

John Day

The eschatologization of the divine conflict with the dragon and the sea

Chapter 4 of *God's conflict with the dragon and the sea*
(Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1985; ISBN 0521256003)

[Note: transliterated text is only approximate, due to the lack of diacritics available in the font set. Consult the original article for precision.]

In the previous chapters we have considered the motif of the divine conflict with the dragon and the sea in the Old Testament from various points of view: the first chapter discussed its association with the creation of the world, the second chapter the alleged naturalization of the chaos monsters, and the third chapter the historicization of the conflict. In accordance with the principle *Urzeit wird Endzeit*, the conflict was also eschatologized, i.e. transposed into the future in association with the last things. From the New Testament, of course, we remember the Revelation of St John, where in Chapter 13 the oppressive Roman empire is symbolized by a seven-headed beast coming out of the sea, clearly deriving from Leviathan the seven-headed sea serpent, and 'the false prophet' is symbolized by a beast representing Behemoth, whilst the satanic power behind Rome is represented in Chapter 12 by a seven-headed dragon, which is overcome by the archangel Michael and thrown down from heaven.¹ A detailed consideration of these New Testament passages lies outside the scope of the present monograph, however, and we shall be concerned here with Is. 27:1 and related mythological passages in the proto-apocalyptic work Is. 24-7, and in particular with Dan. 7.

¹ See H. Wallace, 'Leviathan and the beast in Revelation', *BA* 11 (1948), pp. 61-8. For a more recent and thorough study of this subject, see A.Y. Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (Missoula, MI, 1976). For an older, thorough study of Rev. 12, written before the discovery of the Ugaritic texts, see H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 171-398. On the second beast of Rev. 13 as Behemoth, see above, Ch. 2, n. 59.

The dragon-conflict in Isaiah 27:1 and related material in the 'Isaiah Apocalypse'

Isaiah 27:1

On that day the *Lord* with his hard and great and strong sword will punish Leviathan the twisting serpent, Leviathan the crooked serpent, and he will slay the dragon that is in the sea.

As has frequently been pointed out, these words from the proto-apocalyptic work in Is. 24-7 bear a very strong resemblance to those in the Ugaritic Baal myth, where Mot addresses Baal as follows: *ktmhs. ltn. btn. brh. tkly. btn. `qltn* 'Because you smote Leviathan the twisting serpent (and) made an end of the crooked serpent...' (CTA 5.I.1-2 = KTU 1.5.I.1-2). Again, in CTA 3.IIID.37-9 (= KTU 13.III.40-42), Leviathan the crooked serpent is spoken of as a dragon as in Is. 27:1, *l'istbm. tnn. 'istm[]mhst. btn `qltn slyt. d. sb`t. r'asm* 'Surely I lifted up the dragon, I... (and) smote the crooked serpent, the tyrant with the seven heads.' The close similarity is all the more remarkable both in view of the time-scale involved and because the word ^a*qallaton* 'crooked' which is here paralleled in Ugaritic is found nowhere else in the Old Testament (though the plural of the verb *`ql* [Hab. 1:4] and the adjective *`qalqal* [Judg, 5:6, Ps. 125:5] are so attested, and cf. Rahab which appears as *nahas bariah* 'twisting serpent' in Job 26:13). The striking parallelism between the relatively late text in Is. 27:1 and the Ugaritic texts almost a millennium earlier is a reminder that the closeness of the language of Old Testament texts to that of the Ugaritic texts is not necessarily an indication of an early date for the Old Testament passages in question. Quite often the parallels are in relatively late texts.

The Ugaritic texts cited above make it clear that Is. 27:1 is describing one monster, not three, as has sometimes been supposed. What is referred to in Is. 27:1 parallels the event referred to in Is. 24:21, 'On that day the Lord will punish the host of heaven, in heaven, and the kings of the earth, on the earth.' The reference to 'the host of heaven' in this parallel verse has sometimes been thought to indicate that the monster references in Is. 27:1 allude to three constellations, Serpens, Draco and Hydra.² However, whereas Is. 24:21 refers to the kings of the earth as a whole

together with their angelic princes, it is probable that the reference to the defeat of Leviathan in Is. 27:1 alludes to the downfall of one particular hated power of the time, in view of the use of the sea monster imagery to refer to particular hostile nations elsewhere in the Old Testament,

² So C.F. Burney, 'The three serpents of Isaiah XXVII 1', *JTS* 11 (1910), pp. 443-7, following R. Smend, 'Anmerkungen zu Jes. 24-27', *ZAW* 4 (1884), p. 213.

rather than to constellations. Moreover, the fact that it is here said to be in the sea, its normal habitat, suggests that we do not here have to do with constellations.

Which particular power is alluded to here? A vast number of different suggestions have been made. Qimtu and Rashi saw three powers, Assyria, Egypt and Tyre. Some modern scholars have also seen an allusion to three powers, e.g. the Ptolemies, the Seleucids and the Parthians,³ the Ptolemies, the Seleucids and Macedonia,⁴ or Egypt, Babylon and Assyria,⁵ though sometimes only two powers have been noted, the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.⁶ All these combinations are to be rejected, however, since, as has been noted above, it is now clear that Is, 27:1 is describing only one dragon, not three (or two). Those who posit a single power have cited Babylon⁷ or Egypt.⁸ However, there are some scholars who think that no specific power is meant⁹ but rather evil in general, but this seems improbable.

Part of the problem in identifying Leviathan in Is, 27:1 is the fact that there is no general agreement about the date of Is. 24-7. Often in the past these chapters have been dated very late and have been seen as having their background in the Hellenistic period, e.g. ca. 250 B.C. In keeping with this late date these chapters have frequently been called 'the Isaiah Apocalypse', However, many of the features of the full-blown apocalypses are absent here, which leads one to question the necessity for such a late date. The writing is rather proto-apocalyptic or late prophecy. It belongs, however, 'to that phase in prophecy in which the sharp contours of the here and now begin to be lost in more spacious visions of a transform-

144

ation of all things'.¹⁰ This indicates that the pre-exilic date suggested at the other extreme for these chapters¹¹ is also to be rejected,

³ B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (4th ed., Göttingen, 1922), p. 189; K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Tubingen, 1900), p. 196.

⁴ O. Procksch, *Jesaia I* (Leipzig, 1930), p. 334.

⁵ F. Delitzsch, *Commentar über das Buch Jesaia* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1889), p. 305; F. Feldman, *Das Buch Isaías*, 1 (Minister, 1925), p. 312.

⁶ O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das alte Testament* (3rd ed., Tübingen, 1964), p. 439 (ET *The Old Testament. An Introduction*, Oxford, 1966, p. 326).

⁷ W. Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaja 2* (Leipzig, 1821), p. 810.

⁸ H. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 2 (Neukirchen, 1978), p. 1004.

⁹ P. Auvray, *Isaïe 1-39* (Paris, 1972), p. 239; O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja Kapitel 13-39* (Göttingen, 1973), p. 179 (ET, *Isaiah 13-39*, London, 1974, p. 223).

¹⁰ G.W. Andersen, 'Isaiah XXIV-XXVII reconsidered', *SVT* 9 (1963), p. 126.

¹¹ Cf. I. Mauchline, *Isaiah 1-39* (London, 1962), pp. 195-7; J.H. Eaton, 'The origin of the book of Isaiah', *FT* 9 (1959), pp. 150-1.

In trying to date Is. 24-7, it would seem that whilst the exile is presupposed (cf. Is. 27:8, etc.), indicating a date after 586 B.C., the fact that the Asherim are still standing, symbols of the Canaanite goddess Asherah (Is. 27:9), suggests that the *terminus ante quem* cannot be too long after the return from exile, since every other allusion to the Asherim in the Old Testament relates to the pre-exilic or exilic period. A date therefore in the exilic, or more probably post-exilic period seems certain, but not as late as has sometimes been supposed. The dominant world power of the time would therefore be either Babylon¹² or more probably Persia, and it is therefore conceivable that Leviathan alludes to one of them. However, since the dragon when historicized can symbolize not only the dominant world power of the time (cf. Jer. 51:34; Dan. 7) but also Egypt (cf. Ps. 87:4; Is. 30:7, 51:9; Ezek. 29:3, 32:2), it is possible that Egypt is specifically in view. That Egypt in particular should be singled out for judgement at this time gains in credibility when we recall that this is the case in other proto-apocalyptic

145

works of about the same period, in Joel 4:19 (ET 3:19) and Zech. 14:18-19.

Finally, it is perhaps worthy of note, as J.M. Court¹³ has pointed out that Is. 27:1, as well as some of the preceding verses, may have influenced the imagery in Rev. 12. Thus, Is. 26:17f with its imagery of a woman wailing in labour seems to be alluded to in Rev. 12:2;

Is. 26:20 refers to hiding for a little while until the wrath is past, just as in Rev. 12 the woman is carried to safety into the wilderness for the period of the tribulation; whilst Leviathan, referred to in Is. 27:1, is known to lie behind the seven-headed dragon of Rev. 12.

¹² A number of references in Is. 24-7 speak of the destruction of a city (cf. Is. 24:10-12, 25:2, 26:5-6, 27:10-11) and this has often been identified with Babylon, e.g., J. Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse* (Lund, 1938), pp. 72-84; M.-L. Henry, *Glaubenskrisse und Glaubenshewahrung in den Dichtungen der Jesajaapokalypse* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 17-34; B. Otzen, 'Traditions and structures of Isaiah XXIV-XXVII,' *VT* 24 (1974), p. 206. If this were so, the case for the identification of Leviathan with Babylon might be strengthened. However, in spite of certain attractions, it should probably be rejected. Is. 26:6 speaks of the poor and needy (i.e. the Jews, cf. 25:4) trampling the city, which suggests that it was not far from Judah, the vantage point from which the work is written. According to Is. 25:10-12 the city is in Moab, which would be appropriate on that score (cf. Zeph. 2:9), but these verses are often supposed to be a later addition. However, it may be unwise to reject the one concrete allusion in the book, and Is. 24:17-18 similarly repeats the Moabitic oracle in Jer. 48:43-4. The implication in Is. 24:7-12 that wine plays an important role in the city also fits Moab very well, as Is. 16:7-10 indicates. Is. 24-7 would then merit comparison with Is. 34-5, in that both proclaim judgement on a nation in the vicinity of Judah (in the one case Moab and in the other Edom), which extends into a world disaster, and this is contrasted with the state of Zion. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das alte Testament* (3rd ed., Tübingen, 1964), pp. 438-9 (ET *The Old Testament. An Introduction*, Oxford, 1966, pp. 326-7). There can, however, be no question of Leviathan representing Moab, since elsewhere in the Old Testament the dragon symbolizes either the dominant world power or Egypt.

¹³ J.M. Court, *Myth and history in the book of Revelation* (London, 1979), p. 112.

Other related mythological motifs in Isaiah 24-7

The fact that Is. 27:1 bears such a strikingly close relationship to the Ugaritic Baal epic leads one to ask whether other motifs in Is. 24--7 derive from the same circle of ancient mythic ideas. This is in fact the case, although their full number and significance have not previously been noted.¹⁴

One instance is to be found in Is. 24:18b-19,¹⁵ where we read

- v. 18b For the windows on high are opened,
and the foundations of the earth tremble.
- v. 19 The earth is utterly broken,
the earth is rent asunder
the earth is violently shaken.

With this one should compare CTA 4.VII.25ff. (= KTU 1.4.VII.25ff.)

25	yptb. 1?(26)ln. bbhtm. 'urbt (27) bqrb. hk[lm.] [yp]th (28) b'l. bdqt [.rp]t	He opened a lattice in the mansion, a window in the midst of the pal[ace), Baal [ope]ned a rift (in) the clouds).
146		
29	qlh. qds[.] bH. y]tn	Ba[al utt]ered his holy voice,
30	ytny. bl s[at.s]pth	Baal repeated the is[sue] of his lips;
31	qlh. q[ds. t]r. 'ars	(he uttered) his h[oly] voice [(and)] the earth did q[uake],
32	[s'at. sph.] griri	(he repeated) [the issue of his lips] (and) the rocks (did quake)

The striking thing is not merely the parallelism of the god's theophany and the quaking of the earth in response, but the fact that the Ugaritic text speaks of BaaFs opening a window (*'urbt*) in his palace, corresponding to the clouds. Just as Is. 24:18b says that the *windows on high* were opened (*'arubbot mimmarom niptahu*). It has generally been supposed that the allusion to the opening of the windows of heaven refers back to the P flood story, where this expression is

¹⁴ J.C. de Moor, *Seasonal Pattern*, p. 244, n. 8, called for an examination of Is. 26:19-27:5 in the light of the Ugaritic Baal myth, and W.R. Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic* (Missoula, Mt., 1976) finds that they share a common thematic pattern.

¹⁵ E.S. Mulder, *Die Teologie van die Jesaja-Apokalipse* (Groningen and Jakarta, 1954), pp. 16-17, notes [his and the other Ugaritic references to *'urht*, but fails to note the similar theophanic context of this particular reference and Is. 24:18b-19. Similarly, J. Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh, 1979), p. 202.

found (cf. Gen, 7:11, 8:2), so that some speak of there being a second flood here.¹⁶ I think this is correct, and further evidence for the dependence of Is. 24 on the story of Noah is provided by the reference in v. 5 to those who 'have... broken the everlasting covenant', the worldwide nature of the sin involved suggesting that this can only be the Noachic covenant of Gen. 9 (explicitly called 'the everlasting covenant' in v. 16, cf. v. 12). If so, it must be concluded that Is, 24 has made the unconditional promise of the covenant of Gen. 9 conditional, since the return of the flood because of the sin of man contradicts Gen. 9:15. However, it is striking that Is. 24:19 makes it clear that the primary emphasis here is on the theophany in the thunder, resulting in the shaking of the earth, rather than in the rain, just as in the Ugaritic passage, and similarly both the Ugaritic and Isaianic passages, unlike Genesis, have an association with the theme of the kingship of the deity. It thus seems likely that Is. 24 has combined motifs from the Noah story in Genesis with mythic themes concerning the theophany of the enthroned deity, ultimately deriving from Baal mythology,

Immediately following, in Is. 24:21-3, we have a description of Yahweh's punishment of the kings of the earth and their tutelary gods, the latter we know from later writings being seventy in number (cf. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Deut. 32:8; 1 Enoch

147

89:59ff, 90:22ff.), deriving from the seventy sons of El and Asherah, the divine pantheon (cf. CTA 4.VI.46 ^ KTU 1.4.VI.46 *sb`m. bn. 'atrt*. In v. 23 we read, 'Then the moon will be confounded, and the sun ashamed; for the Lord of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem his glory will be before his elders'. Clearly the sun and moon are thought of as disappearing, but how is this envisaged? Sawyer¹⁷ thinks in terms of an eclipse, but against this stands the fact that in actual experience, when there is a total eclipse of the sun, some of the other luminaries are known to reappear, not disappear (as Sawyer himself informs us!), and furthermore, comparable language elsewhere in the Old Testament seems to be associated with Yahweh's theophany in the storm (e.g. Hab. 3:11; Ezek. 32:7, cf. 30:3, 18). Since the previous verses describe Yahweh's theophany in the storm, it is most natural to suppose that this is the cause of the fading of the sun and moon here too. It has never previously been noted that we find precisely the same thing happening in the Ugaritic Baal myth, following Baal's theophany in the storm:

¹⁶ Cf. O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja Kapitel 13-39* (Göttingen, 1973), p. 154 (ET *Isaiah* 13-39, London, 1974), p. 191.

¹⁷ J.F.A. Sawyer, 'Joshua 10:12-14 and the solar eclipse of 30 September 1131 BC', *PEQ*, 104(1972), p. 139.

CTA 4. VII. 52-60 (= KTUL4.VIL52-60)

52	gm. lg	Baal surely cried aloud
53	[lm]h. b`l. kysh. `n	to his se[r]vitors]: Look,
54	[gpn]. w`ugr. bglmt	[Gupn]-and-Ugar, in obscurity
55	[`mm.] ym. bn, zlmt. r	the daylight [is veiled], in darkness [the exalted princess] (is veiled),
56	[mt. pr`]t[.] `ibr mnt	the [blazing] pinions of... ¹⁸ (are veiled).
57	[shrrm. hblm. b`]rpt	[Flocks are circling round in the c]louds,
58	[tth. bsmm. `srm.] ht	[birds] are circling round [in the heavens]
59	[— glt. `isr— - -]m	[I shall bind the snow]
60	[brq— — - ymtm -]h	[the lightning]

We clearly have a reference to the veiling of the sun here, and the allusion to the clouds in line 57 confirms that this is because of a storm, which surely results from Baal's immediately preceding the-

148

ophany.¹⁹ This Ugaritic parallel supports the view that Is. 24:21-3 belong with vv. 17-20 and are not, as a number of scholars have thought, the work of a separate redactor.²⁰

Finally, yet another passage in Is. 24-7 seems to have its ultimate origin in the same circle of mythic ideas in the Baal text. It has previously been noted by E.S. Mulder.²¹ This is Is. 25:6—8, the description of the eschatological banquet when all nations would come to Zion: 'On this mountain the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wine on the lees well refined. And he will destroy on this mountain the covering that is cast over all peoples, the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death for ever, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from all faces, and the reproach of his people he will take away from all the earth; for the Lord has spoken/ As a

¹⁸ This seems to be another term denoting the sun.

¹⁹ This seems more natural than the view of J.C.L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1978), p. 66, n. 5, that 'The passage is prob. simply a poetic description of the setting sun and the coming of evening, though it is possible (see apparatus) to translate "the sons of obscurity, darkness have veiled etc." and find a reference to attacks by Mot's henchmen (so also by translating "seized" in l. 35).'

²⁰ Those seeing separate redactions here include J. Lindblom, *op. cit.* p. 66; O. Kaiser, *op. cit.*, p. 145 (ET, p. 178); J. Vermeylen, *Du Prophete Isdie a FApocalyptique 1* (Paris, 1977), pp. 360, 379, 381; H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 2* (Neukirchen, 1978), pp. 904, 943.

²¹ E.S. Mulder, *op. cit.*, p. 30. H. Wildberger, *op. cit.*, p. 962 also notes it, though he thinks the passage cited from the Rephaim text a better parallel (see below).

number of scholars point out,²² the words ‘on this mountain’ in 25:6 refer back to 24:23, which speaks of Yahweh’s reigning on Mt Zion. We have, therefore, in Is. 25:6-8 a reference to the banquet in celebration of Yahweh’s enthronement. It is striking that the Baal text similarly describes a banquet in celebration of Baal’s kingship, on the completion of his temple on Mt Zaphon:

CTA 4.VI.44-59 (= KTU 1.4.VI.44-59)

44	sh. ‘ahh. bbhth, ‘a[r]yh	He did call his brothers into his mansion, his ki[ns]folk
45	bqrb hklh. sh	into the midst of his palace, he did call
46	sb`m. bn. ‘atrt	the seventy sons of Asherah;
47	spq ‘ilm. krm. y[n1	he did supply the gods with rams (and) with wine,
149		
48	spq. ‘ilht. hprt [.yn]	he did supply the goddesses with ewes
49	spq. ‘ilm. ‘alpm. y[n]	[(and) with wine], he did supply the gods with oxen
50	spq. ‘lht. ‘arht [.yn]	(and) with wine, he did supply the goddesses with cows
51	spq. ‘ilm. khtm. yn	[(and) with wine] he did supply the gods with seats
52	spq. ‘ilht.ks’at [.yn]	(and) with wine, he did supply the goddesses with
53	spq. ‘ilm. rhbt yn	thrones [(and) with wine], he did supply the gods with tuns of
54	spq, ‘ijht. dkrt[.yn]	wine, he did supply the goddesses with casks [of wine],
55	`d. lhm. sty. ‘ilm	while the gods did eat (and) drink,
56	wpq mrgtm. td	and they were supplied with a suckling of the teat;
57	bhrb. ml[?]t. qs[.m]r	with a salted knife they did carve [a fat]ling;
58	‘i.tsty. krp[nm.y]n	they drank flag[ons ofwi]ne,
59	[bk]s, hrs. d[m. `sm]	the bl[ood of trees from cu]ps of gold.

It has hitherto remained unnoted that ‘the seventy sons of Asherah’ invited to the feast, corresponding to the totality of the divine pantheon, account for the universality of the banquet

²² Cf. H. Wildberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 900, 960.

in Is. 25:6, where ‘all peoples’ come. The seventy sons of Asherah and El lie behind the seventy gods or angels of the nations (cf. Deut. 32:8 [LXX, 4Q Deut.], 1 Enoch 89:59ff., 90:22ff.) the same as are referred to in Is. 24:21-2, corresponding to the seventy nations thought to exist (cf. Gen. 10). Moreover, we have here another example of the application of traditions to Mt Zion which originally related to Mt Zaphon— besides Ps. 48:3 (ET 2; cf. Is, 14:13) note Ex. 15:17, where Yahweh’s enthronement (v. 18) takes place on Mt Zion, the language used being that which is applied to Mt Zaphon (following his victory over the sea; cf. Is. 27:1). Wildberger²³ also compares the Ugaritic Rephaim text (CTA 22.A.13ff. = KTU 1.22.II.13ff.) which speaks of banqueting, apparently in connection with Baal’s enthronement:

13	sm`. 'a!tm [rp'um. hn 'iln]	Hear you [rp'um, sons of divine] beings: on the pa[te of the victor Baal]
150		
14	ym. lm. qd[qd. 'al'yn b`l]	oil of... [shall be poured] and he shall vow
15	smn. prst [ysq, wndr]	[vows]: lo [the victor Baal shall be k]ing
16	ydr. hm. ym [lk. 'al'yn b`l]	at (my) command (and) shall ta[ke the throne of his
17	`l `amr. y'u[hd. ks'a. mlkh]	kingship], the resting place of the seat of
18	nht. kht. d[rkth. bbty]	[his dominion. Into my house]
19	'ash. rp'i [m. 'iqr'a. 'ilnym]	I have called the rp'u[m, I have called the divine beings]
20	bqrb. h[kly. 'athr.....]	into the midst of my pa[lace, its shrine.]

Wildberger further compares the festal meal held in connection with Marduk’s enthronement (Enuma elish III, 134ff.), but, though comparable, this would not have been in the direct line of tradition lying behind Is. 25:6-8, which is rather to be sought in the Canaan-ite mythology alluded to above,

It is wholly in keeping with the view that the eschatological banquet in Judaism (to which Is. 25:6-8 is the first reference) had its origin in the banquet following Yahweh’s and ultimately Baal’s victory over the unruly sea and the chaos monsters that in 2 Esdras 6:52, 2 Baruch 29:4, 1 Enoch 60:24 and Baba bathra 74, it is specifically the chaos monsters Leviathan and Behemoth which are to be devoured at the Messianic banquet. We recall too the reference to the slaying of Leviathan in Is. 27:1.

A word may be said here about Is. 25:8a, where we read of Yahweh that ‘He will swallow up death for ever...’. Sometimes these words are regarded as a later gloss.²⁴ This, however, seems

²³ Cf. H. Wildberger, *op. cit.*, p. 962.

²⁴ E.g. O. Kaiser, *op. cit.*, p. 162 (ET, p, 201).

unnecessary, since not only is the thought of the resurrection of the dead— probably to be understood as a collective restoration of the nation rather than individual resurrection beyond the grave— found elsewhere in the work in Is. 26:19, but it is significant that Baal's kingship was specifically associated with his victory over Mot ('Death'), and that it closely followed on Baal's feast on Mt Zaphon. Thus it may be maintained that traditio-historically the thought of Yahweh's victory over Death is in place in the context of Is. 25:6-8. The parallel allusion to the resurrection of the dead in Is, 26:19 is likewise appropriately placed, since it precedes vir-

151

tually immediately the allusion to Yahweh's defeat of Leviathan in Is. 27:1, the verse from which our discussion began. This is strikingly paralleled in the Ugaritic texts, for no sooner has Baal risen from the dead and defeated Mot than we find the dragon (i.e. Leviathan) posing a threat, at the very end of the Baal cycle (*CTA* 6.VI.50-2— *KTU* L6.VI.51-3).

The exaltation of the one like a son of man over the dragons in Daniel 7

Dan. 7 is one of the most widely discussed chapters in the entire Old Testament. A vast literature has grown up around it, but there is no sign of scholarly agreement either as to the present meaning of the symbolism or as to its ultimate origin. In a dream, alleged to have occurred in the first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, Daniel sees the four winds of heaven stirring up the great sea. Out of the sea emerge, one after the other, a series of beasts, four in number, all of fabulous form. Attention is focused on the fourth beast, which is especially terrible and has ten horns. Then another horn emerges, speaking great things, and three of the other horns are plucked up before it. Next, one who is called the Ancient of Days sits on his throne with his court and the fourth beast is destroyed, and dominion is taken away from the other beasts, and one like a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven and is presented before the Ancient of Days and receives the dominion and kingdom for ever in succession to the beasts. Daniel then enquires of one of those seen in the vision what it all means. He is informed that the beasts represent kings or kingdoms, but that their rule will be succeeded by that of the holy ones of the Most High, who will rule for ever and ever. The ten horns are also explained as representing ten kings, and similarly the horn speaking great things is explained as a particularly terrible king who will oppress the holy ones of the Most High (or simply holy ones), speak words against the Most High, and change the times and the law, for a period of a time, two times, and half a time. But finally the people of the holy ones of the Most High will receive the kingdom.

The four beasts from the sea

There is no doubt amongst critical scholars that the four beasts represent in succession the Babylonian, Median, Persian and

Hellenistic empires, with the little horn symbolizing the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who proscribed Judaism and persecuted those who remained faithful to their religion.²⁵ The idea of four world empires occurring here, found also in Dan. 2, appears to be based on an oriental tradition attested elsewhere.²⁶ The four hostile beasts emerge from the

²⁵ See especially H.H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (2nd ed., Cardiff, 1959). D.J. Wiseman, 'The last days of Babylon', *Christianity Today* 2, no. 4 (25 Nov. 1957), p. 10, in D.W. Thomas (ed.), *Documents from Old Testament Times* (London, 1958), p. 83, and in D.J. Wiseman, T.C. Mitchell, R. Joyce, W.J. Martin and K.A. Kitchen, *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London, 1965), pp. 9-16, has attempted to dismiss the Median empire from the book of Daniel by reading explicative *waw* in Dan. 6:29 (ET 28) and so identifying Darius the Mede with Cyrus the Persian, reading 'So this Daniel prospered during the reign of Darius, even the reign of Cyrus the Persian.' He has been followed by other conservative scholars such as J.M. Bulman, 'The identification of Darius the Mede', *Westminster Theological Journal* 35 (1972-3), pp. 247-67, A.R. Millard, 'Daniel 1-6 and history', *EQ* 49 (1977), p. 73, J.G. Baldwin, *Daniel* (Leicester, 1978), pp. 26f, and D.W. Baker, 'Further examples of the *waw explicativum*', *VT* 30 (1980), p. 134, though not all conservatives share this view, e.g. J.C. Whitcomb, *Darius the Mede* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1959), who prefers rather to equate Darius the Mede with Gubaru. To Wiseman's view it may be objected *inter alia* that, apart from the inherent implausibility of one and the same person being called both Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian, it is impossible to spirit away the Median empire from the book of Daniel by such exegetical ingenuity, since it is required by the presence of the second beast in Dan. 7: the first beast clearly denotes Babylon, the fourth beast must represent the Hellenistic empires, since it is clear from elsewhere in the book (e.g. Dan. 11) that the denouement comes in Seleucid times; this leaves two more beasts, the latter of which must represent Persia (cf. Dan, 10; 1, 20, 11:2), so that the former beast must represent a further empire, that of the Medes, and specifically Darius the Mede, since no other Median ruler is cited between Belshazzar and Cyrus. The presupposition of a Median empire between those of Babylon and Persia likewise rules out Whitcomb's equation of Darius the Mede with Gubaru, quite apart from the fact that the latter was not a king (he was governor of Babylon and the district west of the Euphrates) and there is no evidence that he was called Darius.

²⁶ J.C. Swain, 'The theory of the four monarchies: opposition history under the Roman empire', *Classical Philology* 35 (1940), pp. 1-21, has drawn attention to the fact that the notion of four great empires followed by a more glorious fifth (Assyria, Media, Persia, Macedonia + Rome) appears in various classical texts, including Aemilius Sura (cited by Velleius Paterculus) who can be dated between 189 and 171 B.C., so that the notion pre-dates the Maccabean period. The fact that Media is included in the series and Babylon omitted indicates a Persian origin, and the fourfold sequence of empires in Daniel may therefore derive from Persia, Assyria's place being taken by Babylon because of its association with the legendary Daniel. The four metal ages of Dan. 2, already attested in Hesiod, may likewise be derived from Persia, as they are also found in Zoroastrian sources (cf. D. Flüßer, 'The four empires in the fourth Sibyl and in the book of Daniel', *Israel Oriental Studies* 2, 1972, pp. 148-75), but the dating of the Zoroastrian evidence is uncertain, cf. W.G. Lambert, *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London, 1978), pp. 7-9. G.F. Hasel, 'The four world empires of Daniel 2 against its near eastern environment', *JSOT* 12 (1979), pp. 17-30 has recently pointed out that the Babylonian Dynastic Prophecy also contains a series of four empires, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece (on this text see A.K. Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, Toronto and Buffalo, N.Y., 1975, pp. 24-37) and claims that this sequence is closer than any of the texts traditionally associated with Dan 2. Whilst it is difficult to see why the omission of Media but addition of Babylon makes this any closer to Daniel than the other parallels so far as sequence is concerned, it is interesting as further evidence of the diffusion of the notion of four empires in the oriental world during the Hellenistic period and raises the possibility of a Babylonian origin of the concept in Daniel. The striking parallel between the

sea, which is noted for its turbulence (vv. 2-3). There can be no doubt, in the light of the material considered earlier in this monograph, that the motif of the turbulent sea hostile to God is of Canaanite origin, and it will emerge in the course of this chapter that the imagery of the one like a son of man enthroned by the Ancient of Days over the beasts of the sea is likewise ultimately Canaanite in origin, deriving from the enthronement of (Yahweh-)Baal by El over Yam and his accompanying dragons (Leviathan, etc.). Whilst the four beasts, and especially the last, appear to play the *role* ascribed to the dragon Leviathan in Canaanite mythology, the fact remains that the precise *form* of the beasts does not correspond to that of Leviathan and the other

153

dragons attested in Ugaritic (cf. *CTA* 3.IIID.37-43 = *KTU* 1.3.III.40-46).²⁷

Whence, then, is the precise form of the beasts derived? Various views have been put forward to account for them. These may be summarized as follows: (i) the view that the beasts are derived from Hos. 13:7-8; (ii) that they have been derived from ancient near eastern *Mischwesen*; (iii) that they have an astrological origin; (iv) that they derive from the language of treaty curses. Of these the last may be quickly dismissed. T. Wittstruck²⁸ has recently argued that the imagery of the beasts was derived from the treaty curses, citing

154

the Sefire treaty 11 A 9, where we find the sequence lion, —, leopard, and conjectures on the basis of Sefire treaty I A 31, where apparently we have the sequence snake, scorpion, bear and leopard, that the animal missing from the broken text is the bear. However, it is doubtful whether Sefire treaty I A 31 can give one confidence in this, since the leopard is the only animal common to both lists as they stand, and even this is not certain, and J.A. Rimbach²⁹ thinks that one should read *dbrh* 'bee*' and *nmlh* 'ant' rather than *dbhh* 'bear' and *nmrh* 'leopard' in Sefire treaty I A 31. Even if the sequence lion, bear, leopard were attested in the eighth-century B.C. Syrian Sefire treaty, it would be extremely hazardous to conclude that it must therefore be treaty usage which lies behind the beasts in the second century B.C. book of Daniel.

detailed *vaticinia ex eventu* of Daniel and the Babylonian Dynastic Prophecy and other Mesopotamian texts, to which attention has been drawn by other scholars (cf. W.G. Lambert, *op. cit.*, pp. 9ff.), may lend support to this view.

²⁷ In this Ugaritic passage we find Yam, the dragon (Leviathan), the calf Ars (cf. Behemoth) and Fire (Ishat), the bitch of the gods associated together. In *Enuma elish* the monster companions of Tiamat are described several times as 'the Viper, the Dragon, and the Sphinx, the Great-Lion, the Mad Dog, and the mighty Lion-demons, the Dragon-Fly, the Centaur'. Only the lion is in common with Dan. 7.

²⁸ T. Wittstruck, 'The influence of treaty curse imagery on the beast imagery of Daniel 7', *JBL* 97 (1978), pp. 100-2.

²⁹ J.A. Rimbach, 'Bears or bees? Sefire 1 A 31 and Daniel 7', *JBL* 97 (1978), pp. 565-6.

The theory of the astrological origin of the beasts is rather more difficult to evaluate, but it should probably be rejected. A. Caquot³⁰ proposed this view, noting that the mention of the four winds of heaven stirring up the sea from which the four beasts emerged (cf. Dan. 7:2-3) suggests a connection of each of the beasts with one of the four cardinal points. He then seeks to find the origin of the first three beasts in astrological symbols connected with those regions from which the empires sprang. Caquot thinks especially in terms of the system of Teucer, whose influence is sometimes found elsewhere in Daniel, viz., in Dan. 8, where the symbolism of the ram and the goat, denoting Persia and Syria, is claimed to be due to the fact that in the zodiacal system of Teucer the ram and the goat represent those very nations. However, although the ram in Dan. 8 does denote Persia (cf. v. 20), the goat is actually stated there; to represent Greece, not Syria (cf. v. 21). The influence of Teucer's astrological symbolism on Dan. 8 is therefore questionable.

To return to Dan. 7, Caquot notes that, in addition to the zodiac, there was something which he calls the 'dodecaoros', a system of thirty-six 'decans' according to which three 'paranatellonta' were attached to each sign of the zodiac. It is the influence of these which Caquot endeavours to find in the animal symbolism of the first three beasts of Dan. 7. Now in Teucer's system we find that the cat is one of those in the 'dodecaoros'

155

corresponding to the ram of the zodiac (= Persia). Though the cat is not mentioned in Dan. 7, v. 6 does allude to the leopard as symbolizing Persia, and Caquot thinks that it has taken the place of the cat on the grounds that the latter would not have been known to the Jews. However, the fact that the word *hatul* denotes the cat in post-biblical Hebrew (cf. Targum to Is. 13:22, 34:14) shows that the cat was known to the Jews, and the Letter of Jeremiah 21 (ET 22) actually attests the cat at a date which cannot be far removed from that of the book of Daniel. There is therefore no reason why Dan. 7 should not have alluded to the cat if precise astrological symbolism was required.

There is, moreover, also a problem with the symbolism of Babylon by a lion (Dan. 7:4), since, as Caquot has to admit, it is not the lion but the dog which, in the 'dodecaoros', corresponds to Taurus of the zodiac, representing the south, with which one would expect Babylon to be associated. Here Caquot appeals to Ptolemy, where Mesopotamia, Babylonia and Assyria are ruled by Virgo, which corresponds to the lion of the 'dodecaoros'. The fact that he here has to appeal to a different astrological system weakens Caquot's case.

³⁰ A. Caquot, 'Sur les quatre betes de Daniel VII', *Semitica* 5 (1955), pp. 5-13.

Noth³¹ argued for ‘the dependence of the beasts of Dan. 7 on ancient near eastern iconography. There is probably some limited influence from this, as the first beast, the winged lion, is a well-known *Mischwesen* in Mesopotamia, whilst the four wings and four heads of the leopard recall ancient near eastern portrayals of beasts with four wings and several heads. However, iconography cannot account for the sequence of bear and leopard amongst the beasts, since neither of these is attested frequently in the plastic arts of the ancient orient. Again, an Akkadian text, VAT 10057, discovered at Asshur and dating from the seventh century B.C., which has recently been claimed by H.S. Kvanvig³² to be an important source underlying Dan. 7, reflects the same world of *Mischwesen*, in that it has a series of fifteen gods, mostly of monstrous form, e.g. several with lion and eagle features, one having two heads, and most

156

having ‘feet like a man’.³³ However, it should be noted that in keeping with their rarity in iconography, none of them have bear or leopard characteristics, two of the three named beasts of Dan. 7, and their number (fifteen) differs from that in Dan. 7 (four). Also there is no connection with the sea in the Akkadian text. Accordingly, whilst it may be agreed that Dan. 7 owes something to the general world of Mesopotamian *Mischwesen*, other features are also present. However, a more detailed refutation of Kvanvig’s article, which claims other influence from the Akkadian text on Dan. 7, is reserved for discussion below in the section on the origin of the son of man imagery,

At this point it is also appropriate to note the view of S. Morenz,³⁴ followed by U. Staub,³⁵ that the horns of the fourth beast were suggested by the horned caps which are depicted on Seleucid coins, even though they are not attested of Antiochus IV Epiphanes himself, and indeed, do not occur at all after Antiochus I—Morenz believes that the old coins would have

³¹ M. Noth, ‘Das Geschichtsverständnis der alttestamentlichen Apokalyptik’, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (Munich, 1966), pp. 267-9 (ET ‘The understanding of history in Old Testament apocalyptic’. *The Laws in the Pentateuch and other essays.*, Edinburgh & London, 1966, pp. 210-11.)

³² H.S. Kvanvig, ‘An Akkadian vision as background for Dan’, *Studia Theologica* 35 (1981), pp. 85-9. Kvanvig’s claims are made only in preliminary form and he intends to deal with the matter more thoroughly at some future stage.

³³ It was originally published by E. Ebeling, ‘Hollenfahrt eines assyrischen Königs’, in his book *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* 1 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1931), pp. 1—9, but a more up to date translation was published by W. von Soden, ‘Die Unterweltsvision eines assyrischen Kronprinzen’, *ZA* 43 n.F. 9 (1936), pp. 1-31.

³⁴ S. Morenz, ‘Das Tier mit den Hörnern. Ein Beitrag zu Dan. 7, 7f.’, in his collected essays, E. Blumenthal and S. Hermann (edd.). *Religion und Geschichte des alten Ägypten* (Weimar, 1975), pp. 429-32 (reprinted from *ZAW* 63, 1951, pp. 151-4).

³⁵ U. Staub, ‘Das Tier mit den Hörnern. Ein Beitrag zu Dan 7, 7f.’, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 25 (1978), pp. 366-81.

remained in circulation and the coins of Alexander, which also bear the horned cap, would have continued to be restruck. However, the fact that the kings of Media and Persia are also symbolized by a ram bearing two horns (Dan. 8:3, 20) indicates that horns are not a specific mark of the Seleucids for the writer. Since horns symbolized strength in the Old Testament and the ancient near east, they provided an appropriate element in the beastly symbolism of empires and require no special explanation such as Morenz's (cf. Zech. 1:18-21).

The most attractive view is that the four beasts of Dan. 7 owe their fundamental derivation to Hos. 13:7-8,³⁶ where God declares, 'Therefore I will be³⁷ like a lion to them, like a leopard on the road I will keep watch. I will attack them like a bear robbed

157

of its young, and tear their hearts from their breasts; and I will devour them like a lion, a beast of the field will rend them.' In both Hosea 13:7-8 and Dan. 7 we therefore find four beastlike allusions— 'like a lion', 'like a leopard', 'like a bear' and an unnamed wild beast— to describe the affliction that will overtake Israel from the exile till the time of renewed blessing. Furthermore, we know from the fact that the proto-apocalyptic work in Is. 26-7 was heavily dependent on Hos. 13-14, as I have shown elsewhere,³⁸ that Hos. 13 was a good quarry for an apocalyptic writer seeking to describe the period of affliction prior to the eschaton. Moreover, the fact that the last beast is unnamed, being simply dubbed 'a beast of the field', offers an excellent explanation why the fourth beast of Dan, 7 is left unnamed: the apocalypticist was thus able to exercise his own imagination to the full in his description. The suggestion of U. Staub³⁹ that the writer was describing an elephant is accordingly uncalled for: the apocalypticist deliberately left the fourth chaos monster uncomparated with any actually existing creature.

In conclusion, therefore, it may be maintained that, though the element of the cosmic sea hostile to God has been taken up from Canaanite mythology, the fundamental basis for the four types of beast is drawn from Hos. 13:7-8, with some influence from ancient near eastern *Mischwesen*.

The origin of the figure of the one like a son of man

But what of the origin of the figure of the one like a son of man? This is a much controverted question and it is impossible to review every single view that has been put forward. So far as the *expression* 'one like a son of man' is concerned, it is probably derived from Ezek. 1:26, where

³⁶ Cf. A.M. Farrer, *A Study in Mark* (Westminster, 1951), pp. 255-8.

³⁷ Reading *w^e'ehyeh* with LXX for MT *wa^ehi*.

³⁸ J. Day, 'A case of inner Scriptural interpretation. The dependence of Isaiah xxvi. 13-xxvii. 11 on Hosea xiii. 4-xiv. 10 (JBng. 9) and its relevance to some theories of the redaction of the 'Isaiah apocalypse'', *JTS* 31 n.s. (1980), pp. 309-19.

³⁹ U. Staub, op. *cit.*, pp. 389-96.

the divine presence is said to have 'a likeness as it were of a human form' (*d^emut k^emar'eh 'adam*). Such a claim is supported not only by the general evidence of dependence of Daniel on the book of Ezekiel, including Dan. 7—the fiery wheels of the divine throne in Dan. 7:9 clearly deriving from Ezekiel (e.g. Ch. 1)—but also by the particular fact that the description of the body of the similarly named 'one in the likeness of the sons of men' of Dan. 10:16 (cf. 18) in Dan. 10:6 is clearly taken

158

from Ezek. 1:27, thus suggesting that the expression 'one in the likeness of the sons of men' is taken from the similar expression in the preceding verse Ezek. 1:26, which ought therefore to be the case for the comparable term 'one like a son of man' in Dan. 7:13. The expression 'one like a son of man' thus derives from the description of the divine glory in Ezek. 1:26.⁴⁰

Some scholars in the past, however, e.g. C.H. Kraeling⁴¹ and S. Mowinckel⁴² saw *Anthropos* or *Urmensch* speculation lying behind the figure, such as is attested in the Iranian and Hellenistic worlds. However, the evidence of this in the pre-Christian Semitic world is very slight, and there is now widespread agreement that this is not the source in which the origin of the figure of the one like a son of man should be sought.⁴³

Other scholars, however, such as A. Bentzen⁴⁴ and F.H. Borsch⁴⁵ saw *Urmensch* speculation as having been combined with royal ideology in the Jerusalem cultus and the coming of the rule of the one like a son of man as representing an eschatologization of the king's conflict with the nations at the Autumn Festival, such as is reflected, for example, in Ps. 2. It is true, as we shall see, that the ideology of the Autumn Festival probably does lie behind Dan. 7, but, apart from the dubiety of holding that the king was equated with the *Urmensch*,⁴⁶ it is very peculiar to speak of the king coming with the clouds of heaven; this suggests rather a heavenly being, indeed, in origin, at least, a divine being, in the light of the universal occurrence of the clouds imagery elsewhere in the Old Testament. Indeed, there is no evidence in the book of Daniel at all that the writer was expecting the coming of a Messianic king: in view of the eschatological orientation of the book, such a belief would have been made clear had it existed. On the

⁴⁰ Cf. A. Feuillet, 'Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique', *RB* 60 (1953), pp. 180ff., which also notes other parallels between Daniel and Ezekiel.

⁴¹ C.H. Kraeling, *Anthropos and Son of Man* (New York, 1927).

⁴² S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (ET, Oxford, 1959), pp. 420-37.

⁴³ C. Colpe, '[ho huios tou anthropou]', in G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (edd.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8 (ET, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1972), pp. 408-15. [Greek expression transliterated here.]

⁴⁴ A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (ET, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1970), pp. 74-5.

⁴⁵ F.H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (London, 1967), pp. 89ff.

⁴⁶ J.A. Emerton, 'The origin of the Son of Man imagery', *JTS* 9 n.s. (1958), p. 231.

contrary, we find that the one occasion on which the term *masiah* 'Anointed' is employed (Dan, 9:26), it is used of the High Priest Onias III. (We may accordingly reject all forms of the view that the one like a son of man in

159

Dan. 7 is a royal Messianic figure, whether this be the kind of view held by Bentzen and Borsch, the traditional Messianic view, or the view of H. Sahlin and G.W. Buchanan⁴⁷ that he represents Judas Maccabaeus.⁴⁸

Recently, H.S. Kvanvig, to whom we have already referred above,⁴⁹ has suggested a novel explanation of the origin of the son of man imagery, as of other features in Dan. 7. He claims that the main source behind Dan. 7 is an Akkadian text, VAT 10057, which was discovered at Asshur and dates from the seventh century B.C. In this text a ruler has a night vision in which he sees a series of fifteen gods, mostly in the form of monstrous *Mischwesen*, then a human figure, next a throne vision of Nergal, out of whose arms comes lightning and who is surrounded by the Anunnaki, and this is followed by a scene in which Nergal proclaims judgement on the ruler seeing the vision and speaks of a future ruler who will receive eternal dominion over all nations from the king of the gods, Kvanvig wishes to equate the human figure seen in the vision with this future ruler.

However, although at first the parallelism between this vision and that of Dan. 7 might appear quite striking, it is less so on closer examination. Thus, the gods are fifteen in number in the Akkadian text, unlike the beasts of Dan. 7, which are four in number, none of the divine *Mischwesen* in the Akkadian text have bear or leopard characteristics, unlike two of the three named beasts of Dan. 7, and they are not associated with the sea. Moreover, the judgement that is proclaimed is not on the *Mischwesen*, as in Dan. 7, but on the ruler seeing the vision. Again, although Nergal in the Akkadian text and the Ancient of Days in Dan. 7 both have the role of divine judges, from whom fire emerges and who are surrounded by a host of attendants, the name of the Ancient of Days and his white hair cannot be derived from Nergal but resemble rather, as we shall see, the god El 'the Father of years'. Finally, it is doubtful whether the future ruler is to be equated with the human figure seen in the vision following the

⁴⁷ H. Sahlin, 'Antiochus IV Epiphanes und Judas Mackabaus', *Studia Theologica* 23 (1969), pp. 41-68; G.W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* (New York, 1972), p. 43.

⁴⁸ P.M. Casey, 'Porphyry and the origin of the book of Daniel', *JTS* 27 n.s. (1976), pp. 20-3, has shown that the commonly accepted view that already Porphyry identified the one like a son of man in Dan. 7 with Judas Maccabaeus is due to a misunderstanding based on Jerome's Daniel commentary (PL 25:533).

⁴⁹ See above, p. 155f, and n. 32.

fifteen gods. Ebeling⁵⁰ says that the human figure is probably to be equated with Isum, who appears as Nergal's adviser later in the vision. This would fit with the fact that the human figure is clearly represented as standing below Nergal, and that he is depicted as wearing a red garment, which is consonant with Isum's name, which means 'fire'. Accordingly, it may be concluded that there is only a superficial resemblance between the Akkadian text and Dan. 7, and that there is no reason to suppose that traditions taken up from it have influenced Dan. 7.

As noted above, the figure of the one like a son of man coming with the clouds of heaven is suggestive of a heavenly being, indeed, in origin at least, a god. One view which posits a god behind the figure is that of J. Morgenstern,⁵¹ who seeks an ultimate Canaanite-Phoenician origin of the imagery. He holds that Dan. 7:13-14 reflects Antiochus IV Epiphanes' reform of the Tyrian solar religion: in this Tyrian solar religion the sun is divided into two parts, Baal Shamem and Melkart, which represent respectively the winter and the summer suns, the latter, a young god, taking the place of the former. Morgenstern understands the one like a son of man's taking the place of the Ancient of Days as a reflection of this. However, against Morgenstern it has to be said that his whole reconstruction of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' alleged reform of the Tyrian religion is entirely conjectural and without supporting evidence. Furthermore, it may be noted that the one like a son of man does not take over the place of the Ancient of Days, but rather that of the beasts. Finally, it may be noted that Morgenstern curiously maintains that Dan. 7:13-14 is an interpolation, on the grounds that nothing corresponds to the one like a son of man in the interpretation of the vision, thereby overlooking the holy ones of the Most High.

There is, however, another view which seeks the ultimate origin of the one like a son of man in a Canaanite divine being and which has great plausibility. It was first enunciated in 1958 by J.A. Emerton,⁵² and also in the same year in far less detail by L. Rost.⁵³

I shall now consider in detail the arguments adduced in support of this ultimately Canaanite origin of the Son of Man imagery in Dan.7.

(i) God is represented as the Ancient of Days and possesses white hair (v. 9), i.e. he is depicted as an old man. This is unique in the entire Old Testament. It agrees admirably, however, with

⁵⁰ E. Ebeling, *op. cit.*, p. 6, n. g.

⁵¹ J. Morgenstern, 'The "Son of Man" of Daniel 7:13f. A new interpretation', *JBL* 80 (1961), pp. 65-77.

⁵² J.A. Emerton, 'The origin of the Son of Man imagery', *JTS* 9 n.s. (1958), pp. 225-42.

⁵³ L. Rost, 'Zur Deutung des Menschensohnes in Daniel 7', *Studien zum Alten Testament* (Stuttgart, 1974), pp. 72-5, originally published in *Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 41-3.

the supreme god of the Ugaritic pantheon. El, who is called 'ab ^*snm* 'Father of Years' (CTA 4:IV:24 = *KTU* 1.4.IV.24, etc.). Opponents of this correlation have pointed out, however, that the word for 'years' in Ugaritic is elsewhere *Snr*, not *snm*, and other possible translations have been proposed, namely 'Father of exalted ones',⁵⁴ 'Father of mortals',⁵⁵ and 'Father of (the god) *Snm*',⁵⁶ But there is nothing compelling about these alternative renderings. However, that two forms of the word for 'years' should occur in Ugaritic is not at all surprising, since in Hebrew besides the normal plural *sanim* there also exists a plural construct form *s^enot* (in addition to *s^ene*).⁵⁷ Moreover, in Ugaritic itself, we find the word *r'is* 'head' having three plurals *r'asm*, *r'ast* and *r'ist*. Two points strengthen one's conviction that 'Father of Years' is indeed the correct translation. First, *KTU* 1.108.26-7 (*Ugaritica* V, 2, RS 24.252, rev. 11-12) refers to *lymt. sps. wyrh wn`mt. snt, 'il* 'all the days of Shapash and Yarikh and the most lovely years of El'. Secondly, El is clearly to be regarded as old since there are allusions to his grey hair (CTA 4.V.66; 3.VE.10, 32-3— *KTU* 1.4. V.4; 1.3.V.10, 32-3). Thus, even apart from the epithet 'ab *snm*, there is evidence that El was an aged god. A further point that may be noted is that El is now known to have been called 'judge' (cf. *KTU* 1.108.3a = *Ugaritica* V 2, RS 24.252, line 3a 'il *tpt*, 'El the judge'), just as the Ancient of Days plays the role of judge in Dan. 7.

(ii) Just as the one like a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven, so Baal's stock epithet is *rkb 'rpt* 'Rider of the clouds'

162

(CTA 2.IV.8, 29 = *KTU* 1.2.IV.8, 29, etc.). As Emerton has pointed out,⁵⁸ since elsewhere in the Old Testament it is *always* the deity who manifests himself in the clouds, it is probable that a divine being underlies the one like a son of man.

(iii) The rise to power of the one like a son of man follows the destruction of the sea monsters, especially the fourth one. Although not explicitly stated, we are probably to understand that the one like a son of man himself (under God) defeated the dragon, in view of the fact that the previously mentioned dragon-symbolized empires each in turn (under God) overthrew the one that preceded it. This recalls Baal, whose kingship was assured by defeating the god of the sea

⁵⁴ Cf. M.H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (SVT 2, 1955), p. 33, connecting with one or other of the Arabic roots *snw*, *sny* 'shine, be exalted, eminent, old', or *sanim* 'be tall, prominent'.

⁵⁵ O. Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon* (Berlin, 1951), p. 30. n.4. Cf. Syriac *s^ena* 'to depart'.

⁵⁶ So C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965), p. 492, and 'El, Father of *Snm*', *JNES* 35 (1976), pp. 261-2, On the deities *tkmn* and *snm* and the question of their identity with the Kassite deities *Suqamuna* and *Sumaliya*, see O. Eissfeldt, 'Ugaritisches, 4. *tkmn wsnm*', *ZDMG* 99, n.F. 24 (1945-9), pp. 29-42, and *El im ugaritischen Pantheon* (Berlin, 1951), pp. 66ff.

⁵⁷ Similarly with other expressions of time, *yom* 'day' having construct plurals *y^eme* and *y^embt* and *dor* 'generation' having plurals *dorim* and *dorot*.

⁵⁸ J.A. Emerton, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

Yam (*CTA* 2.IV.32 = *KTU* 1.2.IV.32), and Baal is also credited with defeating the seven-headed sea monster Leviathan (*CTA* 5.I.1-3 = *KTU* 1.5.I.1-3), who appears to have been an associate of Yam (cf. *CTA* 3.IIID.35-9 = *KTU* 1.3.III.38-42). In this connection it is interesting to note that Rev. 12:3, 13:1 and 17:3 actually credit the ten-horned dragon and beast (both reflecting the fourth beast of Dan. 7) with seven heads. There are a number of passages in the Old Testament which allude to God's battle with the sea monster (e.g. Is. 27:1; Job 26:12-13; Ps. 74:13-14, 89:10f., ET 9f.) which have been considered above, and from a number of expressions used (Leviathan, twisting serpent, crooked serpent) it is clear that it is Canaanite mythology rather than, say, the Babylonian myth of Marduk and Tiamat (as Gunkel thought and as some scholars still erroneously suppose) which underlies these Old Testament references (cf. above. Chapter I).⁵⁹ When in Dan. 7 we find God in opposition to sea monsters, we are therefore led to postulate an ultimate Canaanite myth there also.

(iv) No other view accounts so easily for the fact that we have seemingly two divine beings, the Ancient of Days who sits as heavenly judge upon his throne, and the one like a son of man who comes like a god with the clouds of heaven. The one like a son of man is appointed king by the Ancient of Days and acts as his vice-gerent. This accords very well with what we know of the relationship between El and Baal. Thus, *CTA* 6.VI.32ff. (= *KTU* 1.6.VI.32ff.) may actually refer to El's enthronement of Baal as king, but we cannot be certain, as the text is damaged, whilst *CTA* 3.V.43-4 (= *KTU* 1.3.V.43-4) and 4.IV.48 (= *KTU* 1.4.IV.48) 'il

163

mlk. dyknnh may also refer to El's appointment of Baal as king, but it is possible that *mlk* 'king' here alludes to El, not Baal.

Nevertheless, there is clear evidence of El's appointment of gods to their kingship elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts, e.g. in *CTA* 6.I.43ff. (= *KTU* 1.6.I.43ff.). El appoints Athtar as king following the death of Baal, and on another occasion Shapash threatens that El will deprive Athtar of his kingship (*CTA* 2.III.17t = *KTU* 1.2.III.17f) and in *CTA* 6.VI.27ff. (= *KTU* 1.6.VI.27ff.). Shapash threatens Mot that El will deprive Mot of his kingship if he continues fighting Baal. It is therefore likely that Baal's kingship similarly depended ultimately on that of El, as that of the onelike a son of man depended on the Ancient of Days. The complementary nature of the kingship of El and Baal is suggested by *KTU* 1.108.2b-3a (*Ugaritica* V. 2, RS 24.252, lines 2b-3a), where we read 'il *ytb. b`trt 'il tpt. bhd r`y* 'El sits next to Astarte, El the judge next to Hadad the shepherd'.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ See pp. 4-7.

⁶⁰ Cf. A.J. Ferrara and S.B. Parker, 'Seating arrangements at divine banquets', *UF* 4 (1972), pp. 37-9 for a convincing refutation of the translation of this passage (including the previous word *yqr*) by B. Margulis (Margalit) in 'A Ugaritic Psalm (RS 24.252)', *JBL* 89 (1970), pp. 292-304 as 'While the Honor of El sits (enthroned) in Ashtoreth, El rules in Edrei' (cf. Josh. 12:4). In addition to the points made by Ferrara and Parker it should be noted that the fact that Edrei begins with 'but *hd r`y* with *h* tells against

This harmonious association of rulers bears comparison with the statement in Philo of Byblos that 'Astarte the great and Zeus Demarous who is Hadad, king of the gods, reigned over the place with the consent of Kronos' (Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 1.10.31). Such an understanding of the relationship between El and Baal is much more satisfactory than the view that they were in opposition to one another,⁶¹ and has most recently been vigorously defended by C.E. l'Heureux.⁶²

This view of the origin of the imagery of Dan. 7, argued most forcibly by Emerton, has met with a mixed reception. Thus, on the one hand. Cross⁶³ refers to Emerton's article as a 'superb paper',

164

and this view is fully supported by J.J. Collins,⁶⁴ A. Lacocque⁶⁵ and E.W. Nicholson.⁶⁶ On the other hand, a number of scholars, e.g. A.B. Rhodes,⁶⁷ emphasize that the theory is conjectural, and A.J. Ferch⁶⁸ has written an article raising questions against Emerton's viewpoint His points are basically as follows: (i) he notes that the Ugaritic material is complex and ambiguous; (ii) he emphasizes that the resemblances between Dan. 7 and the Ugaritic texts are outweighed by the differences. Thus, (a) on the one hand there are things in the Canaanite myth which are not in Dan. 7 and (b) there are features in Dan. 7 which are not explained by Canaanite mythology. However, I would reply to this that (i) in spite of all uncertainties in the interpretation of the Ugaritic material, the relationship between El and Baal as presupposed by Emerton's article is clear enough. With regard to (ii) it may be argued: (a) it is not surprising that there are elements

Margulis' interpretation.

⁶¹ The view that Baal and El were in opposition to each other, held by such scholars as U. (M.D.) Cassuto, *The Goddess Anath* (E.T, Jerusalem, 1971), pp. 55-7, A.S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen, 1952), pp. 86-93, and M.H. Pope, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-32, is presented in its most extreme form by U. Oldenburg, *The Conflict between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion* (Leiden, 1969).

⁶² C.E. l'Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods El, Ba'al, and the Repha'im* (Missoula, Mt., 1979), pp. 3-108. Similarly, much more briefly, J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan* (SVT 5, 2nd ed., Leiden, 1965), pp. 154-5.

⁶³ F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, p. 345, n. 8.

⁶⁴ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, Mt, 1977), pp.99-101.

⁶⁵ A. Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta, Ga., 1979), p. 129. This is part of a section not in the French, *Le livre de Daniel* (Neuchatel and Paris, 1976), though on p. 108 of the latter (ET pp. 142-3) he notes the probable origin of the Ancient of Days in El.

⁶⁶ E.W. Nicholson, in G.W. Anderson (ed.). *Tradition and Interpretation* (Oxford, 1979). p. 206.

⁶⁷ A.B. Rhodes, 'The Kingdoms of Men and the Kingdom of God: A study of Daniel 7:1-14', *Interpretation* 15 (1961), p. 428.

⁶⁸ A.J. Ferch, 'Daniel 7 and Ugarit: a reconsideration', *JBL* 99 (1980), pp. 75-86.

of the Canaanite myth that are not in Dan. 7, since over one thousand years separate them and the contexts are different, the Ugaritic texts being polytheistic and Dan. 7 monotheistic; (b) Ferch overlooks the fact that Emerton's theory does not claim to explain every detail of Dan. 7 from the Ugaritic myth, but only the most significant underlying theme, for which the parallel is clear enough-

C. Colpe,⁶⁹ whilst offering a number of criticisms, concludes that Emerton's theory accounts for the facts better than any other. However, he misunderstands the theory as it has been presented by Emerton (though not by Rost), for he writes: 'Yet either way, and on all the possible variations, the transfer of dominion from the Ancient of Days to the Son of Man would seem to go back to the wresting of power from an old god by a young one as this was handed down in Canaanite mythology, the rivalry between Baal and El in the Ras Shamra texts being thus far the closest par.'⁷⁰

165

This is clearly a misunderstanding, since in Dan. 7 the one like a son of man does not wrest power from the Ancient of Days. On the contrary, it is the Ancient of Days who appoints the one like a son of man king, and the kingship is transferred rather from the fourth beast to the one like a son of man. Similarly, as noted above, Baal does not wrest power from El, but would rather seem to have been appointed by him. Coipe also expresses doubts about the meaning of 'ab skw as 'Father of Years', but, as has been noted above, this remains the most likely translation, and, in any case, El is clearly represented as being an old man.

A frequently expressed doubt about the theory of an ultimately Canaanite origin of the Son of Man imagery is the long period of time separating the Ugaritic texts (ca. 1350 B.C.) from the time of the composition of the book of Daniel (ca. 165 B.C.). However, this theory does not postulate a direct Canaanite influence on the book of Daniel. Rather, the mythology was handed down in the Jerusalem cult at the Autumn Festival, as has been indicated in Chapter 1. It is commonly accepted by scholars that the theme of the divine conflict with the dragon, with which the kingship of Yahweh was associated, had its *Sitz im Leben* at this festival, even by those who prefer not to speak of it as an Enthronement Festival. Various Old Testament texts show that the myth of God's battle with the dragon was known in Israel as late as the exilic and post-exilic periods, a remarkable example being the passage from Is. 27:1 discussed earlier in this chapter. What is peculiar about the source underlying Dan. 7, unlike these Old Testament texts, is that it preserves a more primitive, Canaanitizing version of the myth in which a distinction is still made between the god who is supreme and the one who is enthroned over the dragon. How

⁶⁹ C. Colpe, *op. cit.*, pp. 415-19.

⁷⁰ C. Colpe, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

are we to account for this phenomenon in Dan. 7? Emerton has conjectured that, at any rate in some parts of the Jerusalem cultus, Yahweh was first identified with Baal, the god who fought the dragon, and subsequently, as Yahweh was identified with El-Elyon, Yahweh-Baal was demoted to the role of an angel, whence the figure of the one like a son of man in Dan. 7. That Yahweh was equated with Baal in certain circles is clear, for example, from Hos. 2:18 (ET 16), where the prophet refers to those who call Yahweh 'my Baal'. In such circles, Yahweh-Baal would presumably have remained inferior to El, like Baal in the Ugaritic texts. The gap in dating that has to be bridged is not therefore between the Ugaritic texts in ca. 1350 B.C. and the book of Daniel in 165 B.C., but the end of the

166

kingdom of Judah in 586 B.C., when we know such syncretistic beliefs existed, and the writing of the book of Daniel in 165 B.C., i.e. just over four centuries.

It is possible that, just as the spread of Christianity has often not totally eliminated some pagan beliefs amongst certain peoples, so the exile did not totally eliminate some pagan beliefs amongst the Jews. An indication of the syncretism that was possible in the post-exilic period is indicated by the Elephantine papyri, where we find Yahweh, or Yahu as he is called, furnished with a consort Anat-Yahu (Anat being Baal's consort in the Ugaritic texts), and worshipped alongside a number of other deities, Herem-Bethel, Ishum-Bethel, and Anat-Bethel.⁷¹ The figure of Yahweh-Baal inferior to Yahweh-El might therefore have lived on as an angelic figure in popular belief amongst some people and this could have been taken up in Dan. 7. On the other hand, it is possible, as J.J. Collins⁷² has argued, that the use of ultimately Canaanite mythological motifs in Dan. 7 is a result of a learned rather than a folk tradition. He points out that we know that Canaanite mythology similar to that of the Ugaritic texts, was available as late as the Roman period from Philo of Byblos, who about the end of the 1st century A.D. translated Sanchuniathon's 'Phoenician history', and that this interest in ancient traditions characterized the Hellenistic age more broadly (cf Berossus) and was the product of learned scribes. In any case, however the mythological imagery reached the author of Daniel, it is clear that for him it had lost its original pagan associations and that it was considered safe to be employed as a vehicle of faith in the time of the crisis posed by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. M. Casey⁷³

⁷¹ See A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1923), 44³ (Anat-Yahu), 7⁷ (Herem-Bethel), 22¹²⁴ (Ishum-Bethel), 22¹²⁵ (Anat-Bethel).

⁷² J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, Mt., 1977), p. 103.

⁷³ M. Casey, *Son of Man. The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London, 1979), p. 37, Admittedly, on p. 232, Emerton's words 'If Dan, vii. 13 does not refer to a divine being, then it is the only exception out of about seventy passages in the O.T.' could lead one to Casey's conclusion, but it is clear from p. 242 that at this late stage Emerton regards the Son of Man as an angel: 'At some stage, the old myth was reinterpreted in terms of the supremacy of Yahwe, who had been identified with both Elyon and

misunderstands Emerton when he claims that the latter maintains that the one like a son of man in Dan, 7 is

167

a second god: rather Emerton is alluding to the prehistory of Dan.7.

The one like a son of man as the angel Michael

I now hope to show that the one like a son of man in Daniel 7 is to be equated with the angel Michael. If this is accepted, the case for the ultimately Canaanite origin of the one like a son of man will be considerably strengthened, for, as will be seen, the angel Michael is himself a figure having his ultimate origin in the same Canaanite mythology. What, then, is the evidence for this view? First, it may be noted that Dan. 7:13 does not actually speak of the Son of Man but rather of one like a son of man. This suggests that the figure is not actually human but rather resembles a human being. Whilst this language is admittedly partly used to set the figure over against the various preceding beasts ('...like a lion', '...like a bear'), the terminology definitely suggests that it is more than this and that an angelic being is in mind, since phrases comparable to this are found elsewhere in Daniel referring to angels, as was first pointed out by Nathaniel Schmidt⁷⁴ in 1900. Thus, in Dan. 8:15 Gabriel is described as 'one having the appearance of a man' and in Dan. 10:16 an angel (possibly Gabriel) is referred to as 'one in the likeness of the sons of men' and again in Dan. 10:18 as 'one having the appearance of a man'. Similarly elsewhere the manlike appearance of angels is alluded to (cf. Dan. 3:25, 9:21, 12:6-7; Gen. 18). In addition, it may be noted that the fact that the one like a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven suggests a heavenly being. Indeed, it suggests a god, but as the writer of Daniel was a monotheist the heavenly figure must be on a lower level, *viz.* an angel.

Before I come to the question of which particular angel is intended, I may note a further piece of evidence suggesting the angelic nature of the one like a son of man. In Dan. 7:18 and throughout the interpretation of the vision, the writer refers to the holy ones of the Most High, the holy ones, or the people of the holy ones of the Most High receiving the kingdom, whereas the vision speaks of the one like a son of man so doing. The one like a son of man must therefore in some way represent these holy ones. But who are they? Here I touch on a controversial matter. Traditionally they have been understood as the faithful Jews who suf-

Baal. Then the Son of Man was degraded to the status of an angel, even though he retained the imagery which was so closely attached to him in tradition.'

⁷⁴ N. Schmidt, 'The Son of Man in the book of Daniel', *JBL* 19 (1900), p. 26.

ferred at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Noth,⁷⁵ however, followed up a suggestion made by Procksch⁷⁶ and Sellin⁷⁷ and argued that the holy ones of the Most High are rather to be understood as angels. In this he has been followed by a number of other scholars including Dequeker,⁷⁸ Barr⁷⁹ and Collins.⁸⁰ I too subscribe to this view. Although at first sight the references might seem to refer to the Jews, careful examination suggests that this is not the case. To begin with, apart from Ps. 34:10 (ET 9), it is clear that the expression 'holy ones' in the plural always alludes to angels in the Old Testament, and this is its usual meaning at Qumran and in other intertestamental literature.⁸¹ It is interesting to note that in one instance, the pro-apocalyptic Zech. 14:5, these angelic holy ones appear at the time of the eschatological divine judgement on the foreign enemy occupying Jerusalem, a context identical to that in which the holy ones appear in Dan. 7.

Furthermore, in Daniel, it may be noted that outside the disputed Dan. 7 (and 8:24), the substantive 'holy ones' clearly refers to the angels (cf. 4:14, ET 17), interestingly mentioned in close connection with 'the Most High'. On this basis, if the meaning

⁷⁵ M. Noth, "Die Heiligen des Hochsten", in *Interpretationes ad Vetus Testamentum pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel septuagenario missae* (Oslo, 1955), pp. 146-61, reprinted in M. Noth, *Gesammelte Studien* (Munich, 1966), pp. 274-90 (ET 'The Holy Ones of the Most High', *The Laws of the Pentateuch and other essays*, Edinburgh, 1966, pp. 215-28.)

⁷⁶ O. Procksch, 'Der Menschensohn als Gottessohn', in *Christentum und Wissenschaft* 3 (1927), pp. 425-43, 473-81.

⁷⁷ E. Sellin, *Alttestamentliche Theologie auf religionsgeschichtlicher Grundlage* (Leipzig, 1933), 1, pp. 129-30; 2, p. 126.

⁷⁸ J. Coppens and L. Dequeker, 'Le fils de l'homme et les Saints du Tres-Haut en Daniel VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Nouveau Testament', *Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia* Ser. 3, Fasc. 23 (1961), pp. 15-54, More recently, Dequeker has defended his thesis against its attackers in 'The "Saints of the Most High" in Qumran and Daniel', *OTS* 18 (1973), pp. 108-87.

⁷⁹ J. Barr, 'Daniel', in H.H. Rowley and M. Black (edd.), *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (London, 1962), p. 598.

⁸⁰ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision.*, pp. 123-52.

⁸¹ Cf. Deut. 33:3; Job 5:1, 15:15; Ps. 16:3, 89:6, 8 (ET 5, 7); Zech. 14:5. C.H.W. Brekelmans, 'The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom', *OTS* 14 (1965), pp. 305-29 and R. Hanhart, 'Die Heiligen des Hochsten', *Hebraische Wortforschung* (SVT 16, 1967), pp. 9&-101, in particular have criticized Dequeker's view that the holy ones in the Qumran literature are normally angels, but Dequeker has more recently convincingly answered these objections and reaffirmed his position in *OTS* 18 (1973), pp. 133-73. G.F. Hasel, 'The identity of "The Saints of the Most High" in Daniel 7', *Biblica* 56 (1975), pp. 173-92 and V. Poythress, 'The Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel VII', *VT* 26 (1976), pp. 208-13, who both argue against the angelic identity of the holy ones, fail to deal with the arguments adduced by Dequeker in his later article.

'angels' makes good sense in Dan. 7, then it ought to be accepted. Now it is often objected that the expressions used in v. 21'... this horn made war with the holy ones, and prevailed over them', and v, 25'...and he shall wear out the holy ones of the Most High' must refer to pious Israelites and not angels, since it is thought strange that angels should suffer.⁸² Even Noth feels compelled to regard the former verse as an interpolation, as does Dequeker, whilst in the latter verse he takes the dubious view that we should translate rather'...and shall *offend* the holy ones of the Most High' as more befitting angels.⁸³ However, I see no grounds at all to consider v. 21 an interpolation or to depart from the natural meaning of v. 25. Both these verses make good sense if the 'holy ones (of the Most High)' refers to angels, for in the very next chapter, Dan. 8:10-13, we similarly find the little horn engaged in what could be termed persecution of, or making war with angels, who are there equated with stars. In v. 10 we read,^t It (i.e. the little horn) grew great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host of the stars it cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them.' V. 12 reads, 'And the host was given over to it together with the continual burnt offering through transgression; and truth was cast down to the ground, and the horn acted and prospered'; moreover, v. 13 refers to two holy ones (clearly angels) speaking. In the vision in the first half of Dan. 8 there is no reference to human beings suffering; rather we hear of angels suffering. Clearly the suffering of the Jews has given rise to the language, but the seer rather takes us behind the scenes to see the repercussions of these events in the heavenly sphere, as he also does in the succeeding chapters, i.e. the war with the angels fighting on the side of the faithful Jews. It is possible that we also have the same idea in Dan. 11 ;36, where we read that Antiochus IV Epiphanes 'will exalt himself and magnify himself above every god ('el) and speak astonishing things against the God of gods', if, as Collins supposes,⁸⁴ this alludes to his

170

exalting himself above Yahweh's heavenly host rather than pagan gods (contrast v. 37). At any rate, this is certainly the case in Dan. 8:10-13 and there is therefore no reason why this should not also be the case in Dan. 7. The only reference to the Jews in Chapter 7 would seem to be the allusion to '*the people* of the holy ones of the Most High' in v. 27. *1* take this to refer to the

⁸² E.g., A. Feuillet, 'Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique', *RB* 60 (1953), p. 194; G.F. Hasel, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-6, 188-9; A.A. di Leila, 'The one in human likeness and the holy ones of the Most High in Daniel 7' *CBQ* 39 (1977), p. 8.

⁸³ Noth seems obliged to reject the traditional translation 'wear out', since this does not seem appropriate for angels. However, in view of the persecution of the host of heaven (angels) in Dan. 8:10-13, the traditional translation is entirely appropriate. Furthermore, it may be noted that Noth's linguistic arguments have been demolished by Hasel, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-6.

⁸⁴ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, Mt. 1977), pp.135-6.

Jews, since the word 'people' is nowhere else found referring to angels, contrary to what Noth supposes,⁸⁵ but suggests rather an earthly nation, i.e. Israel. This is entirely natural, since if the angels on the side of Israel are to receive the kingdom, it is entirely appropriate for the faithful Jews to share in this too. Indeed, the book would offer no word of hope if this were not the case. (Cf. Dan. 12:3, which speaks of the pious Jews in the new age 'shining like the stars', i.e. becoming like angels.) The objection that we cannot have a reference to angels here, since an angelic kingdom is elsewhere unattested in Judaism, is invalid, since we do in fact find this in the Qumran War Scroll 17:7, where we read that God is going 'to raise up the rule (*msrt*) of Michael amongst the angels and the dominion (*mmslt*) of Israel amongst all flesh'.⁸⁶ As will shortly emerge, this, in my opinion, is precisely the meaning of Dan. 7.

After this excursus on the holy ones of the Most High I now return to the question of the identity of the one like a son of man, The purpose of the excursus was to add yet further evidence for the view that the one like a son of man is angelic in nature: if the holy

171

ones of the Most High are angelic, then so should be the one who is represented as symbolizing them, the one like a son of man, though it should be noted that the evidence for the angelic identity of the one like a son of man can stand quite apart from the question of the identity of the holy ones. That a particular angel is intended by the one like a son of man, and that it is not merely a collective symbol of the angels as Coppens thought,⁸⁷ is supported by the fact that the preceding beasts are stated each to represent an individual king as well as a kingdom (Dan. 7:17). That this is in fact the case, and that MT 'kings' is not simply a scribal error for

⁸⁵ Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 150 and 160-1, n. 24 (= *Ges. St.*, pp. 280. 284-5. n. 24, ET pp. 220, 223-4, n. 26), however, maintains that 'am can refer to the 'host' of the angels on the basis of 1QH III, 21-2, where we read *lhitycb bm`md `m cb' qdwsym wlbw' byhd `m `dt nhy smym* which he translates 'To join the garrison of the *host* of the army of the holy ones and to enter into the union of the *host* of the congregation of the heavenly ones (lit. sons of heaven)' but all other translations render 'am as 'im 'with', and rightly so. This is clear from the close parallel in 1QH XI, 13, where we read *wlhitycb bm`md lpnybh `m cb' `d* 'that he may stand in the garrison before you *with* the everlasting host', and where 'am can only be 'im 'with'. This has been pointed out by various scholars, e.g. Brekelmans, *op. cit.* p. 321.

⁸⁶ C.H.W. Brekelmans, 'The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom', *OTS* 14 (1965), pp. 326-9, maintains that the notion of an angelic kingdom is unknown in Judaism, claiming on p. 327 that 1QM 17, 6-8 'deals with the dominion of Michael only and his dominion extends to the gods, i.e. the other angels, whereas the kingdom of Israel extends 'to all flesh'. This, however, would appear to be a false antithesis: since, *ipso facto*, Michael and the angels are superior to Israel, Michael being Israel's guardian angel, it is difficult to see how it can be denied that the rule of Michael and the angels extends over the world.

⁸⁷ *Contra* J. Coppens, 'Le Fils d'Homme danielique, vizir celeste?', *Misceilanees bibliques* 33, *Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia* ser. 4, fasc. 12 (1964), p. 79, who sees the one like a son of man as simply a symbol of the angels, with no particular angelic being in mind. Further arguments in favour of seeing a specific angel, i.e. Michael, as the one like a son of man, will be given below.

'kingdoms',⁸⁸ is borne out by a study of the beasts in question. Thus, just as the first metal of Dan. 2 is specifically stated to denote Nebuchadrezzar (Dan. 2:37-8), so the reference to the first beast in Dan. 7:4 seems to contain an allusion to Nebuchadrezzar and his madness, as a comparison with Dan. 4:13, 30 (ET 16, 33) indicates. The second beast (Dan. 7:5) must have Darius the Mede specifically in mind, since he is the only Median ruler in the author's scheme of things, being immediately followed by Cyrus the Persian (Dan. 6:29, ET 28). Again, the fourth beast (Dan. 7:7-8) has in mind particularly Antiochus IV Epiphanes, indicated by the little horn on whom attention is especially focused. The third beast (Dan. 7:6) denoting Persia ought similarly to have a specific king in mind: although this is conceivably Cyrus, there is no way of being certain.

In the interests of consistency, therefore, the one like a son of man ought similarly to be not merely a collective symbol of the holy ones, as is often thought, but also their specific angelic representative or leader. If so, which particular angel is intended? Z. Zevit has proposed that he is the angel Gabriel, since in Dan. 9:21 there is a reference to 'the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the first', i.e. the vision of Dan. 7. In his first article Zevit⁸⁹ simply maintained that the only heavenly man-like figure in Dan. 7 is the one like a son of man, so that he must therefore be

172

the one to be identified with Gabriel. However, Zevit thereby overlooked the fact that in Dan. 7:16 we read of another angelic being appearing in the vision, one whom Daniel asked to explain its meaning. In a more recent article,⁹⁰ in an attempt, presumably, to take account of this oversight, Zevit has argued that, although we have a reference to another angelic figure in Dan. 7:16, this cannot be equated with 'the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the first' (Dan. 9:21), since the vision of Dan. 7 only extends from vv. 2-15, whilst v. 16 refers to what happens after the vision. This, however, is completely erroneous, since Dan. 7:16 states that Daniel 'approached one of those who stood there', which can only mean one of the angelic beings standing before God in the vision in v. 10. Zevit is therefore incorrect in denying that the figure in v. 16 belongs to the vision and may be identified with Gabriel. Since, moreover, it is Gabriel who elsewhere explains the visions (cf. Dan. 8:15, 9:21), it is more natural to suppose that it is this figure who is to be identified with Gabriel rather than the 'one like a son of man'. Furthermore, as we shall presently see, a considerable body of evidence rather favours the identity of the one like a son of man with another angel.

⁸⁸ The LXX and Theodotion read *basileiai* 'kingdoms', but this probably represents an attempt to bring consistency to the interpretation of the beasts.

⁸⁹ Z. Zevit, 'The structure and individual elements of Daniel 7', *ZAW* 80 (1968), pp. 394-6.

⁹⁰ Z. Zevit, 'The exegetical implications of Daniel viii 1, ix 21', *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 488-92.

Which particular angel is, then, intended by the figure of the one like a son of man? Since he serves as a symbol for the angels as a whole he ought to be their leader, and since he also represents the people of the holy ones of the Most High, i.e. the pious Jews, he ought also to be Israel's patron angel. In view of the important role which he plays we ought also to expect to find allusions to him elsewhere in the book of Daniel. On all these scores the evidence points in the direction of the angel Michael, a view first propounded by Nathaniel Schmidt⁹¹ and more recently taken up by U.B. Müller,⁹² J.J. Collins⁹³ and others.⁹⁴ Thus, first, in Jewish thought

173

Michael is not only Israel's guardian angel but also usually the chief angel. Similarly in Daniel itself we find him referred to as 'your prince' (Dan. 10:21) and 'the great prince who has charge of your people' (Dan. 12:1). Secondly, it is significant that, just as the one like a son of man appears at the time of the demise of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Dan. 7, so in Dan. 12:1 the angel Michael is specifically mentioned as appearing and delivering the people at the time of the overthrow of Antiochus. It is certainly justified to correlate the figure of the one like a son of man of Dan. 7 with the angel Michael in Dan. 12:1, since, even if those are right who maintain that Dan. 2:4b-7:28 and 8-12 come from different authors, the writer of the latter having drawn on an earlier Aramaic source containing the former, the fact remains that the theology and style of the two sections seem identical, and Dan. 8-12 forms a kind of midrash on Dan. 7, so that it may be argued that the overall redactor of the book of Daniel wished to equate the one like a son of man with the angel Michael. Thirdly, it is significant that in Rev. 12 it is the angel Michael who defeats the seven-headed and ten-horned dragon, the ten horns clearly deriving from the fourth beast of Dan. 7. Since in Dan. 7 it is implicitly the one like a son of man who overcomes the fourth beast, and since it is very probable, as various scholars have argued,⁹⁵ that a Jewish source underlies Rev. 12— it is striking, for example, that it is Michael and not Christ who is said

⁹¹ N. Schmidt, 'The "Son of Man" in the book of Daniel', *JBL* 19 (1900), pp. 22-8. Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 63, n. 2, notes a few other scholars early in the century who followed this view.

⁹² U.B. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn im jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, (Gütersloh, 1972), p. 28.

⁹³ J.J. Collins, 'The mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: a point of transition in Jewish apocalyptic', *VT* 25 (1975), p. 602, n. 29, and in *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, Mt., 1977), pp. 144-6.

⁹⁴ A passing reference in J.A. Emerton, *op. cit.*, p. 242 suggests some kind of connection between Michael (and Metatron) and the one like a son of man. Further, it may be noted that B. Lindars, 'Re-enter the apocalyptic Son of Man', *NTS* 22 (1975-6), p. 56, regards the equation of the one like a son of man and Michael as possible, and J.H. Hayes, *An Introduction to Old Testament Study* (Nashville, Tenn., 1979), p. 380, regards it as probable.

⁹⁵ H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 391-7; R.H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John 1* (Edinburgh, 1920), pp. 303ff.; A.Y. Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (Missoula, Mt., 1976), pp. 104-7.

to defeat the dragon— we appear to have here evidence of an underlying Jewish tradition which equated the one like a son of man with Michael. It is possible that further evidence for the equation of the one like a son of man with the angel Michael in sources underlying the Apocalypse is provided by Rev. 10:1ff. and 14:14. In the former passage, we have a description of what is clearly the most important of the seven archangels who appear in Rev. 8: 2ff., and ought therefore to be the angel Michael, yet the description of him 'wrapped in a cloud... his face was like the sun, and his legs like pillars of fire' (Rev. 10:1) recalls the 'one like a son of man... his feet were like

174

burnished bronze... and his face was like the sun shining in full strength' (Rev. 1:13-16), and who customarily comes with the clouds of heaven (cf. Rev, 14:14). This suggests an equation of the angel Michael with the one like a son of man, but since the one like a son of man in Rev, is Christ, it may be argued that the equation pertains to a source underlying the book. Similarly, in Rev. 14:14f. the one like a son of man is alluded to in terms which suggest he is simply another angel (cf. vv. 17-18), and since six other angels appear, the addition of the one like a son of man would make seven, the number of the archangels. Since, however, in the book as it stands, the one like a son of man must be Christ (cf. Rev. 1:13), it is arguable that, as in Rev. 10: 1ff., we have here further attestation of the archangel ological identification of the one like a son of man with the angel Michael in a source underlying the work.

I therefore hold that an extremely strong case can be made for identifying the one like a son of man in Dan. 7 with the angel Michael. To the objection that, if this be so, he should have been directly mentioned by name in Dan. 7⁹⁶ it may be pointed out that it is in the nature of apocalyptic to be allusive, and that neither Antiochus IV Epiphanes nor any of the other kings or kingdoms alluded to in the chapter is directly mentioned by name either.

I come now to that part of the argument which presents new evidence for the ultimate origin of Michael in the figure of the Canaanite god Baal, though more immediately in the figure of Yahweh, with whom in certain circles he was identified, and which consequently strengthens the case for the ultimately Canaanite origin of the one like a son of man argued by Emerton and others, since, if the two figures have an identical origin, it is likely that they are to be equated. Michael, it will be remembered, is Israel's guardian angel In Dan. 10:13 and 21 he is depicted fighting the angelic princes of Persia and Greece. Jewish apocalyptic in fact affirmed that there were seventy angelic princes, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world such as are attested in Gen. 10 (cf. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Deut- 32:8; 1 Enoch 89:59ff., 90:22ff.). Now this concept is derived from the theology which we find in Dcut. 32:8, 'When the Most High

⁹⁶ So M. Casey, *Son of Man* (London, 1979), p, 32; N.W. Porteous, *Daniel* (2nd ed., London, 1979), p. 192.

gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men, he fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God.' As is commonly accepted, this involves reading *b^ene 'el* 'sons of

175

God/EI' with the support of the Qumran fragment 4Q Deut.,⁹⁷ the LXX, Symmachus, Old Latin and the Syro-Hexaplaric manuscript Cambr. Or. 929,⁹⁸ rather than *b^ene yisra'el* 'sons of Israel' with the MT. That the MT is clearly a deliberate alteration of the original Hebrew text by a scribe who did not like the polytheistic overtones of the expression 'sons of EI/God' and not a simple scribal error, as some have supposed,⁹⁹ is shown by the fact that the reference to 'the gods' in Deut. 32:43 has similarly been eliminated from the MT,¹⁰⁰ Now, according to the Ugaritic texts EI (or more precisely his consort Asherah) did in fact have seventy sons (cf. *CTA* 4.VI.46 = *KTU* 1.4.VI.46 *sb`m. bn. 'atrt* the seventy sons of Asherah), thus proving that the ultimate origin of the angelic princes of the nations of Jewish apocalyptic, including those of the book of Daniel, is to be sought in the seventy sons of the Canaanite god EI. As for Michael, the chief of the guardian angels of the nations, he too should be derived from one of the sons of EI, indeed he should be EI's supreme son. This points in the direction of Baal, the chief and most active of the gods under EI, who, as well as being termed 'son of Dagon' (cf. *CTA* 2.I.19, 5.IV.23-4 = *KTU* 1.2.I.19, 1.5.VI.23-4), is also represented as the son of EI in the Ugaritic texts (cf. 3.VE.43. 4.IV.47 = *KTU* 1.3.V.35, 1.4.IV.47).¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Cf. P.W. Skehan, 'A fragment of the "Song of Moses" (Deut. 32) from Qumran', *BASOR* 136 (1954), pp. 12-15. The fragmentary text has *bn^y 'l...*, which could represent *b^ene 'el*, *b^ene 'elim*, or *b^ene 'elohim*.

⁹⁸ On the Cambr. Or. 929 reading (*ml'kwh d'lh*), see M.H. Gottstem, 'Eine Cambridger Syrohexaplahandschrift', *Le Museon* 67 (1954), p. 293; J. Hempel, 'Zu IVQ Deut 32.8', *ZAW* 74 (1962), p. 70.

⁹⁹ Thus, J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, part I. St. Clement of Rome*² (London, 1890), p. 94, followed by *NAB* (cf. *BH3* and *BHS*), held that 'Israel' in Deut. 32:8 has accidentally crept in from the end of the following verse (v. 9), where it is attested in the LXX and Samaritan versions. H.L. Ginsberg, 'A strand in the cord of Hebraic hymnody', *Eretz-Israel* 9 (W.F. Albright volume, Jerusalem, 1969), p. 45, n. 4, held that MT's *yisra'el* arose through a conflation of *b^ene 'el* and an explanatory gloss *sare*.

¹⁰⁰ A.D.H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (London, 1979), p. 385, fails to take account of Deut. 32:43 when he states that in Deut. 32:8 we do not have deliberate alteration of a text whose polytheistic implications were found unacceptable, maintaining that similar allusions elsewhere were not tampered with. Moreover, just because a scribe tampered with Deut. 32:8 and 43 does not require him to have systematically done the same to all the other passages, some of which, e.g. Ps. 82, were more readily capable of being interpreted in other ways (in the case of Ps. 82, of judges).

¹⁰¹ That Baal should be represented as the son of both EI and Dagon is capable of being interpreted in two possible ways: either (i) these represent variant traditions, or (ii) Baal was the son of Dagon in the strict sense, but a son of EI in the sense of being a member of the pantheon which had its ultimate

The angel Michael therefore has his ultimate origin in Baal, but more immediately we should think in terms of Yahweh-Baal and indeed Yahweh, since the writer of Dan. 7 would not have been conscious of the Baalistic origin of the imagery. This is an important new confirmation of Emerton's theory of the ultimately Baalistic, more immediately Yahweh-Baalistic and Yahwistic origin of the Son of Man imagery, since Michael, who appears to be equated with the one like a son of man in the book of Daniel, has been shown to have precisely the same origin as Emerton postulates for the one like a son of man. At the same time, it may be argued, the fact that Michael and the one like a son of man appear to have an identical origin serves to support the view of their equation in the book of Daniel. A further previously unnoted point supporting the ultimately Baalistic origin of the angel Michael may now be pointed out: this is the fact that in Jewish sources Michael is held to be the lord of the winter season and is especially connected with water and snow.¹⁰² This agrees very well with Baal, who likewise was lord of the winter season and brought the rain, and even the snow.¹⁰³

Accordingly, we reject the view of W.C. Graham and H-G. May,¹⁰⁴ followed by M. Hengel¹⁰⁵ and H.O. Thompson.¹⁰⁶ that Michael derives from the Canaanite god Mekal (who was equated with the plague god Resheph), a view which in any case had little to commend it. The name Michael, which means *Who is like God?', is formed on the same analogy as the other angelic names ending in -el, e.g. Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel, etc., and there is no need to seek some other name behind it. However, the name Michael, meaning 'Who is like God?', an expression of the incomparability of the deity¹⁰⁷ (cf. *mi kamokah ba'elim yahweh* 'Who is like you, O Lord, among the gods?' in Ex. 15:11), is consonant with the view maintained here that the figure has its origin in a god, indeed it

origin in El. I prefer the latter suggestion. Perhaps he was son of Dagon and grandson of El (suggestion of Prof. D. Pardee).

¹⁰² E.g., Midrash rabba on Job 25:2, On Michael, cf. W. Lueken, *Michael* (Göttingen, 1898),

¹⁰³ That Baal brought the rain needs no documentation. His bringing of the snow is attested in CTA 4.V.69 = KTU 1.4.V.7, where we read that he should appoint *`dn. tkt. bglt* 'a time for the ship with snow'.

¹⁰⁴ W.C. Graham and H.G. May, *Culture and Conscience* (Chicago, 1936), p. 108.

¹⁰⁵ M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (Tübingen, 1969), p. 344 (ET *Judaism and Hellenism* 1, London, 1974, p. 188).

¹⁰⁶ H.O. Thompson, *Mekal, the God of Beth-Shan* (Leiden, 1970), p. 178.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. C.J. Labuschagne., *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament* (Leiden, 1966).

suggests Yahweh. Such an origin suggests itself likewise for the figure of Metatron, the exalted angel who acts as God's vice-gerent in 3 Enoch and who resembles Michael, for in 3 Enoch 12:5 he is actually called 'the lesser Yahweh'.¹⁰⁸

Summary

In this chapter I have considered the eschatologization of the divine conflict with the dragon and the sea. First of all Is. 27:1 was discussed, and it was concluded that Leviathan is there a term used most probably to denote Egypt, though it might refer to Babylon or Persia. The fact that this passage has such a remarkable parallel in the Ugaritic texts led to an investigation of whether related mythological motifs are attested elsewhere in Is. 24:7. It was concluded that this is indeed the case: the description of the theophany in Is. 24:18b-19, the fading of the luminaries in the face of it in Is. 24:23, the universal banquet of the deity on the sacred mountain in Is. 25:6, and the swallowing up of death in Is. 25:8, all ultimately derive from Baal mythology, as does Is. 27:1.

Detailed attention was then devoted to Dan. 7. Various views of the origin of its imagery were surveyed, and it was concluded that the best theory is that of J.A. Emerton, since it can explain it as an organic whole. This postulates an ultimately Canaanite origin, the Ancient of Days deriving from El, the one like a son of man from Yahweh-Baal, and the sea monsters, especially the fourth one, from Leviathan or Yam. However, this does not explain everything in Dan, 7, The expression 'one like a son of man' is taken over from the description of the divine glory in Ezek. 1:26 as 'a likeness as it were of a human form', whilst the types of the four beasts are derived from Hos. 13:7-8, with some influence from ancient near eastern *Mischwesen*.

With regard to the present meaning of the imagery, it was argued that the one like a son of man is to be equated with the angel Michael, Israel's guardian angel. This was suggested by the use of comparable expressions elsewhere in Daniel to denote angels and by the evidence supporting the equation of the holy ones (symbolized by the one like a son of man) with angels. That a particular angel is intended is supported by the fact that the beasts

178

are similarly interpreted individually as well as corporately in Dan. 7:17, and that the angel is specifically Michael is indicated by the comparable allusion to him in Dan. 12:1. Evidence for the identification of the one like a son of man with Michael amongst the Jews was also deduced from the book of Revelation.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. J.A. Emerton, *op. cit.*, p. 242. Interestingly, Metatron is equated with Enoch in 3 Enoch, just as 1 Enoch 71:14 equates Enoch with the Son of Man.