

identified—whether an individual or group, whether symbol or the subject of a direct vision, whether human or supernatural. If an angel, he must have come from the lower ranks, hierarchy being indicated in the later reference to Michael as ‘one of the chief rulers’ (εἷς τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν πρώτων, 10:13).

The central question for the purpose of this study remains not ‘Who is this?’ but ‘What kind of human features did the figure have?’ Only when the narrative, dramatic character of the scene is appreciated will this distinction be noticed and its significance exploited. Otherwise, one tends to view the vision as a frozen image, focusing on the resultant majesty rather than on the movement from *inglorious* to glorified, from politically *powerless* to royally *powerful*. Once again, meaning and identity need to be kept distinct. The progress in stages must be attended to.²² The same pattern occurs in chs. 4, 8, and 10).

6. CONCLUSIONS

When Daniel 7:13 in the OG is read not only in its immediate context but also within the contexts of chs. 4, 8, and 10 where related terminology, literary patterns, and theological points of view occur, then it becomes possible to conclude that υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου was used by the translator to convey (along with ἐξουθενημένος ἄνθρωπος, and ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός) the sense of frailty and vulnerability.

These terms are intertwined in a fabric of thinking which, though present at times in the MT and T, is more highly developed and consistently maintained by the OG. In the tapestry of his sovereign will, God empowers unlikely candidates with political might and prophetic insight. He has done so in the past, (by implication) continues to work this way in his people’s (the readers’) present, and promises to accomplish his purposes through them in the future.

(Cambridge: University Press, 1977): 11-12, 17-18, and Bowker, ‘The Son of Man’: 24, 44. But this does not do enough justice to the scene. The defendant is ‘awarded damages’, as it were. He is not merely the subject of judicial recognition; there is also the matter of judicial empowerment or authorization. It is as much a theopolitical phenomenon as it is a theojudicial one.

²² Burkett, *Son of Man Debate*:19 fails to give enough weight to the narrative character of Dan. 7. Wilfrid Stott and John Bowker give more. But neither sees this dynamic occurring also in chs. 4, 8, and 10 and being underscored by OG. See respectively “‘Son of Man’—a Title of Abasement”, *ExpT* 83 (1972): 278-81 and ‘The Son of Man’: 19-48.