

form were shaped by an earlier tradition (either oral or written) which each has preserved intact to varying degrees.<sup>3</sup>

In this paper, I will explore some of the shared features of these three accounts, looking at their individual portrayals of the deity, the thrones, and the attendants. After evaluating the proposals for direct dependence, I maintain there is simply not enough evidence to establish the precise relationship between these texts. Moving beyond questions of dependence, relationship, and influence, I consider instead the function of the throne theophany within their respective larger contexts: in each case the theophany is part of a dream vision. I suggest these visions are actually of different types and with different purposes that we can most easily identify by looking at the role of the seer in each dream vision. I will especially focus on Aramaic *Giants*, which is noticeably different from the other two in that it is not a righteous Jewish seer who experiences the dream vision (and sees the throne theophany), but a culpable giant.

## II. The Throne Theophanies of Daniel 7, 4Q530, and 1 Enoch 14

### 1. The Deity

Probably the most important element of any type of theophany is the appearance of the divine. In the throne theophanies of Daniel 7, *Giants*, and *Watchers* the divine names and descriptions of the deity have sometimes been used as a basis for understanding how these texts may relate to one another.

In the Enochic throne theophany (1 En. 14:18–23), the deity is identified as the ʿabiya sebhat / ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη (“Great Glory”; 14:20), a divine epithet that appears only three times in Second Temple Jewish literature: here in *Watchers*, once in the *Epistle of Enoch* (102:3), and in the *Testament of Levi* (3:4). In the larger context, however, other names are also given for the deity, notably qedduš wa-ʿabiy (“Great and Holy One”; 14:1) and ʿabiy (“Great One”; 14:2).<sup>4</sup> The relevant fragments of Aramaic *Giants* employ these same two titles in its own description of the deity – קדישא רבא (“Great Holy One”) (4Q530 2 ii 17) and

<sup>3</sup> See Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 120–23; and more recently his “Early Enochic and Daniel Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in idem, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts* (WUNT I.335; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 103–19 (112–19); Jonathan R. Trotter, “The Tradition of the Throne Vision in the Second Temple Period: Daniel 7:9–10, 1 Enoch 14:18–23, and the Book of Giants (4Q530),” *RevQ* 25/99 (2012): 451–66; John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 300.

<sup>4</sup> The generic title “Lord” is also used (1 En. 14:24).

רַבָּא (“Great One”; 4Q530 2 ii 2, 19 [rec.]).<sup>5</sup> These two titles are not restricted to *Giants* and *Watchers*, however, but also appear elsewhere in the Enochic corpus and in two other Qumran texts, namely *Genesis Apocryphon* and 4QWords of Michael.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the broader distribution of these titles does not demand a relationship of dependence between these two texts, though it may be taken as further evidence for the closeness of these two textual traditions.<sup>7</sup>

In the Danielic throne theophany (7:9–10) only a single title appears, עֲתִיק, “Ancient of Days” (v. 9), though elsewhere in the chapter the deity is referred to as either “Ancient of Days” (vv. 13, 22) or עֲלִיא, “Most High” (v. 25).<sup>8</sup> While “Most High” occurs commonly throughout Daniel as well as elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and numerous texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the title “Ancient of Days” is known in all of Second Temple Jewish literature only from this chapter of Daniel. Nevertheless, some commentators have claimed the deific titles of Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch* 14 are related to one another. In his study of the relation of these throne visions, Helge Kvanvig reconstructs the Great Glory of *1 En.* 14:20 as רְבוּתָא רְבָתָא in Aramaic, which he translates as “the Great (old) Majesty.”<sup>9</sup> Citing a segment of 11QtgJob where God’s greatness is paralleled with his multitude of days, Kvanvig suggests that the Danielic Ancient of Days could then be understood as a derivative of רְבוּתָא רְבָתָא, “considering that the time aspect of רַב is stressed.”<sup>10</sup> Provided that Kvanvig’s reconstruction is correct (though this is far from certain), the example from 11QtgJob in no way indicates the prevalence of this understanding of רַב, and it is still more difficult to imagine the suggested correspondence (and dependence!) between “the Great (old) Majesty” of *1 Enoch* 14 and “the Ancient of Days” in Daniel 7.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> A third divine title שלטן שמיא (“ruler of the heavens”) also appears in these fragments of *Giants* (4Q530 2 ii 16).

<sup>6</sup> For “Great Holy One,” see *1 En.* 1:3; 10:1; 14:1; 25:3; 84:1; 92:2; 97:6; 98:6; 1QapGen 2:14; 6:13, 15; 7:7; 12:17. For “Great One,” see *1 En.* 14: 81:3(?); 103:1, 4; 104:1, 2; 1QapGen 2:4; 4Q529 i 6–12 (six times, once reconstructed).

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of the relation of *Giants* to the Enochic tradition, see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 1–3, 24–28.

<sup>8</sup> See also the related designations קדישי עליונין, “the holy ones of the Most High” (Dan 7:18, 22, 25) and עם קדישי עליונין, “the people of the holy ones of the Most High” (v. 27). For discussion of the strangeness of the form עליונין, see Collins, *Daniel*, 312–13.

<sup>9</sup> Kvanvig, “Throne Visions and Monsters,” 254–55; idem, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 561–63. Collins, however, characterizes this reconstruction as “extremely hypothetical” (*Daniel*, 301 n. 213).

<sup>10</sup> Kvanvig, “Throne Visions and Monsters,” 254–55; idem, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 562–63. 11Q10 28 3–4 reads הוּא אֱלֹהֵא רַב הוּא וְיוֹמוֹהִי סְגִיָּא [לֹא נֵן דַּע וּמְנִין שְׁנוּהִי דִּי לֹא סוּף] (“Behold, God is great and his days are a multitude [(which) we do not k]now, or the number of his years, which are without end”). Cf. Job 15:10.

<sup>11</sup> A much closer parallel for the Danielic title is probably to be found in the Ugaritic title for El as *ab šnm*, “Father of Years” of the Baal myths. There is some debate amongst scholars over how this second millennium BCE myth may have been transmitted and known to the author of Daniel 7. Without the need for establishing direct influence, in this instance it suffices to say that the Ugaritic myth attests the wider usage of divine titles related to time. See further

Besides the naming of the deity in these accounts, the visions of both *Watchers* and Daniel also include a brief description of the deity's physical appearance – an element lacking in *Giants*. In Daniel 7, the Ancient of Days' clothing is said to be white like snow, and the hair of his head is compared to pure wool (v. 9).<sup>12</sup> Though quite longer, the description of the deity in *Watchers* presents several points of comparison. It too speaks of the Great Glory's clothing – it is “like the appearance of the sun and whiter than much snow” (*1 En.* 14:20)<sup>13</sup> – and makes mention of the deity's face, which neither angel nor human is able to look upon on account of its splendor and glory (v. 21).<sup>14</sup>

In a recent article, Ryan Stokes analyzes the depictions of the deity in these two accounts. He notes that (1) their descriptions follow the same order: the deity sits, his clothing is described, then his hair or face is discussed; and (2) their description of God's clothing as white, specifically in comparison with snow, is not found in other texts of this period.<sup>15</sup> Together he takes these two elements to indicate the probable dependence of one text on the other. Stokes then identifies the depiction of the “superbly anthropomorphic gray-haired old man” in Daniel as being rooted in ancient Canaanite traditions, and argues that this portrayal of the deity is necessarily older than that of *Watchers*, which describes the “glorious God, upon whom neither humans nor angels can cast their gaze.”<sup>16</sup> He further reasons that the author of *Watchers* would have had greater reason “to alter Daniel's vision according to the biblical tradition that one cannot see God” rather than the other way around and, thus, concludes that “the Enochic tradition reflects a development of that found in Dan 7.”

While these elements do suggest some relationship between the texts, Stokes' assessment of dependence is problematic. First, regarding the order of the material, it is not unusual that a description of the deity begins at the bottom and continues upward, and, in fact, we find this same movement in Isa 6:1–2: the Lord is seated, his robe fills the temple, and above him are flying seraphim. Second, while the description of God's clothing as white like snow may not be known from other texts of this period, it is not so specific as to demand direct dependence. This is further emphasized in that the descriptions are not exact (white *like* snow vs. whiter *than* snow). Additionally, white clothing is commonly understood as a sign of purity, so it is not surprising that God should be

---

Collins, *Daniel*, 286–94. Consult also other related titles in Gen 23:33; Deut 33:27; Isa 40:28; 1QapGen 21:2.

<sup>12</sup> Or “lamb's wool” (Collins, *Daniel*, 275). Snow and wool occur elsewhere in parallel (e.g., Ps 147:16; Isa 1:18).

<sup>13</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 258 n. 20a. A variant reading in one of the Greek texts implies the deity's clothing is even brighter than the sun.

<sup>14</sup> See also Isa 6:4; cf. Exod 33:20.

<sup>15</sup> Stokes, “The Throne Visions,” 347.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 347–48.

identified as wearing white.<sup>17</sup> Finally, we must point out the inherent difficulties in relating texts based on assumed theological conceptions. These conceptions cannot be arranged according to some strict linear model, and there is no one-to-one correspondence between ideas and chronological dates. Rather different ideas could (co)exist at a single moment in time. By Stokes' own admission the accounts of both *Watchers* and Daniel 7 were clearly influenced by the tradition of the prophet Ezekiel's encounter with the deity in Ezekiel 1.<sup>18</sup> The fact that the author of Daniel 7 consciously chose to portray the deity in a manner different from that of Ezekiel 1 (and which comes quite close to *1 Enoch* 14) signifies that the Danielic idea of the deity was accepted even at a late period, and does not automatically make it older even if the tradition may be observed in generally more ancient writings (see further below).<sup>19</sup>

## 2. The Throne(s)

After the deity, the second most important element of a throne theophany is the appearance of the divine throne(s). While the throne vision scenes seem quite similar in *Watchers*, *Giants*, and Daniel 7, we also find that there are discrepancies with regard to both the location and number of thrones the visionary sees.

Enoch's vision in the *Book of Watchers* opens with the seer's ascension to heaven and his journey through the heavenly temple (*1 En.* 14:8–17). Within the innermost room, he sees “a lofty throne” upon which the deity is already seated. Enoch's vision, therefore, explicitly takes place in heaven and contains a single throne. This contrasts sharply with what we find in *Giants*, where the giant Ohyah begins recounting his dream vision, “the ruler of the heavens descended to the earth, and thrones were erected, and the Great Holy One sat d[own]” (4Q530 2 ii 16b–17b).<sup>20</sup> This vision clearly takes place on earth where an unspecified number of thrones are assembled before the deity takes his seat.<sup>21</sup>

The case in Daniel 7 is less clear. Although most commentators have understood this scene as occurring in heaven, I propose that in comparing this scene of Daniel with our other throne theophanies an earthly location becomes

<sup>17</sup> In the Hebrew Bible, priests are typically understood as wearing white garments; e.g., Exodus 28; Leviticus 16. Cf. Eccl 9:8.

<sup>18</sup> Stokes, “The Throne Visions,” 342.

<sup>19</sup> There he is compared to a man and his appearance from the waist up is likened to metal and from the waist down is compared to fire (Ezek 1:26–28). The description of the deity in *Watchers* also speaks of the brightness of the deity. Cf. also Ps 104:1–4.

<sup>20</sup> Trans. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 120.

<sup>21</sup> The thrones are יחִיטוּ (“erected”) (4Q530 2 ii 17a) and the deity לֵאֲרַעָא נַחַת (“descended to the earth”; l. 16).