

Fourth, the character may be regarded as a Divine Warrior because of certain narrative elements which unveil similarities with the famous scenario of the combat myth.¹⁶

Most likely deriving from his Divine Warrior status, the “One like the son of man” takes on important celestial functions. In particular, he receives dominion, glory, and kingship; yet, this Divine Warrior is also a savior expected to rescue his people.¹⁷ These functions, along with the ontological status of a second glorious divinity, will represent constant features of any future Son of Man materials. We might add here, nonetheless, that the “One like the son of man” is not yet considered an eschatological judge.¹⁸

The distinction between “One like the son of man” and “Son of Man” is also of concern to us at this point. Here, I agree with Sabino Chialà, who argues for a distinction between Daniel’s vague designation “One like the

figure from Ezek 1:26–28, including the same language of imprecision in Ezek 1:26: “a figure like that of a man” (דמוות כמראה אדם; ὁμοιωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου). Several scholars have seen in this figure more than an angelic being, a figure enjoying divine attributes: Ferch sees it as a celestial being higher than an angel and lower than the Ancient of Days (cf. Ferch, *The Son of Man*, 174). Andrew Angels argues that it is not an angel, and “it is hard to conceive of what other sort of celestial being he might be;” cf. Angels, *Chaos and the Son of Man: The Hebrew Chaoskampf Tradition in the Period 515 BCE to 200 CE* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 106. Angels explains on the same page that the Son of Man cannot be an angelic figure as several scholars proposed—e.g., Nathaniel Schmidt, “The Son of Man’ in the Book of Daniel,” *JBL* 19 (1900): 22–28; J.A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” *JTS* 9 (1958): 225–242; esp. 238–242; John Day, *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1985), 167–177—since the “rider of the clouds” denotes an ancient Near Eastern divine title. Cf. Ferch, *The Son of Man*, 171, for the image of the theophanic cloud, and also 174: “Indeed, the manlike being is depicted with divine attributes, while at the same time accepting a subordinate role in the presence of the Ancient of Days.” Cf. Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979); idem, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem* (London: T & T Clark, 2007).

¹⁶ See for instance Angels, *Chaos*, 99–114.

¹⁷ Nevertheless, in Dan 7:26—the verse which describes the destruction of the last king who suppressed the saints of the Most High (possibly the one like the son of man, as Dan 7:22 seems to distinguish the Ancient of Days from the Most High)—is not clear enough which of the two divine characters is the author of this destruction: “But the court will sit, and his power will be taken away and completely destroyed forever.” According to the internal logic of the combat myth, however, it is expected that the Divine Warrior figure (therefore the one like the son of man) would fight, destroy the evil enemy, and save his divine people or human subjects. See Richard J. Clifford, “Cosmogonies in the Ugaritic Texts and in the Bible,” *Or.* 53, no. 2 (1984): 183–201; idem, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994), 82–93.

¹⁸ Ferch, *The Son of Man*, 177: “The Danielic figure is never described as judge or one who is judged.”