

“One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days”
in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13:
Scribal Error or Theological Translation?

by Loren T. Stuckenbruck

(Abbey House, Palace Green, Durham DH1 3RS, United Kingdom)

A. Introduction

In his 1927 commentary on Daniel, James A. Montgomery concluded that the “Septuagint” (Old Greek = OG) version to Daniel 7,13, in which “one as a son of man” is closely identified with the “ancient of days”, originated from a pre-Christian scribal error. A copyist mistakenly copied *ἕως* as *ὡς*, leading subsequently to a change of the following genitive *παλαιού* to the nominative form *πάλαιος*¹. As such, he argued that the text is ultimately a corruption from a text underlying the Theodotianic (= TH) and Masoretic (= MT) traditions (*ἕως τοῦ παλαιού τῶν ἡμερῶν*; אֶחָד כְּצֶדֶק יָד - “unto the ancient of days”).

Montgomery was not the first to notice this “remarkable reading”. In Kyrios Christos (1913), Wilhelm Bousset had already observed and commented on it, but unlike Montgomery supposed that the text may have been produced during the process of translation²: a translator interpreted one “as a son of man” as a heavenly being (rather than as a representative figure) and, in turn, transformed him into the “ancient of days”. Thus, whereas Montgomery would merely observe therein a scribe’s mistake which could be put to theological use at a later stage (e. g. Rev 1,14), Bousset regarded this recension as evidence for a pre-Christian belief in a pre-existent messiah on the part of a Jewish translator³.

These alternative assessments of the data, despite occasional suggestions of other ways of interpreting the OG recension⁴, have continued to find proponents ever since. In addition

¹ The Book of Daniel, ICC, 1927, 304, in which Montgomery reiterates views already published in: idem, Anent Dr. Rendel Harris’s ‘Testimonies’, Exp. 22, 1921, 214–217.

² Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenäus, Göttingen 1913, 15.

³ So Bousset in: Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, rev. d by H. Gressmann, HNT 21, ³1926, 264–265.

⁴ Two sorts of arguments have been advanced against a strict identification of figures underlying the phrases *ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* and *ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν*. First, S. Kim, The ‘Son of Man’ as the Son of God, WUNT 30, 1983, 22–25 (esp. n. 41), has proposed that *ὡς* be read as a comparative particle in both instances: the figure “like a son of man” appears, upon coming, “like [but not as] the Ancient of Days”. It is not necessary, however, to insist that both occurrences of *ὡς* in the OG must function in precisely the same way, especially if the second instance reflects a departure (whether as a mistake or theologically motivated reading) from a text such as is preserved in the MT tradition. Furthermore, since the coming figure in 7,13 has no immediate antecedent (note the reintroduction of the vision at the beginning of the verse), it is difficult not to see in *ὡς*

to a reconsideration of old problems, the ongoing discussion has been fueled by the publication of further materials, most notably the Cologne portion of Papyrus 967 (see section B below). In what follows, I would like to address the problem of how to interpret the differing Greek recensions as they exist in Daniel 7,13 and reflect briefly on the theological significance of their respective readings. This, in turn, may indicate a further need to assess the linguistic and theological character of the OG and TH recensions of Daniel as a whole. Since Montgomery’s error hypothesis has recently been revived with some thoroughgoing textual analysis⁵, I would like to offer several reasons why the view which favors a theological translation at this point in the text should continue to merit consideration⁶.

υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου a circumscriptive substantive, whereas the meaning of the second *ὡς* may either be comparative (“he came/was present as the ancient of days”) or adverbial (“he came/was present [in the same way] as the ancient of days”). The question for debate, then, is whether the figures have been functionally identified or simply coalesced (see D. 4 below). Second, F. F. Bruce, The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel, in: H. A. Brongers et al. (eds.), Instruction and Interpretation, OudSt 20, 1977, 22–40 (esp. 25), raised the possibility of translating *ὡς* as a conjunction of time: “as (when) the Ancient of Days arrived, then (*καί*) the bystanders were present beside him”. Though grammatically tenable, this less offensive reading neither squares with the most common use of *ὡς* in visionary contexts (see J. Lust, Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint, ETL 54, 1978, 65 and n.’s 17–18) nor is there any sign that later epiphanic texts of humanlike figures, insofar as they derive from descriptive elements of Dan 7, have been understood in this way. See Rev 1,14; JosAs 14,8–9; and ApcAbr 10,4–5.

⁵ See esp. S. Pace Jeansonne, The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12, CBQ.MS 19, 1988, 96–98.113–114, and A. Yarbro Collins, The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation, in: James H. Charlesworth (ed.), The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity, Minneapolis 1992, 536–568, who draws from and elaborates the results of Pace Jeansonne’s study. An erroneous text is also clearly argued, though more briefly (following Ziegler), by M. Delcor, Les sources du chapitre VII de Daniel, VT 18, 1968, 290–312, and M. Casey, Son of Man. The interpretation and influence of Daniel 7, London 1979, 132 and 141 (n. 40).

⁶ In recent years several have argued against the erroneousness of the OG: Lust, Daniel 7,13 (above n. 4) 62–69 (the most influential discussion); C. C. Caragonis, The Son of Man, Vision and Interpretation, WUNT 38, 1986, 62–63; and D. E. Aune, Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus, in: Charlesworth, Messiah (above n. 5) 421 and n.’s 63–64. Bruce’s discussion (Oldest Greek Version [above n. 4] 25–26) does not reach any definitive conclusion on the matter, while others – though aware of the interpretive problems involved – seem to regard the reading as part of the Septuagint *translation* tradition: H. R. Balz, Methodische Probleme der neutestamentlichen Christologie, WMANT 25, 1967, 69; A. F. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism, SJLA 25, 1977, 201–202; C. Rowland, The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity, London 1982, 98 (but 101, the reading is referred to as an “LXX variant”); Kim, The ‘Son of Man’ (above n. 4) 22–25, esp. 23 n. 38; O. Betz, Jesus und das Danielbuch, ANTJ 6/2, 1985, 130; and M. Hengel, ‘Setze dich zu meiner Rechten!’, in: M. Philonenko (ed.), Le Trône de Dieu, WUNT 69, 1992, 159. The formidable arguments for a corrupted text by Pace Jeansonne and Yarbro Collins appeal to some details which have not been taken into account in any of this literature.

B. The Textual Witnesses

One of Montgomery's arguments for $\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as a transmission error was the paucity of manuscripts attesting this reading⁷. In their editions to the Old Testament Greek recensions, Henry Barclay Swete⁸ and Alfred Rahlfs⁹ both had at their disposal only Codex Chisianus 88 (9th/11th cent. CE)¹⁰ and Syro-Hexapla (a 7th cent. CE ms. containing a Syriac translation of the Septuagint column of Origen's Hexapla)¹¹. If Montgomery's thesis is correct and if the chief aim of a critical edition is to reconstruct an *Urtext*, then an editor might have grounds for "restoring" $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ for the OG. This is precisely what obtained in Joseph Ziegler's thorough 1954 edition of the Göttingen Septuagint series¹²; also taking citations of the passage in Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Cyprian into consideration, Ziegler felt justified in proposing an OG text to Daniel 7,13 which diverges from that of the previous editions.

At that time, however, Ziegler was not in a position to consider the most significant textual witness for the OG to Daniel 7,13: Papyrus 967, which on paleographical grounds may be dated at least as early as the first half of the 3rd century. To be sure, Ziegler knew of the manuscript — it had been discovered at Aphroditopolis, Egypt in 1931 — and indeed used it. But the entire codex was not available to him. The papyrus leaves published as part of the Chester Beatty collection by Frederic G. Kenyon in 1937 had been separated from fragments discovered in Cologne which contain upper and (mostly) lower portions of the same columns (including Dan 7,13). The latter remained unpublished until Angelo Giessen edited all the extant portions from Daniel 5–12 in 1967¹³. As Chisianus and the Syro-Hexapla, the oldest witness to the OG recension of Daniel¹⁴ reads $\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\langle\nu\rangle$. Does Papyrus 967, then, provide evidence *contra* Ziegler's edition for the original *translation* text?

⁷ Anent Dr. Rendel Harris's 'Testimonies' (above n. 1) 216.

⁸ The Old Testament in Greek 3, Cambridge 1912, xii–xiii (discussion of ms. evidence) and 546–549 (the Dan 7 text).

⁹ Septuaginta II, Stuttgart 1935, 914.

¹⁰ Swete (The Old Testament in Greek 3, xii–xiii [above n. 8]), following F. Field's edition of Origen's Hexapla (Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt. sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta 2, Oxford 1875, esp. 922), misleadingly used the number "87" to refer to Codex Chisianus, while for him "88" functioned to designate a transcription of the ms. made by Leo Allatius in the 17th century; see J. Ziegler, Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco, Göttingen Septuaginta 16/2, 1954, 10. This designation error is repeated by F. G. Kenyon in: The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasciculus VII: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther, London 1937. Whereas Swete attempted to reproduce Chisianus as faithfully as possible as the basis for this text, Rahlfs' text represents the reconstruction of an *Urtext* based on Chisianus and the Syro-Hexapla. Swete's discussion of the mss. (The Old Testament in Greek 3, xii–xiii) is still helpful, though one should also consult Ziegler (Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco, 7–18).

¹¹ For this ms. the editions of Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler — the latter not uncritically — are all dependent on Field's edition, Origenis Hexaplorum (above n. 10).

¹² Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco, esp. 169–170.

¹³ Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel, Kap. 5–12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco, sowie Esther Kap. 1,1a–2,15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967, Bonn 1967.

¹⁴ Giessen (ibid., 18) dates the papyrus to the 2nd century.

C. The Error Hypothesis: An Evaluation

While many have answered this question positively¹⁵, Sharon Pace Jeansonne and Adela Yarbro Collins have recently advanced a series of formidable arguments to the contrary¹⁶. Before I attempt a response to them, it may be helpful, for the sake of clarity, to summarize the discussion thus far by presenting in synoptic format the MT tradition and various readings for the Greek editions and recensions of Daniel 7,13:

MT			
תוה הויה בחורי ליליא וארו עם עניי שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוה ועד ערוק יומיא מסא וקדמוהי הקרבוהי			
Theodotion (Cod. s A and B)	RAHLFS, SWETE (Chisianus, SyH and margin)	ZIEGLER	CP 967
ἑθεώρουν	ἑθεώρουν	ἑθεώρουν	ἑθεώρουν
ἐν ὀράματι	ἐν ὀράματι	ἐν ὀράματι	ἐν ὀράματι
τῆς νυκτὸς	τῆς νυκτὸς	τῆς νυκτὸς	τῆς νυκτὸς
καὶ ἰδοῦ	καὶ ἰδοῦ	καὶ ἰδοῦ	καὶ ἰδοῦ
μετὰ	ἐπὶ	ἐπὶ	ἐπὶ
τῶν νεφελῶν	τῶν νεφελῶν	τῶν νεφελῶν	τῶν νεφελῶν
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἤρχετο
ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου	ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου	ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου	ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἐρχόμενος	ἤρχετο	ἤρχετο	
καὶ	καὶ	καὶ	καὶ
ἕως	ὡς	ἕως	ὡς
τοῦ παλαιοῦ	παλαιὸς	τοῦ παλαιοῦ	παλαιὸς
τῶν ἡμερῶν	ἡμερῶν	ἡμερῶν	ἡμερῶν
ἔφθασε καὶ	παρῆν καὶ	παρῆν καὶ	παρῆν καὶ
	οἱ παρεστηκότες	οἱ παρεστηκότες	οἱ παρεστηκότες
προσῆχθη αὐτῷ	παρῆσαν αὐτῷ	προσῆγαγον αὐτόν	προσῆγαγον αὐτῷ
(Cod. B = ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ)	(SyH margin <i>qrbyn hww</i> ¹⁷)		

Along the lines of Montgomery's explanation, the analyses of Pace Jeansonne and Yarbro Collins agree essentially in postulating a series of corruptive changes to the text. They propose the following sequence: (1) a scribe miscopied an original $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ as $\omega\varsigma$ through influ-

¹⁵ So the authors listed above in n. 6.

¹⁶ See above n. 5.

¹⁷ Lust (Daniel 7,13 [above n. 4] 63) is thus correct to suggest that Ziegler's retroversion of the marginal note in the Syro-Hexapla as *προσῆγαγον αὐτόν* (Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco [above n. 10] 170) — a backtranslation accommodated to TH and followed by Bruce, Pace Jeansonne, and Hengel — is "risky" if not simply wrong. As an active plural participle, the form *qrbyn* may not have a meaning different from that of the Syro-Hexaplaric text (cf. SyH text: *qrbyn*). Moreover, and as Lust notes (ibid., 64 n. 10), the form *lh*, translatable as either *αὐτῷ* or *αὐτόν*, does *not* occur in the marginal note; see Field, Origenis Hexaplorum 2 (above n. 10) 922 n. 16.

ence from the preceding $\omega\varsigma$; (2) in order to accommodate this inadvertent change, παλαιού underwent a deliberate grammatical “correction” to the nominative παλαιός; (3) at the end of verse 13, προσήγαγον was altered to παρήσαν (a secondary corruption, not yet evident in CP 967, and based on the preceding form παρήν); and (4) in order to accommodate παρήσαν, αὐτόν (as in Cod. Alex. = MT) was altered to αὐτῷ.

This text-historical reconstruction may be questioned on several points. First, we may make an observation more immediately concerned with the text of Ziegler: Corruption (3) does not account for the presence of παρήν (in $\omega\varsigma$ παλαιός ἡμερῶν παρήν), the reading from which the change from προσήγαγον to παρήσαν is supposed to be derived. It is possible, if not likely, that παρήν is more an original component in Ziegler’s text than the preposition $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ – Ziegler’s attempted correction of $\omega\varsigma$ –, a term with which the verb makes little sense, i. e. “and unto the ancient of days he was present”. Or, if the reading such as $\epsilon\theta\beta\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu/\pi\omega\omega$ (TH = MT) was original, how would one account for an alteration to παρήν if not that a reading such as $\omega\varsigma$ παλαιός was already in the text? In either case, Ziegler’s text is problematic at this point. Regardless of what one makes of the presence of παρήσαν αὐτῷ in Chisianus and in the text and margin of the Syro-Hexapla (see the second argument below), the mere occurrence of παρήν – which more probably presupposes $\omega\varsigma$ than $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ – may of itself simply reflect a theological intentionality. Παρήν cannot be explained as a textual corruption.

Second, no matter how one interprets $\omega\varsigma$, it is difficult to conceive of the change from παλαιού to παλαιός apart from any theological intentionality¹⁸. Thus, *contra* Pace Jeansonne and Yarbro Collins, who tend to find a theologically useful recension only *after* change (2), theological reflection already appears to have been operative somewhere at the level of (1)–(2), that is, very close to the stage at which the OG version emerged. Of course, this does not lead to any certainty about $\omega\varsigma$ being the result of theological translation. Nevertheless, it is quite conceivable that both $\omega\varsigma$ and the subsequent nominative case arose together¹⁹. At stake is ultimately whether this linguistic association of the “one like a son of man” with the “ancient of days” occurred during the process of translation or, as Pace Jeansonne and Yarbro Collins, occurred through an unintentional error which was later put to theological use. Were the latter argument only dependent upon the readings in Syro-Hexapla and Codex Chisianus – granting that they contain a reading (v. 13 – παρήσαν) secondary to that of CP 967 (προσήγαγον, closer to the verb in the MT הקרבן) –, then the error thesis might be convincing. There is, however, no necessary connection between these readings: the verb προσήγαγον does not have to presuppose an original $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ in the preceding phrase.

This leads to a third problem: what Pace Jeansonne and Yarbro Collins regard as a sequential corrective change (3)–(4) presupposes that the text (having αὐτῷ after προσήγαγον) in CP 967 is awkward and that a scribe hence changed αὐτῷ to αὐτόν²⁰. Indeed, παρήσαν in the Syro-Hexapla and Codex Chisianus is quite probably secondary (as an attempt at correction) to CP 967’s combination of προσήγαγον with αὐτῷ. But does this

¹⁸ So correctly Caragonis, *The Son of Man* (above n. 6) 62.

¹⁹ Pace Jeansonne, *Old Greek Translation* (above n. 5) 98, is keen to note two possible instances of the error $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ to $\omega\varsigma$ among witnesses to the OG (Dan 2,43 and 4,30[33]). However, in neither case is the particle *immediately* followed by a noun (as in 7,13) and it is hard to imagine how a scribe would have produced a difficult text $\omega\varsigma$ παλαιού (sic!) gratuitously.

²⁰ Yarbro Collins, *The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition* (above n. 5) 554: “the corruption of αὐτόν to αὐτῷ follows from sense.”

exclude the possibility that CP 967 itself offers a coherent text? The verb in CP 967 does not necessarily require a direct object and, conversely, the mere presence of αὐτῷ does not require παρήσαν in the text.

D. Clues Indicating a Theological Translation

Given these difficulties, one is not be amiss to consider hints in the OG recension of a deliberate translation process. Within the context of Daniel 7, four reasons (D.1–4) for this hypothesis deserve mention:

D.1. In Daniel 7,21–22 the outcome of the conflict between “the horn” and “holy ones” reaches a conclusion when “the ancient of days came” (MT [= TH] – $\text{עָרַךְ יוֹמָא דְּיָמֵי דְּיָמֵי}$; LXX – $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ τοῦ ἔλθεῖν τὸν παλαιὸν ἡμερῶν) to render judgment. Now the verb “to come” does not describe the “ancient of days” in 7,9 but “one like a son of man” in verse 13²¹. Indeed, it is conspicuous that the “one like a son of man” which appears in the vision (vv. 1–14) is not picked up again in its interpretation in verses 17–27. The result in the OG is a text which distinguishes the “one like a son of man” in verse 13 from the “saints of the Most High” in verse 22. If in the *Vorlage* the “one like a son of man” was being considered as a symbol for the faithful of Israel, a *Tendenz* of the translator may instead have been to regard him as a real heavenly figure (in close association with the “ancient of days”). If, however, 7,13 was already understood as a reference to a concrete figure, then the OG has attempted to lay even more emphasis on the close association between this one and the subject of the throne-room scene in 7,9–10²². In any case, the interpretation (esp. v. 22) may have provided the translator a reason within the *Vorlage*-text to use identification language to coordinate the “one like a son of man” with the “ancient of days”.

D.2. Similarly, a functional correspondence between the worship of the ancient of days in verse 10 and of the son of man figure in verse 14 may have provided reason for an identification. This analogy between the figures, as well as a dissimilation of the son of man from the saints (v. 22), is further underscored in verse 27, where the vocabulary denoting the subordination of earthly powers to “the people of the saints of the Most High” of the OG ($\text{ὑποταγήσονται, πειθαρχήσουσιν}$) *departs* from the terms it uses in verses 10 (ἐθεράπευον) and 14 (λατρεύουσα). In the MT and TH traditions, on the other hand, one of the verbs used in verses 14 and 27 is shared (v. 14 – הִתְחַנַּף , δουλεύουσιν; v. 27 – הִתְחַנַּף , δουλεύουσιν καὶ ὑπακούουσιν).

²¹ Cf. v. 22 with the phraseology of v. 13 – $\text{כְּבָר אֶשׁ אֶתְּהִי וְעַד עַתָּה יוֹמָא דְּיָמֵי דְּיָמֵי}$. The OG translator, recognizing vv. 17–28a as an interpretation of vv. 1–14, may have found support for his identification in v. 13 from identical terminology ($\text{עָרַךְ יוֹמָא, עַד, אֶתְּהִי}$) found realigned in v. 22 where, unlike v. 13, עַד functions as part of a temporal expression, and עָרַךְ יוֹמָא is the subject of אֶתְּהִי . It is impossible to determine the extent to which, in v. 22, the LXX version presupposes an Aram. *Vorlage* different from MT.

²² Caragonis, *The Son of Man* (above n. 6) 74–76, notes this but is not prepared to think that in the second half of the chapter the author has equated the son of man figure with the “saints of the Most High”. Neither does he seem to think that the author wants to identify fully the “one like a son of man” with the “ancient of days”, but rather observes a subtle distinction between עָרַךְ יוֹמָא (7,25 – God = the ancient of days) and $\text{עַלְיָהוּן/עַלְיָהוּן}$ (= the son of man in the phrase “saints of the *Most High*”, as in 7,18.22.25.27). If this distinction was operative at all in the original composition, the Greek recensions have not preserved it.

D.3. On the level of the OG itself, there may be more positive evidence for a deliberate association of the two figures. The phrase οἱ παρευριστάτες προσήγγον (SyH, Chis: παρήσαν) αὐτῷ at the end of verse 13 – altogether absent in TH – recalls vocabulary in the expression παρευριστάσαν αὐτῷ in verse 10. In verse 13 “those standing” are said to have approached the “one like a son of man”, while the “myriad of myriads” in verse 10 are said to have “stood before him [= the ancient of days]” (so also in most TH mss.²³).

D.4. Finally, there have been efforts to find exegetical allusions in Daniel 7 to the merkabah vision of Ezekiel 1²⁴. This traditio-historical derivation has been variously conceived in relation to the Greek recensions. In his assertion of the influence of Ezekiel on Daniel 7,13, J. Lust²⁵ has argued that the Ezekiel 1,26–27, in which a figure “in the likeness of a human” is enthroned on “something like a throne”, underlies the apparent identification between God and the son of man figure in OG (esp. CP 967). For Lust the language of the OG is not the result of translation. He maintained that it preserves an old textform faithful to an *original* (Hebrew) text of Daniel from which the MT Aramaic and TH traditions are derived²⁶. Thus for him the original author of a supposed Hebrew *Vorlage* had identified the “one like a son of man” with the “ancient of days”. Lust’s overall analysis and conclusion is sound insofar as it cautions against an uncritical assumption that MT tradition must always be thought to preserve the most original version. Nevertheless, his insistence on a Hebrew *Vorlage* – not to mention the complete lack of evidence for Hebrew materials for Daniel 2–7 at Qumran – also reflects an uncritical assumption that the OG at Daniel 7,13 and, indeed, OG in its entirety represents a literal translation, a notion which studies comparing the LXX with the TH text-tradition have been hardly willing to conclude. On the contrary, the OG translation is generally “freer” than the TH text, that is, less apt to assign one-to-one correspondences for Semitic lexical items²⁷. Lust, therefore, has too quickly passed over the possibility that the close association of “one like a son of man” and the “ancient of days” may have occurred on the level of translation. Nevertheless, Lust’s basic suggestion that the Ezekiel tradition underlies the ὥς of the OG text remains an insight which must be taken seriously.

Christopher Rowland has argued that the enthroned divine figure “in the likeness of a man” in Ezekiel 1,26–27 and a humanlike “deity” apart from the throne in Ezekiel 8,2–3 reflects a “gradual separation of divine functions” which, in turn, becomes the source of inspiration for the designation of God’s authority to the “son of man” figure in Daniel 7²⁸. Rowland thinks that in Daniel 7,13 the OG version calls attention to the divine status of the “one like a son of man” even more than the original version. In following his view, we

²³ See Ziegler’s apparatus, Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco (above n. 10) 169.

²⁴ For our purposes here, there is no need to establish this general point since this has been adequately done elsewhere; see e. g. the summary (with bibl.) by D. J. Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot. Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision*, TSAJ 16, 1988, 74–78.

²⁵ Daniel 7,13 (above n. 4) 68.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 69: Lust concludes that MT tradition (= TH) “disturbs the parallelism” in the LXX between the phrases ὥς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο and ὥς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν.

²⁷ So correctly Caragonis, *The Son of Man* (above n. 6) 62–63, and esp. Pace Jeansonne, *Old Greek Translation* (above n. 5) 133: “The OG translator was more concerned with providing an interesting and readable Greek style than a consistent, standardized translation. A variety of syntactical and grammatical usages, a wide vocabulary, and picturesque speech characterize the work.”

²⁸ *The Open Heaven* (above n. 6) 98.

would then have to suppose that the translator, unlike the MT and TH traditions, interpreted the Danielic son of man more exclusively in light of Ezekiel 1,26 f. than the *Vorlage*. The language of the OG transforms a “vice-regent, the Son of Man” into one who “takes upon himself the form and character of God himself”²⁹. It is thus tempting to attribute a monotheizing tendency to the translator, who may have seen a theological difficulty in the presence of two heavenly figures in a passage which mentions a plurality of thrones. Along these lines, Alan Segal has considered whether the OG to Daniel 7,13 involved a “purposeful change” which polemicizes against the “two powers” heresy³⁰.

If we consider the other three arguments advanced above in favor of CP 967’s preservation of the most original form of the original OG translation, Rowland’s reconstruction of the traditio-historical background to the OG of Daniel 7,13, and thus for a translation text, would seem the most likely. Not certain, however, is whether Rowland, Segal, and Lust are correct in supposing that the “one like a son of man” in Daniel was being understood in the OG recension as a direct reference to God. On the supposition of a translation text in OG, two further alternatives are possible.

First, it is possible that the expression “ancient of days” was thought to *symbolize* God (or some aspect of God), a view which would have preserved a strict notion of divine transcendence. As a result, an identification of the “one like a son of man” as the “ancient of days” would not have been tantamount to an exaltation of the former to the status of divinity. In this case we have a text in which, on the one hand, the son of man figure has been promoted while, on the other, the identification in the OG of 7,13 leaves little room for a logical equation of the “ancient of days” with God. The same might then be true of the translator’s understanding of the figure “on the likeness of a throne” in Ezekiel 1,26 f. Thus it is possible that the translator was thinking of something like divine “principles” or distinct “manifestations of God” as found in interpretations of Daniel 7 among the later rabbis³¹. Nevertheless, the main difficulty with this understanding of *the translation text* is that the OG, as well as all extant versions, agree in verse 14 that the figure which appeared in the preceding verse “was given” (דָּתַן, ἐδόθη) his authority³². The suggestion of transference of a function to the “one like a son of man” does not square with a notion of complementary manifestations of divine activity.

The second possibility involves an attempt to take the juxtaposition of verses 14 (just cited) and 13 (as in OG) seriously: how can the “one like a son of man” be “present as the ancient of days” only to be “given” divine authority in the following verse? It seems that the humanlike figure, though not necessarily the *same being* as God, is nevertheless made *functionally identical* to God as God’s heavenly representative in judgment and, accordingly, becomes the recipient of like honor³³. This interpretation of the OG would accord well with observations in *D.1*, *D.2*, and *D.3* above. If correct, this textual tradition of Daniel could still have been viewed with suspicion in some circles; it would not have been much of a further

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Two Powers in Heaven* (above n. 6) 202.

³¹ See Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 47–49, who refers above all to b. Hag 14a. Yarbrow Collins, *The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition* (above n. 5) 556 f., regards this as a way Greek-speaking Jews may have read the OG.

³² So Kim, *The ‘Son of Man’* (above n. 4) 25 n. 41.

³³ So Hengel, ‘Setze dich zu meiner Rechten!’ (above n. 6) 160, though I am not prepared here to draw speculation concerning a pre-existent “Messiah” into the discussion.

step to see therein a description of divine judgment which runs against strict monotheistic belief³⁴.

Thus soon after the OG version was produced, ways of reading Daniel 7,9–10 and 7,13 were adopted which must have attempted to protect against any hint of the presence of two *deities*. For some the humanlike figure would be understood as a primary angel who, though sharing traits with the “ancient of days” in 7,10, is not allowed to receive the worship intended exclusively for God³⁵. For other (later) interpreters, as already mentioned, the language was thought to depict different aspects of God’s activity.

E. Conclusion

It is ultimately impossible to determine whether the second $\omega\varsigma$ in Daniel 7,13 has resulted from a scribe’s error or a translator’s theological intention. The attempt has been made here, however, to show how a consideration of elements within the context of Daniel 7, mostly in the OG recension, makes the latter supposition more plausible. Of course, as we have seen, it is not merely a matter of choosing between one or the other option. An initial error could have led to some re-editing of the passage. But whereas Yarbrow Collins, following Pace Jeanson, emphasizes the theological use of a text betraying a series of *corruptions* through transmission, the arguments advanced above raise the question whether the theological activity coordinating the “ancient of days” with “one like a son of man” cannot be observed on the level of translation itself.

³⁴ It is possible that even the original writing may have been considered inappropriate. In his edition on *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*, Oxford 1976, 305, J. T. Milik called attention to a throne-theophany judgment scene in the Book of Giants (4QEnGiants^b = 4Q530, col. 2, 11.17–19) which is strongly reminiscent of Daniel 7,9–10. Here there is no mention of a figure other than “the great Holy One”. For the photograph see E. Tov (ed.), *The Dead Scrolls on Microfiche*, Leiden 1993, PAM no. 43.568 (2 frgt.’s on mid-lower left: 11.7–9 [left frgt.], 4–6 [right frgt.]), with a preliminary translation by K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*. ErgBd., Göttingen 1994, 120 f. Milik argues that the similarities indicate the Book of Giants’ dependence on Daniel. The question of dependence here is debatable, as the Book of Giants could be using a form of the tradition which ultimately antedates the writing of Daniel and is prior to the mention of “one like a son of man”. If, however, Milik’s literary-critical derivation is correct, then it is worth pondering why the Book of Giants has entirely omitted “one like a son of man”.

³⁵ So esp. ApcAbr 10,4–5 and 11,2–3 and JosAs 14,8–9, in which features from the angelophany in Dan 10,5–6 are combined with elements from 7,9–10 and 13, while at the same time the angelic figure is clearly distinguished from God (ApcAbr 17,1–4; JosAs 14,7–10; 15,11–12x). The christological presentation of Rev, which in 1,12–17 likewise reflects a combination of motifs from the same texts, shows an interest in retaining a monotheistic framework, but depicts Christ as superior to angels. The author of Rev, then, comes close to the OG in permitting Christ to be worshiped as well (though as the lamb; cf. Rev 22,4–5 with OG Dan 7,14). For a more extensive treatment of this question and the angel texts cited, see L. T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology. A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, WUNT 2/70, 1995, esp. 168–170 and 207–265.

Erfüllung der Gnadenzusagen an David

von Roland Bergmeier

(76356 Weingarten, Ruländerweg 35)

In der alten Nathanverheißung 2Sam 7, den göttlichen Gnadenzusagen an das Haus David, ist vom Hausbau in zweifacher Weise die Rede: Jahwe wird David ein Haus bauen, d. h. das Königtum seiner Dynastie für immer bestätigen (2Sam 7,11.27; 1Chr 17,10.25), und »der Nachkomme Davids« soll Jahwes Namen ein Haus bauen (2Sam 7,13 f.; 1Kön 5,19; 1Chr 17,12; 22,10), d. h. ein Heiligtum (Sir 47,13). Die bemerkenswerte Transformation dieser Verheißung an das Haus David in eine Zusage an das Volk Israel (Jes 55,3 f.) hat man gelegentlich eine »Demokratisierung« genannt¹, ein Vorgang, der auch die Textschicht 2Sam 7,22–24 bestimmt². Für uns ergibt sich aber als Folge, daß wir nicht mehr in allen Fällen zwingend unterscheiden können zwischen individueller und kollektiver Intention der Deutungsebene³. Vor dieses Dilemma stellt uns auch der thematische Midrasch über die Endzeit, 4Q174 MidrEschat^a, der am Ende seines ersten Hauptteils, im Übergang von Kolumne 2 bis 3,13 eine breite Auslegung von 2Sam 7,10–14 bietet. B. Gärtner hat das angesprochene Phänomen ein Oszillieren messianischer Symbole zwischen individuellem und kollektivem Gehalt genannt⁴. Mit seiner Tendenz, die Erfüllung »der Gnadenzusagen an David« insgesamt auf die Gründung der Gemeinde zu beziehen⁵, hat er sich aber nicht durchsetzen können. G. Klinzing z. B. hat ihm entgegnet, erstens sei in 4QFlor 1,2–7 nur vom eschatologischen Tempel, nicht von der Gemeinde als Tempel die Rede, zweitens sei schwer nachzuvollziehen, wie er in dem zukünftigen »Sproß Davids« die Gemeinde sehen könne, drittens sei 4QFlor kein inhaltlich zusammenhängender Text⁶. Die vorzügliche Rekonstruktionsstudie A. Steudels⁷ läßt dazu ein, diesen Text, wenn auch schon vielfach behandelt, erneut zu untersuchen und die Paradigmen seiner Auslegung einer möglichen Revision zu unterziehen. Es sah ja seit geraumer Zeit fast danach aus, als sei es ausgemacht, daß der Text in seinem ersten

¹ G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bd. II, München ²1961, 254; vgl. auch C. Westermann, *Das Buch Jesaja Kapitel 40–66*, ATD 19, 1966, 228.

² G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bd. I, München ³1961, 308.

³ 2Sam 7,25 ist im Anschluß an V. 21 individuell zu deuten, im Anschluß an die VV. 22–24 vielleicht auch kollektiv.

⁴ *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, MSSNTS 1, 1965, 36.

⁵ A. a. O., 53 f.

⁶ *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*, StUNT 7, 1971, 80–87.175.177.

⁷ *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})*. Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (»Florilegium«) und 4Q177 (»Catena A«) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden, STDJ 13, 1994.