

category than this later figure. Jesus' claim of authority went beyond political messianic claims in the view of the leadership, as it held them accountable for what they would do with him, even to the point of an eschatological threat and rejection of their leadership. Such a challenge would not go uncontested. Not only had Jesus made himself too close to God, he had also created a great, irreversable gap between himself and the leadership. At the least, this is how Mark portrays the event. What must be said about this saying is that much within it seems to fit well in the cultural thought world of first century Judaism.

Notice: This material may be protected
by the copyright law (Title 17 USC).

The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible:
Dan 7:13 as a Test Case

Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis
Oxford, England

The problems posed by Daniel chapter 7 and its vision of a "one like a son of man" (v. 13) are well-known. A final resolution of those problems will require extensive discussion: there are numerous sets of textual data, both biblical and extra-biblical, the latter stretching from second millennium B.C. Ugaritic to late intertestamental; intricate issues of a literary and a tradition-historical nature within Daniel 7 and its pivotal context in the book as a whole, and wider methodological questions, all of which must be addressed. As befits the genre of the present volume, what follows is a preliminary sketch of a thoroughgoing reappraisal of the issues and a new proposal. In places the sketch has been filled in with detail: in others only the pencil drawing shows the outline.

The Status Quaestionis: Towards a New Possibility

In the attempt to interpret our passage there are two overriding issues which have hampered the struggle for an interpretative consensus. These are, first, the search for the text's appropriate life setting and, secondly, the defining of the conceptual parameters within which a vision of heavenly and earthly realities should be read and understood.

History-of-Religions Context:

Ancient Near Eastern Chaokampf and the Temple Cult

Regarding the *Sitz im Leben* of Daniel 7 there are broadly two approaches. First, there are those since Gunkel who have emphasised a very specific history-of-religions background: the ancient Near

East's *Chaoskampf* tradition.¹ Secondly, there are those, particularly within the New Testament academy, who have resisted the importance of that background and simply read Daniel 7 within its own immediate literary context and the wider religio-political situation of the Antiochene crisis.² The former give due weight to the background, whilst the latter privilege the text's foreground. The impasse will only be resolved if these two can be integrated.

The case for a background in ancient Near Eastern mythological traditions in which a god defeats the forces of chaos threatening social and cosmic stability is impressive and have recently been laid-out in detail by J. J. Collins.³ First, the context of Daniel shares with that background the struggle for divine kingship in a time of religious and political conflict. Secondly, the beasts, representing the kings or kingdoms arise in 7:2ff from the sea, whence emerge the chaos monsters in Mesopotamian and Canaanite tradition. The pagan kings are thus viewed as the embodiment of the primeval power of chaos. Thirdly, within the broader ancient Near Eastern background the relationship between "one like a son of man" and the Ancient of Days specifically recalls that between Baal who is victorious in the defeat of the sea monster and El, the head of the Canaanite pantheon. Baal is known as the "rider of the clouds" and El, attended by his divine council (cf. Dan 7:10), is known as "Father of years."

There are, however, problems in supposing the importance of this background, which have led some to reject its relevance in determining the identity of "the one like a son of man". Chief amongst these is the use of traditions which are thoroughly polytheistic in a way which, taken to their logical conclusion implies that the "one like a son of man" is to the Ancient of Days, what Baal

¹ H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895), 323-335, cf. e.g. J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JTS* 9 (1958) 225-42; J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 95-106; J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). For a recent overview and rejection of other history-of-religions proposals see D. Bryan, *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 218-228.

² E.g. M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979) 23, 35-8, cf. A. J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979) 40-77.

³ "Stirring up the Great Sea: The Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993) 121-136, esp. 125-128 and his commentary *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) esp. 280-294.

is to El, i.e. a second deity. Off course, in the present scholarly climate, its leading proponents have to confess that "[t]his configuration has no precedent in the biblical tradition."⁴

Commentators in the Gunkel tradition such as John Day and John J. Collins have not left the identification of the "one like a son of man" with the Baal background, but have moved from that allusion to a primary reference to an angel.⁵ Such a move is not unfounded given that the language at 7:13 is similar to that used elsewhere in Daniel of angels (cf. 8:15; 10:16, 18) and the fact that within the post-biblical period polytheistic traditions are transformed into a developed angelology: pagan gods have become Jewish angels. But the very specific leap from Baal (or Marduk) to an angel coming on the clouds of heaven is a big one. Nowhere else in contemporary texts do angels travel on or with the clouds and nowhere else is there any indication that Jewish angelology takes over the very specific traditions associated with the *Chaoskampf* or with the god Baal.⁶

So, whilst the ancient Near Eastern mythological material provides data which are indisputably in the background of Daniel 7, there is a significant gap between that background and the text's foreground. Collins, for one, is aware of that gap and only recently writes "... for the present we must ... hope that some future textual discoveries will clarify the exact channels by which the material was transmitted."⁷

Older scholarship, for example that of Bentzen and Emerton argued that the means of transmission of this mythological pattern was the annual New Year enthronement festival.⁸ The hypothesis that such a festival ever existed has been difficult to prove. Amongst those who maintain the importance of the Canaanite mythology there are many like J.J. Collins who have hesitated to see the cult as its means of transmission and have suggested instead its survival "either as folk tradition or in learned circles".⁹

⁴ Collins, "Daniel," 290. Neither the objection on the grounds of historical distance from the Canaanite material nor the assumption that an "orthodox" in the Antiochene crisis would not draw on this material has any weight. Collins has ably responded to such criticisms ("Stirring up the Great Sea," 123, 127-132).

⁵ They are ultimately indebted to N. Schmidt, "The Son of Man' in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 19 (1900) 22-28

⁶ The role of Michael in the combat myth in Rev 12-13 may be a parallel, but the text is much later than Daniel 7.

⁷ "Stirring up the Great Sea," 134.

⁸ A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970) 64; Emerton, "Origin," 240-42.

⁹ "Apocalyptic Vision," 102.

However, John Day remains convinced by much of the New Year festival hypothesis and has insisted that there is good evidence that the mythology was indeed passed on through the cult where it has been picked up in Daniel 7. From the wide spread of passages in Israel's Psalter which presuppose the *Chaoskampf* (see e.g. Psalms 24; 29; 65; 74; 89; 93; 104), the importance of God's kingship during the New Year liturgy in post-biblical tradition, the connection between these two in Zechariah 13-14 and other considerations a good case can be made for the endurance of a liturgical recollection of God's victory over the forces of chaos during the New Year festivities throughout the post-exilic period.¹⁰ As a corollary of our discussion we will find new evidence for the importance of a post-exilic "enthronement" festival and the likelihood that Daniel 7 may be one of our best witnesses to that tradition. Whilst the nature of the Temple New Year festival can explain the transmission of this mythological material, as an adequate explanation of both foreground and background it would need to explain the implicit "ditheism" which the mythology imposes on the vision's symbolic world.

Besides the general notion of an angelic "one like a son of man" commentators have traditionally turned to texts such as 11QMelchizedek where a similar pattern may be present. More recently P. Mosca has made the attractive suggestion that there is some anticipation of the Canaanite background to Dan 7:13 in one of Israel's kingship psalms.

Mosca argues that in Psalm 89 the king plays a similar role in the Israelite adoption of the *Chaoskampf* to that of the "one like a son of man" in Daniel. In vv. 9-10 [Eng. vv. 10-11] of that psalm Yahweh's cosmogonic power is celebrated with reference to his ruling the raging sea, stilling the waves and crushing the chaos monster Rahab. However, in v. 25 [Eng. v. 26] the fruits of this divine victory are shared with David whose "hand is set on the sea and ... right hand on the rivers." The pairing of sea and river reminds us of the two parallel names in the Baal epic Yamm and Nahar and this characterisation of David is set in the context of other reminiscences of the relationship between Baal and El: "David is in a sense invited

¹⁰ For recent representatives of this view see e.g. Day, "God's Conflict," 18-21, 34, 158, 165 etc.; T. D. N. Mettinger, *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 92-122; J. Day, *Psalms* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990) 67-87; J. D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil. The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1994) esp. 31-2.

to play Baal to Yhwh's El".¹¹ Mosca's case is strong and it has been greeted with qualified approval by J. J. Collins.¹² This kingship reading has the support of the parallelism between the prerogatives given to the "one like a son of man" in Dan 7:14 and the sovereignty, glory and dominion given to the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar in 2:37 and 5:18.¹³

However, Mosca's proposal suffers from a number of decisive weaknesses. For example, there is no real parallel in Psalm 89, nor the biblical kingship material in general, to the image of the "son of man" coming with clouds.¹⁴ Secondly, apart from the reference to Daniel and his friends being drawn from the royal family in Dan 1:3 the book shows no real interest in the Davidic monarchy.¹⁵ This is not surprising since the issue at stake during the Antiochene crisis was the threat to the Temple cult where the priesthood presided and where there was no real monarchic presence at this time.

The Apocalyptic Worldview and the Angelomorphic-Humanity Tradition

The second problem with which the interpreter of Daniel 7-12 in general and of Dan 7:13 in particular has had to contend is whether realities referred to are heavenly or earthly. The modern discussion has been a battle - of some hostility - between those who insist on a human (e.g. Israel) focused reference and those who take the "one like a son of man" to refer to a divine or angelic figure. This battle, it should be noted has been provoked and fuelled by the modern inability to hold together the earthly and heavenly, the divine and the human.

In another study I have appealed for a cease-fire in hostilities by proposing a new understanding of the text's apocalyptic conceptual parameters which removes the necessity to choose between one side or the other.¹⁶ There is a significant tradition within Jewish texts of

¹¹ "Ugarit and Daniel 7: A Missing Link," *Bib* 67 (1986) 496-517, (p. 512), cf. generally pp. 508-515.

¹² *Daniel*, 293 and "Stirring up the Great Sea" 133.

¹³ Collins, *Daniel*, 311.

¹⁴ See Emerton, "Origin," 233; Bryan, *Cosmos*, 231-2. Mosca appeals to the reference to the "enduring witness in the cloud(s)" in Ps 89:37 [Eng. v. 38] ("Ugarit and Daniel 7," 514), but there their function is very different from that of Dan 7:13.

¹⁵ Collins, *Daniel*, 309.

¹⁶ Besides Lacocque's work my approach is anticipated somewhat by, e.g., M. Black, "Die Apotheose Israels: eine neue Interpretation des danielischen 'Menschensohn'," *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögle* (ed. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg; Freiburg: Herder, 1975) 92-99.

the period in which both human individuals and communities are regarded as angelomorphic: they possess an identity or function which is otherwise predicated of supra-human angels.¹⁷ This angelomorphic-humanity tradition, which approximates to the belief in a "divine" humanity, is associated with the following; the prelapsarian Adam; Israel as a whole; specific communities within racial Israel, such as the Essenes; Israel's righteous patriarchs and heroes (e.g. Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, Jacob, Moses) and particular offices within the divine economy amongst which kingship and the priesthood are the most prominent. Surveying that tradition, and bearing in mind that Adam, Israel, Enoch, the king and a high priest have all at some time been candidates for the role of the "one like a son of man" it at once becomes apparent that we may have here a justification for believing Dan 7:13 refers to a mediatorial figure who is very much human yet also deliberately described in terms reminiscent of the angels and even God himself.

This angelomorphic-humanity tradition is already enshrined in the Hebrew Bible and Septuagint (see e.g. Num 24:17; 2 Sam 14:17, 20; 19:27; Isa 9:5; Zech 12:8; Mal 2:7; Esther LXX 15:4-19), was evidently well established before the Maccabean crisis and was apparently well known to the author of Daniel (viz. Dan 12:3).¹⁸ In a number of traditions the human figure concerned is not only raised to an angelic level of existence, (s)he is also described in ways otherwise reserved for God such that they receive worship and we are reminded of the contours of a later *Two Powers* "heresy".¹⁹ Daniel 7 is, of course, a key text within that later tradition; the full divinity of the man-like figure may already be assumed in the Old Greek Septuagint tradition and is insinuated in the use of clouds as a means of transport.²⁰

Whilst I believe this angelomorphic-humanity tradition and its centrality to the apocalyptic worldview means we no longer need to choose between one side or other in the argument over heaven and earthly perspectives, we are left with a need for clarification: if the "one like a son of man" is an angelomorphic human then who exactly

¹⁷ *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2.94; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997) esp. 11-18, 109-215.

¹⁸ For Dan 12:3 as an eschatologisation of an intra-historical, this worldly angelomorphic belief pattern see my *Luke-Acts*, 138, 213.

¹⁹ See Hecataeus of Abdera (Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca Historica* 40.3.5-6; *A History of the Visit to Jerusalem of Alexander the Great* (Josephus *Ant.* 11:331; see my *Luke-Acts*, 124-5 for discussion); *Life of Adam and Eve* 12-16; Ezekiel the Tragedian *Exagoge* 79-80; *Eth Enoch* 48:5; 62:9.

²⁰ For Daniel 7 in the *Two Powers* debate see A. F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 33-36, 47-52, 122-3, 128-132, 149, 151.

is he? Which of the different characters or communities in the tradition I have plotted is in mind in Dan 7:13? Since P. Mosca has made a good case for the adoption of a Davidic tradition behind the Baal-like "one like a son of man", are we to think of the many biblical and post-biblical texts which speak of the king in angelomorphic terms?²¹ Mosca's recourse to kingship traditions, which have their roots in the pre-exilic period, does not fit well in Daniel as a whole or the seventh chapter. What is needed is an angelomorphic figure who on other grounds we should judge at home amidst Daniel 7's visionary furniture: a figure who quite naturally comes with clouds before the divine throne, who is bound up very closely with the people of God and yet, to whom the characterisation of Baal could be applied.

Glancing at the *Curricula Vitae* of the candidates for the post described in Dan 7:13-4 the high priest is the front runner.²² In the first place, since the high priest is a representative character some of the other figures are included in his candidature: the high priest wears on his breastplate and shoulder pieces the names of the twelve tribes and so represents Israel. To the extent that the arrival of the "one like a son of man" before the Ancient of Days is interpreted in 7:18, 22, 27 as the giving of the kingdom to Israel, the former must either represent, or be symbolic of, the people of God. The high priest is, at the very least, a representative of Israel, if not her concrete embodiment within the cultic drama.

As a number of scholars have recently demonstrated, the high priestly garments also associate him with Adam, which is only natural given the strongly Edenic symbolism of the Temple.²³ In Dan 7:2 the "four winds stirring up the great sea" reminds us of Gen 1:2 and the *Chaoskampf* mythology is firmly embedded in ancient Near Eastern creation accounts so the vision quite naturally climaxes with the coming of a "one like a human being" just as does Gen 1:1-31. As we shall see, Enoch, with whom one tradition of Daniel interpretation identified the Son of Man, is none other than the archetypal priest.

²¹ For the texts see my *Luke-Acts*, 110-118.

²² For the angelomorphic (high) priest see e.g. *Ep. Aristeas* 99, Sirach 50:6; *Jub.* 31:13-15; 1QSb 4:25; 4Q511 35; 4Q545 17-18. To these texts and those discussed in my *Luke-Acts* (pp. 118-129, 186-196) should be added Wis 18:15-18, 21-24 where Aaron is set in antithetical parallelism to the λόγος, the Angel of the LORD.

²³ Besides Ezek 28:12-19 and Sirach 49:16ff, see C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A non-biblical sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996) 44-7, 71-2 for the High Priest's garments as those of Adam in post-biblical literature.

In the second Temple period, under the political constraints of Persian and Hellenistic rule the high priest has also taken over many of the characteristics of the king.²⁴ In Daniel 7 verse 14 has been just cause for those who would see in v. 13 a messianic king, since there he is given "dominion, and glory and kingship". However, in Israel's pre-exilic period sacral kingship involved the king in a position tantamount to that of high priest and there was good scriptural warrant, upon which the Hasmoneans would capitalise, for a high priest with royal powers (esp. Psalm 110). In the case of Daniel 7:13-14 two passages are particularly pertinent in this respect. First, in the midst of Josephus' account of Alexander the Great's encounter with the high priest Jaddua (*Ant.* 11:326-339) the Jerusalem high priest is said (by Alexander!) to have the power to bestow upon the Macedonian leader the Persian empire (11:334). This predication of cosmocratic power to the high priest is immediately followed by a reference to Daniel as the scriptural prediction of Alexander's conquests (11:337). Secondly, in the *Testament of Moses* ch. 10 the coming of God's kingdom in the eschatological dénouement, is bound-up with the appointment of a heavenly warrior priest who will avenge Israel of her enemies (10:2f). George W.E. Nickelsburg has tied the tenth chapter of the *Testament of Moses* closely to Dan 12:1-3 and its author may also have had in mind Dan 7:9ff.²⁵

Not only does the high priest have a strong candidacy since he is wedded so closely to other angelomorphic figures, he does so in that context (the Temple cult) which was evidently the most significant for the development of the human angelomorphic tradition. Time and again there are telling signs that it is the temple cult, its drama and costume, its holiness and the experience of worship in a time and space qualitatively other, which have contributed to a given literary angelomorphic characterisation.²⁶

For there to be certainty that in Dan 7:13 there is described a high priest we will need to establish whether and in what context a high priest could be described as coming with the clouds before the Ancient of Days. Ideally we will also need evidence that the high priest could play Baal to Yahweh's El in the *Chaoskampf* complex. Before we achieve either of these aims, and with a view to bringing the text's cultic *Sitz im Leben* into sharper focus, it will be as well to

²⁴ The best example close to Daniel being Sirach 50:1-4.

²⁵ *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972) 28-31, 82-4.

²⁶ See my *Luke-Acts*, 118-129, 137, 142, 147, 155, 168-9, 172, 186-96, 199.

survey the evidence in support of a Temple and priestly centred reading of Daniel 7.

A Jerusalem Temple Setting in Daniel 7: Some Observations

Within Daniel 7, the work as a whole and its history of interpretation there are many considerations which point to a Temple setting for at least vv. 9-15 of chapter 7 and the importance of that setting within the cultic interests of the book as a whole. These considerations further help to clarify the symbolism of the vision.

The High Priest in the Temple in the History of Interpretation of Daniel 7

In his 1979 commentary André Lacocque proposed that "the vision in chapter 7 has the Temple as its framework", within which the "one like a son of man" coming on the clouds of heaven refers to an eschatological high priest who receives the eternal and irrevocable dominion.²⁷

Regrettably Lacocque's interpretation has not received the attention it deserves.²⁸ This is probably because it lacks the necessary history-of-religions support for the possibility that the high priest could be characterised as the man-figure of 7:13-14. Initially Lacocque seems aware of this problem and comments that "[w]e must not allow ourselves therefore to be carried away by the heavenly decor of Dan. 7.13ff".²⁹ However, a little further on he jeopardises sympathy for his approach with the claim that not only is the "one like a son of man" a high priest, he is also Michael.³⁰ He is not able to produce any evidence to support the equation of the high priest with Michael and the implausibility of his interpretation is further compounded by his belief that the particular high priest in question is Judas Maccabeus.³¹ There is some slight evidence that an identification of the "one like a son of man" with Judas was entertained in antiquity,

²⁷ *The Book of Daniel* (London: SPCK) 124-5. Lacocque's view of the priestly nature of Daniel's apocalyptic *Sitz im Leben* is reiterated in his *Daniel in His Time* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988) 28-9 and "The Socio-Spiritual Formative Milieu of the Daniel Apocalypse," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, (ed. A. S. van der Woude; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993) 315-343, 335-6.

²⁸ It is summarily dismissed by Goldingay, *Daniel*, 196.

²⁹ *Book of Daniel*, 125.

³⁰ *Book of Daniel*, 133-4. He arrives at a similar conclusion in his interpretation of the "prince of the host" in Dan 10:11 (p. 162).

³¹ *Book of Daniel*, 125.

since Jerome was aware of the possibility in his *contretemps* with Porphyry.³² However, aside from the common perception that the authorship of Daniel cannot easily be equated with the Maccabean party (in view, in particular, of the possibly slighting reference to the Maccabees in Dan 11:34), taking the man-figure to be a reference to Judas Maccabeus entails a dating of Daniel 7 after the temple's restoration, which is high impossible.³³

Although the interpretation in Lacocque's commentary lacks methodological rigour, it is suggestive and can be reworked. Whilst we can disregard Lacocque's identification of the high priest with Michael, there is ample data from the period for a view of the high priest as heavenly.³⁴ Lacocque has not been the only commentator to insist on a priestly perspective for the work, and his approach can be substantiated by much else.³⁵

The Temple-Cult focus in Daniel 7-12 and the Book's Implied Authorship

Daniel 1-6 is set in the Mesopotamian exile and chs. 2-6 come from either the Persian or Hellenistic periods. Daniel 7-12 is from the early second century B.C. and describes events during the crisis of Antiochus IV. That crisis was centred on a perceived threat to the Jerusalem Temple cult. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Temple is centre stage throughout chapters 8-12. The cult is not only that sacred space most threatened by Antiochus (8:10-14; 11:30-31; 12:10-13), the author(s) of the visions assume(s) that the time of salvation is when the Temple at last fulfils exilic prophecy (Jer 25:11-12; 29:10) and performs its atoning function (9:24-27; 12:30).³⁶ Although ch. 7 is linguistically and literarily bound to the preceding chapters, its setting in life and apocalyptic genre bind it to what follows and so we might expect that *it also* has a temple focus.

³² For the text see G. Archer, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958) 89-81. Lacocque's interpretation is otherwise anticipated by H. Sahlin, "Antiochus IV Epiphanes und Judas Mackabäus," *ST* 23 (1969) 41-68 and G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews. Translation, Comment and Conclusions* (New York: Doubleday, 1972) 42-48.

³³ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 196.

³⁴ For the texts see n. 22 (above).

³⁵ Compare J. C. H. Lebram, "Apokalyptik und Hellenismus im Buche Daniel," *VT* 20 (1970) 503-24, 514-515; O. H. Steck, "Weltgeschehen und Gottesvolk im Buche Daniel," *Kirche. Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm* (ed. D. Lührmann and G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1980) 53-76, (p. 58).

³⁶ Cf. J. C. H. Lebram, "The Piety of the Jewish Apocalyptists," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983) 171-210, 186.

Jürgen C. H. Lebram has noted that in the context of the ancient world the ascetic elements in the preparation of the seer's visions belong in the context of cultic asceticism (see 9:3; 10:2-3): "The connection between vision and cult is emphasised moreover in ch. 9 by the angel approaching the seer at the time of the evening sacrifice."³⁷ By the second century B.C. there was already a well-established tradition within Judaism of priestly visions and auditions closely associated with the Temple as the place where heaven and earth met. Within the (proto-)apocalyptic corpus we should recall the visionary activity of the priests Ezekiel (esp. chs. 8-11; 40-48) and Zechariah (chs. 1-6).³⁸

There is perhaps some allusion to the priestly identity of the implied authorship of Daniel in the description of Daniel and his friends in 1:4. Though they are in part drawn from the Judaeen royalty, they are also from the among "the nobility", which during the Hellenistic period would mean they were priests. It is therefore not surprising that they are to be "without blemish" and will become versed in the "literature and language of the Chaldaeans", the latter being a priestly caste within late Mesopotamian society.³⁹

In the search for the identity of the book's author(s) commentators have rightly seized on the use of the word *חֲכִים* for the book's heroes (11:33; 12:3, 10). "The wise" are evidently set over against "the many": those who either act against the covenant (9:27) or are in need of instruction from the former. The role of the priests as the teachers in Israelite society was ingrained during this period, and Lebram is probably right to see in "the wise" and "the many" the priesthood and the laity.⁴⁰ Whilst this identification of the work's authorship is by no means necessary for the rest of our argument, it is worth noting that the appropriation of the division between the *maskilim* and the *rabbim* at Qumran, where the leadership was thoroughly priestly, accords well with this proposal.⁴¹

Outside of the canonical Daniel there is also some important evidence that the Israelite Daniel around whom various traditions were formed was regarded, by some at least, as a priest. In the opening paragraph of the Old Greek version of Bel and the Serpent

³⁷ "Piety," 185, cf. 184-5.

³⁸ Outside the biblical corpus see e.g. Josephus *Ant.* 11:326-7 (in context of a specific reference to Daniel (11:337)); 13:282-3.

³⁹ See Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 27.

⁴⁰ "Apokalyptik," 514. For priests as teachers see e.g. Lev 10:11; Deut 17:10; Hag 2:11-13; Mal 2:7; Deut 33:10.

⁴¹ See e.g. 1QS 3:13; 9:12, 21; 1QSb 1:1; 3:22; 5:20; 4Q510-11 *passim*; 4QShirShabb *passim*.

Daniel is said to be a priest. The absence of this identification from the Theodotian recension is perhaps due to a conformity of the latter to the canonical Daniel where no such identity is made explicit. In any case there is no need to see here a very "different strand of tradition" from that of our canonical Daniel and every reason to assume this Greek addition represents widespread opinion.⁴²

Geographical Stage Markers: The Great Sea and the Chaoskampf

The vision opens in Dan 7:2 with the four winds stirring up the "great sea". Inside and outside of the biblical corpus this expression is always used of the Mediterranean.⁴³ However, this creates a problem, since it could not be said literally of the first, second and third beasts that they came from the Mediterranean because they symbolise Babylon, Media and Persia respectively. Only the fourth beast (Greece) can be thought to come from that direction. This has led some to dismiss the overwhelming linguistic significance of the phrase "great sea" and to opt instead for a mythological sea from which the forces of chaos arise.⁴⁴ As we have seen that mythology is essential to the proper understanding of the present chapter.

So how can this apparent tension be resolved? The choice of both the Mediterranean and the mythological *Chaosmeer* is, I suggest, deliberate because from the Israelite perspective the myth was already thoroughly bound up with Jerusalem, the Temple and Zion as the cosmic mountain. As it has long been suspected and has now been ably demonstrated by Jon D. Levenson the old ancient Near Eastern beliefs about temples and their mountains as the centre of the universe, the point at which creation takes place and the meeting point of heaven and earth, were axiomatic in biblical literature.⁴⁵ Those commentators, such as John Day and John Collins who emphasise the importance of the *Chaoskampf* in interpreting Daniel 7 do not actually take full cognizance of the fact that that tradition is fundamentally temple centred.⁴⁶ In the Mesopotamian literature (esp. *Anzu* and *Enuma Elish*) and also in the Ugaritic Baal material the

⁴² Pace Collins, *Daniel*, 419.

⁴³ See BDB 410 and 1QapGen 21:16: Goldingay, *Daniel*, 160.

⁴⁴ E.g. L. F. Hartman and A. A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978) 211; Collins, *Daniel*, 295.

⁴⁵ J. D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985); *Creation, passim*, cf. R. J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972).

⁴⁶ Goldingay sees the absence of the temple context in Daniel 7 as a point of contrast with the ancient Near East's *Chaoskampf* (*Daniel*, 153).

god's conflict with the forces of chaos, whether or not represented by the sea, is inseparable from the search for a temple in a situation where the cosmic stability provided by the cult is either absent or under threat. It is precisely that context in which Daniel was written and which, therefore, suggests that in Daniel 7 we have to do with a struggle centred on the Jerusalem cult.

We can be fairly sure that this mythology was assumed by the author of Daniel 7. Within the (proto-)apocalyptic stream of which his vision is an example Zion and the temple are everywhere assumed to have some kind of cosmological identity. We should note, for example, within Ezekiel 38-9 the importance of the *omphalos* myth in 38:12. With the importance of primeval stone and/or foundation stone imagery in Zech 4:7-10b and the image of living waters flowing from Jerusalem in Zech 14:8 this mythology is presumed in both first and second Zechariah.⁴⁷ Arguably, this is a defining element within the emergence of late biblical and post-biblical apocalyptic. Within Daniel 7, verse 25's reference to Antiochus' attempt to change "the sacred seasons" probably assumes the belief that Israel's cultic calendar is a perfect synchronisation of heavenly and earthly cosmologies, which we know so well from the apocalyptic *Jubilees*.

Within this constellation of ideas, where the chaos mythology has its home, Mount Zion is the epicentre of all cosmic conflict: it is where God's enemies are judged and destroyed (cf. Ezekiel 38-9; Joel 3 & Zechariah 14) and whence God's healing creative presence flows (e.g. Zech 14:8; Joel 3:18; Ezekiel 47).⁴⁸ The importance of these texts and the significance of their Temple focus was noted in J. A. Emerton's important 1958 article on the origin of the Son of Man imagery.⁴⁹ Emerton failed, unfortunately, to spell out their implications for the geographical location of the visual drama, and his observation has not been given adequate attention in subsequent discussion.

With these texts in mind, since the implied reader is somewhere in Israel, (s)he is meant to think of beasts arising out the Mediterranean, coming on to land and threatening the people of God as was the present experience under Antiochus IV.⁵⁰ I would suggest that the

⁴⁷ On the former text see, for example, A. S. van der Woude, "Zion as Primeval Stone in Zechariah 3 and 4," *Text and Context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F.C. Fensham* (ed. W. Claassen; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988) 237-248.

⁴⁸ The classic expression of these motifs outside the Bible is the Babylonian *Epic of Creation*, but it is generally recognised that they are assumed and occasionally alluded to in the Ugaritic texts from Ras Shamra.

⁴⁹ "Origin," 234.

⁵⁰ So, e.g., Casey, "Son of Man," 18-19 and Goldingay, *Daniel*, 164-5.

vision then moves spatially in v. 9 from the pagan coastline to Jerusalem and the Temple as the site of God's earthly throne-room. With the fourth beast "committed to the burning fire" in v. 11 we are perhaps meant to think of Topheth or Gehenna, the place of burning punishment in the valley outside Jerusalem.⁵¹

We are still on earth, but with the eschatological judgement we have heaven on earth. This is entirely natural because in the microcosmic symbolism of the Jerusalem Temple the sanctuary, and in particular the holy of holies, is heaven - the site of God's throne. So, within Daniel 7 as a whole, literal, Jerusalem centred geography and mythological space are combined because that combination was a fundamental assumption for the author and one which was made all too real in the present conflict between paganism and the "orthodox" Temple cult: we do not need to choose between the Mediterranean and a mythological *Chaosmeer*. When, in Dan 11:45, Antiochus meets his end "between the sea and the glorious mountain" a later author in the apocalyptic Daniel tradition has quite rightly understood the topographical imagery of chapter 7.

The Literary Parallelism between Daniel 2 and Daniel 7

All the commentators agree that there is a deliberate parallelism between Daniel chapters 2 and 7. In both there is a dream vision of a four kingdom schema followed by the eschatological manifestation of God's kingdom in Israel. That parallelism functions within a wider set of resonances between chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5, 6, 7 respectively, which create a chiasmic structure within the Aramaic portion of the book.⁵²

Taking such clear intratextuality seriously we are provided with further evidence that Daniel 7 is ultimately Temple centred. In chapter 2 the fourth kingdom of the statue is superseded by God's eternal kingdom symbolised by a rock cut from a mountain which becomes a huge mountain filling the earth (2:34-5, 44-5). The image clearly symbolises, not just the Israelite state, but Zion and her Temple. There are multiple echoes of biblical and post-biblical Zion/Temple-stone imagery here.⁵³ As the Collins notes, these have their home in the ancient Near East's cosmic mountain mythology.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Collins, *Daniel*, 304.

⁵² See e.g. A. Lenglet, "La Structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," *Bib* 53 (1972) 169-190 & Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 11-14.

⁵³ See e.g. Zech 4:7-10; Isa 2:2-3 and compare the later 'eben *shetiyah* tradition. The threshing floor image of 2:35 reminds us of Isa 41:12-16 but also 2 Sam 24.

⁵⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 165 n. 128.

So, as another point of symmetry between chapters 2 and 7, this further confirms our argument that in chapter 7 the four kingdoms are succeeded by a shift to the cosmic mountain where God's judgement takes place.⁵⁵

The Mischwesen from the Sea and Jewish Purity Consciousness

The source of the composite zoomorphic imagery for the beasts in Dan 7:4-8 has been the cause of much discussion. Various derivations from ancient Near Eastern animal imagery have been proposed, but none of these has been found entirely convincing.⁵⁶ David Bryan has now made the persuasive case that a primary concern in the creation of such imagery is the kosher mentality of purity conscious Judaism. The mixing of animal forms (e.g. lion and eagle) and the depiction of wild quadrupeds (lion, bear & leopard) evokes the Torah's judgement that such animals are unclean (Lev 11:27, 29, 41-42). The fact that the first beast looses his wings, and thus his hybrid form, and that he stands on two feet being given a human heart evokes the conversion and purification of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4. "The series of *Mischwesen* forms the perfect background for the emergence of the kingdom of God, represented by [the one who is like a "man",] the archetypal land creature who, according to P, was made in the image of God."⁵⁷ Drawing in particular on the work of Mary Douglas, Bryan demonstrates that here the combination of purity consciousness and monsters representing the forces of chaos is entirely fitting given the concern of biblical purity taboos with order and the threat of chaos. Because Leviathan - the principal expression of chaos in the older, Canaanite *Chaoskampf* mythology - would himself have been viewed as the "king of the unclean creatures", the substitution of the four monsters in Daniel 7, in dependence upon the four kingdoms schema, is entirely natural.⁵⁸

All this does not demand that Daniel 7 be a Temple centred vision. Nor does it mean that Daniel 7 was necessarily written by a priest, since such purity consciousness and the centrality of the temple in that worldview was shared by all second Temple Jews. However, the impurity of the monsters in 7:4-8 suggests that we have here a conflict between pagan chaos and impurity against which the

⁵⁵ The parallelism is appreciated by 4 Ezra 13 where the man from the sea of Daniel 7 carves out the mountain of Daniel 2.

⁵⁶ Collins, *Daniel*, 295-6 and see Bryan's review of suggestions (*Cosmos*, 218-227).

⁵⁷ Bryan, *Cosmos*, 238-9.

⁵⁸ Bryan, *Cosmos*, 239-245.

cult in Zion and the enthroned Yahweh sets itself in vv. 9ff. There is then a spatial and ontological shift from the sea as the locus of pagan chaos in 7:4-8 to Zion as the source of true purity in vv. 9ff. Again this purity-versus-chaos dynamic reinforces the sense that we have here is essentially a second *Temple* version of the *Chaoskampf*.

Enoch, Melchizedek and the One Like a Son of Man

Dan 7:9-15 is one of the most developed throne-theophanies in a long biblical and post-biblical tradition of that genre. In the search to understand its peculiar details a number of scholars have turned to *1 Enoch* 14, which contains many parallels to the Danielic vision. There too there is a particular interest in the wheels of God's throne (*1 Enoch* 14:17, cf. Dan 7:9), whence there flow rivers of fire (*1 Enoch* 14:19, cf. Dan 7:10). Only here in the Hebrew Bible (v. 9) and in *1 Enoch* 14:20 in contemporary literature is God's raiment said to be snow white. Fourthly, and with particular significance for the identification of the man in figure Dan 7:13, in *1 Enoch* 14:8 it is the clouds which usher the human figure into God's presence. Because *1 Enoch* 14 is now universally recognised to be a pre-Maccabean portion of the Enochic corpus, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Dan 7:9-14 is in some way dependent on that extra-canonical heavenly ascent.⁵⁹

However, the significance for the identity of the "one like a son of man" of the parallel with Enoch's cloud-ushered ascent into God's presence has remained obscure. In a later part of the Enochic tradition somebody came to the quite natural conclusion that Enoch was the "one like a son of man" of the Danielic vision (*Eth. Enoch* 37-71).⁶⁰ Yet there is nothing in Daniel 7 which points to such a conclusion and commentators have justifiably ignored the possibility that that was the author's original intention.

The literary similarity between the two texts, I believe, lies in the *tertium comparionis* that both the "one like a son of man" and Enoch are priests. In the Fall of the Watchers cycle, of which *1 Enoch* 14 is a

⁵⁹ See esp. T. F. Glasson, "The Son of Man Imagery: Enoch xiv and Daniel vii," *NTS* 23 (1976-7) 82-90.; H. S. Kvanvig, "Henoch und der Menschensohn," *ST* 38 (1984) 101-31, cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 300. That Daniel 7 is indeed a reworked scene from the Enoch material has been argued by Loren T. Stuckenbruck with respect to a passage from the Qumran Book of Giants ("The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7," *forthcoming*, on 4Q30 ii 17-19).

⁶⁰ On this identification see my *Luke-Acts*, 149-153.

part, Enoch is called a "scribe of righteousness" (12:4). However, several commentators have rightly come to the conclusion that Enoch is also a priest.

Since the work of David Suter and George Nickelsburg the Fall of the Watchers cycle has been widely interpreted as a typological reference to the exogamy of priests who, like watchers in heaven have left their domain of cultic and racial purity by marrying non-Israelite women of the land.⁶¹ On that basis, and drawing attention to the close parallels between Enoch's actions and those of Ezra, Helge Kvanvig has concluded that Enoch is the archetypal scribe and priest.⁶² This view has been developed most fully by Martha Himmelfarb. She points to numerous temple and priestly details of *1 Enoch* 14; taking up the implications of the Suter/Nickelsburg interpretation, the watchers are priests; the tripartite heaven which Enoch enters is modelled on the tripartite division of the second Temple sanctuary; the language of Enoch's approach ("to draw near") is cultic; the Great Glory is himself dressed in priestly attire; the background to scribal and teaching activity is predominantly priestly, and Enoch's role as intercessor and the his right of access to God's presence is otherwise reserved for the high priest.⁶³

As Himmelfarb and others have noted Enoch's priestly credentials were well-known and developed in later literature.⁶⁴ In *Jubilees* 4:25 Enoch makes the evening incense offering. In *2 Enoch* Enoch's angelomorphic transformation is expressed in terms of priestly investiture (22:8-10) and the concluding chapters (69-73) "are devoted to the succession of the priesthood after Enoch's ascension, clearly implying that Enoch himself served as a priest."⁶⁵ So too in the Hekhalot text *3 Enoch* Enoch's investiture is recognisably priestly (see. ch. 12).⁶⁶

⁶¹ Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981) 575-600 and Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in *1 Enoch*," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 115-135.

⁶² H. S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 99-103. Kvanvig thinks that the early Enoch tradition was developed by Levites who returned from Babylon in the fourth century (pp. 135-143, 157-8, 330-333).

⁶³ *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 14-28.

⁶⁴ *Ascent to Heaven*, 25-46.

⁶⁵ *Ascent to Heaven*, 40.

⁶⁶ For Enoch/Metatron's (high) priestly characterisation in Hekhalot and rabbinic literature see *3 Enoch* 15B:1 (OTP 1:303); *Num. Rab.* 12:12 and the *Alphabet of Metatron* (Alexander in OTP 1:265 n. 12a).

This accumulation of priestly data is impressive and could be developed with reference to other parts of the first Enochic corpus. Lest some remain unconvinced and in order to clarify the implications for Daniel 7, it will be worth identifying more exactly the *Sitz im Leben* of the Fall of the Watchers cycle.

Like most commentators Nickelsburg, Suter and Kvanvig have all judged 1 *Enoch* 12-16 a repudiation of the allegedly corrupt Jerusalemite priesthood, which naturally implies a *sectarian* setting for this very early apocalyptic work.⁶⁷ However, whilst the exogamy typology is a convincing explanation of the myth, the conclusion that its authorship is estranged from the Jerusalemite priesthood is unnecessary. Certainly in the *Damascus Document* (2:16-19) and the *Testament of Levi* (14-16) it would be fair to conclude that the fall of the watchers is used as a sectarian rhetoric. However, the socio-religious make-up of Israelite society was very different after the Antiochene crisis (whence these two texts) by comparison with the pre-Maccabean period, whence the Book of Watchers. There is no direct and indisputable evidence for an anti-Jerusalemite sectarian group in the pre-Maccabean period.⁶⁸

Unless, that is, one include in the definition of sectarian the Samaritans, who we know *did* set themselves over against the Jerusalem hierocracy. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar has now made the attractive suggestion that 1 *Enoch* 12-16 is originally directed at Samaritans, on the basis of a passage in Josephus' *Ant.* 11:306-12, which describes how Manasseh, the brother of the high priest Jaddua, married Nikaso, the daughter of Sanballat, governor of Samaria.⁶⁹ The marriage led to Manasseh's expulsion from the Jerusalem hierocracy and the founding of a temple on Mount Gerizim, which was supplied with priests and laity amongst Manasseh's supporters. Tigchelaar finds support for his proposal, not only in the closing chapters of Ezra, but also the combination of anti-Samaritan and anti-exogamy material in *Testament of Levi* 2-7 and *Jubilees* 30. If he is right, this means that in its present form the watchers cycle was composed *from the perspective* of the Jerusalem Temple Jewish community as a satire and moralistic aetiology of the behaviour of "heterodox"

⁶⁷ Nickelsburg "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 586; Suter, "Fallen Angel," 131, 134-5; Kvanvig, "Roots," e.g. p. 333.

⁶⁸ The sectarian understanding of apocalyptic has now come under sharp criticism from S. L. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism. The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995). Compare Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 26-8.

⁶⁹ *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End. Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 198-203.

Samaritan Jews. In all probability it was written by a priest in the Ezra tradition whose hero, Enoch, is created in his own scribal image.

Tigchelaar's hypothesis can, I believe, be supported by two other texts. The first of these is the praise of Simon the Just in Sirach 50:1-21. This passage is framed by a polemic against "the foolish people that live in Shechem" (v. 26) and a statement of Enoch's superiority over Joseph, from whom the Samaritans claimed descent (e.g. Josephus *Ant.* 9.291; 11:341), in 49:14-15.⁷⁰ That frame interprets the hymn in praise of Simon as a glorification of the Jerusalem priesthood over against rival Samaritan hierocratic aspirations: Sirach knew that Enoch was a figure who could be used against rival Samaritan claims.

Secondly, David Bryan has now demonstrated that in a pre-Maccabean "*Original Testament of Naphtali*" underlying both the *Testament of Naphtali* and the *Hebrew Testament of Naphtali* visionary material is used as a Jerusalem based polemic against Samaritans who are represented by Joseph.⁷¹ In that case it is highly significant that in the *Testament of Naphtali* this polemic (chs. 5-6) immediately follows a reference to the admonition "in the writing of the holy Enoch" (4:1) and the lesson to be learnt from "the Watchers [who] departed from nature's order" (3:5).

All this has two important results: 1 *Enoch* 12-17 is best understood and was well known as a mythological satire against Samaritans. As such it is a mainstream Jerusalem Temple text.⁷² In this context Enoch provides ideological support for the Jerusalem priesthood, over against other priestly communities. Just as 1 *Enoch* 14 had recourse to the ascent to heaven of the archetypal priest during the threat posed by the Samaritan schism *within* the Jewish community, so too Daniel 7 created the vision of a priestly ascent to heaven during, what the author perceived to be a threat *from without* the Jewish community.

Besides the Samaritan exogamy allegory, the other widely acknowledged socio-religious referent in the Fall of the Watchers myth is the Day of Atonement ritual.⁷³ In the first instance this is evident in the similarity of the names of one of the two archangelic apostates (Azazel: 1 *Enoch* 9:6; 10:4 etc..) and the destination of one of the two goats during the Day of Atonement ritual (Lev 16:8, 10, 26). As later Christian and Jewish texts make clear, the binding and

⁷⁰ On the opposition between Enoch and Joseph in this passage see my *Luke-Acts*, 148-9.

⁷¹ *Cosmos*, 188-212.

⁷² Cf. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 203.

⁷³ Kvanvig, *Roots*, 100, 102.

detention of the fallen watchers (*1 Enoch* 10) was evidently modelled on the scapegoat's departure and death in the wilderness.⁷⁴ In that case it is highly significant that Enoch's heavenly ascent looks most like the high priest's annual visit to the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. Only on that occasion does he come as close to God's presence as does Enoch.⁷⁵ During the Samaritan crisis, when priestly exogamy had defiled sacred space, it would be quite natural for the rite of purgation in Leviticus 16 to be used as the means by which such a archetypal sin was removed. So, once again, we find strong support for the conclusion that not only is the "one like a son of man" a priest, but his movement into God's presence surrounded by clouds is specifically parallel to another visionary text in which a high priestly figure's entry into the heavenly holy of holies is related to that of the annual Day of Atonement ceremony.

The same conclusion is reached if we reflect on the possible parallel to Dan 7:13 in the Melchizedek pseudepigraphon from Qumran (11QMelch). Many commentators have seized on this text, which predicates מֶלְכִּי־צֶדֶק of Melchizedek (line 10).⁷⁶ Whilst this Melchizedek is normally regarded as a suprahuman angelic figure, a simultaneous identification with the earthly king-priest in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 should not be ruled out.⁷⁷ Most important for our purposes is the fact that the eschatological appearance of this divine judge Melchizedek is described as the Day of Atonement on the tenth Jubilee (line 7 cf. line 2).

This Jubilee theology, which is inextricable from the Day of Atonement festival - the Jubilee being set for the tenth of Tishri (Lev 25:9) - was evidently familiar to the Danielic tradition. Even though Daniel 9 was certainly written after Daniel 7, it is not insignificant that there the interpretation of Jer 25:11-12; 29:10 is given an interpretation in terms of ten Jubilees (490 years). The echoes of an eschatological Day of Atonement that this interpretation might sound

⁷⁴ For the texts see L. L. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Ritual: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JStJ* 18 (1987) 152-67.

⁷⁵ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 18 has noted the similarity between God's garment in *1 Enoch* 14 and that of the high priest during the Yom Kippur ritual.

⁷⁶ E.g. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 172; Collins, *Daniel*, 293.

⁷⁷ See my *Luke-Acts*, 155, 196-7. Compare the use of מֶלְכִּי־צֶדֶק for Moses (from Exod 7:1) in 4Q374 2 ii 6, on which see my "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology" *DSD* 3 (1996) 236-252.

chime in very well with the vision in Dan 7:9-14 if that too envisages a similar eschatological festival.⁷⁸

The Day of Atonement as the Text's Life Setting: A Proposal

Thus far there is much to suggest that Daniel 7 not only belongs in a cultic context, but that it has in mind in particular the New Year festival. John Day has assumed the most relevant festival is Tabernacles. However, the New Year was divided in the second Temple period into three separate festivals - Rosh Hashanah, the Day of Atonement and Tabernacles. Whilst there was no doubt a creative interplay between the meaning of each it might be helpful to clarify whether one of these three in particular was in the author's mind.

Lacocque's conclusion that the Temple context best explained the vision was reached not simply from the cultic focus of the Antiochene reforms but the very specific defilement caused by the appointment of Jason as the high priest after the assassination of Onias III (Dan 9:26): this "new stain ... could only be erased by the coming of the ultimate high priest".⁷⁹ This insight that the coming of the one like a son of man is an act which would remove the impurity which has contaminated sacred space is perceptive and can now be supported by David Bryan's work on the impurity of the *Mischwesen*. Within the Pentateuchal laws governing the cult the means by which impurity which has contaminated the Temple is removed is the rite of purgation prescribed for the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16.

We have already seen that the parallel to *1 Enoch* 14 suggests Daniel 7 has a Day of Atonement focus. It is to a detailed consideration of this possibility that we now turn.

The Son of Man, the Day of Atonement and the Pharisees and Sadducees

Obviously the strongest point of connection between Dan 7:9-14 and the Day of Atonement is the image of God's appearance "on earth" and the movement of both the man-figure and the high priest into his presence. That this New Year festival is specifically in mind is confirmed, I believe, by the clouds motif.

⁷⁸ The Day of Atonement echo in the Jubilee motif has been noted by Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 192, in commenting on the phrase עֵין לְכַפֵּר at 9:24. Note also the division of history into Jubilees in 4QPseudo-Daniel (4Q243-5) line 14.

⁷⁹ Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 125.

As J. A. Emerton rightly pointed out the association of the man-figure with the clouds means he receives a feature of nature which is otherwise only ever associated with God himself in the biblical tradition.⁸⁰ In some instances the biblical cloud theophany is of an apparently non-cultic, historical nature (e.g. Ps 19:1; Ezek 1:4). We are reminded of its role at the giving of the law in the Sinaitic revelation and the cloud leading the people in the wilderness which bears God's presence. However, in another set of texts the cloud is associated with God's presence in the Temple (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:11) and the Tabernacle (e.g. Exod 40:34-38; Num 9:15-22).

In the Day of Atonement text, Leviticus 16, it is stated that God "appears in the cloud above the mercy seat" (v. 2). We are reminded of the cloud of glory which descends upon the Tabernacle. In the context of Leviticus 16 we are probably meant to think of the "cloud of incense" which comes from the high priest's censer rising above the ark (v. 13).⁸¹ Do we need to choose between these two?

In his recent monograph on *Incense in the Ancient Cult* Kjeld Nielsen has argued that we should hold together cultic descriptions of incense burning and the historical accounts of God appearing, for example at Sinai, in a cloud. Though not wishing to deny some pre-cultic historical or mythological tradition, he sees that tradition re-enacted in the cult through the use of incense to create a cloud.⁸² This means that, whenever obviously associated with the divine presence, the use of incense in the cult would remind the participant of the theophanic cloud. In a visionary text, like Daniel 7 where there is good reason to see a cultic framework, this symbolism is quite naturally reversed: clouds are the cosmological equivalent of the Temple's incense smoke. In Leviticus 16 the cloud represents or shields the presence of God, so what are we to make of its association with a putative high priestly "son of man"?

There was, according to rabbinic texts, a heated debate between Pharisees and Sadducees over the interpretation and application of the incense instructions in Leviticus 16. The Sadducees believed that the incense should be applied to the coals at the altar in the courtyard, which means that when the high priest enters the sanctuary he is already accompanied by clouds of incense. The Pharisees vehemently rejected this interpretation and insisted that the

high priest only place the incense upon the coals once inside the holy of holies.⁸³

The relevant texts do not themselves explain why this issue was such a cause of contention and modern commentators have been hard pressed to supply a persuasive rationale.⁸⁴ It might be that the Sadducees were concerned lest the high priest enter the holy of holies unprotected from an unmediated vision of the deity or from demonic attack. But then it is difficult to see why the Pharisees did not share that concern. Hitherto little light has been shed on this argument from what else is known about post-biblical party strife and the issues at stake between the Pharisees and Sadducees.

It is frequently assumed that the scriptural text is clearly in support of the Pharisaic position.⁸⁵ However, LeMoyné has rightly noted that the matter is not clear cut and the Pharisees may not actually have the literal text squarely on their side.⁸⁶ If one reads the Hebrew (or LXX) of Lev 16:12-13 and assumes that it is once inside the holy of holies that Aaron is to place the incense upon the fire (so the Pharisees) then these verses present two problems. First, v. 12 literally reads, "And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire *from* the altar, *from before* the LORD (מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה)". The second prepositional suffix מִן is redundant and reads a little oddly.⁸⁷ Secondly, v. 12b refers to the filling of both hands (dual: הַפְּנֵי יָדַי) with incense: it strains logistical practicalities to imagine the high priest with two hands full of incense carrying at the same time a censer full of fire.⁸⁸

With the Sadducean interpretation both these difficulties at once disappear. The Sadducees, it would appear, read verse 13 not as

⁸³ See *t. Yoma* 1:8, 181; *b. Yoma* 19b; 53a; *y. Yoma* 1:5, 39a; *Sipra* Lev 16:13 (68a).

⁸⁴ See e.g. J. Z. Lauterbach, "A Significant Controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees," *HUCA* 4 (1927) 173-205; J. LeMoyné, *Les Sadducéens*, (Paris: Lecoffre, 1972) 249-263; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1028-31; E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992) 335, 395-7, 466 (where Sanders confuses the Sadducean with the Pharisaic position), 469.

⁸⁵ Lauterbach, "Controversy," 173-4; Milgrom, "Leviticus," 1028; Sanders, *Judaism*, 335.

⁸⁶ LeMoyné, *Sadducéens*, 249-50, 258, 262. R. Leszynsky, "Die Sadduzäer," (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1912) 61 thinks the biblical texts supports the Sadducees.

⁸⁷ Milgrom's suggestions, *Leviticus*, 1025, do not fully alleviate the problem. He points out that "had the text read *lipnê*, the clauses might have been misread "from atop the altar to the presence of the Lord." That would have suited the Pharisees very well.

⁸⁸ Leszynsky, *Sadduzäer*, 62. The Mishnah (*Yoma* 5:1) has to introduce a ladle for the incense where there is none mentioned in the biblical text.

⁸⁰ Emerton, "Origin," 232.

⁸¹ So, e.g., J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (New York: Doubleday, 1991) 1014-5. For the use of cloud language with respect to incense see e.g. Ezek 8:11; Sirach 50:6.

⁸² (Leiden: Brill, 1986) 82ff.

consecutive with v. 12c ("... and he shall bring it inside the curtain *and put the incense...*" (so NRSV)), but as a resumption of v. 12ab: "And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from the altar, *from before the LORD*, (and he shall bring it inside the curtain). And he shall [also] put the incense on the fire *before the LORD*." The redundant "from (before the LORD)" in v. 12a (cf. v. 18) is deliberately included to be picked up in v. 13 where it alerts the reader to the fact that obtaining the coals and placing the burning of the incense both occur at the same place.⁸⁹ Elsewhere the phrase "before the LORD" quite clearly means the altar of the forecourt (e.g. Lev 1:5; 4:4).⁹⁰ No juggling act is intended: Aaron is to carry from the altar the incense upon the coals in the one censer into the inner sanctuary. Admittedly, the ritual prescription could have been less convoluted, but the Sadducees need not be embarrassed by the biblical text.⁹¹

As J. Z. Lauterbach wisely pointed out, "[h]ad the older practice been like the one advocated by their party or had there been an oral tradition favouring their opinion, the Pharisaic teachers certainly would have mentioned it." But in the extant accounts they do not. "It is therefore safe to assume... that in this case the Sadducees followed the traditional time-honoured practice, while the Pharisees were not advocates of an old oral tradition... but the innovators".⁹²

This all suggests the Pharisaic hermeneutic had an ulterior motive. If the Pharisees, for whom eschatology was far more important than it was for the Sadducees, cherished Daniel 7 in the belief that God was going to send a future high priestly figure who would fulfil the action described in v. 13, then they would quite understandably resist Sadducean officiation which appeared to fulfil that passage. The Sadducee/Pharisee separation was evidently occasioned by disagreements over Hasmonean claims to the power of both high priesthood and kingship. In that context the Pharisees did not, as did the Sadducees, accept the realised eschatology of the

Hasmonean priest-kings: they did not, I suggest, accept that any of the Hasmoneans fulfilled Dan 7:13. And during the closing decades of the second Temple period, when the Hasmoneans had all but disappeared from the political scene, they continued to insist, against any Sadducean pretensions to the contrary, that the Day of Atonement ritual could not be conducted such that it might look like a fulfilment of Day 7. They awaited some eschatological figure who would fulfil what the older Day of Atonement ideology believed was fulfilled by the high priest during that festival.

Whether or not the Sadducees desired consciously to fulfil Dan 7:13 remains to be seen. At any rate there is support for our supposition that they wished to continue the traditional manner of the liturgy. Already in the third century B.C. the Book of Watchers provided a model for the ideal priest who would ascend to the holy of holies surrounded by clouds. In Sirach, a book which is often related to Sadduceanism, and which climaxes, as we have already seen, with a description of the ideal high priest who is related closely to Enoch (49:14ff), we also have evidence of the pre-Maccabean dating of the Sadducee's incense policy. There, in ch. 50 v. 6, Simon ben Onias is said to be "like the morning star among the clouds" as he left the sanctuary. Though his *entry* is not described, the author clearly wants to associate a cloud, not simply with the presence of God, but with the person of the high priest. That there is an association specifically with the *incense* cloud may be corroborated by v. 9 where Simon is "like fire and incense in the censer". What is more the comparison between Simon and the morning star places his office quite firmly in the tradition of the angelomorphic humanity which, we have suggested, explains the divergent evidence for the identity of the "one like a son of man" in Dan 7:13.

My proposal can be corroborated by a detail of the rabbinic records concerning the disagreement. According to the Mishnah on the eve of the Day of Atonement a Sadducean high priest would have read to him various scriptures: "And from what did they read before him? Out of Job and Ezra and Chronicles. Zechariah b. Kabutal says: "Many times I read before him out of Daniel" (*m. Yoma* 1:6)." We are not told why these books were read. It is normally suggested that the reading of Daniel is due to the controversy surrounding the belief in the resurrection for which the Pharisees could find support in Dan 12:1-3.⁹³ That is possible and, given the connection between an angelomorphic high priest representing the righteous who therefore experience what he experiences, this is not incompatible with my

⁸⁹ For resumption elsewhere in Leviticus 16 compare v. 11a with v. 6.

⁹⁰ See esp. Num 16:17 where it is assumed that incense is to be placed on the coals according to the Sadducean practice.

⁹¹ The Sadducean desire to have the high priest surrounded by the incense is reminiscent of Moses' experience according to Exod 24:18. It may also have been shared by the Essenes if the fragmentary *Tongues of Fire* text (1Q29; 4Q376) refers to the high priest coming forth with the cloud from the sanctuary, (1Q29 1 3; 4Q376 1 ii 1). On the other side of 4Q376 (4Q377) there is a description of Moses covered by the cloud speaking as God's mouth piece "as though he were an angel" (line 11).

⁹² "Controversy," 176. According to LeMoyné, (*Sadducéens*, 259) Lauterbach's judgement is followed by "la plupart des auteurs", himself included (pp. 259-60).

⁹³ See e.g. LeMoyné, *Sadducéens*, 261-2.

interpretation. However, I suggest, the Sadducean high priest was read Daniel, and particularly chapter 7, so that he knew why he was not to light the incense until he was in the holy of holies. Similarly, the reading of Ezra may have had in mind Ezra 2:63 which looks forward to an eschatological high priest (cf. Neh 7:65).

We are thus led to the conclusion that Dan 7:9-14 describes the eschatological Day of Atonement (perhaps a Jubilee) when the true high priest will come to the Ancient of Days surrounded by clouds of incense. In this very specific context it is worth noting ample evidence that on this day the high priest was angelomorphic. So, for example, in a tradition shared by Philo and the rabbis Lev כל "לא אדם לא יהיה באהל מועד בבאו" (Lev 16:17) is interpreted to mean that there is no mortal man in the holy of holies on the high priest's entry because the latter is actually an angel at this point.⁹⁴ Philo takes the linen garments of this ritual to be symbolic of an immortal identity (*De Somnis* 1:216-7). Jacob Milgrom has now concluded that it was the original intention of the biblical text for the high priest's simple attire to symbolise an angelic identity pertinent to his access to the heavenly assembly.⁹⁵

The High Priest, Baal and the *Chaoskampf*

Our discussion thus far has, I believe, on the basis of the text's foreground - the Temple cult - and some considerations of the more immediate background (e.g. *1 Enoch* 14), established sufficient grounds for a high priestly man-figure in Dan 7:13. Because of the importance of the Baal allusions it is incumbent upon us to say something about the high priest and the *Chaoskampf*. That subject would merit extensive treatment in its own right. Given the confines of this study I can only flag up work in progress and give five reasons why I believe that prior to Daniel 7 the high priest had already taken on an identity mimicking that of Baal.

(1) First, whilst Mosca is right to draw attention to the way in which, for example in Ps 89, Baal motifs are transferred to the pre-exilic king, in the post-exilic period the prerogatives of kingship are transferred to priesthood. *A priori*, then, there is the possibility that the role of the king in the cult with respect to his authority over the

⁹⁴ *Lev. Rab.* 21:12. Philo: *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 84; *De Somnis* 2:188-89; 2:231. See my *Luke-Acts*, 126.

⁹⁵ *Leviticus*, 1016.

mythical forces of chaos should be transferred to the role of the high priest within the same sphere.

(2) Secondly, P. J. Kearney has argued that in Exod 25-31 the sevenfold division in the instructions for the building of the Tabernacle corresponds to the seven days of creation in the P account of Genesis 1.⁹⁶ This correspondence is transparent for the third and seventh sections where the building of the bronze laver (30:17-21: the "sea" of 1 Kgs 7:23) and the injunction to keep the Sabbath (31:12-17) correspond perfectly to the third and seventh days of creation in Gen 1:9-10; 2:2-3. Closer examination would, I believe, reveal a clear correlation between each of the other five sections and P's day's of creation.⁹⁷ The cumulative effect of this intratextuality is to place cosmogony in the context of liturgy and to define the Tabernacle as a microcosm of the universe.

For our purposes Kearney's suggestion is significant because it places the description of Aaron's garments and his ordination (Exod 28-29) in parallelism with the first day of creation (Gen 1:1-5) where, however muted, there are echoes of God's victory over the forces of creation in ancient Near Eastern cosmogonies.⁹⁸ Kearney himself saw a parallelism between God creating light (Gen 1:3-5) and Aaron tending the Tabernacle menorah, to which reference is made in Exod 27:20-21 and 30:7-8 - an *inclusio* around Exodus 28-9.⁹⁹ That, here, Aaron plays the role within the cult that God plays within creation is important because, as John Day has noted with specific reference to Gen 1:3-5, in the ancient Near East the defeat of the forces of chaos is commonly associated with the dawn, light in general and the sun god or goddess.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exodus 25-40," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 375-87. Each section begins "And the LORD spoke to Moses, saying..." (Exod 25:1; 30:11; 30:17; 30:22; 30:34; 31:1; 31:12).

⁹⁷ Kearney has been partially taken up by, e.g., M. Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord, The Problem of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Gen. 1:1-2:3," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981) 501-11, 502 n. 5, 507; Levenson, *Creation*, 82-3, though his central thesis has not received the attention it deserves. Weinfeld's own discussion (506-7) points to the correspondence between the luminaries of the fourth day of creation (Gen 1:14-19) and the consecration of Aaron's sons in God's fourth speech (Exod 30:22-33).

⁹⁸ For those echoes see Day, *God's Conflict*, 49-3.

⁹⁹ "Creation and Liturgy," 375. This relationship between Aaron, God and the creation of light can be correlated with Zech 2:8; 3:9; 4:14.

¹⁰⁰ Day, *God's Conflict*, 102, 121-2. See e.g. Ps 46:6; Isa 14:12f; 17:14; Job 26:12-13; Hab 3:11 and esp. Ps 110:7 of the priest-king.

Similar conclusions are reached if we examine the details of Exodus 28-9 in their ancient Near Eastern history-of-religions context:

(3) The ephod (Exod 28:4f) has puzzled commentators. There is now general agreement that originally and in other contexts the biblical ephod was a garment that covered a statue of a god.¹⁰¹ As such it was a biblical example of a widespread interest in the precious garments of the gods.¹⁰² This symbolism is then assumed to have been lost when in P Aaron is given an ephod.

However, there are good reasons to think the Aaronic ephod retained its divine garment symbolism. In the post-biblical period Jewish tradition continues to interpret the ephod's symbolism in terms of divine clothing.¹⁰³ In the context of the cosmic symbolism of the Tabernacle it would make excellent sense to have Aaron wear such divine costume: "... not only do different parts of the Temple and its objects represent the heavenly abode, but even the priests ... represent the divine retinue, i.e. the angels" and so the high priest represents the presence of God Himself.¹⁰⁴

Outside the Hebrew Bible there are several instances of a word apparently cognate with the biblical אֵפֹד. In one of these the usage points to this garment being worn by the god victorious in the *Chaoskampf*. In a well-known passage from the Ugaritic Baal epic an 'ipd is worn by Baal when he slays Leviathan.¹⁰⁵

Although you [Baal] defeated Lotanu, the fleeing serpent,
destroyed the coiling serpent,
the Tyrant with the seven heads,
you were uncovered, the heaven came loose like the
girdle of your cloak ('ipdk)!

¹⁰¹ See esp. Judg 17:5; 18:14-20; Hos 3:4, cf. 2 Kgs 23:7; ABD 2:550 "Ephod"; HALAT 1:77.

¹⁰² See esp. A. L. Oppenheim, "The Golden Garments of the Gods," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 8 (1949) 172-193.

¹⁰³ In *Gen. Rab.* 38:8 the high priest wears God's garments (cf. *y. Yoma* 7:3, 44b; *Lev. Rab.* 21:11). In 4QShirShabb (4Q405 23 ii 5; 11QShirShabb 8-7 6) the ephodim are worn by the angelic priests of the heavenly realm. See also Josephus *Ant.* 3:180 in context, *Aristeas* 99, *Rev* 1:13-16 and the texts (below) which deal with the breastplate.

¹⁰⁴ Extending the logic of Weinfeld's conclusion: "Sabbath, Temple," 506.

¹⁰⁵ CTA 5.I.1-5 according to the translation of J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Leiden: Brill, 1988) 69-70. The translation of the difficult lines 4-5 has been disputed (by e.g. J. A. Emerton, "A difficult part of Mot's message to Baal in the Ugaritic texts," in *AJBA* 2 (1972) 50-71). However, the older view that we have in the 'ipd a garment is confirmed by the sense of this word at CTA 5.V.2-4, 24.

The first two lines of this text are remarkably close to Isa 27:1 and they are frequently cited in the discussion of Daniel 7.¹⁰⁶ However, hitherto no notice has been taken of the reference in line 5 to an Ugaritic ephod and the implications this might have for Dan 7:13.

(4) Fourthly, the stones on the high priest's breastplate have several very specific and important symbolic functions. In the first place the parallels to Ezek 28:12ff and the Greek Addition to Esther D (15:6) clearly demonstrate that these are specifically attached to divine kingship.¹⁰⁷

In the second place there are three considerations which point to the very specific symbolism of these stones as the property of the god or divine representative who has overcome the forces of chaos. First, in the cuneiform text *Lugal-e* the god Ninurta(/Ningirsu), with whom Marduk is elsewhere identified, and who in this text defeats the forces of chaos in the mountains, takes as his prize a collection of stones similar in number and configuration to those of the high priest's breast plate (esp. lines 498-545). Ninurta's stones are then set up in the cult as an object of worship (542-5).¹⁰⁸ Secondly, this taking of stones as the spoil of the *Chaoskampf* reminds us of the twelve stones taken from the river Jordan in Joshua 4. There too the stones are taken in the context of an event reminiscent of the defeat of the sea/river to be set up in the cult at Gilgal. Thirdly, almost a century ago W. Muss-Arnolt had good cause to compare the high priest's stones with the Tablet of Destinies, which are taken by Marduk from the vanquished Qingu to be worn during the god's ordering of the cosmos (*Enuma Elish* 4:121-2).¹⁰⁹ Both the Tablet of Destinies and Aaron's breastplate are worn over the breast. Support for Muss-Arnolt's hypothesis is perhaps provided by Ezek 28:13 where, in the

¹⁰⁶ See e.g. Ferch, *Son of Man*, 62; Collins, *Daniel*, 287

¹⁰⁷ Compare Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* 25:10-26:15 where the stones are related to those covering Amorite idols. Eschatologically, they will be set above the two cherubim over the ark (26:12).

¹⁰⁸ In particular, the light-giving Hematite (the Truth stone) and Alabaster (498-523) are reminiscent of the Urim and Thummim, the δῆλωσις and ἀλήθεια. For the *editio princeps* see J. van Dijk, *LUGAL UID ME-LÁM-bi NIR GÁL* (Leiden: Brill, 1983). An English translation is available in T. Jacobsen, *The Harps that Once.... : Sumerian Poetry in Translation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987) 260-262.

¹⁰⁹ "The Urim and Thummim. A Suggestion as to Their Original Nature and Significance," *AJSL* 16 (1900) 211-219, where he sets out some of the similarities.

context of a description of the breastplate's stones, the otherwise obscure תִּשְׁבֹּרֶת is cognate with the Tablet (*tup*) of Destinies.¹¹⁰

(5) Finally, confirmation for the view that Aaron wears the garments of the God victorious in the *Chaoskampf* is provided by a remarkable passage in Josephus' *Antiquities* Book 3. In his extended account of the tabernacle and the priestly clothing Josephus comes to describe the sash with which the priests' robe is girded to the upper body:

... they gird [the robe] at the breast, winding to a little above the armpits the sash, which is of a breadth of about four fingers and has an open texture giving it the appearance of a serpent's skin. Therein are interwoven flowers of divers hues, of crimson and purple, blue and fine linen, but the warp is purely of fine linen. Having taken the end of the twisting across the breast and winding it around again,¹¹¹ it is tied and then hangs at length, sweeping to the ankles, that is so long as the priest has no task in hand, for so its beauty is displayed to the beholders' advantage; but when it behoves him to attend to the sacrifices and perform his ministry, in order that the movements of the sash may not impede his actions, he throws it back over his left shoulder. Moses gave it the name of ἀβανῆθ but we have learnt from the Babylonians to call it ἐμίαν, for so it is designated among them (3:154-6).

Why is the sash likened to a serpent (ὄφις) and does this have anything to do with Leviathan? The sash is referred to with the language of "twisting" (ἔλιξ), which is otherwise so characteristic of a snake's skin. This language is also reminiscent of that used of the "twisting" serpent in Isa 27:1-2 and the parallel passage in the Baal cycle (CTA 5.I.1-3) where, as we have seen there is a reference to an ephod. A little further on Josephus says of the High Priest in particular that

.... by the sash, wherewith he encompassed [the robe] he (i.e. Moses) signified the ocean, which holds the whole in its embrace (3:185).

¹¹⁰ For this explanation of Ezekiel's expression see J. Weill, "Les mots תִּשְׁבֹּרֶת dans la plainte d'Ezéchiél sur le roi de Tyre (28:11-19)," *REJ* 42 (1901) 7-13.

¹¹¹ I have departed from the Loeb translation ("wound a first time at the breast, after passing round it once again"), which obscures the fact that the sash

Clearly this suggests that it is not a land serpent that is meant, but a sea serpent: the sash represents both Yam or Tiamat and their monster Leviathan (Lotan) or Qingu. That this symbolic understanding goes back far into Israel's history is suggested by a likely connection with the etymology of the name Leviathan (לִוְיָתָן). It is commonly assumed that this is related to the Hebrew noun לִוְיָתָן , which in Prov 1:9 & 4:9 is some kind of wreath or garland, not unlike our priest's sash.¹¹² In turn it is supposed that both nouns are derived from a hypothetical root לִו which would mean "to turn, twist, wind".¹¹³ If some connection between this mythical beast and a sash embroidered in its image does in fact go back some way in biblical tradition this might explain the linguistic discrepancy between the biblical *lwytn* and the alternative spelling of the same creature's name in CTA 5.I.1 where its consonants are *ltn*: by the period of biblical transmission, if not before, this monster had become associated with a cultic item of symbolic dress, and the precise form of its name affected accordingly.

The express purpose of the sash's sea/chaos monster symbolism would require further examination. However, at this juncture there should be no doubt that the high priest wears a *vainquished* Leviathan: the sash hanging at his side evokes the image of a limp and defeated serpent in the hand of its conqueror.¹¹⁴

With these five points there is, I submit, good evidence that, within the cult at least, the high priest takes on the some of God's identity in the victory over the forces of chaos. Needless to say, whilst it would be over hasty to use the word "ditheism" of this material, the pattern is close to that of the relationship between the Ancient of Days and the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7.

Of course all this requires much fuller investigation: there is enough material here for an extensive history-of-religions

itself is described as possessing "twisting" ($\text{λαβούσα τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐλίξεως κατὰ στέρον}$).

¹¹² BDB 531, cf. the לִוְיָתָן (sing. לִוְיָתָן) which decorate the stands of the basin in Solomon's temple, (1 Kgs 7: 20, 30, 36). Is it a mere coincidence that this basin was called "the Sea"?

¹¹³ See most recently John Emerton's discussion: "Leviathan and *Ltn*: The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon," *VT* 32 (1982) 327-31.

¹¹⁴ It is worth comparing cylinder seal images of the god victorious in the *Chaoskampf*, where the god holds in his hand the limp serpent. See e.g. E. Williams-Forte, "The Snake and the Tree in the Iconography and Texts of Syria during the Bronze Age," *Ancient Seals and the Bible* (ed. L. Gorelick and E. Williams-Forte; Malibu, CA: Undena, 1983) 18-43, 39 (figs. 1, 2 & 4) for examples.

examination of the theology of priesthood in the Hebrew Bible in its own right. Within the constraints of the present context I simply offer these *prolegomena* to a fuller investigation in the belief that they provides the solution to the problem posed by the mythological imagery in Dan 7:13.

The High Priestly Son of Man in The New Testament

Besides the Enochic Son of Man in the Similitudes we would, I believe, find in a thoroughgoing reappraisal of the New Testament Son of Man material some significant support for my proposed rereading of Daniel 7. Passages such as Mark 2:10; 6:5; 10:45 where the Son of Man is specifically related to cultic concerns now come into clearer focus. In an earlier study I have drawn attention to the parallelism between the Son of Man logion in Luke 17:24-5 (cf. Matt 24:27) and a portion of the Qumran Aramaic Levi material which describes the eschatological high priest.¹¹⁵

In the absence of a detailed discussion attention should, in particular, be drawn to three New Testament passages. In Rev 1:13 the risen Christ is not only angelomorphic, he is also dressed in the high priest's garb.¹¹⁶ In the final conflict between Jesus and the authorities, where Jesus openly reveals his claim to be the fulfilment of Dan 7:13 (Mark 14:62), the clash between his own claim to be the true, eschatological high priest and the self-perception of Caiaphas brings the nature of this otherwise puzzling passage into relief. Given the evidently well-known tradition that the Son of Man was to come "as the Ancient of Days" (OG, cf. Rev 1:13-16 and later *Two Powers* debates) and those texts where it is the (true) high priest who receives the people's worship, the charge of blasphemy in response to Jesus' claim to be the Son of Man now begins to make sense.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ *Luke-Acts*, 196, 232-3.

¹¹⁶ See T. Holtz, *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962) 118-121.

¹¹⁷ For the worship of the high priest see Hecataeus of Abdera (Diodorus Siculus *Bibliotheca Historica* 40.3.4-7) and Josephus *Ant.* 11:331 (see my *Luke-Acts*, 120-125). Both the worship of Adam in *Life of Adam and Eve* 12-16 (*Luke-Acts*, 142 n. 190) and the Enochic Son of Man in *Eth. Enoch* 48:5; 62:9 should now be given a high priestly context. To these texts should probably be added the *hymn in praise* of Simon in Sirach 50. As for the charge of blasphemy (cf. Luke 12:10) the argument between the Pharisees and Sadducees concerning the respect due to John Hyrcanus (Josephus *Ant.* 13:294) probably has some significance. There it is likely that the Sadducees were dependent upon a conflation of Exod 22:28 (You shall not revile God (אלהים לא יבזו) or curse a leader of your people) and Lev 24:13-16

Thirdly, the Son of Man title is particularly prominent during the discussion of Jesus' identity at Caesarea Phillipi (Mark 8:27-9:13). A good case could be made for the transfiguration as a revelation of Jesus as the true high priest - the Son of Man. Peter's confusion over the booths suggests we are meant to think of the New Year festival. The emphasis on self-denial in Jesus' teaching (Mark 8:34) fits well with the injunction in Lev 16:29 to "deny yourselves" on the Day of Atonement and these points of correspondence are developed in Matthew's version where the binding of the watchers and the role of Peter as the new stone of foundation (Shetiyyah, cf. *m. Yoma* 5:2) are included (Matt 16:18-19).¹¹⁸

(treatment of blasphemy as a capital offence) in their demand for a death penalty for the Eleazar, the Pharisee who had slandered the high priest Hyrcanus.

¹¹⁸ The work of H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré: L'Arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1947) and Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," on this material has not received the attention it deserves.