



The "Son of Man" of Daniel 7:13 f.: A New Interpretation

Author(s): Julian Morgenstern

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 80, No. 1 (Mar., 1961), pp. 65-77

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3264567>

Accessed: 01/05/2009 14:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE "SON OF MAN" OF DANIEL 7 13 f.

A NEW INTERPRETATION

JULIAN MORGENSTERN

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

ALMOST no problem of biblical science has challenged scholars more than that of the correct interpretation of Dan 7 13 f., and especially of the figure of the "son of man" therein. The interpretation most generally accepted today is that this "son of man" symbolizes the Jewish people;¹ but this interpretation is regarded by most biblical scholars, even those who do approve it, as largely hypothetical, since definitive evidence in support of it, or of any other interpretation of the passage and of the figure in it, seems to be totally lacking. This interpretation represents, of course, a complete rejection of the eschatological interpretation current in Jewish pseudepigraphic writings of the late second and the first centuries B.C., particularly in I Enoch and IV Ezra, and likewise in the NT, that the "son of man" is the Messiah.

Furthermore, some scholars, for the most part of the preceding generation, claim to have discerned in this figure of the "son of man," as he is portrayed in these two verses — as one in human form, coming with the clouds of heaven into the presence of "the Ancient of Days," the supreme lord of the universe, and from him receiving world-wide and everlasting dominion, glory, and kingship — mythological elements, derived in all likelihood from non-Jewish sources. Both Gunkel² and Zimmern³ maintain quite strongly that elements of Babylonian Marduk mythology are basic to, or at least are present in, the picture here.

One important fact may be noted at the very outset of this investigation, viz., that these two vss. are not only not at all integral in the narrative recorded in the chapter, but are even somewhat disturbing, and are therefore in all likelihood an interpolation. Certainly they interrupt the natural unfolding of the main theme of this chapter, the vision of the four beasts. The vision itself is presented in seemingly complete form in vss.

¹ Cf. the remarkably thorough, complete, and scientifically invaluable survey of all the modern literature dealing with this problem and evaluation of the various proposed solutions by Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord*, pp. 3-88, and in addition Muilenberg, "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," *JBL*, 79 (1960), pp. 197-209.

² *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, pp. 305, 307 f. n. 3.

³ *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (3rd ed.), p. 390.

1-12, while 15-28 follow naturally and immediately upon vs. 12 and interpret the vision in all its details. As they stand here, vss. 13 f. seem to record what logically would be the final and climactic action in the vision. But if this incident recorded in these two vss. were a primary and integral part of the vision, we should certainly expect to find some specific reference to it and probably also some interpretation of it clearly set forth at the end of vss. 15-28; but of this there is not a single word. Vss. 15-28 are completely silent with regard to the theme of vss. 13 f. Moreover, they leave the distinct impression that nothing is missing there. Furthermore, a certain basic contradiction seems to exist between vss. 13 f. and the vision proper; for in the latter vs. 27 tells that, following the condemnation and execution of the fourth beast by the court, presided over apparently by "the Ancient of Days," kingship, dominion, and greatness were given to the people of "the saints of the Most High," i. e., to the Jewish people, to be held by it forever; whereas vs. 14 tells that dominion, glory, and kingship were given to the "son of man," who had just come, with the clouds of heaven, into the presence of "the Ancient of Days." It is largely upon the basis of these parallel statements in vss. 14 and 27 that modern scholars have identified the "son of man" here with the Jewish people. But had this been the true import of these two verses, we could certainly have expected at the very least some statement in connection with vs. 27 to the effect that the "son of man" was, or symbolized, the Jewish people. But there is no word to this effect, nor even the slightest suggestion, anywhere in the entire chapter. And furthermore, had this been the actual message of this vision, with vss. 13 f. regarded as an integral part thereof, the question would immediately arise, what the import is of thus representing the Jewish people as a "son of man," coming on the clouds of heaven into the presence of "the Ancient of Days," i. e., into the divine presence. And to this very natural and proper question no answer suggests itself.

Other important considerations enforce this question. As is recognized by practically all modern scholars, *בר אנוש* in vs. 13 is not yet a name or title, as it has become in I Enoch and IV Ezra and in the NT, but is merely a common Aramaic expression, the equivalent of the biblical Hebrew *בן־אדם*. In fact in biblical Hebrew itself *בן־אדם* is a complete synonym of *אנוש*. Both words have the connotation "man, human being," and particularly man in his nature as a mortal being and also as compared with the gods in various respects, but particularly in this quality of human mortality as contrasted with divine immortality.⁴ What vs. 13 says then is, very plainly, "And behold, with the clouds of heaven came one like a human being, and to 'the Ancient of Days' he approached and to him he was brought near." But the very fact that the verse does not

⁴ Cf. Num. 23 19; Isa 51 12; Ps 8 5; Job 25 6.

call him directly a man or a human being, but says explicitly that he was "like a human being," impliedly in appearance, and the added fact that he comes "on the clouds of heaven" tell us unmistakably that this was not a man at all, not a human being, but rather that he was a divine being, a god, who had, however, the appearance of a human being, of a man. Furthermore, since vs. 14 tells that to this "one like a human being" universal and eternal kingship was given, it follows that he must have been a regal figure, a divine king of some kind. Is it possible to identify this figure, this divine king, who had human form, and with him perhaps to identify also "the Ancient of Days," the supreme god, as he seems to be, who sat enthroned in a garment white as snow and with the hair of his head like pure wool — in other words, even as his name or title implies, a god very old in duration of days, and whose throne was of flaming fire?⁵

In a study recently published⁶ I have discussed in some detail the religion of Tyre as it was transformed by Hiram, king of Tyre, at about the beginning of the tenth century B.C., in response to rapidly and radically changing economic, social, and political circumstances, from a religion conforming in all its essential features to the customary West Semitic type of agricultural religion to a characteristic Semitic solar religion. This was in certain aspects decidedly similar to Babylonian solar religion, in which Marduk was the supreme god; but in certain other aspects it differed significantly therefrom and took on a distinctly Tyrian aspect.

The supreme deity of this Tyrian religion — in fact, so it seems, the only deity of any real consequence therein — was the deified sun in its annual course through the heavens. He was represented as a vividly personal deity, a deity composite in character, existing in two reciprocal phases of being. The one phase was that of the sun of the autumnal and winter half of the year, the half of the year when the sun's heat, light, and power are weakest and the days are in consequence relatively short, the sun who, in mythological language, seems to have grown old and weak and even to be dying or dead. The other phase was that of the sun of the spring and summer half of the year, when its heat, light, and power are greatest, when the days are in consequence relatively long, and when, as a result, crops grow and ripen, navigation becomes easier and more expansive, and commerce, international relations, and all existence thrive accordingly. The deified sun of autumn and winter was called by the Tyrians Ba'al Shamem, "Lord of the Heavens." Quite naturally he was conceived of as a god very old and about to die, to descend into the

⁵ Dan 7 9.

⁶ "The King-god among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," *Vetus Testamentum*, 10 (1960), pp. 138-97.

nether world, the realm of the dead, there to abide during at least a portion of the winter half of the year. The deified sun of spring and summer was known as Melcarth, "King of the City."⁷ He, in turn, was conceived of naturally as a god young, strong and active, just risen from the nether world, resurrected and returned to his people to create, to govern, and to bless. But despite these two distinguishing names and representations, actually it was only one god, one god in two reciprocal phases or stages of being, the sun in his complete, annual course through the heavens. Together Ba'al Shamem and Melcarth constituted one single deity, but composite in character, the national god of the vast Tyrian commercial empire.

At the critical moment of the year, apparently at the time of the autumnal equinox, Ba'al Shamem, the old god, was thought to depart from his sanctuary, situated upon the Sacred Island, just west or slightly southwest of the island city of Tyre. He would journey westward over the Mediterranean to the far western end of the earth, where stood the so-called "Gates of Heracles" or, in Tyrian language, the "Gates of Ba'al Shamem," the towering, pillarlike mountain which, at the approach of the god, was thought to split apart into two narrow, towering peaks, between which, at their base, lay the entrance to the nether world.⁸ Through these gates the dying god would descend into the nether world, the region of darkness, the realm of Mot or Sheol or however he may have been called in Tyrian parlance, the god of death. There the now dead god would abide throughout the remaining portion of the solar year.

But at the advent of spring the corresponding mountain at the eastern end of the earth was thought to split apart, likewise into two towering peaks. Through the opening between them, thus laid bare, the exit from the nether world, the "Gates of Melcarth," as, there is reason to believe, they were called, the god ascended into this world above. But he was no longer the old and dead Ba'al Shamem. He had been transformed into his other self, the youthful, vigorous, invincible Melcarth. He had, moreover, just previously, in a bitter struggle gained a decisive victory over the god of the nether world. Now he rose — restored to life, resurrected, rejuvenated — into this upper world of light and life and returned to his city and his people. All this transpired upon the day of the vernal equinox, almost certainly the New Year's Day of this new, Tyrian solar religion. The god came, of course, from the east and just at sunrise of this sacred day. Arrived at his city, he entered his sanctuary and ascended his divine throne, there to judge, to determine destinies for the new year, to govern, to create, and to bless.

Moreover, there is cogent evidence that this resurrection of Melcarth

⁷ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 141, n. 1.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 146-48.

and his return to his city and his people upon the equinoctial New Year's Day were portrayed in vivid, dramatic ritual. In this the king of Tyre enacted the rôle of the resurrected god. The New Year festival of this Tyrian solar religion extended over several days, in all likelihood eight, the final seven days of the old year plus the first day of the new year, the New Year's Day. At an early moment in this festival the king of Tyre went forth from the city, attended by a retinue of priests and officials, to the place, probably some high hill or mountain upon the mainland directly to the east of the city, which, in Tyrian religious belief, was thought to cover the place of exit from the nether world. There, no doubt with appropriate ceremonial, he awaited the moment of resurrection of the god and his rising in radiant form through this exit from below into the world above. The climax of this entire ritual celebration of the festival was the return of the god, of Melcarth, with this rôle enacted in human form by the king. He came just at sunrise of the festal day, at the very first moment of the new year. He came as a heavenly being in human form, in "glory," i. e., enveloped in the light of the rays of the newly risen sun of the equinoctial New Year's Day. He came upon the clouds of heaven, as it were, in majestic and impressive procession, attended by a host of worshipers and subjects, whose number must have increased steadily as the procession drew ever nearer to its goal. He entered the sanctuary through the open eastern portal and there, with appropriate ceremony, ascended the sacred throne. In all this the king played the rôle of the god. The king was the god and the god was the king. And having played this rôle once, at the very commencement of his reign, the king remained ever thereafter a divine being, a god, a god in human form, *Epiphanes*.⁹

In this connection it is a matter of great significance for this study that Herodotus,¹⁰ in describing his visit to Tyre, applies to both Ba'al Shamem and Melcarth the single name, Heracles, and thereby clearly implies that in the Tyrian religion they constituted together one single god, but in two reciprocal phases of being. He distinguishes between them by calling Ba'al Shamem the Olympian Heracles and affirming that he was worshiped by the Tyrians as an immortal, divine being, while the other Heracles, to whom he applies no distinctive name or title, he says, was worshiped by the Tyrians as if he were a hero, i. e., a divine being in human form and subject to mortality, in other words, in the fullest sense of the biblical Aramaic term, a *בֵּר אֱנוֹשׁ*. Not at all improbably Herodotus reached this conclusion because of the identification of the king with Melcarth in Tyrian religious belief and practice.

⁹ This entire matter is worked out in detail, with the evidence bearing thereon, in the work cited in n. 6.

¹⁰ *Hist.* ii, 44.

Now the temple which Solomon, the close ally of Hiram of Tyre, erected in Jerusalem in the second quarter of the tenth century B.C. was, very plainly, patterned directly after the solar sanctuary of Melcarth, which Hiram had erected in Tyre only a few years earlier. The Jerusalem temple was built largely by Phoenician workmen and out of materials imported in considerable measure from Tyre for this purpose, undoubtedly under the supervision of Tyrian architects. Like the Melcarth sanctuary in Tyre, it too stood majestically upon an elevated spot, the Temple Mount, within the confines of the city, Jerusalem, and, like the Tyrian shrine, it too faced due east,¹¹ toward the Mount of Olives, the mountain which, in the folklore of Jerusalem, was thought to cover the place of exit from the nether world, for Jerusalem likewise the place of sunrise upon the two equinoctial days. Certainly this temple of Solomon was a solar sanctuary in every essential respect. And this fact evidences unmistakably that Solomon, in response to the political, economic, cultural, and religious circumstances which had come to obtain in his kingdom in much the same manner and degree as in Tyre but shortly before, had transformed the official religion of Israel into solar religion and Yahweh, Israel's national god, originally a pastoral, nomadic or seminomadic deity, into a solar god. Yet in this transformation Solomon apparently did not go quite as far as had Hiram. Unlike Ba'al Shamem-Melcarth, Yahweh was not transformed into a composite deity of two reciprocal forms or phases of being. Instead, more like the Babylonian Marduk, he remained one single deity.¹² But there is some reason to believe that he too was thought to pass into the nether world at the appropriate moment of the solar year, there to abide for a brief time and then to rise, victorious over his natural enemy, Sheol or Mot or *Hamašhîit*, "the Destroyer" — as he seems to have been entitled in Jerusalem parlance — the local god of death and the nether world, to rise through the opening between the severed halves of the Mount of Olives, the *Har Hamašhîit*, the "Mountain of the Destroyer,"¹³ as it was also called, and from there to return in solemn and awesome procession to his sanctuary in Jerusalem. This he entered through the eastern gate, the so-called "Gates of Righteousness," kept tightly closed throughout the entire year, but opened upon this one highly significant day, the equinoctial New Year's Day, for this particular ceremony. Thence he passed onward on a straight line over the altar of sacrifice in the eastern

¹¹ Morgenstern, "The Gates of Righteousness," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 6 (1929), pp. 1-37.

¹² Also Solomon set the New Year's Day of his solar calendar upon the day of the autumnal equinox instead of upon the day of the vernal equinox, as apparently Hiram had done. Just why Solomon departed in this respect from the Tyrian pattern we do not know because of lack of evidence.

¹³ II Kings 23 13; Jer 51 25.

court of the temple, and there in passing he rekindled the sacred fire upon the altar, kept burning all through the year but extinguished early in the course of the festival as the symbol of the death or falling asleep of Yahweh, the solar deity, and now rekindled as the vivid symbol of the resurrection or awakening of the god and of his return to his sanctuary. From here he moved onward over the porch of the temple building, between the two sacred pillars which, like those in the temple of Melcarth in Tyre, stood at the entrance, and thence steadily westward, down the long axis of the temple building, to the *d'bir*, the sacred recess at its far western end, where stood the throne of the deity, in Solomon's day, so it seems, a throne of gold. This the deity ascended and took his seat, there to exercise judgment over his people and to determine destinies for the new year in the life of the world and of mankind.

There is considerable evidence also that in Jerusalem too, just as in Tyre, the king, as a rule, enacted the rôle of the resurrected or awakened deity, that he too was identified with this solar Yahweh, was regarded as his living embodiment in human form, as the divine son of the god.¹⁴ Apparently it was against this solar representation of Yahweh and this solar religion, departing so extremely and radically from the older, truer, and more inherently Israelite concept and manner of worship of Yahweh, that the short-lived reform movements in the reigns of Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah, instigated by the prophets of the day, were directed.

One other detail of this Tyrian and early Israelite solar religion is significant for this study. In the West Semitic agricultural religion, which for the Tyrians and also to some extent for Israel was the antecedent of the solar religion inaugurated by Hiram and by Solomon, El, the god of the heavens, was the husband of Ashera, the earth-goddess. The rain which fell from the heavens, from El, and penetrated into the fertile soil, into the womb of Mother Earth, fertilized her and caused her to give birth to Tammuz, the deification of the annual crop. El was therefore the divine father and Tammuz the divine son. But viewed from another angle, it was the seed from the crop of one year, sown in the ground, in the womb of Mother Earth, which fertilized her and made her bear the crop of the next year. In the thought and doctrine of early West Semitic agricultural religion, at least in some of its local forms, the Tammuz of the one year (the older Tammuz) was the father, and the Tammuz of the next year (the younger Tammuz) was the son. But this latter Tammuz was destined to become the father of the Tammuz of the next ensuing year. Each deity was in turn divine son and divine father. Father and son were each a Tammuz; father and son were indeed one.

In considerable measure this doctrine was taken over by the Tyrian solar religion. The Ba'al Shamem, the old and dying god of the one year,

¹⁴ "The King-god" etc., pp. 176-97.

descended into the nether world and abode there for a time, at the proper moment to rise in rejuvenated, youthful form, transformed into the Melcarth of the new solar year. Viewed from one angle, Ba'al Shamem and Melcarth together constituted one single deity in two reciprocal phases of divine being. But viewed from another angle, Ba'al Shamem, the old god, was the father and royal predecessor upon the divine throne of Melcarth, the divine son. And inasmuch as the Tyrian king enacted the rôle of the god — and that very probably in both phases of his divine being, but certainly at least in that of the divine son, Melcarth — especially since he came thus to be regarded as Melcarth, small wonder that he came to be regarded at the same time as the divine son, the son of the god, particularly in the latter's phase of being as the old god, Ba'al Shamem; and small wonder also that Melcarth, in turn, came to be regarded, even as Herodotus states, as a hero, i. e., as having the appearance and the nature of a man, i. e., as being mortal.

There is abundant reason for believing that something, and perhaps even much, of this concept of the sonship of the king to the god was transmitted from Tyrian solar religious belief and practice to those of Israel. As has been said, there is some positive evidence that the majority of the kings of Judah, all of the Davidic line, enacted the rôle of Yahweh as a solar deity in the ritual of the equinoctial New Year's Day festival, and that in consequence, to some extent at least, they were regarded as having something of a divine nature, of being one with Yahweh, as being in a quite real sense his son. This will account adequately for the tradition, oft-repeated in the Bible, that the kings of Judah of the Davidic line were all sons of Yahweh.¹⁵

With this picture of Tyrian solar religion, as inaugurated by Hiram and then taken over by Solomon, with relatively few modifications, as the official religion of Judah, centering in the temple in Jerusalem, in both the first and the second temples, flourishing there until the destruction of the second temple in 485 B.C.,¹⁶ before us, it is impossible not to recognize very close parallels in the scene depicted in Dan 7 13 f. The one "like a human being" is, as has already been affirmed, certainly a divine figure. But realizing this, we perceive also that we have here in this picture two distinctly divine figures — the old god, "the Ancient of Days," and this younger and more vigorous god, the "one like a human being"; the one positively divine in every respect, and therefore in principle immortal, and the other having both the appearance and some of the qualities of a human being and especially mortality.

Moreover, both of these divine beings are royal figures. "The Ancient

¹⁵ Cf. in particular II Sam 7 14; Ps 2 7.

¹⁶ Cf. Morgenstern, "Jerusalem — 485 B. C.," *HUCA*, 27 (1956), pp. 101-72; 28 (1957), pp. 15-47; 31 (1960), pp. 1-29.

of Days" has just completed a court session, over which he has presided, and at which the four beasts had been tried. Sentence had been imposed upon them, and they had been executed. During the trial session "the Ancient of Days" had sat upon a seat or throne of flaming fire, the wheels of which were burning fire. Certainly this implies that "the Ancient of Days," as well as the "one like a human being," was a solar divine figure.

The "one like a human being" is brought into the immediate presence of "the Ancient of Days," and to him are given, or transferred, dominion, glory, and kingship — rulership over all the peoples of the earth, dominion which will never pass away, and kingship which will never be overthrown — in other words, kingship eternal and universal. This consideration, too, implies that this "one like a human being" is a divine figure, a god.

But what kingship could this have been, eternal and universal, which was thus transmitted to this younger god? Certainly there could be only one such kingship, the kingship which until this moment had been held and administered by "the Ancient of Days." Unquestionably the implication of vss. 13 f. is that the young and vigorous god replaces or supplants the old god in the rôle of king and administrator of the world, and, furthermore, in all likelihood that the old god, now apparently grown weak and exhausted from age and the administration of his royal duties, yields his place to his young, strong, and vigorous successor and himself retires from the scene. But if this be the true implication of these two verses — and it could hardly be aught else — then this is further and decisive evidence that these two verses are an interpolation, for in vs. 22 not the "one like a human being," but rather "the Ancient of Days," is still acting in the capacity of world king and bringing to completion his judgment upon the fourth beast and the transfer of earthly world dominion from himself to the people of the holy ones of the Most High. Here the "one like a human being" is not even mentioned and is apparently not present.

Now in the scene depicted in vss. 13 f. the two divine figures — "the Ancient of Days," very old, with hair white like wool, apparently weary and exhausted from the long and burdensome administration of his office as king of the world and ready to yield this to his young and vigorous successor, the "one like a human being," who has just appeared upon the scene, coming upon the clouds of heaven — cannot but remind us very forcibly of the pair of Tyrian gods, each in turn a divine king, Ba'al Shamem (the old god, who departs from his sanctuary, journeys westward to the very end of the earth, there to vanish from human sight and descend into the nether world), and Melcarth (the youthful, vigorous re-embodiment of the old god, his son, resurrected, risen from the nether world and returned to his people to assume the divine kingship, to rule, to judge, and to bless). True, the picture in these two verses differs some-

what in its essential details from the picture of the parallel scene in Tyrian religious belief and practice of Hiram's day, as we have reconstructed this, for there Ba'al Shamem departed at about the time of the autumnal equinox, while Melcarth appeared, to take his divine father's place as king of the world only at the vernal equinox. There the young god did not actually come into the presence of the old god and supplant him as king upon the world throne with apparently no intermission between the rulership of the two divine kings. But here apparently the old god does not yield his throne and depart until the young god has appeared, or is about to appear, upon the scene, ready to replace him.

However, we know that Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) reorganized the Tyrian festival radically, at the very commencement of his reign. He seems, among other things, to have combined the two Tyrian, reciprocal, equinoctial festivals — that of the departure and vanishing of Ba'al Shamem at the autumnal equinox and that of the resurrection and return of Melcarth at the vernal equinox — into one single festival, celebrated at or close to the winter solstice and having close affinities with the Roman Saturnalia.¹⁷ This festival, almost certainly of eight days duration, began apparently upon December 18th and came to a climactic end upon December 25th, the eighth day thereafter, the day of the winter solstice, the New Year's Day of the Tyrian calendar as revised by Antiochus IV and adopted by him as the official calendar of his Syrian empire.¹⁸ In the Tyrian religion as thus reorganized, it was in all likelihood upon the *first* day of this festival period that Ba'al Shamem, the old god, was thought to depart from his sanctuary and his people and to vanish, descending into the nether world, and upon the *last* day that the resurrected, rejuvenated, and creative Melcarth was thought to rise and return to his people and his sanctuary, there to replace his aged and vanished father as divine king of the universe. Moreover, as we have shown,¹⁹ it was at the celebration of this festival at Tyre in 172 B.C., as the festival had already been thus reorganized by him, that Antiochus IV of Syria enacted the rôle of the resurrected Melcarth, and thus acquired for himself, so he maintained, permanent divinity and with this the title *Epiphanes*, "the god in human form."

The interpolation of Dan 7 13 f. into its present position in the narrative which the chapter relates would seem to imply that the interpolator meant to suggest, or even to affirm, that the coming of the youthful god in human form upon the clouds of heaven and his installation in the divine kingship of the world took place quite soon — say within the course

¹⁷ Cf. Dan 7 25b.

¹⁸ Cf. Morgenstern, "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel," 1, *HUCA*, 20 (1947), pp. 75-136; "The King-God" etc., pp. 166 ff., n. 1.

¹⁹ "The King-god" etc., pp. 162-64.

of a few, perhaps, even more precisely, eight days — after "the Ancient of Days" had functioned for the last time in his official rôle as divine world king and judge and had then vanished, thus making way for his youthful and more vigorous successor. This eight-day period would then have been the Syrian New Year Festival at the time of the winter solstice. This quite cogent consideration strongly enforces our thesis that the immediate antecedent of the divine figure here, the "one like a human being," was the Tyrian god, Melcarth, while the antecedent of "the Ancient of Days" was that other major Tyrian deity, the reciprocal form of this one, composite Tyrian national god, Ba'al Shamem.

The realization of this fact tells us further that Dan 7 13 f. could not possibly have been composed earlier than the reign of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes). We suggest — though this is of necessity little more than a conjecture, since supporting evidence is entirely lacking — that these two verses are a fragment of an original narrative of some length once integral in the Book of Daniel, all the major portion of which has been lost, and that these two verses, all that remains of the original, have been preserved by being interpolated for some reason or by some accident into their present position; either this or else that these two verses were composed and inserted here by the interpolator himself in order to give a slightly different content and import to the vision recorded in this chapter.

As has been indicated above, this figure of "one like a son of man," i. e., "one like a human being," has been carried over into the Jewish pseudepigraphic writings and there plays an important rôle, particularly in I Enoch 37-71 and IV Ezra 7 28 and 12 32. Here "Son of man" has become a proper noun, the name or title of the divine figure in question. And along with him and in the most intimate relationship with him appears once again the old god, "the Ancient of Days," here called, however, by the undoubtedly closely related name, "the Head of Days." His hair is still white as wool (I En 46 1; 71 10). He sits upon his radiant throne²⁰ as universal, divine king and judges his subjects (I En 47 3; 60 2). To him approaches the "Son of man," risen from the sea and coming upon the clouds of heaven (IV Ezra 13 3). He is made by "the Head of Days" to sit upon the radiant throne, as it were in the latter's stead, and all the kings and the mighty among men render homage unto him, while he exercises judgment upon them (I En 61 8; 62 2 f., 5; 69 27-29). Plainly he too is a royal figure, closely related to "the Head of Days." He is in fact the Messiah, the Anointed One, the Christ (I En 48 10; 52 4); and with this he is also the actual son of God, yet at the same time a descend-

²⁰ כבודו כבוד, cf. Isa 22 23; Jer 14 21; 17 12. For כבוד with the connotation "radiance" cf. Morgenstern, "Biblical Theophanies," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 28 (1913), pp. 35-58; cf. the divine throne in Ezek 1 26.

ant of David (IV Ezra 7 28; 12 32), and apparently too he is about to succeed to the position formerly held by "the Head of Days" as divine king of the world. Plainly in all this there are definite reminiscences of the old institution of the king god, as it had been borrowed by Solomon from Tyrian religious practice and had been operative in Judah during the five hundred years of the first and second temples. And this lends some measure of support to our thesis that basic to the figures of "the Ancient of Days" and the "one like a human being" or "like a son of man" of Dan 7 13 *f.* is the figure of the composite, two-phased Tyrian national god, Ba'al Shamem-Melcarth.

This same course of tradition and thought is present even more clearly and significantly in the NT.²¹ There too "Son of man" is a name or title repeatedly applied to Jesus.²² He too comes in "glory," i. e., in radiant sunlight, upon the clouds, takes his seat upon his throne and ushers in a new era (Matt 19 28; 25 31; 26 64; Mark 13 26; 14 62; Luke 21 27; Rev 14 14). Jesus, as the "Son of man," is the king of Israel (John 1 49), and as such is also the son of God (Col 1 13). He is the son of the Father (John 5 25-27; 6 40) and in this rôle is the ruler of this world (John 12 31-36). He is the Christ, the "Anointed One," the Messiah, and as such is the son of God (John 20 31). Nay more, the Father and he, the Son, are one (John 10 30). The Father is in him and he is in the Father (John 10 38). For further affirmation that Jesus is the son of God cf. Acts 13 33; Heb 1 5; 4 14; 5 5). Also Jesus, the Christ, is the descendant of David (Matt 22 41-45; Mark 12 35-37; Luke 20 41-44) and therefore, in principle, a king of Judah.

Accordingly then, being the son of God and especially being one with the Father, Jesus is, in a very positive sense, a divine being. More than this, being one with the Father, he and the Father together constitute one single divine being, God, in two reciprocal phases of divine existence and functioning. And of these two obviously the Father is the older in age, while he, the Son, is the younger and is a divine being in human form and is likewise mortal. Certainly then this NT picture of the oneness of the Father and Jesus, particularly as it is presented in John, is strikingly similar and is unmistakably related to the picture which we have in Dan 7 13 *f.*, but is even more closely similar and unmistakably related to the picture of the composite Tyrian national god, Ba'al Shamem-Melcarth, particularly as this figure was recast by the Syrian king, Antiochus IV (Epiphanes). Unquestionably there are here direct reminiscences of the king-god institution as it was once current in Judah, but also very positive reminiscences of the same institution in its various aspects and theological implications as these were long current in Tyre

²¹ Cf. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, pp. 346-450.

²² *Op. cit.*, 346-48.

itself and likewise in closely adjacent Caesarea²³ well into the present era. And realizing the close proximity of Galilee to the metropolis, Tyre, and the consequent immediacy of Tyrian cultural influence upon the population of Galilee, it is not at all surprising that definite elements of ancient Tyrian religious belief and practice should have persisted and found positive expression in the traditions and doctrines of a distinctively Galilean Jewish sect, consisting of Jesus and his followers, the forerunners of later Christianity.

This accumulation of evidence then that the two divine figures in Dan 7 13 f. reflect, and that too very closely, the ancient Tyrian national deity, Ba'al Shamem-Melcarth, in both of the reciprocal phases of his divine being and functioning seems cogent and even irrefutable. And this we can understand all the more readily when we realize that the two verses themselves, regardless of what their actual literary origin may have been, were composed almost certainly during the reign of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) of Syria, the king who, with arrogant self-will, transformed the ancient Tyrian religion in various important respects and apparently adopted it for himself and imposed it upon his own nation.²⁴ Accordingly then we must reject completely the interpretation of these two verses which holds that the "one like a human being" is the Jewish people. Rather we must return to the older hypothesis and restate it in a considerably modified and expanded form, to the effect that we can readily discern in these two verses elements of ancient Semitic mythology. But these elements are not of Babylonian, but rather of Tyrian, origin. And not merely the one, but the two divine figures here, "the Ancient of Days" and the "one like a human being," are patterned closely after, not the Babylonian deity, Marduk, but the composite Tyrian solar deity, Ba'al Shamem-Melcarth, in both reciprocal phases of his divine being.²⁵ And the annual departure of the old god, the divine father, and the coming of the resurrected, youthful, vigorous god, the divine son, to replace him upon the heavenly throne as king of his own people and of the entire world, is, we maintain, the immediate pattern of the scene depicted in these two verses.

²³ Cf. "The King-god" etc., pp. 156-62.

²⁴ Cf. Dan 11 36-38.

²⁵ Perhaps some further support of this thesis may be seen in the quite obvious play upon the name, Ba'al Shamem, in the *hāšikkūš m'šōmem* of Dan 11 31, with its clear implication that Ba'al Shamem was the foreign god whose worship Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria had adopted, which he had imposed upon his own people, and which he was now imposing also upon conquered Israel.