

## **The “One Like a Son of Man” According to the Old Greek of Daniel 7,13-14**

Studies of the “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7 typically follow the description found in the Aramaic text of Daniel <sup>(1)</sup>. Reference is made to the two Greek versions of Daniel, the Old Greek (OG) and Theodotion (Θ) <sup>(2)</sup>, when their support deviates from the Aramaic or offers some other relevant insight <sup>(3)</sup>. Although it is important to keep in mind the differences between the Aramaic and Greek versions and the reasons for these differences <sup>(4)</sup>, it is also worthwhile to examine the interpretation provided by the OG because the OG is a witness to a specific tradition of Daniel and since in some sense or at some level, every translation is an interpretation <sup>(5)</sup>. Jennifer Dines states:

Even if it is unclear whether a divergence between the LXX and the MT comes from the translator or from his source-text, a difference of interpretation between the two texts has significance. If nothing else, it shows that there were different streams of tradition, and if the LXX witnesses to some elements of interpretation which have not otherwise been preserved in Hebrew [or Aramaic], it is a very important window onto a period of biblical interpretation before the MT emerged as dominant <sup>(6)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> I am grateful for the various comments and questions given by those who heard earlier drafts of this paper at the Society of Biblical Literature Greek Bible Section, 22 November 2007 and the Scottish Conference for Postgraduate Students in Theology and Religious Studies, 8 June 2006.

<sup>(2)</sup> There are only three known witnesses to the OG text of Daniel in existence today: Codex Chisianus 88 (9<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> century CE), a Syriac version translated from the Greek called the Syro-Hexaplar (7<sup>th</sup> century CE), and Papyrus 967 (2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century CE). Only Papyrus 967 is witness to the OG prior to Origen’s reworking of the Greek Old Testament into his Hexapla. See H.B. SWETE, *The Old Testament Text in Greek* (Cambridge 1912) III,xii-xiii (discussion of ms. evidence); A. RAHLFS – R. HANHART, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart 2006); J. ZIEGLER, *Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta 16.2; Göttingen 1954); J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH, *Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta 16.2; Göttingen 1999); T. MCLAY, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SBLSCS 43; Atlanta, GA 1996) 6-7; L.T. STUCKENBRUCK, “One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days” in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?”, *ZNW* 86 (1995) 270. On P<sup>967</sup>, see A. GEISSEN, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel*. Kap. 5-12 zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther 1,1-2,15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967 (PTA 5; Bonn 1968). N. Fernández Marcos (*The Septuagint in Context*. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible [Leiden 2000] 144) and A. Schmitt (“Die griechischen Danieltexte [‘θ’ und ‘o’] und das Theodotionproblem”, *BZ* 36 [1992] 5, n. 14) date P<sup>967</sup> to the second century AD.

<sup>(3)</sup> One possible exception is T.J. Meadowcroft’s work on Daniel 7 (*Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*. A Literary Comparison [JSOTSS 198; Sheffield 1995] 198-244), but the emphasis of his study is on the comparison of the Aramaic and OG and the possible *Vorlage* of the OG.

<sup>(4)</sup> K.H. Jobs and M. Silva list five reasons for differences between the Greek OT and the Masoretic Text (*Invitation to the Septuagint* [Grand Rapids, MI 2000] 92).

<sup>(5)</sup> See M.A. KNIBB, “The Septuagint and Messianism: Problems and Issues”, *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. ID.) (BETL 195; Leuven 2006) 9; JOBES – SILVA, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 86.

<sup>(6)</sup> J.M. DINES, *The Septuagint* (London 2004) 133.

This paper is a study of what is possibly the earliest extant interpretation of the Aramaic text of Daniel 7 and the “one like a son of man”<sup>(7)</sup>. My contention is first that the OG presents the son of man figure as similar to the Ancient of Days, while not identifying the two figures. And second, the OG depicts the “one like a son of man” in a way that suggests that this figure is messianic.

### I. The Similarities between the “one like a son of man” and the Ancient of Days

Four similarities between the “one like a son of man” and the Ancient of Days can be noted in the OG. First, the son of man figure arrives like the Ancient of Days. Second, the “one like a son of man” appears on the clouds of heaven. Third, the Danielic son of man receives service that suggests cultic worship, and fourth, those standing before the Ancient of Days approach the “one like a son of man” and appear to stand before him.

#### 1. The “one like a son of man’s” Arrival like the Ancient of Days

The most commonly noted and most significant verse in the OG of Dan 7 is v. 13, particularly line c. The entire verse reads: “I saw in a vision of the night and behold on the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man. And like the Ancient of Days he arrived, and those standing there came to him.”

Papyrus 967 reads<sup>(8)</sup>:

- 13 a ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὄράματι τῆς νυκτὸς  
 b καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.  
 c καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶ(ν) παρῆν,  
 d καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότεες προσήγαγον αὐτῷ.  
 14 a καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία βασιλική,  
 b καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα λατρεύουσα αὐτῷ  
 c καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἣτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆι,  
 d καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἣτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῆι

Codex 88, supported by the Syro-Hexaplar, reads<sup>(9)</sup>:

- 13 a ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὄράματι τῆς νυκτὸς  
 b καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο,

<sup>(7)</sup> 4Q246 contains some links to Daniel 7, but the fragmentary nature of the Qumran text provides less certainty about whether the “Son of God” figure is an interpretation of the “one like a son of man”. For various views, see J.J. COLLINS, “The *Son of God* Text from Qumran”, *From Jesus to John*. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge (ed. M. DE BOER) (JSNTSS 84; Sheffield 1993) 65-82; J.D.G. DUNN, “‘Son of God’ as ‘Son of Man’ in the Dead Seas Scrolls? A Response to John Collins on 4Q246”, *The Scrolls and the Scriptures*. Qumran Fifty Years After (eds. S.E. PORTER – C.A. EVANS) (JSPSS 26; Sheffield 1997) 198-210; H.-J. FABRY, “Die frühjüdische Apokalyptik als Reaktion auf Fremdherrschaft. Zur Funktion von 4Q246”, *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*. Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. E. GRÄBER) (BZNW 97; Berlin 1999) 84-98.

<sup>(8)</sup> Text of Geissen, *Septuaginta-Text*, 108-110.

<sup>(9)</sup> Text of RAHLFS – HANHART, *Septuaginta*, 913-914.

- c καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρήν,  
 d καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότερες παρήσαν αὐτῶ.  
 14 a καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῶ ἐξουσία,  
 b καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῶ  
 λατρεύουσα  
 c καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ,  
 d καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῆ

The significance of v. 13c is that the “one like a son of man” did not come *to* the Ancient of Days (as in the MT and Θ), but *as* or *like* the Ancient of Days. Scholars have debated how the OG translation came to read ὡς while the MT has ַּו and Θ has ἕως, and many suggestions have been made. Since we are focusing on the OG as a separate tradition and interpretation, we will not spend time in discussion of the reasons for the difference<sup>(10)</sup>. Therefore, the question to be answered is: What does ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν mean in the OG of Daniel 7,13?

Two possible meanings for ὡς in 7,13c were suggested by F.F. Bruce. The word ὡς can either have a temporal referent: “*When* the Ancient of Days came, then those standing there came to him,” or it means the same as the previous ὡς in 7,13b: “he came *as* the Ancient of Days”<sup>(11)</sup>. One of the major difficulties with the temporal meaning is that it would require a different meaning of ὡς in the previous line. While this is not impossible, the chiastic (P<sup>967</sup>) and the synonymous structure (Codex 88) of the two lines indicate that both uses of ὡς should be taken to mean “as” or “like”<sup>(12)</sup>.

P<sup>967</sup>:

- 13 b2 ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου,  
 13 c καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶ(ν) παρήν,

<sup>(10)</sup> J.A. Montgomery (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [ICC; Edinburgh 1927] 304) suggested that the use of ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν was a scribal error for ἕως. In his critical edition, Ziegler corrected the OG from ὡς to ἕως thinking that ὡς was a scribal error (*Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco*, 170; also in the second edition, Ziegler and Munnich, *Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco*, 338). As is often mentioned, Ziegler did not have the benefit of Papyrus 967 when his edition was published (see J. LUST, “Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint”, *ETL* 54 [1978] 62), but Sharon Pace Jeansonne who had access to the full text of Papyrus 967 relies on Ziegler’s emended text and does not mention Papyrus 967 in her discussion of Dan 7,13. She also concludes that ὡς was a scribal error, which caused παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν to be “hyper-corrected” to παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν (*The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* [Washington, DC 1988] 96-99; also A. YARBRO COLLINS, “The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation”, *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* [ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH] [Minneapolis, MN 1992] 536-568). Other suggestions for the existence of ὡς in the OG witnesses include a purposeful change by the translator for theological reasons, often referred to as “theological Tendenz” (F.F. BRUCE, “The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel”, *OTS* 20 [1977] 25; STUCKENBRUCK, “One Like a Son of Man”, 276. Cf. A.F. SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* [SJLA 25; Leiden 1977] 202; “‘Two Powers in Heaven’ and Early Christian Trinitarian Thinking”, *Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity* [eds. S.T. DAVIS et al.] [New York 1999] 73-95), or that the OG is an accurate translation of its Vorlage (LUST, “Daniel 7,13”, 66; see also MEADOWCROFT, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 26).

<sup>(11)</sup> BRUCE, “Oldest Greek Version”, 25.

<sup>(12)</sup> Lust (“Daniel 7,13”, 65) rules out the temporal option because he says ὡς is never used temporally in a visionary context within Daniel or in the visions of Ezekiel.

Codex 88:

13 b2 ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο,  
13 c καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν.<sup>(13)</sup>

Recently, Otfried Hofius has argued that the “one like a son of man” does not come as the Ancient of Days but that the Ancient of Days is the subject of v. 13c. He states: “Wie in V. 13b der Ausdruck ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου das Subjekt zu ἦρχετο ist, so in V. 13c der Ausdruck ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν das Subjekt zu παρῆν”<sup>(14)</sup>. Hofius has correctly recognized the similar structure between 7,13b and 7,13c, but his interpretation implies the existence of two figures in 7,13 rather than the view taken by most scholars which only sees one figure. Hofius understands this second figure in 7,13c to be the Ancient of Days who is mentioned in 7,9-10<sup>(15)</sup>.

Hofius’ view faces difficulties at four points. First, the verb *παρῆν* in 7,13c cannot merely be translated ‘to be present’ as Hofius does<sup>(16)</sup>. The verb more often carries the meaning ‘to have come’ or ‘to be present’ with a sense of arrival<sup>(17)</sup>. Secondly, a difference exists between the absolute use of *παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν* in 7,9-10 and its descriptive use in the phrase *ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν* in 7,13. The reference to the Ancient of Days in 7,13 is not to the Ancient of Days himself, but rather *ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν* is used as a description of the “one like a son of man”<sup>(18)</sup>. Thirdly, *unlike* Θ and Aramaic Daniel, the pronoun in OG Dan 7,13d (αὐτῷ) refers back to the son of man figure and not to the Ancient of Days<sup>(19)</sup>.

The fourth difficulty with Hofius’ position highlights the similarity between the “one like a son of man” and the Ancient of Days. The grammatical structure of the phrase *ὡς...καὶ ὡς...*<sup>(20)</sup>, which is found here in OG Dan 7,13, typically indicates a parallelism. A subject or a verbal action is described as like one thing and like another. Even if different verbs are used in each of the *ὡς* clauses, as we find in OG Dan 7,13, a parallelism still exists. The subject of each clause is assumed to be the same unless it is clearly stated otherwise and the nouns in the *ὡς* clauses do not function as the subjects of clauses<sup>(21)</sup>.

Joel 2,7 – ὡς μαχηταὶ δραμοῦνται καὶ ὡς ἄνδρες πολεμιστὰι  
ἀναβήσονται ἐπὶ τὰ τεῖχη  
Isa 38,14 – ὡς χελιδὼν οὕτως φωνήσω καὶ ὡς περιστέρα οὕτως  
μελετήσω

<sup>(13)</sup> The underlining notes the change of position in the verbs creating a chiasmic structure in P<sup>967</sup> and a synonymous structure in Codex 88.

<sup>(14)</sup> O. HOFIUS, “Der Septuaginta-Text von Daniel 7,13-14”, ZAW 117 (2005) 84-85.

<sup>(15)</sup> HOFIUS, “Septuaginta-Text”, 86.

<sup>(16)</sup> HOFIUS, “Septuaginta-Text”, 86, esp. n. 67.

<sup>(17)</sup> See for example Num 22,20; Judg<sup>A</sup> 19,3; 2 Sam 5,23; 13,35; 15,18; Ezra 6,3; Esth 9,1; Job 1,7; 2,2; Prov 1,27; Isa 58,9; 1 Macc 12,65.

<sup>(18)</sup> See KIM, *Son of Man*, 23-24.

<sup>(19)</sup> KIM, *Son of Man*, 23. Cf. HOFIUS, “Septuaginta-Text”, 87.

<sup>(20)</sup> By ‘ὡς...καὶ ὡς...’, I am referring to passages in which *ὡς* is used more than once in close succession and separated by a *καὶ*.

<sup>(21)</sup> I could find no instance in the OT, Apocrypha, or the NT of a *ὡς...καὶ ὡς...* construction in which *ὡς* and the noun following it served as the subject of the phrase.

Ezek 38,9 – καὶ ἀναβήσῃ ὡς ὑετὸς καὶ ἦξεις ὡς νεφέλη κατακαλύψαι γῆν  
 Sir 24,15 – ὡς κιννάμωνον καὶ ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωμάτων δέδωκα ὀσμὴν καὶ ὡς σμύρνα ἐκλεκτὴ διέδωκα εὐωδίαν<sup>(22)</sup>.

With respect to OG Dan 7,13, this means that ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου and ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν are being used in the same sort of parallel structure. Both phrases are descriptions of the figure that Daniel sees in his vision of the night coming with the clouds of heaven. The figure who comes with the clouds like a son of man also arrives like the Ancient of Days<sup>(23)</sup>.

Thus, the OG witnesses refer to the “one like a son of man” as similar to the Ancient of Days, but this similarity does not mean that the “one like a son of man” is the same being as the Ancient of Days in 7,9-10<sup>(24)</sup>. But, as with the Aramaic text of Daniel, the OG also presents the “one like a son of man” and the Ancient of Days as two distinct figures. Evidence for this is seen in the giving of authority to the “one like a son of man”<sup>(25)</sup>. Who else is capable of giving the son of man figure authority other than the Ancient of Days? However, although the “one like a son of man” is portrayed as distinct from the figure of the Ancient of Days in 7,9-10, the OG closely aligns the Ancient of Days and the “one like a son of man” by describing the “one like a son of man” as ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν in 7,13c.

## 2. The “one like a son of man’s” Appearance on the Clouds

The second aspect that indicates similarity between the Ancient of Days and the “one like a son of man” is the son of man figure’s appearance on the clouds of heaven. In 7,13b, the OG states that the son of man figure came ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The MT uses the preposition עַל to indicate the son of man figure’s position in relation to the clouds. Θ translates עַל with μετὰ. Some scholars have attempted to argue that the use of ἐπὶ by the OG implies a divine status of the “one like a son of man” since that figure appeared “on” the clouds of heaven rather than “with” the clouds of heaven<sup>(26)</sup>. However, this much weight cannot be placed on the prepositions alone<sup>(27)</sup> especially since the meaning of prepositions is often fluid even within a language. Examples of the fluidity of Greek preposition use can be seen in the references to Dan 7,13 in the NT.

<sup>(22)</sup> See also: Num 23,24; Deut 32,2; 2 Sam 22,43//Ps 17,45; Pss 77,52; 81,7; 88,37, 38; Prov 2,4; Hos. 2,5; 9,10; Nah 1,10; Isa 1,9 (cf. Rom 9,29); Wis 3,6; Sir 15,2; 28,23; 39,22; 47,18.

<sup>(23)</sup> For a more in depth discussion of the difficulties with Hofius’ argument, see B.E. REYNOLDS, “Another Suggestion for ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν in the Old Greek of Daniel 7:13”, *Henoch*, 30 (2008) 94-103.

<sup>(24)</sup> Lust (“Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint”, 68) states: “...in the Septuagint, the ‘Son of Man’ and the ‘Ancient of Days’ are the same.” Cf. M. HENGEL, “‘Sit at My Right Hand!’ The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1”, (ID.), *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh 1995) 184.

<sup>(25)</sup> STUCKENBRUCK, “One Like a Son of Man”, 275.

<sup>(26)</sup> LUST, “Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint”, 68; MEADOWCROFT, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 228.

<sup>(27)</sup> See S.P. JEANSONNE, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12*, 112.

ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν – Matt 24,30; 26,64  
 ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην – Rev 14,14  
 μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν – Mark 14,62; Rev 1,7 (but ἐπὶ in some Rev mss.)  
 ἐν νεφέλαις – Mark 13,26  
 ἐν νεφέλῃ – Luke 21,27

Therefore, it seems unwise to use the prepositions in Dan 7,13 to argue for or against the “one like a son of man’s” similarity with the Ancient of Days. The important point is the figure’s appearance on the visionary stage in the presence of clouds. His position, whether he is on the clouds or with them (or even in them), provides insufficient evidence for determining the nature or identity of this figure.

Rather, the significance is in the reference to clouds. Clouds, in the OT commonly indicate the appearance of YHWH<sup>(28)</sup>. God’s presence in the tabernacle and in the temple is signified by the presence of a cloud (Exod 40,34-35; 1 Kgs 8,10-11; 2 Chron 5,13-14). The pillar of cloud also indicates the Lord’s presence (Exod 13,21-22; 14,19). In Deut 5,22, the Lord’s presence on Sinai is connected with fire, cloud, gloom, and darkness. Jer 4,13 speaks of God’s chariot as closely related to the clouds (cf. Ezek 1,4,28), and Ps 97,2 highlights the relationship between clouds, fire, and God’s throne (cf. Ps 18,11). Even the coming of the Lord in judgment on the Day of the Lord is correlated with clouds (Joel 2,2; Nah 1,3; Zeph 1,14).

Other references to clouds in the OT do not connote the appearance of any other being. They refer to clouds in the sky (Gen 9,13; Job 7,9; 37,11), a cloud of incense (Ezek 8,11), mist that quickly passes away, and to coming judgment (Hos 6,4; 13,3).

No other being, including angels, appears with clouds in the OT. Thus, the “one like a son of man’s” coming with the presence of clouds implies the figure’s similarity with the Lord and most likely indicates a heavenly being greater than the angels<sup>(29)</sup>.

### 3. The “one like a son of man” and Cultic Worship

The third similarity to be noted is the word used for service in the OG, which communicates that the service the “one like a son of man” receives is of the nature of cultic worship. After the “one like a son of man” is given authority, v. 14 says that the nations of the earth will serve him. What is significant about v. 14 for the OG translation is the use of the word λατρεύω. In the Greek OT, this word carries the connotation of service within the

<sup>(28)</sup> A. FEUILLET, “Le Fils de l’homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique”, *RB* 60 (1953) 187-189. See also W. BITTNER, “Gott-Menschensohn-Davidsohn. Eine Untersuchung zur Traditionsgeschichte von Daniel 7,13f.”, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 35 (1985) 349-351. Cf. M. BLACK, “Die Apotheose Israels: eine neue Interpretation des danielischen „Menschensohns“”, *Jesus und der Menschensohn*. Für Anton Vögtle (eds. R. PESCH – R. SCHNACKENBURG) (Freiburg 1975) 97.

<sup>(29)</sup> Cf. LACOCQUE, *Daniel*, 137; C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Son of Man. Vision and Interpretation* (WUNT 38; Göttingen 1986) 71-72; C. ROWLAND, *Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London, 1982), 181-182. Caragounis (*Son of Man*, 74) states that the clouds create a “serious obstacle” for equating the one like a son of man with the holy ones and that “clouds are bearers of the divine presence.”

context of religious duties or cultic practice<sup>(30)</sup>. This can be seen especially in Exodus and Deuteronomy<sup>(31)</sup>. For example, in Exod 3,12, the sign given to Moses at the burning bush is that once the Lord has brought his people out of Egypt, they will worship (λατρεύσετε) him on that mountain. In Daniel, the word λατρεύω is connected with cultic worship and is used nine times<sup>(32)</sup>. The first three (3,12.14.18) refer to the worship of the statue Nebuchadnezzar set up. The next five refer to the worship of God by Daniel or his friends, and the final use is in reference to the “one like a son of man” in 7,14<sup>(33)</sup>. In the NT, service in worship is clearly the meaning of λατρεύω<sup>(34)</sup>.

By using the word λατρεύω to refer to the service given to the “one like a son of man”, the OG may be indicating that the “one like a son of man” will receive worship that is similar to the cultic worship given to God elsewhere in Daniel. The implication of Dan 7,13-14 in the OG is that this figure that looks like a human is something more than human.

#### 4. The “one like a son of man” and “the Standing Ones”

Fourth, those standing before the Ancient of Days in v. 10 approach the “one like a son of man” in v. 13d and appear to stand before him creating a further similarity with the Ancient of Days. For 7,13d, Papyrus 967 reads: καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτῷ, while Codex 88 has καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ. The οἱ παρεστηκότες (“the ones standing” or “the bystanders”) refer to the heavenly multitude of v. 10 that stands before the Ancient of Days. This is highlighted by the use of the verb παρίστημι in vv. 10 and 13<sup>(35)</sup>.

Reference to the standing ones in v. 13d by both Papyrus 967 and Codex 88 indicates that these standing ones approached (προσήγαγον) or came (παρήσαν) to him (αὐτῷ), i.e. they approached the “one like a son of man”. In the Aramaic text and Θ on the other hand, the standing ones present the “one like a son of man” to the Ancient of Days. In the OG, the approach of the οἱ

<sup>(30)</sup> J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Part II K-Ω (Stuttgart 1996). In classical Greek, the word referred to a broader semantic range of service. Cf. LIDDELL – SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1940 [1966]).

<sup>(31)</sup> Exod 3,12; 4,23; 7,16.26; 8,16; 9,1.13; 10,3.7.8.24.26; 20,5; 23,24.25; Deut 4,19.28; 6,13; 7,4.16; 8,19; 10,12.20; 11,13.16.28; 12,2; etc.

<sup>(32)</sup> Dan 3,12.14.18.95; 6,17.21.27; 7,14. Meadowcroft (*Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 229) says λατρεύω is “preserved for dealings with the divine”.

<sup>(33)</sup> The use of λατρεύω in the OG is largely consistent with the Aramaic Daniel’s word פלש which also is used of service to deity in Daniel (Dan 3,12.14.18.28; 6,17.21.27; 7,14). On the other hand, Θ has δουλεύω, the common word for service. There are two occasions where the OG does not use λατρεύω where Aramaic Daniel has פלש – 3,17 (φοβέω) and 7,27 (ὑποτάσσω), and one occasion where the OG uses λατρεύω and the Aramaic text does not have פלש – 6,27 (לדד). OG Dan 4,37 is a plus, which contains λατρεύω.

<sup>(34)</sup> K.H. JOBES, “Distinguishing the Meaning of Greek Verbs in the Semantic Domain for Worship”, M. SILVA, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*. An Introduction to Lexical Semantics (Grand Rapids, MI 1994) 201-211.

<sup>(35)</sup> Ziegler emended the text based on a marginal reading in the Syro-Hexaplar to read: καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτόν (ZIEGLER, *Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco*, 170. Cf. LUST, “Daniel 7,13”, 63). In Ziegler’s emendation, the accusative pronoun suggests that those standing there presented the “one like a son of man”. This is similar to the Aramaic text’s וקדמוהוּ דקרבוהוּ (“and they presented him before him”). Ralphs and Hanhart (*Septuaginta*, 914) and Ziegler and Munnich (*Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco*, 338) follow the text of Codex 88 (καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ).

παρεστηκότες to the “one like a son of man” infers another similarity between the “one like a son of man” and the Ancient of Days<sup>(36)</sup>. In v. 10, the Ancient of Days is surrounded by the great multitude standing before the throne. When the “one like a son of man” arrives, the great multitude approaches this figure. Their approach to the “one like a son of man” shows similarity with their position before the Ancient of Days, and it suggests that the son of man figure has a status similar to that held by the Ancient of Days in relation to the standing ones. This portrayal implies both the “one like a son of man’s” exalted state before the οἱ παρεστηκότες and therefore his similarity to the Ancient of Days, but the OG does so without going so far as to claim identity with the Ancient of Days.

Thus, the OG of Dan 7,13-14 depicts the “one like a son of man” as similar to the Ancient of Days in four ways. (1) The son of man figure arrives like the Ancient of Days. (2) He appears on the clouds of heaven, (3) receives service that suggests cultic worship given to God, and (4) is approached by those who stood before the Ancient of Days.

## II. The Messianic Characteristics of the “one like a son of man”

Now, while in the OG the Ancient of Days and the son of man figure do share these similarities and the son of man figure seems to be a heavenly figure, there are also indications that this figure has messianic characteristics<sup>(37)</sup>. The first messianic characteristic in the OG is that the “one like a son of man” receives kingly authority. Second, he receives an eternal kingdom, and, third, a distinction is made between the “one like a son of man” and the holy ones of the Most High.

### 1. The “one like a son of man’s” Kingly Authority

The first and most significant messianic characteristic is the fact that in the OG the “one like a son of man” receives kingly authority. The OG has a different list of things given to the “one like a son of man” than the Aramaic text. Whereas Aramaic Daniel and Θ speak of the son of man figure being given dominion, honor, and a kingdom (Aramaic: מלכו, יקר, שׁלטן; Θ: ἀρχή, τιμή, βασιλεία); the OG says that he was only given authority. Interestingly, Papyrus 967 refers to it as ἐξουσία βασιλική (“kingly authority” or “royal authority”)<sup>(38)</sup>. In Codex 88 and the Syro-Hexaplar version, the word ἐξουσία is followed by a hexaplaric mark and the words καὶ τιμὴ βασιλική (“kingly authority and honor”)<sup>(39)</sup>. The OG thus indicates that what is given to the “one

<sup>(36)</sup> KIM, *Son of Man*, 24.

<sup>(37)</sup> I am using the word ‘messianic’ in line with J. Lust’s definition of Messianism (*Messianism and the Septuagint*. Collected Essays [ed. K. HAUSPIE] [Leuven 2004] 142): “Messianism can tentatively be defined as 1. the expectation of a future human and yet transcendent savior or saviour, 2. who will establish God’s kingdom on earth, 3. in an eschatological era. In a narrower sense, the expected savior is a descendant of David.”

<sup>(38)</sup> GEISSEN, *Septuaginta-Text*, 108.

<sup>(39)</sup> GEISSEN, *Septuaginta-Text*, 108-109; ZIEGLER - MUNNICH, *Susanna-Daniel-Bel et Draco*, 338. See HOFIUS, “Septuaginta-Text”, 79, n. 27; and KIM, *Son of Man*, 23, n. 38. This appears to be an attempt to bring the OG in line with the Aramaic version.

like a son of man” has to do with kingship and for that reason hints at a possible messianic interpretation of this heavenly figure<sup>(40)</sup>.

When viewed in relation to the portrait of the Davidic Messiah in Pss. Sol. 17, this implication becomes more convincing.

Pss. Sol. 17,21: “See, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David, to rule over your servant Israel in the time which is known to you, o God.”

Pss. Sol. 17,32: “And he will be a righteous king over them, taught by God. And in his days, unrighteousness will not be among them, for all will be holy, and their king will be the Lord Messiah.”

### 2. *The Reception of an Eternal Kingdom*

Further evidence of the son of man figure’s messianic characteristics can be seen in his receiving of an eternal kingdom. In OG Dan 7,14 (also Aramaic Daniel and Θ), the “kingly authority” which the “one like a son of man” receives is said to be eternal authority that will not pass away (καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ). The next line states that the son of man figure’s kingdom will not be destroyed (καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρή). While the “one like a son of man” is not explicitly said to receive an eternal kingdom, the mention of authority and a kingdom that will not pass away are highly suggestive of an eternal messianic kingdom.

In 2 Sam 7,12-13, God promised David that he would establish one of his offspring, and that the throne of this figure’s kingdom would last forever. 4QFlor 10-12 interprets this promise as referring to the kingdom of the Branch of David, or the Messiah:

“And YHWH declares to you that he will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after you and *establish the throne of his kingdom forever*. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me. This (refers to the) ‘branch of David’, who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who will rise up in Zion in the last days, as it is written: ‘I will raise up the hut of David which has fallen’”<sup>(41)</sup>.

Thus, the son of man’s receiving of an eternal kingdom, coupled with the kingly authority he receives, strongly implies that the OG portrays this figure with messianic undertones.

### 3. *The “one like a son of man” and the Holy Ones of the Most High*

Thirdly, a distinction is made between the “one like a son of man” and the holy ones of the Most High which suggests that in the OG the “one like a son of man” is a representative ruler of the holy ones rather than merely a symbol for them. Those who argue that the “one like a son of man” is a symbol of the holy ones do so for a few of reasons. First, the primary reason is that the “one like a

<sup>(40)</sup> See KIM, *Son of Man*, 25, who says that these phrases “could suggest an identification of the heavenly figure in v. 13 with the messiah.”

<sup>(41)</sup> Translation from F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. The Qumran Texts in English (Leiden - Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 136.

son of man” is not mentioned in the interpretation of the dream while the holy ones are not mentioned in the dream. Secondly, both the son of man figure and the holy ones are given a kingdom (v. 14; v. 27), and thirdly, the reception of both kingdoms follows the judgment of the fourth beast both in the dream and its interpretation (vv. 11-12; v. 26). These factors lead some to see a one-to-one correlation between the “one like a son of man” and the holy ones<sup>(42)</sup>.

However, this line of argument is based upon the reading of Aramaic Daniel and does not hold up in an examination of the OG text of Dan 7,13-14. In the OG, an explicit distinction is made between the “one like a son of man” and the holy ones in that the holy ones are mentioned in the midst of Daniel’s vision prior to the appearance of the “one like a son of man”. In the description of the eleventh horn in 7,8, the OG contains the phrase: καὶ ἐποίει πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους. This phrase is absent in 7,8 of Aramaic Daniel and Θ. Its use in OG Dan 7,8 indicates that the holy ones and the “one like a son of man” are separate characters in the dream, and it therefore calls into question the symbolic interpretation, since the main argument for symbolically equating the holy ones with the “one like a son of man” is that the son of man figure appears in the dream and the holy ones in the interpretation. Thus, the appearance of the “one like a son of man” with his kingly authority and eternal kingdom after the mention of war being made against the holy ones may suggest that in the OG this figure functions as a representative ruler of the holy ones.

### III. Conclusion

Examining the portrait of the “one like a son of man” in the OG has indicated some unique characteristics of the son of man figure. This figure is more closely aligned with the Ancient of Days. He is described as having arrived like the Ancient of Days, appearing with the clouds, receiving service due a divine figure, and having those standing before the Ancient of Days approach him. While the “one like a son of man” is similar to the Ancient of Days, there is no indication of equivalency or identification. In fact the giving of authority to the “one like a son of man” implies that the son of man figure’s status is different from that of the Ancient of Days.

The OG portrait of the son of man figure also suggests that the “one like a son of man” has a messianic nature. This is most clearly seen in the kingly authority that the figure receives. Other indications include his kingdom that will not pass away and his distinction from the holy ones of the Most High.

It is possible, then, that the interpretation of the “one like a son of man” in the OG may have provided a basis for the more openly messianic and heavenly interpretations of this figure that are found in later Jewish apocalyptic literature such as the Similitudes of Enoch and *4 Ezra*.

University of Aberdeen  
King’s College  
Aberdeen AB24 3UB-UK

Benjamin E. REYNOLDS

<sup>(42)</sup> CASEY, *Son of Man*, 24-25; A.A. DI LELLA, “The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7”, *CBQ* 39 (1977) 11.

## SUMMARY

While studies of the Old Greek (OG) of Daniel 7,13-14 are not uncommon, they are often undertaken as part of a broader examination of the “one like a son of man”. Rarely, if ever, do these studies focus on the description of this figure in the OG version and what readers of this version might have understood of this character. This study is an examination of the interpretation of OG Daniel 7,13-14, and the argument is made that the OG portrays the “one like a son of man” as similar to the Ancient of Days and as a messianic figure.