The Image of the New Adam in the Book of Daniel (Daniel 4 and 7): Origin, Context and Theological Implications

IGOR BESSONOV (RUSSIAN BIOTECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY)

ABSTRACT

The interpretation of the Son of Man figure in Dan 7 is one of the most hotly debated issues in biblical scholarship. This article is based on the premise that the analysis of the Aramaic Daniel (Dan 1-7), the earlier part of the modern Hebrew-Aramaic book of Daniel, could enable us to determine the original interpretation of the Son of Man figure. A comparison of Dan 7 and Dan 4 allows us to conclude that in the Aramaic Daniel there is a consistent analogy between Adam, Nebuchadnezzar and the Son of Man. Therefore, the Son of Man figure may be defined as the "new Adam" if we use a later vocabulary. In the interpretation of the prophetic dream vision, this figure turns out to symbolise the nation of Israel, which is part of the tendency to identify Israel with man as such and attribute Adam's heritage to Israel.

KEYWORDS: New Adam, the Book of Daniel, Origin, Context, Theology

A INTRODUCTION

A lot of ink has already been spilled over the interpretation of the Son of Man figure in the book of Daniel. The author's main idea will be to relate the image of the "one like a son of man"[1] to the figure of Adam, the first man, whose

* Igor Bessonov, Department of Linguistics and Professional Communication, Russian Biotechnological University (ROSBIOTECH), Russia; email: himins@yandex.ru; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6292-3375.

Submitted: 27/09/2024; peer-reviewed: 27/11/2024; accepted: 26/12/2024. Igor Bessonov, "The Image of the New Adam in the Book of Daniel (Daniel 4 and 7): Origin, Context and Theological Implications," *Old Testament Essays* 37 no. 3 (2024): 1–21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17159/2312-3621/2024/v37n3a4.

1 The author literally calls this figure "one like a son of man" כבר אנש. According to J. Collins, "the preposition -כ 'like,' is best understood as indicating the mode of perception proper to a vision, so that 'like a son of man' means 'a human figure seen in a vision'."; (John J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 305). From this point on, we will refer to this figure simply as

account we find in Genesis and to analyse the historical connections between the theological traditions set forth in the book of Daniel and those associated with the figure of Adam.

It seems that at the present time the most popular interpretation of the image of the Son of Man is his identification with the archangel Michael.[2] This interpretation can be characterised as an understanding of the Son of Man figure in view of the Hebrew sections of the book of Daniel. Indeed, in Dan 9 and 10, angels often appear as human figures (Dan 8:15; 9:21, etc.) and in Dan 12:1, the fundamental eschatological role is attributed directly to Michael, who brought an end to the eschatological tribulations. This interpretation can be characterised as a "reverse reading" of the book of Daniel, an evaluation of the earlier layers of this work in the light of later ones. We will try to address the analysis of the imagery of the book of Daniel in accordance with the history of the formation of this work from historically earlier sections to the later ones. Consideration of Dan 7 as part of the complex history of the gradual growth of the text that eventually became the canonical book of Daniel will allow us to see the “one like a son of man” in a new context and determine the most probable meaning of this figure when it first appeared in the book of Daniel.

B ARAMAIC DANIEL APOCALYPSE

The first stage in the development of the book of Daniel was probably the composition of the collection of stories about the prophet Daniel, which includes Dan 4–6. This point of view is supported by a number of scholars: R. Albertz,[3] C. Newsom,[4] J. Collins,[5] etc. It is based on the fact that the Greek text of Daniel 4–6, which came down to us as part of the Septuagint, differs significantly from the extant Aramaic text of the book of Daniel. It is likely that an earlier collection

---

the “Son of Man,” using this expression without the preposition כ, as the name of the figure depicted in Dan 7.

[2] This identification first appeared in the work of Nathaniel Schmidt, “The ‘Son of Man’ in the Book of Daniel,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 19/1 (1900): 22-28. See also Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 313-317; Reinhard G. Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (vol. 2; ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 97; Klaus Koch “Das Reich der Heiligen und der Menschensohn” in *Die Reiche der Welt und der kommende Menschensohn: Studien zum Danielbuch* **(**Bd II; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995), 140-172.

[3] Rainer Albertz, “The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (vol. 1; ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 183-191.

[4] Carol A Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 10.

[5] Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 37.

of stories about the prophet Daniel may have been used in the Old Greek translation of the book of Daniel that became part of the Septuagint. The author of this collection combined the stories about the prophet Daniel into a single work dealing with the theme of the pride and repentance of powerful Gentile rulers. The literary units that mark the boundaries of the text are the praise of God and his kingdom in Dan 3:31–33 (the beginning of the text) and Dan 6:25–27 (the end of the text). The presence of such a frame indicates that Dan 4–6 existed as a separate work that was used by the author of the later Aramaic chapters. It is likely that this narrative collection originally circulated in Aramaic and was translated into Greek in Ptolemaic Egypt.[6]

Subsequently, a work which might be called the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse[7] was compiled on the basis of this composition. It was supplemented by Dan 1–3 and 7. It is likely that Dan 3 had previously circulated independently. The redactional history of Dan 2 and 7 is more complicated. Some scholars argue that the eschatological content and structural parallelism between Dan 2 and 7 allow us to state that the addition of this frame to Dan 4–6 may have been the main stage in the creation of the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse.[8] Nevertheless, certain stylistic differences between Dan 2 and 7 indicate that they were not written by a single author, but rather were created on the basis of various older sources. Thus, Dan 2, like Dan 4, uses the particle ואלו to introduce certain episodes of prophetic dreams, while Dan 7 uses וארו ("and behold").[9] It seems unlikely that these textual variants could have gone to a single author or redactor. In all likelihood, the dream reports in Dan 2 and 7 were originally created independently of each other. The themes of dream visions in Dan 2 and 7 may have also been drawn together only in a later redaction of the book of Daniel. Thus, some scholars posit that Dan 2 was originally a narrative related to the history of the Babylonian kingdom, predicting either its fall or future restoration.[10] This may be supported by the fact that Dan 2:29 is a doublet of Dan 2:28, which originally may not have had an eschatological meaning that appeared only in a later redaction where we find the phrase "what will be in the

6 Albertz, "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," 182-183.

7 Ibid., 179.

8 Jürgen-Christian Lebram, *Das Buch Daniel* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 1984); Albertz, "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," 183–191.

9 See Peter Weimar, "Daniel 7: Eine Textanalyse," in *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (hrsg. von Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg; Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 1975): 11-36.

10 Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," 92-93; Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 169.

latter days," מה די להוא באחרית יומיא (Dan 2:28), instead of the earlier "what would be after this" (מה די להוא אחרי דנה) (Dan 2:29).[11]

These features of Dan 2 lead many scholars to assume the existence of an independent "Daniel's biography," which included chapters 1–6. Proponents of this view suppose that the Aramaic narrative collection was later supplemented with Dan 7, which became the first apocalyptic vision incorporated in the book of Daniel. The close affinity between the narrative collection and Dan 7 is evident already since both works are written in Aramaic. The date of this redaction is another controversial issue related to the redactional history of Dan 7. A number of scholars suppose that the "little horn," which links the predictions of Dan 7 with the events of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was also added to the text by a later redactor.[12] According to scholars who consider the image of the "little horn" to be part of a later redaction, Dan 7 was completed before the Maccabean crisis, in the third century B.C.E. This view has not been accepted universally. For example, John J. Collins believes that Dan 7 was compiled after the beginning of the persecution of Antiochus at the end of 167 B.C.E. and that the "little horn" was original part of Dan 7.[13] However, he also supposes that the Aramaic part of the book of Daniel was originally a separate composition, created earlier than the Hebrew chapters of the book of Daniel. This view regarding chapters 8–12 has become a mainstream position. For example, Benjamin D. Suchard points out that "the scholarly consensus holds that they were written later"[14] than the Aramaic Daniel.

Thus, we can conclude that most scholars presuppose the existence of the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse before the modern bilingual book of Daniel was created. It is likely that the Son of Man figure originally developed in the context of the Aramaic Daniel, which included Dan 1–7. The linguistic and stylistic unity of the Aramaic Daniel as well as the conspicuous absence of references to the Second Temple, so frequent in the Jewish chapters of the book of Daniel, suggests that the social settings of the Aramaic and Jewish parts of the work were essentially different. It is likely that the interpretation of the Son of Man figure was different as well. If the author of the Hebrew sections brings this figure

---

11 Reinhard G. Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 55-57.

12 Gustav Hölscher, "Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 92 (1919): 113-118; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978): 11-14; Albertz, "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," 187-188; Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," 99.

13 Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 167; Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," 99.

14 Benjamin D. Suchard, *Aramaic Daniel: A Textual Reconstruction of Chapters 1–7* (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 5.

closer to the archangel Michael, the consideration of the Aramaic chapters points us in other direction.

C NEBUCHADNEZZAR AND ADAM IN THE ARAMAIC DANIEL

The main subject of our study is the meaning and implications of the Son of Man figure at that stage in the composition of this work, when it was first included in the book of Daniel. Most scholars suppose that Dan 7 belongs to the later layers of the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse. For this reason, one should look for the origins of the images and ideas reflected in it, first of all, in the earlier sections of the book of Daniel. It appears that Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4 served as the starting point for the text of Dan 7.[15] According to the consensus of scholars, the account of Nebuchadnezzar's madness goes back to the Babylonian traditions associated with Nabonidus and Nebuchadnezzar.[16] However, in the book of Daniel, this narrative was placed in a new context—in the text of the Aramaic Daniel, it is clearly related to the story of Adam.

A number of parallels between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam can actually be drawn on the level of direct literary connections. It is noteworthy that these parallels have already appeared in Dan 2. Daniel begins his dream interpretation with the long description of Nebuchadnezzar’s authority:

> You, O king, the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, and the might, and the glory, and into whose hand he has given, wherever they dwell, the children of man, the beasts of the field, and the birds of the heavens, making you rule over them all--you are the head of gold (Dan 2:37–38).

Compare the description of Adam's dominion in Genesis:

> Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth" (Gen 1:26).

The analogy between the king and Adam seems obvious to many scholars.[17] The Old Greek translation makes this analogy even more complete by also mentioning the king's dominion “over the fish of the sea” (τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης). Collins also mentions the connection of this passage with the

---

15 Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” 95.

16 Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 216-221; Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 87-121.

17 André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (London: SPCK, 1979), 50; Newsom, *Daniel*, 78.

description of the great tree symbolising the king in Dan 4:21,[18] "under which the beasts of the field found shade, and in whose branches the birds of the heavens lived."[19]

The next episode of the Nebuchadnezzar's story relates to his pride and the loss of kingship. Nebuchadnezzar, walking on the roof of his palace,[20] exclaims: "Is not this great Babylon, which I have built by my mighty power as a royal residence and for the glory of my majesty?" (Dan 4:30). Nebuchadnezzar's behaviour can be characterised as a manifestation of pride that led him to attribute his achievements to himself rather than to God. In Dan 5:20, the king's sin is explicitly described as pride: "But when his heart was lifted up and his spirit was hardened so that he dealt proudly, he was brought down from his kingly throne, and his glory was taken from him." Its result is the loss of kingship and expulsion from Babylon. Obviously, in this case we find an illustration of the well-known saying: "Pride goes before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall" (Prov 16:18). This principle is widely represented in both biblical and Rabbinic literature. Obviously, in this case, we can also draw an analogy with the story of Adam. The words of the serpent in Gen 2 persuading Eve to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge already implicitly appeal to the prideful aspirations of the first human couple: "For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen 3:5).

Although most of the Jewish Hellenistic texts, dealing with the story of Adam, do not see him as a prideful sinner, we can suppose that this idea did existed in the Jewish interpretation of Genesis already in the sixth century B.C.E. In Ezekiel, the prophet predicts the fall of the king of Tyre, comparing him with a mythological figure who stayed in the garden of Eden and was expelled from there because of his sin (Ezek 28:16), which can be interpreted as pride ("your heart was proud" גבה לבך) (Ezek 28:17). This text is one of the most difficult biblical passages to understand – scholars have identified this figure either with the first man or with some kind of semi-divine or angelic being.[21] It seems that, in recent studies, the tendency to identify this figure with the primal being is predominant[22] (see, for example, M. Patmore who thinks that the analysis of the

---

18 Collins*, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 170.

19 Verse numbers in Dan 4 follow the New Oxford Annotated Bible.

20 Collins*, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 230.

21 For references, see, for example, James Barr, "Thou Art the Cherub: Ezekiel 28.14 and the Post-Ezekiel Understanding of Gen 2-3," in *Priests, Prophets and Scribes* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992): 213-223.

22 Dexter E. Callender, Jr., *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 87-136; Daphna Arbel, "Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty": The Enoch/Me†a†ron Narrative of 3 Enoch and Ezekiel 28," *Harward Theological Review* 98/2 (2005): 121–

consonantal text of Ezek 28 points at the Adamic figure).[23] In the Hellenistic period, other interpretations of Adam's sin flourished[24] but the original understanding of the first man as a wise but sinful and disobedient figure may have survived in some strands of tradition. Later, similar ideas became popular in apocalyptic and Rabbinic literature. Thus, the authors of 4 Ezra 3:21 and 2 Bar 17:2 stressed Adam's disobedience and sin that led to his banishment from the garden of Eden and further human misfortune. The Rabbis often identified the figure, mentioned in Ezek 28, as Adam, discussing his ideal state before the expulsion from the garden of Eden.[25] Given that the original connection between Ezek 28 and the myth of the first man is highly likely, we can assume that a similar association could exist in the period under consideration and that Adam's sin, which led to his expulsion from Eden, could also be seen as pride.

The next part of Nebuchadnezzar's story is his sojourn amongst the beasts of the field (Dan 4:33) and it again has a number of parallels with Adam's stay in exile. In the story of Nebuchadnezzar, the theme of his relegation to animal status becomes the main subject of the narrative of Dan 4. Depicting the king's exile from Babylon, the author of Dan 4 speaks not only of his eating the grass of the field, but also of his living "with the beasts of the field" עם חיות ברא. Nebuchadnezzar, who like Adam had originally ruled over animals (Dan 2:38; 4:12), is now literally likened to an animal (Dan 4:16). Adam's punishment after his expulsion from Eden is described as follows: "cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field" (Gen 3:17−18). We may compare the description of Nebuchadnezzar's and Adam's diet during their stay in exile: "And you shall be made to eat **grass** like an ox" (עשבא כתורין לך יטעמון) (Dan 4:32) and "you shall eat the **plants of the field**" (ואכלתה את עשב השדה) (Gen 3:18). It is noteworthy that in the whole Bible, only Adam and Nebuchadnezzar are doomed to eat the grass of the field. An additional analogy between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam is that both texts are presented in the form of a prediction of their future fate. In a number of Jewish sources, we also find an indication that Adam's eating the "plants of the field" brings him closer to the animals to whom God gave "every green plant" (כל ירק עשב) (Gen 1:30) for food. In this way, this passage was interpreted by the authors of Targum Neophyti and Fragmentary Targum, who believed that the verse describes

142; Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2–3* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 85-98.

[23] Hector M. Patmore, *Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre: The Interpretation of Ezekiel 28:11-19 in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 207-210.

[24] John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 155-156.

[25] Patmore, *Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre*, 16-26.

Adam's transition to eating grass, which is appropriate for animals (Gen 1:30) and not cereals that are reserved for humans (Gen 1:29).[26] Genesis 3:18 is interpreted in the same way in Genesis Rabbah (20:10). Adam, who was to have dominion over the animals (Gen 1:26), is here placed on the same level with them. The theme of Adam's loss of dominion over the animals was developed in detail in a number of apocryphal traditions. In particular, it appears in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve, probably transmitting a tradition that has already been developed by the time of the composition of the book of Daniel (GLAE 11−12).

Certain parallels between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam also appear in the depiction of his restoration to kingship. In Dan 4, Nebuchadnezzar says that “I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted my eyes to heaven, and my reason returned to me” (Dan 4:34). This description is followed by a list of the royal attributes that Nebuchadnezzar regained after his restoration to kingly status: הדרי וזוי (“majesty and splendour”), which returned to him ליקר מלכותי (“for the glory of my kingdom”) (Dan 4:36). We see here an allusion to Dan 4:30, where Nebuchadnezzar says that he built Babylon “for the glory of my majesty” (ליקר הדרי). It is noteworthy that when listing Nebuchadnezzar's royal attributes Dan 2:37 also says that God gave Nebuchadnezzar the glory (יקרא). In the Old Greek translation of Dan 2:37 where, as we have noted above, the connection between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam is emphasised, this term is rendered as τὴν δόξαν. Similarly, the return of glory (δόξα) to Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned in Dan 4:36 OG, which may be a deliberate reference to Dan 2:37. The theme of Nebuchadnezzar's loss and new obtaining of “glory” brings to mind the portrayal of Adam in the Qumran scrolls and apocryphal literature. Thus, in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve, after eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Adam and Eve were deprived of their glory (δόξα). We find the same idea in 3 Bar 4:16, where the author states that after his sin, Adam was stripped of the glory of God (τῆς δόξης θεου). The Qumran Community Rule also states that the righteous will receive “all the glory of Adam” (כול כבוד אדם) (1QS 4:22−3). Therefore, the theme of the return of “glory” can receive a mystical and eschatological meaning as well.

It is noteworthy that the analogy between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam in the book of Daniel is drawn so clearly that it was already noticed by ancient commentators. Thus, Ephraim the Syrian in the hymn XIII of his “Hymns about Paradise” compares Nebuchadnezzar’s and Adam’s stories, saying that “in this king did God depict Adam” and promises a return to Paradise, similar to

[26] Gary A. Anderson, “The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve,” in *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (ed. Gary Anderson, Michael Stone and Johannes Tromp; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 15.

Nebuchadnezzar's return to the throne, to everyone who truly repented of his sins.[27]

It is obvious that the figures of Nebuchadnezzar and Adam were brought closer together as a result of the work of Jewish scribes who reworked the Babylonian traditions about Nabonidus and Nebuchadnezzar and incorporated them into the Jewish literary tradition. The relative dating of this process is of considerable interest. We have at our disposal the text of the Old Greek translation, which preserves the text of chapters 4–6 in a version that goes back to an ancient booklet of Daniel stories. Using the Old Greek translation, we can try to determine whether there was an analogy between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam in the early Daniel narrative collection.

This question should probably be answered in the negative. The main topic of this narrative collection is the conversion of the Gentile ruler to the one true God. The figure of Nebuchadnezzar in this collection appears in a completely different context—his story is juxtaposed with those of two other kings, Belshazzar and Darius. The most striking images linking Nebuchadnezzar's story to that of Adam are absent from this text. The parallel between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam appears in the Aramaic text of Dan 4, where Nebuchadnezzar's sojourn amongst the beasts of the field is particularly emphasised (Dan 4:23, 25, 32). In the first case, the stay with the beasts of the field is mentioned in the king's dream retold by Daniel. In the second case, it appears in its interpretation and in the third one, – in the pronouncement of a heavenly voice, addressed to Nebuchadnezzar. In the Old Greek translation, there is not much emphasis on the "beasts of the field" with which Nebuchadnezzar is to stay. The parallel between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam becomes even more obvious in Dan 5, where Daniel retells Nebuchadnezzar's story to Belshazzar (Dan 5:18–21). All the elements of Adam's story are present here—universal dominion, pride and punishment for it, expulsion and sojourn "with the wild donkeys." It is probable that in this text, the core idea of the story of Nebuchadnezzar is expressed most clearly. This passage is also absent from the Old Greek translation and is obviously the work of the author of the Aramaic Daniel.

Thus, the Greek text of Dan 4-6 allows us to conclude that the analogy between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam most likely arose after the composition of the narrative collection about Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar and Darius, which later became part of the book of Daniel. Of course, we cannot say precisely whether the analogy between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam arose only in the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse (Dan 1–7) or it was already present in the

[27] Matthias Henze, "Nebuchadnezzar's Madness (Daniel 4) in Syriac Literature" in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (vol. 2; ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 550-571.

hypothetical Daniel’s biography, which included chapters Dan 1−6, although the first version seems preferable.

D THE SON OF MAN FIGURE IN DAN 7, DAN 4 AND ADAMIC TRADITIONS

After we have considered the analogy between Nebuchadnezzar and Adam in the Aramaic Daniel, we can turn to the analysis of Dan 7. On the one hand, the close connection between Dan 4 and 7 is obvious. Underlying the structure of Dan 4 and 7 is the constantly recurring antithesis of human and animal. Nebuchadnezzar, who had been a king, is degraded into the state of an animal (Dan 4:33). The vision of Dan 7 begins with the appearance of four monstrous beasts, symbolising the Gentile kingdoms that ruled over the Jewish people (Dan 7:17), who are symbolised by a human figure, בר אנש (the Son of Man) in Dan 7:13. This figure is to receive the universal dominion and replace the beast as possessors of absolute sovereignty. The period of animal domination over men, abnormal and inconsistent with God's plan, comes to an end, being replaced by the return of reason to Nebuchadnezzar and the enthronement of the Son of Man (Dan 7:14), who receives dominion over the monstrous animals (Dan 7:11−12).

On the other hand, both Dan 7 and 4 have a structural analogy with the story of Adam. The procession of four monstrous animals in Dan 7 is both an analogy of Nebuchadnezzar's madness and his sojourn among the wild beasts and an analogy of Adam's condition after his expulsion from Eden. The enthronement of the Son of Man is analogous to Nebuchadnezzar's restoration to his kingship as well as, perhaps, analogous to the restoration of Adam to his original status, which is discussed in some later apocryphal writings (Life of Adam and Eve; Testament of Adam). Consequently, we can conclude that the entire text of Dan 7 has extensive parallels in both Dan 4 and Adamic traditions.

The first reference to the imagery of Dan 4 appears at the very beginning of chapter 7. Speaking of the first beast, obviously symbolising the Babylonian kingdom, the author suddenly begins to describe its miraculous transformation:

> The first was like a lion and had eagles' wings. Then as I looked its wings were plucked off, and it was lifted up from the ground and made to stand on two feet like a man, and the mind of a man was given to it (Dan 7:4).

It is noteworthy that when composing this passage of Dan 7, the author obviously had in mind the picture of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation in Dan 4. He refers specifically to this story and describes the transformation of the animal, which appears at the beginning of the vision, into a human being. The identification of the Babylonian kingdom with Nebuchadnezzar here looks like a reproduction of the imagery of Dan 2, where the king is identified with a golden head (Dan 2:38). Thus, the theme of Dan 4 and Nebuchadnezzar's transformation

reappears in Dan 7, which indicates a close connection between these chapters. The main focus of the narrative is again the difference between man and animal — emphasised in Dan 7:4, it becomes the basis of the narrative in the entire vision of Dan 7. It is noteworthy that the very expression כאנש in Dan 7:4 brings to mind the phrase כבר אנש, which makes it possible to connect the description of the transformation of the first animal, symbolising Nebuchadnezzar, with the Son of Man figure in Dan 7:13.

The procession of the four animals described in Dan 7 can be compared with Nebuchadnezzar's time away from Babylon or Adam's exile from Eden. According to one of the widespread scholarly traditions, the image of the monstrous beasts coming out of the sea was derived from the Babylonian epic poem Enuma Elish.[28] Even if we agree with the scholars who assume the existence of such a connection, we must admit that in the book of Daniel, it was radically reinterpreted. It is not monsters but animals (חיון) that come out of the sea. The probable source of the specific imagery of the four predatory animals is the passage of the prophet Hosea (Hos 13:7−8), which once again allows us to emphasise the connection of Dan 7 with the process of "intra-biblical exegesis."[29] The procession of the four animals echoes the story of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4. Thus, we read of the root which symbolises the king that "his portion be with the beasts of the field" (עם חיות ברא) (Dan 4:23), the same wording repeated in Dan 4:25 and 4:32, predicting the future fate of the king.

The theme of relations with animals is not touched upon in the description of Adam's expulsion from Eden in Genesis, but we can find it in a number of traditions connected with the story of Adam both in the Bible and in apocryphal literature. We can probably conclude that at a certain point in time this theme became one of the main topics in the description of the consequences of Adam's expulsion as well as in the description of the future eschatological deliverance. We find these motifs in their most developed form in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve (GLAE).[30]

---

[28] For a review and discussion of the subject, see Anne E. Gardner, "Daniel 7, 2–14: Another Look at Its Mythic Pattern," *Biblica* 82/2 (2001): 244–252.

[29] Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," 95–96.

[30] Scholars have not reached a consensus regarding the date and provenance of this work. Docchorn suggests that its earliest form was created in Palestine in the first or second century C.E.; Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). De Jonge and Tromp consider it to be a Christian work of the third or fourth century C.E.; Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997). Levison shows that we may equally admit the possibility of a Jewish or Christian authorship and prefers to take the "agnostic" position regarding the origin

God's words describing Adam's future after his expulsion from paradise are given here in expanded form: “And wild animals, which you used to rule, will rise up in revolt against you with anarchy because my command you did not keep” (GLAE 24:3). Another episode describes Eve and Seth going to paradise to get oil from the tree of life to heal Adam. It goes on to say that:

> Seth went, and Eve, into the regions of paradise. And Eve saw her son and a wild animal battling with him. And Eve wept ... And she said to the wild beast, 'O evil beast, how are you not afraid to fight the image of God? How does your mouth open? How are your teeth strengthened? How do you not remember your obedience −that in the past you have obeyed the image of God.' Then the wild animal cried out, saying, 'Oh, Eve, your greed is not about us, nor your weeping, but about you, since the dominion of the wild animals came to be from you'" (GLAE 10:1−11:1).

Similar motifs are found in other apocryphal texts. Thus, in the Greek Testament of Naphtali,[31] we read:

> But him who doeth not that which is good, Both angels and men shall curse, And God shall be dishonoured among the Gentiles through him, And the devil shall make him as his own peculiar instrument, And every wild beast shall master him, And the Lord shall hate him (T. Naph. 8:6).

In the above verse, we again see the inversion of God's promise to Adam due to human sin; instead of Adam's dominion over the animals, it speaks of the dominion of animals over man.

The focal point of Dan 7 is the giving of the kingdom to the Son of Man: “And to him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom” (שלטן ויקרומלכו) (Dan 7:14). In the interpretation of Dan 7:14, which predicts the transition of authority to “the people of the saints of the Most High,” we read that they are given “the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms”

---

of this work; John R. Levison, *The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2023), 134. In our opinion, the use of Jewish traditions in the composition of the document is quite obvious regardless of the author’s confessional affiliation. For this reason, we will use the Greek Life of Adam and Eve when describing the history of Adamic traditions, particularly those reflected in the book of Daniel.

[31] The history of composition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs has been a subject of a long controversy in scholarly circles; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 133-134. It seems that this work was based on a Jewish source that underwent extensive Christian redaction. The situation with the Testament of Naphtali is somewhat simpler; fragments of this work were found at Qumran and a later Jewish composition, the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali, is known, hence, we can be sure that the Testament of Naphtali is of Jewish origin.

(ומלכותה ושלטנה ורבותא די מלכות) (Dan 7:27). In this case, the book of Daniel uses formulas indicating universal authority. It is noteworthy that close expressions have previously been used in relation to Nebuchadnezzar. Thus, we find a similar formulation "the kingdom, the power, and the might, and the glory" (מלכותא חסנא ותקפא ויקרא) in Dan 2: 37, an analogous phrase "kingship and greatness and glory and majesty" (מלכותא ורבותא ויקרא והדרה) also appears in Dan 5:18. As can be seen, in this case, the kingdom of the Son of Man is again likened to the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar. Similarly, the subjects of the Son of Man in Dan 7:14 are designated as "peoples, nations, and languages" (כל עממיא אמיא ולשניא), a stock phrase that is repeated several times in Dan 3 (Dan 3:4; 7; 29), appears in Dan 4:1-3 (the epistolary introduction to Dan 4) and again occurs in Dan 6:25. In these passages, it refers to all the peoples of the universal empires of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, which are perceived as having universal authority.

The idea of the universal dominion of the Son of Man is here again linked with the story of Adam. Thus, in Gen 1:28, God blesses the first human couple as follows: "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth." We find a similar passage about man's dominion over the natural world in Ps 8:4-8:

> What is man that you are mindful of him, and the son of man that you care for him? Yet you have made him a little lower than the heavenly beings and crowned him with glory and honor. You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen, and also the beasts of the field, the birds of the heavens, and the fish of the sea, whatever passes along the paths of the seas.

As can be seen, the expression "son of man" (בן אדם), appears in this passage, which may indicate a direct literary connection between Ps 8 and Dan 7.[32] The story of Adam and Ps 8, which also develops the theme of Gen 1:26, deal with man's dominion over the natural world. Later Jewish and Christian traditions often understood Adam as the universal ruler of the entire world.[33] We find a similar idea in Dan 7 — the Son of Man is given universal dominion. It is especially interesting that the Son of Man is also given authority over the animals that came out of the sea (Dan 7:12). The fact that the first three beasts remain alive after the execution of the fourth beast has traditionally presented a problem

[32] Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, 98.

[33] Philo of Alexandria (On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses 52. 148). See also Alexander Toepel, "Adamic Traditions in Early Christian and Rabbinic Literature," in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only* (ed. Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 312.

for commentators. It seems that in this case the author of Dan 7 referred to the realisation of divine blessing to Adam — he wanted to stress Son of man’s dominion over the “beasts of the field.” According to the interpretation of the vision the “people of the saints of the Most High” symbolised by the Son of Man will also receive universal dominion (Dan 7:27). It can be assumed that the idea of man's dominion over animals, which can be traced back to Gen 1 and Ps 8, is here allegorically interpreted as Israel's dominion over the Gentiles, which is mentioned in Dan 7:27.

The Son of Man's acquisition of eternal kingship may also have parallels in the theme of return of Adam or whole collective humanity to its original status, which is described in some works of apocryphal literature. Thus, in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve, we read that God tells Adam:

> And I will restore you to your dominion, and I will seat you on the throne (θρόνον) of the one who deceived you. And that one will be thrown into this place so that he may see you seated upon it. Then he himself will be condemned-and those who listened to him-and he will be grieved when he sees you sitting upon his throne" (GLAE 39:2–3).

Similar mentions of the throne of the one who deceived you/your enemy's throne, on which Adam is to sit, appear in the Armenian and Georgian versions of the apocryphon. Adam’s enemy here is either the serpent whose throne should symbolise “the dominion of the wild beasts” (GLAE 11:1), which began after Adam's expulsion from paradise or Satan, who acted through the serpent according to the narrative of the Life of Adam and Eve (GLAE 16:5). The passage referring to Adam's future enthronement is also interesting in light of the mention of thrones (θρόνοι) in Dan 7:9, which already in antiquity were often interpreted as thrones reserved for God and the Son of Man (En. 45:3; 62:3, 5; Matt 19:28; 25:31; b. Hag 14a, b. Sanh 38b). The idea of Adam’s exaltation can also be found in the Testament of Abraham, where Abraham saw “a man upon a seat of great glory” at the gates of heaven. When asked by Abraham who this man is, Abraham's guide, the archangel Michael, replied that “this man who sits between them, this is Adam, the first man whom the Lord created” (T. Ab. 8).

Thus, we can conclude that there is an obvious parallelism between the narrative patterns presented in Dan 7 and 4 and the story of Adam. It seems that in the context of Daniel's dream in Dan 7, as in the context of the entire Aramaic Daniel apocalypse, the Son of Man can be characterised as a human figure with distinctively Adamic features. Using a later terminology, he could be called the “last Adam” (1 Cor 15:45) or the “new Adam.” The author of Daniel apparently did not conceive the Son of Man as a real person, otherwise he would not have connected this image with “the saints of the Most High” (Dan 7:18) or “the people of the saints of the Most High” (Dan 7:27). It seems that the most accurate way to describe the Son of Man figure is to call it a character of a myth created

by the author of Dan 7. The main features of this myth become apparent when the Adamic traditions, the story of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4 and Daniel's vision in Dan 7 are juxtaposed. Both Nebuchadnezzar and the Son of Man are in fact masks behind which the story built around the figure of Adam is concealed. In the story of Adam in Genesis, we find only the first two episodes of this storyline (the Original State - Exile), in the story of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4 we see its full unfolding (the Original State −Exile −Restoration), in Dan 7, we find its last two episodes (Exile −Restoration). It is reasonable to assume that the vision of the four beasts and the Son of Man in Dan 7 actually concerns the future, which has not yet happened — completing Adam's story, describing it in symbolic or even mythical terms.

The set of ideas, presented in the book of Daniel, has a close counterpart in another apocalyptic composition of the Maccabean era, the Animal Apocalypse. Both works were written at the same time and in the same place. The book of Daniel is usually dated between 168/167 and 164 B.C.E.,[34] the Animal Apocalypse — between 165 and 160 B.C.E.[35] Both works were obviously written in Judea, which became the immediate scene of the Maccabean crisis. In this regard, the problem of the relationship between the book of Daniel and the Animal Apocalypse is a very interesting and fundamental question.[36] Close analogies between these works certainly deserve attention. Thus, the sequence of future eschatological events in the Animal Apocalypse (En. 90:20–38**)** fully corresponds to the order described in the book of Daniel (Dan 7:9–14). The end of the eschatological scenario, described in the Animal Apocalypse – the appearance of the "white bull," which gives rise to a new Adamic race – can be seen as a structural analogy of the appearance of the Son of Man figure in Dan 7.

Perhaps the Animal Apocalypse could be seen as an early example of the exegesis of the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse, which included chapters Dan 1−7. At the beginning of the Maccabean revolt, polemics between the two groups of Hasidim may have arisen. Its main subject was the understanding of the Aramaic Daniel apocalypse. The author of the bilingual (Hebrew-Aramaic) book of Daniel supplemented this work with Hebrew chapters, which results in the modern book of Daniel. The author of the Animal Apocalypse allegorised his narrative and presented the coming of the Son of Man as an appearance of the "white bull" and the formation of a new Adamic race.

---

34 Newsom, *Daniel*, 11.

35 Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 70–79; W. E. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary of the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 396.

36 See, for example, Simon J. Joseph, "Was Daniel 7.13's 'Son of Man' Modelled after the 'New Adam' of the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 90)? A Comparative Study," *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 22/4 (2013): 278.

E ANGELIC INTERPRETATION OF THE VISION OF THE FOUR BEAST AND THE SON OF MAN

The mythological plot, which appears in Dan 7, is interpreted by the *angelus interpres* in Dan 7:17-27. We find two interpretations of the enthronement of a human figure in Dan 7. Dan 7:18 says that the kingdom will be given to “the saints of the Most High” and at the end of the chapter, we read that the kingdom will be given to “the people of the saints of the Most High” (Dan 7:27). How should these interpretations be understood and how can we relate them to the Adamic nature of the Son of Man figure?

The study of the book of Daniel, in many respects, resembles the study of folklore with its fundamental multivalence and the possibility of interpreting the same image in different contexts. The most important issue in this case is the relationship between the dream vision and its interpretation. The interpretation of the dream in Dan 7 is obviously not equal to the meaning of its images in the immediate context of the vision itself. Sometimes in dream interpretation, we find a direct identification between the figure seen in the vision and the figure existing outside the dream. Thus, the "Ancient of Days" obviously represents God both in the imagery of Daniel's dream and in its interpretation. Nevertheless, quite often such an unambiguous identity is not observed and the figure seen in the dream does not denote itself but some other object. Such "symbolic dreams" in antiquity were especially characteristic of the Near Eastern tradition.[37] Thus, the four beasts, appearing in Daniel's vision, denote four kings or four kingdoms. The sea from which the four monstrous animals emerge in the vision is interpreted to mean the earth (Dan 7:17). The “great sea” that gives rise to the monsters and the four animals themselves are connected with many layers of different meanings that appear in Dan 7. In the same way, the meaning of the figure of the Son of Man in Daniel's vision is not limited to the interpretation given in Dan 7. Whereas in Daniel's vision the Son of Man can be characterised as the “new Adam” the interpretation associates him with “the saints of the Most High” or “the people of the saints of the Most High.”

This interpretation is presented by *angelus interpres* in Dan 7:18, 27. The enthronement of the Son of Man is interpreted as receiving of the kingdom by “the saints of the Most High” or “the people of the saints of the Most High.” The problem of the proper understanding of who the “saints of the Most High” are

[37] Leo A. Oppenheim, *The interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book* (Literary Licensing, LLC, 2011), 2016-2017; Sally A. L. Butler, “Mesopotamian Conceptions of Dreams and Dream Rituals.” (Doctoral thesis, University College London, 1992), 206-217; Tomáš Vítek, “Allegorical Dreams in Antiquity Their Character and Interpretation,” *Wiener Studien* 130 (2017): 127-152.

has given rise to a long scholarly debate.[38] The central point of the polemics is the question of whether they should be identified with angels who will receive dominion after the fall of the fourth kingdom or with human beings, i.e., the Jewish people. Without going into the details of this controversy, we would like to note that even the identification of the "saints of the Most High" with angels does not necessarily imply that the Son of Man denotes an angelic being such as the archangel Michael. It is well known that Dan 7 ends with the statement about the kingdom being given to "the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:27), who are generally identified with human beings (regardless of the different interpretations of the phrase "saints of the Most High"; קדישי עליונין). It is noteworthy that the very consideration of the structure and vocabulary of Dan 7:14 indicates its structural and lexical similarity to Dan 7:27; these verses, telling about the giving of the kingdom to the Son of Man/the people of the saints of the Most High, have the same message, which is delivered using the similar vocabulary.[39]

Consequently, we can assume that the Son of Man was probably understood by the author of Dan 7 as a visionary symbol of the "people of the saints of the Most High," i.e. the Jewish people. However, in the structure and imagery of the Aramaic Daniel, this figure may be characterised as the "new Adam." Therefore, we can see that the archetypal representative of the human race in dream interpretation is associated with the Jewish people. In this regard, it should be noted that the identification of Israel with man as such and the attribution of Adam's heritage to Israel is a characteristic feature of the Jewish tradition. Thus, many scholars hold that one can speak of a systematic analogy between the story of Adam and the history of Israel already in Primary History and Deuteronomic History.[40] As Jewish thought developed, Israel increasingly

---

[38] John J. Collins, "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 50–66; Klaus Koch, "Das Reich der Heiligen und der Menschensohn," 140–172; Alexander A. Di Lella, "The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39/1 (1977): 1–19; G.F. Hasel, "The Identity of 'the Saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7," *Biblica* 56 (1975): 173–192; V. S. Poythress, "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel VII," *Vetus Testamentum* 26/2 (1976): 208–213; Anne Gardner, "'Holy Ones' and '(Holy) People' in Daniel and 1QM," in *Keter Shem Tov: Collected Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown* (ed. Shani Tzoref and Ian Young; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2013), 151–183.

[39] Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), 24.

[40] See, for example, Joseph Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 66; Anne E. Gardner, "Genesis 2: 4b–3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 43/1 (1990), 16.

began to be seen as the true heir of Adam and Israel's dominion as the true fulfilment of the divine blessing to Adam which gave him universal dominion.

Thus, in the Fourth Book of Ezra, written already after the destruction of the Second Temple, we find the following passage:

> On the sixth day you commanded the earth to bring forth before you cattle, wild animals, and creeping things; and over these you placed Adam, as ruler over all the works that you have made; and from him we have all come, the people whom you have chosen. “All this I have spoken before you, O Lord, because you have said that it was for us that you created this world. As for the other nations that have descended from Adam, you have said that they are nothing, and that they are like spittle, and you have compared their abundance to a drop from a bucket (4 Ezra 6:53–56).

According to Morna Hooker,

> [H]ere we find clearly stated the author's belief that the people of Israel alone are the true heirs of Adam: it was for their sake that the world was created, and the world is thus their rightful inheritance ... The ideas used here are exactly those which we found in Dan. 7. In both passages the conviction that Israel ought to rule the world is based on a belief regarding man's true position in the scheme of creation; in both, the proper order of things has been reversed, and the rightful ruler is in fact under the domination of others.[41]

Later we find similar ideas in Rabbinic literature: “You [Jews] are called man (אדם), but the Gentiles are not called man (אדם)” (Bava Metzia 114b).

For this reason, we may conclude that the identification of the Son of Man with “the people of the saints of the Most High” comes as no surprise. The establishment of the worldwide dominion of the nation of Israel will mean the restoration of Adam and “collective humanity” since Adam's heritage applies only to Israel, the only nation that has a Covenant with God.

F CONCLUSION

Thus, we can conclude that the image of the Son of Man was one of the first attempts in Jewish thought to correlate the images of the “first” and the “last” man. The story of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4 helped the author of Dan 7 to perform this task, having connected the stories of Nebuchadnezzar and Adam he obtained a ready-made model that could then be used to create the text of Daniel’s vision. While creating the image of the Son of Man, the "new Adam," the author constructed some kind of a mythological narrative, which he

[41] Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), 50.

immediately interpreted, identifying the Son of Man figure with the nation of Israel.

G BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albertz, Rainer. "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel." Pages 171-204 in *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception.* Vol. 1. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Anderson, Gary A. "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve." Pages 3-42 in *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. Edited by Gary Anderson, Michael Stone and Johannes Tromp. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Arbel, Daphna. "Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty": The Enoch/Me†a†ron Narrative of 3 Enoch and Ezekiel 28." *Harward Theological Review* 98/2 (2005): 121–142.

Barr, James. "Thou Art the Cherub: Ezekiel 28.14 and the Post-Ezekiel Understanding of Gen 2-3." Pages 213-223 in *Priests, Prophets and Scribes*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Butler, Sally A. L. "Mesopotamian Conceptions of Dreams and Dream Rituals." Doctoral thesis, University College London, 1992.

Callender, Dexter E., Jr. *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Casey, Maurice. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.

Collins, John J. "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 50–66.

_____. *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

_____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.

De Jonge, Marinus and Johannes Tromp. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Di Lella, Alexander A. "The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39/1 (1977): 1–19.

Dochhorn, Jan. *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Gardner, Anne E. "Genesis 2: 4b–3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 43/1 (1990): 1-18.

_____. "Daniel 7, 2–14: Another Look at Its Mythic Pattern." *Biblica* 82/2 (2001): 244–252.

_____. "'Holy Ones' and '(Holy) People' in Daniel and 1QM." Pages 151-183 in *Keter Shem Tov: Collected Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown*. Edited by Shani Tzoref and Ian Young. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2013.

Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel.* Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.

Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Identity of 'the Saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7." *Biblica* 56 (1975): 173–192.

Henze, Matthias. "Nebuchadnezzar's Madness (Daniel 4) in Syriac Literature." Pages 550-571 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception. Vol. 2*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Hölscher, Gustav. "Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 92 (1919): 113-118.

Hooker, Morna D. *The Son of Man in Mark.* Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.

Joseph, Simon J. "Was Daniel 7.13's 'Son of Man' Modelled after the 'New Adam' of the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 90)? A Comparative Study." *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 22/4 (2013): 269-294.

Koch, Klaus. "Das Reich der Heiligen und der Menschensohn." Seiten 140-172 in *Die Reiche der Welt und der kommende Menschensohn. Studien zum Danielbuch.* Bd II. Herausgegeben von M. Rösel Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.

Kratz, Reinhard G. *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.

_____. "The Visions of Daniel." Pages 91-113 in *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception*, Vol. 1. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. London: SPCK, 1979.

Lebram, Jürgen-Christian. *Das Buch Daniel*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1984.

Levison, John R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

_____. *The Greek Life of Adam and Eve.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2023.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *The Eden Narrative. A Literary and Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 2–3.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Newsom, Carol A. *Daniel: A Commentary.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *A Commentary of the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Oppenheim, Leo A. *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East: With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book.* Literary Licensing, LLC, 2011.

Patmore, Hector M. *Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre: The Interpretation of Ezekiel 28:11-19 in Late Antiquity.* Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Poythress, Vern S. "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel VII." *Vetus Testamentum* 26/2 (1976): 208–213.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "The 'Son of Man' in the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 19/1 (1900): 22-28.

Suchard, Benjamin D. *Aramaic Daniel: A Textual Reconstruction of Chapters 1–7.* Leiden: Brill, 2022.

Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Toepel**,** Alexander, "Adamic Traditions in Early Christian and Rabbinic Literature." Pages 305-324 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Vítek, Tomáš. "Allegorical Dreams in Antiquity Their Character and Interpretation." *Wiener Studien* 130 (2017): 127-152.

Weimar, Peter. “Daniel 7: Eine Textanalyse.” Seiten 11-36 in *Jesus und der Menschensohn*. Herausgegeben von Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg. Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 1975.

Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.