

# NEW TESTAMENT ESSAYS

STUDIES IN MEMORY OF  
**Thomas Walter Manson**  
1893-1958

sponsored by  
PUPILS, COLLEAGUES  
AND FRIENDS

edited by  
**A. J. B. HIGGINS**  
*Lecturer in New Testament Language  
and Literature in the University  
of Leeds*

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 1959

*Published by the University of Manchester at*  
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
*316-324 Oxford Road, Manchester 13*

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

## THE BACKGROUND OF MARK 10:45

by

C. K. BARRETT

---

*The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.*

THIS saying raises acutely two of the most difficult, and most disputed, questions of New Testament scholarship: (1) What is the meaning of the term Son of man as used in the gospels? (2) Did Jesus foresee his death, and, if so, how did he interpret it? These questions cannot be handled in this essay, in which it will not be possible to discuss even the authenticity, and the interpretation, of Mark 10:45 itself. One subject only is proposed for inquiry: What factors (other than the creative thought of Jesus, or of the primitive Church) contributed to the formation of this saying? Or (in other words), against what background does the saying become most readily intelligible? It will be necessary to impose a further limitation by making the assumption—in which probably all students of the subject would agree—that the background is to be found within the field of the Old Testament and Judaism.

To many, the question can be answered in a word: the background of Mark 10:45 is to be sought in Isa. 53 (more strictly, in Isa. 52:13–53:12). In this verse, Jesus represents himself (or, is represented) as the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. This opinion is held so widely and by such distinguished writers<sup>1</sup> that it must appear temerarious to throw oneself into the scale against the weight of their learning. Yet there is a danger lest the cautious judgment of a scholar in one generation become the unexamined opinion of the many in the next, and it may render some service to scholarship if at least a few question-marks are set beside this *communis sensus doctorum*. For the influence of Isa. 53 upon Mark 10:45 is by no means so clear and unambiguous as is often

supposed. To say this is not to make the absurd suggestion that Jesus and Mark had never read Isa. 53 or heard of the Servant. The question is not whether there may not be in our verse some distant echo of that passage, but whether the statement about the serving and dying of the Son of man is directly based upon it. It is quite possible that there should be slight resemblances not implying that whoever was responsible for the verse had before his eyes the actual figure of the Servant who was despised and afflicted.<sup>2</sup>

The present essay falls into two parts. In the former, the *language* of Mark 10:45 is examined, with reference to the allusions which have been found in it to the language of Isa. 53; in the latter, an attempt is made to explore the background of *thought* in which the ideas of Mark 10:45 find their place.

## I

1. The term 'Son of man',  $\delta \upsilon \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omicron \upsilon$ , certainly does not in itself suggest Isa. 53 and the Servant. It has however been argued that it is no more than one remove from Isa. 53, and therefore suggests it indirectly.

Thus 'Son of man' certainly recalls Dan. 7; and at least one passage in Daniel calls to mind the Suffering Servant. In Dan. 12:3 *hammāškīlīm* and *mašdīkē hārabbīm* are singled out for special glory in the age to come. But in Isa. 52:13 it is said *yāškīl 'abhdī*, and in 53:11, *yašdīk šaddīk 'abhdī lārabbīm*. So we might conclude: Mark rests on Daniel, and Daniel on the song of the Suffering Servant.<sup>3</sup> This is an unconvincing argument.

(a) Not even two swallows make a summer; two words, one from the beginning and one from the end of the Song, do not prove the use of the Song as a whole. The words (both of which deal with the glory rather than the suffering of the Servant), are not uncommon; *hīškīl* occurs 58 times (excluding Psalm titles), and *hīšdīk* 13 times in the Old Testament. It would be unwise to build a heavy structure on such a foundation.

(b) The words are used in different senses in the two books. In Isa. 52:13 *hīškīl* means, according to K-B,<sup>4</sup> 'to act with insight, piously'; Dr. Mowinckel, perhaps more probably, renders 'will attain his aim';<sup>5</sup> Dr. Engnell<sup>6</sup> thinks of the cultic glorification of the king. When the context as a whole is taken into account it is

hard to doubt that the word describes the success, perhaps the triumph, of the Servant.<sup>7</sup> But in Dan. 12:3 the word points back to 11:33 (*maškīlē 'ām yābhīnū lārabbīm*) and 11:35, and these passages strongly suggest that it means 'the teachers'. It is used in this sense in the Zadokite Document,<sup>8</sup> and in some of the Dead Sea MSS.<sup>9</sup>

The meaning of *yašdīk* in Isa. 53:11 is far from clear, and cannot be discussed here.<sup>10</sup> K-B<sup>11</sup> translate 'to help one to his right'; others<sup>12</sup> prefer an intransitive rendering. The meaning in Dan. 12:3 also is uncertain. Montgomery<sup>13</sup> renders 'set the many right', comparing P. Aboth 5:18 (*kol-hamm<sup>e</sup> zakkeh 'eth-hārabbīm*). It may however be suggested that, as *hammaškīlīm* are the teachers, so *mašdīkē hārabbīm* are 'the judges of the community'. For 'the many' as the community as a whole we may quote Dan. 9:27; 11:33, 39. The use became common in later Hebrew; cf. Zad. Frag. 13:7; 14:12; Man. of Disc. 6:1 *et passim*. Indeed, the Qumran documents go far to support the view, which is otherwise by no means improbable, that the *maškīlīm* and the *mašdīkē hārabbīm* are the same persons, those leading members of the community who were both teachers and judges.<sup>14</sup>

In all probability, then, Dan. 12:3 pronounces a special blessing on teachers and judges—the leading members of the Jewish community—at the time of the resurrection. This has little to do with Isa. 53 and the Suffering Servant.

(c) The two significant words of Dan. 12:3 are five chapters removed from the chapter of the Son of man, and are in the plural. It is not hard for modern scholars, who adopt some sort of corporate interpretation of the Danielic Son of man, to make out a connection between the man-like figure of 7:13 and the leaders of the people mentioned in 12:3; but it is doubtful whether anyone put the passages together in antiquity.

It follows from these arguments that we cannot use Daniel as a connecting link between Isa. 53 and Mark 10:45, at least as far as the words *maškīlīm*, *mašdīkīm*, are concerned. On the Son of man in Daniel see further below.<sup>15</sup>

If it be true that it is impossible to draw a straight line from Mark 10:45 to Isa. 53 through Daniel, the figure of the Son of man in 1 Enoch will scarcely call for consideration. There are indeed in 1 Enoch 37–71 reminiscences of Isaianic Servant passages,<sup>16</sup> but the crucial point is that, whatever verbal echoes may exist,

the Son of man in 1 Enoch does not suffer.<sup>17</sup> This book provides no link between Mark and the *Suffering Servant*.

2. 'Came', ἦλθεν, need not detain us. It does not suggest Isa. 53, nor can it be seriously held to suggest any other background passage. It may be worth while to recall the language of Dan. 7:13: *kēbhar 'eṇāš 'āthēh h'awā'* (LXX: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο; Th.: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος). Daniel's vision is of a future coming, but the aorist ἦλθεν could represent the characteristically paradoxical New Testament view of the fulfilment of prophecy—the Son of man *has* come. Nothing however can be built on this word.

3. The next clause, 'not to be served but to serve', οὐ διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι, offers at first sight a much stronger argument to those who maintain that Mark 10:45 is based on the figure of the Servant;<sup>18</sup> but the linguistic connection with Isa. 53 is less close than is often thought.

In the Servant Songs the Servant is always described as God's 'ebhedh. This word becomes in the Targum (except in 53:11, where there is a free paraphrase) 'abhdā'; the same word is used in the Peshitto. In the LXX it is at 42:1; 49:6; 52:13 παῖς; at 49:3, 5 δουλος; at 53:11 it is paraphrased εἰ δουλεύοντα. In the Old Testament generally the root '-b-d is rendered by a quite bewildering variety of Greek words; but it is never rendered by διακονεῖν or any of its cognates.

These Greek words are in fact very uncommon in the LXX. The verb does not occur at all. διακονία is found as a variant at Esther 6:3, 5 (see below), and at 1 Macc. 11:58, where it appears to mean a dinner service. διάκονος is used disparagingly at 4 Macc. 9:17 of the servants of Antiochus IV; at Prov. 10:4, where there is no Hebrew equivalent; and (with οἱ ἐκ τῆς διακονίας as a variant at 6:3, 5) in Esther 1:10; 2:2; 6:3, 5 (and as an inferior reading at 6:1), where it renders either *na'ar*, or the Pi'el participle of *šāraṭh*, or the two in apposition. Linguistically, διακονεῖν does not recall Isa. 53, or any of the Servant passages.

4. The Son of man came 'to give his life', δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. This clause is said to reflect Isa. 53:12, παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ (*he'raḥ lammāweth naphšō*). It would be absurd to deny a measure of linguistic parallelism between the Old and New Testament passages at this point; but even here it is well to avoid premature conclusions.

The expression in Isa. 53:12 is unique in the Old Testament. '-r-h is not a very common root; in the Hiph'il it occurs only here and at Lev. 20:18, 19, where its objects are *m<sup>e</sup>kōrāh* and *š<sup>e</sup>'ērō* respectively, and it means 'to uncover', 'to make naked'. The meaning 'to pour out' is found with the Pi'el at Gen. 24:20 (object, *kaddāh*) and 2 Chron. 24:11 (object, *hā'ārōn*); and more significantly at Ps. 141:8, where the object is *naphšī* (LXX: *μη ἀνταπέλθης τὴν ψυχὴν μου*). Even this however is not a true parallel to Isa. 53:12, where *naphšō*, agreeing in person with the verb, is probably reflexive. The word *lammāweth* is generally excised by editors on metrical grounds; the fact that it was added shows that without it *he'ērāh naphšō* was not perfectly clear: 'he surrendered himself—to death'. The LXX use of *παραδιδόναι* (rather than *διδόναι*) may support this view.

The simpler phrase used in Mark, *ψυχὴν διδόναι*, seems to have been coming into use in the post-biblical period, perhaps under Greek influence (see also below on *λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν*). Büchsel (TWNT ii. 168) writes, 'The expression is current among the Jews for the death of martyrs, among the Greeks for the death of soldiers'. It can also mean 'to devote one's life in service'. See for examples of the Greek phrase 1 Macc. 2:50 (cf. 6:44, where *ἐαυτόν* probably represents *naphšō*); Ecclus. 29:15. The expression *nāthan naphšō* is also fairly common in post-biblical Hebrew.<sup>19</sup>

It cannot be claimed that *δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν* had a background of its own other than Isa. 53; but neither can it be said that it points unambiguously to that chapter.

5. According to Professor R. H. Fuller,<sup>20</sup> *λύτρον* is a perfectly adequate rendering of 'āšām' (Isa. 53:10: 'im-tāšim 'āšām naphšō). This confident statement is open to question. In the Old Testament 'āšām occurs 46 times; it is rendered in the LXX by *ἀγνοια*, *ἀδικία*, *ἀμαρτία*, *βάσανος*, *καθαρισμός*, *πλημμελεῖν*, *πλημμέλημα*, *πλημμελία*, but never by *λύτρον* or any cognate word.

Again, *λύτρον* renders the roots *g'-l*, *k-p-r*, *p-d-h*, and the word *m<sup>e</sup>hīr*; if we add the Greek cognates *λύτρωσις*, *λυτρωτής*, *λυτρωτός*, and *λυτροῦν* we may add in Hebrew the roots '-r-p, p-l-t, p-š-h, p-r-k, k-n-h, š-g-b, š-g-b. But never does *λύτρον* render 'āšām or any cognate word.

The linguistic data are too striking to be regarded as merely fortuitous; they represent a real difference in meaning between 'āšām and *λύτρον*.<sup>21</sup> The basic idea represented by the root '-š-ḥ

is *guilt*, and although it has been argued<sup>22</sup> that the notion of compensation is essential to the 'āšām it is important here to keep in mind a clear distinction which exists in the biblical, and especially in the post-biblical, texts. The fundamental law is set out in Lev. 5:14-26 (cf. Num. 5:5-10), and analysed more clearly in Zebahim 5:5: an 'āšām is offered in respect of false dealing, sacrilege, intercourse with a betrothed bondswoman, failure to keep a Nazirite vow, and the cleansing of a leper. In at least three cases the Mishnah (following the Pentateuch) expressly distinguishes between the act of restitution, and the offering of the 'āšām;<sup>23</sup> and in Zebahim 10:5 it is said that the 'āšām of the leper is offered 'to render him fit [to enter the Temple and to eat of Hallowed Things]'. It is not a compensation.

In λύτρον the idea of equivalence is central.<sup>24</sup> What the word meant to a Greek-speaking Jew is shown by an often quoted sentence in Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. 107), which describes the unsuccessful attempt made (in 54 B.C.) by the priest Eleazar to buy off Crassus: τὴν δοκὸν αὐτῷ τὴν χρυσῆν λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων ἔδωκεν. Eleazar gave him the golden bar in the hope that he would take nothing else, that he would take it *instead of* all the other things he might have taken.

This sense of equivalence, or substitution, is proper to λύτρον, and also to the Semitic roots mainly connected with it—*g'-l*, *k-p-r*, *p-d-h*. None of these, nor indeed any Hebrew word ever translated by λύτρον, occurs in Isa. 53; but in a number of passages they help to illuminate Mark 10:45. Among these may be noted:

Exod. 21:30	δώσει λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ w <sup>e</sup> nāthan pidhγōn naphšō.
Exod. 30:12	δώσουσιν ἕκαστος λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ w <sup>e</sup> nāth <sup>e</sup> nu 'iš kōpher naphšō.
Cf. Exod. 21:23	δώσει ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς w <sup>e</sup> nāhattāh nepheš tahath nepheš.
and 4 Kdms 10:24	ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ naphšō tahath naphšō.
ψ 48:8	ἀδελφὸς οὐ λυτροῦται · λυτρώσεται ἄνθρωπος; οὐ δώσει τῷ θεῷ ἐξίλασμα αὐτοῦ
Ps. 49:8	'āh lō'-phādhōh yiphdeh 'iš lō'-yittēn le'lōhīm kophrō.



Isa. 52:3                    οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε  
                                   lō' bh<sup>e</sup>kheseph tiggā' ēlū.

In virtue of something given (which may or may not be a ψυχή) a ψυχή is set free.

Thus the linguistic connection between λύτρον in Mark 10:45 and Isa. 53 is non-existent; and the theme of ransoming is far too widespread in the Old Testament to allow us to suppose that it must have been drawn from one particular passage.

6. The last words of Mark 10:45, 'for many', ἀντὶ πολλῶν, have been touched on in the last quotations. ἀντί is bound up in sense with λύτρον; λύτρον demands an ἀντί to follow. ἀντί and its Hebrew equivalent *tahath* occur in Isa. 52:13–53:12, but not significantly. We have 53:9 . . . ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου (. . . *kibhrō* . . . *b<sup>e</sup>mōthāyw*), which may require emendation; and in 53:12 the idiomatic ἀνθ' ὧν, rendering the equally idiomatic *tahath* 'asher. There is nothing here to our purpose.

Great weight is sometimes laid upon Mark's πολλῶν. It is true that here we can cite Isa.

52:14 ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοί (*šam<sup>e</sup>mū 'āleykhā rabbīm*)  
 52:15 θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλά (*yazzeḥ gōyīm rabbīm*)  
 53:11 δικαιοῦσαι δίκαιον εἰς δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς (*yašdik šaddik*  
                                   '*abhdī lārabbīm*)  
 53:12 κληρονομήσει πολλούς (*'ahallek-lō lārabbīm*)  
 53:12 ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν (*hēf'<sup>e</sup>-rabbīm nāsā'*)

It is however difficult to feel that there is anything conclusive in these quotations. It is perhaps trite to point out that in Greek πολλοί and in Hebrew *rabbīm* are common words. It is more significant that in Isa. 53 we have only one example, though an outstanding example, of a theme which runs through the whole of the Old Testament, namely, the relation of the One to the Many.<sup>25</sup>

Our examination of the language of Mark 10:45 is now at an end. It would be difficult indeed, on the basis of it, to claim that Mark's words point clearly to Isa. 53 rather than to any other part of the Old Testament and Jewish literature. Accordingly, we turn to the background of thought.

## II

The real crux of the problem lies in the use of the title Son of man. Superficially at least this (like other sayings which declare that the Son of man is to suffer) is a paradoxical inversion of the meaning of the term. Outside the gospels, the Son of man is in general a figure of glory rather than of suffering: among many passages see Dan. 7:13 f.; 1 Enoch 46:3; 48:5; 69:29;<sup>26</sup> 4 Ezra 13:3 f. It would of course be quite wrong to expect to find a 'background' containing all the thought of Mark 10:45. Full allowance must be made for originality, but even originality almost always works within a given framework of ideas, selecting, rearranging, developing, modifying, contradicting, but never in a vacuum. The question before us therefore is whether the apocalyptic background of thought, which is certainly suggested by the term Son of man, provides a framework of ideas in which Mark 10:45 becomes intelligible without direct recourse to Isa. 53, which, as we have seen, is much less strongly suggested by the terminology of our verse than is often supposed.

There are two main problems, (a) that of the serving, and (b) that of the suffering and dying, of the Son of man.

1. *The Son of man came to serve.* In Mark 10:45 it is said that the Son of man *οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι*. The formulation of this sentence is determined by the words *οὐ-ἀλλά*; the truth is expressed first negatively, then positively. Why should this form of utterance be chosen? There is a partial answer to this question in the context,<sup>27</sup> but it is scarcely sufficient, and we are therefore obliged to consider it further.

The *οὐ-ἀλλά* is intended to bring out a *contrast*. This incidentally goes a long way towards removing the saying from the field of Isa. 53 and the Servant, for it would be more than a little precious to insist that the Servant did not come to be served. There can be little doubt what contrast is intended. The verse sets out to teach a different view of the Son of man from that which was at the time commonly accepted: '... not, as you might think, or do think, to be served, but to serve.' This view finds strong confirmation in what is said elsewhere about the Son of man; see, for example, Dan. 7:14: There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him (*yiphlēhūn*); cf. v. 27, and 1 Enoch 46:3-6; 48:5; 62:8.<sup>28</sup>

According to Mark 10:45, this picture of the glorious Son of man, who comes that all may serve him, is wrong (or rather, incomplete); the Son of man has come not to be served but to serve.

It may be said that it was precisely the figure of the Servant which thus modified the conception of the Son of man. To this suggestion the following replies may be made. (a) The most powerful motive for the *οὐ-ἀλλά* correction was not literary at all, but arose out of the circumstances of the ministry of Jesus. He who was the Son of man, and was to come in glory, had come in humility to serve. (b) We have already seen that the evidence alleged to connect Mark 10:45 with Isa. 53 is unconvincing. There is moreover very little evidence anywhere else in the gospels to suggest Isa. 53.<sup>29</sup> (c) In the Old Testament the idea of service is to be found in many places other than Isa. 53. To mention no others, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, Caleb, David, Hezekiah, and Zerubbabel are all described as God's servants. In particular, Moses is very frequently said, in the Old Testament and elsewhere, to be God's servant, whose meekness, humility, and death (cf. also Exod. 32:32) atoned for Israel.<sup>30</sup> We know that the figure of Moses, and those of the humble men of the Psalms, affected the gospels, and due weight should be given to them in the attempt to discover what led to the change in the character and function of the Son of man.

2. *The Son of man came to give his life.* In this second part of the verse the *οὐ-ἀλλά* contrast is not explicitly continued; nevertheless (especially as *οὐ* precedes *ἦλθεν*) it is possible that its sense is carried on. Certainly it is true that in other sources the Son of man does not give his life but destroys his enemies; e.g. 1 Enoch 46:4 ff.; 69:27 (. . . he caused the sinners to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth . . .). If a contrast with this destroying Son of man is implied, where does it arise?

The question can be answered simply by those who believe that it is possible to trace a more or less direct line of development from an *Urmensch*, or a Tammuz, ideology, through the cultic experiences of the sacred king, to the humiliation and exaltation of the Servant in Isa. 53, and thence in turn to Dan. 7. According to this view, suffering is inherent in the role of the Son of man, and has its roots in primitive mythological thought and in ancient Israelite cultus. It is as proper to the Son of man that he should

suffer as that he should subsequently be glorified. This theory is attractive but unconvincing.

(a) Identification of the Servant with an *Urmensch*, or with Tammuz, is too speculative—as the disagreement on these issues between a number of very eminent scholars is sufficient to suggest. Discussion of the matter would be out of place here, but it may be said that there are at least two major issues on which so much doubt remains, and so little evidence exists, that it is unwise to proceed on the basis of preliminary judgments about them. These are (i) the provenance and date of the oriental *Urmensch* speculations, and (ii) the question how far it is legitimate to draw conclusions about an Israelite cultus, concerning which we have no first-hand information, from the rites of other nations who were for the most part the objects of Israelite suspicion and distrust.

(b) Even if the figure of the Servant in Isa. 53 could be accounted for on the basis of an Israelite crystallization in cultic form of non-Israelite mythology it would still be necessary to demonstrate a continuity of thought leading from Deutero-Isaiah through Daniel and 1 Enoch to Mark; and this is quite impossible. The cultus of the sacred king, if it ever existed, must have ceased at the Exile, and though living tradition may have lasted till the writing of Deutero-Isaiah it could hardly have survived till the second century B.C., still less to the first century A.D. There seems to be no evidence that the figure of the Servant exerted any direct influence upon Daniel,<sup>31</sup> or indeed upon the thought of the Maccabean period in general.<sup>32</sup> It has been maintained<sup>33</sup> that in the time of Christ there were Jews who found in Isa. 53 the promise of a suffering and dying Messiah; but the case does not seem to have been made out.<sup>34</sup>

It is better to begin with the documents. A primary observation is that Jewish eschatology contains an *Unheilseschatologie*. It looks to an ultimately happy future, but its brightness is set off by dark clouds. There are two main features in the unhappy future: (a) the torment and ultimate destruction of the wicked; (b) the temporary afflictions of the righteous, who must pass through a time of trial before reaching the bliss of the age to come. This time of trial is often, and naturally, compared to the travail pains which precede birth. The apocalyptists tend to think, somewhat naïvely, that mankind fall into two groups, the Righteous, or Elect; and

the Wicked. The former suffer in the present age, and prosper in the age to come; the latter prosper in this age, and suffer in the future.<sup>35</sup>

Bliss is preceded and off-set by suffering. Along with this fact may be set another, to which reference has already been made.<sup>36</sup> Jewish thought readily works in terms of representation: an individual may represent his people in his own person. He may even bear their punishment or suffering, and they can bear his.<sup>37</sup> No one who is at home in the Old Testament will be surprised to read in the New Testament that one may act, or even suffer, *ἀντὶ πολλῶν*—provided of course that it is the right 'one'.

A third observation is that, within Judaism, the Son of man as a distinct figure first appears at the time of the Maccabees.

It is true that the words *ben 'ādhām* have appeared long before this. The title is very common as a vocative in Ezekiel. It is used in synonymous parallelism with 'īś at Num. 23:19; Job 35:8; Ps. 80:18; Jer. 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43, and with 'nōš at Job 25:6; Ps. 8:5; Isa. 56:2. Ps. 146:3, where the parallel is *n'dhībhim*, is similar; we must understand 'men who are princes'. Only Dan. 8:17 is left over,<sup>38</sup> and it remains true that the Son of man as an apocalyptic figure arises first in Daniel, that is, at the time of the attempted suppression of Judaism under Antiochus IV.<sup>39</sup>

In this period two great religious issues, so closely related to each other that it is not easy to set them out separately, became prominent. These are the problem of suffering, and the development of individualism in religion. It is simplest to view them together as they crystallized in the experience of Jews under the Syrian kingdom.

The mere fact of suffering does not call for elaboration. Jews who refused to join the 'United Hellenistic Front' which Antiochus IV sought, not without political reason, to impose upon the Levant, were exposed to no common pains. It suffices to recall the story of the seven brothers and their mother in 2 Macc. 7. It is not however the barbarity of the tortures that were devised that calls for notice, but the fact that they were imposed upon, and freely accepted by, individuals. In earlier periods the people suffered as a whole; in the horrors of a siege, or a transportation, all had their part, willy-nilly. It was not so in this period. Those who were prepared to abandon the practice of Judaism could avoid punishment and secure advancement (e.g. 2 Macc. 7:24).

Some took advantage of such opportunities (e.g. 1 Macc. 1:52 f.). It was the voluntary acceptance of martyrdom that stimulated Jewish thought in the direction of individualism. If the whole nation (or at least a very substantial part of it) was transported to Babylon, the divine act of vindication and restoration naturally took the form of the return of the whole nation to its own land. It was the nation that suffered and died, and the nation that was vindicated and raised up. But this was a process that did not apply to the new situation, in which circumstances had forced upon individual Jews the choice between apostasy and martyrdom. Some had been faithful, others had not. It was only right that the future also should be differentiated; and the differentiation appears in classic form in Dan. 12:2: Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

This individualistic evaluation of the destiny of the martyrs could not however do justice to the strong collective or corporate sense of traditional Jewish thought. The martyr's death was not after all a purely personal affair; it was believed to influence the destiny of the people as a whole. Thus 2 Macc. 7:37 f.:

I . . . give up body and soul (*σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν*<sup>40</sup> *προδίδωμι*) for our fathers' laws, calling on God to show favour (*τὸν θεὸν ἱλεων . . . γενέσθαι*) to our nation soon, and to make them acknowledge, in torments and plagues, that he alone is God, and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and in my brothers.

The self-sacrifice of the martyrs, who acted as intercessors before God, would form a means of atonement for Israel. The same theme is developed elsewhere.

4 Macc. 6:27 ff.: Thou, O God, knowest that though I might save myself I am dying by fiery torments for thy Law. Be merciful (*ἱλεως γένου*) unto thy people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction on their behalf. Make my blood their purification (*καθάρσιον*), and take my soul (*ψυχὴν*) to ransom their souls (*ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν*).

17:22: Through the blood of these righteous men and the propitiation of their death (*τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου θανάτου αὐτῶν*), the divine Providence delivered Israel that before was evil entreated.

18:4: Through them the nation obtained peace.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the martyrs are here described as—*λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν*.

These documents are of course Greek books, but we can see the imprint of the ideas they contain in the Rabbinic use of *kappārāh*. It is here that the true linguistic background of *λύτρον* is to be found. In the old Testament, the root *k-p-r* frequently stands behind the LXX use of *λύτρον* and its cognates.<sup>41</sup> The later use of *kappārāh* is equally important. Such expressions as 'The children of Israel (may I make atonement for them!) . . .' are not uncommon.<sup>42</sup> Suffering in general is a means of atonement.<sup>43</sup> Death in particular acts as an atonement, both for the individual who dies, and for others, if the man who dies is righteous.<sup>44</sup> Even the execution of a criminal makes atonement for the man himself; the man being led out for stoning is bidden to say (Sanhedrin 6:2), 'May my death be an atonement for all my sins' (*kappārāh 'al-kol-'awōnōthay*). But 'as the Day of Atonement makes atonement (*m<sup>e</sup>khappēr*), so the death of the righteous (*šad-dīkīm*) makes atonement (*m<sup>e</sup>khappereth*)' (Lev. R. 20:7 (end)). The most important example from our point of view is that of death in martyrdom. The Rabbis undoubtedly preserved the Maccabean view that martyrdom effected atonement; see for example Siphre Deuteronomy 333:

'And his land shall atone for its people' (Deut. 32:43). How canst thou know that the martyrdom [lit. slaying] of Israel at the hands of the Gentiles is an atonement in the world to come? Because it says 'O God, the heathen have come into thine inheritance . . . they have given . . . the flesh of thy saints to the beasts of the earth' (Ps. 79:1 f.) (translation from C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (1938), 226).

R. Akiba and his companions, who were martyred in A.D. 135, form an outstanding example. It was in the Maccabean period that Judaism became 'eine Religion des Martyriums',<sup>45</sup> and this it remained throughout the period with which we are concerned.

We are now in a position to return to the theme of the Son of man. Daniel as a whole is a book of martyrdom. This is evident in the narrative sections, but it is true of the rest of the book too. In 11:33; 12:3 we have seen in the *maškīlīm* the teachers of the people; but they suffered the same fate as their successors, R. Akiba and his companions.<sup>46</sup> Dan. 7 also speaks of the sufferings of the people. Before the appearance of the one described as *k<sup>e</sup>bhar 'e<sup>n</sup>āš*, who represents the people of the saints of the Most

High, there appear four beast-like figures, which correspond to four kings (7:17). It is simply a matter of history that the four kingdoms thus represented had in turn tyrannized over and oppressed the saints; that is, in the terms of the vision, the Son of man, before coming into glory, suffers, and his sufferings are, historically, the sufferings of the martyrs. The celestial work of the Son of man is a mythological, eschatological expression of the deeds of the martyrs; the assured triumph of the Son of man is an expression of the fact that God will surely accept the atoning sufferings of the martyrs, and because of them deliver his people.

If it be asked why a figure so described is chosen to represent the heavenly aspect of the suffering of Israel on behalf of the Law, an answer may be sought in what was said above on the question of individualism, which was so acutely raised by the events of the Maccabean period. Individual responsibility and individual reward were brought into the foreground, but at the same time the solidarity of the people was not lost sight of: what the One did affected the Many. Now more vividly even than King or Priest or Servant, the figure of the Man suggests the representation of the Many by the One. Quite apart from any mythological background which may underlie Dan. 7, one who is defined as Man, whether he be thought of as the *Urmensch* and progenitor, or as Archetypal Man, evidently stands in a special relation to mankind as a whole. If he suffers, he suffers in a representative capacity, and his sufferings, like those of the martyrs, are a *kappārāh*: he gives his life as *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*.

It remains only to add a few details from 1 Enoch. (a) This book belongs to the same context of suffering as Daniel;<sup>47</sup> see for example 1:1; 46:8 (They persecute the houses of his congregations); 47:2 (. . . the blood of the righteous . . . that they may not have to suffer for ever).

(b) As has often been remarked, the Son of man in 1 Enoch stands in close relation to the people: he is the Righteous One, they are the righteous; he is the Elect One, they are the elect; and so on.<sup>48</sup>

(c) In 1 Enoch 71, Enoch is exalted to heaven, and (apparently) identified with the Son of man. We cannot here go into the problems raised by this very difficult chapter,<sup>49</sup> but it must have helped to prepare the way for the conception of one who lived an earthly life (even though, unlike Enoch's, it ended in death), was exalted



to heaven, and there awaited the due moment to appear as Judge of the living and the dead.

To sum up: it appears (a) that the connection between Mark 10:45 and Isa. 53 is much less definite and more tenuous than is often supposed,<sup>50</sup> and (b) that the background sketched in the second part of this essay is such that a creative mind working upon it could produce a saying such as that recorded by Mark.

## NOTES.

<sup>1</sup> In the interests of brevity I quote only T. W. Manson, 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels', BJRL 32 (1950), 192: Jesus 'defined the "Son of man" in terms of the "Servant of the Lord"'. Cf. *The Servant-Messiah* (1953), 73: this definition 'appears clearly in the sayings about the Son of man, especially those which emphasise his task of service and sacrifice'. I regret that my study of the present question leads me to differ in some respects from one for whose work on the New Testament I have the greatest possible admiration.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the fact (for which see below, pp. 3 f. with notes 16 and 17) that though the Similitudes of Enoch contain verbal echoes of Deutero-Isaiah they reveal no conception of a *suffering* Servant.

<sup>3</sup> See C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (1948), 6 f. Cf. also the article by I. Engnell cited in note 6, and A. Bentzen, *Messias, Moses redivivus, Menschensohn* (1948), 53.

<sup>4</sup> *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (1953), 922b.

<sup>5</sup> *He that Cometh* (1956), 196, cf. 204.

<sup>6</sup> I. Engnell, 'The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Servant in "Deutero-Isaiah"', BJRL 31 (1948), 54-93. On *yaskîl*, 75 ff. 'Thus we have the right to assume that the contested *yaskîl* in our text means either "to execute a *maškîl*", i.e. an Annual Festival psalm, or "take the throne, the power in (re)possession" or the like, to wit, after the passion and resurrection. . . . The latter seems to be decidedly preferable' (77). See also H. H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), 43-6.

<sup>7</sup> So BDB, and most commentators.

<sup>8</sup> 13:7, of the *M<sup>e</sup>bhakkêr* (*yaskîl... 'ēth hārabbîm*).

<sup>9</sup> *Manual of Discipline* 3:13; 9:18; *Hodayoth* (*Meg. Gen.*) 2:50, 3.

<sup>10</sup> On the root *š-d-k* in general see G. Quell in TWNT ii, 176-80, and the literature there cited.

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, 794b.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Mowinckel *op. cit.*, 199, 204: 'will stand forth as righteous before the many'.

<sup>13</sup> J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC) (1927), 472 f.

<sup>14</sup> For Rabbis in this twofold capacity cf. e.g. Sanhedrin 6:4 (Simeon ben Shetah), Baba Kamma 8:6 (Akiba). See also passages such as Aboth 1:1; Baba Bathra 8b.

<sup>15</sup> See pp. 13 f., and note 39.

<sup>16</sup> See TWNT v, 686 f. (J. Jeremias); W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (1943), 173 f.

<sup>17</sup> See below, pp. 8 ff. and cf. Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, 410-15.

<sup>18</sup> See below, pp. 8 f., where the theme of service is considered.

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. Tos. Berakoth 7:7 (Zuck. 15:15); Siphre Deuteronomy 306; Mekilta on Exod. 12:1 (1b), and on 15:20 (43b). Cf. also Isaac's self-offering as interpreted in early Judaism; see H. J. Schoeps, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (1950), especially 234; also J. Jeremias, *Judaica* 3 (1947), 253.

<sup>20</sup> *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (1954), 57. On this question in general see J. Jeremias, 'Das Lösegeld für Viele (Mark 10:45)', *Judaica* 3 (1947), 249-64.

<sup>21</sup> It is significant that in his Hebrew New Testament Delitzsch translates *λύτρον* not by 'āšām but by *kōpher*. Similarly G. Dalman (*Jesus-Jeshua* (1929), 118) translates *λύτρον* into Aramaic as *purkân* (cf. the Syriac rendering at Mark 10:45; Matt. 20:28), though 'āšāmā was available if it had seemed appropriate. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Judaica* 3 (1947), 250: 'Im Hebräischen wird das an Gott gezahlte Lösegeld meist mit *kōpher*, vereinzelt mit *pidhyōn* und 'āšām bezeichnet.' But for 'āšām he quotes only Isa. 53:10.

<sup>22</sup> Recently by H. C. Thompson, in *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 14 (1953), 20-6. See also E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht* (1955), 119.

<sup>23</sup> Baba Kamma 9:8: If he confessed it [misuse of a deposit] of himself, he must repay the value and the added fifth and offer a Guilt-offering. Shebuoth 8:3 [loss of a borrowed ox]; Kerithoth 5:2 [sacrilege].

<sup>24</sup> The primary meaning of course refers to the ransoming of a slave by the payment of an equivalent price.

<sup>25</sup> See below, pp. 11-15.

<sup>26</sup> For text and meaning see E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (1946), 9.

<sup>27</sup> Certain disciples (Mark 10:37) have shown themselves, unlike the Son of man, more anxious to be served than to serve. But in the answer to them (10:39) it is promised that they will suffer with Jesus—a promise scarcely consistent with 10:45. It may be that Luke's partial parallel (22:27) is more accurately placed.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. also Ps. 8:5 ff. When this Psalm was understood to refer to the Son of man as a supernatural figure it was seen to represent him as entitled to universal service. Cf. Ps. 110:1; and 1 Cor. 15:27; Eph. 1:22; Heb. 2:6-9.

<sup>29</sup> I may refer here to an important work by Miss Morna D. Hooker, to be published shortly by S.P.C.K. as *Jesus and the Servant*. Miss Hooker's arguments go far to support conclusions which I had arrived at independently.

<sup>30</sup> For evidence, see J. Jeremias in TWNT iv, 856-68.

<sup>31</sup> For a consideration of Dan. 12:3 see above, pp. 2 f.

<sup>32</sup> See below, note 50.

<sup>33</sup> See especially J. Jeremias, 'Zum Problem der Deutung von Jes. 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum', in *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne* (Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel; 1950), 113-19; also TWNT v, 680-98.

<sup>34</sup> This opinion ought of course to be substantiated in detail. Space forbids

this here, and for the present reference to Mowinkel, *op. cit.*, 325-33, 410-15, must suffice.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the Rabbinic view (e.g. Berakoth 7a; T. J. Kiddushin I, § 7, f. 61b, line 62) that in this life the virtuous are punished for their minor sins and the wicked rewarded for their minor virtues, that both may have an unmixed requital in the future.

<sup>36</sup> See pp. 6f.

<sup>37</sup> Out of the literature on this subject may be mentioned H. W. Robinson, 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality', in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments* (BZAW 66; 1936), 49 ff.; A. R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (1942); and D. Daube's acute discussion of 'Communal Responsibility' in his *Studies in Biblical Law* (1947), 154-89.

<sup>38</sup> Ps. 80:18 (which can no longer be regarded as Maccabean in origin) might appear to be another exception; but the parallelism shows that here 'Son of man' is metaphor, and does not refer to a specific figure.

<sup>39</sup> Whether the Son of man may be described as an individual figure is disputed: see especially T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (1935), 211-34; and the article cited in note 1. That the Son of man in Daniel represents a community is certainly true (cf. Dan. 7:13, 27). But a community may be represented by an abstraction of itself with no independent existence (e.g. John Bull), or by a distinct person (e.g. an ambassador). That the Son of man in Daniel is the latter kind of representative is suggested by the following considerations. (a) Daniel certainly knows of heavenly representatives, especially Michael, who acts on behalf of the people of God (10:13, 21; 12:1). (b) It is possible to identify other visionary features of Dan. 7 with individual persons; e.g. the 'little horn' (7:8) is almost certainly Antiochus IV. (c) In 8:15 we read of one *k<sup>e</sup>mar'eh ghebher*; in 10:16 of one *kidh<sup>e</sup>muth b<sup>e</sup>n<sup>e</sup>y 'adhām*; and in 10:18 of one *k<sup>e</sup>mar'eh 'adhām*. It is probable that these Hebrew phrases were intended to mean much the same as the Aramaic *k<sup>e</sup>bhar 'enās* (7:13), and do not stand for abstractions.

There is even less probability that the Son of man in 1 Enoch is a mere abstraction of the people.

<sup>40</sup> *V.l.* τύχην.

<sup>41</sup> See above, p. 6.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. *Negaim* 2:1 ('*anī khappārāh*).

<sup>43</sup> See A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement* (1928), 175-89, especially 188 f.; also J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme Palestinien* (1934/5), ii, 96 ff.; G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (1927), i, 546-52; S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (1909), 307-11; E. Lohse, *op. cit.*, 29-32. There is a good example in Midr. Ps. on 118:18 (243b, § 16): Beloved are sufferings, for they appease like offerings; yea, they are more beloved than offerings, for guilt and sin offerings atone only for the particular sin for which they are brought in each case, but sufferings atone for all sins, as it says, 'The Lord has chastened me sore, but he has not given me over unto death.'

<sup>44</sup> Büchler, *op. cit.*, 189-207; Bonsirven, *ibid.*; Moore, *ibid.*; E. Lohse, *op. cit.*, 32-110.

<sup>45</sup> W. Bousset—H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums* (1926), 374. Some would at this point refer to the 'Dead Sea Scrolls'; but in fact these do not contain such clear references to the atoning power of martyrdom as has

been supposed. See T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (1957), 28 f.

<sup>46</sup> See especially 11:33: They shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many days.

<sup>47</sup> Not necessarily to the same date.

<sup>48</sup> On this see especially T. W. Manson, *BJRL* 32 (1950), 188 ff.

<sup>49</sup> See especially E. Sjöberg, *op. cit.*, 147-89.

<sup>50</sup> The view (see e.g. R. H. Kennett, *The Servant of the Lord* (1911)) that Isa. 53 was itself written in the Maccabean period has little to commend it; and there seems no good reason to believe that Isa. 53 was responsible for the theology of martyrdom developed at that time (though this is stated, without proof, by e.g. N. Johansson, in *Parakletoi* (1940), 72).