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ABSTRACT

THE MICHAEL FIGURE IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL
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Name of researcher: Lewis O. Anderson, Jr.

Name and degree of faculty adviser: William H. Shea, M.D., Ph.D.

Date completed: July 2, 1997

Problem

In the book of Daniel, The Michael figure, although mentioned only three times, occupies a prominent position in history and at the eschaton as the heavenly guardian prince of Israel. The Michael problem, although complex, may be understood as basically twofold: Who is Michael? What is Michael's function?

In the first question, a basic issue is whether Michael is a prominent angel, or a divine, messianic being. Another issue in this same question is the extent to which Michael is to be identified with other OT beings, within or outside the book of Daniel, such as the Son of Man, Prince of the Host, and Angel of the Lord.

In the second question, Michael's function in history in relation to the princes of Persia and Greece and his activity at the
eschaton are considered. For example, is his function military, judicial, or both?

Method

This was an exegetical study of the Michael passages in their historical setting with a comparison also of Michael with other OT figures.

Conclusions

The conclusions reached are as follows:

Michael is leader of the angelic hosts and of Israel, Daniel's people. He is Israel's patron, leader and guardian, in history and at the eschaton. Michael appears to be more than an angel. With his own distinct identity, occupying a position of focus and attention more characteristic of the divine being and functioning as heavenly warrior who intervenes to save his people Israel, Michael is another depiction of God.

Michael is identified with the Prince of the Host of Yahweh, a veiled depiction of God and the messianic, divine Son of Man. The Angel of the Lord is a precursor of Michael, functioning as God's visier and Israel's guardian, as does Michael in Daniel. Michael is God in His role as divine warrior, acting in behalf of His people Israel in salvation and judgment.

The heavenly being who appeared in the fiery furnace is likely the divine Angel of the Lord, and is therefore probably Michael, Israel's guardian.

Michael struggles in history with the demonic prince of Persia to prevent him from influencing the Persian king(s) to stop favoring Israel.
Michael's eschatological functions are both judicial and military as he destroys the anti-God persecuting power, superintends the deliverance of Israel and the resurrection, and inaugurates the glorious new age.
To my wife Saba
For her support and assistance
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This dissertation is a report of an investigation of the Michael figure in the Bible book of Daniel. "Michael the Archangel" is a familiar image, not only to Bible scholars, but also to the average person with a Judeo-Christian background.

The Michael figure, though mentioned in Daniel in only three passages, occupies in Daniel a very prominent position in the activity of heavenly beings. Michael not only possesses pre-eminent authority to do battle with the powers arrayed against God's people in Daniel's time (Dan 10:13, 21), but also figures prominently in the eschatological victory (Dan 12:1-3). Moreover, Michael is mentioned in the NT in roles reminiscent of those in Daniel. He is prominent in the angelology of apocalyptic and Rabbinic Judaism and in ancient and medieval Jewish and Christian angelology. A clear understanding of the Michael figure in Daniel is essential for a clear view of the message of Daniel, and as a prerequisite for understanding later occurrences of Michael in Jewish and Christian literature.

The Michael figure in Daniel has been somewhat neglected in modern scholarship. The focus of works devoted to Michael within the past century has been primarily on developments and elaborations of Michael in extra-canonical, ancient Jewish writings and in ancient and medieval Christian literature. These studies have not ignored the Michael passages in Daniel, but have tended to neglect the close and
extended scrutiny that they need to receive.

Of course, commentaries on Daniel give attention to the Michael figure, and frequently do so with a certain amount of careful and important discussion, but the very nature of commentaries precludes the fuller treatment called for. Important works on angelology have also given Michael's place in Daniel some passing attention, at times fairly significant, but nevertheless lacking the exhaustive treatment which is beyond their scope. Journal articles dealing directly with Michael in Daniel are infrequent. More often such articles treat the Danielic Michael only secondarily, and they do so, basically, from but one approach. Various Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias of religion contain excellent articles on Michael, but they too suffer from a similar brevity in scope.

In this century no dissertation has been written on Michael. In fact, in the course of this research, no exegetical work dealing in depth with the Michael figure in Daniel has been discovered. Thus, the present dissertation contributes toward filling this lacuna in biblical study.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

To study adequately the figure of Michael in the book of Daniel, it was necessary to address three basic issues relating to him: (1) the designations of Michael (i.e., his name, "Michael," and his other principle designation, "prince"); (2) the function of Michael, involving an exegetical study of the passages in Daniel where he is mentioned; and (3) the relationship of Michael to certain other OT figures within and outside of the book of Daniel.
Chapter 1 of the dissertation is a survey of the history of the interpretation of Michael. This is followed by three main chapters. Chapter 2 is devoted to the name Michael and the designation "prince" in the context of the OT and in other relevant literature and documents of the ancient Near East. Chapter 3 deals with the function of Michael, and is primarily an exegetical study of Michael's activity in context. Chapter 4 compares Michael with other figures in Daniel and elsewhere in the OT. Within Daniel, these figures are the Prince of the Host/Prince of princes (Dan 8:11, 25), one like a son of man (Dan 7:13-14), and one like a son of the gods (Dan 3:35). Outside of Daniel, Michael is compared with the "angel of the Lord". Chapter 5 presents a summary of my findings and some conclusions that may be drawn.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Since Michael is named only in Daniel in the Hebrew canon, this study focuses on the book of Daniel and Bible books known to have been written earlier. As Daniel shares many of the literary characteristics of Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings, it is necessary to address the relationship between them and the book of Daniel, especially the question of relative dating. Michael in the NT, though touched upon in passing, was not included within the scope of this study.
CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents a survey of the main lines of developing interpretation of the Michael figure. It proceeds in a modified chronological order, tracing only the main lines of interpretation before the nineteenth century, with more careful attention to more recent interpretation.

Many issues are involved in defining the identity and function of Michael. But the issue upon which opinion is most widely expressed, and therefore most easily traceable, is the question of whether Michael is a divine, messianic being or an angelic being. Therefore, in this survey, this issue has been basic in tracing developing lines of interpretive tradition. Other issues are noted as they emerge.

Interpretations within Judaism

Interpretation in Apocalyptic Judaism

The earliest development in the interpretation of the Michael figure in Daniel emerged in apocalyptic Judaism, the influence of which still persists. Following the introduction of named heavenly beings such as Gabriel and Michael in Daniel,¹ a great expansion of

angelology occurred, especially in certain pseudepigraphical works such as 1 Enoch.¹

The first reference to seven archangels appears in Tob 12:5, “I am Raphael,” says the angel to Tobit, ‘One of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One.’² The others are not named.

In 1 Enoch, Michael is listed as the first of four archangels, variously Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel (1 Enoch 9:1-11), or Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel (1 Enoch 40:8-10, 71:7-9). In 1 Enoch 9, where they are referred to as “the holy ones of heaven,” they appear as intermediaries, who hear the cries of the souls of men because of the blood being shed and the lawlessness on earth, and who then intercede with God.³

In 1 Enoch 20:1-8, seven "holy angels who watch" are listed: Uriel, Raphael, Raquel, Michael "set over the best part of mankind [here, as in Daniel, the patron of Israel] and over chaos," Saraqael, Gabriel, and Remiel.⁴

In various Jewish Pseudepigrapha Michael is regarded as the

---

¹ 1 Enoch, OTP, 1:6-89. This is generally accepted as a composite work, written in Palestine and dated in the second and first centuries B.C. See OTP 1:7; APOT 2:170-171.

² Tobit, APOT 1:185, 194. This accepts R. H. Charles’s dating of Tobit as prior to Jubilees and 1 Enoch.


⁴ 1 Enoch 20:1-8, APOT 2:201.
patron of Israel, the commander of the angels, a mediator between God and man, and the attendant angel/angeles interpres. He is also associated with the care of the dead. In the Apocalypse of Moses and in Adam and Eve, he plays a prominent role in the burials of Adam, Abel, and Eve. Also, Michael announces to Seth and Eve that God had set him over the bodies of men. In the Testament of Abraham, Michael is sent to notify Abraham of his coming death; and when Abraham dies, Michael escorts his soul to heaven. In this same work, Michael has power to prevent souls from becoming captives in hell. In 2 Enoch, Michael brings Enoch before the Lord, and, at

---


6 Adam and Eve 41:1-3, APOT 2:144.


God's command, gives him immortality.  

Furthermore, Michael is depicted as the angel of vengeance. He, along with the other three chief angels, appeals to God over the evil brought on the earth as a result of the sins of the fallen angels. Michael is commanded to bind the evil angels until the judgment, when they will be led off to the fiery abyss. Michael is also to destroy all wrong on earth in order to make the earth a suitable place for the righteous. The four chief angels are to cast the evil hosts into the "burning furnace."  

Moreover, in Jubilees (160-140 B.C.) and in the Testament of Naphtali (mid-second century B.C.) the tradition is present that, after the confusion of languages of Gen 11:1-9, God had appointed seventy angels to be guardian patrons of the seventy nations listed in the table of nations of Gen 10. The references  

1 Enoch 22:6-10, APOT 2:443.  
2 Enoch 9:1, APOT 2:192.  
3 Enoch 10:11-22, APOT 2:194; As. Mos. 9:7-10:3, APOT 2:421; As. Mos. 10:2, the angel who has been appointed chief is Michael; see nX.2.  
4 Enoch 54:6, APOT 2:220.  
5 OTP 2:44.  
6 OTP 1:778.  
7 Jub. 15:32, APOT 2:37; T. Naph. 8:3-10:2, APOT 2:339. In the latter work, the people chose the angels to rule them in preference to God, but Abram chose God. Michael here appears as leader of the seventy angels appointed to teach to each nation a different language. Michael taught Hebrew to the house of Eber. See also 1 Enoch 90:22-23, APOT 2:239. Here God, sitting in judgment, commanded the angelic scribe, who was one of the "seven white ones," to "take those seventy shepherds to whom I delivered the sheep and who, taking them on their own authority, slew more than I commanded them." This seems to be a reference to this same tradition of seventy angels ruling over the seventy nations.
in Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1 to the prince of Persia, to the prince of Greece, and to Michael, "your prince," came to be interpreted in the light of this tradition, and, in turn, reinforced it. This tradition in Jubilees and the Testament of Naphthali also involves Gen 32:8-9 (LXX), in which it is said that when God divided to the nations their inheritance, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the sons of God ["of Israel," MT], but that Yahweh's portion is the people of Jacob.

Qumran Interpretation

The Dead Sea Scrolls are a distinctive body of Judaic literature produced by the sectarian Qumran community on the northwest shore of the Dead Sea between 150-140 B.C. and A.D. 68.1

Michael, in the Qumran War Scroll,2 is one of four chief angels, along with, Gabriel, Sariel, and Raphael. This is similar to some passages in 1 Enoch, except that here Sariel replaces Uriel (1 Enoch 9:10-11) and Phanuel (1 Enoch 40:8-10, 71:7-9).3 In 4QSI reference is made to the seven chief princes, which suggests that the idea of seven archangels is found at Qumran.4 It is evident that

---


3See Józef T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 30, 173 for the view that the angelic name Uriel (1 Enoch) 9:1 was originally written Sariel, then changed by a later copyist.

44QSI 39 I 1:16ff, J. Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran-4Q Serek Ṣṭrōt 'Ēlat Hassabbat," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 7 (1960): 320; Alfred Hertens, Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der
the angelology at Qumran is similar to that of 1 Enoch and other pseudepigraphical works and was influenced by them.1

The heavenly "Prince of Light" (IQS iii.14) is to be identified with Michael.2 Since "all who practice righteousness are under the dominion of the Prince of Lights," we see Michael again as guardian of God's people.

In another text from Qumran, Michael is identified with Melchizedek and assumes various roles, priestly (IQMelch 8), juridical (IQMelch 9), and military (IQMelch 13-15).3

Michael at Qumran is also prominent in the eschaton. God will send eternal help to His people through the power of the angel Michael.4 God will not only exalt the authority of Michael to enlighten the house of Israel, but will also exalt the authority of Michael over the gods [angels] (QM xvii.6-8).5

Texte vom Toten Meer (Echter: KBW Verlag, 1971), 60-61.


Interpretation of Philo

Philo, writing in Alexandria (early first century A.D.) in a context of Hellenistic Judaism, stated, "The firstborn Logos is the eldest among the angels; he is archangel, and bears many names, being called indeed 'Beginning,' 'Name of God,' 'Word,' . . . 'He that seeth,' 'Israel.'" It is noteworthy that Philo applied several designations to the archangel which his contemporaries, the apostles, were applying to Christ, such as "firstborn" (Col 1:15), "Word" (John 1:1-3, 14), "Beginning" (Col 1:18), "Man after His image" (cf. Col 1:15, "He is the image of the invisible God").

Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

In Rabbinic Judaism, angels were created on the second or the fifth day of creation week. This was to eliminate any concept of the participation of angels, such as Michael or Gabriel, in creation. Michael is an angel, and the greatest of the angels. Michael and Gabriel were Adam's "best men" at his marriage. When the three angels came to visit Abraham, Michael, the greatest, walked in the middle, Gabriel, next greatest, walked on his right,

---


3 Midr. Gen 1:3; Midr. Gen 3:8

4b. Ber. 4b.

5 Midr. Gen 8:13.
and Raphael walked on Michael's left. It was Michael who brought
tidings to Sarah of Isaac's birth, who rescued Lot from Sodom, and
who accompanied Eliezar to Haran to find a wife for Isaac.

Michael is the guardian angel of Israel, held accountable to
God for Israel's sins. Michael was the angel who rescued the three
youth from the fiery furnace.

Michael is frequently "Michael, the great prince," though
he is once in the Babylonian Talmud referred to as "Michael the
Archangel." He is also called "Michael, prince of the great
host," evidently identifying him with the "Prince of the Host"
(Dan 8:11).

Christian Interpretation from the New Testament
until the Reformation

New Testament Interpretation

In the New Testament, Michael appears in two contexts. He
is the commander of the heavenly angels and leads them into victorious
battle against the Devil and his angels (Rev 12:7-9). He also appears
twice in the context of resurrection. Designated "the archangel," he

1b, Yoma 37a.
2b, B. Mez. 86b; though in Midr. Gen 50:2, it was Raphael who
rescued Lot.
4b, Yoma 77a.
6b, Hag. 12b; b, Abod. Zar. 42b; b, Zebah 62a, b, Menah. 110a.
7b, Hul. 40a.
8b, Hul. 30a.
contends with the Devil for the body of Moses (Jude 9), presumably a reference to the resurrection of Moses. Also, Christ, at His Second Coming, will descend "with the voice of the archangel" to raise the righteous dead to immortality (1 Thess 4:16, 17). Since both of these NT uses of the word "archangel" take the article, only one archangel is recognized; therefore the archangel in 1 Thess 4:16 may be understood as a reference to Michael.

Interpretation in the Ancient Church

The Ebionite teachings represented by the Pseudo-Clementine writings (mid-second century A.D.) indirectly identify Michael with Christ. They adopted the tradition that God had appointed angelic princes as gods over the seventy nations, but that Christ is God of princes and judge over all. The Father gave to His Son—who is Lord, and who created heaven and earth—the Hebrews as his portion. Also, from the Son of the Lord of all, the law of the Hebrews went forth.

Michael is not mentioned by name by Pseudo-Clement of Rome,

---

1See Martin Rist, "Moses, Assumption of," *IDB* (1962), 3:450. This interpretation is consistent with the appearance of Moses, with Elijah, to Jesus at the transfiguration (Matt 17:3-5; Mark 9:4-5; Luke 9:30-33). But, see Douglas Stuart, "Michael," *ISBE* (1986), 3:348, who does not think Jude 9 is necessarily a reference to the resurrection of Moses.


4Clemens Romanus *Recognitiones*, TLG 007.2.42.

5Clemens Romanus *Homiliae*, TLG 006.18.4.
but Clement depicts the Father as giving to Christ the position of prince of Israel, given to Michael in other accounts of this tradi-
tion as mentioned in this chapter.¹

Another early post-New Testament Christian interpretation of Michael is found in the Shepherd of Hermas (A.D. 60).² In the parable of the willow tree ³ the "angel of the Lord" (Sim. 8.1) who is "glorious and very tall" is identified as Michael (Sim. 8.3). He put the law of God into the hearts of those who believe, and examined them to see if they have kept it, thus performing a work of judgment.

In a later, parallel parable of the tower (Sim. 9), a glorious man and lord of the tower (Sim. 9.5, 6), identified as the Son of God (Sim. 9.11), performed a similar work of judgment, examining the stones of the tower, rejecting and removing some of the stones (Sim. 9.6).

It appears evident that the author of Hermas identified Michael with the Son of God, thus giving a messianic interpretation of Michael.⁴

¹See Jean Daniélou, 126-27.
²Hermas, ANF 2:3.
³Hermas, Sim. 8, ANF 2:39.
⁴M. H. Shepherd, Jr., "Hermas, Shepherd of," IDR (1962), 2:584; Daniélou, 123-24; Robert Van der Hart, The Theology of Angels and Devils, Theology Today, No. 36, ed. Edward Yarnold (Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides Pub., 1972), 62; Lacocque, Daniel, 134. But see Joseph M. F. Marique, "The Shepherd of Hermas, Introduction," The Apostolic Fathers, vol. 1 of The Fathers of the Church (New York: Cima Pub. Co., 1947), 230, "Though Hermas’s doctrine of the Trinity is not unambiguous and has called forth considerable exegesis--in particular the phrase, 'The Son is the Holy Ghost'--it cannot be proved that he puts the Archangel Michael on the same plane. They have the same offices in Hermas’ symbolism, but their dignities are quite different. The Son of God is Lord of His people and Owner of the Tower, whereas the angel is not; Michael constantly appears as an
Hippolytus (beginning, third century A.D.), who interpreted the "one like a son of the gods" (Dan 3:25), the Son of Man (Dan 7:13-14), the anointed Most Holy (Dan 9:24), and the cut off anointed one (Dan 9:26) messianically, seems also to have interpreted Michael messianically. Michael is "the angel assigned to the people," the Angel of Yahweh whom God sent with Israel to lead them to the promised land (Exod 33:2-3). Furthermore, he interprets the "man in linen" (Dan 10:5-6) as both Christ and the Angel of Yahweh, thus interpreting the Angel of Yahweh and therefore also Michael messianically.

Origen (first half, third century A.D.) understood Michael to be one of the archangels, grouping him with Gabriel and Raphael as angels who received names appropriate to their duties. He also referred to Gabriel and Michael (in that order) as examples of angels

---

1ANF 5:3.
2Hippolytus, ANF, 5:188.
3Ibid., 189.
4Ibid., 181.
5Ibid., 180.
6Ibid., 190.
7Ibid., 182.
8Ibid., 183.
10Origen Against Celsus (ANF 4:406).
who—as a class—should not be worshiped, in contrast to the Son of God, who is worthy of worship.¹

In Origen’s interpretation, the Angel of the Lord, whom God sent to accompany Moses and Israel in their wilderness journey from Egypt to Canaan, was the same being as the Prince of the host of Yahweh who appeared to Joshua by the River Jordan (Josh 5:14-15), designated by Origen as "the archistratege Michael," who he identified as the prince of the people who appeared in the book of Daniel.²

Origen interpreted Deut 32:7-8 to mean that the nations of earth were divided among the angelic princes, and that the princes of the kingdoms of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20) and Michael, prince of Israel, were among those angel princes.³

A work falsely attributed to Macarius of Egypt states that Gabriel and Michael are ministering spirits, serving the saints (quotes Heb 1:14).⁴ The writer also spoke of the creation of Gabriel and Michael, "the archangels," of whom God said, "let us make in our image and after our likeness."⁵

Jerome (late fourth, early fifth century A.D.)⁶ understood Michael to be a guardian angel. He wrote of "the angel Michael, who

¹Ibid., 644.
²Origen Selecta in Jesum Nave, MPG, 12:821.38-51.
⁴Macarius, Scr. Eccl. (spurious) Sermones 64 (collectio B), Makarios/Symeon Reden und Briefe, 2 vols. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973), as cited in TLG 001.7.11.4.9-11.
⁵Ibid., TLG 001.32.8.8
⁶NPNF ser. 2, 6:xvi-xxv.
has oversight of the people of Israel." The prince of the kingdom of Persia was, in his opinion, "the angel to which charge Persia was committed, in accordance with what we read in Deuteronomy [quotes 32:8 LXX]."¹

Chrysostom (late fourth, early fifth century A.D.),² understanding Michael to be an angel, suggested that Michael was doing a work of judging angels. Michael did not go immediately to the help of the angel speaking to Daniel, but waited the twenty-one days (Dan 10:3, 12-13) to see which among them would be worthy to ascend with him. There are evil angels, which included the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20). There is war in heaven--concerning men--between the holy and evil angels.³

In a spurious Chrysostom work (date uncertain), the writer, in making a strong appeal, implored his readers by a series of heavenly powers, among them "the four archangels, Michael, Gabriel, and Uriel, and Raphael".⁴ Here is seen the persisting influence of Jewish apocalyptic.⁵

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrene (first half, fifth century A.D.),⁶ saw Michael as a guardian angel of Israel. He declared that

---

²Chrysostom, NPNF ser. 1, 9:7-15.
³Johannes Chrysostom Interpretatio in Danielem Prophetam, MPG, 56:243.
⁴Johannes Chrysostom (spurious) Oratio in Infirmos, TLG 417.326.
⁵1 Enoch 9:1-11, Michael, Uriel, Raphael, Gabriel. Though the order is changed, with Gabriel moved up to second place.
⁶Theodoret, NPNF ser. 2, xii-xiii.
not only individuals have guardian angels, but also nations, for
their protection and care. He cited as examples the prince of the
kingdom of Persia, the prince of Greece, and Michael, the prince of
Israel (Dan 10:13, 20-21; 12:1). He saw all of these as holy angels,
appointed by God. He also appealed to Deut 32:8 (LXX), where God is
said to have established national boundaries "according to the number
of the angels of God."\(^1\) The prince of Persia may work contrary to
Israel's interests because he, as guardian of Persia, in his affection
for them, works for Persia's interests.\(^2\) Theodoret said,
moreover, that the view he presented was "everywhere observed."\(^3\)

Ammonius of Alexandria (fifth century AD) seems to equate
Michael with the Angel of Yahweh, as he spoke of Michael, "who came
to you in the land of Egypt."\(^4\) Also, he set forth the position,
seen earlier in Origen, Jerome, and Theodoret, quoting Deut 32:8 (LXX)
that God placed a guardian angel over each of the nations. He did
this "that they be not harmed by demons."\(^5\)

This survey of the ancient Fathers is not intended to be
complete, but rather representative. Among sources surveyed here, it
seems that in the earlier period, represented by Hermas and Hippoly-
tus, a messianic interpretation of Michael surfaced. Later, however,
probably under the influence of the Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, the

\(^1\) Theodoreti Episcopi Cyrensis In Danielis, MPG, 81:1496-97.
\(^2\) Ibid., col. 1497.
\(^3\) Ibid., col. 1497.
\(^4\) Ammonii Alexandrini Fragmenta in Danielum, MPG, 85:1377.
\(^5\) Ibid., col. 1380.
view that Michael was an angel, specifically, chief archangel, came to prevail. Some aspects of Jewish apocalyptic did not prevail, however, as interest in numerous named angels diminished to include mainly Michael and Gabriel, and occasionally Raphael.

Medieval Interpretation

The view that Michael is one of the archangels, which came to prevail in the ancient Church Fathers, continued into the medieval church.

The Council of Rome under Pope Zachary in A.D. 745 officially recognized only Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael as angels with known names, prohibiting prayers to any other.¹

Two views concerning Michael's rank emerged during the Medieval period. The Greek Fathers of the church had generally placed Michael over all the angels; they say he is called "archangel" because he is the prince of the other angels. Others believe that he is the prince of the seraphim, the first of the nine angelic choirs.²

Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, held that Michael belonged to the archangels, whom he regarded as the next to the lowest of the angelic choirs, and was prince of the angels, who were to him the last and lowest of the nine.³

Thomas Aquinas understood that the guardianship of the human


race was committed to the archangels, or princes, of whom Michael was one (a reference to Dan 10:13).\textsuperscript{1} As Michael was guardian prince of Israel, other princes, such as "the prince of the kingdom of Persia" (Dan 10:13), were guardians of the other kingdoms or peoples.\textsuperscript{2}

The Medieval period contributed little of importance to the discussion of the Danielic figure of Michael.

**Interpretation from the Reformation to the Close of the Nineteenth Century**

**Messianic Interpretation**

George Joye, of Geneva, was one of the earliest Reformation exponents of the messianic interpretation of Michael. "For this Michael here described like the sone of man/prince and leader of the Jewes was the very sone of God of whom sayth the Psal. 113. Who is lyke the lorde our god" (sic). His argument is that ministering angels say or do nothing without Christ their Creator. Since Michael is the only one who could help the angelic spokesman against the prince of Persia (whom he identifies with the Devil), Michael must be Christ. He goes on to equate Michael/Christ with the "angel of God" who redeemed Jacob fror all evil (Gen 48:16).\textsuperscript{3}

Though John Milton did not interpret Michael messianically, he testified that such an interpretation was widespread among

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Thomas Aquinas *Summa Theologica* (1970), 15:57.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., 147-149.
\item \textsuperscript{3}George Joye, *The Exposicion of Daniel the Prophete* (Geneva: G. J., 1545), 174. His commentary on Daniel purports to be "gathered oute of Philip Melanchton, Johan Ecolampadius, Chonrade Pellicane, and out of John Draconite & c," though he gives no references.
\end{itemize}
Protestants at the time he wrote. "It is generally thought that Michael is Christ."1

In John Calvin, further evidence is seen of the revival of the messianic interpretation in the Reformation. He saw two competing views: (1) Michael is Christ and (2) Michael is an exalted angel, the archangel. Calvin preferred the former, which he characterized as the minority view.2 He argued that Jesus claimed that the church was under His protection. Jesus functioned in a role given to Michael in the book of Daniel. But Calvin also allowed the latter view.3 He viewed the "princes" of the kingdoms of Persia and Greece as human rulers.4

Matthew Henry, writing around 1712, held a view identical to that of Calvin: Michael is Christ and the princes of Persia and Greece are human monarchs.5

William Lowth, dating from 1726, commenting on Dan 12:1, stated this is "Christ himself, as he is often represented under the character of an Angel, so he is described under the Name of Michael, Rev. xii.7."6 He also interprets Dan 9:24-27 messianically;


3 Ibid., 368-69.

4 Ibid., 264.


6 William Lowth, A Commentary upon the Prophecy of Daniel
including the "most holy" of Dan 9:24, and the one who would confirm the covenant and cause sacrifice and oblation to cease (Dan 9:27).\(^1\) He regarded the "man in linen" (Dan 10:5-6) as Christ, though not the being of Dan 10:11ff, whom he took to be an angel.\(^2\) Lowth interpreted the "Son of Man" as Christ, for "the Anani, the Clouds, was a known name of the Messias among the Jewish writers,\(^3\) though, interestingly, he did not see the "son of God" (Dan 3:25) as other than an angel.\(^4\) The princes of Persia and Greece he took to be angelic, either good or evil.\(^5\)

George S. Faber, in a work on Daniel dated 1828, identified Michael with the Son of Man in Dan 7 and with Christ. In reference to Jesus' prediction of the coming of the Son of Man, he wrote:

Thus it appears that the coming of the Son of Man here foretold by Christ, the coming of the Son of man foretold by Daniel, the standing up of Michael foretold by Daniel, the bright coming of the Lord foretold by St. Paul, and the coming of the Word of God foretold by St. John, are all identical: for they all take place, at the same time for the same purpose.\(^6\)

This recognition of the parallel between the coming of the Son of Man in Dan 7 and the standing up of Michael in Dan 12 "at the same time for the same purpose" is a new contribution to the

---

\(^{1}\)Ibid., 102-109.

\(^{2}\)Ibid., 116-17.

\(^{3}\)Ibid., 63-64.

\(^{4}\)Ibid., 35.

\(^{5}\)Ibid., 119-121.

\(^{6}\)George Stanley Faber, The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy; Or a Dissertation on the Prophecies, 3 vols. (London: C. & J. Rivington, 1828), 1:222.
study of Michael, not sufficiently taken into account by later writers.

He equated the standing of Michael in Dan 12:1 with the manifestation of the Word of God at the head of the armies which are in heaven (Rev 19:11-16) and with the battle of that great day of God Almighty (Rev 16:14).1

Faber, further, identified the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11) with Christ, and, accordingly, also with Michael.2

F. A. Cox seems to reflect Faber's view: "The standing up of Michael for Daniel's people, corresponds with the going forth of him who is called 'faithful and true' upon the white horse."3 He also identified Michael and the Son of Man (Dan 7:13-14) with Christ.4

E. W. Hengstenberg, writing around the mid-nineteenth century, as part of a search for prophecies, types, and symbols of Christ in the OT, set forth the interpretation that Michael is none other than Christ.

He argued that Michael must be superior to Gabriel, for, in Dan 10, Gabriel is powerless. Michael must first come to his help and set him free before he, Gabriel, can bring the joyful tidings to Daniel.5

He felt that the absolute superiority of Michael over all

---

1Ibid., 2:274.
2Ibid., 2:155.
3F. A. Cox, Outlines of Lectures on the Book of Daniel (New York: C. C. P. Crosby, Clinton Hall, 1836), 243.
4Ibid., 72-73, 168.
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other powers is expressly indicated by the name "who is as God."\(^1\) This interpretation has been followed by some later writers who likewise interpret Michael messianically.

Also decisive in Hengstenberg's view was the designation of Michael as "your prince" (Dan 10:21) and "the great prince" (Dan 12:1). To be prince of the covenant nation is a dignity which could not be possessed by a created angel, but only by one in the sphere of divinity. Since Christ, in His incarnation, came to "his own possession" (John 1:11), then Michael, prince of Israel, must be Christ. The eschatological rescue of Israel (Dan 12:1-3) "is here ascribed to Michael alone, and the subordinate task of Gabriel entirely vanishes."\(^2\)

Hengstenberg also interpreted NT references to Michael messianically. Christ is called Michael in Rev 12:7 because the name Michael contains in itself an intimation that the work referred to here, the decisive victory over Satan, belongs to Christ, not as human, but rather as divine (compare 1 John iii.8.) Moreover, this name forms a connecting link between the Old Testament and the New. Even in the Old Testament, Michael is represented as the great prince, who fights on behalf of the Church (Dan. xii.1).\(^3\)

In the reference to Michael the archangel in Jude 9, Hengstenberg maintains that the attitude of opposition in which Michael stands to Satan is exactly the relation in which Christ stands to Satan throughout the NT.

That Christ descends from heaven with the "voice of the archangel" (1 Thess 4:16) suggests, in his view, that there is but

\(^1\)Ibid., 267-68.  
\(^2\)Ibid., 268-69.  
\(^3\)Ibid., 269.
one divine archangel, and since the shout and the trumpet sound (cf. Zech 9:14) in that passage are of God, so must also the voice of the archangel be the voice of God.¹

Hengstenberg interpreted the Son of Man (Dan 7:13-14) messianically. He held that the clouds accompanying him were evidence of divinity. Quoting Ps 104:3; Isa 19:1; Pss 65:2; 18:10; Nah 1:3, he stated that it is always the Lord who appears with or upon the clouds of heaven. He pointedly rejected the interpretation that the Son of Man was a symbol of the saints.²

Hengstenberg also identified the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) and the Prince of the Host (Josh 5:14-15; Dan 8:11) with Michael.³

He likewise identifies Christ with the Angel of the Lord. He declared that all the Church Fathers except for Origen, Jerome, and Augustine favored this view, a view also "defended by almost all theologians of the two evangelical churches."⁴

Hengstenberg uniquely interprets the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 21) not as angels, but as "the ideal representatives of the imperial powers." "They have purely an ideal, not a real signification. In point of fact, the imperial powers themselves are intended." The "prince of the kingdom of Persia" (Dan 10:13) finds its real import in the later reference in the same verse to the kings of Persia. He explicitly rejects any intimation in the OT or

¹Ibid., 270.

²Hengstenberg, Christology OT, 3:74, 79.

³Ibid.

NT of the existence of guardian angels of heathen empires.¹

George Junkin, in a small book on prophetic interpretation, interpreted Michael messianically. Commenting on Jude 9, with reference to Rev 12:7-9 and Dan 10:13, 21, he states that there is but one archangel known in the Bible. "There is but one head of the angels of glory. Poetry, not always orthodox, has indeed created many; theology knows but one, the Lord our Redeemer."²

E. B. Elliott, in a commentary on the book of Revelation, stated in a footnote:

From comparing Dan. xii.1, "Michael, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people," with Joshua's vision of Jehovah's Captain of the Lord's host (Josh. v.14), we may infer that under the name Michael, (which means, Who is like God?) Christ is here signified in that particular character.³

Ira Chase, though manifesting little direct interest in heavenly beings, refers in passing to Michael the prince as Christ.⁴

Joseph E. Berg is another who identified Michael with Christ. He felt that one referred to as "your prince" (Dan 10:21) and "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people" (Dan 12:1) is "doubtless the Messiah."⁵ He saw, however, a discrepancy between those two passages and Dan 10:13, where Michael is merely

¹Hengstenberg, Christology OT, 4:267.
⁴Ira Chase, Remarks on the Book of Daniel (Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1844), 73.
"one of" the chief princes, something which could not be said of Christ.¹

Joseph Benson, writing about the same time as Berg, felt that the name "Michael," signifying "Who is like God?," with the designation "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people" manifestly points out the Messiah, and cannot properly be understood of a created angel."² Benson rather uniquely understands Dan 12:1-3 to have been fulfilled in Christ's first advent. He also interprets the Man in Linen in Dan 12:7 to be Michael and, thus, an appearance of Christ.³

In related interpretation, Benson interprets the "Son of God" (Dan 3:25),⁴ the Son of Man (Dan 7:13-14),⁵ the "Most Holy" (Dan 9:24),⁶ and the anointed one (Dan 9:25-26)⁷ all messianically.

The prince of Persia (Dan 10:13, 20) he took to be an evil angel.⁸

D. M. Canright, somewhat later, sees Michael as "Christ, the Son of God, commander-in-chief of the angelic armies."⁹

¹Ibid., 139.


³Ibid., 825.

⁴Ibid., 777.

⁵Ibid., 800.

⁶Ibid., 818-19.

⁷Ibid., 818-19.

⁸Ibid., 825.

⁹D. M. Canright, The Ministry of Angels and the Origin,
Uriah Smith, in his commentaries on Daniel and Revelation, interprets Michael as Christ. He puts together three NT passages to prove Michael to be Christ. Jude 9 indicates that Michael is the archangel. 1 Thess 4:16 indicates that when the Lord comes to raise the dead, the voice of the archangel is heard. John 5:28 states that the voice which raises the dead is the voice of the Son of God. Therefore, Michael is the Son of God.\(^1\) Of those surveyed in this study, Smith is the first to set forth this argument.

Also, he, like Hengstenberg, declares that expressions such as "your prince" (Dan 10:21) and "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people" (Dan 12:1) can appropriately be applied to none other than Christ.\(^2\)

In Smith's view, the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) and the heavenly spokesman of Dan 10:11ff. are, throughout, Gabriel.\(^3\)

Smith interprets the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20) as earthly kings. However, Gabriel is not fighting against these kings, but along side of, to uphold them as long as this was in God's providence.\(^4\)

---


\(^2\) Ibid., 292, 390-91.

\(^3\) Ibid., 286-88.

\(^4\) Ibid., 294.
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Nearing the close of the nineteenth century, it can be seen that a significant number of interpreters—of greater or lesser stature—have interpreted Michael messianically. There is a tendency of these same ones to interpret Dan 3:25, Dan 7:13-14, and Dan 9:25-26 messianically as well. Opinion is mixed on whether the prince of Persia refers to a human king or to an angel, either evil or holy.

**Angelic Interpretation**

John Milton (seventeenth century), against what he saw as "much Protestant opinion," held that by the name Michael the Bible signifies not Christ but the first of angels. Michael is the leader of the angels, the one who presides over the rest of the good angels. His reasons for rejecting the messianic interpretation of Michael is that, while Michael "is introduced in the capacity of a hostile commander waging war with the prince of the devils, the armies on both sides being drawn out in battle array, and separating after a doubtful conflict" (Rev 12:7-8), Christ "vanquished the devil, and trampled him under foot singly." Moreover, he regarded it as strange that Paul would reveal new things concerning Christ in such an obscure manner as referring to Him as "archangel" (1 Thess 4:16), and that Paul would even shadow the person of Christ under a difference in name.

3. Ibid., 107.
Milton does identify Michael with the "captain of the host of Jehovah" of Josh 5:14.¹

Joseph Mede (seventeenth century) interpreted "Michael, one of the chief princes" (Dan 10:13) to mean one of seven chief princes (i.e., the seven archangels of Jewish tradition). He sought to show by reference to the seven lamps of the lampstand (Zech 4:2), seven eyes of the Lord (Rev 3:1), and the seven spirits of God (Rev 4:5; 5:6) that this tradition has a firm footing in Scripture.²

Mede interpreted the Son of Man of Dan 7:13-14 to mean Christ at His second coming.³ He also interpreted the anointed one of Dan 9:25-26, as well as the one who would confirm the covenant for one week (Dan 9:27), messianically.⁴

Mede’s position, that Michael is the chief archangel and that the Son of Man is Christ, proved to be an enduring interpretation.

William Lowth (early eighteenth century), after seeming to identify Michael in Dan 12:1 with Christ, then, strangely, comments:

But in this and the parallel texts of Daniel, the Name rather denotes some principle Angel, whom the Jews look’d [sic] upon as the Guardian Angel of their nation.⁵

Thomas Newton, writing in the mid-eighteenth century, stated that "Michael was (Dan. x.21, xii.1) the tutelar angel and protector of the Jewish church" and that he performs the same office of

---

¹Ibid., 105.


³Ibid., 780-81.

⁴Ibid., 700, 706.

⁵Lowth, 1:121.
champion for the Christian church. He interpreted the Prince of princes (Dan 8:25) as the Messiah. 

Isaac Ambrose (mid-eighteenth century) also held to the view that Michael was one of the seven archangels, a view he defended from the Apocrypha and the Bible (Tob 12:15; Zech 6:10; Rev 4:5,6; 8:2). 

Richard Amner (late eighteenth century) regarded Michael as one of the angels "appearing in the character of the protector or guardian angel of the Jewish people." He interpreted the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) to be Michael, and the princes of Persia and Greece to be national guardian angels. Amner interpreted the Anointed Prince (Dan 9:25) to be Cyrus, and the Anointed One who was cut off (Dan 9:26) as Onias III. 

Early in the next century, Adam Clarke mentioned the two views. "Michael, he who is like God, sometimes appears to signify

1 Thomas Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies* (Philadelphia: J. J. Woodward, 1838), 533. The first dated reprint of this work was a three-volume edition published 1754-58. Three other publishers issued editions before this.

2 Ibid., 255.

3 Isaac Ambrose, *The Compleat Works* (Glasgow: Joseph Galbraith, 1768), 617.


5 Ibid., 122.

6 Ibid., 4.

7 Ibid., 202-03.
the Messiah, at other times, the highest or chief archangel," but
seems to favor the latter.¹

N. Folsom (early nineteenth century) regarded Michael as a
tutelar angel.² The Son of Man was interpreted as Jesus Christ,³
and the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes interpreted as Jeho­
vah.⁴ Folsom understood the Anointed Prince (Dan 9:25), the cut-off
Anointed One (Dan 9:26), and the one who confirms the covenant (Dan
9:27) all to be Jesus Christ.⁵

Moses Stuart, concerning the reference to Michael in Dan
12:1, wrote, "the whole phrase amounts simply to Michael, your guard­
ian archangel."⁶ He interpreted the Son of Man to be the Mes­siah.⁷ The princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20) he took to
be angels, though he struggled with the concept of strife between
angels of God.⁸ The Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11) he understood to

¹Adam Clarke, "The Book of the Prophet Daniel," The Holy
Bible, with a Commentary and Critical Notes, vol. 4 (New York:
Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1836), 606, 617.

²Nathaniel S. Folsom, A Critical and Historical Interpreta­
tion of the Prophecies of Daniel (Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1842),
14, 202.

³Ibid., 139.

⁴Ibid., 75.

⁵Ibid., 182.

⁶Moses Stuart, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Boston:
Crocker & Brewster, 1850), 360; see also 324.

⁷Ibid., 216.

⁸Ibid., 323-24.
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be "God Himself."\(^1\) He interpreted the Anointed One (Dan 9:26) to be Onias III.\(^2\)

Albert Barnes (circa 1851) pointedly rejects the messianic identification of Michael.\(^3\) Michael was Israel's guardian angel and highest of the angels, who would interpose and render aid to Israel in that [eschatological] time of great trouble.\(^4\) He understood the Son of Man to be messianic,\(^5\) and the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes to be God, the ruler over the kings of the earth.\(^6\) The princes of Persia and Greece were evil patron angels of those nations, in opposition to God.\(^7\) This latter interpretation is a departure from the prevailing view that these princes are national guardian angels in the service of God.

J. N. Darby, though reluctant to identify Michael, did refer to him as "the archangel".\(^8\) He interpreted the Anointed in Dan 9:25-26 messianically\(^9\) as he did also the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:25).\(^10\)

\(^1\)Ibid., 233.
\(^2\)Ibid., 289.
\(^4\)Ibid., 258.
\(^5\)Ibid., 65.
\(^6\)Ibid., 110-11, 121.
\(^7\)Ibid., 199-201.
\(^9\)Ibid., 74.
\(^10\)Ibid., 47.
Darby continued the tradition of interpreting the Son of Man messianically, but also saw the Ancient of Days (Dan 7:9, 13) as identical to the Son of Man, a view which appeared earlier in a commentary by John Cumming.3

G. A. Auberlen saw Michael as the archangel "at the head of the Israelite Theocracy" and the angel to whom is entrusted the defense of God's church.4

Auberlen understood the princes of Persia and Greece to be patron angels of those countries, against whom Michael, at the head of the "Israelitish Theocracy", stood opposed.5 He understood the anointed most holy (Dan 9:24), the Anointed Prince (Dan 9:25), and Anointed One (Dan 9:26) to be the Messiah.6 The prince to come (Dan 9:26) Auberlen thought to be the Roman general Titus.7

C. F. Keil identified Michael as the Angel of the Lord. In his view Michael's name, "Who is as God," suggests that he is "thus the angel possessing the unparalleled power of God," standing above the angels. He nevertheless places the "Man in Linen" figure of Dan

---

1Ibid., 31-32.
2Ibid., 32.
5Ibid., 56.
6Ibid., 98-100.
7Ibid., 101.
10:5ff.—whom he apparently takes to be Christ—above Michael.¹

W. H. Rule follows what may be seen as a set pattern in one line of interpretation: Michael is a guardian angel-prince,² the Son of Man is the Messiah,³ and in Dan 9:24-27, the Anointed Prince⁴ and the cut-off Anointed One⁵ are the Messiah, while the coming prince is Caesar.⁶

Charles Hodge, since he interpreted Michael as an archangel, felt that the inference seems natural that the princes of Persia and Greece were also angels. Hodge interprets the Angel of the Lord to be uncreated and divine.⁷

A. R. Fausset followed the pattern of interpreting Michael as a guardian archangel,⁸ the Son of Man as Messiah,⁹ the Most


²William Harris Rule, An Historical Exposition of the Book of Daniel the Prophet (London: Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday, 1869), 263.

³Ibid., 209.

⁴Ibid., 252.

⁵Ibid., 253.

⁶Ibid.


⁹Ibid., 421.
Holy\textsuperscript{1} and the Anointed of Dan 9:24-26\textsuperscript{2} as the Messiah, and the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) as the Son of God.\textsuperscript{3} The princes of Persia and Greece, however, he understood to be adverse, evil angels.\textsuperscript{4} On this latter point, no clear pattern had yet emerged.

Michael could not be Christ, he reasoned, because in Jude 9 he is distinguished from "the Lord".\textsuperscript{5}

Otto Zöckler supported the view of guardian angels over nations, with Michael the guardian angel of Israel, seeing parallels in Deut 32:8 and Ps 96:41 LXX.\textsuperscript{6} The name Michael, "Who is like God?," asserts God's incomparable and assisting power. Michael is seen as head of a heavenly host, as in Josh 5:14.\textsuperscript{7} The messianic interpretation is explicitly rejected; Michael in Dan 12:1 is supporting and protecting Israel, though not as Messiah. He notes the close parallel between Dan 7 and 12, and, while he identifies the Son of Man with the Messiah, cautions against identifying the Son of Man with Michael.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., 436.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., 437.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., 441.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., 441, 454.

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., 454.

\textsuperscript{6}Ps 96:41.

\textsuperscript{7}Otto Zöckler, \textit{The Book of the Prophet Daniel}, vol. 13, Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scripture, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 228-29; orig. pub. 1876.

\textsuperscript{8}Ibid., 261.
Literature specifically took issue with Hengstenberg's identification of Michael with Jesus Christ.

This is hardly in accordance with the mention of the other archangel, Gabriel, nor with the other theophanies in the O.T., in which the Logos appears only as the Angel [of] Jehovah, or the Angel of the Covenant.¹

Joseph Seiss followed a typical pattern in Michael interpretation. Michael was an angelic prince.² The Son of Man was Jesus Christ.³ The Anointed Prince (Dan 9:25) was Jesus Christ.⁴ The Prince of the Host was God Himself.⁵ The princes of Persia and Greece were satanic angels.⁶

Lewis R. Dunn identified the Angel of the Lord with the pre-incarnate Christ, but regarded Michael as the patron angel of the Jewish people, a view he felt was confirmed by Jude 9, which he took as Jude's acceptance of the Targum of Onkelos on Deut 34:6, where "it is stated that the grave of Moses was given into the special custody of Michael."⁷

Edward Pusey identifies Michael with the Angel of the Lord, but, though he raised the question, "Whether it were the Son of God

³Ibid., 199.
⁴Ibid., 242.
⁵Ibid., 214.
⁶Ibid., 269-70.
... or no," felt it seemed most probable to view him as a created angel. The princes of Persia and Greece were angels of God, who, seeking the welfare of their peoples, contended with Gabriel and Michael before God, each in submission to the Divine Will.¹

A. A. Bevan, interpreting Michael as the guardian angel of Israel, attributed to Michael an active role. He "will arise to defend the saints."² He specifically rejected interpreting the prince of Persia to be Cyrus; he was understood rather to be the guardian angel of the Persian empire.³ In his interpretation of the Son of Man, Bevan departs significantly from the previously encountered view that the Son of Man is Christ. In his view, the Son of Man symbolized a kingdom, the kingdom of the Israelite saints, just as the four beasts (Dan 7:3-8) symbolize four kingdoms (Dan 7:17, 23).⁴

Bevan also abandons any messianic interpretation of Dan 9:24-27. In his view, the most holy (Dan 9:24) is never of persons; "an anointed one, a prince" (Dan 9:25) represents the high priest Joshua; and the cut-off Anointed One was the high priest Onias III.⁵

Commenting on Dan 10:13, W. T. Bullock thought that Michael may "possibly" be identical with the Prince of the Host of the Lord (Josh 5:14) and of the "Angel of the Lord" (Exod 23:20) "who appears

²A. A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1892), 168, 201.
³Ibid., 167.
⁴Ibid., 118-19.
⁵Ibid., 155-57.
often in the early books of the Old Testament" and "who was assigned specially to be the keeper of Israel."\(^1\) However, he regarded the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes of Dan 8:11, 25 to be "the God of Israel."\(^2\)

Bullock interprets Dan 9:24-27 messianically, including the "most holy" of Dan 9:24.\(^3\)

Edward Dennett's devotional work follows a typical pattern of interpreting Michael as an archangel,\(^4\) the princes of Persia and Greece as satanic angels,\(^5\) and the Anointed Prince as Messiah.\(^6\)

One interesting departure from the pattern was his interpretation of the Son of Man as the Ancient of Days, the Eternal God. This was based on his comparison of Dan 7:22 and Rev 1.\(^7\)

Nathaniel West denied that Michael could be identified with either the Angel of the Lord, or Jesus Christ, but was rather the guardian angel-prince of Israel.\(^8\) The Son of Man was interpreted as Christ at His second coming.\(^9\) The prince of Persia was

\(^2\)Ibid., [no page numbers].
\(^3\)Ibid., [no page numbers].
\(^5\)Ibid., 164, 167.
\(^6\)Ibid., 149.
\(^7\)Ibid., 101.
\(^8\)Nathaniel West, Daniel's Great Prophecy (New York: The Hope of Israel Movement, 1898), 122.
\(^9\)Ibid., 54.
regarded as an evil angel-prince.\(^1\)

In an unusual interpretation, while he understood the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11) to be Onias III, West interpreted the Prince of princes (Dan 8:25) to be Israel's God.\(^2\)

Wilhelm Lueken's dissertation on Michael gave this figure full attention. Though his primary concern was not the biblical picture, he did comment on the biblical Michael texts, and is widely regarded as the standard critical work on the Michael figure.

Lueken believed Daniel contains the earliest mention of the Michael figure in Jewish literature. "Michael" means "Who is like God?,"\(^3\) an interpretation of the name also held by early interpreters, and apparently the universal published view today.\(^4\)

Though the name Michael is "truly Jewish," he thinks it is probable that the archangel names, like other angel names, appearing in post-exilic Judaism were brought back from Babylon, and that Michael is a Hebraization of a foreign name.\(^5\)

Michael was an angel prince, guardian angel of Israel. Each of the hostile heathen kingdoms, such as Persia and Greece, similarly

\(^1\)Ibid., 141.

\(^2\)Ibid., 54, 58.


\(^5\)Lueken, 2.
had a guardian angel prince with whom Michael fought on Israel's behalf.¹

Lueken saw Michael as identified, at least in the LXX, with the Prince of the Hosts of Yahweh in Josh 5:14, and the Prince of the Host in Dan 8:11. He noted that Michael, whose appearance in Dan 12:1 ushered in the end of the tribulation, the deliverance, resurrection and glorification of the righteous, stood at that time in the place of the Messiah.² Michael will arise to deliver Israel from the tribulation brought on by Antiochus Epiphanes. He emphasized that Michael in Daniel is primarily an eschatological figure.³

Twentieth-Century Interpretation

Lueken's work did not bring a consensus on the identity or function of Michael. Interpreters of different schools of interpretation saw Michael as an angel or, alternately, as Messiah. Other issues also became prominent. A shift toward an angelic interpretation of the Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High led to a greater tendency to identify the Son of Man with Michael. Also, the concept of national patron angels and their origin was increasingly debated.

Messianic Interpretation

The messianic interpretation persisted, defined in some detail by R. M. Patterson. He saw Michael's name as a description of his character, "Who is like God," and felt that the role of

¹Ibid., 2, 13.
²Ibid., 26, 27.
³Ibid., 27, 43.
eschatological deliverance of Israel in Dan 12:1-3 is the work of the Son of God (John 5:28-29). Michael is the "first of the chief princes" (Dan 10:13). Patterson also identified Michael with the māl'ak yahweh (Angel of the Lord) figure in the Pentateuch.1

C. H. H. Wright sees the Michael figure in Rev 12:7-9 as portraying "Messiah as the conqueror." Indeed, he identifies Michael with Jehovah Himself, the Prince of the Host and Prince of Princes of Dan 8:11,25. When Michael stands up in Dan 12, it is Jehovah who stands up to save His people and punish their enemy.2

R. D. Wilson questions the theory of national patron angels in God's service, preferring the MT of Deut 32:8, "sons of Israel." He feels that it is likely that the LXX translation of that verse, "sons of God," was influenced by the view of angels propounded in Daniel.3 He thinks it is possible that Michael is the Messiah Himself rather than being another patron angel, that of Israel.4

J. A. Lees, while accepting that Michael is Israel's heavenly patron, also defends the messianic interpretation, finding a basis not only in Rev 12, but "also in the attributes ascribed to him in Daniel."5

---

2Charles Henry Hamilton Wright, Daniel and His Prophecies. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), 180, 319-20
5Ibid., 137.
Clarence Hewitt feels Michael must be the Messiah, or at least a visionary representation of Him.

There is solid Biblical basis for the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ is a "prince" of the house of David, heir to David's vacant throne, and the Messiah of promise. Is He not therefore par excellence "the great prince which stand for" God's people?

There is a strong ground for believing that "Michael" here in Daniel 12:1 is a name applied to the Lord Messiah as He stands upon the earth in the glory of the Father and in resurrection power.¹

Hewitt regards the Son of Man to be Christ,² thus also equating the Son of Man with Michael. He supports the view that the princes of Persia and Greece are evil angels, though he is not really comfortable with it or strongly committed to it.³

G. M. Price interprets Michael messianically. He adopts U. Smith's reasoning that from Jude 9, we learn that Michael is the archangel; in 1 Thess 4:16 we learn that Christ returns with "the voice of the archangel"; and in John 5:28 we are told that the dead will rise when they hear the voice of the Son of God. The conclusion drawn is that the voice of Michael is the voice of Christ, and that, therefore, Michael is a designation for Christ in His heavenly activity.⁴ Further, Price feels that the designation of Michael "the great prince who stands for the children of your people" (Dan 12:1) can only refer to Christ.⁵

¹Ibid., 279-281.
²Ibid., 138-39.
⁵Ibid., 326.
Price, in an apparent attempt to explain the designation "Archangel," proposes that Michael is the name applied to the Son of God, when, as part of His condescension He "took the place of one of the angels before He became human."¹ Price also identifies Michael with the "Angel of the Lord" of the Pentateuch and Judges.²

Price interprets the princes of Persia and Greece as the human kings, rather than supernatural patrons, of those nations.³ He agrees with Smith that Michael fights on the side of these kings, not in opposition to them.⁴

Price interprets Michael's appearance in Dan 12:1 to precede the demise of the anti-God power of Dan 11:45, for Michael's intervention brought it about. That Michael is the one who "stands for" Daniel's people implies that the arising of Michael refers to his intervention to protect his people.⁵

Price interprets the Son of Man (Dan 7:13-14), the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes (Dan 8:11, 25), and--departing from Smith--the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) messianically, and thus, indirectly, identifies them with Michael.⁶

The anonymous commentary on Daniel in the SDABC interprets Michael messianically. The author, like Price, follows U. Smith's argument that since the voice heard at the resurrection is that of

¹Ibid., 268.
²Ibid., 272.
³Ibid., 267.
⁴Ibid., 271.
⁵Ibid., 325.
⁶Ibid., 144, 171, 265.
Michael the archangel (Jude 9, 1 Thess 4:16) and also that of the Son of God (John 5:28), Michael, therefore, must be Christ, the Son of God. The author notes that the name Michael appears in the Bible—presumably in reference to a heavenly being—only in apocalyptic passages (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1; Jude 9; Rev 12:7).^1

The standing of Michael (Dan 12:1), which is Michael taking action to deliver his people, is, according to the author, Christ arising to deliver His people.2

The princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20) are understood as evil angels, powers of darkness, against which Gabriel and Michael struggled to influence the earthly rulers of these nations on behalf of God's people.3

The author also interprets the Son of Man (Dan 7:13-14), the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes (Dan 8:11, 25), and the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) messianically, and thus, again, indirectly, identifies them with Michael.4

N. C. Habel comes very close to identifying the Son of Man as a divine heavenly being, emphasizing the theophanic significance of the cloud motif.5 He denies that the Son of Man is an earthly Messiah or human king, in a sense rejecting the messianic

---


^2Ibid., 878.

^3Ibid., 859.

^4Ibid., 829, 842, 846, 858.

interpretation of the Son of Man. Then he clearly identifies the Son of Man with Michael, whose "advent" precedes the deliverance of the persecuted saints.¹ He does maintain the view that there were national patron princes (Dan 10:13, 20) who were satanic angels.²

As already noted, B. Lindars understands that Michael is God's celestial agent for intervening on behalf of the Jews, and that, though "there are no direct links," Michael is possibly to be identified with the Son of Man.³ He conceives of the Son of Man, whom he sees as the leader of the angelic saints,⁴ as the celestial Messiah, to be distinguished from the Davidic Messiah, though it is not a case of rival views of messiahship. Apocalyptic does not look for political solutions, but for direct divine intervention.⁵ Because Linders regards Michael as a heavenly Messiah, he is included here. Because Michael is to him a national angel, representing the Jews at the divine court, though also engaged in combating their enemies,⁶ Lindars is also included in the survey of those interpreting Michael as angelic. To Lindars, Michael is a heavenly, angelic Messiah.

A. Lacocque takes a different approach. He identifies

¹Ibid., 23.
²Ibid., 12.
³Barnabas Lindars, "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man," NTS 22 (1975-76): 56.
⁴Ibid., 55.
⁵Ibid., 60.
⁶Ibid., 56.
Michael with the Son of Man or, somewhat differently, includes Michael within the Son of Man figure. The Son of Man is identified with the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes (Dan 8:11,25), chief of the angels, who is the "transcendent personification of 'the people of the saints,'" who are the entire angelic/Israelite community of the righteous. He is the "first-born of God," the "primordial righteous man," "pattern man, the prototype of humanity." Lacocque identifies Michael with the Angel of Yahweh (Exod 23:20ff.; Isa 63:9) and the Prince of the Host of Yahweh (Josh 5:14-15), thus a military figure. But he also has a judicial aspect. Like the Son of Man, Michael combines the functions of priest, judge and king. He sees Michael in some sense distinct from the Son of Man, yet the personification of his glorious dimension. This is to explain how Lacocque could interpret the being of Dan 10:5-6 as the Son of Man, and see Michael coming to his aid!

He subscribes to the idea of national patron angels, with Michael (Son of Man) as the guardian angel of Israel.

---

1 Lacocque, Daniel, 162.
2 Ibid., 242.
3 Ibid., 172.
4 Ibid., 128-29.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., 242.
7 Ibid., 209n.
8 Ibid., 200.
9 Ibid., 128.
10 Ibid., 200.
Lacocque sees in the Old Testament uses of the expression הַּאֲמוֹד ('al ("which standeth for" KJV Dan 12:1), in addition to the ideas "to lead" or "to protect," also the idea "stand up to judge," thus seeing a judicial function of Michael in his eschatological activity.¹

D. Ford follows the messianic interpretation of Michael. He sees Michael as the mysterious figure of Dan 10:5-8, noting that Daniel's reaction to this vision is identical with that of other saints, such as Paul, Moses, and Isaiah, who were granted a view of God.² The prince of the Kingdom of Persia is primarily Satan himself, who, by his emissaries, tried to turn the Medo-Persian ruler against Israel. Both Christ and Satan were moving upon the mind of the king.³

A. Ferch, like Lindars, makes a strong correlation between Michael and the Son of Man. He observed that Schmidt's argument that, on the analogy of the man or man-like figures in Daniel, the Son of Man must be an angelic figure has become "programmatic" for later writers who see the Son of Man as an angel. He sees this as the most published opinion in recent Daniel Son of Man research. Ferch counters Volz's criticism of Schmidt's identification of the Son of Man with Michael, by pointing out that Michael, far from being a well-known figure, is mentioned for the first time in the book of Daniel, and that Michael, like the Son of Man, becomes particularly active at the eschaton. He observed, with Zevit, that most commentators who

¹Ibid., 240.
³Ibid., 250.
interpret the Son of Man as an angel identify him with Michael.¹

Ferch sees Michael as both leader and patron of Israel, and finds Michael's eschatological appearance (Dan 12:1-3) in a judicial context as seen in the reference (1) to the "books," (2) to the resurrection, and (3) in the first of the two uses of the verb "stand" in Dan 12:1, a usage which occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament in a judicial context.²

Ferch places primary emphasis on Michael's eschatological role. The author of Daniel believed God's "definite and decisive intervention would occur" through Michael's intervention, at which time Israel would be rescued, her enemies destroyed, and the community restored. Ferch discerns here some messianic overtones. The roles of the Son of Man and Michael are closely parallel; both are linked with Israel's destiny and ultimate vindication. In spite of the close parallels, he stops short of identifying the two figures, because "Daniel does not." Yet he uses the close parallel to argue for the Son of Man to be interpreted as an individual, heavenly being.³

Robert Gurney thinks that Michael may well be the "mysterious, divine 'Angel of the Lord'--also called the angel of his presence and the messenger (angel) of the covenant." In Jude 9, Michael rebukes the devil with the expression, "The Lord rebuke you," the same expression as was used by the Angel of the Lord in Zech 3:1-4 in


²Ibid., 99-100.

³Ibid., 101-05, 107.
contending with Satan.\(^1\) And since the expression "angel of God" is used interchangeably with "Lord," he is convinced that the guardian angel of Israel is Jesus Christ Himself.\(^2\)

Further, since the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11) is generally acknowledged to be God, and since Michael is "the great prince" who stands for God's people, it is natural, Gurney feels, to conclude that Michael is God Himself.\(^3\) He concludes that "the divine Angel of the Lord, the Prince of the Host, Michael, and Jesus Christ are one and the same person."\(^4\) Gurney also equates the "Prince of the Host of Yahweh" of Josh 5:14-15 with the "Prince of the Host" of Dan 8:11.\(^5\)

He also interprets the Son of Man\(^6\) and the Anointed Prince of Dan 9:25-27 messianically.\(^7\)

Gurney proposes the unusual interpretation that the vision of Dan 10-12 depicts events which lead up to and include the \textit{first} coming of Christ. Those who interpret Michael messianically usually view his appearance in Dan 12:1 as relating to the second coming of Christ.\(^8\)


\(^2\)Ibid., 158.

\(^3\)Ibid., 78, 159.

\(^4\)Ibid., 160.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Ibid., 62-63.

\(^7\)Ibid., 120-29.

\(^8\)Ibid., 162-65.
M. Maxwell holds to a messianic interpretation of Michael. He identified Michael with the Prince of the Host of Yahweh in Josh 5:13-15. By the parallel of the command to remove shoes from the feet because of holy ground (Josh 5:15, Exod 3:5), Maxwell also identifies Michael with the Angel of Yahweh (Exod 3:2), whom he understands to be Yahweh in messenger form and the pre-incarnate Christ.¹

As evidence that Michael is Christ, Maxwell also uses U. Smith’s argument that while in 1 Thess 4:16 it is the "voice of the archangel" which signals the resurrection of the dead at the second coming, in John 5:28-29, it is the "voice of the Son of God." Further, in Dan 12:1-4, it is when Michael arises at the end time that the resurrection occurs.²

Maxwell also identifies Michael with the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6). He disputes the idea that Gabriel left Michael behind with the kings of Persia to come to Daniel (RSV), but understands rather that Gabriel had remained with the kings of Persia until Michael came to his aid; thus Michael as well as Gabriel could be present in the vision.³

Maxwell also interprets the stone of Dan 2, the Son of Man in Dan 7:13-14, and "Messiah Prince" of Dan 9:25-27 messianically.⁴

Jacques Doukhan, in recognizing various parallel literary

²Ibid., 273.
³Ibid.
structures in the book of Daniel, saw Dan 7 related to Dan 12 on the motif of the judgment and the parousia. Only in these passages is the theme of judgment and books "associated with the coming of a specific Individual called the Son of Man in Dan 7 and Michael in Dan 2."  

Doukhan concludes, on the basis of a complex literary pattern, that the book of Daniel is an organic unity. In Dan 10, Michael is not appearing for the first time; he is the figure of a heavenly prince appearing again. It is only that he is named for the first time. The same heavenly prince appeared in different settings throughout the book of Daniel.

It is the Son of God in Dan 3 or the angel in Dan 6, the Son of Man in Dan 7, the Prince of the host or the Prince of Princes in Dan 8, the Prince in Dan 9:26a, the man clothed in linen in Dan 10 (cf 12).

Even when Michael was first named (Dan 10:13, 21), he was referred to by a third person. It is in the depiction of the final war in Dan 12:1-4 that Michael is for the first time seen in the vision.

When Michael stands up, he is the last in a series of kings to achieve his victory and take his rule. Michael will arise to action, involving violence, in the overthrow of God's enemies in the

---


2 Ibid., 5.

3 Ibid., 75.

4 Ibid., 100.
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deliverance of God’s people and the establishment of the Kingdom of God.\(^1\)

The messianic interpretation of Michael, which had a revival at the time of the Reformation, has continued as a minority position among Christian interpreters. The tools of biblical scholarship have not caused its demise. Instead, the study of literary and thematic parallels and other factors has resulted in a revival of interest in interpreting Michael as more than the highest archangel, but rather as a divine, messianic figure of heavenly origin.

**Angelic Interpretation**

J. D. Prince understands Michael to be guardian angel of Israel,\(^2\) and sees the princes of Persia and Greece also to be national guardian angels.\(^3\)

S. R. Driver writes that Michael was the patron or guardian angel of the Jews, just as the kingdoms of Persia and Greece had patron angels. Attention turned to the question of the origin of the concept of national patron angels, and the source of named angels. As Driver notes, some hold that they are the ancient gods of the nations, transformed by Israel’s "more consistent monotheism" into angels subordinate to Yahweh, while others ascribe them to later tendencies, seeing God ruling through intermediaries and personifying

\(^1\)Ibid., 101.

\(^2\)John Dyneley Prince, *A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichsb’sche Buchhandlung, 1899), 166. Though Prince, technically, did not write in the twentieth century, Lueken is here regarded as the watershed, and Prince wrote after Lueken.

\(^3\)Ibid., 168.
the spirit of a nation into such a heavenly being.¹ Driver sees Michael as one of the seven archangels, "chief princes" (Dan 10:13), of Tob 12:15. He sees a doctrine of patron or tutelary angels of nations distinctly appearing first in Daniel. He rejects significant Persian influence on Jewish angelology in the second century B.C., where he places the origin of the book of Daniel.²

N. Schmidt makes important contributions to the discussion of the figure of Michael. Writing about the Son of Man figure in Dan 7, he makes a very positive identification of the Son of Man with Michael, "man" being seen as the typical description of angels in Daniel. He rejects a corporate interpretation of the Son of Man, sees strength in the messianic interpretation, but finally rejects that in favor of identification with Michael. He understands Michael to be the guardian angel prince of Israel, who, as a celestial being, fades from the scene once the Jewish saints occupy the kingdom.³

His position that the Son of Man and Michael are the same angelic prince of Israel appears to be a new concept. Earlier identifications of the Son of Man with Michael were messianic, not angelic.⁴

Schmidt, like Lueken, sees a Babylonian source with Marduk's victory over Tiâmât as prototype for the eschatological Son of

²Ibid., xciv.
⁴Ibid., 26-27.
Man/Michael victory over the fourth dragon-like beast. With later
growth of the messianic idea, the work and honor of Michael as
Israel's representative shifted to the Messiah.\(^1\)

Wm. Kelly thinks Michael was "well known to be the archangel
who took a special guardian care over the nation of Israel."\(^2\) He
interprets the Son of Man\(^3\) and the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6)\(^4\)
both to be Christ.

P. Volz, like Driver, emphasizes the importance of Michael's
role. To him the eschatological drama begins with the appearance of
Michael who lifts his--until then lowered--sword, then the end
appears. That no actual action is attributed to Michael is explained
by the author's (of Dan 12) passive manner of expression.\(^5\)

A. C. Gaebelein interprets Michael to be the leading
angel.\(^6\) He interprets the Ancient of Days to be the Son of Man,
and the coming of the Son of Man was the second coming of Jesus.\(^7\)

\(^1\)Ibid., 27. "In the apocalypse of John it is the dragon that
Michael fights; in Assumptio Mosis it is Satan. Originally it was
Tiâmât, and Michael's prototype is Marduk. That the destruction
of the beast is here ascribed to Michael, while in earlier writings the
violation of Rahab-Ribbu, the piercing of the Dragon, the conquest of
Tehom-Tiâmât, are Yahweh's work, is only in harmony with the well-
authenticated development of Jewish thought."

\(^2\)William Kelly, \textit{Notes on the Book of Daniel} (New York:
Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, 1902), 200.

\(^3\)Ibid., 133-34.

\(^4\)Ibid., 197.

\(^5\)Paul Volz, \textit{Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba}
(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1903), 195.

\(^6\)A. C. Gaebelein, \textit{The Prophet Daniel} (New York: Our Hope,
1911), 159.

\(^7\)Ibid., 78-79.
The "little horn" of Dan 8:9-12 was Antiochus Epiphanes, and the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11) is "the Lord." By the prince of Persia, he understands a wicked angel.

R. H. Charles seeks to explain from within Judaism the origin of the idea of guardian angels of the nations. Though God chose Israel for Himself, He was also God of all the world. Therefore He deputed angels to look after and champion the cause of other nations. At a later time, even the guardianship over Israel was deputed to the archangel Michael. Since Michael is guardian of Israel, he is also prince over all the angels.

Charles notes that Sirach and Jubilees 15:32 see God as the immediate ruler of Israel, but that in Daniel and later writers Michael is designated as patron of Israel.

Similarly, in the interpretation of G. A. Barton, each nation has a "prince" or "archangel" to look after its interests. This is true not only of Greece and Persia (Dan 10:13, 20) but of Israel as well, whose patron was Michael. Named angels appear first in Daniel, then greatly expand in non-canonical apocalypses. As monotheism triumphed, heathen deities were reduced to the ranks of demons. Barton does not, however, identify these demons with the angel

---

1 Ibid., 97.
2 Ibid., 159.
princes of other nations, as some have done.\(^1\)

W. Whitla adopts the angelic interpretation, identifying Michael with the Angel of the Lord. The princes of Persia, Greece and other heathen nations were angels of God, showing God's care for the heathen nations. He rejects Persian influence on the angelology of Daniel. Daniel originated in the sixth century and was the first to have named angels.\(^2\)

G. H. Dix sees two competing messianic schools in Judaism: one which looked for the coming of the Angel of Yahweh, the other which expected a spirit-endowed man as Messiah. The former, of greater interest here, made full use of Babylonian ideas, while the latter explicitly rejected them.\(^3\) Rejecting theories of Persian influence, Dix sees the seven archangels of apocalyptic Judaism as coming from Babylonian planetary gods. He sees this in Ezek 9:1-8, where the prophet of the Exile deliberately degraded the pagan gods into angels subordinate to Yahweh. Hebrew names were later added to these angels to sever them from the Babylonian deities.\(^4\) Nibir (Jupiter)\(^5\) became Michael, both functioning as leader of the heavenly host.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\)George A. Barton, "Demons and Spirits (Hebrew)," \textit{ERE} (1914), 4:597.


\(^3\)G. H. Dix, "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits," \textit{JTS} 27 (1925): 233.

\(^4\)Ibid., 234-35.

\(^5\)Ibid., 235.

\(^6\)Ibid., 237-38.
Dix feels that earlier, the Angel of Yahweh, the Angel of the Presence (Yahweh Himself in personal manifestation), was the messianic angel. This מלאך יהוה was obscured by one of the archangels. This one was Phanuel, whose name means "presence of God." Phanuel is "the equivalent of the Angel of Yahweh in the capacity of messianic Peace-giver to Israel." Phanuel is the "Prince of Princes" of Dan 8:25 (God would be called "King" not "Prince"), and the mysterious figure of Dan 10:5-9, "one like unto a son of man," something less than God, but something more than an archangel. He, supported by Michael, fights against the princes of Persia and Greece.

However, Michael gradually came to be regarded as the chief archangel, the "Logos" of Philo, and took over the functions of Phanuel, and became almost--but not quite--equivalent to the Angel of Yahweh. He fills this role in Rev 12. This Angel of Yahweh, Son of Man, Logos, Michael figure became linked with the Christian Messiah, as the Self-manifestation of God.

Some elements of Dix's thesis rest on slender evidence, not the least of which is the idea that the concepts of seven archangels existed when Daniel was written.

E. W. Barnes takes the view that Michael is a guardian angel of Israel. In his analysis, angels as orders of beings do not begin with Daniel, but with the later book, Tobit.
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1 Ibid., 239-40.
2 Ibid., 241-42.
3 Ibid., 243-44.
4 Emery W. Barnes, "The Development of the Religion of Israel
J. A. Montgomery speaks against seeing significant Babylonian influence behind the figures in Daniel. Against the view of Babylonian influences propounded by Dix, he argued that "it is not convincing to argue back from later literature like Rev., or even Enoch, to what must have been the mental background of Dan."\(^1\) Behind the idea of national patron angels, and Michael the prince of Israel, he sees the "sons of God" in Deut 32:8-9 LXX, and the "Captain of the hosts of YHWH" in Josh 5:14. Dix thinks these celestial princes of the nations were seen by the author of Daniel as organized after the fashion of the Persian empire, where each operated in semi-independence, with God's representative intervening to settle disputes over conflicting interests.\(^2\)

J. Montgomery endorses Volz's rejection of Schmidt's identification of the Son of Man with Michael. He agrees with Volz that Michael is a well-known figure in Daniel, while the Son of Man is a future, not-yet-existent one. Montgomery believes that since the four beasts are not real animals, it is not logical to demand the reality of the Son of Man.\(^3\)

G. T. Box rejects any messianic interpretation of the Dan 7 Son of Man figure in Daniel, but sees it as both a symbol of the people of Israel and as a person. This person is the angel Michael from the Return to the Death of Simon the Maccabee," in *The People and the Book*, ed. Arthur S. Peake (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 298-306.


\(^2\)Ibid., 419.

\(^3\)Ibid., 321.
in the thought of the author, who acts as Israel's representative and counterpart. He sees behind the Son of Man/Michael figure the figure of the "Cosmic Man," who, in apocalyptic tradition was gradually invested with messianic attributes, which explains the eventual messianic application of the Son of Man idea. In the book of Daniel, Michael plays an all-important role in determining Israel's fortunes, both in fighting against present angelic enemies, and in bringing salvation and glory in his eschatological appearance. 1

E. Sellin, commenting on the mel'tak yahweh, sees in him a forerunner of the archangel Michael in Daniel. He rejects the idea that the figure is a genuine divine hypostasy, but believes it is rather an angel, who in the post-exilic period became the special guardian angel of Judah. 2

A. Bertholet adopts the view that the princes of the kingdoms of Greece and Persia in Daniel are angelic guardians, just as Michael is of Israel. The source of this view he sees as the deposed gods of the foreign peoples, subordinated to God. He acknowledges that these deposed gods later came to be regarded as demons, but the author of Daniel had not pushed them down that far. The Persian religious world was not seen by the Jews as particularly unfriendly; therefore their angel prince was not viewed as an enemy. 3


2 Ernst Sellin, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1933), 45.

T. F. Stier sees Michael not as the simple prototype of a later, richer development, as Lueken thought, but as a well-known, expected heavenly deliverer in the circles for whom the author of Daniel wrote. Though Michael's function is not precisely defined, it seems clear that through Michael's intervention, the last, decisive victory over heavenly and earthly enemies was expected.¹

J. Morgenstern also understands the "princes" of Persia and Greece to be national guardian angels. These angels were "unquestionably" the old national gods greatly reduced in divine rank under the principle of the universality and unity of Yahweh. They fight against each other, and all against the prince of Israel, even as their nations did against Israel. The prince of Israel is Michael, the most exalted of the angels. However, Michael is not a reduced deity, but rather corresponds to the māl'ak yahweh, Yahweh's immediate representative in His dealings with men.²

L. S. Chafer sees Michael as the only archangel, Gabriel never being given that title. He sees significance in his name, Who is like God, suggesting that it means he is in some respects like God. He does not hesitate to identify the Angel of Jehovah as the pre-incarnate Christ, though he does not explicitly so identify Michael, nor does he equate the Angel of Jehovah with Michael.³


² Julian Morgenstern, "Angels: In the Bible," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, (1939), 1:310

³ Chafer, 410-412.
H. C. Leupold sees Michael as an angel, understanding the significance of his name as pointing to One more powerful even than he, the Creator Himself. He did not identify him with the Son of Man, who he identified with the divine Christ. He saw the princes of Persia and Greece not as national guardian angels but as evil angels, though seeing every heathen nation as dominated by some such prince. He understands Michael's activity in Dan 12:1 to be a warlike activity in protecting God's people.

F. A. Tatford follows Leupold, seeing the Son of Man as Jesus Christ, but Michael as "only a created being" despite his lofty rank. The princes of the heathen nations are evil spirits. Michael is Israel's patron angel, who would rise to deliver God's people from the final persecution at the hands of the king of the north.

This approach was continued by E. J. Young, who, though he speaks of the prince of the kingdom of Persia as "the guardian angel of Persia," quotes Keil approvingly as seeing these guardian spirits as "the supernatural spiritual powers standing behind the national gods," that is, evil powers. Michael is Israel's guardian angel.
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2 Ibid., 308-309.
3 Ibid., 457-58.
4 Ibid., 527.
5 Frederick A. Tatford, *Daniel and His Prophecy* (London: Olyphants, 1953), 114.
6 Ibid., 175-176.
7 Ibid., 216.
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and the Son of Man is a divine Messiah.¹

W. G. Heidt takes a similar view. He rejects the idea that
the princes of Persia and Greece are angels in God's employ. He
offers the novel view that the word šar in these cases should be
amended to read sad, "demon."² He notes that the name Michael
appears in Akkadian, Mannu-ki-ili, which translates identically, "Who
is as god?" This name applied to Michael indicates, not an ack­
nowledgment of God's greater power, but describes Michael himself, as
one who is irresistible in the power given him of God to do His
behests.³ Heidt sees the Angel of Yahweh as a precedent for the
figure of Michael.⁴ He rejects any Persian source for the idea of
seven archangels.⁵

A. Jeffery brought no new ideas, seeing Michael as the patron
angel of the Jews. The references in Daniel, he felt, were the
earliest literary references to Michael.⁶

E. W. Heaton, likewise, held Michael to be the "guardian
angel of the Jews." He spoke of him as "one of the archangels"

¹William George Heidt, Angelology of the Old Testament
²Ibid., 155.
³Ibid., 7-8.
⁴Ibid., 105-106.
⁵Ibid., 107.
betraying an assumption that there were a number of archangels in the mind of the author of Daniel.

He reflects Driver in raising the possibility that the princes of the heathen nations may have developed from the idea that God used intermediary agents in His government, rather than being "the pale residue of the gods of the nations" after Israelite monotheism had triumphed. The idea of national patron angels is more clearly stated in Dan 10:13 than anywhere else in the Old Testament.1

He suggests that the names in Daniel stand for attributes of God, "Michael" ("Who is like God?") for His transcendence and "Gabriel" ("Man of God") for His might.2

T. H. Gaster also holds Michael to be the patron angel of Israel, championing Israel against the rival patron angel of the Persians. An added suggestion of his was that Michael should be seen as the recording angel, since those delivered at his eschatological appearance are those whose names are written in the books (Dan 12:1).3

O. Plöger too holds to the interpretation of national patron angels, with Michael as the patron angel of Israel. By the triumph of Michael in Dan 12:1-4, the author indicates that Michael had swung the heavenly crisis of 10:13 to the benefit of Israel.4

2Ibid., 223.
O. Plöger also holds that the princes of Persia and Greece were patron angels, heavenly representatives of these peoples.¹

N. W. Porteous has basically the same view as Plöger. He sees Michael as the patron angel of Israel, whose rule among the gods God intended to exalt, thus implying the supremacy of Israel. Michael would play the decisive role on God's behalf in the eschatological drama.²

B. H. Hall thinks similarly concerning Michael. Though the Son of Man is Christ, Michael is "one of the angels of God," the prince of God's people. The princes of Persia and Greece he sees as evil angels.³

At this point in our review, a new element is introduced in H. O. Thompson's monograph on Mekal, the god of Bethshan. In the Canaanite city of Bethshan in the Jordan valley below Mt. Gilboa, in an early temple dated to the fourteenth century B.C., a small stele was found with the inscribed image of a god named Mekal. The city of Bethshan was not mentioned as conquered during the Joshua invasion nor at any subsequent time.⁴ Two major questions of interest here are: (1) Was Mekal worshiped during the centuries of co-existence with Israel? and (2) Is the name and figure of Michael related to and perhaps influenced by the figure of Mekal?

¹Ibid., 146, 148.
⁴Henry O. Thompson, Mekal, the God of Beth-Shan (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 5-6.
Thompson occupies considerable space seeking to establish the identity of Mekal with Nergal, Sumerian chthonic god of death and the underworld\(^1\) and with Resheph, Canaanite god of similar character.\(^2\) In respect to the latter, he notes the existence of the designation Resheph-Mkl in Cyprus.\(^3\) In the process he also suggested Mekal has identity links with the pagan gods Set (Egypt), Baal (Canaan), Hadad (Syria), Dagon (Philistia),\(^4\) Chemosh (Moab),\(^5\) Adonis (Greece),\(^6\) etc.!

Of chief interest here is his suggestion of a link between Mekal and the Daniel Michael figure. He suggests several possible Canaanite roots for Mekal, among them vkl "to be able, to overcome, to vanquish," a root he also sees behind the name of Saul's daughter Mical.\(^7\) He accepts "Who is like God?" as the meaning of the name Michael and observes that the roots of Michael and Mekal are quite distinct.\(^8\) However, Mekal, as god of death is also a god of war,\(^9\) and, as he characterizes Michael also as a warlike angel, he sees the

\(^{1}\text{Ibid.}, 119-127.}\n\(^{2}\text{Ibid.}, 144-149.}\n\(^{3}\text{Ibid.}, 144.}\n\(^{4}\text{Ibid.}, 133.}\n\(^{5}\text{Ibid.}, 127.}\n\(^{6}\text{Ibid.}, 159.}\n\(^{7}\text{Ibid.}, 76, 191.}\n\(^{8}\text{Ibid.}, 76.}\n\(^{9}\text{Ibid.}, 121, 144.\)
character they represent as "strikingly similar."

H. L. Ginsberg holds the view that the princes of Persia and Greece are angelic representatives, who clash with each other, pre-figuring the clashes of their respective nations, and that Michael is Israel's patron angel, resisting the princes of the pagan nations on Israel's behalf. The germ of the idea he sees in Deut 32:8-9. Daniel diverges from this in that in Deuteronomy Israel is not ruled by a prince, but by Yahweh directly; in Daniel, Yahweh uses Michael as an intermediary.

J. F. Walvoord, while seeing the Son of Man as Christ interprets Michael as the highest angel, head of the holy angels, and special guardian of Israel. He rejects Calvin's identification of Michael with Christ. He seems to accept the guardian princes of the heathen nations as approximating the national gods.

\[\text{1Ibid., 76. William Foxwell Albright, "Mesopotamian Elements in Canaanite Eschatology," Oriental Studies dedicated to Paul Haupt (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1926), 146-147, 150-151; see also idem, "The Syro-Mesopotamian God Sulmân-Eshmûn and Related Figures," Archiv für Orientforschung 7 (1931-32): 167; and idem, "The Egypto-Canaanite Deity Haurôn," BASOR 84 (1941), 11-12, had some time earlier equated "Rashaf" and Nergal, and, more recently, in idem, "Some Notes on the Stele of Ben-Hadad," BASOR 90 (1943): 33, Albright had written concerning Mekal of Bethshan and this god's links with Rashaf and Nergal, including Mekal's relationship with Rashaf-Mkl on Cyprus. He felt Mekal came from the Sumerian name of Nergal, Umun-urugallak, "Lord of the Great City," which may easily have become Muk(k)alla. He points to the Greek translation of Rashap-Mkl in Cyprus, "Adonis A-mu-ko-lo-i." Albright, however, never mentions a link between Mekal and Michael.}\n
\[\text{3John F. Walvoord, Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Interpretation (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), 167-68.}\n
\[\text{4Ibid., 246, 283.}\n
\[\text{5Ibid., 246-247.}\]
R. Lievestad suggests that the Son of Man is primarily a symbol of the saints (i.e., Israel), but also admits that an individual, messianic interpretation "lies close at hand." He expressed surprise that the figure in 7:13 was not identified by the author with Michael, "the guardian angel of Israel."¹

G. W. E. Nickelsburg discusses Michael's role as Israel's patron angel, seeing it not purely a military one, but also judicial, as the verb "stand" is used in the Old Testament in judicial contexts. "The war he wages has the character of judgment."² He looks to Isa 14 for a parallel of the self-exaltation of the "little horn" against God, and, as Jubilees identifies the patron angels of the nations as evil spirits, feels that it might be the chief demon against whom Michael battles in the eschatological conflict.³ He sees some basis for equating Michael with the "angel of the presence" (Isa 63:9), who helped Israel in the Exodus.⁴

R. Van der Hart sees the Angel of Yahweh, not as a manifestation of Yahweh, but as an angel who so identified with the One who sent him, that he spoke and acted as though God Himself. He is not certain that the māl'āk yahweh was always the same angel.⁵


³Ibid., 14-15.

⁴Ibid., 21.

feels the idea of angels came from the local Israelite tribal gods which were subordinated to Yahweh as the tribes developed a unified national religion. Michael was "most probably" the same as the Angel of the Lord, as seen in Zechariah. Michael became the guardian angel of Israel, as all other nations had their guardian angels. Michael was regarded in Daniel as a heavenly Messiah, appointed to establish in heaven the new order by fighting "for Israel against its enemy-gods (Dan 12:1)." This led to a later virtual identification of Christ and Michael, Van der Hart observed, an "Angel-Christology" which persisted in Christianity for centuries.

J. J. Collins sees an angelic Christology in Rev 12 and other New Testament passages where Christ is leader of the heavenly hosts. Collins interprets the "saints of the Most High" in Dan 7 to be angels, and the Son of Man represents an angelic host and/or its leader. Indeed, the Son of Man is "most likely" the archangel Michael, who receives the kingdom on behalf of his angelic host and of Israel. In this he has taken a position similar to that of N. Schmidt.

Collins elaborates the theory that the struggle between
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Michael and the patron angel princes of Persia and Greece indicates that above earthly battles, heavenly battles take place, with God and His forces battling the gods of the heathen nations against which Israel struggles.  

Collins sees not only a military but also a judicial role in the standing of Michael in Dan 12:1.  

This judicial role is supported, he feels, by reference to "the book" and the explicitly judicial character of the parallel eschatological scene in Dan 7.  

In his dissertation on the Angel of God, V. Hirth relates Michael to the mâl'ak yahweh and to the "Prince of the hosts of Yahweh" (Josh 5:13). He understands the formation of the concept of the heavenly vizier as influenced by the Exile experience, though he sees in some early mâl'ak yahweh passages some tendencies in that direction. Later Michael fills the role of the special champion of Israel and heavenly vizier.  

The figure of the mâl'ak yahweh carried no name until the book of Daniel.  

This vizier is always a creature, however, not partaking of divinity, though speaking and acting with full divine authority as though he were God Himself.  

The recent work of J. Siegen represents the Michael cult in contemporary traditional Roman Catholicism. In a series of 
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rhetorical questions, Siegen identifies Michael with the Angel of the Covenant, the one who gave Abraham the promise of a seed, the Angel of the Lord who interceded to save Isaac from sacrifice, who wrestled with Jacob, appeared to Moses at the burning bush, gave the law at Sinai, called the judges Joshua, Gideon, Samson, and Samuel; the angel who protected the Maccabees against the Seleucids, protected the god-fearers in the heathen world, mediated God's revelation to angels and prophets, called the people back when they were untrue, and was the angel in the myrtle trees (Zech 1). Siegen subscribed to the statement, "In most passages of Scripture, where this mysterious angel is spoken of, God Himself is thereby meant." The Michael figure is so exalted, almost deified, that he is quite parallel to Christ, though he is kept distinct from the Son of Man in Daniel and Christ of the New Testament.

Siegen holds the guardian angels of Persia and Greece to be holy angels of God. They were moved by zeal for God's honor and from love for mankind. They did not always immediately acknowledge God's decisions, and out of concern for the nations under their charge, contended on their behalf. However, they finally yield and submit to God's will.

L. J. Wood sees Michael as the highest angel, assigned by God to be Israel's prince. Though he interprets the princes of Persia and Greece to be demons, he does not subscribe to the idea of national patron angels or demons. The prince of Persia is a demon.

---

1Johann Siegen, Der Erzengel Michael (Stein am Rhein: Christiana-Vorlag, 1975), 14-15.

2Ibid., 13-14.
appointed by Satan to further his program in connection with the Persian government. When Persia is conquered by Alexander and God's people pass under Greek rule, a demon would be appointed to be prince of Greece at that time to hinder God's plans for Israel under Greek dominion.\(^1\) He holds the Son of Man to be Christ.\(^2\)

B. Lindars, however, takes the view that Michael, God's celestial agent for intervening on behalf of the Jews, is possibly to be identified with the Son of Man, though "there are no direct links."\(^3\) He sees the Son of Man to be not a symbol of the saints, whom he takes to be angels, but their leader.\(^4\) He conceives of the Son of Man as the celestial Messiah, to be distinguished from the Davidic Messiah, though it is not a case of rival views of messiah-ship. Apocalyptic does not look for political solutions, but for direct divine intervention.\(^5\) Michael is to him a national angel, representing the Jews at the divine court, though also engaged in combating their enemies.\(^6\)

R. Hammer accepts the concept of national patron angels, subordinate deities, who engage in celestial warfare. The ultimate destiny of nations is determined not upon earth, but in heaven. The triumph of monotheism changed the reference from "deities" to


\(^2\)Ibid., 97.

\(^3\)Lindars, 56.

\(^4\)Ibid., 55.

\(^5\)Ibid., 60.

\(^6\)Ibid., 56.
"angels."¹ Michael is Israel's patron angel, active in the events leading up to the end.² He feels "Prince of the host" usually would refer to an angelic being, but finds reason in Dan 8:11 for it to refer to God.³

J. P. Rohland's work on Michael, like Lueken's, is directed primarily toward post-biblical developments of the Michael cult. However, he did make some relevant remarks in the biblical context. He rejected the idea, common in later Jewish thinking, that Michael is to be identified with the Prince of the Hosts of Yahweh/Prince of the Host (Josh 5:13, Dan 8:11), Archistrategos in the LXX. He disputed that Dan 10:13 indicates military opposition between Michael and the prince of Persia; it could be a legal contention before the high court of God, as some church fathers later understood it.⁴ He saw two different "numina": (1) the Angel of the Lord/the Prince of the Host as military leader, and (2) Michael, the angel of the people.⁵ He saw Michael in terms of angels assigned by God to the nations as patron angels, with Michael the guardian of Israel.⁶

L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella see Michael as guardian angel of Israel. The princes of Persia and Greece support the idea of

²Ibid., 115.
³Ibid., 85.
⁵Ibid., 13-14.
⁶Ibid., 10.
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tutelary angels of nations, based on Deut 32:8. The roots of this they see in the national tutelary gods, who were reduced to angels under Israelite monotheism. They reject the idea that "Michael" in Daniel may be traced back to the Canaanite god Mekal. The name mi-ka-il ("Who is like il [god]?") has been found at Ebla from 2400 B.C. as a personal name. The term "prince" for Michael depends on Josh 5:13, used there for the angel-commander of the armies of Jehovah.1

Di Lella sees the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints of the Most High, not as any individual person such as Messiah or Michael. Against Collins and others, he rejects any "multireferential" application of the symbols of Daniel's vision, such as seeing the Son of Man as both individual and collective. Also, he sees the saints as the people of Israel, not angels, otherwise the book would have no meaning to the people.2

Although J. C. Baldwin interprets the Son of Man as an individual, not as a symbol or representative of the saints,3 she does not view the Son of Man as a heavenly being equivalent to or parallel with Michael. She emphasizes his man-like appearance and the parallels to Gen 1:26-27, seeing the Son of Man as the ideal man.4

Michael is the angelic representative of Israel, just as Persia and

---

1 Hartman and Di Lella, 273, 282-284.


4 Ibid., 143.
Greece each also have an angelic representative.\(^1\)

F. M. Wilson notes without objection Collins's equating of the Son of Man with Michael.\(^2\) While he accepts the identification of the Son of Man with the saints of the Most High,\(^3\) he also interprets the Son of Man to be an individual, transcendent, heavenly being. He is a messianic figure who shares his rule with the saints of the Most High, who are the faithful Israelites, though he is not an earthly hero of the Davidic line.\(^4\)

Z. Zevit, however, while interpreting the Son of Man as an individual, finds reason to identify him with Gabriel, at the same time acknowledging that most scholars who agree with the angelic nature of the Son of Man have identified him with Michael.\(^5\)

D. S. Russell's position is almost identical with that of Hartman and Di Lella. The Son of Man is a symbol of the saints, that is, Israel;\(^6\) each nation has a guardian angel appointed by and subject to God, with Michael as guardian angel of Israel.\(^7\) One difference is that Russell draws the conclusion that if the word translated "Prince" is used with reference to an angelic being
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elsewhere in Daniel (10:13, 20; 12:1), the Prince of the Host of Dan 8:11 must refer to the chief of the angel host, that is, Michael.\(^1\)

Hartman and Di Lella do not draw this conclusion, thinking him to be God, though one may recall that they identify the "Prince of the Hosts of Yahweh" (Josh 5:13) with Michael.\(^2\)

Russell understands the Man in Linen (Dan 10:4-6) to be the angel Gabriel, the same being who spoke to Daniel in Dan 10:11ff.\(^3\)

J. M. Efird interpreted Michael as patron angel of the Jews, and felt that each nation had a patron spirit.\(^4\) He felt that "everlasting" in Dan 12:2 was a mistranslation; the meaning being "life in the coming new age," a life within the historical continuum free from persecution in which the good would be rewarded and the evil punished. Finally, however, all would "then return to Sheol, the ultimate fate of everyone!"\(^5\)

W. E. Filmer understands Michael to be the archangel, Israel's guardian angel.\(^6\) The Prince of the Host, however, "can

---


\(^2\)Ibid., 276.

\(^3\)Ibid., 194.


\(^5\)Ibid., 72-73.

apply only to the Lord Jesus Christ."¹ He also makes the messianic interpretation of the Son of Man.²

J. M. Wilson agrees that Michael is Israel's guardian angel. He sees in Daniel the idea of national patron angels, an idea he ascribes to Persian influence, though he notes the Jewish tradition that the names of the angels came from Babylon.³

In the interpretation of H. Goldwurm, Michael is an angel⁴ and the Son of Man is the Messiah.⁵ The Prince of the Host he takes to be "God Himself."⁶

E. T. Mullen, in the context of a discussion of "the divine council", notes that the members of El's council, who earlier remained unnamed and had no individual identity apart from El,⁷ later developed specialized functions, such as Satan, and some become named, as Michael and Gabriel. The book of Daniel represents the beginning of an elaborate angelology during the late Biblical period.⁸

R. D. Culver adopts the interpretation which sees the Son of

¹Ibid., 83.
²Ibid., 93.
⁴Hersh Goldwurm, Daniel (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Mesorah Pub., 1979), 276-77.
⁵Ibid., 206-07.
⁶Ibid., 223.
⁸Ibid., 276.
Man as Christ, Michael as the guardian angel of Israel, and the prince of Persia as an evil angelic spirit. He believes the language used for the Prince of Princes is too exaggerated to apply to the ancient high priest, and must therefore apply to "the 'great high priest,' the Son of God."  

G. Maier agrees that Michael is the highest angel and guardian angel of Israel, though he designates the prince of Persia as an "angel prince" without calling him a demon. He is primarily opposing the idea that the figure is a human king. 

J. G. Gammie, however, sides with Schmidt that the Son of Man is a personal, angelic figure, therefore Michael, designated in Daniel as Israel's prince and heavenly representative. He sees this as a view "gaining more and more favor."

G. R. Beaseley-Murray, while interpreting the Son of Man as Messiah, rejects an identification with Michael. Michael is not mentioned in Dan 7. His role is to contend with hostile, spiritual powers; there is no mention of his enthronement in the coming age. Beaseley-Murray draws upon the book of Revelation, where Christ the man-child escapes the dragon, but it is Michael by whom

---


2Ibid., 170-71.

3Ibid., 131.


the dragon is overthrown. The victory belongs to God, and the rule is given to the Messiah.¹

Beaseley-Murray counters Montgomery's view that since the four beasts of Dan 7 are symbols, so is the Son of Man. He points out that, in contrast to the beasts, the man-like one receives no mention in the interpretation. The meaning of the vision with respect to the divine intervention was clear enough.²

W. S. Towner takes the dominant position that Michael is the guardian angel of Israel, a peer and counterpart of the princes of the kingdom of Persia and other nations. These princes are angels appointed by God to champion their nations, and for this purpose often fight among themselves.³ To Towner, the Son of Man is both personal and corporate, two features which often blend and merge.⁴

R. A. Anderson understood Michael to be an angel, which is his primary reason for opposing Ibn Ezra's claim that the Prince of the Host is not God, but Michael. The claim, he admitted had some support in Dan 10:13; 12:1, but such an interpretation necessitates a strained exegesis of the rest of Dan 8:11.⁵

P. R. Davies feels that Michael's primary role is not that of Israel's warrior, for in Dan 10 another angel undertakes the fighting

¹Ibid., 56-57.
²Ibid., 56.
⁴Ibid., 104.
and Michael is only a helper. He understands that the "king of the north" has already met his demise before Michael commences his role, and Michael is therefore not the vanquisher of the king. He sees two possible interpretations of Michael's function: forensic and military. He seems to lean toward a dominant forensic role for Michael. He sees forensic meaning in the Hebrew verb "made" as used in Ps 82:1, where the condemned gods are equivalent to the princes of Persia and Greece in Dan 10.

Davies feels that a non-warrior role for Michael is even more probable if the author of Dan 10-12 saw in Michael the Son of Man of Dan 7, for the Son of Man also receives his dominion after the destruction of the beasts, and is not himself, in Davies' understanding, their destroyer.

Davies concludes that Michael's precise role is open to debate.

C. C. Caragounis flatly denies any identification between Michael and the Son of Man. He, like Hartman and Di Lella, opposes Collins's interpretation of the Son of Man as both symbol and representative of angelic saints. Caragounis understands the saints to be the human people of God.

---

2 Ibid., 113-14.
3 Ibid., 114.
4 Ibid.
6 Ibid., 45n, 72-73.
Man is a heavenly, divine Messiah, and thus, with the Ancient of Days, there are two divinities in Dan 7.1

H. Bultema also holds Michael to be chief angel 2 and the Son of Man to be Christ. 3 He interprets the princes of Persia and Greece to be evil angels.4

According to J. E. Goldingay, Michael can be described as Israel's lord.5 He interprets the book of Daniel to say Michael is "the supreme leader." Just as each nation has a representative in the heavenly court who fights its battles, legal and military, so Michael is Israel's heavenly representative. Since Israel is the most significant nation, Michael is, by implication, the most powerful of these heavenly figures.6

In Goldingay's view, Michael stands up in court to fight for Israel, and Michael's victory over Antiochus's heavenly representative means Antiochus is defeated on earth. Michael's intervention establishes that those whose names are found in the book belong to the people of God.7

Goldingay speculates that the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) may

---

1Ibid., 74-75, 79-80.
3Ibid., 222-23.
4Ibid., 302-03.
6Ibid., 306.
7Ibid.
be Michael.¹ He finds in the link between the celestial leader of Yahweh's army in Josh 5:13-15 and the one in Dan 8:11 evidence that the latter is a celestial being, who "might thus be Michael," but "More likely it is God himself, who is presumably the 'leader supreme' (šar šarīm)" of Dan 8:25.²

The Son of Man, in Goldingay's view, is a celestial individual. Goldingay notes that the pointers in Dan 7:13-14 suggest two divine beings, which he attributes to a mythic background. He offers as a possible solution to the apparent ditheism that, though only God comes on the clouds, this figure comes "with/among" them.³

Goldingay feels that the function of the Son of Man is closer to that of Michael in Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1. Michael is a celestial leader who is especially identified with Israel, stands by them and for them against alien celestial leaders. Michael's authority in heaven parallels that of the Son of Man, and they both appear at a similar moment--the time of God's final intervention. That the Son of Man is not a combatant as is Michael may only reflect an earthly setting for the Son of Man, while Michael's battles are in heaven. The same celestial person could have different roles in different contexts. However, Goldingay stops short of identifying the two figures, as in his view, the focus of Dan 7 is on the role rather than the identity of the Son of Man.⁴

¹Ibid., 291.
²Ibid., 211, 218.
³Ibid., 171.
⁴Ibid., 172.
Summary of the Historical Survey

From the brief survey of interpretation of the Michael figure, it becomes clear that there exists no clear consensus on either the identity or the function of Michael. The issues are not drawn along conservative-liberal lines. From the earliest Christian period, two schools of thought have prevailed, which may be summarized as follows:

1. Michael is the Messiah, usually the New Testament Christ. He is often also identified with the Son of Man of Daniel 7 and with the Angel of Yahweh figure. Most see him contending with supernatural patron princes of Persia and Greece who are angels to some, demons to others; some understand these princes to be literal kings of Persia and Greece. His eschatological appearance to deliver the righteous is often equated with the coming of the Son of Man/second coming of Christ.

2. Michael was the most exalted angel, yet distinct from the Messiah, though some see in him messianic functions. Michael is pictured by the author of Daniel as the patron angel of the Jewish people, their direct intermediary and intercessor before God, and one who battles the patron angels of other nations on Israel’s behalf. He is occasionally equated with or seen as successor to the Angel of Yahweh of pre-exilic times.

A third view, developed after the emergence of modern biblical scholarship, identifies Michael with or sees him closely parallel to the Son of Man, without equating him with the Messiah. Some see this figure with a messianic role, yet distinct from the earthly, Davidic Messiah so prominent in the prophets. This is distinctly a minority
view today, as the prevailing view is that the Son of Man is a symbol of the saints of the Most High, not an individual personality. A mediating position with significant support is that the Son of Man is both symbol and personal representative of the saints, frequently also identified with Michael.

There is a variety of other, related issues. The origin of the whole idea of guardian angels of nations is uncertain. Some scholars see them as the national gods transformed into angels under Yahwist monotheism; others see them as a later product of the tendency toward intermediary beings between man and the increasingly more exalted and remote Yahweh. There is no consensus on whether the patron angels of other nations are holy or evil beings, or whether the idea of national patron angels is a valid one at all. Some equate Michael with the Prince of the Host; most see the Prince of the Host as God Himself. Also, the question of a possible relationship between Michael and the "one like a son of the gods" in Dan 3:25 exists.

Though the function of Michael as defender of Israel and God's agent in Israel's eschatological deliverance is generally accepted, there are areas of difference. Is Michael's role in Dan 10 military or intercessory, or both? And in Dan 12, what, precisely, is Michael's function? Is it military? Judicial? Does Michael's standing up precede or follow the commencement of the severe time of trouble? Is the author of Daniel aware of the messianic concept? What, if any, is the relationship between the Son of Man, the Messiah, and Michael in the escatological drama? Is the Anointed Prince of Dan 9 related in any way to Michael?
The lack of consensus on these and other issues relative to Michael justifies a new, in-depth discussion of this mysterious, celestial figure.
CHAPTER II

THE NAME AND PRINCIPAL DESIGNATION OF MICHAEL

This chapter examines the name "Michael" and "prince" (יְהוָה, אֱלֹהִים), the other principal designation given to the Michael figure in the book of Daniel. Attention is given primarily to etymology and ancient cognates. Interpretation of the meaning is left largely to chapter 3, where the name Michael and the designation אֱלֹהִים are each examined within its context in Daniel.

The Name Michael in Hebrew

The name Michael, besides its use for the transcendent figure in Daniel, appears as an ordinary, personal name ten times for ten different men in the OT.¹ It occurs first in Num 13:13, where the father of Sethur of the tribe of Asher, one of the twelve spies sent by Joshua to search the land of Canaan, was named Michael. Though the remaining uses are all found in the post-exilic² books of the Chronicles and in Ezra, all those in Chronicles are placed by the Chronicler in the pre-exilic period of the history of Israel. Two are placed in the pre-Davidic period (1 Chr 6:40; 7:3), two in the Davidic period (1 Chr 12:20; 27:18), and four in the time of the

¹Num 13:13; 1 Chr 5:13, 14; 6:40; 7:3; 8:16; 12:20; 27:18; 2 Chr 21:2; Ezra 8:8.

later kings (1 Chr 5:13, 14; 8:16; 2 Chr 21:2). Michael in Ezra 8:8 is apparently exilic. From this it can be seen that the name was fairly evenly distributed throughout Israel's history.

The tribal or geographic distribution of the name is similarly broad. Nine persons named Michael belong to seven of the twelve tribes; Levi (1 Chr 6:40), Benjamin (1 Chr 8:16), Judah (2 Chr 21:2), and four northern tribes; Asher (Num 13:13), Gad (1 Chr 5:13, 14), Issachar (1 Chr 7:3; 27:18), and Manasseh (1 Chr 12:20). The tribe to which Michael in Ezra 8:8 belonged is not indicated.

Besides these, there are a number of occurrences of Hebrew names etymologically related to Michael. These include eighteen uses of Michal (מיכאל, mikal), perhaps a shortened form of Michael; the name Micaiah (מיכיאחז, mikáyahu; מיכהא: mikvehu; מיכהיא: mikávah), which is like Michael except that יahu (yah) replaces יֵל (ел) and means "Who is like Yah?"; Micha (מיכא, mikä), and Micah (מיכא, mikä).

---


2See G. Buchanan Gray, Hebrew Proper Names (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896), 20. He does not regard all the references to Michael in the Chronicles as authentic, but does accept Num 13:13, (which he attributes to P) and 1 Chr 6:25 as pre-Davidic, and 1 Chr 12:20; 27:18 as from the Davidic Period. His reason for doubting the authenticity of the references to the later Kings period is partly that theophoric names with the element yah in that period came to predominate over those with the element יֵל (ел); see 256-57; also see Martin Noth, IPN, 107-108.

3Achtemeier, 372-73.

4HAL 2:546.

5Judg 17:1, 4; 1 Kgs 22:8, 9, 12-13, 14, 15, 24-26, 28; 2 Kgs 22:12; Neh 12:35, 41; 2 Chr 13:2; 17:7; 18:7, 8, 12, 13, 23-25, 27; Jer 26:18; 36:11, 13.

6BDB, 567; or "Who is like Yahu?" or "Who is like Yahweh?," Johann Jacob Stamm, "Hebräische Frauennamen," Hebräische Wortforschung, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967),
mikāḥ) short forms of either Michael or Micaiah,¹ but possibly with a non-theophorous meaning.² Thus it is clear that the appearance of the name Michael in Daniel is not unique except that in the Old Testament it is applied only in Daniel to a heavenly being.

The name Michael, מיכאל (mikā'ēl) is in the form of a question, and has the meaning, "Who is like God?"³ This view understands the name to be based on three Hebrew words: the interrogative מ (mi), meaning "who?"; the particle of comparison כ (ke), meaning "like" or "as"; and ה (lēl),⁴ one of three related Hebrew words, ה (lēl), מ (elōšah), and מ (elōhīm) used with the meaning "deity," "god." or "God."⁵ The name is accordingly an

---

¹HAL 2:545-46.
²Gray, 156-57.
⁴HAL 2:545; see also 2:432, 544; 1:47; KBL, 519.
⁵Helmer Ringgren, "elōhīm," THAT (1973), 1:291. The word lēl was used as the generic appellative of deity, "god" (HAL 1:48; KBL, 46; TDOT 1:255, 260), most frequently of a pagan deity (TDOT 1:260), as a title for Yahweh (HAL 1:47-48; TDOT 257), and as a proper name equivalent to Yahweh. Its use as an alternate name of Yahweh and as an appellative in personal names such as Michael is most frequent in the earliest period of Israel's existence, and in the post-exilic period (HAL 47; KBL, 46; TDOT 1:259). Klaus Koch, Das Buch Daniel (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), 207, translates Michael "wer ist wie Gottheit," "who is like deity," or, "who is like a god" (KBL, 45, "Gottheit" is given the English translation "god"). This accords with the use of ה (lēl) in its generic sense.
"interrogative sentence name," a rhetorical question emphasizing the incomparability of God. The implied answer is that no one is like God.

The literary device of the rhetorical question was frequently used in the OT to express the incomparability of God, quite aside from its use in such personal names as Michael and Micaiah. It first appears in Exod 15:11, which frames the question:

"Who is like you among the gods, O Yahweh?"

mi kamokah ba'elim. yahweh

"Who is like you, majestic in holiness?"

mi kamokah, ne'edär baqodesh?

Elements like those present in the name Michael can be recognized in this passage.

The "gods" to whom Yahweh is here compared can be thought of either as the heavenly beings belonging to Yahweh's heavenly council--"sons of God" (Ps 29:1; 89:7), angels (Jer 23:18, 22; Job 1:6ff; Pss 58:1; 82:1; 86:8); or as the gods of the surrounding

However, in view of the use also made of 'el (Yah) to refer to the God of Israel, and in view of the monotheism in the Israelite religion, it is likely that by 'el in the name Michael, the author of the book of Daniel and his readers understood their God, Yahweh.

4 Translation in this section is the author's.
5 Hyatt, 165.
nations, whose existence is, by this Psalm, neither affirmed nor denied.\footnote{R. Alan Cole, Exodus, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973), 124. He refers to this henotheistic view as "monolatry," leading later to full monotheism.}

There are several passages in the Psalms which similarly declare the incomparability of God or Yahweh. Among them is Ps 71:19, which declares Yahweh's incomparability in might and righteousness:\footnote{A. A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms, 2 vols., New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1972), 2:516.}

"God, who is like you?"

\begin{verbatim}
élōhîm mî  kâmôîkâ
\end{verbatim}

A longer passage is Ps 89:6-8 (7-9 MT), in which Yahweh's faithfulness and might are described as incomparable. Note vs. 9:

"Yahweh, God of hosts, who is like you, mighty Yah?"\footnote{See Gösta Werner Ahlström, Psalm 89: ein Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden Königs (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1959), 58-63, where he points out that the incomparability of God as proclaimed in vss. 6-8 is associated with His covenant with David. He compares the divine assembly depicted in this passage with those at Ugarit and in Akkadian literature. Though one might question his suggestion that symbols of the "assembly of the gods" may be found in the Israelite sanctuary, his observation that the monotheism of the OT is not philosophical but rather emotional seems to have a certain validity, though it might be better to speak of a monotheism of faith rather than emotional monotheism as an alternative to philosophical monotheism.}

\begin{verbatim}
yahweh.  >elohe seba*ot.  ml kamoka.  hasin y£h
\end{verbatim}

Other Psalms expressing the incomparability of God are Pss 35:10, "Yahweh, who is like you?"\footnote{Charles Augustus Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), 2:304-05, sees this as a possible reference to Exod 15:11.} 73:25a, "Whom have I in heaven
but thee?"; 77:13 (14 MT) "Who is a god great like God?";¹ and 113:5, "Who is like Yahweh our God?"

Mic 7:18 expresses the incomparability of God in syllables virtually identical to those in the name Michael:

"Who is a God like you?"

mi 'êl kâmôkā'

The parallel with Michael---נַקְמַךְ (mîkâ'êl)—is obvious, and supports the translation, "Who is like God?"

The rhetorical question expressing God's incomparability is twice attributed to God Himself: Isa 44:7, קֵמֹךְ כְּמוֹנִי (ûmi kâmônî), "and who is like me?" and Jer 50:44 (MT, 49:19), כִּי יְהוָה כְּמוֹנִי (ki mî kâmônî), "For who is like me?"

For other examples of the negative rhetorical question expressing God's incomparability, see Job 36:11 and Deut 3:24; 4:7, 34.³

¹Mitchell Dahood, Psalms, 2 vols., AB (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1968), 2:224, 230, changes the MT לֹא גָדוֹל (mi 'êl gâdôl kôl'hîm) to לֹא וֹאֵל גָדוֹל (mi 'êl gâdôl=qel'hîm), with the translation, "What god is greater than you, O God?" He bases the change on a dative function of pronoun suffixes, of which, he presumes, the Masoretes were not conversant, and so divided the consonants as it exists. W. Steward McCullough and William R. Taylor point out in "The Book of Psalms, Introduction and Exegesis," JB (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), 4:412, that though the last word in the MT is "like God," the LXX and the Syriac read "like our God," which is followed by the KJV and RSV.

²הֲמוֹךְ (kâmôkâ) is composed of the comparative particle (kemô) and the 2nd pers. sing. masc. pronominal suffix - (kâ). kemô has the same meaning as ָ (ke), "like, as," and is formed from the particle ָ (ke) and indeterra. הַּ (mâh) הַ (mô) (KBL, 441).

³Labuschagne, 19, 22-23. He points out that Deut 4:7 is technically about the incomparability of Israel, but that this can only be said in view of the incomparability of God.
The rhetorical question with an implied negative answer was not used in the OT exclusively in reference to the incomparability of Israel's God. It was a standard literary device of OT writers, with many examples from ordinary speech. In 1 Sam 26:15, David called to Abner, "Who is like you in Israel?" Ahimelech, in 1 Sam 22:14, asked the inquiring king Saul, "And who among all your servants is so faithful as David?" In Eccl 8:1 the question is asked, "Who is like the wise man?"^1

From this it is apparent that the name Michael arose as an expression of the incomparability of God from within a context in which the rhetorical question was a common literary device used in everyday speech. This device was broadly utilized by OT writers to express the incomparability of God. The name Michael can therefore be seen as a natural development from within Israel's own literary traditions.

In assessing the possible significance of the name Michael, it is worth noting also that the Hebrew word מְלָכָּה, in addition to its use as an interrogative pronoun, with the meaning of "who?," as discussed above, can also be used as an indefinite pronoun, with the meaning "one who." From this perspective, "Michael" could be interpreted to mean, "one who is like God."^2

---


^2 Charles F. Jean and Jacob Hoftijzer, Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 149.
Michael in Other Ancient Semitic Parallels

The name Michael or its cognates appears in ancient Semitic languages and cultures other than OT Hebrew. These appearances are investigated first in West Semitic languages, as being closer to Hebrew geographically and linguistically, then in the Akkadian language.

West Semitic Parallels

The West Semitic languages investigated are discussed from earliest to latest, in the following sequence: Eblaite, Ugaritic, Amorite, Aramaic, Palestinian, and Palmyrene.

Eblaite

Very significant is the evidence of the name Michael among the personal names used at Ebla, a city in northern Syria which was destroyed by the Akkadians around 2500\(^1\) (or 2250)\(^2\) B.C. Though the site was later occupied,\(^3\) the important tablets date from this destruction level.\(^4\)

The language of Ebla has close affinities with Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Phoenician, and is therefore classed as West Semitic (or, North-West Semitic) by important scholars.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\)Pettinato, *Archives of Ebla*, 73.


\(^3\)Ibid., 52.

\(^4\)Ibid., 151-52.

tablets refers to the chief Eblaite deity Dagan as "Re KA-na-na-im, which has been translated "Lord of Canaan." This has led to the identification of the language as "Paleo-canaanite." This characterization of the language of Ebla has not been unchallenged. As early as 1977, Ignace J. Gelb suggested that the closest linguistic relatives of Eblaite were Old Akkadian and Amorite, and that the farthest were Ugaritic and, even farther, Hebrew (Canaanite). His position has not changed with increasing evidence available, and has found significant support from others, notably Alfonso Archi. The inclusion here of Eblaite as a West

---


2Giovanni Pettinato, "The Royal Archives of Tell Mardikh-Ebla," *BA* 39 (1976): 50, 52; see also Giovanni Garbini, "Considerations on the Language of Ebla," in *La Lingua di Ebla*, ed. Luigi Cagni (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1981), 82, "Phoenician, as we know it at this moment, is the result of the modernization of the ancient language spoken in Canaan which was not very different from Eblaite."

3Ignace J. Gelb, *Thoughts about Ibla* (Malibu, Calif.: Undena Pub. 1977), 25. He states, "It seems that the whole question of what is West Semitic will have to be reconsidered." He no longer uses such divisions as "western," "eastern," "northwestern," and "south-western" to classify Semitic languages (27-28).

4Ignace J. Gelb, "Ebla and the Kish Civilization," in *La Lingua di Ebla*, ed. Luigi Cagni (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1981), 52. He observes that West Semitic scholars still generally support the West Semitic Affiliation of Eblaite, while Assyriologists consider Eblaite to be either most closely related to Old Akkadian or even a dialect of Akkadian. He sets forth reasons, however, as if to confirm his perception of bias, why Assyriologists are more likely to be right. It is primarily that Assyriologists are more at home in cuneiform, though he acknowledges that Pettinato, who is thoroughly familiar with cuneiform, still holds Eblaite to be Northwest Semitic, though is more cautious than formerly (47-48).

Semitic language is not intended to prejudge the outcome of this continuing debate.

All the documents found in the royal palace at Ebla are written in cuneiform. About 80 percent of them are in the Sumerian language, leaving 20 percent in Eblaite. It is probable, however, that all were read in Eblaite, as the Sumerian characters were logograms, easily translated by the reader into the local language.1

The lexical affinity with Hebrew is quickly apparent in some of the names used at Ebla, such as Ish-ra-il, "Israel"; Ish-ma-il, "Ishmael"; and Da-ni-il, "Daniel";2 and Ebrum or Ebrium, either "Eber" (Gen 10:21), or "Hebrew."3

Eblaite, like Hebrew, uses mi for "who?", ka for "like," and il, like Hebrew lèl for "God." Therefore, it is not surprising to also find the name Mi-ka-il, the equivalent of Michael, on the Eblaite tablets.4

In addition, a name vocalized by Pettinato as Mi-ka-ia, which would be equivalent to the OT name "Micaiah," is found, along with many other names ending in ia. Pettinato argues that this furnishes

---

1Pettinato, Archives of Ebla, 56-57; see also Gelb, "Ebla and the Kish Civilization," 13.

2Ibid., 249, 140.

3Pettinato, "Royal Archives," 47.

4Ibid., 50.
evidence that a specific god Yah in addition to the god Il was worshiped at Ebla.¹

Mitchel Dahood has supported Pettinato's interpretation. He has pointed out that the syllable has been found at the beginning of a name Ya-ra-mu (similar to Biblical "Joram," "Ya is exalted"), with a determinative indicating a divine name. Dahood has interpreted this as referring to Ya, indicating it is a divine name.² Ya is also thought to appear in a longer form at the end of a name, as is seen in comparing the names shu-mi-a and shu-mi-a-u, suggesting that Ya is an abbreviation of Yau.³

Pettinato cites as further evidence that Ya is a divine name a comparison of names from before the reign of the king Ebrium with those after his reign. Many personal names which contained the element Il before his reign had the Il substituted for by Ya. In the following examples, as presented by Pettinato, the pre-Ebrium names are on the left, and those on the right date to his reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Ebrium</th>
<th>Post-Ebrium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En-na-il</td>
<td>En-na-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ish-ra-il</td>
<td>Ish-ra-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-ka-il</td>
<td>Mi-ka-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eb-du-il</td>
<td>Eb-du-ia⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He interprets this to indicate that Ya has the same value as Il and points to a specific deity.⁵ He supports his arguments by

¹Ibid., 48.


³Ibid.


⁵Pettinato, Archives of Ebla, 249.
stating that the reign of Ebrium revealed some sweeping reforms, such as the introduction of a new calendar, and he thought it conceivable that a religious reformation also occurred, replacing devotion to Il with devotion to Ya.¹

Pettinato’s position on the meaning of ia, however, has been disputed. Mattiae has referred to it as "without foundation."² The syllable is generally taken to be a hypocoristicon or an abbreviation.³ Alfonso Archi has tried to demonstrate that some names ending in -il and corresponding names ending in -ia refer to the same person. He also expresses doubt that the shift from -il names to -ia represented a religious revolution, as there were still many -il names in the later period, suggesting the shift may be attributed to a scribal fashion.⁴ Gelb holds that the cuneiform sign vocalized ia by Pettinato should generally be vocalized ni. Though he grants that in many cases it may be vocalized ia at the end of names, a number of names which Pettinato ends in -ia, Gelb ends with -ni.⁵ H.-P.

¹Ibid., 4, 249.
²Mattiae, 11.
⁴Archi, "The Epigraphic Evidence from Ebla," 558-59. On the debate between Archi and Pettinato concerning ia , see also Giovanni Pettinato, "Ebla and the Bible," BA 43 (1980): 203-205, "I am now convinced that both elements [-il and -ya] are generic terms for 'God' and do not indicate, at least not always, a particular divinity"; idem, "BAR Interviews Giovanni Pettinato," BAR 6, No. 5 (1980): 51. Here he cites evidence of the existence of the divine name Ya in the god lists from Mesopotamia as well; Alfonso Archi, "Further Concerning Ebla and the Bible," BA 44 (1981): 146. Here he suggests ia is really ni, and should be vocalized li.
Müller, however, suggests that *ia* at Ebla can be a theophorous element, based on the verb "to be," in parallel with Yahweh as in Exod 3:14.¹

Whether or not *ia* in names at Ebla is a divine name or a hypocoristicon, the name Michael appears at Ebla as Mi-ka-il and finds in these texts its earliest parallel.

It is of interest that the Ebla tablets attest more than one Semitic language in the personal names. The name mannu-ki-il has been found, which Gelb identifies as Amorite, with the meaning of "Who is like El?," identical to that of the Eblaite mi-ka-il. It has been identified as Amorite because of the element mannu, "who?" against the Eblaite mi, "who?"² This phenomenon suggests that neither was derived from the other, as both names retained their distinction within the same society.

Two years before the start of this century, Wilhelm Lueken speculated that the name Michael, along with other angelic names such as Gabriel, Raphael, etc., was a Hebraized Babylonian name, brought back by the returning exiles.³ Two years later, Nathaniel Schmidt, following the same "Bible-Babel" trend, thought that Michael's prototype was Marduk, king of the Babylonian gods.⁴ Despite lack of solid


³Lueken, 2.

evidence for support, the theory of Babylonian borrowing has persisted. Eric F. F. Bishop holds the view that some of the apocalyptic angels came from Babylonian influence, with some of the names of Babylonian origin. But the presence of the name Michael at Ebla makes difficult any continued support of the theory that the name Michael itself owes anything to Babylonian sources. It is lexically West Semitic, with the root being the three words in the question, mi-kā-ʾēl, "Who is like God?"

Amorite

Tablets from the ancient city of Mari, which was located on the Euphrates River northwest of Babylon, are our best source of Amorite names. The tablets cover a period of about seventy years, up until the city fell to Hammurabi, king of Babylon, about the middle of the eighteenth century B.C.3

Herbert B. Huffmon, in his study of Amorite names, classifies as "Amorite" all (North-) West Semitic names of the Mari and other Old Babylonian cuneiform texts.4 Among these are found theophorous names with bothʾēl (Heb. ʾēl), which he feels is not only the general word for god, but also probably the god El,5 and ilāh (Heb.

---

4 Huffmon, 6.
5 Ibid., 162-65; examples: el-i-dagan, ya-di-AN (AN=el), i-li-malik.
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In addition, both Semitic and non-Semitic names with the hypocoristic ending -iya, are very common.\(^{2}\)

Huffmon has found six Amorite interrogative sentence names at Mari, five of which begin with the word meaning "where?" The sixth, Ma-an-na-ha-al-ti-AN, the name of a king of Sippar, uses the interrogative pronoun, manna, "who?," and is an almost exact parallel to the common Akkadian rhetorical question names, such as Mannum-balad-DN, "Who can be without (god)?" He states, "This name may reflect the influence of Akkadian onomastic practices, although Hebrew Mikael is a similar type."\(^{3}\)

The name Michael, or equivalent names formed with a different divine element, does not appear among the Amorite names at Mari. In fact, Labuschagne has not found names denoting incomparability occurring in the Mari texts.\(^{4}\) Gelb, however, suggests that the name Mimma-bir-su, which, when translated as Akkadian, reads "What is his opponent?," should rather be read as Mi-ma-bir-su, "Who is his opponent," taking the first element as mi. This links it with Mi-ka'il "Who is like 'Il?" at Ebla and mikael, "Who is like 'el" in

\(^{1}\)Ibid., 165; examples: i-la-ISDAR, i-la-sa-lim, sa-mu-ti-la, ya-wi-i-la.

\(^{2}\)Ibid., 134-134; examples: a-bi-ya, a-hi-ya, uz-zi-ya, sa-mi-ya. In a footnote he notes that the iya ending is frequent in Akkadian names, and suggests (citing Noth, IPN, 105) that the Hebrew final element -yah may be in some cases a continuation of this hypocoristic ending. But the frequency of the ending iya in Amorite names makes it unnecessary, he points out, to assume that -(i)ya represents borrowing from Akkadian.

\(^{3}\)Huffmon, 103.

\(^{4}\)Labuschagne, 126.
The name would then be a statement of divine incomparability similar to Michael.

Ugaritic

The city of Ugarit, located on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea, far to the north of Israel, was inhabited from neolithic times down to the twelfth century B.C. The important texts, from which the Ugaritic language has been reconstructed, come from a destruction level at about the end of the fourteenth century B.C.

Though theophoric names are common at Ugarit, the name Michael is apparently not found among the Ugaritic documents. Frauke Gröndahl, in her list of Ugaritic personal names containing the theophoric element il, the Ugaritic equivalent of Hebrew 'ēl, includes no name like mi-ka-il or myk'il. Neither does Richard E. Whitaker list any such name in his Ugaritic concordance. Furthermore, Labuschagne has not found one name among the hundreds of proper

---

1Gelb, Thoughts about Ibla, 11. Gelb holds that the language spoken at pre-Sargonic Mari was the same as at Ebla.


5Ibid.

names excavated at Ugarit which he feels is of the type expressing the deity's incomparability.¹

M. Delcor, however, has suggested that the name Michael is present among the personal names of Ugarit represented by the name mkl,² which appears only once³ or possibly twice⁴ in the published Ugaritic documents. But it may be questioned whether mkl would be equivalent to Michael, as it lacks the consonants yod and lamed present in the Hebrew name mikä'el which are present in the Ugaritic alphabet. To be considered as Michael, the name would have to be assumed written defectively. Though the meaning of mkl is not clear, there are many foreign names at Ugarit.⁵ Roy Y. Uyechi suggests a link of mkl with Mu-kal-lim, a Mesopotamian name from the Cassite period.⁶ On the basis of available information, it does not appear that there is significant evidence that the name Michael or its equivalent existed at Ugarit.

---

¹Labuschagne, 126.
³Whitaker, 418; Joseph Aistleitner, Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965), 184.
⁵Roy Yasunori Uyechi, "A Study of Ugaritic Alphabetic Personal Names" (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1961), ii.
⁶Uyechi, 142; see Albert Tobias Clay, Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period, Yale Oriental Series, vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912), 108; see also Albright, "Some Notes on the stele of Ben-Hadad," 33. He suggests that the Sumerian word Muk(k)alla lies behind mkl, the name of the god of the city of Bethshan.
Aramaic

Aramaic inscriptions from ancient times as studied by Edward Lipiński have yielded many theophoric names with *el as the divine element, but the equivalent of neither Michael nor Micaiah. A study of Aramaic texts in Egypt, however, have proved more fruitful. Pierre Grelot has found five occurrences of נ*ח (mikā), which he holds forms an abbreviation of either mīkāyāh or mīkā'el. He also found seven occurrences of נ*ח (mikāyāh).² Kornfeld likewise reports the presence of names which express divine incomparability in Egyptian Aramaic texts: mykā, "who (is) like?"; mykh (variation of mykā); mykyh, "who is like Yh?"; mky (variation of mykā); and mkyh (variation of mykyh).³

A. H. Sayce and A. E. Cowley also report the appearance of the Aramaic forms of the OT names Micah and Micaiah in the Elephantine papyri found in upper Egypt dated 440 B.C.⁴

Aramaic names from Palmyra, some undated, some from the Seleucid era, include Īlḥbl, "God is lord"; quite a few are found with the beginning syllable īl, equivalent to *el, "God"; two occur of mkbl, "Who is like Baal?"; and a limited number exist of mky,  

---

¹Edward Lipiński, Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1975), 17-52, passim; examples: fidri-īl, "My help is El" (17), īel-sumk(I), "El is (my) support" (62), ya-di-īl, "Acknowledged by El" (131).


"Micaiah," and ܡܲܐܝܚܐ, "Mica),¹ short for "Michael."²

From the evidence examined, it is clear that, though the name Michael is not directly attested in Aramaic texts, names in the form of a rhetorical question expressing divine incomparability akin to Michael are found.

**Phoenician**

The name Michael is not found in extant Phoenician or Punic texts and inscriptions. Frank L. Benz lists theophoric names, such as ܝܠܥܐ, "El is Baal" and ܡܟܝ,³ possibly "Micaiah." If the latter contains the two elements ܡܐ and ܟܝ, it is likely a statement of incomparability, and is either a question, "Who is like?" with a hypocoristic ending and the name of a deity implied, or the name Micaiah. In either case, it represents a close parallel to the name Michael.

**Palestinian**

**Mekal, god of Bethshan**

Frauke Gröndahl, in her lists of Ugaritic names, includes the name "ܡܟܠ," the name of the god of the Canaanite city of Bethshan.⁴ The name ܡܟܠ (or, as usually rendered, Mekal) is found inscribed in

---


⁴Gröndahl, 156-57.
Egyptian hieroglyphs\(^1\) on a small stele found in a temple in Bethshan dated to the fourteenth century B.C.\(^2\) The stele also presents an image of the god seated on a throne, and some symbolic elements which help indicate the nature of the god.\(^3\) Bethshan was a Canaanite city-state\(^4\) located in Palestine in the Jezreel valley, at the edge of the Jordan valley, between the territories of the tribes of Manasseh and Issachar.

Bethshan was listed as one of the Canaanite cities not conquered in the campaigns of Joshua (Josh 17:11-13), partly at least because they had iron chariots (Josh 17:16). Judg 1:27 refers to Bethshan and "its villages," indicating the importance of the city. There is no record of any conquest of Bethshan at any subsequent time. By the time of Solomon, however, Bethshan had come under the full control of Israel (1 Kgs 4:12). It is entirely possible that all during the time between the conquest under Joshua and Solomon's reign, while Bethshan's inhabitants lived among the Israelites, a period of several centuries, Mekal was worshiped as god at Bethshan.\(^5\) The hanging of the bodies of Saul and his sons on the wall of Bethshan by the Philistines after Israel's defeat in the battle on Gilboa and the subsequent removal of their bodies by night by the men of Jebesh-gilead (1 Sam 31:10-13) suggests that Bethshan was not yet a city of Israel.

\(^1\)Thompson, *Mekal, the God of Beth-Shan* 180.
\(^2\)Ibid., 5-6.
\(^3\)Ibid., 50.
\(^4\)Ibid., 6.
\(^5\)Ibid., 174.
Very soon after the discovery of Mekal at Bethshan was reported,\(^1\) there was speculation of a link between Mekal and the Michael figure in Daniel. The discoverer, Rowe, initially vocalized the consonants of the hieroglyphs as Mekar,\(^2\) but changed it to Mekal soon after,\(^3\) a position that has come to predominate. J. M. Powis Smith, noting the basic consonants mkl, proposed that the vocalization mikal is possible, which would then be the name Michael. The i, he thought, could have been written defectively without the yod, natural in a script written on stone, and the aleph may have been elided, "not without parallel elsewhere." He felt that certainty was not possible, however, without further discovery.\(^4\)

William C. Graham and Herbert G. May offered the suggestion that "the archangel Michael is a partially depotentized survival of the deity, Mikal,"\(^5\) a suggestion which has been repeatedly echoed in the secondary literature.\(^6\)


\(^{2}\) Ibid., 148.

\(^{3}\) Alan H. Rowe, "Excavations at Beisân During the 1927 Season," *PEF* 60 (1928): 78-80.


Vocalization and etymology of Mekal

A close examination of the hieroglyphs on the Mekal stele reveals five characters forming his name, followed by the determinative sign for a god. The name appears twice on the stele: "Mekal, the god of Bethshan" in the upper register, and "Mekal, the great god" in the lower. The five characters, according to Thompson, represent the Hebrew letters Mem, ayin, kaph, aleph, and lamedh.\(^1\)

The ayin requires close attention. According to Thompson, the hieroglyph for ayin in Canaanite inscriptions can have more than one meaning. In this instance, three possibilities exist: it should be taken (1) as the letter ayin, (2) as a phonetic complement for the mem, which should give the transliteration mi, or (3) dropping the i, read it simply as m.\(^2\) Thompson writes, "Under present circumstances we simply do not know whether the 'ayin' is to be taken as 'ayin,' i.e., a or ā or as a 'determinative' for the m and hence to be transliterated i to give mi, or to be left out to give m."

This, perhaps, explains the lack of certainty in Thompson's final position. If the ayin is taken as a determinative or phonetic complement of the mem, however, the result is a consonantal vocalization of m\(k\)l. It lacks only a yod to approximate the spelling of m\(k\)ál\(ā\)l.

According to Alan H. Gardiner, Egyptian hieroglyphics had a

---

\(^1\) Thompson, 180-86; see also Alan H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), 27, for confirmation of the Hebrew equivalent of the last four glyphs, and 526, for confirmation of the first glyph; see further, S. A. B. Mercer, *Egyptian Hieroglyphic Grammar* (Chicago: Ares Pub., 1927), 160, for added confirmation that the first glyph represents the sound m.

\(^2\) Thompson, 182-83.
glyph, a reed leaf, which was vocalized like the yod in Hebrew.¹

The glyph for 'ayin in second position when following the "m" sound, however, is vocalized as though it were a yod.² W. F. Albright noted that when the 'ayin glyph followed one of two mem glyphs (owl and bevel) the combination was vocalized ma, mi, or mu.³ Of the examples he gave, however, the ma and mu vocalizations were predominately owl-'ayin, whereas the mi vocalizations were predominately bevel-'ayin. Since the Bethshan stele has the bevel-'ayin combination,⁴ it would seem, if Albright's examples were representative of a general pattern, that mi would be the most likely vocalization of the first syllable of the god Mekal's name.

Thompson also notes that the combination mem-'ayin in hieroglyphics can signify the interrogative pronoun "Who?" or "What?"

This compares with the meaning "who?" for mi, the first syllable of mikā'ēl.⁵ Albright thinks the original pronunciation of that combination may have been mi, though later ma and mu developed.⁶

Though the eagle glyph is generally recognized as equivalent to the Semitic jaleph, it is a weak consonant and is susceptible to change or omission. Like the Hebrew jaleph it can become quiescent or lose its consonantal power and serve merely as a sign of a

¹Gardiner, 36-36.
²Ibid., 44.
⁴Thompson, 180.
⁵Albright, Vocalization, 25.
⁶Thompson, 182.
preceding long vowel. The vowel most commonly indicated by the eagle glyph is a, thus the "a" in "Mekal," though it can apply to others also, such as ã or ý.1

This discussion of the vocalization of the hieroglyphs of the name Mekal suggests that the prima facia vocalization would be mik'il, virtually the same as the Hebrew mikä'êl, "Michael." However, the range of possible variations in the vocalization of the šawîn and the šaleph indicates that certainty is not possible.

There are different views of the etymology of Mekal.2 There is no Hebrew/Canaanite root, makal.3 Albright believes the name came from the Sumerian title of Nergal, Ummu-urugalla(k), "Lord of the Great City," the "great city" being Hades, the underworld (Akkadian, "Irkalla"). He suggests that this may easily have become Muk(k)alla, which has the same consonants as Mkl.4 Others have seen the name built on the roots škl, "eat, devour"; škr, "disturb, trouble"; derivatives of šwl, "protect, nourish," including šhl, "perfected, destroyed," and švl, "to be able, to overcome, to vanquish,"5 the latter having perhaps the strongest support.6 Rowe offered the possibility that Mekal may be "an intentional transposition of the word Melak or Malek (=Molech), 'king,' the god of

---

1Ibid., 186.
2Ibid., 171.
3Ibid., 188.
4Albright, "Some Notes," 33.
5Thompson, 76.
devouring fire and pestilence."\(^1\) Thompson concludes that there is "no absolute etymology" for Mekal, but sees in the apparently divergent possible roots the prevalence of the concept of disturbance, destruction, consumption, as contrasted to and combined with the protective, life-giving and life-saving element of the all-powerful, vanquishing deity.\(^2\)

L. H. Vincent also prefers the root \(vkl\) as lying behind the name Mekal, with the idea of "superiority," "domination," "lordship." He suggests the name may be a Pi\(\text{f}\)\(\text{Äl}\) or Hiph\(\text{f}\)\(\text{Äl}\) participle, or a substantive with an initial augment of the maqtal, miqtal, etc., class. This could lead to a name identical to Michal (Mikal), Saul's daughter, who married David.\(^3\) He, interestingly, does not discuss a possible link with "Michael." This is noteworthy, as interpreters generally regard the name of David's wife Michal as a short form of the name Michael.\(^4\) Vincent apparently sees a different etymology for Michal than for Michael.

Thompson takes a different approach, viewing the name Mekal as being closer to Michael than to Michal. He agrees with the identification of the name Michal, Saul's daughter, with Mekal, the name of the god of Bethshan,\(^5\) and thinks that Saul probably named

---

\(^1\) Rowe, "Excavations at Beisan," 80.
\(^2\) Thompson, 192.
\(^3\) Vincent, 526-27.
\(^5\) Thompson, 191-92.
his daughter after this nearby deity. He denies Vincent's claim that the name of Michal matches the name of Mekal trait for trait. Michal omits the aleph, while it is retained by the name Michael. He agrees that Michal's name is related to the verb vkl, suggesting that miyakol ("Who is superior?" or "Who conquers?") is not to be rejected as the meaning of Mekal/Michal, but thinks that the 'al in Michael is the general term for "god" and that the translation is "Who is like God?"

We see here some ambiguity. Vincent sees an identity between Mekal and Michal, but not with Michael, vocalizing the aleph differently than Thompson. Thompson identifies Mekal with both Michal and Michael, though giving Michal a different etymology than Michael, and leaving the etymology of Mekal an open question. He allows the possibility of vkl as a root for Mekal, allowing the eagle glyph between the k and the l of Mekal, to be vocalized other than as an aleph, an aleph absent in vkl. It is apparent that Thompson regards his interpretation of the Egyptian hieroglyphs as somewhat tentative.

A third possibility, not mentioned by Vincent or Thompson, would be to relate Michael to Mekal, both with the aleph, but not to Michal, which lacks the aleph.

The status of Michal, however, though tangentially related to this study, is not critical to its progress, so need not detain us longer. There will be no attempt to resolve this ambiguity. What

---

1Ibid., 179.
2Ibid., 178, 191-92.
3Ibid., 192.
does seem to emerge is the possible identity between the names Mekal and Michael.

Mekal's identification with other Gods

Iconographic symbolism on the Bethshan Mekal stele suggests an identification of the god Mekal with gods of other lands. Without going into unnecessary detail, we can summarize by saying that Mekal has been identified by Albright with the Babylonian god Nergal and the Canaanite god Resheph, which were identified with each other,¹ an identification with which Thompson concurs.² Thompson also sets forth detailed evidence that Mekal was also identified with the Egyptian god Seth.³

These gods had certain characteristics and roles in common. Nergal, Resheph, and Seth were chthonic gods, that is, gods of the underworld, of the dead. They were also gods of pestilence, death and destruction, gods of war, and storm gods. In addition, they were sun gods and gods of fertility.⁴ It was not thought to be incongruous to be both a god of destruction and fertility. Opposite functions were actually common among the deities of the ancient Near


²Thompson, 119-23, 127, 144-45; see also Rowe, "Excavation at Beisân," 79-80; Rowe also identifies the god Mekal with the god Resheph.

³Thompson, 129-35, 143; see also Alan Rowe, A Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs (Cairo: Government of Palestine, 1936), 253; and Rowe, "Excavation at Beisân," 79; where he also identifies Mekal with Seth.

East. The god with power over death could also offer life and health.\(^1\) Thompson thinks Mekal was a chthonic deity with the powers to destroy and make alive.\(^2\)

Mention should be made of the Phoenician inscriptions found on the island of Cyprus, bearing the name of the god Rashaph-MKL, which is associated with a Greek translation, Apollo of Amukloī.\(^3\) The earliest of these date from about 391 B.C.\(^4\) It is clear that the Canaanite god Resheph is identified with the Greek god Apollo, and that MKL is transliterated Amukloī, with the same three consonants, mkl.

Albright supports an identification of the god Resheph-MKL on Cyprus with the god Mekal of Bethshan, and sees the name Amukloī, with the "u" between the "m" and "k" as added evidence of his hypothesis of the origin of the name Mekal.\(^5\)

Fulco expresses doubts that such an obscure, local deity as Mekal of Bethshan would be so popular as to spread to Cyprus and have a city named after him. He suggested that Mekal was a local name for a popular deity, such as Seth of Egypt (the same as Thompson's thesis). He grants that the Cyprus Rashaph-Mekal may have been named for the god of Bethshan, but felt that the similarity between MKL and

\(^1\)Ibid., 154, 157.
\(^2\)Ibid., 52, 157.
\(^5\)Albright, "Some Notes," 33.
Amyklæ was due to Greek syncretism, using homonyms to tie Resheph and Apollo together.¹

Some question that any relationship exists between Rashaph-MKL on Cyprus and the god Mekal at Bethshan,² but, according to Thompson, the iconographic identification of Mekal of Bethshan with the god Resheph does lend credence to such a link.³ Thompson feels the evidence of an identification between Mekal and Resheph "became complete in Cyprus through the 'mediation' of Apollo of Amyklæ."⁴

The broad support (not unanimity) in evidence for a connection between the god MKL of Bethshan and Rashaph-MKL of Cyprus,⁵ would seem to suggest two points of significance for the study of Michael: (1) The distance the name of the god MKL traveled indicates significant influence, and (2) the persistence of the name of the god MKL into the fourth century B.C. suggests that an acquaintance with the name in its association with a transcendent being by the community to which the book of Daniel was directed was at least theoretically possible.

Mekal and Yahweh

Thompson suggests that one reason Bethshan was not disturbed by Israel was that Israel came to identify the god Mekal with Yahweh.

¹Fulco, 38, 51-54.
²Rowe, "Excavations at Beisân," 80; though he thought such an identification is "very doubtful," he indirectly identifies them by identifying Mekal with Resheph (79-80); see Thompson, 164.
³Thompson, 164-65.
⁴Ibid., 170-71.
⁵See Ibid., 164-65, for added information on support for and opposition to this identification.
He suggests a number of points of contact between the chthonic god Mekal and Yahweh. Yahweh, like Mekal, was a God of fertility, a storm God, a war-God, and a God of death.\(^1\) Yahweh is a God of death, partly from the war-God element, with its destruction of the enemy, or, in times of anger, of His own people. Also, He is, like the chthonic gods, a God who causes disease and pestilence. Unlike the chthonic gods, Yahweh is not a God of cemeteries or One who is worshiped by the dead (Isa 38:18; Pss 6:5; 115:17). But He is the God of the underworld in the sense that He can exercise His authority there. Sheol stands naked before Him. Yahweh "brought up" the Psalmist's soul from Sheol (Ps 30:3).\(^2\)

Thompson speculates that Israel in Egypt identified the god Seth with Yahweh. Seth was regarded within and outside of Egypt as the god of foreign lands.\(^3\) Also, the foreign Hyksos rulers of Egypt, under whose rule Joseph may have risen to prominence, and who may be culturally or ethnically related to the Patriarchs, promoted the worship of the god Seth.\(^4\) A rivalry existed between the Egyptian gods Seth and Horus,\(^5\) and Pharaoh himself was the incarnate Horus. Thompson sees the old Horus-Seth battle for supremacy possibly re-played between Yahweh and Pharaoh, who refused to let Yahweh/Seth's people go. Yahweh used the plagues of pestilence.

---

\(^1\)Ibid., 176.

\(^2\)Ibid., 177.

\(^3\)Ibid., 143.

\(^4\)Ibid., 173.

\(^5\)Ibid., 134.
storms, darkness,\textsuperscript{1} and finally only death remained to move stubborn Pharaoh's heart.\textsuperscript{2} If Seth was identified with both Yahweh and Mekal, then it would be natural to identify Yahweh with Mekal.

Adding to that was Israel's failure to capture Bethshan. According to Thompson, this would seem to make Mekal superior to Yahweh, an impossibility in Yahwistic theology, and therefore a further reason to identify Mekal with Yahweh.\textsuperscript{3}

In response, it can be said that an identification of Yahweh with Seth might have been possible from the Egyptian polytheistic viewpoint. However, such an identification by the departing people of Israel, among whom was emerging a strong monotheism, is a highly unlikely proposition. Yahweh declared: "On all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments" (Exod 12:12). Seth was certainly a major god of Egypt, worshiped from prehistoric times. Seth was over Upper Egypt and Horus over Lower Egypt. His worship was promoted by the Hyksos, favored (along with other gods) by Thutmose III, Amenophis II, Hatshepsut and Amenophis IV in the eighteenth dynasty and in favor most of the nineteenth dynasty (the latter part).\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., 173. Pharaoh was the incarnation of the sun, which, each morning, fought and overcame the snake Apophis, who symbolized the hostile darkness. The darkness sent by Yahweh indicated that Yahweh was stronger than the sun-god Horus.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., 175. But see Josh 2:20-23; 3:1-4, where at least two added reasons are given why God did not drive out the remaining nations: (1) to test Israel's faith and (2) to train in military skills. See also Exod 23:29-31; Deut 7:22, where the reason is given that the land would otherwise be overrun by wild beasts. See John Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, The Century Bible (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967), 258.

\textsuperscript{4}Thompson, 129-31.
Also, Seth is identified with the pig. As a black pig, he ate one of the eyes of Horus, causing an eclipse. The pig was unclean and anathema to the worship of Yahweh. Thompson sees evidence from Bethshan that Mekal was identified with the pig, though this evidence is quite tenuous. He grants that this element of Mekal worship was rejected rather than assimilated by Yahwism.

Another consideration is that the Exodus period was a creative, formative period of the Yahwistic worship of Israel. At such a time, syncretistic tendencies would be expected to be at a very low ebb, with the contrasts between the God of their fathers and the gods of their oppressing Egyptian masters strongly magnified by the Israelites. Further, the plague of death to all the first-born (Exod 12:12; 29-33) need not be seen as evidence of an identification of Yahweh with Seth, but may rather be seen as a rejection of Seth's authority. Yahweh, not Seth, is the God who determines who will live or die, and invades Seth's territory with impunity. The Egyptian god Seth had no power to avert Yahweh's announced plague of death (Exod 11:4-8) upon all the first-born of Egypt.

It should not be thought significant that Yahweh and Seth had some common functions. In polytheism, each god has his particular function or set of functions. The monotheistic God Yahweh exercised

1Ibid., 134, 139.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., 176.
4Note the decisiveness with which the syncretistic worship of the golden calf was repressed (Exod 32, especially vss. 20, 25-29). Consider again the significance of Exod 12:12, that God would execute judgments upon all the gods of Egypt.
all the functions of deity. It would be natural, therefore, that Yahweh should come to exercise the functions of any god in the polytheistic pantheon, including those of Seth.

Is it possible that Mekal of Bethshan came to be identified with Yahweh? Evidence can be found that a certain amount of syncretism existed in Israel from the time of the judges into the period of the kings. For example, the northern part of the tribe of Dan apparently worshiped a graven image identified with Yahweh, with Levites as priests, during the entire time the house of God was at Shiloh (Judg 17). The golden calves erected by Jeroboam, king of Israel, at Bethel and Dan (1 Kgs 12:28-29) were for the worship of Yahweh, not some foreign god. The focus of the Elijah and Elisha reforms was opposition to Baal worship; no effort was made then to eliminate the shrines at Bethel and Dan. Even the worship at some of the local "high places," forbidden in Num 33:52 and Deut 7:5; 33:29, and a major target of the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Kgs 18:4, 22; 23:5, 8, 13), was worship of Yahweh. Thompson points to what he considered to be the apparent identification of "Baal Berith" of

---


Shechem with the God of Israel (Judg 8:33; 9:4, 46) as a possible parallel to the identification of Mekal with Yahweh.\(^1\)

This evidence of syncretism in Israel suggests that it is not impossible that the people of Bethshan, living in close association with Israelite worshipers of Yahweh for centuries, gradually conformed their concept of their god Mekal to that of Yahweh, so that by the time Bethshan came under the direct Israelite rule of David and Solomon (1 Kgs 4:12), the identification had become complete.\(^2\)

We cannot agree with Thompson that the Mekal religion made any significant, lasting contribution to Yahwism.\(^3\) The Yahwism that endured, as opposed to local, popular, syncretistic Yahwism, was that of the prophets, who stoutly resisted any syncretistic tendencies. This is seen in Amos’s rejection of the idolatrous Yahweh worship at Bethel (Amos 3:14; 4:4; 5:5; 7:7-17), and by the negative attitude of the author of Judges toward "Baal Berith" (Judg 8:33). The name Mekal conceivably persisted as a local title for Yahweh in Bethshan and vicinity. There is, however, no real evidence, biblical or otherwise, that this happened. It must remain tentative speculation.

\(^1\) Thompson, 174.
\(^2\) Ibid., 179.
\(^3\) Ibid. For a pointed rejection of Thompson’s contention that Mekal contributed to the expansion of Yahweh’s character, see the book review, Carl Graesser, Jr., "Mekal: The God of Bethshan," review of Mekal: The God of Beth-shan, by Henry O. Thompson, in Concordia Theological Monthly 42 (1971): 464; "This hypothesis would be clarified by a discussion of the author’s understanding of Israel’s prior conception of Yahweh, of this vague process of ‘absorption,’ and of its mechanism. Ultimately, however, simple lack of evidence would seem to render any theory regarding the relationship of Mekal and Yahweh rather premature."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Mekal and Michael

The possibility that the god Mekal lies behind the figure of Michael has been mentioned by various scholars, though not all agree with Thompson that the two names are identical. Delcor seems to favor an identification of Michael with Mekal, as well as identifying the Mekal of Bethshan with the later RSP-MKL of Cyprus. However, he suggests the need of a "slight consonantal modification" to make the name Mekal into Michael, though he does not indicate what changes he envisions—possibly to supply the missing yod and aleph as suggested by Smith (see above, 103).

The significance of the possible identity of the names Mekal and Michael should not, in itself, be exaggerated. The name Michael, as we have seen, existed as a common name not only in Israel, but also at Ebla, probably in Aramaic and Palmyrene, and, as shown below, was, in cognate form, fairly widespread in Akkadian. Alexander A. Di Lella states:

It used to be thought that the name "Michael" in Daniel is a survival and a deliberately altered form of the name Mikal, a Canaanite god, that is found on some Canaanite inscriptions. Mikal appears unvocalized as mkl, probably from the verb root vkl which means "to be powerful"; hence, the name can be interpreted as "Powerful One" or "Conqueror." Now, however, we know for certain that the original name behind Hebrew mifcael is mi-kA-il ("Who is like Il, or god?"); a name that appears in the recently discovered Ebla documents written Old Canaanite ca. 2400 B.C.

---

1J. M. P. Smith, 208; Graham and May, 107; Bentzen, Daniel, 79; Hengel, 344; Delcor, 210; Lacocque, 203; Koch, 207; Thompson, 76, 77, 178.

2Thompson, 178.

3Lacocque, 203.

4Delcor, 46, 210-11.

5Hartman and Di Lella, 282.
Beyond the identity of the names, however, is seen the two transcendent figures. The question remains, then, can the figure of Michael be traceable back to the figure of Mekal of Bethshan? Thompson sees a link. He holds to the view that there is a "general tendency of a monotheistic people to take old gods and turn them into angels, saints or demons, under the supreme authority of the one God."¹ He suggests that Mekal became the angel Michael, "He is the patron angel of the Jews."²

If we see the "roots" of this angel in Mekal, it is not at all surprising to find him fighting his old self, the dragon, while protecting his old people of the Exodus, and this new people of the cross.³

To support his thesis of a link between Mekal and Michael, he notes Albright's observation that the belief in angels with specific names, including Michael, must go back at least to the time of the Judges or the United Monarchy, when the names of the angels were good personal names.⁴

In reviewing the various roots suggested for Mekal, Thompson notes the concept of disturbance, destruction, consumption, as contrasted to and combined with the protective, life-giving and life-saving element of the deity.

Then he draws a conceptual parallel between the character of Mekal and that of Michael, noting that the "archangel" Michael is

¹Thompson, 178.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
war-like, works as an intercessor or intermediary, and is the opener of the gate of paradise for the righteous.¹

One might add that there is some similarity in how the two figures are characterized:

"Mekal, the god of Bethshan" (Mekal stele, upper register)
"Mekal, the great god" (Mekal stele, lower register)²
"Michael, the great prince who has charge of your people" (Dan 12:1). Of special interest in this comparison is the use of the adjective "great" for both figures.

In analyzing the view of the Mekal-Michael relationship as set forth by Thompson, two observations could perhaps be made. The first might be to recognize the "history of religions" approach that he appears to take, which seems to assume: (1) that the concepts in the OT religion arise out of previous concepts in their historical context and (2) that there is an evolution of ideas within a cultural context which should be traceable forward or backward, provided we are furnished with adequate documentation.

Of course, it cannot be denied that earlier concepts or motifs do influence the development or expression of later ideas, but original concepts should be allowed to arise, dependent upon no earlier developments. In the book of Daniel, the name and activity of Michael is depicted as a result of transcendent revelations, visions of God. It is not necessary to suppose, despite Volz's

¹Thompson, 192.
²Ibid., 181.
remarks,\(^1\) that Michael was already known to the community to which the last chapters of Daniel were written.\(^2\) It is entirely conceivable that the name and function, indeed, even the existence of this transcendent being are made known through the author to his religious community for the first time in the final revelations of the book of Daniel. In short, there is no necessary connection between the Michael figure and earlier or contemporary figures. Therefore, while a relationship between Mekal and Michael as suggested by Thompson and others is an interesting possibility, it is by no means demonstrated. Accordingly, a study of the chthonic god Mekal, or other gods with whom he may be identified, would not seem useful as a method to inform our understanding of the Michael figure.

A second observation might be made to point out divergent directions in which Thompson sees the influence of the god Mekal upon Israelite religion. First of all, he suggests a possible identification of Mekal with Yahweh, in which Mekal came to be viewed by Israel as a local name for Yahweh. Second, he suggests that the god Mekal met the fate of other neighboring gods in the monotheistic religion of Israel; he was subordinated to Yahweh and evolved into the angel Michael.

It seems that if Mekal was indeed identified with Yahweh, there would have been no need to subordinate him to Yahweh as an angel.

\(^1\)Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie, 10; "Michael ist ein bekannte, bereits aktive Figur; der Menschenähnliche ist noch ein X, ein Ungenannter, Verborgener, Inactiver; er tritt erst mit dem jüngsten Tag dem Geheimnis heraus."

\(^2\)See Ferch, 221.
Thompson pointed out what to him were some similarities between the characteristics of the chthonic god Mekal and Yahweh. He also indicated some similarities between the characteristics of Mekal and Michael.

What this seems to suggest is a similarity also between the characteristics of Yahweh and Michael. If Thompson is correct in suggesting an identification of Mekal with Yahweh, then it would seem that his suggestion that Mekal was subordinated to Yahweh as an angel would be incorrect. If a connection exists between Mekal and Michael, then one might expect Michael to be a divine being rather than a mere angel. Further exploration of this possibility must await chapter 3.

Akkadian Parallels

The identification of the meaning of Michael as "Who is like God?" finds support in parallels in Akkadian personal names. In this summary of evidence from Akkadian names, an approximate chronological order is followed, beginning with the earliest. Among name elements from the Hammurabi dynasty (1792-1750 B.C.), Hermann Ranke, in his work on early Babylonian names, identified the following: ili, meaning "my god," cognate of the Hebrew 'eli; the comparative particle kima, meaning "like," cognate of the Hebrew ke; and the interrogative pronoun mannu, meaning "who?," cognate of the Hebrew mi.2

---

1A. L. Oppenheim, "Hammurabi," 517.
These elements are found together in the name, Ma-an-nu-um-ki-ma-ilija, "Who is like my god?", an Akkadian approximation of the Hebrew name mīkāʾēl, "Michael."¹

This interpretation of the Babylonian name is confirmed by the same first two name elements appearing in combination with the names of particular gods, such as Ma-an-nu-um-ki-ma-Shamash, "Who is like Shamash?", Ma-nu-um-ki-ma-Bel, "Who is like Bel?," and Ma-nu-um-ki-ma-Sin, "Who is like Sin?"²

Nor is this an isolated example. In his study of Assyrian names of 2200-606 B.C., Knut Tallqvist lists Man-nu-ki-ili, "Who is like the god?" and Man-nu-ki-ili-rabu, "Who is like the great god?", the first being identical to Michael in structure and meaning, and the second a variation.³ He also has several variations with the name of a particular god, such as Man-nu-ki-Nabu, and Man-nu-kima-Enlil-hātin, "Who is like Enlil protecting?," and some non-theophoric statements of incomparability, such as Man-nu-kima-abī, "Who is like

¹Ibid., 120. The presence of the syllable ja at the end of this and other Akkadian names, such as Ma-an-ni-ja, ibid., has raised the question whether the equivalent of the name Yahweh may exist in Akkadian. But this syllable is widely understood as hypocoristic, that is, an ending expressing endearment or indicating a pet name, as "Johnny" for "John." See Ranke, 58-59, 234; also, Martin Noth, Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung [Reprodgrafischer Nachdruck der Ausg. Stuttgart. 1928] (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1966): 108-109. But see Knut Leonard Tallqvist, Assyrian Personal Names (Helsingfors: n.p., 1914), 126, where he translates Man-nu-ki-ilija, "Who is like Ya(?) mighty"; cf. also Pettinato, "BAR Interviews," 51, who finds evidence of the god Ya at Mesopotamia.

²Ranke, 120.

³Tallqvist, xv.
A. T. Clay has listed the Akkadian names Man-nu-ki-ilu, "Who is like god?" and Man-ki-i-rab-ilu, "Who is like the great god?" as equivalents of Michael in the Cassite period (1750-1173 B.C.) of Babylonian history.\(^1\)

Name lists from Middle Assyrian (1500-1000 B.C.)\(^3\) contain the combination of mannu-ki, "Who is like--," with the name of a god, plus the name Manu-ki-ia, "Who is like?" standing alone,\(^4\) which is believed to be a shortened form, with the generic term for god, ili or the name of a specific god implied.\(^5\) Middle Assyrian also includes names of similar construction, such as Ma-nu-ger-ili-shu, "Who is an enemy of our (?) god?", Manu-ger-Adad, "Who is an enemy of Adad?", and Manu-ger-Assur, "Who is an enemy of Assur?"\(^6\)

Personal names of Cappadocia include Ma-nim-ki-i-E-li, "Who is like god? as well as Ma-nu-ki-Ishtar, "Who is like Ishtar?" and Ma-nu-um-ki-ab-i-a, "Who is like my father?"\(^7\)

\(^1\)Ibid., 126-127. The name elements ki and kima are used interchangeably, with the same meaning, "like," much as ke and kāmōkāh in Hebrew (see KBL. 441).

\(^2\)Clay, 105, 184.


\(^5\)Sayce and Cowley, 42.

\(^6\)Ibid., 306-07; see Stamm, 238.

J. J. Stamm not only records Akkadian personal names equivalent to Michael,\(^1\) but also notes some place names such as: Mannuki-Assur, Mannuki-Babili, Mannuki-Harran and Mannuki-Ninua, "Who is like Assur, -Babylon, -Harran, and -Nineveh?"\(^2\)

The name Mannuki is even found written in Aramaic script (Mnky) in one of the Elephantine papyri found in upper Egypt, dated 440 B.C., in addition to the Hebrew names Micah and Micaiah. It is evidence of Babylonians or Assyrians present for the commercial transaction it records. It is, again, thought to be short for Mannuki-ilu,\(^3\) just as Micah is a short form of Micaiah.\(^4\)

Nuzu, located east of the Assyrian city of Asshur, was a Hurrian (Horite) city, though the tablets discovered there, dated to the second half of the fifteenth century B.C.,\(^5\) are written in cuneiform Akkadian.\(^6\) Expressions of incomparability appear among the personal names found there as is seen in several names beginning with the Akkadian Mannu-, "Who-?," such as Mannu-ger-adad, "Who is an enemy of Adad?" and Mannuki, \(^7\) "Who is like?" with the name of a

\(^1\)Stamm, 237-38.

\(^2\)Ibid., 84-85 (my translation); see also Tallqvist, 126-27; he translates Mannuki-Babili, "Who is like (the god of) Babylon?" and Mannuki-Harran, "Who is like (the god of) Harran?," but Mannuki-Ninua "Who is like Nineveh?"

\(^3\)Sayce and Cowley, 42.


\(^7\)Gelb, Purves, and MacRae, 95 (translations are mine).
god implied, equivalent to the Bible name Mica, which is short for Michaiah or Michael.

Two other names appear of interest to us here. One is Mikkia, which superficially appears to be a hybrid name comprising the West Semitic interrogative pronoun mi and the Akkadian particle of comparison, kī, which would yield the meaning "Who is like?" with the hypocoristic ending ia. However, the largest segment of names at Nuzu are Hurrian (1,500 of 2,989), and Gelb suggests a possible Hurrian origin of the name Mikkiah. The other name is Ilmika, though there is apparently some uncertainty of the reading of the original tablet. It could be interpreted as a Canaanism, with the same syllables as in the name mēkāl, "Michael." Other examples at Nuzu of theophoric names with the divine name il in first position are Ili-abi, "God is my brother," Ili-abi, "God is my father" and Ilu-malik, "God is Malik." However, Gelb does not identify any names at Nuzu as being West Semitic, which raises doubts about Ilmika, so much like Michael, being the one West Semitic name represented. Gelb suggests that Ilmika also is Hurrian.

From this survey of Akkadian names, it is seen that names in the form of rhetorical questions expressing incomparability were widespread in Akkadian geographically and were common from earliest

---

1Ibid., 97.
2Ibid., 234.
3Ibid., 69.
4Ibid., 68-69.
5Ibid., 209.
times in each period of which we have records. Also, the name Mannu-ki-il and its variants, the Akkadian equivalent of Michael, was widespread in the Akkadian language area.

It is interesting and seemingly incongruous that in polytheistic cultures such as Ebla, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, particular gods could be freely referred to as incomparable.

In concluding this section on ancient Semitic parallels to the name Michael, it can be said that the name Michael, or similar names expressing divine incomparability, was very widespread. It was not, however, found universally, in that no such name is incontrovertibly attested at Ugarit.

The common Semitic origin of the name mīkā'ēl in the ancient Near East is perhaps best illustrated by the appearance of both the names mi-ka-il (Eblaite) and mannu-ki-il (Amorite and Akkadian) existing at Ebla together. This suggests the unlikelihood that either derived from the other.

The Designation "Prince"

Aside from his name, the principle designation of Michael in Daniel is "Prince." He is called "Michael, one of the chief princes" (Dan 10:13), "Michael, your prince" (Dan 10:21), and "Michael ..., the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people" (Dan 12:1 ASV). In each case, the word "prince" is translated from the Hebrew word Ɑ(šar).

1 See Labuschagne, 33-62 passim.

2 Pettinato, "Royal Archives," 47; Gelb, "Ebla and Kish," 44. Though Gelb identifies mannu-ki-il found at Ebla as Amorite, I refer to it here as Akkadian because of its similarity to Akkadian parallels (see 121-24).
Meaning of šar

šar is derived from the Hebrew verb נָשָׁר (šāšar),¹ which means "to rule," "to direct, superintend."² The word šar is used throughout the OT with the basic meaning of chief, chief, ruler, official, captain, or prince.³ It is the most frequently used word for "ruler" or "leader" in any capacity.⁴ The feminine form of the word, נָשָׁרָה (šāšārah), means a princess, a noble lady,⁵ the name of Abraham's wife Sarah.

It has been suggested that šar is basically a military term.⁶ But of the 421⁷ uses of the term šar in the Old Testament, only 141 apply directly to a military captain, with 8 used in "captain of the guard," for a total of 149, by my count, with a military significance. As can be readily seen, military leader, though an important usage, is not the primary meaning of šar. The basic meaning is head, chief, or ruler, and šar becomes a military

²KBL, 933; Wolf, 3:891.
³BDB, 978.
⁴Wolf, 3:891.
⁵KBL, 930.
⁶Nickelsburg, 14.
term only as it is used to refer to one who is head of a group of soldiers.\footnote{See KBL, 929; "military leader" is not one of the definitions given; cf. BDB, 978-79; military leader as "captain, general" is given as the third of eight general applications of the term \textit{$\text{\texta}$}.}

$\text{\texta}$ in the Book of Daniel

The term $\text{\texta}$ appears eighteen times in the book of Daniel, evenly divided, as usually interpreted, between early and heavenly beings.

$\text{\texta}$ as a Designation for Earthly Beings

$\text{\texta}$ is used in the standard sense of human leader or captain nine times in Daniel.\footnote{Dan 1:7-11, 18; 9:6, 8; 11:5.} The first six occurrences refer to Ashpenaz, the "chief ($\text{\texta}$) of the eunuchs" (Dan 1:7-11, 18), who had oversight over Daniel and his fellow Jewish captives when they first arrived at Babylon. The term appears twice in Daniel's prayer (9:6, 8) as he listed the categories of Israelites (kings, princes, fathers) whose sins led to the punishment of the Exile (9:9-11). The last usage applies to a prince of the "king of the south" who later became the rival "king of the north" (Dan 11:5-6).\footnote{The "king of the south" was Ptolemy I, and his "prince" was Seleucus, who later became Seleucus I, the founder of the Seleucid line of kings. A. R. Millard, "Daniel," A Bible Commentary for Today (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1979), 922.}

$\text{\texta}$ as a Designation for Heavenly Beings

The other nine uses of $\text{\texta}$ in Daniel are generally thought to refer to transcendent beings. Of these, the three
occurrences in 8:11, 25 are usually interpreted as referring to God Himself.¹ This leaves six uses in Daniel in which šar refers to three figures, generally thought to refer to transcendent beings intermediate between God and man. These are Michael (10:13, 21; 12:1) and the unnamed princes of Persia and Greece (10:13, 20).²

Related Uses of šar in the Old Testament

šar is used in the OT outside the book of Daniel for both earthly and heavenly beings, but the relative frequency of use for the two categories stands in sharp contrast to that in Daniel. Of the 403 occurrences outside of Daniel, 400 or 401 apply to earthly beings, and only 2 or 3 apply to heavenly beings.

šar as a Designation for Earthly Beings

The uses of šar outside Daniel for earthly beings exhibit a much greater variety than is seen in the narrow sampling within Daniel. Its use as a designation for court officials is seen in its application to the chief butler and chief baker whose dreams Joseph interpreted while in an Egyptian prison (Gen 40:1-41:13), as well as to the "princes of Moab," the high-level delegation the Moabite king Balak sent to Balaam to persuade him to come and curse Israel (Num 22:8-23:17). Its use for public officials at all levels is seen in its application to the taskmasters set over the Israelites in Egypt (Exod 1:11), and to the captains of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and

¹Plöger, 126; see also Towner, 123.

²Keil, 417; Montgomery, 419; Plöger, 148; Delcor, 240-41; Koch, 209; Maler, 366; Philip R. Davies, Daniel, Old Testament Guides (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1985), 74-75.
tens appointed by Moses in the wilderness (Num 31:14-54; Deut 1:15). Its use as military captain is most prominent in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, where the principal leader of a nation's army was "captain of the host" (KJV) or "commander of the army" (RSV). Sisera was "commander of the army of Jabin, king of Hazor" (1 Sam 12:9), just as Abner was "commander of Saul's army" (2 Sam 2:8), and Joab was "commander of the host" (2 Sam 24:2) under king David. Lesser military officers were also called šar (2 Kgs 1:9-14). In the books of the Chronicles, officers of the Levites (1 Chr 15:5-22 including the choir director, 15:27), priests (2 Chr 36:14) and temple officials (1 Chr 24:5) are designated šar. Heads of tribes (1 Chr 27:22; 28:1; 29:6) and of cities (Judg 9:30; 2 Kgs 23:8; 2 Chr 18:25) are also called šar.

šar as a Designation for Heavenly Beings

While šar is used for heavenly beings perhaps nine times in the book of Daniel, it has that meaning only two or three times in the rest of the Hebrew canon. It is used twice in Josh 5:14-15 to refer to the mysterious transcendent being who met Joshua beside the Jordan and identified himself as "commander of the army of the LORD." Since this is the only unequivocal use of šar for a heavenly being outside the book of Daniel, the use of šar for a heavenly being in Daniel has been seen as influenced by this use in Josh 5:14, 15.¹

The other occurrence of šar to a transcendent being is in Isa 9:6, where the future ideal king of David's line is described not

only as "Wonderful Counselor," "Mighty God," and "Everlasting Father," but also as "Prince (šar) of Peace." It could be objected that this person, though a messianic figure, is nevertheless an earthly being, ruling an earthly kingdom. This is, of course, true, though his exceptional character as God's chosen messianic king lifts him above all other OT earthly figures called šar, and justifies mention of him in this section.

Relationship to the Idea "King"

The Akkadian cognate of šar is sarru, which is the standard Akkadian word for "king."¹ This raises the question of the relationship between the term šar and the idea of king in Hebrew, a question important to this study, as it bears upon the interpretation of three passages in Daniel (8:11, 25; 10:13) relevant to this study. šar is not used directly to mean "king" in Hebrew, the word (melek) being preferred for that special position. However, šar is at times closely associated with the designation "king," as in Isa 10:8 in the boastful words the prophet ascribes to the king of Assyria: "Are not my commanders (šārīm) all kings?" Here "kings" is not used as a synonym of "commanders," but as an adjective to describe the exalted position, character, and power of his commanders.² In Exod 2:14, the Israelite slave challenges Moses' authority to intervene in his dispute with a fellow Israelite slave, asking, "Who made you a prince (šar) and a judge over us?". Here the basic meaning of "ruler"


is present.\footnote{A basic function of a ruler in Israel was to act as a judge in disputes between citizens. This was true of the judges (Judg 3:10; 10:2-3; 12:7-11; 1 Sam 4:18; 7:5, 16-17), the kings (1 Sam 8:20; 1 Kgs 7:7; 2 Chr 1:10-11; Isa 2:4; 11:4), as well as the princes of the land (Isa 1:23; Exod 18:21, 22, 25-26). Therefore when Moses sought to act as judge, his right to rule was questioned. See Hyatt, 14; סָרִים, KBL, 930, "administer mishpāt Is 32,1; see Mic 7,3."} When those who were in distress, in debt, and discontented gathered to David who was hiding in the wilderness from King Saul, "he became captain (אָשָׂר) over them" (1 Sam 22:2).

אָשָׂר and melek are used in three poetic passages, written in synonymous parallelism:

With kings and counselors of the earth
who rebuilt ruins for themselves,
Or with princes (סָרִים) who had gold,
who filled their houses with silver (Job 3:14-15)

Kings shall see and arise;
princes, and they shall prostrate themselves (Isa 49:7c)

By their wickedness they make the king glad,
and the princes by their treachery (Hos 7:3).

Though each of these passages are examples of synonymous parallelism, in none of them are "king" and "prince" used as synonyms. The synonymous factor is the basic thought expressed in each of the two lines, not each corresponding element within the synonymously parallel lines. In the first example, kings and counselors are both used in parallel to princes. In the third, king is singular and princes plural. But a more basic explanation lies in the habit of OT writers to think of government in terms of two basic categories, the king and his princes. They are variables within the parallel synonymous statements. Numerous examples could be cited such as "the house of the king and of the princes." (2 Chr 28:21), "in the presence of the king and of the princes" (Esth 1:16), "And Zedekiah
king of Judah, and his princes I will give into the hand of their enemies" (Jer 34:21). In the three instances of the use of "king" and "prince" in synonymous parallelism, the author was using the highest and next to highest categories of governmental authority to state a basic idea twice, the second a variation of the first. The king and the princes are always separate, never confused. The descending rank from king to prince is seen in that "king(s)" always precedes "prince(s)" in these parallels and in all OT passages in which "king(s)" and "prince(s)" appear in proximity. In none of the parallel passages is אֶל used with the meaning of "king."

It might seem that אֶל comes close to being equivalent to מֶלֶךְ (king), in reference to the rulers of the Philistines. The Philistines were not a kingdom with a strong central government, but a collection of city-states, each ruled by a king. The title, מֶלֶךְ (serānim) (used only in the plural), translated "lords," is used in the OT for the Philistine kings. In 1 Sam 29:2-7, the

---

1 See 2 Sam 18:5; 1 Chr 24:6; 2 Chr 23:13; 30:2, 6, 12; 36:18; Ezra 8:25; Neh 9:32, 34; Esth 1:21; Isa 10:8; Jer 1:18; 2:26; 4:9; 17:25; 24:8; 25:18; 32:32; 34:21; 44:17, 21; 49:38; Lam 2:9; Ezek 17:12; Dan 9:6, 8; 11:5; Hos 8:10; 13:10; Amos 1:15; Zeph 1:8.

2 Gen 20:2 refers to Abimelech, king of Gerar. In Gen 26:1, 8, Isaac went to Gerar, to "Abimelech, king of the Philistines." The Hebrew word for "Philistines" in these two verses lacks the article so should perhaps be read "Philistine king," with the understanding that it was only the Philistines in Gerar of which he was king. It should not be thought that Abimelech was king over all the Philistines. In 1 Sam 21:10, 12; 27:2, reference is made to Achish, "king of Gath."

3 Josh 13:3, Judg 3:3; 16:5, 8, 18, 23, 27, 30; 1 Sam 5:8, 11; 6:4, 12, 16, 18; 7:7; 29:2, 6-7; 1 Chr 12:19.

4 It is used there with a different meaning only once (1 Kgs 7:30—axles). That this refers to the kings of the city-states, and not to subordinate officials, is clear from the frequent reference to
designations ḥārim and serānim (the words are not linguistically related) are used interchangeably for the Philistine kings as they went forth to do battle against Israel.¹

We cannot conclude from this, however, that sar and "king" can be used interchangeably. Though the Philistine ḥārim were kings, they were not called ḥārim in this context because they were kings. They were functioning on this occasion as military commanders. Since sar is a standard OT term for designating a military commander,² it was due to their functioning in this role that they were called ḥārim. Their role as king was incidental to their role as sar.

Relationship to the Idea "Angel"

It has been suggested that in Jewish literature of this period (second century B.C.), sar "replaces רַעְלָק (mal'āk) (messenger) as the more usual word for 'angel'."³ This is a surprising and questionable suggestion. While it is true that mal'āk is not widely used in Daniel for angels, it does appear twice (3:28; 6:22). Daniel also uses "watcher" (נָצִיר) three times, all in the fourth chapter

¹In 1 Sam 29:2, the lords (serānim) were "passing on." In 29:3-4, the commanders (ḥārim) of the Philistines objected to David and his men accompanying the Philistines into battle against king Saul and the army of Israel. In 29:6-7, Achish explained to David that the lords (serānim) of the Philistines did not approve of him. It is clear that here, lords (serānim) and commanders (ḥārim) are used interchangeably. We can conclude, then, that the ḥārim of the Philistines who were "passing on" on this occasion, and who objected to the presence of David and his men, were the Philistine kings.

²BDB, 498.

³P. R. Davies, 63.
The expression "holy one" (Aramaic, גָּדוֹל; Hebrew, יִשְׂרָאֵל) is unambiguously used to mean "angel" at least five times (4:13, 17, 23; 8:14). But the more common designation for angels in Daniel is to liken their appearance to that of a man, used for a transcendent, heavenly being nine times in Daniel (7:13; 8:15, 16; 9:21; 10:5, 16, 18; 12:6, 7), though it might be concluded that not all these uses refer to angels. Rather than replacing mal'āk as the word for angel, it might be more correct to say that it designates "a commander of a heavenly army,"¹ that is, a high rank among the angels. The authority it designates, however, is not necessarily over angels, as Michael is designated as "your prince," that is, prince over Israel.²

The designation sar for angel is not common in the Old Testament apocrypha and pseudepigrapha,³ but does appear again in the Dead Sea Scrolls,⁴ apparently under the influence of the book of Daniel.⁵ All references of the word "princes" in the index of R. H. Charles's edition of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha are to the book of Zadok, which is recognized as the work of the Essenes, the sect which also produced the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁶ All references of "prince" in the index of Charlesworth's edition are to 3 Enoch,⁷ a

¹Ibid.
²Hartman and Di Lella, 282.
³Mertens, 102.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Ibid., 61.
⁶APOT. 2:862-63.
⁷OTP. 2:986.
work dated by Charlesworth to the fifth or sixth century A.D., and which tradition even dates no earlier than the second century A.D., too late to be relevant to the context of this study.

At Qumran, "prince" is used both for earthly and heavenly authorities. In the Essene documents, "prince" does not replace the word mal'āk as a designation for angels, but, as in Daniel, designates one who commands angels. The term "angel" is widely used in Qumran literature for heavenly beings. Primarily, "prince" is applied to the heavenly "Prince of light(s)." Michael, mentioned prominently in the War Scroll (9:10-15; 17:6-8), is never directly designated as "prince." There is evidence, however, that Michael is to be identified as the "Prince of light" and "great angel" (War Scroll 17:6), though this view has not won universal acceptance.

---

1 Ibid., 225-26, 229.


5 Yadin, 340-41.


7 Yadin, 235-36; G. R. Driver, Judean Scrolls, 541.

8 Ringgren, 82-83.
It seems clear that 'šār did not in any sense replace 'mal'āk as a standard designation of angels in the second century B.C. nor in the book of Daniel.

'šār as a Designation of Pagan Gods

Charles F. Jean and Jacob Hoftijzer report in their dictionary of West Semitic inscriptions that the term 'šār appears not only as a designation indicating an important official or the commander of the army, but that it was also applied to transcendent beings. It appears as an epithet for the gods Esmun and Shamash.\(^1\) This indicates that the use of the term 'šār for a transcendent being in the OT, limited though it is, was not unique to the OT. It had its parallel in other religions around Israel. Also, though 'šār is not used for God in the OT (unless in the case of Dan 8:11, 25), it was applied to pagan divinities of Israel's neighbors. This might suggest the possibility that the three "prince" figures of the Old Testament, the commander of the armies of the Lord, the Prince of Peace, and Michael, might be regarded as divine.

Summary

The name Michael was a Hebrew personal name, long before the book of Daniel was written. It appears to be a question, formed from the three Hebrew elements 'mî, 'kā, and 'lēl, meaning "Who is like God?" This etymology has parallels in biblical poetic passages. It is also confirmed by (1) the existence of the name at Ebla, (2) evidence of Amorite names expressing incomparability at Mari, (3) evidence for similar names in Aramaic and Phoenician, (4) the existence of cognate

\(^1\)Jean and Hoftijzer, 319.
Akkadian personal name parallels, and (5) its use in post-exilic times at Palmyra.

The name of Mekal, god of Bethshan at the time of the Conquest and perhaps for centuries thereafter, is possibly the same as that of the Michael figure in Daniel. The name is found in Hellenistic times on Cyprus, associated with the name of the Canaanite god Resheph. Various roots for Mekal have been suggested, with vkl. "conquer," "be powerful," being the most popular. Evidence from the hieroglyphics in which the name is written suggests that the name may have the same etymology as Michael. The god Mekal was probably identified with other ancient gods such as Resheph, Nergal (Babylonian), and Seth (Egyptian). Though Yahweh had some traits in common with these, any identification of Yahweh with Seth must be rejected. It is possible, however, that the god Mekal gradually came to be identified with Yahweh by the unconquered, but later assimilated, people of Bethshan, and perhaps by their Israelite neighbors.

The fact that Mekal and Michael share some common roles and possibly have a common name suggests a possible conceptual influence of a persistent Mekal tradition on the Michael figure. And if Mekal was identified with Yahweh, and survives in part in the Michael figure, Michael might be seen as possessing divinity, rather than as being subordinated to the status of an angel.

The prominent designation for Michael is "prince" (šar), which is widely used in the OT with the meaning "head," "chief," "ruler," "official," or "captain." It is not basically a military term, though it is the standard term for military captain, as the captain is chief over his warriors.
The term āšar is used in Daniel to designate both earthly and heavenly beings, being used for each about nine times. For heavenly beings it applies to the "Prince of the Host"/"Prince of Princes" (Dan 8:11, 25), the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13:20), and to Michael (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1). Outside the book of Daniel it is widely used in the OT for earthly beings in authority in widely divergent categories, but in only two contexts for heavenly beings: the "captain of the hosts of the LORD" (Josh 5:14-15) and the "Prince of Peace" (Isa 9:6). The use in Josh 5:14-15 may have influenced the usage in Daniel for transcendent beings.

The Akkadian cognate sarru means king in that language. However, even though there are biblical parallels between the words āšar and king, the term is not equivalent to "king" in the Hebrew of the OT. Even though applied to the kings of the Philistines as they went forth to battle, they were called āšar as military commanders, not as kings.

āšar is not used in Daniel to replace mal`āk as a standard term for angel. Various expressions designate angels in Daniel: mal`āk, watcher, holy one, and variations of "one-like-a-man." āšar is an expression of rank, designating one in authority over other beings or entities, whether earthly or heavenly.
CHAPTER III

DESIGNATIONS AND FUNCTIONS OF MICHAEL
IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

This chapter is devoted primarily to exegesis of the three explicit references to the Michael figure in their context in the book of Daniel.

The Context of the Michael Passages

The three passages which mention Michael are Dan 10:13, 10:21, and 12:1. The immediate context within which the Michael figure is examined, therefore, consists of the final revelation (Dan 10-12) recorded in the book of Daniel. These chapters constitute one extended revelation, a distinct, concluding unit within the book of Daniel.\(^1\) Within this unit there are three clear sections. The first section (Dan 10:1-11:1) forms a prologue, and focuses on transcendent, supramundane appearances, activities, and explanations, introductory to the second section. The second section (Dan 11:2-12:4) contains the primary revelation content, and in itself has two recognizable parts. The first part (Dan 11:2-45) is presented as an extended history, told in the form of a prophecy, of political events of concern to God's people from the beginning of the Persian kingdom

\(^1\)R. K. Harrison, 1106; H. Louis Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948), 33-34.
until the eschaton.\(^1\) The second part (Dan 12:1-4) describes the eschatological events themselves. The third section (Dan 12:5-13) is an epilogue, containing a renewal of the transcendent visionary prologue of Dan 10, with some additional information, chiefly chronological, spoken by the narrating angel to Daniel.\(^2\) It is true that Dan 11:2-12:4 is presented as one continuous future historical sequence,\(^3\) but, with the introduction of Michael in Dan 12:1, the focus changes dramatically from the mundane to the transcendent. Therefore the entire final chapter may be seen as transcendent in outlook.

The revelation of Dan 10-12 is a literal prophecy parallel to the three earlier, highly symbolic, prophecies of Dan 2, 7, and 8. It is necessary, therefore, to refer to the content of these chapters, as well as that of Dan 9:24-27, in an effort to understand the identity and function of the Michael figure in the book of Daniel as a whole.

The author dates the vision of Dan 10 in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia (Dan 10:1). It must be understood, therefore, that the author places the entire revelation (Dan 10-12) in that

---

\(^1\) It may be observed that chaps. 10 and 12 are more alike than either is like chap. 11. There is, however, no substantial reason to suggest that chap. 11 was a later addition, inserted between chap. 10 and 12, as suggested by P. R. Davies, 64. The phrase "At that time" (12:1) does indeed require a specific antecedent, provided by 11:45. There is no example of an OT use of this phrase as a "formal introduction to a description of the eschatological scenario" (ibid.) lacking a clear antecedent.

\(^2\) Hartman and Di Lella, x; "Daniel," Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 5:856-857.

year. The date given in Dan 11:1, "the first year of Darius the Mede," should not be understood as dating the content of that chapter. The narrating angel of Dan 10 continues speaking throughout Dan 11, and in Dan 11:1 the angel refers to an earlier activity, perhaps analogous to his activity in Dan 10:13, in relation to the kingdom of Persia.

**Designations of Michael**

The Michael figure in the book of Daniel has generally been recognized as the patron of Israel, variously referred to as the "patron of the people of Israel," the "guardian angel of Israel," "the Angel Prince of Israel," or "the Angel Prince of the community of God of all times." These conclusions have been drawn primarily from the three Danielic passages under discussion.

**The Designation "One of the Chief Princes" in Dan 10:13**

Dan 10:13 is the first text that mentions Michael. Here Michael is described by the revelatory angel as "Michael, one of the

---


3Lueken, 102, my translation; see also Ginsberg, "Michael and Gabriel," 1487; Jeffery, 507; Jerome's Commentary on Daniel 114; Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel* 226; Hartman and Di Lella, 282; Montgomery, *Daniel* 420; R. A. Anderson, 47; D. S. Russell, *Daniel* 200; Maier, 411; Klaus Koch *Das Buch Daniel*, 207.


5Maier, 367; "der Engelfürst der Israels," "der Engelfürst der Gemeinde Gottes aller Zeiten."

6J. M. Wilson, 125.
chief princes." As one of the "chief princes" מנהיגי מספרים (hassārim hari'sōnim), Michael is here identified as a "chief prince," apparently an exceptionally high rank. The description presents before us two questions: (1) Who are the "chief princes" of whom Michael is one? (2) Is the translation "one of" for the Hebrew (yehad, construct state) in this context correct, or could it as justifiably (or, preferably) be rendered "the first of," indicating that Michael is preeminent among the chief princes, rather than simply being one of them? The translation problem is investigated first.

The Numeral yehad

Matthew Henry wrote more than 250 years ago that Michael is "the first of the chief princes" and not simply "one of the chief princes."¹ A century and a quarter later, Englishman's concordance has the marginal reading of "the first" for the yehad entry for Dan 10:13.² Shortly after this, Alfred Berry refers to Michael as "'One,' or 'the first of the chief princes,’"³ suggesting that either translation is possible. At the beginning of this century, Robert M. Patterson maintained that "the first of the chief princes" is "as it should rather be translated."⁴ This alternative translation has not, however, received support in recent literature.

The Hebrew word for "one of" in this passage is the construct

¹Henry, 1101.
²Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance (1970), 45.
⁴Patterson, 48.
form *jahad*, the absolute form of which is *jahad*. The pointing of the MT as well as the absence of the article makes it evident that *jahad* is used in the construct state.¹ The issue at hand is whether *jahad*, as employed in the phrase *jahad hāssārîm hārîšōnîm*, functions as a cardinal (i.e., "one of") or as an ordinal ("first of"). Though (*rīšōn*) normally functions in Hebrew as the singular ordinal, "first,"² *jahad* can, in certain contexts, function as an ordinal.³ Lexicographers and grammarians appear to agree that the use of *jahad* as an ordinal is limited to expressions related to time, such as the first day of the week (Gen 1:5) or month (Gen 8:13),⁴ and to the "first" in a series,⁵ such as in Gen 2:11; Exod 39:10; Job 42:14. But this latter usage is limited to enumerating things in a series on the same level. There is no example where *jahad* is employed for ranking, unless Dan 10:13 is the single exception.⁶

Is it likely that the author of Dan 10 would use *jahad* in such


²Yates and Owens, 111; cf. KBL, 866-67; Kautzsch and Cowley, 240, 292.


⁵KBL, 27; BDB, 25.

⁶A parallel exists in Dan 6:2; Darius appointed three presidents "of whom Daniel was one" (RSV, ASV), cf. "of whom Daniel was first" (KJV).
a unique way in this context? The usual word to express "first" in rank is ṭiḥṣôn, an adjectival ordinal. Of the occurrences of ṭiḥṣôn, all but four or five are used to indicate temporal (Num 9:1 "in the first month") or spatial (Num 2:9 "they shall set out first") order. The remaining four or five¹ indicate order of rank or importance.

If the author wished to express the idea of first in importance in Dan 10:13, one would expect that he would have chosen ṭiḥṣôn. Are there any reasons why the author might not have done so?

One might argue that there is. The Hebrew for "one of the chief princes" is ʾehād ḫaṣṣārim ḥāriʾṣōnim. The term ṭiḥṣôn is already used here for "chief," the highest rank of ṭārim, "princes." If he had used ṭiḥṣôn to indicate first, he would have written ṭiḥṣôn ḫaṣṣārim ṭhāriʾṣōnim. The author may have, for literary reasons, wished to avoid using ṭiḥṣôn again because the expression has this word already. It could be argued that for this reason he employed ʾehād to mean "first."

The difficulty is that there is no other example in the Old Testament of using ʾehād to mean "first" in rank. However, that does not necessarily rule out the possible use of ʾehād with that meaning in Dan 10:13. Writers are not always precise in their use of terms. For example, out of the 600 OT occurrences of the word ṭôlēk,² only 2 are used to mean "first"³ (1 Chr 23:19, 20—first in Chronological

¹1 Chr 18:17; Ezra 9:2; Esth 1:14; Dan 8:21 (this reference could be interpreted as referring to either time or rank); Dan 10:13.

²Even-Shoshan, 1048.

³According to the RSV. It is arguable that there might be as many as nine (1 Chr 23:8, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20; 24:21; 26:10) or ten (12:9 JB). But if ṭôlēk means "first" in 1 Chr 12:9 (JB), it is
order). Also, as pointed out, of the 182 occurrences of ri'šôn/re'šônāh, only 4 or 5 signify first in rank; all the others mean first chronologically (165) or spatially (10). Of the 970 occurrences of the word lehād/leḥāt, only 35 are used to mean "first." Of these, 30 indicate chronologically first, and only 5 indicate spatially first. The point here is that Bible writers occasionally depart from the customary usages of a word to use it in a non-customary way. The use of lehād for "first in importance" in Dan 10:13 may be one more example of that.

Another point is that in many cases where lehād is used as an ordinal, it functions virtually as a synonym of ri'šôn. Since ri'šôn can be used for "first" in importance as well as in time and space, it would seem that lehād could also be used to express first in importance.

Showing that the meaning of "first" in Dan 10:13 cannot be categorically ruled out, however, does not demonstrate that it is the only example of its use in non-chronological sequence.

---

1 Even-Shoshan, 34-36, 43-44.

2 By my count.

3 By my count.

4 Cf. 2 Chr 36:22 and 2 Chr 29:3; Deut 1:3 and Num 28:18; Gen 8:5, 13 and Ezek 45:18; Ezek 10:14 and Gen 25:25.

5 If we compare the ratio of each usage, we see that one use of lehād to mean first in rank is statistically about what might be expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>ri'šôn</th>
<th>lehād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First in time</td>
<td>166 (or 165)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First in space or series</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First in rank or importance</td>
<td>4 (or 5)</td>
<td>0 (or 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preferred translation. The thirty-two other occurrences of the Hebrew usage of the construct *'ehad*, with a following plural noun, are translated "one of" (or the equivalent) throughout the rest of the Old Testament, and the translation "one of" rather than "the first of" in Dan 10:13 is found in the LXX and Theodotion translations and in all modern translations as well. In no instance where *'ehad* is translated "first" in English is it in the construct state.

On the basis of the linguistic usage examined, the best supported position appears to be to translate *'ehad* with "one of" and not with "the first of."

It is probable that the attempt to translate *'ehad* "the first of" in Dan 10:13 has a theological motivation. Those who see Michael as the pre-incarnate Christ have difficulty seeing him referred to as simply "one of" the chief princes, if these princes are interpreted as exalted angels. If Michael is "first of the chief princes," this places him above even the most exalted of the angels.

The Designation "Chief Princes"

Now attention must turn to the other question in the passage: What is the meaning of "chief princes"? The designation is translated from two Hebrew words, *hesšārīm harišōnim*. The Hebrew word translated "princes" in this designation is the plural of the word *'ār*. The plural of *'ār* is common in the OT, whether referring to military captains (2 Sam 24:4), a king's courtiers (Gen 12:15, Jer 24:8), or tribal leaders (Judg 5:15, 1 Chr 27:22), etc. However, in this passage, it applies to heavenly beings, not earthly, one of whom is Michael. The only other use of the plural of *'ār* for heavenly beings is in Dan 8:25, where a heavenly figure is designated "prince of
princes." Apparently there exists a class of heavenly beings designated "princes" (šārīm).

The "princes" in Dan 10:13, however, are qualified by the adjective rišōnim, the plural of the word rišôn. rišôn can have one of two basic meanings as determined by context: either "former" or "first." Of the meaning "first," it can mean first in time, first in a series, or first in rank or degree. It seems apparent that the use in Dan 10:13 is first in rank or degree, thus the translation "chief" (KJV, Douay, RSV, NASB, NIV; Jeru has "leading," a word equivalent to "chief").

The LXX and Theodotion translations both have "eis tôn archontôn tôn prōtôn" for the phrase under study, with the word prōtôn, meaning "first," for rišōnim. Prōtôn has several nuances, including the meaning "of rank or degree," coinciding with the meaning of the Hebrew word rišōnim.

That Michael is "one of the chief princes" and not simply "one of the princes" suggests that the designation "chief princes" in Dan 10:13 is not equivalent to the designation "princes" as it appears in the expression "prince of princes" in Dan 8:25. What appears to emerge from the designations used for heavenly beings in Dan 10 is the concept of a hierarchy of heavenly beings. The

\[1\] KBL, 866; BDB, 911.
\[2\] KBL, 866; BDB, 911.
\[3\] KBL, 866; BDB, 911; the two lexicons are in essential agreement on this point.
\[4\] BAG, 732-34.
\[5\] Young, Daniel 227; Heidt, 106; see Martin Luther, What Luther Says, 13 vols. (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Pub. House, 1959), 1:392.
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designation "prince" would seem not to be used for angels in general, but to indicate heavenly beings having a particular leadership function. Since Dan 10 refers to the "prince of Persia" and the "prince of Greece" (vs. 20) and "your [Israel's] prince" (vs. 21), this function is widely understood to be that of guardian angel of a particular nation. The designation "chief princes" would then refer to those in a position of highest prominence in the heavenly hierarchy, a position accorded to Michael. Specifically what is the position or function of the "chief princes" is not explained in the book of Daniel.

A widespread view is that these "chief princes" are archangels, of which Michael is one. Parts of the book of 1 Enoch, generally dated in the second century B.C., speak of four "holy ones of heaven," Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel (1 Enoch 9:1-4), or, the "four presences" who are the "four angels of the Lord of Spirits," Michael, Raphael, Gabriel and Phanuel (1 Enoch 40:8-10) and, again, seven "holy angels who watch," Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Michael, Saraqael, Gabriel and Remiel (1 Enoch 20:1-8). The idea that Michael is one of an elite group of highest angels is clearly

1Pusey, 426; Barton, "Demons and Spirits (Hebrew)," 596-97; Charles, Daniel, 262; Montgomery, Daniel, 1927; Bertholet, 34; E. O. James, The Ancient Gods (New York: Putnam, 1960), 277-278; Delcor, 209-210; Hartman and Di Lella, 282-84; Hammer, 103; Towner, 153.

present. The expression "archangels" appears first in 1 Enoch 9:1, where Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel are called "the four archangels." The expression "archangels" also appears in 1 Enoch 71:3, "Michael, one of the archangels," in the section of the book of Enoch called the "parables" or "similitudes" (1 Enoch 37-71). This section is thought to date from the first century B.C. at the earliest, and perhaps from as late as the first century A.D.

In the Apocryphal book of Tobit, thought to date from the third or early second century B.C. (thus before the 164 B.C. date usually assigned by historical critical scholars to Daniel), Raphael refers to himself as "one of the seven angels, which stand and enter before the glory of the Lord" (Tob 12:15). The idea and term "archangels" persists in Jewish apocalyptic literature into the first and second centuries A.D. However, there seems to be a trend away from multiple archangels, as in some later Jewish apocalypses it is

---

1 This reading is disputed, as there is a textual variant (which includes the Ethiopic and one Greek textual family) omitting "the four archangels." See Charles, APOT, 2:192n. The reading cited here is supported by Hartman and Di Lella, 282.

2 Charles, APOT, 2:171.

3 Charlesworth, 98.


6 T. Levi 3:5 (speaks of archangels), dated about 100 B.C. (see Charles, APOT, 2:289-290); Adam and Eve 31:1-32, "Michael the archangel and Joel . . . the archangel," dated first century A.D., Charles, APOT, 2:127; Charlesworth, 74.
only the archangel (singular) Michael who appears, not archangels (plural).¹

The idea of archangels is found in the Qumran literature. In the War Scroll (9:10-15) are found the names of Michael, Gabriel, Sariel, and Raphael mentioned together, apparently reflecting the four archangels of 1 Enoch 9:1-4.² Also, in an angelic liturgy found at Qumran, there is a listing of the fourth through the seventh "among the chief princes," an apparent identification of the "chief princes" of Dan 10:13 with the seven archangels of Tob 12:15 and 1 Enoch 20:1-8.³ In the NT, only one archangel, Michael, appears (1 Thess 4:16; Jude 9). Lewis S. Chafer states flatly "there is but one archangel."⁴ And J. E. Rosscup emphasizes that Scripture speaks of "the archangel" but never of "archangels."⁵

The idea that the "chief princes" of Dan 10:13 refers to the archangels is found in early Christianity. Jerome wrote of the chief princes, "we are of course to understand archangels."⁶ It also persisted in later, Rabbinic Judaism, as in Midrash Rabba on


²Though 1 Enoch 9:1-4 has Uriel, not Sariel as in the War Scroll.

³Strugnell, 320-24, 328-29. The Hebrew words for "chief princes" are נשים ראשות, nēšim rāšīm, rather than ראשי שפתי, ḥaṣārīm harišōnim as in Dan 10:13. Strugnell suspects this difference may be due to the influence of Essene terminology in other fields (324).

⁴Chafer, 411.

⁵Rosscup, 217; see also Patterson, 48.

⁶Jerome, 114.
Num 2:20; Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael were usually regarded as the four principle angels.  

While acknowledging that "archangels" is a "later Greek expression," Samuel R. Driver, echoed by Delcor, indicated that this is the meaning of "chief princes." 

Eric W. Heaton writes of "Michael, one of the archangels." 

Young thinks the designation "one of the chief princes" "seems to indicate an arrangement of degrees among the angels, and among these Michael was an archangel." 

But identification of "chief princes" with archangels is uncertain. The term angel, much less archangel, is not applied to any of the celestial figures in Dan 10 and 12. The term "prince" itself suggests a commanding figure, above the ordinary angel, and it might be thought to mean archangel. One school of thought suggests that the "princes" of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20) are archangels who guard the interests of those nations, and thus every nation has such a patron archangel. 

If "prince" may be taken to be an archangel, then who would be the "chief princes"? Would there be differing levels of archangels? That would be contrary to the picture of archangels in the literature where the term gets its meaning. Klaus Koch writes that a designation corresponding to "archangels" 

2 Ibid., 158; Delcor, 211. 
3 Heaton, 222. 
4 E. J. Young, Daniel, 227. 
5 Barton, 4:597.
is lacking in the book of Daniel;\(^1\) Michael is rather ranked under
the designation "prince."

It is suspected that a consideration in identifying the
"chief princes" with archangels is the conviction of many that Dan­
iel, especially the later chapters, was composed in the second cen­
tury (168-163 B.C.) during the Antiochene persecution which led to
the successful Maccabean revolt.\(^2\) Since, as noted, Tobit and parts
of 1 Enoch, composed about that time or earlier, had well-developed
ideas of four or seven archangels, it would seem that the idea was in
the air. It would be easy to conclude that the author of Dan 10
writing about that time would likely have meant "archangels" by the
designation "chief princes."

Serious difficulties militate against the view that Dan 10
reflects ideas of the works of the third and second century B.C.
Particularly the angelology and terminology in the book of Daniel
betray some distinct differences from that of 1 Enoch and even of
Tobit. The angelology of the book of Daniel appears to be at a
significantly earlier stage of angelological development than that of
the apocryphal or pseudepigraphal works.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Klaus Koch Daniel 207-208; he does, nevertheless, regard
Michael as "leader of all angels" and as "angel-prince [Engelfürst]"
(207).

\(^2\)For a clear statement in support of a second-century
authorship, see Clifford, 23.

\(^3\)Charles, APOT, p:197; Joyce C. Baldwin, "Some Literary Affini­
Excursus: Relative Dating of Daniel and the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

This excursus focuses on the relative dating of the book of Daniel in relationship to the OT apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.

Robert H. Charles has noted that the angelology of Tobit, compared with that of Jubilees and 1 Enoch, is at a "somewhat embryonic state of its evolution," yet compared with the Old Testament as a whole, stands "well within the threshold of the subsequent period."¹ There is a widespread view that the book of Daniel is the first piece of literature to give proper names to prominent angels,² particularly the names Michael and Gabriel.³

Lueken felt that a rich development of angelology, based on the book of Daniel, occurred among the Jewish apocalyptic writings.⁴ Joyce G. Baldwin noted that, compared with Daniel, "Angelology is more fully developed in Enoch."⁵ Commenting on 1 Enoch 85-90, which Charles had dated before 161 B.C.,⁶ Baldwin writes:

By comparison with Daniel, the eschatology of Enoch 85-90 is much more elaborate. The writer of Enoch appears to borrow concepts from Daniel and develop them. Although the two writers could in theory be drawing from a common source or Zeitgeist, if simplicity is any guide, and we usually reckon that the simple precedes

¹Charles, APOT, 1:197.
³Jeffery, 507; Bishop, 145; Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod, 200.
⁴Lueken, 26.
⁵Baldwin, "Some Literary Affinities," 98.
⁶Charles, APOT, 2:170.
the complex, Daniel must be considerably earlier than this Enoch apocalypse.

That the book of Daniel is the starting point for the further developments in angelology and eschatology seen in certain apocryphal and pseudepigraphal works has received important support.²

George A. Barton observes that "the tendency observable in a slight degree in the canonical literature to give the angels individual names appears in a greatly heightened form in the Apocryphal literature." He singled out parts of 1 Enoch, in which "belief in angelic and demoniacal agency is carried to great length," especially the oldest part, chaps. 1-35, and the Parables, chaps. 36-71.³

There are scholars, however, who, as mentioned, argue that the book of Daniel is contemporary with or later than Tobit or those parts of 1 Enoch which describe the archangels. W. Sibley Towner sees Daniel and 1 Enoch 6-9 as contemporary, and tries to explain why the angelology is so different.⁴ Davies feels that some parts of 1 Enoch may be earlier than the time of Antiochus IV, but, in comparing 1 Enoch and Daniel, feels that "they do not provide us with any literary form upon which we can say that the Daniel visions were

---

¹Baldwin, "Some Literary Affinities," 98.


³Barton, 600, 599.

⁴Towner, 118. He believes the writer of Daniel must have deliberately limited his angelology as compared to that of the book of 1 Enoch.
directly modeled or even directly influenced" by Enoch. Angelicus M. Kropp is persuaded by evidence that 1 Enoch 9-10 is before 170 B.C., and therefore, earlier than Daniel.

T. Francis Glasson has argued that Dan 7 is later than 1 Enoch 14--which contains similar phraseology--and therefore dependent on it. Since Dan 10 is likely to have been written later than Dan 7, his argument is relevant to this discussion. He presents convincing evidence that 1 Enoch 4-36, the "Book of Watchers," is pre-Maccabean, and dates probably from the third century B.C. However, his main evidence for Daniel's dependence on 1 Enoch is the pre-Maccabean date of the Enoch passage and his assumption of a Maccabean date for Daniel. However, if Daniel is shown on literary grounds to be earlier than 1 Enoch 4-34, then perhaps Daniel has been dated too late, and is not influenced by Enoch.

---

1 P. P. Davies, 73.


5 Ibid., 83.

6 As one examines passages from Enoch and Daniel cited by Glasson to illustrate his thesis, one is indeed struck by the similarity of expression:

Dan. 7:9    throne . . . and the wheels thereof
Enoch 14:18 throne . . . and the wheels thereof

Dan. 7:10    fiery stream . . . ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him
Enoch 14:19    streams of flaming fire . . . (22) ten thousand times ten thousand before him

---
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Others have agreed with Glasson that Dan 7 is directly dependent on Enoch 14,\(^1\) while still others feel that the author of Dan 7 and Enoch 14 are both drawing upon a common tradition.\(^2\) Rowley, however, states: "It is equally simple to suppose that the author of 1 Enoch drew the idea from the book of Daniel."\(^3\)

One has difficulty avoiding the conviction that the real reason parts of 1 Enoch are thought to pre-date Daniel is the widely held assumption that Daniel was written in the second century B.C. Antiochene/Maccabean crisis.

On literary grounds, it is difficult to regard the book of Daniel as a development (or contemporary) of Enoch, but Enoch can easily be seen as a development of Daniel. A comparison of Daniel and Enoch would appear to support the view that the Enochian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dan. 7:9</th>
<th>His raiment was white as snow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enoch 14:20</td>
<td>His raiment . . . whiter than any snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. 7:13</td>
<td>I was in the night visions, and behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch 14:8</td>
<td>Behold, in the vision clouds invited me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close examination of these passages, however, does not confirm dependence of Dan 7 upon Enoch 14. Rather, there is evidence even here in Glasson's specimen passages that at least one Enoch passage betrays a development from the corresponding Daniel passage. While Dan 7:9 reads, "white as snow," Enoch 14:20 reads "whiter than any snow." One would not likely drop from "whiter than any" to "white as," though a development in the other direction would not be surprising.

\(^1\) Matthew Black, "The 'Parables' of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71) and the 'Son of Man,'" ExT 88 (1976-77): 7.


materials betray an extensive development in various areas, particularly in angelology. Thus, the date of Daniel must be pushed to a time before the established date of the "Book of Watchers" in 1 Enoch.

Russell points to the four "hollow places" (1 Enoch 22), divisions of Sheol to which the spirits of the dead are assigned, graded according to moral judgments.¹ This is clearly a development over Daniel, which knows nothing about a place for spirits between death and the resurrection (apparently a Greek influence).² Daniel simply has two rewards: everlasting life, and shame and everlasting contempt, given to the resurrected dead at the eschaton (Dan 12:2). The "Book of Dreams" (1 Enoch 83-90) has been dated on the basis of Qumran fragments at 164 B.C.,³ approximately where critical scholarship has generally dated the book of Daniel, and emerging from the same community which is thought to have produced Daniel.⁴ However, a black-white dualism is seen in 1 Enoch 85:3-5, perhaps reflecting Iranian dualism, where black is the color of Ahriman.⁵ This suggests a later date for Enoch than Daniel, as there is no black-white dualism in Daniel. 1 Enoch 90:20, "I saw till a throne was erected ... and the Lord of his sheep sat thereon" may have been suggested

²Glasson, 84.
by Dan. 7:9, "I beheld till thrones were placed, and one that was ancient of days did sit." Dan 7:9, in describing God's throne, "its wheels were burning fire," is expanded in 1 Enoch 14:18 (4QEnc 1:7) to "its wheels were like the disk of the shining sun." To this could be added Dan 7:10a, "a stream of fire issued and came forth from before him" paraphrased in 1 Enoch 14:19, "and from beneath the throne came forth streams of fire," an apparent simplification of the more complex wording of Daniel.

Another example of expansion in 1 Enoch of an expression in the book of Daniel is the "Watchers," a term for angels used in the OT only in Dan 4. Di Lella regards "Watcher" in Dan 4:13 (MT 4:10) to be the "earliest known use of the term" to designate an angel. Yet it is used frequently in Pseudepigraphal books 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Testament of the 12 as a designation for an angel, clearly a development from Daniel.

R. D. Wilson notes several differences between the angelology of Daniel and that of 1 Enoch:

1. Daniel introduces angels incidentally, whereas in Enoch, in the "Book of Watchers" and "Book of Noah," angels are the subject of the discourse.

2. Daniel mentions only holy angels, while the "Book of

1 Charles, Daniel, 181.

2 Milik, 199.

3 E. J. Young, Daniel, 102-03, suggests that the expression may have been chosen in that context to express the thought in terms common to the religion of Babylon.

4 Hartman and Di Lella, 172.

5 Towner, 62.
"Watchers" and "Book of Noah" are concerned almost entirely with fallen angels.

3. Daniel names only two angels, whereas these two sections of Enoch name four and then seven holy angels and thirty-seven wicked angels!

4. In 1 Enoch, the duties or functions of both holy and evil angels are given at length, whereas Daniel never refers to the duties of angels as such.\(^1\)

It is not difficult to see that 1 Enoch represents an angel-ology that is greatly expanded and developed compared to that of Daniel.

Another clear difference between Daniel and the later Jewish apocalypses is in terminology for angels. In Tobit, 1 Enoch, and other later Jewish apocalypses, the expression "angel" was the standard term for celestial beings intermediate between God and man, including the named angels. Tob 12:15, "I am Raphael, one of the seven angels, which stand and enter before the glory of the Lord." 1 Enoch 20:1 (introducing the seven archangels) "And these are the names of the holy angels who watch." Then in vss. 2-8, each one of the seven is introduced, followed by a description of his particular duties, by the formula, "Uriel, one of the holy angels . . . , Michael, one of the holy angels" (vss. 2, 5), etc. 1 Enoch 6:1, in describing the fall of the evil angels, refers to them as angels; "in those days were born them beautiful and comely daughters. And the angels, the children of heaven, saw and lusted after them." The

\(^1\)R. D. Wilson, 153.
passage names their leader, Samjaza (vs. 3), and also names eighteen other chiefs of the fallen angels (vss. 7-8).

In the book of Daniel, on the other hand, the named angels, Michael and Gabriel, the unnamed angel(s) of Dan 10:5-21, the "princes" of Persia and Greece, and the Son of Man of Dan 7:13-14 are never referred to as angels. Though the designation "angel" for celestial beings is not unknown in Daniel (3:28; 6:22), it is more common to refer to them as "like a man," "watchers," "holy ones," or "prince" (as in the case of Michael). The designation of angels or celestial beings as "prince" or "chief prince" is not found in the apocryphal or pseudepigraphal literature, though, perhaps due to the influence of the book of Daniel upon the Qumran community, the designation "prince" for a heavenly being confronts us again in the writings from the Dead Sea.

The Qumran literature also gives evidence of angelology and terminology later than that of the book of Daniel. In the War Scroll (1QM 9:10-15) are found the names Michael, Gabriel, Sariel, and Raphael. This reflects the influence of 1 Enoch. The expression "chief princes" (Dan 10:13) appears also at Qumran (4QS 39 Ii 16ff.) and

1 See chap. 2, 136-37.
2 James H. Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 vols. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co, 1983), 2:986. All reference to angelic princes are in 3 Enoch, which dates from the Christian era, too late to be relevant to the intertestament period, idem 1:228-29, 246.
3 Mertens, 61.
4 Mentioned before, this differs from the four names given in 1 Enoch 9:1, which has Uriel, "El is Light" or "Flame of God" (IDB, 739), instead of Sariel, but Milik, 173, reports that Quiran 1 Enoch Aramaic fragments have Arvayi, "prince of God" rather than Uriel, which is found in the Ethiopic text (Milik, 30).
clearly designates a class of seven angels of superior rank. "Fourth among the chief princes," "fifth among the chief princes," on up to seven, and "all the wondrous chief princes" are made mention of.\(^1\) This is apparently influenced by the same tradition of seven archangels as is found in Tobit and \textit{1 Enoch}.

Further influence from \textit{1 Enoch} on the Qumran literature is evident in its interest in hostile angelic figures. In the Cairo Damascus Document are found the figures of Belial (CD 4:12-6:11) and the "angel of darkness" (CD 3:20-22). \textit{1 Enoch}, as we have seen, displays an intense interest in evil angels, while the book of Daniel does not explicitly identify any supernatural foe of God.\(^2\)

Also, the "light-dark" dualism manifested in such expressions as "prince of light," "angel of darkness" (CD 3:20-22), "sons of light," "sons of darkness" (QM 1:1),\(^3\) absent in the book of Daniel, indicates a later development under Persian influence.\(^4\)

More evidence of a date for the book of Daniel earlier than the second century B.C. is seen in Daniel fragments at Qumran. Among

\(^1\)Though the princes of Persia and Greece have been interpreted as evil angels (Auberlen, 57-58; Keil, 416-17; Leupold, 457-58; Tatford, 175; Culver, 170-71; Gleason L. Archer, Jr. "Daniel," The Expositor's Bible Commentary [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Pub. House, 1985], 7:113, 126-27), it is not explicit, and some interpreters view them as angels of God appointed as patrons of their respective nations (Jerome, 114; Pusey, 426; Bertholet, 34; Pflüger, 148; Delcor, 209-10; Hartman and Di Lella, 282-84).

\(^2\)Strugnell, 320-324.

\(^3\)For a discussion of dualism present at Qumran, see G. R. Driver, \textit{The Judean Scrolls} 550-62.

\(^4\)That the dualism at Qumran came from Persian influence, see Gaster, ed., \textit{Dead Sea Scriptures}, 22.
the documents found at Qumran, several fragments of the book of Daniel have been found. The nature of these fragments and the influence of the book of Daniel within the Qumran community have forced a reassessment of dating Daniel in the second century B.C.

Among the significant finds is a passage in a manuscript (4Q174) dated around 30-1 B.C. which reads: "as it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet." This passage makes it clear that the Essenes of Qumran considered Daniel as one of the OT prophets, and this has put an end to doubts about the canonical status of Daniel in the Qumran community.

One of the Daniel fragments is dated palaeographically to the late second century B.C., not later than 120 B.C., that is, within fifty years of 165 or 164 B.C. the date usually chosen by those who date Daniel in the second century B.C. This raises the critical question of how Daniel could have become looked upon as an authentic canonical prophet of the Exile so soon after its alleged date of composition. It seems highly unlikely. As Bruce K. Waltke observed, "The discovery of manuscripts of Daniel at Qumran dating from the Maccabean period renders it highly improbable that the book was composed during the time of the Maccabees."

---


3. Ibid., 222.


5. Ibid.
Frederick F. Bruce highlights the evidence from Qumran that the book of Daniel has exercised a formative influence on the beliefs and terminology of the Qumran community, such as the expressions ʾraʾz (mystery), ṭeḵar (interpretation), maškilîm (wise), and "ships of Kittîm." Nevertheless, Bruce accepts the late date for Daniel, despite the difficulties this would pose for any authority a late Daniel would have in a community whose origins predate 164 B.C.

Waltke points out that fragments in Qumran of some Psalms once thought to be Maccabean have led to the abandonment of the Maccabean date for those Psalms. Fragments of Ecclesiasticus have led to the suggestion that its composition must be pushed into the third century or earlier. Fragments of Chronicles in Qumran have led to the conclusion that no part of the Chronicles can be Maccabean. Yet many scholars fail to apply the same logic to the book of Daniel.

Another significant finding is that the transitions from Hebrew to Aramaic (2:4) and from Aramaic to Hebrew (7:28-8:1) are found in the Daniel fragments from Qumran. This furnishes more evidence for the antiquity of Daniel. Daniel in the Qumran community already was in the standardized form which we have today.

Perhaps most devastating to the theory of late authorship of Daniel is that while certain fragments of Daniel from Qumran are in a text which conforms closely to the later Massoretic tradition, there are some textual variants in them which side with the Alexandrian

1Bruce, 224-234.

2Waltke, 321-22.

Greek (LXX) against the Massoretic and Theodotian versions.\textsuperscript{1} This evidence of different textual versions of Daniel existing at the time of the Qumran community suggests a long period of textual transmission in order for those variants to have developed. This would seem inconsistent with a second-century authorship and would seem to effectively rule it out as too late.

Such evidences as mentioned above have led Russell to refer to Daniel as "the first and greatest of the Jewish apocalyptic writings."\textsuperscript{2} It appears, on the basis of its angelology and other factors, that the book of Daniel does indeed precede that of the Jewish OT apocrypha and pseudepigrapha in date of authorship. For that reason, it is invalid to interpret the expression "chief princes" in the light of the class of archangels prominently mentioned in the later literature. This is the end of the excursus.

The Resumption of the Designation "Chief Princes"

These observations do not rule out the possibility that the expression "chief princes" does, after all, refer to some elite class of angels. One might legitimately draw this conclusion even if it were granted that when Daniel was written the idea of archangels was yet a future development.

But there is at least one other possibility that should not be overlooked. This is that "chief princes" refers to a council of divine entities with status and authority above even the highest

\textsuperscript{1}P. Benoit et al., "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran," \textit{BA} 19 (1956): 86.

\textsuperscript{2}Russell, \textit{The Jews from Alexander to Herod}, 220.
angels. The expression might reflect the divine plurality found in the early chapters of Genesis such as "Let us make man in our image" (Gen 1:26), "the man has become like one of us" (Gen 3:22), and glimpsed also in the mysterious figure of the "Angel of the Lord," in whom God is both the sender and the sent (Exod 3:2-6; Exod 23:20-25). The relationship between the Michael figure and the Angel of the Lord is examined more fully in chapter 4. If the Michael figure is found to manifest elements of divinity, then one would expect the expression "chief princes" to refer to divine personalities.

The Designation of "Your Prince" in Dan 10:21

The next passage to mention Michael is Dan 10:21, where the figure speaking to Daniel identifies Michael as "Michael your prince" (mikā'el šarkem). Michael is here, as in Dan 10:13; 12:1, designated as "prince" (šar). In Dan 10:13, it was used in plural in the phrase "chief princes." Here it is singular, applied not to a class of exalted celestial beings, but only to Michael himself. From this it may be possible to see that attention is being increasingly drawn to the figure of Michael as the prince par excellence.

The Hebrew suffix for "your" is plural, so Michael is here designated not as Daniel's personal guardian, but as the prince of Daniel's people. The question is then posed, "Who are Daniel's people?" Interpreters have generally understood this to be Israel.

---


2 Jerome, 114, commented thus on Dan 10:13, "Then there came to my assistance the angel Michael, who has oversight of the people of Israel"; Henry Cowles, Ezekiel and Daniel, with Notes (New York: D. Appleton, 1871), 447-48; Montgomery, Daniel, 420, more precisely.
The word "Israel" is not found in Dan 10-12, and appears only four times in the book of Daniel (1:3; 9:7, 11, 20). The word "Judah" is used equally sparingly (Dan 1:1, 2, 6; 9:7). The references to Judah in Dan 1:1-2 simply indicate that Jehoiakim was king of Judah at the time of Daniel's captivity. The reference to Israel in Dan 1:3 indicates that Daniel and his companions were "of the people of Israel," thus establishing the premise that the people of Israel were Daniel's people. The reference to Judah in Dan 1:6 similarly identifies Daniel and his companions as "of the tribe of Judah."

The mention of Judah and Israel in Dan 9:7, 11 relates to Daniel's confession of sins. Daniel identifies himself with Israel in his confession: "to us [belongs] confusion of faces, as at this day, to the men of Judah, to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to all Israel" (vs. 7). Daniel is here clearly speaking of ethnic Israel. Later in his prayer, in his intercession on behalf of desolate Jerusalem, he refers to "thy sanctuary which is desolate" (vs. 17) and to "thy city and thy people" (vs. 19). In vs. 20 Daniel summarizes his prayer; he was "confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel." Here Daniel explicitly calls Israel "my people."

When Gabriel in Dan 9:24 begins to make known his revelation to Daniel, he declares: "Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city." The expression "your people" here is unquestionably the nation of Israel. Here again, Daniel's people are identified as Israel.

calls him "the Prince of Israel"; Young, 226; Jeffery, 507; Ginsberg, "Michael and Gabriel," 1487; Hartman and Di Lella, 282, declare, "Michael is the guardian angel of the Jewish people"; Russell, Daniel, 200; Maier, 367, 411; R. A. Anderson, 47.
In view of the identification of Israel as Daniel's people in earlier chapters of the book of Daniel,\textsuperscript{1} it would appear that "your prince" in Dan 10:21 refers to Israel; Michael is Israel's prince.

The designation of Michael to be the prince of Israel is reflected and amplified in subsequent Jewish literature. In the list of the seven "holy angels who watch" in 1 Enoch 20:1-8, Michael is designated as "the one put in charge of the best part of mankind" (vs. 5),\textsuperscript{2} that is, Israel.\textsuperscript{3} In 1 Enoch 89:76, Michael intercedes for Israel. In T. Levi 5:6, an unidentified angel declares, "I am the angel who intercedeth for the nation of Israel," probably an indirect reference to Michael.\textsuperscript{4} In the War Scroll from Qumran (1QM 17:6-8), It is said that God will send help to the elect through the power of Michael, and God's purpose is said to be to establish Michael's dominion among the angels,\textsuperscript{5} in parallel with also establishing Israel's dominion among all flesh.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}But see Gammie, "Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel," 195, who argues that Dan 9 was written later than Dan 11.
\item \textsuperscript{3}"Daniel," SDABC, 262; Hartman and Di Lella, 282.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Charles, APOT, 2:307.
\item \textsuperscript{5}"Angels," as the translation of יֶלֶּחֶם by Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures, 304; Millar Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking Press, 1958), 284, translates יֶלֶחֶם, "gods," but states: "The word 'gods' is often used in the War Scroll and the Thanksgiving Psalms, clearly with reference to angels." (295); compare "gods," Porteous, 170, or "godly," Mertens, 61; Yadin, 230, supports the translation "angels" and lists the instances in which יֶלֶחֶם is a common synonym for angels; see also Collins, "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," 57.
\end{itemize}
The Designation "Great Prince" in Dan 12:1

The third passage identifying Michael is Dan 12:1, where it says, "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people" (ASV). Two issues are addressed in this section: the significance of the designation, "the great prince," and the identification of "thy people," the beneficiaries of Michael’s eschatological activity.

"The Children of Thy People"

The question of who are "thy people" (i.e., Daniel's people) must be examined anew in the context of Dan 12:1-4. The setting of Dan 10:21 is historical, that of Dan 12:1 is eschatological. Would the eschatological context, set by the author in the distant future relative to the exilic setting in which the author places himself, call for a different interpretation of "thy people" than in Dan 10:21 or earlier chapters of the book of Daniel?

"The children of thy people" as Israel

The eschatological context in which the designation appears does not appear to be adequate justification for reinterpreting "thy people" to mean something other than what the expression has meant earlier in the book of Daniel. The expression "your people" (fammekā) is identical in Dan 12:1 and 9:24. There would appear to be no reason to think the author of Daniel would have meant something different by his use of the expression in each of the two different contexts. One further piece of evidence is found in the

---

1 Those who disagree with Rowley, "The Unity of the Book of Daniel," 233-73, that the book of Daniel is a unity, nevertheless
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participle  הָאָמֹד (ha'omêd), "'he who stands' for the children of your people." While the first mention in Dan 12:1 of Michael standing, "at that time shall Michael 'stand up'  הָאָמֹד (ya'omêd) (ASV), is imperfect, and relates to the future eschatological crisis, this second mention of standing has present significance, translated as a perfect participle (hestêkos) in the LXX and Theodotion translations, and as a present tense in all modern English translations. The thought might be paraphrased, "Michael who will stand up in the eschaton is the great prince who now stands for your people." The "children of thy people" (ASV) would thus appear to mean the people of Israel. Here again, as in Dan 10:21, Michael seems to be identified as the guardian of the Jews. Both passages bear witness to this same function, and, taken together, make the writer's meaning unmistakable. As Archer has stated it, "It would appear that God has assigned the special protection of Israel to this mighty champion, the archangel Michael."

"The Children of Your People"
A Holy Remnant

Nevertheless, there is a conditional factor in the context. In the second use of the expression "your people" in Dan 12:1, "your people" are those who are delivered in the eschaton, and are defined

tend to view Dan 9:24-27 as the last part of the book completed (Ginsberg, "The Composition of the Book of Daniel," 274-75), and hold that the author of Dan 9:24-27 was the final editor of the book as a whole (Hartman and Di Lella, 16). Thus, there would be expected a consensus that the meaning of the expression "your people" would be consistent in Dan 9:24 and 12:1.

1Ploeger, 170.

2Archer, "Daniel," 150.
as "every one whose name shall be found written in the book."

Daniel's people in the eschaton are morally and spiritually defined, and do not include all the people of Israel. This understanding is strengthened by the references in Dan 11 to "those who violate the covenant" (vs. 32) and "those who acknowledge him [the persecuting king]" (vs. 39), who are set in contrast to "the people who know their God" (vs. 32) and "those among the people who are wise," who are allowed to suffer persecution "to refine and to cleanse them" (vs. 35). It appears that not all of ethnic Israel are included in the expression "your people" in this context.¹

This is not limited to Dan 10-12, as in Dan 7 there is reference to the "saints of the Most High" (vss. 18, 27, ASV) who will obtain the kingdom of God, and in 8:24, the "little horn" power (Dan 8:11, ASV) is said to "destroy the mighty ones and the holy people."

It is likely that the designations "saints of the Most High" and "holy people" both refer to Israel.² But here, as in Dan 12:1, it is not inclusive of the ungodly in Israel. It is an idealized Israel, a holy remnant, qualified not by ethnic descent alone, but

¹Jeffery, 541.

also morally and spiritually. However, it would still appear that Daniel has Israel, his people, in view.¹

Mertens notes that in the Qumran community, terms such as "people" and "Israel" designate less the nation of Israel than the group chosen from among the nation, in this case, the community of Qumran.² Though Mertens interprets Michael in Daniel as guardian prince of Israel,³ it may be that there is already in the book of Daniel a tendency, more fully developed at Qumran, to use Daniel's "people" and "Israel" for a faithful remnant of Israel.

"Prince" as Michael's Title

In this third and final passage mentioning Michael by name, he is again designated as "prince." This is very significant, as Michael is thus designated "prince" in each passage in which he is named. This suggests that the designation "prince" (ἀρχή) serves as a title for Michael.⁴ The following points support this suggestion:

¹The question may then be raised, how can the eschatological events of Dan 12:1-3 be relevant to Christians today? Since the eschaton is still future, will it be only for Jews, or a holy remnant of Jews? The answer to this question is only partially suggested within the book of Daniel, with its emphasis on holiness and personal judgment. One should look within the theology of the NT for the application of the eschatological hope in Daniel to the Christian church. There it appears that though the term Israel is retained, ethnic considerations have been almost wholly abandoned. See Matt 21:28-22:11; 25:31-46; 28:18-20; Rom 9-11; Gal 3:23-29; 6:16; Eph 2:11-22; 1 Pet 2:9-10; Rev 7:9-14; 10:11; 14:6. See Hans K. LaRondelle, The Israel of God in Prophecy (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews Univ. Press, 1983).
²Mertens, 60.
³Ibid., 61.
⁴R. Mosis, "gādôl" TDOT, (1964), 1:394-95, "gadhol is also found in the titles, 'high priest' . . . and 'great prince' (Dn. 12:1, referring to Michael)."
1. As mentioned, in each passage in which Michael is mentioned by name, he is designated as "prince." This consistency of use suggests that the designation is a title.

2. There is a parallel to other title usages in the Old Testament. The syntax is identical to many instances in which named men are entitled "prince" and "king" in Daniel and elsewhere in the OT. For example, "Jehoiakim king of Judah" (yehôyāqîm melek yehudah), "Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon" (nebûkâdne'šar melek bābel) (Dan 1:1) and "Cyrus king of Persia" (kôreš melek pâras) (Dan 10:1), are syntactically the same as "Michael, your prince" (mekâ'êl šār kem) (Dan 10:21). Also, "prince" (šar) is used as a title in such expressions as "Potiphar . . . captain of the guard" (Gen 39:1), "Zebul the ruler of the city" (Judg 9:30), and "Joab the commander of the army" (1 Kgs 1:19). In addition, there are many examples of šar used as a self-standing title without the presence of a name. One is the title, "captain of the guard" in the Joseph story (Gen 40:3, 4; 41:10, 12). In the book of Daniel is found the title "chief of the eunuchs" (Dan 1:7-11, 18). Even closer are the designations "prince of the kingdom of Persia" (šar malkût pâras) (Dan 10:13), "prince of Persia" (šar pârâs), and "prince of Greece" (šar vâwân) (vs. 20) in the same context in which the title "prince" is applied to Michael.

It appears, therefore, that the designation šar serves as a title for Michael in the three passages in which he is named.

Michael as "the Great Prince"

Dan 12:1 goes beyond Dan 10:13 and 21 in its designation of Michael. In Dan 10:13, Michael is "one of the chief princes," not assigned preeminence among the "chief princes." Dan 10:21 informs us
that Michael is "your prince," prince of Israel, indicating a special relationship with God's chosen people. But Dan 12:1 refers to Michael as "the great prince" (hākār hagādōl).

Two elements within this designation are given attention here, the word "great" and the presence of the article.

The designation "great"

The word gadōl in its different forms meaning "great" is found only in Ugaritic and Hebrew among Semitic languages. The usual word for great among Semitic languages is rab in its various forms and cognates. Even Ugaritic "uses ṣb more frequently than gdl to convey the idea of 'great'." Even Ugaritic "uses ṣb more frequently than gdl to convey the idea of 'great'." Even Ugaritic "uses ṣb more frequently than gdl to convey the idea of 'great'." Even Ugaritic "uses ṣb more frequently than gdl to convey the idea of 'great'." 3

gadōl is used as a superlative expression, sometimes strengthened by the addition of melōd, "very," for example, "Moses was very great in the land of Egypt." Events described substantively can be characterized as extraordinary by the addition of gadōl, for example: "the LORD has a . . . great slaughter in the land of Edom" (Isa 34:6). gadōl can be something approaching a place name when used for some geographical feature, such as "the Great Sea" (Mediterranean Sea) (Num 34:6f; Josh 1:4; 9:1; Ezek 47:15, 19, 20, etc.), and "the Great River" (Euphrates) (Gen 15:18; Deut 1:7). It also appears

1 Ibid., 391.
3 Mosis, 392.
4 Ibid., 393.
5 Ibid., 394.
in titles to express the most exalted rank, such as "great king" (hamelek hagadol) (for the king of the Assyrian empire) (2 Kgs 18:19), "high priest" (hakohen hagadol) (Lev 21:10; Num 35:25; 2 Kgs 12:10; Hag 1:1, 14, etc.), and of special interest to us here, "great prince" (Dan 12:1).¹

The eldest son of a family was the "great" son (Gen 27:1), Joseph declared that Pharaoh "is not greater in this house than I" (Gen 39:9). David "grew great," and God promised to make for him "a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth" (1 Sam 7:9). David said of Abner, "a prince and a great man has fallen this day in Israel." Note the parallel use of "prince" and "great."

gadol is paired with qatan or qadten, the Hebrew words for "small" and "least," to express a totality, "from the least to the greatest" (Jer 8:10) or "both small and great" (Gen 19:11). gadol in such cases represents the upper level of the totality.²

Above all, greatness is ascribed to God. In many passages, the declaration "Yahweh is great" (Ps 135:5) or "Great is Yahweh" (Ps 48:1) seems to be an acclamatory formula, existing independently before being incorporated into the various Psalms or statements of praise. It is self-standing, not bound to any particular activity or attribute.³ Not only is God great (Deut 10:17; Ps 86:10), but also His name is great (1 Sam 12:22; 1 Kgs 8:32). Acclamation of God's greatness ascribes to Him the highest place above the gods and

¹Ibid., 395; KBL, 170.
²Mosis, 398-400; BDB, 153.
³Mosis, 407.
nations, which He occupies as king, creator, and universal judge.¹
R. Mosis holds that "Great" becomes a title of the God of Israel.²

God is also seen to be great in the events of Israel's history.³ Jethro exclaimed, "Now I know that the LORD is greater than all gods, because he delivered the people from under the hand of the Egyptians." (Exod 18:11). Ps 145, which emphasizes God's activity, His "mighty acts" (vs. 4), His "works" (vs. 5), and His "mighty deeds" (vs. 12), etc., declares early in the Psalm, "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised, and his greatness is unsearchable" (vs. 3).

That Michael is designated "the great prince" expresses a quality of extraordinariness about this heavenly figure, distinguishing him from other celestial beings intermediary between God and man. No other celestial intermediary is called "great" in the OT.⁴

---

¹Ibid., 409.
²Ibid., 409-10.
³Ibid., 410-12.
⁴Many interpreters have noted a similarity between the description of the "little horn" power of Dan 8:11 and the "Lucifer myth" of Isa 14 and Ezek 28. See Lueken, 27; Brownlee, 98-99; Nickelsburg, 14-15; 69-70; Clifford, 25-26; John J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 140; Hartman and Di Lella, 283; but see P. R. Davies, Daniel, 74. Of the "little horn" is said, "It magnified itself (higdèl, lit. "made itself great") (Mosis, 404, 406.) even up to the prince of the host." If, as some suggest, the "little horn" figure of Dan 8:11, 25, paralleled in Dan 11:36f, refers not merely to an earthly ruler but, behind him, to a supernatural adversary of God (Lueken, 27; Nickelsburg, 14-15, 70, "The name 'Michael'--'who is like God?'--may constitute a challenge to Lucifer's aspirations and imply that the latter is Michael's opponent in Dan. 12:1" [70].), then there is seen here a supernatural being, not called "great," but which was exalting himself, seeking to make himself great (see Dan 11:36, "magnify himself" [xigdèl] above every god").
Significance of the article with "Great Prince"

The designation "the great prince" in Dan 12:1 has the article in Hebrew. The article in Hebrew indicates that a noun is definite if it is not otherwise made definite by other factors. In his classification of the uses of the article in Hebrew, William R. Harper includes "distinctive," used to convey the idea of pre-eminence.¹ It seems probable that the use of the article in the designation "the great prince" falls within the "distinctive" classification. It was stated earlier that the designation of Michael in Dan 12:1 goes beyond the designations in Dan 10:13, 21. This is true in describing Michael as "great." The presence of the article in the Hebrew makes it emphatic. He is not "a great prince," not merely "one of the chief princes" as in 10:13, but "the great prince." This suggests that there is no other "great" prince; Michael is a prince without equal. Michael has been called "the head of the holy angels,"² the "highest of the angels."³ Maier states that "Michael is the highest ranking among the angels of God."⁴ These statements recognize Michael's pre-eminent position among the intermediary celestial beings.

The designation by which Michael is described in Dan 12:1 goes far beyond those used to describe any other clearly angelic

²Walvoord, 246.
³Wood, 131.
⁴Maier, 411.
figure in the OT canon. The angels are presented as faceless functionaries, devoid of distinct personal identity or independent authority. The focus of attention is always God, the one in authority, on the basis of whose command the angels act and carry out His will. Gabriel, though named, is no exception to this pattern. In both instances of his appearance by name, he is simply carrying out a commanded mission (Dan 8:15-16; 9:21-23). Michael, on the other hand, has his own distinct identity and personality. He is the focus of attention, and, as the great prince and protector of Israel, occupies a position of prominence and authority occupied by God in earlier passages of Scripture (see Deut 32:8-9, 12).

The designation of Michael in Dan 12:1 as "the great prince," thus preeminent among the heavenly beings, has a parallel in the Jewish apocalyptic literature where his preeminence is made more explicit than in the book of Daniel. 1 Enoch 24:6 speaks of "Michael, one of the holy and honored angels who was with me, and was their leader." In 4 QMoS. 10:2 there is a clear reference to Michael, who, as chief of the angels, avenges Israel of their enemies at the end of the world: "Then the hands of the angel shall be filled, who has been appointed chief, and he shall forthwith avenge them of their enemies." 2 In 3 Apoc. Bar. 13:3, the angels refer to Michael as "our commander." In Rev 12:7-9, Michael is leading the angels of God--"Michael and his angels"--in a war against Satan and his rebellious angels.

---

1 C. H. H. Wright, Daniel and His Prophecies, 320.
2 See Driver, Daniel, 156; Charles, APOT, 2:421.
From this study of the three passages of Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1, it can be seen that Michael is an exalted prince of the highest rank among celestial princes. He is "one of the chief princes," thus one of the inner circle of the leading celestial princes. It is premature and perhaps incorrect to identify the "chief princes" as an order of four or seven "archangels." Other possibilities exist, as, perhaps, a council of divine personalities.

Michael is also the prince of Daniel's people, who are identified within the book of Daniel as Israel. To Michael has been committed the special watch-care for the covenant-keeping people of God. Though Daniel's people are Israel, those who benefit from Michael's eschatological intervention are those who pass the judgment of the books, thus, a holy remnant.

The designation "prince" for Michael is a title, analogous to the title "prince" and "king" for human authorities.

Furthermore, Michael is uniquely "the great prince," the prince extraordinary, the highest ranking celestial prince, arising at the eschaton as did Yahweh of old to deliver the holy remnant. He is the figure upon whom the focus rests at the climax of the book of Daniel.

The Functions of Michael in Dan 10

In the last section, the concern is for the identity of the Michael figure. In this section and the next, the functions of the Michael figure are examined in the context of Dan 10-12, primarily Dan 10 and 12, as Dan 11 has a limited contribution for understanding the work of the Michael figure. The main contribution of Dan 11 seems to be perhaps to underscore that the activity of Michael is not
outside of or beyond history, but intimately linked with history, both in its ongoing progress—glimpsed in Dan 10—and at its eschatological climax as revealed in Dan 12.

**Relationship between Michael and the unnamed Figure(s)**

In Dan 10 mention is made of one or two unnamed heavenly beings. One is mentioned in vss. 5-6, who shall be referred to as the "Man in Linen." There is also an unnamed heavenly being who addresses a revelation to Daniel beginning with vs. 11, who shall be called the "Angel of Revelation." The activity of Michael alluded to in Dan 10 is intertwined with and explained by this unnamed Angel of Revelation, the one who narrated the revelation in Dan 10-12, beginning with Dan 10:11. Opinion is divided over two issues in the angelology of Dan 10: (1) Is the Angel of Revelation of Dan 10:11ff. the same person as the dazzling Man in Linen of Dan 10:5-6, who inspired such awe in Daniel (Dan 10:7-9)? and (2) What is the identity of the unnamed figure(s) in Dan 10?

**The View That There Is One Unnamed Figure in Dan 10**

The dominant view is that there is only one unnamed heavenly being in Dan 10. It is widely thought that the Man in Linen and the Angel of Revelation are the same individual.²

---

¹So Lueken, 26.

²Calvin, 258; Keil, Daniel, 410-11; Driver, Daniel, 160; Charles Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel (London: SPCK, 1923), 223; Charles, Daniel, 257; Montgomery, Daniel, 420; Young, Prophecy of Daniel, 25-26; Jeffery, 502; Porteous, 155-56; Baldwin, 180; John J. Collins, Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1981), 99; Bampfylde, 129; A. Berkley Michelson, Daniel and Revelation: Riddles or Realities? (New...
One obvious corollary to this view is that the Man in Linen cannot be identified with Michael, as, in this case, he and Michael would have been working together in contending against the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20-21).\(^1\) Beyond that, Keil, who identified the Man in Linen with the "Angel of the Lord," felt that in Dan 10:13 "there is ascribed to Michael a position with reference to the people of God which is not appropriate to the Angel of the Lord or the Logos."\(^2\)

In response to this last assertion, it would seem that the role attributed to Michael in Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1 of being the guardian of Israel who contended on their behalf would seem to correspond quite closely to that of the Angel of the Lord, who led Israel from Egypt to the Promised Land, and protected them from their enemies on the way (Exod 13:21; 14:19; 23:20-22; Judg 2:1).\(^3\)

Among those who hold the view of only one unnamed being in Dan 10, there are three main views of who this glorious being is: (1) he is the angel Gabriel, (2) he is an anonymous angel, (3) he is a divine, messianic being.

---

\(^1\) Keil, Daniel, 411, the opinion that the Man in Linen is identical with Michael "has no support in Scripture, and stands in contradistinction to vers. 13 and 21, where he who speaks is certainly distinguished from Michael"; cf. Young, Prophecy of Daniel, 225-27; R. A. Anderson, 122-23.

\(^2\) Keil, Daniel, 411.

The unnamed being is the angel Gabriel.

A number of interpreters who believe in one unnamed figure in Dan 10 hold that the glorious being of Dan 10 is the angel Gabriel.\(^1\) This identification is made primarily by analogy with Dan 8:16 and 9:21.\(^2\) James A. Montgomery noted the similarity of Dan 10:5-6 to the theophany of Ezek 1 and the vision of Christ in Rev 1:14f.,\(^3\) and mentioned that "Early Christian exegetes naturally saw him as the Son of God."\(^4\) But he was persuaded that there is only one figure, not two, in chap. 10, and despite the acknowledged dependence upon Ezek 1, he cannot be deity for he was "sent" (vs. 11), and therefore "it is simplest to identify him with Gabriel."\(^5\)

W. Sibley Towner, who also holds this view, sees an additional link between the unnamed being and Gabriel in comparing Dan 11:1 to 9:1; both refer to the first year of Darius. He feels this identification is "further confirmed by the collegiality which this speaker shares with his peer and fellow angel, Michael" (Dan 10:21).\(^6\)

The connection between Dan 11:1 and Dan 9:1 is not to be

---

\(^1\) Pusey, 426; Montgomery, Daniel, 420; Stier, 91; Tatford, 174; Porteous, 155-56; J. M. Wilson, 125; Collins, Daniel, 1, 2 Maccabees, 99; R. A. Anderson, 124; Towner, 149-50.

\(^2\) Collins, Daniel, 1, 2 Maccabees, 134; J. M. Wilson, p.125; Porteous, 155-56, concludes he is Gabriel "in view of his manner of addressing Daniel"; Towner, 149-50.

\(^3\) Montgomery, Daniel, 408-409.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid., 420.

\(^6\) Towner, 149-50.
overlooked. It is strongly suggestive that the writer of Dan 11:1 did intend to identify the Angel of Revelation of Dan 10 with Gabriel.¹

The unnamed being is an unidentified angel.

The view that the heavenly being of Dan 10 is an angel has significant support.² Among those who hold this view, some make no further effort to identify the figure,³ a primary reason apparently being that the author of Dan 10 does not identify him. As Keil

¹See Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel, 29-34, 38-39; idem, "The composition of the Book of Daniel," 268-69, 273-75; idem, "Michael and Gabriel," 1488-89. Ginsberg sees two hands at work in Dan 10-12. He is silent as to the intent of the original author of Dan 10-12 (Apoc III). But the author of Dan 9, who is also redactor of Dan 10-12 (Apoc IV), wished to identify the unnamed linen-clad figure of 10 with Gabriel of Dan 9, and to do this added Dan 11:1, "and ever since the first year of Darius the Mede I have been standing by him to strengthen and support him." The date in Dan 11:1 is the same as in Dan 9:1, the year Gabriel appeared to the seer. He also felt that Apoc IV tried to identify Gabriel of Dan 9, which he wrote, with the Gabriel of another author, Apoc II, of Dan 8:15-16; see also Hartman and Di Lella, 285-86.

However, Ginsberg’s allegations of multiple authorship of Daniel are open to question (see Rowley, "The Unity of the Book of Daniel"; idem, "Some Problems of the Book of Daniel," 216-20). The acknowledged connection between Dan 11:1 and Dan 9:1 is not to be attributed to an interpolation, for Dan 9 makes no mention of any activity of Gabriel on Darius’s behalf.


³Jerome, 113; Calvin, 258; Prince, 166; Driver, Daniel, 160; Farrar, 296; Charles, Daniel, 257; Michaeli, 665; Jeffery, 502; Hammer, 103; Baldwin, Daniel: And Introduction and Commentary, 180; Michelson, 37, 84, 142.
comments, "If he were Gabriel, he would have been named here, according to the analogy of vers. 9, 21."  

Another reason is that the description in Dan 10:5-6 transcends that of Gabriel in Dan 8:17-18; 9:21-22, and the effect on Daniel was more profound in Dan 10 than in Dan 8 and 9.  

A further reason given for rejecting identification with Gabriel is that in Dan 9:24-27, Gabriel only revealed to Daniel a vision centered on God's control of history; nothing was said about a task for Gabriel in that rule. The un-named figure in chaps. 10-12, however, is not only revealing history, but, in contrast to Gabriel's role in Dan 8 and 9, is clearly actively involved, along with Michael, in controlling events in that history. Therefore, it is concluded, he is not to be identified as Gabriel.  

The unnamed being is divine or messianic  

Another important position among those who hold that there is only one unnamed being in Dan 10 is the view that he is a being more transcendent than Gabriel or Michael, perhaps a divine figure.  

Cited in support of this view are the similarities in the description of the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) to the description of God in Ezek 1:7-28; 9:2-11 and that of the transcendent Christ in Rev 1:13-15.  

1Keil, 411; see also Prince, 166.  

2Charles, Daniel, 257; Jeffery, 502.  

3Michelson, 142.  

4Keil, 410, 414; Boutflower, 223; Young, Prophecy of Daniel, 225; B. H. Hall, 3:548-49; Walvoord, 243.  

5Jeffery, 502; Michaeli, 665; Lacocque, 206; cf. Montgomery, Daniel, 408-09.
A number of interpreters have held the view that the heavenly being in Dan 10 is an appearance of divinity, particularly of the pre-incarnate, divine Christ. This latter view was advanced by Carl F. Keil, who identified the being of Dan 10:5-6 with the "Angel of His Presence" the "angel of the Lord," and the one "in the form of a son of man in 7:13," citing Rev 1:13, where the glorified Christ is referred to as the "son of man" to confirm the latter identification. He rejects his identification with Michael as having no support in Scripture, and stands in contradistinction to Dan 10:13, 21, where he is distinguished from Michael. He argued that the coming to his help by Michael does not denote that he who speaks was an angel subordinated to Michael, as a subordinate can give help to his master.

Young follows Keil and believes that the Man in Linen is Christ and identifies him with the "'Angel of the Lord' (i.e., the Lord Himself) who makes war on behalf of His own against the hostile spirit of the heathen world powers." He also defends the view that the Angel of Revelation is superior to Michael; "Michael is seen to come to the aid of his Master."

---

1Keil, Daniel, 410-11, 418; E. J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel, 225; B. H. Hall, 548; Walvoord, 243; Bampflylde, 130-131: In answer to Bampflylde's claim that the man in linen, whom he identifies with the "Prince of the host" (Dan 8:11), and whom he declares cannot be Michael because Michael is "one of the chief princes" while the Prince of the Host is "Prince of princes" (Dan 8:25), one may ask, "Why stay with Dan 10:13? What about Dan 12:1, where Michael is 'the great prince'?" See also Tatford, 172-3; cf. Michelson, 37, 84.

2Keil, Daniel, 410-11.

3Ibid., 410-13, 418.


5Ibid., 227.
However, contrary to this view, Michael would appear to be the superior of the Angel of Revelation.\(^1\) It seems unlikely that a divine being, presumably possessing unlimited power, would be successfully resisted for three weeks by the prince of Persia, then would finally succeed thanks only to the intervention of a subordinate, and, beyond that, leave the subordinate in charge while he, the superior, departed to bring a revelation to Daniel. It seems more likely that a subordinate would face a stalemate in a struggle, which would then be broken by the arrival of a being of superior authority and strength, then the superior would be able to carry on the struggle single-handedly, while the subordinate, according to the pattern seen earlier in the book of Daniel (Dan 7:16ff.; 8:15ff.; 9:21ff.), is dispatched to carry the revelation. This is particularly emphasized when the Angel of Revelation is anonymous and given no special recognition, while Michael is named and is provided designations such as "one of the chief princes" and "the great prince" (Dan 10:13; 12:1).

Calvin rejected the interpretation that the anonymous figure in Dan 10 is Christ precisely because he interpreted Michael to be Christ. Since he saw only one unnamed figure in Dan 10, he could not equate both the Man in Linen and Michael with Christ.\(^2\)

Norman W. Porteous notes the arguments leading some to identify the Man in Linen with Christ, but dismisses them since this figure came merely to communicate a revelation.\(^3\)

Some interpreters who do not draw the conclusion that the

\(^1\)Prince, 166.

\(^2\)Calvin, 258.

\(^3\)Porteous, 155-56.
unnamed figure is divine or messianic do feel he manifests a transcendence beyond that of Gabriel. R. H. Charles felt that he is a supernatural being "holding a pre-eminent dignity amongst such beings."¹ Arthur Jeffery holds the same view, suggesting that the figure is "some supernatural being superior to Gabriel and Michael, and carefully distinguished from them."² He rejects identification with Gabriel, because "his appearance had a graver effect on the seer than that of Gabriel had."³ Early Christian commentators, he noted, saw in this figure the Messiah Christ.⁴

In response to Charles, one might ask, "Who in Daniel holds a more pre-eminent dignity among supernatural beings than Michael, 'one of the chief princes,' 'prince of Israel,' and 'the great prince'?"⁵ That the figure of Dan 10:5-6 is identifiable with Michael seems to be a logical extension of Charles's observations.

Also, Jeffery explains why he rejects identification of the Man in Linen with Gabriel, but he does not show why he rejects his identification with Michael, for Michael does not directly appear to Daniel in the book of Daniel to enable the reader to measure Daniel's reaction to his appearance, unless he does so in Dan 10:5-6.

A. B. Mickelson is reserved concerning the identity of the Man in Linen: "It could be a powerful heavenly being above or equal to Michael and Gabriel. It could even be the preincarnate

¹Charles, Daniel, 257.
²Jeffery, 502.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
But he finally ventured that it seems likely that both he and Michael "are God's messengers--angels in charge of God's control of the affairs of people."\(^2\)

It seems that one reason many reject any identification of the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) with Michael is the conviction that the Man in Linen is also the angelic spokesman addressing Daniel in the later verses of Dan 10, who is clearly distinguished from Michael. But there appear to be contradictions in this view, which have led to divergent interpretations of who the Man in Linen represents. Certain factors have led some to feel the figure is divine. Other factors have led others to feel the figure is angelic, perhaps the angel Gabriel. These contradictions have led to interpretations recognizing two unnamed figures in Dan 10.

**The View That There Are Two Unnamed Figures in Dan 10**

A minority view holds that there are two unnamed heavenly beings in Dan 10:\(^3\) (1) the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) and (2) the Angel of Revelation who addressed Daniel, beginning with Dan 10:11, and presented the revelation of Dan 11:2-12:4.\(^4\)

---

1Ibid., 142.

2Ibid.


4Unger, 1673; Tatford, 172-74; Walvoord, 243; Ford, 242; 248-49; R. A. Anderson, 122-24.
The Man in Linen is divine and messianic.

Those holding this view generally regard the Man in Linen to be a divine, messianic being. The arguments used are basically the same as those used by interpreters who see only one unnamed being in Dan 10, and see him to be divine and messianic. The description of the Man in Linen is similar to that of God in Ezek 1 and that of Christ in Rev 1. The effect of his manifestation upon Daniel is much more profound than that of Gabriel in Dan 8 and 9, or of the figure who speaks to Daniel in Dan 10:1ff.

Unger gives additional reasons why he thinks that the "Man in Linen" is "more plausibly interpreted as being that of the preincarnate Christ, the eternal Word, rather than an eminent angel such as Gabriel." The Man in Linen, like the figure in Dan 7:13 is likened in appearance to a "man." Also, he occupied an exalted position "above the waters" (Dan 12:6-7), while two other angels stood on the two banks. Further, one of the angels appealed to him (Dan 12:6 ASV, NASB) which shows he possesses superior knowledge.

Walvoord calls the vision a theophany, and notes with approval that Keil and Young "consider the man as a genuine theophany or an

---

1Hengstenberg, Christology of the OT, 4:266, 268, 270; Unger, 1673; Tatford, 172-73; Walvoord, 243; Ford, 248-49; Lacocque, 206; Phillips and Vines, 160.

2See above, 186-90.

3Unger, 1673; Tatford, 172-73; Walvoord, 243; Ford, 248-49; Lacocque, 206; see also Charles, Daniel, 257; Jeffery, 502.

4Unger, 1673.
Lacocque does not explicitly identify the Man in Linen with Christ. However, he speaks of this figure as superior to Gabriel, in view of the profound effect of the vision of Dan 10:5-6 upon Daniel. He notes with great emphasis the similarity in detail between the description of this figure and that of the Son of Man in Rev 1:14-15; 2:8. He notes that both this figure and the "Son of Man" figure of Dan 7:13 are referred to as "man." He noted also that "this particular 'man' who was described in terms parallel to those which Ezek 1 uses for the divine majesty." He gives the impression of being very sympathetic to the identification of the Man in Linen with Christ, but prudently stopping short of an explicit claim.

The view that the Man in Linen is an appearance of the pre-incarnate Christ, the Son of God, has received significant support. The similarities in the description of the Man in Linen to those of Christ in Rev 1:13-15; 2:18, and God in Ezek 1 and 9 (1:7, 13-14, 24, 28; 9:2-3, 8, 11) have been noted. Mention has also been made that the linen robe is a priestly vestment (Lev 16:4, 23; 1 Sam 2:18; Ezek 9:2-3, 11; Dan 10:2, 6-7), recalling the priestly role of the risen Christ in the NT (Heb 2:17; 4:15; 8:1; 192

---

1 Walvoord, 243.
2 Lacocque, 206.
3 Keil, Daniel, 410-11, 418; Young, 225; Walvoord, 243; Tatford, 172-3; Phillips and Vines, 160; cf. Michelson, 37, 84.
4 Young, The Prophecy of Daniel, 225.
5 Lacocque, 206; Michaeli, 665.
6 Jeffery, 502; Lacocque, 206.
9:11). This is a weighty argument, not to be overlooked. To this might be added the similarity of the profound effect of the vision upon Daniel to the effect of divine appearances elsewhere in the OT, such as in the cases of Moses (Exod 3:6)\(^1\) and Isaiah (Isa 6:105).\(^2\) On the whole, it seems that the description in Dan 10:5-6 was influenced by that in Ezek 1, 9, and that the writer intended it to be a theophany and not simply an awe-inspiring angelic appearance.

The Angel of Revelation is Gabriel

Those holding that there are two unnamed figures in Dan 10 generally identify the second one as the angel Gabriel.\(^3\) This identification is made, basically, for the same reason those who argue for one unnamed figure give for viewing him as Gabriel: the analogy with the appearances of Gabriel in Dan 8 and 9.\(^4\) He would not be the same being as in Dan 10:5-6, since his presence did not have the profound impact upon Daniel as did the vision of Dan 10:5-6.

A. Lacocque has an original interpretation of Dan 10:10-16. He sees here two heavenly beings. He identifies the Man in Linen with the Son of Man of Dan 7:13, and regards the spokesman of Dan

\(^1\)Zöckler, 13:227.

\(^2\)Ford, 249, "The prophet’s reaction to the vision of Michael (10:5-8) is identical with that of other saints granted a view of God." As examples he pointed to Saul-Paul, Moses and Isaiah.

\(^3\)Hengstenberg, Christology of the OT, 266; Clark, 606; Tatford, 174; Ford, 249; R. A. Anderson, 124; Phillips and Vines, 161.

\(^4\)Ford, 249; R. A. Anderson, 124.
10:10-15 still to be this Son of Man/Man in Linen.\textsuperscript{1} The "Angel of Revelation," whom he feels is Gabriel, does not appear until Dan 10:16.\textsuperscript{2} He rejects the view that the figure in Dan 10:5-6 could be Gabriel, in part because his dramatic appearance seems to transcend that of Gabriel in earlier chapters, and partly because in Dan 9:21, as earlier pointed out by Charles,\textsuperscript{3} Daniel is not affected by Gabriel's appearance, while in Dan 10:8-19 Daniel must be revived three times.\textsuperscript{4}

It is apparent from this study that, on an analogy of the passages where Gabriel is mentioned by name, there is a widespread conviction that the angelic spokesman in Dan 10:10ff. is also the angel Gabriel.\textsuperscript{5} This point cannot be proved, since he is not named, but it seems evident that he is an angel of like station, functioning in a Gabriel-like capacity. The conviction grows that the author wished the reader to believe him to be Gabriel, although, for some reason, perhaps under the belief that he was being guided by the content of a revelation, did not make the identification explicit.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Lacocque, 200, 206.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., 206.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Charles, \textit{Daniel}, 257.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Lacocque, 206.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Pusey, 426; Stier, 91; Lacocque, 212; Russell, \textit{Jews, Alexander to Herod}, 241; Collins, \textit{The Prophecy of Daniel}, 134; Koch, 207-208; Tatford, 174; Archer, "Daniel," 150; see also Hartman and Di Lella, 285-286, who suggest that the final redactor of the the book of Daniel added Dan 11:1 in an attempt to identify the anonymous angel of Dan 11 with Gabriel of Dan 9.
\end{itemize}
Michael and the "Man in Linen"

A minority of interpreters has identified the Man in Linen with Michael. E. W. Hengstenberg identified this figure with Michael and Christ.¹ His basic argument showing that this figure was Michael is that this Man in Linen appeared to be a very exalted, divine figure, above Gabriel. But Michael also appeared to occupy the highest position among heavenly beings, being "one of the chief princes" (Dan 10:13), prince of Israel (Dan 10:21), and "the great prince" (Dan 12:1). He felt that to be prince of the covenant nation is a dignity which could not be possessed by a created angel but only by one exalted into the sphere of divinity.² His reasoning appears to be that since the "Man in Linen" and Michael occupy a similar unique dignity, they must be the same person.

Hengstenberg argued vigorously against the idea that the Angel of Revelation of Dan 10:10ff. could be considered superior to Michael. The prince of the kingdom of Persia had detained "Gabriel" for twenty-one days. However, Michael came to his help, freeing Gabriel to come to Daniel. Concerning this, Hengstenberg remarked, that Michael must be the possessor of superior power, and exalted far above the ordinary angels, is very obvious from this. Gabriel by himself is powerless. Michael must first come to his help and set him free before he can bring the joyful tidings to Daniel.³ The designation "your prince" (Dan 10:21) in Gabriel's statement that "there is none who contends by my side against these except Michael,

¹Hengstenberg, Christology of the OT, 4:266.
²Ibid., 268-69.
³Ibid., 267.
your prince" shows, in Hengstenberg's opinion, "that Gabriel is only a subaltern." He pointed out that in Dan 12:1-3, "the rescue of Israel is here ascribed to Michael alone, and the subordinate task of Gabriel entirely vanishes."^1

The position of A. Lacocque on Michael and the Man in Linen is complex. Because he believes Michael came to the aid of the "Man in Linen" (Dan 10:13), he also feels that the figure in Dan 10:5-6 is superior to Michael and carefully distinguished by the writer from him. 2 But he seems in another passage to identify the Man in Linen with Michael. After detailing some of the existing parallels of the Man in Linen with the Son of Man of Rev 1 and 2 and of Dan 7:13, and with the theophany of Ezek 1, Lacocque states the following in a footnote:

'This man' in Dan 10.5 has been compared to the anonymous angel in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (see Test. of Dan 6.1,5; Test. of Benj. 6.1; Test. of Asher 6.6; Test. of Levi 5.6. He is the angel of peace, an intercessor, mediator, and source of consolation, and he fights for Israel). In fact, we believe it is a question of the angel Michael and the comparison is thus well founded. 3

That he regards both Michael and the Man in Linen as manifestations of the same personality is seen in his interpretation of the "Prince of the host" of Dan 8:11. He equates the Son of Man with

---

1 Ibid., 268-69.
2 Lacocque, 206.
3 Lacocque, ibid.; see also Ford, 249, who identifies the "Man in Linen" with Christ, the "Good Shepherd," and also equates him with "Michael, the great prince." Towner, 149-50, pointedly rejects any identification with the Son of Man of chap. 7, who, he affirmed, "is a symbol of the saints of the Most High-Israel."
the Prince of the army/Prince of Princes of Dan 8:11, 25. He goes on to say that "the title 'Prince of princes' which is here attributed to this personage signifies that he is the chief of the angels (see Dan. 10:20; 12:1)."

The apparent contradiction seems due to Lacocque's view of the "Son of Man" of Dan 7:13, who Lacocque equates with the "Man in Linen." The Son of Man is associated with "the people of the saints." He is the epitomy of the saints and telos of righteous humanity. Lacocque can state that Michael and the Son of Man are "the same personage," yet also say that "the figure of the 'son of man' is an exclusive one and the angel Michael is one of its aspects." Again:

The Prince of Persia opposed the "son of man" (vs. 13) [the figure in 10:5-6] and was defeated thanks only to the intervention of Michael.

In retrospect it is quite clear that we ought not to see Gabriel in Daniel's interlocutor [vss. 13-14], but rather the representative of Israel as in ch. 7. At the same time, Michael is distinct from the 'son of man' and the personification of his glorious dimension.

From these statements we can conclude that the Man in Linen

1Lacocque, 172. He sees a parallel between "the people of the saints" (Dan 8:24) and the "Prince of princes" (Dan 8:25), analogous to the parallel between the Son of Man and the saints of the Most High in Dan 7:13, 18, 25.

2Ibid.
3Ibid., 209.
4Ibid., 126, 131-32.
5Ibid., 162.
6Ibid., 234.
7Ibid., 209.
and Michael appear to be equivalent personalities in Lacocque's thinking.

Some among those who see two unnamed beings in Dan 10 oppose identification of the Man in Linen with Michael. Robert A. Anderson holds that there is no evidence to suggest an identification of the Man in Linen with the angel Michael.¹ He called into question the whole idea of trying to identify unnamed heavenly beings with named ones. "The desire to align these various figures, the one with the other, betrays the influence of a traditional exegesis which did so for apologetic and dogmatic reasons."² However, Anderson himself views the later figure in Dan 10:10ff. as Gabriel,³ which suggests an element of subjectivity.

J. F. Walvoord, though conceding room for debate, feels "the evidence seems more in favor of considering this (Dan 10:5-6) a theophany."⁴ But "in this case," he felt "the man of Dan 10:4-6 is to be distinguished from the angel of Dan 10:10-14 as well as Michael (Dan 10:13),"⁵ though his reasons for distinguishing him from Michael are not made clear.

Zöckler, besides seeing only one unnamed angel in Dan 10,⁶ adds as an additional reason why the figure of Dan 10:5-6 should not be identified with Michael: the fact that Michael is represented as

¹ R. A. Anderson, 122.
² Ibid., 123.
³ Ibid., 124.
⁴ Walvoord, 243.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Zöckler, 226-27.
being not present in vss. 13 and 21.\(^1\) But this would not be decisive, as the Man in Linen appeared, not personally, but in a vision (Dan 10:1, 7-8). There was no direct communication between him and Daniel, either in Dan 10:5-6 or in Dan 12:5-7. There is no evidence in Scripture that someone or something seen in vision need be thought physically present. It was a different case with the "Angel of Revelation," for he touched Daniel (Dan 10:10, 16, 18) to set him up and strengthen him, then gave Daniel full attention to present a relatively long revelation (Dan 11:2-12:4).

The Angel of Revelation in chap. 10 is not a divine figure as he was "sent" (Dan 10:11).\(^2\) He is clearly a subordinate to Michael. Michael is called "the great prince," leaving room for no peer among angelic figures. In his twenty-one-day struggle with the prince of Persia, Gabriel struggled alone, with no angelic hosts by his side.\(^3\) This is apparent from his testimony in Dan 10:21, "There is none who contends by my side against these except Michael, your prince." This indicates that he was a figure of high authority, next only to Michael. This also indicates that no other heavenly intermediaries were qualified to perform this mission; only he and Michael. He could not quit the struggle and leave the prince of Persia unattended, as a crisis of major proportions was at hand. Only when Michael, "one of the chief princes" (note the emphasis on Michael's exalted rank), came to relieve him was he freed for a short

\(^1\)Ibid., 226.

\(^2\)Maier, 364.

\(^3\)Contrary to some speculations, such as Collins, Daniel, 135, "it is likely that both princes were thought to be accompanied by their hosts."
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time to bring his revelation to Daniel (Dan 10:13).

Arguments for identifying the Man in Linen with Michael may be summarized as follows:

1. Proximity. Immediately following the awesome vision of the Man in Linen, Gabriel spoke to Daniel about the superior being Michael, who had come to Gabriel's aid against the prince of Persia. Thus, the Man in Linen and Michael are mentioned in the same context.

2. Rank. As the Man in Linen made such a profound impression on Daniel and is described in terms associated with divinity (Ezek 1:4, 13), he must be regarded as a heavenly being of highest rank. Michael also, as "one of the chief princes," prince of Israel, and as "the great prince" is apparently regarded as of the highest heavenly rank. Michael also is portrayed as the heavenly deliverer of God's people and executor of the final judgment (Dan 12:1-3) occupying the focus of attention in the climactic eschatological passage of the book of Daniel. The vision of the "Man in Linen" may be taken as a preview of the celestial hero Michael who takes the spotlight as other celestial figures fade from view.

3. Divinity. The divine character of the Man in Linen is suggested by his description, which recalls descriptions of God elsewhere in the Holy Scriptures (Ezek 1:4, 13, 22-28; 43:2; cf. Exod 24:10-11; Rev 1:13-16), and by the profound effect upon Daniel, similar to the effect of visions of God elsewhere in Scripture (Exod 3:3-6; Isa 6:1-5; Acts 9:3-9). The divine character of Michael is suggested by:

   a. His prominent position as prince of Israel, a position claimed for God alone in Deut 32:8-12.
b. The personal identity, personal authority and prominent position of Michael in the eschaton (Dan 12:1-3), such as is accorded to no other heavenly being in the Scriptures other than the Davidic Messiah (Isa 9:6-7; Mic 5:2; these two passages suggest heavenly pre-existence and divinity) (Angelic beings are generally faceless functionaries, with no personal identity or personality. Even Gabriel, though named, remains basically a faceless functionary).

c. Michael's function as the eschatological deliverer. This function is attributed to God in other parallel passages of the OT (Isa 24:1; 25:6-9; 26:21; 27:1; 34:2-8; 60:2; Jer 25:31-33; Ezek 38:21-23; Joel 3:1-2, 11-16; Zech 12:3, 9; 14:3).

Recognizing the Man in Linen to be a figure distinct from the angelic spokesman of Dan 10:10ff., and acknowledging the parallels existing between the Man in Linen and Michael, it is conceivable to make an identification of the two figures.

In this section on the unnamed heavenly figure(s) in Dan 10, the principal interpretations have been reviewed. The major view is that one unnamed figure is found in Dan 10, but opinion is divided on whether this figure is the angel Gabriel; an unidentified angel, a peer or superior of Gabriel and Michael; or a divine and/or messianic being. But the minority view, that there are two figures: (1) the divine/messianic Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) and (2) the angelic revelator, generally identified with Gabriel, appears to be a sounder interpretation.
Relationship of Michael to the Princes of Persia and Greece

Michael's functions can be more clearly understood within the framework of his activities. In Dan 10, he is pictured as coming to the aid of the Angel of Revelation in struggles with the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 21). Attention is given to the nature of the crisis referred to in Dan 10:13 to which Michael's aid has been drawn. Before that, however, it is useful to examine the identity of the princes of Persia and Greece.

Identity of the Princes of Persia and Greece

Two views have been held concerning the identity of these princes of Persia and Greece. A view long popular among Protestant interpreters is that they are the kings of these nations. The alternate view is that they are transcendent,

Calvin, 2:252, 264. Concerning the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, he wrote, "I think the angel stood in direct opposition and conflict against Cambyses, to prevent him from raging more fiercely against God's people." Commenting on Dan 10:20, he wrote, "God therefore thus restrained Cambyses by the angel's assistance, and then he protected his people from the cruelty exercised by Alexander, king of Macedon." See also Henry, 1100; Clarke, 606-07, "I think it would go far to make a legend or a precarious tale of this important place to endeavor to maintain that either a good or evil angel is intended here. Cyrus alone was the prince of Persia, and God had destined him to be the deliverer of his people; but there were some matters of which we are not informed, that caused him to hesitate for some time. . . . He . . . for a time resisted the secret inspirations which God had sent him." G. M. Price, 267, called the position that the prince of Persia was an angelic patron or guardian of the interests of Persia "absurd." "The obvious meaning is that there was some important action which the angel now talking to Daniel had been trying to get the king of Persia to do, probably something in connection with the young nation of the Jews at this time striving against great odds to establish themselves in their old national home." The view of Hengstenberg, Christology of the OT (1839), 4:267, is unique, but fits here. He interprets the princes of Persia and Greece as "ideal representatives of the imperial powers" having "purely an ideal, not a real signification. In point of fact, the imperial powers themselves are intended."
angelic beings, who are assigned to these particular nations and who are impeding God's plans for favoring Israel.¹

**Earthly Kings of the Nations**

A study by William H. Shea supports the view that the prince of Persia was Cambyses. Calling upon the advances which have been made in knowledge of the ancient Near East, Shea made the following points:

1. Cambyses had a consistent record of animosity toward foreign cults.²

2. Cambyses was co-regent with Cyrus. He was "King of Babylon" for a period of time while his father Cyrus was "King of Lands," that is, king of the Persian empire as a whole. As king of Babylon, he would have authority over Judah as well, as Judah fell into that satrapy. This would give him authority to create difficulties for the Jews who were attempting to rebuild their temple in Jerusalem.³


³ Ibid., 239-243.
3. There is evidence suggesting that Cambyses may have entered upon this co-regency in the spring of 536 or 535 B.C., on the third day of the first month. If it was in the year 535, this would be exactly three full weeks before Daniel’s vision, which occurred on the twenty-fourth day of the first month in Cyrus’s third year (Dan 10:1, 4). If so, it would likely have been the inauguration of Cambyses as king which precipitated Daniel’s three-week fast (Dan 10:2-3). Cambyses would then be a "prince" of the kingdom of Persia. He would also be a king, so that he and his father could constitute the "kings of Persia" (Dan 10:13, KJV).^  

The view that the prince of Persia is a human ruler is an attractive position. That a supernatural being of high rank was seeking to spiritually influence a pagan monarch, who may have been vacillating between favoring or persecuting the Jews, is a simple, straightforward picture, without troublesome theological implications. But can it be exegetically defended? Following are some arguments which may be advanced in favor of this position.

1. The Hebrew term שָׁר means "chief" or "ruler." True, it probably has never elsewhere been used to mean "king" in the Old Testament. But it does have the basic meaning of chief, ruler, or leader. Since Cyrus (or Cambyses) was ruler of Persia, it would not be inconceivable that he would be called Persia’s prince.

---

^ Ibid., 243-246.

2 KBL, 929-30; BDB, 978-79.

3 KBL, 929-30; BDB, 978-79.
2. The Akkadian cognate of the Hebrew word ʾšar is sarru, and is used in Assyrian and Babylonian literature to mean "king." In an interesting linguistic flip-flop, malku, the Akkadian cognate of melek, which is the Hebrew word for "king," means "prince."¹ If these chapters reflect sixth-century B.C. Babylon, as recent evidence tends to support,² it is possible to think that the author, in this passage, expressed himself in the Akkadian term.

3. Prince is used in parallel with King(s) in Dan 10:13. The last part of Dan 10:13 has textual variations,³ with the NIV translation reading, "Because I was detained there with the king of Persia." If the angel was withstood by the prince of the kingdom of Persia, and was left there with the king of Persia, the parallel could suggest that the prince of the kingdom of Persia and the king of Persia are the same being. In the ancient Christian period, Jerome resolved the textual problem by translating "king" as singular, and concluding that prince and king were both the same figure. He further concluded, however, that "king of Persia" was, like "prince" a reference to a guardian angel of Persia.⁴ Driver thinks

¹CAD, 10, pt. 1:166-69; Marcus, 160, 146.
³BHK, 1278, 2MSSKen מַלְכּוּת (malkūt) "kingdom"; LXX, τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως Πέρσης, "the prince of the king of Persia"; Theod., τοῦ αρχοντος βασιλειας Περσην, "the prince of the kingdom of Persia."
⁴Jerome, 115.
it strange that the angel, after his conflict with the prince of Persia, should have found himself 'beside' the kings of Persia. He prefers the reading of the LXX, "beside the prince of the kings of Persia." The argument that the "prince of the kingdom of Persia" is the Persian king, in a similar fashion, solves the strangeness of the statement. Mertens holds that the prince of Persia "(Dan 10:13)--according to the uncorrected reading of the Masoretic text--is identified with the king of Persia."^2

The soundest position would appear to be to adhere to the MT reading, "kings of Persia." The fact that the MT reading seems problematic suggests that it is more likely the original, and the variants which are easier to interpret may be the result of attempts to "correct" and simplify the original reading.

4. "Prince" may be used as an alternate title for one who is also "king." A discussion earlier in this paper^3 concluded that though "prince" and "king" are often used in parallel, "prince" (šar) is apparently never used with the meaning of "king." There is the example of Philistine kings called šārīm (1 Sam 29:2-7). It was pointed out that this does not mean that šar and melek can be used interchangeably. But in that instance, the plural šārīm did refer to kings. To this may be added the passage of 1 Sam 18:30: "Then the princes of the Philistines came out to battle." Here the context shows that the princes were the kings of the Philistine city-states. They were "princes" or "captains" in the sense that they were not only

---

^1Driver, Daniel, 159

^2Mertens, 102 (translation mine).

^3See above, 133-36.
kings as royal rulers, but at the same time the commanders of their respective armies, i.e., šarîm. This could be considered true of the kings of Persia and Greece. Both Cyrus\(^1\) and Alexander\(^2\) were kings of their respective nations, and, as army commanders, they were also šarîm. The author of Daniel could conceivably have referred to them in that function.

5. There are other examples of the direct influence of supernatural beings upon pagan kings.\(^3\) One recalls the salutary effect upon Nebuchadnezzar of the appearance of one "like a son of the gods"\(^4\) in Dan 3:24-30, and also the message of the "watcher" to Nebuchadnezzar in 4:13ff.\(^5\)

6. There are some theological difficulties with the angelic interpretation. The idea that Persia and Greece had patron angels has

---


\(^3\)Contrary to Walvoord, 246. "the idea of an angel's conflict with a human king seems very inappropriate."

\(^4\)The KJV translation, "Son of God" is not supported by the Aramaic original, יֵלֵֽהָּֽו-נַ֫ו (bar-elahîn). The Aramaic plural for God, elâhîn, is always a true plural, and is never used with a singular verb as is the Hebrew plural for God, elâhîm. The Aramaic singular for "God" is 'elah, used consistently in the Aramaic portions of Daniel (2:4b-7:28). See Prince, 81; Charles, *Daniel*, 76; Owens, 396.

\(^5\)Outside Daniel, God spoke directly in a dream to Abimelek, king of Gerar to warn him not to marry Sarah, Abraham's wife (Gen 20:3-7), and sent dreams to Pharaoh to warn him of a coming famine (Gen 41:1-8).
implications for an angelology not found elsewhere in the Old Testament. These implications are explored in the discussion of the angelic interpretation which follows shortly.

There are also some serious difficulties with the interpretation that the princes are human kings or rulers. Here is a brief listing:

1. The term Aar is never used in the OT with the meaning of "king." Every Hebrew and Aramaic reference to a king in the book of Daniel uniformly uses melek, and this includes more than one hundred references to kings of Babylon and Persia. The reference to Nicanor Seleucus as Aar (Dan 11:5)\(^2\) refers to him as a military commander, before he became a king.

2. In the context where such phrases as "prince of the kingdom of Persia," "prince of Persia," and "prince of Greece" appear, Michael is also called "prince." This suggests that "prince" (Aar) here should have the uniform meaning of a transcendent being.

### Heavenly Beings

Among those who hold that the princes of Persia and Greece are transcendent, angelic figures, there is wide diversity of interpretation. There are two basic views: (1) they are angels in the service of God\(^3\) and (2) they are rebellious, satanic spirits,

\(^1\)With the exception of Deut 32:8-9, LXX. For a discussion of some of the angelological problems, see Heidt, 55-56; also, Calvin, 252; Henry, 1100; Clarke, 606-07; Price, 267; Shea, "Prince of Persia," 234-35; cf. Pusey, 426; Siegen, 13-14, where a bizarre view of relations between angels and God is explained, based on Dan 10:13.


\(^3\)Jerome, 114; Pusey, 426; Charles, Eschatology, 243; Whitla, 94; Montgomery, Daniel, 419; Young, 226-27;
deliberately in opposition to God and Israel.¹

Angels of God

Jerome believed the prince of Persia to be an angel of God to whose charge the kingdom of Persia was committed. He appealed to Deut 32:8 (LXX), which concludes, "according to the number of the angels of God." He understood that the guardian angel of the Persians offered resistance to the angel of Dan 10 because he was acting on behalf of the province entrusted to him, and thus trying to keep the captive Jews from being released. For twenty-one days he pressed his case, enumerating the sins of the Jews as grounds for justly keeping them in captivity.² According to William Whitla, Daniel tells us that "God so cared for the heathen nations--Persian and Greece, that they had each an angel watching over their welfare."³

This has become the standard Roman Catholic view, as

¹Lowth, 1:119-121, gives both views, guardian angels of God and evil angels; Auberlen, 56-57; Benson, 3:825; Cowles, 414; Keil, 416-17; Fausset, 4:441, 454; Seiss, 269-70; Dennett, 164, 167; N. West, 161; M. M. Wilson, Prophetical Suggestions (London: Digby, Long & Co., 1909), 421-422; Gaebelein, 159; Clarence Larkin, The Book of Daniel (Philadelphia: Clarence Larkin, 1929), 224; H. N. Sargent, The Marvels of Bible Prophecy (London: Covenant Publishing Co., 1938), 182-83; Hewitt, 279-281, supports this view though he is not really comfortable with it or strongly committed to it; Heidt, 55-56; Leupold, 457-58; Tatford, 175; Philip R. Newell, Daniel, The Man Greatly Beloved and His Prophecies (Chicago: Moody Press, 1962), 165; Hall, 549; Habel, 12; Wood, 130-31; Archer, "Daniel," 126-27; Bultema, 302-03.

²Jerome, 114.

³Whitla, 94.
reflected in this explanation of Pope Gregory the Great of how holy angels of God could struggle with each other:

Not from hostility and selfishness, not with bitterness, cunning and force, but only from zeal for the honor of God and from love for mankind. The end is a victory of persuasion and the submission to the holy will of God.¹

Johann Siegen, enlarging on this explanation, commented: "The angels have not understood all of God's decisions."²

E. B. Pusey also interpreted Dan 10:13, 20 as indicating that the heathen also were objects of God's care.

The Angels of Persia and Greece were, manifestly, good angels, since they desired the welfare of their people, and they contented with Gabriel and Michael before God, each in submission to the Divine Will, desiring what seemed for the good of his people, which, since their apparent interests were diverse, seemed to be contrary.³

With the rise of modern critical scholarship, this view, in a somewhat modified form, became predominant. It is held that the doctrine of tutelary angels, presiding over the destinies of particular nations, is found in Dan 10-12.⁴ Deut 32:8-9, amended by the LXX, is presented as a confirmation of this view:⁵

When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men, he fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God.⁶

¹Siegen, 14.
²Ibid.
³Pusey, 426.
⁴Driver, Daniel, 157.
⁵Montgomery, Daniel, 419; Hartman and Di Lella, 283.
⁶The LXX reading "sons of God" is found also in a Qumran fragment in Hebrew, as well as the Syriac and Vulgate versions of the Bible (Robert G. North, "Separated Spiritual Substances in the Old
For the Lord's portion is his people,
Jacob his allotted heritage.

According to this interpretation, God appointed a guardian
angel over each of the nations of earth except Israel, which He chose
to rule directly.¹

Sir 17:17 has been referred to in this connection: "He
appointed a ruler for every nation, but Israel is the Lord's own
portion."² The use of the word "portion" in both Deut 32:8 and
this passage seems to support a dependency of Sirach upon the Deut­
eronomy passage. However, it has been questioned whether in Sirach,
"ruler" means an angelic guardian. It can easily be understood as
a human king.³

In looking for a source from which this view of national
patron angels arose, Montgomery feels that foreign influence is not to
be "alleged primarily."⁴ In addition to Deut 32:8f (LXX) and
Eccl 17:7, he sees the existence of national jêlîm, 'divinities' in
Testament," CBO 29 [1967]: 133), though not in the Samaritan Penta­
teuch or Masoretic Hebrew texts, which have "sons of Israel" (NASB).

¹Hartman and Di Lella, Daniel, 283.
²Charles, Daniel, 262.
³Van der Hart, 35. There was a tradition in pre-Saul Israel
that Israel should not have a king like the other nations, but that
God should be their king directly: Deut 33:5, "He was king in
Jeshurun"; Judg 8:23, "I will not rule over you, and my son will not
rule over you; the Lord will rule over you;" 17:6, "In those days
there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own
eyes" (see also 18:1, 19:1; 21:25); 1 Sam 8:5, "appoint for us a
king to govern us like all the nations;" 12:12, "you said to me, 'No,
but a king shall reign over us,' when the Lord your God was your
king." Since in the OT all kings are viewed as appointed by God
(Ps 75:6, 7; Dan 2:21), it is probable that it is to human rulers
that Sirach refers.

⁴Montgomery, Daniel, 419.
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Ps 82. These national divinities were assimilated into the Jewish monotheism under an imperial organization of heaven modeled after that of the Persian empire, with its semi-independent satraps. God assigned guardian angels, or princes, to the various nations, "who much after the fashion of the unwieldy Persian organization, quarrelled and fought with one another," requiring God's ultimate intervention. The term "prince" in Daniel (10:13, 21; 12:1) may be traced to Josh 5:14, where the captain (שָׁבָר) of the army of Yahweh appeared to Joshua.¹

Contributing to the development of this concept, it is felt by some, is a tendency in the later OT period to conceive of God as ruling the world through intermediaries, and also a tendency toward personifying abstract conceptions, such as the spirit of a nation, which then dwell in the heavens, ruling men's destinies.²

It has also been suggested that the national patron angels are "nothing but the old national gods of the various peoples," reduced in rank and transformed into "angels" with loss of personal identity under the absolute monotheism of Jehovah worship. They fight against each other just as their respective nations fight, and, just as their nations fought against Israel, all of them war against Michael, the prince of Israel.³ John J. Collins, to explain Dan 10:13, 21, referred to Isa 36:18-20, where Rabshakeh boasted that his god had delivered all nations into his hand. "What we see here from this

¹ Ibid.
³ Morgenstern, "Angels: In the Bible," 310; see also Driver, Daniel, 157; cf. Heaton, 222.
passage is that behind every nation stands a god, who does battle on behalf of his people. The 'princes' of Dan 10 are clearly an adaptation of this concept.\(^1\) Di Lella writes as follows:

As in former times the patron-god looked after the interests of the nation in his charge, so in orthodox monotheistic circles the guardian angel was thought to be commissioned by the one God to see to it that the affairs of state ran smoothly. If anything went wrong in the nation, then the guardian angel could be blamed for lack of wisdom or skill. In this way, God would be excused from any charge of mismanagement or neglect. To preserve the basic Israelite tenet of monotheism, guardian angels were made subject to God's supreme authority, exercising their functions either by defying the divine will (as apparently the angels of Persia and Greece have done in Daniel 10-12), or by acting explicitly as God's agents (as Gabriel did in chaps. 8 and 9 and the unnamed angel as well as Michael in chaps. 10 and 12).\(^2\)

Deut 4:19, in addition to Deut 32:8 (quoted above), has been cited as evidence in the OT of an older theology that admitted the existence of gods other than Yahweh:\(^3\)

And beware lest you lift up your eyes to heaven, and when you see the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, you be drawn away and worship them and serve them, things which the LORD your God has allotted to all the peoples under the whole heaven.

Raymond Hammer cites in support of an early Israelite belief in the existence of gods of other nations, Deut 29:26, which warns that it might be said in the future that Israel "went and served other gods and worshiped them, gods whom they had not known and whom he had not allotted to them."\(^4\)

It is questionable, however, that Deut 4:19, or any Deuteronomy passage, can be seen to indicate belief in the existence of

\(^1\) Collins, Daniel, 1, 2 Maccabees, 100-01.
\(^2\) Hartman and Di Lella, 283.
\(^3\) Ibid.; Koch, 209.
\(^4\) Hammer, 103.
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gods of other nations, as in the same chapter (Deut 4:36, 39) the existence of other gods is explicitly denied.

The idea that Deut 32:8 refers to angelic beings whom God appointed as guardian angels of all the nations except Israel (which God reserved to Himself), is greatly expanded in late Judaism. In Jub. 15:31-32, an inimical intent is attributed to God:

There are many nations and many peoples, and all are His, and over all hath He placed spirits in authority to lead them astray from Him. But over Israel He did not appoint any angel or spirit, for He alone is their ruler.

In a late T. Naph. 8:3-10:2, the tradition is related that when the nations were divided, in the days of Peleg, God appointed seventy angels to teach the seventy families of earth seventy languages.\(^1\) When the task was accomplished, God through Michael commanded the seventy nations to choose whom they would worship, and who would intercede for them in heaven. Each of the nations chose the angel who taught them their language, thus separating themselves from the Lord and accepting the rule of an angel. Only Abraham chose to worship God.\(^2\)

\(^1\)That there were 70 nations on earth besides Israel is a well-attested tradition. The 70 nations can be found in the Gen 10 "table of nations" by counting each name in the genealogy once, except the names of Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth, and Nimrod. S. R. Driver, Daniel, 157, states, "The later Jews developed the doctrine further (beyond Dan 10:13, 21; Deut 32:8; Ecclus. 17:17), teaching, for instance, that each of the 70 nations mentioned in Gen 10 had its Angel-Prince who defended its interests, and pleaded its cause with God (cf. the Targ. of Ps.-Jon. on Gen 11:7-8 and Deut 32:8; and Weber, System der Altsynag. Theol., 165f.)." See also Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, 254; where he refers to the geographical scheme of 70 nations, each one of which is guided by a Son of God. The ethnic table of Gen 10 contains the names of 70 nations, descended from the 3 sons of Noah. Seventy angels are guardians of these 70 peoples.

\(^2\)Charles, Robert Henry, "The Testaments of the Twelve"
It is apparent that in late Judaism, Deut 32:8 was widely taken to mean that God had appointed guardian angels over the nations of earth except Israel, which He reserved for Himself. As noted, the LXX reading suggests this view. Modern critical scholarship tends to agree that the LXX reading is more likely the original.\(^1\)

However, there are reasons for doubting this and for taking the Massoretic Hebrew text (MT) to be the original, preferred reading. The Samaritan Pentateuch, which probably pre-dates the LXX,\(^2\) agrees with the MT, a not insignificant witness to the antiquity of its reading. True, fragments of Hebrew text representing various OT books existed at Qumran which agree with the reading of the LXX, against the MT,\(^3\) but this Hebrew textual version is not attested earlier than the second century B.C., and could be explained as having been influenced by the interpretation of Danielic angelology emerging in apocalyptic Judaism during that period.\(^4\)

Also, the expression "sons of God" appears to be used in the OT to refer to angels\(^5\) in general, not to a special class of Patriarchs,\(^\) APOT, 2:363; cf. Targ. Jerus. to Gen 17:7-8, cited in Leuken, 14.

\(^1\)Gerald Cooke, "The Sons of the (the) God(s)," ZAW 76 (1964): 32.


\(^4\)R. D. Wilson, 68.

\(^5\)The expression "sons of God" appears only seven times in five
heavenly beings.¹ But in the OT the angels of God are presented as more than seventy in number (the number of nations in Gen 10). Note Deut 33:2, "The LORD came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon us; he shone forth from Mount Paran, he came from the ten thousands of holy ones."² It seems highly unlikely that a Bible passage would speak of "sons of God," meaning angels, as limited to seventy in number.

It has been argued that the expression, "sons of God," in accord with regular Hebrew usage, means "beings of the god-class," "members of the pantheon,"³ that is, gods. Deut 32:8 (LXX) would then be seen to say that Jehovah, the supreme God, appointed gods over the various nations of earth, while He chose to be God directly over Israel. Use of the expression "sons of god" to mean polytheistic gods in Ugaritic literature has been appealed to as contexts (Gen 6:1, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Ps 29:1; 89:6) in the OT (MT). Though context must be consulted in determining the meaning in each occurrence, it is evident that in at least two (Job 38:7; Ps 89:6) or possibly three (Job 1:6; 2:1) contexts, it refers to heavenly, angelic beings. The occurrence in Ps 29:1 likely also means heavenly beings, though this is not completely evident from the context.

¹There is a series of synonymous parallels in Ps 89:5-7, which seem to indicate that "the heavens," "the assembly of the holy ones," those "in the skies," "sons of God," "the council of the holy ones," and "all that are round about him" are various synonyms, all referring to angels of God.

²See also 2 Kgs 6:16-17, "those who are with us are more than those who are with them"; Ps 68:17, "With mighty chariotry, twice ten thousand, thousands upon thousands, the Lord came from Sinai into the holy place"; Dan 7:10, "a thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him." They are metaphorically referred to as "stars" (Judg 5:20; Job 38:7), which, in the Scriptures, are innumerable (Gen 15:5; 22:17; 26:4).³T. H. Gaster, "Sons of God," TDB (1962), 4:426.
evidence that it is used that way vestigially in the OT. 1

It is true that "son of" something can mean, in Hebrew idiom, one of a particular class. 2 But it can also mean subordination in terms of a father-son metaphor. Israel is referred to as God's "son" (Exod 4:22-23) and "sons" (Hos 1:10). The "sons of the prophets" were not necessarily prophets, but disciples and students of the prophets Elijah and Elisha (2 Kgs 2:3-5; 4:1, 38-41; 6:1-7). 3 Likewise, the angelic "sons of God" can be seen not as gods, but to pertain to God and be subordinate to God. 4

The reading of Deut 32:8, "according to the number of the sons

1Ibid.; Lowell K. Handy, "Dissenting Deities or Obedient Angels: Divine Hierarchies in Ugarit and the Bible," BR 35 (1990): 24-30, points out that at Ugarit, the lowest stratum of deities was totally subordinate to El, and functioned in a manner similar to Biblical angels. The other two strata of Ugaritic gods, the major, dissenting deities and craft gods, find no functional equivalent in the Bible. See also Cooke, 46, "Members of the heavenly company remain essentially characterless functionaries."

2Just as "son of man" means "man" (Ps 8:4) and a "son of a murderer" (ASV) means, a "murderer" (RSV) (2 Kgs 6:32), and the "sons of Jericho" (RSV) means "The residents of Jericho" (Ezra 2:3-35).

3Adam Clarke, "The Second Book of the Kings," The Holy Bible, with A Commentary and Critical Notes (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1928), 2:490; "2 Kings," SDABC (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1954), 2:850-851; a prophet is generally called by the title "prophet," as "Elijah the prophet" (1 Kgs 18:36), or "a company of prophets" (1 Sam 10:5). Gerald Cooke noted that "son of____" can carry a connotation of subordination as well as the primary means of classification. The sons of the prophets of the Elisha cycle associate themselves with and do obeisance to Elisha after the mantle and spirit of Elijah have fallen on him (2 Kgs 2:15). The sons of the prophets were associated with a leading prophet in a way that suggests subordination in terms of a limited metaphorical fatherhood (see Cooke, 24). For the view that the "sons of the prophets" were members of a prophetic guild or order, see B. D. Napier, "Sons of Prophets," IDB (1962), 4:426.

4Cooke, 24.
of Israel" is not at all "incongruous." From Exod 1:5 we learn that "all the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons." The full genealogical list is in Gen 46:8-27, and concludes, "All the persons of the house of Jacob, that came into Egypt, were seventy." It was significant enough for the writer of Deut 32:8 to make mention that the number of nations was the same as the number of the offspring of Jacob. This is an intelligible and adequate explanation for the MT reading of this passage. There is a relationship between Deut 32:8-9 and Num 23:9, where it is emphasized that Israel "shall not be reckoned among the nations," perhaps meaning it did not appear in the table of nations of Gen 10. In spite of this, "the LORD'S portion is his people, Jacob his allotted heritage" (Deut 32:9).

Also, there is a theological difficulty in the view of seeing holy angels of God contending with each other, and, even temporarily, resisting the divine will until God intervenes directly.

The Biblical picture of angels is that they are totally loyal, faceless agents of God, fully informed and prompt to do His will. Ps 103:20-21 presents this view:

Bless the LORD, O you his angels, you mighty ones who do his word, hearkening to the voice of his word!

---

1 As claimed by Gaster, "Sons of God," 426.

2 The number 70 is one of the significant numbers of the Bible. Moses took 70 elders to worship in God's presence (Exod 24:1, 9-11), and appointed 70 elders to receive a portion of God's Spirit (Num 11:16, 24-25); the Exile was to last 70 years (Jer 25:11-12), and 70 weeks were allotted to Israel (Dan 9:24).

3 The occurrence of the name "Israel" in Deut 32:8 and "Jacob" in vs. 9 serves to link vs. 8 and 9 together. Perhaps the writer's intent was to indicate that although Israel was not reckoned among the nations, nevertheless there was a 70 in Israel, which, in a way, balances the 70 of the nations.
Bless the LORD, all his hosts,
his ministers that do his will!

Such a one would not resist a special angelic envoy of God for three weeks, necessitating the dispatching an envoy of even higher authority before finally yielding, presumably grudgingly and unwillingly. The celestial communication system is not so cumbersome that it would take that long and require that much activity to convince the appointed guardian of Persia of what God’s will is. It seems improbable that an angel of God could misunderstand God’s will for Israel for more than a few moments, if God wishes him to know. A logical assessment is that these princes were not in God’s employ, but were demonic, hostile spirits.

Also, the idea of loyal angels struggling with each other is difficult to find in the Bible. Hartman and Di Lella see only traces of heavenly battles between angelic beings in Ps 82 and Isa 24:21. The tradition, he feels, "achieves clear expression only in the book of Daniel and in later apocalyptic literature." Usually, he reports, the OT portrays Yahweh and His heavenly host fighting against human enemies on earth.

It would appear that the view that the princes of Persia and Greece are heavenly beings appointed by God as guardian angels of the nations is not as soundly based as its wide support would suggest. It remains somewhat tentative and speculative.

---

1The prophet Elisha revealed to the king of Israel the secret military plans of his foe, the king of Syria (2 Kgs 6:8-12). In Dan 9, Gabriel was dispatched from heaven after the prophet’s prayer began and arrived with a message before the brief prayer concluded (Dan 9:23).

2Hartman and Di Lella, 283.
Angels in rebellion against God

A second major view understands the princes of Persia and Greece to be satanic spirits in opposition to God; rebellious angels, consciously and deliberately attempting to frustrate the divine will.\(^1\) What makes this view attractive is the theological difficulty in the alternate view of seeing holy angels of God contending with each other, and, even temporarily, resisting the divine will until God intervenes directly.

R. H. Charles feels there must be a judgment of angels supposed in the book of Daniel, because of "the angelic patrons of Persia and Greece, who were hostile to Israel."\(^2\)

George A. Barton understands that the heathen deities whose worshipers had been hostile to Israel were reduced to the rank of demons.\(^3\)

Alfred Bertholet holds that the prince of Persia is the deposed Persian god, and that from such deposed heathen gods have come demons. However, he feels that the author of Daniel did not reduce the Persian god that far. The reason is, he feels, that Jews in general did not judge the Persian religious world to be unfriendly, and indeed were much influenced by it.\(^4\)

Carl A. Auberlen sees the princes of Persia and Greece as "individual angels standing at the head of individual kingdoms of the

\(^1\)See 221, note 5.

\(^2\)Charles, *Eschatology*, 243

\(^3\)Barton, "Demons and Spirits," 597.

\(^4\)Bertholet, 34-35.
world," "spirits of the world," who were opposed by Michael and the unnamed angel of Dan 10. They struggled with and finally subdued him to gain superiority over the Persian king.¹

C. F. Keil sees the prince of Persia as the daimonion of the Persian kingdom, i.e., the supernatural spirit power standing behind the national gods, which we properly call the guardian spirit of this kingdom. The šar of the kingdom of Persia stood beside the kings of the Persians to influence them against Israel, and to direct against Israel the power lying in Persian heathendom.²

"To dislodge this 'prince' from his position and deprive him of his influence" was, in Keil's view, the task of the angel of Dan 10 and of Michael.³ Thereafter, "Michael stood in his place beside the kings of Persia, so as henceforth to influence them in favor of Israel."⁴ Thus, Daniel speaks of "a war in the kingdom of supernatural spirits."⁵

William G. Heidt suggests another approach. He feels that instead of reading šar, we should read šēd (demon).⁶ The writing of the ancient Hebrew sibilant used in each is the same, and the

¹Auberlen, 56-57.
²Keil, Daniel, 416.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid., 417.
⁵Keil, Daniel, 417; see also Leupold, 457, who feels that the prince of Persia is an angel-'prince,' but not a guardian angel, as a guardian angel must be good; this angel is opposing God's angel, so cannot be good. Demons are "without a doubt, referred to here."; Tatford, 175. Culver, 170-71, declared, "It is in complete harmony with Scripture to suppose the princes of Persia and Greece who opposed Gabriel were the devil's own angels."
⁶šēd is used twice in the OT (Deut 32:17; Ps 106:37) as that to which the heathen sacrifice. In 1 Cor 10:20 Paul clearly refers to these passages, when saying that pagans sacrifice to demons.
Hebrew letters for "r" (חי) and "d" (דבר) are easily confused because of their orthographic similarity. Therefore, the אדרים are שדים. There is no textual or ancient version support for this twofold emendation of the text, however, and the argument is of doubtful validity. The infrequency of the use of שד in the OT and the lack of usage in the book of Daniel together with the ancient versions supporting MT, and the use of מַר for Michael in the context, argues for retaining the MT reading, מַר.

Archer states frankly that he sees the prince of Persia as "apparently the satanic agent assigned to the sponsorship and control of the Persian realm." He is "the demon assigned to Persia by the prince of hell." Archer speaks of "contests of strength between the warriors of heaven and the warriors of hell."2

The view of Norman Habel is very similar, but he adds that the references to princes of Persia and Greece implied that "each nation had its heavenly prince (Dan 10:13). Satan and his cohorts were rampant everywhere."3 Thus he sees a patron angel assigned by Satan to each nation to resist the will of God.

L. J. Wood presents a variant view. He holds that the princes of Greece and Persia were demons, appointed by Satan, but it was only a special assignment, not a permanent assignment, as malevolent patron angels of those respective countries. The assignment of a demon to a pagan nation would be made at the time that God's people came under the rule of that particular nation. The purpose would be

1Heidt, 56.
2Archer, "Daniel," 113, 126.
3Habel, 12. See also Phillips and Vines, 162.
the same, namely, to hinder God's work and program with His people during the supremacy of that particular nation.¹

In general, it appears that this last view is the most defensible; that the princes of Persia and Greece are demonic spirits, and that there is insufficient evidence to state that there is a permanent assignment of a demonic spirit to each nation.

Ps 82

Before this can be enlarged upon, however, it seems necessary to deal with the implications of Ps 82, which has been frequently appealed to, along with other passages, to explain the origin of the view that God has appointed patron deities or angels to all the nations, with the implication that Dan 10 harmonizes with that view.²

Ps 82 does present a vexing puzzle for interpretation. On the surface, it appears to reflect a polytheistic concept. It begins (vs. 1, ASV):

God standeth in the congregation of God; He judgeth among the gods.

After presenting a rebuke for unjust judgment, the Psalm continues (vss. 6-7):

I said, Ye are gods, And all of you sons of the Most High. Nevertheless ye shall die like men, And fall like one of the princes.

¹Wood, 130-31.

Human authorities. There are two prevailing interpretations of Ps 82. One is that it is a message of reproof to human authorities.¹ The Psalm has traditionally been interpreted as being a message of reproof to the unfaithful human judges of Israel.² Vss. 2-4 tend to support this view, as it is juridical iniquity that is condemned, and ordinarily this would involve human beings;³ it is difficult to see how this rebuke and exhortation could apply to celestial beings.⁴

In this view, "congregation of God" is equivalent to


²Delitzsch, Psalms, 2:401; Clarke, "Psalms," 479; Moll, 455. This view is reflected in the KJV, where "congregation of god" is translated "congregation of the mighty," and in the NASB, where "among the gods" is rendered, "in the midst of the rulers."

³McCullough and Taylor, 443.

⁴Julian Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," HUCA 14 (1943): 31. Morgenstern’s solution to this problem (115-16) was to presume that Orthodox Jews of the late third century B.C. inserted vss. 2-4, the most heinous crimes conceivable for that day, in place of an original divine berating of the sons of god for the sin, recorded in Gen 6:1-4, of taking the daughters of men for wives, and bearing sons to them. The original which he thought was removed to make room for the current vss. 2-4, was presumably too troubling for the Jews of the later date. This solution of Morgenstern, fascinating and ingenious as it is, besides being too speculative to be taken as serious exegesis, is inaccurate in characterizing the Jewish attitude of that period toward the sin of angels marrying humans. It was, in fact, greatly expanded in Jewish pseudepigraphal works such as 1.Enoch and Jubilees. One might ask, if scribes were to make changes, why did they not also modify vss. 1 and 6 to remove the suggestion of polytheism, conceivably more troubling than the idea of angelic beings taking human wives.
"congregation of Yahweh" (Num 16:3; Deut 23:1-3; Josh 22:17), that is, the assembled people of Israel, perhaps as they assemble in the courts of justice which He has established. The judges are called "gods" and "sons of the Most High" in that, as God's representatives, they are clothed with God's power and authority to dispense judgment and justice. The practice of the KJV of translating 'elohim as "judges" in Exod 21:6; 22:8, 9, and the parallelism of Exod 22:28, are cited as examples to justify that meaning here. Also, the mortality (vs. 7) of the "gods" of this Psalm is thought to show that the reference is to humans.  

A big difficulty on this interpretation, however, is that it does not seem adequately to explain vss 6-7. The statement, "You are gods . . . Nevertheless you will die like men," makes less sense if those addressed are men already. Also, in the Exodus passages in which 'elohim is translated "judges," the word is more correctly translated "God," as the party was brought before God at the tabernacle and God handed down His decisions through His officiating human representative.

---

1 Clarke, "Psalms," 179.
2 Delitzsch, Psalms, 401; Briggs, 215, agrees the "gods" are human, but not wicked rulers in Israel. According to him, they are the wicked governors of the nations holding Israel in subjection, and are called gods, because, as rulers and judges, they reflect the divine majesty of law and order in government. Moll, 445, rejects this view, as "foreign princes are never designated 'sons of God' in the Old Testament."


4 McCullough and Taylor, 443-44.

5 Cole, 166.
Heavenly beings. The view that the "gods" are human authorities is becoming increasingly supplanted by the view that Ps 82 has a celestial setting, and that it is transcendent beings who are being judged by God. The dominant view is that this Psalm reflects an earlier period in the development of Israel's religion in which the existence of pagan gods of other nations was accepted. All the gods of the nations met together in a divine council, an "assembly of *El." However, Yahweh was king of all the gods, and in this Psalm, was passing judgment on the pagan deities for their "moral obtuseness," which is responsible for the cosmic disorder. In consequence, they lose immortality and are ejected from heaven. The Psalm is seen to assert the power of the God of Israel over the other gods. Sentence is passed on them (vss. 6-7) because, in not protecting the weak from the strong (vss. 2-5), they have forfeited the right to be gods. Dahood calls the Psalm "a prophetic liturgy of the Lord's judgment on pagan gods."^1

It is held that this view is borne out by various references in the OT to a heavenly council or gathering over which Yahweh presides (Pss 29:1; 58:1; 103:20-21; 148:2; 1 Kgs 22:19-22; Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6; Dan 7:9-10; 10:13, 20-21). This divine council is said to have parallels in other ancient Near East literature. ^2

E. T. Mullen points to what he considers parallels to the

---

^1Dahood, Psalms, 268.
^2Rogerson and McKay, 164.
^3Dahood, Psalms, 268.
^4Ackerman, 271-72; McCullough and Taylor, ibid., 442-43.
heavenly council in Ugaritic mythological tales. In Ugaritic literature, the god El is depicted as the exalted king over the pantheon.\(^1\) Also, he points to some terms for "assembly" or "council" common to both Ugaritic and OT literature.\(^2\) In general, however, it can be said that the evidence from terminology for a literary relationship between the council of the gods in Ugarit and the Old Testament is not strong.\(^3\) Nevertheless, conceptual similarities appear to exist.

It is of interest that in the Ugaritic texts, the members of the council on El’s mountain play no active role. There is no interaction between them. Their identities remain obscure. They remain unnamed, and have little or no function in the assembly.

\(^1\)Mullen, 28. The gods of the divine assembly are commonly called banu ilil(-mi) "the sons of El," or, banu qudsi, "the sons of Qudsu." This is compared to benê lelim (Ps 29:1; 89:7); benê telohim (Deut 32:8 LXX); benê haqelohim (Gen 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1), all meaning, "sons of God;" and benê helyon (Ps 82:6), meaning "sons of the Most High" (119).

\(^2\)Some terms for "assembly" or "council" common to both Ugaritic and OT literature: iddat (Ps 82:1) (Ugar. idt CTA 15.11.7, 11), mōsted (Isa 14:13) (Ugar. mō’idu CTA 2.1) and perhaps dōr (Amos 8:14), (Ugar. dr). In Amos 8:14, instead of derek ("way," he reads doreka ("your pantheon"), "which is parallel with elohēka 'your gods,' giving perfect parallelism to the verse and requiring no emendation of the consonantal text" (118n.). See also Pss 14:5; 49:20; 73:15; 86:11; 112:2; Jer 2:37. For further study see F. J. Neuberg, "An Unrecognized Meaning of Hebrew Dōr," JNES 9 (1950): 215-217; P. R. Ackroyd, "The Meaning of Hebrew Dōr Considered," JSS 13 (1968): 5-8.

\(^3\)Dr ilidr bn ilil is the most common designation of the assembly of El in the Ugaritic texts. However, its use is uncertain in the OT (see preceding note). And the term qahal, common in the Old Testament for the congregation of Israel, and used for "heavenly council" in Ps 89:5, is lacking at Ugarit, as is sōd, used for the heavenly council in Ps 89:8; Jer 23:18; Job 15:8. Also the term pḥr, the common designation for the council of the gods in Canaanite and Akkadian texts, is lacking in Hebrew (Mullen, 118-19). The expression "the mount of El" (CTA 4.II.36) is equivalent to Ezek 28:14, "the holy mount of God" (Mullen, 128).
proceedings. The assembly of El does not appear to include as members the prominent, named Ugaritic gods, such as Baal, Yam, and Mot. The assembly of El is clearly not presented as an assembly of the gods of the nations. The faceless gods/sons of god are lesser divinities, analogous perhaps to the angels of the Old Testament.

Though the texts from Ugarit do indicate that the concept of a heavenly assembly of God was not limited to Israel in Old Testament times, negative support is found in the Canaanite parallels for the interpretation that Ps 82 is depicting a council of the pagan deities of the various nations.

Various statements in the OT asserting Yahweh's supremacy over all gods have been thought to show that the existence of other gods was accepted in early stages of Israel's religious development. For example (ASV):

For Jehovah is a great God, And a great King above all gods. Ps 95:3.

For great is Jehovah, and greatly to be praised: He is to be feared above all gods. Ps 96:4.

Worship Him, all ye gods. Ps 97:7.

For thou, Jehovah, art most high above all the earth: Thou art exalted far above all gods. Ps 97:9.

---

1 Mullen, 177-78.

2 See Ugaritic document CTA 2.1, lines 20-37; Mullen, 123-24; Goldingay, 291.

3 Against Ackerman, 301, "It was commonly held in the ancient Near East that the various major gods possess 'inheritances' which had been allotted them by the ruler of the divine assembly." It is questionable that such a view was held anywhere in the ancient Near East. Each nation had its gods, and, to a certain extent, recognized the gods of other nations. But there is little evidence that an overall divine assembly is understood to have allotted them.

4 McCullough and Taylor, 443.
Oh give thanks unto the God of gods. Ps 136:2.

Such statements as these, however, do not necessarily concede the existence of the gods of the other nations. Side by side with some such statements, their power or existence is explicitly denied. For example, in Ps 96:5 (the verse following Ps 96:4 quoted above) the Psalmist declares: "For all the gods of the peoples are idols." The word translated "idols" here is יֶלַיִלְו (yelilow), plural of יֵלַי (yeli), meaning "worthless" (Job 13:4; Jer 14:14), and used mainly to speak contemptuously of pagan gods as nonentities (Lev 19:4).²

Ps 86:8, "There is none like thee among the gods, O Lord, nor are there any works like thine" is followed shortly by vs. 10: "For thou are great and doest wondrous things, thou alone art God."

It is highly unlikely that a psalmist in Israel would say of the pagan gods, "I say, 'You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you'" (Ps 82:6).³

---


²Further, Deut 3:24, "what god is there in heaven or on earth who can do such works and mighty acts as thine?" and 4:19, "And beware lest you lift up your eyes to heaven, and when you see the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, you be drawn away and worship them and serve them, things which the LORD your God has allotted to all the peoples under the whole heaven" are in the same context as 4:39, "know therefore this day, and lay it to your heart, that the LORD is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other." See also Deut 4:34-35, which, in the same passage, may be thought to recognize yet denies other gods: "Or has any god ever attempted to go and take a nation for himself from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, by wonders, and by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the LORD your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? To you it was shown, that you might know that the LORD is God; there is no other beside him."

³Derek Kidner, *Psalms 73-150*, Tyndale Old Testament
Another approach to interpreting Ps 82 is to regard the "gods" and "sons of the Most High" not as foreign deities or even as foreign deities which have been demoted to the status of angels under the pressure of developing monotheism, but as heavenly, angelic beings belonging to God's heavenly assembly from the earliest traditions.

The picture of the "Assembly of El" in the Ugaritic documents would seem, as suggested above, to support such an interpretation. In this view, the term "gods" and "sons of God," along with "Watchers" (Dan 4:10, 14), "Holy Ones" (Job 15:15; Dan 4:10, 14), "God's host" (Gen 32:2; Ps 103:21), etc., are terms which properly designate angels. Attention has already been called to Ps 89:5-7, where...
"heavens," "assembly of the holy ones," "who in the skies," "sons of God," "council of the holy ones," and "all that are round about him" are synonymous parallels, all referring to angels. 

Ps 8:5, "thou hast made him little less than God" ("angels" LXX); Ps 58:1, "Do you indeed decree what is right, you gods?"; Ps 97:7, "all gods bow down before him," may be other examples of angelic beings referred to as "gods."

Looking carefully at Ps 82, it is clear that God is not pictured as merely the first among equals. He is in supreme command, with the inherent power to pass judgment on the gods, and to strip them of their immortality. He has irresistible sovereignty over the gods. There appears a clear distinction between the essential nature of God and that of the gods. The gods are gods in a lesser, accommodated sense, analogous to the status of angels.

Another factor evident in Ps 82 is that the "gods" addressed there are out of favor with God. Their moral failures were so severe

---

1 von Rad, 78, commenting on "sons of God" as used in Job 1:6; 2:1, held they "may be described at once as malākim even though they are called benē ha'elōhim which roughly means heavenly beings."

2 See Ahlström, Psalm 89, 59, who regards the heavenly beings as satellite-gods surrounding the God of heaven. Yahweh is a great king over all the gods (Ps 95:3), and the highest God in a pantheon of gods. They are a royal household who attend the God of heaven. He does not refer to them as foreign gods. See also Heidt, 6.

3 Van der Hart, 24; see also Heidt, 2-4, who favors "God," but allows that "angel" "remains a possible translation."

4 As was, for example, Marduk among the Babylonian gods in Enuma Elish, Alexander Heidel, ed., The Babylonian Genesis, 2d ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), Tablet 4, lines 1-29. For the view that Yahweh was one of the sons of God, see De Boer, 188-89.

that they have come under God's judgment and are to receive the sentence of death. This factor has led to the view that Ps 82:6-7 refers to the degradation of the angels.\(^1\) The "princes" mentioned in Ps 82:7 are construed to mean fallen gods or angels.\(^2\)

Isa 24:21-22 is cited as a parallel, where it is said that "the high ones on high, i.e. fallen angels," are gathered together as prisoners in the pit before they are finally condemned and executed.\(^3\) Kidner defends this view as one that seems truer than the view that the "gods" are human judges. He holds that "these 'gods' are 'principalities and powers,' 'the world rulers of this present darkness' (cf. Eph 6:12)." He also refers to Dan 10:13, 20f. and Isa 24:21 as other examples of OT references to fallen angels. He rejects the view that Ps 82 is a relic of polytheism, the gods of the heathen not yet denied, but domesticated and brought to account. "The Old Testament never wavers in its abhorrence of heathen gods."\(^4\)

The view that the "gods" of Ps 82 and the "princes" of Dan 10:13, 21 are fallen heavenly beings brings to mind parallel themes or motifs which belong to the broader category of the supernatural adversary of God in the OT. This is developed in at least three


\(^2\)Ackerman, 402-10; José M. Bertoluci, "The Son of the Morning and the Guardian Cherub in the Context of the Controversy between Good and Evil" (Th.D. diss., Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1985), 104-05, sees Ps 82 as offering parallel elements to Isa 14:12-15: membership in the divine council, expulsion and death.

\(^3\)Takahashi, 348.

\(^4\)Kidner, 296-97.
other motifs: (1) the serpentine foe, (2) Lucifer, and (3) Satan. One is the motif of a transcendent, serpentine adversary over whom God triumphed in a primeval battle. This adversary appears under the name of Rahab\(^1\) or Leviathan.\(^2\) These references are parallel to accounts in Babylonian\(^3\) and Ugaritic\(^4\) myths of a primeval battle between their god and a threatening adversary. It is possible that these accounts all may be traceable to an earlier, common Semitic tradition of a primal contest between a divine figure and a formidable adversary.\(^5\) Also perhaps belonging to this motif is the idea of a supernatural being hostile to God in Gen 3, where there is a hint of the demonic character of the serpent.\(^6\)

\(^1\)Job 9:13 (RSV), "beneath him bowed the helpers of Rahab"; 26:12-13 (RSV); Ps 89:10; Isa 51:9.

\(^2\)Ps 74:14, "Thou didst crush the heads of Leviathan"; Isa 27:1.

\(^3\)Enuma Elish, Tablet 4, lines 57-122, Heidel, 39-42, 88. In Babylonian myth, the god Marduk overcame the personified ocean Tiamat in a titanic struggle, a victory which confirmed him as king of the gods.

\(^4\)D. Winton Thomas, ed., "The Baal Myths," in Documents from Old Testament Times (New York: Harper & Row, Pub., 1958), 130, 132. In Ugaritic tablets, Baal slays "Lotan, the Primeval Serpent, Didst make an end of the Crooked Serpent, the foul-fanged with Seven Heads." The literary similarity between this Ugaritic passage and Isa 27:1 is so striking that there is little doubt that the Bible writer drew from the earlier (Ibid., 118) Baal tradition to express his prophecy of God's eschatological victory over his ancient serpentine adversary. The mention of the "seven heads" in the Baal myth recalls the Ps 74:14 report that God "didst crush the heads" of Leviathan, and the seven heads of the dragon and of the beast of Rev. 12 & 13. The dragon of Rev. 12 is identified with Satan (vs. 9), the supernatural arch-foe of God. The tradition of a seven-headed dragon is also widespread in the earliest ancient Sumerian and Babylonian traditions (Heidel, 107-108).

\(^5\)Heidel, 139. This is not Heidel's view, but he allows it as a possibility.

\(^6\)Eichrodt, 2:207.
Another adversary motif is the figure of the fallen Lucifer, "Day Star, son of Dawn," who sought to exalt himself to equality with the Most High but was cast down to Sheol (Isa 14:12-19). The story found in Ezek 28:12-19 is very similar, with its testimony to the pride of the "covering cherub," his being cast out of the "mountain of God," and his ultimate destruction. These two stories are thought to be variants of the same ancient tradition.

There is, in addition, the figure of Satan, found in Job 1:6-12, 21, 22; 2:1-9; and Zech 3:1-4 as "the adversary," a

---

1 This story is thought to be a much earlier story of a rebel celestial figure incorporated into the book of Isaiah. See Robert B. Y. Scott, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39, Introduction and Exegesis," IB (1956), 5:262.

2 Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," 111; Ezek. 28.11-28 likewise refers to this myth in the picture of the divine being to whom the king of Tyre is likened, here called specifically the cherub, who dwelt in Eden, the garden of Elohim, upon the holy mountain of Elohim, who was at first perfect in his service of the Deity until one day iniquity manifested itself in him and his heart became proud and he conceived a foolish thought, so that the deity was compelled to expel him from the mountain of Elohim and cast him down to earth." It is grammatically possible to translate the Hebrew construction vəqəl of vs. 14 either as the direct object sign, "Thou wast the anointed cherub that covereth, and I have set thee" (ASV) or as the word "with," "With an anointed guardian cherub I placed you" (RSV). The latter, however, regards the passage as a variant account of the fall of man from the Garden of Eden, difficult to harmonize with vss. 17-19, where he receives an extraordinary punishment, more appropriate for a rebel angel prince than fallen man, and quite similar to the fate of Lucifer in Isa 14:15. Also, his qualities of wisdom and beauty, his sin of pride, and his description under the symbol of the iniquitous king of Tyre argue against his being seen as the first man, Adam.

3 Morgenstern, "The Mythical Background of Psalm 82," 111; Bertolucci, 145, 302.

4 1 Chr 21:1 does not have the article, and may be read "an adversary," and thus may possibly not be identifiable with the figure of Satan.
supernatural figure bringing accusation and suffering upon God's people.¹

The motifs of Satan and of the serpent are brought together in Rev 12:7-9 as the arch-foe of God, along with Michael as the leader of the angels of God contending victoriously against the serpent Satan and his rebel angels, casting them to earth. Julian Morgenstern holds that in the account in Ps 82, the stories in Isa 14 and Ezek 28, the Satan motif in Job and Zechariah, and the warfare in Rev 12:7-9, we have to do with variants of only one "myth," which "must have been current in Judaism for a very long period."²

In reviewing the various interpretations of Ps 82, it seems

¹The view that Satan in Job is an angel of God entrusted with the task of Public Prosecutor (Eichrodt, 2:205-06; see also De Boer, 188-89) is difficult to support. In Job, Satan is not depicted as a messenger of Yahweh who roams about the world, taking note of the sins and crimes of men, which he then reports to Yahweh (so Morgenstern, "The Mythical Background of Psalm 82," 41-42 [13-14]). Rather, he brings false, malicious accusations against innocent Job, then directly, "without cause" (Job 2:3) brings about the destruction of his wealth and the death of his children and inflicts unbearable misery upon Job himself. Morgenstern, "The Mythical Background of Psalm 82," 42, while holding that Satan in Job "is not yet a malevolent divine power, actually hostile to the Deity Himself," nevertheless states, "He is not yet the actual counterpart in Judaism of the Zoroastrian Ahriman; but he is clearly well on his way to becoming such." In Zechariah, Satan was rebuked by Yahweh for standing by to accuse Joshua, to whom God was extending grace. In both cases, Satan seems to be working at cross purposes with God, hardly functioning as a holy angel. Indeed, Satan is not pictured in Job as one of the "sons of God," but appears among them as an intruder; and God's question to him, "Whence have you come?" appears to be a challenge, as if saying, "What right have you in this council?" When Satan replied he had come from the earth, God mentioned the righteousness of Job, as though Job might more justifiably than Satan represent earth in the council.

²Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," 109-111. He does not, however, discuss the OT serpent motif in his article. There do not appear to be direct links in the OT between the "fallen heavenly being" motif and the serpent motif. However the parallel concept of a supernatural adversary of God suggests that these are variant expressions of a single primal tradition.
that the soundest is that it has a celestial setting, and the "gods" and "sons of the Most High" refer to transcendent figures, mighty angels of God who have rebelled against Him and are being brought into judgment for their misdeeds and their consequent unfitness to continue as intermediaries between God and man.¹

Likewise, the princes of Persia and Greece mentioned in Dan 10 are perhaps best to be seen as fallen heavenly beings, working with a common purpose to frustrate the divine will and to obstruct God's plans to favor Israel. To see them as semi-autonomous patron angels of the various nations is to go beyond the evidence, and to read the speculations of pseudepigraphal works into the book of Daniel remains questionable. The titles "prince of Persia," and "prince of Greece" do not necessarily presuppose that each nation is seen to have an assigned prince.² All that can be said from the evidence is that these two nations, Persia and Greece, each had a satanic prince assigned to them as they encountered God's people Israel, to move these nations against them to persecute them and destroy their faith.³ It is true that the book of Daniel does not speak explicitly of Satan or fallen angels,⁴ but the picture of these princes fits in with the broader OT recognition of supernatural adversaries to God as noted above. They need not be seen as a "preliminary stage

¹Ackerman, 491; Goldingay, Daniel, 292; Bertoluci, 141-142.
²As in Collins, Daniel, 1. 2 Maccabees, 100.
⁴Koch, 208.
toward," but as further evidence of the idea of fallen angels in the OT.

To answer the question of how satanic angels could be called "sons of the Most High" (Ps 82:6), one need only recall Isa 14 and Ezek 28, where the prince of evil is described as an angel that was cast down because of his pride and self-exaltation. In the picture of Yahweh found in the Bible, nothing has an origin apart from Him. This is well expressed by Paul in the New Testament, where "we" are said to contend against principalities, powers, etc. (Eph 6:12), yet we are informed that all things, including all principalities and powers, were created by and for Jesus Christ (Col 1:16).

There is an argument, noted above, that since Michael came to help Gabriel against the "prince of the Kingdom of Persia," when Gabriel left him behind, Michael should be understood to have remained with the "prince of the Kingdom of Persia," not with someone else. Therefore, the argument runs, whether one holds the prince to be either a heavenly or an earthly being, the "prince of the Kingdom of Persia" should be identified with the "king of Persia," or as one of the "kings of Persia." This argument may be answered as

---

1 Bertoluci, 101-104, 145.

2 Koch, 208, writes, "Indeed a whole series of questions remain open here. The book of Daniel knows as yet no Satan and no fallen angel. Are the national princes a preliminary stage toward that?" (my translation).

3 See above, 207.

4 Driver, Daniel, 159.

5 Shea, "Prince of Persia," 240-241; cf. Mertens, 102, the prince of the kingdom of Persia (Dan 10:13) "according to the uncorrected reading of the Masoretic text--is identified with the king of Persia."
follows: If the prince of Persia is viewed as a heavenly being, the focus of his efforts is nevertheless the earthly king(s) of Persia. Therefore, when Gabriel and/or Michael are contending with the heavenly prince of the kingdom of Persia, they would do so at the place where the king(s) or Persia is (are) located. To be withstood by the prince of Persia, Gabriel needed also to be with the king(s) of Persia.

Another issue in identifying the princes as fallen heavenly beings is that elsewhere in the book of Daniel the term "prince" is used to designate angelic beings only on God's side, never for fallen angels, demons, or Satan.¹ Though this is true, this issue may not be as significant as it might first appear, as the three references to the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20) would be the only Danielic reference of any kind to supernatural foes of God.² Moreover, besides these three references, the Hebrew term for "prince" is applied to only two other transcendent figures in the book of Daniel, the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes (Dan 8:11, 25) and Michael (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1). Outside the book of Daniel it is again applied only to two other transcendent figures, the "prince of the host of Jehovah" (ASV) who appeared to Joshua by the Jordan River (Josh 5:14, 15), and to the messianic "Prince of Peace" of Isa 9:6. The number of uses seems too small to draw definitive conclusions. If the princes of Persia and Greece are viewed as angelic foes of


²Though some see traces of a transcendent foe behind the "little horn" of Dan 8:9-11, see Lueken, 27; Nickelsburg, 14-15; Hartman and Di Lella, 283; Collins, Daniel, 100, 138, 140; Davies, Daniel, 74.
God, they constitute two out of six figures,¹ one-third of those designated in the OT as אָֽרָֽאִים. This seems to be an adequate percentage to justify allowing the term to designate angelic foes of God.

W. H. Shea has ably demonstrated that a credible case can be made for the view that the princes of Persia and Greece represent earthly beings.² However, there is also evidence which supports the view that these princes represent heavenly beings. It would appear that the view that holds the princes of Persia and Greece to be heavenly beings who are in rebellion against God may be better supported by the evidence.

Activity of Michael in Dan 10

Having identified the princes of Persia and Greece, we shall now look at Michael's activity in Dan 10. Michael's activity is mentioned twice, in Dan 10:13 and 10:21.

To understand the issue in Dan 10:13, it is useful to reconstruct the historical circumstances which created the crisis demanding the intervention, first of Gabriel and then also of Michael.³ The superscription of Dan 10 dates this chapter in the

¹(1) "prince of the host of Yahweh" (Josh 5:14-15); (2) "Prince of peace" (Isa 9:6); (3) "Prince of the Host"/"Prince of Princes" (Dan 8:11, 25); (4) "prince of the kingdom of Persia"/"prince of Persia" (Dan 10:13, 20); (5) "prince of Greece" (Dan 10:20); (6) "Michael, one of the chief princes," "Michael your prince," "Michael, the great prince" (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1).


³This procedure may be questioned by some who hold the book of Daniel to be second century in origin, and who feel that the crisis with Antiochus IV is the focus of the book. Nevertheless, if the author of Dan 10-12 had not wished to focus on a crisis he knew occurred in the third year of Cyrus, he could have left out 10:13-15a, 20b-21; 11:1, with no significant loss to the vision as a whole. The internal dating of the vision and the general accuracy of the
third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, on the twenty-fourth day of the first month. A decree of Cyrus issued in the first year of his reign (Ezra 1:1-4) granted the Jews permission and material assistance to return to Judah and rebuild the ruined temple in Jerusalem. It is evident, then, that the crisis does not deal with securing from Cyrus a release of the Jews from the Exile and permission to build the temple. This was already obtained two years earlier.

In the book of Ezra, the progress of re-establishing the Jewish worship ritual at Jerusalem is chronicled. In the seventh month of Cyrus's first year, the altar of sacrifice was built, and the sacrifice of animals was restored (Ezra 3:1-3). In the second month of Cyrus' second year, the foundations for the new temple were laid (Ezra 3:8-10). Soon after, "the adversaries" of the returned Jewish exiles, persons who had been settled in the Israelite lands following the exile of the ten northern tribes by Assyria, requested and were denied permission to join the Jews in their building of the temple and in the restored worship at the temple (Ezra 4:1-3). Thereupon, the "people of the land" sought to prevent the building of the temple, both by acts of hostility, and by "hiring counselors against them to frustrate their purpose all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius king of Persia" (Ezra 4:4-5). Evidently the enemies of the Jews sent messengers to the court of Cyrus to turn him

against the Jews and reverse his policies of favoring them. It may be that the crisis alluded to in Dan 10 was precipitated by the arrival of these messengers bringing to Cyrus false, malicious accusations against the Jews in Jerusalem.

Another possibility may be that the crisis was created by the installation of Cambyses, son of Cyrus, as vassal king of Babylon under Cyrus, as suggested by William H. Shea¹ and as discussed above.² Since Cambyses was known to be hostile toward foreign religions,³ and since Palestine would be included within the satrapy of Babylon, thus under administrative control of Cambyses, his elevation may have portended grave difficulty for the restoration of the temple in Judah. Possibly the "counselors" hired by the Palestinian enemies of the Jews had found Cambyses a sympathetic listener prior to his elevation. Another scenario may be that in case Cambyses was installed as king the previous year,⁴ the accusing messengers presented their case to Cambyses about the time of the New Year celebration of Cyrus's third year.⁵

In either case, the crisis was probably related to the efforts of the Jews to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem and the efforts at the Persian or Babylonian court of local enemies to prevent it. If this view is correct, the onset of the crisis occasioned two responses:

²See above, 205-06.
⁴Ibid., 245.
⁵Ibid.
1. Daniel's fast (Dan 10:2-3). For three full weeks, he fasted, mourned, refrained from anointing himself, and prayed (10:12).

2. Gabriel's intervention. It was Gabriel's desire to come to Daniel at the start of his fasting and praying (Dan 10:12), but was prevented by a more urgent assignment. He was dispatched to contend with the "prince of the kingdom of Persia," who withstood him twenty-one days (Dan 10:13), the same period of time as Daniel's fast, which continued until Gabriel's appearance to him.

What is proposed here is that Cyrus is the focus of the crisis. Cyrus issued the original decree granting liberty to the Jewish exiles and furnishing material aid for rebuilding the Jewish temple. This was in harmony with Cyrus's generous general policy of restoring all captive peoples to their own lands and to restore neglected or desecrated shrines of various religions within his realm.¹ Even if Cambyses was already a king in the province of Babylon, vassal to his father Cyrus who was king of the Persian empire,² he would not likely reverse his father's edict without consulting him first.

A reconstruction of the events of Dan 10 might be as follows: A rebel angelic prince was assigned to the kingdom of Persia to frustrate God's purpose to restore the Jewish nation and religious rites. This prince was moving upon the mind of Cyrus, striving to influence him to make an exception to his general policy, and with-


draw his favor from the Jews. The elevation of Cambyses and/or the arrival of the messengers from the Jew’s local enemies, events perhaps arranged through the influence of the supernatural evil prince of Persia, gave the evil prince a favorable opportunity and precipitated the crisis. Cyrus wavered in his purpose to help the Jews. Since God would not allow the evil prince to occupy the field uncontested, He sent Gabriel to counteract his influence. But despite Gabriel’s immense powers, the evil prince withstood him three weeks; that is, Cyrus still wavered. Seeing the need for reinforcements, God sent Michael, "one of the chief princes," the figure of highest power available, to Gabriel’s aid. With the arrival of Michael, Gabriel was freed to visit Daniel, but only for a short time. He must hasten back to continue the struggle, "now I will return to fight against the prince of Persia" (Dan 10:20).

The last part of Dan 10:13, "and I remained there with the kings of Persia (ASV), "wašāni nōtartî šām jēqal malḵē pārāš," has puzzled exegetes, and yielded at least three different interpretations. The problem is twofold: the meaning of the verb in the MT and the existence of a variant reading. The verb in the MT is nōtartî, Niphal (passive), perfect, first person, singular of xtr, "be left over," "remain over."¹

Among those following the MT reading, there are at least four different interpretations:

According to some, it is simply, "I remained there" (KJV, ASV). The NASB translates it, "for I had been left there," left alone, that is, during the three weeks until Michael arrived. This,

¹"xtr", HALOT, 148.
however, would not take into account the nuances of the verb, which does not mean simply "left," but "left over," "be over and above."¹

In defense of this translation, however, see Gen 32:24; 1 Kgs 17:17; Isa 1:8, where "left" seems adequate, and "left over" is not implied.

Another interpretation is, "I was superfluous there," that is, no longer needed. Since Michael arrived, I was free to come to you.² This would not necessarily imply victory, simply that since Michael has taken over the struggle for the moment, Gabriel was free to leave.

Driver, holding that the last part of Dan 10:13 means the angel was no longer needed there, felt that it also implied victory. To him it meant "was left over (viz. in the conflict): the 'prince of Persia,' for the time, succumbed; the angel, with Michael's aid, overcame his opposition, and so was able to come to Daniel."³

Another variation is to take the verb to mean, "to excel," "have precedence,"⁴ a derived meaning attested to in Gen 49:4. The meaning would then be that the angel had the superiority there, triumphing over the prince of Persia. Luther followed this option, "I was victorious there."⁵ Keil, holding this interpretation, sees

---

¹"Yatar." Gesenius, 377; see also S. R. Driver, Daniel, 159.
²S. R. Driver, 159.
³Ibid.
⁴"Yatar." Gesenius, 377.
⁵"vtr." HALOT, 148.
⁶Martin Luther, as quoted in S. R. Driver, Daniel, 159, "da behielt ich den Sieg."
it to mean that after twenty-one days, the angel and Michael together
gained the mastery over the demon prince of Persia, and now stood in
his place beside the kings of Persia, so as to influence them in
favor of Israel.¹

Based on the Greek versions (LXX, Theod.) the Hebrew text has
been amended to read we'ôrô hôtarti,² "'I left him' there beside
the kings of Persia" instead of wa'âni nôtarti, "'I was left' there
beside the kings of Persia" (my translation). This Hebrew recon­
struction takes the verb to be a Hiph*îl rather than a Niph*al, and
includes a radical change from 'ânî, "I," to lôrô, "him."

Those following the LXX and Theodotion versions, "I left him
there" (RSV, JB), take it as a simple statement that the angel, in
coming to Daniel, left Michael there at the scene of the struggle
with the kings of Persia.³ The idea is that until Michael came to
help him, Gabriel was occupied with contesting the prince of Persia.
With the coming of Michael, the angel was then free to come to Daniel
with his revelation.

The attractiveness of this interpretation is that it makes a
simple, straightforward, easy-to-understand statement. The MT
reading is not as easily understood, and thus makes added exegetical
demands upon the reader.

However, this does not mean that its textual basis is more
correct. The Greek-supported translation, "I left him there," also
fails to take into account the meaning of the verb, "be left

¹RHK, 1278n. on Dan 13:10.
²Keil, Daniel, 417.
³S. R. Driver, Daniel, 159.
over.\(^1\) The LXX was based on a popularizing type of text, and is a rather free translation.\(^2\) Also, there is evidence that the "Theodotion" text of Daniel, which is closer to the MT than to the LXX, cannot be ascribed to Theodotion, but is a translation originating earlier than Theodotion, who lived in the second century A.D.\(^3\) It would seem that the MT reading should be preferred.\(^4\)

From reviewing the various interpretations of this statement in Dan 10:13, it seems that the most supportable is, following the unamended MT, "I was left over," that is, "not needed," "superfluous." As observed above, this could be either because (1) Michael had arrived and took over the conflict, or (2) with Michael's coming, victory was obtained, the crisis was over, and the angel was therefore free to come. The latter appears more likely, as the coming of Michael would not necessarily, in the absence of victory, render Gabriel's considerable power superfluous. The fact that Gabriel had to hasten back "to fight against the prince of Persia" (Dan 10:20) does not indicate that victory had not been won. It may simply be that while the immediate crisis was over, the struggle went on until the fall of the Persian empire at the hands of the Graeco-Macedonian army of Alexander the Great, for "when I am through with him, lo, the

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Wärthwein, 53-54.

\(^3\)Ibid., 54.

\(^4\)Hartman and Di Lella, Daniel, 265: "Neither of these forms [Heb. text reconstructions based on LXX & Theod.] is close to the letters of the MT, and the Greek translators were probably merely giving a free rendition of the passage in order to make sense out of it in the context."
prince of Greece will come" (Dan 10:20). Victory in this crisis may be seen in the fact that no recorded decree to cease work on the temple was issued by a Persian king, though constant efforts were made toward that end by the enemies of the Jews (Ezra 4:5; 5:6-17).

Michael's activity, it appears thus far, was apparently to come to help Gabriel gain a victory over the malevolent "prince of the kingdom of Persia," who was seeking to influence the rulers of Persia against the people of God, who had recently, due to favor shown by Persian king Cyrus, returned from exile to their homeland.

The last words of Dan 10:13, "the kings of Persia" (MT), also have variant readings, which have occasioned different translations and interpretations. Theodotion has the reading "the prince of the kingdom of Persia," a reading followed by the RSV and defended by Di Lella, and the LXX has "the prince of the kings of Persia" preferred by Charles and Driver. A few Hebrew manuscripts exist with the readings "kingdom of Persia," as is also found in 6QDan, and "king of Persia," the latter followed by Jerome in the Vulgate (and thus by the Douay) and more recently by the NIV.

From a certain broader perspective, it is possible that "king/kings" is/are the embodiment of the "kingdom." Therefore, whether one adopts the variant "kings," "king," or "kingdom" of Persia, the interpretations would not be too separate from each other.

Behind these variants lies the difficulty of interpreting

---

1Hartman and Di Lella, 282.
3Jerome, Daniel, 115.
"kings of Persia."¹ In one view, it seems that if the Angel of Revelation was contending with the prince of Persia, it should have been with this prince that he (or Michael) was left.² In another, if earthly authority is meant, there seemed to have been only one king of Persia at that time, namely, Cyrus, as the co-regency of Cyrus and Cambyses was thought to have begun near the end of Cyrus’s reign, perhaps 530-29 B.C.³

There is evidence, however, as mentioned above, that Cambyses may have become vassal king of Babylon in the second year of Cyrus’s reign. The Nabonidus Chronicle indicates that the annual New Year’s festival was not observed in Babylon during Nabonidus’s absence, as his participation was needed for its celebration.⁴ Even his son Belshazzar, to whom Nabonidus had entrusted the kingship while he was gone,⁵ apparently could not take the king’s place in the celebration. However, from the same source we learn that Cambyses, son of Cyrus, apparently participated in the New Year’s celebration at the beginning of Cyrus’s second regnal year⁶ (or possibly third or fourth).⁷ This is evidence that Cambyses was

¹S. R. Driver, Daniel, 159.
²See above, 205-06.
⁷Shea, "Prince of Persia," 244-45.
functioning in a kingly role. It is conceivable that Cambyses was installed as vassal king of Babylon at that time. As pointed out above\(^1\) although Cambyses would not at that time be a king of Persia, he would be a Persian king of Babylon. The "kings of Persia" could therefore be seen as referring to Cyrus and Cambyses, in harmony with the MT text.\(^2\)

Perhaps at this point the nature of the confrontation between Michael and the prince of the kingdom of Persia should be more carefully examined. Along with the idea of national patron angels for all nations, it has become widely accepted that the community in which the book of Daniel was written believed that wars on earth had their counterparts in heaven, as the guardian angels of the warring nations also struggled with each other. Indeed, in this view, the outcome of the heavenly struggle determined the outcome of the corresponding war on earth.\(^3\) It is thought that the author of Dan 10 believed that events on earth were recapitulating the warfare raging in heaven\(^4\) so that the heavenly battle was what really mattered, the earthly counterpart being a mere by-product.\(^5\) Collins spoke of the earthly and heavenly battles as "really two dimensions of the same battle." Earthly battles are

\(^1\)See above, 203-04.


\(^4\)Towner, 153.

\(^5\)Hartman and Di Lella, 284.
Corresponding to the kings on earth and their conflicts are the patron angels of the peoples and the battles waged between them.¹

According to Collins, "When two nations fight on earth, it is because their patrons are fighting in heaven."² Thus the ultimate destiny of nations is determined, not upon earth, but in heaven.³

Though this view is a logical corollary to the idea of national patron angels, it can be shown that this is not the concept behind the figures in Dan 10. The victory of Michael in this chapter over the prince of Persia was historical, not cosmic. The victory of Michael did not and was not expected to result in the dominance of Judah over the Persian empire.⁴ It secured a more limited objective, though nonetheless critical, of avoiding royal disfavor. Also, although there was an evident confrontation between Michael and the prince of Persia, there was no corresponding conflict between Persia and Judah. Persia is not viewed in the book of Daniel, nor in the OT as a whole, as an enemy of Judah. Cyrus is viewed as a deliverer and a benefactor (Isa 41:2-4, 25; 44:28-45:1-5; 48:14-16; Dan 9:25; Ezra 1:1-3), as was Darius, who reaffirmed Cyrus's beneficence toward Judah (Ezra 6:1-12).

¹Collins, "The Son of Man and Saints," 55.
²Collins, Daniel, 1. 2 Maccabees, 134.
³Hammer, 103.
⁴See Delcor, 210, "In effect, when the angel of this or that nation wins the victory in the heavens, the king of this or that people is equally vanquisher on the earth" (translation mine); Collins, Daniel, 143, "It is precisely Michael's rule over the heavenly realm which makes possible the dominion of Israel on the human level"; Box, 214, "his [Michael's] victory over the angels of other nations in heaven, and his receiving the kingdom, would mean precisely Israel's victory over enemies on earth and attainment of world-rulership."
The biblical passages frequently cited to uphold the view of two-level warfare fail to sustain it. Ps 82 and Isa 24:21 do point to God's judgment and punishment of rebel angelic beings, but contain no hint of celestial warfare between national patron angels.¹ Though heavenly battles were frequent between the gods of the various nations in pagan, polytheistic mythologies,² these were rarely, if ever, related to historical battles. Collins grants that in the OT, Yahweh's supernatural adversaries are usually ignored,³ but it would be more correct to say that in OT stories, when Yahweh, as the divine warrior, marched forth with His heavenly armies, heavenly adversaries did not exist; the gods of other nations are not pictured as supernatural beings, but as lifeless objects of wood and stone (Deut 4:28; Ps 115:4-8; Jer 10:3-10; Isa 40:18-20; 44:9-20; Hab 2:18-19). In Judg 5:19-20,⁴ where Deborah and Barak fought against the Canaanites, the "stars, from their courses" fought, not against other angelic powers, or against the gods of the Canaanites, but against Sisera. What emerges is that God and His heavenly forces indeed are involved in Old Testament battles, but what they are battling are earthly foes, not heavenly.

In the future struggle against the sons of darkness, found in the Qumran War Scroll,⁵ though both Michael and the holy angels,

¹As claimed by Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 55; Towner, 172.
²Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 56.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Cited by Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 56, as an example of a two-dimensional battle.
⁶Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 56.
indeed, God Himself, fight in the war (War 1:10-17; 10:1-12:18), and also Belial and his spirits (13:1-14:1; 16:11-17:15), it is not a two-dimensional war. It is not that the angels fight it out in the heavens while the men fight on earth. Angels and men "engage side by side in combat" (War 1:10-14)\(^1\) in a one-dimensional battle, with the earthly battle the focus of the struggle.

Also, in the battle described in 2 Macc 10:29-30, angels participated directly in the action, not in a different, heavenly dimension.\(^2\) See also 2 Macc 3:24-26, where angelic beings also intervened on the earthly level. Collins notes that in 1 Macc, although the Jews believed that victory depends not on the size of the army, but upon strength from heaven, the activity of man was not irrelevant. In a sort of synergism, strength comes from heaven, the victory is achieved by God, but the role of the human forces is vitally important. God fights with the swords of the Maccabees.\(^3\)

Di Lella indicates that "the usual Old Testament scenario portrays Yahweh and his heavenly host fighting against human enemies on earth (Judg 5:19-20; Hab 3:12-13)."\(^4\) It may be worth noting that in the principle content of the Dan 10-12 vision, the contest between the king of the north and the king of the south in Dan 11,  

---

\(^1\)Caster, The Dead Sea Scriptures, 282.

\(^2\)See Stier, 91-92. The battles of warriors in the air over Jerusalem in 2 Macc 5:1-3 is not clearly fought by angels. They were more likely portents of events to come to be wrought out by human combatants. See Hartman and Di Lella, 284.

\(^3\)Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 196.

\(^4\)Hartman and Di Lella, 284.
the idea of an angelic struggle between the princes of those two kingdoms is absent.

It can be seen, then, that in the OT, the earthly battle is not a recapitulation of a heavenly contest between competing patron angels. Earthly powers are not fighting because their patrons are fighting in heaven. The earthly struggle is primary, and it is on earth that the real struggle is played out. Heavenly agents fight to influence earthly events. Thus it is in Dan 10. Michael contended with the prince of Persia to influence Cyrus to continue to favor the Jews. Thus, with nations as with individuals, it is incorrect to say that their ultimate destiny is determined in heaven and not upon earth. Influenced, yes, but not determined. The focus and final determination takes place on earth.

As suggested above, the contest was over the decisions of the human kings of Persia. Keil aptly states the issue:

The supernatural spiritual power standing behind the national gods, which we may properly call the guardian spirit of this kingdom[,] . . . stood beside the kings of the Persians to influence them against Israel, and to direct against Israel the power lying in Persian heathenism . . . . The angel, ver 5, came on account of Daniel's prayer to dislodge this "prince" from his position and deprive him of his influence, but he kept his place for twenty-one days, till Michael came to his help; that he so gained the mastery over him, that he now stood in his place beside the kings of Persia, so as henceforth to influence them in favor of Israel.2

Whether the victory involved a physical displacement of the prince of Persia or simply a spiritual displacement in the mind of the Persian king(s) is difficult to say, but not critical.

---

1As in Hammer, 103.
2Keil, 417.
Another question regarding the activity of Michael is whether it is military in nature. George W. E. Nickelsburg stated, "Michael is clearly a military figure in Daniel, as the title šar and the descriptions in chapter 10 indicate." He states further: "the unnamed angel describes how he and Michael have been fighting the angelic prince of Persia." Also, "When Persia falls, they will battle the prince of Greece."\(^1\) George H. Box had earlier said that Michael, with Gabriel, "fights with Israel's enemies, the angels of Persia and Greece."\(^2\)

Collins, going further, feels it is likely that both princes were thought to be accompanied by their hosts,\(^3\) thus presenting a clash of celestial armies! This latter idea is manifestly controverted within the context itself, as Gabriel tells Daniel that "there is none who contends by my side against these except Michael, your prince" (Dan 10:21). Clearly, these two highest of all celestial figures, next to God, were the only ones qualified to handle such demanding challenges. It is true that Michael is pictured in Rev 12:7-9 as leading the angels of heaven into victorious battle against Satan and his angels, but that cannot be extrapolated backward into this context in Dan 10, not only because it was written much later, but also because of the different nature of the crisis portrayed.

Johannes P. Rohland, however, feels that the language of Dan 10:13 is too indefinite to conclude that there was a war of Michael.

\(^1\)Nickelsburg, 14.
\(^2\)Box, 214; see also Hammer, 103; Walvoord, 283.
\(^3\)Collins, Daniel, 135.
against the angel-prince of Persia. The angel in the vision, he
asserts, did not speak of a struggle; he simply said he "withstood"
me, which is to say, "stood facing me," or, "put himself against me."
Whether this means a military opposition or another kind of oppo­sition, he declares, does not come out of this formulation. Rohland
suggests it might mean "an argument, a legal contention before the
high court of God" which, he felt, fits with Michael's assigned
sphere.¹

He felt that even in Dan 10:20, working from the Theodotion
version, the word polemein ("fight") with meta tinos does not signify
"against," but "in connection with," "in common with," which still
leaves in doubt "the purely military character of this struggle in
heaven." The differing interpretations of the Church Fathers, Rohland
shows, indicate that Dan 10:13-21 concedes no unambiguous declaration
whether Michael is understood as a defender of the Jews against the
claims of the Persian angel as (1) a military warrior, or only (2) as
the intercession of an advocate for his client.²

Rohland makes a useful point. As was discussed pre­viously,³ although "military leader" is an important use of σάρ, the
term is even more widely used as head, chief, ruler; or official or
representative of a king.

Rohland suggests that the idea is that of judicial contention
before God. This would not be altogether unreasonable, seeing that
Michael appears to be associated with judgment in Dan 12:1-3. This

¹Rohland, 11-12 (translation mine).
²Ibid., 12-13.
³See above, 129-30.
view is, however, dependent on the idea of patron angels of nations, each defending his own territory against that of others. As this view lacks an adequate Biblical basis, the solution must lie elsewhere. As has been suggested above, the contention appears not to be for the decision of God, but for the decision of Cyrus. Both princes are seeking to influence the mind of Cyrus for or against the people of God.

It must be recognized, however, the Hebrew words for "fight with" (lehillāhēm sim) in Dan 10:20 clearly signify doing battle with a foe. Whatever the nature of the contention of Michael and Gabriel with the prince of Persia, it had the character of combat.

Before moving to the exegesis of Dan 12, the purpose of the author in writing of the contention of the celestial princes should be discussed. It was apparently to reassure the readers of God's watch-care for His people. It is probable that the author was trying to create in the mind of the reader a picture of divine concern for and intervention in human affairs, particularly as they relate to the people of God. God's mighty agencies are not merely spectators in the events described in Dan 11. Though the Jews encounter suffering, God works to limit their suffering and to preserve His people. But though the events of Dan 10 and 11 are historical, they have the eschaton in view. Gabriel came (Dan 10:14) to show Daniel "what

---

1 BDB, 535; HAL, 500; HALOT, 175; see Josh 9:2 where the identical Hebrew words are used for the Canaanite nations gathering "to fight with Joshua and with Israel" (ASV); see also 2 Chr 11:1; and Jer 41:12.

would befall your people in the latter days."¹ Dan 11 moves irresistibly toward the time of final intervention and eternal deliverance of God's chosen.² Dan 10 introduces by name Michael, the great prince who will arise at the eschaton when God's people are delivered.

Dan 10 portrays an intense conflict among heavenly beings. The chapter opens with a vision of a transcendent being of awe-inspiring appearance and voice, probably Michael, who would play an increasingly important role as the revelation of Dan 10-12 unfolds.

Following this, another heavenly being, perhaps Gabriel, addresses Daniel, explaining his delay in coming, before presenting the revelation of Dan 11:2-12:4, which he had come to bring. The activity of Michael in Dan 10 is portrayed as a contention against the prince of the kingdom of Persia, an evil heavenly being working in opposition to God.

Initially, Daniel had fasted and prayed three weeks, evidently concerning some crisis of God's people who had returned from exile three years before. Gabriel was prevented from coming to Daniel because he was contending with the malevolent heavenly prince of Persia, who was perhaps seeking to influence king Cyrus to reverse his favorable policy toward the Jews. After three weeks of stalemate, Michael came to help Gabriel, and victory was gained.

This permitted Gabriel to come to Daniel with the revelation, while Michael stayed with the kings of Persia, Cyrus, king of Persia, and his son Cambyses, vassal king of Babylon, to occupy the position

¹Hartman and Di Leila, 284.
²Driver, Daniel, 159; Nickelsburg, 14.
of influence with these kings from which the prince of Persia had evidently been expelled. No heavenly armies assist Gabriel and Michael, none other aside from these two are qualified to deal with the malevolent heavenly princes of Persia and Greece.

The Functions of Michael in Dan 12

The final mention of the Michael figure in the book of Daniel, and perhaps the most significant, is in the section of Dan 12:1-4. While Michael had a prominent role in Dan 10, here he has a preeminent role. In this section, Michael’s functions continue to be the focus of the study.

Eschatological Setting

It is quite evident that Michael’s appearance in Dan 12:1 is in an eschatological setting. This is seen in the use of the expression "time of the end" (εἰκός), used five times in the book of Daniel, each usage pointing to the eschaton.

The events of the eschaton, which take place at the "time of the end,"

1Stier, 92; Philip P. Davies, "Eschatology in the Book of Daniel," JSOT 17 (1980): 39, Davies defined the eschaton as the point, the occasion, the moment at which God acts definitively in history to fulfill his purpose for it. He feels that in times of prosperity the eschaton may be seen to have arrived or to be about to emerge from the present (39). This may be seen in the period soon after the return from Exile in Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah. In times of distress, however, the eschaton is represented as future, and is described in sharp contrast to the present circumstances, emphasizing a divine reversal of the order of things.

2Dan 8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4, 10.

the end," occur within the time frame of history.¹ According to John R. Wilch, the author of Daniel had a truly historical viewpoint. He states, "When the salvation event puts an end to history, it is a part of the historical course of events; it is the last event and therefore does not itself take place beyond history."²

The expression "At that time" (Dan 12:1) anchors the eschaton within history, linking the arising of Michael to specific historical events which were future to the author. It is a prophetic way of "attaching events of an eschatological order to historical acts which have just been described, without any interval; see Isa 7.4; Jer 30.18; Ezek 34.11."³ Michael, as God's agent, will arise at the time of those events to usher in a divine reversal of things.

The final, eschatological time had already begun in Dan 11:45, as the self-exalting, blasphemous enemy of God's people, at the height of his arrogance in planting his tents between the sea and the glorious holy mountain, "shall come to his end, with none to help

¹Simon J. De Vries, "Observations on Quantitative and Qualitative Time in Wisdom and Apocalyptic," in Israelite Wisdom, ed. John G. Gammie et al. (New York: Scholars Press, 1972), 266, observes that there are very many uses of the time-word vom in the historiographic and prophetic corpora, but few in wisdom or apocalyptic. On the other hand, uses of let are fewer in the former and more in the latter. He feels the movement away from vom to let parallels the development within Hebraic literature away from historiography and prophecy onward toward wisdom and apocalyptic." Whether this phenomenon is due, as De Vries suggests, to an onward development within Hebraic literature or to a tendency toward different word choices within differing literary genres undergoing parallel development, let is the term used in Dan 8:17; 11:40; 12:1, 4, 9, 11, to designate the eschatological situation.

²Wilch, 114-15.

³L. Dennefeld, La Sainte Bible, 7:693, as quoted by Lacocque, 240.
him." The words "At that time" (Dan 12:1) are recognized to refer back to Dan 11:40, "At the time of the end."\(^1\) The arising of Michael appears to precede the demise of the blasphemous king of the north.\(^2\) This is true because the deliverance of God's people would seem to coincide with that event. "The time of the end" is, therefore, a phrase referring to a defined period of time within which certain events were to transpire, leading up to the final end,\(^3\) and is not synonymous with the end of time. Wilch paraphrases "the time of the end" with "the End situation."\(^4\) He holds it not to be a short moment but the final "act," which begins in Dan 11:40 prior to the decisive intervention by the "great prince" Michael.\(^5\) Within that "time of the end" period, beginning with the

---

1 Plöger, 170; Keil, 474. But see Davies, Daniel, 113; who says that Michael acts after the demise of the 'king of the north' in Dan 11:45.

2 Against Davies, Daniel, 113: "If, as seems apparent, he acts after the demise of the 'king of the north' in 11.45, then Michael is not the vanquisher of the king." On 115 he makes reference to "the clumsy repetition of 'at that time . . . till that time; but at that time' in 12:1" which "makes a precise sequence difficult to discern." But the repetition is what keeps the sequence of events clear to the reader.

3 Gerhard Pfandl, The Time of the End in the book of Daniel Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Adventist Theological Society Pub., 1992), 316-17. He concludes that the expression "time of the end" "always applies to the last period of Heilsgeschichte prior to the time when "the everlasting kingdom will bring to an end and replace world history."

4 Wilch, 111-12; see also De Vries, 267: "Cēṯ (usually translated "time") refers first of all to a situation and only by extension to the specific time-element that may be part of a given situation. Our English word 'time' is an appropriate rendering of Hebrew Cēṯ, because it combines as Cēṯ does the temporal and the situational aspects."

5 Ibid., 111.
attack by the king of the south (Dan 11:40) and ending with the
destruction of the king of the north and the deliverance of God's
people, Michael stands up.

Further evidence of the eschatological nature of Michael's
appearance in Dan 12:1 is furnished by parallels with revelations
found earlier in the book of Daniel. These are found in Dan 2:31-45;
7; and 8-9:24-27. Dan 2:44 speaks of the establishment of God's
everlasting kingdom, which will destroy the existing kingdoms. This
is paralleled in 7:13-14 in which dominion, glory, and kingdom were
presented to one like a son of man by the Ancient of Days, a dominion
which would be over all peoples, nations, and languages forever.
Dan 7:27 describes eternal worldwide dominion given to the people of
the saints of the Most High. Dan 8:26 states of the last anti-God
power, "by no human hand, he shall be broken." It is true that Dan
12:1-3 does not mention the kingdom of God, which is given prominence
in Dan 2:44 and 7:14, 27. Nevertheless, the passage of Dan 11:45;
12:1-3 parallels these, and gives additional details.

The eschatological deliverance would involve the destruction
of the anti-God power,¹ it would be preceded by a time of unprece-
dented trouble,² judgment would take place,³ there would be a
resurrection of the dead to eternal life,⁴ and a state of blessed-

¹Keil, Daniel, 474.
²Cf. Joel 3:9-12; Isa 26:20; Jer 4:19-26; 30:5-7; Ezek
38:8-16; Zech 12:3; 14:2.
³Cf. Joel 3:2, 12, 14; Isa 24:21-22; Ezek 9.
ness for the chosen ones would ensue. The appearance of Michael in
Dan 12:1-3 is to be seen as presenting the eschatological intervention
of God, leading to the establishing of God's rule in parallel with
Dan 2:44; 7:13-14, 27.2

Eschatological Activity

"Stand Up"

The action of Michael in Dan 12:1 is that "at that time" he
shall "stand up" (ASV) (ya'ämôd).

Dan 12:1a may be translated as follows: "And at that time
shall Michael stand up, the great prince who stands for the children
of your people."

As is evident, forms of the verb "stand" (šâmâd) appear twice in
this passage. The first is "stand up" (ya'ämôd) and the second is
"who stands for" (hâ'ämôd 'al).

Here are some examples of other English translations: "And at
that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for
the children of thy people" (KJV).

"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince
who standeth for the children of thy people" (ASV).

"At that time shall arise Michael, the great prince who has
charge of your people" (RSV).

"At that time Michael will stand up, the great prince who
mounts guard over your people" (Jeru).

11:6-9; 35; 60:10-22; 62; 65:17-25; 66:10-14, 22-23; Jer 30:18-22;
31:1-14; 33:40; 33:7-25; Ezek 36:23-31; 37:21-28; Zech 14:6-11, 20-
21.

2Heaton, 241.
"Now at that time Michael, the great prince who stands guard over the sons of your people, will arise" (NASB).

"At that time Michael, the great prince who protects your people, will arise" (NIV).

Translation tradition wavers between a more formal, literal translation, represented by the KJV and ASV, and a more idiomatic, easily read translation, represented by the RSV, Jeru, NASB, and NIV. The first verb is translated either "stand up" or "arise," the second either "who stands for," or some expression as "stands guard over" (NASB) which indicates a guardian relationship in regard to Daniel’s people.\(^1\)

Since the two uses of the verb "to stand" are not necessarily related in meaning, they will be discussed separately. First we examine in more detail the verb va\(^a\)m\(^d\), "stand up," "arise."

Of the use of \(^a\)m\(^d\) to mean "arise" in the sense of "appear," in Daniel, all examples refer to a kingdom, ruler, or forces that

---

\(^1\)See HAL, 795, "auftreten Esr 2:63; Neh 7:65"; KBL, 712; BDB, 764; though \(^a\)m\(^d\) has many uses, such as "take one's stand," for intercession (Gen 19:27), against (Judg 6:31), over-have charge of (2 Chr 26:18); "present" oneself before (Gen 43:15); serve (1 Sam 16:22); "stand still, stop" (Josh 10:13); remain (2 Kgs 15:20), etc., one late use prominent in later chapters in Daniel (Dan 8:22, 22, 23; 11:2, 3, 4; 12:1) is "arise, appear, come on the scene." "Arise," therefore, is a satisfactory translation of the first use of the verb (though, interestingly, Jeru chose to stay with a literal translation).

\(^2\)But \(^a\)i\(^o\)^m\(^d\) \(^a\)l allows more than one possible meaning. See KBL, 712, which suggests "Vorsteher sein über" ("be head of"), "schützend stehen vor" ("stand protecting for"), and "eintreten für" ("intercede" or "plead for," see Harold T. Betteridge, Cassell's German Dictionary [New York: Macmillan Pub. Co., 1978], 180). The translation, "who stands for," is less interpretive, and gives the English reader more flexibility in interpretation in selecting the options present in the Hebrew original.
would arise. In Dan 8:22 it refers to four kingdoms that would arise. In Dan 8:23, it is the bold, latter-day persecutor who "shall arise." The pattern continues in Dan 11:2, 3, 7, 14, 20, 21, 31. The "contemptible person" (Dan 11:21) is the last king in Dan 11 who is said to "arise" or "stand up" (ASV), in parallel with 8:23 (in Dan 11:31, "forces from him . . . appear"). The next figure after Dan 11:21 said to "arise" is Michael.  

It seems evident that the author intentionally placed Michael as the last of a series of ruling figures predicted to arise, juxtaposed against the immediately previous, persecuting power who arose. The previous power arrogantly defied God and persecuted Israel, while Michael, in sharp contrast, rose to deliver God's people, destroy the persecutor, and usher in the coming age of exaltation and immortality. This pattern of contrast is paralleled by the vision of Dan 7, in which four evil kingdoms, symbolized by four ferocious animals, are succeeded by the sharply contrasted everlasting kingdom of one like a son of man.

It is suggestive also to note that uses of גָּאָם meaning "arise" in the book of Daniel previous to Dan 12:1 all (except for Dan 11:31) have the significance of accede to power, to take over rulership. That Michael arises as the last of a series of those who accede to power, it would appear that Michael, the great prince, likewise accedes to power, takes over the rulership. Utilizing this 

\[\text{1}^\text{Doukhan, 100.}\]

\[\text{2}^\text{In Dan 11:2, the form of the verb is Qal part., Dan 11:3, 20, 21, Qal perf., Dan 11:14, 31, and 12:1, Qal imperf.}\]
sense also provides another parallel with Dan 7:13-14, where it is rulership that is conveyed to the Son of Man.¹

Two meanings have been seen in the use of the expression "stand up" in its context: (1) military and (2) judicial.² Let us turn our attention first to the military use. The verb āmad is often used with reference to warlike activity,³ either defensively, as "stand before" the foe (Josh 21:44; Judg 2:14; Ezra 9:15, etc.), or offensively, as "stand against" to conquer (Judg 6:3; 2 Chr 20:23; etc.). The context indeed seems to suggest a military role for Michael,⁴ with the demise of the persecutor (Dan 11:45) and the deliverance of God's people (Dan 12:1).

Some see reference here to a heavenly military battle in which Michael defeats a supposed angelic prince of Syria coinciding with the demise of the anti-God power on earth.⁵ This interpretation extrapolates from Dan 10:13, 20-21, and is based on the unsupported interpretation that angelic battles determine a corresponding earthly struggle. We have seen already that this goes beyond Daniel. There is no reference to an evil angelic prince in Dan 11:40-12:3. The picture of Michael rising to destroy Israel's last-day persecutor of God's people and deliver his people, remains.

"At the crucial time, Michael will rise up to interpose as

¹See chap. 4, 317-61, for a fuller comparison of Michael and the Son of Man.

²Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 57.

³Leupold, 527.

⁴Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 57; Davies, Daniel, 113.

⁵Collins, Daniel, 108; Nickelsburg, 39; Van der Hart, 61; Davies, Daniel, 114.
Israel's champion against the king of the north and to deliver them from the awful persecution through which they have been passing."\(^1\)

While, as noted above, Nickelsburg saw the military role of Michael in the title עָר and in the larger context (Dan 10:13, 20-21; 12:1), he saw in the word āmād a judicial role. The verb occurs in the OT in judicial contexts. Disputants in a lawsuit stand for judgment (Deut 19:17; Josh 20:6; Isa 50:8). Priests (Ezek 44:24) and Yahweh (Isa 3:13) stand to judge. In Zech 3:1, Satan, in a judgment scene, stands to be an adversary to Joshua (see also Jub. 48:9; 18:9).\(^2\)

Mention has been made of a parallel between Michael and the Angel of the Lord in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges. Nickelsburg sees a parallel with the Angel of Jehovah in Zechariah. In Zech 1:12, the "angel of the Lord" pleads Israel's cause with Yahweh. Zech 3 has a judgment scene, with Joshua on trial. Both Joshua and the accusing angel, Satan, are standing before the "angel of the Lord," who rebukes Satan and dismisses the charges against Joshua. The Angel of the Lord is both judge and advocate for the defense. Nickelsburg sees another parallel in Job, where Satan has accused Job before God, but Job expresses confidence that at last an "angelic figure," his redeemer, would stand (yāqūm, from qām, with a meaning similar to āmād) upon the earth to act as his advocate. Parallels in Jubilees (17:15-18:12) to these passages in Zechariah and Job suggest a tradition in which the Angel of the Presence had an explicitly judicial function.

---

\(^1\)Tatford, 216.

\(^2\)Nickelsburg, 11-12; see also Lacocque, 240.
These parallels and the occurrence of the term *ámád* suggest that Michael's defense of Israel was not only military, but also judicial.¹ Nickelsburg states, "The war he wages has the character of judgment."² He stands in judgment to vindicate Israel and to punish Israel's persecutors. Further, attempting to trace the development of the motif of the exaltation of the saints at the judgment, Nichelsburg notes that in Dan 12 the judicial function and prerogative belongs to Michael.³

Collins feels the precise connotation of *ámád* is not clear, and finds its meaning in the context, which, he feels, suggests a military role for Michael as protector of Israel, military victory being the main emphasis in Dan 12.⁴ But he feels the context also supports a judicial role, by reference to "the book" in Dan 12:1 and by the explicitly judicial character of the parallel eschatological scene in Dan 7.⁵ The two connotations of *ámád* military and judicial, he feels are not incompatible with each other.⁶

Close examination of the various uses of *ámád* in the Old Testament reveals that in the largest number of cases, the flow of thought goes beyond the verb itself, usually to the object of a

¹Lacocque, 242; Davies, Daniel, 113-14; Goldingay, Daniel, 306.
²Nickelsburg, 12-14.
³Ibid., 81-84; 171.
⁴Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 57.
⁵Ibid., 57.
⁶Collins, Daniel, 136; see also 113-14.
prepositional phrase such as "stand before" someone in authority (Gen 18:22); "stand by" (Deut 5:31); "before" or "against" the foe (Josh 21:44; Judg 6:3); "over" in authority (Num 7:2); "stand" or "stay" someplace (Ezra 2:1; Exod 9:28) etc. In a number of uses, people "stand to do," or "stand and do" something (Esth 7:7, "Haman stood up to make request for his life"; Isa 3:13, "Jehovah standeth up to contend"; Jer 7:2, "Stand . . . and proclaim . . . this word" [ASV]).

In a majority of the uses of ָמַד to mean "arise" or "appear," there is no flow beyond the verb; the verb completes the thought. The subject arises without reference to doing anything or to any prepositional phrase. As in Dan 12:1, the idea is to "appear" or "emerge."^ 1

That Michael is not said to arise to do anything needs to be investigated further. Clearly, his arising is not intended to be irrelevant to the eschatological developments described. He arose to be the leading force in those events.2 The fact that no actual

1Interestingly, of the 21 examples detected, 17 of such uses are found in exilic or post-exilic literature (see BDB, 764), with 13 in the book of Daniel. Those not exilic or post-exilic are Eccl 4:15; Isa 44:11; 48:13, which most critical scholars would also place in or after the Exile. Examples outside the book of Daniel are found in 1 Chr 20:4; 2 Chr 7:6; Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65; Esth 4:14.

The remaining uses of the verb ָמַד in Daniel are as follows: "stand before the king" (in service), Dan 1:5, 19; 2:2; "stand before" the foe (military defense), Dan 8:4; 10:13; 11:15, 16, 25; "stand against" (attack) Dan 8:25; 11:14; continue, remain, Dan 10:17; 11:6, 8, 17; be in a particular location, as "stand in the glorious land," Dan 11:16, "stood before the river," Dan 8:2, 6, 15, "stood before me," Dan 10:16, "stood . . . on the bank of the stream," Dan 12:5; "stand for," Dan 12:1; "establish." Dan 11:14; "set me upright" (cause to stand), Dan 8:18; "set forth" an army, Dan 11:11, 13.

2Hammer, 115.
action is attributed to Michael may be due, as Paul Volz observed, to
the author's passive manner of expression.\textsuperscript{1} But the fact that
Michael is not said to arise "for" some activity, leaves the door
open to consider that he arose "from" some previous activity. To
consider what that activity may have been, it is useful to look again
at the parallel vision of Dan 7. Dan 7:9-10 pictured a heavenly,
eschatological judgment in which the "books" were opened. The idea
of books/book reappears only in Dan 12:1. This is very relevant
because "every one whose name shall be found written in the book" in
Dan 12:1 will be delivered. This judgment, while occurring before
the end and continuing until the end (Dan 7:26), occurs within
historical time (see Dan 7:11-12), prior to the establishment of the
eternal rule of the one like a son of man (Dan 7:13-14).

At the commencement of the heavenly judgment, "thrones were
placed, and one that was ancient of days did sit" (Dan 7:9, ASV).

Though passages have been noted in which one stands to judge (Isa
3:13; Ezek 44:24), in this judgment, God \textit{sits} to judge.

Other passages in the OT also indicate that in certain con-
texts, being seated is the appropriate position for judgment. In
Exod 18:13, Moses sat to judge the people, and the people stood about
Moses while he judged. In Ruth 4:2, the elders of the city sat in
the gate to witness Boaz's purchase of the right of redemption of
Naomi's land. In Jer 26:10, the princes of Judah sat in the gate to
hear the case against Jeremiah; in Jer 39:3, the princes of Babylon
sat in the gate to hold session.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1}Volz, \textit{Jüdische Eschatologie}, 195.

\textsuperscript{2}M. Gorg, "\textit{vāṣab}," TDOT, 6:425, notes that sitting in the gate
In an eschatological judgment, God through Joel calls the nations to come to the valley of Jehoshaphat, "for there I will sit to judge all the nations round about" (Joel 3:12). Similarly, in Dan 7:9-10, "one that was ancient of days did sit" and "ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him." In Dan 7, not only did God "sit" (Dan 7:9), but the verb is used twice more in this context, the court "sat" in judgment (Dan 7:10), and the court "shall sit" in judgment (Dan 7:26). The court, in this case, possibly refers to a council of judges. The picture of the judgment in Dan 7:9-10 recalls the prophet Micaiah's description of the heavenly council in his time, "I saw the LORD sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing beside him on his right hand and on his left" (1 Kgs 22:19; cf. 2 Chr 18:18). In Dan 7:9-10 the heavenly setting is similar, though there are "thrones" (plural), and the focus is the eschatological judgment from books.

The mention of "thrones" (plural, Dan 7:9) suggests that, in addition to God, at least one other pre-eminent figure was to be seated in the course of this judgment. In view of the exalted position of Michael as Israel's guardian prince, it is conceivable that the author of Dan 12:1-3 understood him as seated also on one of the
gen 19:1) or "holding a session" (Jer 39:3) in the gate has legal overtones when the text involves a formal judicial assembly as in the case of Jeremiah: "obviously a 'regular court session.'"


2Delcor; 150; Hartman and Di Lella, 217; Montgomery, Daniel, 296-971; Plöger, 104.

3Ackerman, 307-308, observes that the Sovereign sits to judge, others stand around.
thrones. When Michael stands up, then, it could signify that he is rising from his participation in the heavenly judgment at its conclusion to deliver God's people, who have been exonerated in the judgment and whose names have been retained in the books.

"Stand For"

The second use of the verb "stand" is ḥâlômêd, a Qal active participle, followed by the preposition ʿal. The articular participle itself means "he who stands" or "the one who stands." The combination of ṭâmâd ʿal is used in various ways in the OT. Besides the most common usages of "stand beside" (Gen 18:8; 1 Kgs 13:1; Ezek 47:10) and "stand upon" (Gen 47:17; Josh 11:13; Jer 6:16), are included the meanings "stand against" (Lev 19:16; Judg 6:31; 1 Chr 21:1; 2 Chr 20:23; Dan 8:25; 11:14); "wait upon," "attend" someone (Judg 3:19; Kgs 22:19; Zech 4:14); "stand at one's post, perform one's task" (2 Chr 7:6; Ps 109:6; Hab 2:1); "stand over" in the sense of having authority over or responsibility for1 (Num 7:2; 1 Sam 19:20; Neh 12:44); and "defend," "protect,"2 (Esth 8:11; 9:16), though this last meaning is found only in this one context, where the Jews "stood for their lives" (KJV), that is, defended themselves.

Interpreters understand the expression ṭâmêd ʿal in Dan 12:1 to mean either "stand over"3 or "stand for," "stand on behalf of."4 Nickelsburg feels that in Dan 10:13, 21, Michael's role as

1Nickelsburg, 11.
2Lacocque, 240; Nickelsburg, 11.
3Leupold, 527; RSV.
4Charles, Daniel, 325; Nickelsburg, 14; "ṭâmâd," Gesenius, 637.
commander is not emphasized; rather, he is depicted as the defender of Israel, fighting against the angelic princes of Persia and Greece. The translations tend to support this concept of Michael as the defender of God's people, as is seen in the NASB, "stands guard over" and JB, "mounts guard over." Two possible meanings of ha*ome4 (al for the Dan 12:1 context are given by Walter Baumgartner: "schützend stehen vor" ("stand protecting for"), and "eintreten für" ("intercede or plead for [a person], take [someone's] part, champion [someone's] cause"). The possibility that Michael is depicted as standing for God's people in the sense of interceding for them in a judgment setting should not be overlooked. As Moses sat judging Israel, the contending parties "stood before" Moses (Exod 18:13). The case for a judicial intercession by Michael is strengthened by the parallel in Zech 3:1-5. Here Joshua the high priest stood before the Angel of the Lord, clothed with filthy garments, which represented iniquity. The accuser, Satan, also stood at (tômed 'al) Joshua's right hand. Others stood before the Angel of the Lord, who himself also stood (Zech 3:5). This appears to be a judicial proceeding in which the Angel of the Lord vindicated and acquitted Joshua. Perhaps Michael

1 Nickelsburg, 11.
2 See above, 262-63.
3 HAL, 796.
4 KBL, 712.
5 Betteridge, 180.
has been doing something similar for God's people at the judgment bar of God.  

In either case, it denotes a continuing activity as Israel's guardian prince, not something which commenced only at the time of the end when Michael arose. Michael's earlier intervention against the prince of Persia on behalf of Israel (10:13) and his being designated "your prince" (10:20) are evidence of the continuing nature of his special responsibility for Israel.

The continuing responsibility of Michael for Israel places Michael in Daniel in a role analogous to that of the Angel of the Lord in the Pentateuch and Judges. This is explored more fully in the next chapter.

**Time of Trouble**

In the context of the arising of Michael, the author speaks of a terrible time of trouble. "And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never has been since there was a nation till that time" (Dan 12:1b). The expression "time of trouble" (êt sārāh) appears seven other times in the OT. Of these, Jer 30:7 provides the closest parallel to its use in Dan 12:1. It reads:

> Alas! that day is so great  
> there is none like it;  
> It is a time of trouble for Jacob;  
> yet he shall be saved out of it.

---

1 See Barton, "Demons and Spirits," 596; Sellin, 45.
2 Dix, 243; Sellin, 45-46.
3 Judg 10:14; Neh 9:27; Ps 37:39; Isa 33:2; Jer 14:8; 15:11; 30:7; see also "times of trouble" (Ps 9:9[10]; 10:1), and "day of trouble" (2 Kgs 19:3; Pss 20:1; 50:15; 77:2[3]; Prov 24:10; 25:19; Isa 37:3; Jer 16:19; Obad 12, 14; Nah 1:7; Zeph 1:15).
Similarities between the two passages include: (1) identical expression in Hebrew; (2) eschatological context (see Jer 30:1-8); (3) incomparability: "such as never has been" (Dan 12:1), "there is none like it" (Jer 30:7); (4) followed by the deliverance of God’s people. The similarities are sufficient to support the view that the author of Dan 12 drew from Jer 30:7.

The expression "time of trouble" seems to have become a technical expression to describe an eschatological time of distress used also in 1 Macc 9:27; As. Mos. 8:1; Mark 13:19; Matt 24:21; Rev 16:18.

One is tempted to say that Michael will arise to deliver Daniel’s people from this severe trouble. But this is unlikely the primary meaning. In the phrase, "and there shall be a time of trouble," the state of things indicated by the Hebrew word translated "and there shall be," according to Hebrew syntax, follows the action of the opening verb, "shall stand up." Therefore, the "time of trouble" sequentially follows the arising of Michael, as though Michael’s arising provoked or ushered in the time of distress. This distress may be seen, therefore, not only a time of trouble for Israel, but perhaps primarily for the ungodly nations which have

---

1 Nickelsburg, 15; Lacocque, 241.
2 Charles, Daniel, 325-26; Jeffery, 540-41.
3 Lueken, 43; Box, 214.
4 J. M. Powis Smith, William R. Harper’s Elements of Hebrew (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921), 89; Yates and Owens, 105. The verb wehāyṭāḥ occurs in the perfect form, with the waw consecutive, following the imperfect form, ya‘āmōd.
5 Calvin, 370-71.
oppressed them.\(^1\) It may be considered parallel to Dan 7:26, "they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end."

In the prophets, a parallel may be seen in Isa 26:21, "Jehovah cometh forth out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain" (ASV). Here (see also vss. 19-20), as in Dan 11:45-12:2, the motifs of judgment against the wicked and resurrection for God's people\(^2\) are seen. Other parallels can be seen in Joel 3:9-16, where God summons the nations to war, then treads the wine-press of His wrath in the punishment of the wicked; Jer 25:30-33, "The LORD has an indictment against the nations; he is entering into judgment with all flesh, and the wicked he will put to the sword . . . those slain by the Lord on that day shall extend from one end of the earth to the other" (31, 33); Ezek 38:21-22, where Jehovah will call for a sword against Gog, and, with pestilence and with blood, enter into judgment with him; and Zech 14:2, "Then the LORD will go forth and fight against those nations as when he fights on a day of battle."\(^3\) God's time of eschatological wrath against the wicked is reflected in

---

\(^1\) Cf. R. A. Anderson, 146, holds that the prophecies of Isa 24-27 and Zech 12-14 telling of judgment on the nations surrounding Israel prepare the way for the book of Daniel, and that two aspects, judgment on the nations, and judgment and refining of Israel itself, both have a place in Dan 12:1-2.


\(^3\) See Jeffery, 541, "One common feature in descriptions of the great tribulation . . . is the great war when the Gentile nations assemble for a final assault on Jerusalem and its righteous inhabitants (Zech 14:2ff.)."
Job 38:22-23, where God asks Job, "have you seen the storehouses of the hail, which I have reserved for the time of trouble, for the day of battle and war?"; also in Ps 75:8, which speaks of the cup in Yahweh's hand, which He will pour out and "all the wicked of the earth shall drain it down to the dregs." This motif of the eschatological war appears again in the New Testament in Rev 16, in the seven last plagues, and in Rev 19:11-21, in which the Word of God riding on a white horse smites the nations and treads the winepress of the wrath of God.

It is true that the people of God must also endure this distress. But, as God's protection is over them during it, they are delivered out of it. The passages of Isa 26:20, "hide yourselves for a little while until the wrath is past," and Jer 30:5-7, "it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it," come to mind.

The question of why the "time of trouble" would be more severe than at any time "since there was a nation till that time" may possibly be answered within the larger revelation of Dan 10-12. The author of Dan 10-12 appears to teach a purifying benefit to God's people as a result of trials. Dan 11:35 declares, "Some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine and to cleanse them and to make them white, until the time of the end, for it is yet for the time appointed." Since trials purify, the severest trials will bring the greatest purification. As purification is apparently a preparation

1 Lacocque, 242.
2 Baldwin, 203.
3 Keil, Daniel, 474-75.
for the life of the coming kingdom, God will delay the inauguration of His kingdom until His people have experienced the severest of trials. Those about to enter life eternal should not taste of trials less intense than those of some earlier period.

This is expressed in Dan 12:7, "when the shattering of the power of the holy people comes to an end all these things would be accomplished." When Daniel did not yet comprehend, Gabriel added, "Many shall purify themselves, and make themselves white, and be refined; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand; but those who are wise shall understand" (Dan 12:10). Also, "Blessed is he who waits and comes to the thousand three hundred and thirty-five days" (Dan 12:12). The message appears to be to wait patiently for God to act, and not lose faith amid trials.

This suggests another reason why Daniel may have pictured the last trials as the most severe. The very intensity of the trials which God's people suffer is therefore itself a sign that the final deliverance is near at hand. Since trials are a harbinger of deliverance, they intensify feelings of hope and joyful expectation. This motif is not only implicit in Daniel, but is made explicit in the synoptic Gospels of the New Testament and in the book of Revelation.\(^1\) The increasing severity of trials becomes a reason to "look up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing nigh" (Luke 21:28).

The increase of wickedness, and thus of trials, before God's

---

\(^1\)Matt 24:3-24; Mark 13; Luke 21:5-36; Rev 3:10-12; 11:18.
decisive intervention is a motif also in earlier revelations in Daniel. This is seen in the degeneracy of the metals in the vision of Dan 2:31-45 and the increasing ferocity of the beasts in Dan 7, climaxing with the persecuting fourth beast and the eleventh horn (Dan 7:8, 25), roughly paralleled by the "little horn" power in Dan 8:9-12, 23-25.

In several earlier OT accounts of divine intervention, it appears that God waited to act until either wickedness or persecution, or both, were most intense. This was true in regard to the Noachian Flood (Gen 6:1-7); the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:20-21; 19:13); the Exodus (6:5-8); and the destruction of the Amorites in Palestine (Gen 15:16; Deut 20:16-17).

The prophets (Isa 24-27; Jer 25:30-33; Ezek 38; Joel 3; Zech 12:1-6; 14) picture God's final deliverance of Israel to be at a time of intense trial and threat to their existence. The author of Dan 12 appears to be within that tradition.

Deliverance on the Basis of the Book

The judgment motif in Dan 12:1-3 is most explicit in the mention of the book. Only those "whose name shall be found written in the book" will experience the deliverance brought to pass at Michael's intervention.

Mention of divine books of record is an early tradition in Old Testament literature. In Moses' plea with God to forgive Israel for their sin of idolatry, he requested, "if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written" (Exod 32:32). Mal 3:16-18 refers to a register of those who will be spared in God's judgment and live as citizens of the new Jerusalem/Israel (see Mal 3:1-4).
Ps 69:28 and Isa 4:2-6 this book is known as the book of life, that is, the book of those who will live.\(^1\)

The reference to the book in Dan 12:1 is clearly more immediately dependent on Dan 7:10, where the books were opened at the beginning of the heavenly judgment which precedes the eschaton. It is on the basis of the decisions rendered at that judgment that the fate of God's people is determined. Since Michael is the prominent figure in this context, it is apparently he who is executing the verdict of the divine court on the basis of the names in the book. He not only delivers the suffering people of God, but perhaps also supervises the resurrection and leads the way into eternal life.\(^2\)

**Final Deliverance**

The final deliverance of God's people is foretold in Dan 12:1c-2:

But at that time your people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book. And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

The expression "at that time" occurs twice in Dan 12:1. The first occurrence indicates the time Michael arises. The expression occurs a second time to indicate when "your people" are delivered. The second, however, should not be thought to point back to Dan 11:40 as did the first, but to the "time of trouble" which has intervened. The "time of trouble" is the closest antecedent to the second occurrence of the expression, "at that time." "At that time," at the time of trouble, God's people would be delivered.

\(^1\)Nickelsburg, 16. 

\(^2\)Similarly, Koch, 207.
The identity of "your people" is a significant question. Since Daniel is the one spoken to, "your people" would seem to be Daniel's people. As discussed above in this chapter,¹ Daniel's people, throughout the book of Daniel, are the people of Israel.² The only earlier use of the expression "your people" in the book of Daniel is in Dan 9:24, where it clearly refers to the people of Israel. Also, Daniel, in his prayer, spoke of "my people Israel" (Dan 9:20) (see also Dan 1:3, 6; 2:25; 5:13; 6:13; 9:7, where Daniel is identified with Israel and Judah).³ In light of the identification of Daniel's people as Israel/Judah earlier in the book of Daniel, it is felt that this is the meaning also in Dan 12:1.⁴

The promise of deliverance to Israel is, however, conditional, in that the deliverance is restricted to those whose names are in the book. These have been vindicated in the heavenly judgment from books in Dan 7:9-10, a judgment which is presupposed in this

¹See above, 168-74.

²John W. Birchmore, Prophecy Interpreted by History (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1871), 80; Montgomery, Daniel, 85, 87; Jeffery, 541; Owens, 457.

³The book of Daniel does not offer the covenant privileges to non-Israelites. That Nebuchadnezzar offered praises to God (Dan 3:28; 4:34-37) does not basically change the picture. This is in contrast to the book of Isaiah, where the Gentiles are expressly included in the covenant in the future restoration (Isa 19:19-25; 56:6-8; 60:3).

⁴But see Davies, Daniel, 115, "The intervention of Michael vindicates not the Jews, but the righteous." "'Your people' is not the nation Israel, and deliverance is not the nation's earthly sovereignty. Instead, those who are to be delivered have been already named 'in the book'"; see also Hasel, "Resurrection," 280; "The larger apocalyptic context of the Daniel pericope points in the direction of a resurrection to everlasting life that is neither restricted to Israelites nor does it include all Israelites."
passage. In this passage is revealed an interest in personal salvation, rather than national salvation. Deliverance is limited to a faithful, righteous remnant in Israel. In this sense, P. R. Davies is right in stating that "your people" is not the nation Israel.  

There seem to be two events in Dan 12:1-3 in the deliverance of God's people. The first is the deliverance of the living people of God from distress. They have been suffering intense persecution. Michael's intervention results in the destruction of the enemies of Israel, and, by analogy with Dan 2:44 and Dan 7:14, 17, the surviving remnant will enter into God's everlasting kingdom. Thus, it is a final deliverance. Their experience in the kingdom is described in Dan 12:3. Nothing else is revealed in Dan 12:1-4 about this kingdom. One must look to Dan 2:34-35, 44 and 7:14, 17, 27. Here we learn that history on earth continues, but on a new plane. God's kingdom is established, which sweeps away all previous kingdoms. It is ruled by the Son of Man, and given to the saints of the Most High. Persecution has ceased forever. 

Though Dan 12:1 does not indicate that eternal life is conferred on the delivered ones, this might be implicit on the basis of two factors. One is the reference to everlasting life received by the righteous who are raised from the dead. If those who are raised to life to participate in the kingdom are immortal, it is not unlikely

---

1Davies, Daniel, 115. 
2Ibid. 
3Cf. Isa 4:3, "he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem"; see Hasel, "Resurrection," 280.
that those delivered from persecution were thought also to obtain everlasting life.

The second is that their names are in the book. If, as seems possible, the author of Dan 12:1-4 identified the book mentioned there with the book in Ps 69:28 ("book of the living") and the record referred to in Isa 4:3 ("every one who has been recorded for life in Jerusalem"), he may have interpreted it as a book of life eternal.

The second event in the deliverance described in Dan 12:1-3 is the resurrection of the dead to eternal life. "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan 12:2). The author gave vivid expression to the Israelite hope of resurrection from death to eternal life. This is to be viewed as a literal, bodily resurrection.

It is widely thought that the author of Dan 12:1-3 reflects an influence from Isa 26:19, where the resurrection of the dead is set in the context of judgment and national restoration, just as it is in Daniel. Nickelsburg sees a judicial function in the

---


2 Nickelsburg, 23; "Our writer appears to envision a resurrection of the body. The Isaianic passage on which he draws (26:19) says that the bodies of the dead will rise."

3 Nickelsburg, 19-20; Hartman and Di Lella, 307; Hasel, "Resurrection," 267-281. Di Lella suggests that the author of Dan 12:2 is giving "an inspired midrash" of Isa 26:19. Nickelsburg, 18, refutes the view that Isa 26:19 is a matter of national restoration by pointing to the contrast between the raising of the dead in Israel (26:19) and the fact that their dead overlords will not rise (26:14).
resurrection, as the dead are raised to life to be judged and have their fate meted out to them.¹

The reason for the emphasis on the resurrection in Dan 12:2 has been thought due to the theological dilemma posed when some of the most pious of God's people, precisely due to their piety, had died in severe persecution. They had died precisely because they had chosen to obey God's law. Conversely, others professing to be God's people saved their lives by gross disobedience. Thus piety caused death, and disobedience led to life. This confounded Israelite standards of justice and retribution. Resurrection to life, on the one hand, and to punishment, on the other, solved this dilemma.² The resurrected righteous are raised to participate in the new kingdom.³

The view has been expressed that Dan 12 goes beyond Isa 24-27 in its resurrection doctrine, in that it mentions the resurrection not only of the pious, but also of evildoers.⁴ That this is the case seems confirmed by Isa 26:14, which, speaking of the wicked dead, declares, "they will not live . . . they will not arise." However, Isa 24:22 indicates that the kings of the earth, after being gathered as prisoners in a pit, "after many days they will be punished." The pit is frequently used as a symbol of death, a synonym of sheol (Ps 30:3; Isa 14:15). This passage seems to say that after the wicked kings die, God will visit them with punishment.

¹Nickelsburg, 23.
²Ibid., 20.
³Ibid., 23.
⁴Ibid., 20.
It is not at the time of death; it is "after many days," apparently an eschatological punishment, just as is the simultaneous punishment of the evil angelic figures, "the host of the high ones" (Isa 14:21). It seems then, after all, that the author of Isa 24-27 provides a prototype of the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked in Dan 12:2. The wicked do not arise to life in its true sense, but "awake" to shame and contempt.

**Reward of the Wise**

Whether from among the living remnant, delivered from persecution, or from among the resurrected godly, Dan 12:3 indicates two qualities of persons chosen for special glory: the wise, and those who turn many to righteousness. These have been interpreted as two distinct classes of persons. However, most view this verse as a synonymous parallel; those who turn many to righteousness are the wise. They are the same group and receive the same reward. The description of this group appears to reflect Isa 53. As the servant of the Lord shall "make many to be accounted righteous" (Isa 53:11), so the wise are "those who turn many to righteousness."3 The reward is to "shine like the brightness of the firmament" and "like the stars for ever and ever." This is doubtless to indicate the glory of God's people in the new Jerusalem in the restored

---

1 Jeffery, 543.

2 Davies, 110; Nickelsburg, 24; Hartman and Di Lella, 309.

3 Other similar motifs are those of oppression (Isa 50:6; 53:8; Dan 12:1) and resurrection and exaltation following death (Isa 53:8-9, 10, 12; Dan 12:2-3). In terminology as well as motifs, Dan 12:1-3 reflects the influence of the Isaiah servant songs, especially Isa 53. See Nickelsburg, 24-25; Lacocque, 243.
kingdom of Israel, similar to the idea expressed in Matt 13:43, "Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father." The idea of bright light associated with the coming age is seen also in Isa 24:23; 30:26; 60:19.

It should not be thought that, because "stars" often designate "angels," the author of Dan 12:3 taught that the faithful will become angels in heaven. Dan 12:3, in a simple comparison, states that they shine like the stars, like the brightness of the firmament. These is no intimation that they will become stars, or shine with the stars, thus angels. Furthermore, though "stars" are indeed used to designate heavenly beings in the OT, that is unlikely to be the meaning here. The parallel "brightness of the firmament" shows that the author was using a simile, employing the brightness of the literal stars as a figurative expression of the glory of God's faithful in the eschatological kingdom. Influence from Isaiah would indicate an earthly kingdom (Isa 24:24; 25:6-9; 27:6). The parallels in the visions of Dan 2 and 7 suggests that the faithful become citizens of God's kingdom, which would be located on earth (Dan 2:35, 44; 7:13-14, 27). There is no warrant, therefore, for interpreting Dan 12:3 to mean that the "wise" become angels, ascend to heaven to participate in an angelic kingdom, or the like.

---

1Nickelsburg, 23, 82.

2So Nickelsburg, 82, 85; Collins, Daniel, 137-38; Towner, 167; see 1 Enoch, 104; 2 Apoc. Bar., 49-51.

3See Bentzen, Daniel, 52; Davies, Daniel, 117-18.

4As argued by Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 57.

The deliverance of the faithful, the resurrection of the dead, and the glorification of the wise are eschatological events occurring at the time of Michael's appearance. Michael is the prominent heavenly being who arises at the time these events take place. It appears that he is the heavenly deliverer, that he stands supervising the resurrection, and ushers in the coming age. This has implications for the authority and identity of Michael.

Identity and Functions of Michael

Thus far in the chapter, Michael has been identified as guardian of Israel, his activity and functions in chaps. 10 and 12 have been briefly examined, and the eschatological events which transpire when he shall arise have been touched upon. It seems that we are in a better position now than at the beginning of the chapter to evaluate the true nature and character of the Michael figure.

Michael's Leading Role in the Eschaton

Michael, as Israel's patron angel, is active in the events leading up to the end.¹ He has a leading part to play in the triumph-day of God.² From his role as guardian of Israel in the time of the Persian and Greek empires, we can understand that his appearance as Israel's champion at the height of their distress will mean the coming of salvation and glory.³

The eschatological drama begins with the appearance of Michael. As Volz observed, it is as if he roused himself out of

¹Hammer, 115.
²Russell, Jews, 243; Goldingay, 306.
³Lueken, 43; Box, 214.
sleep and lifted his drawn sword, which until then was lowered to the
ground, then the end appears.\(^1\) Whether Michael's intervention is
military or judicial, or both, the result will be that Israel will be
rescued and a resurrection will follow.\(^2\) As Michael was the heav-
enly guardian par excellence of the Jews, the people in the circle of
the author of Dan 10-12 hoped to receive from Michael the last,
definitive victory over all enemies, heavenly and earthly.\(^3\)

Michael defends the Jews against the persecuting king of the
north; by analogy with Dan 10:13, 20-21, the demonic powers behind
the evil king will fall and the king will be killed; then the end
will be ushered in.\(^4\) Michael is leader of the angels, and prince
over Israel; as such, it is presupposed that Michael serves as a
mediator between God and mankind.\(^5\) Michael clearly appears in the
book of Daniel as a messianic figure.\(^6\) Lueken observed that in Dan
12:1-4, Michael "stands in the place of the Messiah."\(^7\)

Michael's role in Daniel transcends that of an angel. In
12:1, he is designated "the great prince." He stands unique as "'the'
great prince," the only great prince, the prince above all other
princes. To call him "the great prince" is to exalt Michael above

\(^1\)Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 195.
\(^2\)Stier, 92-93; Collins, *Daniel*, 136.
\(^3\)Stier, 91
\(^4\)Keil, 474; Nickelsburg, 14.
\(^5\)Koch, 207.
\(^6\)Van der Hart, 61.
\(^7\)Lueken, 26.
all other creatures, and to confer on him honor and recognition not accorded to a created being elsewhere in the Scriptures.\(^1\)

Michael, a Divine Being

What seems to emerge from the description and role of Michael in this context is that he is more than an angelic figure; he indeed exhibits traits of divinity. As expressed earlier, Michael is accorded a degree of distinct personal identity as well as dignity, rank, and authority not elsewhere accorded to an angel. He is a messianic, salvific figure, a savior, filling a role as eschatological warrior and executor of judgment assigned only to God in Israel's earlier and even later traditions.

When Israel was in the wilderness, "the LORD alone did lead him" (Deut 32:12). Moses and Israel sang, "The LORD is my strength and my song, and he has become my salvation; this is my God, and I will praise him. . . . The LORD is a man of war" (Exod 15:2-3). When Israel went forth to war, the priests declared to the warriors, "the LORD your God is he that goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to give you the victory" (Deut 20:4). In the eschatological battle, "the LORD will go forth and fight against those nations as when he fights on a day of battle" (Zech 14:3).

In Dan 10 and 12, however, it is Michael who is functioning in that capacity. If Dan 12:1 had been written, "At that time shall Yahweh arise" it would seem to be a very fitting role that was attributed to Him. In Deut 32:9, Yahweh is the guardian of Israel, "the LORD's portion is his people, Jacob is his allotted heritage."

\(^1\)See above, 175-80.
Even in Sir 17:17 and Jub. 15:32, God is still the immediate ruler of Israel; in Dan 10 and 12, Michael is Israel’s ruler and guardian.  

Ginsberg noted the parallel function of Yahweh and Michael. He stated that the author of Dan 10-12 depended upon Deut 32:8-9 for his angelology, but that he diverged from his source in one important respect: whereas Yahweh rules Israel directly, without an angelic intermediary in Deut 32:8-9, in Daniel, Michael is the intermediary.

But why would the author of Daniel insert Michael as an intermediary if he were so familiar with the Deuteronomy text which states that God is directly Israel’s patron? It may be that we can see here an intimation that the author of Dan 10-12 invested Michael with a function and identity so impinging on the divine, that he saw no disharmony in attributing this divine function to Michael.

The marks of divine authority seen in the figure of Michael have led many to identify Michael with the divine Christ in His pre-incarnate existence. Some have directly identified Michael with Jehovah. Some have urged that the name Michael can be understood to signify "One who is like God."  

1 See Charles, Daniel, 262.
2 Ginsberg, "Michael and Gabriel," 1478.
3 Calvin, Daniel, 2:369; Hengstenberg, Christology, 4:266-69; Auberlen, 254; Lees, 3:2048;
4 C. H. H. Wright, Daniel, 320.
5 The name Michael, "Who is like God?" in its application to the Michael figure in Daniel, has been seen by some as pregnant with fuller meaning than simply a rhetorical question in praise of God as it clearly is in its other uses in the Old Testament. It has been seen as a statement rather than a question, making a statement concerning the Michael figure. Clarke, "Daniel," 606, spoke of
In Rev 12:7-9 we again see Michael in his role as heavenly warrior, defeating and casting down the dragon. This also is a divine work, as in Isa 27:1, it is Yahweh who, in an eschatological battle, defeats the primeval serpent. It is a replaying of the motif of contending with the evil angelic princes in Dan 10:13, 20-21.

The prevailing view among scholars is that Michael is an angel, one of a small class of archangels, and, as patron of Israel, God’s people, the highest ranking archangel.\(^1\)

A reason given for not regarding Michael as divine Messiah is that, in contrast to the Son of Man, there is no mention of his enthronement in the age to come.\(^2\) However, each vision contributes its own details, and there is no necessity to repeat.

"Michael, he who is like God." Chafer, 410, defines the name Michael as "'Who is like god' which meaning is significant. In what respect he is like God is not disclosed." G. F. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), 446, as quoted by Heidt, 7-8, while viewing Michael as an angel, believed that the name was "an actual statement concerning the angel himself, and expressing the irresistibility of him to whom God gives the power to execute His behests."

Others have interpreted Michael’s name in an opposite direction, seeing it as a deliberate attempt, in light of the great authority and prominence of Gabriel and Michael, to protest against forgetting that God’s power, being that of the Creator of the angels, is much greater than theirs. Leupold, 458.

It is credible, however, to think that the author of Dan 10-12, if he did perceive Michael as a divine figure, may have used the name "Michael" precisely because it points to divinity, suggestive of the power and authority of the one who bore it. But this cannot be pressed, as the significance of the name is ambiguous.

\(^1\)Goldingay, 306; Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel, 82; Auberlen, 254; Lowth, 121; West, 190; Bevan, 168, 201; Kelly, 200; Gaebelein, 198. Larkin, 251, details Michael's functions: command the heavenly armies, deliver his people, and have something to do with the resurrection of the dead, without sensing that these are tasks of redemption, God’s work; Goldwurm, 276-77.

\(^2\)Beaseley-Murray, 54-55.
If Michael is not the Messiah, then a scenario develops in which Michael arises to overthrow evil and deliver God's people, then the rulership is given to the Messiah, who until this point plays a passive role! This does not fit with the picture of messianic or personal divine intervention portrayed elsewhere in the Scriptures.

The role of Michael as divine warrior and contender against evil spirits is amplified in post-OT Jewish literature. When the evil angelic prince Semjaza and his associates married human women and thus defiled themselves, it was Michael who bound them until the day of judgment and condemnation (1 Enoch 10:11-12). God commanded Michael in the last day to destroy all wicked spirits, destroy wrong and evil from the earth to let truth and righteousness appear (1 Enoch 10:15, 20). It is Michael who shall avenge Israel of their enemies (As. Mos. 10:2). In the Qumran war scroll (1QM 17:6-8) Michael is seen in a military role, as he intervenes with his angels to redeem Israel, at which time he will "establish Michael's dominion among the godly and Israel's dominion among all flesh." In later Rabbinic literature (Ex. Rabbah 18:5), Michael is depicted as the vindicator of Israel against Edom, i.e., Rome.

The association of Michael in Dan 12:2 with the resurrection

---

1Ibid., 55, 57.
2Messianic: Isa 11:4; divine: Jer 25:30-33; Ezek 38:17-23; Joel 3:9-16; Zech 14:3.
3Charles, APOT 2:421; see note on 10:2.
4Mertens, 61.
5Gaster, "Michael," 373.
from the dead is significant. In the pseudepigrapha, Michael is associated with custody of the dead. In both *Apoc. Mos.* 37:4-6 and *Adam and Eve* 48:1-2, God hands the deceased Adam over to Michael to be in his charge until the day of reckoning and judgment. Michael taught Seth how to prepare Eve for burial (*Apoc. Mos.* 43:1-2). God has set Michael over the bodies of men (*Adam and Eve* 41:1-3). In the *T. Abr.*, it was Michael who was sent to fetch the soul of Abraham at his death. Michael and other celestial beings prepared an elaborate bed for Moses to die in, and then they carried him four miles to bury him in a valley.

The association of Michael with the resurrection is resumed in the New Testament. In Jude 9, Michael, here called "archangel," contended with the devil about the body of Moses. In 1 Thess 4:16, it is following "the voice of the archangel" (ASV) and the trump of God.

---

1 It may be recalled (above, chap. 2, 102-04) that the god of Bethshan, at the time of the conquest of Canaan by Joshua and probably for centuries afterward—as Bethshan was never conquered by Israel—was "Mekal," a name which may be identical to the name "Michael." One of Mekal's functions was god of the underworld, god of the dead. As god of the dead, he would have the power to release the dead from the underworld, the power of resurrection (above, chap. 2, 110). As Yahweh also has power over sheol, to deliver from sheol (above, chap. 2, 112), this is one significant common trait. This becomes even more significant when we see Michael appearing most prominently in a context of resurrection. Mekal was further seen as a god of war. Yahweh also is "a man of war" (Exod 15:3) (above, chap. 2, 112), and Michael also appears to have a military function (above, 266-67). It is very interesting that two associations of the Michael figure: (1) the heavenly warrior who defends Israel and vanquishes their enemies, and (2) his appearance at the resurrection, both of which also have links to the god Mekal, cling to Michael and are augmented and embellished in the later literature.

2 Oesterley, 219.

3 Midrash Rabbah on Deuteronomy, chap. 11, sect. 10, 183-86, as cited by Robert Leo Odom, *Israel's Angel Extraordinary* (New York: Israelite Heritage Institute, 1985), 73.
that the dead in Christ arise.

In emphasizing the divine character of the Michael figure, it must be recognized that in the book of Daniel a clear distinction is maintained between Michael and the One whom Daniel refers to as the one "ancient of days" and the "Most High." This phenomenon of two divine persons is seen also in Dan 7:9-10, 13-14 where the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man appear, and further in the appearances and references to the "Angel of the Lord." Discussion of these figures must await the next chapter, where the Michael figure is compared with other OT figures.

Michael's role as mediator between God and man is also elaborated in the later literature. He becomes mediator between God and angels as well as between God and men. At Adam's creation, it is Michael who summons the angels and commands them to worship Adam. When Satan refused, he was cast out of heaven (Adam and Eve 12:1-16:4). After Adam sinned, Michael blew his trumpet to summon the angels to hear God's sentence upon Adam (Apoc. Mos. 22:1-2). Michael revealed to Adam and Eve the coming birth of Seth (Apoc. Mos. 3:1-3). He was sent to inform Seth and Eve that Adam would die from his sickness (Apoc. Mos. 13:2-6). Not only did Michael mediate between God and the original family, but he was the attendant of Adam in Adam's vision (Adam and Eve 25:1-3; 28:3-29:1) as well as in some of the visions of Enoch (1 Enoch 60:3-5, 24; 69:14-15; 71:3-5; 2 Enoch 22:6-10). In the Greek apocalypse of Baruch, there is a reference to the offering of the prayers of men to God by Michael.¹ In the T. Abr., Michael interceded on Abraham's behalf, and, again, a

¹Oesterley, 219.
sinner’s entry into Paradise was secured by the combined intercession of Abraham and Michael.\(^1\) In 3 Apoc. Bar. 11:1-7, Michael holds the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Also, he receives the prayers of men. In 3 Apoc. Bar. 11:8-15:4, Michael bears the merits of men and presents them to God; he also is the commander of the angels, and mediates between the angels and God, bringing their petitions to God, and returning with the answers and instructions from God.

While these later developments in regard to Michael cannot be used to interpret the Michael figure in Daniel, they do make more explicit some of the implications of the picture of Michael found in Daniel.

**Summary**

This chapter has been devoted to examining Michael within the context of the last three chapters of the book of Daniel itself. Here we have seen that Michael is the leading, guardian prince of Israel, and chief over the angels. When Gabriel’s power in contention with the evil angelic princes of Israel fails, Michael comes with greater power to prevail. He combines forces with Gabriel to secure continued favor for the returned Jewish exiles from the Persian rulers, and stands ready to aid Israel against the evil angelic prince of Greece. In the last great persecution, Michael will arise to execute the sentence of the heavenly court against the evil persecutor, to deliver Israel, to superintend the resurrection of the dead,

\(^1\)Ibid.
and, among those who rise, to give an eternal, exalted reward to the righteous and everlasting punishment to the wicked.\(^1\)

Michael stands as mediator between God and Israel. He is the deliverer of Israel. He is "the great prince," so described as having his own distinct identity, personality and authority, that he is a messianic figure, possessing the honor and dignity of divinity. He occupies a role attributed only to God elsewhere in the Old Testament.

\(^1\)Larkin, 251.
CHAPTER IV

MICHAEL AND OTHER OLD TESTAMENT FIGURES

In seeking to understand the Michael figure, interpretation must look beyond the immediate context of Dan 10-12 to the rest of the book of Daniel and elsewhere in the OT for possible prototypes or parallels which would illuminate our understanding of the identity and function of Michael. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on a comparison of Michael with other figures in Daniel and elsewhere in the OT. Within the book of Daniel, Michael is compared with the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes (Dan 8:11, 25), the Son of Man (Dan 7:13), and one like a Son of the Gods (Dan 3:25). Outside Daniel, Michael is compared with the Angel of the Lord.

Michael and Other Danielic Figures

Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes

The most characteristic title of Michael is נָוָן (נָוָן), "prince." It is applied to him in each of the three passages where he is mentioned by name (Dan 10:13, 21; 11:1), as well as to the adversarial, celestial princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20). Beyond that, the only other heavenly figure in Daniel to whom the title נָוָן is applied is the one called "Prince of the Host" (Dan 8:11), and "Prince of Princes" in the interpretation of the same
vision (Dan 8:25). This figure is now compared with the Michael figure.

The interpretation that the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes is God, held by Jerome¹ and Calvin,² is the position widely held by the majority of commentators in the modern period.³ Compelling reasons for this identification do indeed exist in Dan 8:11. The little horn power "took away from him the continual burnt-offering, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down" (ASV). From this passage it is clear that the Prince of the Host had a sanctuary,

¹Jerome 85, 87. Jerome referred to the Prince of Princes as "Prince of Power." Other ancient commentators, such as Aphrahat, The Demonstrations of Aphrahat, NPNF, Second Series, 18:345-412; Hippolytus, The Extant Works and Fragments: Exegetical, ANF, 5:163-241; and John Chrysostom, Herméneia Eis ton Daniel Prophètēn, PG, 56:195-245; have not commented on the identity of the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes figure. An exhaustive search of the Fathers, however, has not been made.

²Calvin, Daniel, 2:128;1 "I have not the least doubt that God is here meant by the Prince of princes."

³Among those holding this view: Lowth, 78, 86; Clarke, "Daniel," 4:599; Folsom, 75; Benjamin Harrison, Prophetic Outlines of the Christian Church and the Antichristian Power as Traced in the Visions of Daniel and St. John: in Twelve Lectures (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1849), 120; Stuart, 233; Barnes, 2:110-11, Cowles, 376; Keil, 297; Fausset, 427; Seiss, 214; Bullock, 4:n.p.; Dennett, 126-27; George F. Moore, "Daniel viii.9-14," JBL 15 (1896): 193-94; Joseph Tanner, Daniel and the Revelation (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898), 513; Nathaniel West, 58; Prince, 146-47; Karl Marti, Das Buch Daniel, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, 18 (Tubingen: Mohr, 1901), 58; Kelly, 151; Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie, 12; C. H. H. Wright, 180; Gaebelain, 97; Montgomery, Daniel, 335; Charles, Daniel, 207, 221; Leupold, Daniel, 369; Young, Daniel 172, 191; Jeffery, 473, 482; Heaton, 194, 200; Michaeli, 656, 658; Porteous, 125; Plöger, 126, 129; B. H. Hall, 541; Walvoord, 187, 198; M. Delcor, "Les sources du chapitre VII de Daniel," VT 18 (1968): 183; Owens, 432; Clifford, 24; Wood, 103; Hammer, 85; Hartman and Di Lella, 283; Baldwin, Daniel, 157; D. S. Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod 237; Goldwurm, 223; Collins, Daniel, 1. 2 Maccabees, 88; Maier, 305; R. A. Anderson, 95-96; Towner, 123; Archer, "Daniel," 100; Phillips and Vines, 125.
and that he was the object of cultic worship.\textsuperscript{1} Both are prerogatives of deity alone.\textsuperscript{2} Moreover, since the chiefs of the angels are called "princes," their "prince" might be seen as none other than God Himself.\textsuperscript{3}

Furthermore, it is argued that by analogy with other expressions of superlative in the same kind of construction, such as "King of kings," and "Lord of lords," the expression "Prince of Princes" should be understood to mean "the princeliest of all," that is, God.\textsuperscript{4}

However, simply to interpret the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes as God is not an adequate treatment of the designation. One needs to account for use of the designation šar (prince). R. Hammer stated that "usually 'the Prince of the Host' would refer to an angelic being (cf. 12:1)."\textsuperscript{5} If šar is here a simple reference to God, then this is the only place in the OT where šar is so used.\textsuperscript{6}

The significance of this fact, that God is never referred to as šar


\textsuperscript{2}Hammer, 85; Phillips and Vines, 125. In Israelite religion, only God had a sanctuary. The Mosaic tabernacle built in the wilderness was succeeded by the temple of Solomon, then that of Zerubbabel. But there was a heavenly sanctuary where God dwelt, and which served as the pattern of the Israelite sanctuary. See Frank B. Holbrook, "The Israelite Sanctuary," in \textit{The Sanctuary and the Atonement}, ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Lesher (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1981), 3-6.

\textsuperscript{3}Leupold, 369; Jeffery, 482; B. H. Hall, 541.

\textsuperscript{4}Jeffery, 482; see also Hartman and Di Lella, 236.

\textsuperscript{5}Hammer, 85.

\textsuperscript{6}Jeffery, 474; see also Owens, 432.
elsewhere in the OT, should be considered carefully. As noted in chap. 3,¹ one weighty argument against interpreting the princes of Persia and Greece as earthly kings is that the expression שאר is never elsewhere in the Old Testament applied to an earthly king. The same argument would seem to apply here. This calls for close scrutiny of this figure, to determine why in this context שאר would be used to designate a divine being.

Furthermore, God is widely referred to in the Old Testament as "king."² He is called "King of heaven" in Dan 4:37. If שאר never elsewhere designates a human king, but only a king's military commanders and other subordinate officials, it would seem even less likely that the expression שאר would be used for God. Even the expression "King of kings" is not used for God in the OT. He is referred to as "Lord of kings," within the book of Daniel (2:47). If the author wished to refer to God as the One in authority over the angelic princes, one would anticipate an expression such as "King of princes" or "Lord of princes."³

It appears that the author of Dan 8:11, 25, in using the designation Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes, was speaking of deity depicted in a different role than that of Lord or King. To fully understand the meaning of the passage, it is necessary to discover what that role was.

Of primary importance is the use of the expression "Prince of

¹See above, 208.
²See Deut 33:5; 1 Sam 12:12; 1 Chr 29:20; Pss 10:16; 24:7-10; 95:3; Isa 6:5; Jer 10:10; Dan 4:37; Zech 14:9 as examples.
³Dix, 241.
the Host" elsewhere in the OT. It is a widely used expression, especially in the books of 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, and 1-2 Chronicles, where it signifies "captain(s) of the army" (KJV). Generally it refers to the captain of a national army, as "captain of the host of Israel," "captain of the host of Judah" (1 Kgs 2:32 ASV), or "captain of the host of the king of Syria" (2 Kgs 5:1 ASV), or, in plural, to the officers of an army, whatever their rank may be (2 Sam 4:2, 4).

However, the expression is used in only one other passage in the OT to refer to a celestial being. The mysterious, transcendent being appearing to Joshua by the Jordan is twice referred to as šar šebāl yahweh, "prince of the host of Yahweh" (Josh 5:14-15). The expression as it appears in Daniel is not identical to its appearance in Joshua, as Joshua adds "of Yahweh," but no doubt the Prince of the Host of Dan 8:11, if interpreted as a transcendent being, was understood to be the Prince of the Host of Yahweh. Since only in Josh 5:14-15 and Dan 8:11 is this expression used for a heavenly being, an influence from Joshua on Daniel may be seen. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the author of Dan 8 also had a heavenly being in mind and purposely chose that expression to

---

1 See Gen 21:22; Deut 20:9; 1 Sam 12:9; 2 Sam 10:16, 18; 1 Kgs 1:19, 25; 2:32; 2 Kgs 4:13, 5:1; 1 Chr 26:26; Neh 2:9, as examples. See šar, BDB, 978.

2 Jeffery, 474, 482; Montgomery, Daniel, 335; Trent C. Butler, Joshua, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 7 (Waco, Tex.: Word Book Pub., 1983), 61; A. Graeme Auld, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, The Daily Study Bible (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), 35; Lacocque, 168, 188, 208. Lacocque has noted this and other parallels as well between Josh 5:13-15 and the book of Daniel. For example, cf. "I have now come" (Josh 5:14), "I have now come" (Dan 9:22), "I have come" (Dan 10:12); "Joshua fell on his face to the earth" (Josh 5:14), "I was frightened and fell on my face" (Dan 8:17).
ident-ify the being there with the being mentioned in Joshua.¹

Many have interpreted the Prince of the Host to be Onias III, high priest at the time of the persecutions of Antiochus III.² One argument against this view is the analogy of *yahweh seba'ot*, and the predilection of the author of Daniel for such titles as God of Heaven, Lord of Heaven, King of Heaven.³ Another is that it is disputable whether the term šar is ever used in Scripture to designate a high priest.⁴ The expression šar hašāḇa, a military term, was never used in the OT to designate the office of high priest.⁵ Further, the analogy with the transcendent "Prince of the host of Yahweh" of Josh 5:14-15 argues for interpreting the Prince of the Host in Dan 8:11 also as a heavenly being.⁶ Furthermore, the

¹See Leuken, 27. He notes that in the LXX both Josh 5:14-15 and Dan 8:11 translate the expression "archistratēgos," thus "Dan 8:11 LXX, therefore, expected the deliverance out of the distress which the Little Horn-Antiochus-Antichrist brought, by the Archistrategen Michael." See also 2 Enoch 33:10 where "the archistrategē Michael" is referred to.

²Henry, 1079; Amner, 182; West, 95; Newell, 113; Maier, 305. Maier interprets the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11) to be the high priest, but the Prince of Princes (Dan 8:25) as God, a position for which there is little support.

³Moore, "Daniel viii.9-14," 193.

⁴*BDB* 978, 5. The technical term in the OT for "high priest" is hakōhēn hašāḇa, and for "chief priest," kōhēn harōḵ. The term šar is plural in 1 Chr 24:5; Ezra 8:24, 29, while the designation for high priest would be singular. The offices referred to in these positions likely designate some responsibility for the sanctuary other than that of high priest.


⁶Ibid. See also Keil, Daniel, 354-355.
historical situation does not support Onias III being the fulfillment of the passage.¹

It seems apparent from three factors in the context (Josh 15:13-6:5)² that the being appearing to Joshua was viewed as divine

¹Keil, Daniel, 451-52. "The murder of Onias III was perpetrated without the previous knowledge of Antiochus, and when the matter was reported to him, the murderer was put to death at his command (2 Macc 4:36-38)." According to other accounts, Onias was not killed at all, but escaped to Egypt (Josephus Wars of the Jews I.i, I.vii.x.2,3). See Price, 243; Samuel Rolles Driver, The Book of Daniel, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: University Press, 1922), 140.

²It has been argued that Josh 5:13-15 was not part of the original narrative, and therefore, was not connected with Josh 6:1-5. See Martin Noth, Das Buch Josua, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, vol. 7 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1938), 4; John Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 71-72.; Patrick D. Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 129. It is true that Josh 6:1-5 could stand alone, in parallel with other examples of direct speaking to Joshua by Yahweh (cf. Josh 4:1; 5:2; 7:10; 8:1, etc.) and if Josh 5:13-15 were removed, its absence would not break up the flow of the story. In this case, the Prince of the Host would not be called Jehovah in the original pericope (John Bright, "The Book of Joshua, Introduction and Exegesis," JB [New York: Abingdon Press, 1953], 2:576). Nevertheless, factors (1) and (2) below would still suggest the presence of divinity. Also, the insertion of the Prince of the Host pericope, if not part of the original text, must have taken place at an early date, so that the author of Daniel would have read and accepted the account as it stands today (S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910], 106; Edward J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1950], 160; Butler, 60). Also, the editor who would have inserted it into the narrative did so in a way that Josh 6:1-5 appears to be part of the theophany, and thus the Prince of the Host was, in Josh 6:2, identified with Yahweh.

One strong argument against seeing Josh 5:13-15 as a later insertion, is that it is incomplete without 6:1-5. The Prince of the Host only appears, with no message for Joshua, though a message is clearly anticipated: "What does my lord bid his servant?" (Josh 5:14). (For the idea that the verses "are sufficiently self-contained, as to make further supplementation superfluous," see Marten H. Woudstra, The Book of Joshua, NICOT [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1981], 104. If Josh 5:13-15 was a later insertion, there must have been a message contained in it, which was dropped by the editor, in favor of the already-existing message in Josh 6:1-5 (J. Gray, Joshua, 72; Bright, 576; Robert G. Boling, Joshua, AB [Garden City, N.Y.: Doublday & Company, 1982], 196). That is, how-
in nature: (1) He accepted worship from Joshua (Josh 5:14), (2) Joshua was commanded to remove his shoes, for the place where he was standing was holy (Josh 5:15; cf. Exod 3:5), (3) the narrator referred to the being, in Josh 6:2, as "Yahweh."

The text does not identify the heavenly visitor as an angel. What we have here is the description of a definite theophany.

The being that appeared to Joshua was in human form, so much so that Joshua asked him to identify himself, in fear that he might be an enemy soldier (Josh 5:13). Thus he was not a theophany in majestic glory, such as Moses was permitted to behold on Mt. Sinai (Exod 33:17-34:7). The being Joshua sees and talks with at first appears to be distinguished from Jehovah, designating himself as the "captain" or "prince" (אֲדֹנָי) of His hosts, and only later, in Josh 6:2 is he referred to as Yahweh. Aside from this experience, Yahweh spoke directly to Joshua on several occasions, without any accompanying visible appearance (Josh 1:1; 3:7; 4:1, 15; 5:2; 7:10; 8:1, ever, mere speculation. It appears sounder to assume that the Josh 5:13-15 pericope was part of the original narrative, with Josh 6:2-5 containing the original message of the celestial visitor, and Josh 6:1 being a parenthetical explanation (H. Freedman, Joshua and Judges [London: Soncino Press, 1950], 27; William H. Morton, "Joshua." The Broadman Bible Commentary [Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1970], 2:320-321).


etc.). This dramatic, unusual appearance of the "Prince of the Host" as a "man," thus in appearance a human form, suggests that this incident in Josh 5:13-6:7 was a highly unusual communication from Yahweh, with a specific purpose. That purpose can be seen in the military designation "Prince of the Host of Yahweh." Joshua was faced with a military task, the conquest of Jericho, and beyond that, the conquest of the promised land.

These considerations lead one to conclude that the šar in Josh 5:114-15 is an earthly manifestation of the heavenly God as a military leader, giving divine instruction to Joshua for the immediate conquest of Jericho, and thus dramatic reassurance of His continued leadership in the conquest of the land as a whole.

Drawing upon Josh 5:13-6:5, the Danielic passage (Dan 8:11-13) depicts the Prince of the Host, a warrior figure as he was in Joshua, in combat with the Little Horn power. The Little Horn power is seen "magnifying itself, even to the Prince of the host," removing his continual ministry (tāmid), overthrowing the place of his sanctuary, and casting the truth to the ground (Dan 8:11-12). The military designation "Prince of the Host," however, indicates that the heavenly šar, after what seem to be decisive setbacks, will in the end be as victorious over his enemy (the Little Horn power) as Yahweh was in the days of Joshua.

The question of the identity of the being in either Dan 8:11 or Josh 5:14-15 is sometimes expressed in terms of being either God, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, an angel in charge of the
heavenly hosts.\textsuperscript{1} What we may be looking at, however, is a being who is not "either, or" but "both, and," that is, Yahweh who is both God and the leader of the heavenly armies, the divine Warrior,\textsuperscript{2} \textit{yahweh seba\'ot}, "Lord of hosts" (1 Sam 1:11; Ps 24:10; Isa 1:24; 2 Kgs 3:14; Mal 1:14), intervening on behalf of His people.\textsuperscript{3}

The use of the term \textit{sar} for the Prince of the Host and for the exalted figure of Michael is a clear terminological link, and suggests a possible identification of these two figures. The use of the title \textit{sar} for the Prince of the Host of Jehovah in Josh 5:14-15 is widely thought to be the source lying behind the use of \textit{sar} for Michael in Dan 10 and 12.\textsuperscript{4} Bullock concluded that the "prince of

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{1} Jeffery, 472. Jeffery, though identifying the Prince of the Host in Daniel 8:11 as God, pointing to Josh 5:13-15 and the use of \textit{sar} there and for the figures in Dan 10:13, 20; 12:1, made reference to an alternate view: "that some see in this passage not God himself, but the angel in charge of the heavenly hosts." Russell, \textit{The Jews from Alexander to Herod}, 237. Though Russell held that the "Prince of the Host" of Dan 8:11 referred to God, he nevertheless conceded that "it may allude to the angelic leader of the heavenly host." See also Russell, \textit{Daniel}, 144.

\item\textsuperscript{2} Patrick D. Miller, "El The Warrior," \textit{HTR} 60 (1967): 428-429.

\item\textsuperscript{3} Moore, "Daniel viii.9-14," 193-194; Prince, 146-147; Porteous, 125; Archer, "Daniel," 100; Alomia, 377-402. Alomia notes that to the Hebrews, Yahweh was not only the supreme commander of the heavenly troops, but also the leader of the armies of Israel. He cites the following texts in support of his view of Yahweh's role as a military leader; 1 Kgs 22:19; 2 Kgs 6:13-17; Ps 68:18; Exod 15:2-3, 11 ("YHWH is a warrior," vs. 3); Exod 14:14, "YHWH will fight for you"; Judg 4:15-15; 5:4-5; 20-21; Exod 20:18; Ps 68:7-8; Ps 24:8, 10, "YHWH strong and mighty, YHWH mighty in battle, . . . YHWH of hosts"; Ps 103:19-22. He spoke of "YHWH as a warrior \textit{par excellence}," 383. Millard Lind, \textit{Yahweh Is a Warrior} (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1980), 1, 79, "The concept of Yahweh fighting the battle and Israel not fighting at all was not a late theological development but was already expressed in Israel's pre-kingship literature, a concept which is there stated as grounded in a historical event" (79). The expression \textit{yahweh seba\'ot} is interestingly missing in Joshua (it does not appear in any book before 1 Sam) and in Daniel.

\item\textsuperscript{4} Montgomery, \textit{Daniel}, 419, "The book of Dan. presents a
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the host of Yahweh (Josh 5:14-15) may 'possibly' be identified with Michael.\(^1\)

The Greek translation of "Prince of the Host," both in Josh 4:14-15 (LXX) and in Dan 8:11 (LXX and Theod.) is "archistrategos." This is the title repeatedly applied to Michael in 2 Enoch\(^2\) and became the standard designation for Michael in the Byzantine Church.\(^3\) Lueken believed that by the Prince of the Host the author of Daniel meant "probably Michael"; "Dan 8:11 LXX, therefore, expected the deliverance out of the distress which the Little Horn-Antiochus-Antichrist brought, by the Archistrategen Michael."\(^4\)

J. P. Rohland opposes the identification of Michael with the "prince of the host of Yahweh." He is cognizant of Michael's role in Daniel as guardian prince of the Jewish people. But he nevertheless denies that the title archistrategos (used in the LXX for "prince of the host" in Josh 5:14 and Dan 8:11) has any connection with the name Michael. He sees two different "numina": a commander-in-chief angel on the one side, and Michael, the angel of the people, on the other. The title "Michael the Archistrategos" found in the full-fledged doctrine of the nations, i.e., their celestial-patrons. For the term we may compare 'the Prince (i.e. general) of the army of YHWH,' Jos 5:14."; Heaton, 222; Grill, 243; Hartman and Di Lella, 282. "The use of the term 'prince' in these verses [Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1] probably depends on Josh 5:14-15, where the angel-commander of the army of Yahweh is so named"; Frank W. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (M.A. Thesis, Andrews University, 1983), 125.

\(^1\)See also Bullock, on Dan 8:11 [n.p.].

\(^2\)See 2 Enoch 33:10a.

\(^3\)Lueken, 26-27.

\(^4\)Ibid.
pseudepigrapha is, he feels, a fusion of the two.¹

But there is more than one difficulty in Rohland's position. First of all, Michael does have military associations, not primarily from his title zar (though this is used to mean military commander in Josh 5:14, the passage from which the author of Dan 8 probably drew the term), but from Dan 10:20-21, where Michael is clearly involved in a "fight" as he "contends" by the side of the angel who spoke to Daniel. These are military expressions and suggest that the earlier struggle (Dan 10:13) was also viewed in military terms.² Second, the title zar, as well as the activity of each, seems to serve as a link between Michael and the Prince of the Host of Yahweh.

It appears that Rohland, in his legitimate effort to point to non-military aspects of the Danielic Michael figure, goes too far in seeking to set him apart from the Prince of the Host, who he feels is an unambiguously military figure.³

Montgomery noted that:

Polych. [Polychronius] finds here (Dan 8:11) 'the presiding angel of the nation,' and AEz. [Aben Ezra] Michael, following the clew [sic] of the use of the word for angels in 10:13, 20, cf. Josh 5:14; in Targ. to Ps 137 Michael is the prince of Jerusalem.⁴

A. Lacocque, in rejecting the interpretation of the Prince of the Host as the High Priest Onias III, stated, "We must not think only of the High Priest, but also of the archangel Michael, the prince of Israel." And of the Prince of Princes, he remarks, "The

¹Rohland, 10-11; 13-14.
²Lacocque, 242; Goldingay, Daniel, 172.
³Rohland, 13-14.
⁴Montgomery, Daniel, 335.
title 'Prince of princes' which is here attributed to this personage signifies that he is the chief of the angels (see Dan 10:20; 12:1)."\(^1\)

R. A. Anderson, in reply to Lacocque, disagrees with the identification of the Prince of the Host with Michael, his objection being that an angel could not properly fulfill the remainder of Dan 8:11 without "strained exegesis."\(^2\)

Russell, noting the terminological link of ἀρχή between the Prince of the Host and Michael, felt that if the term signified an angel, then the passage (Dan 8:11) "refers to the chief of the angel host who is identified in 10:21, for example, as the archangel Michael."\(^3\)

Likewise, John Goldingay noted that:

In Josh 5:13-15 the leader of Yahweh's army is a celestial being, and the leader of the army here might thus be Michael, though the description of his authority goes beyond that of Michael elsewhere. . . . More likely it is God himself, who is presumably the "leader supreme" (יָשָׁר אֶלֶּהוֹ) of v 25, the one who

\(^{1}\)Lacocque, 162, 172; see also Paul A. Porter, Metaphors and Monsters (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1983); 88-89, "Michael the prince of the heavenly flock ([Dan] 8:11 cf. 10:21) delivers Israel from Antiochus, the little horn of the he-goat (8:25; 12:1)."; Lees, 3:2047, of Michael, "perhaps also 'the prince of the host' (8:11)." James Barr, "Daniel," Peake's Commentary on the Bible (London: Nelson, 1962), 598, wrote, "'prince' (ἄρχη) in Dan usually means the great angelic beings, cf. 12:1 etc., and should be so taken probably here and in v. 25." However, he also allowed the application to God. Nickelsburg, 70n. 82, interpreting the Little Horn as Antiochus, wrote, "For Antiochus' opposition to Michael, cf. Dan 8:11," thus explicitly identifying the Prince of the Host as Michael.

\(^{2}\)R. A. Anderson, 95-96.

\(^{3}\)Russell, Daniel, 144; idem, The Jews from Alexander to Herod, 237. But he feels the context supports interpreting the Prince of the Host as God.
is יְהוָה הַמַּחֲ抽检 ("Yahweh of armies," EVV "the LORD of hosts").¹

But if ֶאר can be accepted as a designation for God in Dan 8:11, 25, then it may be possible to accept that Michael as well as the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes is a manifestation of God in His role as heavenly warrior, intervening on behalf of His people in history (Dan 10:13, 20-21) and at the eschaton (Dan 12:1). Michael would then be the name of the being referred to as the Prince of the Host and Prince of Princes (Dan 8:11, 25).²

Some interpreters have felt that behind the account of the assault of the Little Horn against the host of heaven and the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:10-11) lay some transcendent struggle. Lueken thought that Daniel might have utilized mythological elements, as the assault of the dragon against heaven. He confesses he has found little evidence in Jewish writings for a dragon struggle of Michael, but points to Rev 12:7-9 as raising the possibility that some such evidence may yet be found.³ Some scholars have seen a more relevant background in the Isa 14:12-14 account of Lucifer's self-exaltation to equality with God.⁴ G. Nickelsburg thought that there was an

¹Goldingay, 211, cf. 218.
³Lueken, 27.
⁴Folsom, 75; B. Harrison, 149; Brownlee, 98-99; Montgomery, Daniel, 335; Nickelsburg, 14-15, 69-70; Hartman and Di Lella, Daniel, 236; Clifford, 25-26, "Antiochus' raising of himself against the divine assembly and even the Most High God is a re-use of the old Canaanite myth of the rebellion in the heavens which finds its OT reflex in such passages as Isa 14:3-21 and Ezek 28:1-19"; Collins, Daniel, 1, 2 Maccabees, 140; John J. Collins, Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature (Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. T. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1984), 100; John J. Collins, "Daniel and His
angelic power behind the Little Horn who was the chief demon. The insolence described in Dan 8:9-11 and 11:36 is expressed "in language akin to that of the 'Lucifer' myth in Isaiah 14." He felt that the "Lucifer myth" recurs again in Rev 12, where the chief figure is explicitly identified with Satan, and his opponent is Michael. He thus sees the Prince of the Host and Michael as equated in these parallel versions of the "Lucifer myth." Nickelsburg speculated that the name Michael, "Who is like God," may constitute a challenge to Lucifer's aspirations, "I will make myself like the Most High," and imply that the latter is Michael's opponent in Dan 12:1. However, though the texts of Dan 8:11 and Dan 10:13, 20-21 allow for an interpretation involving demonic beings, the text of Dan 12:1 does not seem to suggest the presence of a demonic being.

Three designations used in Dan 8:10 to describe the object of the activities of the "Little Horn" are "host of heaven," "host," and "stars." Generally all three designations are understood to refer to the same thing, whether it be astral deities, angelic

---


2Nickelsburg, 14-15; see also Collins, Daniel, 1. 2 MacCabees, 140.

3Nickelsburg, 70.

4For the view that the "Host of heaven," "host" or "stars" of Dan 8:10 refer to astral worship or heathen deities, see Moore, "Daniel viii.9-14," 193 (cites Isa 24:21ff; Deut 4:19; 32:8; 1 Enoch 80ff); Montgomery, Daniel, 334; Jeffery, 474; Collins, "Son of Man and Saints," 59. See discussion by Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 397-98.
beings,¹ or the people of God.² In the phrase "some of the host and some of the stars it cast down to the ground," the waw is widely accepted as epexegetical, "some of the host, even some of the stars," "host" and "stars" being the same.³ However, though the syntax allows this, OT usage favors interpreting the waw as coordinative, not explicative.⁴ There is room therefore for interpreting "host" and "stars" as referring to two separate groups.⁵

If the Little Horn figure in Dan 8:9-12 can be thought of as the earthly embodiment of the anti-God chief demon, somewhat analogous to the king of Babylon in Isa 14⁶ and the king of Tyre in

---


²For the view that "host" and "stars" signify earthly beings, the people of God or their priests or leaders, see Jerome, 85-86; Lowth, 77; T. Newton, 254; Faber, 1:133; M. Stuart, 232-33; Benson, 806; Keil, 296-97; Bevan, 132; C. H. H. Wright, 180; Charles, Daniel, 204; Young, Daniel, 171; Owens, 432; Wood, 103; Archer, "Daniel," 99; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 398.

³Keil, 297; Moore, "Dan 8:9-14," 193; Bevan, 132; Charles, Daniel, 204; Archer, "Daniel," 101.


⁵A number of older commentaries distinguished between the "host," Israel, and the "stars," the leaders/priests/teachers of Israel: Lowth, 77; T. Newton, 254, Faber, 2:155; 254; Dennett, 126; West, 54; M. M. Wilson, 398; Jenkins, 38-39.

⁶Bertolucci, 217. He also sees a parallel between
Ezek 28, and if the "host" or "stars" (Dan 8:10) is interpreted as angels, then the power with which the Prince of the Host has to contend would not be simply a self-magnifying earthly power but also a transcendent demon which the earthly Little Horn power embodies.

This would parallel the activity of Michael (Dan 10:13, 21) contending with the princes of Persia and Greece, reinforcing the probability of the identification of Michael and the Prince of the Host.1

Isa 14:12-15, Ezek 28:12-17, and Rev 12:7-9, in that, in each passage, the writer switches from the present or near future to a past event which is the cause of the present moral situation, then switches back to the present. For parallels between Isa 14 and Dan 10-11, see Folsom, 75; B. Harrison, 149n.; Lang, 112, "The reality behind the myth is shown in this chapter 14 of Isaiah"; Goldingay, 210, "The notion of attacking the stars . . . goes back to Isa 14:13."

1 The NT book of Revelation—though too late, of course, to influence the interpretation of Dan 8:10-11—seems to fit in with this interpretation. In Rev 12, with some parallels to and possible dependence upon Dan 8:10-11, it is the great red dragon, identified as the Devil and Satan, whose tail drew a third of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth (Rev 12:4). Also, Michael is seen leading the angelic armies (Rev 12:7-9), thus functioning as the commander (prince) of the angelic host of heaven. If the red dragon of Rev 12 was meant as a symbol of Rome or of Herod (Weidner, 167, 156; Reuben L. Hilde, "An Exegesis of the Little Horn of Daniel 8" [M.A. thesis, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1953], 99; C. Mervyn Maxwell, Revelation, vol. 2, God Cares [Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Pub. Assoc., 1985], 320), we see here also, as possibly in Dan 8:9-12, a symbol with not only the transcendent evil power of Satan in view, but also an earthly, evil power behind which he lay, and above and through which he worked.

For the influence of Dan 8:10 on Rev 12:4, see T. Newton, 254; Weidner, 156; R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), 1:319; Lang, 112, "The meaning of these terms seems fixed by Rev 12, which chapter, and the next, are so closely related to the visions of Daniel"; Robert H. Mounce, The Book of Revelation, NICNT (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1977), 238; J. P. M. Sweet, Revelation, Westminster Pelican Commentaries (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979), 196. Beale, 274-75, does not specifically link Rev 12:4 with Dan 8:10, but speaks of "thematic similarities" between Dan and Rev, such as the heavenly battle between good and evil "princes" (Dan 10:20-21; 12:1) and the angelic battle between Michael's forces and those of the dragon (Rev
Another widely held view is that the expression "host of heaven" and/or "host" and "stars" in Dan 8:10 refers to the people of God or Israel. If Goldingay's recent suggestion be true that the Aramaic expression (Dan 7:18) traditionally translated "saints of the Most High" might better be translated "holy ones on high," it might denote living earthly beings seen as exalted in God's sight or by their association with God, much as Eph 2:6 expresses that God has "raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places." If the "host" in this context signifies Israel, then the Prince of the Host in this context would be the Prince of Israel. This would identify the Prince of the Host with Michael, as he is "your [plural] prince" (Dan 10:21), and "the great prince who has charge of your people" (Dan 12:1), that is, Prince of Israel.  

12:7-9). Such thematic affinities (both this example and elsewhere in the two books), he concludes, "can be seen to point to a general theological dependence of the Apocalypse upon Daniel."

1 Jerome, 85; Keil, 296-97, "The words of the angel, ver. 24, show that by the stars we are to understand the people of the saints. . . . the tribes of Israel . . . are called 'the hosts of Jehovah' (Ex. 7:4, 12:41);" Birchmore, 42; Bevan, 132; Jenkins, 38-39; Wright, Daniel, 180; Montgomery, Daniel, 333-334; Charles, Daniel, 204; Young, Daniel, 171; Tatford, 128; Owens, 432; Wood, 103, "'the host of heaven,' meaning the stars (Jer. 33:22), which here represent the people of God in Palestine;" Archer, Daniel, 99; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary," 397.

2 John Goldingay, "Holy Ones on High in Daniel 7:18," JBL 107 (1988): 495-97. But see Hasel, "The Identity of the Saints of the Most High in Daniel 7," 173, where, as Goldingay acknowledges ("Holy Ones on High," 497), it is shown that the Aramaic word translated "Most High" could be treated as a proper name, so the whole phrase would be determinate, and the translation, "the holy ones of the Most High," would be justified.

3 Goldingay, "Holy Ones on High," 497. He thinks, however, it more naturally suggests beings who are celestial in some way.

4 Porter, 88-89.
This would not conflict with the interpretation that the Prince of the Host is God, as long as Michael is interpreted, not as an angel, but as a divine being in His warrior role.

From the evidence we have examined, it appears that the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes in Dan 8:11, 25 could be understood as the same personage as Michael, the Prince of God's people, the divine Deliverer in His role as commander of His forces in the heavens and of His people on earth.

Koch appears to favor the identification of the Prince of the host with Michael. In reference to Michael he states:

According to 12:1, he is viewed as "great prince," which no doubt means the leader of all the angels, and at the same time, as prince over Israel, the people of the covenant (10:13, 21); perhaps he is the one, who at the end of the world opens up the heavenly books and with that, leads in the way of the resurrection. If one identifies him with "Prince of the Host" and "Prince of Princes" (8:11, 25), he stands in the book of Daniel over the Jerusalem temple and its cult—accordingly at the only legitimate holy places on earth—and becomes injured himself through its profanation. That Michael served as "mediator of God and mankind" (TDan 6; Bousset-Gressmann, 327; Lueken: 1898) is then already presupposed.

The messianic interpretation of the Prince of the Host/Prince

---

1See above, 305, note 3.

2Koch, Daniel, 207; Nach 12,1 gilt er als Grossfürst, was doch wohl den Anführer aller Engel meint, und zugleich als Fürst über Israel, das Volk des Bundes (10,13.21); vielleicht ist er derjenige, der am Ende der Welt das himmlische Buch aufschlägt um damit die Auferstehung in die Wege leitet. Wenn man ihn mit "Fürst des Heeres" und 'Fürst der Fürsten' (8,11.25) gleichsetzt, steht er für das Db über dem Jerusalemer Tempel un seinem Kult--damit an der einzig legitimen heiligen Stätte auf Erden--und wird durch deren Entweihung selbst beeinträchtigt. Vorausgesetzt würde dann schon, dass Michael als 'Mittler Gottes und der Menschen' wirkt (TDan 6; Bousset-Gressmann, 327; Lueken: 1898)." See also Russell, Daniel, 144, if Dan 8:11 refers to an angelic being, then "it refers to the chief of the angel host who is identified in 10:21, for example, as the archangel Michael."
of Princes has long been popular among Christians.¹ This

¹Theodoret of Cyrene, MPG, 81:1452, equated the Prince of Princes with the King of kings and Lord of lords of 1 Tim 6:15, thus with Christ. Lowth, 78, argued that the Prince of the Host be understood of "God himself," "or else of Christ the High Priest over the House of God, whose Sanctuary the Temple is called in the following Words." Isaac Newton, Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John, ed. and intro. by William Whita (London: John Murray, 1922), 220-221, less ambiguously, asserted that the Prince of the Host was "the Messiah, the Prince of the Jews, whom he [the "little horn" power] put to death."

Through the modern period, a small but persisting number of interpreters have held the messianic interpretation of the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes figure: Isaac Newton, 220-21; Faber, 2:155; Clarke, Daniel, 599; T. Newton, 255; Cumming, 270; Darby, 47; Uriah Smith, Daniel and the Revelation, 154; Birchmore, 42; M. M. Wilson, 398; Ethel Stout Jenkins, The Time of the End (Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1944), 39; "Daniel," SDABC, 4:842-46; G. M. Price, 171; Filmer, 93; Culver, 131; Gurney, 78; Maxwell, Daniel, 155, 172.

The messianic application has generally taken three forms:

1. The Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes passages (Dan 8:11-25) have been seen as a prophecy of the time of Christ's incarnation (I. Newton, 220-221; Lowth, 78, 86; Darby, 46; see also Hilde, 34, 99-100; Filmer, 93; Culver, 131) with the Little Horn who exalted himself against him interpreted as Rome (I. Newton, 121; T. Newton, 255, "If by the prince of princes be meant, as most probably was meant, the Messiah, then Antiochus had no share in the completion; it was affected by the Romans"; Clarke, "Daniel," 598-99; Thomas R. Birks, The Two Later Visions of Daniel (London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1846), 174-86; U. Smith, 154; R. Hilde, 99-100; "Daniel," SDABC, 4:842-46; Price, 171; Maxwell, Daniel, 155, 172).

2. These passages have been interpreted as Christ in His pre-incarnate existence, relating to His people Israel at the time of the second century B.C. Antiochene crisis (Walvoord, 187, 198. He saw the Little Horn as Antiochus and the Prince of the Host as God, but noted that "Christ existed in Old Testament times as God and the Angel of Jehovah and as the defender of Israel").

3. These passages have been applied to Christ in His post-incarnation heavenly existence, attacked by an antichrist power which threatened His people and His true worship. Earlier exegetes saw Islam as the Little Horn threatening Christ in His people (Faber, 2:155; Cumming, 270). Others have seen the medieval papacy as the Little Horn, replacing Christ's heavenly, high-priestly ministry in His heavenly sanctuary with an earthly priestly ministry in an earthly sanctuary, and persecuting dissenters (U. Smith, 155; "Daniel," SDA Bible Commentary, 4:843; Price, 172-177; Maxwell, Daniel, 162-179; William H. Shea, Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1982), 55; Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' The Heavenly Sanctuary," 399-420).
interpretation generally approaches the Prince of the Host from the New Testament perspective, and cannot influence us here. There does not seem to be direct evidence in Daniel 8:10-11 to support a messianic interpretation.

A messianic interpretation of the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes finds possible indirect support from the parallel prophecy concerning "an anointed one, a prince" (Dan 9:24-27), and is discussed in detail later in the appendix.1 A messianic interpretation of the Prince of the Host would harmonize with the identification of the Prince of the Host with Michael, for there is a long tradition of a messianic interpretation of Michael as well.

In summary, a case can be made to identify the Prince of the Host of Dan 8:11 with the Michael figure in Daniel. The title Prince of Princes (Dan 8:25) carries virtually the same meaning as "the great prince" (Dan 12:1). Both figures exhibit apparent traits of divinity. The title "prince" is used in Daniel for transcendent beings (Dan 8:11, 25; 10:13, 20-21; 12:1). The title Prince of the Host and the use of the designation "prince" for Michael both may have been influenced by the celestial "Prince of the host of Yahweh" who appeared to Joshua with instructions for the conquest of Jericho, and who also seemed to possess divinity. Furthermore, the function of the Prince of the Host appears to be equivalent to that of Michael as the head of the angels and prince of Israel. As אָּדָם is never used for an earthly king in the OT, but is reserved for his leading subordinates, it would seem that since God is called King in the OT, and never elsewhere called אָּדָם, the title אָדָם used here for God

1 See Appendix.
suggests a role for Him as heavenly warrior.

The Prince of the Host may be understood as Prince of the heavenly angelic host and/or protector and deliverer of the hosts of Israel on earth. This approximates the position of Michael, the transcendent prince of Israel. The Prince of the Host appears to be a veiled manifestation, as is Michael, seemingly to occupy a position subordinated to God as God's highest intermediary, or as God in a veiled manifestation. Morton is right in cautioning against thinking that Joshua saw God in the figure by Jordan; "God is spirit" (John 4:24) and "no one has ever seen God" (John 14:9);\(^1\) "You cannot see my face; for man shall not see me and live" (Exod 33:20).

Michael and the Son of Man

Michael and "one like a son of man" each appear in an eschatological setting at the close of one of the visions in Daniel. In the respective visions in which they appear, they each have special prominence and position at the time when the historical period is being superseded by a new divinely ordained order. Therefore, it is necessary to compare the two figures, to determine the similarities and differences between their identity and function. Particularly, an effort is made to determine whether the two figures are to be understood as the same being.

To conserve space, the expression "one like a son of man" (Dan 7:13) is abbreviated to "Son of Man," though I recognize at the same time the limitations and weaknesses of the abbreviation.

Nathaniel Schmidt, introducing what he called "a new

\(^1\)Morton, 321.
interpretation" of the Dan 7 Son of Man figure, declared that he "is an angel, and more particularly Michael, the guardian angel of Israel." To support the angelic interpretation, he points to other phrases in Daniel similar to "one like unto a son of man" which are used to designate angels. This usage is so uniform that "unless there is strong reason for seeking a different explanation, this should be accepted." He pointed to the Danielic passages usually cited where this kind of usage is found, as well as to Dan 3:25, where an angel is called "a son of the gods"; Rev 14:14, where the transcendent figure is "one like a son of man"; and Ezek 1:26, where God Himself is described as kemarēh īādām "as the appearance of a man" (KJV). He further looks at 1 Enoch 87:2, where the four archangels were "like white men."

But, "the only one of these man-like beings who is so closely identified with Israel as to represent it in the celestial byth dyn [house of judgment] is Michael." Gabriel is the angelus interpret, who struggles with the angel of Persia (later of Greece) until Michael arrives.

But it is Michael who everywhere represents the new world-power, Israel. When the kingdom is finally delivered to the people of the Most High, it is he who rises triumphantly, 12:1. He is declared to be the celestial prince of Israel, 10:21; 12:1. As Israel's representative before the celestial court Michael is given the world-kingdom.

This interpretation seems to satisfy all requirements. The heavenly being that has the appearance of a man is understood in the same sense as in all other passages in Daniel. It is not necessary to create a special meaning for it here. The figure is not a product of the author's imagination, not a vague symbol of a distinctly modern sentiment, but a well-known personality, the guardian angel of Israel.

But, in Schmidt's view, the Son of Man/Michael figure is not

the Messiah. With the growth of the messianic idea, Schmidt thought it natural that the work of Michael and the honor ascribed to him as the representative of Israel should shift to the shoulders of the Messiah.¹

J. J. Collins also identifies the two figures. In view of the prominence of Michael in Dan 10-12, Collins feels that "the 'one like a son of man' is the archangel Michael, who leads and represents both the heavenly host and their human counterparts, the faithful Jews."²

Among those who object to identifying Michael with the Son of Man are those who interpret the Son of Man as a symbol of the "saints of the Most High," but see Michael as an individual.³ Hartman and Di Lella's objection to the identification of the Son of Man with Michael is in response to Collins, who argued that the Son of Man in Dan 7 symbolizes primarily the angelic host and its leader Michael.⁴ Hartman and Di Lella reject the interpretation of the saints as angels, as "this apocalypse was composed and circulated in order to console and encourage the suffering Jews." If we substitute "the


⁴Collins, "The Son of Man and the Saints," 66. See also Caragounis, 47-48.
angels" wherever the expression "the holy ones (of the Most High)"
appears, the book would have small comfort for the persecuted
community.¹

They dispute Schmidt’s reasoning that the description of
angels elsewhere in Daniel as manlike figures requires the Son of Man
to be an angelic figure. The others are a "clear-cut unireferential
symbol," while the Son of Man and holy ones in Dan 7 are "in no way
recognized as angels from what is said about them."²

In response, it can be said that referring to angels as man-
like is not using symbols, but simply describing the figures, pre-
cisely as in Dan 7:13. If one can carve the Son of Man away from an
identification with the saints, the objections of Hartman and
Di Lella are largely answered. The "saints of the Most High" can be
interpreted as Israel, and the Son of Man can still be equated with
Michael, as the prince of the saints/Israel. Indeed, interpreting
the saints as Israel facilitates such an identification.

Maurice Casey challenged the identification by Schmidt and
Collins of the Son of Man with Michael. From the fact that the
author described angels in human terms, Casey thought it did not
follow that he could not describe anything else as 'man-like' as
well. "On this logical point Schmidt’s argument collapses."³

To reply to Casey, Schmidt's argument does not collapse.
Granted, the author of Daniel could use 'man-like' for something

¹Di Lella, 7.
²Hartman and Di Lella, 93-94.
³Maurice Casey, Son of Man (London: SPCK, 1979), 32.
other than heavenly beings, but the presumption would be for a similar meaning, whether one holds to a single or multiple authorship of Dan 7-12.

Examination of Some Basic Issues

Before further pursuing the question of a possible relationship between Michael and the Son of Man, it is useful to examine several crucial issues such as: Is the Son of Man a symbol? Is he an individual? Is the Son of Man an angelic being? How is the Son of Man related to the "saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:28)? Is the Son of Man a divine being?

Son of Man, symbol or individual

A much-debated question in regard to the Son of Man is whether he is a symbol of the "saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:18, 22, 25, 27), or an individual personality. The currently prevailing


interpretation is that the Son of Man appears as a symbol of the saints of the Most High. Just as the four beasts of prey in the vision (Dan 7:3-8) symbolized kings or kingdoms in the interpretation (Dan 7:17, 23), so the Son of Man in the vision is taken to symbolize the "saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:18), or "the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:27) in the interpretation. The use of the prefix for "like" (ke) in the vision is appealed to as supporting evidence. The beasts are "like a lion" (Dan 7:4) and "like a leopard" (Dan 7:6); in Dan 7:5, dāmevāh is used as a synonym of ke for stylistic alternation. Similarly, in an exact parallel, the Son of Man is "'like' a son of man" (Dan 7:13).^1

The interpretation of the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints is thought confirmed as one compares the Son of Man in the vision with the saints in the interpretation of the vision. In the vision, "dominion, glory and kingdom" were given to the Son of Man and "all peoples, nations and languages should serve him" and "his dominion is an everlasting kingdom" (vs. 14). Similarly, in the interpretation, "the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High" (vs. 27). Since the Son of Man is not mentioned otherwise in the interpretation, and since the future position of both the Son of Man in the vision and the saints in the interpretation is described in identical terms, it is thought that

---

^1Bevan, 119; Montgomery, Daniel, 318; Campbell, 148-149; Casey, Son of Man, 25.
the interpretation of the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints is established.¹

Among those interpreting "saints" as Israel, support for this line of reasoning is sought in the Jewish concept of corporate personality. The Son of Man is seen as a corporate figure, a collective symbol of the people of Israel.² Also, the contrast in symbolism, dreadful beasts for conquering Gentile empires, a man-like figure for Israel, is thought to signify the moral, spiritual superiority of Israel.³

To the objection that if the Son of Man is taken as a symbol, consistency demands that the "Ancient of days" also be regarded as a symbol, an answer is that the text does not say "like an ancient of days"; deity is a person, not a type.⁴

Though this reasoning appears convincing and is the most widely held view, persistent questions have been raised concerning its validity. It has been argued that since the Son of Man figure represents the "acme and perfection of obedience to the will of God,"


³Montgomery, Daniel, 318; Bowman, 285.

⁴Montgomery, Daniel, 318; however, Di Lella, "One in Human Likeness," 91, takes "Ancient One" to be a symbol of the God of Israel.
one "wholly devoted to Him" in contrast to the beasts who were opposed to God, it cannot represent imperfect Israel.\(^1\) Further, Young feels that if the Son of Man were intended as a symbol, the author would have been more explicit; the reading of Dan 7:13-14 gives the impression that the figure is an individual, messianic figure.\(^2\) Another argument has been that since there is wide acceptance of the view that the author of Dan 7 used earlier mythological materials in which the prototype of the Son of Man was indeed a heavenly individual, the figure in Daniel should likewise be regarded as an individual.\(^3\) The appearance of the Son of Man in later Enochian materials has been thought possibly due to "an earlier tradition which conceived this one like a son of man as an individual eschatological figure." Also, the plural "thrones" (Dan 7:9) is thought to suggest that the Son of Man is an individual participating in the judgment.\(^4\)

None of these arguments, however, has been found decisive in establishing that the Son of Man is an individual.\(^5\)

More compelling arguments have been brought forward, however,

\(^1\)Young, Daniel's Vision of the Son of Man, 18-19.

\(^2\)Ibid., 26.

\(^3\)Ibid., 27; Marshall, 84.

\(^4\)F. M. Wilson, 33.

\(^5\)Ibid. The text does not say that the Son of Man is the very opposite of the beasts in the fullest degree. Also, an individual in an earlier work can be used as a symbol in a later time (as indeed, in the case of the name "Israel"), and an earlier symbol can later be used for an individual. See also Hartman and Di Lella, 217; Montgomery, Daniel, 296-97. There is no indication that the Son of Man participated in the judgment (thus, sit on a throne); the thrones may have been occupied by other, unnamed figures.
which appear to discredit the view that the Son of Man is a symbol of the saints, and establish the view that he is an individual, personal figure. One is that since other transcendent figures in Daniel described as "one having the appearance of a man" (Dan 8:15), speaking with "a man's voice" (Dan 8:16), "the man Gabriel" (Dan 9:21), "a man clothed in linen" (Dan 10:5), "one in the likeness of the sons of men" (Dan 10:16), "one having the appearance of a man" (Dan 10:18), are all individuals, not corporate, symbolic figures, the figure "like a son of man" should be similarly interpreted. The Hebrew prefix ke, "like," is used in 8:15; 10:16, 18. Therefore the Son of Man figure in 7:13 is also to be taken as an individual, transcendent figure.

Another compelling argument is that the "saints" appear not only in the interpretation but also in the vision. Ferch has pointed out that to divide Dan 7 into vision (Dan 7:2-14) and interpretation (Dan 7:15-27) is "inadequate and misleading." While Dan 7:17-18 are interpretation, Dan 7:19-22 constitute Daniel's recollections of and elaboration of the vision, and thus pertain to the vision, not to the interpretation. These verses contain the "characteristic visionary formula," hāzēn hāwēt (I beheld), lād df (until) (Dan 7:21, 22) and the name for God, "Ancient of Days," which

1F. M. Wilson, 37.

2Little can be made of the differences between the use in Dan 7:13, "like (ke) a son of man" on the one hand, and the uses in Dan 8:13 "like (ke) the appearance of a man," 10:16 "like (ki) the likeness (dēmit, cf. Aramaic cognate dāmevāh, 7:5) of the sons of man," and 10:18 "like (ke) the appearance of a man" (translation mine).


4Auberlen, 41.
elsewhere occurs only in the vision (Dan 7:9, 13). Since the Son of Man and saints both appear in the vision, the Son of Man cannot be taken as a symbol of the saints.¹

Furthermore, the saints appear in the vision as objects of persecution by the "little horn" before the Ancient of Days sits in judgment, while the Son of Man appears after the heavenly judgment has begun.² Kraeling asks, if the saints are in conflict with the fourth beast prior to the arrival of the Ancient of Days, "How then can they be incorporated a second time in the newly arriving Son of Man?"³ The fact that the symbolic horn makes war with the actual saints also indicates that the passage is part of the vision, not the interpretation. Moreover, the vision in no way indicates that the little horn persecuted the Son of Man.⁴

C. Caragounis has pointed out the difference between (1) Dan 7:27a, which corresponds to 7:18 and 22; and (2) 7:27b, which parallels 7:14. The difference between the "dominion," "glory," and "kingly rule" given to the Son of Man in absolute terms as set forth in Dan 7:14, and the "kingly rule," the "dominion" and the "greatness" of the kingdoms under the whole heaven spoken of in Dan 7:27a as given to the saints, "is very material and raises a serious

¹Ferch, The Apocalyptic "Son of Man" in Daniel 7, 181-82; see also Boutflower, 59-61.

²Ferch, The Apocalyptic "Son of Man" in Daniel 7, 181-82.


obstacle to the identification of the 'Son of Man' with the saints.\textsuperscript{1}

Another factor is the worship given to the Son of Man. In the passage, "all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him" (Dan 7:14). In the interpretation, it is not the saints who are served, but the Most High, "his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him" (Dan 7:27, ASV).\textsuperscript{2} It appears, then, that it is the Most High, not the saints, who is the recipient of this service, in accord with the traditional translation (see Luther's Die Bibel, KJV, Douay, ASV, NASB, NIV; also, LXX, Theod.). This accords better with the usage of the Aramaic word for "serve," which is always accorded to a divine being in Biblical Aramaic.\textsuperscript{3} The fact that the kingdom is given to the Son of Man (Dan 7:14) and also to the saints (Dan 7:27) indicates not that they are identical, but that they both share it together, the Son of Man

\textsuperscript{1}Caragounis, 72-73.

\textsuperscript{2}The RSV translation of Dan 7:27, which indicates concerning the saints that "all dominions should serve and obey them," is apparently an incorrect translation. Grammatically, in vs. 27, the word "kingdom" has a third person, masculine, singular pronominal suffix, thus, "his kingdom," and the object of the verb "serve and obey" is the third person, masculine, singular leh requiring the translation, "serve and obey him." The nearest antecedent to "his kingdom" and "serve and obey him" is "the Most High."

Against Goldingay, "Holy Ones on High," 495-97, that gadšâq telonin should be translated "holy ones on high," see Hasel, "The Identity of the Saints of the Most High in Daniel 7," 173n., where, as Goldingay acknowledges ("Holy Ones on High," 497), it is shown that the Aramaic word translated "Most High" could be treated as a proper name, so the whole phrase would be determinate, and the translation "the holy ones of the Most High" would be justified.

\textsuperscript{3}Ferch, The Apocalyptic "Son of Man" in Daniel 7, 167-170.

The root of the Aramaic word translated "serve" is pâlâh, which is used exclusively for religious service, worship or veneration of God or pagan gods in Biblical Aramaic outside of Dan 7 (Dan 3:12, 14, 17, 18, 28; 6:17, 21; Ezra 7:24).
ruling over the saints in the new kingdom.1

One obvious difference between the Son of Man and the four beasts in the interpretation, one generally ignored by those who see the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints, is that while the beasts and the horns are explicitly explained in the interpretation, the Son of Man is not. As Young has pointed out, Dan 7:17 states, "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth"; again, "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth" (Dan 7:23a); and "the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise" (Dan 7:24a; KJV).

Nowhere in the chapter, however, is there a statement such as "And the one like a Son of man is the saints of the most High." That obvious fact must not be overlooked. No explicit interpretation of the Son of Man is given in the later parts of the chapter.2

It would be well to consider why there is no explicit explanation of, or even mention of, either the Son of Man or the Ancient of Days in the interpretation of the vision. It might suggest that neither the Son of Man nor the Ancient of Days was intended to serve

---

1Boutflower, 61.

2E. J. Young, Daniel's Vision of the Son of Man, 7-9. This was already perceived by Auberlen, 40. See also Morgenstern, "The 'Son of Man' of Daniel 7:13f.," 65-66, 77. Of the interpretation of the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints, he remarks, "this interpretation is regarded by most biblical scholars, even those who do approve it, as largely hypothetical, since definite evidence in support of it . . . seems to be totally lacking.

"Had this been the true import of these two verses [Dan 7:14, 27], we could certainly have expected at the very least some statement in connection with vs. 27 to the effect that the 'son of man' was, or symbolized, the Jewish people. But there is no word to this effect, nor even the slightest suggestion, anywhere in the entire chapter.

"Accordingly then we must reject completely the interpretation of these two verses which holds that the 'one like a human being' is the Jewish people." See also Boutflower, 61; Dequeker, 84.
as symbols at all. It appears that the Son of Man and Ancient of Days were adequately presented in the vision, and needed no explanation in the interpretation. The Son of Man is the description of a literal, individual figure. Similarly, the Ancient of Days is not a symbol of God, but simply another, transparent way of speaking of God.¹

Ferch gives a list of differences between the Son of Man and the saints, which are cited against interpreting the Son of Man as a symbol the saints. Among those not yet mentioned are:

1. The saints are a terrestrial group; the Son of Man is a transcendent individual.

2. The coming of the Son of Man into the presence of the Ancient of Days takes place in a theophanic setting with the language of royal audience and investiture. There is no parallel of the saints.

3. The Son of Man gets the kingdom in heaven in the presence of the Ancient of days, and probably from him. The saints get the kingdom on earth.

4. Judgment is rendered concerning the saints. The Son of Man does not judge nor is He judged.²

5. There is a parallel between the Son of Man and Michael; both are transcendent, messianic figures emerging at the end-time in connection with the deliverance of the saints. The fact that Michael is an individual, in a role parallel with that of the Son of Man.


²Ferch, The Apocalyptic "Son of Man" in Daniel 7, 176-177.
argues for interpreting the Son of Man also as an individual.1

It would seem that the soundest position would be to interpret the Son of Man as a transcendent being, and not as a symbol of the "saints of the Most High."2

Son of Man, symbol and individual

There is a significant school of Son of Man interpretation which agrees that the Son of Man is identified with the saints of the Most High, yet also sees an individual identity in the Son of Man. Stier expressed the basic approach of this view. He states that for the oriental, king and people signify a unity, so that the "democratic" interpretation of the Son of Man vision as the rule of the "people of the saints" will not exclude that in the kebar Yenakh [Son of Man] is meant not a mere symbol of the people, but their true representative.3

G. H. Box basically interprets the expression Son of Man as a symbol of the people of Israel, as well as referring to an individual person. He thinks the term is a descriptive one for an angelic being, "presumably Michael in the thought of the writer of Daniel--who acts as Israel's representative and counterpart."4

Jeffery, holding a similar view, suggests that "since each beast represents both a king and a kingdom, this figure also represents a king and a kingdom." As the lion represented, not the

---

1Ibid., 107.
2Ibid., 174.
3Stier, 97.
4Box, 213-214.
Babylonian people, but the kingdom of Babylonia or its king Nebuchad­
nezzar (who as king could also represent the kingdom, cf. 2:39), "so
here the figure represents not the saints but the kingdom of the
saints and the king who inaugurates that kingdom, the messianic king.
This is the connection between the son of man and messianic king."¹

On this last point, however, one must be cautious. The
expression "kings" in Dan 7:17 does not refer to individuals,² so
that "kings" and "kingdoms" are expressions used interchangeably as
virtual synonyms. The "four kings" of Dan 7:17 become "four
kingdoms" in Dan 8:22. While the he-goat of Dan 8:21 is the "king of
Greece," the great horn between his eyes is the "first king." Thus
the earlier expression, "king of Greece," apparently means "kingdom
of Greece."

Lacocque seems to accept the identification of the Son of
Man with the saints, but continues to speak of him as an individual.
He speaks of the Son of Man as the head of "the people of the Holy
Ones." "The figure of the 'one like a son of man' . . . is presented
as the epitome of the Saints, for he more than anybody else bridges
heaven and earth."³

But Di Lella has raised a serious question about how these
symbols can be interpreted. An objection of his to the theory that
the Son of Man symbolizes Michael and the angels, as well as the

¹Jeffery, 461. See also Muilenburg, 200; Owens, 425. Owens,
appealing to "the principle of corporate personality," feels that
"there is no reason why this figure could not be used to refer both
to saints as a whole and to a saint as an individual." Leivestad,
247.

²Zückler, 158.

³Lacocque, 126, 131-132. See also Towner, 105-106.
loyal Jews, is that the author must then be judged guilty of unusually careless rhetoric and of a deplorable use of symbolism. Since the four beasts symbolize four pagan empires, and "the little horn" symbolizes Antiochus IV, and the "Ancient One" (vss. 9, 13, 22) symbolizes the God of Israel, "then we must assume that those responsible for this apocalypse meant each of these symbols to have a one-to-one relationship with the respective reality being symbolized."¹

This appears to be a sound conclusions. If the Son of Man is a symbol, he symbolizes one referent only. He can symbolize an individual or the saints, but not both.²

Lacocque's somewhat confusing identification of, yet distinction between, the Son of Man and Michael figures can be attributed to his acceptance of the Son of Man both as an individual and as a symbol of the saints, a view which appears to be unsound.

It is probable that the Son of Man is not intended to be a symbol. He appears to be an individual personality. Therefore, it is possible to consider whether the Son of Man figure is to be identified with the Michael figure of Dan 12:1-3.

Son of Man, a divine figure

As has been noted, among those who interpret the Son of Man as an individual, heavenly being, he is often identified with Michael and is interpreted as angelic. As Schmidt wrote, "he is an angel, and more particularly Michael, the guardian angel of Israel."³ This

¹Di Lella, 8; Hartman and Di Lella, 91-92.
²Caragounis, 47-48.
³Schmidt, 26.
is true also for Box, who, though he observed that the Son of Man "was invested with attributes proper only to Jahweh Himself," because he identified the Son of Man with Michael, whom he took to be an angel, felt constrained to interpret the Son of Man as an angel (he might have drawn the alternate conclusion that Michael was more than an angel and had divine qualities). The Son of Man is therefore seen as Israel's guardian angel, their representative and counterpart in the spirit world.

The angelic interpretation of the Son of Man is attractive to those who interpret the Son of Man as a symbol of and/or representative of the "saints of the Most High," and who interpret the "saints" or "holy ones" as heavenly beings.

However, the view that the "holy ones" refer to angels and not primarily to the people of Israel raises the question of what meaning or relevance the book would have for those to whom it is addressed. What comfort would it be to the persecuted people of God that the angels participate in God's kingdom?

Further, the holy ones are objects of persecution by the earthly Little Horn power (Dan 7:21, 25), something not easily understood if they are heavenly beings.

---

1 Box, 213-14.
2 Porter, 131-134. See also Collins, Daniel, 64; Davies, Daniel, 105-106.
3 Noth, "The Holy Ones of the Most High," 218, 224-225; Habel, 22-23; Dequeker, 186; Collins, "Son of Man and the Saints," 61-63; Lindars, 55; Bowker, 24-25; F. M. Wilson, 31-32.
4 Di Lella, 7.
5 Baldwin, Daniel, 152. That Dan 7:21-22 are not later
The strength of the argument, that the "holy ones" of Dan 7 refer to angels, rests on the supposition that the expression is elsewhere in the OT almost universally used in reference to heavenly beings.\textsuperscript{1} However, this supposition has been shown to be questionable. Hasel feels that of the thirteen OT uses of qedôšîm, four probably refer to earthly beings.\textsuperscript{2} As long as both usages are established, the number of examples in the OT of the use of the term qedôšîm is too small to establish a statistically preferred usage.\textsuperscript{3} Accordingly, the context must determine the meaning, which seems to heavenly being, is more than an angel and is, in fact, a divine call for interpreting the holy ones in Dan 7:18, 21, 25, 27 to be the earthly people of God.\textsuperscript{4}

There is evidence that the Son of Man, interpreted as a heavenly being, is more than an angel and is, in fact, a divine being.

The most conspicuous accompaniment of the Son of Man to suggest divinity is his association with clouds. A. Feuillet has pointed to the theophanic character of clouds in the Bible. Clouds are a frequent accompaniment of theophanies and are reserved to theophanies; when angels appear, the cloud is absent.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1}Noth, "Holy Ones," 218-221.
\textsuperscript{2}Hasel, "Identity of the Saints," 178-79.
\textsuperscript{3}Poythress, 211-212.
\textsuperscript{4}Hartman and Di Lella, 90-91.
\textsuperscript{5}Feuillet, 187-88.
L. Sabourin has also focused attention on the theophanic nature of the Biblical cloud. He drew attention to the cloud as a covering of God on Mt. Sinai. The glory of God came down upon the mountain, and a cloud covered the mountain, partially veiling the glory of God within the cloud. When God summoned Moses up on the mountain, Moses entered the cloud to commune with God (Exod 15-18). When Moses went up on the mountain again, with new tables of stone in his hands, "the LORD descended in the cloud and stood with him there" (Exod 34:5). When God spoke the Ten Commandments, He spoke "out of the midst of the fire, the cloud, and the thick darkness" with a loud voice (Deut 4:11; 5:22).

C. Caragounis also, noting that in the Bible "clouds uniformly are the means for transportation of the deity," saw the clouds as evidence that the Son of Man had divine status. Since the Son of Man is not the Ancient One, he suggests that two divine principals are posited in Dan 7.

There are numerous references to God or Yahweh accompanying Israel in the Exodus and the wilderness wanderings within a pillar of cloud.

---

1Leopold Sabourin, "The Biblical Cloud," BTP 4 (1974): 298; his article is intended to "bring out and express as clearly as possible, some of the more significant conclusions" of a doctoral dissertation written in Spanish by a Basque Jesuit, J. Luzarraga, Las tradiciones de la nube en la biblia y en el judaismo primitivo (Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1973).

2Caragounis, 71n., 74n., "See, e.g. Ps 18:10ff; 97:2; 104:3; Isa 19:1; Nah 1:3 and the numerous appearances of Yahweh in the clouds, e.g. Ex 16:10; 19:9."

3Ibid., 75, 79-80.

4Ibid., 75.
cloud by day and of fire by night (Exod 12:21-22; Deut 1:32-33). Ps 97:2 states, "Clouds and thick darkness are round about him." For further associations of God with clouds in the OT, see also 1 Kgs 8:10; 2 Chr 5:13-16; 1 Ezek 10:3-4.

In the NT, God spoke from a theophanic cloud at the transfiguration (Mark 9:7). In Christ's ascension, the cloud serves as a theophanic vehicle (Mark 16:19; Luke 24:51; Acts 1:2, 9), and also He will return as the Son of Man "coming in clouds" (Mark 13:26; Matt 24:30; see also 1 Thess 4:17; Rev 14:14-16). In the ascension and parousia, the cloud became understood as vehicular. This is explicit already in the OT: Ps 104:3, praying to God, Thou who "maketh the clouds thy chariot." In Ugaritic texts, Baal is the "rider on the clouds." Sabourin stated, "In connection with Dan 7:13 it is

---

1Ibid., 297; see also Exod 13:21f; 14:19-20, 24; 16:10; 33:9; 40:34, 36-38; 43:34f; Lev 16:2; Num 9:15-22; 10:12, 34; 11:25; 12:5, 9; 17:7 (RSV 16:42); Deut 31:15; Neh 9:12, 19; Pss 78:14; 99:7. G. E. Mendenhall, The Tenth Generation, the Origins of the Biblical Tradition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 60-61, has endeavored to show that the cloud (šā'ān) of God was more than simply vehicular, but was so closely identified with God that it was itself a manifestation of God, interchangeable with melāh. Although the pillar of cloud is more than simply vehicular in the wilderness wanderings, it may go too far to say that it is equivalent to the melāh, though it may be true in a sense that "both refer to the manifestations by which deity becomes functional in human experience." (Mendenhall, 59). While the melāh is equivalent to Yahweh, it would be difficult to show that the šā'ān, while theophanic, was ever more than an accompaniment of the divine presence. In Dan 7:13, the theophanic clouds (šā'ānē) are apparently vehicular, as the Son of Man came "with the clouds of heaven."

2Sabourin, 308-309.

3G. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, 80-82; the word is tārpt, "cloud," a conceptual, though not linguistic, parallel to šā'ān.
observed that the coming with the clouds is an exclusively divine attribute (cf. Isa 19:1; Ps 104:3).^1

Since clouds are regarded in the Bible as an accompaniment of deity, the Son of Man who comes with the clouds of heaven must be a divine figure.\(^2\) If divine, then the Son of Man figure cannot be a symbol of the people of Israel, and therefore must be a divine individual.\(^3\) Young feels that we can learn from Daniel's vision "that there is truly a plurality of Persons in the Godhead."\(^4\)

Hartman, though acknowledging that clouds are an accompaniment of a theophany, nevertheless holds that the Son of Man in Dan 7 is a symbol of the Israelite saints of the Most High. He sees a parallel between Moses entering the cloud on Mt. Sinai (Exod 24:18) and the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven to the throne of the Ancient One. He understands the author to say that faithful Israel will come into the divine presence to receive everlasting dominion, thus replacing the dominion of the four beasts.\(^5\)

But his explanation has a logical flaw. Though Moses and the Son of Man both come into the divine presence, in Exodus the cloud

---

^1 Sabourin, 308-09.


^3 Bullock, 7:13; Caragounis, 72.


^5 Hartman and Di Leila, 102.
surrounded the deity, and in entering the cloud, Moses approached the divine presence.\(^1\) In Dan 7, in contrast, the cloud is not said to surround the Ancient of Days, it is rather the Son of Man who comes with the clouds of heaven. The clouds are an accompaniment, not of the Ancient of Days, but of the Son of Man, thus attributing divinity to the Son of Man.

Further, the Son of Man is not said to ascend or descend. The movement is within the heavens. Thus, the Son of Man seems unlikely to signify the saints, who are upon earth.\(^2\)

Moreover it seems apparent that if the saints were to be ushered into the divine presence, something to that effect would have been said in the interpretation. Even the parallel passage in Dan 12:3 fails to suggest that the wise ascend to heaven, simply that they shine "like" the stars.

J. Goldingay suggests that "the scene's pointers toward the unlikely conclusion that it envisages two divine beings" reflects a mythic background. While he admits that celestial beings other than God do not appear in or on the clouds of the heavens elsewhere in the OT, "Only God comes on the clouds (Isa 19:1; Ps 104:3)," he thinks it may be significant that the humanlike figure "comes with/among them, not on them."\(^3\)

However, an examination of the many Biblical passages where clouds are a divine accompaniment shows that it is not significant.

\(^1\)Feuillet, 188.
\(^3\)Goldingay, Daniel, 171.
whether the divine being is in, on, or with the clouds. True, clouds receive Christians in 1 Thess 4:17, but they are the clouds which accompany the divine Christ at His return. Humans can enter the clouds accompanying the divine being, just as Moses entered the clouds on Sinai (Exod 24:18). But the Son of Man was not with a divine being when he came with the clouds of heaven. That he came alone with the clouds attests to his divine status.

According to J. Morgenstern,

The fact that he comes ‘on the clouds of heaven’ tells us unmistakably that this was not a man at all, not a human being, but rather that he was a divine being, a god. . . . Furthermore, since vs. 14 tells that to this ‘one like a human being’ universal and eternal kingship was given, it follows that he must have been a regal figure, a divine king of some kind.

Another evidence of the divine nature of the Son of Man is that "all the peoples, nations and languages should serve him" (Dan 7:14). As mentioned earlier, the verb "serve," pālah, is used in Biblical Aramaic exclusively for religious service, worship, or veneration of a deity. The fact that such worship was accorded to the Son of Man suggests he was regarded as a divine being.

A further indication of the divine character of the Son of Man may be seen in the parallel between the Son of Man in the vision

---

1Exod 16:10; 19:9; Ps 18:10; 97:2; Rev 1:7; 14:14. Goldingay’s reference, Daniel, 171, to the cloud coming to collect Moses in Josephus (Ant. 4.4.48) is weak, as it does not state that Moses ever entered the cloud. Also, it is later than Daniel, as is the reference in targums to Exod 19:4 to clouds carrying Israel.


3See 330-31; also Dequeker, 184, ‘To serve’ (pālah) in Daniel refers only to the Gods (Dan 3:12, 14, 17, 26; 6:17, 21); Desmond Ford, 147; KBL "pālah," 1113; "serve (God)."

and the Most High in the interpretation. As pointed out earlier, according to the Aramaic grammar (and the LXX and Theodotion versions), it was probably not the people of the saints of the Most High, but the Most High Himself, of whom it is said, "his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him" (Dan 7:27 ASV). Since in Dan 7:14 it is said all peoples, nations, and languages should serve the Son of Man, and his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away or be destroyed, it is suggestive that the Son of Man and the Most High are referred to in parallel here. Both rule an everlasting kingdom, and both are worshiped by all the nations and peoples of earth. Thus, there is perhaps a stronger argument for identifying the Son of Man with the Most High than with the saints.1

Black remarked that the Son of Man has "ceased to be simply a symbol for the numen praesens of Jahweh; like 'the man dressed in linen' of Ezek. 8:2, it has become a separate divine being."2

Quoting Feuillet:

The mysterious personage of the Son of Man in Daniel is a kind of visible manifestation of the Invisible Deity. . . . Taking account of all these [literary and theological] data [from Ezekiel] one can then advance the theory that the Son of Man belongs to the category of the divine glory with the same title as the human appearance seen by Ezekiel (1:26).3

Black then observed that this, in effect, means that Dan 7 knows of two divinities, the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man.

Daniel 7 is not only in the form-tradition of Isaiah 6

1 Dequeker, 182-184.
3 Feuillet, 61.
(cf. 1 En. 14) and Ezekiel 1, which are all theophanies, but represents a highly significant development of it into a theology which seems virtually ditheistic.¹

Is this interpretation ditheism? To declare a figure divine, who is clearly distinguishable from another figure of elevated rank called God, would seem to jeopardize a monotheistic stance. In his dissertation on the Son of Man, Ferch was very sensitive to this concern. He concluded that the Son of Man in Dan 7 "enjoys certain divine attributes."² He attempted to avoid the charge of ditheism by pointing out that the Son of Man "accepts a role which is definitely subordinate to that of the Ancient of Days."³

It may be questioned, however, whether this qualification can successfully avoid the charge of ditheism. Most polytheistic systems portray their gods as within a sort of hierarchy, with a king of the gods, and other gods of greater or lesser rank subordinate to him. Marduk was king of the Babylonian gods, thus, all other gods occupied positions subordinate to that of Marduk.⁴ In the Canaanite pantheon El seems to be undisputably the elder, supreme deity, with Baal (as well as Yam and Mot) in a subordinate position, obtaining his kingship from El, and needing to petition El to obtain a

¹Black, "The Throne-Theophany," 61; Goldingay, Daniel, 171.

²The term "attributes" may not be the most fortunate choice, as no divine powers or acts are attributed to him. Since the basis for viewing him as divine rests primarily with the cloud motif and the service due him, divine "accompaniments" might be a better term.

³Ferch, 173.

⁴Thomas, 8-9.
house. But this does not spare these pagan religions the charge of polytheism.

The real issue in ditheism is not whether there are two transcendent figures who are looked upon as divine, nor whether the relationship between the two figures is one of supremacy and subordination on the one hand or equal in position on the other. The issue is whether the two figures are two independent deities, each with his own purposes (which would be ditheism), or whether the two figures are so closely identified in purpose, in nature, and in character that they function as one. We may compare, for example, that in Christian theology there are three figures held to be divine, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, without any apparent feeling that monotheism is thereby compromised.

From the evidence examined here, it appears evident that the Son of Man figure is not only an individual personality, but is also a divine figure. The accompaniment of the theophanic cloud, the worship accorded to him, and his close identification with the Most High argue convincingly that the author of Daniel intended the Son of Man figure to be taken as a divine being, who would appear at the eschaton to become eternal ruler over all kingdoms of the world as well as over the saints of Israel, who would participate in his universal domain as the dominant people of the earth.

The Son of Man Identified with Michael

It would appear that the identification of the Son of Man with Michael is a sound position. Also, the fact that the author did

\footnote{Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, 77-82, 89.}
not name Michael in Dan 7 does not weaken the identification. Each vision progressively adds detail. The parallel of the Son of Man in Dan 7 and Michael in Dan 12 seems unmistakable. The real question to pose is, Why did not the Son of Man appear in the vision of Dan 12:1-3? One may answer, he did—under the name Michael.

André Lacocque holds a view similar to that of Schmidt, holding that the descriptions of angels as having human appearance support the angelic interpretation of the Son of Man. He stated that the author identified the Son of Man "explicitly in several passages of chapters 8-12, with the angel Michael." \(^1\) "Indeed, we believe it is a question of the same personage." \(^2\)

Lacocque, however, makes a distinction between the Son of Man, whom he identified with the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6) and the Michael figure who came to his aid. \(^3\) He resolves this seeming contradiction by seeing the Son of Man figure as an inclusive one, "and the angel Michael is one of its aspects." \(^4\) "Michael is distinct from the 'son of man' and the personification of his glorious dimension.\(^5\)

Lacocque also notes the close link of the judicial setting of the Son of Man and Michael, declaring, "Like the 'son of man' in

\(^1\) Lacocque, 133.
\(^2\) Ibid., 162.
\(^3\) Ibid., 209.
\(^4\) Ibid., 242.
\(^5\) Ibid., 209.
chapter 7, Michael combines the functions of priest, judge and king."¹

There appears to be a tendency for scholars who interpret the Son of Man as an angelic figure, whether or not they see him also as symbolic, to identify him with the Michael figure in Daniel.² On the other hand, some interpreters who have noted the close parallels between the Son of Man and Michael figures have nevertheless stopped short of an identification.³

Arthur Ferch comes very close to an identification. He notes the significance of the title šar as applied to Michael in Dan 10:13 and 12:1, the judicial context of 12:1-3, his intimate association with Israel as "your prince" (10:21), and his intervention on behalf of his people in history and in the eschatological context. He observes that "Michael's intervention, whether military or judicial or both, results in the destruction of Israel's enemy and its rescue followed by a resurrection." In the Michael figure he finds a close longitudinal parallel in Dan 7. This applies particularly to the roles played by both Michael and the SM. In Dan 7 the SM is intimately linked with the welfare and interests of Israel as is Michael in the final apocalypse. . . . The judgment and the manifestation of the SM signal the oppressor's fall and Israel's rescue, as does Michael's intervention. . . . In both


²Zevit, 490.

³Leivestad, 247, commented in passing, "In view of chapters viii and x it is rather surprising that there is no evidence that the figure in vii. 13 was identified with Michael, the guardian angel of Israel." Lindars, 56, regarded chaps. 8-12 of Daniel to be "a kind of midrash on the vision" of Dan 7. Noting that God, in those chapters, uses a celestial figure, Michael, as an agent for His intervention on behalf of the Jews, he remarked, "It is possible that he is to be identified with the 'one like a son of man' of vii. 13, but there are no direct links."
cases a judgment precedes final rescue and the restoration of God's people to a new community which enjoys an everlasting kingdom. . . . Both the SM and Michael are linked with Israel's destiny and ultimate vindication.

He notes some differences, as Michael does not enter the court scene to receive dominion, etc., but "acts as if already in possession of some of these features." The Son of Man is not cast in a military-judicial role, yet both he and Michael are leaders of Israel. The resurrection is not mentioned in Dan 7, yet it may be implied. The differences, therefore, are not particularly significant. Ferch concludes, then, that the Son of Man and Michael parallel more closely than any other figures or "complexes" examined, Biblical or extra-Biblical.

Nevertheless, Ferch hesitates to identify the two figures, apparently convinced that "Daniel does not identify these two figures." In spite of this hesitancy, however, Ferch argues that "their substantial affinities" suggest that the Son of Man is to be understood as an individual, heavenly being, who, at the end of the age, displays certain messianic characteristics.1

---

1Ferch, "The Apocalyptic 'Son of Man' in Daniel 7," 99-107. Ferch appears to apply a different method in interpreting the activity of the Son of Man than he does in interpreting that of Michael in Dan 12:1-3. In arguing against the participation of the Son of Man in the judgment of Dan 7:9-10, he notes that "the SM plays a rather passive role in Dan 7. . . . There is not a single hint that the SM ascends a throne, which would be only appropriate for the judge." He argued that for the Son of Man to participate in the judgment, vs. 13 would need to be introduced before the last sentence of vs. 10, and concludes, "it is unlikely that the SM functioned as judge in Dan 7" (148-49). In contrast, he attributes a much more activist role to Michael. "Michael becomes particularly active at the eschaton" (97). He quotes with approval Nickelsburg's conclusion (Nickelsburg, 14) that Michael's defense of Israel is both military and judicial (100). It is only due to Michael's intervention during this tumultuous period that Israel will be rescued and her enemies destroyed, and the community of Israel be restored (101).

However, in response to Ferch, though Michael is said to
Ferch seems to display a certain inconsistency. To argue from the parallels between these two figures that the Son of Man is an individual would seem to require an identification of the two. To the extent that one hesitates to identify the two, one would also hesitate to use Michael to support the individual interpretation of the Son of Man.

Another ground used for objecting to the identification of Michael with the Son of Man is what is felt to be a fundamental difference in how the two figures were perceived by the community to which the apocalypse is addressed. Lueken felt that Michael is brought in so abruptly, so unexpectedly, that one must conclude that Michael was already a known figure in the community. Michael was seen already as guardian of the Jews, and they hoped for his intervention especially now, when their enemy was so threatening.¹

This was pressed by Volz. He felt that identifying Michael with the Son of Man contradicted the whole character of the mystery "arise" (12:1), no actual action is attributed to Michael in 12:1-3, whether it be military, judicial, supervising the resurrection, etc., a fact which Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie, 195, attributed to the author’s passive manner of expression. Since Ferch agrees that Dan 7 and 12 have a common author, the author’s passive manner of speaking could explain why the Son of Man appears to play a passive role in Dan 7, without excluding him from participation in the judgment. The fact that the description of the arrival of the Son of Man is located after the last sentence of vs. 10 does not necessarily exclude the Son of Man from participation in the judgment, for, as Ferch admits, to describe his coming before that last sentence would cause an abrupt transition in thought. It would disrupt the flow of the description. The description is schematic, not necessarily in strict chronological order. It might be that the author wanted to finish describing the commencement of judgment and describe its effect on the beast before introducing the Son of Man. It is analogous to introducing the arising of Michael in Dan 12:1, though his arising must have contributed to the demise of the evil king, whose end is described in 11:45.

¹Lueken, 26; see also Stier, 91.
which otherwise characterized the apocalypse. Michael is a known, already active figure, while the Son of Man was still an X, an "Ungenannter" (unnamed one), a concealed, inactive figure, who first emerged from mystery on the last day. He thought that the relationship between the unnamed Son of Man and other named figures, such as Michael, was of very little concern to the author of the apocalypse. He also felt it very probable that Dan 7:13 and 12:1 each stem from a separate tradition. According to Volz, they show no inner relationship and there is a difference in the prominent salvation person.¹

Ferch has largely replied to Volz:

However, the facts are that Michael, Gabriel, and the SM are mentioned for the first time in the apocalyptic book of Daniel. The force of the objection is further dissipated when we remember that the function of Michael is certainly not limited to the past (Dan 10:13, 20-21), for like the SM, Michael becomes particularly active in the eschaton (12:1-3).²

Ferch’s answer is sound. Both Michael and the Son of Man appear for the first time in Daniel as transcendent, eschatological figures. There is little evidence that Michael appears as a reflection of an established tradition. Michael is adequately introduced in Dan 10 to serve as a background to his arising in Dan 12:1-3. Also, though the eschatology of Dan 7:13-14 and Dan 12:1-3 is described differently, the descriptions are not incompatible, and could easily be viewed as complementary by the author of Dan 10-12. The Son of Man is introduced in Dan 7 with no title or name; 12:1-3 can be viewed as a further unfolding of the mysterious figure, at the

¹Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie, 9-12.
²Ferch, 97.
same time giving him a name, that is, Michael.\(^1\)

Later in this chapter, it is suggested that the Angel of the Lord figure serves as a prototype of the Michael figure. Michael, prince of Israel, is paralleled by the \textit{mal'āk yahweh}, who was commissioned by God to lead Israel into Canaan (Exod 32:34).\(^2\) But the Angel of the Lord can also be understood as a prototype of the Son of Man. Just as the \textit{mal'āk yahweh} guided Israel from within the theophanic pillar of cloud, so the Son of Man comes to the Ancient of Days with the theophanic clouds of heaven. Both figures have the accompaniments of divinity, both are transcendent figures set apart from ordinary angels, both occupy a mediatorial role between God and Israel. When the Angel of the Lord appeared to individuals in the earlier traditions of Israel, he at times looked like a man to them (Gen 18:2; 32:24; Josh 5:13; Judg 6:11-12; 13:6, 8), just as the "one like a son of man" in Dan 7:13. That the Angel of the Lord can be seen to lie behind both Michael and the Son of Man may furnish added credibility to the identification of the two figures.

Following is a summary of positive links seen here between the Michael figure and the Son of Man:

1. Each within his context is the focus of attention as the prominent, transcendent, eschatological figure with his own distinct personality and identity.

2. Each occupies an exalted position in relation to Israel. The transcendent Son of Man becomes king of Israel's everlasting kingdom, the object of their worshipful service. The transcendent

\(^1\)Habel, 23.

\(^2\)Hirth, 110.
Michael is "the great prince," prince of Israel, leader and defender of Israel.

3. Both appear in a context of judgment. The Son of Man appears before God at the time of the heavenly judgment to receive everlasting rule over the kingdoms of earth. Michael arises, perhaps from judgment, to oversee the enforcement of the decisions to life or disgrace, made on the basis of the books mentioned in both Dan 7:10 and 12:1.¹

4. In both contexts, Israel is delivered from its oppressors, and ushered into a future, exalted existence.

5. Both the Son of Man and Michael have elements of divinity. Michael occupies the place of Yahweh as guardian of Israel, arises for its deliverance as Yahweh arose for its deliverance in earlier traditions, and is accorded the focus of attention as deliverer of Israel, as accorded only to God in earlier traditions. He occupies the place of the Angel of the Lord as the leader of Israel. The Son of Man comes with the theophanic clouds of heaven, an accompaniment elsewhere only of divinity, and receives service accorded elsewhere only to God. The everlasting dominion given to the Son of Man in the vision (Dan 7:14) is parallel to the everlasting kingdom of the Most High in the interpretation (Dan 7:27).

Ferch was perhaps excessively cautious in hesitating to identify Michael with the Son of Man. It is true that the author of

¹The assertion of Goldingay, Daniel, 306, that the "book" referred to in Dan 12:1 is not one of the "books" mentioned in Dan 7:10 would appear without foundation. Since the judgment of Dan 7:9-10 is from the "books," it would seem clear that the author intended that the occurrence of the names of those to be resurrected in the "book" is to be understood as a direct result of the judgment according to the "books." The idea of books of record in heaven is
Daniel does not explicitly identify the two figures. But it is felt that an identification can be made without such an explicit identification.

The book of Daniel does not explicitly identify the image of four metals and clay in Dan 2 with the vision of the four beasts in Dan 7, yet the identification of these visions is generally accepted. Similar self-evident identifications could be made of the four heads of the leopard of Dan 7:6 with the four horns of the goat in Dan 8:8, as, indeed, the bear and the leopard of Dan 7 with the ram and the goat of Dan 8, none of which are explicitly identified by the author.\(^1\)

It would appear that the Son of Man and Michael stand in the same kind of parallel relationship as these other parallels. The differences which exist between most of these parallels should not blind one to the significance of the similarities. Each vision was not intended to be mere duplication of the earlier parallel vision(s). Each added new details or emphasized different aspects of the parallel features of earlier visions. It appears evident that the author of Dan 10-12 intended the reader of his work to identify the Michael figure with the figure of the Son of Man. It is proposed here that he is giving a further identification of, further

---

\(^1\)One could go on to mention other parallels of Dan 7, 8, and 9 with the vision of Dan 10-12, such as: (1) mention of "an anointed one, a prince" (Dan 9:25) and the "prince of the covenant" (Dan 11:22), (2) the blasphemous words of the "little horn" (Dan 7:8, 25) and the speaking of "astonishing things against the God of gods" (Dan 11:36), (3) casting down of the place of the sanctuary (Dan 8:11, ASV) and the profaning of the temple (Dan 11:31), (4) the taking away of the continual burnt offering (Dan 8:12; 11:31), (5) the fourth terrible beast with the little horn (Dan 7:8; 8:9-11), and (6) the little horn (Dan 8:9-11) and the contemptible person (Dan 11:21-45).
describing the role of, and providing a name for the earlier, mysterious Son of Man figure.

**Michael and a Messianic Son of Man**

An identification of Michael with the Son of Man, as proposed here, may have messianic implications for Michael. This would be the case if the Son of Man can be shown to be a messianic figure.

There is no lack of interpreters who identify the Danielic Son of Man with the Davidic Messiah.\(^1\) Schmidt, though he finally identifies the Son of Man with Michael, sees real strengths in the messianic explanation of the Son of Man, preferring it to interpreting the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints.\(^2\) Young strongly contends for a messianic identification of the Son of Man figure. To him, the individualistic meaning of the Son of Man was primary and original; any collective significance was secondary, not the other way around.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Lowth, 1:63-64; A. Barnes, Daniel, 2:65; Auberlen, 40-41; Benson, 800; M. Stuart, 216; Keil, 237, 269-275; Boutflower, 59-62; Riehm, 193, 194, 196; Goldwurm, 206-07; Lacocque, 146-47; Beaseley-Murray, 56.

\(^2\)Schmidt, 24.

\(^3\)E. J. Young, Daniel's Vision of the Son of Man, 6-7. Riehm, 193, 194, 196, weighing the argument that the Son of Man figure is a symbol of the saints, he writes, "We consider, however, the old and prevalent interpretation of the passage to be the right one—that . . . which refers the passage to the Messias." He does not regard the Ancient of Days and Son of Man figures to be figurative. He feels that the reason the author of Dan 7 did not characterize the coming deliverer as Davidic is because no Davidic ruler was any longer on the scene. Leupold, Daniel, 308-09, also rejects any symbolic interpretation of the Son of Man: "It is the Messiah directly."
Sellin, feeling that the messianic Son of Man "is somewhat different than a representative of God from the house of David, he is the heavenly representative of God," understands that in the Son of Man "the Messianic expectation is transcendentized."\(^1\) Goldingay holds a similar position:

The grounds for identifying the humanlike figure as the Davidic anointed are circumstantial ones. There are no direct pointers to this in the text, though as the one whom God commissions to exercise his kingly authority, the humanlike figure fulfills the role of the anointed one, whether or not he is actually an earthly Davidide.\(^2\)

Bowman defends the messianic interpretation, citing late Jewish literature to show that in both apocalyptic and rabbinic Judaism, the Son of Man was interpreted as the Messiah.\(^3\)

Bentzen distinguishes between the "present Messiah" the king of Israel, described, for example, in Ps 47:5, and the "Son of David," the coming king, described in such passages as Isa 9, 11, and Mic 5. The "present Messiah" is not eschatological, but is called by God in history for a historical function. The "Son of David" Messiah is, however, eschatological. And though the Son of Man of later literature is much more "metaphysical" and much more "transcendent" than the Messiah of Isa 9, 11, and Mic 5, it is obvious that this "Messiah" is both man and God. Bentzen claims we are not told how

\(^1\)Sellin, 126, "ist etwas anderes als ein Stellvertreter Gottes aus Davids Haus, er ist der himmlische Stellvertreter Gottes," "die messianische Erwartung transzendentalisiert."

\(^2\)Goldingay, Daniel, 170; see also Caragounis, 86: "If the 'SM' is to be understood of the Messiah, then Daniel's conception of messianism runs counter to what is often thought of as the traditional Jewish conception of an earthly messiah. . . . No human messiah will do for Daniel."

\(^3\)Bowman, 285-88.
the Messiah attained divinity, but sees hints, as Ps 2 speaks of adoption, and Isa 7 and possibly also Ps 110:3 suggest a supernatural birth. Bentzen regards both the "present Messiah" and the future king to be described as in some sense divine. In Ps 45:6, it is said of the present Messiah, "Your divine throne endures forever and ever." In Isa 9:6, the future king is called "Mighty God," and Mic 5:4 "also places him in a relationship to Yahweh which is that of a man elevated above normal humanity." One could also mention Mic 5:2, where it is said of the coming ruler: "whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting" (ASV). Furthermore, as Bentzen points out, the "present Messiah" in some of the "Royal Psalms" (e.g., Ps 72, as well as the "Son of David" in Isa 9 and 11 and Mic 5) is associated with ideas of an earthly Paradise.

The rise of eschatology, Bentzen suggests, carried with it a new interpretation of the Royal Psalms. The Anointed of Yahweh is no longer a present figure, he is the coming king. This occurred already in Isa 9, 11, and Mic 5. And, he suggests, the eschatologizing of Ps 2 is encountered in the dream-vision of Dan 7, where the "kings of the earth" (Ps 2:2) correspond to the four beasts (Dan 7:3-8), Yahweh corresponds to the "Ancient of Days," and the Anointed, to whom was offered "the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession," corresponds to the "Son of Man," to whom was given dominion over all peoples, nations, and languages.

Bentzen sees in a "king ideology" a common root for three forms of the conception of the Messiah (1) the Royal Messiah, (2) the

---

1Bentzen, 40.

2Ibid.
Servant of Yahweh who secures salvation through innocent suffering, and (3) the Heavenly Son of Man.¹

Levy contends that Jewish Messianism had its start in the book of Isaiah.² Though the expectation of the future "Son of David" is found as early as Amos 9:11-15, it is in Isaiah and Micah that the Messiah is first transcendentalized and deified, and in which his coming inaugurates a new age with paradisiacal conditions.

Jeffery also sees a connection between the Messiah and the Son of Man figure. Just as, in his view, each of the beasts represented a king and a kingdom, so the Son of Man represents not the saints, but the kingdom of the saints, and the messianic king who inaugurates the kingdom.³

Borsch, like Bentzen,⁴ sees the legends of the "First Man" and also "Primordial Man" as lying behind the Messiah and the Son of Man figures. The figures of the Messiah, Son of Man, and Suffering Servant should not, he felt, be studied as though wholly disparate in origin. They have "common roots." He rejects the attempts of certain scholars to retain in distinct categories the conceptions of an earthly, human Messiah and a heavenly, pre-existent

¹Ibid., 73-77. See also Muilenburg, 201. Muilenberg also sees the Son of Man as messianic. "A messianic interpretation seems to us not only permissible, but probable." He also, like Bentzen, recognized the implications for the divinity or sacral nature of the Lord's Anointed in the Royal Psalms.


⁴Bentzen, 77.
Son of Man. The picture of the Messiah as one in the heavens, or as a ruler in paradise, is not completely the result of late influence by the Son of Man ideas. He notes that since even Mowinckel wrote that "the Messiah had come to be endowed with mythical, superhuman features, derived from the myths about paradise and primordial times" as early as Isa 9:1ff., \(^1\) "it becomes difficult to know where and when any absolute distinctions are to be made" between the Messiah and the Son of Man. \(^2\)

Commenting on Daniel's "man-like hero, a heavenly king who would rule over all the earth," Borsch asks:

Is he the Messiah? The best answer is both yes and no. He is the messianic king in the sense that he is the royal figure, derived ultimately from kingship ideology, who will do all that was expected of the Messiah. There would be no room both for a Messiah and for one such as Daniel describes. Yet he is not the Messiah in so far as others would be thinking of an earthly hero who would establish his glorious reign on earth. Seen in this way, the two conceptions are mutually exclusive even though they sprang from the same soil. \(^3\)

Balz proposes that the Danielic Son of Man and Messiah are closely related concepts in which Daniel reinterprets and transcendentals the Messiah. \(^4\) Though it is true that, as Ferch has pointed out, the national Messiah, the idealized Son of David, characterized by transcendent traits, still falls short of the heavenly,

---


\(^2\) Borsch, 132-133.

\(^3\) Ibid., 143.

eschatological, "messianic" Son of Man of Dan 7, this does not invalidate Balz's position. It would appear that the author of Dan 7 did indeed consciously transcendentalize the Davidic Messiah.

Walvoord seems correctly to assess the situation. The Son of Man is given dominion over all peoples and nations. This is the very role the Scriptures assign to the Messiah (Ps 72:11). There cannot be two figures performing the same function.2

Lindars, in distinguishing the Son of Man from the "Messiah of David," speaks of him as "the celestial Messiah." But "we are not to suppose that rival views of Messiahship are at issue." He said that the variation of views on messiahship corresponds with differing emphases of general outlook; apocalyptic does not generally look for political solutions, but to the direct intervention of God.3

Ferch notes that there can be registered "a number of impressive parallels between the Messiah and the Danielic Son of Man." He lists the messianic traits of the Son of Man figure: (1) he receives dominion, glory and the kingdom (Dan 7:14a); (2) all peoples, nations and languages serve him (vs. 14a); (3) his kingdom is everlasting and indestructible (vs. 14b); and (4) he shares his rule with the saints (vss. 18, 27). Also, he granted that if vss. 13-14 depict a royal investiture, the affinities between the Son of Man and Messiah would be strengthened.

1Ferch, "The Apocalyptic Son of Man," 81.
2Walvoord, 167-68.
3Lindars, 60.
However, Ferch felt:

a most powerful objection prevents us from identifying the Danielic SM with the Messiah. Even with all the divine prerogatives attributed to the Messiah the latter still falls far short of the heavenly, transcendent, eschatological Danielic figure (with Messianic characteristics) which is ushered into the presence of the Ancient of days with (or 'upon') the clouds.

Ferch felt that though the points of contact between the Messiah and the Son of Man could have given rise to their identification and the transcendentalizing of the Messiah in the pseudepigrapha and the NT, their identity does not yet appear in Dan 7.¹

In response to Ferch, it can be said that there can be only one Messiah. As Borsch said, there is no room for both a Son of Man and a Messiah. Also, as Borsch pointed out, the transcendentalizing of the Messiah was not a post-Danielic development under the influence of the Son of Man figure. It had already begun in Isaiah and Micah, and indeed, in the "present Messiah" of the Psalms.

Schmidt finally rejected the messianic interpretation of the Son of Man because it fails to explain how the Messiah, once introduced, could so completely and unceremoniously have dropped out of the author's thought, so that in the future deliverance, Michael has so much to do, the Messiah nothing.² But there is an obvious alternative; that is to accept Michael as messianic.

The evidence, I believe, suggests a probability that the author of Dan 7 consciously identified the Son of Man with the Davidic Messiah. It is widely recognized that the book of Isaiah had

¹Ferch, "The Apocalyptic Son of Man in Daniel 7," 81-82.
significant influence on the book of Daniel. In view of the evident influence of Isaiah upon Daniel, it would appear that the author of Daniel would have been fully aware of the Messianic passages of Isa 9 and 11. He would have recognized that the description given of the future world-wide dominion of the Son of Man would involve the Son of Man taking over the position of the Davidic Messiah.

Evidence was given above of the influence of Ps 2 upon Dan 7. It is apparent that Ps 2 is also reflected in Isa 11. As Yahweh's Anointed will have the nations as his heritage, and the ends of the earth as his possession, and "break them with a rod (جهاد) of iron" (Ps 2:9), the shoot from Jesse will "smite the earth with the rod (جهاد) of his mouth" (Isa 11:4) (see also Rev 2:28; 19:15).

The transcendence of the Davidic Messiah should not be underestimated. Given pre-existence in Mic 5:2, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (ASV), and divinity in Isa 9:6, "Mighty God, Everlasting Father," it is not to be wondered

---

1 Nickelsburg, 171, the resurrection motif in Dan 12:2 is related to Isa 26:19; Nicol, 501-504, has discerned influences from Isa 6 upon the visions of Dan 7, 8 and 9; Ginsberg, "The Oldest Interpretation," 402-03, feels there is influence from Isa 52:13-53:12 on the language of Dan 12:3 as well as 11:33, 34. To this might be added the influence of Isa 53:8 upon Dan 9:26 and 11:22. A phrase in Isa 28:22 and 10:23 has influenced Dan 9:26-27. Compare also Isa 37:7 and Dan 11:44-45; see Clifford, 25. A number of interpreters have noticed the similarity between the self-exaltation of the "little horn" of Dan 8:10-11 (cf. 11:36-38) and the self-exaltation of "Lucifer" in Isa 14:3-21 and of the rebel prince of Ezek 28:1-19. See Clifford, 25; also Brownlee, 98-99n.; Hartman and Di Lella, 283.


3 In Isa 9:6, besides giving the Messiah the divine names "Mighty God" and "Everlasting Father," he is also named "Prince of
that Daniel could conceive of him coming to the Father with theophanic clouds, suggestive of divinity. Though the Son of Man is first seen coming with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of days, he nevertheless will rule upon the earth forever, and thus has essentially an earthly, not heavenly, function, analogous to that of the Messiah. Also, although the Son of Man is not said to master the world through victorious armed conquest (Isa 11:14), the manner in which world dominion is achieved is not specified. As early as Isaiah, however, the Messiah is said to smite the earth with the rod of His mouth, and slay the wicked with the breath of His lips (Isa 11:4), a transcendent approach not exceeded in the NT (2 Thess 2:8; Rev 19:15), to say nothing of Daniel.

The crux of the matter is that the author of Daniel would have had difficulty in simultaneously entertaining the concept of the Davidic Messiah and of a separate Son of Man. The identification of the two would have been coercive and inevitable. It is not likely that the author of Daniel would have doubted that the Son of Man figure which he saw in vision was precisely the Davidic Messiah. The alternative to this would be that the author of Daniel gave up the hope of the promised Messiah, and replaced it with a different hope: Peace." The Hebrew word for "Prince" here is מַלְשֵׁן. This is the only use of מַלְשֵׁן for a transcendent being outside the book of Daniel except for its use for the "Prince of the host of Yahweh" who met Joshua by the Jordan River (Josh 5:14). This "Prince of Peace" was to reign forever over Israel on the throne of David (Isa 9:7). The author of Dan 10-12 was probably not unaware of this usage when he called Michael the Prince of Israel, "the great Prince, who standeth for the children of thy people" (Dan 12:1). The Son of Man/Prince Michael and the Prince of Peace have overlapping roles, which might well be understood by observing that the author of Daniel emphasized the transcendent, exalted role of the messianic Son of Man in chap. 7 and of the Michael figure in chaps. 10-12.
direct intervention from heaven by the Son of Man and Michael figures. Since the author of Dan 9 focused on the Anointed Prince, which I believe can be shown to be messianic,¹ it seems apparent that Daniel has not abandoned the Messiah in favor of a different source of deliverance. But, quite apart from the identity of the Anointed Prince of Dan 9, the links between the Son of Man in Dan 7 and the messianic Psalms and the Davidic Messiah of Isaiah and Micah appear sufficiently strong to establish the messianic identification of the Son of Man figure. Rather than seeing the Son of Man as an alternative to the Messiah, the more likely explanation is that the author of Daniel has transcendentized the Messiah even farther than was done by Isaiah and Micah along the lines suggested by Balz, a view implicit in the positions of Bentzen and Borsch. This transcendentizing, however, seems a matter of degree, quantitative rather than qualitative.

The author of Daniel presenting a messianic Son of Man as a transcendent figure destined for world dominion on the one hand, and presenting an Anointed Prince as a vulnerable human Messiah destined for suffering, on the other, is not essentially different from that of the Isaian author of the Servant Songs, who portrayed the Servant as a figure of world power and influence (Isa 42:1-4; 49:6; 52:13), and also as a figure rejected, oppressed, and suffering (Isa 50:6; 52:14-53:10a).

The sudden appearance of the Son of Man with the clouds of heaven does not necessarily conflict with the earthly birth of the Davidic Messiah (Isa 9:6a). It may be recalled that the Davidic

¹See appendix.
Messiah is also viewed as possessing divinity and being pre-existent (Isa 9:6b; Mic 5:2). The Servant figure was also exalted again after his rejection and death (Isa 53:10-12). Further, the Anointed Prince appeared within history, while the Son of Man emerges at the eschaton. However, the author made no attempt to resolve the tension seen to exist between the picture of an exalted Son of Man and a vulnerable human Messiah.

The evidence reviewed above may be seen as supporting a positive identification of the Son of Man with the Davidic Messiah.

Since we have earlier identified the Michael figure with the Son of Man figure, and now have identified the Son of Man with the Messiah, we have thus indirectly identified Michael with the Messiah.

Michael and the One "Like a Son of the Gods"

There remains but one transcendent figure in the book of Daniel with which to compare the Michael figure, that is the fourth figure in the fiery furnace, whom the pagan Babylonian monarch described as "like a son of the gods" (dâmêh lebara ūlelahîn) (Dan 3:25).

The KJV (and Douay, 3:92) translation, "like the Son of God," is supported by the Greek Theodotion translation, homoia huiō Theou. The LXX supports the singular "of God," though gives it the translation, homoiôma aggélou Theou, "like an angel of God."

However, the Aramaic original does not support translating "God" in the singular. The Aramaic ūlelahîn is in the plural, grammatically equivalent to the Hebrew ūlelahîm, the usual term for God in the OT. But, in contrast to the Hebrew, the usual term for God in
Biblical Aramaic is always written in the singular, *Jelâh*, not in the plural. *Jelâhin* is a true plural, meaning "gods." Therefore, the expression under discussion is correctly translated, "like a son of the gods" (RSV).

According to Semitic idiom, "like a son of the gods" would mean a divine being, "like a god." The appearance of the fourth person in the furnace may be a genuine theophany. Though J. J. Niehaus did not include this in his list of OT theophanies, at least three, and perhaps five, of the ten components which he lists of the theophany Gattung are present. In some theophanies Niehaus cites,

1There is evidence that in Akkadian, the plural *ilâni* was used as a singular, so also in Aramaic, the plural *Jelâhin*: see Montgomery, Daniel, 214; however, it is in the context of Biblical Aramaic that the meaning of the expression must be sought.

2Owens, 396.

3Prince, 81; Charles, Daniel, 76; Owens, 396.

4Cowles, 315; Hammer, 42, considers the intent to signify an angel; Efird, 36-37; see also Michaeli, 636 (see chap. 3, 217-18).

5Niehaus, 322.

6Ibid. 31-32. These are: (1) Introductory description in the third person, (2) Deity's utterance of the name of the (mortal) addressee, (3) Response of the addressee, (4) Deity's self-asseveration, (5) His quelling of human fear, (6) Assertion of his gracious presence, (7) The hieros logos [Greek for "holy word"] addressed to the particular situation, (8) Inquiry or protest from the addressee, (9) Continuation of the hieros logos with perhaps some repetition of some of elements 4, 5, 6, 7, and/or 8, (10) Concluding description in the third person.

7Components 1, 8, 3, 6, and 10 appear to be present. This assumes that Nebuchadnezzar is the implied addressee, and that the self-asseveration and assertion of his gracious presence were conveyed, not verbally, by the striking appearance of the transcendent visitor, and the circumstances attending his appearance.
only two to four components are present.\(^1\)

It is probable that the traditional translation, "like the Son of God," has been influenced by the conviction, animating the history of Christian treatment of this passage, that the figure is Jesus Christ.\(^2\)

The trend in recent scholarship is away from the Christological interpretation toward the view that the figure was intended to mean an angel.\(^3\) In support of this, it has been noted that angels have occasionally been called "sons of God"\(^4\) or even "gods"\(^5\) in the OT.\(^6\)

Though the expression "sons of God" evidently refers to common angels in some OT contexts, it is not so used in Daniel unless

---

\(^1\)Niehaus, 154, Gen 1:27-30, components 1, 7, 10; 172-73, Gen 15, components 1, 7; 196, Exod 19:16-20:17, components 1, 7, 8, 9; 236, Judg 6:19-24, components 1, 3, 5, 10.

\(^2\)Towner, 55; see Hippolytus, 188; I. Newton, 225; Charles Popham Miles, Lectures, Expository and Practical, on the Book of the Prophet Daniel (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1841), 80-81; Cumming, 120; Benson, 777; Darby, 15; Fausset, 399; Kelly, 72; Gaebelinein, 46; Larkin, 64-65; E. J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel, 94; Tatford, 59; Hall, 520; Wood, 53; Culver, 58; Bulterma, 120-21.

\(^3\)Jerome, 43-44; Lowth, 35; M. Stuart, 93, "Nebuchadnezzar recognizes in the fourth the appearance of a supernatural being. Simply this, and nothing more"; Barnes, 1:223; Prince, 81; Charles, Daniel, 76; Leupold, 158; Bentzen, 37; H. L. Ginsberg, Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends, ANET, ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1955), 635, identified him as Gabriel; Michaeli, 636; Grill, 244-45; Owens, 396; Hammer, 42; Baldwin, Daniel, 106; Goldwurm, 128-29; Russell, Daniel, 69; Towner, 55-56; Goldingay, Daniel, 71.

\(^4\)Lowth, 35; Charles, Daniel, 76; Russell, Daniel 69; Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; 2:1; see also Pss 29:1; 89:6, "sons of El"; 82:6, "sons of the Most High."

\(^5\)Van der Hart, 24; Grill, 244-45; see Pss 8:5; 82:6; 86:8, 10; 96:4.

in Dan 3:25. Even here, it is used in the singular, while every other OT use is plural, "sons of God," not "son of God/gods."

Another reason put forth for not taking this as a reference to Christ is that it was spoken by a pagan king. "Nebuchadnezzar was not knowledgeable enough . . . to be able to discern the identity of the fourth figure."¹

However, such thinking may miss the real question of what the author’s purpose was in including those words of the king in this story. Though to interpret the expression to mean "godlike," and its parallel expression "angel" in vs. 28 may be "entirely genuine to Aramaic paganism,"² it is a pious Hebrew, not a pagan, writing the book, and he may have included the phrase for a theological purpose.

The fact that the figure is called "his angel" in Dan 3:28 does not ensure the interpretation that he is an ordinary angel. God’s angel could be understood as the mallāq yahweh, the Angel of the Lord, who was, as explained later in this chapter,³ a divine figure with all the authority and titles of divinity—a manifestation of deity. A heavenly figure, again called "his angel," intervened

¹Owens, 396; Leupold, 158. Leupold felt the church fathers judged the expression as though it had been uttered by an apostle or prophet, and not as though from the lips of a "spiritually blind heathen king." He saw the king as familiar with the idea of offspring resulting from promiscuous relations between polytheistic gods and certain mortals. "Such offspring would quite naturally be marked by superior bearing and beauty. Any angel would impress the king as belonging to this class." But see Phillips and Vines, 65, who, while acknowledging that Nebuchadnezzar "had no spiritual vocabulary, so he used the language of paganism to describe a spiritual reality that was beyond his ability to understand," nevertheless interpret the figure messianically.

²Montgomery, Daniel, 214; see also Baldwin, Daniel, 106.

³See below, 369-86.
also to save Daniel from the lions in Dan 6:22. These two interven-
tions would involve a heavenly being of similar nature.

Since the book of Daniel uses the expression "angel" only in
Dan 3:38 and in 6:22, it seems apparent that "angel" is not used in
Daniel as a technical term for angels in general. Several other
expressions such as "holy one" (Dan 4:13, 8:13), "watcher" (Dan 4:13,
17), a man-like figure (Dan 7:13; 8:15; 10:18), and "prince" (אֱלֹה
(Dan 8:11, 25; 10:13, 20-21; 12:1) are used in Daniel to designate
transcendent beings.

These observations would suggest that some meaning other than
simply "angel" may be intended by the expression ־ר יַלְמִין, "a son
of the gods" (Dan 3:25) and מַלְאָכֶה, "his angel" (Dan 3:28).

The fact that in Aramaic idiom "a son of the gods" signifies
"a divine being," "a god" needs to be carefully considered.
Nebuchadnezzar thought that this heavenly being was divine. He
unhesitatingly recognized in the fourth person a divine being who
intervened on behalf of Shadrach, Meschach, and Abednego in response
to their appeal. It is possible to see this figure as a manifest-
atation of God Himself, Yahweh.

Since the basic meaning of the Aramaic expression ־ר יַלְמִין
is "a divine being," and he is referred to as God's מַלְאָכ, it is

---

1Arch, "Daniel," 57; Cowles, 315.
3Efird, 36-37; Bultema, 121.
4Dennet, 46; Gaebelien, 46.
probable that the author had the mal'āk yahweh in view.¹

The mal'āk yahweh had appeared in earlier times to intervene on behalf of God's worshipers, to bring deliverance, blessing, and guidance. His appearance was a sign of divine favor.² Here again, for deliverance of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace, we may see God manifesting Himself in His mal'āk.³

The fact that the mal'āk appeared in the flames of the furnace may also be significant, as fire often accompanies theophany in the OT (Gen 15:17; Exod 3: 13:21-22; 19:18; Num 16:35).⁴ The author may here find fulfillment of the promise of Yahweh's presence with them in time of danger so that "when you walk through fire you shall not be burned" (Isa 43:2).⁴

¹Cumming, 123; Zöckler, 101; Benson, 777; Rule, 19-20; Montgomery, Daniel, 214-15; Tatford, 59; Plöger, 65; Culver, 58; Towner, 255-56.
²With the exception of 2 Sam 24:15-17 (1 Chr 21:15-30).
³Montgomery, Daniel, 214-15; as also Lacocque, 65. Montgomery noted that the term "angel" was "appropriate to common WSem. diction as expressing an appearance-form of Deity." He gave as example, the Phoenician malkštrtt, "Angel-of-Ashtart"; mlkbēl, "Angel-of-Baal"; and the Palmyrene deity, mlkbēl, "Angel-of-Bêl." "In these cases the 'angel' is similar to the primitive 'Angel of YHWH.'" In fact, though the Jewish community generally identifies the figure in Dan 3:25 simply as an angel, "AEz. identifies with the Angel-of-YHWH appearances."
⁴Danna Nolan Fewell, Circle of Sovereignty (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988), 79. She spoke of the irony in the choice of fire as a means of execution, as the "blazing fiery furnace" was a foreshadowing of the deliverance. But see John Charles Hugh Laughlin, "A Study of the Motif of Holy Fire in the Old Testament" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975), 64-65, "Here the 'fire' is certainly not holy but refers to the fire used in the local lime kilns." See also Bullock on 3:25, that the fourth person is a Divine being sent as a messenger by the supreme God. Also Dennett, 46, who saw him as Yahweh.
⁵Dennett, 46. For the influence of Isa 26:19 on Dan 12:1-3, see Nickelsburg, 171, and Hasel "Resurrection in the Theology of Old
Of interest is that in Dan 3:25 one god-like in appearance manifest Himself in an earthly, historical setting to deliver His loyal people, while in Dan 7:13, one man-like in appearance appears in a heavenly, eschatological setting to receive from God eternal rule over the nations of earth. Since they are both heavenly beings intimately associated with God's people, it may be possible that, in the mind of the author, they were the same being.

In summary, certain factors within the book of Daniel lend support to the idea that the "one like a son of the gods" transcends a common angel. First, the expression itself means "like a divine being," or "like a god." It would appear that the author intended to say that the transcendent being was a divine figure, and used the king's words to express it. The appearance of the being in fire strengthens this conclusion.

Second, the expression "his angel" (Dan 3:28) points to the māluḵ yahweh figure, who was, in earlier traditions, God in self-manifestation. God's angel in this passage was theophanic, a divine figure made visible to men, as was the Angel of the Lord more anciently.

Third is his position as a heavenly bringer of salvation. He is bringing personal salvation to the three Hebrew young men in a


1Plöger, 65.

2So Lacocque, 66.
historical setting, just as Michael brought national deliverance to the Jews in the historical Persian period (10:13), and as the Son of Man and Prince Michael will bring salvation to God's people at the eschaton. In each case these special figures appear at decisive moments, at saving events: Michael in Dan 10:13; 12:1-2; the Son of Man in Dan 7:13-14; so one like a son of the gods in Dan 3:25.

Evidence suggests that the heavenly being who appeared with the loyal Hebrews in the fiery furnace is not an ordinary angel, but a special, divine figure, on a level with the Angel of the Lord, Son of man, Prince of the Host, and Michael.¹ It may be possible to consider the motif of the transcendent hero as divine bringer of salvation running through the book of Daniel.

It might also be noted that the description "like a son of the gods" faintly echoes the name of Michael, "who is like God?" Other transcendent beings have been likened to men, "like a son of man" (Dan 7:13) or "having the appearance of a man" (Dan 8:15), etc. But that this figure is likened to a god may be a veiled allusion to the figure revealed near the end of the book, named "Who is like God?"

That Michael is Israel's guardian prince would make it very appropriate that it would be he who would appear in the furnace in that role to deliver the three worthies who risked their lives for the honor of God.

It seems that the evidence is sufficiently strong to suggest a possibility that the author, through the appearance of this figure,

¹Bultema, 121, recognizes Michael as one of various possibilities, but felt a definite answer cannot be given.
intended to anticipate the later revelation of the Son of Man and/or Michael, somewhat as the vision of Dan 2 anticipates the more detailed vision of Dan 7.

Michael and The Angel of the Lord

In several early OT stories, a celestial being appeared with a divine communication. The mode of appearance varied, but certain elements emerge which form a pattern, linking the stories together. The most characteristic element is the designation of the being as mallāk yahweh, "the Angel (messenger) of Yahweh" or mal'āk ālēhīm "the Angel of God." Of equal importance is the fact that the Angel of Yahweh is often also called Yahweh, presenting a "fluctuation or fluidity" between Yahweh and the Angel of Yahweh.¹

The Angel of the Lord, particularly in the Exodus narratives, appears as a sort of guardian or patron angel of Israel, in a striking parallel to the function ascribed to Michael in the book of Daniel. No study of Michael would be complete without comparing him to the Angel of the Lord.

Passages Which Refer to the Mal'āk Yahweh

The passages in which the Angel of the Lord appears fall into three groupings, (1) isolated appearances to individuals (in Genesis, Numbers, and Judges), (2) the Angel of the Exodus (in Exodus and Judges), and (3) visions of Zechariah.

¹Takahashi, 347.
1. The seven passages of isolated appearances to individuals are: (1) Gen 16:7-13, to Hagar when she fled from Sarah; (2) Gen 21:17-18, to Hagar again, when she was banished; (3) Gen 22:11-12, to Abraham, about to slay Isaac; (4) Gen 28:12-17; 31:11-13, to Jacob at Bethel when fleeing from Esau; (5) Num 22:7-38, to Balaam with drawn sword; (6) Judg 6:11-23, to Gideon; (7) Judg 13:2-23, to Manoah and his wife to announce the birth of Samson.1

2. The passages concerning the Angel of the Exodus are: Exod 3:1-4:17; to Moses at the burning bush; Exod 14:19, in the pillar of cloud; Exod 23:20-25, God's promise to send an angel to guard Israel and bring them to the promised land; Exod 32:34; 33:2, repeating the promise; Num 20:16, testimony that God did send the angel; Judg 2:1, to Israel, identifying himself as the one who brought them out of Egypt and into the promised land.

3. The visions of Zechariah: Zech 1:8-12, as a man on a red horse; Zech 3:1-7, the angel before whom Joshua stood.

Analysis of the Mal'ak Yahweh Passages

Following is an analysis of passages to understand the characteristics of the mal'ak yahweh.

Isolated appearances to individuals

In the seven accounts of isolated mal'ak yahweh appearances to individuals, certain common features recur. Common to all seven

---

1 Other passages such as Gen 18, the three visitors to Abraham; Gen 32:24-30, the being who wrestled with Jacob; and Josh 5:13-15, the Captain of the hosts, also belong to this literary genre, but because the mal'ak yahweh is not specifically mentioned, they are omitted from this survey.
accounts, the heavenly visitor never refers to himself as mal'āk yahweh or mal'āk ālōhîm. Features common to six of the seven accounts are:

1. The narrator refers to the visitor as mal'āk yahweh or mal'āk ālōhîm. Only in the Jacob story is this feature absent.

2. The visitor speaks with personal, divine authority. For example, "I will greatly multiply your descendants" (Gen 16:10). This feature is missing only in the Manoah story.

Features common to three of the accounts are:

1. The narrator calls the visitor Yahweh or God (1 Hagar, Jacob, Gideon).

2. The person(s) visited calls the visitor or perceives him to be the mal'āk yahweh or mal'āk ālōhîm (Jacob, Gideon, Manoah).

3. The visitor was visible, manlike (1 Hagar, Balaam, Manoah).

Features common to two of the accounts are:

1. The person visited calls the visitor God or Yahweh (1 Hagar, Manoah).

2. The person visited shows fear (Gideon, Manoah).

3. The visitor spoke from heaven (2 Hagar, Abraham-Isaac).

4. The visitor suddenly disappeared after an offering was presented by the person visited (Gideon, Manoah).

It is worth noting that in all seven accounts, the transcendent visitor either is referred to as God or Yahweh by the

---

It is true that the celestial visitor spoke of Yahweh in third person (vs. 11), but it is not unknown for God to refer to Himself in third person (Gen 18:14; Exod 4:5). In the Balaam story, the narrator seemed to make a distinction between the mal'āk yahweh and God or Yahweh (Num 22:22, 31).
narrator or the one visited, or speaks as though he were God. It seems apparent from these passages that the malāk yahweh is portrayed as a divine being, God in a veiled self-manifestation. They are theophanies.

Jacob's Blessing

In Gen 48:15-16, in Jacob's formula of blessing upon Joseph's two sons, in an evident reference to the malāk yahweh, Jacob used the expression malāk in a triple parallel literary construction,

The God before whom my father Abraham and Isaac walked,
The God who has been my shepherd all my life to this day,
The Angel (malāk) who has redeemed me from all evil,
Bless the lads.

Besides the synonymous parallelism, there seems to be an upward progression of benefits received by Jacob, with the highest, "redeemed from all evil," attributed to the Angel! It would be highly anticlimactic to invoke God twice, then, in the final invocation, invoke a mere created angel. Jacob apparently equated the Angel with God, likely in reference to "the angel of God" who appeared to him in a dream at Paddan Aram (Gen 31:11-13) and earlier at Bethel (Gen 28:12-17).

The Angel of the Exodus

The theophany to Moses at the burning bush (Exod 3:1-4:17) had characteristics similar to the "isolated appearances to individuals," and could have been classed with them. However, it is the first of a series of references to the Exodus Angel as is clear from Exod 3:8: "I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians,

---

1Heidt, 75.
and to bring them up out of that land to a good and broad land, a land flowing with milk and honey."

The similarities between this theophany and those of the previous category just surveyed are so striking that it ties together the stories of the Exodus Angel and the others. This indicates that we are dealing not with two separate mālāḵ yahweh traditions, but one.

1. He appeared in a flame. It is not recorded that Moses saw a form (Exod 3:2).

2. The narrator first referred to him as the mālāḵ yahweh (Exod 3:2).

3. The narrator subsequently referred to him as Yahweh and God (Exod 3:4ff).

4. The apparition identified himself as God (Exod 3:6) and Yahweh (vs. 15).

5. The voice from the flame speaks with divine authority (Exod 3:7-8).

6. The element of fear is present, "Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God" (3:6).

The figure explicitly claimed to be God. Moses accepted the figure as God. In fact, neither the divine visitor nor Moses in the narration refers to Him as "the Angel of Yahweh." The figure commanded Moses to tell the elders of Israel, "Yahweh, the God of your fathers . . . has appeared to me" (Exod 3:16). The only clue we have that this is the mālāḵ yahweh is provided by the narrator (Exod 3:2), who also identified the Angel of Yahweh as Yahweh.

It is remarkable that this, one of the most significant self-
revelations of God in the OT, in which God identified Himself as "I AM" (3:14), was introduced by the statement that "the angel of the LORD appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush" (3:2).

In this account and in the ones discussed previously, the narrators and the persons in the stories used "Angel of the Lord"/"Angel of God," "Lord" and "God" interchangeably. The Angel spoke with full divine authority. It appears that the "Angel of the Lord" is understood as a manifestation of Yahweh Himself. Perhaps the only distinction that can be made is that between Jehovah and Jehovah in manifestation. "The angel of the Lord so fully represented or expressed Jehovah that men had the assurance that when he spoke or acted among them Jehovah was speaking or acting."^1

---

2Carl Friedrich Keil and Frank Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, 2 vols., Commentaries on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1952), 1:439. They held that the transition between Jehovah and the Angel of Jehovah "proves the identity of the two." See also Oehler, 133, who can "only distinguish the divine which has entered into the sphere of created phenomena from the Divine Being in his celestial infinitude." Barton, "Demons and Spirits," 595, "there was no clear line of distinction between Jahweh and His angel." E. W. Barnes, 302. E. A. Speiser, Genesis, AB, vol.1 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1964), 118, sees the mal'āk yahweh as "a manifestation of the Deity, but not necessarily a separate being." Eichrodt, 2:27, concurred that the ancient narrators "saw in the mal'āk ywhw in certain cases the operation of God Himself." But he cautioned, "Yet this operation was not so direct that the Lord of heaven could be said to have come down to earth in person." The mal'āk yahweh was "as if he were making use of a mask or dummy . . . a form of Yahweh's self-manifestation which expressly safeguards his transcendent nature." Hyatt, 71, states simply, "the angel of the Lord is a self-manifestation of Yahweh. . . . The term is simply interchangeable with 'Yahweh'"; Miller, Divine Warrior, 67; J. M. Wilson, "Angel," 125; Funderburk, 163-163; Niehaus, 190-191.

The one in the pillar of cloud and fire which accompanied Israel is referred to as Yahweh (Exod 13:21), and as "the angel of God" (Exod 14:19). Here the divine identity of the Exodus angel again appears.1

There is evidence for a distinction of persons between Yahweh and the mal'āk yahweh in two passages in reference to the Exodus angel, Exod 23:20-25 and 33:2-3, 12-16.

In Exod 23:20, God declares to Moses, "I am going to send an angel before you to guard you along the way and to bring you into the place which I have prepared." God here is seen as sender; the mal'āk is someone sent. Thus is drawn a distinction between sender and sent. Exod 23:21 is significant in that it portrays both the essential distinction of the mal'āk from Yahweh, and the mal'āk's divine character.2 Throughout this verse, God is speaking of His mal'āk in third person, yet in each of the five phrases, divine prerogatives are ascribed to him. The first three phrases constitute a triple synonymous parallel, "Give heed to him and hearken to his voice, do not rebel against him," an extraordinary recognition of the mal'āk's own personal authority. Rebellion against the mal'āk's command is called rebellion against not God, but the mal'āk. This differs from 1 Sam 8:7, "they have not rejected you, but they have

(1908), 1:94, calls the figure, "Jehovah Himself in self-manifestation."

1Niehaus, 195, "He appears to be the same angel who Yahweh later says will lead the people to the Promised Land. The language used to portray the guardian angel also confirms the idea that the angel and Yahweh are one."

2Ibid., 191. While Niehaus affirms that the mal'āk yahweh and Yahweh are one, he does not comment on their duality, the essential distinction between these two divine figures.
rejected me from being king over them." Were the *mal'āk* merely an
ingelic messenger of Yahweh as Samuel was a human messenger, it would
have read, "hearken to his voice, do not rebel against me." The
fourth phrase, "for he will not pardon your transgressions," suggests
he would have authority over the forgiveness of sins.1 The fifth
phrase, "for my name is in him," confirms the essential deity of the
*mal'āk*, for God's name, Yahweh, is equivalent to God Himself.2

The distinction of persons is even more clearly emphasized in
Exod 23:25. In vs. 25a, God referred to "the Lord your God" in the
third person, a practice not unusual for God.3 But, continuing,
God reversed His use of pronouns in mid-sentence: "and *he* will bless
your bread and your water; and *I* will remove sickness from your
midst" (NASB). The fact that he referred to himself as "*I*" in vs.
25c means that the pronoun "*He*" in vs. 25b refers to someone other
than Himself, which would be the *mal'āk*, and, since "Yahweh your God"
is the antecedent to "*He,*" indicates that God spoke of the *mal'āk* as
"Yahweh your God."4

---


2 Ibid; Barton, 595, Walter C. Kaiser, *Toward and Old Testament

3 For example, Exod 23:17, 19; 24:2.

4 The RSV follows the LXX and renders the pronoun in vs. 25b
"*I.*" However, the LXX reading could be seen as a late editorial
correction by a scribe who was offended that an angel would be
referred to as "the Lord your God." A correction from "*He*" to "*I*" is
thus understandable, but a change from an original "*I*" to "*He*" would
be most unlikely. Moreover, there is a literary pattern of God
speaking first of the angel, then of Himself, several times in this
passage, of which vs. 25 is the last example: the "*angel*" will "bring
you to the place which *I* have prepared" (vs. 20); "obey his voice and
do all that *I* say" (vs. 22, NASB); "My angel will bring you in to the
land of the Amorites," etc., "and *I* will completely destroy them"
In Exod 33, the distinction between the persons of Yahweh and His malak is similarly seen. In vs. 2, God repeats His promise, "I will send an angel before you" (cf. 23:20; 32:34), then in vs. 3, the sentence continues, "for I will not go up in your midst, because you are an obstinate people." God’s angel here appears to be more than a mere exteriorization of God, otherwise how could the angel go with Israel, and yet God be said not to go? Moses and Israel were distressed at the thought that God would not accompany them. In Exod 33:12, Moses wanted to know who would accompany him. The promise of an angel was perhaps too ambiguous for Moses. In vs. 14, God introduced a new expression, promising "My presence (panay, literally "face") will go with you." This reassured Moses; he was satisfied with that expression, stating in answer, "If thy presence will not go with me, do not carry us up from here" (vs. 15), and interpreting it to mean "thy going with us" (vs. 16). God did not change His mind and decide to go with them personally rather than send His malak. As the angel which carries God’s presence, He is to be distinguished from ordinary angels.¹ Later references to the guidance of the malak show that God’s malak and God’s presence are the same. The guidance of the malak did not mean the loss of God’s presence. God would be present in His malak. Though God, the sender, would remain behind, nevertheless, His presence, the sent, would go with them.² This is evidence that the malak is a distinct, divine (vs. 23, NASB). This pattern argues forcefully for following the MT, "He" in Exod 25b.

¹ J. M. Wilson, 125.

² Attempts to explain the malak yahweh proposing that malak
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figure, the equivalent of but not the person of the one speaking to Moses.

The identification of God's mal'āk with His presence (Exod 33:2-3, 12-16) is reflected in Deut 4:37, God "brought you out of Egypt with his own presence," and in Isa 63:9, "In all their affliction, he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them," both apparent references to the Exodus angel.¹

In the two passages just reviewed (Exod 23:20-25; 33:2-16) is found a clear, explicit statement of the distinction in persons between Yahweh and the Angel of Yahweh. Here two persons are clearly brought to view. No attempt is made in the OT to resolve the tension between the statement that "Yahweh our God is one Yahweh" (Deut 6:4, ASV) and the evident duality of Yahweh as revealed in the mal'āk yahweh passages.

Num 20:16, "But when we cried out to Yahweh, he heard our voice and sent an angel and brought us out from Egypt" indicates that the angel's role was not seen to begin at Sinai, but was seen as active earlier, in the Exodus itself.

This passage also testifies that Yahweh did send the angel. Here the distinction between Yahweh and the angel is maintained.

The encompassing role of the angel and his sense of full,

self-conscious divine authority is seen finally in Judg 2:1-4, where the angel of Yahweh said, "I brought you up from Egypt, and brought you into the land which I swore to give to your fathers." Reference is made to "my covenant." He chided Israel, "you have not obeyed my command."

The visions of Zechariah

The mal'āk yahweh appears in two passages in the book of Zechariah. The first is in a vision as a man on a red horse (Zech 1:8-12), who is apparently the angeles interpres of the vision (Zech 1:9-10; 12-13).

In the second passage (Zech 3:1-7), a judgment scene is presented, with the Angel of the Lord functioning as judge (Zech 3:1). The angel appears to be called mal'āk yahweh and Yahweh interchangeably (Zech 3:1-2, 4).

In this account, the priest Joshua stands before the mal'āk yahweh with Satan standing at Joshua's right hand, bringing accusation against him. It is Yahweh who rebukes Satan. In Zech 3:4, it is the Angel of the Lord who commands that Joshua's filthy garments be removed and who tells Joshua, "Behold, I have taken your iniquity away from you, and I will clothe you with rich apparel." He here spoke with divine personal authority in removing Joshua's sin.

Barton notes that the Angel of the Lord in both passages (1:11ff., 3:1ff.) "appears as a kind of Grand Vizier among the other angels," and that he appears in chap. 3 as a "kind of guardian

---

1 Barton, "Demons and Spirits," 596. As also Herman Röttger, Mal'āk Jahwe--Bote von Gott (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978), 15.
of Israel, since he protects the priest, the representative of the
nation."1

According to Morgenstern, in Zech 3 the mal'āk yahweh
"presides over the divine court, precisely the same function which,
in the older literature, Yahweh Himself discharged (see Isa 6)."2

Von Rad expresses a similar view: "In Zechariah the mal'āk
yahweh stands at the head of the entourage of Yahweh as well as
having his particular office in relation to Israel," but also adds
that the mal'āk yahweh "blossoms out as an angelus interpres."3

The significance of this latter point is that in Zechariah
the mal'āk yahweh is in direct communication with the prophet, much
as the figure was in the earlier books of the OT. The figure has not
been basically redefined in Zechariah.4

1Barton, "Demons and Spirits," 596. See also Sellin, 45.
2Morgenstern, "Angels: In the Bible," 307-08.
3Gerhard von Rad, 77n., 79.
4Some have proposed three or four stages of development in
Yahweh's communication with man: (1) earliest period, Yahweh appeared
directly to man as in Eden, (2) early median period, to protect His
invisibility, Yahweh appears at night, or as an unrecognized man
(Hermann Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis [New York: Schocken Books,
1964], 104), (3) late median period, the mal'āk yahweh manifests God,
rather than the unveiled Yahweh (John Skinner, A Critical and Exeget-
tical Commentary on Genesis, ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910],
287), (4) latest period, Yahweh recedes further into transcendence,
and is revealed through created angels or prophets (Eichrodt, 29).
Biblical evidence, however, does not appear to support the
idea of development. The three later proposed stages exist in the
Biblical literature side by side. In the Hagar stories, there is
very little stress on visual appearance, the second featuring only a
voice from heaven. Direct appearances of God or Yahweh at night or
as a stranger occur later, to Abraham, to Jacob, and to Joshua, with
other mal'āk yahweh appearances later and in between. Created
angels, visions and prophets appear at random throughout the period.
Indeed, a prophet arose with a message of repentance (Judg 6:8-10)
just prior to the appearance of mal'āk yahweh to Gideon. And the
angel of Yahweh appeared as late as David (1 Chr 21), Elijah (1 Kgs
The interpretation of the mal'āk yahweh as a manifestation of Yahweh, however, has not met with unanimous approval. Another school of thought sees this figure not as a manifestation, but as an angelic representative of Yahweh.¹ That the angelic messenger spoke as though he were God has been explained by appealing to characteristics of Semitic thinking. In Semitic thought, the messenger-representative was conceived of as being personally, even to his very words, the presence of the sender.² Joseph's steward is cited as an illustration of this concept. The steward, speaking as Joseph, could say to Joseph's brothers, "he with whom it is found shall be my slave" (Gen 44:10). In accord with the Hebrew concept of corporate personality, Joseph is regarded as being present through the agency of his steward. The messenger is an extension of his master's personality, and thus does not merely represent, but is virtually the one who sent him. This, it is proposed, explains why the mal'āk yahweh is frequently indistinguishable from Yahweh Himself.³

There is no doubt some substance to this view, and it may

¹Hirth, 30-31. He proposed that mal'āk yahweh should be translated indefinite: "a messenger of Yahweh" rather than "the messenger of Yahweh" (as also Stier, 61-62). He acknowledged that a mal'āk yahweh at times had the same function repeatedly, but held that it is not said that it is always the same divine messenger who performed the function.

²W. G. MacDonald, "Christianity and 'The Angel of the Lord,'" in Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1975), 331; see also Ahlström, Aspects of Syncretism in Israelite Religion 17-18; Boling, 131; Pusey, 422.

³A. R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, 2d ed. (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961), 5, 29; see also Van der Hart, 23.
lead one to conclude that some Angel of the Lord appearances may be explained as an ordinary angel. But this "messenger style" has limitations in explaining the mal'ak yahweh phenomenon. When Joseph disclosed to his brothers "I am Joseph," how did his brothers know that it was not another mal'ak of Joseph speaking on Joseph's behalf? Similarly, one introduced at the burning bush as mal'ak yahweh declared, "I am the God of your father." As Heidt has pointed out, no instance in sacred or profane literature exists in which a representative, i.e., of a king, says, "I am the king."¹ Also, even if by a kind of ellipsis, the introductory formula "Thus saith Yahweh" is omitted in some individual cases, it still cannot be made a general rule of explanation. Furthermore, this view is inadequate to explain the change in grammatical subject in the narration, outside the actual spoken words of the subject. It was the narration quite as often as the angel who identified him with God or Yahweh.² 

The Abraham-Eleazar relationship (Gen 24:1-61) has been cited as an example of a servant empowered to act for his master.³ However, Eleazar never declared, "I am Abraham," nor did he speak as though he were Abraham at any time. The distinction was always clear.

If the "messenger style" was so clearly understood, the prophets could have omitted the introductory formula, "Thus saith Yahweh," when delivering God's message, yet it was almost universally used. Examples of a prophet omitting the introductory formula (see Deut 29:5-6) are very rare. Yet in the case of the mal'ak yahweh,

¹Heidt, 99.
²Eichrodt, 26-27.
³MacDonald, 331.
the situation is reversed. The *mal'āk* rarely used an introductory formula in speaking of God in the first person. If the "messenger style" as a true Semitic idiom was at work here, the ratio should be similar to that of human messenger, not reversed. Therefore the "messenger style" is flawed and inadequate as an explanation of the *mal'āk yahweh* enigma.

Another passage which the representative theory seems inadequate to explain is Gen 48:16, where Jacob placed "angel" in parallel with "God."¹

In explaining why the *mal'āk yahweh* accepted worship, it has been suggested that the intermediary character of angels was such that they were "capable of communicating all man's responses—even worship—to God."² However, angel worship is discouraged in the New Testament (Col 2:19; Rev 19:10; 22:8). To see the *mal'āk yahweh* as a self-manifestation of God and thus worthy of worship seems to be a sounder solution.

Some, in defending the concept that the *mal'āk yahweh* is a created angel, reject efforts to harmonize into one concept all the passages referring to the *mal'āk yahweh*.³ Each story is examined in isolation, with the conclusion that in each case a created angel is in view.⁴ However, it appears that a methodological mistake is made

¹See above, 372.
²MacDonald, 332-33.
³Stier, 23-24. He rejects the traditional idea that the Scriptures are to be viewed as an "organic whole," and finds there no fixed, systematic concept-structure (Begriffsgefüge), but rather the traces of a living development.
⁴Ibid., 23, 39-40. Stier, 20-24, divides the *mal'āk yahweh*
in dealing with each story in isolation. A common tradition can lead to a uniform meaning of an expression such as *mal'āk yahweh*, without dogmatic intent on the part of the narrator. It is true that some uses of *mal'āk* (as Gen 24:7) may be understood as an ordinary angel. However, it does not dismiss the clear pattern of *mal'āk yahweh* appearances which emerge from the literature.

Proponents of the angelic position have acknowledged that a particular angelic figure is designated as *mal'āk yahweh* in a series of texts related to the Exodus and the wilderness wanderings unto Canaan, in which he accompanied Israel as leader and helper. But this figure is also seen as a created angel.

appearances into two groups, group A (Gen 21:18b; 22:12b; 31:11ff.; Judg 2:1-4), in which the question is whether the angel of Yahweh speaks as Yahweh as an expression of a relationship between the two, and group B (Exod 3:2ff.; Num 22:22ff.; Judg 13:3ff.; Judg 6:11ff.; Gen 16:7ff), in which the question is whether the *mal'āk* was distinctly designated as Yahweh by the ancient author or by the person(s) to whom the *mal'āk* appeared. Rejecting any "dogmatic" accent on the part of the ancient narrator, he feels that the "identity theory" (referred to in this study as the "manifestation theory") results from a "summary exegesis" (24-25).

---

1Ibid., 61.

2Hirth, 112; Stier, 61; Exod 14:19; 23:20ff.; 32:14; 33:2; Num 20:16; probably also Josh 5:14; Judg 2:1, 5; 5:7; Exod 3:2; farther, Isa 63:9 and perhaps also Zech 12:8.

3Hirth, 115; Stier, 64-65. The crucial passage, "my name is in him" (Exod 23:20) Stier paraphrases "My being (as the embodiment of my ethical attributes) is in Him." It is not in the sense of a personal presence of Yahweh in the angel, he proposes, but in the sense of a moral unity of like character, that Yahweh's name is in him. The fact that Yahweh and the *mal'āk yahweh* appear to "flow into each other" is attributed to the careless writing of the narrator. He rejects the formula "name-being" as the "doubtful fruit of a summary exegesis," and sees the identification of Yahweh with His *mal'āk* as dogmatically erected. On this latter point, Stier is not immune from the same charge of dogmatic bias. Also to see God's name associated with His being is hardly a fruit of "summary exegesis," but rather of sound exegesis (A. H. McNeile, *The Book of Exodus*, 7, 408).
The position that the **mal'āk yahweh** is a created angel has been adequately answered by Eichrodt:¹

In Gen. 31.11, 13 the **mal'āk ḥašēlōhim** can say to Jacob: 'I am the God of Bethel', thus identifying himself with God. Consequently, when the words of the **mal'āk** in Gen. 21.18 and 22.11 make use of the divine 'I,' this is not to be regarded as a naive self-identification on the part of the emissary with the one who has given him his orders, but as a sign of the presence of God in the angel phenomenon."

Another, even more recent, study, by H. Röttger, takes a somewhat different direction. He concludes that the concept of the **mal'āk yahweh** is relatively uniform in content and relatively exactly definable chronologically. A basically uniform model runs through all the textual evidence. The **mal'āk** is characterized as: (1) distinguished from Yahweh, being pure instrument, who spent himself in his mission; (2) his mission is the bearing of the saving, protecting, and leading word of God. He was active as leader in the Exodus and the Conquest. He called Israel to repent, gave protection before their enemies, and summoned the deliverer of Israel. In the Patriarchal narratives, his mission was shown in the saving and guiding word of God. Having said this much, however, Röttger felt

---

¹Eichrodt, 24.
that, in the OT, it was not important to enter into speculation con-
cerning the special relationship between Yahweh and His messenger, or
over the being of the messenger himself. Therefore, he felt he
should not put forth this question in his investigation, much less
try to answer it.\(^1\) Röttger, thus, avoids the question of whether
the mal'āk yahweh was God's manifestation or His representative. He
confined his task to describing his function.

In spite of recent studies of the mal'āk yahweh which either
reject the view that he is a manifestation of Yahweh, or purposely
avoid the question, the evidence supporting the manifestation theory
seems not to have been adequately dismissed. The view that the
mal'āk yahweh is seen in the definitive passages surveyed above as
Yahweh in His self-manifestation is accepted as substantiated.

Prince of the Host as
Angel of the Lord

There appear to be two points of contact between the mal'āk
yahweh and Michael, giving evidence that the mal'āk yahweh is a close
parallel and prototype of Michael: (1) identifying the mal'āk yahweh
with the Prince of the Host of Yahweh in Josh 5:13-15; (2) direct
comparison of the role and function of Michael and the mal'āk yahweh.

Positive links between Michael and the Prince of the Host
have already been established. If the Prince of the Host in Josh
5:13-15 is accepted as another manifestation of the mal'āk yahweh,
it would strengthen the case for the identification of the mal'āk
yahweh with Michael.

The appearance of "Prince of the host of Jehovah"

\(^1\)Röttger, 275-276.
(Josh 5:14-15) to Joshua is widely regarded as another manifestation of the "Angel of the Lord."^1

Evidence that Joshua would not have regarded him as a common angel, but rather as the mal'āk yahweh, is that he commanded Joshua to put off his shoes because he stood on holy ground, and that he is called Jehovah in 6:2. These are paralleled in Exod 3:2-7, where the figure who appeared to Moses in the burning bush is called "mal'āk yahweh" (Exod 3:2) by the narrator, commanded Moses to remove his shoes for he stood on holy ground (Exod 3:5), and then is called Yahweh in introducing his message (Exod 3:7).^2

Though Bright does not connect Josh 6:1-5 with the Prince of the Host theophany, he remarks: "Although the heavenly visitor is not here identified with the Lord, the line between the angel of the Lord and the Lord himself is not sharply drawn in the O.T.,"^3 thus assuming an identification of the Prince of the Host with the mal'āk yahweh.

The implications of this identification are clear. If, as seems evident, the Prince of the Host of Yahweh in Josh 5:14 is to be identified with the Angel of the Lord, and if the Prince of the Host is to be equated with Michael, as proposed above, then there is

---

^1Hengstenberg, History of the Kingdom of God, 1:415-16; Barton, "Demons and Spirits," 594; Paul Heinisch, Theologie des Alten Testamentes (Bonn: n.p., 1940), 105, quoted in Heidt, 106; Bright, 576; Funderburk, 162; Woudstra, 105; Gurney, 159; Sellin, 45; Boling, 198-99.

^2Hengstenberg, History of the Kingdom of God, 415-16; Morton, 320, "The commander of this heavenly host is the angel of the Lord (cf. Exod 32:; Num 22:22-23; Judg 6:11-24), who is not clearly distinguished in the Old Testament from the Lord himself. . . . The theophany is obviously meant to parallel the experience of Joshua with that of Moses at the burning bush (cf. Exod 3:1-12)."

^3Bright, 576.
another link between the Angel of the Lord and Michael.

Not all agree with this line of reasoning, however. Keil did indeed think that the author of Dan 10 drew upon the figure of the Angel of the Lord. Keil identified the figure not with Michael, but with the Man in Linen (Dan 10:5-6; 12:6ff), whom he carefully distinguishes from Michael.¹

The link between Michael and the Angel of the Lord provided by the Prince of the Host figure, suggestive as it is, does not in itself establish that the author of Daniel saw Michael as the mal'āk yahweh. It is important to compare the identity and function of the two figures, which is the next step in this presentation.

In summary, the following may be said of the mal'āk yahweh:

1. The mal'āk yahweh is a manifestation of Yahweh, a divine figure, to be distinguished from the numerous, undifferentiated angels in God's heavenly court.²

2. The mal'āk yahweh is as a separate divine person, distinct from another divine individual referred to as Yahweh.

3. The mal'āk yahweh has his own distinct personal identity and personal authority.

4. The mal'āk yahweh functions as God's manifestation and

¹Keil, 410-11.

²Röttger, 276. He also distinguished the role of the mal'āk from that of the apocalyptic interpreting angel, such as Gabriel (Dan 8, 9, cf. 10:11-12:13). However, Michael likewise fits neither of these categories, but is closer to the mal'āk in function, lending credibility to the idea that the author of Daniel modeled Michael upon the mal'āk yahweh figure.
representative to man, an intermediary between God and His people, God’s vizier.

5. The *malāk yahweh* functioned as guide and guardian to Israel in the Exodus, in their wilderness sojourn, leading them to the promised land, in the conquest, and subsequent history of Israel.\(^1\)

6. The *malāk yahweh* was Prince of the Host of Yahweh, thus prince of the angels of God as well as guardian angel of Israel.

7. The *malāk yahweh* fulfilled a judicial function.

**Parallels with the Michael Figure**

In comparing Michael with the distinguishing characteristics of the *malāk yahweh* point by point, it is possible to discern the following parallels:

1. Michael is not expressly identified as God or Yahweh, though Michael occupies a position relative to Israel as guardian and protector which is ascribed elsewhere to Yahweh, suggesting that he performs a divine function.\(^2\)

2. Michael appears as a distinct heavenly being.

3. Michael possesses his own personal identity and authority distinct from the faceless functionary, or background role of ordinary angels.

4. As prince of Israel, as Israel was his people, Michael

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Gurney, 158-159; Miller, *The Divine Warrior*, 411-431. Miller points out that Yahweh was depicted in the OT as a warrior God. Yet the function of Michael in Daniel is that of a warrior intervening on behalf of his people. Michael may be seen as a divine figure, an apocalyptic manifestation of Yahweh.
occupied an intermediary position, representing God to His people, serving as God's vizier.¹

5. Michael is leader, patron, and guardian of God's covenant people, presiding over the transition from this age of persecution to the coming age of God's kingdom, directly paralleling the role of the mal'āk yahweh in the journey from Egypt to Canaan.²

6. Michael is prince of Israel, God's covenant people, as well as prince of the heavenly angels.

7. Michael will arise at the eschaton in a judgment setting and preside at the resurrection of the dead.

There are differences between the Angel of the Lord and Michael. Michael, unless he is identified with the Man in Linen, is not a theophany. He never appears to Daniel. He is revealed only through the words of the Angel of Revelation of Dan 10-12. This fact, however, does not negate the clear parallels between the two figures.

In view of the striking parallels of function between Michael and the mal'āk yahweh, it seems apparent that Michael is to be seen as fulfilling the role of the mal'āk yahweh in the book of Daniel.³

¹Röttger, 15, seeing the mal'āk as heavenly vizier (Exod 23:20f; Zech 1:8; 3:1ff) sees the heavenly vizier in an eschatological role in Dan 12:1ff.

²Heidt, 105-06, sees the guardian mal'āk of Exod 33 as a precedent, if not a parallel, to the idea of guardian angels as seen in Daniel; Funderburk, 162, sees the Angel of the Lord as "the guardian angel of the chosen race," thus, a clear parallel to Michael, pictured in Daniel as guardian prince of Israel.

³Hippolytus, ANF, 5:190; Bullock, n.p., comments on Dan 10:13; Hengstenberg, History of the Kingdom of God, 1:211; see also 464-66; Keil, 419, 424; see also Whitla, 94; Pusey, 425; Gurney, 158-159; Alomia, 425; Siegen, 14; "Heiliger Michael, bist du der 'Engel des Bundes,' der 'Engel des Herrn,' der das Volk Israel begleitet hat in
The mal'āk yahweh is a parallel and prototype of Michael in the book of Daniel.

Sellin, writing of the mal'āk yahweh figure, states: "However exactly he came to be fully sharply distinguished from Yahweh, he is already a forerunner of the archangel Michael in Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1."¹

Dix, in seeking to trace the development of Israelite angelology, stated that the "Angel of the Presence" was regarded by the prophets as the messianic Angel. "Consequently he was now becoming obscured and lost to view behind an archangel who, in popular regard, was displacing him."² He felt he traced it to Uriel/Phanuel, whom he identified with the "man in linen" (Dan 10:5-6), who he felt was the Angel of Revelation for the vision of Dan 10-12, to whose aid Michael came (Dan 10:13).³ In later Jewish apocalypses, "gradually, however, Michael came to be regarded as the chief archangel, and absorbed the functions of the others until he became almost--but not quite--the equivalent of the ancient Angel of Yahweh." The task of expelling the dragon from heaven, assigned in Isa 27:1 to Yahweh, is given in Rev 12 to Michael, who "has come to be accounted captain

¹Sellin, 45-46; "Aber gerade dieser wird ganz scharf von Jahwe unterschieden, er ist bereits ein Vorläufer des Erzengel Michael bei Daniel 10:13, 21; 12:1."

²Dix, 238.

³Ibid., 241.
of the hosts of Yahweh—a title originally give to the Angel of Yahweh," and who is sufficiently representative of the ancient Angel to be given the task.¹

In response to Dix, it is here proposed that the transition from the malāk yahweh to Michael had already occurred by the writing of Daniel; the "man in linen" is more likely Michael than Phanuel.² It may be recalled that the literature in which Phanuel/Uriel appears as part of plural archangels manifests a later development in angelology than is found in Daniel.³

Hirth sees Michael's title in Dan 12:1, the "great prince," as indicating a "vizier-function." Though he felt that the heavenly vizier conception was influenced by the Exile, he saw pre-exilic roots, especially the messenger who accompanied Israel in the Exodus, and in the "prince of the hosts of Yahweh" (Josh 5:13-15). But, "in later time, Michael is the special champion of Israel."⁴ He observed that the malāk yahweh carried no name until the time of Daniel, thus implicitly identifying Michael with the malāk.⁵

¹Ibid., 243.
²D. Ford, 248-49; Goldingay, Daniel, 291.
³See above, 156-167.
⁴Hirth, 101, "In späterer Zeit ist Michael der besondere Streiter für Israel."
⁵Ibid., 110; Augustin Calmet, "Michael," Calmet's Great Dictionary of the Holy Bible, 4 vols. (Charlestown: Samuel Etheridge, 1813), 2:n.p.; "Some believe that Michael conducted the Israelites in the desert, of whom it is said, Behold I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, & c." Calmet also referred to Michael as the one who appeared to Moses at the burning bush, He who appeared to Joshua by Jericho, He who appeared to Gideon and also to Manoah.
Hirth and Stier, though interpreting the mal'āk yahweh to be an angelic representative of Yahweh, recognize the special function of the Exodus angel as leader and guardian of Israel. This, of course, has its close parallel in the Michael figure. Stier developed systematically the hypothesis of the heavenly vizier in Israel. The heavenly vizier is the representative of the supreme God, who carries out His will on earth. Stier sees this function fulfilled in the figure of the Exodus angel, especially Exod 23:20f., and also in the figure of Michael in Dan 12:1.

Eichrodt concurs, seeing reference to the vizier in Josh 5:13; Exod 23:20ff., and Judg 5:23, along with Ezek 9:2 and Mal 3:1, leaving passages such as Exod 14:19; 32:34; 33:2; Num 20:16 to fall into place of themselves. Though, according to Eichrodt, the "mighty activity of the divine Lord" left no room for such a parallel and competitive being and thus he does not make himself fully felt in the historical narratives of early Israel, the heavenly vizier plays an important role in the later period, as in Dan 12:1 and some pseud-epigraphal works.

North observed that "strangely, mal'āk never occurs in

\[1\] Hirth, 112; Stier, 63-70; 90-92.

\[2\] Stier, 62-93; see Eichrodt, 197n.

\[3\] Stier, 63-65, 91-92. It is clear, therefore, that even if one rejects the view that the mal'āk yahweh is God in His self-manifestation, he can still be seen in a function closely paralleling that of Michael in Daniel, and thus, can be seen to serve as a prototype or precursor of Michael.

\[4\] Eichrodt, 197-98; these include T. Dan. 5f.; T. Levi 5; As. Mos. 10:1ff, etc.
Masoretic Daniel; Michael is 'prince' in Dan 10:13; 12:1." The implication here is that Michael replaces the mal'ak yahweh in Daniel.

Nickelsburg comments on the "possible identification of Michael with the angel in Isa 63:9." Focusing on alone-ness of the angel in his fight (Isa 63:3, 5; cf. vs. 9 and Dan 10:21), he felt the general form of the epiphany was the same.2

The function of the mal'ak yahweh in Zech 3 reveals similarities to the function of Michael in Daniel. He stands as chief of all the angels—a kind of grand vizier among the angels,3 an intermediary between God and man, and since he protects the priest, representative of God's people, a kind of guardian angel to Israel.4

In Zech 3:2, the one who declares to Satan, "Yahweh rebuke you," is Yahweh, or the Angel of Yahweh, if the designations are interchangeable as in earlier mal'ak yahweh stories. It is noteworthy that in Jude 9 (apparently drawing upon the pseudepigraphal book, As. Mos., no longer extant),5 it is Michael, contending with Satan over the body of Moses, who declares to Satan, "The Lord rebuke you." The author of Jude undoubtedly had this passage in Zech 3:2 in

---

2Nickelsburg, 21.
3Barton, 596.
5Rist, 450.
mind, evidence of his identification of Michael with the Angel of the Lord in Zechariah.1

In discussing the development of the concept of national guardian angels, Morgenstern remarks:

The šār of Israel is Michael, the most exalted of the angels (Dan 10:13; 12:1). But unlike the other šārīm, he is obviously not a reduced national deity, but corresponds rather to the mal'āk yahweh of Zechariah, the chief of the angels and Yahweh's immediate representative in His dealings with man.2

The similarities between the mal'āk yahweh in Zechariah and the Michael figure in Daniel are striking. Not only does he appear as chief of the angels, and guardian angel of Judah, but he also appears in a context of judgment, as Michael is in Dan 12:1-3.3 Just as Michael in Daniel occupies Yahweh's place as patron of Israel (Deut 32:9-12), the mal'āk yahweh in Zechariah is likewise Judah's guardian, and occupies the place of Yahweh presiding at the heavenly court. Accordingly, the Michael figure in Daniel may be seen generally to perform the function attributed to the mal'āk yahweh figure in Zechariah as well as in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges.

In summary, it appears that one can identify the mal'āk as possessing divinity, yet as being a personality distinct from Yahweh, with his own distinct identity and personal authority. Though the evidences of divinity in the Michael figure are less explicit, he appears to fill a divine role. He also is a personality distinct from Yahweh, with his own personal identity and authority, functioning as God's vizier. Michael is also the prince and guardian of

1Van der Hart, 50; Gurney, 158.
3Ibid., 308.
Israel, occupying a salvific role, and functions in a setting of judgment, superintending the resurrection to eternal life. He ranks above God's angelic host, and functions as leader of the angels, and as an intermediary between God and Israel. The parallel is so strong that the mal'ak yahweh is recognized as a parallel, prototype, and precursor of the Michael figure in Daniel. Michael can be viewed essentially as a divine personality, approximating the mal'ak yahweh figure under a different designation.

Summary

This concludes the comparison of Michael with other figures within and outside the book of Daniel. To briefly summarize, the evidence justifies the identification of the Michael figure, first of all, with the Prince of the Host, Prince of Princes figure. Though this figure is to be identified with God, his designation as šar, a title never even used for a king in the OT, referred to Him in a special function as the divine warrior, intervening in behalf of His persecuted people. The Prince of the Host figure appears linked by his title to the figure who met Joshua by the Jordan (Josh 5:14). As this figure demanded divine honor, yet was functioning as captain of Yahweh's host, the figure by the same designation in Daniel appears also to be a transcendent, divine figure, Prince of the Host of Yahweh. Since the title "prince," used for Michael, may be traced back to this Prince of the Host figure, and since both appear to be transcendent figures of the highest authority, they also appear to be one and the same figure.

The Michael figure is also thought to be identified with the Son of Man figure. Both are transcendent beings who emerge
prominently at the eschaton in a setting of judgment and deliverance for the saints. Both occupy parallel positions in the respective visions in which they appear. Just as the Son of Man has divine accompaniments, so Michael occupies a center of focus, an exalted status and position of power and authority as the guardian prince and deliverer of Israel, which suggests divinity.

The "one like a son of the gods" (Dan 3:25) appears as a personal guardian and deliverer within history of the three friends of Daniel, much as Michael appeared as national deliverer within history in Dan 10:13, 21. The fact that God had sent "his angel" to deliver them (Dan 3:28; as also in Dan 6:21) could suggest that this was a manifestation of God through the Angel of the Lord figure, much as in Israel’s earlier traditions and in the book of Zechariah. This raises the possibility that Daniel was here introducing the motif of the "divine hero," who emerged later in the book as the Son of Man, Prince of the Host, and Prince Michael.

Looking outside the book of Daniel, the Angel of the Lord, who appeared in Israel’s early traditions as a manifestation of Yahweh, is a close parallel to Michael. This is particularly evident in that the Angel of the Lord, by a commission from Yahweh, also acted as guardian and guide to Israel, delivering them from Egypt and leading them to the promised land. Not only was his function as guardian of Israel in Israel’s early traditions virtually identical to that of Michael in historical (Dan 10:13, 21) and eschatological times (Dan 12:1), but the probable identification of the Angel of the Lord with the Prince of the Host (Josh 5:14) lends added support to
interpreting the Angel of the Lord as a prototype of the Michael figure.

It is, of course, not sufficient to identify the Michael figure in isolation with the Prince of the Host and the Son of Man, or observe the close parallel between Michael and the Angel of the Lord. These identifications and parallels could suggest a pattern pointing to a divine figure alongside of Yahweh, who is also Yahweh, and who serves as deity in self-manifestation on behalf of His people throughout the history of Israel and more prominently at the eschaton. Specific designations differ, the specific form of manifestation changes, and the way the figure is perceived or expressed changes with the changing fortunes of Israel's history.

The Michael figure rises above the essentially faceless, functionary role of the angels to take the spotlight as "the great prince," who works for Israel's deliverance within history, and rises to deliver them at the eschaton. He combines within his person the functions of Yahweh or Angel of Yahweh as the personal guardian and deliverer of Israel, and of the Son of Man as the transcendent figure who appears at the eschaton. Though he is not described as ruling over Israel in the future age (as is the Son of Man), as Prince of Israel, Israel's guardian and deliverer, such an assignment would not be incompatible with the Danielic depiction of the Michael figure.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter presents a summary of the principal chapters which report the findings of this study, followed by the conclusions to which the findings point.

Summary of Chapter 2: Name and Principal Designation of Michael

The Name Michael

The name Michael appears in the OT ten times as a human name. The persons named Michael are distributed quite widely both geographically among the tribes and in the history of Israel.

A number of other names are etymologically related to Michael, such as Michal, Micaiah, Micha, and Micah. The name Michael in Daniel, therefore, is unique only in that it is used to designate a heavenly being.

The name Michael means "Who is like God?" an interrogative sentence name used as a rhetorical question to emphasize the incomparability of God. The rhetorical question was frequently used in other OT passages to express the incomparability of God. The rhetorical question with an implied negative answer was also used in contexts in which the reference was not to the name of God. The name Michael emerged from a common literary device within Israel’s literary traditions.
Cognates of the name Michael, or similar names formed with different divine elements, appear also in other ancient Semitic languages. Names equivalent or similar to Michael are found in Eblaite and Amorite, though not Ugaritic. The related name Micaiah and Mica, an abbreviated form of Michael, appear in Aramaic, and Micaiah is found in Phoenician.

On an inscription in the Palestinian city of Bethshan, the name Mekal, possibly the equivalent of Michael, appears as the name of a local deity. Though opinion is divided on whether the Egyptian hieroglyphics, in which the name was written, are equivalent to the Hebrew letters of Michael, it appears a distinct possibility. In that case, we would be confronted with a local deity within the borders of Israel with the name Michael.

The god Mekal has been identified with other gods in the region. He has been identified with the Babylonian god Nergal, the Canaanite god Resheph, and the Egyptian god Set. These gods--Nergal, Resheph, and Set--were chthonic gods, gods of the underworld and the dead; also of pestilence, death, destruction, war and storm, as well as the opposite functions of the sun and fertility.

The name of the god Rashaph-MKL appears in a fourth-century B.C. Phoenician inscription on the island of Cyprus, identifying the god Rashaph-MKL with the Greek god Apollo. It is thought--though disputed by some--that Rashaph-MKL of Cyprus is the god Mekal. The significance of this for the study of Michael is that the transporting of the name of the god Mekal to Cyprus indicates significant influence, and the persistence of the name Mekal into the fourth century B.C. suggests that the author of the Book of Daniel could
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possibly have been aware of the name Mekal in its association with a transcendent being.

The suggestion has been made that the Israelites came to identify Mekal with Yahweh. Yahweh, like Mekal, it is suggested, was a God of fertility, storm, war, and death. Also, Yahweh at times caused pestilence and disease. Though evidence for it is lacking, it is possible that the god Mekal came gradually to be identified with Yahweh by the people of Bethshan as they became assimilated, and perhaps also by the neighboring Israelites.

More in favor is the identification of Mekal with Michael. It is true that the name Michael and its cognates were widely used as a personal name in the ancient Semitic world. But Mekal and Michael are both transcendent beings. It has been suggested that the god Mekal became the archangel Michael. Michael is a military figure and is associated with resurrection and entrance to paradise, thus, with authority over death—functions somewhat related to those of Mekal. Moreover, just as Mekal is designated "the great god," so Michael is designated "the great prince."

If there were an identification of Mekal with Yahweh, then Mekal need not be subordinated to Yahweh as the archangel Michael. One might rather look for evidence of deity in the figure of Michael.

Nevertheless, it is not necessary to locate a background to the appearance of Michael in Daniel. It is probable that the transcendent Michael was an original development at the time the book of Daniel was written. A relationship between Mekal and Michael is not demonstrated, and remains only an interesting possibility. It has
little to contribute to an understanding of the transcendent figure of Michael.

In Akkadian inscriptions, interrogative sentence names have been found stating incomparability containing names of deities. Among them, the name Mannu-ki-ili, Akkadian cognate of the name Michael and its variants, has been found in every period from earliest times of which we have records. Also, the use of the name was geographically widespread in the Akkadian language area.

The name Michael or similar names expressing divine incomparability was geographically widespread in ancient Semitic languages.

The Designation "Prince"

The designation "prince" (šar) was used with each occurrence of the name Michael in the book of Daniel. It is from the verb "to rule," "to direct," and is used in the OT to mean chief, ruler, official, or captain. It is not primarily a military term, but becomes such when used in a military context.

"Prince" is used in the OT primarily for earthly persons. Of the twelve uses for transcendent beings, only three occur outside the book of Daniel: the Prince of the Host in Josh 5:14-15, and the messianic figure in Isa 9:6.

"Prince" is used in Daniel to designate both earthly and heavenly beings. Of the nine uses for transcendent beings, three designate Michael. The other six designate the Prince of the Host/Prince of princes (Dan 8:11, 25) and the princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 20). It is likely that the use in Josh 5:14-15 influenced the use in Daniel.
The designation ṣar is not used in the OT with the meaning "king," though its cognate sarru means king in Akkadian. "Prince" is used in parallel with kings in the OT, but never to mean king. The distinction between king and prince is always clear. Though the kings of the Philistines were referred to as "princes," it was in their role as military commanders, not in their role as kings. Neither does ṣar become the term for "angel" in Daniel. It rather designates heavenly beings in authority over angels or over nations, as prince of Persia, prince of Greece, prince of Daniel’s people.

The term prince is not used in the OT Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, but does reappear in the literature of the Qumran community, apparently under the influence of the book of Daniel. There it is used for both earthly authorities and the transcendent "Prince of Light." Though Michael is mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls, "prince" is never directly used to designate him. It is not used in the Qumran literature as a replacement for the usual term for "angel."

ṣar has been found in West Semitic inscriptions as a designation of pagan gods. This indicates that the OT is not unique in using the term to designate transcendent beings, and may suggest that the heavenly figures called prince in the OT could be in some sense divine.

**Summary of Chapter 3: Designations And Functions of Michael**

The passages which mention Michael (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1) are found in the final vision of the book of Daniel, which is in chaps. 10-12. The account of the vision is in three sections: the prologue
(Dan 10:1-11:1), the primary revelation (Dan 11:2-12:4), and the epilogue (Dan 12:5-13). The focus of the prologue, epilogue, and the final events (Dan 12:1-4) is on transcendent activity, in contrast to the natural, earthly activity of Dan 11:2-45. The vision of Dan 10-12 is parallel to earlier Danielic visions of Dan 2, 7 and 8, so it seemed necessary to examine these prophecies as well as Dan 9:24-27 to understand Michael's identity and function. The entire vision is placed in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia.

Designations of Michael in Dan 10 and 12

The view that Michael is the patron of Israel has come primarily from the Michael passages in the book of Daniel.

In Dan 10:13, Michael is spoken of as "one of" the chief princes. Though some have thought this should be translated, the "first of" the chief princes, Hebrew usage does not support it, and "one of" is the preferred rendition.

The use of the expression "chief princes" indicates that there is a class of heavenly beings designated "princes." That there are also "chief princes" indicates a hierarchy of heavenly beings. The designation "prince" would seem to indicate a rank above ordinary angels. "Chief prince" would indicate a position of highest rank in the heavenly hierarchy.

A widespread view is that these "chief princes" are archangels, of whom Michael is one. That Michael is one of four or seven archangels appears in 1 Enoch, Tobit, the Qumran literature, early Christian literature, and ancient Rabbinical Judaism. But the designation "prince" would seem closer to expressing the idea of
archangel than "chief prince," giving us no equivalent of "chief princes" in the literature.

One reason for identifying "chief princes" with archangels is the common view that Dan 10-12 was written in the second century B.C., by which time the concept of archangels was well developed. But the angelology and the terminology for angels in Daniel are quite different from that in 1 Enoch and Tobit. Daniel's angelology seems to be at an earlier state of development than that of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

**Excursus: Dating of Daniel and the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**

There is a fairly widespread agreement among scholars that the angelology of the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, such as Tobit and 1 Enoch, is noticeably more complex and advanced than that found in the book of Daniel.

Since parts of 1 Enoch are thought to pre-date the Maccabean date often assigned to Daniel, efforts have been made to discover influence from 1 Enoch on Daniel. The undeniable influence could, with perhaps more justification, be from Daniel to 1 Enoch. On literary grounds, the evidence of extensive development in 1 Enoch in angelology and in other areas as compared to Daniel argues for an earlier date for the book of Daniel.

The Qumran literature also represents a development over Daniel in angelology and other areas. Influence from 1 Enoch and Tobit may also be seen in Qumran documents.

Evidence from Daniel fragments from Qumran also argues for a date of composition earlier than the Maccabean period. Daniel was
accepted as a prophet. Manuscripts have been found dated within fifty years of the alleged date of the composition. Different textual versions have been found. Also, the book of Daniel seems to have exercised a formative influence on the Qumran community, a community whose origins predate 164 B.C.—end of excursus.

Even if one proceeded on the assumption that the authorship of Daniel preceded that of Tobit, 1 Enoch, and the Qumran Literature, the expression "chief princes" might still refer to some elite class of angels.

However, the possibility must not be overlooked that the expression "chief princes" refers to a council of divine entities, especially since Michael is found to possess elements of divinity.

In Dan 10:21, Michael is designated "your prince." Since "your" here is plural, Michael is designated as prince of Daniel’s people. Daniel’s people throughout the book of Daniel are Israel, and would be here also. Michael is prince of Israel. This identification of Michael as prince of Israel is amplified in later Jewish apocalyptic and Qumran literature.

In Dan 12:1, the expression "thy people," though it is in an eschatological context, here too refers to Israel. However, it excludes the ungodly in Israel, and thus has in view an idealized Israel, a holy remnant.

The designation "prince" appears to be a title for Michael. It is used to designate him in each of the three passages in Daniel in which he is named. Also, the pattern of title usages in the OT serves as evidence that "Prince" is used as a title for Michael.

The adjective "great" used to describe Michael is
significant. The Hebrew word for "great" is the highest superlative employed. It is used for persons of highest eminence, and is frequently employed as a term of exaltation for God. Nowhere else in the OT is "great" used to describe a heavenly intermediary.

The employment of the article in the designation "the great prince" makes it emphatic that Michael stands alone as the highest of the heavenly intermediaries. Michael, in contrast to angels elsewhere encountered in the OT, has his own distinct identity, authority, and personality. In his role as Israel's patron and deliverer, and standing in the focal position in the end-time events, he occupies a position filled by God in earlier OT passages.

The position of authority held by Michael in Daniel is made even more explicit in Jewish apocalyptic literature and in the book of Revelation.

Michael is an exalted prince of the highest rank among the heavenly princes. He is also prince of Daniel's people, a holy remnant of Israel. He bears the title "prince" and is "the great prince," the highest ranking celestial being, arising at the eschaton as did Yahweh of old, to deliver the holy remnant. At the climax of the book of Daniel, the focus rests on Michael.

The Function of Michael In Dan 10 and 12

In Dan 10 and 12, Michael is seen functioning in relationship to history.

The Function of Michael in Dan 10

In Dan 10, one or two unnamed beings appear, the "Man in Linen" and the "Angel of Revelation." Opinion is divided over
whether there is one or two beings, and what is the identity of the
unnamed figure(s). The dominant view is that the Man in Linen and
the Angel of Revelation are the same person, which would preclude
identifying the Man in Linen with Michael.

Those who see one heavenly being in Dan 10 interpret him as
(1) Gabriel, (2) an anonymous angel, or (3) a divine Messiah. He is
seen as Gabriel on analogy with Dan 8 and 9. Some see him as anony­
mous because he is unnamed, his appearance and effect are more
striking than that of Gabriel, and his active role in events con­
trasts to Gabriel's role as revelator only. Others have taken him to
be a divine Messiah because his description is similar to that of God
in Ezek 1 and 9, and of Christ in Rev 1. Some of these have identi­
fied him with the Son of Man of Dan 7 and with the Angel of the Lord
of the Exodus experience, and view him as superior to Michael. But
Michael would need to be the superior since (1) success against the
prince of Persia was not achieved until Michael's arrival after three
weeks of inconclusive struggle, (2) Michael stays behind while the
other is sent with a revelation—a lesser function, and (3) Michael
is a named being and, furthermore, is designated "the great prince."

Some feel that the Man in Linen is pre-eminent over Gabriel
and Michael, but that he is not a divine Messiah. The belief in one
unnamed heavenly being in Dan 10 prevents an identification with
Michael, who would otherwise seem to have the preeminence.

Difficulties with the view of only one being in Dan 10 have
led a minority to see two: the awe-inspiring Man in Linen (Dan
10:5-6) and the Angel of Revelation (Dan 10:11ff.). The Man in Linen
is generally regarded as divine and messianic, because of the impact
on Daniel similar to the impact of theophanies on men elsewhere in Scripture (Exod 3:16; Isa 6:1-6), and because of the parallel passages of Ezek 1, 9; Rev 1.

The second figure is then generally regarded as Gabriel because of the parallel with Dan 8 and 9. This seems likely to have been the intent of the writer, though it was not made explicit.

A minority of interpreters have identified Michael with the Man in Linen. Both figures have an exalted dignity above other heavenly beings, and thus are the same being. Michael is Israel’s patron prince, and he alone appears to rescue them in the eschaton.

Others who see two figures do not identify the Man in Linen with Michael, primarily because the writer of Dan 10 does not explicitly do so.

The Angel of Revelation is subordinate to Michael, who, as "the great Prince," has no angelic peer. The revelatory angel could be helped in his struggle with the prince of Persia by no heavenly being other than Michael. Thus the Angel of Revelation was of high authority, with Michael having the highest rank of all.

The Man in Linen is identified with Michael because: (1) Michael is mentioned immediately following the vision of the Man in Linen; (2) the awe-inspiring appearance suggests the highest rank, a rank analogous to that of Michael, "the great Prince," who delivers God’s people at the end and executes final judgment, occupying the focus of attention at the eschaton; and (3) the description of the Man in Linen suggests divinity. Michael’s prominent role as prince of Israel and eschatological deliverer also suggests he is a divine being. Angels elsewhere are faceless functionaries.
Michael and the Princes of Persia and Greece

In Dan 10, Michael comes to the aid of the Angel of Revelation in struggles with the princes of Persia and Greece. In discussing Michael’s relationship to the princes of Persia and Greece in Dan 10, it was felt necessary first to identify these princes. There have been two basic views: (1) they are the earthly kings of these nations, and (2) they are heavenly beings assigned to these nations, impeding God’s plans for favoring Israel.

In the first view, Cyrus or Cambyses has been suggested as prince of Persia. Relatively recently, in favor of Cambyses, it has been pointed out that he harbored animosity toward foreign cults, was co-regent with Cyrus (thus "kings" of Persia, Dan 10:13) with direct authority over Palestine, and possibly entered into co-regency exactly three weeks before the date assigned to Daniel’s vision!

In favor of this view:

1. The Hebrew šar means "chief," "ruler," or "leader" and therefore could be thought to apply to Cyrus or Cambyses and Alexander.

2. The Akkadian cognate sarru means "king" in Akkadian literature. If written in sixth-century B.C. Babylon, the author may have here used an Akkadian term.

3. "Prince" is in parallel with "kings" or "king" (NIV) in Dan 10:13 suggesting the two terms refer to the same individual.

4. Both Cyrus and Alexander were also military commanders, a position designated by šar, and the term could have been applied to them in that function.
5. Heavenly beings have elsewhere directly influenced earthly kings.

6. The concept of patron angels of Persia and Greece has no parallel elsewhere in the OT.

Against this view, however:

1. **כאר** is never used in the OT with the meaning of "king."

2. The designation of the heavenly being Michael as prince (כאר) in the same context suggests that the princes of Persia and Greece are also heavenly beings.

In the second view, that the princes of Persia and Greece are heavenly beings, there are two basic views: (1) they are angels in God's service and (2) they are satanic spirits.

If angels of God, it is thought that every nation has an angelic patron who defends the interests of his respective nation. This leads to contentions between the angelic patrons which are resolved by God's final decisions. God Himself was originally Israel's patron, but by the time Daniel was written, this role was assigned to the archangel Michael. Since Israel was God's chosen people, Michael was the highest of the patron princes. The concept of patron angels of nations has been thought to originate from either foreign influence or from Israel's demoting of national gods to the status of angels, each still over its nation, God ruling the nations through intermediaries.

Some see behind this an older OT theology which acknowledged the existence of gods other than Yahweh, allotted by Him to the various nations. However, in the context of the passages cited in support of this, the existence of other gods is explicitly denied.
In pseudepigraphal works, the tradition is found that after the Flood, angels taught the nations their languages, and these angels were chosen by the nations as their gods, except for Israel who chose to worship God.

The concept of national gods or angels finds support in Deut 32:8 LXX, a reading widely supported in current scholarship. There it is said that when God gave the nations their inheritance, He set their bounds according to the number of the sons of God. However, there is support, such as the Samaritan Pentateuch, for the MT reading, "children of Israel." Further, "sons of God" elsewhere designates angels, which are spoken of as innumerable, not seventy in number.

The idea that "sons of God" designates gods, and that, in earlier theology, Yahweh appointed lower gods over the nations, similarly, does not find support in other Biblical usage of the expression.

The MT reading, "sons of Israel," can indicate that it was significant to the author that the number of the nations was the same as the number of offspring of Jacob as found in Gen 46:8-27. And though Israel was not listed as one of the nations (Gen 10), yet God chose Israel as His own heritage.

Furthermore, the concept of heavenly angels of God contending with each other does not fit with the Biblical concept of angels. They are described elsewhere as totally loyal, informed, and prompt to do God’s will. It is not credible that an angel in God’s service would for three weeks resist an angel representing God’s purposes.
The view that the princes of Persia and Greece are rebellious angels deliberately opposing God's will is attractive because it eliminates the theological difficulty of holy angels resisting, even temporarily, the divine will. Some have understood these princes as national gods reduced to demons. In any case, in this view, the revelatory angel of Dan 10, with Michael, overcame the evil prince of Persia, enabling them to directly influence the Persian kings to favor Israel. Some suggest that every nation has an assigned evil prince. Others see this as only a special assignment, a view perhaps more defensible.

Ps 82 has been interpreted as referring either to human judges or to heavenly beings. By some it has been cited in support of understanding the princes of Persia and Greece as demoted national gods under Yahweh's authority. It seems that Ps 82 may rather be best understood as God passing judgment upon fallen heavenly beings. This last interpretation is strengthened by recalling the OT motifs of the serpentine foe Leviathan/Rahab, Lucifer, and Satan, suggesting that the concept of heavenly beings in adversarial relation to God was widespread. Likewise the princes of Persia and Greece are fallen heavenly beings deliberately trying to thwart God's plans to favor Israel.

Michael was left with "the kings of Persia" because the struggle was to determine which heavenly being would influence the earthly kings concerning events affecting Israel.

The use of šar to designate demonic princes of Persia and Greece is not improbable, since the number of examples of the use of
the designation for heavenly beings is insufficient to establish a statistical norm.

The evidence would appear to best support the view that the princes of Persia and Greece are heavenly beings in rebellion against God.

The crisis which called for Michael’s intervention in Dan 10 related not to securing permission for Jews to return to Judah, for that had already been obtained. It was more likely due to the efforts of the non-Jewish people of Palestine to prevent the Jews from rebuilding the temple and establishing themselves on the land. This effort included sending messengers to Cyrus to turn him against the Jews. Or it might have been due to the installation of Cambyses as vassal king under Cyrus of the area including both Babylon and Palestine. Cambyses is known to have been hostile toward foreign religions.

The crisis led to Daniel’s three-week fast and to Gabriel’s intervention. Gabriel’s unsuccessful three-week struggle with the prince of Persia prevented him from coming to Daniel during that period. The crisis focused on Cyrus, who granted to the Jews liberty and material assistance in rebuilding their temple, then came under pressure to reverse this policy. The influence of the evil prince of Persia led Cyrus to waver. Gabriel was sent to counteract this influence, but was withstood by the evil prince. After Michael was sent into the struggle, Gabriel was not so urgently needed, and was freed to visit Daniel briefly, then hasten back to continue the struggle. The fact that Gabriel had to return indicated that, though
a victory was achieved and the crisis was over, the struggle continued.

The "kings of Persia" with whom Michael was left by Gabriel would be Cyrus and Cambyses.

The confrontation between Michael and the prince of Persia was not, as some think, a heavenly struggle between these two beings, the outcome of which determines the outcome of an earthly struggle between their client nations. Michael's victory is not cosmic but historical. The objective was not the dominance of Judah over Persia, but preserving the Persian royal favor toward Judah. Persia was not regarded by Judah as an enemy; Cyrus was viewed as a deliverer and Darius as a benefactor. There is no Biblical concept of two-level warfare, heavenly and earthly. When God and His forces go to battle, they battle primarily earthly foes, not heavenly. The battle is one-dimensional, with the earthly struggle the focus. In the OT, the earthly battle is not a re-capitulation of a heavenly battle between hostile transcendent beings. The earthly struggle is primary and the real struggle is played out on earth. Michael and Gabriel out-maneuvered the prince of Persia to influence Cyrus to continue to favor the Jews.

The question arises whether Michael's activity is military in nature. In Dan 10, only Michael and Gabriel are qualified to enter the struggle with the princes of Persia and Greece; no clashing of heavenly armies is in view. It is debatable whether the contest necessarily points to a military conflict. Further, the context does not point to a judicial contention, for it is not God's decision but
that of Cyrus which is at issue. But the expression "fight with" (Dan 10:20) signifies a contention with the character of combat.

In writing of the clashes between Michael and Gabriel and the princes of Persia and Greece, the author was probably seeking to assure the faithful community that God is concerned about earthly affairs and that He does intervene on behalf of His people. But these events have the eschaton in view. The account moves on to the final intervention and deliverance of God's people. Michael, introduced in Dan 10, is the great prince who will arise at the eschaton when Daniel's people are delivered.

The Function of Michael in Dan 12

The final and most significant mention of Michael in Daniel occurs in an eschatological setting, at the "time of the end," the final events of the historical time line. It is then that the great blasphemous enemy of God's people shall come to his end. The eschatological nature of the events associated with Michael's arising is seen in the parallel prophecies of Dan 2, 7, 8-9. Michael's appearance represents God's intervention involving a time of intense trouble for God's people, the destruction of the anti-God power, a judgment, a resurrection from the dead, and an ensuing state of blessedness for the chosen ones.

When Michael shall arise, he is the last of a series of powers in the vision of Dan 10-12 said to arise to take power. His arising in power to deliver God's people contrasts to the preceding anti-God persecuting power which arose. Michael's arising suggests a military function for Michael in this context. But he does not here combat a transcendent foe, as in Dan 10; he rather destroys the
last-day persecutor of God’s people to deliver them. Michael also arose in a judicial setting. He stands in judgment to vindicate Israel and punish their persecutors.

The judgment from books in Dan 7 occurred within historical time prior to the establishment of the eternal rule. Here God sits to judge. In view of the plural "thrones" (Dan 7:9), it may be that Michael arose from participating in the judgment to deliver God’s people who have been vindicated in the judgment.

That Michael "stands for" Daniel’s people can mean that he represents them before God in judicial context, or that he stands guard over them in authority and protection. In either meaning, it is an activity continuing from the past (Dan 10), analogous to that of the "Angel of the Lord" (Pentateuch and Judges) into the eschaton (Dan 12).

When Michael arises, there will be an incomparable "time of trouble," similar to a time of trouble referred to in Jer 30:7, a passage which may have influenced the author of Dan 12. This time of trouble follows Michael’s arising; his arising seems to usher in the time of distress. The distress may be not only for Israel, but perhaps primarily for the punishment of the ungodly persecuting nations. Parallels can be seen in the prophets of an eschatological punishment of the nations by God, a motif which reappears in the seven last plagues (Rev 16) and the triumphant Word of God smiting the nations (Rev 19:11-21). God’s people must also endure this time of distress, but they shall be delivered out of it. While the time of trouble brings punishment to the wicked, it purifies God’s people and prepares them for His kingdom. Since the trials are predicted,
their intensity serves as a sign to the people of God of the nearness of God's approaching kingdom, and tends to fortify their courage.

Though Daniel's people who are delivered are the people of Israel, the promise of deliverance is not unconditional. It is restricted to a faithful remnant in Israel who have been vindicated in the heavenly judgment and whose names are retained in the books.

There are two phases of the deliverance of God's people in Dan 12:1-3. First is the deliverance of the living people of God from the distress of the time of trouble, their probable obtaining of eternal life, and their entrance into God's eternal kingdom. Second is the resurrection of the righteous dead to eternal life. The second is also in the context of judgment, as those raised go either to life or to shame and contempt. The two fates redress the injustice of the experience of each class in the present age. The resurrected righteous then enter the eternal kingdom of God.

Those rewarded at the final deliverance are the wise and those who turn many to righteousness, probably a synonymous parallel; the wise are those who turn many to righteousness. The reward is to shine like the brightness of the firmament and as the stars forever. This does not mean the resurrected wise become angels or join an angelic kingdom. The brightness of the firmament and stars is used figuratively for the glory of God's faithful in what is essentially a kingdom located on earth.

It is at the eschatological appearance of Michael that the faithful are delivered, the dead are raised, and the wise glorified. Michael is the prominent heavenly deliverer, who arises to supervise the resurrection and usher in the coming age.
Identity and Function of Michael

Michael's appearance as Israel's champion at the height of the distress will mean the coming of salvation and glory. The eschatological drama begins with his appearance. The result of his intervention will be the rescue of Israel and a resurrection from the dead. Daniel's people expected to receive from Michael the final victory over all enemies, the persecuting king of the north as well as the demonic powers behind him.

Michael, as leader of the angels and prince over Israel, is mediator between God and mankind. In Daniel, he appears as a messianic figure.

Michael, as "the great prince," transcends angels, and has honor and recognition not elsewhere in Scripture given to a created being. Michael appears to have traits of divinity. The distinct personal identity, dignity, rank, and authority attributed to him is never given to an angel. He is a messianic, salvific figure, the eschatological warrior and executor of judgment, functions assigned elsewhere to God. God only, in other OT writings, is the heavenly warrior and patron and protector of Israel. In Daniel, Michael functions in that capacity. It appears that the author of Dan 10-12 regarded Michael as a divine being.

The association of Michael with the resurrection of the dead finds parallels in pseudepigraphal works such as the Apocalypse of Moses, Adam and Eve, and the Testament of Abraham, and in the NT in Jude and 1 Thessalonians.

In attributing a divine-like function to Michael, the author of Dan 10-12 maintains a clear distinction between Michael and God,
just as in Dan 7 there is a distinction between the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days.

Michael's mediatorial role is elaborated in certain pseudepigraphal works and in the NT. He becomes mediator between God and angels as well as between God and man. His intercession includes bearing the petitions of both men and angels to God and returning with God's answers and instructions. These works, while they cannot be used to interpret Michael in Daniel, do make explicit what appears to be already implicit in Daniel.

Summary of Chapter 4: Michael And Other OT Figures

Michael and Other Danielic Figures

Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes

Though the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes of Dan 8 is a reference to God, it is a highly unusual designation. It is difficult to find other places in the OT where the word *sār* (prince) is used to designate God.

The designation "prince of the host" is used widely in the OT to designate military officers. In only one other passage did it designate a heavenly being, that is when the "Prince of the host of Yahweh" (Josh 5:14-15) appeared to Joshua by the Jordan River. This usage likely influenced the author of Dan 8:11, who intended to designate the same being. The author of Dan 8 did not have Onias III in mind; high priests were never so designated, nor does the historical situation support such an interpretation.

The context in Joshua indicates that the prince of the host there was a divine being, God. Because Joshua and Israel were
facing an immediate and extended military task, God, in the theo-

phany, refers to Himself as "Prince of the host of Yahweh," that is,
a military figure, in this context. Likewise, Daniel depicts God as
an ultimately victorious warrior figure in combat with the Little
Horn power on behalf of His people.

The terminological link "prince" between the Prince of the
Host and Michael is suggestive that they are the same being. The use
of "prince" in the Joshua passage probably lies behind its use in
Daniel for both the Prince of the Host and Michael. Both figures
appear to have similar functions, intervening on behalf of Israel.
It seems apparent that the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes is to
be identified with Michael, a manifestation of God as heavenly war-
rior intervening on behalf of His people in history and at the
eschaton.

Behind the assault of the Little Horn against the Prince of
the Host in Dan 8:10-11 may lie a transcendent struggle between a
demonic being and God, akin to Lucifer’s self-exaltation in Isa
14:12-14. A similar transcendent struggle is seen in Rev 12 where
Satan and Michael are in heavenly combat. Though demonic beings
could be seen in Dan 8 and 10, there is no evidence of a demonic
being in Dan 12.

If the "host" or "stars" of Dan 8:10 are interpreted as
angels, then the Prince of the Host would be contending with a trans-
cendent demon lying behind and working through an earthly Little Horn
power. This would parallel Michael’s struggle with the transcendent
demons in Dan 10. Also, Rev 12 pictures a dragon power which cast
some of the stars to earth. Michael functions there as prince of the
angelic host leading them in combat with Satan and his angelic army. Since the dragon in Rev 12 represents Rome through whom Satan worked, a demon could likewise lie behind and work through the Little Horn of Dan 8:10-11.

If the "host" of Dan 8:10 refers—as some think—to Israel, then the Prince of the Host would be Michael, for Michael is prince of Israel.

The Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes appears to be the same personage as Michael, the divine Deliverer in his role as commander of the angelic hosts and of his people on earth.

The title "Prince of Princes" carries virtually the same meaning as "the great prince." Both figures bear traits of divinity. Both are transcendental beings who bear the title "prince," a title drawn from the divine Prince of the host of Yahweh figure of Joshua. Also the function of the Prince of the Host as head of the angels and of Israel is equivalent to that of Michael. Michael, Prince of the Host, guardian of Israel, is a divine, heavenly deliverer, God in a veiled manner of speaking.

**Michael and the Son of Man**

Michael and the Son of Man each appear in an eschatological setting at the close of one of parallel visions in the book of Daniel. In their respective visions, each is prominent when the historical period is superseded by the divine order. This has led some to identify the two figures as the same angelic being, the most prominent of the angels. Expressions in Daniel and other apocalyptic literature such as "like a man" uniformly designates angels, and the expression "one like unto a son of man" in Dan 7 should also, it has
been concluded, designate an angel. Of the angels, only Michael is so identified with Israel that only he can represent Israel in the heavens. The Son of Man is not a symbol, but the guardian angel of Israel. In this view, the guardian angel is not the Messiah; with the growth of the messianic idea, the functions and honor of Michael shifted to the Messiah.

This identification of the Son of Man with Michael seems to be a strong position. The Son of Man, unnamed in the Dan 7 vision, reappears in Dan 12 under the name Michael. Supporting this is the common motif of the judicial setting. Both figures are intimately associated with the interests of Israel. Both occupy the prominent position in the eschatological drama. The appearance of each signals the oppressor’s fall and Israel’s rescue and the establishment of a new order in the everlasting kingdom of God.

The fact that the author of Daniel does not explicitly identify the Son of Man with Michael is insufficient grounds not to make such an identification. Numerous other clear parallels between visions in Daniel are not explicitly identified.

Some refuse to identify the Son of Man with Michael because they interpret the Son of Man as a symbol of the saints of the Most High, but regard Michael as an individual. Others accept the Son of Man as a symbol and representative of the saints, whom they regard as angels. In this latter interpretation, the Son of Man is generally identified with Michael.

But the Son of Man is not necessarily a symbol of either Israelite or angelic saints. He is a heavenly being who is appointed by the Ancient of Days to rule the Israelite saints forever. Seen
this way, his identification with Michael is facilitated.

Examination of some basic issues

**Son of Man--symbol or individual.** The prevailing view is that, just as the four beasts of Dan 7 symbolize four kingdoms, so the Son of Man is a corporate symbol of the saints, whether angelic or Israelite.

But if the Son of Man was intended as a symbol, it is not immediately apparent. The impression is that he is an individual person, as is seen in the interpretations in the later apocalyptic literature. Also, elsewhere in Daniel, expressions such as "like a man" uniformly indicate heavenly individuals. Further, the "saints" appear in the vision as well as in the interpretation, so cannot be symbolized by the Son of Man. Indeed, the saints are persecuted in vision by the horn before the Ancient of Days sits in judgment, while the Son of Man appears after the judgment scene, and was not said to be persecuted. The Son of Man is worshiped, as is the Most High, not the saints, in the interpretation. The Son of Man is in heaven, the saints on earth. In addition, neither the Son of Man nor the Ancient of Days is explicitly explained in the interpretation as are the beasts and horns. This may be because they were not symbols at all, and therefore needed no interpretation. The appearance of the person of Michael in a parallel vision suggests that the Son of Man is also a person. The Son of man is taken here as an individual, the same person as Michael in the later vision.

**Son of Man--symbol and individual.** The view that the Son of Man is both symbol and individual has received significant support.
He is symbol of the kingdom of the saints and of their messianic king. But this ignores the necessity of allowing a symbol to have a one-to-one relationship with the reality being symbolized. A symbol should have only one referent. The Son of man is not a symbol, but an individual person.

**Son of Man—a divine figure.** Those who identify the Son of Man with Michael often interpret the Son of Man as an angel, in part because Michael is thought to be an angel, and in part because they identify the Son of Man with angelic saints.

Identifying the saints as angelic, however, would seem to strip the book of Daniel of much relevance for the oppressed Israelite community. And it would seem difficult for an earthly Little Horn power to persecute angels. The idea that "saints" is a standard OT term for angels has not been sustained. The context must determine usage.

There is persuasive evidence that the Son of Man should be regarded as a divine being. Clouds are an accompaniment of divinity. Two divine beings are found in Dan 7, the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days. Another factor is that He is the object of worship, accorded only to a deity. Also, there is a parallel between the Son of Man in the vision and the Most High in the interpretation. Each receives an everlasting kingdom and is worshiped.

The seeming ditheism in Dan 7 is avoided when one considers that Christian trinitarianism is not thought to compromise monotheism. Unity in purpose, nature, and character retains monotheism.

The Son of Man appears to be an individual, divine person,
who would appear at the eschaton to rule all kingdoms of earth as well as over the Israelite saints who would participate in His rule.

The Son of Man identified with Michael

The Son of Man is to be identified with Michael. The parallels seem unmistakable. Michael, as well as the Son of Man, is first introduced in the book of Daniel, with no evidence of an earlier established tradition. Michael in Dan 12 is a further unfolding and naming of the mysterious Son of Man.

The Angel of the Lord can be understood as a prototype of the Son of Man. Both were accompanied by a cloud or clouds. Both had the accompaniments of divinity. Both were above ordinary angels. Both fulfill a mediatorial role between God and Israel. The Angel of the Lord at times appeared like a man. As shown below, the Angel of the Lord may lie behind Michael as well, and this may further confirm the identification of the Son of Man with Michael.

An identification of Michael and the Son of Man is possible even though the author does not explicitly do so. Neither does the author make explicit the identification of the visions of Dan 2 and 7, or of the four heads of Dan 7 and the four horns of Dan 8, yet these identifications seem self-evident. Other similar parallel motifs exist between the different visions in Daniel. The parallel between the Son of Man and Michael is a similar case. That differences exist between these parallels should not blind one to the intended identification. One vision complemented the other rather than replicating it. The vision of Michael in Dan 12 is naming the Son of Man and further expanding on his functions.
Michael and a messianic Son of Man

The Son of Man of Dan 7 is widely identified with the Davidic Messiah. Though some see the Messiah here transcendentalized and no longer an earthly Davidic ruler, others see the transcendentalized, divine Messiah as still Davidic in some sense. It is felt here that the author of Dan 7 identified the Son of Man with the Davidic Messiah. The author of Dan 7 had before him the transcendentalizing of the Messiah in the Psalms, Isaiah, and Micah.

Daniel's presentation of the transcendent, messianic Son of Man as well as the cut off messianic Anointed Prince is similar to the Isaian Servant Songs, in which the Servant had world influence, but also suffered. In Daniel the earthy, suffering prince appeared within history, while the transcendent Son of Man appears at the eschaton.

Since the Son of Man is identified here with Michael, the identification of the Son of Man with the Davidic Messiah indirectly identifies Michael with the Davidic Messiah.

Michael and the One "Like a Son of the Gods"

The expression in Dan 3:25 "one like a son of the gods," properly means, in Aramaic idiom, "one like a god." The recent trend toward interpreting the expression to designate an angel overlooks the fact that (1) the expression is not used elsewhere in Daniel for an angel, and (2) in the Hebrew usage, an expression used to designate angels is "sons (plural) of God," not "son (singular) of God."

Though the being is called "angel" in Dan 3:38, "angel" is not the usual term for an angel in the book of Daniel, and may rather
refer to the Angel of the Lord, a manifestation of God. His appearance in a furnace may be significant, since fire often accompanies theophany in the OT.

A god-like being intervenes to deliver His loyal people in a historical setting, just as Michael brought deliverance to Israel in a historical setting and the Son of Man and Michael will bring salvation to God's people at the eschaton. In each case these figures appear at decisive moments, saving events. The being in the furnace is a divine figure, like the Angel of the Lord, Son of Man, Prince of the Host, and Michael. One might see the motif of the transcendent hero as divine bringer of salvation running through the book of Daniel.

Michael and the Angel of the Lord

A heavenly being called the Angel of the Lord or Angel of God, who at times seems to be God Himself, appears in three groupings of passages: isolated appearances in Genesis, Numbers and Judges; passages associated with the Exodus; and in Zechariah. The isolated appearances were to Hagar, Abraham, Jacob, Balaam, Gideon, and Manoah and his wife. In these the Angel was referred to by the writer or by persons in the story as Yahweh or God, and speaks with full, personal, divine authority. In some appearances, the being was seen; in others he was only a voice from heaven. In some he accepted worship. In some an element of fear was present from seeing God. Jacob, in his blessing (Gen 48:15-16), evidently identified this angel with God.

In the Exodus appearances, the same pattern of referring to the angel as either God or Yahweh is evident. This Angel of Yahweh
calls Himself "I AM," and "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." He resided in the pillar of cloud and fire accompanying Israel in the wilderness. In the Exodus appearances, two divine persons are evident: God who sends the Angel to accompany Israel, and the Angel who is sent, who is also Yahweh and who speaks and acts with full authority. In Judges, the Angel claims to have led Israel out of Egypt and into the promised land.

In Zech 1, the Angel of the Lord appears on a red horse and acts as angelis interpres of the vision. In Zech 3, Joshua stood before the Angel of the Lord in a judgment scene in which the Angel functioned as judge and spoke with divine authority in removing Joshua's sin. He functions also as guardian of Israel in protecting the high priest, Israel's representative. The figure has not been re-defined in Zechariah.

In all three groups of passages, the Angel of the Lord appears as God in His self-manifestation. In the Exodus narratives, God's angel sent is a person distinct from God the sender.

Another interpretation which has been offered is that the Angel of the Lord is simply an angelic representative of Yahweh, who, in a corporate sense, is an extension of God's personality, and could therefore speak with full authority. This "messenger style" is not adequate to explain all cases, however, and therefore the concept of the Angel of the Lord as God in His self-manifestation is sustained.

Efforts of some to examine each Angel of the Lord pericope in isolation, and finding an angelic explanation adequate in each case, fail to deal with a pattern which evidences a common tradition.

The attempt has been made to interpret only the function of
the Angel of the Lord, sidestepping the issue of whether the Angel was divine or angelic.

However, the evidence supports the view that the Angel of the Lord is Yahweh in His self-manifestation.

The Angel of the Lord is a close parallel and prototype of Michael. This is seen in a direct comparison of the role and function of Michael and the Angel of the Lord. Both have personal identity and authority distinct from the faceless, functionary background role of ordinary angels. Both functioned as guardians of Israel and served as intermediaries between God and Israel. Each seems to function as God's visier. Each fulfilled a judicial function relative to Israel. Just as the Angel of the Lord led Israel from the bondage of Egypt to their own land in Canaan, so Michael presides over the transition from this age of tribulation to the coming age of God's kingdom. It seems apparent that Michael fulfills in Daniel the function of the Angel of the Lord in the earlier literature.

Another point of contact between Michael and the Angel of the Lord is found in identifying the Angel of the Lord with the Prince of the Host in Josh 5:13-15. Links between Michael and the Prince of the Host have already been established. The Prince of the Host in Josh 5 is widely regarded as another manifestation of the Angel of the Lord. The parallel with Exod 3:2-7 is particularly strong.

This link, along with the similarities in function between Michael and the Angel of the Lord, provides evidence that the Angel of the Lord and Michael might be viewed as the same heavenly being.

The function of the Angel of the Lord in Zechariah reveals
similarities to the function of Michael in Daniel. He is chief of the angels, an intermediary between God and men, and functions as a guardian of Israel. The rebuke of Satan by the Angel of the Lord in Zech 3 is echoed in Jude 9, where it is Michael who rebukes Satan. Also, both Michael in Daniel and the Angel of the Lord in Zech 3 appear in a context of judgment.

The Angel of the Lord is a divine being distinct from Yahweh. Similarly, Michael appears to fulfill a divine function. Both the Angel of the Lord and Michael function as heavenly leader and guardian of Israel. Michael fulfills a messianic, salvific function in the setting of judgment, superintends the resurrection to eternal life, and rules over God's angelic host as their leader, and is an intermediary between God and Israel. Michael so strongly parallels the Angel of the Lord that the Angel of the Lord is to be regarded as a prototype of Michael. Michael is essentially another depiction of the Angel of the Lord under a different designation.

**Conclusion**

**Michael's Identity and Function**

Michael is designated as prince of Israel, Daniel's people. Michael is therefore Israel's heavenly representative, patron, leader, and guardian. The people of Israel have been especially placed under the care, guidance, and tutelage of Michael, their prince.

Michael is more than a "prince." He is "one of the chief princes," thus a heavenly being of the highest rank. The expression "chief princes" may include the highest ranking angelic beings. But
if so, this need not exclude a being of a divine nature as the highest ranking of the "chief princes."

The expression "chief princes" may, however, be a designation for divine beings. In the OT, there appears to be more than one divine being. In Daniel, the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days both appear to be divine beings. In the Exodus experience, the "Angel of the Lord" is a manifestation of God, bearing the name Yahweh, yet a being distinct from the One designated as God and Yahweh, who sent His Angel to accompany Israel from Egypt to the promised land. God is, in Dan 8, referred to as Prince of Princes. The expression "chief princes" may be a reference to the plurality of divine beings, of whom Michael is one.

Michael is also "the great prince." The use of the article indicates that there is only one "great" prince. It expresses a quality of extraordinariness about Michael, distinguishing him from other heavenly intermediaries between God and man. Michael is prince without a peer.

The designation by which Michael is described in Dan 12:1 goes far beyond those used to describe any other OT angelic figures. Angels generally are faceless functionaries, without distinct personal identity or authority. The focus is always upon God, the One in authority, on the basis of whose command the angels act and carry out His will.

Michael, in contrast, has his own distinct identity and personality. He is the focus of attention. As the great prince and guardian of Israel, Michael occupies the position of prominence and authority occupied by God in earlier OT narratives.
What seems to emerge from the designations and functions of Michael in Dan 10 and 12 is that he is more than an angelic figure. He exhibits the functions and prerogatives of divinity. Michael is accorded a degree of distinct personal identity, dignity, rank, and authority not elsewhere accorded to an angelic being. He is a messianic, salvific figure—a Savior. He is filling a role as historical and eschatological warrior and executor of judgment assigned only to God elsewhere in the OT. Michael is to be understood as another depiction of God.

Michael functioned as guardian prince of Israel in history as well as at the eschaton. The princes of Persia and Greece mentioned in Dan 10 are to be understood as fallen, angelic beings. They are not to be regarded as functioning in God's employ, but rather, in an adversarial relationship to God. They are satanic spirits, rebellious angels, consciously and deliberately attempting to frustrate the divine will. Their activity was to turn the policies of their respective nations against Israel to impede God's plans for favoring Israel.

There is insufficient evidence to conclude that there is a permanent assignment of a demonic spirit to each nation. All that can be said from the evidence is that these two nations, Persia and Greece, each had a satanic prince assigned to them as they encountered God's people Israel, to move these nations against them to persecute them and destroy their faith.

In Dan 10, the author depicted a historical crisis affecting the Israelites who had, under the favor shown by Cyrus, returned to Palestine from Exile. The transcendent prince of the kingdom of
Persia was seeking to influence the kings of Persia to reverse the policy of favoring the returned exiles. Gabriel intervened to combat the influence of the evil prince. After a three-week standoff, Michael came to the aid of Gabriel, and victory was achieved. Gabriel was dispatched to bring a revelation to Daniel, while Michael remained with the kings of Persia to keep the prince of Persia from re-establishing his influence. The gravity of the situation required Gabriel's return to resume the fight to prevent the evil prince from re-establishing his influence with the kings of Persia.

The struggle was not a simple, celestial contest between Michael and the prince of Persia, removed from the earthly situation. The focus of the struggle was an actual, earthly situation, the outcome of which would result in benefit or loss to God's people. The struggle was for spiritual influence upon the kings of Persia.

Nor was the struggle a judicial contention before God, with each patron pleading the case of his client nation for God's deciding verdict. The contention appears to be for the decision not of God, but of Cyrus.

The confrontation of Michael and Gabriel in Dan 10 with the princes of Persia and Greece has the character of combat, as the word "fight with" signifies. The frequent OT use of אָרְשָׂא, "prince," to designate a military leader also fits with the idea of combat.

God's purpose in revealing Michael's historical intervention on Israel's behalf was probably intended to reassure Israel of God's concern for them and His willingness and ability to intervene on their behalf in times of crisis, especially the eschatological crisis with which the vision came to a climax.
The activity of Michael in Dan 12 is eschatological. This does not signify events beyond or outside of history. His intervention is rather the last of a series of historical interventions, this still within the historical perspective.

Michael's appearance takes place before the demise of the evil king of the north. He arises within a period of time designated the "time of the end" to accomplish certain objectives, which include:

1. Overthrow the evil persecuting power.
2. Deliver Daniel's people, those whose names are in the book of life.
3. Superintend the resurrection of the dead.
4. Usher in the coming age of exaltation and immortality.

Michael arose as the last of a series of ruling figures predicted to arise and take power. The previous one to arise persecuted God's people. But, in contrast, Michael would arise to take power to intervene for the final deliverance of God's people.

The arising of Michael included two significant functions:

1. Military--Michael intervened militarily at the eschaton, as he had historically, to bring about the demise of the anti-God power and deliver the faithful in Israel.
2. Judicial--Reference to the book places Michael's intervention in a context of judgment. It provides a link with Dan 7 where judgment is from books. The bestowal of rewards based on names in the book presupposes such a judgment. It is possible that when Michael arises to deliver Israel, he arises from participating in the judgment. When rewards are bestowed, they are bestowed on the basis
of judgment. The bestowal of rewards is an act which completes the judicial process.

Michael's activity in affecting the demise of the persecuting king of the north also has the character of judgment. Michael is carrying out the verdict of the heavenly court against the enemies of God's chosen ones as well as the verdict in favor of the chosen.

That Michael "stands for" Israel may suggest more than that He is their guardian prince in history and at the eschaton. It may also suggest a mediatorial function for Michael. He may also have represented Israel before God in the heavenly judgment.

Michael and Other Figures

Prince of the Host

Michael is to be identified with the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes figure of Dan 8:11, 25. Behind the Prince of the Host of Daniel lies the Prince of the host of Yahweh of Josh 5:14-15. Both are divine Beings, manifestations of God in God's function of divine warrior, fighting Israel's enemies to bring victory and deliverance to His people. This is also a function of Michael. He is guardian of Israel and functions in a military capacity on their behalf in history and eschatology. Michael may likewise be viewed as another depiction of God, fulfilling His role as defender and deliverer of His people.

The Little Horn power which magnified itself up to the Prince of the Host may be the earthly embodiment of a transcendent, demonic figure working in and through the little horn to accomplish its goals. This would present a parallel to the activity in Dan 10 in which Michael contended against transcendent foes.
The designation "Prince of Princes" conveys a meaning similar to the designation "the great Prince." Both the Prince of the Host and Michael may be seen to be divine beings. The function of the Prince of the Host appears equivalent to that of Michael, head of the angels and prince of Israel.

The Son of Man

Michael is to be identified with the Son of Man figure of Dan 7. This identification accepts the Son of Man as a transcendent, individual being. Both Michael and the Son of Man appear as transcendent beings in an eschatological context at the close of their respective visions. Each occupies a position of special prominence at the time of transition from the present, historical period to the new, glorious, future period. The Son of Man has accompaniments of divinity, and becomes ruler of an everlasting, universal kingdom. Michael functions in a commanding position, functioning in Yahweh's place as Israel's guardian prince and deliverer. Both figures are intimately linked with Israel's interests and destiny at the eschaton. Both appear in a context of judgment and deliverance. The conclusion seems inescapable that the Son of Man reappears in Dan 12 under the name Michael, in a vision contributing additional information regarding his eschatological function.

The Son of Man in Daniel is to be regarded as Messiah. Though he appears in as a transcendent, divine being, he rules over a universal, everlasting earthly kingdom in the coming age, a function assigned to the Davidic Messiah in the Psalms and certain prophets.

Michael not only occupies a messianic office as prince of God's covenant people, but also performs a messianic function when he
intervenes at the eschaton for the deliverance of Israel. The people of Daniel placed their hopes for future deliverance and glory upon the intervention of Michael, their prince.

One Like a Son of the Gods

Michael may possibly be identified with the "one like a son of the gods" of Dan 2:25. The being who appeared in the furnace was a divine being, probably an appearance of the Angel of the Lord, a self-manifestation of God. This god-like being intervened in history for the deliverance of individuals loyal to God, just as Michael intervened in history and at the eschaton to deliver the people of Israel, loyal to God. This personal deliverance anticipates the later, wider, national and eschatological deliverance.

Angel of the Lord

The Angel of the Lord, who appeared in Israel's early traditions as a manifestation of Yahweh is a close parallel and prototype of the Michael figure. The Angel of the Lord, particularly in the Exodus narratives, functioned as leader and guardian of Israel, very much as Michael functioned in the book of Daniel.

This same figure appears again in Zechariah in a context of judgment, contending with a transcendent adversary, again reflecting the functions of Michael.

The Angel of the Lord appears as a divine figure, distinct from and sent by another being designated as God, just as the Son of Man, whom I have identified with Michael, though distinct from the Ancient of Days is nevertheless a divine being.

Michael is a divine figure alongside of Yahweh, who is also
Yahweh, and who serves as deity in self-manifestation on behalf of His people throughout the history of His people Israel, and more prominently at the eschaton.

Michael rises above the anonymous, faceless functionary role of the angels to take the focus as the great prince who intervenes for Israel's deliverance in history and rises to rescue them at the eschaton. Michael combines within his person the functions of the Angel of the Lord as the personal guide and guardian of Israel, of the Son of Man as the transcendent being who appears at the eschaton, and of the Messiah, as the hoped for eschatological deliverer. Though he is not described as ruling over Israel in the future age as are the Messiah and the Son of man, as Prince of Israel, Israel's guardian and deliverer, such a position would not be out of character for the Michael figure as delineated in the book of Daniel.
APPENDIX

AN ANOINTED ONE, A PRINCE

The identity of "an anointed one, a prince, is of significance to this dissertation. If, as I believe, it can be shown that the anointed one, a prince (Dan 9:25) is messianic, this may support a messianic interpretation of the Son of Man (Dan 7:13), and, accordingly, of Michael.

"An anointed one, a prince," נַגִּיד נָהַשְׁמָה, is introduced in Dan 9:25. "Anointed prince" is not a correct translation, as נַגִּיד would need to stand after the word to be an adjective. "An anointed one, a prince" (RSV), or "the anointed one, the prince" (ASV) is correct. The figure is called the "Anointed Prince" here for the sake of brevity.

1 Keil, 354.


3 The translation with the article "the anointed one, the prince" would be acceptable if נַגִּיד were taken as a definite title. It is generally denied that נַגִּיד ever appears as a title; see D. S. Russell, Daniel, 188. However, a case can be made that by the time Daniel was written, נַגִּיד had become a title; see Boutflower, 191-192; Archer, "Daniel," 119-20; W. H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in 70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 88-89. Shea downplays the absence of the article with נַגִּיד in Dan 9:25, 26. "This absence does not seem so significant when it is compared with similar cases in Daniel when an expected article does not appear in the text. The passage is poetic in form and the article was used less frequently in poetry. Daniel's Hebrew may also have been influenced by the post-positive article in his Aramaic."
Anointed One

The word "anointed one" in vs. 25 is מָשָׁה, a noun built on the root מָשָׁה, "to anoint."¹ In Israel, persons were anointed to signify God's appointment to select offices. Examples exist for anointing to be king (1 Kgs 1:34), priest (Exod 28:41), and prophet (1 Kgs 19:16). The predominant use was for anointing kings of Israel and Judah, especially the first three kings, with David the most prominent.²

מָשָׁה, like מָשָׁה, is a theological term; every anointing is divinely initiated. The anointed is "the anointed of Yahweh." Its use indicates a special relationship to Yahweh.³ Also, like מָשָׁה, the predominant use of מָשָׁה is related to the throne succession history and other Davidic traditions. Following the book of Leviticus onward to the Exile, it is used only in reference to kings. Anointing was, first of all, a royal rite.⁴ This royal application is found almost exclusively in the Psalms.⁵ It appears also in the prophets, including the post-exilic prophets.⁶ The undisputed application of מָשָׁה to the priesthood is limited to Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:22 (15).

---

¹"מָשָׁה," HALOT, 218.
³Ibid., 53-54.
⁵Ibid., 55; in Ps 105:15 (=1 Chr 16:22) it is used for the Patriarchs.
⁶Ibid., 57.
Prince

The Hebrew word for "prince" in Dan 9:25 is נָגִּיָּד, a word which has the basic meaning of "exalted one," 1 "chief, ruler." 2 נָגִּיָּד does not appear in the OT before 1 Samuel; its use begins with its application to Saul, and the greatest single concentration of its uses (11 times) is its application to the three kings of all Israel--Saul, David, and Solomon--before the division of the nation, and particularly to David (7 times). 3 In the books of Samuel and Kings, it is used only for a king or one destined to become king. 4

The appointment to be נָגִּיָּד is basically by Yahweh, as when Samuel anointed Saul: "Has not Yahweh anointed you to be prince (נָגִּיָּד) over his people Israel?" (1 Sam 10:1). 5 The נָגִּיָּד-election by divine appointment serves as a legitimization for the function of leader over Israel (cf. 2 Chr 6:5). 6

---

1 Hasel, "nāgīyād," 213.
2 "nāgīyād" KBL, 592.
4 Ibid., 209; McCarter, 178-79, asserts that nāgīyād is a title applied only to one designated to become king before he begins to reign.
6 Shaviv, 112; Hasel, "nāgīyād," 213; J. J. Gluck, "Nagid--Shepherd," VT 13 (1963): 144-149. We need not follow Gluck's suggestion that nāgīyād is etymologically related to nōqēd, "shepherd," to agree with him that one appointed as nāgīyād received the designation by an appointment, and that the designation is used with a connotation of ideal leadership as king in Israel.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
In some passages it is used in parallel with šar, as in 1 Chr 27:16, 22; also compare 1 Chr 24:5, "šarim of the sanctuary" with 2 Chr 35:8, "négídim of the house of God." However, from the time of Saul and David, the term šar was used as a technical term for each military captain or commander. This was not true of the term nágíd. Nágíd seems to be associated with special appointment, though not šar. Nágíd, while not synonymous with king, is often used for a king, but šar is rarely, if ever, so used.

Outside the three uses in Daniel (9:25, 26; 11:22), nágíd is used six times to mean ruler of the house of God, which is clearly in one instance high priest (2 Chr 31:10, 13). The term is used for non-Israelites: for one class of Assyrian military officers (2 Chr 32:21), and, notably, for the infamous "prince of Tyre" (Ezek 28:2).

It is probably correct to say that the designation nágíd had, by the time of the writer(s) of 1, 2 Chronicles, lost some of its precise conceptions as seen in the books of Samuel and Kings, and was used more widely to include temple administrators, nobility, and military officers.

Though the word clearly has a rather wide range of applications, its most prominent usage is its special meaning as the leader of Israel appointed by Yahweh. In the books of Samuel, it is

---

2 Ibid., 216-17.
3 Ibid., 219.
4 Westermann, 34-35.
5 nágíd, KBL, 592.
used only with that meaning, twice for Saul, and five times for David. It is also applied to Solomon twice in that significance (1 Kgs 1:35; 1 Chr 29:22), and once similarly to Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:7). It appears in Isa 55:4 for the future Davidic messiah. The association of nāgīd with the tribe of Judah (1 Chr 5:2; 28:4, "he chose Judah as leader [nāgīd]") is clearly connected to the early tradition that the ruler in Israel should come from the tribe of Judah (Gen 49:10), which was fulfilled through David.

The person under consideration, "an anointed one (māšı̂aḥ), a prince (nāgīd)" (Dan 7:25), unites two designations in one person. The only other context in the OT where anointing and nāgīd are brought together in one person is in the appointing of kings, such as Saul, David, and Solomon. The connection between anointing and nāgīd appears in such passages as 1 Sam 9:16, where God commanded Samuel concerning Saul, "you shall anoint him to be prince [nāgīd] over my people Israel"; 1 Sam 10:1, "Has not the LORD anointed you to be prince over his people Israel?"; 1 Chr 29:22, of Solomon, "they anointed him as prince for the LORD, and Zadok as priest" (note the two anointed leaders in Israel, prince and priest; the priest, then, would not be a prince). See also 2 Sam 5:2-3; 1 Kgs 1:35, 39. It would seem apparent that it is these passages which lie directly behind the use by the author of Dan 9:25 of the expression "an anointed one, a prince."

The soundest position seems to be that the author of Dan 9

---


2Hasel, nāgīd, 216.
drew the expressions "the anointed one" and "the prince" directly from the literature in which Saul, David, and Solomon were each anointed as prince over Israel. He appropriated the expressions māṣīḥah and nāgīd from their application to Saul, David, and Solomon, to apply them to the Anointed Prince, and was possibly influenced also by the use of māṣīḥah in Ps 2:2,¹ to use "Messiah" for the first time in Dan 9:25 as a technical designation for the future ideal Davidic ruler.²

It should be noted that there is one clear example outside of Daniel of a high priest being called nāgīd in relation to his high-priestly office. Azariah, identified as "chief priest" (2 Chr 31:10), is also referred to as "the chief officer [nāgīd] of the house of God" (2 Chr 31:13). This suggests that persons designated "nāgīd of the house of God" in other passages (1 Chr 9:11, 20; Neh 11:11; Jer 20:1; cf. 1 Chr 12:27, "The prince [nāgīd] Jehoiada of the house of Aaron") may also be chief priests. The designation was not used with precision, however, as there are references to a Levite who was chief officer [nāgīd] in charge of the dedicated offerings in the house of the Lord (2 Chr 32:12) and to "chief officers [nēgīdē, plural] of the house of God" (2 Chr 35:8).

Granting that nāgīd was used for the chief priest at the time

¹Boutflower, 191-192; R. D. Wilson, 132, 138-139.

²Though this is widely denied. See Russell, Jews from Alexander to Herod, 144; who does not find the term in Jubilees or 1 Enoch 1-36, 91-104 (the early sections), and sees "Messiah" used as a technical term first in Pss.Sol. 17:36. However, Ṣār, as a term for a heavenly being, used prominently in Daniel, is also missing in Jubilees and 1 Enoch, but appears again in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Mertens, 104). This shows a weakness in Russell's argument; a term used in an influential work may be ignored by later literature for a time before it is finally adopted.
of the chronicler, nevertheless the expressions "anointed" and "nāgīd" were never used together in the OT in reference to a chief priest.¹ This makes "chief priest" an unlikely candidate for the identification of the Anointed Prince of Dan 9:25.

Various identifications have been offered for "an anointed one, a prince" (Dan 9:25). Some commentators identify the anointed prince as either Cyrus,² Zerubbabel, or Joshua (high priest under Zerubbabel).³ There are difficulties with each of these three identifications. Each requires the "seventy weeks" of Dan 9:24 to begin with Jeremiah's prophecy (Dan 9:2, Jer 25:1, 12) of a return of the exiles after seventy years. The "word" (Dan 9:25) to restore Jerusalem lacks the article in Hebrew, so would not likely refer to Jeremiah's prophecy. Also, Jeremiah's prophecy cannot be a "word to restore and build Jerusalem," as it makes no mention of such activities.⁴ Furthermore, if Cyrus is regarded as the one who issued the

---

¹References to anointing the high priest or referring to the high priest as an "anointed one" are all found in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, with the exception of 1 Chr 29:22, where reference is made to anointing Solomon as nāgīd and Zadok as priest. All references to nāgīd as meaning chief priest are in the books of Jeremiah, 1, 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah.

²Ammer, 202; Maier, 345.

³Bevan, 156, and Montgomery, Daniel, 378-79, prefer Joshua; Heaton, 213, 214, follows Montgomery; Jeffery, 495, suggests Cyrus, Zerubbabel or Joshua; Porteous, 142, follows Montgomery; Owens, 440, follows Jeffery; Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod 239, follows Jeffery; Towner, 143, Joshua or Zerubbabel; Goldingay, Daniel, 261, Zerubbabel or Joshua.

initial decree leading to the restoration of Jerusalem, and the Anointed Prince was to appear sixty-nine "weeks" after the decree, Cyrus would appear to be too early. Zerubbabel is questionable, as he is never referred to as either anointed or a nāgīt, and also he arrived in Jerusalem as governor in 536 B.C., only two years or less after the command of Cyrus to rebuild the temple, also, therefore, too early to arrive at the end of the sixty-nine "weeks." This would be true of the high priest Joshua as well.

Another interpretation is to accept Dan 9:25 as a messianic prophecy, with the "anointed one, a prince" understood as a future

1Boutflower, 187.
2There is no grammatical basis for the RSV translation of only seven weeks to the coming of the anointed one. Most translations keep the seven-week and sixty-two-week periods together (see KJV, Douay, ASV, NASB, Jer., NIV); see also D. Ford, 228-229.
3Leupold, 422.
4Keil, 354.
6"Ezra," SDABC, 3:325. Since the "ascension-year" method was used by Babylon and Judah, the year Babylon was conquered, 539 B.C., was Cyrus's "ascension year," with his "first year" beginning in the spring of 538. Since the Jewish year begins in the fall, Cyrus's first year by Jewish reckoning did not begin until the fall of 538, and the decree may have been issued any time from then until the fall of 537.
7The seventy "weeks" of Dan 9:24-27 are generally thought to be weeks of years, 490 years in all. See Hasel, "Interpretation of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," 6. If Cyrus's decree was issued in 538-37 B.C, sixty-nine weeks of years (483) years would terminate no earlier that 55 B.C., much too late for Zerubbabel or Joshua.
8The following interpret Dan 9:24-27 messianically: Mede, 700-706; Lowth, I:103-109; I. Newton, 130; Samuel Osgood, Remarks on the Book of Daniel and on the Revelations (New York: Greenleaf's Press,
Davidić figure, as the two designations most clearly suggest.

From the evidence examined, it seems quite persuasive that the Anointed Prince of Dan 9:25 is intended as a reference to a future ideal king of the line of David, thus genuinely messianic.

**Anointed One in Dan 9:26**

The interpretation of the second use of **mâšîaḥ** (Dan 9:26) is similarly divided. It traditionally has also been interpreted messianically. It is widely interpreted today, however, to refer to Onias III, Jewish high priest who was reportedly slain during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Some see Onias III also as the Anointed Prince of Dan 9:25.

The Onias III interpretation, however, presents difficulties. "An anointed one, a prince" of Dan 9:26 is frequently understood to

---


---

1Boutflower, 192-93; R. D. Wilson, 138; Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 69; Filmer, 110; Maier, 348.

2Ammer, 203; M. Stuart, 289; Bevan, 157; Charles, Daniel, 248; Montgomery, Daniel, 379; Michaeli, 663; Porteous, 142; Efird, 63; Owens, 441; Towner, 144; Goldingay, Daniel, 262.

3Hubert Junker, *Untersuchungen über literarische und exegetische Probleme des Buches Daniel* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), 81; Plöger, 141.
be the same figure as the "prince (nāgīd) of the covenant" of Dan 11:22.¹ From 11:22, we learn that the prince of the covenant is, like the armies, "swept away and broken," before the contemptible king. If the account in 2 Macc 4:36-38 is authentic, Onias was murdered without Antiochus's previous knowledge, and when the matter was reported to him, the murderer was put to death at the command of Antiochus. Antiochus, then, was not implicated in Onias III's death. He was put to death at the instigation of the incumbent high priest, Menelaus.²

Also, Onias was not high priest at the time of his murder, but was in seclusion in Antioch (2 Macc 4:7, 33); therefore it is questionable that he could be considered "prince of the covenant" at the time of his death.³ If, on the other hand, Josephus is to be believed, Onias was not slain, but fled to Egypt, where he established another temple and served as its high priest.⁴ This seems more probable.⁵ But, also significant, as mentioned above, māšīḥah nāgīd is never used for a priest in the OT, a factor which would also weaken the case for Onias III.⁶ In fact the whole Maccabean thesis

¹See Zöckler, 200, 247; Montgomery, Daniel, 379, 451; D. S. Russell, Daniel, 188, 207; Jeffery, 496, 525; Owens, 441, 452; Goldingay, Daniel, 267, 299. Some, however, who interpret Dan 9:26 messianically, interpret the prince of the covenant (Dan 11:22) otherwise, for example: Hall, 113-14, 137 (Ptolemy Philometer).

²Keil, 451.

³Ibid.


as the solution to the interpretation of and the problem of the time
of composition of Dan 8:9-14; 9:24-27; 11:20-45 has been called into
question due to the inconsistencies and contradictions which the
thesis has not been able to overcome.¹

Since the Anointed Prince of Dan 9:25 appears at the end of
the seven and sixty-two "week" period, and an anointed one is to be
"cut off" (slain) after the sixty-two-week period, it would appear
that the Anointed Prince of Dan 9:25 and the anointed one of Dan 9:26
are the same person.

Here is summarized the A:B::A:B::A:B literary form of 9:25-
27, suggesting that the first part of each of the three verses
focuses on the Anointed Prince, while the last part of each deals
primarily with the city and/or temple.² This can best be portrayed
in parallel columns (version quoted, ASV):

25 A (1) Know therefore and dis-
cern, that from the going
forth of the commandment to re-
store and to build Jerusalem
unto the anointed one, the
prince, (2) shall be seven
weeks, and three-score and
two weeks:

   B (1) it shall be built again,
   with street and moat, (2) even
   in troublous times.

26 A (2) And after the threescore
and two weeks (1) shall the
anointed one be cut off, and
shall have nothing:

   B (1) and the people of the prince
   that shall come shall destroy
   the city and the sanctuary;
   (2) and the end thereof shall
   be with a flood, and even unto
   the end shall be war; desola-
   tions are determined.

   B (2) and upon the wing of abomi-
   nations shall come one that mak-
   eth desolate; (1) and even unto

¹Arthur J. Ferch, "The Book of Daniel and the 'Maccabean

the week (1) he shall cause the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate [one that is decreed is poured out on the one who makes desolate (NASB)].

Note how the sections under B alternate and contrast with the sections under A. Also note that each of the A sections is subdivided into statements (1) about the Messiah and (2) about "weeks." Similarly the B sections, which introduce the desolater prince, are subdivided into statements (1) about construction and destruction and (2) about distress and desolation.1 The unity of the A sections is enhanced by a play on the word "week," which appears in each verse. The B sections have a play on the Hebrew word for "cut," which, unfortunately does not come through in translation; "moat" (Dan 9:25) and "determined" (Dan 9:26, 27) come from the same Hebrew root hrs meaning "cut."2

Poetic analysis of Dan 9:24-27 demonstrates also that the MT punctuation which places the coming of the Anointed Prince at the close of the seven weeks, and assigns the rebuilding of the city to the sixty-two weeks--reflected in the RSV translation--is incorrect. The seven weeks and sixty-two weeks must be kept together, for a total of sixty-nine weeks, after which the Anointed Prince would come.3

1The (1), (2) numbering of A and B of each of the vss. 25-27 was added by Maxwell, Daniel, 216-218.
2Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9," 12; Maxwell, Daniel, 217.
A Point of Contact with Michael

It remains to be shown how the Messiah of Dan 9:25-27 has any point of contact with the Michael figure. There appears to be no direct contact. But there seems to be indirect contact in at least one direction. This is in the parallel between the "Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes" in Dan 8:11, 25 and both the "Anointed Prince" of Dan 9:25 and the "prince of the covenant" in Dan 11:22.

It is widely accepted that the anointed one who is cut off (Dan 9:26) is the same person as the prince of the covenant who is swept away (Dan 11:22). There is evidence that the vision of Dan 9 was intended as a further detailing of the vision of Dan 8. The links between the two visions are strong, particularly the figure of Gabriel (Dan 8:16; 9:21), and the reference to the "vision at the first" (Dan 9:21), an evident reference to the vision of chap. 8. Other links include concern with time periods (Dan 8:14; 9:24-27), concern for the sanctuary (Dan 8:11; 9:17; 26-27), and the activities of the persecuting power (Dan 8:9-12; 9:26-27). The sequence of the "little horn" exalting of himself against the Prince of the Host and the overthrowing of the sanctuary (Dan 8:11) is the same as that of the cutting off of the anointed one and the destruction of city and sanctuary (Dan 9:26). It is proposed that the reference to the coming of the anointed prince and his being cut off (Dan 9:25-26) is

1KBL, 592; Montgomery, Daniel, 451.
2D. Ford, 205.
3That the "prince who is to come" (Dan 9:26) is an adversary and usurper of the Anointed Prince, see Doukhan, Daniel: the Vision of the End 75. For the contrary view, that this is another reference to the Anointed Prince, whose people brought about the destruction of their own city, see Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," 92-94.
intended by the author to be an expansion of the little horn magnifying himself against the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11). The parallel suggests that the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes be identified with the Anointed Prince. If so, it would seem that the designation ṣar views him in a transcendent capacity, and the designation nāgīd in an earthly, messianic role.

Since we have earlier proposed an identification of the Prince of the Host with Michael, it is felt that a possible link has now been established between the Anointed Prince and the Michael figure.

It is recognized that a more widely held link is between:
(1) the little horn magnifying itself against the Prince of the Host (Dan 8:11), and (2) the contemptible king magnifying himself above every god and speaking marvelous things against the God of gods (11:36). This valid parallel has implications for divinity in the Prince of the Host/Michael figure.

Recognizing that Daniel has been influenced by the book of Isaiah, it is possible that the author of Dan 9 was influenced

---

1 For an identification of the Prince of the Host/Prince of Princes with the Anointed Prince, see I. Newton, 225; Young, Messianic Prophecies, 14; D. Ford, 169; Maier, 389; Beale, 274. For the interpretation that the exaltation of the Little Horn against the Prince of the Host is a prophecy of the crucifixion of Christ during the Roman period, see I. Newton, 121; U. Smith, 154; G. M. Price, 171, Maxwell, Daniel, 155, 172; "Daniel," SDABC, 4:842-43, 845-46.

2 E. J. Young, Messianic Prophecies, 14.

3 Owens, 432.

4 Ginsberg, "The Oldest Interpretation," 402-03. He suggests that the author of Dan 11, 12 had identified the Servant of Isa 52:13-53:12 with the "Maskilim" [Enlightened or Enlighteners] (the "wise" Dan 12:3), and the "many" and "righteous" of Isa 53:11 are
by the "Servant Songs" of Isaiah. In the first song (Isa 42:1-4), the servant appears as a leader of worldwide influence and authority, who will "bring forth justice to the nations," "establish justice in the earth, and the coastlands wait for his law." In Isa 52:13, he is "exalted and lifted up and shall be very high." However, this exalted servant is slain, "cut off" (Isa 53:8) as a sacrifice for Israel (Isa 53:4-10a, 11b, 12b). Yet the servant revives and is exalted to greatness once again (Isa 53:10b, 11a, 12a). One can even see a similarity in literary structure between Isa 53:10-12 and Dan 9:25-27, except that instead of alternating between (A) the Messiah and weeks and (B) building/destruction and oppression, the alternation is between (A) the sacrificial self-offering of the servant and (B) the revival, satisfaction, and exaltation of the servant. And rather than the A:B::A:B::A:B order of Dan 9:25-27, the order is A:B::B:A::B:A.

The author of Daniel could easily have identified the Servant of Isaiah with the Davidic Messiah. In Isa 49:6-7, he is said to "raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel," a work associated with the "root of Jesse" in Isa 11:10-12. Also, being a light to the nations, salvation to the ends of the earth (Isa 49:6), reflects the conditions described under the Davidic king in Isa 11:4-9, with the earth becoming "full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea" (vs. 9).

found also in Dan 12:3. For other examples of the influence of Isaiah on Daniel see Nicol, 501-505; who compares Isaiah's call vision (Isa 6) to visions of Daniel, especially in Dan 7 and 9:21-23; Nickelsburg, 171; and Hasel, "Resurrection in the Theology of the OT Apocalyptic," who shows influence of Isa 26:19 on Dan 12:1-3.

1E. J. Young, Messianic Prophecies, 69. Though "cut off" in these two passages is not the same Hebrew word (krt, Dan 9:26; gzr Isa 53:8), the meaning here is identical, "put to death."
Summary

Possible links may be found between Michael and the Anointed One, the Prince (Dan 9:25). First, the Anointed Prince in Dan 9 is seen to be a messianic figure. He is also seen to be in a position within the vision of Dan 9, parallel to the position of the Prince of the Host in the vision of Dan 8, thus, an apparent detailing of the vision of the Prince of the Host. Both figures appear to be attacked by a desolating power who would also assault God's sanctuary. Since the Prince of the Host of Dan 8 has been identified with Prince Michael, this would link Michael with the Anointed One, the Prince.

The messianic character of the Anointed Prince further indicates that the author of Dan 9 held to the concept of an earthly, Davidic Messiah. Since it is probable that Dan 7 and Dan 9 had the same author,1 this suggests that the author of Dan 7 had not abandoned the messianic hope in favor of an apocalyptic intervention by a transcendent, non-messianic Son of Man. The Son of Man may be seen, therefore, as a transcendentalized Messiah. This suggests that Michael's intervention is also messianic in character.
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