

Who Did Daniel See in Dan 10?

Copyright (c) 2004 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

Introduction

In Dan 10 the prophet is confronted by a "man dressed in linen" (vs. 5) whose appearance is then described in some detail. There is a question whether a second supernatural being appears in the chapter. Below I argue that there are two supernatural beings in Dan 10 rather than one and that the transition between them occurs at vs. 10. When all the available evidence is considered, the first (the "man dressed in linen") can be identified as Michael and the second (the "one who looked like a man," vss. 16, 18) as Gabriel. The reasons for the identifications I propose are discussed against the backdrop of a paper by Gillian Bampfylde entitled, "The Prince of the Host in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls."¹

Elsewhere I have suggested that "Michael" is one of many names for Christ.² The Greek title *archaggelos* "archangel," used to describe Michael in Jude 9 (see also 1 Thes 4:16) and in the pseudepigraphical literature is not the same as *aggelos* "angel." Its closest Old Testament counterpart is *śar-ś^hbā²-YHWH* "commander of the army of the Lord" (Josh 5:14-15) or *śar-haššābā²* "Prince of the host" (Dan 8:11).³ Despite their appearance in English, "commander of the army of the Lord" and "Prince of the host" are the same in Hebrew. The word *mal'āk*, however, translated "angel" in about half its occurrences in the Old Testament, is entirely different.⁴ The "archangel" of canonical Scripture is not called that because He is an angel in the Greek or English sense of the word but because He is Commander over the angels.⁵ But even this claim is not sufficiently inclusive. He is Commander over the church as well (Phil 2:9-11).

One reason why it is important to identify the cast of characters correctly in Dan 10 is that Michael is twice mentioned there. If the "man dressed in linen" is still speaking in vs. 13 and 21, then the identification of Michael with Christ must be abandoned, because no one refers to himself in the third person. On the other hand, if the "man dressed in linen" is Michael and if Michael is the preexistent Christ, as I claim, corresponding to the glorified Christ described in Rev 1:13-16, then a second party must be introduced in Dan 10 at some point before vs. 13.

The Text of the Passage

Daniel 10-12 is a literary unit composed of three main parts which can be roughly identified with chaps. 10, 11, and 12. The middle section (Dan 11:2-12:3) is a prophetic narrative intended to give Daniel still more information about what he had seen in chap. 8.⁶ As such it complements the earlier prophetic narrative of chap. 9, which also explains chap. 8. On either side of Dan 11:2-12:3 there is a brief dialogue between the prophet and the angel who presents this material to him.

Grouping the verses

The text of Dan 10 can in turn be divided into four subscenes that share a common motif of encounter and response. Verses 1-3 are introductory and can be set aside for present purposes. In vss. 4-9 Daniel sees a brilliant supernatural Being standing before him and is overcome by the sight. The remaining three examples of encounter and response are found in vs. 10-15 (an angel touches Daniel, he stands initially but then falls prostrate on the ground and cannot speak), vss. 16-17 (the angel touches Daniel's lips, he has no strength and cannot breathe), and vss. 18-19 (the angel touches Daniel again, he receives strength to listen). The final verses of the chapter (Dan 10:20-11:1) are introductory to the narrative of chap. 11 and correspond chiastically to 12:4 where Daniel is told he must "close up and seal" what he has heard.

The question of who Daniel deals with at any given point in chap. 10 is best approached on the basis of sections rather than individual verses. Thus, instead of twenty-one units of text we are dealing with four plus two introductory passages--one for the three chapters in general (10:1-3) and one for the middle chapter in particular (10:20-11:1). Finally the four scenes of chap. 10 can be combined as two groups which consist respectively of scene 1 (vss. 4-9) and scenes 2-4 (vss. 10-19).

Establishing points of transition

The first scene has to do with the "man dressed in linen" (10:5) and extends from vs. 4, which gives the setting for vss. 5-6, up to vs. 9 where Daniel is overcome by what he has seen. "Then I heard him speaking, and as I listened to him, I fell into a deep sleep, my face to the ground" (Dan 10:9).

The second group of scenes begins in vs. 10 with the words, "A hand touched me . . ." It is not necessary to assume that the hand which touched Daniel in vs. 10 was that of the "man dressed in linen" in vs. 5. In fact there is reason to believe otherwise. It would have been easy enough to say, "His hand touched me . . .," referring back to scene 1, but this is not what the text says. I suggest that vs. 10 marks the appearance of a second supernatural being in the chapter--a companion of the first. The one Daniel sees and hears in vss. 10-19, and on through chap. 11, is not the same as the "man dressed in linen" in vss. 4-9.

A second possible point of transition, which I reject, is vs. 16 at the beginning of scene 3: "Then one who looked like a man touched my lips, . . ." The argument has two parts. First, Daniel deals with the same individual in scenes 3 and 4: "Again the one who looked like a man touched me . . ." (Dan 10:18). Thus, the "man" who touched Daniel at the beginning of scene 4 was the same one who had touched him earlier in scene 3. And second, Daniel deals with the same individual in scenes 2 and 4: he is called "'O man highly esteemed'" (vs. 19) in scene 4 and this same phrase occurs in scene 2 ("you who are highly esteemed," vs. 11). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the one who calls Daniel "'highly esteemed'" in the one passage calls him "'highly esteemed'" in the other also. If the same speaker is present in scenes 3 and 4, and if the same speaker is present in scenes 2 and 4, it follows that the same speaker is present in scenes 2 and 3. If there is a transition anywhere in the chapter from one supernatural being to another, the best place for it is vs. 10 and not vs. 16.

The Work of Gillian Bampfylde

Bampfylde's paper has been cited earlier.⁷ In it she assumes that Dan 10 makes reference to only one supernatural being. "There are two companions in 12:5, but these have not appeared on the scene until then." Thus, she asserts that Dan 8:11, 16, 25; 10:16, 18; and 12:6, 7 all apply to the same "man" that Daniel sees and describes in 10:5-6. The passages she cites are summarized below. See table 1.

Table 1
Parallels to The "Man Dressed in Linen"
According to Bampfylde

Description	References
Status of a "Prince"	
"Prince of the host"	8:11
"Prince of princes"	8:25
Appearance of a man	
One who looked like a man	10:16
The one who looked like a man	10:18
Dressed in linen	
A man dressed in linen	10:5
The man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river	12:6, 7
Association with water	
A man's voice from the Ulai calling	8:16
The man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river	12:6, 7

Bampfylde correctly distinguishes between the dazzling personage of Dan 10:5-6 and Gabriel, but is wrong in attempting to dissociate Him from Michael and is also wrong in attempting to remove Gabriel from chap. 10 altogether.

[The "man dressed in linen"] is therefore to be identified with "the Prince of the host" (8:11). This Prince of the host is not Michael, for although Michael is the patron of Israel and an arch-angel, he is *not chief* of the arch-angels in intertestamental literature, e.g. 1 Enoch 9:1-10:16; 20:5; 24:6; 54:6; 60:4-5; 68:2; 71:9. In the Book of Daniel there is no possibility that Michael might be the chief Prince. He is known as "one of the chief princes" (Dan. 10:13), whereas the Prince of the host (8:11) is called "the Prince of princes" (8:25). The man described in 10:5-6 is certainly one of the highest angels,—a "Prince" and a heavenly military commander. Neither is he to be identified with Gabriel, for he addresses Gabriel himself.⁸

It should be pointed out that establishing a link between biblical Michael and pseudepigraphical Michael is not the same as eliminating one between biblical Michael and the "Prince of the host." To suggest that it does makes canonical Scripture a tool for interpreting the pseudepigrapha rather than the reverse and obscures the historical processes by which the pseudepigraphical writings came into being.⁹ As regards Gabriel, a similar argument applies. Once we have established that Gabriel is absent from vss. 4-9 it is still an open question whether he is absent from the rest of the chapter.

Bampfylde makes four positive assertions and three negative ones in her paper. Her positive assertions are (1) that the "man dressed in linen" (10:5) is the same as the "man" whose voice is heard "from the Ulai" (8:16), (2) that the "man dressed in linen" is also the same as the "Prince of the host" (8:11), (3) that the "man dressed in linen" is closely associated with the "one like a son of man" (7:13) as well as the fourth "man" in the blazing furnace who looked "like a son of the gods" (3:25), and (4) that the "Prince of the host" is the same as the "Prince of princes" (8:25). This last point requires no discussion.

The three negative assertions referred to above are (1) that the "man dressed in linen" (10:5) is not Gabriel, (2) that the "one who looked like a man" (10:16, 18) is not Gabriel, and (3) that the "man dressed in linen" is not Michael. Of these seven proposed facts I can agree with all but the last two. In my view Michael is the subject of Dan 10:4-9 and Gabriel is the subject of Dan 10:10-19 and the speaker throughout 10:20-12:4.

Three positive assertions

Three of Bampfylde's positive assertions are now discussed below. Her fourth point, that the "Prince of the host" is the same as the "Prince of princes," is obviously correct and need not detain us.

The "man dressed in linen" speaks from the Ulai. Bampfylde demonstrates that the "man dressed in linen" of Dan 10:5 is the same as the "man" whose voice is heard from the Ulai in Dan 8:16 by showing that there is a third passage parallel to both.¹⁰ The third passage is Dan 12:6, repeated in 12:7, where we find a reference to "the man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river." The first part of this description ("clothed in linen") is parallel to chap. 10, while the second part ("above the waters of the river") is parallel to chap. 8. Because Dan 8:16 and 10:5 are parallel to the same passage in chap. 12, they are parallel to each other. Thus, Bampfylde correctly concludes that the "man dressed in linen" (10:5) is the One who speaks from the Ulai.

The "man dressed in linen" is the "Prince of the host." The main piece of evidence linking the "man's voice from the Ulai" (Dan 8:16) with the "Prince of the host" (8:11) five verses earlier is that when He speaks Gabriel feels compelled to obey.¹¹ What the voice says is, "Gabriel, tell this man the meaning of the vision" (Dan 8:16). In response Gabriel immediately comes closer to Daniel to tell him the meaning of the vision. This is an important fact about the narrative. Despite the elevated nature of his own position Gabriel is still one of the angels in the host or army of heaven and as such must obey any orders received from his Prince. If the "man dressed in linen" (10:5) speaks from the Ulai, and if the One who speaks from the Ulai is the "Prince of the host" (8:11), then the "man dressed in linen" is the "Prince of the host," as Bampfylde indicates.

The "man dressed in linen" is "'a son of the gods'". There is a connection also between the "man dressed in linen" and the fourth "man" in the blazing furnace: "Look! I see four men walking around in the fire, unbound and unharmed, and the fourth looks like a son of the gods" (3:25).

He [the "man dressed in linen"] is described fully in 10:5-6 as a fiery angel of majestic demeanour, rather similar in appearance to the fourth person seen in the fire by Nebuchadnezzar and described by him as a "son of the gods", which is a reference to angels.¹²

It is true that Nebuchadnezzar describes the fourth Person in the furnace as an angel in vs. 28. But he is drawing on his own belief system in doing so. The Aramaic expression, "like a son of the gods" (*dāmēh l'bar-^llāhîn*), simply means "like a supernatural being." Nebuchadnezzar's awareness that he stood in the presence of One who was more than human does not settle the question of who he saw. It is enough to point out, as Bampfylde has, that Nebuchadnezzar in chap. 4 and Daniel in chap. 10 saw the same dazzling sight. The "man dressed in linen" (10:5) is the same as the One "like a son of the gods" (3:25).

Summary. According to Bampfylde, the "man dressed in linen" (Dan 10:5) is the same as the "Prince of the host" (Dan 8:11), the One who speaks "with a man's voice from the Ulai" (8:16), and the "Prince of princes" (8:25). He is also the same as the One who looked "like a son of the gods" (Dan 3:25) in Nebuchadnezzar's blazing furnace.

Three negative assertions

Each of the above positive assertions is correct. Only one of the three negative assertions discussed below, however, bears scrutiny. It is true, as Bampfylde suggests, that the "man dressed in linen" is not Gabriel. But she is wrong to suggest that Michael is not the "man dressed in linen" (10:4-9) and that Gabriel is not the "one who looked like a man" (10:16, 18).

The "man dressed in linen" is not Gabriel. Bampfylde has already shown that the "man's voice from the Ulai" is that of the "man dressed in linen." She now points out that because the voice addresses Gabriel, Gabriel cannot be the one speaking.¹³ The passage in question reads as follows:

(16) And I heard a man's voice from the Ulai calling, "Gabriel, tell this man the meaning of the vision." (17) As he came near the place where I was standing, I was terrified and fell prostrate. "Son of man," he said to me, "understand that the vision concerns the time of the end." (Dan 8:16-17)

By showing that Gabriel is not the one heard in Dan 8:16, she correctly concludes that Gabriel is not the one seen in Dan 10:5-6. The "man dressed in linen" is not Gabriel.

The "man dressed in linen" is not Michael. Bampfylde's second negative assertion is that the "man dressed in linen" is not Michael.¹⁴

I have no explanation for why Michael should be called "one of the chief princes" in Dan 10:13. In the absence of further information all I can do is withhold judgment on this passage.¹⁵ Bampfylde, however, makes vs. 13 a center of emphasis and suggests that because Michael is called "one of the chief princes" in 10:13 He cannot be the "Prince of princes" in 8:25.

Dan 10:13, however, is not the only passage that refers to Michael. Elsewhere He is called not only "your prince" (10:21) but "the great prince" (12:1)--not a great prince. So if I cannot account for Dan 10:13, Bampfylde cannot account for Dan 12:1. There is no reason to set "the great prince" (12:1) off in contrast with the "Prince of the host" (8:11) or the "Prince of princes" (8:25). When all of the relevant biblical evidence is considered it is entirely safe to conclude that Michael (10:13, 21; 12:1) is the same as the "Prince of the host" (8:11) and therefore the same as the "man dressed in linen" (10:5). Indeed there is evidence, discussed in

a later section, that makes this conclusion not only safe but inescapable. The "man dressed in linen" is Michael.

The "one who looked like a man" is not Gabriel. Speaking of the "one who looked like a man" (10:16, 18) Bampfylde says, "Neither is he to be identified with Gabriel, for he addresses Gabriel himself."¹⁶ Here the reference is to Dan 8, not 10. "Gabriel, tell this man the meaning of the vision" (Dan 8:16). This verse was used above to show that the "man dressed in linen" (10:5) is not Gabriel, and that is correct. He is not Gabriel. But here the same passage is being used to show that the "one who looked like a man" (10:16, 18) is not Gabriel and this is a different matter entirely. To reason from Dan 8:16 to 10:16 one must make the prior assumption that the "man dressed in linen" is the "one who looked like a man." There are a number of reasons why this cannot be.

The best evidence for rejecting Bampfylde's interpretation of Dan 10:16 and 18 is contained within her own argument. She points out, as stated above, that the "man dressed in linen" (10:5; 12:6, 7) addresses Gabriel as He speaks "from the Ulai" (8:16). This means that Gabriel is present with whoever speaks from the Ulai. He is a companion of the speaker and not the speaker himself. Verses 16-17 were quoted earlier, but I now include vs. 15.

While I, Daniel, was watching the vision and trying to understand it, there before me stood one who looked like a man. (16) And I heard a man's voice from the Ulai calling, "Gabriel, tell this man the meaning of the vision." (17) As he came near the place where I was standing, I was terrified and fell prostrate. (Dan 8:15-17)

The "one who looked like a man" in Dan 8:15 stands in front of Daniel (*l^cnegdī*), while the voice that he hears comes from a position above the water of the river (*bēn ūlāy*). Thus, the "one who looked like a man" in 8:15 and the source of the "man's voice from the Ulai" in 8:16 are not the same individuals at all and stand in different physical locations relative to Daniel. The most natural interpretation of the above passage is that the "one who looked like a man" (8:15) is Gabriel and not the One who addresses Gabriel. Thus, the same individual who stands in front of Daniel in vs. 15, receives a command to explain the vision to him in vs. 16, and comes closer in order to do so in vs. 17. In Dan 10:16 and 18, as also in Dan 8:15, Gabriel is the "one who looked like a man."¹⁷

For whatever reason Bampfylde does not mention Dan 8:15 in her paper, but the evidence from this verse must be carefully considered. The "one who looked like a man" in chap. 10 is a companion of the "man dressed in linen" just as the "one who looked like a man" in chap. 8 is a companion of the "man" who calls from the Ulai. It has already been pointed out that the second member of both pairs is the same. Here I claim that the first member of both pairs is also the same. Moreover it is entirely reasonable that this should be the case. The cast of characters does not change from chap. 8 to chap. 10 but remains the same. An argument for change is what would require a defense.

Excursus on the "Man Dressed in Linen"

In Dan 10 the "man dressed in linen" is obviously more than a man. Consider the entire description given in Dan 10:4-6.

On the twenty-fourth day of the first month, as I was standing on the bank of the great river Tigris, (5) I looked up and there before me was a man dressed in linen, with a belt of the finest gold around his waist. (6) His body was like chrysolite, his face like lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and his voice like the sound of a multitude. (Dan 10:4-6)

An encounter very similar to this and a description virtually identical to it appears in Rev 1:12-16.

I turned around to see the voice that was speaking to me. And when I turned I saw seven golden lampstands, (13) and among the lampstands was someone "like a son of man," dressed in a robe reaching down to his feet and with a golden sash around his chest. (14) His head and hair were white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes were like blazing fire. (15) His feet were like bronze glowing in a furnace, and his voice was like the sound of rushing waters. (16) In his right hand he held seven stars, and out of his mouth came a sharp double-edged sword. His face was like the sun shining in all its brilliance. (Rev 1:12-16)

Phrase by phrase it is almost literally true that the above descriptions are the same, as the following comparison indicates:

Text Exhibit

Dan 10	Rev 1
(5) a man dressed in linen, with a belt of the finest gold around his waist.	(13) someone "like a son of man," dressed in a robe that reached down to his feet and with a golden sash around his chest.
(6) His body was like chrysolite, (14) His head and hair were white like wool, as white as snow,
his face like lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and his voice like the sound of a multitude. ...	and his eyes were like blazing fire. (15) His feet were like bronze glowing in a furnace, and his voice was like the sound of rushing waters. (16) In his right hand, he held seven stars, and out of his mouth came a sharp double-edged sword. His face was like the sun shining in all its brilliance.

There can be no question on two crucially important points: (1) John describes Christ, and (2) John's description in Rev 1 is equivalent in much of its wording to that found in Dan 10. The most natural interpretation of these closely similar descriptions is that both men saw the same things. Daniel portrays the preexistent Christ, John the glorified Christ.

As C. Mervyn Maxwell reminds us, there are at least two other occasions when Christ is seen in His glory--one during His earthly life and one after His resurrection.¹⁸ The first of these is the transfiguration.

His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light. (Matt 17:2)

The second is Paul's vision on the way to Damascus, which is strikingly similar to that recorded by Daniel.

When Paul, nearing Damascus, experienced *his* vision of Christ, he and his companions fell to the ground, but he alone discerned the full impact of the vision (see Acts 9:1-19; 22:4-16; 26:9-18). In Daniel's case "great trembling" took hold of the attendants who accompanied him; and like Paul, "Daniel, alone saw the vision." Daniel 10:7.¹⁹

There is, however, no basis for claiming any literary dependency for Rev 1:13-16 in relation to Matt 17:2 or to Acts 9:3; 22:6; 26:13. It is just that similar events are described. The

connection between Rev 1:13-16 and Dan 10:5-6 is much closer. Between Dan 10 and Rev 1 there is a direct literary link that involves shared words and phrases.

Excursus on Michael

Michael in the War Scroll

It was stated earlier that on biblical evidence it is safe to equate Michael with both the "Prince of the host" and the "man dressed in linen." Bampfylde's argument, however, does not rest entirely on biblical evidence. A major part of her argument is that Michael cannot be the same as the "man clothed in linen" because in intertestamental documents He does not have sufficient stature to give commands to an angel like Gabriel. Here I comment only on the passage from the War Scroll that Bampfylde herself introduces. She states that,

Michael has no special importance in the scrolls except as the patron of Israel (cf. 1Q M 9). Translators of a crucial passage in the War Scroll give different interpretations to it. This is 17,6-7. It can be translated without difficulty if the "mighty angel" is understood *to assist Michael* as well as Israel. When this angel is identified with Michael it forces a strain on the translation that the underlying grammar does not support.

The lines referred to from the War Scroll are now quoted in Bampfylde's proposed translation.

And he (God) will send eternal help
to his redeemed lot
by the valour of the Angel of Might
to the dominion of Michael
in eternal light;
to light up with joy the House of Israel;
Peace and blessing for the lot of God!--
to exalt among the gods
the dominion of Michael
and the rule of Israel among all flesh.

Notice that the above passage has an even number of lines. Bampfylde does not say so, but in fact we are dealing here with poetic couplets. Easily identifiable parallels include (a) help and (b) redemption in the first pair of lines, (a) light and (b) light in the third pair, (a) blessing and (b) exaltation in the fourth pair, and (a) dominion and (b) rule in the fifth pair. In each case the same entity is described twice. Thus, help is the same as redemption, light is the same as light, blessing is the same as exaltation, and dominion is the same as rule.

The second pair of lines is the one under discussion. Here we have (a) the Angel of Might and (b) Michael. I suggest that the author of the passage understood both members of this couplet (Angel of Might, Michael) to be one and the same, just as he did in all the others. This is not to say that the author of the War Scroll had a correct understanding of Michael's identity, but merely that Bampfylde has misinterpreted the relative status of Michael in this

particular passage. If the author had a limited concept of Michael's importance, it is not evident from the lines quoted above.

Michael in the New Testament

In the New Testament Michael is mentioned only two times by name (Jude 9; Rev 12:7). In the one case He is called "the archangel Michael," while in the other "Michael and his angels" expel "the dragon and his angels." Thus, the "archangel" is the dragon's opposite counterpart. This is another part of Michael's status that must not be ignored.

1 Thes 4:16-17. It is true that the name "Michael" occurs only two times in the New Testament, but it would be a mistake to assume that Jude 9 and Rev 12:7 are the only passages that supply us with relevant information.²⁰ For example consider 1 Thes 4:16, where Michael is not named but the term "archangel" is used. The setting for what Paul says about the archangel in 1 Thes 4:16 is the second coming of Christ.

(16) For the Lord himself will come down from heaven, with a loud command, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet call of God, and the dead in Christ will rise first. (17) After that, we who are still alive and are left will be caught up with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And so we will be with the Lord forever. (1 Thes 4:16-17)

The above passage makes a valuable contribution to our fund of knowledge about Michael for two reasons--in part because of what the passage itself says and in part because it has two very close and obvious parallels. One is in the New Testament, the other in the Old. Both are cited below.

Rev 19:11-21. Whereas in 1 Thes 4:16-17 only the term "archangel" appears, in Rev 19:11-21 neither "archangel" nor "Michael" is used. It is clear, however, that here also the archangel is leading the angels at His command into battle. The following passage offers the New Testament's closest parallel to 1 Thes 4.

(11) I saw heaven standing open and there before me was a white horse, whose rider is called Faithful and True. With justice he judges and makes war. (12) His eyes are like blazing fire, and on his head are many crowns. He has a name written on him that no one but he himself knows. (13) He is dressed in a robe dipped in blood, and his name is the Word of God. (14) The armies of heaven were following him, riding on white horses and dressed in fine linen, white and clean. (15) Out of his mouth comes a sharp sword with which to strike down the nations. "He will rule them with an iron scepter." He treads the winepress of the fury of the wrath of God Almighty. (16) On his robe and on his thigh he has this name written: KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS. (Rev 19:11-16)

Michael in the Old Testament

Dan 12:1-3. The other parallel with 1 Thes 4--the one from the Old Testament--is Dan 12:1-3 and here the name "Michael" does appear.

(1) "At that time Michael, the great prince who protects your people, will arise. There will be a time of distress such as has not happened from the beginning of nations until then. But at that time your people--everyone whose name is found written in the book--will be delivered. (2) Multitudes who sleep in the dust of the

earth will awake: some to everlasting life, others to shame and everlasting contempt. (3) Those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever. (Dan 12:1-3)

According to Bampfylde, whoever it is that speaks from the Ulai in Dan 8:16 has the authority to command Gabriel. In the present context there is no one who would be better qualified to do this than Michael--the "archangel" or Prince of the host, both of which are terms that refer explicitly to commanding heaven's angel armies. Thus, Michael is the name of the "Prince of the host," the "Prince of princes," and the "man dressed in linen." Other biblical examples of such names are "Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace" (Isa 9:6).

On the night He was betrayed Christ commented on this very issue of His command of the angels. "Do you think I cannot call on my Father, and he will at once put at my disposal more than twelve legions of angels" (Matt 26:53)? Nor is His authority over the church on earth any different from His authority over the angels in heaven. His is a universal dominion.

(9) Therefore God exalted him to the highest place and gave him the name that is above every name, (10) that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, (11) and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. (Phil 2:9-11)

Discussion. The context provided by Daniel's pseudepigraphical imitators in regard to the identity of Michael is positively misleading. It is legitimate and desirable to study the various intertestamental documents to learn what their writers and readers thought about a given topic, but having done so it does not follow that they were right. In this case they were very wide of the mark and could not help but be. The relationship of the divine Logos both to God and to man is not intuitively obvious. It is not something that can be discovered by borrowing words from an inspired writer and using them frequently. On the contrary, it is something that cannot be known at all until it is revealed by the Holy Spirit.

In terms of the literary analysis of Dan 10 proposed above, Michael is the One Daniel deals with in scene 1 (vss. 4-9) and Gabriel is the one he deals with in scenes 2-4 (vss. 10-19). For this reason table 1 must be revised so as to eliminate Dan 10:16 and 18. These last two verses do not refer to the "man dressed in linen" but to His companion Gabriel. See table 2.

Table 1
Parallels to The "Man Dressed in Linen"

Description	References
Status of a "Prince"	
"Prince of the host"	8:11
"Prince of princes"	8:25
Dressed in linen	
A man dressed in linen	10:5
The man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river	12:6, 7
Association with water	
A man's voice from the Ulai calling	8:16
The man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river	12:6, 7

Discussion

There are a number of other passages that should be brought into the discussion besides those already mentioned. As Bampfylde points out, the "one like a son of man" must be compared with the fourth Person in the blazing furnace who looked "like a son of the gods."²¹ But there is also a connection between the "one like a son of man" and the "one desired by women" (11:37) and between the "one desired by women" and the "prince of the covenant" (11:22). Finally, the "prince of the covenant," who is "destroyed," must be compared point by point with the "Anointed One, the ruler" (9:25), who is "cut off" (9:26), to "confirm a covenant" (9:27). The "prince of the covenant" in chap. 11 is identically the same as the "Anointed One" or Messiah in chap. 9. When the scope of the argument is extended in this way, the prince passages which use the word *śar* (8:11, 25; 10:21; 12:1) are seen to be closely related to those prince passages which use the word *nāgîd* (9:25; 11:22).²² I submit that these two words (*śar*, *nāgîd*) refer to one Prince.

When the *śar* passages and the *nāgîd* passages are brought together as I suggest the messianic significance of both can be better appreciated. Dan 9:25-27 belongs to the *nāgîd* group and provides surely the clearest, most detailed, and most widely acknowledged prophecy of the first advent of Christ to be found anywhere in Scripture.²³ By contrast, the associations of Dan 10:4-6 are with the *śar* group. As such Dan 10:5-6 has messianic implications. It is a crucial weakness in Bampfylde's argument that these implications are ignored. There is an emphasis on the contribution of intertestamental literature but a failure to grasp adequately the one essential element that binds the two Testaments together, i.e., the Messiah.

Conclusion

There is more to draw from the present discussion than that Bampfylde has misidentified the "man dressed in linen" in Dan 10. The writings of both Daniel and John are apocalyptic in nature and there are a number of general similarities between them. But apart from such purely thematic associations as the shared motif of successive world empires,²⁴ and shared lexical expressions such as "(some)one like a son of man" (Dan 7:13; Rev 1:13), there is an actual chiasmic link between the two books of Daniel and Revelation which has its basis in literary structure. The book of Revelation begins, as the book of Daniel ends, with a detailed description of Christ.

Note: All Scripture quotations in this paper, except when noted otherwise, are from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright (c) 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society.

¹ *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 14 (1983): 129-34.

² Hardy, "Michael," *Historicism* No. 6/Apr 86, pp. 39-48.

³ Moulton and Milligan caution that *archaggelos*, which is a Greek word, 'was coined in Judaism to express a Jewish idea.' . . . There is no Hebrew term 'archangel.' The closest equivalent would be *śar-š'bā-YHWH* 'commander of the army of the Lord,' as in Josh 5:14-15, or its equivalent *śar-haššābā* 'Prince of the host' in Dan 8:11. In a military context *śar-haššābā* means the commanding general responsible for sending others on missions or assignments.

He in turn, however, would be sent out by the king. On this analogy the 'archangel' could indeed be considered an 'angel' in the sense of Hebrew *mal'āk*, but not in the sense of Greek *aggelos*. It is a Hebrew concept clothed in Greek syllables" (ibid., pp. 39-40).

⁴See Hardy, "What Does the Hebrew Word *mal'āk* Mean?" *Historicism* No. 5/Jan 86, pp. 2-25.

⁵The terms "Michael" and "archangel" became very popular for pseudepigraphical writers, but this is not where either the terms themselves or the ideas they represent first appear. "Michael is not a pseudepigraphical figure borrowed by biblical writers, but a biblical figure borrowed by pseudepigraphical writers" (ibid., p. 46). The genius of pseudepigraphical writing is for themes, as well as authors' names, to be borrowed precisely because they are already well known. Matthew Black in a recent article ("The Strange Visions of Enoch," *Bible Review*, Summer 1987, pp. 20-23, 38-42) takes the opposite position. He claims that the similarities between 1 Enoch and such canonical books as Genesis, Daniel, Jude, and Revelation, with 2 Peter depending in turn on Jude, is best explained by assuming that 1 Enoch preceded the other books and that the inspired writers borrowed from it rather than the reverse. This is not an isolated claim. "You can't understand Christian origins unless you understand the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. So says Professor James H. Charlesworth of Princeton Theological Seminary, and he is clearly riding the crest of modern scholarship" (Hershel Shanks, "Don't Let Pseudepigrapha Scare You," *Bible Review*, Summer 1987, p. 14). But whatever the direction of influence, it does not follow that influence implies agreement. I submit that the "archangel" of canonical Scripture is not necessarily and in every sense the same as the "archangel" of pseudepigraphical scripture. It is not possible to reason directly from the one to the other.

⁶Hardy, "Some Relationships among Dan 8, 9, and 10-12," *Historicism* No. 7/Jul 86, pp. 52-67.

⁷See n. 1, above.

⁸Ibid., p. 130.

⁹See n. 3, above.

¹⁰"Prince of the host," pp. 129-30.

¹¹Ibid., p. 130.

¹²Ibid., p. 129.

¹³Ibid., p. 130.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵See Hardy, "Michael," pp. 39-48.

¹⁶"Prince of the host," p. 130.

¹⁷The Hebrew varies. Dan 8:15 says *k'mar'eh-g'āber* (lit., "like the appearance of a man [*g'eber*]"), Dan 10:16 says *kid'mūt b'nê-ādām* (lit., "like the form of the sons of man [*ādām*]"), and Dan 10:18 says *k'mar'eh ādām* (lit., "like the appearance of a man [*ādām*].") The main difference is that two words for "man" are used. In Dan 8:15 the word is *g'eber*, which refers specifically to a "young, vigorous man"; in Dan 10:16 and 18 it is the more general term *ādām* "mankind, people." The meanings of all three expressions, however, are equivalent to each other.

¹⁸*God Cares*, 2 vols. (Mountain View, CA/Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981/85), vol. 1: *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, p. 259.

¹⁹Ibid. 2:259.

²⁰Hardy, "Michael," 39-48. ²¹"Prince of the Host," p. 129.

²²See Hardy, "Two Words for 'Prince' in Dan 10-12," *Historicism* No. 6/Apr 86, pp. 2-11.

²³In an earlier paper (Hardy, "The Day-Year Principle in Dan 9:24-27," *Historicism* No. 3/Jul 85, pp. 48-50) I pointed out that during the first few Christian centuries Dan 9:25-27 was, without any exceptions that I know of, universally accepted by the church's writers and theologians as a messianic prophecy. Not only is this true, but Jewish scholars also recognized the nature of its claims. The fact that some 500 years after the fact Dan 9:24-27 was still being

applied--by Jews--as reaching its fulfillment in the first century A.D. is clear from the following curse: "Blasted be the bones of those who calculate the end. For they would say, since the predetermined time has arrived, and yet he has not come, he will never come. But [even so] wait for him, as it is written, Though he tarry, wait for him" (*The Babylonian Talmud*, I. Epstein, ed. [London: Soncino Press, 1935], Sanhedrin 97b [659]). The only prophecy in all Scripture that specifies the time when the Messiah was to appear is Dan 9:24-27, so this is the passage referred to. The fact that Rabbi Samuel ben Nahmani, in the name of Rabbi Jonathan, felt the need to utter such a curse is in itself clear evidence that a substantial number of Jewish readers had correctly understood the messianic nature of Daniel's prophecy and the timeframe for its expected historic fulfillment. They felt the Messiah had disappointed them by not coming, but they looked for His appearance on the basis of Dan 9:24-27. Thus, the church was not alone in its understanding of the facts surrounding this prophecy, even though it was alone in accepting their fulfillment.

Besides the two ancient points of view on Dan 9 represented above there was a third that should be mentioned. The old Roman gods still had their supporters. Porphyry was a pagan philosopher who, probably capitalizing on positions already current among Jews or a minority of Christians in Syria when he wrote, directed himself specifically against the messianic aspects of Daniel's prophecies (P. .M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 [1976]:15-33). We should be very clear that his views on Dan 11, where he is most often cited, did not have to do with Dan 11 as such but with Dan 9. The antichristian implications of Porphyry's work are acknowledged but brushed aside by James A. Montgomery (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary [Edinburgh: T. &T. Clark, 1927], p. 469), who praises Porphyry's influence on later generations of scholars and holds it responsible for the modern liberal position with its "sane exegesis" of Dan 11. And so today Jews, liberal Christians, and secular scholars are in general agreement with Porphyry as over against the believing fathers of an earlier age.

²⁴See Hardy, "The Four-Part World Empire Motif in Daniel and the Corresponding Seven-Part Motif in Revelation," *Historicism* No. 9/Jan 87, pp. 15-41.