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Abstract

Both Mark’s son of man Christology and Paul’s second Adam Christology depict Jesus functioning as an idealized human figure. In each, a core component is Jesus’ obedience in going to death on a cross. This, in turn, is a representative obedience that leads to the conquest of hostile powers. Jesus’ death, moreover, becomes a model for the life of his followers within both models. These Christologies also encompass Jesus’ resurrection and heavenly enthronement at God’s right hand, and both interpret this as entailing a restoration of humanity’s primeval vocation to rule the world on God’s behalf. Finally, participation of Jesus’ followers in his eschatological glory underscores that for both Mark and Paul these are high, human Christologies.
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In Mark’s Gospel, Jesus is depicted throughout as an idealized human being. This paper will argue that Mark’s idealized human Christology is both signaled and captured, in part, through the self-designation “Son of Man” on the lips of Mark’s Jesus. Such a high, human Christology is best explained as an Adam Christology refracted through the lenses of both Daniel 7 and the earliest narratives about Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection. As idealized human figure, Mark’s Jesus has authority to rule the world on God’s behalf, suffers and dies, is raised from the dead, rules at God’s right hand, and returns in heavenly glory. Moreover, this pattern frames the calling of Jesus’ disciples as well, indicating how they are to faithfully live their lives on earth. With such a Christology in place, we find resonance between the Jesus narrative of Mark and the Adam Christology of Paul. In its second section, this study will proceed to compare
Mark’s Son of Man with Paul’s second Adam as one who dies and is raised and whose narrative proves prescriptive for the lives of Jesus’ followers. This conjunction of early Christologies will underscore the significance of high human Christology in the early Jesus movement, delineate a rich, common set of concerns shared by Paul and Mark, and raise afresh the possibility of a historical connection between the author of Mark and the apostle Paul.¹

I  Mark’s Son of Man as Adam Figure

A  Narrative Unity

As is often noted, phrase “Son of Man” appears in the Synoptic Tradition only in the mouth of Jesus. In the Gospel of Mark these occurrences are sometimes grouped into those claiming authority for a person on earth, those predictive of suffering (and resurrection), and those indicating a future glorious return.² As particular passages are dissected, and especially as historical Jesus studies exercise their influence, questions arise as to the provenance of various sayings, and whether they intend to refer to humanity in general, to the Jesus of the narrative world, or to a future, coming redeemer. Important as such questions may be for answers to the various puzzles they seek to unravel, the interpretation of Mark as a narrative demands a different approach. The Gospels are stories that create their own narrative worlds, and invite interpretations that do justice to the characters, events, sayings and, perhaps most importantly, overall plots. Thus, I will briefly argue here that the various sayings form a coherent literary theme.³ Bultmann himself acknowledged that the writers of the Gospels made the connection that he would not allow for the historical Jesus: Jesus as the Son of Man on earth is the same as the Son of Man who is coming eschatological deliverer.⁴

³ Cf. Edwin K. Broadhead, Naming Jesus, Titular Christology in the Gospel of Mark (JSNTSup 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic 1999), e.g., 132.
⁴ Bultmann, Theology, 29-30.
Within the narrative world of Mark, it is clear that their reference to Jesus unifies the Son of Man sayings. The first time that the phrase appears in the Gospel (Mark 2:10), within the healing of the paralytic (Mark 2:1-12), it refers to Jesus as the one who has authority both to heal the paralyzed man and to forgive his sins. That Jesus heals the man is proof that “the son on earth has authority on earth to forgive sins” (2:10). Similarly, in the juxtaposition of Peter’s confession with Jesus’ prediction of the Son of Man’s looming death and resurrection, Jesus’ self-references (“Who do people say that I am?” Mark 8:27, and, “If anyone desires to follow after me, let that person deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me,” Mark 8:34) make it clear that he is the Son of Man so referenced. In the narrative of Mark’s Gospel, the readers thus encounter Jesus and only Jesus as the Son of Man. Only Jesus uses the phrase, and within the gospel it is self-referential even when referring to the parousia. This latter point becomes evident when the warning against being ashamed of Jesus is tied to the Son of Man being ashamed of such a person upon his coming in glory (Mark 8:28). It is underscored at the trial when Jesus is asked if he’s the Messiah and provides an affirmative answer that entails the future return of the Son of Man (Mark 14:61-62). Thus, the character of Jesus provides unity to the Son of Man sayings as they all refer to him in some fashion.

There is more to be said about the unity of the Son of Man sayings as they have been inscribed in our earliest Gospel narrative. First, and perhaps most evidently, Mark 8 so juxtaposes the first Son of Man passion-resurrection prediction (8:31) with the first Son of Man parousia saying (8:38) that the former’s suffering and resurrection paradigm become inextricably linked to the latter’s depiction of glory and its locating of the cross at the center of the eschatological judgment. When the Son of Man returns in glory, there will be eschatological life for those who have followed Jesus on the way of the cross (Mark 8:35). In the story of Mark, the identity of Jesus as suffering and vindicated Son of Man and the identity of the Son of Man who comes in the eschaton as an active agent within the final judgment scene are inseparable, and thus are to be interpreted jointly as facets of the same reality.

---

5 Werner G. Kümmel, “Jesus der Menschensohn?” SbWGF 20 (1984):147-88, rightly comments that interpreting this verse as a reference to humanity in general leads to “exegetischer Gewaltsamkeit” (168).

6 Simon Gathercole, “The Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel,” ExpT 115 (2004): 366-72, also argues for this unity and for a common reference to Dan 7, which I will advocate below.

7 This linkage has been suggested before, especially based on a reading of Dan 7 that is quite similar to what this chapter will suggest. See Morna Hooker, Son of Man In Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term “Son of Man” and Its Use In St. Mark’s Gospel (Montreal: McGill
At first blush, the idea that Mark has similarly joined the sayings about the Son of Man present on earth with those about the coming eschatological judge seems unlikely. The two such sayings appear in ch. 2 of Mark (2:10, 28), some six chapters before the passion prediction and coming judge sayings of ch. 8 (8:31, 38). And yet, textual proximity is not the only way to link passages in a narrative.\(^8\) As it happens, Mark links the first and the last uses of the phrase Son of Man (Mark 2:10 and 14:62, respectively) such that they bookend Jesus’ conflict with the Jewish religious leaders. The first usage occurs in the story of the healing of the paralytic, which is also the first conflict story in Mark’s gospel.\(^9\) The last usage occurs in the story of Jesus’ Jewish trial. In addition, these are the only two scenes in the book in which Jesus is charged with blasphemy. Such commonality demonstrates Mark’s hand at work: Jesus’ first conflict in the Gospel entails his being accused of blasphemy and this becomes the charge on which he is condemned to death in his final confrontation with Jewish authorities before being crucified. Moreover, in both instances it is the authority that Jesus claims for himself as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου that generates the charge.\(^10\) And so Elizabeth Struthers Malbon concludes regarding these passages, “Thus controversies over blasphemy, over determining the boundaries of God’s authority and Jesus’ authority, frame the ‘Son of Humanity’ statements in Mark’s narrative.”\(^11\) Having established that Mark’s Son of Man sayings form a coherent literary unit, I turn now to the possible influence of Dan 7:13-14 for illuminating the title across Mark’s Gospel.

### B Daniel 7

In summarizing the development of the Son of Man Christology of the early church, Bultmann had this to say: “But in contrast to the Son of Man of the

---

\(^8\) Norman Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 104-21, suggests on the basis of redaction criticism that the passion-resurrection narratives and the authority sayings from ch. 2 all come from Mark’s hand as a way of correcting possible misapprehensions of Jesus’ Son of God status, and integrating suffering into both Jesus’ and the disciples’ calling.

\(^9\) This connection with Jesus’ conflict with the Jewish leaders is well made by Tuckett, “Present Son of Man,” 64-65, as another indication that Mark’s Son of Man sayings form a unified whole: in each of them, Jesus’ death looms ahead of any glory that might await.

\(^10\) Hooker, *Son of Man*, 84: “he claims this authority for himself as the Son of man, and not for himself *per se*.” Cf. Broadhead, *Naming Jesus*, 132.

apocalypses and in agreement with the Son of Man of the earliest Church, the eschatological Judge and Savior Jesus Christ is none other than the crucified Jesus of Nazareth whom God raised from the dead and appointed to his eschatological role." The question to address here is what, in fact, is the extent of the contrast between the apocalyptic vision of Dan 7 and the Son of Man in Mark? More to the point, once we recognize that Mark alludes to Daniel's human-like figure in the Son of Man sayings that refer to Jesus' future coming (Mark 13:26; 14:62), and put this together with the unitary nature of Mark's portrayal of the Son of Man, how does this biblical predecessor shape our understanding of Mark's Jesus?13

Daniel Boyarin has recently tackled this question, concluding that the interrelationship between the Daniel's Son of Man and Mark's provide early grounding for the church's claims that Jesus is divine.14 In Boyarin's analysis of Dan 7, there are two layers of tradition, one that retains an ancient two powers cosmology and one that reinterprets the second divine power as the people of God.15 The latter he sees as a later interpretation of the original version, an

---

13 In what follows I will argue for a thoroughgoing allusion to Dan 7's "one like a Son of Man" across Mark's Gospel, in substantial agreement with the proposal of Hooker, *Son of Man in Mark*. From a somewhat different, but complementary perspective, Adela Yarbro Collins, in Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 150-52, argues that Mark sees Dan 7:13-14 as a prophecy fulfilled in Jesus as messiah and Son of Man, first during his time on earth and then in his glorious return. My attention to a thoroughgoing influence of Dan 7 across Mark stands in some disagreement with Darrell L. Bock, "Did Jesus Connect Son of Man to Daniel 7? A Short Reflection on the Position of Larry Hurtado," *BBR* 22 (2012): 399-402; and his earlier, "The Use of Daniel 7 in Jesus' Trial: With Implications for His Self-Understanding," in *Who Is This Son of Man? The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus* (LNTS; ed. Larry Hurtado and Paul L. Owen; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2011), 78-100. In making an argument about the historical Jesus, both Bock and Hurtado are working with constraints that do not apply to working with Mark as a narrative. Within that discipline, they limit the Danielic allusions. But Mark's narrative is under-interpreted if left to the constraints of historical Jesus studies that do not give full weight to the manner in which the ministry of Mark's Jesus as Son of Man forms a coherent literary whole.
15 Boyarin, “Daniel 7.”
interpretation produced during the Maccabean crisis.\textsuperscript{16} He argues that the NT Son of Man sayings reflect the divine Son of Man cosmology of the original hand. I find Boyarin’s reading highly unlikely. First, it demands that Mark (or his predecessors in the tradition) home in on an earlier thread of an amalgamated tradition, disregarding the interpretation of the text (as people of God) in favor of an alternative, purportedly “original” interpretation of the vision. Second, Boyarin’s reading does not reckon fully with the way apocalyptic literature often employs visions that are indicative of this-worldly realities, which are only disclosed in the interpretation of the vision. I will argue below that if the interpretation of the vision is taken seriously, and the one like a Son of Man is affiliated with the people of God rather than a divine figure, then the significance of the Danielic background and Mark’s telling of the Son of Man’s story come into sharper focus.

Consideration of the first two Son of Man sayings will highlight the problematic nature of the claim that Jesus as “Son of Man” is divine. First, Mark’s Jesus uses the Son of Man locution in two controversy stories, and in each he claims unique authority for himself. In the first, he is claiming authority, as Son of Man, even to forgive sins (Mark 2:10). Inasmuch as this is responding to the scribes’ question, “Who can forgive sins but God alone?” (Mark 2:7), the story is ripe for a divine Son of Man interpretation. And yet, such an interpretation is not without its problems, and an authoritative, human representative is a better reading of the passage’s Christology.\textsuperscript{17} One problem with the divine Christ interpretation is that the scribes, as opponents of Jesus in the narrative, are not trustworthy interpreters of Jesus’ identity. Another point of caution is raised by Matthew’s Gospel, which points the reader in a different direction by concluding that the crowds celebrate God giving such authority either “to” or “among” people (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, Matt 9:8). The authority in view may be a delegated authority, even in Mark. Third, the conjunction of the Son of Man saying with the notion of authority likely alludes to Dan 7:14, so we will have to piece together a holistic understanding of the Son of Man in Mark to draw a

\textsuperscript{16} Boyarin, \textit{Jewish Gospels}, 43.
\textsuperscript{17} In a peculiar footnote in \textit{Jewish Gospels}, Boyarin says that his understanding of “divinity” is “functional,” descriptive of someone who “exercises divine activites,” rather than “ontological” (p. 55). This, in fact, seems to be precisely how Jesus is depicted in Mark, which is why I disagree with Boyarin’s reading of Dan 7 and how it relates to the Gospel. Both Dan 7 and the Adamic overtones signal a human being who is given the function of ruling the world on God’s behalf.
firm conclusion. But a preliminary point is this: in Dan 7 the Ancient of Days gives authority to another figure, the human-like being, who comes into his presence. So even in the vision, the one who exercises authority is not “God alone,” but a second figure. This leads to a fourth consideration: God and Jesus are distinct characters in Mark, and indeed throughout almost the entirety of the NT. It is unlikely to the point of near impossibility that readers of Mark are to assume that Jesus is himself the “God alone” who can forgive sins. A fifth consideration is offered by Morna Hooker. She suggests that the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς alludes to the authority God gave Adam and Eve in Gen 1:26, 28. Such a conjunction of Dan 7 and Gen 1 will be essential to apprehending the Son of Man as woven into the tapestry of Mark’s gospel. Sixth, Christopher Tuckett has argued that the location of the first two Son of Man sayings in controversy stories has been too readily overlooked—by so placing the sayings Mark is showing even here that to be Son of Man is to be rejected. Although I do not agree with Tuckett that the authority of Jesus is a secondary or tertiary issue in the sayings, recognition that Jesus’ claims fall within the controversy stories in ch. 2 ties the sayings to the later predictions of the suffering and vindicated Son of Man, and might suggest that as Son of Man Jesus plays the role not only of exalted and enthroned figure, but also of the beleaguered saints of the most high from Dan 7’s vision. I will return to this below.

The second authority saying comes at the climax of the grain plucking controversy. Here we receive the clearest possible indication that Son of Man is not, for Mark, a signifier for divinity. While this saying has garnered a great deal of attention as pointing toward an aphoristic use of “Son of Man,” such an interpretation is not how the phrase works in Mark’s gospel. In the pericope Jesus has already compared himself to David, thus indicating that his own messianic mission allows for the Sabbath breaking that his disciples appear to be involved in. In the first appearance of the Son of Man saying, it clearly refers to Jesus; thus, the ideal reader knows that Jesus uses the title self-referentially. So when Jesus uses the phrase and thereby claims lordship over the Sabbath,

19 See Hooker, Son of Man In Mark, 91.
22 This also paves the way for the clear indications, later, that, as Collins suggests, messiah and Son of Man are equivalent titles in Mark (King and Messiah, 130-32).
he is claiming such Lordship not for humanity in general, but for himself. By placing the saying after Jesus' gloss on Sabbath as being created for humanity, Mark signals that Jesus' authority is located in his filling the role of idealized human figure: an Adamic and/or Davidic claim mediated through the imagery of Dan 7’s one like a human being. Mark 2:28 decisively undermines the notion that Mark’s Son of Man is a divine figure, signaling to the reader that the original meaning of “the human being” continues to flavor the connotations of the phrase in Mark’s story.

If we take seriously the unity of the Son of Man sayings, and the allusions to Daniel that clearly color Mark’s use of them, then we are in a position to clarify a couple of puzzling aspects of the suffering Son of Man sayings. One of these puzzling aspects is that Mark’s Jesus claims that the Son of Man will be raised after three days (μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34), a timeframe that sits uncomfortably next to the tradition of Jesus’ resurrection two days after his crucifixion—a disharmony that likely compelled the changing of the phraseology to “on the third day” in Matthew and Luke (Matt 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Luke 9:22; 18:33). Second, although the necessity of the Son of Man’s suffering is typically grounded only in the nondescript δεί (e.g. 8:31), in 9:12 Mark’s Jesus specifies a scriptural basis for this suffering (γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. . .). Although it is tempting at this point to appeal to circumlocution, and thereby claim that Jesus is simply saying “I,” such that we might look to any number of scriptural precedents, I want to suggest that we take seriously the fact that it is only under the rubric of Son of Man that Mark’s Jesus speaks of suffering. He never says “I,” nor does he ever say “the son,” nor “the Christ.” In fact, the “Son of Man” title that is clearly tied to Dan 7, including in the move from suffering Christ to returning judge in Mark 8, is the Christological category for reframing what it means to be Messiah (Mark 8:27-31; 15:61-62). Each of these aspects of Mark’s Son of Man Christology is explicable once we recognize that Mark’s Son of Man corresponds to the one like a son of man of Dan 7 who is also the persecuted people of God.

Jane Schaberg draws our attention to the LXX of Dan 7:25: “παραδοθήσεται πάντα εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἕως καιροῦ καὶ καιρῶν καὶ ἕως ἡμίσους καιροῦ” (an essentially literal rendering of the MT). Here we find not only verbal resonance with the passion predictions in the words παραδοθήσεται and εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, but also a more nuanced understanding of the metaphor of handover (παραδοθήσεται) as referring to the transfer of authority and power, rather than simply the handing over of body. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the suffering of the Son of Man as aredeemer figure who is given authority and power over all creation.


χεῖρας, but also the conceptual parallel of a timeframe that ends after the third: time, times, and half a time or, three and a half. This, she suggests, explains Mark’s unusual claim that Jesus is to be raised after the third day. The passion predictions are, in fact, passion-resurrection predictions. This Son of Man of whom Jesus speaks is not only glorified after suffering, he is raised after dying. Schaberg observes that in Dan 11-12 resurrection comes to those who are faithful and wise during the persecutions suffered under Antiochus. The movement of the “holy ones” from defeat (Dan 7:8, 21, 25) to enthronement, characterized by the Son of Man’s exaltation in Dan 7 (Dan 7:18, 22, 27), is depicted in terms of the resurrection and glorification of the faithful in Dan 11-12. Mark’s suffering Son of Man thus fills the role of the faithful, suffering people of God, i.e., God’s representative humanity on earth, whose faithful suffering is vindicated by God through resurrection from the dead.

Shifting to the returning Son of Man sayings (Mark 8:38; 13:26; 14:62), we not only find clear allusions to Dan 7:13 in the language, e.g., of coming on the clouds, but also that Mark’s Son of Man, like that of Daniel, comes in the clouds only after being delivered over to death. Whatever its prehistory might be, Mark’s returning Son of Man is “preexistent” only because he lived on earth, died, and was raised from the dead. Importantly, the climactic Son of Man saying in 14:62 demonstrates that the appellation is a refraction of the “son of God” and “Christ” titles. To the question, “Are you the messiah, the son of the Blessed?” Jesus gives the unequivocal answer, “ἐγώ εἰμι,” followed by, “And you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven” (Mark 14:62). Both because it is Jesus’ framing of what “Christ, son of the blessed” means, and also because the allusion to Dan 7 appears to enfold Ps 110:1 (Ps 109:1, LXX) with its reference to sitting at God’s right hand, the identity of Mark’s Son of Man is messianic. Jesus rules and returns not because he is preexistent divinity, but because he has been faithful son of God on earth and is therefore exalted to God’s right hand. The authority that Jesus

---

28 The first passion prediction makes the same point clear with respect to the title Christ: its true content is only known in light of Jesus as suffering Son of Man. Cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and Mark,” in Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 338-42, here 341.
exercised upon the earth, and over all things created for the sake of humanity, because he was “the human one,” he then holds in exalted fashion as this same, but glorified, “human one.” The Son of Man is enthroned at God’s right hand as the crucified human Jesus who was then raised from the dead.

Contrary to the claims of Boyarin, I find that Mark’s development of a Son of Man Christology develops not from what may be an earlier layer of Dan 7, but from what he sees as the later, interpretative layer. Mark’s Son of Man exercises authority on earth as God’s idealized representative human, then is handed over to suffering and death before finally attaining vindication through resurrection and subsequently coming on the clouds of heaven. Even this brief pass through the Son of Man passages and their connections to Daniel has raised the question of Jesus’ relationship to Adam. I turn now to address this connection in more detail.

C Daniel 7 as Anti-Creation and Re-Creation

I will shortly be turning to the suggestion that Mark intends for his “Son of Man” to carry Adamic connotations, a suggestion recently revived by Joel Marcus. It seems to me that we cannot jump straight from Jesus to Adam because there are two widely recognized allusion to Daniel’s “one like a Son of Man,” one in Mark 13:26 and the other in Mark 14:62. However, Dan 7 mediates an Adam theology that, as such, is important for the interpretation of Mark.

The imagery of Dan 7 functions as an anti-creation/new-creation myth in which the rule of the nations over Israel is depicted as the terrorizing picture of beasts enthroned over the earth; the restoration of the “rightful order” of Israel’s rule over the nations is depicted as the restoration of humanity to its place of ruling the world on God’s behalf. Theorizing such an anti-creation/


31 In addition to the argument laid out below, if Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings,” in The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 222-23, is correct to see a connection between Daniel’s one like a Son of Man and the “Son of Man” in Ps 8:4-5, in the early reception of the text if not in its composition, then an Adamic significance for Daniel’s human-like figure is bolstered further.

32 This reading is compatible with the common suggestion that Ugaritic (or Babylonian) Chaoskampf myths inform the story’s imagery (cf. John J. Collins, Daniel with An Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature (FOTL 20; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 78-80), inasmuch as Gen 1 is, itself, a refracting of that tradition within the religious tradition of Israel. In his commentary, Collins explains that the beasts’ arising from the sea indicates, “They are the embodiments of the primeval power of chaos symbolized by the sea in
new-creation framework for the significance of the imagery yields several positive exegetical results. First, this explains the recurring references to the beasts being made like humans. The lion with wings stands on two feet like a human, and receives a human mind (Dan 7:4). This is a depiction of beasts taking the place that is originally assigned to humanity in the creation narrative of Gen 1, of exercising dominion over the earth. The short interpretation of the vision coheres with this reading: "As for these four great beasts, four kings shall arise out of the earth" (Dan 7:17, NRSV; cf. Gen 1:24-25). To be made like a human being is to be given rule over the earth. Although this theory does not account for the description of the bear, it encompasses well the statement about the leopard that "dominion was given to it" (Dan 7:6, NRSV) as well as the final statements about the fourth beast, to the effect that it had human eyes and a boastful speech (Dan 7:8). At the level of the vision, the problem is that beasts are acting like humans in ruling over the world.

The second important result of positing an anti-creation/new-creation framework is that it helps explain the force of someone who looks like a human being enthroned to rule the world on God’s behalf. With the judgment being pronounced on the beasts, the vision moves to the appearance of “one like a human being” to whom God gives dominion, glory, and kingship, ruling over all the nations of the earth (Dan 7:11-14). At the level of the vision itself, order is restored when the primeval, idealized picture of Gen 1:26-28 is restored: humanity now rules over the beasts rather than being ruled by them.

In this reading, Gen 1 has become the particular Judean lens through which the ancient Chaoskampf imagery is being employed in the second century BCE. When we peer through the visionary imagery to the earthly reality it signifies we see Israel displacing the foreign nations as rulers of the earth, unseating the Greek reign represented by Antiochus IV in particular (this is so, even if the one like a Son of Man is supposed to represent some angelic figure rather than Israel as such). Such a vision of Israelite rule over the world no doubt

---

33 Thus, the point would be neither that being made like a human is a “blessing” or a “curse” for the beast itself (cf. John Goldingay, Daniel (WBC 30; Dallas: Word, 1989), 161-62), but that this is a bad thing for the world.

34 Collins, Daniel, 295, suggests that the most plausible source for the four beasts is Hos 13:7-8, a prophecy in which God rages against Israel like a lion, leopard, bear, and beast—its own inversion of both creation and covenant.

35 Collins and Collins, King and Messiah, 78. John Collins is a proponent of the humanlike figure of Dan 7 representing the archangel Michael, and also affirms that the “people of the saints of the most high,” who receive the kingdom in 7:27, is Israel or faithful Israel.
lies behind the priestly creation narrative itself, as a story of origins that demonstrates not the role of humanity in general, but the role of humanity as Israel is to fulfill it.\(^{36}\) It is only when the people of the God who is creator and king are extending the reign of their God into the world in faithfully executing God’s dominion over all peoples (Dan 7:27) that the world is rightly ordered under God.\(^{37}\)

Mark’s Jesus reflects the broader theology and themes of Dan 7 in several ways. He not only claims ἐξουσία on earth as Son of Man, he also goes about preaching the near arrival of the dominion of God (cf. the extensive use of βασιλε* terminology in LXX Dan 7, esp. 7:27). But for the purpose of drawing a connection with Adam, perhaps no Son of Man saying is more important than the claim Jesus makes at the end of the grain-plucking pericope: “The Sabbath was made for humanity, not humanity for the Sabbath; therefore, the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath” (Mark 2:27-28). Here, Jesus connects his authority as Son of Man with the creation of humanity and institution of the Sabbath as related in the priestly creation story.\(^{38}\) Mark indicates in this passage that he is not tone deaf to the Adamic overtones of Daniel’s Son of Man vision, or that, at very least, he recognizes in a titular usage of “the Son of Man” that Jesus makes a parallel claim for himself as being an idealized human figure through whom the reign of God is restored.\(^{39}\) In this, Jesus plays the role of not only Daniel’s “one like a Son of Man,” but also of Adam, and the later idealized human ruler, David. We are now in a place to turn to the Adam allusion suggested by Marcus.

Joel Marcus argues that an Adamic interpretation of the Son of Man sayings “permits integration of [the three] seemingly disparate religionsgeschichtlich backgrounds.”\(^{40}\) As the glorious, coming Son of Man, Jesus reflects the dominion and glory of “the prelapsarian Adam, which will be restored to him at the eschaton.”\(^{41}\) Marcus shows how Jewish tradition depicts this exalted state for Adam coming by way of resurrection, entailing Adam’s lost glory, and including his playing the role of eschatological judge.\(^{42}\) As Marcus himself points out, the role of eschatological judge is “parallel” to Daniel 7’s “one like a Son of Man.”

---

\(^{36}\) Hence the echoes of Gen 1 throughout the patriarchal narratives (e.g., Gen 17:6; 28:3-4; 35:11).

\(^{37}\) Cf. Collins, Daniel, 324.

\(^{38}\) See Adela Yarbro Collins, Mark: A Commentary (Herm; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 204-5.

\(^{39}\) On the “informed readers” being aware of the Dan 7’s Son of Man, cf. Collins, Mark, 205.

\(^{40}\) Marcus, “Son of Man as Son of Adam,” 48.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 48.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., 57-59.
Man.” To this I would add that if Mark is reading in tandem the stories of suffering leading to eschatological glory of Dan 7 and Dan 11-12, then the means by which the suffering people become the exalted Son of Man may include resurrection. Similarly, the authority sayings reflect Adam’s authority over the created order. Marcus highlights how Adam’s rule as vice-regent under the heavenly king is depicted as a royal authority, destined to be restored. The idea that a usurping Satan, in particular, has taken the place that by rights belongs to Adam pervades the literature Marcus surveys. In the exegesis of Daniel 7 I have supplied above, a similar set of assumptions is in view; namely, that the world prior to its consummate restoration is ruled by usurpers who will be replaced in favor of God’s rightful human ruler. Finally, Marcus suggests that the suffering of the Son of Man corresponds to the suffering and death that is endured by the post-lapsarian Adam as well as the wider world. Here he cites the widespread tradition, detectable in Gen 3 itself, that Adam (and Eve’s) sin led to suffering and death. Parting slightly from Marcus, I seems to me that Dan 7 provides a much cleaner parallel to the Gospels, inasmuch as Daniel’s humanlike figure is the glorification of the faithful saints who suffered precisely because of their fidelity, in contrast to Adam whose suffering and death are due to transgression.

Marcus’ argument indicates that by cultivating the Son of Man tradition as it does, Mark taps into a deep vein of Adam tradition that has bubbled to the surface in Dan 7. The verbal correspondences with Dan 7 confirm that this is the primary biblical precedent for what comes to be a title of Jesus. But Mark has also transformed Daniel’s phrase, “one like a son of a man” (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, Dan 7:13), into “the son of the man” (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). This is a possible signal, as Marcus argues, that the reader should ask the question, “Which man?” to which question the answer would be “Adam.” The most significant point is that both the Daniel-focused approach I laid out and Marcus’ Adam-centered approach yield the same exegetical result for Jesus’ appropriation of the Son of Man title in Mark: Jesus is being depicted as an idealized human figure as he

Ibid., 59. The parallel is closer to the vision of 1 Enoch, however, where judgment is more directly in view (1 En. 45:2-3; 61:8; 62:3-12); see Adams, “Coming Son of Man,” 44-45.

On the likelihood of Mark’s melding the various visions of Daniel, see J. R. Daniel Kirk, A Man Attested by God: The Human Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

Marcus, “Son of Man as Son of Adam,” 49, a point made earlier by Hooker, Son of Man, 91.

Ibid., 59-60.

Ibid., 49.

Ibid., 60.

Ibid., 40-47.
exercises rule upon the earth, as he suffers in faithful obedience to God, and as he later returns in glory as God’s enthroned king. Such an idealized human Christology fits well within what we might term an “Adam Christology,” by which we would mean not only direct reflections on Adam per se, but also the depictions of other idealized human figures (such as Moses or David) throughout the biblical and early post-biblical Judean tradition.

D The Functions of Mark’s “Human One”

The threefold division of Son of Man sayings provide a serviceable framework for articulating the narratival and theological function of Mark’s Jesus as “the Human One.” As one who has “authority on earth,” Mark’s Jesus brings the rule of God to bear in the present, thereby displacing the rule of spiritual powers that are hostile toward both God and humanity and inaugurating the reign of God (cf. Mark 3:23-30). Doing so as a human being, Jesus also opens up the door for his followers to share in the renewed vocation of humanity to exercise the authority of God in ruling the world on God’s behalf (e.g., Mark 3:14; 6:7, 12-13).

As one who had to be rejected and suffer in order to enter his glory, Jesus fulfills the role of idealized, faithful martyr. Such martyrdom not only demonstrates Jesus’ own fidelity to God, it is a crucial component in freeing other people from enslavement to the kind of hostile powers that pervade Mark’s narrative world (Mark 10:43). Here, too, what Jesus does as idealized, faithful human under God serves as a model for his followers. Their way of life is to unfold in imitation of his, following him on the way of the cross (Mark 8:34-38).

Finally, Jesus’ own movement from suffering and death through resurrection culminates in his heavenly exaltation that includes a return in glory. In Mark 8:38, Jesus describes the Son of Man’s return as taking place with the glory of his father (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ), a signal that the exalted, returning figure comes with a divine glory that is derivative of God’s (and thus not inherent in himself). There is some connection with the final judgment and eschatological salvation, although the Son of Man is not directly said to exercise the function of judge. In both this passage and that in Mark 13:24-27, the coming of the Son of Man includes an angelic entourage. Finally, the claim at the trial to be the Son of Man who is “at the right hand of power” indicates that the post-resurrection, exalted state will be one in which Jesus rules at God’s right hand.

---

50 Collins, *King and Messiah*, 150-51, suggests that Mark views the earthly ministry of Jesus as the first in a two-stage fulfillment of Dan 7:13-14. I agree that Jesus’ ministry on earth is a fulfillment of Daniel’s vision, but tend toward seeing the earthly ministry as proleptic of a post-resurrection enthronement rather than the first stage of a two-step process.
in fulfillment of Ps 110. This is a Christological claim to the effect that Jesus as a resurrected human being will reign at God’s right hand as enthroned Son of Man.

In each of these ways, Mark’s Son of Man is an idealized, representative human being who plays the role that Paul assigns to Jesus as Adam figure. I turn now to the Pauline texts.

II Paul’s Second Adam

Paul uses comparisons between Christ and Adam, including the language of Christ as “second” (1 Cor 15:46) or “last” (1 Cor 15:45) Adam, to convey much the same theological content as Mark’s Son of Man. Under their respective rubrics, Paul’s Adamic Christ and Mark’s Son of Man suffer as part of bringing about the rightful reign of God over the earth through the displacement of powers hostile to humanity; both exercise reign over the earth on God’s behalf; and both have an eschatological future that includes the salvation and final glorification of those who have shared Jesus’ cruciform calling. Even though Paul’s accounting of Jesus’ work does not include his time on earth, the notion of Jesus exercising authority over the earth as God’s chosen human agent, and that authority being gotten by way of Jesus’ redemptive death on the cross, is amply attested. Thus, while employing different language, there is a functional equivalence between Mark’s “Son of Man,” and Paul’s second Adam.51

A New Adam in Resurrection: 1 Corinthians 15

The earliest direct mention of Adam in Paul’s letters comes in 1 Cor 15:22. The passage describes how Jesus represents and contains within himself the destiny of those who are “in Christ Jesus” (1 Cor 15:20-22). From these initial verses, two points are worthy of mention. (1) Jesus is described as “firstfruits,” an indication that other people are part of the same eschatological “harvest” that began with him—and therefore that Jesus is now as they will be.52

51 It should be noted that I am not, here, arguing for dependence or a shared historical source for this tradition. The latter argument is advanced by Yongbom Lee, The Son of Man as the Last Adam: The Early Church Tradition as a Source of Paul’s Adam Christology (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012).

52 This is the first clue that Joseph Fitzmyer’s distinguishing “typological” and “apocalyptic” arguments in 1 Cor 15:21-28 is unwarranted—the typology is, itself, an “apocalyptic” argument. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J., First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (YAB 32; New Haven: Yale, 2008), 567-68.
(2) The Christology in view is a human Christology. The resurrected Jesus is the ἄνθρωπος through whom resurrection devolves upon other humans, just as Adam was the ἄνθρωπος through whom death devolved upon other people (1 Cor 15:21). The initial conclusion to be drawn is that Paul’s Adam Christology is a Christology that describes an idealized representative human being. Resurrection is a signal that Jesus the Messiah, who as such rules over and represents other people in various ways, is a human being. This is a high, human (rather than divine) Christology. Thus Gordon Fee concludes with regard to this text, rightly in my view, “the emphasis in this first instance is on Christ’s real humanity. Whatever else is true of Christ, in his incarnation he was a true human being, who died as Adam died; otherwise, the analogy does not work at all.”

As Paul further develops this Adam Christology, it melds with his reigning Messiah Christology (1 Cor 15:24-28). Here we see how Paul’s Adam Christology as an idealized human Christology bears much the same weight as Mark’s Son of Man Christology. First, Paul is still developing his resurrected-Adam Christology. Here, I part ways with Fee and Fitzmyer. The former sees Paul leaving behind the Adamic Christology in favor of royal “messianism,” the latter in favor of an “apocalyptic” vision, and both thereby artificially limit the significance of Paul’s Adam Christology for understanding the passage. The continued development of an Adam Christology is clear from several perspectives in addition to the fact that Paul returns to the theme explicitly in vv. 44-49. First, Paul once again takes up the “firstfruits” (ἀπαρχή) image (15:23), now indicating that the time at which the remainder of the harvest will be brought in is at Christ’s παρουσία (15:23). Thus Fitzmyer’s relegation of these verses to a separate, apocalyptic argument rings hollow. Second, the raising of those who are Christ’s is depicted as something that happens with the final consummation of the Messiah’s royal rule. Paul uses the phrase “in Christ” as his antithesis to “in Adam” in 15:22, indicating that his Adam Christology is the category of Jesus as Messiah and undermining Fee’s splitting of these. Third, the Messiah’s reign abolishes all other rules and authorities, concluding
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54 Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 570.
55 Gordon D. Fee, Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 115, though I might quibble with the notion of “incarnation” in Paul.
56 Fee, Pauline Christology, 116; 567-68; Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 567-68.
with the destruction of death (15:26)—something that is made known with the resurrection of Christ’s people. Thus it is not only the case that Jesus is both raised and resurrected king, but that the very power defeated in Jesus’ being raised is the one that must finally be dethroned for the new humanity to come fully into existence. We will see that in Rom 5:12-21 such a defeat of hostile powers is what Jesus does as the “one man” who offsets the work of Adam. Fourth, the distinction between “typological” and “apocalyptic” arguments is unsound, inasmuch as Paul’s Jesus is an eschatological Adam figure, something that will become more clear as we see the Adamic elements in Rom 8:29 within the larger context there.

As raised and exalted new Adam, Jesus rules the world on God’s behalf, a claim that in 1 Cor 15:25 echoes Ps 110:58 and that in 1 Cor 15:27 alludes to Ps 8:6.59 Given the allusion to Ps 110 in Jesus’ final Son of Man saying at the trial in Mark 14:62, Paul’s resurrected second Adam is fulfilling precisely the role that Mark depicts for the glorified Son of Man—the resurrected, enthroned human being who is ruling the world on God’s behalf.60 In Rom 5:17, Paul will locate the restoration of human rule over the earth within his Adam Christology. Paul’s use of Ps 8:6, which reflects on humanity’s place at creation, underscores the overlap between Paul’s messianism and his Adam Christology; Christ’s rule fulfills humanity’s primal vocation to be God’s vicegerent upon the earth.61

One final connection should be drawn between Paul’s resurrected, Adamic Christ in these verses and Mark’s Son of Man. The authority that Mark’s Jesus exercises manifests himself as the king over God’s kingdom. “Son of man” is the rubric by which Jesus refracts the title “Christ” (Mark 8:29-33 and 14:61-62), thereby indicating that he will come into full possession of his kingship over God’s kingdom only through the path of suffering, death, and resurrection prior to enthroned glory. In turn, 1 Cor 15:24-25 indicates that the resurrected Jesus, the second Adam, is the one who exercises kingship (βασιλεύειν) over God’s kingdom (τὴν βασιλείαν).62 This rare appearance of kingdom terminology in
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58 See Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 573.
59 Ibid., 574, who also notes that the two Psalms are used in close conjunction in Eph 1:20-22.
60 Wright, *Climax*, 28, suggests that Dan 7 is also in the background here. While I do not go so far, the suggestion underscores the similarity of the Mark’s Son of Man as exalted king at God’s right hand (with his allusion to Ps 110), and Paul’s Adamic Christ playing that same role. Lee, *The Son of Man as The Last Adam*, 23-95, sees the shared use of Ps 110 as an indication that Jesus’ “son of man” language created a widespread Adam typology that surfaces not only in 1 Cor 15, but also Eph 1:20-23; Heb 1:3; 2:8; 1 Pet 3:21b-22.
61 Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 574, acknowledges the creational import of Ps 8, but does not make the connection to the Adam typology with which the section began.
62 Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 572, 573.
Paul is an important point of connection with the Gospels’ Jesus. As Mark’s Son of Man exercises authority so that God’s kingdom might be made manifest, so too does Paul’s resurrected Adam-figure.

The comparison and contrast between first Adam and last Adam that ensues in 15:44-49 extends the picture of how Jesus represents humanity. The kind of “body” that Jesus has, “from heaven,” and “spiritual” (πνευματικόν, 15:46), will also be borne by those who are part of the new humanity. Here I must take issue with Fee. He claims, “even though the contrast is maintained by the language of the ‘first man Adam’ and the ‘last Adam/second man,’ the emphasis on Christ is no longer on his humanity but on his present heavenly existence in a raised/transformed body.” The contrast Fee makes is a false one: the emphasis on Jesus’ raised body is precisely an emphasis on the new kind of humanity that is represented by the resurrected Jesus, to which the rest of the new humanity will be conformed. Jesus continues to play the role of idealized humanity as he possesses all the glory that awaits those who are raised with imperishable bodies, fully and finally conformed to the new-creation’s image of God which is found in the son (1 Cor 15:49; cf. Rom 8:28-30).

This particular dynamic of Paul’s Adam Christology does not offer much in the way of direct correlation with Mark’s Son of Man Christology. However, it does underscore that Paul’s use of “image” language (εἰκόνα, v. 49) is an expression of his Adam Christology, a consideration that has some bearing for the interpretation of passages such as Rom 8:28-30, where bearing Christ’s image comes as the final upshot of being raised with Christ at the renewal of creation; and 2 Cor 3:18, 4:4, where image-formation is once again in view with creation overtones. Paul’s Adam Christology does not seem to be contained to passages that mention Adam explicitly, but lies behind other passages that describe the ongoing and/or future transformation of humanity into the “spiritual” likeness of the resurrected Jesus.

63 Fee, Pauline Christology, 116.
64 Scroggs, Last Adam, 95-100; cf. Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 599-600.
65 Thus, Scroggs rightly, in my view, addresses new creation in connection with Paul’s last Adam Christology; Last Adam, 59-74; esp. 68-69.
66 A stronger conclusion than that reached by Pheme Perkins, “Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles,” in Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J. (CBQMS 48; ed. P. Spitaler; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2011), 128-51; here 142. Perkins says that other uses of image language with respect to Christ’s relationship to believers “can be defended or enriched by the Adam-Christ analogy but are not dependent upon it.” I might say that they are constituent parts of the same whole rather than “dependent” on it; suggesting that the other uses
A somewhat strange intrusion into 1 Cor 15 sounds a final note that will carry us into Rom 5. After launching into praise about the coming defeat of death, Paul introduces the notion that sin, death, and law are all tied up in one another: “The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law” (1 Cor 15:56). The victory over these is had by God’s doing, “through our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 15:57). The connection between sin, death, and law is not a topic on which 1 Cor in general sheds light; however, it is precisely the complex of ideas that Paul’s Adam Christology is marshaled to untangle in Rom 5-8.

B Romans 5-8: Suffering, Rule, and New Creation

In Rom 5, Paul introduces Adam as a figure who is a type of Jesus (Rom 5:14), but who largely stands in contrast to him. The point of comparison throughout the text is that the actions of the one person ramify to all those whom the figure represents (vv. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19). And yet, in choosing Adam as the figure with whom to compare and contrast Jesus, and in using parallel expressions to delineate each (εἷς ἄνθρωπος, ὁ εἷς ἄνθρωπος, and ὁ εἱς), Paul demonstrates that they share not only in representation, but in representing humanity as, themselves, representative human figures. Once again, I will be arguing that the Christology is a high human Christology. I am thus wary of the claims of Otfried Hofius that push toward a divine Christology. He reads the passage as indicating that the greater salvation Jesus works occurs because Christ is “Son of God’ in origin and essence (5:10),” (rather than working within Paul’s claim that he is appointed son of God at the resurrection, Rom 1:4), and is the person “in whom…. God himself acts,” so that we have a “divine action that is based upon the unity of the Crucified with God.” Paul’s Adam Christology is not a divine Christology in this sense, but is a Christology in which Christ as the first human of a new humanity determines the destiny of the other human figures who will participate in that family (cf. Rom 8:28-30). At the heart of the Adam Christology is the logic of 1 Cor 15:21 that God has placed the destiny of humans in the hands of representative ἄνθρωποι (1 Cor 15:21, 47; Rom 5:15, 18, 19). Thus Gordon Fee is right to conclude that “in each case Paul brings Christ into the

---


picture to emphasize his genuine humanity, a humanity that he shared fully with Adam and thus with us, but without sin.”

In delineating the contrast between these two figures in Rom 5, Paul is somewhat vague as to what, specifically, Jesus does to bring about the gift and grace (5:15, 16, 20-21) that are righteousness (5:19), life (5:18), and rule (5:17). However, the usage of the singular when Paul speaks of Jesus’ righteous act (δι᾽ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, 5:18), within a letter that has focused on Jesus’ death as the means by which righteousness comes to God’s people (e.g., Rom 3:21-26; 4:25), points to Jesus’ death as his act of obedience (5:19; cf. Phil 2:7-8).

This obedience in suffering is the means by which a change in rule is introduced; specifically, it enables the rule over the earth by an idealized humanity. First, this passage in particular, along with the ensuing discussions in chs. 6-7, are concerned with the question of who reigns over humanity. As we saw the language of reign and kingdom deployed in 1 Cor 15, so also the βασιλεύω root is sprinkled throughout the discussion in 5:12-21 (5:14; 5:17 (2x); 5:21 (2x)) and it appears as well in 6:12. Paul depicts the establishment of these reigns as the results of the representative agency of Adam and of Jesus, Adam inaugurating the reign of death (5:14, 17), which includes the reign of sin (5:21; 6:12), and Jesus inaugurating the reign of grace (5:21) and of those who receive it (5:17). Thus, in a way analogous to Mark’s Son of Man having to suffer, die, and be raised in order to fulfill his role as Christ (Mark 8:27-33), so too Paul’s Adamic Christ dies to transform the lordship of the earth. Second, as with Mark’s Son of Man (Mark 2:28), Paul’s Adamic Christ plays the role of κύριος in this unfolding drama of displacing enslaving powers (Rom 5:21; 6:23; 7:25; 8:39). We have already seen in 1 Cor 15 that Paul’s Adamic Christ, like Mark’s Son of Man, rules as king enthroned at God’s right hand. Here, the restoration of humanity’s rule over the created order is described as the future of all those for whom Jesus died, not just Jesus himself: “Those who receive (οἱ. . . λαμβάνοντες) the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign (βασιλεύσουσιν) through the One, Jesus Christ” (Rom 5:17). Thus, Jesus’ Adamic work of death draws those whom he represents back into the role assigned to Adam in the Gen 1 creation narrative: reigning over creation.

69 Fee, Pauline Christology, 272.
70 So also Hofius, 179; Byrne, “Adam, Christ, and the Law,” 219.
71 The phrase “kingdom of God,” prevalent in the Synoptic traditions, does not appear as such in this passage, but does occur occasionally elsewhere (Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20; 6:9-10; 15:24-25, 50; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:5; Col 1:13; 4:11; 1 Thess 2:12; 2 Thess 1:5).
72 Cf. Wright, Climax of the Covenant, 39.
73 Cf. Wright, Climax of the Covenant, 36.
Though Paul and Mark use different metaphors for relating Jesus’ crucifixion and the follower’s own suffering, each sees the death as not merely representative but also as determinative for the believer’s way of life. Mark’s suffering Son of Man calls his followers to take up their cross and follow so that they, too, might find their life by losing it, a depiction of future, eschatological salvation (Mark 8:34-38). Paul’s Adam Christology lays the groundwork for the “union with Christ” theology by which he calls his readers to live into the reality of their dying with Christ in order to attain to eschatological salvation (Rom 6:6-11). For Paul, this “dying with Christ” is the means by which those who are in him begin to participate in the present moment in their freedom from the reigns of sin and death (Rom 6:12-14, 18-23). In other words, the shift in reign that Paul says takes place due to Jesus’ Adamic suffering in 5:12-21 is to realize itself in the present, as people now serve God rather than sin and death.74 Jesus as κύριος opens up the possibility that sin and death might no longer be lord (κυριεύει, 6:9; κυριεύσει, 6:14).

In my exposition of Mark’s Son of Man, I argued that Jesus in that narrative fulfills the role of Adam precisely because he fulfills the role of Daniel’s Son of Man: by defeating the forces hostile to God’s people, and taking his seat at God’s right hand, Jesus reestablishes the place of humanity as those who rule the world on God’s behalf. An analogous network of themes takes root in Rom 5:12-21 as well, where Paul delineates the place of the two representative human figures in the change of rule over the earth, and it grows over the subsequent three chapters of the letter, where the defeat of sin, death, and law, under the lordship of the new Human One, becomes the occupation of Christ’s people as well. Christ is an Adam figure in death, resurrection, and rule, and those representative Adamic acts are to typify the new humanity just as the first Adam’s sin and transgression typified the old.75 Chapters 6-8 describe how Jesus as resurrected and last Adam is the one in whom God gives the victory over “the sting of death [which] is sin, and the power of sin [which] is the law” (1 Cor 15:56).

In Rom 6, Paul argues that the baptismal union of Christ and believers is to play out through their taking hold of future resurrection life in the present, an image that he builds on when he demands that those in Christ present themselves to God and their members to God as weapons of righteousness (Rom 6:12-13).76 The change in rule here is from the rule of sin to a rule of righteous-
teousness (Rom 6:11; cf. 5:15, 17, 19, 21). As in Mark, Jesus is the king, but the rule is mediated for God, so that God is the one who is served and obeyed when Jesus’ lordship is enacted. Freedom from sin brings about “enslavement” to God (6:22). Paul rehearses these arguments about freedom and service in ch. 7, only there the enslaving power he addresses is the law.77 Once again, participation in Jesus’ death and resurrection are the means to faithful service of God (something the law promised but was unable to deliver on because of the reigns of sin and death, 7:10-13).

Rom 8 does not mention Adam directly, but a few aspects of the passage point toward a continuing development of Paul’s Adam Christology. First, there is the shocking description of Jesus as God’s son sent “in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom 8:3).” Morna Hooker suggests an Adamic overtone here: “The connection between Paul’s argument in chapter 5 and what he says in chapter 8 is clear: it is by entering the condition of Adam—coming in the likeness of sinful flesh—that Christ has been able to free men from condemnation.”78

Second, there is the description of God’s people in Rom 8:29. Paul says that these are “preappointed to become conformed to the image (τῆς εἰκόνος) of his son.” The εἴκων language not only echoes Gen 1:26-27, it also repeats the way that Paul speaks about people’s relationship to Jesus in 1 Cor 15:49.79 This might be a hint that in Romans, too, Paul’s resurrected Jesus (not only the crucified Jesus of Rom 5:12-21) plays the role of second Adam: the language he uses of how those in Christ come to be Christ’s siblings, God’s children, προώρισεν (8:29), comports with the way that Jesus becomes (ὁρισθέντος) royal son at his resurrection (1:4).80 A final indication that Rom 8 is a facet of Paul’s Adam Christology comes from the immediately preceding context.81 The future of resurrected humanity holds within itself the future of the created order, another hint that their sharing in Jesus’ destiny is entering into a new humanity that is the harbinger of a broader new creation (Rom 8:18-24).82

77 Ibid., 120-21.
79 For both reasons, I am unpersuaded by Perkins, “Adam and Christ,” that this verse is not a component of Paul’s Adam Christology. Better is Scroggs, Last Adam, 68-69.
81 Cf. Scroggs, Last Adam, 72.
82 Perkins, “Adam and Christ,” speaks of Paul’s “eschatological anthropology” applying to those “incorporated into the new creation,” an assessment with which I agree, and which leads me to contend, against Perkins, that this anthropology is important in passages such
Christ plays one more role in Rom 8, and that is to superintend what appears to be an eschatological judgment scene. In a pithy description of the ministry of Jesus, Paul says, “Christ Jesus who died; rather, who was raised, who is also at the right hand of God, who also intercedes for us” (Rom 8:34).

Here, Paul describes his Christ in a sentence that could well summarize Mark’s Son of Man in passion, resurrection, and glory, including the enthronement at God’s right hand that we saw in Mark 14:61. And, like Mark’s Son of Man, Paul’s Jesus superintends the final judgment, and is determinative to a great degree on its outcome, but is not said to act as judge. Ultimately, however, this “final judgment” scene is about conquering the powers that oppose God’s people, a framework that summarizes the overcoming of hostile forces that Paul describes from Rom 5:12ff., that resonates with the role of Jesus as authoritative Son of Man, and that happens in both Mark and Paul through Jesus’ representative death and his followers’ willingness to embrace the way of crucifixion. Mark’s Son of Man and Paul’s second Adam both locate the participation in the new order Jesus inaugurates in cruciform conformity to the way of Jesus.

C  Philippians 2?

Though Paul does not mention Adam by name in Phil 2:5-11, the protoplast has often been seen behind Paul’s description of Jesus’ obedience unto death and subsequent exaltation to glory. Morna Hooker, for instance, writes,

Only when we come to the term κύριος are we reminded of what Adam was meant to be; he was commanded to rule the earth (κατακυριεύειν, Gen 1:28) . . . This lordship in no way detracts from the authority of God—on the contrary, it brings glory to God, and Christ thus fulfils the original purpose for Adam.83

James Dunn has famously interpreted the passage along a similar line. He argues that Jesus’ being μορφή θεοῦ (Phil 2:6) is an allusion to Adam’s creation in God’s image, and μορφή δούλου (Phil 2:7) as a reference to humanity’s post-fall enslavement to corruption (cf. Rom 8:18-21) or spiritual powers (Gal 4:3).84 Similarly, he reads “equality with God” as an allusion to the temptation to be
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83 Hooker, From Adam to Christ, 99.
like God with which the serpent tempted the primordial couple (Gen 3:5), and Jesus' being made in the likeness of men as “the kind of man that all men now are” (one might compare Rom 8:3, "likeness of sinful flesh"). As in Rom 5:12-21, and as Mark's Son of Man stands in contrast to the disciples who routinely reject Jesus' cruciform way of obedience, the Christ of Phil 2 not only "embraces Adam's lot" as enslaved to hostile powers, but Adam's subjection to death, and receives in return a restoration of Adam's lordship over all creation. Thus, the Christ hymn in Philippians contains the same narrative contours as those defining Paul's Jesus as second Adam and Mark's Jesus as Son of Man—and this is so even if the hymn evinces a preexistence Christology that is otherwise not central to Paul's Adam Christology.

The point where the hymn most differs from what we saw in Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15, however, is the absence of representation. Within the rhetorical flow of Philippians, the hymn stands as an encapsulation of how the Philippians are to live their life together in community (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Phil 2:5). The model in place here is much more focused on imitation than on representation. In this particular aspect, the Christ hymn stands closer to passion prediction and subsequent call to discipleship in Mark 8 than to the Adam Christology of Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15. However, the function of Christ as representative Adam figure can be drawn from the broader context of Philippians, where believers' own lives will resolve with the same glorifying of God as Jesus’ (Phil 1:11; 2:11); and, Jesus' authority as resurrected Lord gives him the power to transform the physical bodies of believers into the glorified form that his own body wields (Phil 3:21). Throughout these passages, Jesus is an idealized and representative human figure, such that Scroggs can rightly conclude:
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85 Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 115-16. In Murphy-O'Connor's study, the conclusion is analogous: “The message of the hymn is that Christ was a man who nonetheless differed from other men,” 43.

86 A point highlighted by Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 57.


88 In making a claim for Adam Christology in this passage, Wright suggests that there are echoes of Ps 8, Gen 1, and Dan 7 (*Climax of the Covenant*, 58). If this were to be the case, then the connections with not only Adam but also the Son of Man would be all the more firmly established; however, we should probably be content with the more modest claim that sees the connection with Adam Christology in the exaltation of an obedient person to humanity's intended place of rulers of the world on God's behalf.

89 Perkins, “Adam and Christ,” 133.
“The resurrected and exalted Christ is the perfect realization of God’s intent for [hu]man[ity],” and is also the mediator of that true humanity.90

Conclusion

In his explorations of Adam in Paul’s thought, N. T. Wright suggests, “[T]he role traditionally assigned to Israel had devolved on to Jesus Christ. Paul now regarded him . . . as God’s true humanity.”91 Such a conclusion places Paul’s Adam Christology in precisely the same space that I reckoned for Mark’s Son of Man, the latter adapting portraits of Israelite representatives from Dan 7 and Gen 1-2 (and, perhaps, Psalm 8). This article has shown that a crucial component to the Christologies of both Mark and Paul is Jesus as an idealized human being, embodying in his crucifixion the obedience that is humanity’s due to God, and embodying in resurrection glory (and, for Mark, in Jesus’ life on earth) the reign over the earth that was humanity’s primeval gift from God. Moreover, for both Mark and Paul this idealized human figure demonstrates what faithfulness to God must look like for those who claim to belong to him: followers must participate in the conquest of hostile powers by embracing crucifixion as not only the way in which Jesus comes to his heavenly throne, but the way in which his followers will attain to eschatological glory. Thus, although Son of Man and second Adam are not identical theological constructs, they are functional equivalents, each explaining how the one who was crucified can also be proclaimed Lord and Christ, looking to an eschatological conclusion to his reign, and explaining the ongoing life of suffering that is to typify his followers. In an era when early high Christology is increasingly the thesis of scholarly endeavors, these conclusions serve as an important reminder that at least some NT authors invest Jesus’ humanity with a salvific freight that points toward Jesus as the successful heir to humanity’s primordial calling to be an obedient child of God who rules the world on God’s behalf.

Such a rich web of connections between Mark’s Son of Man and Paul’s last Adam provides another possible entrée into the question of whether Mark evinces Pauline influence. In an article published in 2000, Joel Marcus takes up Christology, and the theology of the cross in general, to argue for such a connection.92 The conclusions of this study provide more evidence for a theologically significant overlap between the two bodies of literature in the

90 Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 100, 102-5.
area of Christology. If there is no direct influence, then the shared vision of Jesus as an idealized eschatological human figure illustrate either a common predecessor or an uncanny coincidence. In either case, Jesus as an idealized human might need to begin figuring more prominently into scholarly accounts of Christology among the earliest Jesus followers. These are issues for further research.