

### 3. The motifs of the judgement scene, the “Ancient of days”, and the “son of man” (verses 9–14)

#### 3.1. Babylonian influence

GUNKEL’s references to the second part of the vision of Dan 7 are remarkably scant. According to GUNKEL (1895: 331) the expression “son of man” is the title of the “Gottes-Überwinder”<sup>195</sup> of the underlying myth of Dan 7 which, accordingly, would be Marduk.<sup>196</sup> Furthermore, GUNKEL explained the stream of fire as a reflection of the underlying variation of the *Enuma Elish*.<sup>197</sup>

It was N. SCHMIDT (1900: 27) – known for his angelic interpretation of the “son of man” – who for the first time mentioned Marduk by name as the prototype for Michael which he equated with the Danielic “son of man”.

ZIMMERN a few years later followed GUNKEL and mentioned expressly the enthronement of the “son of man” as reference to Marduk (SCHRADER/ZIMMERN/WINCKLER 1903: 390f, 523), and compared the blasphemous words spoken by the fourth beast with those of Tiamat against Marduk (ibid. 513; also J. JEREMIAS 1916: 630 with n. 3).<sup>198</sup> While GRESSMANN (1929: 368) followed ZIMMERN and defined the enthronement of the universal ruler as the common theme of Dan 7 and the *Enuma Elish*, he also added new parallels: (a) the Babylonian “tablets of destiny” relate to the Danielic books; (b) the Danielic judgement shows a relationship to the *Enuma Elish* because “der Gedanke des Gerichts der Götter ... zweifellos [auch] babylonisch [ist]” (ibid.); (c) only the rebellious Kingu was killed by Marduk, while the other rebels were set free, a fact which could explain why the judgement of the beasts of Dan 7 is not uniform. Despite all these allusions to the *Enuma Elish*, the missing parallels for the “Ancient of days”, the “son of man” and

---

<sup>195</sup> Misunderstood by CASEY (1979: 35) when he stated that according to GUNKEL “in the myth ‘Son of man’ was the title for the conqueror of God” (capitalisation of “god”); cf. Gunkel’s wording in n. 197.

<sup>196</sup> Although GUNKEL did not identify the “son of man” with a specific figure of the *Enuma Elish* epic, it seems obvious that the young Babylonian god Marduk is referred to who overcame Tiamat and was awarded with eternal dominion (1895: 371).

<sup>197</sup> “Auch der im Zusammenhange des Daniel so rätselhafte ‘Menschensohn, der auf den Wolken des Himmels kommt, wird zur Tradition gehören; denn es ist schwer zu sagen, wie der Verfasser von sich aus auf dies Bild gerade für Israel hätte verfallen können; zumal Israel ja in dem Gesichte schon unter dem Namen ‘die Heiligen’ erwähnt war. Im Mythos würde ‘Menschensohn’ der Titel des Gottes-Überwinders sein. Auch die an Mythologisches anklingende Beschreibung des Thrones Gottes, besonders des ‘Feuerstromes’, der von ihm ausgeht, wird ein Stück der Tradition sein” (ibid. 331).

<sup>198</sup> WINCKLER (1905: 297–299) proposed the equation of the “son of man” with Marduk on the basis of genealogy. Ea is called “man” (*amēlu*) and his son Marduk is therefore “the son of the man”, i.e., of Ea. There is however no specific reference to Dan 7 in WINCKLER’S discussion.



the eschatological outlook in Babylonian mythology were reasons that led GRESSMANN to doubt that the Babylonian explanation is indeed sound.

KRAELING (1933: 228–230) basically followed GRESSMANN by pointing to the Babylonian New Year's festival as the background for the throne scene of Dan 7<sup>199</sup> at which the *Enuma Elish* was recited, the fate of life was determined, and Marduk's sovereignty was transferred to the king of Babylon in an enthronement rite.

While HEATON gave biblical tradition in the second part of the vision ample room, the Danielic books provided the springboard for reference to the Babylonian "tablets of fate" and New Year's festival (1956: 179f) which he considered as possible background for the enthronement of the "son of man" (ibid. 183) whom he correlated implicitly with Marduk (ibid. 180, 185).

Although after HEATON the *Enuma Elish* was abandoned in favour of the Ugaritic Baal cycle, BEASLEY–MURRAY (1983: 46) recently still maintained that "the Akkadian Creation Epic in some respects has closer affinities to Daniel's vision" by referring to the convening of the assembly of the gods.

Soon after GUNKEL another Babylonian background for the "son of man" was proposed by F. HOMMEL. He pointed to the Babylonian Adapa,<sup>200</sup> which is also designated as the "seed of mankind".<sup>201</sup> In the Adapa myth he is:

represented ... on the one side ... as mortal ... yet on the other side it equalized him with the god Marduk ... and in this way guaranteed his everlasting existence in heaven, and his future appearance among men; it is surely not too rash to assume that another portion of the Adapa legends gave direct expression to the expectations of such a reappearance (1899: 344).

Although HOMMEL did not specifically discuss Dan 7, pointing rather to the Messianic aspect of the god-man Adapa, he implied the Danielic "son of man" as predecessor of the New Testament "son of man".

JEREMIAS stated that the designation of Adapa as "seed of mankind" corresponded to the biblical expression for the "anderen Adam"  $\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$  (1899: 586, n. 3) and was therefore important for the linguistic development of this expression. Furthermore JEREMIAS (1916: 630 n. 6 and p. 546) considered the clouds of heaven as a faded expression of a "kosmischen Wettererscheinung" in connection with an apotheosis.

Likewise short-lived was the proposal by H.L. JANSEN who, in his discussion of the "son of man" in 1 Enoch, also touched briefly on the Danielic "son of man". JANSEN traced the "son of man" back to the Babylonian god Ea–Oannes. The following features in the Book of Daniel reflect, according to JANSEN, his Babylonian heritage: (1) Ea–Oannes emerges from the sea as do the beasts in Dan 7

<sup>199</sup> The "Ancient of days" and the slaying of the dragon were traced back by KRAELING to Iranian origin.

<sup>200</sup> The Adapa myth was already referred to by GUNKEL (1895: 148, n. 3), not in connection with Dan 7 but Gen 1 as prototype of the *Urmenschen*.

<sup>201</sup> On the attempt to harmonise the expressions "seed of mankind" and "son of man" cf. W. KRISTENSEN, "De term 'Zoon des Menschen', toegelicht uit de anthropologie der ouden," *ThT* 45 (1911) 1–38; esp. p. 4 (cited by KEARNS 1982: 16).



(1939: 105f),<sup>202</sup> (2) the contrast between beasts and the man-likeness of the “son of man” results from the disintegration of the *Mischgestalt* of Ea-Oannes into these two Danielic entities (ibid. 106); (3) the term “son of man” can be explained on the basis of the dual manifestation of Ea-Oannes as god and as human being. Furthermore JANSEN mentioned Tammuz who was also addressed as “man” or “mankind”. Since traits of Tammuz were transferred to most gods, the epithet “man(kind)” could also have been passed on to Ea-Oannes (ibid. 109); (4) Ea-Oannes is connected with the primordial time, therefore the principle of *Urzeit-Endzeit* can be adduced to explain the eschatological nature of the Danielic “son of man” (ibid. 110f).

Last to mention is **W.F. ALBRIGHT** (1940: 291f) who connected the expression “son of man” with the Assyrian *Atrahasis*, whose epithet is according to the Assyrian recension from the 7th century B.C.E. “man” (*amêlu*). ALBRIGHT considered the possibility that *Adapa*, also known as “the very wise” (i.e., *Atrahasis*; cf. HOMMEL 1899: 343) and “seed of mankind” (*zêr amêlûtu*), was the Sumerian name of the *Atrahasis* figure. As HOMMEL had done, ALBRIGHT focused on the Messianic<sup>203</sup> “son of man”, touching only briefly on Dan 7 as genealogical reference.<sup>204</sup>

<sup>202</sup> So already REITZENSTEIN 1904: 109, n. 4.

<sup>203</sup> “There are a number of points ... which make it very probable that Atrahasis, the recurrent Mesopotamian savior of mankind from catastrophe ... was actually fused in Jewish-Aramaic tradition with the figure of the Messiah ...” (Albright 1940: 291f).

<sup>204</sup> Critical remarks against a Babylonian influence include the following (cf. also n. 24 on p. 7):

- (1) Probably the harshest general criticism was voiced by KRAELING (1927: 14) when he stated: “A number of efforts have been made to solve the Son of Man problem in this way, and all have failed miserably. In the early years of this century ... the individuality of Jewish and Israelitic thought was being sacrificed on the altar of Babylonian civilization ... These efforts could be taken seriously only at a time when the novelty of Oriental discovery destroyed the sense of distance and proportion”;
- (2) *Enuma Elish*: The interpretation of the “son of man” against the background of the *Enuma Elish*, i.e., the identification with Marduk was considered with “great reservation” (MUILENBURG 1960: 207) and according to JUNKER (1932: 58) was not well received. Among the criticised issues of the “son of man” were: (a) he is not a divine being (DELCOR 1968: 306); (b) he is not slaying the fourth beast and is not involved in combat (KOCH 1980: 231) nor has he an inactive role (DELCOR 1968: 306f); (c) he does not become king over the gods (KOCH 1980: 231); (d) the designation “son of man” is not explained (DELCOR 1968: 307);
- (3) *Adapa*: While GOLDINGAY (1988: 151) was content with a general dismissal of this myth as parallel to the “son of man”, more specified remarks point out that: (a) Adapa has no eschatological, protological (CAQUOT 1967: 52; COLPE 1969: 412), nor judicial or salvific function (ibid.); (b) the designation “seed of mankind” linguistically parallels *בֵּר נִשָּׂא* but does not semantically contribute anything (ibid.);
- (4) *Ea-Oannes*: After MUILENBURG’S (1960: 207) doubt about the identification of the “son of man” with Ea-Oannes, COLPE expounded that although there is concurrence of some motifs the context of Ea-Oannes is a primordial cultural accomplishment which is no counterpart for an eschatological judgement (ibid.; CARAGOUNIS 1986: 39, n. 12). Recently KVANVIG (1988: 525; cf. ibid. 28ff, 191ff) simply remarked that “the concept of Ea-Oannes as described by Jansen did not exist”;



### 3.2. Canaanite influence

The Canaanite background of the second part of the vision of Dan 7 was launched with a reference by MONTGOMERY (1933: 111)<sup>205</sup> in which he cited the Danielic “Ancient of days” as parallel to the Ugaritic phrase *ʿab šnm*,<sup>206</sup> although usually EISSFELDT’S (1934: 578 with n. 3) statement in his *Introduction to the Old Testament* is mentioned in this regard, briefly remarking that the “Ancient of days” has now a parallel in the “king, father of years” of the Ras Shamra–texts.<sup>207</sup>

BENTZEN (1937: 30, 33 = *ibid.* 1952: 48, 61), referring to BAUER (1933: 15), MONTGOMERY (1935: 111), and JACK (1935: 13), likewise mentioned the “Ancient of days” as parallel to the *ʿab šnm* of the Ras Shamra–texts, but added in his commentary on Daniel a second analogy, namely, the assembly of gods as found at Ugarit. In his book *Messias. Moses redivivus. Menschensohn* BENTZEN (1948: 74 = *ibid.* 1955: 75 = *ibid.* 1970: 75) indirectly paralleled the “son of man” with the Canaanite god Baal as did BAUMGARTNER in 1939. However, most of BENTZEN’S interpretation of Dan 7 focused on the alleged Israelite enthronement festival as the background of this vision (cf. p. 95). Following BENTZEN’S commentary on the Book of Daniel of 1937, BAUMGARTNER (1939: 221) established a further correspondence between the Canaanite god Baal and the “son of man” in Dan 7:14 by pointing out that both are said to be given eternal dominion.<sup>208</sup> JEFFERY (1956: 457f) also briefly mentioned that “El is called ‘king, father of years’” and repeated BENTZEN’S remark on the Ugaritic assembly of gods however without taking a firm stance on a Canaanite background of Dan 7.<sup>209</sup>

The early discussion on the Canaanite background of the “son of man” imagery was pushed forward significantly by EMERTON. Following BENTZEN in principle, EMERTON also considered the alleged Israelite enthronement festival as the most immediate background of Dan 7 (1958: 230–234, 240; cf. below on p. 96). As se-

---

(5) *Atrahasis*: A link to the “son of man” has not been demonstrated (MUILENBURG 1960: 207) because *Atrahasis* has no eschatological function and the Danielic “son of man” is not a saviour (CAQUOT 1967: 52).

<sup>205</sup> Although this seems to be the first published remark in this regard, the wording of MONTGOMERY’S statement (“the often cited ‘Ancient of Days’ of Dan.”) suggests that in academic circles this parallel was already very well known. Cf. also KITTEL (1924: 76f) who already equated the “Ancient of days” with the Canaanite god El.

<sup>206</sup> On the various interpretations of this phrase see n. 216 on p. 60.

<sup>207</sup> This remark was expanded in the second edition of EISSFELDT’S *Introduction to the Old Testament* by paralleling the “Ancient of days” with the notion that El also was an aged god (1956a: 649, n. 1).

<sup>208</sup> Although BAUMGARTNER (1939: 221) attributed this second parallel to BENTZEN (1937: 33f) the latter does not mention it.

<sup>209</sup> “Some have suggested that this picture [of the judgement scene] has drawn largely on Mesopotamian material, while others have thought of an Iranian source, and more recently Ugaritic material has raised the question of a Canaanite origin. It is not impossible that elements from all three sources have gone into the formation of various details of the picture, but for the conception of a grand assize at which the nations are to be judged by God the writer seems to have drawn in the main from the O.T. material” (JEFFERY 1956: 457).



veral scholars before him had done, EMERTON “noticed that the representation of God as the Ancient of days in Daniel. vii recalls the description of El as *’ab šnm*” (1958: 229; 234). Newly-added parallels included the remark that El is “as an aged deity with grey hair” (ibid. 229) similar to the “Ancient of days” with his white hair. He compared the “son of man” coming with the clouds of heaven with the Ugaritic Baal who “is frequently spoken of as flying on the clouds” (ibid. 232) and the slaying of Yam by Baal with the destruction of the fourth beast by the “son of man”, although the biblical text does not explicitly state this (ibid.).<sup>210</sup> The last aspect relating to the Ugaritic background discussed by EMERTON (ibid. 239–241) involved the relationship between the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man”. EMERTON indicated that two features parallel the Danielic vision and the Ugaritic text: First, two distinct divine figures are mentioned, and second, one of them is subordinate to the other. According to Ugaritic texts, El is superior to Baal. EMERTON proposed a similar hierarchical relationship in the early Israelite history of El (or El Elyon), and Yahweh,<sup>211</sup> whom he equated with the Canaanite god Baal. Summarising his article, EMERTON stated: “There are good grounds for believing that the enthronement of the Son of man by an aged deity goes back to Canaanite myth and ritual, and that behind the figure of the Son of man lies Yahweh, and ultimately Baal” (ibid. 242).

Independently of EMERTON, ROST in 1958 made a very brief remark in regard to the “Ancient of days”, equating him with the Ugaritic El (1958: 42) who abdicated in favour of a younger god, or at least designated his successor.<sup>212</sup>

DELCOR (1968: 302 = ibid. 1971: 150), although not absolutely convinced that the title “Ancient of days” derives from the Ugaritic *’ab šnm*, held that the concept of the elderly God in Dan 7 corresponds to the Ugaritic descriptions of El. Furthermore, he added a new feature by pointing to the judicial function of the “Ancient of days” which is paralleled in the Ugaritic texts since the god Yam is also qualified as judge (*ṭpṭ nhr* “Judge River”<sup>213</sup>) indicating his power as victor. In Dan 7 this view had been demythologised in so far as that it was now applied to the “Ancient of days” who judged the four empires which received their power from the sea.

A decade after EMERTON the background of the “son of man” again received close attention with COLPE’S (1969: 403–481) article “ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου” in the

<sup>210</sup> Emerton upheld this equation because kingship is conferred both on Baal as well as the “son of man” after the destruction of Yam, respectively the fourth beast (EMERTON 1958: 232).

<sup>211</sup> EMERTON (ibid. 241) mentioned as single biblical text in favour of this view Deu 32:8, 9: “When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. <sup>9</sup>For the LORD’S portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance” (KJV). EMERTON however read with the LXX and a Hebrew fragment from Qumran (so also RSV) the last word of v. 8 as “El” instead of “Israel”, thus interpreting this passage so that Elyon allotted each god a nation, and in the case of Yahweh it would have been God’s people.

<sup>212</sup> Similar to EMERTON (cf. n. 210) ROST reasoned whether the cause for the conferral of kingship could not have been a reflection of the victory over the chaos dragon that is associated with the enthronement of Marduk or the requests by Anat as in the Ugaritic myth (1958: 43).

<sup>213</sup> Cf. KAPELRUD 1952: 102f.



*Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. After reviewing several proposals<sup>214</sup> COLPE concluded that only the Canaanite hypothesis can be labelled as “tragfähig” i.e., workable, displaying a rather critical and ambivalent assessment.

Thus, the heavily-cited Ugaritic term *ʿab šnm* as parallel to the “Ancient of days” received a critical assessment by COLPE which was also supported by KEARNS (1982: 173f, n. 402) and COLLINS (1993a: 127 = *ibid.* 1993b: 290; cf. also below p. 70 with n. 256, no. 1). COLPE pointed out that *šnm* cannot be understood only as the genitive plural of *šnt* (“year”)<sup>215</sup> but also as a proper name of a district or of a son of El or otherwise (1969: 420 with n. 142).<sup>216</sup> COLPE remarked that *ʿab šnm* has in any case no direct parallel in regard to the wording (*ibid.* 419f). Likewise reserved is his evaluation of the parallel between El with a grey beard (*šbt dqn*), and the “Ancient of days” with hair like wool (*ibid.* 420; cf. also COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 21).

Much more weight was given by COLPE to two other features of Baal, namely, his epithet, “Rider of the Clouds” (*rkb ʿrpt*) and his alleged<sup>217</sup> attempt to replace his rival El (1969: 420, 422).

A central problem of the Canaanite background of Dan 7 according to COLPE (*ibid.* 420) is the fact that no unbroken tradition can be traced back from the “Ancient of days” to the Canaanite god El. Even such a crucial link between Jewish apocalyptic and Canaanite mythology as the Israelite God Yahweh, who absorbed aspects of the Canaanite god El, does not allow clear-cut equations such as El = “Ancient of days” and Baal = “son of man”. This is the case because Yahweh incorporated not only characteristics of El (e.g., supreme god) but also features of Baal (e.g., “Rider of the Clouds”), therefore prohibiting exclusive designation of El as predecessor for the “Ancient of days” and Baal for the “son of man” (*ibid.* 420f). Because predicates of two Canaanite gods were merged in Yahweh, COLPE

<sup>214</sup> I.e., Old Testament, Iranian, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Gnostic influences as well as rabbinical Adam speculations (COLPE 1969: 408–418).

<sup>215</sup> On the two plural forms *šnm* and *šnt* see CROSS 1973: 16, n. 24.

<sup>216</sup> A summary of the various explanations for the phrase *ʿab šnm* was given by KEARNS (1982: 173, n. 402): “Father of Years” (VIROLLEAUD 1931: 198; BAUER 1933: 82); “Father of Sunem” (GORDON 1940: 50); “Father of the Exalted Ones” (POPE 1955: 33; rejection of “Father of Mortals” as suggested by EISSFELDT); *šnm* = name of a Kassitic god (EISSFELDT 1945–49: 29–42); “Father of Years” (ROST 1958: 42); “Father of Years” (DAHOD 1965: 49); “Father of the (place) *Šunem*” (DELCOR 1968: 301); “Father of the Luminaires” (OLDENBURG 1969: 17); El, the father of the Kassitic god *Šnm* (JIRKU 1970: 278f); “Father of Years” (CROSS 1973: 16); El, the father of the Kassitic god *Šnm* (GORDON 1976: 261f); *šnm* = name of the abode of El (AISTLEITNER 1955: 5); *qrš mlk ab šnm* = “district of the king a[nd] the father: the *šnm*” (*ibid.* 1967: Stw. 2651). The following should be added to this list: “Father of the Exalted Ones” (SCHMIDT 1966: 23, n. 4; KEARNS 1982: 112), and “Father of Years” (DAY 1985: 161).

<sup>217</sup> Cf. however the criticism by DAY (1985: 163 with ns. 61f that include a short bibliography of scholars that maintain that Baal and El were in opposition to each other and a refutation of that position; cf. also *ibid.* 164), CARAGOUNIS (1986: 41, n. 17), and COLLINS (1993b: 291, n. 118) on the misinterpretation of the Ugaritic and Danielic texts by COLPE, which do not speak of the cessation of dominion and of rivalry (cf. also COLLINS 1993b: 287, n. 80; esp. KEARNS 1982: 87f, n. 9, and pp. 112f; FERCH 1980: 83).



(ibid. 421) was forced to assume that the tradition behind Dan 7 involved a hypothetical phase of a new differentiation into the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” that would account for two distinct beings in the Danielic account.<sup>218</sup>

After a very critical discussion COLPE concluded with caution:

Trotz solcher Einwände scheint die kanaanäische Hypothese aber dem wirklichen Sachverhalt bis auf weiteres am nächsten zu kommen. Die mythographische Ähnlichkeit zwischen dem Verhältnis des Alten der Tage zum Menschensohn einerseits u[nd] dem Verhältnis Els zu Baal andererseits, das sich dem weiteren Befund des Weiterlebens älteren Gutes in isr[aelitisch]–jüd[ischer] Überlieferung ... einfügt, enthält zugleich einen Zshg [i.e., Zusammenhang] von Motiven, welcher den Motivparallelen, auf die sich die anderen Hypothesen stützen, fehlt. Das erlaubt noch am ehesten eine religionsgeschichtliche Filiation (ibid. 420).<sup>219</sup>

Neither HAMMER (1976: 77) nor the French scholar LACOCQUE added significantly new aspects to the Canaanite background hypothesis.<sup>220</sup> Unique, however, was LACOCQUE’S argument with regard to the title “Ancient of days” which he equated with the perduration of God when he stated that “at Ugarit as here [in Dan 7], this perduration of God is linked to his enthronement as king and judge” (1976: 108 with n. 10 = ibid. 1979: 143; n. 100).

<sup>218</sup> Even more difficult in its final analysis is another option mentioned by COLPE (1969: 421). Instead of considering Yahweh with its adapted predicates of El and Baal as background of the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man”, COLPE also mentioned the possibility that “the transfer of the predicates”, although not provable, could have taken place already in the Canaanite realm rather than later in Israelite thought. Thus the Yahwistic tradition would not be behind Dan 7 but we would have a revived and reinterpreted Canaanite tradition as immediate background. If COLPE has not been misunderstood then one would have not only an unprovable transfer of predicates of El and Baal in Canaanite thought but also a further differentiation into the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” by the author of Dan 7. However, if one thinks of Canaanite influence on Dan 7 it would be much more logical to consider a direct link between El and the “Ancient of days” and between Baal and the “son of man”, without any intermediary composite concept such as “El–Yahweh–Baal”. This conclusion which excludes Yahweh in the traditio–historical development, was made by COLLINS (1977: 99f; cf. below on p. 68).

<sup>219</sup> Cf. the criticism of COLPE’S ambivalent conclusion: “Paradoxically enough he shows in some detail the untenableness of his hypothesis, but at the end having no other hypothesis to fall back to, he espouses it half–heartedly as the one coming ‘closest to the actual facts’” (CARAGOUNIS 1986: 41, n. 17); “Trotz gewisser Schwierigkeiten möchte Colpe die aufgezeigte Hypothese für tragfähig halten. Aber seine eigenen Einschränkungen lassen ziemlich deutlich werden, dass eine Ableitung auf den Vorstellungen über El und Baal problematisch ist” (MÜLLER 1972: 33).

<sup>220</sup> LACOCQUE’S specific references were to: (1) the grey hair of the “Ancient of days” and El (1976: 108f = ibid. 1979: 143; ibid. 129); (2) the “son of man” which recalls Baal as vanquisher of the dragon and of Yam and as the enthroned king (ibid.); (3) the epithet, “Ancient of days” originating from the Ugaritic “father of years” (ibid. 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142); (4) the cloud imagery recalling Baal as the “Rider of the Clouds” (ibid. 1979: 146, n. 121). HAMMER (1976: 77) only mentioned El as aged deity with grey hair and Baal killing the dragon Itu thereby establishing his kingship.



The most detailed traditio–historical and religious–historical study on the Canaanite background of Dan 7 was put forward by KEARNS. The starting point of KEARNS’ (1982: 27) tradition–history on the second part of the vision of Dan 7 is a brief footnote by COLPE (1969: 418, n. 118) remarking that possibly behind the *nomen proprium* “Baal” the proper name “Hadad” stood. Taking up this notion, KEARNS extended the proposed Canaanite tradition–history of Daniel further back by stressing that the proper name Baal should only be regarded as the epithet of the god Hadad (1982: 58–71)<sup>221</sup> who is already mentioned as subordinate god in the pantheon of Ebla from the 24th and 23rd century and whose earliest ethnic association can be traced back to the Amorites in Syria in the 19th century (ibid. 32f). KEARNS argued that the Ugaritic Baal myth could not be the ultimate origin of Dan 7<sup>222</sup> but has to be considered only as a 14th century epic version of a Hadad–related cultic–mythic tradition complex dating back to the beginning of the 19th century,<sup>223</sup> whereby the main actor Hadad is called by his epithet Baal (ibid. 65).<sup>224</sup> In

<sup>221</sup> According to the tradition complex of Hadad, El was the king of the assembly of gods, while Hadad, subordinate to El, was the ruler over the assembly of gods. Thus, it is Hadad’s position that accounts for the epithet “Lord (*bʿl*)” (of the gods). By the 14th century Hadad’s epithet was so dominant, that it practically superseded the name Hadad (ibid. 60–62).

<sup>222</sup> Cf. ibid. 85, n. 1: “Als C. Colpe ... die kanaanäische Hypothese aufstellte ... griff er, um das ursprüngliche Traditionsgefüge zu erfassen, auf das aus Ugarit stammende Baalepos zurück. Sein Resultat war mager ... Trotz der durch dieses Resultat aufgezwungenen Vorbehalte meinte Colpe, dass die kanaanäische Hypothese ‘dem wirklichen Sachverhalt bis auf weiteres am nächsten kommt. Dieses vorläufige Ergebnis muss vertieft werden. Es reicht aber nicht aus, lediglich Traditionselemente aus dem ugaritischen Baalepos unkritisch heranzuziehen, sondern man muss von einer sachgemässen Bestimmung des Inhalts des Traditionsgefüges um Hadad ausgehen.”

<sup>223</sup> Tracing back the Hadad–Yam battle to the beginning of the second millennium has repercussions on the similar Marduk–Tiamat tradition of the *Enuma Elish* epic. LAMBERT (1965: 295f) explained the theme of a conflict between a deity and the sea as of Amorite origin that was introduced as the Amorites settled in Babylonia (on the influence of the Amorites see already C.T. CLAY in 1919 as cited by SHEA 1977: 40). Furthermore, “the *Epic of Creation* is not a norm of Babylonian or Sumerian cosmology. It is a sectarian and aberrant combination of mythological threads woven into an unparalleled compositum. In my opinion it is not earlier than 1100 B.C.” (LAMBERT 1965: 291). LAMBERT was followed by JACOBSEN (1968: 107) in regard to the western origin of the deity–sea monster battle motif, however, he differed from LAMBERT in dating the *Enuma Elish* to 1400 B.C.E. (ibid. 1976: 189f; cf. TSUMURA 1989: 48, n. 18). TSUMURA (ibid. 49) and KEARNS (1982: 88 with n. 10; cf. also pp. 33f) followed LAMBERT and JACOBSEN’s position of a western origin of the general motif of the conflict of a storm–god with the sea. In the particular case of the conflict motif in the *Enuma Elish* in 1988 LAMBERT revised his earlier position in so far as that he now assumes northern Mesopotamian traditions as direct predecessors (TSUMURA 1989: 48 with n. 17) but maintained the date of about 1100 B.C.E., which is also favored by HUTTER (1996: 45).

<sup>224</sup> KEARNS characterised this ancient cultic–mythic tradition complex of Hadad as having a fixed relationship between Hadad, El, Yam, and Anat, which included certain requisites as well as certain mythic events (1982: 85). The mythic events are: (1) Yam revolts against the assembly of gods led by El; (2) Hadad fights Yam and destroys him; (3)



regard to the evidence for such an ancient tradition complex of Hadad, KEARNS stated:

Die Grundstruktur dieser kultisch–mythischen Hadadtradition ist vornehmlich durch eine sekundäre Entwicklung erkennbar. Spätestens am Anfang des 2. Jahrtausends entstand eine dichterische Fassung der Hadadtradition. Diese wurde unter Zugrundlegung der kultisch–mythischen Hadadtradition ausgebildet, ist aber keine getreue Wiedergabe derselben, sondern ist durch Gesetzmässigkeiten der dichterischen Erzählkunst gekennzeichnet. Eine unkontaminierte Version der dichterischen Hadadtradition ist nicht erhalten. Dagegen sind aber vier verschiedene Verwertungen vorhanden, aus denen man ihren Hauptinhalt erschliessen kann (ibid. 85f).

These four utilisations of the poetic Hadad tradition are, according to KEARNS (ibid. 86–90): (1) The first part of the 14th century Ugaritic Baal epic, i.e., the battle between Hadad and Yam (CTA 1 and 2);<sup>225</sup> (2) the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* (between 1500–1100)<sup>226</sup> replacing Hadad with Marduk;<sup>227</sup> (3) the Hurrian myth of Ullikummi from the 16th/15th century whereby Hadad is replaced by Teshub, the Hurrian storm–god;<sup>228</sup> (4) the Egyptian *Story of Astarte* from the 14th century, replacing Hadad with Seth.<sup>229</sup>

However, the only reliable<sup>230</sup> witnesses for the reconstruction of the details of the ancient cultic–mythic tradition complex of Hadad are, according to KEARNS: (1) allusions and citations of the Hadad tradition in the Ugaritic Baal epic; (2) allusions in some Amarna letters; (3) the *Phoenician History* by Philo of Byblos; (4) Old Testament passages relating to Yahweh; (5) Canaanite elements in the tradition of Seth of Avaris; and (6) the Greek myth of Typhon and Zeus (ibid. 92–96).

In regard to the relationship of the Hadad tradition to Dan 7 KEARNS concluded:

Die Apokalyptik, sofern sie die Hadadtradition betrifft, ist durch eine Eschatologisierung des um Hadad geformten kultisch–mythischen Traditionsgefüges gekennzeichnet. Der ontologische Horizont dieser Eschatologisierung war nicht die vorfindliche, geschichtliche Welt, sondern eine transzendente Sphäre, die als eschatologische Grösse noch aussteht. Das kultisch–mythische Traditionsgefüge wurde in einen transzendental–eschatologischen Äon ver-

---

Hadad is awarded with the rule over the assembly of gods (ibid. 91). On the unclear role of Anat see ibid., n. 25.

<sup>225</sup> Text: GINSBERG 1969: 129–131 (CTA 1 and 2 = VI AB and III AB B, III AB C, III AB A).

<sup>226</sup> TSUMURA 1989: 48, n. 18.

<sup>227</sup> Text: SPEISER 1969a: 60–72 and GRAYSON 1969a: 501–503.

<sup>228</sup> Known from its Hittite translation, “The Song of Ullikummi”, from the 14th century. Text: GOETZE 1969: 121–125. Cf. also the reference to “The Song of Ullikummi” by BEASLEY–MURRAY 1983: 46 and below n. 238 on p. 66.

<sup>229</sup> Text: WILSON 1969a: 17f. A more distant version of the Hadad tradition is according to KEARNS (1982: 90 with n. 23) the Greek Perseus–Andromeda saga.

<sup>230</sup> Inconclusive according to KEARNS (ibid. 92 with ns. 27f) are iconographic evidence and stele inscriptions.



legt und wurde damit zum apokalyptischen Traditionsgefüge. Der Anlass zur Eschatologisierung der Hadadtradition ist ungeklärt (ibid. 98f).<sup>231</sup>

Apart from the origin of the Hadad tradition and its relationship to Dan 7, KEARNS argued for parallels between the Hadad tradition and the following Danielic expressions:

(1) “coming with the clouds of heaven” (ibid. 102–107);<sup>232</sup> (2) “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed” (ibid. 107f);<sup>233</sup> (3) the “glory” or the radiant aura (“Schreckensglanz”; Aram. יקר; Akk. *melammu*) of the eternal king<sup>234</sup> (ibid. 108–111);<sup>235</sup> (4) the

<sup>231</sup> The proposed reformulation of the Hadad tradition into an eschatological, apocalyptic version was assessed by COLLINS (1993b: 292 = ibid. 1993a: 132) as “extremely hypothetical” because it is inferred from Jewish texts and is not attested in any pagan source.

<sup>232</sup> KEARNS discussed especially the following biblical texts in connection with the frequently cited Ugaritic epithet of Baal “Rider of the Clouds”: Psa 68:5; Deu 33:26 (cf. below n. 235); Isa 19:1; Psa 104:3; 18:11//2 Sa 22:11; Psa 68:33.

<sup>233</sup> KEARNS linked the Ugaritic formula *tqh.mlk 'lmlk drkt.dt drdrk* (CTA 2 IV 10), “You shall receive your eternal kingdom, your dominion (endures from) generation (to) generation” with its two key words *mlk*/מלכו (“kingdom”) and *drkt*/שלטן (“dominion”) by way of Psa 145: 13: “Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endures throughout all generations” (מלכותך מלכות כל עמים וממשלתך בכל דור ודור) to Dan 3:33: “His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation” (מלכותה מלכות עלם ושלטנה עם דר ודר) Dan 4:31: “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation” (שלטנה שלטן עלם ומלכותה עם דר ודר) Dan 6:27: “His kingdom shall never be destroyed, and his dominion shall be to the end” (מלכותה די לא תחבל ושלטנה עד סופא), and Dan 7:14 “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed” (שלטנה שלטן עלם די לא יעדה ומלכותה די לא תחבל).

<sup>234</sup> “And to him was given dominion and *glory* and kingdom” (ולה יהיב שלטן ויקר ומלכו).

<sup>235</sup> KEARNS tentatively interpreted this term as a reflection of a not–directly–attested Hadad tradition which also appears in other passages of the Old Testament as the Hebrew term נאור (“majesty”) in conjunction with עז (“power”): (1) Psa 93:1: “The Lord reigns; he is robed in majesty; the Lord is robed, he is girded with strength” (יהוה מלך נאור לבש לבש יהוה עז התאזר); (2) Deu 33:26: “the one who rides through the heavens to your help, and in his majesty on the clouds” (רכב שמים בעזרך ובנאותו שחקים) corrected by CROSS/FREEDMAN (1947: 6, 7) to the following original text without *matres lectionis*: “the one who rides [through] the heavens with his power, the one who rides in [his] majesty on the clouds” (KEARNS 1982: 103f, n. 58); (3) Psa 68:35: “Ascribe power to God, whose majesty is over Israel, and his power is in the skies” (תנו עז לאלהים על ישראל נאותו ועזו בשחקים). KEARNS noted that Deu 33:26 uses besides נאות/עז also the formulas “the one who rides through the heavens” (רכב שמים) and “the one who rides on the clouds” (רכב שחקים) and Psa 68:33, 34 in conjunction with נאות/עז the phrase “the one who rides in the heavens, the ancient heavens” (רכב בשמי שמי קדם; Psa 68:33). Psa 93 is next to נאות/עז also associated with additional elements from the Hadad tradition (cf. below n. 236).



relationship between the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” (ibid. 112–119),<sup>236</sup> and (5) the phrase “son of man”.<sup>237</sup>

<sup>236</sup> The relationship between El and Hadad is described by KEARNS as follows: “In der Sache des Königtums sind El und Hadad auf einander bezogen. El ist König im statischen Sinn, dass er König war und König bleiben wird. Hadad unterscheidet sich von El, indem er seine Königsherrschaft erwirbt. Durch den Sieg über Jamm wird das Königsein Els nicht ausser Kraft gesetzt, sondern der Sieg Hadads endet in einem Nebeneinander von El und Hadad, beide mit königlicher Würde. El ist *mlk* ‘König’. Hadad *mlk* ‘übt die Königsherrschaft aus’. El ist der Urgrund der Königsmacht, dagegen ist Hadad der bevollmächtigte Gebieter, der die Ausübung der Königsgewalt innehat. El ist der Oberkönig, Hadad sein Vasall” (ibid. 112f). It is this relationship of two divine beings – El superior to Hadad, the latter after his victory over Yam installed as king and carrying out the kingly power in the assembly of gods – which KEARNS saw reflected in the Dan 7:13, 14 where the “son of man” receives eternal kingship from the “Ancient of days”. Three passages from the Psalms were cited by KEARNS that reflect the Hadad tradition in this respect and serve as links to the apocalyptic text: (1) Psa 82:1: “Yahweh stands in the assembly of God; in the midst of the gods he judges” (אלהים נצב בעדת אל בקרב אלהים ישפט) was understood by KEARNS as Elohistorically edited, therefore he replaced Elohim with Yahweh. In a further step this meaning was explained by KEARNS as an interpretation of an underlying Hadad tradition that would have read: “Hadad stands in the assembly of El; in the midst of the gods he reigns”; (2) The next passage adduced was Psa 93:1–4 which exhibits according to KEARNS the following elements of the Hadad tradition: (a) Psa 93:1a: “The Lord is king/the Lord has become king”; (b) Psa 93:2: Yahweh’s reign is everlasting (מעולם); (c) Psa 93:3: The rebellion of the sea; (d) Psa 93:4: Since Yahweh is described as being mightier than the sea the underlying conclusion is that his kingship is the result of his victory over the sea; (3) The last linking passage is Psa 29:10: “Yahweh sits on the flood and Yahweh sits as King forever” (יהוה למבול ישב וישב יהוה מלך לעולם); cf. KTU.101,1–2: *b’l jtb k tbt gr hd r [ ] k mdb* “The Lord sits, like a throne [is] the mountain, Hadad [ ] like a flood” [ibid. 117, n. 128]) reflecting the victorious Hadad who sits on Yam and is installed as eternal king.

<sup>237</sup> KEARNS’ starting point for his tradition–historical elaboration of this issue is the shift from Canaanite to Aramaic which occurred when the Hadad tradition was handed down. While in Canaanite dialects the epithet “Baal” was understood as the appellative “Lord”, the Aramaic consonantal equivalent בעל provided an additional divergent meaning, i.e., “husband”. Thus, using the same consonantal word in Aramaic as in Canaanite would have become a source of misunderstanding. Therefore, KEARNS proposed a translation based on the *meaning* of the appellative “Lord” rather than the employment the same consonantal word in Aramaic with its semantic ambiguity. The Aramaic semantic equivalent to the Canaanite בעל was according to KEARNS ברנש (ibid. 72f). KEARNS (1978: 16–88) argued that the origin of the Aramaic ברנש is the Ugaritic *bns* (“royal vassal”) which developed into the Aramaic ברנש whereby the meaning shifted from “royal vassal” to “lord” and finally resulted by pseudo–etymology in בר אנשא. Cf. however the criticism of this hypothetical development by COLPE (1981: cols. 375–378), HUEHNERGARD (1987: 47), KVANVIG (1988: 492, n. 58), and COLLINS (1993b: 304, n. 242). In fact KEARNS had to admit that “der historische Vollzug des Übergangs vom kanaanäischen zum aramäischen Epitheton ... nicht erfassbar [ist] ... Historisch sichtbar ist lediglich das Endresultat” (1982: 73). As a single instance for such a result KEARNS (ibid. 75, n. 306) cited a late rabbinical text, *pKil 31c47* that mentions the Aramaic epithet ברנש דטור “Lord of the field” which is also attested in its Canaanite form בעל שר from Ugarit (KTU 4.183,1; ibid., n. 302). From this evidence KEARNS concluded: “In die



After KEARNS’ detailed study, the remark by BEASLEY–MURRAY (1983: 46f), who was inclined to see the Ugaritic Baal cycle as only one significant background for Dan 7 while also considering similarly patterned myths,<sup>238</sup> was considerably more modest. BEASLEY–MURRAY “postulated that the original figure [for the “son of man”] was the storm god, common to many Semitic religions, and that his place in the vision was due to his playing the traditional role of conqueror of the sea monster” (ibid. 55).

In his book on God’s conflict with the dragon and the sea, DAY discussed Dan 7 under the heading “The eschatologization of the divine conflict”. When one takes the main thrust of his book into account, his forceful argument for a Canaanite background of the second part of the vision of Dan 7 comes as no surprise. DAY basically followed EMERTON, repeating the long-known arguments without adding significant new aspects.<sup>239</sup> In regard to one of the basic problems of the Canaanite background, i.e., its transmission history, DAY (1985: 165f) took up EMERTON’S conjecture<sup>240</sup> that the alleged<sup>241</sup> Israelite enthronement festival served as transmitter

---

Eschatologisierung des Traditionsgefüges um Hadad wurde auch das im kultischen Bereich verwurzelte Epitheton einbezogen. Es erscheint sowohl in reichsaramäischer pseudoetymologischer Umsetzung als *br-nš* [Dan 7:13] als auch in dem nur durch Zwischenglieder mehrerer Übersetzungen erhaltene *homo* [4 Ezr 13:5]” (ibid. 79). Cf. however the criticism by COLLINS (1993a: 132 = ibid. 1993b: 292; ibid. 291, n. 116) due to the hypothetical character of this conclusion.

<sup>238</sup> Referred to were the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* and the Hittite “The Song of Ullikummi” (BEASLEY–MURRAY 1983: 46).

<sup>239</sup> The arguments put forward were: (1) based on the presupposition that the description of the “Ancient of days” as having white hair indicates an old man (contra see JUNKER 1932: 52, HAAG 1993a: 164; ibid 1993b: 58) DAY again resurrected the criticised and reluctantly cited parallel to the Ugaritic term *’ab šnm* by basically following the line of argument put forward by CROSS (1973: 16, n. 24) without advancing new convincing arguments to silence the doubt about this parallel (see also above p. 60 with n. 216 and below n. 256, no. 1 on p. 70); (2) both El and the “Ancient of days” are judges (DAY 1985: 161); (3) the “son of man” comes with the clouds of heaven and Baal is known as “Rider of the Clouds” (ibid. 161f); (4) the kingship of the “son of man” follows the destruction of the sea monsters, as Baal is assured the kingship by defeating Yam (ibid. 162); (5) the relationship between the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” is best reflected in the relationship between El and Baal (ibid. 162f). In addition to these usually-cited parallels a further link was proposed by DAY (ibid. 167, 177) by equating the “son of man” with the angel Michael and tracing this angelic figure back to the Canaanite god Baal. To support a Canaanite link to the angel Michael, DAY argued that according to Jewish apocalyptic there existed seventy angelic princes (Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan on Deu 32:8; 1 En 89:59ff; 90:22ff), one for each nation. This view is according to DAY a reflection of the Ugaritic belief that the consort of El, Asherah, had seventy sons (CTA 4 VI 46). DAY furthermore argued: “As for Michael, the chief of the guardian angels of the nations, he too should be derived from one of the sons of El, indeed he should be El’s supreme son. This points in the direction of Baal, the chief and most active of the gods under El ... The angel Michael therefore has his ultimate origin in Baal ...” (1982: 175f).

<sup>240</sup> “One question remains. If, in the early monarchy, Yahwe was subordinated to Elyon in the Jerusalem cultus, how was the tradition of two divine beings transmitted to the author of Daniel? Amid so much uncertainty and so many conjectures, no answer can be given



of the Canaanite mythological theme of the divine conflict with the dragon.<sup>242</sup> From this position DAY argued that:

the gap in dating that has to be bridged is not therefore between the Ugaritic texts in ca. 1350 B.C. and the book of Daniel in 165 B.C., but the end of the kingdom in 586 B.C., when we know such syncretistic beliefs existed, and the writing of the book of Daniel in 165 B.C., i.e., *just* [my emphasis] over four centuries (ibid.).

No new arguments were brought forward by GOLDINGAY (1988: 151),<sup>243</sup> REID (1989: 85–87),<sup>244</sup> and J.L. CRENSHAW (1992: 371).<sup>245</sup>

The most sustained discussion of a Canaanite background for the second part of the vision of Dan 7 was made by COLLINS over a period of almost twenty years. After a brief reference to a Canaanite background of the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” (COLLINS 1975: 601), a more detailed discussion followed in 1977. According to COLLINS “the clustering of images which we find in Daniel 7:9–14 can only be understood directly against a background of Canaanite myth” (ibid. 1977: 99). As his predecessors had done, COLLINS listed the commonly-cited parallels<sup>246</sup> without referring to COLPE’S criticism of the epithet “father of years” and the parallel to the white hair of the “Ancient of days” (cf. above p. 60). But as COLPE had

which claims anything more than the possibility. It must suffice to show that the transmission of such a tradition was not impossible” (EMERTON 1958: 241f).

<sup>241</sup> DAY (1985: 165) stated that “it is commonly accepted by scholars that the theme of the divine conflict with the dragon, with which the kingship of Yahweh was associated, had its *Sitz im Leben* at this festival, even by those who prefer not to speak of it as an Enthronement Festival”. Cf. this statement with the following by COLLINS (1993b: 289f): “Emerton supposed that the Canaanite traditions had been transmitted in Israel in connection with the festival of the enthronement of Yahweh, which ‘was probably an adaptation of a pre-Davidic Jebusite rite.’ This part of his thesis has not won support ...”.

<sup>242</sup> DAY (1985: 166) also gave room for COLLINS’ explanation that learned scribes transmitted Canaanite myths (cf. below p. 68).

<sup>243</sup> Only one specific parallel was addressed, and this one with reluctance, namely, the alleged correspondence between the titles of El and the “Ancient of days”. Taking up COLLINS’ proposed explanation of how these Canaanite thoughts have been transmitted (cf. below p. 68), GOLDINGAY concluded: “In recapitulating this old ritual pattern, Dan 7 may then have its own links with these ancient myths, via learned circles in Judaism rather than because they lived on in the temple cult” (GOLDINGAY 1988: 151).

<sup>244</sup> REID followed COLLINS in regard to the title of the “Ancient of days” (a position however abandoned in the meantime by COLLINS; cf. above p. 60 and below p. 70 with n. 256, no. 1) and pointed out that the depiction of the “Ancient of days” as an aged figure and high god indicates similarity to El (cf. also his reference to Zeus below in n. 360 on p. 107). In regard to the “son of man” he followed the position of EMERTON.

<sup>245</sup> Crenshaw compared the “Ancient of days” with the Ugaritic *’ab šnm*.

<sup>246</sup> (1) Baal, the “Rider of the Clouds” and the “son of man” coming in the clouds of heaven; (2) the white-haired El and the “Ancient of days” with hair like cleanest wool; (3) El’s title “father of years” recalls the “Ancient of days”; (4) El presides over the heavenly council as the “Ancient of days” presides over a divine council; (5) El is judge as is the “Ancient of days” (ibid. 1977: 100f); (6) the conferral of kingship of the “son of man” derives from Baal’s enthronement (ibid. 105).



already pointed out, COLLINS also acknowledged that "the central problem of this imagery is the presentation of the 'one like a son of man' who comes 'with the clouds of heaven'" (ibid. 99f), i.e., that in the Old Testament the superior Yahweh is associated with clouds, while in Dan 7 a subordinate divine being is associated with this same imagery. Although some attempts were made to prove a subordinate position of Yahweh to El Elyon,<sup>247</sup> COLLINS dismissed them, stating: "The idea that there is another God superior to Yahweh is foreign to the OT" (ibid. 100). Thus "nowhere in the OT is Yahweh juxtaposed with another heavenly being in the way the 'one like a son of man' and the 'Ancient of Days' are juxtaposed here [in Dan 7]" (ibid.). From this follows that COLLINS, in contrast to COLPE, did not consider an intermediate Yahwistic background as viable but held that "the imagery of Yahweh riding on the clouds is itself derived from the storm-imagery of the theophanies of Baal" (ibid.).<sup>248</sup>

Thus, in contrast with the first part of the vision which COLLINS linked to Old Testament imagery (influenced by Canaanite mythology), the motifs of the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man" "can not be derived from the OT, but presupposes independent mythological traditions. These traditions are best represented by the Ugaritic texts from the second millennium B.C." (ibid. 101). A significant handicap of this position are the postulated "independent mythological traditions" that have to be assumed in order to close the gap between the Ugaritic texts and the author of Dan 7.<sup>249</sup> Furthermore, COLLINS faced not only a problem in transmission history but also the recognition that "we have [also] no solid evidence as to how or in what form the traditions represented by the Ugaritic texts were available in the second century B.C." (ibid. 102).<sup>250</sup>

The following suggestions were made by COLLINS: (1) although it was perceived as problematic, he argued that the enthronement scene might indicate the survival of a Canaanite-influenced royal cult in Jerusalem as folk tradition or in learned circles. The same has to be assumed for the "Ancient of days" and "son of man" imagery (ibid. 102); (2) the translation of the ancient *Phoenician History* by Philo of Byblos from about the end of the first century C.E. shows that "ancient Canaanite lore was accessible in the Roman period" (ibid.); (3) there is evidence for a general "interest in old traditions throughout the Hellenistic world" (ibid.).<sup>251</sup>

Although COLLINS acknowledged that it is still uncertain how the author of Dan 7 got hold of the Canaanite material he allegedly used, "there is not reason, however, to doubt that ancient traditions closely related to the Ugaritic myths were available in the second century B.C." (ibid. 104.).

<sup>247</sup> Cf. EISSFELDT 1956b: 29f; see also n. 211 above on p. 59.

<sup>248</sup> Cf. also end of n. 218 on p. 61.

<sup>249</sup> Cf. also KEARNS 1982: 28, n. 121.

<sup>250</sup> The same point was of course also realised by COLPE (1969: 240), which prompted him to propose a Yahwistic link between the Canaanite origin and the Jewish Apocalyptic, a proposal that is very difficult to maintain (cf. above p. 60 and n. 218).

<sup>251</sup> COLLINS (1977: 102f) mentioned the copying of Babylonian kingship myths and rituals, the copying of a Sumerian lament for Uruk, and Berossus' translation of the Babylonian cosmogony in the Hellenistic period. Furthermore, he referred to the Egyptian Oracle of the Potter from the Hellenistic period which harks back to 1991 B.C.E.



In addition to pointing out parallel features between Dan 7 and Ugaritic texts, COLLINS (ibid. 105f) also established a mythic pattern in Dan 7, focusing on the confrontation between the powers of chaos and the opposing heavenly beings, which can be tabulated as follows:<sup>252</sup>

<i>Ugaritic text</i>	<i>Dan 7</i>
a) Revolt of the sea demanding the surrender of Baal and kingship over the gods	a) Revolt of the sea through beasts rising from it
b) Defeat of the sea by Baal	b) –
c) Manifestation of Baal's kingship	c) Final kingship of the "son of man"

Very different is the destruction of the enemy: In the Ugaritic text the sea is defeated in battle, in the Danielic text a divine judgement scene is held which is followed by the destruction of the beasts from the sea (ibid. 105).<sup>253</sup>

COLLINS' (1993a: 125–128, 131–135 = ibid. 1993b: 286–294) recent article, particularly the commentary section on the religio-historical background of Dan 7, did not add significantly new aspects<sup>254</sup> with the exception of a reference to KEARNS' (1982: 46–57) study which according to COLLINS demonstrates "the continued vitality of the cult of Baal Hadad, the Baal of the Ugaritic texts, into the Christian era". There is however a lack of cultic texts to "fill out the traditions associated with the cult in the later period" (ibid. 1993a: 132 = ibid. 1993b: 191f)<sup>255</sup>

<sup>252</sup> A recent formulation of the pattern of relationship is the following: "What is important is the pattern of relationships: the opposition between the sea and the rider of the clouds, the presence of two god-like figures and the fact that one who comes with the clouds receives everlasting dominion" (ibid. 1993a: 128 = ibid. 1993b: 291). Cf. also MOSCA (1986: 508) who presented the following similar pattern: "(1) Baal's battle with the Sea, which leads to the proclamation of the storm god's kingship; (2) Baal's kingship, which is, and must be, sanctioned by El; and (3) El's own kingship, which is not thereby undermined." Again another pattern has been put forward by BEASLEY-MURRAY (1983: 46): "Thus the pattern of *threat* from the sea monster, *assembly* of the gods, *deliverance* by the storm god, and his consequent exercise of *sovereignty* is clear."

<sup>253</sup> It has to be noted that the Danielic account has more facets than COLLINS mentioned here. Thus, the sentence of the judicial assembly is not spelled out, it is solely the fourth beast that is slain and burned, while from the remaining beasts only their dominion is taken away and their lives prolonged for a limited time (cf. also COLLINS 1993b: 303f).

<sup>254</sup> He repeated that the "general analogy in context" is "the conflict for universal kingship" (1993a: 126). Furthermore, the subordination of a divine being to the "Ancient of days" "has no precedent in the biblical tradition. It is quite intelligible, however, against the background of Canaanite mythology, where Baal appears in subordination to El" (ibid. 127). Descriptive parallels are: (1) Baal's epithet "Rider of the Clouds" and the coming of the "son of man" with clouds; (2) the portrayal of El as an aged god and the exceptional description of God in Dan 7 in this way; (3) the epithet of El as "judge" and the judicial role of the "Ancient of days"; (4) the divine council of El and the multitude mentioned with the throne scene in Dan 7 (ibid.).

<sup>255</sup> References to the cult of Hadad from the rise of the Aramaeans down to the Byzantine period include the name of Hadad in stele inscriptions, treaties, temple dedication inscriptions, various literary notes, its usage as theophoric names of rulers, iconographic



thereby not solving the basic problem of the transmission of the Canaanite tradition to the Jewish apocalypticist of Dan 7. Noteworthy is also the support for COLPE’S reluctance to cite the epithet “father of years” as a true parallel for the “Ancient of days” (ibid. 1993a: 127 = ibid. 1993b: 290; cf. also p. 60 of this study).<sup>256</sup>

---

witnesses, place names, its association with specific cult sites (KEARNS 1982: 40–57) but lack cultic texts.

<sup>256</sup> Critical remarks against a Canaanite influence include the following (cf. also n. 49 on p. 13):

- (1) The “Ancient of days”: (a) the Ugaritic expression *ʿab šnm* has been criticised as an “untenable parallel” to the “Ancient of days” (GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; cf. also COPPENS 1968: 500; FERCH 1980: 82; GOLDINGAY 1988: 151; KVANVIG 1988: 508) and in fact has even been abandoned by the most outstanding supporters of a Canaanite background (COLPE 1969: 419f; KEARNS 1982: 173f, n. 402; COLLINS 1993a: 127 = ibid. 1993b: 290; cf. also above p. 60 and n. 216 on p. 60); (b) El as “judge” is only mentioned once in the Ugaritic texts (CROSS 1973: 21) whereby the translation of *il p̄l* is disputed. The assembly of gods mentioned in the same passage depicts El with his consort and Hadad who is singing and playing on the lyre while the messengers of Yam demand Baal, thus a context that “hardly parallels to the judgement scene of the apocalypticist” (FERCH 1980: 83);
- (2) The “son of man”: (a) There is no specific allusion to Baal (KVANVIG 1988: 508); (b) according to the Ugaritic myth “Baal not only triumphs over Yam and Mot but also dies at the hand ... of Mot. Baal’s death finds absolutely *no parallel in a demise of the S[on of]M[an]*” (FERCH 1980: 81); (c) Baal vanquished Yam but nothing similar is said about the “son of man” (KVANVIG 1988: 508; COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 23; CASEY 1979: 37; cf. also n. 49, no. 7b on p. 13); (d) the use of clouds associated with Baal does not fit the “son of man” but rather Yahweh (COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 23); (e) the “son of man” is not a divine figure thereby introducing “a second deity into the monotheistic faith of Israel” (CASEY 1979: 37), cf. however the response by DAY (1985: 166f): “M. Casey misunderstands Emerton ... [who] is alluding to the pre–history of Dan. 7”;
- (3) The conferral of kingship to the “son of man”: (a) GESE (1983: 380, n. 16) warned to correlate the Ugaritic enthronement of Baal with the “son of man” since this would traditio–historically be impossible against the background of the falling–away of the El–Baal confrontation in the Iron Age and its replacement by the “Zeuswerdung” of Baal, i.e., Baal Shamem; cf. ODEN 1977); (b) the ultimate conferral of kingship upon Baal after the outcry of Astarte “Yamm is indeed dead! Ba‘al shall be king” (*ym./mt b‘Im ymlk*; Driver 1956: 82, III\*A, l. 32) is according to FERCH “by no means certain” (1980: 83–85; cf. also KOCH 1980: 234); (c) even if Baal should have received kingship, such a feature is not specifically Canaanite (KVANVIG 1988: 508); (d) the enthronement of the “son of man” is similar to that of a “terrestrial king because the Son of Man takes over kingship after four previous terrestrial kings (v. 17), and because the kingship is political rather than cosmical (v. 14)” (ibid.); (e) it is “an impossible thought for a Jew” (ibid. 351, n. 24) that Yahweh should confer *his* kingship, therefore it must be “the kingship given to the rulers on earth” that is conferred to the “son of man”. “Accordingly the Ugaritic myth would communicate something entirely different from the vision, and the reason why the composer would interpret his reality in the light of this myth is hard to explain” (ibid.); (f) Baal has nothing to do with the rule over people, nations, and languages nor with an eschatological investiture (KOCH 1980: 234); (g) the ascension to power by the “son of man” is not