

‘SON OF MAN’,
‘PITIABLE MAN’, ‘REJECTED MAN’
EQUIVALENT EXPRESSIONS IN THE OLD GREEK OF DANIEL¹

Eugene E. Lemcio

Summary

Far from being a generalised synonym for ‘man’ or ‘human’, the phrase ‘son of man’ in the Old Greek of Daniel bears the sense of ‘frail’ or ‘vulnerable human’. This becomes apparent when the expression ‘son of man’ and the dynamics of chapter 7 are compared with the phrases ‘rejected man’, ‘son of man’, and ‘pitiable man’ in chapters 4, 8, and 10.

1. Introduction

It is my thesis that υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός, and ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος are equivalent expressions, appearing in four chapters whose contexts and internal dynamics share common elements and patterns. By this I mean that each of the three conveys the sense of persons experiencing the downside of human experience: its frailty, vulnerability, and unlikelihood. The translator of the Old Greek (OG), more than the originators of the Massoretic Text (MT) and Theodotion (T), stresses the theological point that it is to people in such circumstances that God grants political power and prophetic insight.

¹ Part of the research for this article was funded by a Senior Faculty Grant from the Center for Scholarship and Development at Seattle Pacific University in 2003. It constitutes part 1 of a larger study that will deal with the implications of these findings for the New Testament. Both parts are offered to honor the friendship of the Revd Dr John Bowker, who nearly thirty years ago argued that *ben ’adam* and *bar ’enosh* conveyed the sense of frailty, vulnerability, and mortality in Daniel 7, the OT, the Targums, and Mark’s Gospel. See John Bowker, ‘The Son of Man’, *JTS* 28 (1977): 19-48. I am contending that this sense is also shared and underscored by two additional expressions within three other chapters of Daniel in the OG.

Language

One of the by-products of this investigation is the conclusion that, in the OG of Daniel, υἱός ἀνθρώπου is not merely a synonym for ἄνθρωπος, as scholars assert across the board. Rather, it is an idiom of choice for conveying the specialized meaning of ‘frail human’ or ‘vulnerable human’. Although some have argued that ‘son of man’ in 7:13 refers to an angel², this is definitely not the case in 8:17. However, even if the former is an angelic figure, the question remains, what kind of human features did he have? A rough analogy might be drawn from the use of σάρξ and σῶμα. On some occasions, the two can function as synonyms (Job 41:14-15, Prov. 5:11). But in the expression, ‘all flesh [is as] grass’ (Isa. 40:6), it is the former rather than the latter that conveys the transient nature of human experience. Context per individual author (or translator) determines usage. Thus, I am not claiming that son of man must mean ‘frailty’ or ‘vulnerability’ in every situation. But the evidence suggests that, for the translator of OG in Daniel, this is the expression of choice.

Theology

Broadly speaking, OG exaggerates the theology of reversal common to so much of the OT. In particular, it focuses on those occasions where, contrary to expectations, the lowly (for whatever reason) and otherwise unlikely are raised to royal status to exercise political power (chs. 4 and 7).³ Also exaggerated is the status of those in positions of power whose fall is thereby greater or against whom the lowly are contrasted. In another variation of this thinking about God, revelation about divine politics is given to a weakened prophet (chs. 8 and 10).⁴ Thus,

² E. g. Christopher Rowland argues that this supernatural figure is portrayed as midway between that of an ‘ordinary’ angel and God himself. See *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982): 182-3. More recently, see Thomas Slater, ‘One Like a Son of Man in First Century AD Judaism’, *NTS* 41 (1995): 183-98. However, neither Slater nor Bowker nor Rowland takes into account the Hellenized Jewish tradition in this regard.

³ This point is missed by Collins when he notes simply that ‘The theme of God’s ability to exalt the lowly is a common one’. Daniel stresses the exaltation of the lowly to royal and prophetic prominence in the exercise of political and revelatory functions. See J. J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993): 228.

⁴ By ‘politics’, I refer to the means by which authority is legitimated and distributed in human society. Various strategies for accomplishing this have been proposed throughout history. Of course, the Bible advocates divine politics as the best way to realize the goal. For Daniel and other biblical authors, the question to be answered is ‘Who rules, really – and how?’.

theopolitics is common to all four chapters.⁵ In the latter two instances, a powerful revealer provides a foil for the pitiable one who receives the revelation. Such reversal is expressed 'historically' (ch. 4), eschatologically (chs. 8, 10), and with apocalyptic symbolism (ch. 7).

Method

I shall be relying for the most part on the Goettingen critical text of the Septuagint.⁶ However, this will be done with an eye to P967, the earliest pre-Hexaplaric witness to the OG of Daniel (not later than first half of the third century C. E. and not fully available to Ziegler in 1954).⁷ Its testimony will be especially relevant to the reading at 7:13, as discussed below, which differs significantly from Ziegler. (Material in the tables not found in P967 (sometimes a function of damage) is indicated by []; that appearing in the papyrus, but not in the critical text, by < >. None of these few instances affects the thesis being defended.)

Besides appealing to this document for textual purposes, I am also citing it for rhetorical ones. Scholars note the peculiar feature wherein chs. 7 and 8 appear prior to chs. 5 and 6. If the translator of OG exercised the freedom to transpose these materials, apparently to achieve a more chronological order, I shall temporarily re-order chapters for purely heuristic reasons thus: 8, 10, 4, 7. This will enable me to proceed from the hardest data in the least contested passages to the softer, more challenging ones. However, no argument will rest on such transposition. Throughout the text, I shall be using a number of figures in table form, the first of which is included at the outset for easier reference.⁸

⁵ Holger Gzella, *Cosmic Battle and Political Conflict. Studies in Verbal Syntax and Contextual Interpretation of Daniel 8* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003): 7-8.

⁶ Joseph Ziegler (ed.), *Susanna. Daniel. Bel et Draco (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. XVI.2*; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

⁷ See Angelo Geissen (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Text Des Buches Daniel* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1968) and Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of the Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* (Fasc. VII; London: Emery Walker, Ltd., 1937).

⁸ My proposal for Daniel would fit the usage of 'son of man' and accompanying phenomena in OG of Ezekiel 1 and 2:1, 3, 6, and 8.

Figure 1

	DANIEL 4	DANIEL 7	DANIEL 8	DANIEL 10
1.	DANIEL 4	DANIEL 7	DANIEL 8	DANIEL 10
1	ορασις [(23)20], (28)25	οραμα (1, 13)	ορασις (1-2)	τ. ορασις τ. μεγαλην (7-8)
2	ευπνιον (5)2, (13)10	υπνον (2)	ευπνιου (2)	
3	θηριων (33)30b	θηρια (3-7)	θηρια (4)	
4	ωσει	ωσει (4)		
5	λεοντος	λειναια		
6	πτερυγες	πτερα		
7	αετου	αετου		
8		ποδων <i>ανθρωπων</i>		
9		<i>ανθρωπινη</i> καρδια		
10		κερατα (7-8)	κερατα (3-5)	
11		τ. ποσι καταπατουν (7)	κατεπατεθη, καταπατημα (10, 13)	
12		οφθαλμοι (8)	[οφθαλμων (5)]	
13		<i>ανθρωπινοι</i>		ομοιωσις χειρος <i>ανθρωπου</i> (16)
14		[κερας ανεφθη]	ανεφθη κερας (9)	
15		κερας (11, 20-21)	κερας (6-9, 20-22)	
16			ως ορασις <i>ανθρωπου</i>	
17			(Γαβριηλ 15-16)	ως ορασις <i>ανθρωπου</i> (18)
18				
19				
20				
21			φωνην <i>ανθρωπου</i> (16)	<i>ανθρωπος</i> (5)
22	παντος <i>ανθρωπου</i> (32)29		ο <i>ανθρωπος</i>	ουκ. . . ισχυς, ου κατισχυσα (8)
23				εστην τρεμων (11)
24			εβομβηθην (17)	πεπτωκως επι προσωπον (9)
25			επεσα επι προσωπον (17, 18)	ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΛΕΙΝΟΣ (11)
26	ΕΞΟΥΘΕΝΗΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ (31)28	ΩΣ ΥΙΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ (13)	ΥΙΕ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ (17)	
27			επι προσωπον χαμαι (18)	

	DANIEL 4	DANIEL 7	DANIEL 8	DANIEL 10
I.				
28				[Ταπεινώθησαι] (12)
29				προσώπον. . . επι τ. γην (15)
30				ουκ. . . ισχυς (16, 17)
31			ασθενησας . . . πολλας (27)	ηβηνησα (17)
32				πως. . . παεις. . . κυριου (17)
33			λογουτος αυτου (18)	εν τ. λαλησαι αυτον (11)
34			αψαμενος μου ηγειρε με	ηγειρε, σθηθι (10-11)
35				κατισχυσε με (18)
36				ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΛΕΙΝΟΣ (19)
37				υγιαινε· ανδριζου κ. ισχυε
38			εγω απαγγελω σοι (19)	ισχυσα. . . ενισχυσε με υποδειξαι σοι τι (14)
39				βασιλ- (13, 20)
40	διδοται (31)28	εδοθη (14, [27])		
41	βασιλ- (30-32, 34)27-29	βασιλ- (14, 18, [27])	βασιλ- (20-23)	
42	εξουσιαν (31)28	εξουσια (14, [27])		
43	δοξαν	δοξα (14)		
44	αφηρηται	ου μη αρθη		
45		τεσσαρες βασιλεια (17)	τεσσαρες βασιλεις (22)	
46	παραλημψεται	παραληψονται (18)		
47		πολεμον συνισταμενον (21)	φθερει. . . (24)	
48		προς τ. αγιους (cf. v. 9)	δημον αγιου	
49	<υπερψαθη υπερ παντας τ. ανθρωπους>	εις τ. υψιστον (25)	η καρδια. . . υψωθησεται (25)	υψο- (10) (cf. 3)
50	[υψαθη σου η καρδια]	αλλοιωσασι καιρους κ. νομων (25)	εγενηθησαν επι τ. θυσια (12)	
51			αι αμαρτια	
52		[λαω (27)]	λαου (19)	τ. λαω (14)
53			επ εσχατου τ. οργης	επ εσχατου τ. ημερων
54				

Caveat

Before proceeding, it is necessary to challenge Delbert Burkett's effort to deny the interpretation (at least as early as the 17th century) that son of man in Aramaic and Hebrew refers to the lowliness, vulnerability, and mortality of human experience. He and others assert that, since humans are by nature vulnerable and mortal, there would be no point in calling attention to this universal condition and awareness.⁹

However, not all of human experience is this way all of the time. There are moments and periods of glory, strength, excellence, and achievement. My contention is that, for these and more 'normal' human experiences, the OG consistently uses ἄνθρωπος or ἀνὴρ to render various Hebrew or Aramaic words for man or human (cf. Figure 1 for a display of usage in the chapters under consideration). Only when qualified by a noun (υἱός) or adjective (ἐλλεινός or ἐξουθενημένος), does ἄνθρωπος convey the proposed sense.¹⁰

2. 'Son of Man' (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου), 8:17

We begin our case here because υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου at 7:13 is so controverted. Consequently, it will be the last of the passages to be analyzed. Regarding the overall structure of the chapter, Daniel has a vision containing images of powerful animals in conflict. He feels helpless to interpret the dream when approached by an angelic visitant with human features (OG: ἄνθρωπος or T: ἀνὴρ). Strengthened by the angel, Daniel, addressed as υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, is given its explanation. The non-human symbols represent conflict between mighty political forces, whose activity embraces the cosmos.¹¹ Thus surrounded by such images, personages, and entities, the seer is made small by contrast.

More specifically (see Figure 1), the animal imagery of the vision as well as its explanation are full of references to horns (nine times) and

⁹ Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate. A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS 107; Cambridge: University Press, 1999): 13-21, esp. 20-21.

¹⁰ (Pseudo-?) Augustine's observation (which I cannot credit formally as yet) is apt here: 'We are born between the urine and the feces'. The American poet, E. E. Cummings, in the third stanza of an untitled poem (which I found discarded by the lectern after expounding this theme) wrote, 'how should tasting touching hearing seeing // breathing any—lifted from the no // of all nothing—human merely being // doubt unimaginable you?' (1944).

¹¹ Gzella, *Cosmic Battle*.

strength (seven times): forms of *κερα-* (3-9, 20-22) and forms of *ισχ-* (7-9, 22-24). Furthermore, Gabriel appears in human form to do the bidding of a human voice: *ἄνθρωπος* in all three instances of OG (15-16), *ἀνήρ* (twice) in T. In both translations, the Seer falls upon his face twice (17-18) before being raised (18). However, Daniel’s reaction to these experiences in the OG (17) is more dramatic (*ἐθορυβήθην*) than in T (*ἐθαμβήθην*). At the end of the experience (27), OG says that Daniel was ill for many days (*ἀσθένησας ἡμέρας πολλάς*). T puts it more mildly: *ἐκοιμήθην κ. ἐμαλακίσθην ἡμέρας*.

Empowered and enlightened by Gabriel (over against the beasts), the one addressed as *υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου* is made privy to their destiny: eschatological wrath (19) because of repeated hubris against God (See *ψ-* forms in 10, 25; cf. 3) and oppression of his people (24-25). Figure 2 shows how the OG magnifies the strength of Daniel’s reaction (17, 27), the ferocity of Israel’s opponents (10, 11, 13), and the corresponding suffering endured by God’s people (19, 25). Were it not for the extraordinary power of God, one might with some justification be tempted to ask, what is a *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* in such circumstances?

Figure 2

v.	THEODOTION	OLD GREEK
10	συνεπάτησεν	κατεπατήθη
11	ἐρράχθη	τ. ὄρη τ. ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἐρράχθη κ. ἐξήρθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν
	θυσία	κ. θυσία, κ. ἔθηκεν αὐτήν ἕως χάμαι
13	συμπατηθήσεται	εἰς καταπάτημα
17	ἐθαμβήθην	ἐθορυβήθην
19	ὀργῆς	ὀργῆς τ. υἱοῖς τ. λαοῦ
25	ὁ ζύγος τ. κλοίου αὐτοῦ κατευθύνει	ἐπὶ τ. ἀγίους τ. διανοίημα αὐτοῦ κ. εὐοδωθήσεται τ. ψεῦδος
27	Δανιηλ . . . ἐμαλακίσθην	Δανιηλ ἀσθενήσας ἡμέρας πολλάς

3. ‘Pitiable Man’ (*ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός*), 10:11, 19

Formal Similarities with Chapter 8 (See Figure 1)

Both chapters employ the language of vision (*ὄρασις*) for the experience (line 1). In each case, the revealer has human (*ἄνθρωπος*) appearance (line 18) or is simply referred to as ‘(the) human’ (line 22). In response to the grandeur of the angelic presence in these instances,

Daniel falls upon his face (line 25), distressed (line 24), and weakened (line 31). There is a comparable raising up (line 34) and revelation (lines 33, 39). Its subject has to do with the eschatological (line 54) emergence of arrogant kings (lines 41, 49) who oppose God's people (53).

Formal Differences with Chapter 8

Whereas in 8:3-10, 13, 20-22, images of aggressive animals (which represent the political might of earthly counterparts) contrast sharply with Daniel, the Seer in ch. 10 is sharply distinguished from the magnificence of his 'angelic' interpreter (10:4-6). Each acts as a foil for the other.

Differences between OG and T (See Figure 3)

Furthermore, although the MT and both Greek translations point up the differences between the Seer and the heavenly emissary (See Figure 1), it is the OG that exaggerates them most.

According to both translations, Daniel had been mourning and fasting for three weeks (2-3). On the banks of the great river Euphrates, he

saw and look: a man [consistently ἄνθρωπος in OG, ἀνὴρ in T], one clothed in linen; and his waist was girdled with linen [MT and T: gold]; and from his center, light; and his body as beryl; and his face was as the appearance of lightning; and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his legs as shining brass; and the voice of his speaking as the sound of a multitude (4-6).

Christopher Rowland has observed that in this description the angel's appearance rivals that of the Ancient of Days himself (7:9-10),¹² thereby making Daniel's opposite condition more acute.

'And no strength was left in me; and look a ruinous spirit came upon me, and I lost strength' (8). 'I fell with my face to the earth' (9). At this, a hand extended and raised him upon his knees and upon the soles of his feet (10). The angel then addressed him as 'pitiable human' (11): (OG: ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός; T, 'man beloved': ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν) and prepared him for revelation (10-11).

¹² C. Rowland, *Open Heaven*: 97-100.

Although trembling, Daniel is told not to fear. His desire to understand, and his humility before the Lord his God are to be rewarded (11-12). Upon receiving a revelation concerning the struggle between Michael and the captain [OG: στρατηγός, T: ἄρχων] of the Persian king (13-14), Daniel again falls to the earth and is silent (15). Next, according to the OG, something like the hand of a man (ὡς ὁμοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου; T: ὡς ὁμοίωσις υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου) touched Daniel's lips, thereby enabling him to speak (16).¹³

Figure 3

v.	THEODOTION	OLD GREEK
6	φωνὴ . . . ὡς φωνὴ ὄχλου	φωνή . . . ὡς φωνὴ θορύβου
7	τ. ὀπτασίαν	τ. ὄρασιν τ. μεγάλην ταύτην
8	ἡ δόξα μου μετεστράφη εἰς διαφθόραν	πνεῦμα <ἀπόστραφεν> ἐπ' ἐμὲ εἰς φθοράν
11	ΑΝΗΡ ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΩΝ	ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΛΕΕΙΝΟΣ
16	ὁμοίωσις υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου	ὁμοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου
17		ἐγὼ ἡσθένησα
19	ΑΝΗΡ ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΩΝ	ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΛΕΕΙΝΟΣ

For the second time, the Seer acknowledges his lack of strength and especially his status, vis-à-vis the angel: 'How is a servant (παῖς) able to speak with his lord (κύριος)?' (16-17). Daniel reports becoming weak and losing strength (forms of ἰσχ- occurring nine times), there being no spirit left in him (18).

Undeterred, the angel once more fortifies this pitiable human (again, ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός; but T: ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν, 'man beloved'): 'Fear not, be healthy (ὑγίαινε); be manly (ἀνδρίζου); and

¹³ The fragmentary witness of the DSS is described thus by Abegg: 'In pap6Qdan, . . . the verb 'touched' is feminine, while in the Masoretic Text it is masculine; the subject in pap6Qdan is most likely 'hand' (with LXX), whereas in the Masoretic Text it is the one in human form'. See M. Abegg, Jr.; P. Flint; and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: Harper, 1999): 99. The author acknowledges in n. 63 that this is a reconstructed reading. An examination of the photograph and edited text reveals that only <h of the suspected ng''h are (barely) visible. See M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, 'Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran', *Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan* (III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962): 115. In his attempts to compare bny >dm here with br >nsh in 7:13 and show that both expressions are applied to angels, Collins neglects the differences in number and does not acknowledge the OG's (and DSS's) comparison with 'a hand of a man' (ὁμοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου). Cf. Collins, *Commentary on the Book of Daniel*: 335-37.

be strengthened'. At this, the prophet gains strength, saying, 'Let my lord speak, for he has strengthened me' (19). Thus empowered, Daniel learns that his revealer must return to do battle with the captain of the king of the Persians, the captain of the Greeks being on his way. Only the angel Michael had supported him in these matters (20-21).

There can be little doubt that the OG accentuates the contrast between the personae, for both T and the MT describe Daniel's frailty in lesser terms. Unlike them, OG stresses the distinction between the grand human-like (ἄνθρωπος) features of the angel and the lowly human-like condition (ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός) of the Seer. Consequently, because υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου in 8:17 and ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός in 10:11 & 19 function similarly in comparable situations (See Figures 1, 2, and 3), they appear to be equivalent expressions for a human condition different from the might of powerful political symbols and entities and with the human-like appearance of supernatural personages. Whatever the case in T (and MT), υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου cannot, without further ado, be regarded in OG as merely a synonym for ἄνθρωπος. The latter is general, requiring a qualifier such as ἐλεεινός to be the equivalent of the more specific υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.

How does this linguistic phenomenon contribute to the *theological* motif in chs. 8 and 10? It emphasizes the view of God as the one who works with persons who might not seem qualified to be the recipients of his revelation. Daniel, who had mourned and fasted, he who had humbled himself and been open to instruction, he who in the presence of the dazzling ἄνθρωπος had been regarded as pitiable human (ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός), he it is who becomes empowered to receive the vision about the outcome of the historical, eschatological, and cosmic struggle.

4. 'Rejected Man' (ἔξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος), (4:[31]28)¹⁴

As in the case with chs. 8 & 10, the pattern of mysterious dream followed by revelation through an interpreter occurs here. However, there are some notable differences from these two chapters. Here, the one to receive the vision and its interpretation is a political figure rather than a prophet. He is an enemy of God and God's people rather than God's spokesperson, who is himself a captive. And it is Daniel who,

¹⁴ Numbers in parentheses indicate the OG (and in most cases, T) versification.

while crediting God as the source, becomes the mediator of revelation rather than the recipient of it. A human agent replaces the supernatural one.

Furthermore, many have noted that the most dramatic differences between the principal Greek versions (and between the OG and MT) appear in ch. 4: blocs of material with no parallel in MT or T as well as shared material which OG clearly 'slants'. Of the many texts that could be cited, I will focus on those that enlarge the magnitude of Nebuchadnezzar's hubris, his punishment, and subsequent restoration. This then will be a foil for appreciating the significance given to his unlikely successor: 'a rejected man' (ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος). In the main, I shall present these differences in English paraphrase or translation, charting the Greek to display the most obvious verbal differences.

The magnificence of Nebuchadnezzar's reign is acknowledged in the original vision, wherein the great tree had become home to the sun and moon, which illuminated the entire world [(11)8]. A powerful angel calls for its destruction, uprooting, and neutralization [(13)10-(14)11]. As a result, the tree is quickly cut down and destroyed: in one day, one hour [(17)14a]. In a shift of metaphor, the tree is not only torn and thrown down but it is also consigned to eating grass with the beasts and delivered into prison, manacled hand and foot [(17)14a] and beaten [(26)23]. The agents of this judgment are none other than the Most High and the angels, who will pursue the king [(24)21, (32)29] to prison [(25)22].

The OG intensifies Daniel's reaction to the dream: 'Daniel was greatly amazed and forebodings agitated him. He was afraid, trembling seized him, and his appearance changed. He shook his head for about an hour, and agitated he answered me'... [the king]' [(19)16]. T simply reports that Daniel 'was perplexed for about an hour, and alarmed by his thoughts'.

In keeping with this intensification, OG magnifies the enormity of Nebuchadnezzar's hubris. T employs μεγαλύνειν in (22)19 and elsewhere; OG uses ὑψοῦν alone in recounting Daniel's accusation: 'You have been exalted [by God] over all the peoples who are on the face of the whole earth. Your heart was raised up in arrogance and power through all the acts against the Holy One and his angels. Your

deeds were seen, how much you desolated the House of the living God on account of the sins of the sanctified people'.¹⁵

Figure 4

1.	THEOD. [foll. MT]	OG
	Dan 4: (17)14	Dan 4: (17)14
1	κύριος	κύριον
2	ὥ	ὅσα
3	ἐάν	ἐάν
4	δόξῃ	θέλῃ
5	<u>δώσει</u>	ποιεῖν
6	αὐτήν	αὐτοῖς
7	κ. ΕΞΟΥΔΕΝΗΜΑ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ	
8	<u>ἀναστήσει</u> ἐπ' αὐτήν	
	THEOD. [foll. MT]	OG
	Dan 4:(32)29	Dan 4:(31)28
9		[ἡ βασιλεία Βαβυλῶνος <u>ἀφήρηται</u>
10		σου] κ. ἐτέρω <u>δίδο-</u>
11		ται, ΕΞΟΥΘΕΝΗΜΕΝΩ
12		ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩ ἐν τ. οἴκῳ
13	ἕως οὗ γινῶς ὅτι κυριεύει ὁ	σου· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ <u>καθίστημι</u> αὐτὸν
14	ὑψιστος	ἐπὶ τ. βασιλείας σου
15	τ. βασιλείας τ. ἀνθρώπων,	κ.τ. ἐξουσίαν σου κ.τ. τρυφήν σου
16	κ. ὥ ἐάν δόξῃ, δώσει αὐτήν	<u>παραλήμψεται</u> ,
17		ὅπως ἐπιγινῶς ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ
		θεὸς τ. <θρόνου σου>
		ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. ἀνθρώπων
		κ. ὥ ἐάν βούληται <u>δώσει</u> [αὐτήν].
		ἕως δὲ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς βασιλεὺς
		ἕτερος ἀφρανθή-
		σεται ἐν τ. οἴκῳ σου κ. <u>κρατήσει</u> τ.
		δόξης σου κ.

¹⁵ The translation is by Matthias Henze in *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar, The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (Leiden: Brill, 1999): 246. Pierre Grelot sees Nebuchadnezzar's experience as the precursor to the villainy and fall of Antiochus IV. See 'La Septante de Daniel iv et son substrat semitique', *RB* 81 (1974): 21. However, he does not suggest how this might have been significant for a later readership living outside of Palestine. Might there have been something more local in view (say, in Alexandria)? Whatever the answer, it does not affect the linguistic and theological points being scored.

This, then, incurs a harsher judgment [(24)21-(27)24], being described more dramatically in that the kingdom is torn from Nebuchadnezzar and, adding insult to injury, is given to a rejected / despised person [(31)28]. But the king’s repentance is more extensive, thereby resulting in a greater restoration [(27)24]. This eventuates in a profounder praise [(37)34a-c].

Here, then, is the background for the passing of royal power from Nebuchadnezzar to his successor, an ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος. Vocabulary common in Daniel regarding the transfer of political power from a greater entity to a lesser one is made even more prominent in OG (Figure 4). The language of transfer in T (lines 5, 8 and 15) is doubled in OG; and it occurs in greater variety, employing terminology in one limited passage that occurs throughout the entire book (underscored in lines 9-12, 15, 17). Although there is no parallel in OG Daniel to T (and MT) at (17)14, OG doubles the language in (31)28 of a rejected person’s taking over the kingdom, authority, and glory from the deposed king, for which there is no significant equivalent in T and MT.

Summary and Conclusions

As in the case of the later chapters, arrogance against the divine sovereignty is the issue (vv. (17)14, (22)19, and (31)28). Nebuchadnezzar’s hubris is akin to that of other rulers (4:(22)19; 8:10, 25). Taken together, the results of these studies show that, just as Daniel, called υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου (8:17) and ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός (10:11, 19), was strengthened from a weakened condition, so it is that a rejected person, ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος [4(31)28], is to be elevated to a position of power.¹⁶ The dynamics are the same, whether the particular issue is prophecy or politics, whether one is speaking of the revelatory or royal. In all three instances, an expression with ἄνθρωπος was qualified in some way to make the point. Here is yet

¹⁶ T. J. Meadowcroft sees this ‘hint of a usurper’ as having ‘less to do with the story at hand than with the polemical requirements of the LXX narrator’. My contention is that, on the contrary, it has everything to do with the story and theology of this episode, both within ch. 4 and in the company of chs. 8, 10, and 7. Cf. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel. A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSS 198; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995): 52. Similarly, F. F. Bruce interprets this account as ‘something of the nature of a palace revolution’, which other ancient sources link to the subsequent Medeo-Persian rule. See ‘The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel’, *OTS* 20 (1976): 30-31. Again, there is no effort to relate the passage to the overall theological concerns of the translator.

further evidence that the latter term and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου are not mere synonyms.

5. 'Son of Man' (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου), 7:13

A precise reading of this controversial expression *in Greek* can be accomplished in two ways: one negative and the other positive. For the sake of methodological integrity, one must avoid importing into the translator's mind what one thinks the Aramaic expression meant. Furthermore, traditio-historical considerations appropriate to the study of Aramaic Daniel are not valid here. For example, if, in the reception history of MT Daniel, subsequent readers would have lost the significance of an alleged incorporation of Canaanite myth, then later Greek readers (perhaps in Alexandria?) certainly would have. Positively, we must relate this chapter to the other three, both formally and theologically, because they provide the context without which it can be misread.

Formal Similarities among Chapters 4, 7, 8, 10 (See Figure 1)

A vision (4, 7, 8, 10, line 1) occurs in a dream (4, 7, 8, line 2) about beasts (4, 7, 8, line 3) with horns (7, 8, lines 11, 16-17), and tramping feet (7, 8, line 12). Rulers struggle over kingship (4, 7, 8, 10, line 41) and suffer the consequences of hubris (4, 7, 8, lines 49-50). In the presence of superior power (whether human or supernatural), a figure designated as ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος, υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, and ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός (4, 7, 8, 10, line 26) is granted glory and strength (4, 7, 8, 10, lines 34, 40-41), although originally despised, without glory, and weakened (4, 7, 8, 10, lines 26, 31).

Formal Similarities between Chapters 7 and 4 (See Figures 1 and 5)

These two chapters are related in several additional respects, made more pronounced in OG. The personae in view are directly concerned with politics and royalty. In ch. 4, God deposes Nebuchadnezzar on account of his hubris [(22)19, (31)28] and subsequently restores his throne [(36)33-(37)34a-c]. In between, another takes his place [(31)28]. In ch. 7, the beasts (=kings) are deprived of their authority (12) and one like a υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου receives from the Ancient of Days eschatological authority, universal service, and an everlasting kingdom (13-14).

In a moment of heavy irony, the signs of animal strength in 7:4 (wings, eagle, and lion) become the sub-human characteristics of the deposed king [(33)30b]. The human heart (ἀνθρωπίνη καρδία) granted to the first beast (7:4) is that which, according to OG, is taken from the king, whose flesh and heart changed so that he walked among the beasts of the earth [(33)30b].¹⁷

Figure 5

1.	DANIEL 4	DANIEL 7
1	ὄραματος (28) 25	ὄραμα (1, 13)
2	ὑπνω (13) 10	ὑπνον (2)
	"Beastly" King Nebuchadnezzar	The Four Beasts = Kings (17-18)
3	θηρίων (33) 30b	θηρία (3-7)
4	ὡσεί	ὡσει (4)
5	λέοντες	λέανινα
6	πτέρυγες	πτερά
7	ἀετοῦ	ἀετοῦ
8	ΕΞΟΨΘΕΝΗΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ (31) 28	ΩΣ ΥΙΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ (13)
9	δίδοται (31) 28	ἐδόθη (14)
10	βασιλείαν	βασιλεία
11	ἐξουσίαν	ἐξουσία
12	δόξαν	δόξα
13	ἀφήρηται	οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ

So as to gain a greater appreciation for the contrast in power between the beasts and the one designated as υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in OG, Figure 6 shows how the translator magnifies the extent of the damage that they inflict and the corresponding suffering endured, both by humankind in general (vv. 5, 7, 19) and by God's people (or their heavenly counterparts or symbols) in particular (8, 21, 25). OG also portrays their greater reward more vividly (18, 27).

The Meaning (not Identity) of υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου

In order to remove a significant obstacle from this complex discussion, it is possible and necessary to distinguish between the *meaning* of υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου and the *identity* of the figure so named. Failure to do so obscures the issue. The point, for the present study, is not *who?*, but

¹⁷ Meadowcroft, *Aramaic and Greek Daniel*: 236, has noticed this verbal linkage between the two chapters. But he does not make a point about the irony which binds them.

what kind? In other words, my aim has not been to determine whether ‘one like a son of man’ is referring to a being (angelic or otherwise) in the divine court or whether the translator regarded the expression as an individual or corporate symbol for earthly realities (or blended them in a complex manner).

Figure 6

v.	THEODOTION	OLD GREEK
5	φάγε σάρκας πολλάς	κατάφαγε σάρκας πολλάς
7	ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ σιδηροῖ . . . συνεπάτει	ὀδόντας σιδηροὺς μεγάλους . . . καταπατοῦν
8		ἐποίει πόλεμον πρὸς τ. ἁγίους
17	τ. θηρία	τ. θηρία τ. μεγάλα
18	ἕως αἰῶνος τ. αἰώνιον	ἕως αἰῶνος κ. ἕως τ. αἰῶνος [τ. αἰώνων]
19	τ. πόσιν αὐτοῦ συνεπάτει	καταπατοῦντες τ. ποσί
21	ἐποίει πόλεμον μετὰ τ. ἁγίων κ. ἴσχυσε πρὸς αὐτούς	πόλεμον συνιστάμενον προὸς τ. ἁγίους κ. τροπούμενον αὐτούς
25	τ. ἁγίους ὑψίστου παλαιώσει κ. ὑπονοήσει δοθήσεται ἔν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ	τ. ἁγίους τ. ὑψίστου κατατρίψει κ. προσδέξεται <ἀλλοιωθήσεται> πάντα εἰς τ. χεῖρας αὐτοῦ
27	αἱ ἄρχαὶ αὐτῷ δουλεύσουσι κ. ὑπακούονται	[ἔξουσία αὐτῷ ὑποταγήσονται κ. πειθαρχήσουσιν αὐτῷ]

Rather, the question which I am posing and attempting to answer is, what sort of human features did the figure possess—however he is identified? Given the phenomena observed in chs. 4, 7, 8, and 10 (both ‘vertically’ and ‘laterally’), I contend that *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is not a mere synonym for *ἄνθρωπος*, as is universally asserted. The latter is general; ‘son of man’ is particular, reserved by the OG translator to convey the downside of human experience: its frailty and vulnerability.

A Potential Objection

Considerable discussion has arisen over the reading of p967, the earliest witness to the pre-hexaplaric text of the OG, dated not later than the first half of the third century. Although Ziegler’s reconstructed text of the OG and T read that one like a son of man was brought *to* the Ancient of Days as in MT, this manuscript supports all other Greek

witnesses whereby he comes *as* the Ancient of Days.¹⁸ At first glance, this appears to undermine the thesis being defended. However, a closer look at the details needs to be conducted.

For our limited purposes, the only relevant issue is the character of the comparison as mediated by the narrative form of the text. Above all, the exegete must be careful about employing the language of 'deity', 'divinity' or 'nature' so as not to impose later theological convictions.¹⁹ More to the point of my inquiry, is the initial *dissimilarity*, whatever the reading, between one like a son of man and the One holding court.

The Narrative Key

The figure brought to the throne did not originally have kingly authority (ἔξουσία βασιλική); nor, prior to this time, did he possess all the nations of the earth according to their kind (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη), or all glory rendering service to him (πᾶσα δόξα λατρεύουσα αὐτῷ). These were given to him by the Ancient of Days.²⁰ They were transferred to him, thereby making his possession of them derivative. In this important sense, one like a son of man was not like the Ancient of Days.²¹ The point holds, however the figure is to be

¹⁸ J. Lust points out that Ziegler's emendation from ὥς to ἕως is based solely on patrological evidence. See 'Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint', *ETL* 54.1(April 1978): 62. The manuscript tradition of the LXX (with ω~) is preserved at this point by A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (vol. 2, 7th ed.; Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

¹⁹ This tendency laces the work of Seyoon Kim, *The Son of Man as the Son of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985): 15-24.

²⁰ Failure to make this important distinction has led Lust to claim, 'In the LXX text, the 'Ancient of Days' and the 'Son of Man' are one and the same symbol, referring to God and his heavenly kingdom'. See 'Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint': 67. This also seems to be the conclusion of R. Timothy May, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003): 156. Sharon Pace Jeansome is among those who refuse to collapse the images and blur the distinction. Cf. *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988): 113. Meadowcroft pits the MT against the LXX: 'It remains an open question in the MT whether or not the son of man's authority becomes intrinsic or remains derived. The LXX has decided in favour of the first option'. See *Aramaic and Greek Daniel*: 230. Perhaps there needs to be more clarity about usage. Does not 'becoming' violate the state of being 'intrinsic'? Loren Stuckenbruck sees one like a son of man's becoming '*functionally identical*' [his italics]. But how does this deal with the language of transfer? See "'One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days" in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?', *ZNW* 86.3/4 (1995): 268-76.

²¹ Some scholars tend to speak of the event more as vindication, a declaration by the judge of the defendant's being in the right. See, among others, Morna Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: SPCK, 1967): 29, C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977): 11-12, 17-18, and Bowker, 'The Son of Man': 24, 44. But this does not do enough justice to the scene. The defendant is 'awarded

identified—whether an individual or group, whether symbol or the subject of a direct vision, whether human or supernatural. If an angel, he must have come from the lower ranks, hierarchy being indicated in the later reference to Michael as ‘one of the chief rulers’ (εἰς ἀρχόντων τῶν πρώτων, 10:13).

The central question for the purpose of this study remains not ‘Who is this?’ but ‘What kind of human features did the figure have?’ Only when the narrative, dramatic character of the scene is appreciated will this distinction be noticed and its significance exploited. Otherwise, one tends to view the vision as a frozen image, focusing on the resultant majesty rather than on the movement from *inglorious* to glorified, from politically *powerless* to royally *powerful*. Once again, meaning and identity need to be kept distinct. The progress in stages must be attended to.²² The same pattern occurs in chs. 4, 8, and 10).

6. CONCLUSIONS

When Daniel 7:13 in the OG is read not only in its immediate context but also within the contexts of chs. 4, 8, and 10 where related terminology, literary patterns, and theological points of view occur, then it becomes possible to conclude that υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου was used by the translator to convey (along with ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος, and ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός) the sense of frailty and vulnerability.

These terms are intertwined in a fabric of thinking which, though present at times in the MT and T, is more highly developed and consistently maintained by the OG. In the tapestry of his sovereign will, God empowers unlikely candidates with political might and prophetic insight. He has done so in the past, (by implication) continues to work this way in his people’s (the readers’) present, and promises to accomplish his purposes through them in the future.

damages’, as it were. He is not merely the subject of judicial recognition; there is also the matter of judicial empowerment or authorization. It is as much a theopolitical phenomenon as it is a theojudicial one.

²² Burkett, *Son of Man Debate*:19 fails to give enough weight to the narrative character of Dan. 7. Wilfrid Stott and John Bowker give more. But neither sees this dynamic occurring also in chs. 4, 8, and 10 and being underscored by OG. See respectively “‘Son of Man’—a Title of Abasement”, *ExpT* 83 (1972): 278-81 and ‘The Son of Man’: 19-48.