

STUDIA ANTIQUA

A STUDENT JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY
OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 2
FALL 2015

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
PROVO, UTAH

STUDIA ANTIQUA

A STUDENT JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

EDITOR
Juan D. Pinto

FACULTY ADVISORS
Stephen D. Ricks
Cynthia Finlayson

REVIEW BOARD
Daniel Becerra
Daniel Belnap
David Calabro
Luke Drake
Nick Frederick
Kerry Hull
Kent Jackson
Seth Jeppesen
Joe Spencer

January 2016

ISSN: 1540-8787

Studia Antiqua is a semiannual student journal dedicated to publishing the research of graduate and undergraduate students from all disciplines of ancient studies. The views expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of Brigham Young University or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The continued publication of *Studia Antiqua* is made possible through an internship provided by the BYU Religious Studies Center.

Studia Antiqua accepts manuscripts for publication year-round. Manuscripts should be sent to studia_antiqua@byu.edu and should include a title page with the author's name, major, and year in school. For submission guidelines and other valuable resources, please visit rsc.byu.edu/studiaAntiqua.

STUDIA ANTIQUA

CONTENTS

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 2

FALL 2015

ABBREVIATIONS iv

EDITOR'S PREFACE vii

HALEY WILSON

A Survey of the "Son of Man" from Daniel to Jesus, Part 1: A Reevaluation of Daniel 7 and Its Subsequent Implications on the "Son of Man" Debate1

AMANDA COLLEEN BROWN

Out of the Dust: An Examination of Necromancy as a Literary Construct in the Book of Mormon 27

ABBREVIATIONS

All abbreviations are taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 8.4.

AASF	<i>Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae</i>
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ArOr	<i>Archiv Orientalní</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago, 1999.
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907.
BMes	<i>Bibliotheca mesopotamica</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BSC	Bible Student's Commentary
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CDME	<i>A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian</i> . Edited by R. O. Faulkner. Oxford, 1962.
COS	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Edited by W. W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden, 1997–.
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> . Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden, 1995.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EDNT	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by H. Balz, G. Schneider. Grand Rapids, 1990–93.
EgT	<i>Eglise et théologie</i>
ExpTim	<i>Expository Times</i>
HBC	<i>Harper's Biblical Commentary</i> . Edited by J. L. Mays et al. San Francisco, 1988.
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
IB	<i>Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York, 1951–57.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962.
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
IOS	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JFSR	<i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>

vi ABBREVIATIONS

JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.
<i>MDB</i>	<i>Mercer Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by W. E. Mills. Macon, 1990.
<i>NewDocs</i>	<i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> . Edited by G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn. North Ryde, N. S.W., 1981–.
<i>NIB</i>	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i>
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTS	Old Testament Studies
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
SHANE	Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East
SP	Sacra pagina
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–76.
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDPV</i>	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This issue of *Studia Antiqua* is my first as the journal's editor. I am grateful for this opportunity and for the learning experience that it has already proven to be. The journal is what it is today thanks to the work of countless past contributors, editors, reviewers, and advisors. It is always intimidating to follow the successes of those who have come before, and my work on this issue is no exception. However, the previous editor, Jasmin Gimenez, as well as faculty advisors and experienced colleagues, have provided invaluable guidance. It is with their support that I happily present to the reader this issue of *Studia Antiqua*.

This fall issue comprises two articles, one by a current student of Brigham Young University and another by an alumnus of the university. The first is written by Haley Wilson, whose article reanalyzes the Aramaic phrase "son of man" in Daniel 7. She offers an alternative view for understanding the phrase's history and various usages, including similar phrasing used by Jesus in the New Testament. In the second article, Amanda Brown surveys the role of necromancy in the Hebrew Bible. She then expands on her observations to evaluate Nephi's interpretation of relevant passages and his influence on Mormon and Moroni in their own writings.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all of the reviewers who have contributed to this issue. As has always been the case, this journal would be impossible without their willingness to share of the various expertises they possess. The life of a university professor or PhD candidate is demanding enough without the added burden of reviewing articles for a student journal, yet our esteemed faculty and friends selflessly do so. I hope I have not been overly persistent in my communications and requests to the peer reviewers. This journal is indebted to them.

Likewise, I wish to thank our financial donors for their continued support. I would especially like to thank the Religious Studies Center, which provides the internship that makes it possible to devote the necessary time to publish this journal. In addition to the internship, the student editors and employees of the Religious Studies Center provide the ideal setting for an inexperienced editor such as myself to feel at home. I am grateful for all their efforts.

Juan D. Pinto
Editor in Chief, *Studia Antiqua*

A SURVEY OF THE “SON OF MAN” FROM
DANIEL TO JESUS, PART 1: A REEVALUATION OF
DANIEL 7 AND ITS SUBSEQUENT IMPLICATIONS
ON THE “SON OF MAN” DEBATE

HALEY WILSON

Haley Wilson is a junior at Brigham Young University majoring in ancient Near Eastern studies with an emphasis in the Greek New Testament. She recently completed a minor in Modern Hebrew.

The Problem

Arguably one of the biggest conundrums of biblical scholarship can be found in a single verse of the apocalyptic book of Daniel: “I saw one like a son of man [NRSV: “human being”] coming with the clouds of heaven.” (7:13) Understood in Hebrew as בן אדם and Aramaic as בר אנש (as it appears in Daniel 7), both may be translated as “human being” or “someone.” The plural, בני אדם, is often used to refer to humanity in a general sense. The same understanding can be lent to the Aramaic בר (א)נשא and בר (א)נש.¹ For quite some time an association has been made between the Semitic idiom and the Greek expression of the New Testament, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, literally “the son of the man,” which occurs more than fifty times in the Gospels with reference to Jesus.²

1. Though it is after our period of interest for this work, the anachronism בר אנש is worth noting in light of the fact that the 𐤁 coalesced into the 𐤅 in Western Aramaic in the rabbinical writings (post 200 CE). See J. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), 149.

2. It is noteworthy that by the time the phrase appears in the synoptic tradition it appears in some instances as indefinite and in others as definite (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου respectively) with the Greek “ο” acting as the nominative singular definite article and “του” acting as the genitive singular definite article (leading some scholars to translate ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου literally as “the son of the man”). This change can be explained in two ways. First we could argue that Jesus himself referred to Daniel 7 in his teachings about the kingdom of God and he thus spoke of “the” son of man (of Daniel 7:13) as about to come to inaugurate the kingdom of God on earth. The other option is that the phrase “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7:13 was transformed into a title for Jesus after his death by his followers who identified the risen and exalted Jesus with the figure of Daniel 7. While the first suggestion is possible, the second is more pertinent to our particular discussion of the “son of man” in the synoptic tradition and will be an important facet of the discussion in the future. (A. Yarboro Collins, “The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as ‘Son of Man,’” in *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* [Leiden: Brill, 2000], 139–58, see 145).

2 WILSON: A SURVEY OF THE “SON OF MAN”

While the Hebrew/Aramaic idiom refers quite frequently to humanity in a collective context, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου typically refers to a specific individual.³ It is the Aramaic idiom and its allusion to humanity that will be of interest in this work.

Since within the parameters of this paper I cannot meticulously and comprehensively trace the son of man debate from its conception to the present, the focus of this study will be confined to the Jewish literature ranging from the Babylonian exile until just before the second half of the first century CE, utilizing a brief textual survey. With the hopes of offering a better understanding surrounding the development of the son of man in Jewish thought, this paper will propose and defend the view that the son of man phrase, as it appears in the Gospels, alludes to but is not directly connected with “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7:13. It will be argued that, originally, the idiomatic son of man of Daniel was utilized as a descriptive metaphorical literary device and was not meant to be understood messianically. However, by the first century CE, with the texts of 1 Enoch and later 4 Ezra, it had developed into a title with messianic connotations.

This will be accomplished by first examining the phrase as it was likely understood in the historical context of Daniel 7, with emphasis placed on the possible intent of the author, followed by an analysis of the phrase as it appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls to demonstrate its use before the first century CE as a reference to humanity and not the Jewish Messiah. Finally, I will examine the pseudepigraphic text of 1 Enoch, which is important for our discussion since it is the first instance in Jewish literature that the son of man appears in an eschatological context. I will conclude the survey with an analysis of 4 Ezra to solidify and support my claim. By reexamining and emphasizing the context of Daniel 7, it is my argument that we will be able to better understand the son of man sayings as they were attributed to the peasant-turned-preacher, Jesus of Nazareth.

The Debate Today

In what can only be categorized as the most extensive work on the subject to date, D. Burckett observed, “The son of man debate . . . serves as a prime

3. For a more in-depth study of the Semitic idiom in relation to the Greek phrase refer to Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 156–166; see also Mogens Muller, *The Expression “Son of Man” and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation* (London: Equinox, 2008), who not only provides a well-thought-out history of the “son of man” phrase but does so in the context of the development of christology.

illustration of the limits of New Testament scholarship.”⁴ Due in part to this fact, the scholarship which has been done and the interpretations that have arisen as a result are so extensive and varied that an in-depth discussion is not possible in this work. However, in order to better understand varying scholars’ treatments of Daniel’s son of man, a brief summary regarding recent scholarship, which establishes a relationship between the son of man of Daniel and the son of man of the New Testament, is a necessity to begin this study.

An Aramaic Idiom vs. the Greek Title

Ever since the second century, scholars and exegetes have observed a correlation between Daniel’s son of man and Jesus’ son of man sayings in the Gospels.⁵ However it wasn’t until the twentieth century that landmark studies were done which began to suggest a connection between the Aramaic and the Greek. In what is arguably the most comprehensive treatment of the son of man problem from the early nineteenth century, Paul Fiebig deconstructed the phrase *בר אנש* and treated the words separately as *בר* and *אנש*. Invaluable to our study is his conclusion that there is no detectable difference in meaning in the uses of *אנש*, *אנשא*, *אנשא*, *בר*, and *בר אנש*.⁶ Twenty years later, J. H. Moulton

4. See introduction; D. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 5; other scholars who have commented on the difficulty of the debate include the following: R. Fuller, “Review of *Die Entchristologisierung des Menschensohnes*, by Rollin Kearns,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 721–23, “The problem of the son of man is a can of worms. No one can write anything about it which will command general assent or provide a definitive solution”; and W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vols. 1 and 2 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1988–91), “Study of the mysterious synoptic title, ‘the son of man,’ has become a specialized field of its own wherein scholarly discord reigns supreme. . . . The ever-mushrooming literature on the son of man offers a host of conflicting and sometimes confusing claims and counterclaims.”

5. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcion*, 4.10. In this particular section Tertullian is discussing Jesus’ use of the son of man phrase in Mark 2:10, “Was it not that it was his wish by this title son of man from the book of Daniel to turn their complaint back upon them in such form as to prove that he who was forgiving sins was both God and Man—that one and only son of man in terms of Daniel’s prophecy, who had obtained power to judge, and by it of course the power to forgive sins (for he who judges also acquits)—and so after that cause of offence had been dispersed by his citation of scripture, they might the more readily recognize from that very act of forgiving sins that he and no other was the son of man? Actually, he had never before professed himself the son of man, but on this occasion first on which he first forgave sins—that is, on which he first exercised judgement, by acquittal.”

6. Paul Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn: Jesu Selbstbezeichnung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des aramaischen Sprachgebrauches für Mench* (Tübingen: Halle a. S., 1901), 59–60. Fiebig concludes that the four phrases are essentially all connected in their meaning. This is significant since in Isaiah 56:2, in the poetic context of a prophetic oracle in general and in a “proverb”-like saying, the phrase “son of man [בן אדם]” occurs parallel to “man [אנוש]”: “Happy is the man [NRSV, ‘mortal’] who does this, the son of man [NRSV, ‘one’] who holds fast.” Again in Psalm 8:4, “What is man [אנוש] that you are mindful of him, and

4 WILSON: A SURVEY OF THE “SON OF MAN”

made the following statement in regards to the studies that appeared at the turn of the century and the perplexities that surrounded the attempted methods of connecting the Greek to the Aramaic: “The fascinating pursuit of Aramaic originals may lead to a good percentage of successful guesses; but they are mere guesses still, except when a decided failure in the Greek can be cleared up by an Aramaic which explains the error and this acts as corroboration.”⁷

Moulton’s statement, though made almost one hundred years ago, clarifies the fundamental problem with scholarly tenacity to assert that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is appropriated from a non-Greek source. It is not so far-fetched to claim that when Jesus used the phrase he was speaking Greek, as opposed to Aramaic or even Hebrew. It is noteworthy that only a few scholars have argued for his speaking of Hebrew.⁸ I am of the opinion that Jesus likely spoke Aramaic. However, it is widely accepted by scholars that the Gospels were likely composed in Greek, yet there has been no unanimous consensus regarding the original language of the phrase. Suffice it to say that just because the phrase does not fit with one language does not mean it belongs to another. In short, scholars who jump to the conclusion that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is an unusual Greek construction and thus must be Aramaic or Hebrew arguably do not have enough data to take that plunge. In fact, until further research is done

a son of man [בן אדם] that you care for him?” It should be noted that these particular verses, which speak of the exaltation of man [NRSV, “human beings,” “mortals”], are cited (from the Septuagint) and applied to Jesus in Hebrews 2:6–8. In the LXX, the terms are ἀνθρώπος and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. One final pre-Danielic passage of note is Psalm 144:3, which carries a similar meaning as Psalm 8:4, “O LORD, what is man [אדם] that you regard him, or a son of man [בן אנוש] that you think of him?” We see then that the phrases אנוש, בר אנש, and אדם בן are interchangeable, and this is true for Daniel 7:13 (apart from the comparative כ which gives the phrase an almost simile-like element). The similarities between the three phrases is, in my opinion, a good starting point for arguing that the son of man of Daniel 7 did not initially have any messianic connotation attached to it.

7. J. H. Moulton, *Accidence and Word-Formation*, vol. 2 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920), 116.

8. For an argument of the phrase being of Aramaic origin, see Maurice Casey’s recent work, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem* (London: T&T Clark, 2009). For defense of a Greek origin, see Gerard Mussies, “Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, CRINT (1976), 1040–60; Jonas Greenfield, “The Languages of Palestine, 200 BCE–200 CE,” in *Jewish Languages: Theme and Variations*, ed. H. H. Paper (Cambridge, MA: Association for Jewish Studies, 1978), 150; Stanley Porter, “Did Jesus Ever Teach in Greek?” *Tyndale Bulletin* 44.2 (1993): 199–235; and Jan N. Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?*, NovTSup 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1968). For a decent discussion of all possibilities and support of my general opinion, see A. Lukaszewski, “Issues Concerning the Aramaic Behind ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: A Critical Review of Scholarship,” in *Who Is This Son of Man? The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*, eds. L. Hurtado and P. Owen, LNTS 390 (New York: T&T Clarke, 2012), 14–27.

on the syntax of the languages involved, no further clarification seems possible with respect to an Aramaic son of man.

Jesus and the Son of Man

Another facet to this debate is the number of conceptualizations surrounding the son of man, as used by Jesus. Not surprisingly, the amount is as great as the number of articles written on the subject. On one side, we see the “human son of man,” in which it is argued that the phrase is used to designate Jesus’ humanity.⁹ Within this claim lie three distinct interpretations: the son of man as simply human, as the lowly human, and as the ideal human. An observable trend shows that frequently when scholars argue the son of man sayings as referring to a solely human son of man, they tend to rely on the Greek form relating to the presumably earlier Semitic form. The problem with this approach as a whole is that these scholars seem to ignore the obvious differences between the Aramaic/Semitic phrase “one like a son of man” versus the Greek “*the* son of man”—in other words, the difference between the phrase as an idiom versus a title.¹⁰

While we have already briefly touched on the subject, it is worthwhile to note that in a study conducted by Seyoon Kim,¹¹ the proposition was made that when we speak of the son of man concept, we refer to the use of the image, “one like a son of man,” as found in Daniel 7. When we refer to the son of man as a title, we have in mind its use to describe a certain, apocalyptic figure, who can then be spoken of as “the son of man.” It is specifically the son of man title as a New Testament phenomenon that appears to have had messianic overtones,¹² while the messianic overtones (or lack thereof) of the original Aramaic phrase are uncertain. As I also mentioned previously, many scholars will argue that it cannot be determined, and thus it is doubtful whether the Greek phrase “son of man” could be equated with the Jewish Messiah at the time of Jesus; these scholars go so far as to reject the phrase as a title.¹³ Yet there are many scholars

9. Craig A. Evans, “Mark 8:27–16:20,” in *World Biblical Commentary on Mark* (Waco, TX: Word, 2001), xxv. Evans focuses his attention on the Aramaic phrase ܐܢܫܐ ܕܢܗܝܡܢܐ as meaning “a son of man” in a general sense. This idea is supported by L. W. Hurtado’s work, *Lord Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), in which Hurtado discusses the humanity of Jesus expressed by the son of man sayings in the Gospel of Mark.

10. Arguably one of the few individuals who shares such a contrasting view between the phrases. See Martine E. Sheldon, *Jesus, Fourth Ezra and a Son of Man Tradition in the First Century A.D.* (MA thesis, Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, May 1998).

11. S. Kim, *The Son of Man as Son of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

12. Bock, “The Son of Man in Luke 5:24,” 110 (see footnote 7).

13. One of the most noted scholars that rejects the idea of the son of man as a title is Craig A. Evans who devotes but one paragraph to this point in his book, *Fabricating Jesus: How Modern Scholars Distort the Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 46,

6 WILSON: A SURVEY OF THE "SON OF MAN"

that contend to the contrary, claiming that the utilization of the titular phrase designated Jesus as the long-awaited Messiah and deliverer.¹⁴ To put it simply, no consensus can be reached. Scholars have examined the etymological traits of the Aramaic idiom and the Greek title to prove their individual points. At the same time, scholars have increasingly begun to look at the use of the son of man in scripture and other literature. It is a similar approach that I wish to take as I reevaluate the importance of the original context of Daniel 7.

Analysis of Daniel

The book itself is pseudepigraphic in authorship. It was allegedly written in the name of an Israelite captive named Daniel who was favored by God and interpreted dreams. Yet it is uncertain whether the events surrounding the life of this Daniel figure as they are recorded in the work of Daniel actually occurred, and it continues to be a topic of debate for many scholars to this day.

stating, "There is no clear evidence that 'son of man' in the time of Jesus was understood as a title of the Messiah." Another individual who shares Evan's opinion is Manson, *The Servant-Messiah* (Cambridge, 1953), 72–4. Likewise, C. H. Dodd in *According to the Scriptures* (London, 1952), 116, writes that Jesus used it to identify "with the people of God as their 'inclusive representative'". See also: F. D. Moule, *The Origins of Christology* (Cambridge, 1977), 11–14; and F. D. Moule, "Neglected Features in the Problem of the Son of Man," in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (London: Cambridge, 1982), 11–22, in which Moule states that the son of man phrase is "not a title so much as a description . . . of his martyr-ministry on earth in the past and for his heavenly vindication looked for in the future." Similarly, Hooker in *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: McGill, 1967), 174–98 (especially 192), argues that the term is not a reference to the Messiah but rather is an expression of his basic purpose, meaning, and destiny: "It expresses his position in the world, a position found upon his relationship with God." J. C. O'Neill in "The Silence of Jesus," *NTS* 15.2 (1969): 153–67, maintains that Jesus' messianic consciousness was not expressed by the use of any messianic titles; for further discussion, see also G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (Fortress Press, 1981), 168–77.

14. This perspective is taken by Kim, *The Son of Man as Son of God*, and Darell B Bock, "The Son of Man in Luke 5:24," *BBR* 1 (1991): 109–21, who agrees with Kim but feels that his argument is not clearly defined. Also in Darrell Bock's *Blasphemy and Exaltation: A Philological-Historical Study of the Key Jewish Themes Impacting Mark 14:61–64* (Tubingen: J. C. B., 1998), 203, he maintains his original opinion and further states that Jesus utilizes the concept of the son of man to assert his divine identity. Other scholars who support the usage of the son of man phrase as reference to the Messiah by Jesus include the following: Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn* (Tubingen and Leipzig, 1901), 95, who regarded the phrase as open to a messianic understanding by Jews in general; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im spathellenistischen Zeitalter*, 3rd ed., rev. by H. Cressmann (Tubingen, 1926), 268; idem, *Kyrios Christos*, 2nd ed. (1921; repr., Gottingen, 1966), 13, who thought that the son of man was reference to a "distinctly apocalyptic Messiah" based on 1 Enoch; Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (ET Oxford, 1959), 360–65, who borrowed elements of Fiebig's view with Bousset's theory, asserted that "the son of man was widely regarded as one with the Messiah," but added, "in apocalyptic circles the phrase did not refer to the Messiah [but rather] a distinct heavenly eschatological figure."

By genre, Daniel 7 is classified as an apocalypse.¹⁵ With this as a backdrop, a distinction must be made between a “historical apocalypse,” like the passage of Daniel 7, and an otherworldly journey, similar to that of the Enoch literature. The otherworldly journey contains a stronger interest in cosmological speculation.¹⁶ In contrast, Daniel is a “historical” apocalypse, which is characterized by visions with an interest in historical events. So what is to be said about the dating and background of the pericope of Daniel 7?

The original author places Daniel, the hero of sorts, in the midst of the Babylonian exile. The date of the book itself has been debated by scholars almost as intensely as the reality of its protagonist.¹⁷ I am well aware that the dating of Daniel carries a great amount of influence over my argument and acknowledge the fact that under different dating parameters my conclusions could be considered lacking in certain areas. In this work I will argue an early sixth century dating which seems most probable on circumstantial and linguistic grounds.

While there are many scholars who argue a later dating, there are other scholars who believe that Daniel was more likely composed in the sixth century BCE, by an unknown author living in the midst of the Babylonian captivity.¹⁸ The scholars who support this idea have given numerous reasons as to why an earlier date is more probable. One of the most persuasive arguments is the evidence that the book of Daniel was well known by the second

15. The word *apokalypsis* (ἀποκάλυψη) in Greek literally means a “revelation” or “unveiling.” This particular work will utilize the definition as outlined by the Society of Biblical Literature Genres Project, which defined this genre as “revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.” See J. J. Collins, ed., *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre, Semeia* 14 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979).

16. M. Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983).

17. A later dating of the second century BCE was suggested by the Neoplatonic philosopher Porphyry in the third century. He argued that, although Daniel was set during the Babylonian exile, it was actually composed around the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and this theory has withstood the test of time. While it is debatable whether Daniel 1–6 could have been written in the Babylonian exile, it has been widely accepted that Daniel 7–12 refers to the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. See the works of P. M. Casey, “Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel,” *JTS* 27 (1976): 15–33; and J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Livonia, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 88–89, for more on this debate.

18. Among scholars who maintain this opinion are William H. Shea, “The Neo Babylonian Historical Setting for Daniel 7,” *AUSS* 24 (1986): 31–36; and Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994).

century.¹⁹ Another point to consider is the languages found in the text. Critics against an early date will claim that the use of Persian, Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic, as found in Daniel, provides evidence for a later date. Realistically, we must consider the alternative. There are three words of Greek origin found in the entire book. The crux of the criticism is the argument that Alexander the Great did not spread Greek through the Near East until the fourth century; thus, there is no way that Daniel could have had any knowledge of the language. However, all three of the words are musical instruments (see Dan 3:5, 7; 10:15). The word *lyre* (NRSV, Dan 3:5, or *zither* in NIV) comes from the Greek word *kithara*, a term which is found in Homer's works *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* (dating back to the eighth century). While the other two Greek words (*psalterion*—harp, and *symphonia*—pipes) are not found in other works, I suggest that if Daniel had been composed in the second century it is probable that we would see more than just three Greek words appearing in the work. It is in this context of the sixth century that the convoluted figure who is "one like a son of man" must be considered. In order to do this we must understand, in a general sense, how the messianic expectations of the Jewish people developed and evolved during this time period.

Few scholars and historians will argue that dramatic shifts did not take place among the Israelites during and after Babylon. Disputably one of the most notable transformations can be seen in the ritualistic and theological practices of the people.²⁰ While we have stated that "son of man" as a title does not appear until the Enoch literature, it is not surprising that as the Jews underwent intense persecution, first in Babylon then later by rulers such as Antiochus IV Epiphanies, we see this general change in worldview. Specifically, they attributed the disaster of the exile to their own impurity. They had betrayed their God and allowed the Mosaic laws and cultic practices to become corrupt; the Babylonian Exile was thus understood as proof of Yahweh's displeasure.

19. Miller, *Daniel*, 25–26, points out that that the author of Ben Sira may have been acquainted with Daniel. Miller mentions Hebrew fragments that have been discovered, which cover about two-thirds of Ben Sira, originally written in Hebrew (195 BCE) but later translated into Greek (about 130 BCE). These Hebrew fragments seem to depend on the Hebrew portions of Daniel.

20. In an examination of the subject carried out by George A. Barton, Barton concludes that "in a remote, yet direct way, the exile helped to transform the messianic expectations of the Jews from the simple character in which they had been held by the prophets to the supernatural character that they take on in the apocalyptic literature." See George A. Barton, "Influence of the Babylonian Exile on the Religion of Israel," in *The Biblical World* 37, no. 6 (University of Chicago Press, 1911): 369–78.

During this period, Jewish leaders focused less on a theology of judgment and shifted their emphasis to a theology of salvation.²¹ With this transformation, it is not surprising that a figure like that of Daniel 7:13, who is to ultimately liberate the “holy ones” and act as the medium through which they would receive “an everlasting kingdom” (Dan 7:27), would, in time, become synonymous with the Davidic Messiah whose appearance would usher in the deliverance of God’s people.

7:1–8 (Vision of the Four Beasts)

Now that a historical backdrop has been erected, let us begin our discussion of the pericope itself. Daniel’s vision begins in 7:2 when the four winds of heavens stir up the great sea, alluding to other ancient Near Eastern creation traditions in which the sea is associated with mythological monsters and forces of chaos (see Ps 74:13–14). Indeed, in this pericope four beasts do come out of the sea, each representing a distinct kingdom. “The first was like a lion and had eagle’s wings. . . . It was made to stand on two feet like a human and given a human mind,” (7:4) which is a reference to the Babylonian empire, since lions and eagles were frequently utilized in Assyro-Babylonian art.²² The second beast “looked like a bear . . . [with] three tusks in its mouth,” (7:5) and can be understood to be a representation of Media, for we read in other passages that, just like a bear was feared for its ferocity (see 1 Sam 17:34 and Prov 28:15), Media was feared for its cruelty (see Isa 13:17 and Jer 51:11, 28). The third beast is described as a leopard “with four wings of a bird on its back and four heads” (7:6). According to D. S. Russell, in regard to this third beast/kingdom, “the four wings may represent the speed of Persia’s conquest and the four heads perhaps refer to the four kings familiar to the Jews—Cyrus, Xerxes, Artaxerxes, and Darius.”²³ And then there is the fourth beast, “terrifying and dreadful and exceedingly strong . . . [with] ten horns . . . [and] another horn appeared. . . . There were eyes like human eyes in this horn and a mouth speaking arrogantly” (7:7–8). For those scholars who seek to argue a later dating, it has been, for the most part, undisputed that this fourth beast symbolizes the Greek kingdom under Alexander the Great and his successors: a threat to the Jews, as these rulers sought to Hellenize the Near East. The very human horn that appears and speaks arrogantly is usually understood by these scholars to be Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who uprooted the three kings which

21. In texts such as Ezekiel and Isaiah, we see hopeful prophecies that the Israelites would, at some unknown future point in time, be gathered together once more, their society and religion would be purified, and the unified Davidic kingdom would be re-established.

22. D. S. Russell, *Daniel*, (Westminster John Knox Press, 1981), 116.

23. Russell, *Daniel*, 117.

had laid hold of the throne before him. Because he was ruthless and arrogant, the Jews suffered abominably under his rule (see 1 Macc 1:24; 2 Macc 5:17). However, there are no clues in the text which indicate that this abominable creature (or any of the beasts in general) absolutely has to be understood as Antiochus IV Epiphanes (or the other rulers we have previously mentioned). However, it is quite possible that this “great and terrible” beast could represent someone like Nebuchadnezzar, who invaded Israel and deported many of the people to Babylon, where they would live in captivity for roughly the next fifty years. The book of Daniel, however, does not provide enough evidence to be certain of who or what the beasts were meant to represent.

7:9–14 (Judgment and Heavenly Council)

The figure of the ancient of days (עתיק יומים) and the later-appearing human being (כבר אנוש)²⁴ give a sharp contrast to the four monstrous beasts mentioned previously.²⁵ As the language becomes more poetic, we are introduced to a very human figure seated upon a throne, preparing to judge the world. He is surrounded by an innumerable concourse of heavenly attendants. His hair is the same color as his raiment: a radiant and dazzling white. All of this evokes the same imagery as the heavenly council presented in 1 Kings 22:19, Job 1:6, Ezekiel 1, and Isaiah 6:6, in which God presides over his heavenly court. In addition, much of the imagery is borrowed from the Psalms (see Pss 82:1; 90:2). The personification of God as judge, accompanied by the fire of judgment which engulfs his throne and consumes the wheels around it,²⁶ is also not uncommon in the imagery of the Hebrew Bible (see Pss 50:3 and 97:3). In Daniel 7:11 the fourth beast is judged and put to death and the rest of the beasts are stripped of the dominion that they possess.

It is in the last two verses of this section of the pericope that we find our point of interest. In Daniel 7:13 we see for the first time in Jewish literature “one like a son man” who comes riding upon the clouds of heaven. He appears before the ancient one from whom he receives power and dominion and

24. This Aramaic phrase denotes the same meaning as the Hebrew equivalent *ben adam* בן אדם (found scattered throughout the OT, especially in the book of Ezekiel in reference to the prophet himself).

25. While the *HarperCollins* translates these verses utilizing “ancient one” and “human being,” translations such as the Septuagint render the translation as “ancient of days” and “son of man,” respectively. (Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* [London: Oxford University Press, 2007], 1012).

26. This imagery of a throne ablaze with fire recalls the chariot throne of Ezekiel from which fire erupted (see Ezek 1:26; 43:6).

authority over all things.²⁷ It is here that further discussion is merited regarding what scholars think of this original “son of man.” Since no interpretation of the son of man is provided later in the pericope, we must confine our analysis to verses 13 and 14.

Daniel 7:13–14 Reconsidered

Just like the volume of scholarship done on the phrase itself, the pericope of Daniel 7 (specifically vv. 13 and 14) has attracted the minds and opinions of scholars for quite some time, especially in recent decades. Due to the vast number of opinions, only three distinct views expressed by different scholars will be briefly discussed and analyzed in order to shed further clarity on the original phrase as it was found in the Jewish context of Daniel. These three opinions have previously been discussed by John J. Collins, who claimed that, while there have been many varying points of view, three main categories of explanation have been proposed “since the emergence of critical scholarship.” They are (1) a heavenly being (usually considered to be the archangel Michael), (2) an exalted human being such as a king or a messianic figure who fulfills the promises made to David, and (3) a collective symbol of the Jewish people.²⁸ These are the three viewpoints that will now be addressed and examined. Ultimately, I will offer a fourth option: that the author’s initial intention was simply to explain what he saw in a way that would have made sense to his original Jewish audience.

An Angel: Michael?

Verse 13 of Daniel 7 in its entirety reads, “I saw one like a son of man [NRSV “human being”] coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him.” For most scholars proposing that this figure represents an angel, the foundation of their argument is the association that they make between the son of man and the clouds. In my opinion, there are those who take this meaning and association a little too far. They connect the clouds with the heavens and thus with angels and more specifically the archangel Michael. According to Norman Russell,²⁹ the

27. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Harvard University Press, 1997), 16; M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, VTSup 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1955), 32.

28. John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 308.

29. Norman Russell, *Doctrine of the Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (London: Oxford, 2005), 67; “It should be noted that the discrediting of the notion of ‘corporate personality’ (Rogerson 1970) has made the idea of the son of man as a representative figure one that must be treated cautiously.” John J. Collins, “The Son of Man and the

simplest explanation is the most satisfactory. He claims the "one like a son of man" is an angel, probably Michael, entrusted with the protection of the people of Israel. He notes that only later, in Christian tradition and in the book of Parables (1 Enoch 37–71), does he become a messianic figure, the elect of God. Albani, while a supporter of the corporate figure interpretation, adds, "there are good reasons for the angelic interpretation."³⁰ Yet if we are to truly understand what the author intended in this case, we must look at the original Aramaic. It should be noted that while an association can be made, the preposition utilized to establish the connection should not be overlooked. We are told that "one like a son of man" comes "with" (עִם) the clouds of heaven. The preposition suggests association and should not be confused with the article עַל, which would mean that the son of man came "upon" the clouds of heaven. This meaning would deify him, as if he were Yahweh or some other figure associated with God.³² Along a similar thread of thought, E. J. Young argues against this connection entirely, stating, "Nowhere in the Old Testament are the clouds represented as the accompaniment of an angel, but rather that which belongs to the Lord."³³

Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 93 (1974): 61 was a good example of this caution when he stated "it is most probable that the figure of 'one like a son of man' represents an angelic host and/or its leader," leaving room for the possibility that this figure could be equated with both the people of Israel and the angels of Heaven. See also I. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1902), 50; M. Noth, "The Holy Ones of the Most High," in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Oliver & Boyd, 1966), 215; L. Dequeker, "The 'Saints of the Most High' in Qumran and Daniel," *OTS* 18 (1973): 108. There is only one individual (that I am aware of) who claims the figure is Gabriel. He argues this from the identity of Gabriel in Daniel 9:21; see Z. Zevit, "The Structure and Elements of Daniel 7," *ZAW* 80 (1968): 385–96 (396).

30. Matthias Albani, "The 'One Like a Son of Man' (Dan. 7.13) and the Royal Ideology," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 47, argues that in the Hebrew Bible the throne of the most high is usually surrounded by heavenly attendants (see Dan 7:10; 8:10), which are described as human-like beings (see Dan 10:16, 18; cf. 8:15; 9:18; 10:5). He proposes that one like a son of man "means likeness to, but not necessarily identity with a human being." The archangel Michael is thus best understood as "one like a human being."

31. According to *Strong's Biblical Concordance*, Entry H5973, the word עִם is defined as the "adverb or preposition, with (i.e. in conjunction with), in varied applications; specifically, equally with; often with prepositional prefix (and then usually unrepresented in English):—accompanying, against, and, as (× long as), before, beside, by (reason of), for all, from (among, between), in, like, more than, of, (un-) to, with(-al)." It should be noted that nowhere is the preposition "upon" associated with עִם.

32. E. J. Young, *Daniel's Vision of the Son of Man* (London: Cambridge, 1958), 12. He writes that the clouds are regarded as an accompaniment to the Lord (see 2 Sam 22:12; Job 22:14; Ps 128:34).

33. Young, *Daniel's Vision*, 13.

A Messianic Symbol

In traditional biblical imagery, the rider upon the clouds is typically understood to be Yahweh. J. A. Emerton argues, “The act of coming with clouds suggests a theophany of Yahweh himself. If Dan 7.13 does not refer to a divine being, then it is the only exception out of about seventy passages in the Old Testament.”³⁴ This association is easily explained by the fact that this same imagery appears in, and may have originated from, Ugaritic myths in which Baal (often referred to as a rider of the clouds) is subordinate to El, the father of gods and human beings. Drawing a similar conclusion, Benjamin Reynolds argues that based on the Old Greek reading the figure of the son of man is messianic.³⁵ Yet this claim is rather tenuous, because it assumes that the idea of God’s messianic kingdom and the Messiah himself were considered by the author of Daniel to be one in the same. That is something we cannot determine from the evidence at hand. Despite this flaw in reasoning, some scholars attempt to draw a connection between one like a son of man and the rider on the clouds. Heinz Eduard Todt claimed a messianic understanding, seeing in Daniel 7:13–14 the figure of a “transcendent redeemer.”³⁶ Yet, as we will discuss in the following section, the association between this metaphorical son of man and the clouds is merely a contrasting element that connects him to heaven as opposed to the four beasts that come out of the sea. Ultimately, the preposition ב does not imply a direct association, as all the previously mentioned scholars make it out to be, no matter how one approaches the argument. Nor are there enough indicators in the text itself to suggest such a connection. Thus, the son of man cannot be associated with either an angelic or a messianic figure.

A Corporate Figure

Perhaps the most popular theory upheld by scholars is the idea that “one like a son of man” is to be interpreted collectively as the people of Israel. The

34. J.A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” *JTS* (1958): 225–42, (see 231–32). For a counterargument, see J. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 303, who states, “Position upon the clouds, which the writer avoids, would rather be the attribute of Deity” (see Isa 19:1; Ps 104:3), thus going back to the discussion of ב and ע (footnote 23).

35. Benjamin Reynolds, “The ‘One Like a Son of Man’ According to the Old Greek of Daniel 7,13–14” *Bib* 89 (2008): 70–80. This concept has previously been supported by scholars such as Geerhardus Vos, *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus* (New York: George H. Doran, 1926), 228 ff., who maintained that the passage in Daniel was genuine messianic prophecy and the one like a son of man is none other than the Messiah.

36. See Heinz Eduard Todt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. D. M. Barton (London: SMC, 1965), 22. Likewise R. B. Y. Scott, “Behold He Cometh With the Clouds,” *NTS* 5 (1958–9): 127–32, emphasizes the transcendence of the scene, referring especially to the clouds.

Israelites were symbolized as the single individual that was belittled and crushed under persecution but later restored to its former glory. This concept was proposed by C. H. Dodd³⁷ and is shared by D. S. Russell, who states that the son of man is collective in sense and “represents the kingdom of God given to the people of God.”³⁸ In his recent work *He That Cometh*, Sigmund Mowinckel states, “In the present form of Daniel’s visions of the beasts, the son of man is a pictorial symbol of the people of Israel, not an individual figure, and not a personal Messiah of any kind.”³⁹ Scholars like Mowinckel firmly contend that this symbol of the fifth kingdom (God’s kingdom) is a human figure, which purposefully contrasts sharply with the animal-like symbols of the beasts. The difference is further emphasized by the fact that this human figure comes from and is connected to heaven, while the beasts came up out of the abyss of the chaotic sea. It is from this vantage point that I propose a fourth suggestion: the son of man was nothing more than a literary device utilized by the author to explain what he saw. In other words, a metaphor to describe the indescribable.

What Did the Author Really Mean?

While it is difficult to know exactly what the author was thinking thousands of years ago when he wrote a text, there are a few indicators within the text itself that provide us with some insight. These particular clues include the comparative כ coupled with the alternate reading of the Septuagint and a lack of interpretation of the man-like figure later in the pericope. Taking these specific linguistic elements into consideration, it is far easier to understand that the author of Daniel intended to explain what he saw through the utilization of images familiar to the reader, notably, the reader himself.

I have previously mentioned in this work that the comparative כ attached to the phrase בר אנוש only appears in Daniel 7. However, its importance cannot

37. See C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet and Co., 1952), 118.

38. Russell, *Daniel*, 122. Another proponent of this idea is Albani, “The ‘One Like a Son of Man,’” 47–53. Albani finds proof of the son of man as a corporate figure in the collective interpretation of Daniel 7:18, 27. He states, “There is no doubt that ‘the one like a son of man’ here represents in some way ‘the people of the holy ones of the Most High,’ a collective symbol of the Jewish people.”

39. Sigmund Mowinckel and G. W. Anderson, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 350. One can also read a similar opinion by James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Matthew Black, “The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the ‘Son of Man’: A Study in Tradition-History,” in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 56–73, goes so far as to say that the author of Daniel was setting forth an “apotheosis of Israel in the end time, a deification of the Saints of the most High.”

be overemphasized. According to the Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon,⁴⁰ the article כ is typically used as a prefix meaning “like of” or “like as,” denoting a comparative statement or metaphorical clause. This is the case in Daniel 7:13. The author tells us that Daniel witnessed one “like a son of man.” He did not even go as far to say he saw “a son of man,” which would have suggested an individual; rather, as the Old Greek of the LXX reads “as it were a son of man.” Important to our discussion is that this method of description in the Old Testament is not confined to this one instance. It is worth noting that within the pericope of Daniel 7 we see further examples. The author in verses 4 through 6 describes the first beast “like a lion (כאריה)” who stood on two feet “like a human being (כאנוש)” and the third beast “like a leopard (כנמר).” We see in all these examples the comparative כ, obviously a literary mechanism frequently utilized by the writer of Daniel 7 to describe manifestations, which Daniel witnessed, in ways that the reader could comprehend and envision himself. Finally, it must be remembered that the whole chapter recounts a vision that Daniel experienced. It is possible that he did not see an actual sea nor actual animals arising out of it. Arguably, it could be considered one large and intricate metaphor.

Another important textual evidence is that later in the pericope, no interpretation of the figure is offered.⁴¹ We read in verse 16 that Daniel approaches an angelic attendant which lingered nearby and questioned him with the desire to understand what he had seen. In verse 17 the interpretation begins with the four great beasts being described as four kings “which shall arise out of the earth.” In verse 18 we are told that the holy ones will receive the kingdom and possess it forever. Yet it is important to note that the “saints” mentioned here are the people of God and should not be confused with heavenly beings.⁴²

These explanations, it has been argued, are substantial and similar enough to identify the figure like a son of man with the saints of the most high. I concur that the resemblance in the language is present and should not simply be swept aside without careful examination and a justification of one’s reasoning. It is clear that to the son of man and also the saints, a kingdom, eternal in nature, was given. In the one instance it is said to be the kingdom of the man-like figure; in the other it is identified as the kingdom of the holy ones. These facts

40. See F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891–1906), 453.

41. For scholars who believe an interpretation for the son of man is provided, see Hugo Gressmann, *Der Messias* (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht Goettingen, 1929), 344, 356.

42. This opinion is maintained by Martin Noth, “Die Heiligen Des Höchsten,” in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (München: Kaiser, 1957), 274–90.

cannot be denied, but does the conclusion really follow that there is an actual interpretation of the one like a son of man similar to the later interpretation provided of the four beasts?

E. J. Young brings up two points that I believe answer this question.⁴³ The first contends that nowhere is an explanation given of the son of man as it is supplied for the four beasts. With respect to the beasts we have seen, it is clearly stated: "As for these four great beasts, four kings shall arise out of the earth." (Dan 7:17) Later we read, "As for the fourth beast, there shall be a fourth kingdom on earth that shall be different from all the other kingdoms," (Dan 7:23) and again, "As for the ten horns, out of this kingdom ten kings shall arise." (Dan 7:24) Nowhere in the chapter do we find expounded such an idea as "the one like a son of man is the saint of the most high." This obvious fact cannot be overlooked. The second point that Young argues is that the nature of the description of the saints of the most high is not one that warrants the assertion that it is the son of man who is being depicted. In verse 18 the saints are said to receive (יקבלון) the kingdom and to possess it (יקבלון). Judgment was given to the saints (or, for the saints), and the dominion and sovereignty and greatness of the kingdoms under all the heavens were given to the people of the saints of the most high. From here an obvious question arises: From whom will this eternal kingdom be received? Those scholars who favor the theory that the son of man embodies Israel will say that the kingdom is received from God. Yet let us consider an interpretation that is equally possible, which asserts that the kingdom is received by the saints from the son of man to whom it had been given by God in verse 14. The saints, we are told, are to receive and to possess the kingdom. This appears to suggest that they receive the kingdom somewhat as a steward for his master; it is entrusted to them forever. At the same time, it is a kingdom which belongs to God and which has only been temporarily relegated to the saints. Ultimately, it is the son of man who acts as mediator through which the kingdom is bestowed.

To conclude this section, let us recall that in light of the ubiquitous usage of the Hebrew/Aramaic כ as a comparative mechanism to denote metaphorical references, and due to the lack of an explicit interpretation of "one like a son of man" in the chapter, I have asserted that the passage of Daniel 7:13 has, in many instances, been over analyzed, and the original intent of the author has been stretched beyond reasonable boundaries. Given different dating parameters and language interpretations, the conclusions which I have argued against could be considered reasonable. We should also not completely disregard the

43. Young, "Daniel's Vision," 9–10.

implications that these varying approaches to the passage could have on our understanding of the pericope as a whole. However, in many cases extensive analysis of “one like a son of man” is unnecessary and overreaching. In short, it is a desperate attempt by scholars to complicate that which was never intended to be complex. Based on prior discussion and textual evidence, I maintain that “one like a son of man” was intended as a literary device, and the author, in utilizing it, fully expected the reader of his day to understand this intent. I believe that there was no special meaning or translation behind the original phrase. It is only after some time that “one like a son of man” becomes more than just a stylistic literary device; indeed it would transform into a title for the Jewish Messiah.

Texts of the Intertestamental Period

Yet this transformation did not occur overnight. In this section, and the following, I will commence the aforementioned survey of the son of man phrase (בר אנש) as it appears in texts from the intertestamental period. The survey will narrow its focus to the Jewish texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Testament of Joseph and Wisdom of Sirach (two texts only extant in Greek). It will then look at 1 Enoch (where the phrase appears in a titular sense for the first time), and finally end with 4 Ezra. The survey will demonstrate that, while some scholars have claimed a messianic interpretation for the son of man figure as early as Daniel, such an interpretation cannot be demonstrated in the texts until the first century CE with the parables of Enoch. Let us begin with the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Dead Sea Scrolls

Most scholars date the fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the mid second century BCE. The phrase as it appears in Daniel 7:13 (כבר אנש) minus the comparative כ, is found in the Genesis Apocryphon and the targum fragments of 11QtgJob 9:9 and 26:3. Receiving lesser attention than documents such as the Community Rule and Melchizedek scroll is the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen 21:13), in which the phrase בר אנש (“a son of man”) appears as an indefinite reference equivalent to the Hebrew איש (“human being”) found in Genesis 13:16 (which the Apocryphon seems to paraphrase). In both texts, God makes the following promise to Abraham: “And I will multiply your seed like the dust of the earth which no son of man (בר אנש) can count.”⁴⁴ Here the phrase seems to take on the connotation of “a human being” or more

44. Here I utilized the translation of M. Casey, in his work, “Aramaic Idiom and the Son of Man Problem,” *JSNT* 25 (2002): 3–32 (29). It should be noted that Yochanan

accurately “no one.” Finally, the targums of 11QtgJob 9:9 and 26:3 are worthy of note. In these texts the generic singular offers a sense of human beings in distinction from God. In these instances the phrase is still utilized as an idiomatic expression referring to a “human being” and בר אנוש appears to simply replace the Hebrew בן אדם. As it stands, neither suggests a messianic figure.

Testament of Joseph

The text of interest stems from a pseudepigraphic body of texts consisting of twelve sections or “testaments,” each one attributed to one of the twelve patriarchs of Israel.⁴⁵ Over the years, scholarly debate has focused primarily with speculations surrounding date and provenance of such a compilation, especially with recent discoveries of The Testaments at Qumran. In the course of the discussion, two main options have emerged for understanding the development of the work as a whole: The first is that a Jewish writer compiled a selection of testaments associated with Jacob’s twelve sons and later a Christian editor or copyist(s) interpolated a few excerpts to relate the text more directly to Jesus. The other predominant theory follows that a Christian assembled the testaments utilizing Jewish sources. According to James Vanderkam, due to the scarce occurrences of demonstrably Christian excerpts, it seems more likely that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is a Jewish work with some Christian emendations.⁴⁶ While I agree with Vanderkam’s assessment

Thorion, “אדם and בן אדם in den Qumrantexten,” *RdQ* 10 (1980): 305–308, confirms that the Hebrew has the same meaning.

45. According to Raymond E. Surburg, in each of the testaments three distinct elements can be noticed. “First the patriarch gives the history of his own life, telling of the sins he has committed and also the virtues he has demonstrated. . . . Next, the writer draws for his readers a practical lesson from the material related, warning them against the sins of the heroes in the story; on the other hand, they are encouraged to emulate the virtues related. Ethical instruction was a prominent feature of this work. Finally, the patriarch enters the field of the apocalyptic, and informs his sons of future happenings.” Raymond E. Surburg, *Introduction to the Intertestamental Period* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1975), 129.

46. See James C. VanderKam, *Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 100–101, in which he adds, “at Qumran texts that may be related to two of the testaments have been found: the Aramaic Levi text has a large amount of the material that appears in the Testament of Levi, and a Testament of Naphtali (4Q215) shares some points with the Greek work of the same name. In light of the uncertainties about the genesis of the Testaments, it is very difficult to date. Suggestions have ranged from the second century BCE to the second century CE.” Similarly, Leonard Rost has written “The date and milieu proper to the Testaments has been a matter of debate ever since the manuscripts were discovered. Most recently M. de Jonge has attempted to demonstrate that they were composed by a Christian author around A.D. 200 on the basis of earlier Jewish traditions. The author, according to de Jonge, had only the Testaments of Levi and Naphtali before him; the rest of his material he drew from the traditions of the Book of Jubilees and the midrashim in order to preach his Christian ethics using the sons of Jacob as examples.” (*Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon* [Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976], 144.)

of authorship, there is still an issue of date which cannot be solved within the parameters of this work. However, it must be sufficient for the present to assert that the text itself dates to around the second century BCE, and the Christian passages are merely interpolations added later.⁴⁷

Of specific interest to this work is one of the testaments attributed to Joseph, the full title of which reads: The Testament of Joseph, The Eleventh Son of Jacob and Rachel. In chapter 2, Joseph recounts his experience in the house of the Pharaoh when his brothers sold him into Egypt. In his recount to his posterity of the lessons he learned in prison we find the phrase “son of man.” According to a translation offered by R. H. Charles, the passage of interest (verse 5) is rendered: “For God is not put to shame as a man, Nor as the son of man (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) is he afraid, Nor as one that is earth-born is He [weak or] affrighted.”⁴⁸ We see in this passage that “the son of man” is associated with the “earth-born” and “man” in a general sense. The Greek is arguably similar to the Hebrew בן אדם and the Aramaic בר אנש and is nothing more than a textual allusion meant to distinguish between the superiority of a mighty God and the inferiority of lowly humanity. It is evident that any hint of a messianic context is lacking in connection with this “son of man.”

Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach

According to *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach is “a book of instruction and proverbs, written in Hebrew around 180 BCE in Jerusalem by an instructor of wealthy youths. It was later translated into Greek in Alexandria by the author's grandson sometime after 132 BCE.” Though Sirach 17 exists only in Greek, as far as we know, a brief discussion of the Hebrew fragments merits brief discussion in order to demonstrate that Hebrew was in fact the original language.

Until recently, Hebrew fragments of Sirach were only known in several rabbinic quotations.⁴⁹ Yet the Greek manuscripts survived to be utilized by Christians due to the book's presence in the Septuagint. Of note here are the Cairo Genizah manuscripts copied in the 10th–12th centuries CE. These manuscripts exist today because they were the work of a non-rabbinic Jewish group (the Karaites). The Hebrew manuscripts were placed in the storeroom (*genizah*) of the synagogue at Old Cairo and were rediscovered in 1896. As

47. This view is shared by Emil Schurer, *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus* (New York: Schocken, 1973), 118–20 (cf. n. 45 in regards to debates about dating).

48. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).

49. The original Hebrew was lost as a result of the rabbinic canon excluding it from their books. Despite this fact, some continued to reference it.

a result, we now have six Genizah manuscripts covering about two-thirds of Sirach; however, the Hebrew text is still missing for Sirach 1:1–3:5 and most of Sirach 16:27–30:10.

The other known Hebrew fragments of Sirach were found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Small, late first-century fragments of Sirach 6 were discovered in 1952 in Cave 2 of Qumran. Then, in 1956, excavators discovered in Cave 11 the Psalms scroll (dated to the early first century CE). The scroll contained half of Ben Sirach's concluding poem on wisdom (51:13–20). Arguably more significant is another discovery made at Masada in 1964 containing parts of six chapters of Sirach (39:27–44:17). This manuscript dates from the early first century BCE, only one hundred years after the original.⁵⁰

The section of interest is chapter 7, specifically verse 30, which is rendered in the NRSV as "For all things cannot be in men, since a son of man (ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) is not immortal." Immediately the reader can draw a connection between "a son of man" and "humanity" in light of the fact that both are not "immortal." Just as in the Testaments, we see that "son of man" is nothing more than a reference to humanity, demonstrating that as late as the first century BCE, the phrase "son of man" continued as a sort of metaphorical literary device and was utilized (similarly suggested in previous instances) as a reference to humanity's inferiority to God.

Pseudepigraphic Literature

Up to this point we have discussed instances of the phrase that demonstrate absolutely no messianic interests in the figure of the son of man. There has been no indication that an association had yet been established between a messianic deliverer and that of the man-like figure who came with the clouds of heaven. It is however not surprising that over time the concept would develop and evolve into a reference which could be associated and identified with God's anointed one. Many scholars have established that by the first century CE, messianic expectations, while quite diverse and varied, had been defined. E. W. Heaton supported this stance, expounding, "There is no evidence that the writer [of Daniel] even thought of a messianic leader . . . but when later such an interest did arise, it is understandable there should have been a close connection between (and therefore terminology common to) . . . the individual figure who came to be thought of as its principal and embodiment." Evidence of this "interest" in a later symbol for the Messiah can be noted in

50. See "Sirach," *NIDB* 5 (2005): 285–89 (esp. 289).

1 Enoch 37–41 and 4 Ezra 7:28 and 12:32.⁵¹ Let us examine these two works outside the context of the New Testament in order to shed some light and understanding on this issue.

*The Parables of Enoch*⁵²

1 Enoch is a text enveloped in conjecture and uncertainty. Known also as the Ethiopic book of Enoch, our interest lies in perhaps the most baffling of the sections known as the Parables. Like the title of the composite work insinuates, the only full manuscript preserved in its entirety is written in Gêez, or classical Ethiopic, the liturgical and canonical language of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. Fragments of the other sections that make up the book of Enoch have indeed come down to us in small extracts of Latin, Coptic, and Syriac, along with some Aramaic fragments from Qumran and a substantial arsenal of Greek manuscripts. Unfortunately, however, the Ethiopic remains are the only witness to the text of the Parables.

Thus begins the conundrum. At least a thousand years of copying separates the earliest manuscripts of the Parables from its introduction into Ethiopia. This is based on the conjecture that the earliest Ethiopic manuscript of Enoch, Lake Tana 9, dates from the early fifteenth century.⁵³ This fact, along with the ample evidence of textual corruption, leads many scholars to suggest and support the theory that the Ethiopic text represents a translation of a translation. Darrell D. Hannah states, “We cannot be certain whether the original language of the Parables, as opposed to the other portions of Enoch, was Aramaic or Hebrew.”⁵⁴ Perhaps most interesting is the fact that upon comparing those

51. At this point, the phrase “son of man” has become a proper noun, a title of the divine figure. The son of man approaches a figure similar to the anointed of days, known in 4 Ezra as the obviously related “Head of Days.” The son of man comes out of the water upon the clouds of heaven (4 Ezra 13:3). He is made to sit upon the throne in place of the “Head of Days,” and all the kings and mighty men worship and adore him as he judges them (see 1 Enoch 61:8; 62:2, 5; 69:27–29). He is not only a royal figure closely related to the “Head of Days” but he is also the Messiah, the anointed one (1 Enoch 48:10; 52:4). Along with this, he is the Son. Scholars have often argued that Christians influenced or modified the aforementioned works in order to associate them with Jesus.

52. The following section and discussion is heavily indebted to Darrell D. Hannah, “The Elect Son of Man of the Parables of Enoch,” in *LNTS* 390, eds. Larry W. Hurtado and Paul L. Owen (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 130–58.

53. Other early manuscripts include EML 7584 (late 15th c.), Paris Abbadianus 55 (15–16th), EML 1768 (15–16th), EML 2080 (15–16th), British Library Or. 485 (early 16th), and Berlin Or. Petermann II, Nachtrag 29 (16th).

54. Hannah, “The Elect Son of Man,” 134. He expounds upon this statement by telling us that there is evidence (limited but not uncontroversial) that the Ethiopic translators had access to a Semitic *Vorlage*, as well as the Greek. For this same idea, see E. Ullendorf, “An Aramaic ‘Vorlage’ of the Ethiopic Text of Enoch?” in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Etiopici (Roma, 2–4 aprile 1959)* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1960),

portions of the book of Enoch which exist in Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic, we can see evidence of editing. In others words, the Greek and Ethiopic versions are not simple translations of the Aramaic, but rather, a reworking of it. In reality, we do not possess the original text, and some evidence proposes that the text we do have should be treated with caution and care.⁵⁵

The text of the first book of Enoch consists of five sections, with the Parables (1 En. 37-71) forming the second major section after the book of Watchers (6-36) and coming before the book of Heavenly Luminaries (72-82), the Dream Vision (83-90), and the Epistle of Enoch (91-105).⁵⁶ It is widely accepted that of these five sections, the Parables are regarded as the last to be written. As with many ancient texts, the exact date of composition is up for debate. Today, most place the Parables at the turn of the century (between first century BCE and first century CE).⁵⁷ Still, there are some that argue for a date later in the first century CE.⁵⁸ However, this idea is easily argued considering

259-67; and M. A. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25 (1978-79), 345-59 (esp. 351).

55. M. A. Knibb, "The Book of Enoch or Books of Enoch: The Textual Evidence for 1 Enoch," in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*, SVTP 22 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 36-55 (esp. 44). He ultimately concludes, "The relationship between the Ethiopic and Greek on the one hand and the Aramaic on the other is not that of straight translation, but is rather comparable to that between the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah and the Hebrew text that served as the *Vorlage* of the Greek of Jeremiah."

56. Knibb, "The Book of Enoch," 41, n. 23.

57. Scholars who maintain this view include: J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977), 51-65; M. E. Stone, "Enoch's Date in Limbo; or Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables," in Boccaccini, *Enoch*, 444-49; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (London: SCM, 1981), 221-23; J. H. Charlesworth, "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?," in Boccaccini, *Enoch*, 450-68; G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 144-49; cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 177-78, who would place the Parables in the early or mid-first century BCE.

58. E. G. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables," 358, argues for the end of the first century based on a theory proposed by Milik who pointed out the absence of any portion of the Parables in the eleven different copies of the book of Enoch, including the portions from Qumran. Suter is of a similar opinion placing the date of the Parables "as close as possible to the fall of Jerusalem." See D. W. Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Enoch," in Boccaccini, *Enoch*, 415-43 (esp. 440). James Charlesworth writes, "This pseudepigraph has evoked divergent opinions; but today there is a consensus that the book is a composite, portions of which are clearly pre-Christian as demonstrated by the discovery of Aramaic and Hebrew fragments from four of the five sections of the book among the Dead Sea Scrolls. One of these fragments, moreover, Hena, was copied in the second half of the second century B.C. The main question concerns the date of the second section, chapters 37-71, which contains the son of man sayings. J. T. Milik (esp. no. 755) has shown that this section, which is not represented among the early fragments, is probably a later addition to 1 Enoch; but his contention that it was composed around A.D. 270 (no. 755, p. 377) is very speculative. If, as most specialists concur, the early portions of 1 Enoch date from the first half of the second century B.C., chapters 37-71 could have been added in the first century

that only about five percent of the entire book of Enoch has been retained in the eleven Qumran manuscripts. Thus it does not aid one in establishing a credible argument in favor of a later date.⁵⁹ Not surprisingly, these very same “late dating” scholars claim that Christians influenced the content of the Parables. Michael Knibb, contending this idea, has stated, “given the subject matter of the Parables it seems very hard to understand the absence of clear references to Christ if the Parables are Christian.”⁶⁰

Thus we are left to consider the text, arguably under a Jewish context and outside of Christian influences. The parable of interest to us is found in 46:1–4,⁶¹ where the Parables seem to draw from, or at least, follow, a similar tradition as Daniel 7. Here Enoch beholds one who has “a head of days” (from here on he is referred to as “the Head of Days”) and with him, one who is described as having the appearance of a man and “a gracious face, like the angels.” Here the phrase “son of man” is introduced:

He answered and said to me: “This is the son of man who has righteousness, with whom dwells righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of the spirits has chosen him, and whose lot has the pre-eminence before the Lord of the spirits in uprightness for ever. This son of man whom you have seen shall raise up the kings and the mighty from their seats and the strong from their thrones, and shall loosen the reins of the strong and break the teeth of the sinners. (1 Enoch 46:3–4)

Throughout the parables (69:27 being the exception) the expression is rendered “this/that son of man” or “the son of man who . . .” It should be noted that in classical Ethiopic (which we have reasoned to be the original language of the text) there is no definite article,⁶² thus the demonstratives “this” and “that,” are utilized. The phrase “son of man” used most frequently is also used in the Ethiopic Bible to translate “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7:13 (and later the son of man sayings in the New Testament). In the context of the final judgment, the hiddenness of the son of man is discussed, as well as his

B.C. or first century A.D. The original language of 1 Enoch appears to be Aramaic, except for the Noah traditions, which were probably composed in Hebrew. The earliest portions display impressive parallels with the nascent thoughts of the Jewish sect which eventually settled at Qumran.” (*The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* [Chico, CA: Scholars Press for SBL, 1981], 98.)

59. Stone, “Enoch’s Date in Limbo,” 446.

60. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables,” 350.

61. I have not attempted here to survey all of the references to the son of man or the passages that seem to allude to Daniel 7 in the Parables of 1 Enoch. For this reason it is worthy to note that, in addition to 46:1–4, such imagery appears in 48:2; 62:5, 7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:27, 29; 70:1; and 71:14, 17.

62. See Stefan Weninger, ed., *The Semitic Languages, The International Handbook* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 169–70.

revelation to the chosen one (62:7). There are obvious connections to Daniel 7, especially in chapters 46–48.

At this point it is important to note the other potential Old Testament sources for the text, which include Psalm 2 and Isaiah 11, 42, 49, 52 and 53.⁶³ Through the utilization of this additional material the anonymous writer creates a composite figure consisting of the one like a son of man, the Davidic King, and the Lord's servant found in the pseudepigraphic text of Second Isaiah. The connection among these three figures tentatively suggests that the author intended to take the man-like figure of Daniel 7 and describe him in language borrowed from Davidic royal oracles and Deutero-Isaianic texts about the servant of the Lord. It should be noted, however, that in 1 Enoch, this "son of man" is not the bearer of God's eternal kingdom like he is bequeathed in Daniel 7. He is seated on the divine throne of glory in order to execute judgment (see 69:27–29). Thus we see this transformation from Daniel's "one like a son of man," a metaphorical literary device, into a messianic title⁶⁴ of "this/that son of man" of the Parables, who executes the judgement of God among his people. Whether it is meant to be messianic or simply an apocalyptic figure whose coming represented the onset of God's reckoning cannot be determined, and opinions may vary, but what we can safely say is that by 1 Enoch the phrase becomes a title for a specific individual associated with deity and the end of days.

4 Ezra (2 Esdras)

Since the phrase *בן אדם* does not appear in 4 Ezra, and there is also extensive debate on whether it was heavily influenced by Christian writers, many scholars may find the inclusion of this source a bit superfluous and misplaced. I would argue to the contrary, but proceeding with a certain level of caution is a must. I assert that from portions of the text, which profess a lack of Christian influences, we can see that the man-like figure, which was previously

63. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* 6 (1991): 137–40.

64. According to Nickelsburg in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, this author employs language from the servant passages and royal oracles, "in order to describe this function, which Daniel does not attribute to the 'one like a son of man.' It is this goal to convey this function that underlies a dramatic shift in intent." Here it is important to note the landmark work of Ulrich B. Muller's *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes* from 1972. Muller claims that the concept of the son of man first emerges in 1 Enoch through the personification of God's intervention in the last days in the figure of 'the Elected' being connected with the man-like of Dan. 7.13. He isolates as secondary concerns 1 Enoch 48.10 and 52.4, where the designation 'the Anointed' was introduced, similar to 1 Enoch 71. While I do not entirely agree with him, Muller ultimately concludes that 1 Enoch remains the only true witness to a special son of man concept (see pp. 38–43, 107–55, and 157–216).

associated with messianic expectations in 1 Enoch, is now individualized and specified as a single entity.⁶⁵

An allusion to the figure of Daniel 7:13–14 is established in the identification of a man in a vision “kept for ages by the Most High to deliver His creation” with the Messiah, who takes his stand on the Mount of Zion and burns up Israel’s enemies (4 Ezra 12:26; 13:33–38, 52). The first instance in which we see a reference to the son of man specifically is in 4 Ezra 13:3 where we read, “And I looked and beheld, the wind made something like the figure of a man come up out of the heart of the sea, and I looked and beheld that the man flew with the clouds of heaven.” While the text does not explicitly read “one like a son of man,” the connection to and potential influence of Daniel 7 is undeniable. We see the man-like figure that, in this case, “flew with the clouds of heaven” and is later referred to in the same chapter by the Most High God as “My Son . . . as a man coming up from the sea” (13:32). Thus we see this man-like figure, who is called the Son of God, take on the role of the Messiah as judge of all the world, for God tells Ezra, “And he, my Son, will reprove the assembled nations for their ungodliness and will reproach them to their face with their evil thoughts and the torments with which they are to be tortured, and will destroy them without effort by the law” (13:37–38).⁶⁶

Therefore, we can deduce that the “man” of 4 Ezra, though not explicitly mentioned, is not merely a duplication of “one like a son of man” of Daniel 7. As we saw with 1 Enoch, by 4 Ezra the phrase has taken on distinctive features, and this is the peak of the tradition: a messianic figure which has been saved to judge the world, ultimately destroying the wicked and rewarding the righteous. As we mentioned previously, the son of man has become an individual figure in contrast to the abstract entity of Daniel. We see also that the attributive adjective that was Daniel’s son of man has transformed into a title by 1 Enoch and is confirmed by the text of 4 Ezra. Finally, in both texts it is evident

65. For scholars who express similar sentiments regarding 1 Enoch and 4 Ezra, see J. Bowman, “The Background of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Old Biblical Literature,” *ET* 60 (1948–49): 11–15 (see 13–15); Pierre Grelot, “Le Messie dans les Apocryphes de l’Ancien Testament. Etat de la question,” in *La Venue du Messie. Messianisme et Eschatologie*, ed. Edouard Massaux (Bruges: Deschlee de Brouwer, 1962), 19–50; F. M. Wilson, “The son of man in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 8 (1978): 28–52 (38–49); Barnabas Lindars, “Enoch and Christology,” *ET* 92 (1980–81): 295–299; C. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John* (1984), 108–112; James C. VanderKam, “Daniel 7 in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37–71),” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, eds. Charlotte Hempel and Judith Lieu (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 291–307.

66. For a support of my argument regarding 4 Ezra and the son of man, see Sheldon, *Jesus, Fourth Ezra*, 45–86 (esp. 85–86).

that the "son of man" has grown from an ambiguous reference to a specific designation for the Messiah.

Conclusion: Implications for the Debate

The question remains: how does a reconsideration of Daniel 7 contribute to the volumes of scholarship that already exist? The main goal of my paper is to provide a more thoughtful survey of "one like a son of man" in its original Jewish context that would aid scholars in their study of the extant evidence. Rather than persisting in looking for new and unconsidered possibilities, we need to reexamine what we have previously explored. In reflecting back on what has been done and looking forward to what will be accomplished in regards to the son of man phrase, scholars need to be careful to not let tradition and popular ideas convolute their thinking and perceptions of the issues.

In future studies I believe that my discussion of Daniel will aid in surveys on the "son of man" phrase attributed to Jesus by the Gospel writers. While there is not room to discuss the many facets of the controversy, it is important to note that as we move forward with an understanding of Daniel's "son of man" acting as a literary device and not a messianic symbol, it will be far easier to reconstruct the original intent of the later Gospel writers, who wrote about a Jewish peasant who came to be known by the Christians as not only a Jewish Messiah but also a Savior to all the world. Perhaps, in so doing, we will be one step closer in reconciling the Jesus of faith with the Jesus of history and ultimately unlocking the key to the man that was the historical Jesus of Nazareth.

OUT OF THE DUST: AN EXAMINATION OF NECROMANCY AS A LITERARY CONSTRUCT IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

AMANDA COLLEEN BROWN

Amanda Brown graduated from Brigham Young University in 2014 with a degree in ancient Near Eastern studies, with an emphasis in the Hebrew Bible. She will begin graduate work at Hebrew University this Spring.

And thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust.¹ (Isaiah 29:4)

Because it is commonly interpreted as a prophecy of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, Isaiah 29:4 is a foundational scripture within the Latter-day Saint faith.² However, one exegetical interpretation of this passage suggests necromancy is a thematic literary element. The definition of ancient necromancy carries greater literary weight than normally colloquially understood by Latter-day Saints,³ and uncovering the proper context and traditions

1. Scriptures from the Hebrew Bible throughout this paper were taken from the King James Version. While the language is usually archaic for an academic study, it is here used because of the linguistic similarities between the KJV and the Book of Mormon.

2. This paper will primarily address how Isaiah 29:4 was interpreted in the Book of Mormon and the ramifications of reading necromancy into the text. I have bracketed out the topic of the historicity of the Book of Mormon, as this paper is merely a criticism of the literary aspects that allusions to necromancy would lend to certain passages' interpretations.

3. My research through commentaries on the Book of Mormon indicates a preference for an exegetical reading of Isaiah 29:4. In 1987, Joseph F. McConkie and Robert L. Millet stated that Nephi applied Isaiah 29:4 to his people who would cry from the dust and serve as a voice of warning. (Joseph F. McConkie and Robert L. Millet, *Doctrinal Commentary on the Book of Mormon* [Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1987], 306.) In that same year, D. Michael Quinn discussed what "familiar spirit" meant before 1830 in *Mormonism and the Magic World View* but did not connect this to the Book of Mormon text. (Michael D. Quinn, *Mormonism and the Magic World View* [Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1987].) Brant Gardner's 2007 multi-volume work, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon*, further explored the possible connection between necromancy and certain Book of Mormon passages (Brant Gardner, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon* [6 vols.; Greg Kofford Books, 2007].) In 2008, Paul Hoskisson compared 2 Nephi 26:16 and Isaiah 29:4 as a case study for differentiation between exegetical and exegetical readings of scripture (Paul Y. Hoskisson, "The 'Familiar Spirit' in 2 Nephi 26:16," *Insights* 28, no. 6 [2008]: 7.) In this, Hoskisson discussed

through a literary interpretation establishes an interesting metaphor of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon. Furthermore, defining the literary components harnessed by the original writers to exhibit YHWH's elevated cultic status, as compared to proclaimed "foreign" religious practices, is essential in this discussion. Finally, theorizing that these literary elements are congruous with Book of Mormon passages would suggest that a reinterpretation of scripture in Nephi, Mormon, and Moroni is requisite. Indeed, the metaphor goes far beyond the basic concept of necromancy, thus providing a new perspective on ancient traditions and concepts. These ideas include: that the text itself is purported to speak out of the ground, that the necromancer has a very specific role, and that YHWH's involvement in ancient Israelite court revelation is preeminent.

Necromancy in the Ancient Near East

A general survey of necromancy as it is portrayed within both the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near East is vital to this undertaking. Necromancy is "the practice of consulting the dead, usually with the help of a medium,"⁴ and was used "to obtain information from [the dead,] generally regarding the revelation of unknown causes or the future course of events."⁵ Therefore, ancient necromancy was an attempt to manipulate the spirits of dead ancestors⁶ into revealing information about the future, to which they had special access.⁷ The Hebrew Bible does not polemicize necromancy as frequently as the cults surrounding Baal or Asherah, probably due to a less widespread acceptance of the practice in popular Israelite religion.⁸ However, the texts dealing with necromancy clearly indicate that it occupied a definite place outside of the nation's approved religion at the time of redaction.⁹

the possible ramifications of reading necromancy into a Book of Mormon text. However, his work is by no means exhaustive on the topic.

4. Philip J. King and Larry E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 380.

5. Brian B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 11; Fred Miller, "Prophecy in Judaism and Islam," *IS* 17 (1978): 28; Edmund B. Keller, "Hebrew Thoughts on Immortality and Resurrection," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 5 (1974): 20–21; Harry A. Hoffner Jr., "Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew 'Öb," *JBL* 86, no. 4 (1967): 395–96.

6. For more on the connection between ancestor cults and necromancy, see Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*.

7. Theodore J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 2.

8. Phillip Johnston, *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament* (InterVarsity Press: 2002), 153.

9. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead*, 104, and Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 153.

The Hebrew nouns commonly associated with necromancy are *עפר*, *אורב*, and *ידעני*.¹⁰ *אורב* is usually paired with verbs that indicate inquiry for information¹¹ and seems to indicate a conscious, yet unidentifiable, being,¹² though it can refer to either the medium or ghost. The LXX translation of *אורב* is “ventriloquist,” to denote chirping or muttering, though this may not be an accurate representation of the word either, as it does not harmonize all of the word’s aspects.¹³

ידעני is often paired with *אורב*, though not always. Many commentators have also associated *ידעני* with chirping or muttering sounds either emitted from the ghost or the medium.¹⁴ *עפר* is thought to carry the sense of loose earth or dust.¹⁵ The latter often connotes mourning and self-abasement;¹⁶ however, when seen in conjunction with the words previously discussed, the context signifies the grave and netherworld. Furthermore, the inhabitants of the ancient underworld were thought to dwell in fields of dust, thereby becoming persons of dust themselves.¹⁷

Hebrew Bible Context

The Hebrew Bible verifies that necromancy was present in ancient Israel;¹⁸ however, assessing the extent of its influence over the commonwealth is difficult from the extant evidence. Textual evidence within the Hebrew Bible provides little indication that ritualistic implements, other than the enigmatic *אורב*, were necessary to practicing necromancy.¹⁹ Lack of material evidence within the archaeological record complicates both determining how widespread necromancy was in ancient Israel and whether specific tools were used.²⁰ Thus the texts that refer to necromancy become the only source of clarification on this topic.

10. For a more in-depth analysis on the word’s etymology, see Hoffner, “Second Millennium Antecedents”; and Irving L. Finkel, “Necromancy in Ancient Mesopotamia,” *AfO* 29, no. 30 (1983), 14.

11. Hugo Enrique Mendez, “Condemnations of Necromancy,” (MA thesis, University of Georgia, 2009), 5.

12. Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 151.

13. Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 161.

14. Mendez, “Condemnations of Necromancy,” 39.

15. Botterweck, et al., *TDOT* 11, 259, 260.

16. *Ibid.*, 263.

17. *Ibid.*, 264, 265; Keller, “Hebrew Thoughts,” 16.

18. Douglas W. Mackenzie, “Faith and Superstition,” *BW* 27, no. 6 (1906), 412.

19. It should be noted that there are ritual texts in Assyria that could possibly depict incantations of necromancy. See Finkel, “Necromancy”; and Lewis, *Cults of the Dead*, 97, 98.

20. For evidence of the cult of the dead, including necromancy, see Schmidt, *Israel’s Beneficent Dead*; and Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*.

The Holiness Code, of which Leviticus 19:31 is a part, condemns seeking after those who are wizards or have the voice of a ghost rather than condemning the practice itself.²¹ Following this disallowance, Leviticus 20:27 pronounces that those who practice necromancy will be put to death by stoning. This punishment indicates the seriousness of being a medium in the eyes of the state cult. Deuteronomy 18:10–12 is consistent with the previous statements in its disavowal of those who are wizards, practice necromancy, or have the voice of a ghost.²² These verses also contend that YHWH will drive out such people from the land of their inheritance, thus pitting Yahwistic prophecy against necromancy.²³ That this taboo was in place against necromancy at the time of the law's codification is also established. This information in turn provides insight into the authors'/redactors' viewpoint and can help determine how they interpreted necromancy to advance the texts in question.

These prohibitions by the Deuteronomist imply that necromancy—and other forms of divination—were at times somewhat attractive to the people of Israel. However, such behavior conflicted with YHWH's demand for complete devotion to the state cult from his adherents. This is most effectively portrayed in Saul's encounter with the witch of Endor in 1 Samuel 28.

According to the text, on the eve of Saul's final battle, the king sought out the services of a necromancer. The witch of Endor was found, and through necromancy she called up the deceased prophet Samuel so Saul might plead with his deceased spiritual leader for information on the outcome of the battle of Gilboa.²⁴ Verse 15 of the chapter demonstrates Saul's fear and the circumstances that provoked his deviation from YHWH's revelatory process. It states, "And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." According to this account, the catalyst behind Saul's actions is the terror of imminent death. It is also apparent that Saul believed the situation provided no other option for gaining mastery over the near future. Furthermore, he felt that the information was substantial enough to risk his standing before YHWH.²⁵

21. Mendez, "Condemnations of Necromancy," 4.

22. King, *Biblical Israel*, 196–98.

23. Johnathan Stökl, "How Unique Was Israelite Prophecy?," in *The Wiley-Blackwell History of Jews and Judaism* (Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2012), 54.

24. Hoffner, "Second Millennium Antecedents," 396.

25. 1 Chronicles 10:13–14 states the repercussions of Saul's act of necromancy as the reason for his ultimate downfall. It reads: "So Saul died for his transgression which he

In another instance where necromancy was employed to divine the future during a period of crisis, we find that YHWH's response to the Judahite king compares the political situation to necromancy. The text presents the following circumstances: Ahaz was contemplating a confederacy in order to fend off an impending invasion, and Isaiah weighed in on behalf of YHWH. The author of the passage is found using עֵפֶר and אוֹר together in the Hebrew text, which creates a framework for reading this passage as a reference to necromancy. The verses in question read:

And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. (Isaiah 8:19–20)

The author is here commenting on the potential alliance and their allies' trust in a divinatory method, which was previously declared as unsound. Warning Judah that, despite the formidable threat the Assyrians pose, the security necromancy proffers will be of little help, clarifies the cultic political position and the preeminence of the prophet as sole diviner for YHWH.²⁶ In the same breath, the author paints necromancy as a type of the support that would be received and insinuates that any help they will provide will be of little value, just as their necromancers provide little divinatory aid.²⁷ This can also

committed against the Lord, even against the word of the Lord, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to enquire of it; And enquired not of the Lord: therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse." To the Chronicler, this foray into popular religion appears to have been Saul's culminating insult to the cult surrounding YHWH. For a literary analysis of Saul's characterization by the Deuteronomist as the prototype for kingship failure, see Matthew Michael, "The Prophet, the Witch and the Ghost: Understanding the Parody of Saul as a 'Prophet' and the Purpose of Endor in the Deuteronomistic History," *JSOT* 38, no. 3 (2014): 316–46.

26. Mendez, "Condemnations of Necromancy," 36, 42–43.

27. As a side note, in this study of sources from the Hebrew Bible, the centrality of the medium stands out as vital to the practice. In 1 Samuel 28 and Isaiah 19:23 necromancy included more than merely worshipping household gods (see, Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, 217–18). Furthermore, it is clear from the prohibition against them that mediums and those who possess familiar spirits were vital to necromancy's execution. This is further substantiated in that it was the mediums that bore the brunt of the criticism within the text, rather than the practice itself. Such a distinction intimates that without certain individuals in place to communicate with the dead, necromancy would not be able to survive. This is most clearly evident in Saul's encounter with the witch of Endor. The text reveals that Saul could not raise up Samuel's ghost by himself, nor could he at first see the spirit of Samuel. This is evidenced by the fact that Saul asked the witch what she saw. While the chapter seems to later portray Saul and Samuel having a face to face conversation, it is definite that opening communication with the dead prophet was a role unique to one who possessed a familiar spirit. From this we can gather that in a sense, the medium's position was seen as a threat to the official prophet/priest's cultic station as one who receives revelation for

be read as an attempt to curtail such popular religious activities before they could become real concerns to the cult based in Jerusalem.²⁸

Furthermore, the passage conveys that, should the country indulge in necromancy, the results would be the exact opposite from their intention. Indeed, it is indicated that rather than enlightening those who seek out information from the dead, such practices will work to their detriment, just as any alliance with Egypt would also end poorly for the people of Judah when confronted with an invasion. In the end, trusting in YHWH as Judah's best source of divination (and subtextually, political aid) is extolled,²⁹ and the nation is warned that only disappointment will result from seeking other avenues.

Next, Isaiah 19:3 demonstrates the political connotation necromancy and other divining methods had in the ancient Near East. It states, "And the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof; and I will destroy the counsel thereof: and they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards." This proto-apocalyptic prophecy, which foretells the political ruin Egypt will experience by the hand of the Assyrians because of YHWH's wrath, plainly identifies the consequences that the text's compilers attributed to practicing necromancy. It affirms that when Egypt would look to their necromancers and familiar spirits for guidance in the ensuing fallout, the revelatory power such sources possessed would be negated, thus proving to the people of Judah that YHWH is the only deity with revelatory license.³⁰ The text also casts Egypt as foreign and highlights its people's indifference toward YHWH, because they did not adhere to the god³¹ of Israel's sanctioned method of divination.³²

Isaiah 29:4 is a compelling passage concerning necromancy in Isaiah, especially when viewed within the parameters of Latter-day Saint interpretation. The verse in question states, "And thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech

YHWH, thereby threatening the state cult as a whole. This perspective would have heightened its illegality in the eyes of the biblical authors, thus creating a cause for strict prohibitions and later literary negativity toward the practice.

28. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead*, 130.

29. Mendez, "Condemnations of Necromancy," 20.

30. Christopher B. Hays, "The Covenant with Mut: A New Interpretation of Isaiah 28:1–22," *VT* 60, no. 2 (2010): 234. Mendez, "Condemnations of Necromancy," 45–46.

31. While I am aware that translating אֱלֹהִים as "god" may be problematic as Samuel's ghost is so designated in 1 Samuel 28, I feel that this translation provides overall clarity for my topic. As I do not discuss the ramifications of its placement within said pericope, I have chosen this common translation.

32. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead*, 55; while Hays, "Covenant with Mut," 232, specifically discusses Isaiah 28, the methodology behind the text also proves true in this case.

shall whisper out of the dust.” Once again, the Hebrew words that are translated here as “one that hath a familiar spirit” (NRSV “voice of a ghost”),³³ along with words such as “dust” and “out of the ground,” are indicative of necromancy.³⁴

Historically, the entire pericope’s *sitz im leben* is part of an oracle of war written to Ariel that reflects Sennacherib’s 701 BCE campaign against Judah, specifically Jerusalem.³⁵ When juxtaposed against all of the passages that have heretofore been discussed, the rhetoric of Isaiah 29:4 appears to be completely out of character for the book. To compare YHWH’s city with an אוב seems incongruous for the author; therefore, there must be an underlying facet of the prophecy of Sennacherib’s siege of Jerusalem and the surrounding countryside that necromancy uniquely stresses.

There are several points worthy of consideration from the verse above. First, the author “sought to demonstrate that the preferred source of revelation is Yahwistic prophecy. . . . [This passage] portrays the cessation of Yahwistic prophecy as coincident with the adoption of necromancy.”³⁶ In other words, the author sought to juxtapose the validity of Yahwistic prophecy with the knowledge gained from necromancy and utilized it to illustrate that the city would be as a familiar spirit until YHWH delivered them through the state cult religious practices.³⁷ The city’s status as a familiar spirit could be realized in several ways. One possible interpretation suggests a demolition of the city so complete that its inhabitants’ only recourse is to communicate with future generations through a practice such as necromancy.³⁸

Another viewpoint is introduced when verse four is taken in conjunction with verse ten, which promulgates YHWH’s control over the situation. Verse ten explains that YHWH had placed the people of Judah and their prophets to sleep and covered the seers. This is a commentary on the king’s advisors and prophets who were not speaking the word of YHWH. Comparing the inhabitants of Jerusalem to an illegitimate revelatory operation is not entirely

33. Hoffner, “Second Millennium Antecedents,” 398.

34. Finkel, “Necromancy,” 15; Hoffner, “Second Millennium Antecedents,” 386.

35. For a discussion on the evidence for Sennacherib’s influence in Isaiah, see Routledge, “The siege and deliverance of the city of David in Isaiah 29:1–8,” *TynBul* 43 (1992).

36. Schmidt, *Beneficent Dead*, 164.

37. Jonathan Stökl’s words on another pericope in Isaiah provide another interesting nuance to how we might be able to harmonize why Isaiah’s literary usage of necromancy is not an outright condemnation of the practice. It reads, “it is easier to assume that idioms from the polytheistic past are still being used in a monotheistic environment.” Jonathan Stökl, “Divination as Warfare: The Use of Divination Across Borders,” in *Divination, Politics and Ancient Near Eastern Empires*, eds. J. Stökl and A. Lenzi, *Ancient Near Eastern Monographs 7* (Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature), 61.

38. Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 111.

far-fetched when viewed in this context. Overall, the underlying message of the pericope is that YHWH controlled Judah's fate, even if the court sought to replace his preeminence by discounting the message of his true prophet.³⁹ Harmonizing this chapter with previous scripture on the topic appears challenging at first glance, but when approached literarily, communicating with the dead as a sign of the spiritual state of the city at the time of the siege can be interpreted in line with the sentiment expressed elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.

Necromancy in the Book of Mormon

Scriptures in Nephi

Almost from the outset of Mormonism's doctrinal history, Isaiah 29:4 was associated with the coming forth of the Book of Mormon. In fact, the text itself connects the book's coming forth from the "grave" to its writers/redactors speaking from the dust. Second Nephi 3:19–20 adds Lehi's insight into how necromancy can be read into the events surrounding the discovery and translation of the Book of Mormon. It states, "And it shall be as if the fruit of thy loins had cried unto them from the dust; for I know their faith. And they shall cry from the dust; yea, even repentance unto their brethren, even after many generations have gone by them. And it shall come to pass that their cry shall go, even according to the simpleness of their words."

Second Nephi 26:15–16 is a fairly obvious commentary on Isaiah 29:4 as much of the structuring in the latter half of the verse is parallel to it. As is so often Nephi's *modus operandi*, he appears to have taken a scripture in Isaiah and reinterpreted it for his own prophetic purposes. The latter end of the verse prophesies, "For those who shall be destroyed shall speak unto them out of the ground, and their speech shall be low out of the dust, and their voice shall be as one that hath a familiar spirit; for the Lord God will give unto him power, that he may whisper concerning them, even as it were out of the ground; and their speech shall whisper out of the dust."

Nephi finishes his account by connecting his words to one crying from the dust in 2 Nephi 33:13, which states: "And now, my beloved brethren, all those who are of the house of Israel, and all ye ends of the earth, I speak unto you as the voice of one crying from the dust: Farewell until that great day shall come."

Second Nephi 3:19–20 and 2 Nephi 33:13 fit into the greater literary tradition of the book as the dying testaments of patriarchs. Earlier in the chapter, Lehi quotes a prophecy from Joseph of Egypt that a righteous seer would be

39. Mendez, "Condemnations of Necromancy," 60.

raised up and bring forth God's word, so those who had died would be able to cry from the dust. The one who is to be, as it were, a spokesman for the dead could thus be interpreted as the medium that facilitates contact between the spirits and those they warn.

Nephi picks up the Isaiah 29:4 theme in 2 Nephi 26 and reinterprets it in order to support his prophecy of the ultimate destruction of his people. He then exploits the language of Isaiah to prophesy that those who were destroyed will speak to a mysterious character identified as "him" and it is implied that "he" will then spread these whisperings to others. While the male character is not established within the pericope, it can be inferred from the previous passage that Nephi is here alluding to a redactor or translator. Nephi seems to be building off of both Isaiah and his father's interpretation and further connects the ultimate destruction of his people and the translation of his words to the whole. It is also worth noting that because this people would not heed the prophet's revelation from YHWH, they would suffer similar consequences to those predicted by the prophet in Isaiah 29. This reiterates that the sole way the people's history could be discovered is through their dead souls speaking from out of the ground.

Nephi again refers to this scripture in 2 Nephi 33. The text connects Nephi himself as one of the prophesied individuals who will cry from the dust. This poignant chapter appears to link the idea of necromancy to the influence the deceased Book of Mormon prophets believed they would hold over their descendants who read their words. The chapter also perpetuates the idea that voices from the dust play an imperative role within the necromancy metaphor as they are the ones who beg that their writings will be able to reach into and affect significant change upon the future.

Scriptures in Mormon and Moroni

After a silence on the subject, the theme is again picked up in Mormon 8:23⁴⁰ where it proclaims, "Search the prophecies of Isaiah. Behold, I cannot write them. Yea, behold I say unto you, that those saints who have gone before me, who have possessed this land, shall cry, yea, even from the dust will they cry unto the Lord; and as the Lord liveth he will remember the covenant which he hath made with them."

Finally, Moroni 10:27 employs crying from the dust imagery in the concluding chapter of the Book of Mormon: "And I exhort you to remember these things; for the time speedily cometh that ye shall know that I lie not, for ye

40. Moroni is most likely quoting Nephi's Isaiah and its context, rather than the original Isaiah 29:4. See Gardner, *Second Witness*.

shall see me at the bar of God; and the Lord God will say unto you: Did I not declare my words unto you, which were written by this man, like as one crying from the dead, yea, even as one speaking out of the dust?"

Moroni seeks to contextualize the coming forth of the Book of Mormon in terms of speaking from the dust, which is synonymized with speaking from the dead in this verse. As Mormon 8:23 begins with the command to study the words of Isaiah, it is fairly certain that Isaiah 29:4 is the basis for Moroni's interpretation. This verse states that the saints will cry unto God from the grave for the fulfillment of his covenant with them. This statement adds a certain nuance to the prophecy, as YHWH is now an active participant in the act, thereby placing the metaphor under divine sanction. YHWH's fulfillment of his original promise to the dead establishes him as an integral member in the necromancy metaphor. Because YHWH heard the dead prophets' pleas for their covenant with him to be fulfilled, he would later direct a translator of the plates, at which point the dead would then be allowed to share their insights on the future with the people of the modern era.⁴¹ It is therefore plausible that Moroni is building off of Lehi and Nephi's interpretation to further proclaim the ultimate purpose of the Book of Mormon.⁴²

Finally, Moroni 10:27 concludes the references of necromancy within the Book of Mormon along with the record itself. Moroni here transfers necromancy into a face-to-face meeting where deity, the dead, and those they warned all come together at YHWH's judgment bar. This scene places the responsibility of acting on the dead's directives upon those who read the Book of Mormon. Thus, the role of the hearers is elevated from mere receivers of prophetic information to active participants who, once supplied with such knowledge, must then employ it or risk divine judgment from not only YHWH, but also Moroni as the text's redactor, who supplied the information in the first place.

The Book of Mormon's interpretation of necromancy can be accorded a similar function to that of its Hebrew Bible counterpart. These scriptures, while employing necromancy as a metaphor to discuss the discovery and translation of the Book of Mormon, also repeatedly remind the reader of the fact that God is the one who allows these events to take place. Thus, just as in the Hebrew Bible, we see the state cult's prophets employing the principles of necromancy to remind the people that their God is the acting force behind all revelation given to man. This is evidenced in each of the scriptures discussed above: Lehi presents the Book of Mormon as possessing the spirit of one who is departed

41. Quinn, *Mormonism*, 152–53.

42. Gardner, *Second Witness*, 418–19.

and states that YHWH will give power to the necromancer to interpret the voices of the dead. Nephi expands the idea by framing his last testament within the language of necromancy. Finally, Moroni concludes by naming YHWH as the deity who has orchestrated these proceedings. While necromancy was an outlying practice from Israelite religion and religion as recorded in the Book of Mormon, it was nevertheless employed as a metaphor for YHWH's relationship with his covenant people as illustrated in the Hebrew Bible as well as the fulfillment of his covenant to bring forth the Book of Mormon.

Conclusion

The Hebrew Bible contains numerous references to the ancient art of divination through communing with the dead, and the Book of Mormon elaborates upon this concept. Though there are many harsh proscriptions against the practice in the Hebrew Bible, many passages reference necromancy and its connected imagery literarily. The authors specifically employed the imagery in order to further promote the idea that YHWH could control the revelatory practices of not only Israel, but the entire world, according to the faithfulness of the people. This argument is also applied by Book of Mormon prophets to the book's discovery and translation. Despite the different focus of the Book of Mormon references, the idea that YHWH is the omniscient source for information about the future is still clearly present in each passage. Additionally, the imagery necromancy conjures in these passages is both rooted in the actual practice and transmits these concepts through metaphor to juxtapose YHWH against popular religion and its practices.