8

The Danielic Son of Man

The "Son of God" text from Qumran suggests that Daniel 7 was understood with reference to a Davidic messiah from an early point. Such an interpretation is also reflected in Rabbi Akiba's famous exposition of the plural "thrones" in Dan 7:9 as "one for Him (God) and one for David."[1] It is also assumed in the statement attributed to the Jew Trypho in Justin's Dialogue: "These and other scriptures compel us to await one great and glorious, who receives the everlasting kingdom as son of man from the Ancient of Days."[2] The "one like a son of man" who comes with the clouds of heaven in Dan 7:13, however, also gave rise to a different kind of messianic expectation, which emphasized the heavenly, transcendent character of the savior figure. The heavenly "Son of Man" is attested in the *Similitudes of Enoch* and in *4 Ezra,* and also plays a prominent role in the New Testament.

For much of the twentieth century, the notion of a *Menschensohn,* or Son of Man figure, was thought to be independent of the Jewish scriptures, so that Dan 7:13 was a witness to it, but not the source from which it derived. There was considerable diversity of opinion about the origin and precise nature of this figure. More imaginative scholars, like Sigmund Mowinckel, held that "conceptions of a more or less divine Primordial

1. b. Ḥag. 14a, b. Sanh, 38b. See Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986) 133-34. The suggestion of Maurice Casey, *Son of Man. The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979) 86-87, that the reference is to the historical David, is without any supporting parallel. See the comments of William Horbury, "The Messianic Associations of 'The Son of Man,'" *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1985) 45-46.

2. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho,* 32. Justin's value as a witness to Jewish views remains in question.

Man were widespread in the ancient east. Apparently there is a historical connexion between the varying figures of this type, which seem to be derived, directly or indirectly, from Iranian or Indo-Iranian myths."[3] The Jewish conception of "the Son of Man" was "a Jewish variant of this oriental, cosmological, eschatological myth of Anthropos,"[4] influenced by a syncretistic fusion of Iranian and Mesopotamian concepts. At the least, the phrase "Son of Man" was thought to be a well-known, readily recognizable title for a messiah of a heavenly type, in contrast to the national, earthly, Davidic messiah. As late as 1974 Norman Perrin could claim that all the recent studies of the "Son of Man Problem" he had reviewed agreed on one point: "there existed in ancient Judaism a defined concept of the apocalyptic Son of Man, the concept of a heavenly redeemer figure whose coming to earth as judge would be a feature of the drama of the End time."[5]

In the latter part of the century, however, the pendulum swung away from this consensus. Already in 1968, Ragnar Leivestadt had declared the apocalyptic Son of Man to be a phantom,[6] and he followed this pronouncement with the directive "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man."[7] Perrin argued that "there is no 'Son of Man' concept but rather a variety of uses of Son of Man imagery."[8] The arguments of Geza Vermes on the Aramaic usage of the phrase "son of man" directed the discussion away from the apocalyptic texts. Vermes concluded that "no titular use of the phrase 'the son of man' can be substantiated" from Daniel, *1 Enoch* or *4 Ezra,* and that "the association between *ho huios tou anthropou* and Dan 7.13 constitutes a secondary midrashic stage of development, more understandable in Greek than in Aramaic."[9] Barnabas Lindars is typical of much recent scholarship when he declares the "Son of Man" concept to be "a modern myth."[10]

3. Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh. The Messiah Concept in Israel and Later Judaism* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1955; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 422.

4. Ibid., 425. In this, Mowinckel was following the theories of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* popular in the early 20th century. See further Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah,* 75-78.

5. Norman Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 24.

6. R. Leivestadt, "Der apokalyptische Menschensohn ein theologisches Phantom," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 6 (1967-68) 49-109.

7. R. Leivestadt, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971-72) 243-67.

8. Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage,* 26.

9. G. Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 96-98.

10. B. Lindars, *Jesus, Son of Man* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983) 3.

This critical reaction to the older *religionsgeschichtliche* theories is justified in some respects. The theory that derived the Son of Man from Iranian-Chaldean syncretism rested on the amalgamation of a cluster of different figures both in Judaism and in the Hellenistic Near East. In the Jewish context, the Son of Man figure was constructed by combining features from Daniel, *4 Ezra* and the *Similitudes.* Scholars rightly question the historical validity of such composite pictures. The notion that the Son of Man was a variant of a widespread myth of the Primordial Man has been laid to rest with no regrets. It is also now granted that "Son of Man" was not a title in common usage. The significance of the latter point, however, has been exaggerated, and the whole debate about titular usage has been too narrowly focused. It is, after all, possible to conceive of a figure to whom Daniel 7 and other texts refer even if there is some variation in the manner of reference. Consequently, some issues remain in dispute. There have been some new suggestions in recent years that at least Daniel and *4 Ezra* refer to a figure derived, not from oriental syncretism, but from specific Canaanite or Babylonian sources.[11] These proposals are unconvincing, in my judgment. Daniel 7 remains the source of Jewish expectation of an apocalyptic Son of Man. There is good evidence, however, that by the first century CE there were some common assumptions about the figure in Daniel's vision that go beyond what is explicit in the biblical text. Whether or not these common assumptions are deemed to amount to a Son of Man concept, they are important for our understanding of Jewish eschatology in the first century.

Daniel 7

There is no doubt that traditional imagery is used in Daniel 7. I believe that the ultimate source of this imagery can be found in the Canaanite myths of the second millennium, which speak of the rebellion of Yamm, the unruly sea, and the triumph of Baal, the rider of the clouds.[12] This imagery had

11. Canaanite: Rollin Kearns, *Vorfragen zur Christologie* (3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1978-82); Babylonian: Helge Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988).

12. "Stirring Up the Great Sea: The Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7," in A. S. van der Woude, ed., *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 106; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993) 121-36.

long been adapted in Israelite religion, and had its *Sitz-im-Leben* in the royal cult in the preexilic period.[13] We do not know precisely from what source Daniel derived it, but that is hardly surprising in the present state of our knowledge of Jewish religion prior to the Maccabean revolt.

The question of traditional imagery must be distinguished from the question of literary sources. One scholarly tradition, represented by Martin Noth, and recently by Rollin Kearns, has held that a pre-Danielic "Son of Man" source can be distinguished in Daniel 7:9-10, 13-14.[14] These verses are marked off from their context as poetry in the standard edition of the Hebrew Bible, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia,* but many commentators have been reluctant to conclude that a switch from prose to poetry requires a change of authorship. Besides, the poetic character of vv. 13-14 has been questioned.[15] The parallelism of classical Hebrew poetry is lacking in v. 13, and the whole chapter is written in a rhythmic style. Noth argued that the *Similitudes of Enoch* knew only these verses of Daniel 7,[16] but his conclusion has been questioned on the ground that a number of other allusions are possible.[17] Even if the author does not allude to any other part of Daniel, we cannot safely conclude that he was not acquainted with it, only that he was selective in his allusions. Since he clearly alludes to some verses in Daniel 7, and since these verses are not attested outside of Daniel, the simplest conclusion is that he drew on the Book of Daniel, rather than on its hypothetical source.[18]

13. See John Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

14. Martin Noth, "Zur Komposition des Buches Daniel," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 98/99 (1926)143-63; Kearns, *Vorfragen zur Christologie* 2.16. This position is now endorsed by Daniel Boyarin, *The Son of Man and the Genealogy of Rabbinic Judaism* (New York: Fordham University Press, forthcoming) chapter 1.

15. S. Niditch, *The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 30; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980) 190.

16. Noth and Kearns claim that the author knew only Daniel's source. Karlheinz Müller, "Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Menschensohnvorstellung in den Bilderreden des Henoch und im Buche Daniel," in Ernst C. Suttner and Coelestin Patock, eds., *Wegzeichen. Festschrift H. M. Biedermann* (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1971) 258, posits a common written source for the *Similitudes* and Dan 7:9, 10, 13.

17. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter,* 26-27, argues that *1 Enoch* 46:7 ("And these are they who judge the stars of heaven") depends on Dan 8:10. The case is stronger if one accepts the emendation of R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906) 88: "these are they who cast down the stars of heaven." For other possible reminiscences see Casey, *Son of Man,* 107-10.

18. So also Volker Hampel, *Menschensohn und Historischer Jesus* (Neukirchen-Vluyn:

Moreover, if the imagery of Daniel 7 is ultimately derived from Canaanite myth, the vision of the Ancient of Days and "one like a son of man" belongs to the same complex of tradition as the beasts from the sea, and so it is very unlikely that these verses circulated in isolation. Even apart from this consideration, many scholars think that the contrast between the beasts from the sea and the human figure is an intrinsic part of the vision, and this, too, militates against a distinct Son of Man source.

I have argued at length elsewhere that the "one like a son of man" in Daniel 7 should be understood as a heavenly individual, probably the archangel Michael, rather than as a collective symbol.[19] The expectation of angelic, heavenly savior figures is well attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The "Treatise of the Two Spirits" in the Community Rule declares that God has given humanity "two spirits in which to walk until the time of his visitation, the spirits of truth and falsehood. . . . All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light, but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness." The Prince of Light reappears in the War Scroll (1QM 13), where he is opposed to "Belial, the angel of Mastema." In 1QM 17:7, God raises up the kingdom of Michael among the gods (אלים) and the kingdom of Israel among all flesh. In 11QMelchizedek, the god (אלהים) who rises in the heavenly council and administers divine judgment is called Melchizedek.[20] It seems likely, however, that Michael, Melchizedek and the Prince of Light were three names for the same figure, and that the dualism of the princes of light and darkness was already laid out in the Testament of Amram in the middle of the second century BCE.[21] This dualism involved a significant development beyond what is found in the book of Daniel,[22] but shared with the older apocalypse the expectation of deliverance by the hand of an angel. Quite apart from Qumran dualism we also find an angelic deliverer in the *Testament (Assumption) of Moses,* around the turn of the era ("Then will be

---

Neukirchener Verlag, 1990) 42. Hampel, however, takes the unusual position that Dan 7:13-14 are secondary in the book of Daniel (ibid., 23).

19. J. Collins, *Daniel,* 304-10.

20. Mason, '*You Are a Priest Forever,*' 179-83.

21. J. T. Milik, "*Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-reša'* dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (1972) 95-144; Kobelski, *Melchizedek,* 49-83. See now Émile Puech, "Visions de 'Amram," in E. Puech, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXII. Textes Araméens Première Partie. 4Q529-549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001) 283-405.

22. See my essay, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages,* 287-99.

filled the hands of the messenger who is in the highest place appointed. Yea, he will at once avenge them of their enemies").[23] These angelic saviors are not properly called messiahs, as they are not anointed and in any case are not human figures. They are, however, immediately relevant to the development of traditions relating to the Son of Man.[24]

The *Similitudes of Enoch*

The earliest Jewish evidence for the interpretation and reuse of Dan 7:13-14 is found in the *Similitudes of Enoch.* The date of this document has been controversial, especially since no fragment of it has been found at Qumran.[25] Absence from Qumran, however, does not require a date after 70 CE. Other pseudepigrapha whose early date is not disputed, such as the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Testament of Moses,* are also unattested in the Scrolls. It has been suggested that the *Similitudes* would have been unacceptable at Qumran because of the near equality of the sun and the moon in chapter 41.[26] In any case, the "community of the righteous" presupposed in the *Similitudes* (e.g. 38:1) was a different conventicle from that of Qumran. If the document was produced in the latter years of the Qumran sect, in a different community, it is not surprising that it had not found its way into the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is doubtful whether a Jewish author would have made such explicit use of the expression "Son of Man" for a messianic figure after that phrase had been appropriated by the Christians. On the other hand, the influence of the *Similitudes* should be recognized in Matt 19:28, 25:31, where the Son of Man is said to sit on his throne of glory.[27] Since

23. The consensus of scholarship is that the messenger is an angel. See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life* (2nd ed.), 43-46. Tromp, "Taxo, the Messenger of the Lord," 202-5, reviews earlier interpretations, but argues that the messenger is the human figure Taxo.

24. See Barnabas Lindars, "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975) 52-72; Kobelski, *Melchizedek,* 130-37.

25. For a review of the debate see D. W. Suter, "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion," *Religious Studies Review* 7 (1981) 217-21, and the essays in Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man. Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 415-96.

26. M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977) 51-65.

27. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter,* 149-82; cf. Johannes Friedrich, *Gott im Brüder* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1977) 135.

the *Similitudes* make no allusion to the fall of Jerusalem, a date prior to that event seems most likely.

It is beyond doubt that the *Similitudes of Enoch* allude to Dan 7:9-10, 13-14. The clearest allusions are in *1 Enoch* 46:1: "And there I saw one who had a head of days, and his head (was) white like wool; and with him (there was) another, whose face had the appearance of a man . . ." and in *1 Enoch* 47:3: "And in those days I saw the Head of Days sit down on the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened before him, and all his host, which (dwells) in the heavens above, and his council were standing before him."[28] The "Head of Days" is the Enochic equivalent of the "Ancient of Days" in Daniel 7, and the one who accompanies him is Daniel's "one like a son of man." The Son of Man figure in the *Similitudes* is initially introduced as one "whose face had the appearance of a man" (46:1). Enoch then asks his angelic guide "about that son of man, who he was and whence he was. . . ." The angel responds that he is "the son of man who has righteousness, and with whom righteousness dwells. . . ." The manner in which he is introduced does not presuppose that "Son of Man" is a well-known title; it is simply a way of referring back to the figure "whose face had the appearance of a man," while simultaneously recalling Daniel 7.[29] The same figure can also be referred to as "the Chosen One," or "the Righteous One."[30] He is also said to be "like one of the holy angels" (46:2). Angels are often portrayed in human form in apocalyptic literature (compare Dan 8:15; 9:21; 10:5, 18; 12:6-7). While the "Son of Man" is distinguished from other angels (Michael in 60:4-5; 69:14; 71:3; the four archangels in 71:8, 9, 13), his rank is higher than theirs.[31]

It is generally held that this "Son of Man" is identified with Enoch

28. The parallels have often been laid out. See Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter,* 14-23; G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984) 97-100; Caragounis, *The Son of Man,* 101-2.

29. The Ethiopic demonstrative could, in principle, be a translation of the Greek definite article, but this is unlikely here, since the demonstrative is never found with the title "the Elect One" in the *Similitudes.* See Casey, *Son of Man,* 100. Three different Ethiopic phrases are used for "Son of Man" in the course of the *Similitudes.*

30. The title "Elect of God" appears in a text from Qumran (4QMess ar), but there it seems to refer to Noah, See J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran," in idem, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament,* 127-60; F. García Martínez, "4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah," in idem, *Qumran and Apocalyptic,* 1-44.

31. On the notion of an exalted angel in apocalyptic literature, see Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982) 94-113.

himself at the end of the *Similitudes.* In *1 Enoch* 71:14, Enoch is greeted by an angel on his ascent to heaven: "You are the Son of Man who was born to righteousness, and righteousness remains over you and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not leave you."[32] As is well known, R. H. Charles removed this anomaly by emending the text, a procedure now universally rejected.[33] The supposed identification, however, remains problematic.[34]

1 Enoch 70–71 constitute an epilogue to the *Similitudes,* or rather two (arguably even three) epilogues. First, there is an introductory statement in 70:1-2, in the third person, that "after this" Enoch was lifted up from humankind. Then the narrative switches to the first person, with Enoch as narrator. 70:3-4 is a transitional passage, but 71:1-17 is a second account of the ascent of Enoch, this time in the first person.[35] The third person narrative, however, clearly distinguishes Enoch from "that Son of Man." In 1 Enoch 70:1 we are told "And it came to pass after this that his name was lifted up alive to the presence of that Son of Man, in the presence of the Lord of Spirits." Attempts to get rid of this reading are scarcely less tendentious than those of Charles.[36] In 1976 Maurice Casey pointed out that one important manuscript, Abbadianus 55 (U), omits the word *baxabehu,*[37] "to the presence," before "that Son of Man," and can be translated "that the name of that son of man was lifted up alive to the presence of the Lord of Spirits."[38] In the meantime four, possibly five, other manuscripts support-

32. Trans. Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978) 2.166.

33. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* 2.237.

34. See the essays in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah,* 153-259, and my discussion in Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah,* 90-94.

35. See George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables," in Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah,* 23-47 (especially 42-43), and Michael A. Knibb, "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch," ibid., 48-64, especially 62-63. J. C. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man" in J. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 169-91, following E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im Äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund: Gleerup, 1946) 164, argues for the unity of chapters 71–72, but does not deal with the transition between vv. 2 and 3. VanderKam is followed by Leslie W. Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah,* 299-337 (here 307).

36. E.g. Casey, *Son of Man,* 105, appeals to "considerations of intrinsic probability."

37. I follow the transliteration of T. O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic* (Harvard Semitic Series 24; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1978) 8.

38. See Maurice Casey, "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7 (1976) 25-26; *Son of Man,* 105; A. Caquot, "Remarques sur les chaps. 70 et 71 du livre éthiopien d'Hénoch," in H. Monloubou, ed., *Apocalypses et*

ing the minority reading have come to light.[39] The omission, however, is still most easily explained as a scribal error: R. H. Charles wrote of Abbadianus 55 that "the omissions are capriciously made; sometimes words, sometimes phrases, sometimes whole sentences and paragraphs are excised to the entire destruction of the sense."[40] If one thinks in terms of scribal alteration, Abbadianus 55 should be rejected as the easier reading: a scribe is more likely to have harmonized the text of Abbadianus 55 by bringing 70:1 into agreement with 71:14 than to have introduced the apparent contradiction presented by the majority reading.[41]

J. C. VanderKam, who recognizes that the reading in *1 Enoch* 70:1, which seems to distinguish between Enoch and the Son of Man, cannot be eliminated, nonetheless argues that "What the author appears to have intended in 70:1 was that Enoch's name was elevated to the place where those characters whom he had seen in his visions were to be found, namely in the throneroom of the celestial palace. That is, he does not see the son of man here but begins his ascent to the place where he himself will perform that eschatological role."[42] VanderKam's desire to make sense of the text as it stands, without recourse to the hypothesis of redaction, is commendable. It does not seem to me, however, that his suggestion here is a possible interpretation of the Ethiopic text. Enoch's name was lifted to, or *to the presence of* that Son of Man and to the presence of the Lord of Spirits (Eth *baxabehu*),[43] not to the place where he had seen them or to perform their

---

Théologie de l'Espérance (Paris: Cerf, 1977) 113. One later manuscript (Abbadianus 197, W) has an identical reading, and another (Abbadianus 99, V) omits some further words but has the same sense. VanderKam, however, correctly notes that even the reading in MS U can be translated as "his name was raised to that of son of man" ("Righteous One," 184). See M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 1.208.

39. Daniel C. Olson, "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables," *JSP* 18 (1998) 27-38, especially 30-31.

40. R. H. Charles, "The Book of Enoch," *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* 2.166. See further Michael A. Knibb, "The Translation of 1 Enoch 70:1: Some Methodological Issues," in A. Rapaport and G. Greenberg, eds., *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzmann* (JSOTSup 333; London and New York: Continuum, 2001) 340-54.

41. Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Leiden: Brill, 1985) 250, suggests that a Christian scribe may have altered the text but does not explain why the scribe did not then change 71:14.

42. VanderKam, "Righteous One," 184. VanderKam arrives at this conclusion because he is reluctant to admit an internal contradiction in chapters 70–71.

43. Dillmann's lexicon offers (1) apud, juxta, penes; (2) ad, versus, in. (A. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* [Leipzig: Weigel, 1865]).

roles. *1 Enoch* 70:1, then, makes a clear distinction between Enoch and the Son of Man, which cannot be avoided. This distinction, in fact, seems to be presupposed throughout the *Similitudes,* where Enoch sees the Son of Man without any suggestion that he is seeing himself.

The distinction between Enoch and the Son of Man in 70:1 is also crucial for another disputed question in the *Similitudes:* the preexistence of the Son of Man. According to *1 Enoch* 48:3: "Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits." The act of naming is closely related to creation — compare Ps 147:4 where Yahweh names the stars.[44] Also the name often stands for the person, as in *1 Enoch* 70:1 where the *name* of Enoch is raised aloft. Consequently, *1 Enoch* 48:3 seems to mean that the Son of Man was created before the sun and the stars. Moreover, 48:3 adds that "he was chosen and hidden before him before the world was created." It seems reasonable to assume that he had to exist in order to be hidden. Yet a number of scholars have held with T. W. Manson that preexistence here only means "a project in the mind of God."[45] So VanderKam suggests that "perhaps, then, the choosing and hiding refer to no more than premundane election and concealment of his identity."[46] For VanderKam, a crucial question is whether any text shows the Son of Man as already existing in heaven during Enoch's earthly life. Precisely such a text is provided by 70:1, where Enoch, at the end of his life, is exalted to the presence of the Son of Man. If the Son of Man was already present in heaven in the antediluvian period, then the texts in chapter 48 can reasonably be interpreted to mean that he was created, like wisdom, before the creation of the earth.

What then of the apparent identification with Enoch in 71:14? In light of the transition from third person to first person at 70:3, it is very likely that the second epilogue was added secondarily.[47] It is possible, but not demonstrable, that a Jewish redactor identified Enoch with the Son of Man

44. Also the opening verses of the Babylonian creation story, the *Enuma Elish.* See further Gottfried Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985) 165-71.

45. T. W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 32 (1949-50) 183-85.

46. VanderKam, "Righteous One," 180.

47. Compare Knibb, "The Structure and Composition," 63; Nickelsburg, "Discerning the Structure(s)," 43. Nickelsburg suggests that chapter 71 is "a summary of the whole Enochic experience with a tendentious addition, namely, the identification of Enoch as the future eschatological judge."

to counter the Christian identification with Jesus.[48] The apparent identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 71:14 remains a problem, however, even for a redactor. If the two figures are indeed identified, then the author, or redactor, must have regarded Enoch as the heavenly man incarnate, although Enoch was apparently unaware of his own identity throughout his visions, and was separated from his heavenly form during his earthly career. So VanderKam suggests that "a creature of flesh and blood could have a heavenly double or counterpart."[49] A partial parallel for such a concept can be found in the *Prayer of Joseph,* where Jacob declares that "I, Jacob, who am speaking to you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit," and goes on to recall that "when I was coming up from Syrian Mesopotamia, Uriel the angel of God came forth and said that I [Jacob-Israel] had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob."[50] Jacob, however, was apparently aware of his heavenly identity, as he proceeds to tell Uriel's name and rank among the sons of God. Alternatively, we would have to suppose that Enoch's identity was somehow merged with that of a being from whom he was previously distinct. In the later *Sefer Hekhalot,* or *3 Enoch,* Metatron, "the little Yahweh," declares that he is Enoch, son of Jared, who was taken up in the generation of the Flood (4:3-5), enlarged until he matched the world in length and breadth (9:2) and installed on a throne of glory (10:1).[51] In this case, however, it would seem that the human Enoch is transformed into a new angel, rather than merged with one already in heaven. The fact that Enoch is later identified with Metatron may seem to favor the view that he is here identified with the Son of Man, in view of "the overall trajectory of the Enoch tradition,"[52] but it should also be

48. Stefan Schreiber, *Gesalbter und König. Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenerwartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften* (BZNW 105; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000) 342; idem, "Henoch als Menschensohn. Zur problematischen Schlussidentifikation in den Bilderreden des äthiopischen Henochbuches (äthHen 71,14)," *ZNW* 91 (2000) 1-17.

49. VanderKam, "Righteous One," 182-83. So also Andrei Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 84, and, tentatively, Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation,* 65. Chester notes that Enoch and the Son of Man are clearly separate figures prior to this point.

50. Trans. Jonathan Z. Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2.713. Compare also GenR 68.12, where Jacob's features are said to exist in heaven while he is on earth.

51. See P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1.258-63; Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God,* 132-34.

52. J. R. Davila, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," in Carey C. Newman,

noted that the titles used in the *Similitudes* (Son of Man, Messiah, Righteous One, Chosen One) are almost entirely lacking in 3 Enoch, except for one occurrence of Chosen One.[53]

It is possible that the *Similitudes* identify Enoch with the Son of Man in a way that has no exact parallel, but another possibility must also be considered. *1 Enoch* 71:14 is one of two passages in the *Similitudes* where "son of man" is used in direct address. In 60:10 an angel calls Enoch "son of man" after the manner of Ezekiel, but this passage has usually been discounted as part of a Noahic fragment, and from a different author. It serves to remind us, however, that in itself the phrase "son of man" only means "human being." Usually in the *Similitudes,* the reference is specified by the use of the demonstrative. "That Son of Man" is the figure Enoch saw in chapter 46, and simultaneously the figure of Daniel's vision. Where the demonstrative is lacking, it is usually rendered superfluous by the context: 62:7 follows an occurrence with the demonstrative in 62:5 and 69:27 follows an occurrence in 69:26. The greeting addressed to Enoch in 71:14 is exceptional in this regard. In fact, the Ethiopic greeting *'anta we'etu walda be'esi* could even be translated "you are *a* son of man . . ." since Ethiopic has no definite or indefinite article, and the word *we'etu* here functions as a copula rather than as a demonstrative.[54] This appears to be how this passage was read in Ethiopic tradition, where the heavenly Son of Man was assumed to be Christ, and Enoch, obviously, was not identified with him.[55] The possibility arises, then, that Enoch is not being identified with the Son of Man of his visions at all.[56]

The objection to this view is that 71:14 ("you are the son of man who was born to righteousness, . . . and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not leave you . . .") recalls the first appearance of "that Son of Man" with the Head of Days in 46:3 ("you are the son of man who has righteous-

---

James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (JSJSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 3-18 (here, 12).

53. James R. Davila, "Melchizedek, The 'Youth,' and Jesus," in J. R. Davila, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 248-74 (here, 264); Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition,* 85.

54. See Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic,* 29.

55. For information about Ethiopic tradition I rely on information supplied by Daniel Assefa.

56. So also Mowinckel, *He That Cometh,* 442-43. Ephraim Isaac, "1 Enoch," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1.50, argues for the general sense "human being" here on the grounds that the Ethiopic word is *be'esi,* but *be'esi* is also used in 69:29, where Isaac capitalizes Son of Man.

ness and with whom righteousness dwells").[57] Enoch is not being greeted simply as a human being, but as a very specific human being, in language closely related to that used for the heavenly Son of Man. He is not necessarily identified with the heavenly figure, however. Throughout the *Similitudes,* there is close parallelism between the elect and the holy in heaven and their counterparts on earth.[58] So in 38:1-2 we read "When the community of the righteous appears . . . and when the Righteous One appears before the chosen righteous. . . ." The Son of Man is the preeminent Righteous One in heaven, the supernatural counterpart not of the individual Enoch but of all righteous human beings. In this respect, his relation to the earthly righteous is similar to that of the "one like a son of man," or of the archangel Michael, to the Judean community in Daniel, or of Michael or the Prince of Light to the human community in the Qumran War Scroll. Insofar as Enoch is preeminent among righteous human beings he has a unique affinity with the heavenly Son of Man. Moreover, there is a significant variation between 71:14 and the earlier passage. In 46:3 the Son of Man simply "has" righteousness; in 71:14 he "was born to righteousness." Enoch, then, is a human being in the likeness of the heavenly Son of Man, and is exalted to share his destiny. According to *1 Enoch* 62:14 and 71:17, other righteous human beings, too, will enjoy length of days with *that* Son of Man. Enoch is first among the earth-born righteous. He must still be distinguished, however, from his heavenly counterpart.

The figure of the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* shows considerable development over against Daniel's "one like a son of man." In later, rabbinic, tradition the name of the messiah is listed among the things that preceded the creation of the world.[59] The Son of Man is equated with the messiah in *1 Enoch* 48:10 and 52:4. While the title messiah plays a minor role in the *Similitudes,* it is all the more significant that the identification of messiah and Son of Man can be assumed. Daniel's "one like a son of man" appears after the judgment of the beasts/kingdoms. In the *Similitudes* he is said to cast down kings from their thrones and from their kingdoms, and he takes his seat on his throne of glory as judge (62:5; 69:29). He also has the role of

57. Different Ethiopic phrases are used in the two passages, *walda sabe'* in 46:3 and *walda be'esi* in 71:14, but these may be only translation variants.

58. Collins, "The Heavenly Representative," 113. E.g. in 61:4 "the chosen will begin to live with the chosen," i.e. the human chosen ones will begin to live with the heavenly ones.

59. See Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975) 1.684-85; 2.1005-6. Urbach notes that "there are no grounds . . . for a distinction between the pre-existence of his name and the pre-existence of his personality."

revealer.[60] In many respects he seems to be assimilated to the Deity (who also sits on the throne of his glory). In 48:5, people fall down and worship him.[61]

In view of the aggrandizement of the Son of Man in the Similitudes, many scholars have assumed that the figure is informed by non-Jewish traditions.[62] This assumption has been seriously challenged in recent years.[63] Some new elements in the *Similitudes* can be seen to arise from ambiguities in the text of Daniel. Some are suggested by other biblical passages, or are required by the context of the *Similitudes* themselves. The fact that "thrones were set" in Dan 7:9 led naturally enough to the inference that one of them was for the "Son of Man" figure. It was a short step from there to the assumption that he had an active role in the judgment. That he will cast down the kings from their thrones corresponds to the destruction of the beasts/kingdoms in Daniel. The books opened in *1 Enoch* 47:3 are not the books of judgment as in Daniel 7 but rather the books of life as in Dan 12:1. The apparition of the figure on the clouds in Daniel could easily suggest preexistence. The portrait of the Son of Man figure was filled out with reminiscences of preexistent Wisdom (Proverbs 8), which was also a revealer, and of the hidden servant of the Lord (Isa 49:2: "in his quiver he hid me away").[64] There are also messianic overtones, even apart from the use of the title messiah. The account of the Chosen One in *1 Enoch* 62:2 ("the spirit of righteousness was poured out on him and the word of his mouth kills all the sinners . . .") recalls Isa 11:2, 4.[65] The motif of a second figure enthroned beside God has its clearest precedent in Psalm 110, an-

60. For a summary of the roles of the Son of Man, see Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 116-19. Stuckenbruck, "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism," 101, comments that all these functions are co-opted into a profile for the messiah, but that profile is shaped by Daniel 7 far more than by traditional messianic expectation.

61. This, at least, is the most natural reading of 48:5: "All those who dwell upon the dry ground will fall down and worship before him. . . ." It is conceivable, however, that the implied antecedent is the Lord of Spirits.

62. So especially Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*, 190; compare already Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1903) 251.

63. See especially Theisohn, *De auserwählte Richter.* Ulrich B. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbaring des Johannes* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972) 36-51.

64. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 114-43. Compare also the motif of the light to the nations in *1 Enoch* 48.4. See also Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (2nd ed.), 93-98, on parallels between Isaiah 52–53 and *1 Enoch* 62.

65. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 63.

other royal passage.[66] Nonetheless, he is not a Davidic messiah in any conventional sense. He does not establish a kingdom on earth. Rather, some attributes traditionally associated with the Davidic messiah are here transferred to a heavenly savior figure.

The Enochic Son of Man cannot be adequately understood only in terms of allusions to texts and traditions. The *Similitudes* were not composed for the sake of expounding Daniel, but to articulate the worldview of a particular group of Jews in the first century CE. The Son of Man is an integral part of the symbolic world of the *Similitudes.* Fundamental to that worldview is the belief in a hidden world where the power structures of this world are reversed. The Son of Man is the heavenly counterpart of the righteous on earth.[67] While they are oppressed and lowly, he is enthroned and exalted. When he is manifested at the eschatological judgment, they will be exalted, too. The *Similitudes,* then, make creative use of Daniel 7 to develop their own new expression of the faith and hope of the righteous.

While they are not primarily a work of interpretation, however, the *Similitudes* remain an important witness to the early understanding of Daniel. They take for granted that Daniel's "one like a son of man" is a heavenly individual of very exalted status. While they offer no reason to think that this figure was known independently of Daniel, they show how the Danielic text inspired visions of a heavenly savior figure in first-century Judaism.

Fourth Ezra

Daniel 7 is also reflected in *4 Ezra* 13, a Jewish apocalypse from the end of the first century CE.[68] There Ezra reports:

> Then after seven days, I had a dream in the night. I saw a wind rising from the sea that stirred up all its waves. As I kept looking, that wind brought up out of the depths of the sea something resembling a man and that man was flying with the clouds of heaven. . . .

66. In light of these parallels, Casey's argument that the author does not attribute kingship to the Son of Man, because Enoch was not a king, or because of deliberate rejection of the Davidic line, is unconvincing (*Son of Man,* 111).

67. See further Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination,* 177-93.

68. Ibid., 156.

The apocalypse was certainly composed in a Semitic language,[69] but is only extant in several versions, of which the Latin and Syriac are most important. The statement "that wind brought up out of the sea something resembling a man" is missing in the Latin, apparently because of *homoioteleuton.* Most scholars assume that the missing passage read *homo* for "man" since this is what the Latin uses elsewhere in the chapter, and the Ethiopic has *be'esi,* man.[70] The Syriac, however, reads *'yk dmwt' dbrns,* which suggests that the original may have read "son of man," (בן אדם or בר אנשא), and it can be argued that the author used the longer phrase initially and the shorter "man" thereafter.[71] A further textual problem concerns the relation between the wind and the man. The Ethiopic version reads "this wind came out of the sea in the resemblance of a man." It has been argued that this is the *lectio difficilor,* and that "wind" is a misconstrual of the רוחא/רוח, "spirit."[72] This reading is dubious at best, and most scholars restore the Latin on the basis of the Syriac, which has the wind bring the man up.[73]

Regardless of the precise terminology, most scholars take the man flying with the clouds as a clear allusion here to Daniel 7.[74] There is no doubt that *4 Ezra* knew and used Daniel, and specifically Daniel 7. In *4 Ezra* 12:11 the interpreting angel tells Ezra explicitly: "The eagle you observed coming up out of the sea is the fourth kingdom that appeared in a vision to Daniel your brother. But it was not interpreted to him in the same way that I now interpret it to you." Since this reference to the four-kingdom motif comes in the vision immediately preceding *4 Ezra* 13, it is *prima facie* probable that the vision of the man from the sea is also based on Daniel 7. Moreover, the interpretation in chapter 13 provides an unmistakable allusion to Daniel 2, when it says that the mountain on which the man takes his stand was "carved out without hands" — a detail not mentioned in the vision.

69. Most scholars favor Hebrew, but Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic,* 521, offers a retroversion of chapter 13 into Aramaic.

70. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic,* 517.

71. Caragounis, *The Son of Man,* 127-28. Compare the *Similitudes, 1 Enoch* 46:1, which initially refers to "another, whose face had the appearance of a man."

72. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic,* 517-20.

73. See Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras* (Anchor Bible 42; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974) 302; M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 381.

74. See André Lacocque, "The Vision of the Eagle in 4 Esdras, a Rereading of Daniel 7 in the First Century CE," in K. H. Richards, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 237-58. The allusion has been disputed by Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic,* 522-23. For criticism of his position see my essay "The Son of Man in First Century Judaism," *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992) 460-61.

Michael Stone has argued strongly that the vision (*4 Ezra* 13:1-13) is an independent piece, reinterpreted but not composed by the author of *4 Ezra.*[75] The interpretation contains extensive material that is not directly connected to the vision. The description of eschatological woes in vv. 29-38 is introduced to explain the fire and tempest that come from the man's mouth. It refers back to the vision at several points, but is rather circuitous as an interpretation. The host that the man collects is identified as the ten lost tribes, which then become the subject of a digression (vv. 40-46). The companions of the man are introduced in v. 52 although they were not mentioned in the vision (but cf. 7:28). The order of interpretation is also confused: the sea, which appears at the beginning of the vision, is not interpreted until vv. 51-52. Stone notes the contrast with *4 Ezra* 12, where the interpretation follows the vision closely, and concludes that "only the attempt to give a new interpretation to a vision which he had before him" can explain the data.[76]

While it may seem unduly complicated to argue that *4 Ezra* used both Daniel 7 (explicitly in chapter 12) and another source that itself depended on Daniel 7 (in chapter 13), the cumulative weight of Stone's arguments is compelling, especially in view of the contrast with chapter 12.[77] The strongest argument concerns the eschatological woes. These provide the context for the interpretation of the vision, but we should expect that if the same author had composed the vision he would have represented the context therein, and laid an adequate foundation for the interpretation. Even if the vision was originally independent, however, the figure flying on the clouds must still be understood as an allusion to Daniel 7. The vision cannot be taken as evidence for a "Son of Man" concept independent of Daniel 7. Moreover, the allusion to Daniel 7 must have been recognized by the author of *4 Ezra:* hence the placement of the vision immediately after the explicit reference to Daniel in chapter 12.

75. Michael E. Stone, *Features of the Eschatology of 4 Ezra* (Harvard Semitic Studies 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 123-25; "The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra," in J. Neusner, ed., *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough* (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 305-6; and "The Question of the Messiah in 4 Ezra," in Neusner et al., eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs,* 213. Kearns, *Vorfragen zur Christologie,* 2,53-62, also isolates an independent vision, but his argument depends on imposing unwarranted standards of formal consistency on the material. See the critique of Kearns by Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic,* 527-29.

76. Stone, *Features,* 124.

77. For a contrary view, see Casey, *Son of Man,* 122-29. See Stone's rebuttal, in *Fourth Ezra,* 395-96.

In the interpretation, the "man" of the vision is identified as "he whom the Most High has been keeping for many ages, who will himself deliver his creation" (v. 26).[78] This figure is further identified, in the Latin and Syriac versions, as "my son" (13:37, 52) and thereby with the messiah, who is called "my son" in 7:28.[79] We have noted in the preceding chapter that *4 Ezra* 13:33-38, which deals with the assault of the Gentiles on Mount Zion, is reminiscent of Psalm 2.[80] In the Psalm, the Lord says: "I have set my king on Zion my holy mountain," and continues in the next verse: "you are my son, this day I have begotten you." In *4 Ezra* 13, too, the messiah takes his stand on Mount Zion (13:35). In any case, it is clear that the man of the vision is identified with the messiah in the context of *4 Ezra.* This identification is probably implicit already in the vision, where the man takes his stand on a mountain and burns up the attacking multitude with a fiery breath: compare Psalm 2 and Isaiah 11, where the shoot from the stump of Jesse will kill the wicked with the breath of his lips. The motif of gathering the people (13:12-13) is associated with the messiah in *Psalms of Solomon* 17:26.

Stone has written that "even if the man in the dream was the traditional 'Son of Man,' the author had to interpret that figure to his readers. Moreover, the author has shorn the Son of Man of all his particular characteristics in the interpretation and treated him as a symbol. This would be inconceivable if the Son of Man concept was readily recognizable to him and his readers."[81] Presumably, by "the Son of Man concept" Stone means the composite Primordial Man of the old "history of religions school," which is certainly not implied in *4 Ezra.* It can hardly be doubted, however, that an allusion to Dan 7:13 was readily recognizable to both the author of the interpretation and his readers. The fact that an interpretation follows does not necessarily mean that the vision would have been unfamiliar or unintelligible. Interpretations were a conventional part of the apocalyptic genre, and provided an opportunity for the author to give a new twist to

78. A. Peter Hayman, "The 'Man from the Sea' in 4 Ezra 13," *JJS* 49 (1998) 1-16, argues that in the original vision the man stood for Yahweh, and that his rising from the sea symbolized victory over Yamm as in the Ugaritic myth.

79. See Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah,* 94-98; Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra* (JSJSup 130; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 195-98.

80. This is also noted by George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," in Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 6:141 and Stuckenbruck, "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism," 106-8. See Collins, "The Interpretation of Psalm 2," 61-63.

81. Stone, "The Question of the Messiah in 4 Ezra," 213.

familiar, traditional symbolism. The statement that this figure is treated as a symbol also requires some qualification. Apocalyptic symbols may be either allegorical or mythic-realistic. So for example, the beasts in Daniel 7 are allegorical symbols that stand for something else (kings or kingdoms), but the Ancient of Days is a mythic-realistic representation of God, and is identified rather than interpreted. In *4 Ezra* 13 the man is clearly a mythic-realistic representation of the messiah: "then my son will be revealed, whom you saw as a man coming up from the sea" (13:32). So, while the author shows no awareness of a Hellenistic-oriental myth of a "Primordial Man," he is surely offering an interpretation (or reinterpretation) of Daniel's "one like a son of man."[82]

Like the *Similitudes of Enoch, 4 Ezra* 13 contains much that is not explicit in Daniel's vision. The vision is reminiscent of traditional theophanies of the divine warrior. All who hear the voice of the man melt before it, as the mountains traditionally melted before the Lord. The man then takes a much more active part in the destruction and judgment of the wicked than was the case in Daniel. The interpretation of the figure owes much more to traditional messianic motifs than to Daniel 7.

Unlike the *Similitudes of Enoch, 4 Ezra* has a developed notion of a Davidic messiah. In 7:28-29 he is called "my son (or servant) the messiah." He is "revealed with those who are with him," a formulation that seems to imply preexistence. They "rejoice four hundred years." Then the messiah dies, the world reverts to primeval silence for seven days and the resurrection follows. This scenario has no clear precedent in earlier traditions, but has some interesting parallels in other works of the late first century CE. In *2 Baruch* 29–30 the messiah "shall begin to be revealed," and Behemoth and Leviathan shall return from the sea to serve as food for all that survive. A period of wonderful fertility follows, after which the messiah "will return in glory." The Christian book of Revelation naturally gives prominence to the death of the messiah. More remarkably, it also provides for two resurrections rather than one. The elect who share in the first resurrection reign with Christ for a thousand years (Rev 20:4). In each of these apocalypses there seems to be an attempt to combine different eschatological traditions, one of which looks for a kingdom on this earth while the other looks for resurrection of the dead and a new creation, by having each tradition define a stage in the eschatological process.[83]

82. Compare Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 188.

83. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn*, 91.

A more traditional account of the messiah is found in *4 Ezra* 11–12. Here he appears as a lion, symbolizing his Judahite descent (cf. Gen 49:9-10).[84] The lion is interpreted explicitly as "the Messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days, who will arise from the offspring of David" (12:32). The lion confronts an eagle, symbolizing Rome, which is further identified as the fourth beast of Daniel's vision (12:11). The messiah will denounce Rome for ungodliness, then "he will bring them alive before his judgment seat, and when he has reproved them, then he will destroy them" (12:33). He will then set free "the remnant of my people." This judgment scene is presumably the same as the one described in chapter 13, which, as we have seen, also draws on traditional messianic imagery. Since the messiah is "revealed" in *4 Ezra,* he can readily be identified with the figure who comes on the clouds. Unlike the *Similitudes,* however, the judgment takes place on earth and is associated with the restoration of the Jewish people. In short, the messianic imagery defines the savior figure here to a much greater degree than in the *Similitudes.*

Yet the understanding of the messiah is also modified by the correlation with the "Son of Man" figure. As Stone has noted, "Kingship nowhere figures in the concept of the Messiah" in *4 Ezra,* and his Davidic descent (12:32) is "a traditional element and not at all central to the concepts of the book."[85] Rather, he is a preexistent, transcendent figure, whom the Most High has been keeping for many ages.

The relation of *4 Ezra* 13 to the *Similitudes of Enoch* is also complex. On the whole, the "man from the sea" is very different from the Enochic Son of Man. The one is a warrior who takes his stand on a mountain and is concerned with the restoration of Israel and Zion. The other is a judge enthroned in heaven. There is no allusion to the *Similitudes* in *4 Ezra,* and there is no reason to posit literary influence between them.[86]

Common Assumptions

Nonetheless, the *Similitudes* and *4 Ezra* have some common features that are significant for the understanding of Daniel 7 in the first century.

84. Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict,* 180; Stuckenbruck, "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature," 104-5.

85. Stone, *Features,* 131-32.

86. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter,* 145, concludes that 4 Ezra 13 does not reflect the *Similitudes* in any way.

First, both assume that the "one like a son of man" in Daniel refers to an individual, and is not a collective symbol. In fact, the collective interpretation is not clearly attested in Jewish sources until Ibn Ezra.[87]

Second, this figure is identified in both works as the messiah, and the understanding of "messiah" is thereby qualified. The title messiah has only minor importance in the *Similitudes,* but the fact that it is still used there shows that it must have been commonly associated with the Danielic "Son of Man." This again is in accordance with the prevalent interpretation in early Jewish tradition.[88]

Third, he is preexistent: "the one whom the Most High has kept for many ages,"[89] and therefore a transcendent figure of heavenly origin, even if he also has a Davidic ancestry in *4 Ezra.* Both figures, in different ways, appropriate imagery traditionally reserved for God: the Enochic Son of Man sits on the throne of glory, and the figure in *4 Ezra* is portrayed in terms of the theophany of the divine warrior.[90] Even the association with the clouds in Daniel was a motif traditionally associated with the Deity.[91]

Fourth, this figure takes a more active role in the destruction of the wicked than was explicit in Daniel.

If "servant" rather than "son" is the original designation of the messiah in *4 Ezra,* then the possibility arises that both documents associate this figure with the Isaianic "servant of the Lord." In neither document, however, does the Son of Man figure undergo suffering. While the *Similitudes* contain some clear allusions to the text of Isaiah (e.g. 48:4, "light of the nations," cf. Isa 49:6), that is not the case in *4 Ezra* 13. At most, the motif of "hiddenness" may be derived from Isa 49:2 ("in his quiver he hid me

87. Casey, *Son of Man,* 81-83, claims to find the collective view in two late rabbinic passages, *Midrash on Psalms* 21.5 and *Tanhuma Toledoth* 20, but even he admits that it is not obvious in either case. Casey's further claim that Porphyry held a collective interpretation that he had derived from Syrian tradition (*Son of Man,* 51-70) goes far beyond the evidence. Jerome, in his commentary at 7:14, challenges Porphyry to identify the figure ("Let Porphyry answer the query of whom out of all mankind this language might apply to . . ."), thereby implying that Porphyry had failed to do so.

88. b. Sanh. 98a; Numbers Rabbah 13.14; *Aggadat Bereshit* 14.3; 23.1 and Rabbi Akiba's explanation of the plural "thrones" as one for God, one for David (b. Ḥag. 14a; b. Sanh. 38b). See Caragounis, *Son of Man,* 131-36. See further Horbury, "The Messianic Associations of 'The Son of Man.'"

89. 4 Ezra 13:26. Compare 7:28. Caragounis, *The Son of Man,* 129.

90. Stone, *Features,* 127-28.

91. J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1958) 231-32.

away"). It would be quite misleading, however, to speak of a "suffering servant" in this connection.

The correspondences between *4 Ezra* and the *Similitudes* point to common assumptions about the interpretation of Daniel 7 in first-century Judaism. It is difficult to say how widespread these assumptions were. Allusions to Daniel 7:13-14 are conspicuously absent at Qumran (apart from the "Son of God" text, 4Q246), despite the heavy use of other parts of Daniel, especially chapter 11, in the Scrolls. However, there is no evidence of influence between the *Similitudes* and *4 Ezra,* and they were certainly not products of a single group. It is reasonable to suppose that their common assumptions were also shared by others in first-century Judaism.

The notion of a heavenly savior king, not explicitly called a messiah, is also found in the fifth *Sibylline Oracle,* a document of Egyptian Judaism from the late first or early second century CE.[92] Three passages in this oracle speak of a savior figure.[93] *Sib Or* 5:108-9 speaks briefly of "a certain king sent from God" (not necessarily from heaven). *Sib Or* 5:256-59 is Christian in its present form: "There will again be one exceptional man from the sky, who stretched out his hands on the fruitful wood, the best of the Hebrews, who will one day cause the sun to stand, speaking with fair speech and holy lips." The structure of the passage, however, requires a saving figure at this point,[94] and only the allusion to crucifixion is necessarily Christian. The notion of a Joshua-*redivivus,* however, might be inspired by the name of Jesus, and so the value of this passage as evidence for Jewish beliefs is suspect. *Sib Or* 5:414-33 speaks of "a blessed man from the expanses of heaven with a scepter in his hands which God gave him" in "the last time of holy ones." This latter passage brings Daniel 7 to mind, especially in view of the allusion to holy ones,[95] but it is not certain whether an allusion is intended. The passage does, in any case, emphasize the heavenly origin of the savior figure.

The notion of a king from heaven is not without parallel in the Helle-

92. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism,* 87-89; Martin Hengel, "Messianische Hoffnung und politischer 'Radikalismus in der 'jüdisch-hellenistischen Diaspora,'" in Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East,* 655-86.

93. Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation,* 350-1. A fourth passage, 155-61, which speaks of a great star that will come from heaven and burn the deep sea, Babylon, and the land of Italy, might arguably be included, but the imagery here is more complex.

94. On the structure of *Sib Or* 5 see Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles,* 74. Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation,* 399-400 also accepts the authenticity of the oracle apart from verse 257.

95. Horbury, "Messianic Associations," 44-45; Paget, "Egypt," 188.

nistic world outside of Judaism. The *Oracle of Hystaspes,* which is now widely recognized as a Persian-Hellenistic composition of the last century BCE, says that in a time of distress when the righteous are shut in and besieged, God will "send from heaven a great king to rescue and free them, and destroy all the wicked with fire and sword."[96] The identity of the "great king" in a Persian source is disputed. Hinnells argues for the Zoroastrian savior *Soshyant.*[97] Colpe proposes a native Persian king.[98] There is no reason to posit Persian influence on any of the Jewish texts we have been considering, however. Such similarity in concepts as we find here can be adequately explained as a common reaction to the spread of Roman rule in the Orient.

In Jewish writings the emphasis on the heavenly character of the savior king appears in texts of the first century CE, especially in the period after the failure of the first revolt against Rome and the destruction of the Temple (*4 Ezra, Sib Or* 5). We may suspect, then, that it reflects a certain disillusionment with messiahs of human, earthly origin. The disillusionment was not complete, as can be seen from the messianic revolts of the early second century. Also the hope for a heavenly deliverer, under God, is attested in the early apocalyptic literature, notably Daniel 7, and the heavenly messiah of the *Similitudes* is likely to be older than 70 CE. What we find in the writings of the first century CE, however, is a tendency to combine traditions about a Davidic messiah with the expectation of a heavenly savior. There was, then, some flexibility in the use of messianic traditions in this period. Daniel's "one like a son of man" could be understood either as a purely heavenly figure (in the *Similitudes*) or as a messiah who operates on earth to restore Israel *(4 Ezra).* Danielic imagery could be applied to the Davidic messiah to give him a more heavenly, transcendent character than is apparent in other sources. In short, "Davidic messiah" and "Son

96. Lactantius, *Divine Institutions* 7.17. Since Hystaspes is only transmitted by the Christian Lactantius, there are doubts about the authenticity of some of the material. See John R. Hinnells, "The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman World: A Study of the Oracle of Hystaspes," in E. J. Sharpe and J. R. Hinnells, eds., *Man and His Salvation. Studies in Memory of S. G. F. Brandon* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973) 125-48; Hans G. Kippenberg, "Die Geschichte der Mittelpersischen Apokalyptischen Traditionen," *Studia Iranica* 7 (1978) 70-75; Anders Hultgård, "Persian Apocalypticism," in John J. Collins, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism.* Vol. 1. *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998) 74-76.

97. Hinnells, "The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation," 144.

98. Carsten Colpe, "Der Begriff 'Menschensohn' und die Methode der Erforschung messianischer Prototypen," *Kairos* 12 (1970) 81-112.

of Man" were not mutually exclusive concepts. Each involves a cluster of motifs, which could be made to overlap. Rather than two types, we should think of a spectrum of messianic expectation, ranging from the earthly messiah of the *Psalms of Solomon* and several Dead Sea Scrolls, through the transcendent messiah of *4 Ezra* to the heavenly figure of the *Similitudes of Enoch*. Perrin's conclusion that "there is no 'Son of Man' concept but rather a variety of uses of Son of Man imagery,"[99] can be defended, if we recognize that the variety is limited and does not negate the core of common assumptions either about the figure in Daniel's vision or about the Davidic messiah.

99. Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage*, 26.