing in Jesus' exousia, so that, even though the sons of the high priest attempted this action in the name of Jesus, they were totally ineffective.

The apostle Paul, however, sharing in Jesus' exousia, (2 Cor. 11:8), easily drives out evil spirits - but always in the name of Jesus. "But Paul was annoyed, and turned and said to the spirit, 'I charge you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.' And it came out that very hour." (AA 16-18)

Apparently, Jesus Himself had no need to call upon anyone. He seems to be personally capable of maintaining an absolute authority over evil spirits. The numerous exorcisms He accomplishes in the course of the gospel carry in their own way the core of the message He sought to bring: the kingdom of God has come and evil has no place in it.³⁹

The fundamental attitude of Jesus toward evil was evident from the beginning - and even before the beginning - of His public life. He makes it very clear in the temptation sequence which immediately follows His baptism by John that He will not have any part with evil.⁴⁰ Mark's gospel is very brief in its description of this situation. "And he was in the wilderness forty days, tempted by Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him". (Mk. 1:13)

Though brief in its description of the temptation scene, Mark's gospel includes elements which indicate the ultimate rejection of Satan and the evil he represents. The mention of wild beasts, which are traditionally associated with the presence of the evil powers (cf. Psalm 22:11-21, Ezek. 34:5, 8, 25), and

with the triumph of good over evil (Job 5:22f, Isa: 11:6-9), clarifies Jesus' relationship with evil. He rejects it and triumphs over it.⁴¹

The use of exousia in the teaching situation and subsequently in the action of exorcism furnishes information about essential characteristics of Jesus' exousia. In virtue of His possessing it, He can implement new interpretations of the Law as can the Rabbi and, secondly, He can overcome evil spirits with a simple word. In both events He evidences a self-reliance which surpasses that ordinarily exhibited by one in possession of delegated authority.

Jesus' cure of the paralytic presents another situation which helps us approach an answer to the initial question about the nature of His exousia. Some friends of the sick man brought him to Jesus with hopes of having him cured. Approaching the scene, the friends realised the impossibility of getting near Jesus because of the crowd and instead, climbed to the roof of the house, removed a few of the shingles, and lowered the paralytic on his mat. Jesus promptly responded to their faith and said to the paralytic, "My son, your sins are forgiven." (Mk. 2:5) Reflecting on the situation, the scribes were disturbed.

Now some of the scribes were sitting there, questioning in their hearts, "Why does this man speak thus? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?" And immediately Jesus, perceiving in his spirit that they thus questioned within themselves, said to them, "Why do you question thus in your hearts? Which is easier to say to the paralytic, 'Your sins are

forgiven', or to say, 'Rise, take up your pallet and walk'? But that you may know that the Son of Man has authority (exousia) on earth to forgive sins" - he said to the paralytic - "I say to you rise, take up your pallet and go home." And he rose, and immediately took up the pallet and went out before them all...(Mk. 2:5-12)

It is reasonable to affirm that, in its basic structure the narrative has a foundation in history. Firstly, it is not necessary to attribute the whole situation to the creative imagination of the community when eyewitnesses to Jesus' life and action were still alive when the gospel narrative was being composed. Secondly, details in the narrative are grounded in tradition, for example, the suspicious and hostile attitude of the scribes.⁴² There is, however, the opposite opinion, that is, that the event has no foundation, as such, in history. The episode could have been developed in Christian preaching to convey the lesson that bodily healing is just a sign of the healing of the soul. The controversial element included in the narrative could be a type of the early Christian controversy with the synagogue.⁴³ Though the latter interpretation is certainly plausible, it seems unnecessary. As mentioned above, the existence of eye-witnesses to Jesus' actions, the vividness of detail with regard to the house and the crowds, and the accurate description of the scribes' reaction make the assumption that the narrative is merely typical superfluous.

Jesus made it very clear that His exousia in forgiving sin is genuine when He substantiated this invisible power to forgive sins

by effecting in a visible manner the cure of the sick man. The emphasis in the passage, however, is on forgiveness. In fact the immediate action of Jesus in forgiving the man is quite abrupt and may perhaps indicate that He saw the man's present difficult situation as flowing from sin. The scribes were immediately conscious of the implications of Jesus' claim to forgive sins: only God can do this. Their immediate conclusion is that He is guilty of blasphemy. The charge of blasphemy remains tentative - an aspect of the narrative which supports the historicity of the event. It would not have been advantageous to the scribes to verbalize their accusations at that instant since the crowd was in sympathy with Jesus. One can easily imagine that if this gospel passage were the product of the creative initiative of the community, the discretion evidenced here would be lacking. The ambiguity of the scribes' attitude toward Jesus would probably have been clarified publicly.⁴⁴ The purpose of the action seems to be to inform the scribes that Jesus, the Son of Man, has power on earth to forgive sins.⁴⁵ The scribes look upon Jesus as a man, and a mere man could not forgive sins. Jesus, however, indicated that He is more than a man. He claimed to do what, for them, only God could do, forgive sins. This may be validly understood as a claim to possess the same divine exousia the Jews attributed only to Jahweh.⁴⁶ The text indicates that Jesus was conscious of His participation in Jahweh's exousia, since the power to forgive sin had been looked upon by the Jews as the sole possession of God.

As the gospel narrative proceeds, it reveals Jesus sharing His exousia with His chosen twelve. "And he appointed twelve to be with him, and to be sent out to preach and have authority (exousian) to cast out demons." (Mk. 3:14-15). The use for which the exousia is destined is quite compatible with the purposes for which Jesus Himself employed it. He had, as they would in the future, driven out demons. The text indicates that the disciples were to receive authority from Jesus, just as Jesus had from His Father.⁴⁷

The fact that the exousia can be shared indicates some relationship with the ordinary use of the word. (Plato, Aristotle, and the Septuagint spoke of it as something which can be shared or acquired.) The possibilities intrinsic to the exousia ordinarily spoken of, however, are not the same as those found in Jesus' exousia. His exousia reaches beyond the possibilities open to man alone. It presupposes a divine commission and authorisation to break the rule of evil and establish the Kingdom.⁴⁸

The same theme is picked up again later in the narrative: "And he called to him the twelve, and began to send them out two by two, and gave them authority (exousian) over the unclean spirits... So they went out and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many demons and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them." (Mk. 6:7, 12-13) Jesus' delegation of His own authority to the Twelve enabled them to drive out the devil both by

preaching and exorcism as the Master had done, and to cure sickness as He had also done.

The historical foundation of this narrative is in question. Wellhausen doubts that it has any historical foundation. He believes it to be symbolical and representative of an ideal of the truth. Rawlinson,⁴⁹ in agreement with Manson,⁵⁰ accepts the historicity of Jesus' delegation of authority. Taylor also agrees and asserts that the sayings of Jesus are the kernel of the narrative. He believes that they are gleaned either from oral tradition or from an early collection comparable to Q and M.⁵¹ R. Creed concurs with Taylor when he asserts that "There seems to be no conclusive reason why we should assume that Jesus did not at some period associate the Twelve with Him in his work of preaching the advent of the kingdom."⁵²

The support of scholarly opinion in behalf of the historicity of the event narrated in Mk. 6:7 aids in expanding the concept of exousia in Mark's gospel. It is reasonable to affirm that Jesus delegated His exousia to His chosen Twelve with the intention that they continue the work of establishing the kingdom. This commission demanded that they be equipped to break the rule of evil. Hence their share in exousia enabled them to "preach with power", cast out devils, and cure the sick.

The burning question about Jesus' exousia is raised definitively after Jesus had cleansed the Temple.

And they came to Jerusalem. And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold and those who bought in the temple, and he overturned

the tables of the money changers and the seats of those who sold pigeons; and he would not allow anyone to carry anything through the temple. And he taught, and said to them, "Is it not written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations?' But you have made it a den of robbers. And the chief priests and the scribes heard it and sought a way to destroy him; for they feared him, because all the multitude was astonished at his teaching. And when evening came they went out of the city. As they passed by in the morning they saw the fig tree withered away to its roots. And Peter remembered and said to him, "Master, look! The fig tree which you cursed has withered." ... And they came again to Jerusalem. And as he was walking in the temple, the chief priests and the scribes and the elders came to him, and they said to him, "By what authority (exousia) are you doing these things, (tauta) or who gave you this authority (exousian) to do them?" Jesus said to them, "I will ask you a question; answer me, and I will tell you by what authority (exousia) I do these things. Was the baptism of John from heaven or from men? Answer me." (Mk. 11:15-21, 27-30)

In all probability the account of the temple cleansing and of Jesus' confrontation with the chief priests, scribes and elders has an historical foundation, though Taylor believes the incident belongs to a much earlier period in Jesus' ministry. The fact that Jesus objected to current practices in the Temple with regard to money and the purchase of sacrificial victims and the probability that He would do something about it and subsequently be questioned about His right to take action against the evils He saw are quite acceptable. Taylor goes so far as to say that verse 33 is so original and unlike invention that it is "excessive scientific caution" to question the fact that verses 28-30 are an historical

account.⁵³

The tauta employed in the question the high priests, scribes, and elders address to Jesus, seems to refer to the cleansing of the temple in particular and by logical extension, to other unusual actions performed by Christ. This tense situation arose evidently from a specific action - the temple cleansing - and evoked a response from Him which the early Christian community treasured. He indicated in His counter-question about John's baptism that His exousia was from God. This question creates a difficult situation for Jesus' questioners. If they affirm that John's baptism was merely human, they risk offending and alienating the people. If they affirm that his baptism was from above, they must account, firstly, for their lapse in responsibility in permitting Herod to kill John, and secondly for their own lack of acceptance. The safest answer is no answer at all. "We do not know." Jesus replies in like manner. "Nor will I tell you what authority (exousia) I have..." (Mk. 11:33)

Jesus' action in driving undesirable elements from the temple may simply have stemmed from His sense of justice. The pilgrims who had to change their money in order to pay the temple tax were being consistently cheated. Jesus objected strongly and acted on His conviction. The lack of official interference can be accounted for on the grounds that popular sentiment was with Jesus. That the action also has Messianic overtones can

also be admitted, since from the time of Ezekiel the renewing of the temple was seen as belonging to Messianic times.⁵⁴

When later asked by the chief priests, scribes, and elders about the nature of His authority, Jesus answers with a double question. Implied in His question is the fact that John's exousia was from God and more important, that Jesus' exousia surpasses that of John.⁵⁵

Jesus, here as in other situations, remains content to let His visible action confirm His authority. His initial authoritative teaching in the synagogue, (Mk. 1:21f), is clarified and substantiated by the authority in His word of exorcism, (1:23-28). His authority to forgive sin is revealed in the healing action of His word, (2:1-12). The accomplishment of the command to the fig tree, (11:12-14, 20-24), surrounds the effective words He spoke at the cleansing of the temple, (11:15-19).⁵⁶

There occurs one final instance in which the term exousia is employed: "Take heed and watch; for you do not know when the time will come. It is like a man going on a journey, when he leaves home and puts his servants in charge (exousia), each with his work, and commands the doorkeeper to be on the watch." (Mk. 13:33f). The word as used here has no unusual significance. On the contrary, it is quite in accord with the meaning of the term in profane Greek and in many passages of the Septuagint Greek. A superior simply transfers temporarily his exousia to some of

his inferiors to carry on in his behalf while he is away. The specific ways in which this exousia will be manifested are not defined. It may safely be assumed that the slaves will do as the master ordinarily did when he was home.

This brief parable accurately portrays the attitude of the Church in Mark's day. It was in daily expectation of the second coming of the Lord.⁵⁷ The readiness of the members depended in great measure on the manner in which they exercised their exousia.

Is it possible at this point to formulate an answer to the original question? Exactly what is the nature of Jesus' exousia? There seems to be a fundamental agreement between profane, Septuagint, and Marcan Greek. Exousia appears as a capacity for doing something.⁵⁸ The differences involved become apparent when one examines the things that are accomplished in the name of exousia. Whereas the profane Greek of Plato and Aristotle speaks of exousia as a limited capability, Septuagint Greek introduces an expanded understanding of the term when used in relationship to Yahweh. Wisdom mentions exousia as the absolute power of the Lord over life and death (16:13). Daniel describes God's dominion (exousia) as lasting for "endless ages". (4:3)

The Marcan usage introduces another new characteristic. Whereas Wisdom and Daniel spoke of exousia as a property of God and consequently as absolute and unlimited, Mark's gospel indicates that an exousia similar to that attributed to God alone belongs to

Jesus of Nazareth. While He cures sickness, teaches authoritatively, clears merchants from the temple by means of His exousia, He also effectively claims to forgive sins.

The gospel is carefully constructed so that each time Jesus claims to do something not visible to the human eye, He immediately vindicates His claim by effecting something visible to the human eye. The curing of the paralytic is perhaps the most startling. Here the man is cured of his paralysis as a proof that his sins were truly forgiven by Jesus. Sin is traditionally the greatest evil among men: hence, in claiming to overcome it, and in authenticating the claim, He has in a certain sense overcome all evil. His total victory over evil, however, emerges in the Resurrection.

The answer to the question posed above is at this point only a partial one. It can be said that this "new authority" is a capacity for many things: teaching with power like unto that of the Rabbi, curing the sick, operating effectively in re-evaluating the temple, and forgiving sins.

This New Testament exousia shows itself to be a decisively creative power; whatever it contacts, it recreates. Moreover, Jesus exercises His exousia in order to vivify the kingdom He has come to establish. His authority is a formative cause in the establishment of the kingdom.

Perhaps a more complete reply to the initial question will be possible if the source or foundation for Jesus' exousia is explored

more extensively. This will be the topic of discussion in the final section of this paper.

CHAPTER III

SIGNIFICANCE OF 'SON OF MAN' AND 'SON OF GOD' TITLES IN RELATIONSHIP TO JESUS' EXOUSIA

CHAPTER III

SIGNIFICANCE OF 'SON OF MAN' AND 'SON OF GOD' TITLES
IN RELATIONSHIP TO JESUS' EXOUSIA

Up to this point, the problem has been to establish some reasonable understanding of the nature of Jesus' exousia as described in Mark's gospel. The data presented, which are essential in determining the nature of Jesus' exousia, deal extensively with observable phenomena: to prove He possessed the exousia necessary to forgive sins, Jesus cured the paralytic and he walked; to restore the possessed man to himself, Jesus merely spoke the authoritative word and the evil spirit left his victim.

Accepting, then, the fact that Jesus possessed an authority not ordinarily found in the common man, a further question must be formulated, one which is basic to the whole issue. Who was this Jesus Christ, that He could lay claim to and effectively exercise this unique exousia? The old query so often thrust at any individual who acts in a manner not ordinarily found within a particular societal group is fittingly addressed to Jesus. "Who do you think you are?" A partial answer to this will be formulated on the basis of information Mark's gospel furnishes about two complementary titles of Jesus - 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God'.

The 'Son of Man' in the second gospel resembles, in greater or lesser degree, similar figures designated as 'son of man' in several traditions: the Near Eastern primal man, the

apocalyptic son of man in I Enoch and IV Esdras, and the one 'like a son of man;' in the Book of Daniel. Reliable scholarly opinion, however, supports the assertion that the Son of Man figure in the New Testament relies fundamentally upon the Book of Daniel.⁵⁹

At the start of this discussion it is well to realise that the figure of the son of man in the Book of Daniel raises many questions to which answers mutually opposed are addressed. The literary genre itself allows for this perplexing situation, for Daniel is ordinarily classified as apocalyptic and employs esoteric language and pseudonymity.⁶⁰

What then is the meaning of the son of man personage in the Book of Daniel? The key passage is found in the seventh chapter of the Book.

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion (exousia) and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion (exousia) is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed. (Daniel 7: 13-14)

In the passages which immediately precede the one cited above, an interesting situation is described which bears on the ultimate status of the "one like a son of man". Four great beasts rise singly from the sea, one more terrible than the next. As Daniel beheld this spectacle another separate action commenced. Thrones were arranged and the Ancient of Days occupied one of

them. It is at this point that "one like a son of man" appears before the Ancient of Days and is given the government, honor and endless dominion.

The last beast mentioned above was particularly terrible:

He made war with the saints and prevailed over them, until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given for the saints of the Most High, and the time came when the saints received the kingdom. (Dn. 7:21f)

They receive the kingdom formerly belonging to the Beasts. This same action of bestowing the kingdom is described more fully later in the chapter and is worth restating here because of the relationship it has to the earlier vision in which "one like a son of man" received everlasting dominion.

And the kingdom and the dominion (exousia) and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions (exousiai) shall serve and obey them! (Dn. 7:27)

In the text cited earlier the same kingdom was given to the "one like a son of man". Where he comes from is not mentioned. He could perhaps be considered the representative of the "saints of the Most High". Hence there is an easy shift from the one to the other,⁶¹ that is, from the singular son of man to the plural "saints of the Most High". Just as the beasts represent both the king and the people of the kingdom, so the son of man figure represents both Israel's true king and the people of Israel, but remains an individual.⁶²

In addition to his role of representation, the one like a son of man appears to be more than a mere mortal. He comes on the clouds of heaven, a phenomenon which in apocalyptic literature is very often associated with a theophany or intervention of Yahweh.⁶³ In addition, apocalyptic literature regularly employs men to represent celestial beings, while it uses beasts to represent men and nations.⁶⁴

The sense of both passages seems to be that the holy ones of God or Israel receive the kingdom from the Ancient of Days, that is, from God. Israel's expectations are fulfilled when the heathen powers have been destroyed and she rules supreme, subject only to God.⁶⁵

The son of man figure, as indicated above, appears as representative of the people of God and betrays something of a heavenly nature. The son of man figure appears at a time - the last two centuries B. C. - when Judaism was a firm adherent of monotheism.⁶⁶ Very probably the author of the Book of Daniel did not view the son of man as divine, that is, as equal to God; the developments in his own culture make this somewhat difficult. The multiplication of deities in other contemporary religions, however, provides some basis for singling out an individual with some special share in divinity. The son of man figure in Daniel, then, remains open to a multiplicity of interpretations, particularly in light of later developments; but, as mentioned above,

it can at least be said that the figure represents Israel's true King and the people of Israel. (cf. p. 28)

It may be said that the presence of the son of man points to the termination of heathen rule over the earth and the introduction of the new age and the new kingdom - the kingdom of God. The son of man is himself king over all the nations of the earth⁶⁷ and his presence means the presence of the Kingdom. His functions are based upon the fact that he received exousia from the hands of the Ancient of Days. This exousia, then, is his essential attribute.⁶⁸

What particular qualities of Jesus does the author of the second gospel wish to clarify with his use of the 'son of man' title? Does it bear the same meaning that the son of man figure calls forth in the Book of Daniel?

A brief examination of the specific texts in the New Testament's second gospel which employ the 'son of man' as a title will help formulate an answer to the above question. Mark 2:5-12 deals with Jesus' cure of the paralytic. He spoke of Himself in this situation as the Son of Man when He overcame evil in its most destructive manifestation, that is, as sin. Very simply He said: "But that you may know that the Son of Man has authority (exousian) on earth to forgive sins" - he said to the paralytic - "I say to you, rise, take up your pallet and go home." (Mk. 2:10)

According to Taylor, this use of the Son of Man title is historically reliable and need not be traced back to the creative

influence of the Christian community. The title bears Messianic overtones, but very probably, was not common in the Hebrew Messianic tradition. Hence it is unlikely that the scribes immediately understood Jesus' statement as a Messianic claim.⁶⁹

Recall again the relationship the son of man figure in Daniel bears to the kingdom. His presence indicates the reality of the presence of God's kingdom. The scene in Mk. 2:5-12 indicates that Jesus, precisely as Son of Man, has power over the evil of sin and its effects. Total victory over evil will exist in the kingdom at the end of time. In the case of the forgiveness and cure of the paralytic, however, the kingdom is made present, though not in all its dimensions, at the word of Jesus, the new Son of Man. As the son of man in Daniel possesses authority in the kingdom, so too, Jesus possesses authority in the kingdom. First he forgives sin and then vindicates this action in His cure of the paralytic.

Recall again that the second gospel shows Jesus making the following initial address: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel." (Mk. 1:15) The establishment of this kingdom necessitates the destruction of evil, particularly moral evil, a significant obstacle to the historical growth of God's kingdom. As Jesus overcame moral evil and its effects, He was conscious of establishing the kingdom. It is here in forgiving sin that Jesus suggests He is more than a wise teacher and prophet. In this action He claims a function which

properly belongs to God. The insinuation, seems to be that He is somehow so intimately related to God that He can act effectively as God does, and in His own name.⁷⁰

The next relevant passage occurs in Mark 2:28: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; so the Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath." There are divergent opinions about the significance of the son of man expression here. Taylor suggests that the phrase ho huioi tou anthropou could simply be a variant reading of the Aramaic phrase bar nasha which can simply mean 'man'. Hence the sense would be that since the Sabbath was made for man and not vice versa, man is really master of the Sabbath. There would be no need here to suggest that only Jesus, Son of Man, is master of the Sabbath.⁷¹

On the other hand, as Rawlinson contends, even if the Evangelist followed an Aramaic source he must have been conscious of what he was doing in rendering bar nasha 'man' in verse 27 and 'Son of Man' in verse 28. Further, Jesus would not have been likely to say that 'man' was lord of the Sabbath which God Himself had instituted.⁷² In light of the overall structure of the gospel, it is most likely that the last phrase with 'Son of Man' in it is a Christian comment and was added to the present text.⁷³

Taylor agrees with Rawlinson that the last phrase is a Christian addition and explains that originally the phrase expressed the conviction that Jesus is the Lord of all that belongs to man, including the Sabbath.⁷⁴

The next passage to be considered reads thus: "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." (Mk. 8:31)

The passage seems to have an historical foundation since it is quite reasonable that Jesus foresaw His fate, at least in general terms, and consequently, spoke of it to His disciples.⁷⁵ Though, generally, much more emphasis is given to the Petrine confession which immediately precedes the present text, the central reality of Christianity emerges here. The new teaching concerning Messianic suffering is more important than the confession. Jesus' realization that He must suffer is closely bound up with His basic sense of Messianic vocation.⁷⁶ The specifics included in the text may be considered as additions after the fact.⁷⁷

The Son of Man consciousness which is evident here differs somewhat from the consciousness which is based solely on the concept of the son of man as it appears in the Book of Daniel, Esdras, or Enoch. It seems that in these texts Jesus absorbs the significant characteristics of the Servant of Yahweh found in Isaiah and makes them an integral part of what He uniquely understands as the Son of Man.⁷⁸ Whereas in Daniel, Enoch, and Esdras the son of man is to some extent a figure who pre-exists but comes at the end time to receive the kingdom, all

the while remaining somewhat non-historical, Jesus views the son of man as part of history and as one who establishes the kingdom in history. In his very choice of the Son of Man title, He concurs at least implicitly with the assumption that the son of man pre-existed.⁷⁹ Whereas in Daniel, Enoch, and Esdras the son of man is in no way associated with suffering, Jesus speaks of the son of man as one who must suffer much at the hands of others.⁸⁰

The vision Daniel saw undoubtedly conveyed the conviction that the son of man was a figure of the triumphant Israel which would enjoy world empire and dominion after all heathen powers had been overcome. The Jesus Christ of Mark's gospel who calls Himself the Son of Man sees the way to the establishment of the kingdom as one of suffering and death. It is in this action of suffering the ultimate human pain and overcoming it that the prince of this world - evil personified - is conquered. Jesus overcomes the ultimate evil - death - in His resurrection.⁸¹

The Son of Man title appears again in Mark 8:38: "For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Taylor again affirms the historicity of the event, along with Rawlinson, but suggests that it is misplaced in the narrative and belongs to a period earlier than Caesarea Philippi.⁸²

The Q form upon which Mark's text is based probably resembles the following: "Whosoever shall deny me before men,

him will I deny before my Father which is in heaven".⁸³ A comparison of the passages reveals that, in the original saying Jesus and the Son of Man are identical. Taylor accounts for the distinction which appears in Mark's gospel on the grounds that Jesus spoke of Himself in the first half of the statement as He historically existed at the time, a teacher, but subsequently referred to Himself as He would be after the resurrection. In other words, Jesus appears in this text as "Son of Man designatus".⁸⁴

Another possible interpretation of the text as it appears in Mark's gospel is that Jesus referred to the chosen community of which He was to be the Head when He used the title 'Son of Man' in this context.⁸⁵ In effect, then, He said that if people rejected His teaching and Person then, they would subsequently be judged and cast out by the community He was in the process of forming. The text as here formulated portrays Jesus as Founder of a new community and as possessed of a consciousness of a unique relationship to God. The last half of the statement, however, may be a later Christian adaptation influenced by later beliefs about the Second Coming.⁸⁶

Jesus as Son of Man in Mark's gospel departs from the son of man figures which appear in Daniel, Enoch, and Esdras in that the New Testament Son of Man suffers, dies, and rises. The bond establishing continuity, however, is constant; the Son of Man possesses everlasting dominion in the Kingdom of God. In the

New Testament He must establish the kingdom by the exercise of His own authority and, in doing this, He absorbs the significant characteristics of the long-awaited messiah whose function was understood as establishing the kingdom for Israel.⁸⁷

The next Son of Man saying occurs immediately after the Transfiguration. "And as they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of Man should have risen from the dead." (Mk. 9:9). Taylor and Rawlinson affirm the historicity of the event in opposition to both Lightfoot and Wrede. The two latter authorities view the Transfiguration and the subsequent injunction to silence as a creation of the early Church to explain more clearly some of its conviction about the Person and office of Jesus.⁸⁸ Taylor believes that, though the reference to the Son of Man and the Resurrection is abrupt, it really is not out of place. The messianic overtones of the Transfiguration were obvious enough to warrant Jesus' injunction to be silent. He wished to avoid the possibility of His Messiahship being misunderstood in terms of the political messiah Israel awaited. The association of the Son of Man with the Resurrection underlines the new understanding of the Son of Man Jesus is establishing. Antecedent to His use of the title, the concepts of death and resurrection were totally excluded from that of son of man.

This same understanding of Jesus as the Son of Man

emerges in the following saying: "Elijah does come first to restore all things; and how is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?" (Mk. 9:12). Taylor considers the narrative to have an historical foundation⁸⁹ while Loisy believes it to be a redactor's insertion.⁹⁰ In the second gospel Jesus makes the statement in answer to a question posed by His disciples about why the scribes said Elijah had to come first. He answers by affirming that Elijah had come and was working. A parallel text in Matthew 17:13 explains that Jesus really identifies Elijah with John the Baptist.⁹¹

The reference to statements in Scripture about the future of the Son of Man is probably based upon Isaiah 53 and Psalm 22. Though in neither text is there any mention of the Son of Man, there is a vivid description of one who suffers intensely. The Isaian text is directly concerned with the fate of the servant who "was wounded for our transgressions" and "crushed for our iniquities" (Is. 53:5). In Mark 9:12 the author of the text reinforces the fact that Jesus is a new Son of Man - one who suffers and is abandoned by men. The reinterpretation of the son of man figure comes more clearly into focus.

The theme of Mark 9:12 occurs again in Mark 9:31. Here the sacred writer portrays Jesus teaching His disciples that "The Son of Man will be delivered (paradidotai) into the hands of men and they will kill him; and when he is killed, after

three days he will rise." This passion prediction is one of the best authenticated and is extremely significant. Taylor, Weiss, and Otto all affirm its historical foundation.⁹² The verb paradidotai (to be handed over) is used in a futuristic present tense which conveys a genuine sense of assurance. The implication seems to be that God, His Father, will hand Him over to His enemies and at their hands He will die.⁹³

The purpose of the central section of the passage seems to be to establish the thesis that Jesus Himself was not taken by surprise. He saw what would happen and viewed the whole as part of the plan of His Father.⁹⁴

The last part of the prophecy dealing with Jesus' resurrection is by some considered an addition made by the Christian community on the basis of subsequent events and beliefs.⁹⁵ It is, however, quite probable that Jesus Himself spoke of His resurrection in view of His own understanding of His mission which would not end with His death. At this point, however, it is not possible to make a definitive statement with regard to the source of this portion of the prophecy since the evidence in favor of either position is not compelling.

The author of the second gospel describes Jesus once more as conscious of His fate. Again this conviction of Jesus - that He, the Son of Man will suffer and die - is voiced. Mark 10:33f reads "Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem; and the Son of Man will be delivered to the chief priests and the scribes, and

they will condemn him to death and deliver him to the Gentiles: and they will mock him, and spit upon him, and scourge him, and kill him; and after three days he will rise." This third passion prophecy reinforces the author's apparent conviction that Jesus spoke more than once of His coming Passion.⁹⁶ This prophecy is the most detailed, and though this indicates that the text was influenced by knowledge of events which occurred after the passion, the prediction itself may be accepted as finding its ultimate source in Jesus.⁹⁷

All three of the Passion predictions, (8:31, 9:31, 10:33), employ the Son of Man title and effectively indicate a unique understanding of it when applied to Jesus. The author of the second gospel portrays Jesus as one who is convinced that He, precisely as Son of Man, must suffer many things, be rejected, killed, and rise again. Since these passion predictions suggest strongly the use of a story given in tradition, they should not be relegated to the creative genius of the community. It is quite reasonable to assume that Jesus could understand His probable fate. Had not the prophets all been killed and, more recently, John the Baptist? Were not the Jewish authorities hostile toward Him?⁹⁸

A subsequent statement in Mark 10:45 delineates one of the fundamental truths the gospel teaches: "For the Son of Man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." This teaching has been called the "key to

Mark's gospel"⁹⁹ and is considered by Taylor to be a genuine saying of Jesus.¹⁰⁰ The meaning of the first half of the statement is obvious. There is a clear-cut portrait in general terms of the mission of the Son of Man as the Idea Servant of Isaiah 53.¹⁰¹

The move from the general idea of service to the particular action of giving one's life as a ransom indicates Jesus' desire to fulfill the destiny of the Servant of Jahweh.¹⁰² Weiss, however, rejects this interpretation, arguing that the ideas found here appear nowhere else in His teaching. Hence it is quite improbable that He thought of His death as a "ransom for many". Taylor answers this by cautioning that one should not forget that lutron (ransom) is used metaphorically and the metaphor does convey a truth - that Jesus suffered vicariously for men.¹⁰³

Mark 10:45, as did the passion predictions, shows Jesus' redefined understanding of Himself as Son of Man. He is the Servant who carries out His task in the fullest possible manner by giving His life for the many.

Mark 14:21 presents once again the Son of Man as one who will suffer: "For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed." Both Rawlinson and Taylor affirm the historical foundation of the narrative.¹⁰⁴ This statement draws a distinction between the departure of the Son of Man and the betrayer who causes His going. Though the responsibility of the betrayer is in no way lessened, the role of the Divine will receives more emphasis. The Son of

Man freely chooses and accepts His destiny which involves intense suffering. This saying conveys a significant meaning only to one who has fused the ideas of the Son of Man and the Suffering Servant.¹⁰⁵ Here, as in previously cited texts, Jesus expresses His understanding of His role as one of establishing the kingdom through suffering.

Mark 14:41 reveals a like grasp of His fate: "The hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed (paradiodotai)¹⁰⁶ into the hands of sinners." The time had come in the sense that the unique Messianic ministry of Jesus had reached a climax. At this hour He was delivered to the opponents of the Messianic kingdom and through His submission to them, would overcome them and definitively announce the presence of the kingdom.¹⁰⁷ Here again, the Son of Man is one who must suffer.

The fullness of Jesus' grasp of His role as Son of Man emerges in His eschatological sayings. These stress the Son of Man's exaltation. In Mark's miniature apocalypse, a vivid description of the end times culminates in a statement about the Son of Man: "And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory..." (Mk. 13:26). The assertion that these words find their origin in Jesus Himself is acceptable even to Bultmann, though he argues that Jesus did not identify Himself with the Son of Man figure.¹⁰⁸ The passage itself is based upon Daniel 7:13, but is radically reinterpreted. Whereas in Daniel a figure resembling a man - "one like a son of man" - is seen, the Son of Man in Mark appears as a "superhuman per-

son invested with divine authority and clothed with heavenly light".¹⁰⁹

That His origin is not just human is suggested in the description of His coming "on the clouds". The latter expression is often used in the Old Testament to designate the presence of God.¹¹⁰

Subsequently, Jesus reiterated this prediction as He confronted His judge: "...you will all see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven!" (Mk. 14:62)¹¹¹ The author of the second gospel presents Jesus as possessed of an understanding of the victorious figure in Daniel which permeated His consciousness to the extent that, in this situation of ultimate decision, He assents to death because of His confidence in rising again. He knows that He will finally triumph.¹¹²

The historical character of this statement has led to much discussion but, according to Taylor, it is probable that in reply to the high priest's challenge Jesus spoke of His triumph in terms very close to Mark's version. The saying combines Daniel 7:13 and Psalm 110:1. In doing this the author of the text asserts that the triumph and glory the Jews attributed to the Messiah would belong to Jesus. His enthronement at God's right hand is itself a symbol of His triumph.¹¹³

Though Jesus' "coming in the clouds" is often understood as indicative of the final Parousia, another interpretation is possible. C. H. Dodd remarks that the symbolic vision in

Daniel calls forth for the prophetic eye a reality both of the supernatural world - the ultimate triumph of the cause of God over all evil powers - and of the natural world - that Israel would politically overcome her foes. Thus the heavenly vision speaks not only its own truth but points to another historical reality. So too, in Mark 14:62, the supernatural triumph evident in the Son of Man's coming in the clouds points to an historical occurrence - the fact that through Jesus' death and resurrection, He effectively founds His Father's kingdom in history.¹¹⁴

The Son of Man title, then, as uniquely redefined within the context of Mark's gospel includes within it the roles attributed to the Messiah and the Suffering Servant of Yahweh. Further, it points to Jesus' consciousness of being present before the Ancient of Days - God - and of being the recipient of His authority in the kingdom. The Son of Man title brings out primarily the role of Jesus in the establishment of the kingdom. He is the central representative of the new Chosen People and exercises His authority to form a community acceptable to His Father. Though this certainly reveals much about the role of Jesus, it does not cast sufficient light on His relationship to the Father.

The "Son of God" title focuses attention on Jesus' relationship to the Most High. Firstly, within the context of Mark's gospel, the title was never used by Jesus in reference to Himself. The case is quite the opposite with the title 'Son of

Man'. The fact that the title occurs infrequently in the gospel (four times in comparison to thirteen times for the 'Son of Man' title) is accounted for by some on the basis that the title held special theological significance for the gospel's author.¹¹⁵

As was pointed out in regard to the 'Son of Man' title, there are elements in the 'Son of God' title which establish continuity of thought with the Old Testament and Judaism; further, there are elements which diverge from the traditional understanding. The basic idea called forth in designating anyone a son of God during the Old Testament period and well into the New Testament era was not that a relationship based on generation existed between the individual and God, but that God had chosen the individual for a special task and the expected response of the elect one was perfect obedience.¹¹⁶ In other words, the individual thus designated was holy. The title was also generally applied to anyone believed to possess some special divine power, as for example, a miracle worker.¹¹⁷ There are many examples of its employment in these ways. Exodus 4:22 uses it to designate the whole nation of Israel: "Thus saith the Lord: Israel is my first-born son...". Again this title is used for the kings of Israel: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son..." (2 Sam. 7:14). Sirach 4:10 describes the obedient man as son: "Then you will be like a son of the Most High".

Which of these ideas belong to the 'Son of God' title when

applied to Jesus, or does He, perhaps, redefine the concept?

In many reliable manuscripts of Mark's gospel, the book opens with the words, "The beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ, the son of God". The verse is probably intended by the author of the gospel as a title since he used no article before arche.¹¹⁸ The implications of the title begin to become apparent in the baptismal scene in Mark 1:10f. Jesus went to John to be baptized and in the course of the ceremony, had an unusual experience. A voice from heaven addressed Him thus: "Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased". The fact that Jesus underwent this baptism is historically acceptable¹¹⁹ (cf. Jn. 1:29-34). The nature of Jesus' experience is variously understood. Mark may have desired to describe objective phenomena seen by Jesus since he gives no indication that he intended to record a vision. This experience of Jesus could certainly have included auditory and visual elements. The account in Mark could also indicate that the author believed that the Messiahship of Jesus was not revealed to the people in general.¹²⁰

The use here of the term agapetos for 'beloved' is significant in that, when used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew yahidh, it means 'only begotten'.¹²¹ The sacramental situation and the use of this term effectively indicate that here we are confronted with an individual who is uniquely related to His heavenly Father.

The meaning of Mark 1:10 according to Fuller, is rooted not in Christ's consciousness, but derives from a subsequent Christological development in the Palestinian community. Fuller would achieve some grasp of how Jesus understood His baptism by examining (1) His subsequent actions and (2) His authentic references to John the Baptist. Proceeding thus, he asserts that, after the baptism Jesus began preaching, teaching, exorcising, healing, calling disciples and associating with undesirables. On the basis of these actions, the community came to believe that in the baptism Jesus received His 'call' to this ministry.¹²²

Among the Lord's references to John the Baptist, His question about the nature of John's authority in Mark 11:27-33 is one of the most significant. Fuller believes that Jesus received His call in John's baptism and also His exousia to respond to that call.¹²³ Hence, there is much involved in His attempt to clarify the fact that John's baptism was truly from God.

Taylor, on the other hand, believes that a genuine understanding of Jesus' consciousness is available in the baptismal event, and asserts that Jesus' sense of Sonship and anticipation of His Messianic destiny precede the experience of baptism and explain why He submitted to a baptism for sinners.¹²⁴ It is in the baptism that He dedicates Himself to His mission and identifies with sinful Israel though He Himself is conscious of no personal sin.

Cullmann agrees with Taylor and affirms that a genuine

grasp of Jesus' self-understanding is possible. That the words from heaven are based upon Isaiah 42:1 and that Jesus subsequently spoke in terms of Himself as a Son of Man who must suffer, further support the authenticity of meaning.¹²⁵

Though legitimate questions arise as to the nature of the phenomena which occurred at the baptism, it can be stated that some sense of mission was present in Jesus and this seems to have been based upon His consciousness of a unique relationship between Himself and the Father. Fuller's reasons for judging the religious experience of Jesus described in the baptism as a "subsequent Christological articulation"¹²⁶ do not give an adequate explanation for the exegete's position. It would seem that developments in Christology posterior to Jesus' historical existence would find their foundation in His historical existence. The weight of the argument in favor of the actual baptism of Jesus, if anything, supports the historical foundation of the narrative.

It is also significant to an understanding of Jesus' self-consciousness as presented in Mark's gospel that immediately after this identification as unique Son of the Father, Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert and here confronted Satan and overcame him - an effective beginning in the establishment of the Father's kingdom. His ministry, though not evident to society, began there.

The role of the Spirit in this situation cannot be underestimated.

The spirit, who makes it plain that His (Jesus') existence is from God and who unites His exist-

tence with God includes endowment with power in this origin of His existence and union of His existence. As the essence of God is power, so endowment with power is linked with the gift of the Holy Spirit. Endowment with the Spirit gives Him exousia, a definite personal authority which He has in substantial term, the dunamis to exercise.¹²⁷

In a later passage the evil spirits are responsible for addressing Jesus as Son. "...whenever the unclean spirits beheld him, they fell down before him and cried out, 'You are the Son of God.' And he strictly ordered them not to make him known." (Mk. 3:11-12). The author of Mark's gospel believes that the evil spirits recognized Jesus' identity as one whose role was to break the power of evil in the world. (cf. Mk. 5:7) Jesus, in turn, commanded them to remain silent about His identity because the 'Son of God' title would not be adequately understood by those who heard. The common more limited meaning of the term would only be a hindrance later when a much expanded concept would be developed. Taylor asserts that in this context, the address is not just a Messianic title, but rather expresses a conviction on the part of the author, that Jesus is a superhuman person.¹²⁸

In a subsequent passage an occurrence similar to Jesus' baptismal experience took place. At the scene of the transfiguration, when Jesus was seen talking to Elijah and Moses by Peter, James and John, He shone with a brightness more intense than any His followers had ever cast their eyes upon. After Peter had

remarked how good it was that they were present to see this wondrous event "a cloud came and overshadowed them, and from the cloud came a voice, 'This is my beloved (agapetos) Son: listen to him.'"

(Mk. 9:7)

The presence of Moses and Elijah in the narrative indicates the beginning of the messianic kingdom since both were bearers of Jahweh's word and furthered the preparation for the final kingdom. The presence of the cloud which embraced both the heavenly and earthly figures and the transformation of Jesus in such manner that one recalls the doxa of God in the Old Testament reinforce the eschatological atmosphere of the narration.¹²⁹

The nature of the religious experience of Jesus and the disciples is open to question. A possible explanation would be to say that on the mountain a strong conviction came upon them that Jesus was the son of God in the sense that He was called to a special mission by Jahweh. There could have been auditory and visual elements as other mystics have described.¹³⁰

The important element here in the development of the second gospel is the revelation that Jesus is Son and should be heard. The title here confirms Jesus' divine commission and His complete oneness with the Father in carrying it out.¹³¹

Mark 5:7 reinforces Mark 3:11. It reads: "he said, 'What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me'." The text bears strong

resemblance to 3:11: the reference to shrieking, worshipping, the confession of Jesus as the 'Son of God', and the fear of torment. The use of the name by the demon is connected with the ancient belief that knowledge of the name carries with it power over an adversary. The precise location of the incident in the country of the Gerasenes and the details about the activities of the man possessed all point to the authenticity of the event. The structuring of the narrative, however, follows the pattern found in many other exorcisms.¹³² The same conclusions can be drawn from this text as were from Mark 3:11. There is recognition on the part of the demon of Jesus' identity, but here there is not the usual command of silence. Instead Jesus said: "Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you." (Mk. 5:19) The change in His attitude can be accounted for on the basis that He was in pagan territory and hence, did not employ the same reserve as He did in Israel.¹³³ The meaning of His mission and identity was less likely to be misunderstood in this area.

Mark 13:32 presents a situation almost universally accepted as historical: "But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father". The genuineness of the text is assured since it is unlikely that words attributing ignorance to Jesus would be in the text unless He was known to have spoken them. The saying shows that Jesus

used the name 'the Son' of Himself, not as angels and men are called 'sons of God', but to describe His distinctive relationship to God. It truly manifests His consciousness of being Son of God in a "pre-eminent" way.¹³⁴ The state of ignorance Jesus spoke of here coincides with other passages which confirm that the fixing of the end time is "the most sovereign act of God the Father", who by His own exousia establishes the day. (cf. AA 1:7)¹³⁵

One of the final events which clarifies the Father-Son relationship occurs in the garden at Gethsemane. Here it is not the Father who addresses Jesus as Son but Jesus who calls God Father. "Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what thou wilt." (Mk. 14:36) The familiar note of obedience, this time as a readiness to adhere to the Father's will even if it meant death, is quite evident. The manner of address, however, is unusual. The familiar form of address - Abba - indicates an intimacy which is based upon a "unique revelation which was bestowed upon him". As Jesus used the word, it carried overtones of a revelation not accessible to everyone and seems to indicate the central awareness of His consciousness.¹³⁶ Fuller asserts that "Jesus can call God 'Abba' because he has known him as the one who has drawn high in His own word and deed, and He admits to the same privilege those who have responded to His own eschatological message."¹³⁷

The distinctive teaching of Jesus about God as the Father of individual believers arises out of his own unique consciousness of sonship. He himself was wont to address God as 'abba' (Father) in the same way that a son

would address his earthly father. This was not the practice within Judaism in the days of Christ; the Jew would address God liturgically as 'abbi' (my father), but would not use the familiar 'abba'. But the use by Jesus of the intimate 'abba' left such an indelible impression on the minds of his disciples that it even survived translation into Greek. Though the Gospels are reticent upon the subject of the inner life of Jesus, they leave us in no doubt about this consciousness of his own special relation to the Father. The use of 'abba' makes it difficult to deny that Jesus thought of himself as uniquely God's Son or to suppose that the Church derived the idea of his Sonship from any other source than Jesus himself. He is conscious of having been assigned a special mission and task by God; he conceives of his own response in biblical terms, viz. sonship and obedience.¹³⁸

The text of Mark 14:61-62 formulates Jesus' response to the high priest. "Again the high priest asked him, 'Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' And Jesus said, 'I am'." This passage is problematic. The question addressed to Jesus is the equivalent of "Are you the Messiah?". The answer "I am" comes through very strongly as an absolute affirmative, while the parallel texts in Matthew and Luke are more ambiguous and convey the sense of "You say that I am". (cf. Mt. 26:64, Lk. 22:67-70). The high priest declares this statement blasphemy. It may be that the event described here is not historical but really reflects the faith of the Church and Mark's basic Christology.¹³⁹

The final statement of the centurion at the foot of the cross brings the thought development of the gospel full circle. "And when the centurion who stood facing him saw that he thus breathed his last, he said, 'Truly this man was the son of God!'" (15:39)

Taylor asserts that the centurion's confession may have been a "spontaneous recognition of divinity" in a man of exceptional holiness. The sacred writer seems to intend more in his use of the centurion's exclamation, namely, an expression of belief in Jesus' divinity in the full Christian sense.¹⁴⁰ If this is so, it creates the balance for the opening line of the gospel: "The beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God." Lohmeyer agrees with Taylor and says that the confession of the centurion surpasses that of Peter and proclaims the very truth which the high priest had condemned as blasphemy a short time before.¹⁴¹

Though the centurion's understanding of his statement is difficult to ascertain, it can at least be said that Jesus' holiness, evidenced in His attitude of acceptance, called forth his exclamation. Though the centurion perhaps did not possess the full Christian understanding of the Son of God expression, the belief that the gospel's author in formulating the narrative wished to convey the fullness of the Christian message, is acceptable. The author seems to have a special understanding of the fact that the 'Son of God' title expresses the most secret and final revelation of the person and work of Jesus. Consequently he respects Jesus' reserve in

the use of the title by carefully leading the reader by a historical presentation alone to the centurion's confession.¹⁴²

Cullmann summarizes rather well the significance of the Son of God title.

...it expresses the very essence of Jesus' self-consciousness in a way quite different from the majesty implied by 'Son of Man' or even 'Messiah'. 'Son of God' expresses Jesus' constant experience of complete unity of will with the Father, the full perception of revelation which makes itself known to him as a unique recognition of himself by the Father. This is more than simply the prophetic consciousness of a man who knows himself to be God's instrument; more than the 'compulsion' which the Apostle Paul feels when he cries, 'Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel (1 Cor. 9:16). God acts not only through him, but with him.¹⁴³

In the presentation of Mark, then, the Son of God title also functions as an indicator of who Jesus thinks He is and, consequently, of why He acts as He does. The title reveals that Jesus is related to the Father as no other man is and hence can do what no other man can do.

His calling upon God as Father when the passion began indicated the consciousness which would permeate all subsequent happenings. He would be the totally submissive Son. The resurrection introduces Him to the fulness of life as a Son, while the Ascension is the "final vindication of Jesus as the true Son of God ..."¹⁴⁴ "So the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was caught up into heaven and took his seat at God's right hand." (Mk. 16:19)

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the evidence given in Mark's gospel and the supporting references here employed, it is possible to make some statements about the problem posed at the beginning of this paper, that is, what is the nature of Jesus' exousia and upon what does He base it.

- (1) Jesus' exousia, while in certain circumstances possessing the characteristics common to any ordinary exousia, is unique in that, in His own name, Jesus effectively demonstrated that He could act as the Jews thought only God could act. He overcame evil in all forms, that is, He cast out devils, cured disease, forgave sins, controlled nature, and overcame death.
- (2) Jesus acts authoritatively and substantiates His activity in revealing Himself as the Son of Man. Daniel's son of man figure came at the end of time, was trans-historical, received everlasting dominion over all peoples in God's kingdom. Jesus as Son of Man absorbs most of these characteristics but becomes historical, works to establish God's kingdom in history by means of the exousia. He possesses, and effectively establishes God's reign by suffering and rising, thus assimilating the roles of Messiah and Suffering Servant to that of the Son of Man.

(3) Jesus acts authoritatively and substantiates His activity by being identified as Son of God - not merely in the traditional Judaic sense of being chosen and responding obediently, but as one who shares a unique and intimate relationship with the heavenly Father.

So personal is the bond between Jesus and the Father that the latter can say "This is my beloved (only-begotten) Son; listen to him." (Mk. 9:7) The Son, in turn, responds perfectly when faced with the ultimate choice. "Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee: remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what thou wilt." (Mk. 14:36)

Jesus' exousia, as described in the second gospel, was directly concerned with the establishment of His Father's Kingdom. His was the task of forming an eschatological community in which His own exousia was to be the formative principle. Jesus' possession of this unique capacity was due to who He was. In part He shaped the historical revelation of His own Person by way of the titles He used for Himself or allowed others to use of Him. Two among these, 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God' convey complementary concepts which assist in understanding the nature and use Jesus made of His exousia in time. The former clarifies the role of Jesus in the community while the latter directs attention to the singular relationship existing between Jesus and His Father.

The author of the second gospel describes Jesus as conscious of Himself as being distinctively related to God, but does not definitively prove the fact that He was divine in the sense of being of the same nature as God. He remains the deus absconditus, not a deus mortuus, who personally extends Himself to man in history in order that man in response might share in the life of the Kingdom of God.

FOOTNOTES

¹Werner Foerster, "New Testament Exousia" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. by Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), Vol. 2, 560.

²C. H. Turner "Ho Huioi Mou Ho Agapetos", The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 27, No. 105, (Jan. 1926), 122.

³Plato's The Republic III, 360D, trans. and ed. by B. Jowett (New York, The Modern Library, 1947).

⁴The Laws, XI, 936A, in The Dialogues of Plato, trans. and ed. by B. Jowett (New York: Random House, 1937).

⁵Gorgias, 461E, in The Dialogues of Plato: Selections, trans. and ed. by B. Jowett (New York: Liveright Publishing Corp., 1927).

⁶Plato's The Republic, V, 460B.

⁷Plato, Gorgias, 525 A in Dialogues... Selections.

⁸Plato's The Republic, VIII, 554C.

⁹Aristotle, Politica, 1331^b40, in Student's Oxford Aristotle, trans. and ed. by W. D. Ross (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), Vol. 6.

¹⁰Ibid., 1255^b36.

¹¹Ibid., 1315^a14.

¹²Aristotle, Rhetorica, 1369^a13, in The Works of Aristotle, trans. and ed. by W. D. Ross (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1959), Vol. 9.

¹³Ethics, 1161^a9, in Student's Oxford Aristotle, Vol. 5.

¹⁴Foerster, "New Testament Exousia", 563.

¹⁵Ibid., 564.

¹⁶See note two above.

¹⁷Foerster, "New Testament Exousia", 565.

¹⁸Other terms used to translate the derivatives of mashal are arche, dunamis, stratia, oikonomia and ischus. When the Hebrew term refers to the power of God or His Sovereignty, it is ordinarily translated with the singular exousia. When used in the plural, exousiai often refers to lesser spiritual powers. cf. Foerster, "New Testament Exousia", 562, 569. cf. also Gen. 1:16; 3:16; 1:18; 4:7; 24:25; 37:8; 45:8, 26 Deut. 15:6, Jos. 12:2, 1Kings 9:19, Prov. 28:15; 29:12, 16; Isa. 16:1; 14:5.

¹⁹Foerster indicates that the expression 'eis exousian' found in Ps. 135:8-9 is really equivalent to an angelic power, 565.

²⁰Ibid., 564.

²¹Ibid., 564.

²²Ma. 3:6, 24; 4:9, 24; 7:16.

²³Foerster, "New Testament Exousia", 565.

²⁴Ibid., 564.

²⁵Ibid., 565.

²⁶Ibid., 565. The significant data concerning the son of man and the holy people of the Most High will be discussed later in connection with the consideration of the basis of Christ's authority.

²⁷Ibid., 562.

²⁸Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1959), 170, citing Johannes Weiss, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Vol. 1 (Goettingen, 3rd ed. revised by W. Bousset, 1917), 78.

²⁹T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus (Cambridge at the University Press, 1961), 22.

³⁰Ibid., 22.

³¹Ibid., 20.

³²A. Tricot, "The World of Judaism", Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. 2, edited by A. Robert und A. Feuillet, trans. by Msgr. P. Skehan, Edward Arbey, et al (New York: Desclee Co., 1965), 55.

³³David Daube, "Exousia in Mark 1:22 and 27", Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 39(1939), 50.

³⁴Ibid., 45.

³⁵Ibid., 49.

³⁶Frederick C. Grant, "The Gospel According to Mark," The Interpreter's Bible, ed., George A. Buttrick et al. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1951), Vol. 7, 751.

³⁷Ibid., 847. cf. also Taylor, 488.

³⁸Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 176. In opposition to Taylor's view of this section as historically founded Rawlinson believes it to be typical. See A. Rawlinson, St. Mark, with Introduction, Commentary and Additional Notes (6th ed. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1947), 24-25.

³⁹cf. Mk. 3:15, 6:7; 5:1-20; 9:14-29.

⁴⁰James Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark (Studies in Biblical Theology", No. 21; Chicago: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1957), 28.

⁴¹Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 164.

⁴²Ibid., 192, 196.

⁴³Rawlinson, St. Mark, 24-25.

⁴⁴Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 196.

⁴⁵Ibid., 196-197.

⁴⁶C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: SPCK, 1954), 82.

⁴⁷Rawlinson, St. Mark, 40.

⁴⁸Foerster, "New Testament Exousia", 569.

⁴⁹Rawlinson, St. Mark, 77.

⁵⁰T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London, Oxford University Press, 1949), 73.

⁵¹Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 302.

⁵²Ibid., 302, citing R. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London, 1930), 125.

⁵³Ibid., 468-469.

⁵⁴Ibid., 463-464.

⁵⁵Ibid., 470.

⁵⁶Robinson, 49.

⁵⁷Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 523.

⁵⁸Foerster, "New Testament Exousia", 562.

⁵⁹Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1961), 130-131.

There existed a widespread Near Eastern concept of a primal man who was the first created of all beings and who would come again at the end of time as the judge of all creation. In the interim between creation and the end time, the Son of Man was a hidden figure. This rather common religious belief very probably furnished some of the understanding of the figure in Daniel, but as we explore the use of this concept specifically in Daniel we find new distinguishing characteristics introduced. (cf. Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 150.)

It has also been suggested that the New Testament usage of the Son of Man title is more immediately influenced by the Son of Man figure found in the Book of Enoch. (cf. Rudolph Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), 141-144. and R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963), Vol. 2, 214ff.) Charles, however, asserts that the son of man in Enoch depends upon the son of man figure in Daniel 7, (214). In another section Charles strongly asserts that the Book of Enoch is historically the source for the New Testament doctrine of the Son of Man. (185) Richardson disagrees. "It is true that reigning, judging, revealing and succouring the righteous are all elements in the Gospel picture of the Son of Man; and yet it is equally true that the latter picture is a long way removed from the fantasies of Enoch. There is no saying of Jesus in the Gospels

which echoes any phrase from that compilation, and there is no reason at all to think that Jesus had ever read the work, whether or not we think that Paul or the Johannine writer may have done. On the other hand it seems highly probable that Jesus was much influenced by the Danielic vision of the giving of the kingdom to the people of the saints of the Most High, a vision which itself is far removed from the fully developed Enochian conception of the heavenly Son of Man. Charles thought that the latter was developed out of the Daniel passage, while Mowinckel thinks that Dan. 7:13f and the Similitudes have a common background. (He That Cometh, Chap. X) There is a considerable difference between 'one like unto a son of man' as a poetic symbol of the people of Israel and the pre-existent heavenly Messiah of Enoch; but it may be that one or both conceptions can be traced back to the ancient myth of the Primal Man. (J. M. Creed, 'The Heavenly Man', Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 26, 1925, 113-136.)" 130-131.

The source of the Similitudes in Enoch, a common designation for the section dealing with the Son of Man sayings, has not been definitively established. In fact, a serious doubt in this regard arises because of the absence of this particular section from the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is the possibility that the Similitudes are simply Christian insertions in an already existent document.

The apocalypse found in the Second Book of Esdras extends from chapters 3 to 14 and is dated after the fall of Jerusalem but not later than the reign of Hadrian (117-138). See also Grant, The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 2, 640; Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, 69.

⁶⁰John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), 443.

⁶¹Arthur Jeffery, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 6, 460.

⁶²Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 140.

⁶³The Book of Daniel with a commentary by Raymond E. Brown, S. S. (New York: Paulist Press, 1962), 25.

⁶⁴Wilfrid J. Harrington, O. P. Record of the Promise: The Old Testament (Chicago: The Priory Press, 1965), 238.

⁶⁵Arthur Jeffery, 425.

⁶⁶Manson, The Servant Messiah, 73.

⁶⁷Johnson, 417.

⁶⁸Howard Teeple, "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 84, Part 3 (September, 1965, 213).

⁶⁹Andre Feuillet, "L'Exousia du Fils de l'Homme d'apres Mc. II, 10-28 et par." Recherches de Science Religieuse, Tome 42 (Avril-Juin, 1954), 171.

See Also Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. by F. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 352.

⁷⁰Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 200.

⁷¹Martin Hopkins, God's Kingdom in the New Testament (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964), 26.

⁷²Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 154.

⁷³Rawlinson, 33-34.

⁷⁴Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 220.

⁷⁵Ibid., 374.

⁷⁶Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), 118.

⁷⁷Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 377.

⁷⁸Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 145.

⁷⁹Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1962), 35.

⁸⁰Ibid., 35.

⁸¹The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 4, 642.

⁸²Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 383, Rawlinson, 116.

⁸³Rawlinson, 116.

⁸⁴Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 383.

⁸⁵Ibid., 384.

⁸⁶Ibid., 383.

⁸⁷Jesus refuses to be known publicly as the Messiah probably because of the political implications bound up with the common usage of the title. This gives rise to the 'Messianic Secret' theme which recurs throughout the gospel.

cf. W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in das Evangelien (Goettingen, 1913), 61, 66f.

J. W. Bowman, "Eschatology of the New Testament", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 2, 138.

Martin Hopkins, God's Kingdom in the New Testament, 25.

Manson, The Servant Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus, 73.

⁸⁸Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 393, citing Robert Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of Mark (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 92. cf. Rawlinson, 121.

⁸⁹Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 386.

⁹⁰Grant, 778, cites Loissy.

⁹¹"The disciples understood then that he had been speaking of John the Baptist." Mt. 17:13

⁹²Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 402, citing R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, tr. by F. Filson and B. L. Woolf (London, 1938), 361f, and J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, tr. by F. Grant, et al., (London, 1937).

⁹³Ibid., 403.

⁹⁴Rawlinson, 110.

⁹⁵Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 402.

⁹⁶Ibid., 124, 437.

⁹⁷Ibid., 374-375.

⁹⁸Ibid., 124, 125, 438.

cf. Fuller, Foundations, 106, for the opposite opinion. "The majority of Jesus' sayings about his death contain either an explicit Christology (notably the predictions of the passion, which will be discussed later) or an explicit soteriology (so Mk. 10:45^b and the cup word at the last supper, Mk. 14:24). They must, therefore, on the grounds of traditio-historical criticism be assigned to the early church, rather than to Jesus himself." (cf. Das Markusevangelium, Erich Klostermann (Tuebingen Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1950), 78, 79)

Fuller assumes that Christology is the Church's response to the history of Jesus and accepts few of the sayings of Jesus in the synoptic gospels as historically rooted. The rest he ascribes to the post-resurrection church. It is difficult to accept Fuller's conclusions in this area since the weight of scholarly evidence seems to support the opposite point of view, namely, that Jesus could easily

have made statements about Himself and His fate. Certainly the extensive details which are present in the prophecies would not be viewed by most scholars as finding their source in Jesus Himself, but that He could in general terms speak of His impending fate is an acceptable thesis. (cf. Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Markus, p. 220)

⁹⁹Martin Hopkins, O.P. God's Kingdom in the New Testament, 29.

¹⁰⁰Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 443, 446.

¹⁰¹Rawlinson, 146.

¹⁰²Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 445, 446.

¹⁰³Ibid., 445-446.

¹⁰⁴Rawlinson, 202.

Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 541.

¹⁰⁵Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 541-542.

¹⁰⁶The verb paradidotai is once more employed and while in Mk. 9:31 it conveyed conviction about a future event, here it conveys the same firm conviction about an imminent event.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 537.

¹⁰⁸Alan Richardson, Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, 134, citing Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1, 26.

¹⁰⁹Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 518.

¹¹⁰Ibid., 518.

¹¹¹Mk. 8:38; 9:9.

¹¹²C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), 73.

¹¹³Rawlinson, 217.

¹¹⁴Dodd, 82.

¹¹⁵Karl Adam, The Christ of Faith (New York: New American Library, 1962), 140.

¹¹⁶X. Leon-Dufour, "The Synoptic Gospels", Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. 2, ed. by A. Robert and A. Feuillet, trans. by Msgr. Patrick Skehan, Edward P. Arbey, et al. (New York: Desclee Co., 1965), 208.

¹¹⁷Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 275.

¹¹⁸Ibid., 272.

¹¹⁹Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 1952.

¹²⁰Ibid., 617.

¹²¹Grant, 654.

¹²²Fuller, Foundations, 116.

¹²³Ibid., 116-117.

¹²⁴Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 618.

¹²⁵Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, trans. by J. K. S. Reid ("Studies in Biblical Theology"; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954), 16.

¹²⁶Fuller, Foundations, 117.

¹²⁷W. Grundmann, "Dunamis", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), Vol. 2, 301.

¹²⁸Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 228.

¹²⁹Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck U. Ruprecht, 1963), 178.

¹³⁰Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 392.

¹³¹Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 278.

¹³²Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 280-281.

¹³³L'Evangile Selon Saint Marc, trans. by J. Huby, S.J. (9^e edition revue, par les soins de P. M. Benoit, O.P., Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961), note on Mark 5:20, 39.

¹³⁴Taylor, Names, 64-65.

¹³⁵Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 288.

¹³⁶Joachim Jeremias, The Central Message of the New Testament (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965), 27.

¹³⁷Fuller, Foundations, 106.

¹³⁸Richardson, 149.

¹³⁹Grant, 890.

cf. Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 119-120.
Dodd, 66.

¹⁴⁰Taylor, Gospel According to St. Mark, 597.

¹⁴¹Ibid., 598, citing Lohmeyer, 347.

¹⁴²Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, 295.

¹⁴³Ibid., 282.

¹⁴⁴Hopkins, 39.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adam, Karl. The Christ of Faith. New York: New American Library, 1962.
- Aland, Kurt. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Editio Tertia. Stuttgart: Wuertembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965.
- Arndt, William and Gingrich, F. W. (eds.) A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (from W. Bauer's Greek). 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Asticus, D. Fredericus. Lexicon Platicum Sive Vocum Platoniarum Index. Vol. 1. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1956.
- Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: SPCK, 1954.
- Barron, Milton L. (ed.). Contemporary Sociology: An Introductory Textbook of Readings. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1964.
- Bonitz, H. Index Aristotelicus. Secunda Editio. Graz-Austria: Akademische Drucke-u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- Catholic Biblical Association. A Commentary on the New Testament. Kansas City: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1942.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. 2. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament. ("Studies in Biblical Theology", No. 1) Translated by J.K.S. Reid. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1954.
- _____. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

- Dodd, C. H. Gospel and Law: The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- _____. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Fuller, Reginald. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Grant, Robert M. A Historical Introduction of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Harrington, Wilfrid J. O. P. Record of the Promise: The Old Testament. Chicago: The Priory Press, 1965.
- Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Vol. 1. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Heinisch, Paul, Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by William Heidt, St. Paul: The Liturgical Press, 1955.
- Hopkins, Martin, O. P. God's Kingdom in the New Testament. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1964.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Central Message of the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965.
- Klosterman, Erich. Das Markusevangelium. Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1950.
- Lapide, Cornelius. The Great Commentary of Cornelius a Lapide. Translated by Thomas W. Mossman, B. A. London: John Hodges, 1881.
- Lightfoot, Robert H. The Gospel Message of Mark. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Markus Evangelium. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1965.
- Manson, T. W. The Servant Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- _____. The Sayings of Jesus. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.

- McKenzie, John L., S.J. The Power and the Wisdom: An Interpretation of the New Testament. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1965.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Moulton, W. F. and Geden, H. K. A Concordance to the Greek New Testament according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963.
- Orchard, Bernard, et al., Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1951.
- Otto, Rudolph. Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. Muenchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Plato. Dialogues of Plato: Selections. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. New York: Liveright Publishing Co., 1927.
- _____. Dialogues of Plato. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. New York: Random House, 1937.
- _____. The Republic. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. New York: The Modern Library, 1947.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. St. Mark, with Introduction, Commentary and Additional Notes. 6th ed. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1947.
- Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- _____. (ed). A Theological Word Book of the Bible. New York: Macmillan Co., 1960.
- Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 21) Chicago: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1957.
- Ross, W. D. (ed.). The Student's Oxford Aristotle. Vols. 1-6. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- _____. The Works of Aristotle. Vol. 11. Rhetorica. W. R. Roberts. De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum. E. S. Forster. De Poetica. Ingram Bywater. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Schnackenburg, Rudolph. The Church in the New Testament. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Taylor, Vincent. The Formation of Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1964.

_____. The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indexes. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1959.

_____. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1962.

Todd, John M. (ed). Problems of Authority. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1962.

Wickenhauser, Alfred. New Testament Introduction. Translated by Joseph Cunningham. New York: Herder and Herder, 1958.

Yarnold, G. D. By What Authority? Studies in the Relations of Scripture, Church and Ministry. London: A. R. Mowbray Co. Ltd., 1964.

ARTICLES

- Daube, David. "Exousia in Mark 1:22 and 27," Journal of Theological Studies, 39(1939), 45-59.
- Feuillet, Andre. "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la Tradition Biblique," Revue Biblique, 60(1953), 170-202.
- _____. "L'Exousia du Fils de l'Homme (d'apres Mc. II, 10-28 et parallele)," Recherches de Science Religieuse, 42(1954), 161-192.
- Foerster, Werner. "Exousia", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. (4 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), 2, 560-574.
- Grant, Frederick C. and Luccock, Halord E. "The Gospel According to St. Mark," The Interpreter's Bible, 7, Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951, 629-647.
- Grundmann, W. "Dunamis" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. (4 Vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), 284-317.
- Johnson, S. E. "Son of Man," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdom Press, 1962.
- Keck, Leander E. "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," Journal of Biblical Literature, 849 (1965), 341-358.
- Leon-Dufour, X. "The Synoptic Gospels," Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. 2. Translated by Msgr. Patrick Skehan et al. New York: Desclee Co., 1965, 125-305.
- McKenzie, John L. "Authority and Power in the New Testament," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 26(1964), 413-422.
- _____. "The Transformation of Old Testament Messianism," in Studies in Salvation History. Edited by C. Luke Salm., F.S.C. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

- North, C. R. "Servant of the Lord," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, 4, 492-494.
- Rist, M. "Book of Enoch," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, 2, 103-105.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. "The Method of Form Criticism in Gospel Research," Theology Digest, 12(1964), 147-152.
- Sheehan, John, S. J. "The Septuagint and the New Testament," The Bible Today, (1965), 1133-1136.
- Starr, Joshua. "The Meaning of Authority in Mark 1:22," Harvard Theological Review, 23(1930), 302-305.
- Teeple, Howard. "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology," Journal of Biblical Literature, 84(1965), 213-250.
- Tricot, A. "The World of Judaism", Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. 2. Translated by Msgr. Patrick Skehan et al. New York: Desclee Co., 1965, 29-90.
- Turner, Charles. "Ho Huios Mou Ho Agapetos," The Journal of Theological Studies, 27(1926), 113-129.

SCRIPTURE

The Book of Daniel: with a commentary by Raymond Brown, S. S. (confraternity text), Paulist Press: New York, 1962.

L'Evangile Selon Saint Mark. Traduite en francais sous la direction l'Ecole Biblique de Jerusalem. Traduit par J. Huby, S. J. 3^e edition revue, par les soins de P. M. Benoit, O.P. Paris: Des Editions du Cerf, 1961.

La Sainte Bible Polyglotte. contenant le Texte Hebreu Original, le Texte Grec Des Septante, le Texte Latin de la Vulgate et la Traduction Francaise de M. L'Abbe Gloire. Introduction, Notes, Cartes et des Illustrations par F. Vigouroux. Ancien Testament. Tome 6 (Daniel, 1 and 2 Macchabees) Paris: 1906.

Septuaginta: Adfred Rahlfs. Editio Septima. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.

The Septuagint Bible: The Oldest Version of the Old Testament. Translated by Charles Thomson. ed. and revised by C. A. Muses. Colorado: Falcon's Wing Press, 1954.

Revised Standard Version of Scripture, published by Harper and Row, is used for all direct quotes except in those instances in which reference is made to books not included in the RSV. The American Translation, published by the University of Chicago Press, is used here.